

# Red Cedar River Water Quality Partnership Meeting Minutes

2/18/14 Dunn Co Ag Service Center, Menomonie, WI

**Present at the meeting:** Ron Verdon-TMLIA; Dan Prestebak, Amanda Hanson- Dunn Co. Land Conservation; Katie Wantoch-UW-Extension Dunn Co; Tyler Gruetzmacher-Barron County Conservationist; Paul LaLiberte, Buzz Sorge-WDNR; Julia Olmstead-UW-Extension Farmer Led Council project leader; Dan Zerr-UW-Extension Natural Resource Educator

**Introductions and Updates:** The meeting opened with introductions, and everyone sharing any new information/developments pertinent to the Red Cedar River Watershed (RCRW) efforts.

- Katie: Introduced herself, as this was her first meeting, and stated that she will be attending the Dunn Co meetings, and Tim Jergenson would attend the Barron Co meetings.
- Dan P: The Town of Grant group wants to expand their Ag Enterprise Area to include some more geography adjacent to the current AEA.
- Buzz: Recently attended the Wisconsin River conference and shared many items from that event, including some of the advances made in water quality modeling and GIS tools by DNR staff, some of which may be relevant for RCRW needs.
- Julia: The Hay River Farmer Led Council is meeting regularly and moving forward. One member of this group will be with Julia for a presentation at the Red Cedar Conference on 3/13.
- Ron: Attended the Dunn Co meeting to review the county land and water plan (a meeting that Dan P then also mentioned and discussed), and mentioned that NRCS did a great presentation on soil health at that meeting. Also updated the group on the bank erosion project that TMLIA is sponsoring.
- Paul: Also commented on the Wisconsin River conference, and how that process was moving along, and the differences and similarities with the RCRW effort. Posed the following question as a theme for how we approach P issues in the RCRW; "How do we use the TMDL implementation process to make phosphorus reduction efforts more successful?" Also mentioned that Marinette Co is looking to get TMDL money from the state for monitoring, by doing a nine-point plan **without** a TMDL in place. If approved, it could siphon money from TMDL project availability.
- Tyler: Shared some results from SEH Consulting showing an incredibly high concentration of P in the sediments of the Chetek Lake chain, and discussed with the group the idea that lake sediments may be a valuable commodity used for fertilizer in the not too distant future. Also discussed current bills being proposed in the legislature that may change rules for how trading and adaptive management work between point sources and non-point sources of water pollution.

**Review of Last Meeting and Action Items:** Minutes from the last meeting were discussed, along with some action items from the previous meeting. Among those were an update on available funding

from Paul. He agreed to provide a list (attached with these minutes) of grants available from DNR. Large TRM (Targeted Runoff Management) grants will offer 10% of their total for staffing. Also, some staff at DNR are proposing a budget item that establishes a fund for farmer-led council projects, but not sure if this will move forward. Paul also mentioned the point sources in both Dunn and Barron Counties that may have an interest in any sort of pollutant trading or adaptive management. There were a handful in Dunn Co, and several more in Barron Co.

The group also discussed what to call the effort at this point, with the possibility of changing the name in the future as planning processes proceed. The group agreed to go by the name ***Red Cedar River Water Quality Partnership***.

**Lessons Learned from St. Croix TMDL Comments from EPA:** Buzz shared some thoughts on the comments returned by EPA to the St. Croix River TMDL Implementation Team. The plan was generally approved but EPA had a few comments about discrepancies between counties in the St. Croix Basin regarding the time frame for implementation. Buzz believes a good lesson from the St. Croix effort is to have the right people at the table as planning moves forward.

**Stakeholder Analysis:** Dan Z led a discussion and analysis of potential stakeholders in the RCRW. The group was asked to write down possible stakeholders on individual post-it notes. These were then arranged by Dan Z with the group's guidance, on a flip chart graph with a grid showing influence and impact on the x-axis, and importance and interest on the y-axis. The graph was divided into four grids, with high interest/high impact in the upper right, high interest/low impact in the upper left, high impact/low interest in the bottom right, and low impact/low interest in the bottom left. Results are listed below (from the upper right to lower left in each of the four quadrants). The list will be used in the next meeting to discuss if more stakeholders should be at the table, and if so, who.

#### High Impact/High Interest

WDNR

Dunn Co Land Conservation, Planning and Zoning

Barron Co Land Conservation

UW-Extension

TMLIA

Dick Lamers

Rod Olson

Farmers

NRCS

Dunn Co Alliance

Town of Grant Ag Enterprise Leadership

Local Media

Non-Farm Rural Landowners

Dunn Co Board

Low Impact/High Interest

Recreational Groups (snowmobiles, ATV, hunting, fishing, etc.)

Health Services

Farmers Union

Educational Entities

Turkey Store

Dairy CAFOs

High Impact/Low Interest

Custom Manure Haulers/Custom Field Work

Crop Consultants/Feed Mills/Fertilizer Vendors

Implement Dealers

Excavators/Contractors

Cash Grain Farmers

Farm Bureau

Ethanol Industry

FFA Alumni

4H Groups

Barron Co Board

Absentee Landowners

Farm Finance Institutions

Mid-Level Dairy Farms (between 250-999 animal units)

Low Impact/Low Interest

The Public

Point Sources

Rice Lake District

City of Menomonie City Council

Chetek Lakes Association

City Councils of Cities with No Lakes

**Next Meeting:** The Partnership's next meeting will be at 9 AM on March 25<sup>th</sup> in Barron Co.