



# One Watershed One Plan

## Work Plan

**Grant Title:** 2014 – One Watershed, One Plan Pilot – Red Lake River Watershed

**Grant ID:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Fiscal Agent Organization:** Pennington SWCD

**Grant Agreement Day-to-day contact** (if different from fiscal agent day-to-day contact): Peter Nelson

## 1. Selection of Plan Consultant(s)

### Task No. 1.1: Scope of Work for Plan Consultant(s)

The vision of *One Watershed, One Plan* is to align local water planning on major watershed boundaries towards *prioritized, targeted* and *measurable* implementation plans. Comprehensive, process-based models and tools are capable of *prioritizing* sub-watersheds for restoration and/or protection activities by identifying critical source areas of potential risk and/or highest contribution. This step has been completed through development of the WRAPS and the Water Quality Decision Support System, however, the expertise of a consulting company may be needed to utilize the information from these models and tools.

The Red Lake River Watershed Planning Group will also seek to contract services for a professional facilitator and/or a plan writer to assist in developing a watershed-based plan that meets the vision of the *One Watershed, One Plan*.

**Lead:** Myron Jesme

**Support:** Nicole Bernd

**Suggested Start Date:** After work plan approved

**Completion Date:** December 31, 2014

**Subtasks:**

- ✓ Develop Scope of Work for plan writer and facilitator
- ✓ Scope of Work sent to consultant(s)
- ✓ Meet with potential consultant(s)

**Outcomes:**

- ✓ Consultant(s) hired to utilize the comprehensive, process-based model and/or tool, and facilitate and write plan

## 2. Establishment of By-Laws, Notifications, Committees, and Initial Planning Meeting

### Task No. 2.1: Establishment of By-Laws which will include: establishment of committees, teams and workgroups

By-Laws, committees, teams, and workgroups need to be established for successful development and implementation of the plan.

A **Policy Committee** will be composed of local decision-makers, as identified in the Memorandum of Agreement, with the purpose of making final decisions about content of plan and submittal. The committee may or may not continue after plan adoption, depending on formal agreement.

An **Advisory Committee(s)** will be composed of local representatives/stakeholders as outlined in the bylaws and the Interagency Core Team, and will make recommendations on plan and plan implementation to the Policy Committee, including identification of priorities. Advisory committees are required to meet public and stakeholder participation goals and requirements identified in statute for existing local water plans.

Lastly, a **Planning Workgroup** will be composed of Local Water Plan Coordinators from each County, Watershed District Administrators, BWSR Board Conservationist, and Consultant(s) for purposes of logistical non-policy decision-making in the process.

**Lead:** Peter Nelson

**Support:** Tanya Hanson

**Suggested Start Date:** September 1, 2014

**Completion Date:** December 31, 2014

- Subtasks:**
- ✓ By-Laws established
  - ✓ Policy Committee established
  - ✓ Advisory Committee established
  - ✓ Planning Workgroup established
  - ✓ Roles and responsibilities explained in the By-laws for each committee, team, or workgroup
  - ✓ Membership, roles, responsibilities, and expectations for participation in committee, team, or workgroup explicitly described

- Outcomes:**
- ✓ Broad range of stakeholder participation to ensure an integrated approach to watershed management
  - ✓ Met goals and requirements identified in statute for public and stakeholder participation for existing local water plans

#### **Task No. 2.2: Notify plan review authorities and other stakeholders**

Prior to the development of the plan, notification of plan initiation must be sent to the plan review authorities. The notification may also be sent to other stakeholders, or alternative methods for receiving input may be used for these interested parties.

**Lead:** Nicole Bernd

**Support:** Myron Jesme

**Suggested Start Date:** October 1, 2014

**Completion Date:** December 31, 2014

- Subtasks:**
- ✓ List of review authorities / stakeholders compiled (i.e.: Cities, Townships, Drainage authorities, federal and state agencies, tribal governments, lake or river associations, citizen-based environmental group(s), sporting organization(s), farm organization(s) and agricultural groups, other interested and technical persons such as current and former county water plan taskforce members)
  - ✓ Formal notification drafted
  - ✓ Formal notification sent
  - ✓ Notification includes invitation to submit priority issues and plan expectations
  - ✓ Notification allows 60 days for response
  - ✓ Method to obtain public input: such as web survey, workshops with specific interest groups, citizen surveys, etc.

- Outcomes:**
- ✓ Notification sent
  - ✓ Input received from stakeholders
  - ✓ Input received from public

**Task No. 2.3: Aggregate watershed information and review for commonalities, conflicts, and gaps**

Aggregate watershed information in order to best make use of existing local water plans, input received from review agencies, TMDL studies, WRAPS, and other local and agency plans. The assessment and aggregation of plan information is not intended to be exhaustive, but rather a compilation for the purposes of understanding current priorities and goals for the watershed. LGU staff and Interagency Core Team will provide information to consultant(s) who will compile information, identify gaps and conflicts, and develop a plan outline.

- Lead:** Myron Jesme  
**Support:** Peter Nelson  
**Suggested Start Date:** July 1, 2014  
**Completion Date:** December 31, 2014
- Subtasks:**
- ✓ Aggregated data, issues, goals, strategies, actions, etc.
  - ✓ Identification of gaps and conflicts in existing data
  - ✓ Outline of what the plan will look like completed for use of public input
- Outcomes:**
- ✓ Better watershed orientation, understanding, discussion, and prioritization

**Task No. 2.4: Hold “public information meeting(s)” or “kickoff meeting(s)”**

An initial planning meeting(s) will be held after response is received from agencies and stakeholders and an initial assessment/aggregation of plan information has been completed.

- a. In consideration of the size of the watersheds, the Policy Committee may want to consider more than one initial planning meeting(s). Thoroughly document this participation.
- b. The planning and facilitation of the meeting(s) will be contracted out to consultants.

- Lead:** Nicole Bernd  
**Support:** Peter Nelson  
**Suggested Start Date:** November 1, 2014  
**Completion Date:** January 31, 2015
- Subtasks:**
- ✓ Publish legal notice for meeting to uphold requirements of MN Statutes §103B.313, Subd. 3
  - ✓ Materials and handouts for the meeting(s)
  - ✓ Attend and conduct the meeting(s)
  - ✓ Meeting minutes taken and posted to web page
- Outcomes:**
- ✓ Meeting minutes and attendance used to document public involvement process

### 3. Draft Plan

#### Task No. 3.1: Draft Plan - Continue to aggregate watershed information

Continue to aggregate watershed information as in Task 2.3 above. If gaps and conflicts in inventory information are identified through the plan development process, consider implementation action(s) to fill the gap and resolve conflict rather than delaying the planning process to generate new data.

**Lead:** Myron Jesme

**Support:** Peter Nelson

**Suggested Start Date:** January 1, 2015

**Completion Date:** February 28, 2015

- Subtasks:**
- ✓ Input received at the initial planning meeting, existing local water plans, input received from agencies, TMDL studies, Water Quality Decision Support System, WRAPS, and other local and agency plans utilized in draft plan
  - ✓ Information reviewed for commonalities, conflicts, and gaps
  - ✓ Aggregated data, issues, goals, strategies, actions, etc.
  - ✓ Data and inventory information incorporated in plan by reference, with a general description and information on where to find the data and inventory information

- Outcomes:**
- ✓ Better watershed orientation, understanding, discussion, and prioritization
  - ✓ Gaps filled by implementation actions
  - ✓ Project remains on track

#### Task No. 3.2.1: Draft Plan - Analyze and Prioritize Issues

Prioritization is recognition that not all identified issues can be addressed in the timeframe of a ten-year plan - some items will be addressed before others. This plan will demonstrate a thorough analysis of issues, using available science and data. Consultants will be responsible for facilitating committee meetings and using the scientific data and stakeholder input to develop this section of the plan.

**Lead:** Tanya Hanson

**Support:** Nicole Bernd

**Suggested Start Date:** January 1, 2015

**Completion Date:** April 30, 2015

- Subtasks:**
- ✓ Priority issues reviewed, aggregated, and summarized from existing local plans, studies, and information, feedback received from initial notifications to the plan review authorities and stakeholders, and the initial planning meeting; filtered through local knowledge
  - ✓ A summary of the issues and resource concerns identified and drafted into plan
  - ✓ Steps created, used, and documented in plan to consider and prioritize the identified issues

- ✓ Reach understanding of, and agreement on, the watershed issues and priorities that will be addressed within the lifespan of the plan.

**Outcomes:** ✓ List of agreed upon priority issues for the watershed for the ten year timeframe of the plan, drafted into plan.

**Task No. 3.2.2: Draft Plan - Establish Measurable Goals**

Measurable goals are developed to address the priority issues, and can be evaluated over the ten-year life of the plan. Some goals will be watershed-wide; however, the majority should be focused on a specific subwatershed or natural resource. Goals for prevention of future water management problems should also be considered. Consultants will facilitate the committee meetings to gain input and use the scientific data to document initial goals, with the understanding that some may be adjusted through discussion of the implementation plan.

**Lead:** Peter Nelson

**Support:** Myron Jesme

**Suggested Start Date:** February 1, 2015

**Completion Date:** June 30, 2015

- Subtasks:** ✓ Develop measurable goals to address priority issues and indicate an intended pace of progress

**Outcomes:** ✓ Goals drafted in the plan that clearly describe where the planning partners want to be or what they want to achieve within the 10-year timeframe of the plan

**Task No. 3.2.3: Draft Plan - Develop a targeted and measurable implementation plan and schedule**

Targeting takes a closer look at the priority issues and goals and identifies cost-effective, targeted, and measurable actions necessary to achieve the goals. Actions are included in the plan in consideration of available technical skills and capabilities, knowledge of landowner willingness, funding resources available, and implementation items or projects from existing local water plans and information, and the Strategies and Actions table from the WRAPS. These actions are entered into a schedule or table and supported by descriptions of overarching programs. Consultant(s) will use tools to target actions to achieve measurable results, which will include the test of the PTMApp, currently in development.

A progress tracking tool may also be created to summarize watershed-wide or specific subwatershed / natural resource strategies. A progress tracking tool is a management tool for planning partners to track activities and progress towards the goals defined in the implementation plan and schedule. They are updated annually, and are therefore flexible to accommodate and track changes in budgets and schedules.

**Lead:** Nicole Bernd

**Support:** Tanya Hanson

**Suggested Start Date:** March 1, 2015

**Completion Date:** August 30, 2015

- Subtasks:**
- ✓ Implementation plan and schedule created that coordinates local water management responsibilities, activities, and necessary technical services across jurisdictional lines while maintaining core local government services on jurisdictional boundary
  - ✓ Implementation plan and schedule covers a period of 10 years
  - ✓ Progress tracking tool created to track activities and progress towards goals
  - ✓ Use the PTMApp to identify targeted and measurable actions
  - ✓ Identify areas where shared services or project partnering could be used
- Outcomes:**
- ✓ Implementation plan drafted that describes the coordination and programs necessary for achieving the actions in the schedule
  - ✓ Implementation schedule drafted into plan with targeted and measurable actions, including a description of each action, location, responsibility, cost, schedule, potential funding sources of the action, and how the action will be measured

**Task No. 3.2.4: Draft Plan – Final review draft**

The consultant will compile drafted sections in to completed draft.

- Lead:** Myron Jesme  
**Support:** Peter Nelson  
**Suggested Start Date:** June 30, 2015  
**Completion Date:** August 30, 2015
- Subtasks:**
- ✓ Compile drafted sections of the plan
  - ✓ Complete internal review among partners
- Outcomes:**
- ✓ Final plan draft prepared for informal and formal review.

**Task No. 3.3: Draft Plan - Reassess the Formal Agreement and modify as necessary**

Modifications and/or a new agreement may be necessary for the implementation plan and needs of the participating local governments. The Minnesota Counties Intergovernmental Trust (MCIT) and/or legal counsel of the participating organizations may be consulted to assist in this determination. LGU staff will be responsible for correspondence with MCIT and individual legal counsels.

- Lead:** Myron Jesme  
**Support:** Peter Nelson  
**Suggested Start Date:** March 1, 2015  
**Completion Date:** October 31, 2015
- Subtasks:**
- ✓ Formal Agreement used for the planning process is reassessed
  - ✓ If necessary, modification(s) or new agreement(s) will be drafted and approved by Policy Committee. Individual board approval will be requested.

- Outcomes:** ✓ Formal Agreement modified as necessary to implement the actions identified in the plan, such as shared services or collaborative grant-making

#### 4. Formal Review and Public Hearing

##### Task No. 4.1: Formal review

The participating local governments may need to approve the draft prior to submittal. Plan review authorities have 60-days to provide comment on the plan, submitted to both the Policy Committee and BWSR. Policy Committee makes plan available to stakeholders for comment.

**Lead:** Myron Jesme

**Support:** Tanya Hanson

**Suggested Start Date:** September 1, 2015

**Completion Date:** December 31, 2015

- Subtasks:**
- ✓ Policy Committee: submit plan to plan review authorities for formal review
  - ✓ Submit draft electronically (*or*) submit paper copies if requested
  - ✓ Make a copy of draft online for stakeholder comment
  - ✓ Clear process defined for stakeholder comment
  - ✓ A summary of comments received in the review period must be provided to BWSR, and the state review agencies, and anyone who provided comments and must be made available to all others on a website or upon request
  - ✓ Comments received to Planning Committee and BWSR within 60 days

- Outcomes:**
- ✓ Draft plan reviewed by review authorities and/or local governments
  - ✓ Input received

##### Task No. 4.2: Public hearing

The Policy Committee will schedule and hold a public hearing(s) on the draft plan no sooner than 14 days after the 60-day review period of the draft plan. The committee may want to consider more than one hearing because of the size of the Red Lake River Watershed.

**Lead:** Myron Jesme

**Support:** Peter Nelson

**Suggested Start Date:** December 1, 2015

**Completion Date:** March 31, 2016

- Subtasks:**
- ✓ Policy Committee: Schedule meeting
  - ✓ Consultant(s) and Policy Committee: Meeting agenda prior to each meeting
  - ✓ Consultant(s): Materials and handouts for each meeting
  - ✓ Consultant(s) and Policy Committee: Attend, conduct, and present



testimony at meeting

✓ Meeting minutes posted to web page

**Outcomes:** ✓ Meeting minutes used to document public involvement

✓ Public Hearing(s) conducted

## 5. Approval by BWSR

### Task No. 5.1: Approval by BWSR

Board actions:

- A. The board shall review the plan for conformance with the requirements of Minnesota Statutes §103B101, Subd. 14, this policy, and the plan content policy. Review process includes staff review and recommendation to a regional BWSR Committee where the plan will be presented to the committee by representatives of the participating local government(s). Committee makes a recommendation to the BWSR Board where final decision is made.
- B. The board may approve or disapprove a plan which it determines is not in conformance. The board shall complete its review and approval within 90 days or the next scheduled board meeting.
- C. Appeals and dispute of plan decision follow existing authorities and procedures of BWSR Board.

Pilot Actions:

The planning workgroup and/or the policy committee, or some representation from both will attend the BWSR committee meeting to present the comprehensive watershed management plan. The group may have the consultant(s) assist with the presentation.

**Lead:** Nicole Bernd

**Support:** Peter Nelson

**Suggested Start Date:** December 1, 2015

**Completion Date:** Within 90 days *or* the next scheduled board meeting

- ✓ Local governments approve the final draft prior to submittal (if in Formal Agreement)
- ✓ Policy Committee submits the final draft plan, a copy of all written comments received on the draft plan, a record of the public hearing(s), and a summary of responses to comments including comments not addressed and changes incorporated as a result of the review process to the plan review agencies for final review

**Outcomes:** ✓ BWSR Board approves or disapproves a plan which it determines is not in conformance.

## 6. Local Adoption

### Task No. 6.1: Local adoption

Local adoption by the local plan authority is required within 120 days of BWSR Board approval. If so granted through a joint powers agreement, the adoption may be by a watershed joint powers entity. If

no joint powers entity with authorities of the local plan authority was created, each local government unit shall adopt the plan individually and implement separately.

- Lead:** Peter Nelson
- Support:** Nicole Bernd
- Completion Date:** Within 120 days of BWSR approval
- Subtasks:** ✓ A copy of resolution(s) to adopt the plan sent to BWSR in order to be eligible for grants
- Outcomes:** ✓ Plan implementation

## 7. Grant Reporting

### Task No. 7.1: Annual Grant Reporting (during grant)

Annual grant reporting is required to track the progress towards goals in the pilot watersheds.

- Lead:** Peter Nelson
- Support:** Tanya Hanson
- Completion Date:** Annual: February 1st
- Subtasks:** ✓ Submit grant reporting
- Outcomes:** ✓ Documenting progress towards stated goals and work plan

### Task No. 7.2: Final Grant Reporting

Final grant reporting is required to evaluate the progress towards goals in the pilot watersheds, and share lessons learned of the pilot watershed program.

- Lead:** Peter Nelson
- Support:** Tanya Hanson
- Completion Date:** Post grant completion
- Subtasks:** ✓ Submit final grant report  
✓ Share lessons learned
- Outcomes:** ✓ Evaluate final progress towards goals