

**Benton County Water Resources Advisory Committee Minutes**  
**Tuesday July 26, 2011 – 1:30 PM**  
**Benton County Commissioners Room – Foley, MN 56329**

The Benton County Water Resources Advisory Committee meeting was called to order by Chairperson Duane Cekalla at 1:30 p.m. at the Benton County Commissioners Room on July 26, 2011.

**CHECK Voting members present:** Warren Peschl – Benton County Commissioner, Wade Bastian – Benton SWCD, Jim Moshier – City of Foley, Duane Cekalla – Little Rock Lake Association, Guy Spence – Citizen at Large, Craig Gondeck – Citizen at Large, Ken Nodo – Citizen at Large

**CHECK Voting members absent:** none

**CHECK Voting member excused:** John Bemboom – Elected Township Official, Brian Kaschmitter – Elk River Watershed

**CHECK Others Present:** Katie Winkelman – Benton SWCD, Gerry Maciej – Benton SWCD, Chelle Benson – Benton County DOD, Mark McNamara – Benton County DOD, Pat Gheling – NRCS, Dan Martens – U of M Extension, Mark Wettlaufer – MDH, Jason Weirnerman – BWSR, Kimberly Thielen Cremers – Stearns County SWCD, Joe Wollak – Benton County Commissioner, Marlin Hage – DNR Forestry, Lori Stevenson – USFWS MNPLD, Montgomery Headley – Benton County Administrator, Bernie Thole – Benton SWCD

(Three Priority Issues in Comprehensive Water Plan: 1) Groundwater quantity and quality, 2), 3) Feedlots and Nutrient Management.)

**1. Welcome and Introductions:**

**2. Review/Approve Minutes:** Motion by Ken Nodo, Second by Guy Spence to approve the May 24, 2011 minutes. Motion Carried. Page one Item 4 –C – Kimberly Thielen Cremers shared information about an open house for the St. Cloud Urban Area Mississippi River Corridor Plan.

**3. Agenda:** Motion by Craig Gondeck to approve agenda, Second by Warren Peschl. Motion Carried.

**4. EQIP**

Pat Gehling explained the purpose of the local workgroup as identifying priorities for use of EQIP funding.

Eligible practices have not changed since last year.

A spreadsheet was provided that lists all of the different things that have been done through EQIP in Benton County.

The third page shows what was done with EQIP last year.

There are three people who are thinking about manure facility work during the coming year. Larger projects result in large use of dollars.

A question was asked about sealing only 6 wells. There were 6 done through EQIP. There were additional wells done with district funds. For EQIP, that applicant has to be a farmer.

Funding for the next year may be less

High tunnel question – most all practices are conservation based but Seasonal High Tunnels are more directed to crop productivity, conversation responds was yes it is directed for a longer crop season thus potential for more crop productivity but this is an effort to reach out to another group of farmers.

The state is changing how dollars are allocated among a selected priority with local dollars. Applications for other things will be compete in the state pool. Ag waste systems will come out of a statewide competitive pool.

Group was asked to select a category of funding that we would like to focus on:

Pool Fund Categories:

Livestock concerns grazing

Cropland – nutrient management, manure management,

Pasture/Hayland

Discussion:

How many situations are there where cattle are in waterways? Not as many as there used to be. Are the ones that are less major or not so much? Both.

Most of the work done with grazing and pastures has not been along water ways.

Is 20 head of cattle in lake a greater problem than what happens on cropland?

Why has the process changed? One reason is to simplify the pools and how the pools are managed. This doesn't lock up as much money in pools that may be difficult to use.

It could be difficult to get people on lakes to take their efforts seriously if someone else has cattle in the lake.

It looks like the cropland area would offer the greatest opportunities.

Picking a priority area will be an annual process.

If a livestock owner wants to fence cattle away from a lake, there are other sources of funds that could be available also.

Consensus Decision: The cropland category should be the Benton County priority.

1. Local Resource Concerns:

Soil Erosion

Water Quality

Wildlife Habitat

Water Quantity

Pasture conditions/grazing concerns

Invasive species problems

Consensus Decision: Water Quality would be the priority concern in Benton County.

2. Geographic Areas A through H listed.

Should item H be kept on the list?

Consensus Decision: Drop item H.

3. Describe highest priority items.

Under item B adding quality along with quantity to read Flooding/Surface Water Quality/Quantity.

4 Developing questions to review applications. Reviewed list of items. Key is to reference water quality in each of the criteria.

Fifth item change Grazing Systems to Water Quality and changed to read “the application will install prescribed grazing in existing cropland being converted to pasture.

Sixth item titled changed to...Flooding and Surface Water Quality

Seventh item titled changed to Water Quality

Ninth titled changed from Sedimentation to Water Quality

Tenth titled changed from Sedimentation to Water Quality

The final item is being eliminated – wildlife

Added additional item “Water Quality - the application will install any practices that are 150-300 feet to any watercourse that is identified on a topographic map, soil survey map, or to any DNR identified protected water.

Blowdown areas where shelterbelts are blown down, we’ll probably not see trees planted in these places again.

Concern about setting a priority for being within 100 feet of water ways because with “gully-washer” rains the impact area is a lot wider than 100 feet. Suggestion that there might be higher points within 100 feet and feet points for farther defined distance. Concensus 0 to 150 45 points and 150 to 300 25 points.

-----  
Recess WRAC meeting and public hearing at 2:17 on water plan amendment.

#### WATER PLAN AMENDMENT

Page 24 Objective Number 4, perennial vegetation by Jason W. This statement is more stringent than state law. 103E.021. Write is as installing perennial vegetation consistent with 103E.021.

Page 27 SSTS f) storage not stooge.

Katie commented that a lot of agency comments were related to surface water concerns and we are not conducting a full rewrite so comments must fit with the three existing priorities (Feedlot/Nutrient Management, Groundwater, Development). ..... Katie’s comments. Applied the concept to specific items.

In example: A comment provided was to promote and support the construction of sediment ponds, basins (including re-establishment of wetlands) and other erosion and sediment control BMPs .....as written this would not fit into the three priorities however bits and pieces were added to

Page 20 h) and h1) and Page 22 similar with riparian b1) as well as added this to Development Goal 3 Objective 1 (g) with additional verbiage (as related to existing development and future developments (page 25))

City of St. Cloud and Upper Mississippi... submitted comments related to protecting the Mississippi as a drinking water resource. Edits Proposed:

Page 29 Groundwater Goal 2 Objective 2 reword the Objective to read **Locate and protect Benton County Groundwater and surface water drinking resources**. Then assist in the development of the county hydro Geologic Atlas as one of the action items and existing (a) (making work with appropriate entities to identify aquifer thresholds to maintain adequate quality water supply for consumptive use) a sub action item (1) and omit maintain surface water resources.

JasonW indicated BWSR would not have a problem with this.

Mark (Minnesota Department of Health) suggested that as Metro areas downstream might seek funds related to taking care of the Mississippi, naming this in our document could put us in the loop.

Page 27 Groundwater Goal 1, Objective 2 add (g) Support the implementation of the City of St. Cloud Source Water Protection Plan and Upper Mississippi River Source Water Protection Project (UMRSWPP) that helps protect the Mississippi River as a local and regional drinking water resource

Page 24 Development Goal 2 Objective 2. Investigative statement. May need to define criteria that limits the scope of this. Make the objective a more investigative statement related to a) for Objective 2. Are there state rules that already cover a lot of the critical issues that might occur with activities in shoreland areas? Are counties and communities around us doing things that would be useful in Benton County? Consider whether new regulations could create a lot of unbuildable lots. Straw vote indicated for support to explore. Suggested that action item a) become the objective and make the objective the action item and to read, "Explore the proposal of...."

Are we reviewing these things at another meeting? The plan was to take these from here to commissioners. Suggested that this be reviewed by the group before forwarding. A final draft should be written before it moves forward. Application for a lot of grants will be August 8 through September 20.

The plan would have to be approved by BWSR to be useful in grant applications. Jason indicates that the current plan fits a lot of things that grants would be applied for. So there is probably not a great need to push this through.

Most people want to do what is right. They want some guidelines for the work that needs to be done. We need to be flexible.

#### General Edits:

Page 5 Added Descriptions are taken directly from the Comprehensive Local Water Management Plan 2008-2018 (Appendix A).

Page 8: The acres did not add up in the second paragraph the total should be approximately 67, 650 not 67, 648.

Page 16

- Added below Estimated Benton County Reductions (2008-2010 state programs only)
- Combined soil savings and sediment savings to be 143.35 tons because the difference between soil savings and sediment saving is the conservational practice being implemented.
- EQIP changes
  - 3 roof structures to be 281 feet of roof structures
  - 2 Terraces to be 2710 feet of Terraces
  - 1 Grassed Waterway to be 1916 feet of Grassed Waterways

Page 18: Added years to CSP title 2010-2011

Page 20 Feedlot and Nutrient Management Goal 1 Objective 1 (h) changed the word buffers to BMP's (example buffers,) the same for on Page 22 Objective 3.

Page 27 Groundwater Goal 1 Objective 3 (f) changed stooge to storage.

Page 30 Ongoing Activities – Implementation Plan

Under USDA Conservation Programs added CSP – Conservation incentive based program and capitalize the W in Wildlife and changed description to read Wildlife habitat establishment/management program.

3:07 Public Hearing Closed

WRAC Meeting Reconvene

Reiterated that point will for the most part be distributed the same with the exception that we gave the new category (150-300 feet from watercourse) 25 points and increase the point to 45 for practices installed within 150 feet to any watercourse that is identified on a topographic map, soil survey map, or to any DNR identified protected waters.

**2. Next Meeting**

September 27, 2011, 1:30 pm at the Benton County Commissioner's room.

**3. Adjournment**

Motion to adjourn by Ken Nodo, Second by Guy Spence. Motion Carried. Meeting adjourned at 3:12 pm.

Respectfully Submitted by  
Dan Martens, Secretary and  
Katie Winkelman, Water Plan Facilitator

<p>Approved by:</p>  <p>Signature: _____ Date: _____</p> <p style="text-align: center;">WRAC Board Chairperson</p>
--