

Wednesday, May 2
Conference Call, Rock River Recovery Implementation Team Meeting
T. Ford note-taker

Central Office

Amy Callis
Keri Fleming
Corinne Billings

Fitchburg

Mike Vollrath
Kevin Kirsch
Mary Anne Lowndes
Dan Heim
Andy Morton
Eric Rortved
Lloyd Eagan

Waukesha

Sharon Gayan
Doris Thiele
Maureen McBroom

Horicon

Theresa Ford
Jim Congdon

External

Suzanne Wade

Web page update

Lloyd: contacted Margie Damgaard, Margie connected Lloyd to Brian Yulga at Central Office. Planning on 1/month update.

Mike: funnel information from teams to team leaders to Implementation Team to Theresa. Theresa will assemble the information to send to Brian.

Corrine: let's not reinvent the wheel, Lisa Helmuth was working on revising the RR TMDL web site, let's use what work is still relevant

Jim: Steve worked with Lisa on interactive mapping. Theresa also worked with Lisa.

Theresa: Lisa is out of the office. Theresa will send Lisa an email asking if Brian could get access to the work already done.

Mike: information to go on the website- meeting minutes, agendas, notices. Can also bring ideas to this meeting/group.

Sector Team Updates

Urban Stormwater

- Urban stormwater met on April 3rd in Fitchburg
 - 12 total, 3 DNR staff, 9 external (all but one are engineers); planning on 12 to 18 months of meetings
 - April 3 meeting
 - Kevin talked about TMDL/modeling/MS4 issues
 - structured brainstorming of potential issues, plan to break out issues to discuss
 - next meeting is May 10th @Waukesha office

- will be talking about area issues and Roger Banneman will talk about urban phosphorus sources
 - 90% of issues generated (during brainstorming) can be addressed by the team
 - 10% of the issues are external influences or involve other sectors (tracking attenuation)
- Corinne: please share these issues, ideas with the statewide stormwater liaison group
- Eric: end product will be guidance for internal and external users
 - something broader than MS4 (stormwater) to address the wasteload allocation \leftrightarrow load allocation movement
- Corinne: there has been discussion of implementation tracking on larger scale, but no decisions/guidance/strategy
 - working on phosphorus loading models
 - tracking will be increasingly important
- Andy: what do we want out of a tracking database?
- Jim: this kind of information we wanted to be displayed on an interactive map (web site) – changes over time, improvements, water chemistry, conservation work
- Eric: meeting notes will go out May 3 to the team members
- Eric: Maureen had some ideas/questions about the final product of the whole implementation effort. What is the RR Implementation plan?
 - MS4 \rightarrow will produce a guidance document
 - Corinne's suggestion: each sector team would contribute to a larger plan, what does the plan look like? Is it based on the nine key elements framework?
 - Corinne: sector team leaders should do some advance planning of meeting with the team members
 - maybe sector team leaders meet to discuss
 - level of detail, format, watershed unit size (HUC12)
 - Andy: is this a topic for the next meeting?
 - review nine element plan
 - what do we want out of this process
- Maureen: the MS4 team is working across three TMDLs (Fox, Rock, Milwaukee) and working on specific Rock River issues
- Kevin: MS4 issues are consistent across the state
- Lloyd: Rock River is first up for TMDL implementation
- Corinne: the door is wide open in terms of precedent, this is the first TMDL out of the chute in the post priority watershed era
- Doris: permit issuance is time sensitive, permits will be issued in the near future \rightarrow implementation options need to be available before permits are issued
- Mike: implementation options won't change, use/interpretation may change
 - counties not all up to date or on the same page about TMDL
- Lloyd: 1st permit term is 5 years of research

- Doris: 3 years to facility plan, 4th year the plan has to be ready (decisions made regarding options)
- Lloyd: Dane County/MMSD/Clean Lakes have good relationships, not all counties are there

Outreach

- Jim/Ruth/Suzanne have not met yet as a group
- overall plan – each team continue to develop and implement as needed according to statutory regulations, need to focus on non-statutory aspects
 - assist with educating counties
 - let MMSD lead the way and share that information
 - many NGOs that need to be brought in, coordinate their activities with TMDL
- Suzanne: how to bridge together the different sector teams
 - using monitoring to bring relevance to ag non point issues
 - educating on why some sector teams are moving forward more quickly than others
 - volunteers for sector teams – some changes
 - use the Clean Lakes model in bringing together government and landowners
 - what are the external outreach needs
 - what are the between sector communication needs
- Jim: had originally planned on quarterly meeting to include all the sector teams, also open to the public
- Dan: information from MMSD on adaptive management pilot project?
- Lloyd: could bring in Dave Taylor or Lloyd can bring updates to this group

MMSD Adaptive Management Pilot at Six Mile Creek sub watershed (Bad Fish Creek)

- cooperative agreement between EPA/DNR/MMSD
- 41 communities participating, providing financial support
- Dane County is the broker, drafting adaptive management application
- looking for non point reductions
- USGS baseline monitoring
- how do they demonstrate compliance?
 - > EPA agreed to compliance by calculation
- how do they demonstrate water quality in the stream?
 - > number of points?, when?, legacy pollutants?

- Dan: guidance on Adaptive Management?
- Lloyd: must demonstrate water quality at the end
- Jim: basin-wide meeting?
 - prevent re-inventing the wheel
 - generate interest, ideas, connections

- Andy: annual meeting? basin-wide conferences?
- Mike: funding for outreach?
 - Ken Gensko/Shelley Warwick putting together a plan
 - Corrine: funds are limited, some funding for printing/design work, extension helping with webinars, possible funding for events (319 money), doesn't hurt to ask.
- communication plan?
 - annual tour?
- Suzanne: extension unlikely to have the time/resources to give enough attention to this, will be asking volunteers to run events
- Corrine: need to develop a communication plan
- Jim: needs to be an allocation of funds for outreach
- Lloyd: private sponsors for Clean Lakes, Clean Rivers conference, could pass the hat for these efforts
- Jim: outreach team could work on finding funding sources
- Andy: scope of the team? basic function to identify gaps
- Lloyd: will have a regional communications person in Fitchburg soon
- Suzanne: Jim/Ruth/Suzanne need to meet to define this 'new' sector team.

Wastewater

- Doris: who should be included on the sector team? municipal? industry? consultants? Paul Kent/MEA?
 - Corinne: review existing sector team volunteers
 - Lloyd: MEA and Paul Kent have other venues (higher on the food chain) to express their opinions, less interested in the front line work
- Doris: plan to have the team help with choosing sequence of watersheds, reviewing and editing language in permits
 - which watershed to start with – volunteer or selected? will have to select.
 - not all permittees are happy about the revoke/reissue plan, sector teams could help with 'buy in' to the idea

Role and Responsibilities –OR-- Plan the Plan

-original sector team invitation letters have a distilled version of the team roles/responsibilities

Lloyd/Dan: team charges are different because the statutes and compliance issues are different

Doris: for wastewater – generate questions/get clarifications on watershed permitting, adaptive management, water quality trading

Lloyd: for finding the weak points in the guidance

Corrine: should also utilize the statewide TMDL team

Monitoring

- Dan: no activity to date, plan → assessment to help entities decide what/where to trade, support adaptive management efforts, work with wastewater team to identify opportunities
- Suzanne: RRC monitoring coordinator looking for citizen monitoring tier 2 locations
- Jim: manage adaptive management to keep data valid
- Dan: upstream/downstream monitoring for phosphorus – will this affect permits? is it worthwhile?
- Greg: good exercise for understanding in-stream conditions, could recruit WAV folks to take samples and ship to state lab

Agriculture

- Mike: first challenge is issues with teams formed before phosphorus rules were promulgated, who should be included?
- Kevin: ag implementation vision
 - Large load allocation by watershed
 - Broken down to manageable chunks
 - Grid or tracking tool to id high loading areas
 - Shift 319 money away from water quality trading/adaptive management
 - Concentrate 319 fund on non point source dominated stream segments, target hotspots
 - Opportunity to establish a baseline
- Corinne – can the DNR develop a grid tool (for tracking/management) for the Rock River Recovery?
 - Kevin – was/is part of the overall plan
- Mike: planning on meeting after gathering interest
 - Would like to host a version of the wastewater meetings for the county conservationists/land and water conservation staff

Mike: where are we on the priority list for upper management?

Corinne: outlined initially to steering committee (now mostly retired)

Future meetings – May 16th, every third Wednesday? Format?

Corinne: keep Central Office on the invite list

Possible agenda topics:

- Roles
- Charges

- Measurables

Meeting with EPA?

- Should we consult EPA about watershed permitting?
 - Goes through Russ Rasmussen, Lemke and Mugan
 - Backlog vs. watershed permitting, which is the priority?
 - Present EPA with a plan and then get feedback
 - Have pilot drafted and watershed chosen.