Wednesday, May 16
Rock River Recovery Implementation Team Meeting
Fitchburg/LiveMeeting
T. Ford note-taker

LiveMeeting	Fitchburg	Lloyd Eagan
Keri Fleming	Mike Vollrath	Ruth Johnson
Corinne Billings	Kevin Kirsch	Greg Searle
Sharon Gayan	Dan Heim	Doris Thiele
	Andy Morton	Suzanne Wade
	Eric Rortvedt	Jim Congdon

Sector Team Updates

Urban Stormwater

The technical team met on May 10th in Waukesha with some folks leaving for a DOT meeting in the afternoon.
-addressed issues of actual MS4 area, not a static issue
    - initial WLA and revised WLA
-need to look at grid map and a way to shift WLA ←→ LA
    -long term tracking developed and maintained by DNR

-need another discussion on a long term scale (5-10 years) of GIS mapping needs
-allocation of GIS resources in a management decision
-all of the GIS staff were moved to WW (TMDL development)
    - municipalities supply the information and the DNR will referee

-what is the need? sets us up for the whole basin.
    -feeds into interactive mapping on website

-is this an internal or external problem? level of technical complexity.
-in house staff could develop this, staff are assigned to TMDL
-timeframe of actually pursuing this?
    -there is a need to revise allocations before WPDES permits go out

Jim Bertolacini/Implementation Guidance Team/Kevin Kirsch and Adam Freihofer – communicating to those affected by TMDLs

Need a targeted meeting for 1. questions in the near term 2. get input from all sides

Lloyd: still have to define the 'ask' is this staff time? is it a consultant?
    -TMDL Implementation Guidance Team can help but shifting resources will require the 'deciders'

-also need to define the short term and the long term
-could this be an NRCS grant? need to convene a large cross sector group
1. getting the issue on paper
2. Corinne Billings or Jim Bertolacini
3. Kevin Kirsch ad Adam Freihofer

Eric – will assemble for stormwater
Andy – will assemble for agriculture

Monitoring
-watershed selection to match up with WW permitting
-waiting to meet until WPDES permitting begins
-connections to ag non point, Pleasant Valley conditions
-pre and post assessment: what's there? what the reduction potential?
-Rock River Coalition has a new monitoring coordinator (Nancy Sheehan) and would be interested in more level 2 WAV monitoring projects
-can the sampling start this season? also up/down stream sampling for WW treatment plans
-Lake Sininisippi/Hustisford is monitoring

Agriculture
-disappointing response from county conservationists regarding knowledge of the TMDL, effects on agriculture
-Green County positive on the Federal funding (no one else applied)
-wanting better than 70% cost share
-use existing information and presentation
-NRCS, DATCP, DNR -> county

-regarding NR 151 and TMDL, Corinne is willing to help

Lloyd – hold off on adaptive management information to the counties, need more clarification from the powers that be, does not preclude an introduction to adaptive management or water quality trading

Corinne – yes, include county input like Dane and their adaptive management pilot project, possible that there will b e some local assistance (DATCP not much assistance)

Outreach
-UW Ext hiring Suzanne as a contractor roughly beginning July and ending December
-discussed planning with Mike, meeting the outreach team, method of sharing information, phone survey of stakeholders (Suzanne has already developed a list) and online survey of broader set of stakeholder needs (list already developed)
-240 hours with the plan written by October
-to include meeting with non profits and non governmental organizations, articles for Rock River Reflections, more watershed forums to include all aspects of the Rock River Basin

-even if a great plan is written, we will still need someone to do it (monitoring aspect)
-not easy to get good coverage (UW Ext or DNR) when responsibilities are spread across multiple individuals

-watershed forums are a good format to get buy in from the local level; much of the implementation is the constituency pushing for it and the critical mass is needed

-the model being developed for implementation in the Rock River could be used in other basins

-what are the survey questions?
    -what do people need to understand? what skills need to be acquired

Lloyd – identification of audiences and messages in a cost effective way

-this also provides solid evidence to support many requests
-a plan and strategy would inspire partners and potential partners

Wastewater
-no progress
-team will be more useful after watershed selection, don't need a very large group (as compared to original invitation)

-team revisions
    Eric – limit to a certain number, anyone beyond that can attend and receive updates
    Corrine – fine to re-shuffle but consider political or other issues, advisory teams in Fox were encouraged to report out to others in similar sctrs
    Jim – emphasis should be on the workin (technical team members)
    Mike- thank the 'existing' members, explain the shift to a new phase of the process and there are no expectations placed on volunteers (door is open for departure), need emphasize 'working' group
    Andy-what do you want of the team?
        ag-acknowledge the problem, willing to create solutions

-complications of team member population?
    -actions post meeting whether or not they participate
    -membership has some responsibility to keep the group on track
    -some of the loud voices would rather talk to the powers that be
    - has a side board/mission which focuses on technical implementation , not policy
    -suggest that teams are being re-formed due to NR changes

-draft letter to team members to re-structure

Mike - how does this team interact with sub teams?

TMDL Implementation Guidance

1. implementation in progress
2. trading? holding pattern
3. 4 to 5 sub groups
    a. WPDES group most active in writing guidance and answering questions
    b. watershed permitting group – wait and see

-Central Office provides support to basin level
-how does Doris interact with the WPDES team (C.O.)?

-could go either way

-keep Kari and Corinne involved and communication lines open

-watershed permitting

-haven't made a final decision on the which sub watershed to start with

Lloyd – geographic location is important, start at the top to keep the playing field level

-need to examine the land area in the watershed
-start at the top to start addressing non point issues (headwaters, East Branch has the highest loading which dumps directly into the marsh)
-this an opportunity to work across district and region lines

-which watershed to choose?

WT3 has more expired permits, all in one region, more beans for permit backlog

WT6 would be political suicide but could also net bonus points

WT5 is off to the side and doesn't affect other parts of the basin

-anticipate delays for variances (mercury and chloride)
-would need to notify interested parties (municipalities, industries, other lobby groups) of the plan to revoke and reissue or modify
-will need help from other parts of the state on getting all permits (grouped) out on time
-smaller group to work on the first set

-need to include central office, regional staff, permittees

-chose WT 1 (headwaters) to start, more discussion on the other watersheds

-Kathy Lake from MMSD to present on the adaptive management pilot project at the next meeting of this group

Clean Lakes – meets every 2 months, the strategic planning group meets every two weeks

-summary of 70 recommendations (written by Strand, contracted through Clean Lakes)

Next Meeting
June 20th 1-4 pm