

**Murray County Local Water Management Plan Meeting  
Minutes February 13, 2017**

The Murray County Local Water Management Plan Task Force held a meeting on Monday, February 13, 2017, at 1:00 pm in the Meeting B Room, Murray County Government, Slayton, MN.

**Members Present:** Craig Christensen, Jay Takle, John Busman, Larry Byers, Rick Parker, James Jens, Dave Thiner, Jon Bloemendaal, Dave Kremer, Justin Hoffmann, Duane Spartz, Jean Christoffels, and Ken Bickner  
**Others Present:**

Ken called the meeting to order.

**Agenda #1 Review/approve Local Water Management Plan 2017-2027**

Ken reviewed the next steps of the updating process and asked for any changes or additions to the amended document. Since the last document review by the Task Force, Ken identified that the Lake Sarah Dam was added to the plan update, along with monetary estimations for the tasks in the table at the back of the document to replace the term “In-Kind”.

Jay thought Objective 2.8 should include Lincoln-Pipestone Rural Water (LPRW), however, it was explained that LPRW is included under 2.2, whereas 2.8 specifically identifies Red Rock Rural Water’s (RRRW) new well project in Dovray Township. LPRW has done extensive exploration in Murray County, however, they are not actively pursuing a new well in the county at this time; LPRW is in the process of connecting to the Lewis and Clark water system.

Justin brought up the condition of the Lake Sarah dam as being one that may need attention in the near future. The Plan update currently identifies Lake Sarah, Summit Lake, and Lime Lake dams as being in need of repairs or replacement.

Buffers along county ditch systems are required to be 16.5 feet; Murray County Commissioners have not yet committed to enforcement of the new Buffer Law.

Objective 1.11 (1.12), Craig felt the number of EQIP projects could be raised to 10 over the next five years; and for 1.13 (1.14), the number of grass waterway projects could be bumped up to twenty total in the next five years. The numbering of the objectives was changed due to the addition of 1.10 “Develop a list of “other waters” to be protected as required by the Riparian Protection and Water Quality Practices law, to be included in the LWMP. Adopt the list provided as an addendum to the LWMP.” This is a requirement of the SWCD that must be completed by July 1<sup>st</sup>.

Objective 1.4, John questioned whether they could look at the ditches for monitoring. Ken stated that when the county proposes to monitor for the source of pollutants, it will also include those tributaries that might have an influence. These identified waters were focused on because they have a fecal coliform impairment.

For costs on 1.11 (1.12), because EQIP is an NRCS program, the \$5,000 per year should be sufficient to cover staff costs, however, actual projects could be in excess of \$20,000 each. Craig said for 1.13 (1.14), the estimated cost of \$300 for staff time is way too low. He also noted that instead of calling them grass swales, they should be called grass waterways; most waterways run about \$4-5K and it would involve at least 100 hours for five projects each year. Craig said to use \$5,000 per waterway with 20 hours staff time per waterway; waterways are for erosion control.

Objective 1.21 (1.23), Dave Thiner said it is not a grant to the Prairie Ecology Bus because they have to conduct the educational seminars at the schools and the county fair before funds would be distributed to them. The Prairie Ecology Bus also hired another Environmentalist for Aquatic Invasive Species (AIS) to develop classroom AIS trainings.

A question was raised as to where funds would be coming from to complete these objectives. Ken explained the objectives are like a wish list and funding sources would be from landowners, county funds and any other state and federal dollars available for projects; this Plan is not a budget.

Dave Thiner is not a fan of the word “promote” and feels that “marginal” is subjective, and may not be liked by area farmers. Ken noted that the county doesn’t need to wait for people to come in, he feels the county could proactively approach landowners with potential sites for projects.

Jon questioned who and how the streambank inventory would be handled as identified in 1.15. In cooperation with BWSR, DNR, and SWPTSA, Ken proposes to conduct a desktop flyover of the county, isolate some areas and then with landowner approval, do a physical inspection of the site. Ken added that BWSR specifically requested the streambank inventory, but that doesn’t mean a stabilization project will be able to be completed everywhere it is needed.

Objective 3.6, Dave Thiner asked for clarification on what it means. This is work that Howard Konkol is currently doing, which is conducting environmental reviews of ditch projects; about 12% of his time.

Objective 4.12, the county is required to inspect a minimum of 7% of the total feedlots in the county every year; Jon noted he actually did 8 or 9% last year through the Des Moines River Watershed project.

Objective 4.7, Dave Thiner questioned whether the GIS layer for all septic systems was going to create some sort of an inspection program of existing septic system. Ken thought if a property was issued a septic permit back in 1996 and nothing since then, he thought it probably should be inspected. Jean pointed out that Murray County did a township by township inspection of all septic system within shoreland areas of the county a number of years back, and that the county will be looking at the possibility of amending the zoning ordinance to require inspections of septic systems at the time of property transfer. This objective is not to create a septic system inspection program; Murray County is already more restrictive than the State because any addition to a dwelling requires the inspection or upgrade of the septic system.

This is a 10-year plan with a state requirement that it must be amended in five years. A public hearing will be held by the County Commissioners on Tuesday, February 28, 2017, at 9:30am, to take public comment on the 2017-2027 Murray County Local Water Management Plan Final Draft.

**MSP: John Busman, Duane Spartz to recommend approval of the 2017-2027 Murray County Local Water Management Plan Final Draft to the County Commissioners with the following changes:**

- 1. Objective 1.12 – increase the number of projects from five to ten in the next five years.**
- 2. Objective 1.13 – change “Promote, assist, and seek funding...” to “Assist landowners and seek funding...”**
- 3. Objective 1.14 – change “grass swales” to “grass waterways” and increase the number of waterway projects to twenty in the next five years with estimated costs of \$5,000 per waterway and 20 hours staff time per waterway.**
- 4. Objective 1.23 – delete “grant to Prairie Ecology Bus”**

#### **Agenda #4 Next Meeting/Adjourn**

No date was set for the next meeting.

**MSP: Dave Kremer, Larry Byers to adjourn.**

Respectfully submitted,

Jean M. Christoffels  
Secretary, Murray County Environmental Services