<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11:00 a.m.</td>
<td>Call to Order</td>
<td>Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Review and Approve Agenda</td>
<td>Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minutes of September 9, 2015</td>
<td>Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Financial Report</td>
<td>Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Review and Submittal Process</td>
<td>Info./Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project Status and Update – Chuck Fritz and Nate Dalager</td>
<td>Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Policy Board and Citizen Questions</td>
<td>Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adjourn</td>
<td>Action</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The meeting was convened by Vice-Chairman Don Jensen at 11:00 a.m. The following Policy Committee members (or their alternates), Local Governmental Unit staff and Contract staff were present:

Policy Committee Members present: RL WD: Don Diedrich, Polk Co. Commissioner; Don Jensen, Pennington Co. Commissioner; Ron Weiss and Chuck Flage-Alternate, Red Lake Co. Commissioner; Grant Nelson, Pennington SWCD

Local Governmental Unit Staff present: Myron Jesme, RL WD; Tanya Hanson, Red Lake SWCD; Matt Fischer, BWSR; Peter Nelson and Bryan Malone, Pennington SWCD.


The Policy Committee reviewed the agenda. Don Jensen requested the addition of a Change Order for HDR Engineering, Inc. to the agenda. Motion by Grant Nelson, seconded by Ron Weiss, and passed by unanimous vote that the Policy Committee approve the agenda with the addition of a Change Order for HDR Engineering, Inc. Motion carried.

Motion by Grant Nelson, seconded by Ron Weiss, to approve the September 9, 2015 Policy Committee Meeting minutes as presented. Motion carried.

Peter Nelson reviewed the Financial Report as of October 31, 2015. Nelson stated that HDR Engineering, Inc. and the Local Governmental Unit’s (LGU’s) are close to the budgeted amount. Nelson stated that it is unclear how the grant that was received through the Northwest Minnesota Foundation would be allocated. It was the recommendation of the Planning Group, that the Policy Committee not take action on this month’s financial report until the budget can be reviewed to determine how to handle the additional grant that was received. Nelson stated that the ending cash balance as of October 31, 2015 is $17,286.09, with 90% of the grant received and the remaining 10% will be sent once the grant is spent. Nelson reviewed the payables breakdown with the Policy Committee. After further discussion, it was the consensus of the Policy Committee that action not be taken on the Financial Report until further review.

Matt Fischer discussed the time line of the 1W1P approval process, which includes public hearings and comment periods. Fischer stated that the plan will need to be submitted to the BWSR North Region Committee which meets four times a year. In order for the plan to be reviewed at the June North Region Committee meeting, the final draft plan would need to be complete by December. The final draft would be needed by mid-March to mid-April to be prepared for the following meeting of the North Region Committee in September. Once the draft plan is submitted there would be a 60 day comment period, with a minimum of two weeks between when the comment period ends and a public hearing is held. Discussion was held on holding three public hearings in conjunction with each of the County Board meetings. Each individual LGU would be required to adopt a resolution to hold the hearings in this manner. Myron Jesme stated that he will have discussion with RL WD Board, to discuss the possibility of
holding the RLWD hearing in conjunction with the Pennington County hearing. Fischer stated that after the public hearings are held, the Policy Committee would meet to review comments received, and make any recommended changes to the plan. The plan would then be submitted to each individual County and SWCD Board as well as the RLWD Board for their approval prior to submittal to BWSR. Fischer stated that with the tentative time frame, the Policy Committee meeting would be held the day before the first SWCD meeting. Fischer asked if the individual Boards would consider approval of the plan for submittal, with the understanding that minor details could be changed by the Policy Committee, to allow representation at the BWSR North Region committee meeting. Fischer asked the Policy Committee if they felt the Plan should be submitted individually to each Board prior to being submitted for comment. It was the consensus of the Policy Committee that it would not be necessary to present the Plan individually to each Board prior to being submitted for comment. Fischer stated that this discussion is all subject to change depending on when the final draft of the plan is completed. Fischer will work with LGU staff to present a resolution that will document changes on how the process will be handled. The Policy Committee will give approval to the Resolution once it is prepared.

Nate Dalager presented a project status and update to the Committee. Dalager stated that the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) and Planning Group continue to meet, but have not gone beyond the goals. Issues were identified with what’s going on in the geographical region as it pertains to water, and then determine what those priorities are. The TAC and Planning Group completed an exercise where they voted on Priority statements. LGUs, State, and Federal Agencies voted on priority statements, which allowed for Dalager to determine what was the most important to the individuals on the TAC. In the case of a tie, the highest points from the LGU moved that priority up. The resources were tied to that Priority statement and then ultimately have the measurable goals that we can measure the progress against so we know what our focus is in the next 10 years. The TAC will be tasked with the job of where they can come up with projects to attain our goals. Then a decision will be made on how we are going to do this and who will move forward to get the effects of the plan. The draft plan would have a March timeframe.

Nate Dalager reviewed the Change Order request which included a cover letter and a modified version of the original budget. Dalager added two columns to the original budget, one being the anticipated budget and the other being the actual. Dalager stated that he tried to articulate where the extra efforts have been or will be. Dalager stated that this process has been a long time coming and until now it was not clear as to what this process would entail. Dalager stated that he completed the RLWD 10 Year Plan in 2006, with an area of six thousand square miles for $120,000. Dalager stated that he did not anticipate the involvement this process would take. The LGU’s have their finger prints all over the planning process, it wasn’t just a plan laid out with the LGU’s just making minor comment/revisions. The LGU involvement has been thorough and will make for a better plan document. Included in the handout was a spreadsheet showing the original scope task, original scope assumption, percentage of completed tasks and additional cost to include the revised budget amount of $137,898. Dalager stated that he completed this spreadsheet in anticipation of what the hours would be to complete the process. Dalager explained some of the examples of the table. The process became very interactive, therefore requiring extra hours/costs:

Chuck Fritz stated that as the Facilitator, he agreed with Dalager’s comments that there were issues early on that needed to be worked through. Because of these issues, the planning zones of upper, middle and lower were developed. Also, in the prioritization process, Dalager had
planned on using a Comparative sub-watershed analysis which would create the priorities. This prioritization process did not suit the team, as the team wanted to have ownership, hence the voting system was developed. Dalager also did not anticipate the interaction as it relates to the PTMApp.

Don Dietrich asked where the additional grant of $25,000 from the Northwest MN Foundation is included in the budget. Dalager stated that the additional funding was not included into his revised budget. Fischer stated that the original budget for the LGU staff is also spent, therefore a decision as to where the additional grant should be applied to in the budget is required. Fischer has spoken to BWSR Staff in regard to additional funding. Fischer suggested that the budget be turned back to the LGU staff to review, compare the proposal that was submitted and come back with recommendations. Fritz stated that he will project what will be required from his budgeted amount as he feels there will be some excess amount available.

Jesme stated that we initially had two quotes for plan writing, and we don’t want to lose track as to what was proposed and what was being accomplished. The Houston Engineering proposal has no information or vision for work with the PTMApp, therefore Jesme feels there are some missing tasks and scope of work. Jesme stated that he recently participated in a state roundtable discussion for 1WI P Pilot Projects, where all participants stated that they are all over the budgeted amount and are not sure in how they will handle this issue.

Fritz stated that moving forward with the PTMApp will require someone with GIS skills to take it and create the products that we need from it. That task is no where identified in any discussion going forward. GIS maps will need to be created for the plan. Fritz further stated that the task of applying the PTMApp data to this plan has not been identified. Fritz added that this is a separate contract between IWI and BWSR.

Grant Nelson discussed the scope of work, stating that we should stay inside the scope of work and that we should not be paying for tasks already defined in the budget.

Fritz stated that the International Water Institute has a staff member that could produce the needed maps that were not clearly identified or listed in the scope of work. Bryan Malone stated that map development was in the RFP, but the PTMApp process of mapping was not.

Don Jensen stated that we have a recommendation from Matt Fischer to have the LGU staff review the revised budget and report back to the Policy Committee. Grant Nelson stated that the LGU staff need to take into consideration discussion of the Policy Committee, he further recommended separating out the PTMApp issue from the budget to get a clear view of the proposed budget.

Motion by Don Diedrich, seconded by Ron Weiss, to send the proposed Change Order presented by HDR Engineering, Inc. back to the Planning Work Group for review and report back to the Policy Committee at a later date. Motion carried.

Matt Fischer discussed the BWSR Expectations/Involvement handout that gives in-sight as to how other pilot projects are doing. This document summarizes the comments of staff from all 5 pilots that met at Breezy Point towards the end of October.
Motion by Grant Nelson, seconded by Ron Weiss, to adjourn the meeting. Motion carried.

[Signature]
Don Diedrich