

Jessie Lake Watershed Technical Advisory Committee

Meeting Minutes

February 28, 2008



Upstairs conference room, DNR office Grand Rapids, MN

The Jessie Lake Watershed TAC met on Thursday, February 28, 2008 at the DNR Regional Office in Grand Rapids, MN with the following present: Karl Koller (MN DNR), Noel Griese (Itasca SWCD), Harold Goetzman (Jessie Lake Watershed Assoc), Bill Nelson (Jessie Lake Watershed Assoc), Don Carlson (MPCA), Chantel Cook (USFS), Luke Rutten (USFS), Jim Gustafson (Itasca SWCD), Nolan Baratono (MPCA).

1. Agenda reviewed and approved.
2. Draft minutes of November 28, 2007 meeting amended and approved. Minor housekeeping items addressed.
3. Action items update from 11/28/07 meeting: #1 Noel reported that the draft RFP was completed with the help of Don to be reviewed later in the agenda. #2 Nolan reported that he had discussed with Bruce Wilson (MPCA) and Steve Heiskary (MPCA) models to require the contractor to use for the TMDL. They concluded that instead of requiring a specific model it would be better to lay out specific expectations from the modeling to allow the contractor to choose the best fit model. #3 Noel reported a web page for the Jessie Lake TMDL was currently under construction. Brief background information and reports already posted with more detailed data summaries still being worked on. #4 Noel contacted Paul Schreiber (MPCA) and Mark Evenson (MPCA) to request stream data that MPCA has collected on the major tributaries since the CWP. Mark projected data to be compiled by the end of February at the earliest. #5 Limited discussion on cooperators roles at this juncture in the project. Further discussion on cooperator roles will follow as the implementation plan is developed.
4. General RFP Discussion/Comments: Don stated that MPCA would be entering into a contract with the SWCD shortly and the SWCD will have oversight of the TMDL. Concerns were brought forward by Bill, Harold, and Karl as to a third party (SWCD) overseeing the TMDL. Concerns raised included the potential that the third party might hire an unqualified contractor, contractors taking advantage of the third party by submittal of inflated bids, and unsatisfactory contractor work because MPCA was not leading the project. Nolan and Don assured that the MPCA would only enter into a contract with agencies they felt had adequate resources to satisfactorily complete the project and stated that MPCA places technical advisory teams in place to oversee all TMDL projects. Nolan also stated MPCA recommends locally led TMDL's because the sustainability of a project lies at the local level where implementation takes place. Noel stated that the SWCD has and intends to continue to request MPCA's input throughout the TMDL project.

Bill asked how the RFP was to be announced. Nolan and Don commented that the SWCD is responsible for posting and sending out the RFP as it sees fit. Noel and Jim stated the RFP will be mailed to MPCA's master contractor list and to contractors the SWCD deemed qualified.

5. Specific comments for the revision of the RFP Document: Nolan discussed the need for specific language to lay out expectations of the model(s) used in Tasks 1 & 2 to help guide the contractor. Bill commented that the RFP should maybe request two models be used to get two sources of corroborating evidence. Nolan stated that is a possibility but could likely increase costs substantially and other factors like Margin of Safety are built into the TMDL process. Jim felt it would potentially bring in further confusion if two models were used and there were conflicting results. Group consensus was to request one model be used.

Chantel suggested the need for more specific language for reporting load reductions and Nolan agreed that how data is to be reported should be outlined in the RFP.

Don suggested removing Task 4 (Reporting) and incorporating it into Tasks 1, 2, & 3. Include project updates to SWCD under mentioned tasks and the SWCD reports to the TAC on contractor's summary. Shortly after each Task Summary delivered to the SWCD, the contractor requested to give informal presentation to TAC. Luke suggested the need for language for an expected deliverable and due date prior to each TAC-Contractor meeting. Group discussed the need to be specific in the RFP that the TAC-Contractor meetings are to be "Informal" presentations and the one public meeting the contractor is to present at would be a "Formal" presentation.

Harold commented on the need to be specific on the number of copies of the proposal the contractor is responsible to submit.

Noel stated that he would continue to work with Don on the RFP and timelines.

6. Future TAC Meetings: TAC agreed to reconvene when contractor is awarded contract.

7. Action Items:

1. Noel G and Don C will complete the RFP document.
2. Nolan B to submit specific modeling language to Noel for the RFP.
3. Noel G to complete Jessie Lake website database prior to RFP announcement.
4. Noel G will continue to follow-up with Mark Evenson on obtaining stream data.
5. Noel, Jim, and Don will develop criteria for selecting contractor.
6. Itasca SWCD to mail RFP to selected contractors.

Next meeting date: To be determined

Location: To be determined