Drainage Work Group Meeting Notes  
September 15, 2016  
12:30 - 3:30 p.m., Minnesota Farm Bureau Building, Eagan, MN

Attendance  
John Kolb, Rinke-Noonan; Mark Morreim, MNLICA; Stu Frazeur, MNLICA; Ron Ringquist, MVA; Steve Colvin, DNR; Cole Rupprecht, MFBF; Joe Smentek, MSGA; Rob Sip, MDA; Les Everett, UMN; Ray Bohn, MAWD; Wayne Anderson, MPCA; Mark Dittrich, MDA; Greg Knopff, Senate Analyst; Mark Ten Eyck, MCEA; Jerome Deal, MAWD; Dan Wilkens, RRRWMB; Andrea Hendrickson, MnDOT; Laura Nehl-Trueman, MnDOT; Janelle Taylor, House Research; Chuck Fritz, IWI; Alan Perish, MFU, MVA; Tim Gillette, BWSR; Al Kean, BWSR

Handouts prior to or during the meeting  
1) DWG Meeting logistics and agenda for 9-15-16  
2) DWG Meeting Notes for 8-11-16  
3) DWG - Communications Committee Discussion Paper - Draft 9-10-16  
4) DWG Communications Committee Options - Rob Sip Draft 7-14-16  
5) DWG Communications Cmte Products Table - Rob Sip Draft 7-14-16  
6) HF-2365 / SF-2380 Draft DWG Discussion Paper, 8-7-16  
7) HF-2011 / SF-2029 Draft DWG Discussion Paper, 8-7-16  
8) Woodchip Bioreactors Faribault County Ditch 62 Project Summary - ISG  
9) Saturated Buffer Site: Northfield MN Fact Sheet - MDA, ESE

Introductions and agenda overview  
All in attendance introduced themselves. Al Kean provided extra copies and an overview of the agenda, noting that it was very full. May or may not have time for further discussion about HF-2011 / SF-2029 near the end of the agenda.

Approval of 8-11-16 meeting notes  
Extra copies of meeting notes were distributed. Corrections or additions were invited. None were identified.

Share information about recent and upcoming drainage related events  
- **ASABE - UMN, Int’l Drainage Symposium**, Sep. 7-9, 2016, Mpls. (250 attendees, 13 countries)  
- **Buffer Science and Design Symposium**, Sep. 16, 2016, UMN, St. Paul; Buffer Field Trip, Sep. 17  

Runoff-Based Drainage Assessments Option  
Chuck Fritz, IWI, presented a PowerPoint overview of the prototype GIS method developed as a proof of concept and application to 3 pilot drainage systems. Grit May, IWI, and Zach Herrmann, HEI, were connected via conference phone.  
- Review of the GIS method and data layers used, including hydro-conditioned digital elevation data, digital Soil Survey data, land use data, county parcel data, 40-acre tracts, and national wetland inventory.  
- Overview of refinements to adjust runoff curve numbers for wetland storage, and refinements to more precisely define runoff curve numbers for road corridors.
• The project team used 3 pilot drainage systems that were recently re/determined to compare the prototype results with viewer benefits-based results for defining relative assessments.
• Results are variably different, which points out that this comparison is really apples and oranges. The current viewing method used to apportion drainage system costs, including repair costs, is based on monetary benefits. The runoff-based method is based on the premise that relative runoff and/or sediment delivery to a drainage system are potentially better variables for assessment of repair costs than monetary benefits of the drainage system. Runoff and sediment can be weighted differently in the prototype to address types of drainage systems (ditch or tile) and types of repairs (e.g. ditch clean out, ditch bank stabilization, tile repair).
• The project team is now working on documentation in a report for the GIS prototype method.
• The DWG is substantially ready to move on to discussing how a runoff and sediment based option for repair costs might be included in drainage law.
• Some discussion about how the prototype might assist viewing for drainage projects for which a benefit-cost consideration is required, in regard to existing accelerated runoff and sedimentation provisions in drainage law.

**DWG Communications Committee**

This was a fuller discussion of this topic, for which time had been cut short by other agenda topics that ran long at the July and August meetings.

• Al Kean provided a draft DWG discussion paper dated 9-10-16 for this topic, which summarized previous information and discussion, including questions and considerations.
• Rob Sip briefly overviewed his previous request for the DWG to discuss this topic.
• Discussion about workload and DWG priorities, including questions about agencies working together on drainage communications as an alternative, and what expectations are realistic about DWG endorsement of products, or not.
• The updated Minnesota Public Drainage Manual is seen as a key communications document.
• BWSR is updating the Drainage page on its website, as a key resource with links.
• Ag landowners are reportedly interested in more drainage information.
• DWG decided to form an ad hoc subgroup to further explore possibilities and constraints.

**Discussion about HF-2365/SF-2380**

• Al Kean had updated the DWG discussion paper for this topic, dated 9-10-16, reflecting results of prior discussions and including 3 additional alternatives (A, B, C) to consider for potentially updating Section 103E.715, Subd. 4.
• The DWG does not have consensus to support the bill language.
• Alt. A is revised punctuation of existing text in Section 103E.715, Subd. 4(a)(2). Generally lukewarm response.
• Alt. B updates punctuation and some text in Subd. 4(a)(2). Also lukewarm response. It was noted that this alternative doesn’t include update of the text referring to “original construction”, as included in Alt. C.
• Alt. C updates punctuation and outdated text and adds another provision in Subd. 4(a). It was noted that this alternative includes an “and” and “or” in the same provision, which is a statute construction problem.

**Discussion about HF-2011/SF-2029**

Tabled to the next meeting, due to meeting time limit.

**Next DWG meeting:** Thursday, Oct. 13, 2016, 12:30 -3:30 p.m. at Minnesota Farm Bureau in Eagan.