

## Appendix C – Nutrient Pilot Project Meeting Notes

### Nutrient Reduction Pilot Project Meeting– March 24, 2015 Watson Creek Subwatershed, Root River Watershed

---

March 24, 2015

DNR/MDA/SWCD Conservation Building, Preston MN

Present: 2 Fillmore County SWCD staff (Donna Rasmussen, SWCD Administrator, John Boyum, SWCD Nutrient Management Specialist), 2 state staff, 4 local staff

#### Agenda

**9:30 – 10:00 Coffee/snacks**

**10:00 - 11:45: Overview of N-BMP Tool and Minnesota Nutrient Planning Portal**

**Root River Watershed focus (HUC 8)**

- Welcome and Introductions – Donna Rasmussen (5 minutes)
- Introduction to Root River watershed planning activities
- Donna Rasmussen (10 minutes)
  - Overview of the project and MSU planning portal - Kim Musser, MSU (15 minutes)
  - Complete lunch orders from the Sweet Stop and Sandwich Shoppe
  - Walk through the N BMP Tool for nitrogen and phosphorus - Wayne Anderson and/or Dave Wall - MPCA (1 hour)
  - Q&A (15 minutes)

**11:45 - 12:30: LUNCH IS PROVIDED.**

**12:30 - 2:30: Subwatershed Analysis: Review and Discussion – Watson Creek (HUC 12)  
example (nitrogen focus)**

- Review subwatershed analysis based on Mark Tomer's [Agricultural Conservation Planning Framework](#) - Rick Moore, MSU (1 hour)
- Feedback and discussion about potential conservation planning opportunities - Kim Musser/Rick Moore (1 hour)

## Root River Watershed - Nutrient Pilot Project

### March 24, 2015 Meeting Notes

Present: Donna Rassmussen, Fillmore County SWCD District Administrator

John Boyum, Fillmore County SWCD Nutrient Management Specialist

<add names of four local and two state staff>

### Overview of N-BMP Tool and Minnesota Nutrient Planning Portal

- PTM Mapper (Houston Engineering) versus Tomer's approach
- Seven counties inside and outside the watershed
- Crooked Creek Watershed – Flood control focus
- Future implementation plan to be more flexible than county level
- Friends of the Root River – non-profit focus on more education and outreach

### Minnesota Nutrient Planning Portal

DNR Sharepoint sites could also be added to the website

### Watson Creek Overview

- High in nitrogen, sediment, bacteria, medium in phosphorus
- GIS model that maps agro-ecoregions and BMPS, stats in selected regions
- Combine BMP tool and GIS tools

### WRAPS table

- 45% reduction, accounts for the land use suggestions

**One watershed One Plan** is aggressive; it is a good starting point

- The technical advisory meetings will be interesting
- Can tailor it to a specific watershed
- Will be able to get an idea what we hope to achieve

### General Tomer Tool Suggestions

- NRCS won't build a holding pond larger than 30 acres
- NWR – add soil type
- Farmer agronomist meeting in June, could look at this
- Focus on funding and small field, focus site
- Interactive GIS Prezi

### Whitewater Project (GIS/Tomer) - Sarah Porter

- Make more compatible to NRCS specs and regs, may be helpful (e.g. 30 acres for sediment control basins – according to NRCS)
- Tomer tool is another "tool" in the toolbox, how can it be more accessible via web?
- Apply to Ag certification program?
- How to make it easy to deliver to landowner (well and easily written, open source)
- Converting measurement (meters to feet, hectares to acres)
- Economic relation to BMP, Tomer Tool, financial benefits
- Education may be directed to agronomists

### **Moving forward**

- Give options and ideas
- Deliver good information, benefits, and cost share
- Downstream impacts and time-table, lawsuits are coming
- Explain drinking water quality impacts and “close to home” relation
- Gear to agronomist and crop advisors
- Show the financial score, don't focus on yield, but overall cost

**Minnesota Nutrient Reduction Strategy  
Nutrient Pilot – Root River Watershed  
Survey Results - March 24, 2015**

P=Phosphorus  
N=Nitrogen  
B=Both

The goal of this survey is to better understand landowner willingness to implement BMPs identified in Minnesota’s Nutrient Reduction Strategy in the Root River Watershed. These results are a snapshot of perceived landowner interest based on 6 completed surveys at a meeting on March 24, 2015 in Preston, MN. Participants were primarily local conservation staff working in the Root River Watershed.

	Landowner Interest				
	1 (Low)	2	3	4	5 (High)
<b>Fertilizer Use Efficiencies</b>					
Recommended Fertilizer Rates (B)		1	4	1	
Placement and Timing of application (B)			2	4	
Reducing soil P (P)		2	3	1	
Livestock feed management (P)			2	3	
Nitrification inhibitors (N)		1	2	2	
<b>Increase and Target Living Cover</b>					
Cover Crops (B)		1	2	3	
Perennial Buffers (B)		2	3	1	
Forage and biomass planting (B)		4	2		
Perennial energy crops (B)	2	3	1		
Conservation easements and land retirements (B)		5	1		
<b>Drainage Water Retention and Treatment</b>					
Constructed Wetlands (N)	3	2			
Controlled drainage (N)	2	3		1	
Bioreactors (N)	2	4			
Two stage ditches (N)	3	3			
<b>Field Erosion Control</b>					
Conservation Tillage and residue management (P)			1	4	1
Terraces/grasses waterways (P)			1	5	
Sediment control basins (P)					
		1	3	2	
<b>Urban Stormwater and Other sources</b>					
		1	1		1
<b>Wastewater Treatment</b>					
		2			1

# Nutrient Reduction Pilot Project Meeting– July 2, 2015

## Watson Creek Subwatershed, Root River Watershed

---

July 2, 2015

DNR/MDA/SWCD Conservation Building, Preston MN

Present: 2 Fillmore County SWCD staff (Donna Rasmussen, SWCD Administrator, John Boyum, SWCD Nutrient Management Specialist), producers in Watson Creek Watershed (4), MPCA (2) WRC (2)

### **Minnesota Nutrient Planning Portal**

- Minnesota Nutrient Reduction Strategy
  1. Define progress with clear goals
  2. Building on current strategies/successes
  3. Prioritize
  4. Leading local implementation
- Great discussion on maps and their meanings

### **Common questions that need to be answered when beginning the conversation with producers and landowners**

- Where do we get the data from?
- How often do we monitor those points?
- What does impairment even mean (local folks still recreate, fish, etc. in waterbodies)?
- What are the “natural” nitrate levels?
- What happens when cover crop dies? Where does that “captured” N go? (Skeptic on movement of N leaching)
- What are IA application rates?

### **Existing perspectives/opinions**

- Producers are willing to experiment, or already are (cost of N is about \$35/acre)
- Producers are afraid of being singled out and persecuted
- Timing is tricky for cover crops
  - Maybe after soybeans (loosens soil)
  - Could meet reduction goals with 20% cover crop adoption – meeting participants felt that was an optimistic number for cover crop adoption
- They feel they are already there
  - Lots of corn/corn, which may suggest why they don't feel they need to do the fertilizer application rates
  - Manure is most effective when incorporated
  - Nobody wants to over apply fertilizer because it costs money
- 6% reduction in fertilizer use (currently 94% efficient)

- Split application not so good in this area
- Karst database online goes back to 1995

#### **How we facilitate participation with producers moving forward**

- Producers want to be informed on what we are trying to do – keep building the relationships
  - Put the wellhead impairments from MDH on the Nutrient Planning Portal website
- Take it down to the field-scale
  - Grassed waterways are promising
    - Cross-slope forming is common (not contour)
  - Get the technicians out there
  - Get absentee landowners involved
  - Program to accommodate 2 split runs
- Farm visits every year
  - Make sure to raise up good projects and recognize that work
- Get rid of farm assistance if not complying (needs to be added)
- Next meeting about maintenance and BMP's
- Make the application rates regional!!