

Cannon River 1W1P

Technical Advisory Group

Meeting #4 Notes

January 17, 2018

9:00am – 12:00pm

Rice County Government Center
320 Third St NW, Faribault, MN 55021

Technical Advisory Group: Cole Johnson (*City of Northfield*), Shaina Keseley (*BWSR*), Melissa King (*City of Faribault*), Peggy Obear (*PIIC*), Todd Piepho (*DNR*), Kristi Pursell (*CRWP*), Bradley Rademacher (*City of Owatonna*), Emily Resseger (*Met Council*), Jennifer Ronnenberg (*MDH*), Justin Watkins (*MPCA*)

Planning Work Group: Brad Becker (*Dakota County*), Brad Behrens (*Rice County*), Ashley Gallagher (*Dakota SWCD*), Eric Gulbransen (*Steele SWCD*), Beau Kennedy (*Goodhue SWCD*), Josh Mankowski (*LeSueur County*), Steve Pahs (*Rice SWCD*), Glen Roberson (*Goodhue SWCD*), Brian Watson (*Dakota SWCD*).

EOR Consulting Staff: Camilla Correll, Meghan Funke and Jason Naber

❖ Meeting Goals

- Meeting format is similar to past TAG and PWG meetings. We will review where we are at with draft plan contents and what measurable goals are but the primary goal is to work through measurable goals for the tier one priority issues for the Resources component.

❖ Review Draft Sections of Cannon River 1W1P

- Analysis and Prioritization of Issues and Resource Concerns- The draft was presented to the Policy Committee at their January 19th meeting (presentation is posted to the Cannon River 1W1P website). There have been changes to the map since this meeting. Changes include:
 - Changed the name of some labels, such as Cannon Bottoms is now Cannon/Mississippi River Bottoms
 - Took groundwater off, specifically the DWSMA layer, but Large Communities still remain a priority area.
 - Keep lobes from WRAPS delineated or merge the boundaries? Decision was to remove lobe layer and focus only on displaying priority areas in this map. WRAPS lobes are only a reference for planning and we don't have to use these boundaries.
 - Groundwater preliminary maps were displayed. The thought is to have a surface waters priority areas map and a separate groundwater priority areas map; the group was comfortable with this idea. The first map had pollution sensitivity, nitrate testing results, and groundwater dominated lakes. The second map had DWSMAs, Arsenic, and sensitivity. Layering this data allowed for priority areas to be delineated. Recommend that groundwater map, just like the surface water map, focus on showing priority areas, and put more detailed maps in either the inventory or the appendix. There was a comment made that all maps should be made in a format that colorblind people can see, there is also an online tool to help with this.
- Land and Water Resource Inventory- EOR is in the process of making changes based upon feedback. Thank you to everyone for great feedback. EOR may also follow up with people on specifics. The revised document will be brought to the next meeting.

❖ Introduction to Measureable Goals

- Board of Water and Soil Resources (BWSR) has a guidance document on Setting Measurable Goals that helps explain the process. This was included in your meeting materials. Shaina walked everyone through the document. Camilla also provided two examples of how a concern becomes an issue statement, then a measurable goal and then implementation activities.

❖ Draft Measureable Goals

➤ Introduction

- A broad overview of the draft document was provided. The draft was provided as part of the meeting materials, however EOR worked with MPCA, made some revisions and a new version was handed out to the group.

➤ Lakes, Streams and Rivers

- Goal 1: Originally had at least a 10% reduction in watershed phosphorus loading to lakes. This has been removed as there is not enough data to support this goal. The implementation activity of completing Lake Management Plans has been added. This will then provide data for goals.
 - Are there any phosphorus budgets complete? Some are done in individual TMDLs and there is a watershed wide budget. There is currently a study with MPCA and the University of Minnesota will collect and analyze sediment cores for 16 lakes in order to develop Lake Management Plans, which may include in lake treatments.
 - Amendments to the 1W1P may be needed after Lake Management Plans are complete. Make sure we know what the process is for amending the Plan.
 - Some concern with relying upon Lake Management Plans as this may not garner much support from the counties; specifically they may not want to fund these. It was also noted that 1W1P could provide this funding if in our plan. TMDL lakes get grants and same may be said about lakes with management plans.
 - TMDLs refer to internal loading as un-accounted for phosphorus.
 - Group would still like to have reduction goals in the Plan, even without the Lake Management Plans.
 - There was a question about implementation and what is need for local share/match. Could prioritization be tied to projects that can garner match? Overall there is a 10% match required, which is less than in the past. This can be from staff time, landowner contribution, EQIP/federal dollars, etc. It does not have to be 10% per project, so everyone can work together to get to the required match. It was noted that most active Lake Association that could garner match in Rice County is not considered priority for this 10-year plan.
 - Considering that many are groundwater dependent lakes, is a second goal related to groundwater needed? It may be, could also be under Groundwater goals.
 - Who is measuring these lakes? Monitoring is an ineligible activity under 1W1P grants. Watershed based funding must be for implementation. MPCA does their intensive watershed monitoring on the 10 year cycle. Question becomes is annual monitoring needed? It may not be as change takes time. This is also an area where we can work with local partners and volunteers for data collection and effectiveness monitoring.
 - Is there a process for adaptive management? Yes, review will occur on a 5 year basis.
- Goal 2: Focus is on the four lakes that are closest to meeting water quality standards. There are options to further prioritize, such as upstream to downstream. The group is comfortable with these four lakes.
 - Hunt has an 82% reduction listed, is this really reasonable in a 10 year plan? It may not be, we can set different goals such as a 50% reduction in external load
 - When looking at phosphorus, should look at a shoreline inventory and buffer implementation. This is typically addressed in shore land ordinances, and would also be looked at as part of a Lake Management Plan.
 - How or at what level do we track our measurable goals? May end up being multiple levels of goals. Tracking at the high level but also using activities as measures.

- Goal 3: As currently written it is tied to IBI, however if not measuring this we need a goal more tied to implementation activities. Issue statement should also look more at impairments and be included in description.
 - Where does Groundwater fit? Dependent resources currently tier two. We should be complete in each section and then highlight overlaps.
 - There should be a broader blanket issues statement for streams and then break it down. There is a tie to Landscape Concerns, could link to high load sub-basins to target or stack data for multiple benefits.
 - Value based decisions are okay in 1W1P because we can't do everything in 10 years.
 - Will streambank erosion be address? Yes, in implementation if tied to resource concern.
- Goal 4: Issue statement for streams should be expanded to watershed wide. Group is comfortable with the current e.coli reduction goal being tied to recreation areas.

➤ Wetlands

- Issue Statement: The storage function of wetlands ranked higher than other benefits and is the focus here rather than habitat benefits.
- Goals 1, 2 and 3: Would be better to frame goals as a net gain than just maintain status quo. Also not wise to tie to programs/laws as these can change, keep goals more broad.
 - Goodhue County has ordinance that puts preference towards local wetland credits, but there are not always banking credits available.
 - Focus should be on restoration. We can promote banks but also utilize CREP, RIM, Fish and Wildlife Services or others. When you factor all these programs we are probably exceed no net loss. There is no good inventory or data set on wetlands.
 - Could also look at ratio of wetlands in lake watershed.
 - Do we focus on quantity or quality? Response was quantity.
 - Do we break down into wetland types? Response was no.
 - Look at ac/ft reductions in 'x' watershed? Yes, need hydrologic models for this.
 - ◆ Waterville has a study
 - ◆ Owatonna has GSSHA for Maple Creek
 - ◆ Northfield has Spring Creek study
 - ◆ Faribault is working on a floodwall study
 - ◆ Look at straight river marsh area too?
 - Education and outreach of wetlands, should it be here, in education issues or in both? We will see.
 - Could look at the Restored Wetland Inventory and assume a pre-settlement condition and set a goal based on that.
 - Wetlands are a resource but we're losing the resource component when we focus only on their flood reduction benefits. Is this really a flooding issue and therefore it should be under Landuse Concerns and wetlands become a tier 2 concern? Possibly, we will see.

➤ Groundwater

- Issue Statement: Chloride is not a drinking water concern, but is becoming a concern, explain why it is included in statement. This is written as a drinking water issue statement, however there are none drinking water goals such as groundwater dependent resources.
- Goals should be organized by public and private water supplies. Public supply DWSMAs already have some measureable goals in them.
- Is well testing considered monitoring? Not specified, but likely is acceptable.

- Goal 2: should say achieves or exceed state and federal drinking water standards. Parameters should also be selected.
- Add a goal on well sealing and well construction.
- Goal 3: Rewritten to trout streams and groundwater dependent priority lakes.
 - DNR appropriations covers this, however it is needed as goal if we want any activities related to this.
 - Legal section of the plan is needed, it is good to cross reference but laws can always change. Recognize them but do not tie goals to laws.

➤ Summary

- EOR will re-organize and get the document back out to the group
- Next month we will develop goals for Landuse and Socio-Economic Concerns.
- We will need to decide how much information to include for tier 2 concerns.

❖ **Next Steps**

- Next meeting will be **February 21st**, 9am at the Rice County Government Services Building.
- Water Conversations
 - March 6th in Northfield at the Archer House
 - March 15th in Owatonna at Cabela's