

Cannon River 1W1P

Technical Advisory Group

Meeting #12 Notes

April 3, 2019

9:00am – 12:00 pm

Faribault Armory

3000 W Airport Rd, Faribault, MN 55021

Technical Advisory Group: Cole Johnson (*City of Northfield*), Shaina Keseley (*BWSR*), Mark Duchene (*City of Faribault*), Becky Smith (*City of Faribault*), Todd Piepho (*DNR*), Kristi Pursell (*CRWP*), Jennifer Ronnenberg (*MDH*), Wayne Cords (*PCA*)

Planning Work Group: Brad Becker (*Dakota County*), Brad Behrens (*Rice County*), Ashley Gallagher (*Dakota SWCD*), Eric Gulbransen (*Steele SWCD*), Beau Kennedy (*Goodhue SWCD*), Haley Byron (*Waseca County*), Holly Kalbus (*LeSueur County*), Steve Pahs (*Rice SWCD*), Glen Roberson (*Goodhue SWCD*), Mark Schaetzke (*Waseca SWCD*), Mike Schultz (*LeSueur SWCD*),

Advisory Staff: Camilla Correll (*EOR*), Jenny Mocol-Johnson (*BWSR*)

❖ Updates on Recent Meetings

A brief summary of the Open House was provided. There were 24 people in attendance. Only one comment received, from Circle Lake, and the same comment was reflected in the 60-Day comment letter. The last Policy Committee meeting was held March 13. At this meeting the PC submitted the Draft Plan for 60-Day review and started to think ahead to implementation. There were updates on the status of members signing the JPA for forming the Cannon River Watershed Joint Powers Board (CRWJPB). Dakota County, Dakota SWCD and North Cannon River Watershed Management Organization (NCRWMO) are all in a place where it is best for them to wait for a Board of Water and Soil Resources (BWSR) decision on how Watershed Based Funding (WBF) will be distributed, as there are currently separate processes for the 7-county metro area and greater Minnesota 1W1P. The intent and hope is for all three of these entities to participate and sign the JPA.

❖ Review Comments and Responses

➤ Summary of Comments

- A spreadsheet of all comments and draft notes/responses was passed out at the meeting. There were a total of 162 comments received from 12 different organizations or agencies. Comments were grouped into three categories in order to best utilize the time of the TAG. There were 23 comments that the TAG needed to discuss, 19 comments were related to checking numbers and will be addressed directly by EOR, and the remaining 120 comments were easier to address as they primarily pertained to providing clarification or grammatical edits. It was noted that depending upon the discussion, at the end of the meeting a sub-group could be formed to further address comments. The group agreed on this approach to reviewing comments.

➤ Metropolitan Council, Comment #2, Flowchart

- A point of discussion as there was a contradicting comment supporting the flowchart.
- Decision: Change the text introducing the flowchart to clearly state it is an actual example from the plan.

➤ Waseca County, Comment #1, Clear and Loon Lakes

- Comments from Waseca EDA and Waseca Lakes Association were all similarly requesting Clear and Loon to be higher priority, and/or clarified in the plan. Map of priority areas has Waseca Lakes listed in the call out, but is not referenced elsewhere in the plan. There was also an MPCA comment about Clear and Loon Lakes and their drainage areas being primarily MS4 areas. This led to discussion on changing the Stormwater Ordinance Development issue back to Stormwater management and the possible inclusion of a retrofit goal. There was some support from other communities on this as well. BWSR mentioned a tool should then be added to table 6-2. There was discussion on the best tools, MIDS can measure but not target, and currently only studies are a good targeting tool for stormwater retrofits.
- Decision: Add Waseca lakes area to priority area descriptions either under #2 or a new #5. Modify map to show Waseca lakes area (don't use blue). Ensure Clear, Loon and Goose are in local priorities section.

Also modify Stormwater issue, and add a goal for retrofits. Add MIDS as measuring tool and studies as targeting tools for the new goal, or describe process for each city.

- **MPCA, Comment #6, E.coli and Regional Programs**
 - Discussion on whether to add a regional programs and/or funding section. E.coli was previously discussed and it was noted it's hard to track and numbers are 'best guesses'. Le Sueur does have numbers for reductions for septic projects. It was agreed that e.coli numbers are good on a project scale but cannot be translated to a resource reduction
 - Decision: Modify issue statement for 3.1.1-C to mention the regional programs in MPCA comment.
- **MPCA, Comment #11, 0.5 acre activity**
 - Discussion on whether to delete or integrate into another activity. Good to have mention of short season crops as they may be present in target drainage areas, but can easily vary in acreage from year to year.
 - Decision: Remove as its own activity and incorporate into 3.2.1-B-2 by adding language on short season crops.
- **MPCA, Comment #20 and #21, 300 AU and Shoreland**
 - Discussion on why originally 100AU, and it was thought that purpose was just to address smaller operations, which would still happen with 300AU but 300AU would also align with state mandatory planning requirements. Discussion on whether feedlot is defined, but Animal Units AU is purposely used as this is defined by State.
 - Decision: Change to 300 AU and modify activity 3.1.1-C-% to place higher priority within shorelands.
- **MDA, Comment #4, Other programs/funding**
 - Similar discussion on adding programs and/or funding section.
 - Decision: No change, programs change and they are covered broadly under State Funding section.
- **MDA, Comment #5, MAWQCP**
 - Decision: Add to table 5-1 and every SWCD receives an X as they all offer the program.
- **BWSR, Comment #4, WQ goals modest**
 - Concern was that water quality goals are modest and may be hard to track progress, MPCA had similar concerns. Really have to focus efforts to see change. Goals are in targeted drainage areas, which is good, and they become smaller as the group weighed what is needed with what is feasible to accomplish in 10 year. WQ monitoring may not always show results, will have to rely on other tools as well to show progress. Discussion on HSPF being a good measuring tool, while the BMP spreadsheets are still good for planning just not as good for measuring.
 - Decision: Leave the water quality goals as they are but add a bullet to the list of criteria in work planning section that highlights if there is momentum in a targeted area, continue implementation so we see change.
- **BWSR, Comment #27, Activity 3.1.2-A-1**
 - Removing "elsewhere in the sub-watershed as needed" was not an issue but there was discussion on "other tools". Concern that new tools may become available during the 10 year plan, if this happens a plan revision could be made.
 - Decision: Modify the activity to reference table 6-1 and add SWMM to table 6-1 as a targeting tool for wetlands.
- **BWSR, Comment #38, Lake Management Plans**
 - There was discussion about moving the lake management plans up in the timeline, so as to complete both the impaired lakes and protection lake plans before 2025. Originally spread out due to local capacity, but group would be okay with either timeline.
 - Decision: Shift three impaired lakes lake management plans to be completed before 2025. EOR will re-evaluate cost of each plan and develop list of what would be in a lake management plan for that price.
- **BWSR, Comment #39, Stream Restoration**
 - BWSR recommended using feet of restoration as a measurement. Group estimated usually \$100-\$150 a foot.

- Decision: Use 1,700ft of stream restoration, this fits with the current activity of \$250,000 for stream restoration.
- **BWSR, Comment # 43, Percentage Tracking**
 - Recommendation to use pounds instead of percentages. During discussion group liked both percentage and acres, but adding pounds could be helpful too.
 - Decision: Have percentages, acres and pounds in implementation table.
- **BWSR, Comment #50 and #55, Financial stipends**
 - Clarification on the comment was provided. Group did not have strong opinions either way.
 - Decision: Remove 'financial stipends' from both activities (3.3.1-A-1 and 3.3.2-B-5).
- **BWSR, Comment #57**
 - Clarification on comment was provided and confusion on list seems to stem from the way they are written.
 - Decision: Write all bullets in statement form.
- **BWSR, Comment #67, Programs Table**
 - Table has been reviewed multiple times, however there still seem to be errors. Responsibility of local staff to submit and ensure correctness.
 - Decision: Gallagher will send out table again with instructions to staff on updating.
- **BWSR, Comment #69, WRAPS**
 - Recommended making drainage goals more consistent with WRAPS.
 - Decision: BWSR staff will coordinate with Melissa Lewis to get more clarification on this comment.
- **BWSR, Comment #73, Operation and Maintenance**
 - Elements may be in the plan but not in section 5.3, maybe just a reference would work however it was unclear if this is sufficient. Definitions of "public works and facilities" are needed as well.
 - Decision: Seek clarification from Melissa Lewis and double check Plan based upon response.
- **BWSR, Comment #75, Table 5-4**
 - Discussion on adding enforcement to the table, no objections. Some discussion on meaning of categories, such as well ordinance could be thought of as the delegated well programs too.
 - Decision: Gallagher will send table out with instructions to staff, and well ordinance and delegated program will be clarified.
- **BWSR, Comment #77, Funding Tables**
 - Concern with table 5-7 is primarily with 'incentive programs' as this category seems large and not reflective of activities. This is a summary table and all activities were placed into a category. There was also discussion on including NCRWMO and Belle Creek and there was concern with this from the group, as they are under local priorities. This could set precedence and make it unclear as to where to draw the line for including funding.
 - Decision: Seek clarification from Melissa Lewis. Update name of table 5-7 to provide clarification and break incentive programs into sub-categories.
- **BWSR, Comment #85, Criteria List**
 - Recommended removing the first bullet in the list. Clarification was sought.
 - Decision: Ask Melissa Lewis for clarification.

❖ Check In and Next Steps

- Group discussed forming a sub-group to review and formulate responses to comments. The group was comfortable with progress made today and felt a sub-group was not needed. Timeline was also discussed and it was decided to delay the submittal for 90-Day review. Originally thought if no comments were received at public hearing, the Policy Committee could submit that same day, however they will now be asked to have another meeting. Date proposed for the meeting is June 5th. If Gallagher and EOR have a conference call with BWSR staff, invite the full group. Grammatical errors will be addressed by EOR with this round of revisions, and then if there are further comments those can be made on the next version. TAG/PWG will meet on May 22nd to review comments and changes made to Plan.