

Cannon River 1W1P

Technical Advisory Group

Meeting #11 Notes

October 22, 2018

9:00am – 12:00 pm

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

Technical Advisory Group: Margaret Wagner (*MDA*), Cole Johnson (*City of Northfield*), Shaina Keseley (*BWSR*), Mark Duchene (*City of Faribault*), Todd Piepho (*DNR*), Kristi Pursell (*CRWP*), Emily Resseger (*Met Council*), Jennifer Ronnenberg (*MDH*), Justin Watkins (*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*), Dale Oolman (*Steele County*), Steve Pahs (*Rice SWCD*), Mark Schaezke (*Waseca SWCD*), Mike Schultz (*LeSueur SWCD*), Brian Watson (*Dakota SWCD*)

Advisory Staff: Camilla Correll (*EOR*), Meghan Funke (*EOR*), Jenny Mocol-Johnson (*BWSR*), Ed Lenz (*BWSR*), Melissa King (*BWSR*)

❖ **Agenda and Meeting Goals**

Large portion of the meeting was dedicated to working through Section 3 and addressing any outstanding comments. Agenda included decision items and the ‘parking lot’ was used to document any topics that were not needed for finishing the plan, but will need to be discussed in the future. A short presentation on tools utilized in this 1W1P and comparison to other plans was added to the agenda.

❖ **Timeline Review**

In the time between the last TAG meeting on July 24 and this meeting there have been a number of conference calls. A general update email was provided a few weeks ago. Meeting on July 27 was held to address Belle Creek Watershed District and North Cannon River Watershed Management Organization. There was a conference call on August 13 to address the required water storage goal. Summary of the decision made was sent out to the TAG. There have been two conference calls with BWSR to discuss goals, how they are worded and measurability. From these discussions came the creation of the Justification of Goals and Pace of Progress portions of the updated draft of the plan. In general we have heard from BWSR staff that our Plan is different, but different does not necessarily mean the Plan is insufficient. We intentionally made our plan different from the pilots in the beginning with consultant selection to decisions made throughout the planning process.

❖ **Tools Comparison**

A short presentation was provided by EOR to show how tools have been used during the Cannon River 1W1P just in a different order or process than some other watersheds. The question was asked of the group if this is what they wanted from the beginning and the group agreed that the tools selected and process used is what they had intended.

❖ **Justification of Goals and Pace of Progress**

The Navigation of the Plan flowchart was provided for the group. This flowchart was created and presented at the Policy Committee meeting on September 26 to help walk the Policy Committee through the plan by using one example. This flow chart helps show where the two new components are in the plan. The Justification of Goals and Pace of Progress were added to help ‘show our work’ and help any person picking up the plan figure out where the goals came from and how they will be tracked.

The discussion dove into the example on the flowchart, which was for Protection Lakes. Questions raised included, how does an activity of creating a Lake Management Plan result in actual reductions. The table is more of an accounting tool, where other activities may have direct reductions and then through accounting it is anticipated that the items identified in a lake management plan will need to have at least the reduction number

in the table in order to meet the overall goal. Further in the plan it is clear that not all activities result in a direct reduction and this is indicated in the tables with Not Applicable. Change wording in activity to say complete lake management plans 'and implement projects'. This will address the concern about reductions appearing to come from plans when we know they actually come from projects.

There was a concern brought forward that the plan has a number of further planning activities or education and outreach activities that will not result in direct pollutant reductions. Response discussion was that the plan is not intended to be a load reduction plan but is a comprehensive watershed management plan, which incorporates technical and social aspects of the watershed. Where reductions can be identified, they have been identified. It is also recognized that for some activities where it is difficult to have a direct correlation to reduction numbers, outputs have to be acceptable for measurability as well. This led to a discussion on measurability and how to show the pace of progress towards meeting a goal during the ten year plan. Other plans show pace as a percentage, but this is not a requirement. We will also need to be able to show pace through key milestones in eLink workplans.

Questions as to how the goals were developed by the group. This is the Justification of Goals, which for many are based on WRAPS. It depends upon 'the currency' used in the goal. There were also a number of sub-group calls. At the May TAG meeting people volunteered for sub-groups. The sub-groups then had conference calls to go through the goals and activities to compare what is needed to what is reasonable to accomplish. Sub-groups reported back to the full TAG.

There was discussion on the Implementation Table and how these connections to measurability/reductions could be made clearer by adding another column. The information is in the plan, the decision to add the column or not is a matter of formatting choices. It is unsure if these formatting choices will truly address BWSRs concerns with measurability.

A comment was made that the flowchart handed out at the meeting was helpful and a question as to whether one would be created for every issue. Most likely not as there are 20 tier one issues.

There was a comment made that seeing other tools such as ACPF in the toolbox was encouraging as MDA see value in this tool.

❖ **Worksheet for Section 3**

The worksheet was introduced as a way to work through section 3 of the plan. A number of items at the top had been discussed with BWSR but there were still a few overarching concerns to address. It was not possible to address all of BWSRs comments before this meeting and BWSR preferred the group to see/discuss their comments, which is why they were included in the worksheet. It was made clear by BWSR staff that where it states 'addressed during conference call with BWSR' does not mean that BWSR has approved of a section, they may still have concerns.

First Issue that was discussed is Protection Lakes. A few clarifying questions were brought forward. Explanation of why Sprague is not tier one is needed, and same should be done for a few of the streams. If not all the coldwater streams are listed as tier one, why were some removed. The response was that this ties into the weight of evidence approach used, which also includes public input. If not clear in the text, add to justification of goals.

Second issue discussed was Wetland Restoration. The acres have changed in the goal, but it is still not clear if this is a per year or ten year goal. The response was that the numbers were calculated using the NBMP spreadsheet which is what is utilized in WRAPS.

Overarching concern for Protection Lakes, Impaired lakes, Pollutant Impaired Streams and Wetland Restorations is that BWSR would like to see the use of another tool for further targeting. It was not stated that a tool was required, but it was clear that BWSR staff may consider the plan insufficient as it is currently written.

Drinking water was the next set of goals that was discussed by the group. MDH helped form these goals and provided an overview to the group. MDH reached out to a number of public water suppliers and used GRAPS. First two goals relate to public suppliers and the last two are for private wells. In goal 2, four communities are listed because data shows they are vulnerable. It was asked whether the trend analysis would be conducted by MDH if not listed in the goal, and the response was it would not, which is why it is included. Goal 4 is trying to connect land use. The 60% is from the WRAPS and 5 ppm is halfway to the threshold but also aligns fairly well with MDA groundwater protection rule threshold of 5.4 ppm. Comment that the word 'protect' in goal 3 assumes that current conditions are good and that may not be the case. It was recommended to change this wording. There was discussion on whether nitrate testing would be eligible for Clean Water Funds (CWF). The response is that it depends on situation and is debatable but probably not. There was discussion that MPCA would be able to support these goals and provide some tools that could be surrogates for indicators and providing measurability. The group thought that 25 projects a year would be doable because like many other projects, they could also overlap with other activities. Source control could be a variety of types of projects including well sealing.

The group jumped to discussion on Shoreland Management goals. Comment from BWSR indicated that goals need to be tied to water quality and load reduction numbers. Goal 1 is no net loss and load reductions are identified in the plan where we currently have numbers available.

Discussion became focused on tools and measurability. There was not consensus among BWSR staff as to whether further tools are needed or not. The PWG never intended to use only PTMapp, or comparable tools, in this plan. The original application submitted for the BWSR grant was read and the PWG felt that they are meeting what they submitted. Many in the PWG did not want to delay the planning process further, they are willing to work with BWSR but ultimately they are answering to their Boards and the Policy Committee. The PWG will need one BWSR contact so that clear direction can be given and the process can continue. BWSR thinks that a repeatable reduction number is not possible without the use of a tool. It was asked if the NBMP spreadsheet, as used for many of the current goals, was considered an acceptable tool. The response was yes it is acceptable but it is not clear in our plan and needs to be put more in the forefront. Comment was made that Plan Content Requirements seem to continuously change based upon which BWSR staff is interpreting them and that 1W1P will never be a local process or a local plan until BWSR invites local input into developing and defining their Plan Content Requirements.

There was a quick check in with the group. The local staffs ultimately bring the plan to the Policy Committee and then the Policy Committee sends the plan out for 60 day review. Local staffs were asked what their current comfort level with the plan was with zero being no comfort and 5 being ready to submit for 60 day. The majority of the group felt we were at a 4, with some at a 3, some at a 5 but no one was under a comfort level of 3. If there are future conference calls with BWSR the full PWG would like to be invited, no need to coordinate schedules, just extend the invite so people can choose to listen in or not.

❖ **Next Steps:**

- Addressing BWSR comments and amending plan accordingly
- Next meeting is tentatively planned for **February 13, 2019**, 9am at the Rice County Government Services Building, pending 60 Day review is complete.