

Cannon River 1W1P

Technical Advisory Group

Meeting #3 Notes

November 15, 2017

9:00am – 12:00pm

Faribault Armory

3000 W Airport Rd, Faribault, MN 55021

Technical Advisory Group: Mark DuChene (*City of Waseca*), Spencer Herbert (*MDA*), Cole Johnson (*City of Northfield*), Shaina Keseley (*BWSR*), Melissa King (*City of Faribault*), Todd Piepho (*DNR*), Kristi Pursell (*CRWP*), Bradley Rademacher (*City of Owatonna*), Emily Resseger (*Met Council*), Bob Stark (*City of Red Wing*), 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*), Michael Schultz (*LeSueur SWCD*).

BWSR Advisory Staff: Jenny Mocol-Johnson

EOR Consulting Staff: Camilla Correll and Meghan Funke

❖ Meeting Goals

- Goal is to finalize the watershed issues and concerns by working through results of the previous TAG meeting and the Watershed Concerns table. An example of the Lake Superior North Plan was presented to show where we are headed. Goal is to have tier one, two and three priorities. It will also be noted if another entity has a program to address the priority concern

❖ Programs Table

- The summary of programs table was distributed to all. It is in a new format that will help everyone identify gaps. Program information can help when thinking about priorities. County and SWCD staff need to review the table. This table should focus only on dedicated funding programs, not grants. There was a comment about city or other partners programs are not included (e.g. MS4). They could be polled, but this programs table is representative of the local water plan authorities. There was also a comment about SWCDs that have a Non-Structural Practices Plan, these should be reviewed.

❖ Review results from last TAG/PWG meeting

- All of the results from last meetings discussion were available. The map of priority areas was reviewed. When asked about the process, EOR explained that previous planning efforts have demonstrated that starting with the long list of issues and concerns is difficult for participants because everything is a priority without context. By starting with the prioritization process with the priority areas, meeting participants can better assess remaining issues and concerns relative to cost, capacity and need.
 - Cannon Bottoms:
 - Doesn't reflect the whole karst area, should this be made larger to include the Northfield area?
 - Lakes Area:
 - Include Circle Lake and Union Lake in this area as well.
 - Straight River Tributaries:
 - Add phosphorus or low flow phosphorus as a concern. Reference page 40 of WRAPS.
 - Large Communities:
 - Add recreation as a concern.
 - Northfield DWSMA is karst, is there a way to add this in the concerns. DWSMAs could also be ranked high-medium-low with existing data from MDH. There should also be a general statement on non-delineated DWSMAs.

- It was noted that the tribal community in the watershed has not participated in 1W1P.

❖ **Watershed Concerns and Issues Table**

- The group worked through the document together and addressed all items that have not been covered. EOR electronically updated a table of tier one, two and three priorities as the group provided input on where to place items.
 - General Comments:
 - Think beyond the benefits to the watershed, such as benefits to Lake Pepin.
 - One column is titled “where is issue/concern in planning area?” What do we call areas outside of the priority areas on the map? We should use same names as WRAPS, such as Middle Cannon.
 - Streams, Lakes and Rivers:
 - Bacteria- We need more data on e.coli source. This could stay in this category or move to lack of monitoring data. Bacteria is a regional issue and hard to prioritize based on this indicator alone as it can vary a lot within one stream reach. Focus should be on feedlots and un-sewered communities. There was discussion on whether we are seeing improvements in WQ since there have been improvements to feedlots. It is hard to show results on this as bacteria is living and can live in stream/lake environments even after the source is addressed.
 - All impaired waters a priority? During last month’s TAG impaired waters were paired down, one tool that assisted with this was the nearly/barely list. These lakes are all within a priority area.
 - Lack of monitoring data and assessments- There is a need for better data sharing. All existing stations should be included, a table or map format would be beneficial (put in Land and Water Resource Inventory). It was noted that level gauges are needed above all flood prone communities. There was discussion that focus should be on projects, especially because there has been some input from Policy Committee members that they want to see projects get done with this plan. They don’t want to do any more planning. This doesn’t mean that there is no monitoring, but it is more focused on project effectiveness.
 - Wetlands:
 - Financial needs- There are gaps in existing programs (RIM, CREP) and can be difficult to implement.
 - Somewhat of a lower priority as wetlands come out more as an implementation strategy. Fens are more impacted by groundwater. Also a counter point that since they do address many issues, why aren’t they higher? Need to stay at a broader level now when discussing
 - Do we know where high quality wetlands are? Could prioritize on this information if it exists. WRAPS has some reference on wetland loss on pages 18-20. Currently protection for existing wetlands through WCA. It was noted that WCA doesn’t protect from stormwater runoff/pollutants.
 - Restoration would rank higher than protection due to existing programs/regulations.
 - Groundwater:
 - Lack of data on quantity. Quantity is somewhat addressed by DNR appropriations permitting.
 - No tools/funding for irrigation water management.
 - Quality is more of an issue, except for groundwater dependent natural resources, then quantity is important.
 - Recharge is partially addressed by zoning in DWSSMAs.
 - GRAPS should be utilized when setting priority areas.

- Ecosystems:
 - Natural corridors should be watershed wide, but are tier two or three priorities. Can also fit better in quality of life as a component to recreation.
- Invasive Species:
 - AIS has been driven by money but counties have plans/programs
 - Do terrestrial invasives have direct correlation with WQ? Not many, but buckthorn could as it shades out grass cover (understory) and makes soil more prone to erosion.
 - Invasive species category can be divided to Lakes and Recreation and then not be a standalone concern.
- Climate Change:
 - May fit better in Landscape concerns category.
 - High concern for communities, lower for others.
 - Add warming of micro-climates as a concern.
 - Nutrient loading more prevalent in large rain events and drought/heavy rain cycles.
- Agriculture:
 - Feedlot- manure application seems to be more of an issue than the feedlot itself. Fertilizer could also be ranked high as concerns for manure and fertilizer are almost the same.
 - Soil health is ranked high due to ability to affect multiple issues. Healthier soils hold more water on the landscape and require fewer inputs.
 - How does loss of farmland affect WQ? Is it not just trading issues to development?
 - This is a very large category, but more details will be in the implementation strategies.
- Forestry:
 - An issue that not many seem to care about until there is an issue (i.e. people see trees being cut down). Somewhat of a lower priority concern (tier two).
 - Need more tools such as change in tax structure for forest land.
- Development:
 - Le Sueur has a no-net-loss policy, which is implemented through zoning. Existing shoreland quality and restoration is a different issues than protection from development.
 - Townships in Goodhue are wanting more development for tax base.
 - Stormwater retrofits are needed, especially in smaller, non-MS4 communities.
 - Septics generally rank higher, but there was discussion on whether that is compliance or inventories. Zoning should address compliance issue.
 - Waste disposal and waste waterwater (municipal) management are two separate issues, and both have programs in place.
 - Are there any direct discharge communities?
 - Some communities have flood events that lead to overflows in systems. Storage and its relation to climate change should be looked at to determine capacity. Also, is there capacity for more development (this should be a city comprehensive plan item).
- Drainage:
 - Is this the same as riparian areas? Not really, this includes public and private ditches and tile drainage.
 - Altered hydrology is a high issue as it increases flows and peak rates.
 - Old designs are an issue. Need new ditch system designs that factor in storage, reduced peak flows.

- Education and Outreach:
 - Stewardship should be added.
 - Training and education primarily relates to government officials/decision makers and is a higher priority. Need to have citizens with 'water literacy' as they put pressure on the decision makers.
 - How is stakeholder group defined?
- Coordination and Partnerships:
 - More monitoring coordination needed.
 - Websites- is there a one stop shop for information/data? CRWP used to serve in this function, unsure of this in the future.
 - Need to enhance existing partnership and develop new ones. We are a new partnership that needs to be fostered too.
- Funding and Implementation:
 - Many comments throughout the day apply here as well.
 - Hard to think about this now, and we may have more after working on implementation strategies.
- Recreation and Livability:
 - Species protection could be high, but then also mentioned that they only have more of a secondary benefit to WQ.
 - High need to maintain and create new recreation opportunities.
- Summary: These priority issues and concerns will be summarized by EOR and will go out to TAG/PWG for final review before they are brought to the Policy Committee on January 10th.

❖ Next Steps

- No December meetings.
- A summary on our tier one, two and three final priorities will be prepared by EOR.
- Next TAG meeting will be **January 17th**, 9am at the Rice County Government Services Building.