**Advisory Committee Meeting**

**Wednesday, Jan. 26, 2-3:30pm**

**NOTES**

**[Meeting Recording](https://youtu.be/T7C-K3HoTT8)**

1. A8) Subcommittee - Request for approval: Rock Lake (Pine County) Subwatershed Analysis (roll call vote)
   * Jay – the subcommittee recommends funding this project
   * Question from Emily – is there a pollutant reduction estimate for projects already completed in the Rock Lake watershed?
     + Jeremy – no, and there are likely not 274 projects in that watershed. Phosphorus reductions from completed projects is yet unknown. Part of the reason for doing the SWA is to determine where P loads are coming from. MPCA will likely provide funding to complete water chemistry analysis. Jeremy can provide actual number of completed projects for the application before it goes to Chisago SWCD board for final approval
     + Caleb – since coming to the committee earlier, they have identified funding for the water chemistry component and allocated more resources for the SWA
     + Michelle – how does this study on work completed previously for the St. Croix TMDL
       1. Jeremy – no data was collected from this location for the TMDL. Need to prioritize locations for projects where they will actually provide a benefit.
     + Craig – total project cost listed as $8000 and grant request is $12,000. Is there a typo?
       1. Jeremy will update the correct total project cost and send to Angie. The grant request is correct.
       2. Hoping to get work done by May of 2022
     + Karen – how much is remaining in the SWA budget? And is there a match required
       1. $80k is left in the budget and no match is recommended
       2. Pine Co is providing $500 in match
   * Roll call vote: 15 yes. 2 absent/abstaining.
2. A7) Internal Analyses subcommittee – Susanna Wilson – Witkowski
   * Request for approval: Forest Lake Internal Load Analysis (roll call vote)
     + A7 Subcommittee fully supports moving forward on this project
     + $50k total in the WBIF budget for internal analyses. This project would be $16.5k. CLFLWD will provide about $20k in match
     + The subcommittee will continue evaluating other proposals to potentially bring to the steering committee
     + Jay – what should we set as a requirement for external load reduction before doing an alum treatment? The state recommends 75%. This project is at the 80% level so it meets this goal.
       1. Emily – before CLFLWD does the alum treatment it will be even closer to 100% external load reduction. CLFLWD is making a relatively small funding request with the thought in mind that other partners will have internal loading studies that may need funding too. If we are getting close to the end of the grant and have available funds, CLFLWD could spend more.
       2. Matt Moore – who at the state has been providing guidance on external loading for whole-lake treatments? If it comes from BWSR, it is not a rule. DNR has not provided clear guidance.
       3. Susanna – the A7 group is looking into what the threshold is for external load reduction prior to in-lake treatment. That is part of the reason for holding off on the other proposals submitted.
       4. Michelle – BWSR does not have a hard and fast rule
       5. Jay – we should set a threshold as a group. The science is clear that we need to control external loading before doing internal treatment
       6. Jamie – supports a policy but might not want to set a hard fast number because there may be variables and also differences between how shallow and deep lakes act.
       7. Matt Moore concurs that it is hard to set a hard number, given the variables in ecotypes for lakes in our area. We need to demonstrate that we are doing everything we can to reduce external loading
       8. Craig – we’re getting off track on this discussion. It’s good to bring suggestions to the subcommittee but can we vote on the project at hand? Also, does the steering committee want to consider approving a higher amount?
       9. Karen – MPCA [www.pca.state.mn.us/sites/default/files/wq-s1-98.pdf](http://www.pca.state.mn.us/sites/default/files/wq-s1-98.pdf)
          1. "No threshold of external phosphorus reduction has been identified to trigger the use of internal loadmeasures. Although there are estimated, unpublished guidelines suggesting 50% or greater internalloading will limit the efficacy of watershed management activities to reduce in-lake phosphorus (KenWagner, pers comm), the use of “rule of thumb” management decisions over simplifies the complex andunique nature of individual lakes and our relatively limited knowledge of the application of internal loadcontrols."
       10. Jay – should we approve the current request today and consider upping the funding later if the other projects do not rank as high?
       11. Angie - are you suggesting upping the funding request to $25k? The WBIF grant work plan suggested funding two projects at $25k each
       12. Karen – would like to vote on the current funding request
       13. Susanna – we could bring this proposal back to the steering committee in Feb. after the subcommittee has time to review other projects
       14. Jamie – supportive of the project but feels awkward about adding more money when there is already local funding in place to complete the project
       15. Matt – this would supplement, not supplant what a LGU is doing. We could put a “not to exceed” clause in the agreement and then provide more funding if available
       16. Angie – proposal to vote on the application as is.
   * Roll call vote. 12 yes. 5 absent/abstaining.
3. Planning team updates
   * 2022 Timeline for implementation and planning
   * Financial update
   * Request for approval to update the Lower St. Croix interactive web map and migrate the map to a new server (roll call vote)
     + Emily provided background on the need to update the map
     + Chisago SWCD would have a contract directly with Barr to do this work
     + Matt Downing – is there detail on what we are paying for? The WCD is about to pay $30k for a new server and theoretically could host the map. Is it on a server or on the cloud?
     + Craig – it’s critical to get the map updated for the purposes of annual reporting. Could Barr do that work and then turn it over to WCD to host? If so, would there be a fee for WCD to host?
     + Jay – it is a relatively small amount and didn’t seem worth it to request other proposals. Can’t imagine that it would be cheaper to host at WCD than at Barr.
     + Emily – the current proposal is to host the map until Dec. 2023 so we could consider moving it after that.
     + Angie – could we vote on approving up to $5600 today, with the possibility that it might end up being less if we just have Barr update the map but then host it internally
     + Matt M – we will likely find that it is more work than it is worth.
     + Matt D – would like to do a bit more research to make an informed decision
     + Angie – WCD recently created a brand new project tracking database with info on 9000+ urban and rural projects completed over the past 15 years. Would like to see that integrated with the interactive map and potentially expanded to the entire Lower St. Croix to create an effective tracking system that is also very visual
     + Darrick – will these map updates address outlying areas of the watershed like Isanti and Pine County?
     + Emily – yes and no
     + Jay – we’ll get the missing data sets into the map as soon as we can. Right now the map is a good education tool. We can discuss allocating more funding toward this goal in the next work plan.
     + Darrick – would like to see the majority of our funds going toward putting projects in the ground instead of technology updates. The map seems like a secondary activity.
     + Jay – the map should help with reporting to BWSR and public education
     + Roll call vote: 14 yes. 3 absent/abstaining.
4. Discussion: 2022 Annual Plan of Work and 2021 Progress Report – Emily Heinz
   * Review/ discuss changes to the 2022 annual plan of work
     + Columns added to identify Fiscal Agent/Responsible Party and Funding Source for each activity
     + Items noted that align with current WBIF grant work plan
     + Partners asked to review and update by Feb. 23
   * Plan for progress reporting
     + Emily will upload the 66 line spreadsheet to a Sharepoint – local partners should add their completed projects to the applicable activities
     + Craig – do you want dots on a map or a narrative for the projects
     + Emily – the question is what does the partnership want?
       1. For BWSR reporting, a lot of detail is needed.
       2. For annual reporting, it’s up to us on how much info we want to collect
       3. Craig – state funded projects are all tracked on a map in eLink
       4. Jay – we have very little guidance from BWSR on how to track the work of the partnership. Could look into costs to expand the WCD project database to the full watershed or basin.
       5. Angie – long term it would be nice to have a map & project database like WCD has. It’s easy to track projects for 1yr, but would be really good to have something better at the end of 10yrs. Could we bring this back to the planning team for further convo?
       6. Craig – the excel file that Emily put together is a great start. Can we just add one more column to the spreadsheet where partners can add a narrative on projects they’ve completed.
5. Subcommittee Updates
   * A1) Agronomy Outreach – Jay Riggs
     + [Jennifer Hahn hired to serve as embedded agronomy outreach specialist in the Lower St. Croix Watershed](https://mailchi.mp/c33b56ed6f38/lower-st-croix-partnership-july-2021-agenda-updates-6670977?e=3ac67bf3fa)
     + Joel Larson – very excited about Jennifer starting on Feb. 28
   * A2,4,5) Urban and Agricultural Projects – Craig Mell and Mike Isensee
     + Reminder to talk with subcommittees about potential projects for 2022-23
     + Matt Moore – has a $1.2M project planned for Trout Brook and will be asking for $350k from the Lower St. Croix WBIF grant. SWWD has a 30% design. Will go to subcommittee and bring to steering committee in February.
     + Great River Greening is also putting $365k toward the project.
   * A3) Watershed Education – Barbara Heitkamp
   * A6) Wetland Restoration – Becky Wozney
   * A8) Targeting and Prioritization Analyses – Jay Riggs
     + Jay – prioritization protocols are underway. Subcatchment delineation and prioritization work by EOR are underway and they are working with Chisago SWCD. Hope to have work completed by March and then move on to the hot-spot analysis. Tree canopy protocol to be done by Feb. 9. EOR is using the most recent data (per question by Jackie Anderson).