**Steering Committee Meeting**

**Wednesday, Oct. 27, 1-2:30pm**

**MINUTES**

1. Administrative Updates
   * Financial update – Craig Mell
     + Reviewed financial info shared at PC meeting
   * Discussion: Funding allocation for 2022-24 biennium
     + Next round we will get about $20k more. Will receive July 1 of 2022 if we have a work plan in place.
2. Subcommittee Updates
   * **A1) Agronomy Outreach** – Jay Riggs
     + Subcommittee is reviewing applications
   * **A2,4,5) Urban and Agricultural Projects** – Craig Mell and Mike Isensee
     + Update on SWWD WBIF funded project in Denmark Twp – Matt Moore
       - Completed in June. SWWD just received the final pay request and will send to Chisago SWCD for grant reimbursement.
       - Matt suggested that the group talk about engineering costs and including those into overall construction cost vs as a separate TA cost
     + Update on Pine SWCD WBIF funded project on Rock Lake – Paul Swanson
       - Still waiting on contractor to begin the project and get fence posts in the ground before the ground freezes.
   * **A3) Watershed Education** – Angie Hong and Barbara Heitkamp
     + Quarterly newsletter sent via MailChimp on Wednesday, Oct. 20
     + Workshop for local decision-makers – Conservation Development, MIDS and shoreline/wetland protections (2022)
       - Let Angie and Barbara know if you want to be involved in the planning – Mike I said yes. Jay available for consultation as needed. Tiffany yes.
       - Possible location - Pleasant Valley Orchard (owned by Jim Birkholz). Previous workshops on a boat were a big draw.
       - Mike - Try to have multiple workshops and opportunities for people to attend – city councils, planning commissions, north and south communities
     + Workshop series for small farmers (2022)
     + Jay – what can we do to further clarify the difference between EMWREP and LSC education?
       - Emily - Maybe just add a line at the top of the table to show the funding amounts for the two programs
   * **A6) Wetland Restoration** – Becky Wozney
     + Any prospective projects coming up?
       - CMSCWD is considering applying for funds for a wetland restoration on Goose Lake
     + Becky – do we want to revisit the idea of pushing projects vs operating on a first come, first serve basis?
       - Jay – first come, first serve works well if we have lots of prospective projects, all of which are high priority
       - Angie – can understand the concern if we have funding allocated and no one asks for it. Then we should be pushing projects in those areas
       - Jamie – it would help for the policy committee to know how many prospective projects there are – 2 vs 20?
       - Mike I – it is a lot of work to put together an application, so it would be good to have a casual conversation first to know how our projects might rank compared with others
       - Craig – if it weren’t for the SWWD project, we would have hardly spent any money from our current WBIF grant
       - Emily – it would be good to remind the policy committee that prioritization and targeting is happening currently with WBIF funds and will identify in-the-ground projects
       - Melissa – if we want Clean Water funds to be available for monitoring, we need to speak up when BWSR updates policies for the next round of funding
       - Matt – SWWD will have a project next year that continues on restoration work happening on Trout Brook. Would fit into the urban BMP category.
       - Barb P - Maybe the PC needs to be reminded about your criteria and that some projects aren't moving forward?
       - Angie – good for them to know that we are holding out for quality projects in priority locations
   * **A7) Internal Analyses** – Susanna Wilson – Witkowski
     + Call for projects – due Oct. 31
       - No major updates since Monday’s PC meeting
       - Rush and Goose Lakes are interested in applying and will be asking Chisago County to apply on their behalf
       - Current funding will only allow for two internal lake studies to be completed
   * **A8) Targeting and Prioritization Analyses** - Mike Isensee
     + Enhanced street sweeping program
       - Mike reviewed the memo. EOR submitted a proposal for $8500 to develop a street sweeping protocol to be used by up to 20 cities.
       - Also shared draft street sweeping program language, to be approved at a future meeting. “The LSCP will conduct an Enhanced Street Sweeping Evaluation at the request of communities interested in participating in the enhanced street sweeping grant program. To initiate the evaluation, a community must apply to have a street sweeping study completed with the intent to adopt changes to their street sweeping operations. Enhanced Street Sweeping Evaluations will be completed for a cost between $3,000-$5,000 each, depending on scale.”
       - Questions:
         1. Karen – would EOR conduct the studies or just develop the protocol?

Just the protocol. Cities could then decide if they use internal staff or hire a consultant to conduct the studies and apply for $3,000-$5,000 to support plan development in each community

* + - * 1. Barb/Melissa – BWSR – how does this use what was already developed for Forest Lake?

EOR used the protocol to create the FL plan. This would put the protocol into writing and make it available for anyone to use

* + - * 1. Jamie - Ranking in the protocol evaluates if streets are low, medium or high density of tree cover and notes their connectivity to surface water. Is that all?
        2. Jay – we could have someone internally translate the Forest Lake plan into a protocol, but it will cost $8.5k to have EOR do it for us
        3. Jerry – how were the priority communities identified?

They were identified during plan development. The plan prioritized cities with direct drainage to the St. Croix River or its tributaries.

However, once the protocol exists, anyone can use it. There just isn’t funding to provide cost-share to cities that aren’t in priority locations.

Jerry – would like to see cities in the Chisago LID included as eligible for enhanced street sweeping

Emily – perhaps those cities were just missed in the WBIF work plan. We could do a work plan amendment to include them. Chisago LID lakes are identified as priority water bodies in the plan

* + - * 1. Chisago SWCD has reached out to cities and they are eager to work with us on street sweeping as soon as this process moves forward
        2. Who will be the contract holder moving forward?
        3. Roll call vote:

Anoka SWCD - aya

Brown's Creek WD - aye

Carnelian Marine St Croix WD - aye

Chisago County - aye

Chisago Lakes LID - aye

Chisago SWCD - aye

Comfort Lake Forest Lake WD - aye

Isanti County - NA

Isanti SWCD - aye

Middle St. Croix WMO - aye

Pine County - aye

Pine SWCD - aye

South Washington WD - aye

Sunrise River JP WMO - aye

Valley Branch WD - NA

Washington CD - aye

Washington County - aye

* + - Delineation and Prioritization of Contributing Subcatchments for Pine County and the Sunrise River
      * Mike I reviewed the second proposal, which would allocate $26,772 to delineate subcatchments, hydrocorrect catchments (with County and State inventories of culverts, bridges, stormsewer and other relevant hydrologic structures) and identify highly contributing and highly landlocked basins for the Lower St. Croix portions of Pine County and the Sunrise River.
      * The work would be subcontracted to EOR.
      * Most other parts of the watershed already have similar work completed.
      * The proposal would use a process similar to what was used for similar delineation and prioritization work in CMSCWD.
      * Identifying landlocked areas will allow us to focus on highly connected areas for project implementation
      * This would come out of the A8 budget. May also require a work plan amendment.
      * Mike I – there will also be a proposal coming soon for a Pollutant Hot-spot Evaluation for the Sunrise River
      * Emily – is this application as complete as it could be? Our project application packet doesn’t currently have criteria for Targeting and Prioritization projects
        1. Jay – understood but this is core info needed to conduct our targeting and prioritization efforts and will lead to the development of the criteria
      * Jamie – if our grant work plan is also our annual work plan, would we need PC approval to make changes to our work plan?
        1. Craig – On Monday, the PC approved combining funds for ag and urban projects and shifting funds less than $50k without PC approval
        2. However, we are not changing the grant work plan, we’re merely providing more detail as to what we are doing with funds already allocated in the work plan. Our work plan only earmarked a portion of the funds, not all. The SWA was identified as an activity in the work plan and this is part of that activity.
        3. Barb P – the grant work plan is not the same as the annual work plan. At some point in time, we will be getting funds from other sources besides for just the WBIF grant.
        4. Jamie – if we change the grant work plan, it might trigger concerns from the policy committee that we are changing our annual work plan without review of participating entities. However, we don’t really need to change the work plan, as all of these activities are in the grant work plan.
        5. Barb/Craig – we should continue talking with the policy committee about JPE vs JPC
        6. Mike / Craig – do we need to engage BWSR staff at subcommittee level before bringing projects to the steering committee to make sure they meet the scope of the WBIF grant work plan?

Emily - Next planning team mtg is Nov 10th. Could BWSR attend that mtg and we can get into more detail and get all on the same page with interpretation of work plan and whether these activities are considered part of the work plan?

* + - * Roll call vote:
        1. Anoka SWCD - ay
        2. Brown's Creek WD - aye
        3. Carnelian Marine St Croix WD - aye
        4. Chisago County - aye
        5. Chisago Lakes LID - aye
        6. Chisago SWCD - aye
        7. Comfort Lake Forest Lake WD - aye
        8. Isanti County - NA
        9. Isanti SWCD - aye
        10. Middle St. Croix WMO - aye
        11. Pine County - aye
        12. Pine SWCD - aye
        13. South Washington WD - aye
        14. Sunrise River JP WMO - aye
        15. Valley Branch WD - NA
        16. Washington CD – aye
        17. Washington – aye
  + Craig – Chisago SWCD is willing to be the contract holder for subcontracts with EOR but doesn’t want to be the project lead
    - Mike I – is willing to lead these projects but would like financial compensation because this is a lot of work on projects happening outside his watershed
    - Matt M – watershed districts can’t spend their funds outside of their geographic area
    - Karen – this is another reason to continue talking about JPC vs JPE
    - Craig – does this fit under the admin time already allocated to WCD?
      * Jay - Yes, but we still need to think of a way to compensate CMSCWD for the time that Mike I is spending on basin-wide activities
    - Craig – Chisago SWCD can hold the contracts for these two activities and we can work on a different plan for the next round of funding

1. Progress Update – Emily Heinz
   * Cumulative progress toward water quality goals – already shared on Monday at PC meeting
2. Other discussion:
   * Topics for future meetings?
     1. Engineering costs for projects – included in overall construction cost or as a separate TA cost?
     2. Timeline for the upcoming 2023/24 WBIF grant funds work plan
     3. Policy Committee involvement: JPC vs JPE
     4. Project funding (prioritized vs. first come first serve)
     5. When are WBIF work plan revisions required? WBIF work plan vs LSC annual work plan
     6. Who holds contracts for basin-wide projects? And how to provide funding for partner staff time going towards basin wide projects?