**Lower St. Croix One Watershed, One Plan**

**Advisory Committee**

**December 12, 2019 Notes**

Craig Mell walked the advisory committee through the work done by the smaller group of advisory members on the implementation tables.

* The priority lakes list was reduced from around 150 to around 25. The lakes selected were based on the tier A ranking in ag and urban areas. They were also selected using a list from the MPCA on lakes which would respond in the most cost effective way to phosphorus reduction.
* The rivers and streams selected were based on the St. Croix TMDL, with downstream impacts considered.
* GW dependent lakes were removed as they were covered in the initial list of 25 lakes.

Ultimately, changes were made based on many comments received by BWSR, because as it stood, it would not have been approved. The list of lakes especially needed refinement. Barb Peichel explained that the goal of BWSR’s comments was to get the plan to a place that it will pass through easily once officially submitted.

Laura Jester walked through the implementation tables to discuss the changes made. She noted these tables had been approved by the policy committee and this was kept in mind as adjustments were made.

**Agriculture:**

* The group discussed the feasibility of the AIS goal and what wording to use.
* Mike Isensee asked if MIDS should be included in the stream hydrology category.
* The group agreed that the goal “reduce complaints about high water levels by 90%” needed to be changed to something more measurable. Jerry Spetzman of the Chisago LID said this goal was important to his organization. He suggested changing the goal to: “damage to property caused by high water levels is minimized”.
* The pollutant loading goals for Lake St. Croix were discussed. TSS reductions were understood to be secondary benefits of BMP’s targeting phosphorus removal. The nitrate goal was removed as there is currently not a good model for nitrate reduction. It is understood that the nitrate reduction will occur as a secondary benefit to ag BMP’s such as vegetative BMPs, and nutrient management plans, etc. Margaret Wagner wanted to make sure the goal would be linked back to surface waters and not just groundwater. The group discussed the lack of nitrate standard in surface waters, separate from drinking water, and found the most recent data on nitrate in the St. Croix.
* There was discussion around staffing details in the outreach/education section for the implementation activities. The group decided against specifying “part time” FTE for the agronomist. The group questioned if this section was including activities that the LGU’s are already doing, and that other sections of the plan did not include this. The group discussed adding the language “supplement existing programs with” before detailing activities such as agricultural technical assistance, etc.
* Craig Mell informed Mike Isensee that the ag BMP goal was realistic in terms of quantity and cost
* The group discussed the phosphorus reduction goal of 5% decrease for all the listed lakes. The group wondered if this would imply each lake had to be reduced by 5% or if they could focus on delisting a few of the lakes on the list instead for an overall 5% reduction. Barb Peichel said BWSR was ok with some targeted/focused activities.
* Craig Mell asked how tracking progress towards these goals would be reported in terms of distinguishing local efforts vs. efforts funded by the watershed based funding. Barb Peichel said BWSR knows that there will be a combination of efforts.
* The group discussed the SSTS Shoreline goal. Susanna Wilson asked for Chisago’s to be changed to reducing the amount by 50%, and will provide Laura Jester with those actual numbers. The group discussed most county requirements of replacing SSTS systems if needed at the point of sale. The group refined the “gap” the 1W1P would cover as identifying phosphorus contributing SSTS systems at vulnerable shorelines (through an inspection program or otherwise) before the point of sale and providing funding assistance for replacement at those times. This kind of replacement is not something counties are currently interested in doing. The group kept the original goal and wording.

Jay Riggs asked about the timeline of getting the final implementation tables to the Policy Committee for their January meeting. He wondered if the advisory committee members have received comments from their respective organization’s boards in time to work them into the tables. He believes it is important for participating organizations who will be replacing their plans with the 1W1P to incorporate their board’s feedback. It was eventually suggested that organization’s boards could give their feedback to their representative member on the policy committee for the policy committee’s January meeting. The review of the implementation tables would happen at the local board’s January meetings.

Mike Isensee raised concern about 4 high quality lakes from CMSCWD that had fallen off of the lakes list. The regionally significant lakes list now only includes impaired lakes in need of restoration activities rather than high quality lakes in need of protection activities such as land acquisition/easements. The group discussed whether lakes present in local management plans would be eligible for funding if the convening group decides to group the metro/non-metro funding. Currently, metro funding can be used for items in local management plans, but not non-metro funding. If these kinds of lakes are not included in the implementation tables, and the convening group decides to pool the funding, local management plans would not be eligible for the watershed based implementation funding. Laura Jester believes there may be a place later in the plan for protection strategies such as land acquisition/easements such as the sustainable land use goal in the urban/development section.

Jay Riggs asked if the implementation tables contained the ability for adaptive management and a plan amendment process. He wants this to be added to the tables as umbrella statements or activities so that they will be eligible for funding. Laura Jester asked Jay to provide her with some more concrete suggestions.

**Developed/Developing Lands:**

Laura Jester explained that there had been consideration about overlap between issues in the agricultural area and urban area. The conclusion was that as long as the issues were in one area or the other they would be captured by the plan.

* Mike Isensee asked the group if the MIDS/ordinance adoption goal should be increased. The group discussed whether one of the staff options would be to hire a FTE to work with the communities on MIDS adoption. The group decided that a FTE could be hired in years 3 or 4 to 5 or 6 with a ½ position the year before for lead time, with the purpose of working with communities on adoption of the MIDS standard as their ordinance.
* The regional lake list lost Lily and McKusick. Matt Downing asked if McKusick could be added back on due to its regional significance of outletting directly to the St. Croix.
* The group discussed the new development for habitat purposes goal. Angie Hong asked if this work would fit well with the scope of the FTE who would be responsible for the MIDS adoption work, as it fits in with working with local communities’ on their ordinances/permits. The group agreed that this position would not have the same skill set as the earlier identified need for land acquisition/easements.
* The group discussed the sustainable development goal. One FTE would be lumped with MIDS and community ordinances. Another FTE would be involved with land acquisition/easements and preservation programs which would be outlined in the ecosystem services section on pg 15. The priority location would be struck until the ecosystem services table.

**Ecosystem Services:**

* Jay Riggs asked whether the overarching activity line should include education and outreach activities related to habitat restoration. There were education and outreach activities identified later in the table, but Jay was concerned the heading was inconsistent with the other sections, and wanted to ensure funding would be available for these sorts of activities. Laura Jester suggested that education and outreach was included as it was implicit in the activities later in the table, as with the other sections.
* The group added “direct catchments” to the St. Croix as a priority location (similar to the rivers/streams).
* Barb Peichel suggested adding language about enforcement or BMP’s to the trout stream goal to indicate that the activities occurring will not just be surveys.
* Pg 13, line 9, Isanti County was struck.
* The group discussed the AIS goal and decontamination stations. There was discussion around the “High Effort, Low Impact” rating of this goal, funding required, and whether or not to keep it in the plan. This is an important priority for the Chisago LID. The group asked about how local priorities were reflected elsewhere in the plan.
* The shoreline ordinance update was changed for its priority location to be basin wide instead of per lake.
* The group revisited how to better define the protection of lakes within the sustainable development goal, and how to call out land acquisition/easements as a strategy. Mike Isensee and Tiffany Determan will help Laura with this.
* The group discussed priority locations in regards to habitat fracturing and whether there was a map layer for this issue. Jay Riggs expressed concern that the upland goals are not all reflected in the implementation table. Jay will work with Laura on his suggestions to improve the tables.

The next Advisory Committee meeting is scheduled for January 9, 9:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.