**Steering Committee Meeting**

**Wednesday, March 23, 2-3:30pm**

**In attendance:** Angie Hong – EMWREP/LSC, Todd Kulaf – Isanti SWCD, Tom Dietrich – Washington County, Paul Swanson – Pine SWCD, Jay Riggs – WCD, Barbara Heitkamp – EMWREP/LSC, Michelle Jordan – BWSR, Joel Larson – MN Extension, Karen Kill – BCWD, Emily Heinz – CLFLWD, Jamie Schurbon – Anoka SWCD / Sunrise JPWMO, Craig Mell – Chisago SWCD, Mike Isensee – CMSCWD, Matt Moore – SWWD, Matt Downing – MSCWMO, Caleb Anderson – Pine Co., Becky Wozney – Anoka SWCD, Jennifer Hahn – LSC/Extension

**AGENDA**

1. Review revised 2022 Annual Plan of Work and 2021 Progress Report – Emily Heinz
	* [Annual Plan of Work & Prog Report (Table 5-1).xlsx](https://clflwd-my.sharepoint.com/%3Ax%3A/g/personal/emily_heinz_clflwd_org/ETS0UDrHX5NLh89IM1WDaxUBD2PW-SnQvjvDKFuxFtt90g?e=Nhry7B)
	* See also 2021 WBIF – Lower St. Croix Watershed Partners Annual Report
	* Questions:
		+ Some of the reported activities from 2021 are in non-priority locations. For example, do we report on all AIS watercraft inspections or just ones at St. Croix River access points?
			- Matt Downing – it would be too time consuming to break out hours and accomplishments for just the river
			- Matt Moore – AIS travel between water bodies so it makes sense to report on everything we’re doing in the watershed
			- Angie – we have to report out to BWSR on WBIF funded work but the other projects we’re tracking are more for internal purposes – just to let the policy committee know about the good work we’re doing together. For example, there was a big project on Lily Lake that resulted in the lake getting de-listed. It doesn’t really fit into any of the priority categories but seems like important info to share internally and with our PC.
			- Karen – this helps to clarify the intent of this reporting. She wanted to makes sure nothing would get double reported in eLink.
			- Susanna – she can report out on Chisago SWCD AIS inspections as a whole and in priority locations.
			- Michelle – the intent of this is for the group to be able to evaluate and measure our progress
			- Matt D. – he is already reporting AIS work to the DNR and the county and doesn’t want to triple report
		+ Emily – it seems like people are making notes to avoid double reporting within the spreadsheet. What about the rows that are currently blank?
			- Angie – maybe we can leave them blank for now and then revisit at the end of next year. It may be that we’re not actually able to address some of our “wishful thinking” goals and will need to revise our plan accordingly at the five year mark
			- Jerry – he only added info for actions that received funding but could add in more info about other things they did
			- Tom – he and Stephanie are working internally to gather info on some of the Washington County projects and will report out soon
			- Craig – we should also look to see if any of the goals not being addressed are priority A goals vs B and C level goals
			- Michelle - Page 108 describes what you planned to do for annual reporting: [https://static1.squarespace.com/static/5b0dadc59772aeb1df30d0d8/t/5f9aea83cfd1f030c1d3bb17/1603988135744/Final+Lower+St+Croix+Comp+Plan+OCT+2020.pdf](https://static1.squarespace.com/static/5b0dadc59772aeb1df30d0d8/t/5f9aea83cfd1f030c1d3bb17/1603988135744/Final%2BLower%2BSt%2BCroix%2BComp%2BPlan%2BOCT%2B2020.pdf)
				* "Required baseline information will include a summary of activities completed during the reportingperiod, dollars spent, budget balance remaining, measurable output achieved, and progress toward Plangoals. Pollutant load reduction estimates from the tools used to identify practices will be used to trackprogress toward goals"
		+ The group approved the annual plan of work and progress report to bring to the policy committee in April. All members voting yes.
		+ Please add any additional activities by April 11 or 12 so that Angie and Emily have time to include the info in the April 25 PC packet.
2. Subcommittee Updates

A1) Agronomy Outreach – meet Jennifer Hahn!

* She met with local partners last Monday and got good input on where to focus in the coming year. Will be working to plan three field seminars this year.

A2,4,5) Urban and Agricultural Projects – Craig Mell and Mike Isensee

* + - Nonstructural land management policy – draft sent out via email on 3/23/22
		- Craig and Jennifer talked about the draft policy sent to the SC
			* The list of non-structural practices was adjusted to remove pasture and hay planting, conservation cover, and tree/shrub establishment to fit BWSR requirements
			* There draft policy allows flexibility for cover crops to allow producers to move around the acres covered from year to year within a 3-yr contract
			* Rates are based off of NRCS approved rates
		- Questions:
			* Todd - How will it affect reporting if cover crops move from field to field each year? Phosphorus reductions will differ depending on each field’s conditions.
				+ Craig – you’d have to calculate and report pollutant reductions each year
			* Todd - Would an entity have one contract or three?
				+ Craig – it would be one three-yr contract
			* Emily – how will the other practices related to continuous cover be funded?
				+ Craig – we may need to amend our work plan to allow for these other practices to be funded with 10-year contracts
				+ Michelle is reaching out to other partnerships to learn how they are approaching this issue. Additionally, the LSC work plan says that Jennifer will work with farmers to develop nutrient management plans. Where might those fit in?
				+ Jamie – activity 4 includes ag and urban non-structural policies. We already created a policy for street sweeping. Are there any other practices we intend to promote or develop policies for?

No

* + - * + Michelle – does the group want to consider having one cost-share policy that these other components fit into vs three separate policies?
				+ Craig – how many of the LSC partners currently have a cost-share policy?

About half. (see chat notes)

Chisago SWCD can do once a year or quarterly payments to local partners for nonstructural practices in their area.

* + - * + Craig – does the policy need to get incorporate into the WBIF work plan?
				+ Angie – is it necessary for all of the partners to have a cost share policy or just the SWCDs since that would cover all geographical areas? Farmers already complain that they have too many hoops to jump through. Couldn’t they apply to a SWCD for funds and if there is extra support available through a WD, we figure it out behind the scenes to get them the extra money
				+ Jay – there are examples when landowners are getting funds from both the WCD and a WD
				+ Craig – would prefer to have as few contracts as possible.
				+ Craig – request that Jennifer keep working on this ag policy and work with the A2,4,5 committee to incorporate street sweeping as well. Then bring a complete policy back to the steering committee for review on April 27.
				+ Jennifer – if we combine all of this into one implementation document will some projects be applicable to WDs and others to SWCD? Will that create any conflicts?
				+ Matt – let’s not get in a box.
		- Mike then shared the draft street sweeping program document
			* Entities will be required to weigh sweepings and report this for us to use in measuring phosphorus reductions
			* The recommended funding will be $100/curb-mile – up to $5000 per community. This will be an annual payment for three years.
			* Each community will also create a targeted street sweeping plan.
			* Angie and Barbara will work with the subcommittee to do outreach and plan a workshop for communities this summer / early fall

A3) Watershed Education – Barbara Heitkamp

A6) Wetland Restoration – Becky Wozney

A7) Internal Analyses – Susanna Wilson – Witkowski

A8) Targeting and Prioritization Analyses – Jay Riggs

* EORs street sweeping protocol has been delayed 4 weeks and the targeted monitoring protocol is also delayed. 2 of the 4 protocols are being reviewed.
1. Continued discussion on possible transition from JPC to JPE
	* Legal memo – LSC Governing Structure and Management Authority – Craig Mell and Jamie Schurbon
		+ Policy committee does not have the authority to create policies unless we become an entity.
		+ We need to discuss how we will manage and apply for funds beyond WBIF if we want to
		+ This legal memo was sent to all of the local partners’ attorneys
	* Review input from [advisory committee survey](https://forms.gle/GEEsRbEdaCPkW1fA6) – Angie Hong
		+ Angie shared summarized themes via email and during the meeting
	* During the last PC meeting, most members seemed to be leaning toward JPE. After talking with Fran Miron and other reps in Washington County, that doesn’t seem to be the case. It could be more of a 50/50 split in terms of preference.
	* Suggestion to schedule a meeting during the first or second week of April just to talk only about this issue so that the SC has time to develop a recommendation or possible options before the April 25 SC meeting.
		+ Angie will send out a doodle poll to schedule.