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

**Advisory Committee**

**July 11, 2019 Notes**

Jen Kader updated the Advisory Committee on where the group is in the 1W1P planning process. The group is currently working on task 3.3: Targeted and measurable implementation schedule and programs. Tasks 3.4, 3.5, and 3.6 are also occurring. Today the group will be prioritizing outputs across all program areas within activity categories: protection, restoration, agriculture, urban, and research and monitoring. The group will be incorporating initial strategies and using filtering criteria. The prioritization process involves considering: the original tiered structure, level of effort vs. level of impact, priority locations, and “shifters” i.e. outputs that would reduce the effort need for other high impact activities. Activities considered to be high impact and low effort were suggested to be placed on the timeline at 1-2 years. High impact, high effort activities were suggested to be 3-10 years. Low effort, low impact activities are suggested to be selectively chosen based on whether they are a “shifter”. And high effort, low impact are not suggested to be incorporated in this first 10 year 1W1P. Any activities not identified as a priority in the first 10 year timeline will still be included in the plan for future planning efforts past 10 years. The group was also asked to refine priority locations during this process. The group was reminded not to lose track or sight of social capacity strategies as they will be coming back into the plan later in the process. Barb Peichel asked how the local priority issues will be included in this process, as have been marked so far by an asterisk. Laura Jester will follow up on this question.

The group then split into activity categories and worked through the measurable outputs prioritization and timeline process.

#### End Meeting Conversation

Jen Kader and Laura Jester asked the group to reflect on the process and discuss any takeaways. Mike Isensee said the Research and Monitoring group noticed that there were many Tier C outputs that needed to be completed in the 1-2 year timeframe in order to complete the Tier A and B outputs. Other groups noticed this as well, as there are studies that need to be completed early on in order to support other activities. Karen Kill noticed that some of the outputs deemed 1-2 year activities are already being done by LGU’s.

Mike Kinney noted that other prioritization processes he has been involved in started with allocating time based on funding available and working backwards from there. He said he believed this drove the prioritization process effectively, and is concerned about accomplishing the goal without using this process. Karen Kill said she believed the group had been incorporating those notes throughout the process.

Angie Hong noticed that during the process AIS issues seemed to fall lower in the prioritization and wondered if this was because AIS is more effectively addressed from higher levels of government rather than LGU’s. Mike Isensee noted that AIS can also be scaled even more locally in ways that are more effective such as Lake Associations. He believes it’s a social capacity and funding concern. The group discussed AIS eradication vs. management strategies such as rapid response efforts, and whether these are effective. The group decided to revisit priority locations for AIS and look at the level of effort and impact on that scale. The group discussed lake associations and their varied responses to AIS efforts.

Craig Mell and the agricultural group noted that the BMP outputs required working with willing farmers. He said the strategies needed were focused on technical assistance and projects. And he noted that there were refined priority locations identified for these outputs. Mike Kinney said he saw that outputs involving MIDS all were placed early on in the timeline as policy and planning all takes time. The group said MIDS adoption was seen as a “shifter”. The group discussed political will in the context of MIDS as well as outputs related to ditches and wetlands.

Jen Kader noted that there was a balancing act between detail and flexibility in the plan in order to create the most effective plan.

The group noticed there were more outputs placed in the 1-2 year timeframe than later on in the timeline. The group asked how the outputs would be prioritized further. Karen Kill said that many outputs in the protection category had to start in the 1-2 year timeframe simply due to the nature of protection as a strategy. She said this was also due to the low effort, high impact outputs being directed to the 1-2 year timeframe. She noted that in general it is difficult to measure the success of protection. Jen Kader said the next step in the process was to incorporate inputs like funding and capacity to create the feasible prioritization. Angie Hong asked what funding would look like in the future. Dan Fabian said BWSR is still working on this but that there would always be watershed based funding and competitive grants. He said BWSR is working on re-authorizing the legacy grant.

Laura Jester said the policy committee would be presented with todays activity and then would move into a high level overview of options for organizing for implementation. She said the policy committee would also go through the TRIZ exercise, or as the group might remember it, brainstorming the worst case scenario and how to get there.

Jen Kader presented the filtering criteria to use during implementation of projects:

1. Diagnostic study (project readiness)
2. Priority resource
3. Cost benefit
4. Willing landowner (project readiness)
5. High scoring
6. Project readiness

The group discussed the difference between the prioritization process and the filtering criteria to use during the implementation of projects. Barb Peichel asked how this could be adapted to programmatic strategies rather than structural practices.

The group decided to add:

1. Where you put the project (small scale) within the priority location (large scale)
2. Degree of impact/ amount it moved the needle towards the 10 year goal
3. Riskiness of investment (based on the AIS discussion)
4. Funding balance across categories of work (based on structural vs programmatic strategies)
5. Capacity to implement the project/the likelihood of success

Angie Hong asked who decides which percentage of funding would go to programmatic vs structural strategies. Laura Jester said there are some processes in place for this questions, such as the cost-share programs LGU’s implement.

The next Advisory Committee meeting is scheduled for Thursday August 8, 9:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m., location to be determined.