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**Advisory Committee**

**August 11, 2019 Notes**

The advisory committee discussed the building of the implementation table. Angie Hong suggested mailing a paper version of these tables to the policy members before the next policy committee meeting. The tables are sorted by program area but there is no “social capacity area” as these are activities across all the other areas.

Jay Riggs and Jamie Schurbon suggested a placeholder for social capacity activities so they don’t get lost in the budget discussion. Barb Piechel said there were many things that needed to be considered in these tables and recalled seeing an earlier version in which social implementation actions didn’t have measurable outputs. Margaret Wagner suggested listing these activities in the table so they will be able to get funding. Angie Hong suggested that these activities could be noted with a different color. Margaret Wagner asked if there could be color coding to find structural vs programmatic actions within the different program areas. Jen Kader suggested an icon to represent activities related to relationship building and trust. John Freitag asked if there could be an indication of activities with multiple benefits within the tables to help with the prioritization process. Dan Fabian noted that the funding allocation needed to be refined.

The group discussed the arrangement of the tables and the use of filtering within Microsoft Word to use the plan as a working document. The group discussed whether a map could be created with the priority projects. Jay Riggs suggested adding the making of a map as an activity within the plan. Jay Riggs requested terminology be defined and that the use of SWA’s be included in the plan. He said the level of detail in SWA’s can’t be replicated at a watershed scale, and that reference documents and protocols could be used for the northern basin in the absence of SWA’s.

The facilitators asked what was missing in terms of layout and formatting. Barb Piechel said she didn’t see water conservation as an output in the agricultural program area. The group wondered if they were missing a cross-referencing tool between the tables. The group suggested renaming the uplands, AIS, and wetlands category as ecosystem services. The group then split into small group discussions to refine funding intentions.

#### End Meeting Conversation

The group discussed additional questions after the completion of the small group activity.

* Changing non-structural and structural to ecological and engineering in order to differentiate between programs vs. projects
* Re-wording outputs to be more specific and accurate
* Nitrate goal was removed from the developed category
* Changing outputs to water quality measures rather than BMP quantification
* Override the 100% goals suggested by the policy committee in order to have more realistic goals
* The group discussed again why phragmites was called out specifically in the AIS categories

The group raised questions about funding. Barb Piechel said BWSR should have a decision on watershed based funding in October. The group agreed that the current funding allocation is not refined yet or reflective of what level and sources of funding are available.

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