

## LOWER ST. CROIX ONE WATERSHED, ONE PLAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE

### MARCH 14, 2019 NOTES

The goal of the meeting is to work through the goals, outcomes, and priority locations for Wetlands and to finalize this process for Lakes.

#### Presentations

Tim Smith presented about BWSR's Comprehensive Planning Framework for wetland restoration prioritization analysis and modeling efforts and how this is used to target priority areas for projects. He noted this was a stakeholder driven process that supports the watershed approach to wetland replacement. He noted there are 47 high priority areas for wetland replacements (which includes the 55% of Restorable Wetlands from NRRI map). This equals about 9,000 acres. There was discussion about BWSR wetland banking and road projects.

Jay Riggs discussed the limited availability of potential wetland restoration sites in Washington County. Craig Mell discussed the opposite issue he is experiencing in Chisago County where there are opportunities but not enough financial incentive for landowners to participate. Tim Smith said BWSR is working on the rate available for landowners to incentivize wetland banking. He noted that Clean Water Funds might be able to be used to augment state banking payment dollars and he reported the State is looking for more flexible payment rate factors.

Laura Jester reminded the group that the plan must include an approach to address water storage. Jason Carlson of the DNR presented his current analysis of calculating and projecting water storage needs in the Lower St. Croix based on cumulative discharge and precipitation data. The group discussed if this approach could be used for stormwater events and infiltration standards. Jason reported that in 2050 it's projected that there will be an additional 7.64 inches of runoff leaving the watershed. Mike Isensee asked if efforts should be made to capture and store several small event (up to 7.6 inches) or large storm events. Jay Riggs noted that it's important to have good curve numbers established.

### Create goals, outcomes and priority locations for Wetlands

#### *Wetland Quality*

##### *Goal A and B*

Mike Isensee asked what the trigger point would be for Goal A as it is hard to retroactively implement a buffer. He suggested adding "during development or redevelopment" and asked where the wetland management type systems were coming from for this goal. Laura Jester said it was coming from BWSR guidance on wetland types and buffers. Barb Piechel said the recommendations came from the MnRAM program and not BWSR. Craig Mell asked why not combine Goal A and B and use the buffer law requirement of 50 feet average, 30 feet minimum. He said wetland delineations don't result in a management type. Jay Riggs suggested that language be added that some LGU's have stricter buffer requirements. He said the larger recommended buffers came from different management goals for higher quality wetlands, whereas the buffer law referred to agricultural areas. Craig Mell said he would prefer a flat buffer law rather than one based on wetland management types due to the nature of wetland delineation and development in northern counties. Jay Riggs explained that he saw this

document as recommendations rather than requirements. Dan Fabian asked how the group would quantify this goal. Mike Isenese suggested an adoption rate. There was consensus that a subcommittee could determine appropriate buffer widths as a recommendation to the larger group.

#### *Goal C*

There was discussion about public and private drainage projects and specifying type 3 wetlands as needing to be protected. Laura suggested the goal be to review all drainage projects. Craig suggested specifying public and judicial drainage ditches and explained that an issue he has experienced is that there is not enough review of project prior to ditch maintenance.

#### *Goal D*

There was discussion around whether *phragmites* is an AIS and if this goal could also be in the lakes section. Jerry Spetzmen asked if the priority location should be Chisago Lakes Improvement District and that this came from Carlos Avery as the location of concern.

### ***Wetland Quantity***

#### *Goal B*

Jay Riggs asked to add all of Washington County as a priority location due to limited opportunities for restoration there. Laura Jester will ask BWSR for their prioritized restoration layer to be added to the interactive map.

Dan Fabian suggested the measurable output be focused on restoration rather than creation due to that having a higher success. Jay Riggs said creation has worked in Washington County. Caleb Anderson asked if Pine County's lack of soils data is why they were not included in the BWSR prioritization map. Tim Smith said there was not a lot of opportunity to restore there. Tim Smith said the demand from the road project could result in 100-150 acres of demand annually so 1,000 acres was a realistic goal. The group discussed how northern counties have a long way to go with wetlands as there is not even a requirement to delineate currently.

#### *Goal A*

Barb Piechel said Goal A and output 1, and 3 needed to have more clarification and explanation as to how it is measurable. The group did not remember why the wording was the way it was as it seemed redundant due to WCA. Tim Smith thought it could be related to the issue of replacing wetlands in the watershed the impact is happening in rather than outside the watershed. Jay suggested restating the goal as "no net loss of wetlands within the basin". Craig Mell asked what a reasonable goal would be of wetland bank creation and suggested "create and maintain at least 2 wetland banks in the watershed". Barb Piechel asked how to track and avoid loss occurring from ditch maintenance. The group suggested changing "reduce" to "mitigate" for this goal.

### ***Wetland Data***

Jay suggested the location for MLCCS be basin wide.

Pine County was identified as the only location that had a data gap for wetland inventory. Tim Smith asked if the goal would be to inventory historical WCA data and asked what process LGU's are currently taking to track WCA actions. The group decided it would be necessary to track WCA reporting in order to track no-loss data. Jay Riggs asked if most wetland replacement was banking and if there was monitoring of on-site replacement. The data produced by tracking this would be fed into

the implementation section.

A small group would discuss the rest of the wetland section. Their recommendations would be sent to the whole Advisory Committee for review and comment before being sent to the Policy Committee for their March 25<sup>th</sup> meeting.

## **Finalize Lakes**

### ***Water Quality***

#### *Goal B*

Jay suggested to reword the statement so it just read “implement MIDS” instead of “or similar” and that this should be a priority basin-wide. Laura Jester said she liked the flexibility provided by keeping “or something similar”. Mike Isensee will present MIDS to the Policy committee.

#### *Goal A*

Craig Mell asked if “annual cropping impacts” was referring to row crops.

#### *Goal C*

There was discussion around the output of reducing failing SSTS as it is already state standard. Laura Jester asked if the output instead should be to inventory and assess instead of fix with a priority area of around impaired waters.

Barb Piechel said the Lakes section was not ready for the policy committee as there are too many highly prioritized lakes. She suggested the group re-evaluate and come up with a system of prioritization. The group tried to pin down which sections were complete and if completed sections such as the outputs could go before the Policy committee. There was more discussion on the priority lakes list and how lakes could be narrowed down by whether there was a lake management plan, a TMDL, whether the lake is near or barely impaired, and protection of unimpaired lakes.

The lakes section will not go to the Policy committee and the Advisory committee needs to finish discussing the rest of the issue statements.

## **Schedule next Advisory Committee meeting**

The approach for this process for the final resource areas will be different than what was done for the first few resource areas. This change will be implemented in order to meet the timeline of finishing this action item by May.

The next meeting will take place on April 11th.