

# Meeting Agenda

Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Meeting



ISG

Project Name: Mississippi River St. Cloud One Watershed One Plan

ISG Project Number: 28039

Date: Wednesday, February 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2023

Time: 1pm - 4pm

Location: Sherburne History Center, Remote Option Available Upon Request

Invitees: Gerry Maciej (Benton County), Emily Forbord (Benton SWCD), Greg Schultz (Meeker County), Joe Norman (Meeker SWCD), Susan Shaw (Mille Lacs SWCD), Dan Cibulka (Sherburne SWCD), Francine Larson (Sherburne SWCD), Lynn Waytashek (Sherburne County), Zach Guttormson (Sherburne County), Dennis Fuchs (Stearns SWCD), Kyle Weimann (Stearns SWCD), Cole Loewen (Stearns County), Becky Schlorf (Stearns County), Barry Rhineberger (Wright County), Luke Johnson (Wright SWCD), Alicia O'Hare (Wright SWCD), Darren Mayers (BWSR), Brad Wozney (BWSR)

Partners and Staff Present: Benton SWCD (Fiscal agent) - Gerry Maciej, Emily Forbord, Meeker SWCD - Joe Norman, Meeker County - Greg Schultz, Mille Lacs SWCD - Susan Shaw, Sherburne SWCD (Plan Coordinator) - Dan Cibulka, Francine Larson, Stearns SWCD - Dennis Fuchs, Brittany Lenzmeier, Sherburne County - Zach Guttormson, Stearns County - Cole Loewen, Wright SWCD - Alicia O'Hare, Wright County - Barry Rhineberger

Other Attendees: BWSR - Darren Mayers, Lindberg Ekola, Brad Wozney, MDA - Casey Field, MDH - Chad Anderson, DNR - Reid Northwick, MPCA - Phil Votruba, NRCS - Chris Hogge, TNC - Todd Holman, USFWS - Cody Carlstrom

---

*Boser called the meeting to order at 1:00PM.*

## INTRODUCTIONS

Attendees introduced themselves, including agency affiliation and noted their favorite task.

## DISCUSSION TOPICS

### Agenda Item #2: Land and Water Resources Narrative (LWRN):

- a. **Address comments needing committee input and consensus.** A brief overview of the purpose of the LWRN was provided. LWRN is used during the planning process and support actions in the plan. A list of comments received on the LWRN was provided.
  1. **Seeing font for the partnership used in paragraph format, it is difficult to read.**
    - a. Font currently used is Josefine Sans. Headers can remain in Josefine Sans and Franklin Gothic will be the standard font.
  2. **LWRN is on the long side, consider removing some maps and focusing on information that provides the best clues about the watershed's future. Also provide context on how the watershed fits within the broader Upper Mississippi River Basin Note: Several other comments recommend adding additional maps to the narrative.**
    - a. Currently, the BWSR guidance is roughly 2-3 pages, however, most plans are longer due to verbiage and maps. The report should focus on maps and graphics as readers will read those first. Many of the maps also area available in WRAPS reports; a link could be provided to assist with space. When putting maps together, it should be aware that too much information is shared on maps, they become hard to read. Overall, staff are not concerned with the length of the LWRN, however, the focus should be on quality of content and move unnecessary information out and place it elsewhere in the plan. Those additional details could be provided in a WRAPS report update.
  3. **Our typical practice is to have a list of acronyms provided either at the beginning of the plan or in an appendix, as well as to use the full name with the acronym in parenthesis the first time it is used in the plan. Is this what the group would prefer to see?**
    - a. Acronyms provided should be placed at the beginning of the plan.

4. **Incorporate recreational and tourism opportunities, ag statistics, and scale of lake property values to the introductory paragraphs. Also had a recommendation to add economic information such as tourism statistics, county agricultural statistics, and commercial/industrial statistics.**
  - a. Staff would like to see additional information on general agricultural statistics as ag is a large portion of the watershed as well as adding lake property values to the plan. However, that may be more challenging, but the assessor's office can assist with obtaining that information. Additional statistic information could be found online - National Agricultural Statistics Service, Census Bureau, etc. MNDOT may have recreational data available.

**5. Incorporate size of MS4 jurisdictional boundaries.**

- a. Currently, a map and list are provided. ISG will develop a map, however, if a map becomes too difficult to read, a table will be provided of all the MS4 cities.

**6. Land Use Map**

- **Discussion on lumping categories (forests, wetlands, developed, hay/pasture/crops). Is lumping or existing gradient preferred? One other suggestion was to add a stacked bar chart to show the color gradients while having the map categories lumped. Develop figure 1-3 (Graph of land cover within watershed), duplicative of land use map**
  - a. The land use map color gives perspective to each type of land, urban, rural, forest, etc., however, that are some groups that can be lumped together for the purpose of the LWRN. The LWRN is providing a "snapshot" of the watershed. The hay/pasture/crops could be lumped into one section. Staff suggested that not all categories have to be lumped together, but instead, for example, 3 forest related land use could be lumped together. The map should be on a 11x17 stand-alone page to allow easier understanding and reading visibility. Figure 1-3 indicates relative information but does not have to be large. If there is room available on the map page, Figure 1-3 could be included. Suggested to move the bar chart into a pie chart.

**7. Impaired waters map**

- **Differentiating impairments by color.**
  - a. One color should be utilized for impairments. The tables could live in either the WRAPS reports or elsewhere in the documents.
- **Eliminate tables 1-2 and 1-3 or leave both map and tables.**
  - a. A high-level overview of the maps is sufficient. The maps could be referenced in the WRAPS reports or another place in the plan.
- **Merge impaired lakes and impaired streams maps to create an overall impaired waters map?**
  - a. The maps can be merged; however, the colors should be different for lakes and streams.
- **Map of unimpaired, nearly-barely, and phosphorus sensitivity lakes?**
  - a. Maps of unimpaired, nearly-barely would provide an overview of where there are opportunities to implement more on-the-ground conservation practices. ISG to look at developing a soils drainage map. We had that those maps were being removed from the LWRN but might be used later in the plan.
- **Map of unimpaired and nearly barely streams?**
  - a. The LWRN is a high-level and these types of maps can be found elsewhere in the plan.

**8. Feedlot Map: Show non-compliant feedlots with a different symbol or color?**

- a. The map is not necessary and will be removed. The map can be incorporated at another time, if necessary.

**9. Table 1-4 Stressor ID: create a map and include altered watercourses layer, as well as identifying public and private drainage systems. (Note: if public and private drainage systems layers exist for all counties, please forward to ISG as we were only able to find for one or two counties). Keep table but add total length of impaired reaches for each parameter.**

- a. Keep the table as is with no map.

**10. Elevation Map Color Scale:**

- **Brown to green; Red to green; Other? Use average land slope instead of elevation (hillshade or slope)?**
  - a. The elevation color map could be red to green, however, no white. A hillshade will be completed, with a transparency elevation over the hillshade.

**11. Figure 1-8 Soil Types Map: group categories or leave as is?**

- a. Replace with a soils association map. A soil association is made up of adjacent soils that occur as areas large enough to be shown individually on the soil map but are shown as one unit because the time and effort of delineating them separately cannot be justified.

**12. MPCA Environmental Justice Information - leave link to MPCA map or see if data is available and if so, create and incorporate a map.**

- a. Leave as currently presented.

**13. General Map Comments**

- **Do not use color palette for partnership as default map colors.**
  - The colors being used in the maps currently are too similar to each other and the individual map features do not stand out as a result.
  - Could use color palette for map and legend borders.
- Do not use blue for anything in maps other than water.
- **Recommendations to use instead: For water quality, red = bad, green = good, unimpaired waters should be blue. Use a gradient for anything in between.**
  - a. Blue should be reserved for water. Utilize colors of watershed logo. Avoid neon colors and fire engine red. Utilize general map comments provided as provided above.

**14. Endangered Species Data: noted in narrative that species listed are present in Sherburne and Wright Counties. We have requested NHIS database information for the other counties in the watershed but haven't received it yet. When that information is received, it will be added to the LWRN, and the sentence will be updated accordingly.**

- a. Remove protected and endangered species table and provide a summarized level. A full details list can be provided in an appendix or a habitat section if that is identified as a high priority.

---

**Agenda Item #3: Kick-off Meeting Recap:**

- a. **Summary of feedback received.**
  - a. An overview of the surveys was provided. There were 10 responses to the virtual open house following the kick-off meeting event: 1 rural, 2 city, and 7 lake shore residents.

---

**Agenda Item #4: Data Aggregation Update:**

- a. All materials have been received, final review and report timeline. Anticipated report for March TAC meeting will be available.

---

**Agenda Item #5: Outline Upcoming Tasks:**

- a. **Establish CAC (more discussion on this later in meeting).**
  - a. After Policy Committee (March).
- b. **Priority Issues/Issue Statements.**
  - a. March meeting, starting point based off data aggregation.
- c. **Priority Resources.**
- d. **Measurable Goals.**

**Agenda Item #6: Prioritization Tools - High Level Overview:****a. Discuss options for prioritization tools (zonation, HSPF, PTMapp, etc.)****a. Landscape Stewardship Plan:**

- Analyzes the relationship between land cover and water quality
- May be developed at the same time as the watershed plan

Ekola provided an overview of the Landscape Stewardship Plan (LSP) tools that are available for 1W1P modeling. LSP is a tool that is utilized for a targeting, prioritization, and measurement. There are 14 1W1Ps that have utilized and used LSP with their planning. The concern was raised about staffing capacity. A professional forester does not have to be staffed/on site. Sherburne SWCD, Stearns County, and Stearns SWCD are in favor of moving forward with this modeling process. Wright SWCD's Board has not been able to address this topic and discuss. Staff suggested that it would be beneficial to gather additional information about conservation efforts. Cibulka and Ekola will address the topic and provide additional details. Staff asked for a dollar amount to be provided. Ekola stated that once the partners have made a decision, it will take about 30 days to gather all the information and schedule the first meeting.

**b. Zonation:**

- Identifies values-based natural resources priorities
- Can be used to compare values and results between different committee
- Does not assist with development of measurable goals, would be a precursor to developing goals

Staff indicated that Zonation modeling is not needed.

**c. Hydrological Simulation Program (HSPF)**

- Simulates watershed hydrology in relation to how pollutant navigate through the watershed
- Model is available watershed wide
- Can be used for prioritization and developing measurable goals

**d. Prioritize, Targe, and Measure Application (PTMapp)**

- Identifies ideal location for BMPs on the landscape
- Currently available for select areas with the watershed, not currently available watershed wide.
- Can be used for prioritization and developing measurable goals.

Discussion was held on different modeling preferences. Staff had a slight preference to HSPF over PTMapp. ISG will coordinate with Benton SWCD to provide further information and details on different modeling options. Votruba will explore MPCA involvement and flow model calibration.

**Agenda Item #7: Future Meeting Details and Expectations:****a. Virtual vs. In-person.**

- Some topics that will be addressed in the future will be easier to discuss in person. Having a virtual option would be useful for some folks who travel.

**b. Recurring Meeting Date (monthly).**

- Recommended to send a poll out to staff to coordinate dates/times.

**c. Flow of information.**

- Current MRSC Process: Content > CAC > TAC > ISG > TAC > PC
- ISG's Process: Content > SC > ISG, >TAC > SC > PC
- Recommended MRSC Process - Content - SC (group content) > CAC (prioritize content) > ISG (process data and generate measurable data) > TAC (review content and data) > PC (approve content).

## MEETING AGENDA

- i. The flow of the information is in place to keep things progressing forward. This topic will be discussed and determined at the next Steering Committee meeting.
- d. **Decision making process.**
  - a. An overview was provided of the fist to five model.
- e. **Project Timeline.**

---

### Agenda Item #8: Next Steps:

- a. **Complete data aggregation and provide detailed summary**
- b. **Incorporate comments on Land and Water Resources Narrative**
  - a. Final TAC Approval
  - b. PC Approval
- c. **Prioritize issues and develop issue statements.**

---

### Agenda Item #9: Adjourn

*Boser adjourned the meeting at 3:51PM.*