

Agenda

Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Meeting

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

ISG Project Number: 28039

Date: Tuesday, March 21st, 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 (also representing Benton County), Emily Forbord, **Meeker SWCD** – Joe Norman, **Mille Lacs SWCD** – Susan Shaw, **Sherburne SWCD** (Plan Coordinator) – Dan Cibulka, **Stearns SWCD** – Kyle Weimann (note taker), **Sherburne County** - Zach Guttormson, **Stearns County** – Cole Loewen, **Wright SWCD** – Alicia O’Hare, **Wright County** – Barry Rhineberger

Other Attendees: **BWSR** – Darren Mayers, **TNC** – Todd Hollman

Cibulka called the meeting to order at 1:03PM.

Landscape Stewardship Plan:

- Cibulka provided a memo regarding timeline and cost for Landscape Stewardship Plan development
- Total cost of approximately \$25,000 with DNR covering half the cost, remainder to be covered by partners. One partner would be fiscal agent with DNR.
 - All partners interested, but cost and approval process are concerns
- Discussion of how the result would be used if priority issues/resources are already being developed.
 - Can be targeting effort or implementation criteria, not necessarily priority issues for planning.
- Interested partners can have further discussion about funding, including with Lindberg Ekola
 - If all partners do not participate (notably ones with very small portions of the watershed), would change the cost for remaining partners.
 - Splitting costs by watershed % with a not to exceed cost based on participating partners.
 - Clearwater River Water District participating would affect Stearns/Wright/Meeker shares.
 - Maciej will discuss further with Benton County zoning director and Benton SWCD Board.
 - Loewen stated that important to have clear cost breakdown prior to pursuing board approval.
 - Mayers said BWSR looks favorably at the LSP and it is beneficial for implementation.
 - Cibulka has discussed with CRWD but needs to follow-up.
 - Commitment to interest but no commitment to financial cost until indication of participation

Plan Requirements:

- Viewing of BWSR video of expectations and plan requirements: *Making Choices to Show Results* (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=h-Ly1h0mRH0>)
 - Prioritize, Target, Measure
 - Concentrated effort in priority areas = tangible results
 - Activity Counts – Modeled Estimates – Direct Monitoring Measurements

- Using limited public resources most effectively

Data Aggregation:

- Existing reports submitted by partnerships have been evaluated and aggregated by ISG
- Main Resource Categories and reference counts
 - Surface Water – 194
 - Surface Water Quality
 - Protect Surface Water Resources
 - Altered Hydrology
 - Erosion & Sediment Control
 - Habitat/Natural Resources – 84
 - Manage, Enhance, and Restore Habitat
 - Policy/Regulation – 60
 - Land Use Management
 - Groundwater – 48
 - Quality
 - DWSMAs
 - Data Studies/Monitoring – 38
 - Data Collection primarily (few gaps)
 - Quality of Life – 28
 - Aquatic Recreation
 - Emerging Concerns – 25
 - Climate Change
 - Education and Outreach – 15
 - Public outreach
 - Process – 14
- Prioritize Investments in the Watershed
 - Combined responses from kick-off and virtual input
 - Surface Water 35%
 - Groundwater 25%
 - Land Use 22%
 - Habitat 18%

Priority Issues:

- Issue statements lead to targeting, definition of measurable goals, development of strategies and outputs, and ultimately the implementation plan:
 - Desired future condition
 - 10-year measurable goals
 - Targeting criteria
 - Implementation strategies
- Activity: Brainstorming concerns within each of the top 4 categories from data aggregation plus ‘other’
 - Concerns with organized into themes within each category
 - Participants given 4 sticky dots to identify top themes within each category, no more than 2 per theme
 - Participants placed color-coded sticky dots to rank categories 1 (highest priority) to 5 (lowest priority)
- Surface Water
 - Top themes
 - Nutrient/runoff from landscape
 - Bacteria
 - Streambank/Shoreline erosion
 - Urban stormwater
 - Flow/altered hydrology
 - Internal loading
 - Little focus on protection of unimpaired/at risk waters

- Alicia: targeted areas versus specific issues (eg. Runoff is an issue for protection lakes as well as impaired lakes)
 - Concern versus activity. What should be an issue statement?
 - Internal loading issues will never be addressed by other treatment
 - Bacteria levels are very high in many areas of the watershed. Self-reproducing? What is the actual source?
 - Urban stormwater
 - Shoreline/streambank erosion
 - Discussion of Mississippi River proper versus tributaries and other resources
 - Some areas of riverbank erosion on Mississippi
 - Pass-through this watershed
 - Improving tributaries will improve Mississippi River
- Groundwater
 - Top themes
 - Quality / Drinking water / contamination
 - Quantity
 - Wetland aquifer recharge (unpermitted wetland loss, altered hydrology)
- Land Use/Policy
 - Top themes
 - Urban expansion and greenspace
 - Enforcement of regulations
 - Drainage management
 - Shoreline ordinance
 - Discussion of land use being a tool versus an issue/concern
 - DNR: land use is a strategy to address an issue, not a stand-alone issue
 - Loewen: forces conversation between LGUs
 - Maciej agrees a strategy/tool
- Habitat
 - Top themes
 - Loss of connectivity/fragmentation
 - Forest management
 - Habitat protection
 - Invasive species
 - Discussion of role of habitat issues in a water plan
 - Maciej: Habitat is a tool to address water quality
 - O'Hare: watershed plan, not a water plan
 - Loewen: overlap between habitat and others; multiple benefit analysis is essential to maximize ROI
 - Mayers: Watershed management plans must address enhanced protection and restoration of aquatic and terrestrial habitat
 - Habitat issues can be leveraged for additional funding opportunities from other entities (comprehensive plan)
- Other
 - Top themes
 - Monitoring
 - Contaminants of emerging concern
 - Education/Outreach
 - Resiliency
 - Outdoor recreation
 - Education/Outreach critical to successful implementation. Tool or issue?
- O'Hare: should consider including an issue area about upland/land surface
 - Weimann: Soil health should be a priority beyond of its role address surface water and ground water issues
 - Hollman: Achieve many of the goals by including soil health

MEETING AGENDA

Priority Resources:

- Survey to be completed by partners

Land & Water Resource Narrative:

- Draft provided for review
- If no major content changes, will go to PC for approval at 3/24 meeting

Next Steps:

Adjourn

Meeting adjourned at 4:04PM.