



Citizen Advisory Committee Meeting #2 Outcomes

Vision Statement: Collaborating to conserve, improve, and achieve measurable progress towards natural resource goals in our shared watershed.

Summary: The Mississippi River St. Cloud 1w1p Citizen Advisory Committee met on August 7th, 2023 for their second meeting to discuss two primary planning components: 1) Measurable Goals and 2) Targeting Criteria. The team heard a presentation from 1w1p project staff (Stephanie Hatzenbihler of Stearns SWCD and Dan Cibulka of Sherburne SWCD) then split into two groups to discuss these two planning components further. The meeting concluded with a large group discussion around common themes.

Measurable Goals identify the desired result that our collaborative envisions for the issue, and plans to commit to achieving. Goals assist us in making progress upon an issue. In the case of this planning effort, the goals we identify have a deadline which is the end of the a 10-year time period. At that point, we would assess if goals have been reached or not and new goals would be developed.

Targeting Criteria are characteristics of the natural resources that our collaborative will use to identify where in the watershed we should focus our work to impact the priority resources and issues. The include where work should be completed as well as when work should be completed and are created with achievement of Measurable Goals in mind.

The following are notes that collected from the Citizen Advisory Committee group discussions on each Issue Statement.

1. Surface Water – Pollutant Runoff

Issue Statement: No comments

Desired Future Condition: No comments

Measurable Goal 1: Consider a percentage instead of a number.

Measurable Goal 2: Should it say only lakes?

Measurable Goal 3: In narrative – how will we monitor and measure this? What will happen if a problem is discovered?

Targeting Criteria: Item 2 – include land regulated by Buffer Law. Item 3 – Data source for feedlots?

Strategies: No comments.

2. Surface Water – Altered Hydrology

Issue Statement: Replace “timing” with flow rate; add “negatively” in front of impacting

Desired Future Condition: Replace “timing” with flow rate; add “,” after regime

Measurable Goals: Goal seems to be developed to maintain the average status. More specificity is needed to indicate “how” maintaining the specific status will be achieved. Is this goal mainly about data collection / surveying the timing of volume of water delivered downstream? Goal doesn’t have an endpoint, how would we “express what percent of progress toward the DFC be ascertained? Does “ecological functioning of riparian areas and aquatic habitats” capture quality of life (flooding)? No, it doesn’t.

Targeting Criteria: Culvert replacement projects, FEMA flood maps, flood fringe areas, historical maps to ID water storage areas, wetlands with hybrid cattails.

Strategies: Replacements, attenuation basins, wetland restoration with hybrid cattail removal.



Citizen Advisory Committee Meeting #2 Outcomes

3. Surface Water – Internal Load Processes

Issue Statement: Consider adding “internal load processes” into statement. As its currently written it is easily confused with pollutant runoff.

Desired Future Condition: Change to a positive statement...currently has “is not a”

Measurable Goals: no comments

Targeting Criteria: Shallow lakes with lack of weed growth, DNR fish studies – carp population. Note, target criteria currently reads as notes to the writers of them, please provide more details.

Strategies: Alum treatments, lake drainage (may not be preferred, but mentioned project at Little Rock Lake).

4. Groundwater – Quantity

Issue Statement: No comments

Desired Future Condition: No comments

Measurable Goals: Is local infiltration and filtration replenishing regional groundwater levels? Programming developed with LGUs and include in MS4 reporting: MCM1 perhaps? Can we recharge too much – when does quality become an issue? There are data gaps and a lack of understanding of groundwater. What is the role of different agencies at the state level? This seems to be a goal drafted to maintain an average status and largely about data collection / surveying. How will we achieve the average status? Where is the endpoint, how would we express what percent of progress towards the DFC is ascertained and communicated?

Targeting Criteria: Are we addressing shallow or deep wells, are one used more than the other?

Strategies: Education is a critical component.

5. Groundwater – Quality

Issue Statement: No comments

Desired Future Condition: No comments

Measurable Goals: All good goals.

Targeting Criteria: Township maps of high nitrates are a targeting tool that should be used.

Strategies: Education is a critical component. What is the best way to spread information? You don't know what you don't know! Money is best spent on the guy/gal that excels in outreach and can connect to people on the subject matter. This topic needs to be brought to individuals, people do not understand that fertilizing their lawn has an impact on our drinking water. Similarly, people do not understand that watering vast areas of lawn impacts our aquifer levels.

Groundwater both Issue Statements. There seems to be incongruence between the two Issue Statements. Issue Statement #2 indicates that quality is “impacted by naturally occurring processes and land use practices” but there is no such mention of these as impacting Issue Statement #1 Quantity. . . wouldn't naturally occurring process and land use practices impact both? Maybe land use practices and plans for handling extreme naturally occurring processes are a way into defining more clear Measurable Goals for Issue Statement #1 Quantity.

6. Habitat and Natural Resources – Restoration, Protection + Preservation

Issue Statement: No comments.

Desired Future Condition: No comments.

Measurable Goals: There is an appetite for shoreline restoration, several projects per year on the larger lakes. It all adds up and benefits habitat as well as other things. Culture is interesting, people with cabin lots like to see manicured landscape on their lakeshore lots.

Targeting Criteria: Dump pits existing in the watershed that need restoration? One that we know of in Palmer Township.



Citizen Advisory Committee Meeting #2 Outcomes

Strategies: There is an education piece that is important and this needs to be continuous because of frequent turnover of these properties.

7. Landscape Resiliency – Soil Health

Issue Statement: Need to add “degraded” or something that identifies the issue. The proposed Issue Statement is more encompassing.

Desired Future Condition: No comments.

Measurable Goals: Do road ROWs and public ditch buffers fit into soil health? Is that an opportunity for LGUs to partner with state for miles of improvement? Is there a need for lakeshore soil health component in the soil health goal? Healthy soil along a lake helps to stabilize shorelines.

Targeting Criteria: asked for clarification on what is considered a “highly erodible land”.

Strategies: No comments.

General Comments

It’s desirable that the granularity of detail on how targeted locations got in the future completed plan remain in the completed plan.

It would be helpful for citizens to know the various acronyms of agencies and existing surveys and data-collection programs that are used for defining Measurable Goals and Target locations. For example, what is, MPCA SSE; or BMPs; or TMDL? Perhaps an appendix of acronyms in the completed plan. It would also be helpful for the Mississippi St Cloud Watershed Collaborative to communicate these because it provides solid sources for any readers of the plan, thus, enhancing the authority of those creating and implementing the plan.