

Cannon River 1W1P

Technical Advisory Group

Meeting #13 Notes

May 22, 2019

9:00am – 12:00 pm

Rice County Gov. Services Building
320 3rd St NW, Faribault, MN 55021

Technical Advisory Group: Shaina Keseley (*BWSR*), Becky Smith (*City of Faribault*), Todd Piepho (*DNR*), Justin Watkins (*PCA*), Emily Bartusek (*PCA*), Emily Resseger (*Metropolitan Council*), Bradley Rademacher (*City of Owatonna*)

Planning Work Group: Brad Becker (*Dakota County*), Brad Behrens (*Rice County*), Ashley Gallagher (*Dakota SWCD*), Eric Gulbransen (*Steele SWCD*), Beau Kennedy (*Goodhue SWCD*), Holly Kalbus (*LeSueur County*), Steve Pahs (*Rice SWCD*), Glen Roberson (*Goodhue SWCD*), Mike Schultz (*LeSueur SWCD*), Brian Watson (*Dakota SWCD*)

Advisory Staff: Jenny Mocol-Johnson (*BWSR*), Melissa King (*BWSR*)

❖ Agenda and Meeting Goals

Agenda was modified to address the BWSR memo that was emailed to the group late on Tuesday. The group then planned to review changes to the Plan and if time allowed, go through the response to comments. Goal was to reach consensus on moving the Plan forward to the Policy Committee.

❖ BWSR Memo on WRAPS Data

Memo was handed out, and contents were explained. BWSR has concerns with response to their comment #1 and it is related to a response to MPCA comment #2. The load numbers used in the tables for protection lakes and impaired lakes reduction goals do not match WRAPS. The reason they do not match is that WRAPS/TMDL existing loads do not separate internal from external load. This is the primary reason that numbers from WRAPS/TMDLS were re-calculated. The WRAPS document was still utilized; especially the BMP scenario tables (tables 14 and 15). MPCA supports the methodology used but also would like to see more explanation of how the loads were calculated. An example of how the tables could be modified to include the WRAPS/TMDL numbers was handed out to the group. There was some discussion on the Lake Management Plans, and whether it made more sense to not do the internal/external math and just wait for the LMP numbers. Adjusting the reduction goals in the tables for protection lakes and impaired lakes could have implications on the reductions already calculated for the activities. After discussion BWSR and the group would support either of the following options, with the group's preference on the option that maintains plan and timeline, and BWSR's preference on only using WRAPS/TMDL numbers.

1. Remove calculations that separated internal/external load, and only use WRAPS/TMDL numbers to calculate load reduction goals.
2. Use the modified tables, add an appendix that works through an example of methodology used to determine the existing load and add more into the narrative as to why numbers were recalculated from WRAPS.

❖ Review Changes to Plan

The group went through the revised Plan and where changes, larger than just grammar or clarification, were made they were mentioned. The following bullets are where discussion occurred or changes are needed.

- **Page 32** – Question on why “Active watershed management in the Tier One Protection Lake watersheds will be beneficial regardless of the findings of future lake management plans.” This was in response to a comment from MPCA.
- **Page 41** – Information in issue statement on e.coli should be referenced, MPCA thinks it comes directly from WRAPS, in particular this sentence... “Additionally, regional work such as the feedlot and small community wastewater projects have been underway for years and have contributed to the implementation of projects in the Planning Area.”
- **Page 47-** Goal 1 and 2 could be written to match format of how Goals for lakes were written.

- **Page 76** – In Ag Runoff Goals it is confusing to have a range for percent reduction in Goal #1 and #2. Since there is the reference to the tables, remove percentage range and only use the value on lbs/yr.
- **Page 84** – Goal #1 needs to be updated, as it doesn't match a response to one of Met Council's comments. Currently reads "the goal for annual volume reduction in the Cannon River at Welch is 40,154 acre-feet" but according to the comment response it should be a 10-year goal, not an annual goal. The response to comment will also have to be updated as it has the old number.
- **Page 89** – Last sentence on this page should be changed to Stormwater Management since the issue title changed... "Implementation for Ordinance Development will be focused in all non-MS4 communities in the Cannon River Planning Area."
- **Page 89** – The word voluntary should be added to Goal #2 to read "... To retrofit voluntary stormwater practices..." For this Goal and others, make sure the changes are carried through to the implementation table.
- **Page 117** – Implementation activity 3.1.1-C-1 should actually be 1,700 feet not 17,000 feet. Activity should be updated in the table and the text.
- **Water Management Entities (NCRWMO and BCWD)** - New information related to how adopting the 1W1P Plan would affect the NCRWMO has led to the NCRWMO decision to participate in 1W1P but not adopt the Plan. NCRWMO will maintain their own Plan. The original option of extending the NCRWMO Plan to 2029 to align with 1W1P dates would still have to go through BWSR Committee/Board and would likely not be approved. One concern was that including the NCRWMO Plan in the appendix would make any amendment to their NCRWMO Plan subject to approval by the CRWJPB. There are also changes to the Metro Watershed Based Funding Policy that are still being determined, if NCRWMO maintains their own Plan it may be the best way for them to access these funds. The NCRWMO Plan will be removed from the appendices and any reference to the appendix will be removed from the body of the Plan. BCWD does not have the metro layer affecting their decision, and they still intend to adopt the 1W1P Plan as their Plan. They do not anticipate changes needed before the 5 year amendment, and even if the CRWJPB has to approve the changes this is not a concern for them. Therefore, any documents for BCWD can remain in the Plan.
- **Page 162** – Discussion on Illicit Discharge Enforcement program description, who are the MS4s and should they be listed. Decision was to change "A number of planning partners" to "Some planning partners" and other resources can be used to look up MS4s.
- **Page 173** – Table 5-2 needs to be completed. Other edits include:
 - Use years for available data in table when possible
 - Remove lake IDs
 - For streams title column header "Stream Flows" not "Continuous Daily Stream Flows" and put frequency in the boxes
 - Discussion on Groundwater Levels and what would go here, could be static water levels, communities water suppliers track this
 - Flooding of Communities sub-sections should be large communities instead of the Cannon and Straight Rivers. However, Cannon and Straight River monitoring should still be documented in table.
 - Discussion that this was a good way to provide a gap analysis. Questions on whether it is useful to the group, answer was yes, but it will just be a starting point for the actual monitoring plan.
- **Page 176** – There was discussion on Figure 5-1, it can be hard to interpret due to scale and some programs not even being on the bar graph due to zero dollars. There is also table 5-3 that shows the same information in table format, where numbers are more clear. Decision was to add \$0 in the legend by Capital Improvements.
- **Appendix A, Page 9** – Table 0-6 is pulled from the NRCS Rapid Watershed Assessment, but should be updated to reflect the Planning Area acres. Table shows no tribal land, however with the addition of the Vermillion/Mississippi River Bottoms to the Planning Area there should be tribal land. Either do a GIS analysis or merge with data from Vermillion WRAPS to get accurate acres.

❖ Review Response to Comments Spreadsheet

The group briefly went through the spreadsheet to review response to comments. The following bullets are where discussion occurred or changes are needed.

- **Met Council #6** – Flood storage goal is a 10-year goal, but has changed and response needs to be updated. Some thought it was still a lofty goal. However, the goal has been vetted by the group.
- **MPCA #2** – An updated response was provided, but will need to be updated further after changes are made based on the discussion pertaining to the BWSR memo on WRAPS/TMDL numbers.
- **BWSR #1** – Will now just reference response to MPCA comment #2.
- **BWSR #21** – Suggested adding a source or justification for reduction values with nutrient management BMPs. The Plan already cites the P BMP spreadsheet. MPCA noted you could probably dig deeper into the spreadsheet for a source but citing the spreadsheet is sufficient. Also noted that title of Table 3-6 is missing the word phosphorus.
- **BWSR #66** – Comment that since the term ‘local context’ was questioned it should just be explained more.
- **BWSR #72** – Drainage was addressed in the response but it should be further described as to how roads were addressed.
- **General** – Update responses with specifics of where changes were made if not already stated.

❖ Check In and Next Steps

- **Review** - Updates will be made to the Plan and the response to comments spreadsheet. Policy Committee materials need to go out on May 29th however updates will still be sent to the group with highlights of changes, so that there is an opportunity for review and comment.
- **June 5, 2019** – Policy Committee meeting where it is anticipated the Plan will be sent out for 90-day review.
- **BWSR Committee and Board Meetings** – Southern Committee date has not been set yet, waiting to time it with the Missouri Plan. The PWG will present the Plan at the Committee meeting. BWSR Board will meet August 28th/29th, no presentation at this meeting as they will review the Southern committee recommendation.
- **TAG** – Thank you to all who have contributed though out the planning process. The TAG will continue during Plan implementation and we look forward to continuing to work with everyone.