



BROWN'S CREEK WATERSHED DISTRICT

1380 West Frontage Road, Hwy 36, Stillwater, MN 55082

Tel: 651-275-1136 ext. 26

Fax: 651-275-1254

Minutes

Citizen Advisory Committee Meeting

Thursday, January 12, 2006 7:00-9:00 p.m.

Location: Washington County Government Center
14949 62nd Street North, Room 21
Stillwater, MN 55082

Call to Order

Meeting called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Chair, Rick Vanzwol.

Members Present: Rick Vanzwol, BCWD Manager, CAC Liaison
Connie Taillon, BCWD Manager
Shari Larkin, WCD/Recording Secretary
Pat Conrad, EOR
Camilla Correll, EOR
Lisa Tillman, EOR
Amanda Goebel, Washington County
Lee Busse, CAC
Karen Richtman, CAC
Lee Miller, CAC
Dan Kalmon, CAC
Brett Frey, CAC
Bill Pelfrey, CAC
Gary Faust, CAC
Tom Henderson, CAC
Paul Richtman, CAC
Dick Huelsmann, CAC

Approved

Announcement: Amanda Goebel from Washington County runs the Water Consortium Group, which is a monthly meeting of Watershed Managers on things involved in water. Mark Doneux will be at the Wednesday, March 1st meeting at 3:00. He will make a presentation on Citizen Advisory Committees. A handout was presented. If you have any comments, please contribute them to Karen or Rick. All are invited to the meeting.

2. Elect Committee Officers

Rick asked if the members wanted to run the committee. Rick is willing to serve as Chair. A question was asked to define the role of the officers. Rick responded that this committee would most likely only have a Chair and perhaps a Recording Secretary, but the Committee can do whatever they would like. It was decided to put the item on next months meeting agenda and leave things the way they are for now.

3. Approve December 15, 2005 BCWD Citizen Advisory Committee Minutes

Motion to approve meeting minutes by Lee Busse. Seconded by Gary Faust. Motion passed.

4. Rule Revision: BCWD Rule 4.0 Buffers—Presented by Pat Conrad, EOR

Last meeting we had quite a bit of discussion about wetland buffers. What they are, why they are important, and concluded with these things to consider. Pat thought that would be a good place to start this meeting to see if people have thoughts about any of these points:

- When should the buffer rule apply? To what size/type of water bodies?

- 1 ▪ What size buffer should be required?
- 2 ▪ Should buffer quality be addressed in the rule?
- 3

4 The current rule applies to only DNR protected waterbodies, which generally means greater than five-acre wetlands in
5 townships and greater than 2.5 acres in cities. The buffer on those waterbodies varies based on their susceptibility to
6 stormwater, and that varies from 100 feet down to 25 feet. The previous function and value assessment looked at all
7 wetlands 2.5 acres and larger. The BCWD is currently conducting a function and value assessment on wetlands 1-2.5 acres.
8 The BCWD Board is leaning towards changing the wetland buffer rule to apply to all wetlands greater than one acre in
9 surface area.

10
11 Q. Did you come up with an estimate on the quantity of wetlands that would be affected by a change in the rule? I would
12 assume that is about 80%.

13 A. Pat agreed.

14
15 Q. CAC: Could a one-acre or less area have a need to be protected? Could it be that sensitive, or that valuable?

16 A. We should probably make the distinction that they are all protected. This organization doesn't do that protection. The
17 Wetland Conservation Act is the legislation that protects wetlands from filling and draining and that is administered through
18 the municipalities in a lot of areas. Some watershed districts do it, but in this area it is the municipalities that do it with
19 assistance from the Washington Conservation District. All wetlands down to very small wetlands are afforded protection
20 under the law from filling and draining. What we are talking about here is more of the additional protection of having a
21 buffer to it.

22
23 Q. CAC: How would you make that determination? In walking around the area, some buffers look like there isn't even 50
24 feet and some have varying quality to the buffer. Would the quality of the buffer required be more important than just
25 requiring a buffer? You would have to have some criteria that went with it. There are some really incredible places that are
26 very small wetland areas. If they are a very small wetland area and they are really important, then, yes, they are protected, but
27 unless you had a buffer around them, they aren't really protected because the farmer might come and plow up to the edge and
28 impact it.

29 A. Definitely. These are some of the issues that need to be considered.

30
31 Q. CAC: What authority does the Watershed District have to set buffer sizes or requirements.

32 A. The Watershed District has been given authority to manage surface water. Typically, it's issues like flooding. They also
33 have the authority to manage water quality in other aspects of water resources. The research that is out there can make a very
34 clear tie into the preservation of buffer areas around wetlands to the quality of the surface water itself.

35
36 Q. CAC: Expanding the buffer zone significantly could actually consume a lot of property. How well had that been
37 established in Minnesota or tested in the courts?

38 A. Unsure of the answer on the court cases, but there are many municipalities, agencies and watershed districts have buffer
39 requirements. For example, even within the BCWD, Oak Park Heights and Stillwater have buffer requirements.

40
41 Q. CAC: If you look at Stillwater's buffer versus a 100-foot buffer, that's a big difference. Your position is that the
42 watershed district does have the authority to set a new requirement that is more stringent than a municipality.

43 A. Absolutely.

44
45 Q. CAC: Are there any other watershed districts that have extended down to one acre that you are aware of?

46 A. Yes.

47
48 Q. CAC: What kind of feedback did they get?

49 A. It is always a struggle for them and the more flexibility they have in their rules, they can get around some of that.

50
51 Q. CAC: Do you mean having some kind of grievance addressing process?

52 A. Some sort of a variance procedure.

53
54 Comment: If you have a one-acre wetland. A 50-foot buffer around that is another acre. This starts to add up pretty fast.
55 Sometimes that might be unreasonable.

56
57 Q. CAC: Is it possible to base it on function versus just down to one acre regardless of what that wetland provides or if it's a
58 direct line into a groundwater supply?

59 A. That is what we are going to get into tonight. Talk about the function and values assessment work and potential
60 classifications. That should be in the handout.

Managers:

Craig Leiser, President • Gail Pundsack, Vice-President • Connie Taillon, Treasurer • Gerald Johnson, Secretary • Rick Vanzwol, CAC Liaison

1
2 Q. CAC: The other piece was to know what is the purpose of the buffer...if it's solely water quality or habitat protection
3 also. General aesthetics as well? Or are we talking about what performance standards could be done instead of just saying an
4 acre. If what we are trying to prevent is certain levels of nutrients going in and we've identified what's harmful and we can
5 set that as the performance standard, and it's just a water quality issue than maybe it should be up to the developer to choose
6 the BMP and to put that in place. If it's habitat we are looking at, it might be a different performance standard that's needed
7 to be met. To arbitrarily just say that a 50-foot buffer around everything that is this function or type, you're going to run into
8 a lot more issues that way. It doesn't give a lot of flexibility to the people we are dealing with.

9 A. The research that we went through last month at the meeting really shows the greater lengths of wetland buffers.
10 Minimums of 100 feet. That's what the research shows for water quality and habitat.

11 Q. CAC: Did that research apply to things like a one-acre wetland? I interpreted it more as streams and lakes.

12 A. I don't think it did. I would say that at some point that might break up a little bit and not be as valid for a one-acre wetland
13 as it would the Brown's Creek corridor.

14 Q. CAC: Has the concept of Grandfathering the sale of a property been established in Minnesota law to change the
15 requirements?

16 A. That is not how the district would apply the rule. The district would apply the rule in new subdivisions and in new land
17 projects.

18 Q. CAC: Does the watershed district have the authority to trade off wetlands for buffers? In other words, you look at the
19 map, could you trade off if someone did a better buffer on a more important piece of wetland? Small ones would end up with
20 a very significant compensating buffer zone around a high value wetland.

21 A. The district could do something where they would have buffer mitigation, where if you were subdividing some land and
22 you've got a really nice wetland and you've got another one that's not as nice, that this one is supposed to have a 25 and this
23 one is supposed to have 100, give us 200 on this one and you can have nothing on that one. I think that they could have the
24 flexibility to do that.

25 Q. CAC: You don't have the legal authority to give up wetlands in exchange for buffers?

26 A. You can't give up wetlands, but you could mitigate a buffer for a buffer but the wetland still has protection under state
27 law.

28 Q. CAC: Did you say that the rule that is under consideration is only going to be applied in the case of a subdivision? It
29 won't be applied to my farm having a one-acre wetland on it?

30 A. No. All of the watershed district's rules only apply to changes in land use. If someone subdivided their land, or if you
31 came through on your farm and put in a storage building and parking associated with that. That would trigger the district's
32 rules.

33 Q. CAC: Farming use doesn't trigger it, but a certain amount of earth moved or displaced is what triggers it, doesn't it?

34 A. Each of the rules has a different trigger. Some are a subdivision, some of the stormwater rules have a different trigger, like
35 filling in a flood plain. Typically it is a certain amount of land disturbed, such as 5,000 square feet of additional impervious.

36 Pat gave a presentation on different methodologies for classifying wetlands according to their functions and values.
37 Currently, the watershed district classifies its wetlands for protection according to wetland susceptibility to stormwater
38 impacts: 100-foot, 75-foot or a 50-foot buffer for highest to lowest susceptibility. This rule was based on a study published in
39 the late 1990's by a group of wetland and stormwater professionals in the metro area and they came up with some
40 recommendations for wetland management that was based on their susceptibility to stormwater impacts. That system breaks
41 down to what the dominant vegetation type and the hydrologic regime of the wetland. The concept is certain types of
42 wetlands have a tendency to degrade quickly as more stormwater is introduced. Often diversity is reduced, for example a
43 cattail marsh or a reed canary marsh, because few wetland plants can tolerate the extremes called "bounce". That becomes
44 one of the key factors for why we break down the management according to stormwater susceptibility; however, that
45 classification system does not address some of the other functions. Some people have begun to look at the functions and
46 values of wetlands and developed a classification system based on the individual functions and values of that wetland.

47 The methodology used to determine the function and value of wetlands in the watershed district is called MNRAM, which is
48 Minnesota Routine Assessment Methodology. It looks at vegetative integrity, wildlife habitat and fisheries habitat,
49 hydrologic regime and flood retention, shoreline protection and water quality, groundwater interaction, aesthetics and
50 recreational types of components. The underlying concept is the more complex the wetland system is, the better that wetland
51 is.

52 Wetland Functions:
53
54

55 **Managers:**

56 Craig Leiser, President • Gail Pundsack, Vice-President • Connie Taillon, Treasurer • Gerald Johnson, Secretary • Rick Vanzwol, CAC Liaison
57
58
59
60

- Vegetative integrity – the higher level of diversity and different types of plant communities indicates greater value
- Wildlife habitat - whether or not there are rare species, if it provides seasonal habitat, what is the diversity of the plants, density and connectivity and prevalence of that habitat.
- Fishery habitat – is it contiguous with a large water body and could it intermittently support fish. A lot of wetlands provide spring fish spawning habitat. A lot of the wetlands within this watershed have a very low fisheries habitat.
- Maintenance of hydrologic regime looks at how natural a particular wetland’s regime is or how much has it been altered by either the construction of an outlet structure or by having stormwater already routed to it.
- Flood and stormwater storage attenuation is how well will it hold back big storm events, how well will it hold backwaters in the spring.

The western and southwestern portions of the watershed consist of a lot of landlocked basins that do not really drain to the creek. The Brown’s Creek corridor is all connected flowing from School Section and Goggins Lakes to the St. Croix. The whole southern portion of the watershed flows into Long Lake and then to the creek. We have seen areas of land locked basins where flooding problems have occurred then a lot of the natural wetland areas within that watershed were not protected when that area was developed. A lot of the areas were connected so you basically had no flood or stormwater storage attenuation in the wetlands in that watershed. That is one of the things that we are talking about here is preserve those little pockets of wetlands in our watershed so that as it develops in the future, we won’t run into problems like that.

Q. CAC: How did this group, or whoever has the authority, let Stillwater do what Stillwater has done?

A. BCWD has had rules since January 1, 2000 and has only reviewed new development since that time. Prior to the watershed district establishing in 1997, there was a WMO. The municipalities got together to figure out how to divide up the capacity of the stormwater drainage.

Q. CAC: Is there a different management for the drainage-type system versus a wetland, pond, lake? Are there different rules that apply?

A. Long Lake is afforded protection as a lake, not a wetland. The district has rules about stormwater output, nutrient flow, volume reductions that applies to any of the waters. The state does have ditch law, but that would apply to a traditional ditch and Long Lake’s drainage system is not a traditional ditch.

- Shoreline and water quality protection - this is basically the wetlands that are adjacent to larger water bodies they provide opportunities to remove nutrients and sediment and protect the shoreline similar to the way we talked about buffers protecting these functions within the wetlands.
- Groundwater interaction – we look at whether or not the wetland is supported by groundwater or if it’s a recharge area where spring snow melt comes into the wetland and recharges the groundwater. There is actually at least one very unique wetland within the watershed that’s a groundwater seep. It’s called a fen. It’s in the area out Highway 12 west of Long Lake. It’s on top of a hill, and groundwater pours out of the side of the hill and it supports some very unique plants.
- Aesthetics, recreation and education, cultural and science values. These are the human influenced values.

All of the wetlands are scored as either exceptional, high, medium or low and base the categories on these functions and values. On the proposed classification system, there are 8 or 9 different scorings combinations that would classify the wetland in the “preserve” category. This proposal for an alternative buffer classification methodology was based on a system that is developed by the Board of Water and Soil Resources (BWSR) using the MNRAM process.

Q. CAC: In looking at the table, I was surprised that they weren’t first categorized as whether they were a stream, or a lake, or a landlocked basin, that type of a categorization.

A. This applies to the wetlands. The district’s rules have lakes, streams and wetlands.

In looking at the table from the report, it was recommended to have buffers greater than 50 feet for water quality and greater than 100 feet for wildlife habitat for the preserve classification, so we are recommending 100 foot. For the managed areas, their recommendation is 35-50 feet and we are saying 50-75 feet. Similarly, for the third category we are saying more like 25-50 feet.

Q. CAC: Within the rule, is there a variance process?

A. There is a variance process. The district also already has a wetland buffer averaging policy. The buffer can be reduced to no less than half of the required buffer, but the average has to be equivalent to at least the standard buffer width.

Managers:

Craig Leiser, President • Gail Pundsack, Vice-President • Connie Taillon, Treasurer • Gerald Johnson, Secretary • Rick Vanzwol, CAC Liaison

1 Q. CAC: How do you deal with the quality of the vegetation?

2 A. We would like to get to the point where instead of just having a buffer preservation, that we would have more of a buffer
3 creation. If that area adjacent to the wetland wasn't what we would consider a buffer, then we would want it to be a buffer.
4

5 Q. CAC: I don't think we can ignore the slope. I'd like to see the Board consider establishment of something akin to
6 raingardens as part of the buffer. So that the water might be runoff and running towards the wetland may have a place to
7 temporarily collect.

8 A. That is an excellent suggestion. The only thing that we might be bumping up against is the justification why we are
9 protecting that buffer in the first place. Right now we are saying we need to protect the wetland and that the buffer is what's
10 going to mitigate the stormwater impacts of that house going in.

11 Q. CAC: Where we have a situation where a buffer doesn't exist but it needs to be created, we talk about the quality of
12 what's created. It certainly would be a concept to be encouraged.

13 A. If there is a variance request where they want to decrease the buffer width, maybe that is something that could be
14 recommended. Basically you are saying that the buffer zone adjacent to your wetland is not adequate enough to provide this
15 water quality function.
16

17 Q. CAC: Once the dirt is in place, it takes significant effort to destroy it. You could take a lawn mower through a buffer zone
18 and wipe out vegetation, it takes a lot more work to take the dirt and move it. There is also the flood mitigation and that sort
19 of thing. It keeps some of the water from even getting to the wetland. I also realize that there may be negative impacts on that
20 because it reduces the amount of fluctuation in the wetland which is a natural phenomenon and if a particular wetland was
21 ringed by raingardens that held a 2-year event, it would be pretty rare for that wetland to actually fluctuate.

22 A. I would caution you that you might be hitting one or two of the functions of that buffer, but you might not be hitting them
23 all.
24

25 Q. CAC: Making it too narrow reduces the wildlife.

26 A. Yes. I like your idea of the performance standard, but I think it would be difficult to hit every one of those functions.
27

28 Q. CAC: When you had the chart up that showed the different feet recommendations, who made the recommendation of the
29 first range?
30

31 A. That is what is in the report from the Board of Water and Soil Resources. That is what their recommendations were. Pat
32 will forward the report to members. The report takes the MNRAM methodology and makes a management recommendation
33 based on that. Based on the research that we talked about last month, these aren't as big as what we have right now. Pat
34 wouldn't make a case for going smaller than what the district has right now.
35

36 Q. CAC: How do man-made holding ponds, for a development for example, fit into this?

37 A. They are not jurisdictional wetlands because they technically don't meet the criteria. Someone could make the argument
38 that it was created for the purpose of stormwater management, but in 5-years if you decided you didn't want a stormwater
39 pond there, you could fill that.
40

41 Q. CAC: Wouldn't there be an argument under the preserve category for the averaging idea because the minimum of 100 feet
42 for the wildlife habitat, it would be ideal if it was a little wider than 100 feet at some point so that the wildlife would have a
43 good habitat and you just really need the 50 feet for water quality so you could go a minimum of 50 and go a little higher
44 than 100. It seems like you would want to encourage some areas be bigger than the 100 feet.

45 A. Yes, definitely.
46

47 Rick suggested a tally sheet of some kind for the next meeting.
48

49 **5. Best Management Practices Cost-Share Program—Presented by Connie Taillon, BCWD Board Manager**

- 50 **▪ Program Criteria**
51 **▪ Priority Area/Project Ranking**
52

53 The cost-share program is a wonderful new program that provides grant money for landowners who are interested in installing
54 best management practices, such as rainwater gardens, infiltration trenches, porous pavement and other innovative approaches.
55 The goal of this is to treat the stormwater runoff at its source, which ultimately will protect downstream resources. The cost-share
56 involves 100% for the design, 50% for the installation cost for up to \$5,000 cost-share per project. The Watershed District has
57 budgeted \$40,000 total for this program in 2006, which is 5 or 6 projects in 2006. We have based this program on other existing
58 programs, such as the Washington Conservation District, whose brochure should be in your packet, and also Carnelian Marine
59 Watershed District, which we are looking at for the grant agreement criteria. The goal of the program is to provide incentives for
60 water resource protection and educate landowners. The watershed district did not have rules 10 years ago. Now here is a way to

Managers:

Craig Leiser, President • Gail Pundsack, Vice-President • Connie Taillon, Treasurer • Gerald Johnson, Secretary • Rick Vanzwol, CAC Liaison

1 retrofit people's yards on an individual landowner basis to get that water quality that we didn't have permitting authority on
 2 before. So that would include buffers for lakes or wetlands. And it's up to us to decide what the priority would be, at least for this
 3 year. This year is a unique year because the program has to fit within our already existing water management plan. As we
 4 continue with the third generation management plan process, we can add a specific retrofit program that may include larger
 5 capital improvement components. However, the program must have an educational emphasis in 2006.
 6

7 If 10 projects come in and we can only pick 5, how do we prioritize? For example, a priority could be if someone's yard or a
 8 public property is draining directly to MPCA impaired waters. Right now we are looking at a Long Lake Management Plan. So
 9 maybe we could look specifically at drainage to Long Lake for instance and have that be a top priority. Feedback?

10
 11 Q. CAC: One concern is, as the newest member of a neighborhood, with the yard that probably has the most impact on Brewer's
 12 Pond, our yard has the runoff from the neighbors yard coming through it and while they wouldn't have to be directly involved in
 13 changing their yard because they don't back up to the pond like we do, their run off does affect the pond. When you talk about
 14 collaboration, does that include the neighbors whose yards are running off? Or does that only include the neighbors who need to
 15 change their yard because it's impacting the pond?

16 A. More collaboration among neighbors, regardless of specific drainage patterns, provides more education to the public. The
 17 project could be more visible due to size and/or more landowners receive one-on-one education
 18

19 Q. CAC: Having worked on other grants in determining priorities to how the funding goes, it seems like you have to weight some
 20 of these things. Each of the items in the list is important, but you need more weight to some of the numbered items. If
 21 collaboration is really high on the list, then it's weighted higher than wildlife habitat improvement. You have to come up with
 22 some way of being able to say what is most important. What are we really looking for?

23 A. For this year it is education. Next year we can change program purpose. This year is a trial run. Every year thereafter it can be
 24 voted on and perhaps increased.
 25

26 CAC Comments on Priority Criteria:

- 27 ▪ Benefits to water quality.
- 28 ▪ A priority might be something that people can see and has educational value to it. At \$40,000, some of your bang for
 29 your buck would be a beautiful raingarden with informational signs. \$40,000 spread in this district is not going to go far.
- 30 ▪ In the first year then, they need to be visible projects. Maybe from that standpoint, the projects should be in a school or
 31 some other highly visible area.
- 32 ▪ A number of years ago we went on a tour. Someone had done some shoreline restoration. There is great value in those
 33 tours and having the sites open for tours, rather than just something a person can walk by on their own. I learned more
 34 on that shoreline tour than I ever learned walking by a shoreline restoration at a park, like in Shoreview. There needs to
 35 be an educational component. Showing the change of the space is also important.
- 36 ▪ Another point is if you were going to put more emphasis on how much treatment you are getting in one practice versus if
 37 you could get everybody in the watershed to do one raingarden, that one raingarden alone wouldn't do a lot. But the
 38 cumulative affect of everybody doing a little bit would have a great impact on the resource.
- 39 ▪ Use Minnesota native plants.
 40

41 CAC Comments on specific project areas:

- 42 ▪ The East side of Long Lake development was built without adequate treatment ponds. Fast wash off of fertilizers go
 43 straight into the lake. I can see that as a high priority area.
- 44 ▪ The City of Stillwater is in the process of designing a park immediately south of the railroad tracks and west of Neil,
 45 near the diversion structure. That would be an excellent location for a demonstration raingarden. If it was well designed
 46 and well built, it directly impacts the water that we consider part of Brown's Creek. The same thing could apply to north
 47 of the railroad tracks.
- 48 ▪ Another park that is being worked on is Schulenberg Park. It's in the planning process. They have been encouraged to
 49 do some sort of infiltration for localized source run off of the ball field. They are talking about a perimeter of hedges.
 50 The watershed should be paying attention when major projects like this come up.
 51

52 CAC Comments on Cost-Share Agreement:

- 53 ▪ A maintenance plan should be required. To throw \$5,000 at a project and have it only be there for 3 months is not the
 54 best thing.
- 55 ▪ One way for landowners to save money is to provide some of the cost-share match with in-kind labor.
 56

57 Send Connie an email with further comments or suggestions.
 58

59 6. Third Generation Watershed Management Plan: Vision Statement and Issue Statements—Presented by Camilla Correll 60 & Lisa Tilman, EOR

Managers:

Craig Leiser, President • Gail Pundsack, Vice-President • Connie Taillon, Treasurer • Gerald Johnson, Secretary • Rick Vanzwol, CAC Liaison

1
2 ▪ Review Third Generation Plan Process Timeline

3 A watershed management plan gives information on the District's resources, directs the actions of the district and describes
4 funding mechanisms; in order for a project to be funded through the District, it must be in an approved management plan. The
5 current management plan was written as a five-year plan with an implementation section extending through 2006. The 3rd
6 generation watershed management plan will be a ten-year plan, guiding District activities for 2007-16. The planning process is
7 intended to involve the public and other government agencies to solicit input on the plan, which will be done with a Citizen's
8 Advisory Committee and a Technical Advisory Committee that has more City and Agency representatives. The plan will also go
9 through a formal public review period once it's drafted. There are state statutes that define what has to be in a plan. To meet the
10 aggressive goals in the timeline, the draft plan has to be done in April. In the next CAC meetings, we will discuss some of the key
11 parts of the plan. This meeting we will talk about the district's vision and the issue statements, and the next meeting we want to
12 look at the goals and policies. Then in March we will try to work together to develop an implementation plan for the education
13 outreach and stewardship portion. Finally in April we will have you all review the entire draft plan.
14

15 CAC Comments on the CAC Role:

- 16 ▪ Q. How did we decide that this is the role of this committee? I don't see anything about projects, impacts of those
17 projects, value of those projects, and so on. How did this become our role?
18 ○ A. Typically, the Citizen's Advisory Committee provides develops codes and policies and the education portion
19 of the implementation plan. The other part of the implementation plan that the district will also look at is capital
20 improvement projects, groundwater projects, groundwater management, and stormwater management. They
21 typically get feedback from those portions of the implementation plan from the technical advisory committee,
22 but if the Citizen's Advisory Committee has interest in those areas, then we could surely open that discussion
23 up at the March meeting to things beyond the education and outreach part. It just depends on the level of
24 interest of the group.
25 ▪ Q. We're back to discussing rules and visions, not projects and costs. You're looking for input from us on whether a
26 project is worth doing, or the cost is worth that, or the impact is going to be best with certain projects, that's outside of
27 the scope of what this discussion is?
28 ○ A. Today's discussion, yes. First you develop the issues statement, then you develop goals and policies to
29 address those issues statements, and those goals and policies get put into an implementation plan. "We need to
30 improve water quality in Long Lake" is a specific goal. How do we do that? Maybe we put alum treatment in
31 there. So alum treatment goes into your implementation plan and we put dollar amount for each of the projects
32 and we end up with a budget for the District over the next 10 years. That has to go through some ranking
33 process at some point, and if the Citizen's Advisory Committee is interested in being involved in that process,
34 they are welcome to.
35 ▪ Q. When will this plan be developed so we can see it? I think we all want to have more time to think about it than just
36 show up at the meeting and discuss it.
37 ○ A. In March we want you to view an implementation plan for the education and outreach portion of the plan. If
38 you want to review the other segments, that will have to be added to the timeline. Unfortunately we have a very
39 short schedule, so with only one meeting a month, there is only so much you can do at one meeting. Each of
40 these months, we get the input from the Citizen's Advisory Committee, we get the input from the Technical
41 Advisory Committee, we write that chapter, and we bring it to the board for their input, and then we start over
42 again on the next chapter. Drafts will be distributed as soon as they are available. We would like to have the
43 issues statement chapter done for you to look at next month and you can give us more feedback.
44 ▪ I've sat on some previous County advisory committees, and it sounds like some of the other experience. We're presented
45 something at a meeting, we know we don't have enough time, we go on. The professional consultants end up doing the
46 work and they give it over to the commission and that's it. I do think if we are going to have any kind of input
47 whatsoever, we have to have things in advance of meetings so that we have the opportunity to read and review them.
48 ▪ Q. I want our input to be more substantial than vision statements. If we're going to have advice, we want to know what's
49 going to be a significant part of the plan moving forward.
50 ○ A. We definitely want you to be a significant part of the plan; today it is just the vision and issues statement.
51 ▪ Q. What does the advisory committee want to advise on? Do we want to talk about plans? Do we want to talk about
52 implementation? I see on the schedule there is an implementation plan specifically for education and outreach. What
53 about the implementation plan for other parts of the watershed and the other important things that are going to happen?
54 There is significant input on other things and probably more impact to the community than just education and outreach.
55 ○ Our goal was not to not have you participate in any way that you want to. But the first part is definitely the
56 vision statement and you can't know all the issues and have a preconceived notion of the vision statement
57 before you define the vision statement. So if we got enough feedback on the vision statement, our next thing
58 would be to look at the issues statement. It's a process. You define the issues statement, you define the goals
59 and policies and then you have the components for the implementation plan. What we proposed to discuss
60 tonight was the issue statement topics. If we could get feedback on the issues statements in the next couple

Managers:

Craig Leiser, President • Gail Pundsack, Vice-President • Connie Taillon, Treasurer • Gerald Johnson, Secretary • Rick Vanzwol, CAC Liaison

weeks, maybe we can get them more defined. That would help us stay on schedule. Technically, if the plan isn't completed in 2007, we can't levy funding for 2007, although there is some flexibility in that schedule.

- Q. Who defines the roles of the committee? The board? The committee itself?
 - I think the committee ought to have input. If a decision has to be made, I think the board would have to make it.
- What is a Vision Statement? Brainstorm revisions to current vision statement

A vision statement should be what you would see at the completion of this plan, what the district should look like, how people should be interacting and other ideas like that. We want the vision statement to set an attainable standard for the district. So it shouldn't be something that we can never get to. We want it to inspire us to move toward this goal of our vision. The vision statements from 2000 (present and future) were read. Feedback?

CAC Vision Statement Comments:

- Comment. Are vision statements usually this lengthy? This is more of a narrative. I would like to see it shortened and more concise.
- The first sentence or two...isn't that what watersheds are all about? Don't we want to preserve what we have and understand the interconnectedness of everything that is involved today? I agree that this is lengthy. Should be right to the point.
- For people who want to protect the environmental impact of the future, lobby the legacy of a strong, healthy environment that sustains the quality of habitat and water, and also maintains the integrity of the interconnectedness of all the watersheds.
- To enhance and improve the environmental quality of the watershed.
- As it pertains to the streams, the very last sentence in the "future" vision is a vision of the Creek. I agree with what that says. It is a good vision.
- We need to be careful to not only focus on Brown's Creek.
- Preserving and protecting not only surface water quality, but the interconnections between surface and groundwater quality as well. It's important to have a holistic vision.
- I would suggest that our eventual list of specific projects is dramatically affected by the vision statement. If my vision for the western half of the district is that there should be a maximum of 5 wetlands and let's get rid of the rest, that's a dramatically different vision than we want to protect many of them. Our vision is that there should be a variety of wetlands.
- What do you want to see in your community in 10 years? That's what your vision statement should include.
- I think the present vision statement sums up the big picture problem. There is a lot of rapid development; this is the cause of our problems. What do we do about that? How do we balance the development? We can't stop it. How do we minimize the impact?
- No one has mentioned flood. This district was formed because of two major flooding problems. We've talked about water quality, etc. In the meantime, you have to keep basements dry.
- Revise Issue Statements and Prioritize

CAC Comments on the Issue Statements:

- Q. Do you have a list of what you think is going to be part of that plan? We have no plan at all for what's going to happen in those 10 years?
 - A. The district wouldn't come up with that before getting input from the CAC and TAC. We have an idea about where there are problems in the district, but we haven't formulated a list.
- Q. How can they get input from us if we have no idea where the focus is?
 - A. That's what we are trying to define tonight. What are the issues? Where are the problems?
- I heard someone say we need to maintain the water quality that we have and actually improve it. With that kind of statement, we can go to our engineers and tell them this is what we want to accomplish as far as water quality. Tell us what the buffers need to be to make that happen.
- We don't really know what the issues are. Give us a little framework so we know what the people who have a lot of history with the watershed are grappling with. Maybe we could have someone at the next meeting talk about those things.
 - If you need some background on watersheds...what is a watershed, what are the resources of the watershed, what does the watershed look like, how is the western half different from the main stem or the northern part of the watershed, talk about the projects we have done prior/during the second generation plan, what are we doing this year, where do we stand today...we can certainly provide you with that information. However, for today, we have big picture projects in mind...improving water quality, bigger capital improvement projects, but smaller projects, the things we don't see because we aren't traveling in those landlocked basins every day, those are the types of issues we are trying to identify from the residents.

Managers:

Craig Leiser, President • Gail Pundsack, Vice-President • Connie Taillon, Treasurer • Gerald Johnson, Secretary • Rick Vanzwol, CAC Liaison

- 1 ▪ Q. What are the issues that you think are left to be resolved as the current plan is coming to an end? What are the big hot
- 2 buttons?
- 3 o A. We didn't want to provide examples tonight that would feed the group.
- 4 ▪ Q. What you are looking for is my experience as a member of this community with just what I know about. What is
- 5 important to me about the watershed?
- 6 o Yes
- 7

8 **7. Adjournment**

9 **Lee Busse, seconded by Dan Kalmon motioned to adjourn the meeting at 9:30. Motion passed.**

10
11 **Take Home Projects:**

- 12 1) Review the list of issues and comment on. Email your responses to Karen Kill at Karen.kill@mnwcd.org by noon on
- 13 Wednesday, January 18th.
- 14 2) Review Second Generation Management Plan Goals and Policies section for next meeting.
- 15 3) Send Rick an email saying what you think the role of the advisory committee should be.
- 16

17 **Next Meeting on Thursday, February 9, 2006:**

- 18 1) Rule Revision: BCWD Rule 3.0 Erosion Control and BCWD Rule 7.0 Floodplain Management
- 19 2) Third Generation Management Plan: District Goals & Policies
- 20

21
22 Respectfully Submitted,
23 Shari Larkin, Recording Secretary

Managers:

Craig Leiser, President • Gail Pundsack, Vice-President • Connie Taillon, Treasurer • Gerald Johnson, Secretary • Rick Vanzwol, CAC Liaison