

MINUTES
JANUARY 6, 2011
CLFLWD WATER MANAGEMENT PLAN TAC/CAC MEETING

Meeting started at 12:35 PM

Members in Attendance: Chris Klucas PCA, Dan Seemon COE, Jerry Spetzman Chisago County, Steve Schmaltz Forest Lake Assoc., Paul Hudala WSB/Wyoming, Doug Borglund Forest Lake, Anne Hulburt Scandia, Todd Udvig WCD, Jack Frost MCES, Lisa Tilman EOR, and Doug Thomas CLFLWD.

Summary of Changes to Plan in response to Previous TAC/CAC and Board Comments:

Lisa Tilman went over the more significant changes in the current draft Plan that were a result of previous meetings and workshops.

- Added objectives back into the Issue & Goals Section.
- Added language to articulate the District's adaptive management strategy.
- Added the load reduction goals into the Lakes Section.
 - Steve Schmaltz commented that it would be helpful to add a column to Table 1 with what the existing P concentrations are for the lakes listed in the table.
- Combined and consolidated similar programs/activities into fewer categories.
- Added evaluation metrics, potential partners, and potential funding sources to each of the Implementation Sections.
 - Steve Schmaltz asked if under the Lakes Section 4.6.2 (5200 series) C, which discusses invasive species control pilot projects, does the current language limit funding of a program identified or brought forward in the future. Doug T. explained that it would not limit funding of a future program or activity as long as whatever it was fits within the intent of the activity/program described in the Plan. Jerry Spetzman recommend that in 4.6.2 (C) a sentence or two about aquatics such as curly leaf and experimental work that is going on and needs to occur be added.
- Addition of maps that show the location of projects by the 4 major lake management areas.

Discussion of Updated Plan Content

Steve S. pointed out an error in numbering on page 45. He mentioned that the statement is written as half full rather than half empty and would like to see the wording changed to reflect that Forest Lake is at risk and that from his point of view the timeframes for action seemed to be pushed out a bit far considering the importance of Forest Lake to the area and economy. Doug T. suggested and there was agreement that one thing we could do is distinguish between the three lakes as they do act somewhat independently and that Lake 1 is at more risk for water quality to degrade.

Dan Seemon commented on the inclusion of the Bixby Park project in the Comfort Lake section of the Plan. He asked that given its history and that it is an existing wetland area why was it in the Plan. Doug T. commented that it is in the Plan as the watershed district set out at the beginning of the Plan update to bring forward all of the potential projects that might be considered in the next 10 years and that the Bixby Park project was one that was identified in the 2007 Water Quality Study/CIP Plan. He also noted that by being in the Plan it does not mean that it is automatically going to be built. Lisa T. also pointed out that for large projects such as Bixby Park they are identified in two parts with the first part being a feasibility study and then an implementation/construction phase only if the project was determined to be feasible and able to be permitted.

Anne Hulbert commented on the recommended local plan completion dates in the Local Plan Section of the draft Plan. She noted that Scandia is not projecting to update its local plan until the full 2 years after the CLFLWD Plan update was approved. Although they will be beyond the 2 year requirement with some of the other WD's they are not planning on budgeting for their Plan update until 2013 and recommended that we use that date in the Plan. Doug T. noted that the table was to show recommended dates that would tend to minimize the amount of local planning taking into consideration the adjoining WD's, however if Scandia is not planning on updating its local plan until 2013 that is what we will put into the Plan.

Jerry S. commented that he did not see any mention of the two county water plans and that they should be listed as plans that the CLFLWD will coordinate with.

Dan Seemon provided Lisa T. with a small correction to the COE section on page 87.

Gerry Spetzman noted the poor print quality of the Chisago Co. Petition in the Appendix and offered to get Lisa a better copy if they cannot find one.

Todd Udvig noted that in Jyneen Thatcher's absence she had commented on that many of the photos in the Plan would benefit by having a caption.

Paul H. commented on the measurement matrix in the Permitting Section and that it could be better if it somehow acknowledged the different scale of permits knowing that only three inspections on a major project taking place over an entire season is not enough. There was some discussion at this point on how this relates to the rule requirement which has an inspection standard in it as well. Anne H. suggested relating the metrics back to the rule requirement for inspections.

Todd U. noted that there was no real matrix for volume banking on page 24. He commented that we should consider adding a measurement of an annual audit/report of the volume bank.

Jack Frost asked where in the Plan does it say what you are going to do with the data. Lisa T. pointed out that the Plan calls for both an annual assessment of data and a more

intensive evaluation of data every three years both to be used to assist in refining objectives and activities in relation to attaining the goals in the Plan.

Todd U. mentioned that there should be some metrics regarding the quality of the data and that maybe the district should be checking or evaluating the QA/QC programs of those that are doing the sampling and data analysis.

Doug T. pointed out the new Ag/Rural Incentive Program in the plan along with a few small changes to the Community and Urban Stormwater programs. Paul H. asked if the language on page 30 unintentionally limits the type of projects by using the word retrofit. Doug T. commented that it was not the intent to limit it to only retrofits but for the program to be used within the cities where enhancements above and beyond any permit requirement could be built including areas such as parkland. He further noted that the language needs to be redone to reflect the broader scope.

Jack F. asked about using dollars spent in the Projects metrics. General discussion followed on the merit of dollar spent vs. good projects. Jack commented that for him it ties to marketing and sales of the program rather than just spending the money. Steve S. commented on how quality is monitored or measured. Doug T. noted the program criteria in the Appendix and that a significant part of the application process is for the applicant to quantify the cost and estimated pollution reduction benefit from the project. Anne H. recommended against using number of projects as a measurement as it can be affected by the dollars that are allocated.

Anne H. suggested that the measures in Section 4.5.6 should be differentiated as many of the project and programs in this section are very different. Lisa T. agreed to prepare something specific to each program/project as they are all quite different as pointed out.

Steve S. noted the importance of or the question of needing to be or to become aware of emerging issues. Doug T. commented that we will build into the measure the idea of how well staff and managers are staying informed on emerging issues and research.

Summary of Formal Plan Review Timeline.

Doug T. went over the next steps regarding the Plan Update which included:

- Final Board workshop (Jan 11th)
- Board acceptance of draft Plan and begin 60 day local review (Jan 20th)
- Public Hearing (May or June)
- 45 day State review (begin in July)
- State approval and Local Adoption (October /November 2011)

Meeting adjourned @3:00 pm.