

Appendix D. Planning Meeting Minutes

Watershed Management Plan Workshop Summary
Middle St. Croix
Watershed Management Organization
February 24, 2003, 3-5pm

Washington Conservation District
(Located in River Heights Plaza, Stillwater, next to the Washington County License Center)

a. Issue Identification—WMP

a. Which resource issues are important in MSCWMO?

The following issues were listed as being important:

Development
Runoff/Stormwater,
Erosion and Sediment Control
Pollution
Flooding
Water Quality
Education/Outreach
Habitat/Fish/Wildlife
Regional Coordination
Wetland
Streams/Rivers
St. Croix/Bluffs/Gully
Funding/Cost
Rules/Regulations
Enforcement
Groundwater
Plume

b. Which resources are of specific concern? Priorities?

The major issue of concern was development in the watershed. Stemming from that the three major issues of concern are:

--Runoff/Stormwater
--Erosion and Sediment Control
--Education

Other comments made include:

A separation should be made between the WMP (plan) and the rules.

The plan needs to be proactive rather than reactive.

There is a distinct difference between the MSC watershed and other Watershed Districts in the area. Other watersheds in Washington County have one major drainage with headwaters and an outlet, the MSC watershed has many small parallel watersheds that all flow into the St Croix. Can we find a similar watershed district that has a similar hydrologic layout?

What specifically are BWSR's requirements for a plan?

Does/Can this plan fulfill requirements of a 3rd generation WMP?
We need a comprehensive list of the other Watershed Districts Rules.

A Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) should be formed to help develop the rules.

The new NPDES Phase II requirements for cities may have an impact on the MSC plan.

b. Watershed Management Plan Requirements

Washington County's Water Governance Study listed 8 criteria MSCWMO must fulfill to be considered implementing. These were discussed and emphasis was given to Criteria #3 in regard to the WMP

It was mentioned that MSCWMO needs to get the latest requirements BWSR and the state have for watershed management plans. What is required to be in a WMP?

c. Work plan and Timetable

Bob Fossum will be compiling the following for the March regular meeting of MSCWMO:

- a. More detailed descriptions of the major issues that were identified at the workshop
- b. These descriptions will include: a detailed description, data/resource inventory needs, associated costs to the district, other stakeholders
- c. The Washington County Water Consortium Draft Report of the Summary of Rules of Watershed Districts in Washington County
- d. BWSR and State requirements of a Watershed Management Plan

A revised work plan and timetable will be discussed at the March meeting as well.

Middle St. Croix Watershed Management Organization
Community Input Meeting
May 30, 2003
Baytown Township Hall

Call to Order

Meeting called to order at 7:00P.M. by Manager McPherson.

Members Present

John McPherson, West Lakeland; John Jansen, Lake St. Croix Beach; Anders Hansen, Baytown Township; Jim Gilles, Lakeland; Ron Nelson, Stillwater; David Beaudet, Oak Park Heights; JoElla Givens, Lakeland Shores, Robert Kamps, Bayport.

Others in Attendance:

Dawn Hilde, Recording Secretary, Bob Fossum, WCD. A list of attendees is attached.

The MSCWMO Board introduced themselves.

Bob Fossum welcomed the community members and gave an overview of the agenda for the meeting.

Description of Middle St. Croix WMO

Watershed Management Plan – What and Why

WMP Content

Feedback/Input From Audience

David Beaudet reviewed the background of the MSCWMO, the Joint Powers Agreement and the need for rules to protect and manage the water in the MSCWMO.

Mr. Beaudet explained the difference between WMO's and Watershed Districts. Washington County tried to combine WMO's in the County into larger watershed districts. The MSCWMO sued to retain its right to exist and not become part of a larger watershed district. One of the biggest differences between them is the size of their budgets. The administration budget for the MSCWMO 2003 is \$1,750.00. If it had become part of the Brown's Creek Watershed District the budget would be \$440,000. This money would come from property taxes.

Mr. Beaudet spent the day of May 29th talking to legislatures about receiving taxing authority for the MSCWMO. During these discussions he was told Washington County was lobbying against this taxing authority.

Bob Fossum presented information on the following:

Education:

Become a larger player in the watershed

Make citizens aware and informed of the watershed and its function and activities

Communicate and educate through the member communities newsletters/newspapers.

Inventory/Data Collection:

Water Resource inventory will be completed as part of WMP
Continued monitoring of water quality and quantity of lakes and ponds of importance.
The WMO has been monitoring Lily Lake for many years.
The mapping of WMO with new two foot contours will provide the WMO with good basic information.

Regulation:

Rules and Regulations will be part of WMP and will apply to development in the watershed and focus on stormwater management, erosion and sediment control, and wetland protection.
Watershed review process will be incorporated into existing city/township review process – more efficient and streamlined process than permitting.

Financing:

Currently – MSCWMO funding through fees paid by member communities.
Prefer ad valorem taxation vs. current funding process – more fair for communities in MSCWMO and other watersheds.
Administration is funded by all communities, large expenditures (projects) are funded by those that directly benefit.
Regulation/Review – fee charged to developer.

John Jansen stated it is always better to be under local control (Joint Powers Agreement) than be controlled by a large government authority.

Perro Pond Pipe Project

The old Stillwater Prison caused flooding because of the large area of impervious surface. The legislature provided the funds to repair the problem.

Bob Fossum asked for questions from the audience.

Eric Johnson, City Administrator, Oak Park Heights

Are you adding another layer of government to permitting? Would developers have to receive permits from the local governments and WMO? No, the WMO would like to give input to each local authority if we have concerns about erosion and stormwater issues.

How do you know the Perro Pond problem is solved? Perro is a volume problem and it is now being piped directly to the St. Croix River.

Bill Nelson - asked ***“will developers have to come to the WMO and the watershed for permits?”***

Bob Fossum explained one parcel is only in one WMO or watershed so developers will only need one permit.

Kent Grandlienard – ***How can we educate Washington County Board?*** John Jansen responded that the Washington County Board has been studying this issue for some time and would like to see one large watershed in the County.

John Jansen stated that some WMO's have taxing authorization.

Bill Nelson asked if ***“County has control over money received from the state?”*** No.

Terry Swan, Lakeland Township – ***“Can the WMO continue if it meets the criteria set by Washington County?”*** Yes.

David Beaudet stated the McKnight Study evaluating all water management groups put the costs for MSCWMO just above average.

Bob Fossum stated that BWSR is the ultimate judge as to whether or not the WMO is functioning or failing.

John McPherson stated the WMO should talk to Ed Cain to get details on legislative action.

Konrad Koosmann, WCD, stated that most failures of WMO's are because the Joint Powers Groups fail.

JoElla Givens feels that local control is best.

Terry Swan – The difference in costs between WMOs and Watersheds makes the decision easy.

Judy Sventek, Met Council – The WMP should have a cost analysis in it.

Bill Nelson – ***“How can we get the county board on our side?”*** Wally Abrahamson was a supporter of the WMO but has retired. The WMO will have to talk to the present Commissioners and find a supporter.

John Jansen made a motion to adjourn, seconded by Anders Hansen. Vote: 8/0

Meeting adjourned at 8:05P.M.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dawn Hilde

List of Attendees:

Penny Huonder	Baytown Township	430-4992
Mary McComber	Oak Park Heights	351-7879
Konrad Koosmann	Washington Conservation District	275-1136
Judy Sventek	Met Council	602-1156
Ray Swanson	West Lakeland Township	436-2261
Jerry Peterson	West Lakeland Township	436-6677
Nancy Jacobson	St. Mary's Point	436-7157
Sharon Ridgway	Bayport	439-5576
Ron Fredkove	Baytown Township	439-6048
Sharon Lee	Lakeland	436-7280
Eric Johnson	Oak Park Heights	439-4439
Kent Granlienard	Baytown Township	430-1142
Bill Nelson	Baytown Township	439-7118