

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING  
OF THE  
COMFORT LAKE–FOREST LAKE  
WATERSHED DISTRICT  
Thursday, January 14th, 2021**

**1. Call to Order**

President Spence called the January 14th, 2021 regular board meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. via online video conference.

Present: President Jon Spence, Vice President Jackie Anderson, Treasurer Steve Schmaltz

Absent: Secretary Jen Oknich

Others: Michael Kinney, Emily Heinz, Garrett Miller (CLFLWD Staff), Meghan Funke, Cecilio Olivier (Emmons and Olivier Resources), Steve McComas (Blue Water Science), Chuck Holtman (Smith Partners)

**2. Setting of Meeting Agenda**

Manager Anderson moved to approve the agenda as presented. Seconded by Manager Schmaltz. Upon a roll call vote, the motion carried 3-0.

<b>Manager</b>	<b>Aye</b>	<b>Nay</b>	<b>Absent</b>
Jon Spence	X		
Jackie Anderson	X		
Stephen Schmaltz	X		
Jen Oknich			X

**3. New Business**

**a) Blue Water Science Reports and Presentation**

Mr. McComas, from Blue Water Science (BWS), gave a presentation on the aquatic invasive species surveys performed on District lakes in 2020, beginning with Bone Lake then covering Comfort, Keewahtin, Moody, Shields, and Forest Lakes.

**Bone Lake**

At Bone Lake BWS conducted a curly-leaf pondweed (CLP) delineation in April 2020, resulting in 5.14 acres to be treated at two primary locations. The CLP at these locations was treated, then a second delineation was conducted in June 2020 – peak CLP growth season - which showed good control of the CLP in the treatment acreage and not much CLP anywhere else around the lake. Mr. McComas then presented a hotspot map for Bone Lake showing a pattern of heavy CLP growth in the northeast and southwest corners of the lake.

Mr. McComas then moved to the Bone Lake Eurasian Watermilfoil (EWM) delineation, which occurred in June 2020. He discussed how the June delineation did not find enough heavy EWM growth to justify a treatment and recalled that no treatment was recommended at that time. Upon a second assessment in July 2020, BWS saw little to no new sprouting of EWM, making this a good year for EWM control overall. He then presented a hotspot map of historic EWM growth areas, indicating that the majority of EWM growth occurs in the northern bend of the lake as well as the southwest corner.

Mr. McComas then proceeded to discuss the Bone Lake zebra mussel treatment in 2019, calling the treatment plan “very efficient” at covering the 0.57 surface acreage by the Bone Lake landing. BWS and District staff did not find any adult or juvenile zebra mussels in 2020, although veliger stages were found indicating that there is a small breeding population somewhere in the lake. Mr. McComas inquired if any homeowners had reported finding adult zebra mussels in the lake, on docks or lifts, etc., to which Watershed Assistant Garrett Miller responded that no zebra mussels had been reported or discovered during outreach. Mr. McComas was tentatively optimistic that the impact on Bone Lake might not be too large but cautioned that there is an exponential growth curve for the species so it may be several years before the population density increases significantly.

### **Comfort Lake**

Steve McComas (BWS) discussed the April 2020 curly-leaf pondweed (CLP) delineation on Comfort Lake, noting that there was almost no CLP found in the lake and recalling that no treatment was recommended for CLP on Comfort Lake. The second CLP assessment that took place in June 2020 revealed very slight growth in CLP population despite being peak growing season for CLP, making 2020 a good year for CLP in Comfort Lake overall.

Mr. McComas then proceeded to discuss Eurasian watermilfoil (EWM) in Comfort Lake. A June 2020 delineation by BWS revealed that there was EWM growth in the nearshore areas on the north, east, and south shores of Comfort Lake. He then discussed the “very successful” Comfort Lake Association (CLA) EWM treatment and control program using their own equipment and herbicides. A September EWM assessment on Comfort Lake revealed that the growth in hotspot EWM areas was reduced significantly with only light growth where it was present. Mr. McComas then asked Manager Anderson for her thoughts on the treatment overall. Manager Anderson stated that she thought the EWM situation was “much improved”, then discussed the MN Department of Natural Resources (DNR) authorization for an early treatment and noted that the year we got that authorization the treatment also went very well. Manager Anderson wondered why the CLA would be able to get that permit but CLFLWD was not able to. She indicated that the CLA was using the BWS delineation and that it does not seem to her that the DNR was required to come out and do its own assessment. She recalled that a previous time the CLFLWD wanted to do this treatment it took the DNR almost 4 weeks to do a delineation, causing the critical treatment window of opportunity to close. She closed by adding that the 2020 treatment was a good effort. Mr. McComas pointed out that this year was unusual due to the COVID-19 pandemic factor causing DNR staff to go out less frequently, noting that they relied on the BWS delineation for this year’s treatment. He then covered previous year EWM hot spots, pointing out locations around the lake where moderate to heavy growth has been seen since

2014. Mr. McComas stated that EWM concentration can be expected to fluctuate year to year depending on nutrient levels in the lake. Manager Anderson interjected with a question regarding lilies and whether white and yellow lilies are counted during the delineation, which Mr. McComas was able to clarify that all lilies – spatterdock or “yellow” lilies and the white lilies – are included under the delineation of “lilies”.

### **Moody Lake**

Steve McComas (BWS) covered both the April 2020 meander survey and May 2020 point-intercept survey for curly-leaf pondweed (CLP), noting that they resulted in a recommendation for CLP treatment covering 3.11 acres in two treatment areas on the west and east shores of Moody Lake. Fortunately, the lake is small enough that the 3.11 acre treatment area was large enough to attain whole-lake control of CLP on Moody Lake, with Mr. McComas noting that a June 2020 point-intercept survey of Moody Lake revealed “[not] one sprig of viable curly-leaf in the lake”.

### **Shields Lake**

Mr. McComas moved on to discuss the Shields Lake curly-leaf pondweed (CLP) delineation and point intercept surveys in April 2020 and May 2020 respectively, which resulted in a recommended treatment area of 3.54 acres. Mr. McComas noted that upon completion of the treatment a June 2020 CLP assessment revealed whole-lake control of CLP like Moody Lake, with all detected CLP either dead or dying and nonviable.

### **Forest Lake**

Steve McComas (BWS) then moved to talk about the Forest Lake curly-leaf pondweed (CLP) delineation by meander survey in April 2020. He noted that there was light growth on the north end of 1<sup>st</sup> lake, very little in 2<sup>nd</sup> lake, and significant growth in 3<sup>rd</sup> lake on the north end which resulted in a recommended treatment area of 59.29 acres mostly in 3<sup>rd</sup> Lake with smaller treatment in 1<sup>st</sup> Lake. Unfortunately the delineation survey may have been conducted too early, as Mr. McComas noted that the CLP assessment in June 2020 revealed significant growth in 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> Lakes – even at the 1<sup>st</sup> Lake treatment sites – although the 3<sup>rd</sup> Lake treatment did at least succeed at controlling CLP very well, with “hardly any” growth in 3<sup>rd</sup> lake overall. Mr. McComas then showed a CLP hotspot map for Forest Lake from 2012-2020, showing CLP treatment areas as well as the widespread distribution of the “very successful” CLP in Forest Lake. Manager Schmaltz commented that while out ice fishing he noticed extensive midwinter growth of CLP, likely due to extensive clear ice allowing sun through for CLP growth. Mr. McComas posited that snow cover may have been part of the reason for the late growth of CLP in summer 2020, which could explain the issues encountered surveying and treating it. Manager Schmaltz would like this noted as a possible cause for a quick start to CLP season in 2021. Mr. McComas then presented the historic treatment acreage for CLP and Eurasian watermilfoil (EWM), commenting that this year may be a large treatment year for CLP before moving on to EWM.

Mr. McComas noted that when EWM was first observed in 2015 CLFLWD and the DNR were very aggressive with a 30-acre treatment in year 1. He then moved to discuss the June 2020 EWM delineation, showing that the majority of EWM is found on the north edge of 1<sup>st</sup> Lake with light growth in 2nd Lake. Mr. McComas recalled that the treatment for the

smaller 2<sup>nd</sup> Lake sites was extremely aggressive in an attempt to keep it out of the rest of the lake as long as possible. In 2020 the delineation resulted in a recommended treatment area of 25.85 acres, mostly in 1<sup>st</sup> Lake, which was overall extremely successful using a combination of ProsellaCORE and diquat. Mr. McComas noted that this combination yielded very good control, with the August 2020 assessment revealing extreme control in treatment areas. He then covered the historic Forest Lake EWM hotspots, noting that EWM is likely to eventually spread throughout 2<sup>nd</sup> Lake. He showed the treatment acreage gradually increasing over the years as evidence to support this.

Mr. McComas moved on to flowering rush in Forest Lake, discussing the pre-treatment July 2020 delineation in 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> Lakes which yielded a treatment area of 5.91 acres in those lakes. He discussed a challenge when treating flowering rush with regards to treatment patterns and whether spot treatment or “polygon” treatment of a large group of patches would be more effective. He noted that of the 5.91 acres treated the applicator performed a mix of spot treatments, scattered patch treatment, and polygon treatment. Upon returning to the lake for an August 2020 assessment on the continued growth of flowering rush, a second treatment of 5.14 acres was recommended in similar regions of 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> Lakes as before. After a final assessment survey in October 2020, flowering rush was deemed to be “very much under control”, with live plants totaling only 0.06 acres. Mr. McComas noted that control has been successful, but the plant is very persistent. He presented an analysis of the presence of flowering rush in Forest Lake, noting that it has dropped to less than one tenth of an acre in the last four years, showing the treatment program is very successful.

### **Lake Keewahtin**

Mr. McComas commented that Keewahtin has “not really any submerged invasive species”, remarking that it is “one of the nicer lakes in the District for native plant coverage” and species richness (a measure of species diversity per sample taken). Unfortunately, purple loosestrife is very widespread around the lakeshore on Keewahtin, which Mr. McComas posits may require future treatment programs to control.

### **Summary**

CLFLWD lakes are all generally healthy, although the ongoing challenge is to manage aquatic invasive species (AIS) and protect native plants in a cost-effective manner. Manager Spence thanked Mr. McComas for his time and asked if there were any questions for him. Manager Anderson asked if the plant diversity in Keewahtin should be reflected in other District lakes or if it is “more specific by lake”. Mr. McComas indicated that plant biodiversity tends to vary lake by lake as it is affected by the existing seed bank in the lake, the last several hundred years of history in the lake, and the lake basin sediment composition – for example, Forest Lake, Comfort Lake, and Bone Lake have a silty sand composition that is unlikely to support a wide diversity of plants despite being able to support a wide distribution of plants. Manager Anderson inquired further if plant diversity is affected by the water source i.e., groundwater. Mr. McComas clarified that the source of the water does indeed have an effect on nutrient load and water quality, with lakes that have higher drainage feeds typically being lower quality than stream fed lakes. Manager Anderson then asked for clarification on the EWM treatment in Forest Lake and whether it is being done by CLFLWD or the Forest Lake Lake Association (FLLA). Mr. McComas said he believes it

is the lake association, then asked Manager Schmaltz for clarification. Manager Schmaltz confirmed that it is the FLLA.

Manager Schmaltz moved to accept the 2020 AIS reports as presented. Seconded by Manager Anderson. Upon a roll call vote, the motion carried 3-0.

<b>Manager</b>	<b>Aye</b>	<b>Nay</b>	<b>Absent</b>
Jon Spence	X		
Jackie Anderson	X		
Stephen Schmaltz	X		
Jen Oknich			X

**b). Blue Water Science 2021 Service Agreement**

Manager Anderson moved to authorize the Administrator, on advice of counsel, to enter into an agreement with Blue Water Science in accordance with the January 14, 2021 services agreement and in an amount not to exceed \$26,500; and authorize the Administrator to request additional services from Blue Water Science, not to exceed \$2,650 (10%), to be compensated in accordance with the 2021 service agreement. Seconded by Manager Schmaltz. Upon a roll call vote, the motion carried 3-0.

<b>Manager</b>	<b>Aye</b>	<b>Nay</b>	<b>Absent</b>
Jon Spence	X		
Jackie Anderson	X		
Stephen Schmaltz	X		
Jen Oknich			X

**c) Aquatic Invasive Species Year-End Report**

**Aerators**

Watershed Assistant Miller discussed the Moody Lake aerator and low total oxygen levels due to snowpack in winter 2020, although the levels did not become lethal. He presented a fish kill rapid response plan in the event of low dissolved oxygen in the future.

Mr. Miller discussed the Shields Lake aerator program with the City of Forest Lake and expressed high hopes for the dissolved oxygen levels in that lake this winter.

**Carp Removal**

Mr. Miller covered issues with the Shields Lake rough fish management program, notably a DNR permit restricting the size of carp removal gill netting and finding treatment plans with WSB Engineering that would not conflict with the Shields Lake alum treatment. They developed a one-way gate attached to a pond on the Forest Hills golf course in an attempt to trap carp for removal upstream of the main lake, which ultimately was unsuccessful. Mr. Miller mentioned potentially coordinating with bow fishermen in 2021 as a low-disturbance way to remove carp.

Mr. Miller brought up the MN Aquatic Invasive Species Research Center (MAISRC) Carp Biocontrol program using the Koi Herpes Virus (KHV). KHV seems to only impact carp and not any native species, so CLFLWD may like to explore targeted carp kills using it if it is determined to be safe. He mentioned that we may coordinate with researchers to submit Shields Lake carp samples for free testing, and he intends to deliver an update in the coming months.

### **Zebra Mussels**

Mr. Miller presented the zebra mussel sampling plate results, which did not show any adult zebra mussels on the Bone Lake shoreline. The plates at Comfort and Forest Lakes are showing an increase in zebra mussel population in Comfort and Forest Lakes, with a massive population of zebra mussels in Forest Lake in particular. The population is likely to continue increasing as time passes.

Mr. Miller discussed the Bone Lake zebra mussel surveying conducted in summer of 2020, which did not find any adult zebra mussels or water hyacinth.

### **Purple Loosestrife**

Mr. Miller briefly covered a purple loosestrife management plan using purple loosestrife-eating Galerucella beetles. The CLFLWD may investigate beetle rearing programs for loosestrife control.

Mr. Miller presented the results of a District roadside survey conducted in August 2020, which identified many locations around the District with standing loosestrife. In particular, he noted the heavy occurrence of the plant in Forest Lake.

Mr. Miller showed results from a shoreline survey of Little Comfort for purple loosestrife, with numerous plants around the shore – particularly along the south shore. A similar survey on Moody Lake fortunately did not find any specimens. A survey of Lake Keewahtin revealed extensive patches of purple loosestrife, along with a fledgling wild population of the Galerucella beetles.

Mr. Miller covered a PLM Lake & Land Management treatment of Forest Lake for purple loosestrife that came at no cost to the District. Depending on the results of the chemical treatment Mr. Miller may explore using this treatment in the future at other sites around the District.

Manager Anderson requested clarification on the Forest Lake purple loosestrife treatment. Mr. Miller was able to clarify that between 45-50 sites were treated, which encompassed all known Purple Loosestrife sites on the lake. Mr. Miller indicated that the Garlan 3A treatment should be effective and the results will be surveyed this year.

### **Phragmites**

Mr. Miller updated the Bone Lake non-native phragmites treatment from 2019, showing that the treatment site had seen native arrowhead regrow in the place of the treated phragmites. He will keep an eye on it in the future but expects the native plants will outcompete the non-natives, and the treatment will be a complete success. No additional treatment was needed in 2020.

### **Starry Stonewort**

Mr. Miller conducted a literature review of MAISRCs starry stonewort literature and is working with Steve McComas (BWS) to prep a report and management plan for starry stonewort in the future. Watercraft inspectors and volunteers have been surveying for starry stonewort this year, with no reports of the plant being reported in 2020.

Mr. Miller presented a DNR list of infested waters and their distance from District water bodies as a risk assessment strategy for the District. Starry stonewort tends to dry out and become nonviable within only an hour or two, which Mr. Miller pointed out is concerning for Medicine Lake in particular, as it is only 40 minutes away from the District. Luckily, other infested waters are further from the District, decreasing risk overall. Mr. Miller plans to extend coverage further in 2021 as well as operating the decontamination unit more frequently once the COVID-19 pandemic has subsided.

### **Watercraft Inspection Program**

Mr. Miller explained that the CLFLWD had 8 inspectors last year and was able to run the program with a small surplus of funds that in the future will be used to increase the quality of the program via more handouts (stickers and pamphlets) as well as potentially a lead inspector for weekend work.

### **Recap and Future Plans**

Garrett Miller discussed potential future projects, including flowering rush rhizome removal and herbicide research, tweaks to the Forest Lake curly-leaf pondweed treatment, rapid response plan development for various issues, utilization of the behavior change grant funds, and continuing to map and analyze purple loosestrife to develop a more concrete management plan for March.

### **d) Governance Manual Annual Review**

Administrator Kinney noted that CLFLWD policy provides for annual governance manual review. Managers Spence, Anderson, and Schmaltz agreed no changes to the governance manual are needed.

### **e) Land Acquisition and Management Program**

Administrator Kinney mentioned that the list of consultants should not be included on the website documents and reiterated that this should be seen as a starting point for CLFLWD staff to receive board feedback. President Spence commented that based on experience it will be nice to have a guidance document for future District growth and noted that he feels it will help keep work on target in the future. Manager Anderson commented that as a policy document it might require a board vote and asked if the process outline even needs to be posted on the website. Mr. Kinney confirmed that it was posted as part of the board packet upload. Manager Anderson reiterated that it is important that in the future items like this are kept separate from the posting. Manager Anderson also felt it is important to get this policy filled out and start using it, asking again if a policy vote is necessary. Legal Counsel Holtman indicated that because it is not a completed document it does not need a vote as it closely follows what is outlined within the

District Watershed Management Plan and prescribed policy. He explained that as steps are added to fill out the plan and add steps for staff to follow it makes sense for the Board to adopt it as official policy. Mr. Holtman reiterated that consultants need not be included in the policy document to keep District options open regarding consultant choice. Manager Anderson accepted Mr. Holtman's explanation and stated that she would like to get moving on this promptly. Mr. Kinney noted that staff have been doing preliminary work on this policy, but that they are heavily focused on our Clean Water Fund grant projects and the associated properties as priorities at this point.

Mr. Kinney then brought up that there may need to be more board-level discussion regarding District priorities for land acquisition, outlining critical areas such as Washington Judicial Ditch 6 (WJD-6) and Little Comfort Lake that have value for water quality programs. Mr. Kinney recalled discussions with the Forest Lake School District about a potential environmental education facility as another item to consider for land acquisitions. Mr. Kinney discussed that the District should consider the Houston Engineering workload analysis for land acquisition considerations relating to the District office in the future as well. Mr. Kinney stated that by the end of the month he should have framework items drafted for the Board as well as more salary survey information from Gallagher. Manager Anderson requested clarification that Mr. Kinney is talking about expanding the District's education programs to be much more involved. Mr. Kinney explained this would include education programs as well as crossover with the District's land acquisition interests. Manager Anderson felt that the District needs to be more readily available for these programs to follow District core philosophy regarding using wetlands and open spaces for flood mitigations. She noted that there are opportunities throughout the District to purchase this land before it disappears. She brought forth concern that the opportunities to purchase this land will be missed if the District focuses too much on more expensive programs such as building construction and stated that she prefers instead to focus on more cost-effective land acquisition so the District can take advantage of these opportunities quickly.

Manager Anderson then stated that hiring outside firms or realtors to do the land acquisition work may be more efficient than having staff handle it. She requested that by the next board meeting CLFLWD staff bring a list of action items for discussion so that this can get started quickly. Mr. Kinney noted the District is in contact with a realtor in the Forest Lake area as well as a firm recommended by Manager Anderson, to discuss the District's land acquisition needs. Manager Anderson asked Mr. Holtman if an RFP would be legally required. Mr. Holtman confirmed it is not. Manager Schmaltz requested to know what other watershed districts may be doing for land acquisitions in the metro area as benchmarks for future District activity as well as to learn what people they use for their land acquisition work. With respect to one appraiser located in central Wisconsin, Manager Schmaltz mentioned that he would like consultants to live closer to the District for the benefit of familiarity in property. Manager Anderson feels that if the consultant has the needed experience then the distance shouldn't be a reason to pass them up. Manager Schmaltz reiterated that District staff should re-contact other watersheds for land acquisition assistance and benchmarking. Manager Anderson then mentioned another section on the chart should be included that shows the source of the funding required for these purchases. Legal Counsel Holtman noted that the appraiser referenced by Manager Schmaltz has done work for the District previously and offers a focus on valuation of natural resource properties. He suggested that if the District needs a more traditional property

valuation, it may find that a local appraiser without that specialization to be suitable. Mr. Kinney asked if the Board would like a formal RFP on land acquisitions and office space. Manager Anderson noted that the District office project should be kept separate from land acquisitions because of the one-time nature of the project, which Manager Schmaltz agreed with. President Spence indicated that it would be best for Mr. Kinney to make his decision, but if he is unsure then the District should err on the side of conducting a formal RFP. Manager Anderson noted that Mr. Kinney should prioritize speed which would mean selecting a firm based on its work history and references.

#### **f) District Office Space**

Mike Kinney reminded the Board that the District's current office space lease ends in two years. He indicated that the guidance issued during item 3e should be sufficient for this item. Manager Schmaltz offered that the District should keep in mind office space needs and future considerations for educational purposes and accessibility such as major walking pathways, as well as the existing office space requirements. Manager Schmaltz noted that an RFP would be much more useful for this purpose because of the extensive and growing requirements for District staff. Mr. Kinney brought up the current need for expansion due to overcrowding and difficulties with research and monitoring in the current space as well as future needs for equipment storage, noting that the ability to utilize the current conference room for work will be diminished once the COVID-19 pandemic has lessened in severity. Manager Anderson reiterated that an external firm could be valuable to fine-tune the District vision while helping with architecture and other miscellaneous issues as they arise. She circled briefly back to item 3e, noting that general land acquisition will not require the same depth of service as office space improvements. Manager Schmaltz suggested the District consider purchasing an existing building and remodeling it, noting that a RFP would help identify options. Manager Schmaltz stated that the District may have difficulty finding a suitable renovation property within its boundaries, in which case it may need to look for vacant land. The managers asked Administrator Kinney to develop a recommendation for consultant services to assist in all facets of the District's effort.

#### **g) Local Government Road Wetland Replacement Program**

Administrator Kinney indicated that he and Ms. Heinz discussed this item with Board of Water and Resources (BWSR) staff some years ago. Mr. Kinney stated that Emmons & Olivier Resources (EOR) performed wetland banking surveys and feasibility District-wide. Ms. Heinz noted that there are currently no wetland banking credits available in bank area 6.

President Spence asked whether the funds from the road replacement program will follow and be used by the lead organization. Mr. Kinney indicated that program funding would strictly be used for wetland restorations to mitigate wetland impacts from local government road projects.

Manager Anderson noted that wetland banking projects would enhance the District's wetland areas and offset flooding. She offered that the discussion be postponed until the next meeting so that members of the Board can review materials more thoroughly. She believes the program has a lot of potential for the District.

Treasurer Schmaltz inquired if the program would apply to road expansion work that affects wetlands, e.g., the wetland north of Hayward Ave. Mr. Kinney clarified that the program would cover work of that nature and noted that currently wetland credits are often purchased 2:1 in northwest MN due to a lack of local wetland bank credits - hence the need for a local program. He agreed with Manager Anderson that delaying the item will benefit discussion as the District will be able to get Jason Naber from EOR involved.

There was consensus to schedule this item for discussion at a future meeting, at which time Jason Naber will join the discussion.

#### **4. Old Business**

##### **a) Watershed Management Plan Update**

Planning Coordinator Emily Heinz stated that comments on the first draft Watershed Management Plan (WMP) are included in the board meeting packet. She noted that the feedback from the District's BWSR Conservationist, Dan Fabian, was generally positive with no items that would not receive BWSR approval from so far. Manager Anderson noted that she has extensive comments to bring forth regarding the Plan and explained that overall, she notices a lack of internal edit process that should have taken place and believes that it isn't as clearly written as the previous plan update. Manager Anderson feels that overall, the WMP is too wordy and that the overview needs more work, specifically the underlying principles that drive the District. She indicated the Plan should contain more explanation regarding how and why the District does what it does. She would like this addressed in the executive summary as well. Also, she would like text to explain the District's designation of lake management districts, and the rationale for that. Manager Anderson noted that a lot of her line by line items are addressed by the comments from Manager Schmaltz and Manager Spence, but there will need to be a lot of work completed on the Plan rewrite to ensure a good product for the next ten years. Manager Schmaltz commented that time needs to be spent "wordsmithing".

Manager Schmaltz then noted that time will need to be spent among the Board to make sure priorities for high-level adjustments are in line to streamline the process. Dr. Funke added that she and Ms. Heinz had spent time discussing the overall vision for the WMP such as goals and priorities. She stated that refining the Plan (i.e., formatting, wordsmithing, etc.) can be done more efficiently once managers are in agreement on the content itself. Manager Anderson mentioned that the District should consider using EOR for editing and writing rather than contracting it out. Ms. Heinz reiterated that further refinement of the format and text will be done once the broad strokes of the Plan are agreed upon. Ms. Heinz mentioned the WMP update schedule will be updated as needed as work continues.

##### **b) Lower St. Croix One Watershed One Plan**

Mr. Kinney mentioned that he is continuing to work on persuading the Lower St. Croix (LSC) Planning Team to follow watershed district methods for project targeting and prioritization. He noted that Manager Anderson will attend the next Policy Committee meeting as the lead District representative. He noted Manager Schmaltz will be in

attendance as well. Mr. Kinney explained he has spoken with Paul Gardner of the Clean Water Council about obtaining CLFLWD metrics for the council, with a focus on One Watershed One Plan (1W1P) items. Mr. Kinney noted that the District is continuing to make a case for our management methods based on efficiency. Ms. Heinz commented that the packet for the next policy committee meeting will be sent out early due to the Martin Luther King holiday. Manager Schmaltz requested a paper copy of that meeting packet.

There was discussion about the District's concerns regarding 1W1P program structures and policy. Manager Anderson explained that she hopes to get the Policy Committee to prioritize hotspot areas and to utilize existing monitoring data and studies to maximize efficiency. Manager Anderson indicated that prioritizing and targeting six select areas should meet 95% of the target nutrient load reductions within 12-15 years, and ideally the Committee could be convinced to follow this prioritized, targeted, measurable structure in the 1W1P. The managers again expressed concern about the potential for state funding to be used simply to displace county funding of conservation district baseline work. Mr. Kinney noted that he has already discussed many of these items with the Steering Committee and Planning Team, reiterating that CLFLWD would not want to proceed in the way they are proposing and would like to continue prioritizing diagnostic monitoring. Manager Schmaltz indicated that one of the most critical issues to prioritize is adjusting or improving agricultural practices to reduce nutrient load. Manager Anderson proposed a meeting amongst herself, Manager Schmaltz, Mr. Kinney and Ms. Heinz to resolve issues with the proposed 1W1P plans and draft comments for the Policy Committee meeting. Ms. Heinz noted the deadline for submitting the draft Watershed Based Implementation Funding work plan to BWSR is March 1<sup>st</sup>.

## **5. Summary and Approval of Board Direction**

Directives from the meeting were summarized:

- Staff will bring land management guidance to next meeting, will talk to other appropriate watershed districts for program benchmarks in the meantime, and will add an element concerning funding sources to the program outline.
- Mr. Kinney will check with other watershed districts and otherwise consider selecting 1-2 realtors and come to the Board with a recommendation.
- Mr. Kinney will conduct outreach and provide recommendations on consulting firms or RFP for office space considerations.
- Jason Naber will attend the next meeting to discuss the BWSR Local Government Road Wetland Replacement Program.
- Staff will print paper copies of 1W1P Policy Committee packet.
- Staff will arrange Zoom meeting between Manager Schmaltz, Manager Anderson, Mr. Kinney and Ms. Heinz to discuss 1W1P.

**6. Adjourn**

Manager Anderson moved to adjourn the meeting. Seconded by Manager Schmaltz. Upon a roll call vote, the motion carried 3-0, and the meeting was adjourned at 8:47 PM

<b>Manager</b>	<b>Aye</b>	<b>Nay</b>	<b>Absent</b>
Jon Spence	X		
Jackie Anderson	X		
Stephen Schmaltz	X		
Jen Oknich			X

**a) Next regular board meeting – January 23, 2020**

Jen Oknich, Secretary \_\_\_\_\_