

Project Name	Brown's Creek Watershed District (BCWD) Watershed Management Plan Update	Date	10-22-2024
Meeting Location	Washington County Conservation District Office		
Regarding	Watershed Management Plan Update; Lake Management; Wetland Management		
Attendee(s) + Info.	TAC Members		
Full attendance in Appendix A	CAC Members District Staff and Consultants		
Recorded By	Alexander Furneaux, EOR		

Meeting Overview

EOR staff attended the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) meeting to lead a discussion on two Issues that will be revised as part of the BCWD Watershed Management Plan (WMP) update. Camilla and Alexander provided a summary of the work completed since the TAC last met, including updating them on the CAC and Board meetings, and the list of Issues to be discussed with the TAC. EOR also shared the approach to considering climate change impacts and DEI in the planning process. The remainder of the meeting was used to discuss two Issue categories "Lake Management" and "Wetland Management".

TAC members were asked to identify concerns/threats, management strategies, monitoring opportunities, and engagement opportunities associated with these Issues. Of importance was understanding how these Issues are evolving and what updates are required to ensure the relevance of the Issue for the coming 10 years.

Discussion

The following summary of the meeting discussion includes input received from the TAC during the meeting, input on these Issues received following the meeting (if any), and input on the Issue received through prior engagement as part of the Watershed Management Plan Update.

This input is summarized in **Table 1** and **Table 2**. Information from these tables will be used to update the following subsections of the Issue Statements in the Plan in the following ways:

- **Concerns/Threats** – Informs potential updates to the General Issue Statement (3.X.1), Relevance to the District (3.X.2), and Sub-Issue Areas (3.X.3).
- **Management Strategies** – Informs potential Goals (new or updated).
- **Monitoring Opportunities** - Informs potential Implementation Items (new or updated).
- **Engagement Opportunities** – Informs potential Implementation Items (new or updated).

Table 1. Lake Management

	Concerns/Threats	Management Strategies	Monitoring Opportunities	Engagement Opportunities
Within the Plan Currently	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nutrient impairment. <i>E. Coli</i> impairment. TSS. Invasive aquatic species. Lake level fluctuation, worsening due to climate change. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lake management (subwatershed, shoreline, in-lake, containment). Lake management plans and implementation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Water quality. Water level. Lynch and Goggins aquatic macrophyte (plant) surveys which have uncovered some rare plant species. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meetings with lakeshore owners during the Pond/Lake Management Plans.

<p>New to the Update</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PFAS contamination. • Chloride impairment. • Loss of natural shoreline and native shoreline vegetation (habitat degradation). • Little or no enforcement of shoreland ordinances. • Increased flood elevations from larger storms. • Increased intensity of lake use; more boats, bigger motors, bigger wakes. • Interest in understanding if development patterns around lakes are impacting the lakes, how is zoning influencing land use and land cover near lakes? • Lack of public access to most lakes. • Encroachment on the Long Lake public trail by private landowners. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shoreline bioengineering only, no rock or sand; alternates including vegetation and stormwater management for shoreland lots. • Rip rap and sand blankets being installed without a permit requirement, DNR rule issue; desire to see more BCWD oversight. • Set a measurable goal for native shoreline per lake; informed by current status and tied to monitoring activities. • Consider where investments are being made relative to the people who have access to the benefits; are there ways to increase equitable access to lakes? • AIS not a watershed issue, leave it alone unless there is a direct water quality benefit. BCWD can help people stay informed on AIS; clearly define the BCWD's role on AIS to manage expectations (define where the BCWD stops and where DNR and Washington County lead); partner with these organizations. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Acknowledge AIS as an issue but not necessarily a priority for BCWD to lead. • Learn more about Lake Improvement Districts to see if this would be a good fit for some lakes. • Consider dust suppressants and water softeners as additional sources of chlorides, in addition to road salt. • Will the H/H model map the floodplain in the developed parts of 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DNR score the shore monitoring. • Conduct monitoring routinely; 3-year rotations. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ While it was suggested that BCWD could do the public-access and impaired resources, and use citizen science to assist with the other resources, the group concluded that the use of volunteers may create too much inconsistency in the data (something that needs to be weighed) • Aerial and on-lake monitoring. • Evaluate potential pollutant loads from septic systems including the impact of water softeners. • Set a goal of a % of natural shoreline. • Look for a reference that ties lake score to an understanding of the status of the lake. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Setting expectations about the ecosystem functions of wetlands compared to lakes; people wanting to cut down shoreline vegetation for a better view. • Increased public education about these resources; consider signage near lakes, direct HOA outreach and outreach to shoreline properties. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Realtor workshops – ensuring these individuals are representing these resources responsibly and accurately. ○ Shoreland owner workshops – what can these property owners do with their land. • Coordination with LGUs protection and enforcement. • Formalize lake names. • Native shoreline restoration/management cost-share. • Free/discounted/cost-shared shoreline rehabilitation design from a landscape architect. • Highlighting shoreline conservation efforts of specific properties as good examples for others to replicate.
--------------------------	---	--	---	--

	Concerns/Threats	Management Strategies	Monitoring Opportunities	Engagement Opportunities
		the city and in landlocked portions of the watershed? What events are we running?		<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Partnership to determine how to address discharge to Lake McKusick

Table 2. Wetland Management

	Concerns/Threats	Management Strategies	Monitoring Opportunities	Engagement Opportunities
Within the Plan Currently	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Encroachments, such as development, filling, and vegetation removal. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Loss of wetland area, type, and value; important to consider. • Aquatic invasive species. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Loss of wetland plants to invasive species (phragmites, thin leaf cattails). • Decreased groundwater contributions. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ As appropriations increase, do we anticipate wetlands drying up? • Nutrient loading. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Historically nutrient loaded wetlands releasing Phosphorus. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vegetation management, UMN phragmites management. • Pond management plans. • Restoration and enhancement of high priority wetlands. • Wetland buffer quality. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GIS database of recorded buffers. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •

<p>New to the Update</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chloride impacts. • Failing septic systems with a lack of back-up sites needing intervention. • Flooding, depending on the wetland type. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WCD invasive species control needs funding. • High replacement ratios for high quality wetlands, localize mitigation so replacements occur within the watershed. • BCWD taking on some WCA responsibilities through permitting? Is this possible with staff capacity? • Sub-issue regarding loss of wetland area and type; degradation and loss, degradation can be more nuanced (e.g. wetlands that have too much water causing aquatic species die-off). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New and emerging invasive species monitoring. • Monitoring loading including historic high loading review • H/H future flood footprint. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Managing expectations of ecosystem functions for wetlands and lakes. • Pollinator and wildlife wetland workshops. • Locker with stand-up paddleboards. • Ducks Unlimited – connect people that aren’t normally connected within the watershed; don’t normally see ducks any more. • City of Stillwater partnership to provide boating opportunities off the pier/dock in the Liberty Development. • Trout Unlimited and Pheasants Forever connection. • DNR fishing in the neighborhood program, connect with this program. • Increase public access to small lakes and large wetlands. • Stillwater in support of reuse, especially with redevelopment of the athletic center.
--------------------------	--	---	---	---

Appendix A – Attendance

TAC Members

- Jay Riggs, WCD
- Mike Isensee, CMSCWD
- Jessica Collin-Pilarski, Washington County
- Daniel Scollan, DNR
- Michelle Jordan, BWSR
- Abby Shea, MDH Wellhead Protection
- Steve Christopher, Metropolitan Council
- Matt Oldenburg-Downing, Middle St. Croix Watershed Management Organization
- Jesse Farrell, City of Stillwater
- Miranda Nichols, MPCA

CAC Members

- George Vania
- Jyneen Thatcher
- Anne Maule Miller

Staff

- Karen Kill
- Cameon Blake
- Hannah Peterson
- Camilla Correll
- Alexander Furneaux