



**MISSISSIPPI RIVER
ST. CLOUD
WATERSHED**

Comprehensive Watershed Management Plan

Policy Committee Meeting Minutes

Proceedings of the Mississippi River St. Cloud 1W1P Policy Committee Meeting held on December 5, 2024. Vice Chair, Shelly Binsfeld called the meeting to order at 11:00am.

Date / Time:	<i>December 5, 2024 11:00am - 1:00pm</i>
Location:	<i>In-Person: Sherburne History Center 10775 27th Ave SE, Becker, MN 55308 Remote option available, use MS Teams Calendar Invite link</i>
Note Taker:	<i>Stephanie Hatzenbihler, Stearns SWCD</i>
1w1p Website:	<u>https://www.millelacsswcd.org/1w1p/mississippi-river-st-cloud-watershed-plan/</u>
Voting Members Present:	Benton County– Scott Johnson, Benton SWCD Wade Bastian, Sherburne SWCD- Shelly Binsfeld, Stearns County Tarryl Clark*, Stearns SWCD- Tom Gregory, Mille Lacs SWCD Dan Campbell, Wright County- Tina Diedrick, Sherburne County Andrew Hulse*, Meeker SWCD- John Haffley, Bill Daluge Wright SWCD
Non-voting Members Present:	
Alternate Voting Members Present:	
Alternative Nonvoting members present:	Meeker SWCD- Bob Schiefelbein,
Voting Members Absent:	Meeker County– Danny Schiefelbein
Partners and Staff Present:	Stephanie Hatzenbihler– Stearns SWCD staff, Gerry Maciej Benton SWCD staff, Emily Forbord- Benton SWCD staff, Dan Cibulka Sherburne SWCD staff, Becky Schlorf Stearns County, Angela Beckman Stearns County, Alicia O'Hare- Wright SWCD staff, Zach Guttormson BWSR staff, *Francine Larson– Sherburne SWCD staff, *Matt Danz Sherburne County Staff, *Miranda Wagner, Sherburne SWCD staff, Paul Marsten ISG*
Members of the Public	6 members of the public attended the meeting

*Individuals joined via Zoom virtually.

Welcome and Introductions (Chair).

1. Attendance was taken by Hatzenbihler.
2. Policy Committee Members introduced themselves

Review and Approve Agenda (Chair).

1. Approve Meeting agenda. **Motion by Johnson to approve meeting agenda; second by Diedrick.** Affirmative by roll call: Johnson, Bastian, Binsfeld, Clark, Gregory, Campbell, Diedrick, Haffley, Daluge, Hulse. Opposed: None. **Motion carried.**

Conduct Public Hearing for the MRSC CWMP Draft Plan (Chair)

Binsfeld requested that staff begin by providing an overview of the reason for the public hearing. Cibulka provided an overview and shared that the draft Mississippi River St. Cloud Comprehensive Watershed Management Plan was available for a 60 Day public review and comment period from July 8 through September 6. Following this comment period, the steering committee reviewed comments, made changes to the plan, and responded to the comments received. The Public Hearing is being held to review the draft plan prior to submission to the BWSR Board for review and approval. The Public Hearing is a requirement per BWSR One Watershed, One Plan Operating Procedures.

Motion by Bastion to open the public hearing second by Clark Affirmative by roll call: Johnson, Bastian, Binsfeld, Clark, Gregory, Campbell, Diedrick, Haffley, Daluge, Hulse. Opposed: None. **Motion carried.**

There was one person from the public that signed up to speak during the public hearing. The person presented the following information to the Policy Committee:

Name and Address: Karen Durant, 15777 Forsythe Ave NW, Clearwater, MN 55320

Primary concern: Durant reported that Fish Lake in Wright County is experiencing water quality issues that are being influenced by the outlet of the lake into Fish Creek and then the Mississippi River. There is a wetland area located downstream from the lake outlet that has been impacted by construction of a railroad, Interstate 94, and County Highway 75. There was a Fish Lake Management Plan developed in 2009, but a TMDL study has not occurred yet. Durant has observed water from the Mississippi River flowing upstream through the Fish Creek Tributary back into the lake. A pipe was installed that connects the tributary to the lake. Durant believes that the water quality is being negatively impacted due to the wetland being crossed by the road and rail infrastructure. Durant would like to see this area be identified in the plan for projects to address the water quality concerns she has observed.

Following Durant's report, Binsfeld asked three times if there was anyone else present to speak. No additional speakers stepped forward.

Motion by Johnson to close the public hearing second by Gregory Affirmative by roll call: Johnson, Bastian, Binsfeld, Clark, Gregory, Campbell, Diedrick, Haffley, Daluge, Hulse. Opposed: None. **Motion carried.**

Review Public Hearing Comments (Chair)

Binsfeld requested that Cibulka review the plan and report if the area of concern shared by Durant is identified. Cibulka shared the following pages in the plan that shows that Fish Lake is a priority resource, and the downstream area is within the 1000 ~~ft~~ high priority buffer around the lake, the further downstream area is in a priority area to the Mississippi River. Cibulka provided an explanation of the high priority, priority, and opportunity areas. Cibulka reported that since the area of concern is currently identified as a high priority and priority area that it would be an eligible location to target for projects to address the resource concerns. Cibulka requested that ISG review the map on page 23 to ensure that the delineation between high priority and priority areas is accurately reflected with the 1000 feet buffer around the lake.

Motion by Delugeto maintain and reflect a 1000 feet high priority buffer around Fish Lake second by JohnsonAffirmative by roll call: Johnson, Bastian, Binsfeld, Clark, Gregory, Campbell, Diedrick, Haffley, Daluge, Hulse. Opposed: None. **Motion carried.**

Consider Submittal of MRSC Draft CWMP (Chair)

Motion by Johnson to approve the submission of the draft Mississippi River St. Cloud Comprehensive Watershed Management Plan to the Board of Water and Soil Resources (BWSR) for final review and approval second by Diedrick.

Discussion:

- Binsfeld shared that she recalls being at box one in the timeline and recognized the hard work and dedication of the collaborative partners' staff.
- Clark sends a thank you to the citizen advisory committee, Binsfeld agreed.

Affirmative by roll call: Johnson, Bastian, Binsfeld, Clark, Gregory, Campbell, Diedrick, Haffley, Daluge, Hulse. Opposed: None. **Motion carried.**

Review and approve 0708-2024 meeting minutes (Chair).

Approve meeting minutes. **Motion by Gregory to approve meeting minutes as presented second by Campbell**Affirmative by roll call: Johnson, Bastian, Binsfeld, Clark, Gregory, Campbell, Diedrick, Haffley, Daluge, Hulse. Opposed: None. **Motion carried.**

Project Update (Cibulka and Maciej)

Timeline and Activities

- Cibulka provided an update on the project timeline and next steps.
- Plan to keep 1st Thursday of the month at 11am on everyone's calendar for informal meetings in early 2025

Financial Report

- Maciej provided a Fiscal Agent report and shared that we are on track to spend funds. ISG requested additional funds due to additional work that occurred. The request falls within the existing grant budget utilizing reallocation from underspent areas and contingency funds. The authorization to use the contingency funds is a decision by the Fiscal Agent, Benton SWCD; however, they asked for direction and input from the Steering Committee. The Steering Committee was supportive.
- Binsfeld identified a calculation error in the fiscal report, Maciej will have that

corrected.

Update on plan implementation process (Cibulka & Hatzenbihler)

Cibulka and Hatzenbihler presented an overview of the JPA language and forming the JPE Board, as well as the recommended implementation operation structure and approach as discussed by the Steering Committee and partner attorneys.

- Binsfeld recommended exploring adding language to address reallocation within contracts between JPE Board and Partner LGUs.
- Hulse recommended exploring moving reallocations to a central fund, then make new allocations to projects that need funds.
- Binsfeld also recommended discussion plans to prevent a slow burn rate of the grant funds.

Binsfeld adjourned the meeting at 12:17 PM.

Respectfully submitted by Stephanie Hatzenbihler, Stearns County SWCD, Water Plan Coordinator on behalf of Tina Diedrick, Wright County, County Commissioner.

Comment Number	Commenter	Page Number	Section	Comment	Response
1	BWSR	53	Climate	Extreme weather/Climate resiliency should be discussed/included in the narrative. You have goals or issue statements that were created or developed with extreme weather/climate resiliency in mind(storage/erosion/etc).	Added the following narrative after paragraph 1 on page 53: This increasing precipitation trend is expected to continue, which will result in added stresses to the water resources in the Watershed, "making attention to annual weather and long-term climate patterns critical to adequately address extreme weather. By allocating attention and
2	BWSR	85		Goal 3 – is there an assumption as to the average volume reductions associated with the 96 BMPs, and is that separate from the 5,200 acre-feet indicated in Goal 1?	Goal 1 is a watershed wide target of reducing runoff from the landscape by all BMPs considered, while Goal 3 is specific to urban BMPs focused on stormwater implementation. No change made to
3	BWSR		Measurable Goals	It is great that the targeting criteria is mentioned for each priority issue - can you somehow reference the multiple benefits analysis/tie it to the section where the targeting is discussed? This will assist in plan readability by the general public.	Following the targeting criteria on each priority issue in chapter 3 (with the exception of internal loading), referenced the location of the multiple benefit analysis information and corresponding maps in chapter 4.
4	BWSR	86		Which 11 waterbodies? Targeting included but no additional info. Would they overlap w/goal 2 waterbodies? How do these two goals interact?	Added the following narrative as a footnote under goal 1: "The 11 waterbodies may include some or all of the following: Indian Lake, Fish
5	BWSR	95	Measurable Goals	Some explanation of why targeting criteria/layers was chosen would be beneficial. Specifically for map layers included in the MBA. Plan readability for the general public.	Criteria and layers were identified by the SC and TAC during review of the issue framework. Layers were selected that best represent critical areas to target for restoration and protection strategies that addressed the priority issues. Areas identified for restoration focused on potential impacts of sources and stressors, whereas areas of higher quality and higher ecological function were selected to identify areas suitable for protection. Narrative was added to the "Multiple Benefits Analysis" section on pages 103 - 104 of the 60-day review draft to provide clarity on this process.
6	BWSR	102		Cost Estimating – calling out WBIF specifically may be problematic here...As you know, WBIF will not be your only source of funding for carrying out the plan.	Added language to the Cost Estimating paragraph on page 102 to clarify that WBIF will not be the only source of funding for technical
7	BWSR	102	Targeting	It's understood that the partnership will use a variety of targeting tools to get to the field scale depending on the situation. However, it is unclear which tools	Added a row to Watershed Wide Data, Studies, and Monitoring table "Utilizing targeting tools to target within select HUC12
8	BWSR	103	Multiple Benefits Analysis	As we have discussed during plan development, timing of addressing priority resources is a critical factor with targeting. Please clearly distinguish in the plan between high priority and priority areas as it relates to timing of focused outreach efforts and implementation and the use of the multiple benefits analysis. How do partners know where to work first?	Added the following narrative to page 103: "Using a combination of the targeting efforts described above and the multiple benefit analysis, the Partners will focus on implementation in High Priority areas first. Priority areas will be considered when key project components align with Plan goals, and efforts in High Priority areas have hit a roadblock or are still in progress. Opportunity areas may be considered in unique situations where implementation efforts in High Priority and Priority areas have been unsuccessful, or when the Opportunity area project

Comment Number	Commenter	Page Number	Section	Comment	Response
9	BWSR		Implementation Schedule	It would be appropriate to include maps of all the data layers involved with the MBA within the appendix. (Useful for 5 year assessment/evaluation)	Individual maps for each of the MBA layers will be made and added to Appendix F of the plan document.
10	BWSR		Implementation Schedule	Users of the plan may follow better if the planning region map preceded the implementation schedule for each planning region.	Agreed, thank you for pointing this out! We've added the planning region map for each region prior to the implementation tables for that region.
11	BWSR		Implementation Tables	How do the Timeline Priority "exclamation points" in tables/timeline relate to working in high priority and priority areas? Do they relate to a level of effort?	Updated the narrative on page 115 under Timeframe (changed to Timeline to match tables), "The timeline indicates the relative level of
12	BWSR	179	Land use Management controls	The first two land use management controls recommendations don't indicate opportunities to actually strengthen land use controls for environmental protection. See next comment:	Removed "Implementation of restored wetlands in targeted areas and Restoring native habitat in floodplain areas" from the recommendations for Land Use Management Controls on page 179. Changed the last sentence of the preceding paragraph to: "An
13	BWSR	179	Land use Management controls	How can this CWMP be more easily utilized by local zoning authorities to make more informed land use decisions (i.e.. CUP's/IUP's/Variances/zoning) based on local Comprehensive Land Use Plans? Add language to the plan now to accomplish this. In addition, consider adding an action to work on improving the connection between land use and watershed management plans.	Added the following narrative to page 179: "The Partners also have a watershed-wide Data, Studies, and Monitoring table row dedicated to coordinating with zoning staff regarding various land use management controls. Additionally, the Partners recommend that county and city comprehensive plan updates incorporate comprehensive watershed management plans within their jurisdiction by reference or through the adoption of specific goals from the comprehensive watershed management plans."

Comment Number	Commenter	Page Number	Section	Comment	Response
14	BWSR	186	5.6	It does not appear that plan content requirements for describing current monitoring programs has been met (see item F. 5a of the 1W1P plan content requirements) . It is also unclear if current and future baseline monitoring provides the ability to assess trends in the priority resources(See F. 5b). Please describe this in the plan and identify any monitoring gaps. If monitoring does not cover the priority waters, explain why.	Added the following narrative to page 186, "Data collected will also be used to evaluate progress towards water quality goals by tracking long-term water quality trends, particularly at the five year plan evaluation. The MPCA WPLMN program has three monitoring sites located within the Watershed and data from these sites, as well as others, may be used to improve model calibration in addition to tracking short and long term water quality trends. Monitoring conducted by the Clearwater River Watershed District captures portions of Stearns and Wright Counties and as of 2024 includes 13 lake sites and 10 stream sites. Parameters captured include total phosphorus, orthophosphorus, total suspended solids, and
15	BWSR	196	6.2	The terminology used in the paragraph and flow chart is confusing. Please distinguish between biennial plan, work plan, and grant workplan.	Added clarification to graphic and narrative indicating that the Partners will be developing a biennial work plan that will be used to develop the biennial funding request. The Partners will review the biennial work plan on an annual basis and refine as needed.
16	BWSR	196	6.2	Consider adding language to address the partnership's grant workplan creation/review process and submittal to BWSR.	Updated narrative on page 196 to read: "These approved biennial work plans will be used to develop the biennial funding requests to BWSR.
17	BWSR	197	Plan Amendments	The plan should describe an amendment process that BWSR will determine. Consider eliminating the paragraph starting with "any proposed amendment..." and replace it with something like "if the Board determines that an amendment should proceed, the MRSCWP will follow the BWSR process for state approval of the plan amendment."	Updated as requested.
18	BWSR	197	Plan Amendments	Stating revision requests that will not warrant an amendment process may be problematic - specifically the last two bullet points. It sounds like the partnership can make plan amendments on their own. We would recommend that discussions around the plan should be routed to BWSR first before the partnership makes any decisions on their own. An unapproved amendment could create serious challenges for grant reconciliation. These two bullet points	Removed the sentence about not warranting plan amendments, along with the corresponding bullet points to eliminate potential for confusion regarding amendments.

Comment Number	Commenter	Page Number	Section	Comment	Response
				<p>First sentence: 10 years starts after BWSR Board approval(state approval) - not after locally adopted.</p>	
19	BWSR	197	Plan Amendments		Removed "and local adoption" from the first sentence on page 197.
20	BWSR	198	Five Year Evaluation	<p>Under this section, please list likely items the partnership will commit to evaluate at the 5 year evaluation, particularly issues with insufficient data during plan development that address priority issues and resources, such as but not limited to eColi data and strategies, water storage/alterd hydrology strategies, identification of CIPs, refining targeting approaches, staffing/technical assistance and engineering bottlenecks, coordination of projects with drainage and road authorities, and the social science of conservation to understand the barriers to voluntary conservation, to name a few.</p>	<p>Added the following narrative under Five Year Evaluation on page 198, "Topics the Partners will evalute during the five year evaluation process include but are not limited to E.coli data and strategies, water storage/alterd hydrology strategies, CIP identification, refining targeting approaches, staffing/technical assistance and engineering bottlenecks, coordination of projects with drainage and road authorities, and the social science of conservation, particularly understanding the barriers to voluntary conservation."</p>

Comment Number	Commenter	Page Number	Section	Comment	Response
21	BWSR	198	Partnership Assessment	These types of assessments will take some staff/consultant time to complete. Are these performance assessments built in to the plan/implementation budget?	The Steering Committee discussed the various assessment types and concluded that the current funding allocations within the Plan are sufficient. Added the following narrative to page 198 under Partnership Assessment: "Partnership Assessment efforts will use the information from the Tracking and Accomplishment Assessments as a starting point and will expand from the detailed implementation action and cost assessments to the broader assessments of overall performance with implementation and progress towards Plan goals."
22	BWSR	199	Funding	WBIF should not be included as a line item. If you want to roll it into the "state" line, that would be more appropriate– but unless you are planning to call out	Merged WBIF into the State row in Table 6.1 and updated dollar amount to reflect that change.
23	BWSR	199	Funding	Please add brief descriptions in the narrative as to what is included in the state and local funding source amounts.	Added the following descriptions to Table 6.1: "State: Conservation Delivery, SWCD Aid, BWSR, MAWQCP, etc." and "Local: County
24	BWSR		General Comment	Is there a budget/cost estimate included in the plan to begin pursuing noted CIPs?	Known cost estimates for CIPs are included in the implementation tables, as well as the funding table (Table 6.2) on page 199. The footnote on page 199 identifies the rows within the implementation
25	BWSR		General Comment	We understand that soil health is a large component and priority of the plan. Wind erosion is a significant resource concern within the watershed (HEL layer was used to prioritize work areas). Consider adding language to the plan that will address wind erosion. Remember, this is a CWMP and not including wind erosion within the plan may inhibit partners from obtaining funding from other grant sources.	Added the following narrative to page 94, Landscape Resiliency issue: "The Watershed varies in topography and soil types, creating circumstances where water erosion is prominent in areas with high topographic relief and wind erosion a challenge for vast areas of flat, open landscapes. Improving soil health and structure is an important technique to reduce both wind and water erosion." Added the following narrative on the bottom of page 95 under the HEL targeting criteria: "The inclusion of wind and water HEL is intended provide flexibility for the Partners to pursue funding to address wind erosion concerns, in addition to water erosion concerns, as needed".
26	BWSR		General Comment	Please ensure the priority areas going to be available digitally (GIS or other) for the partnership to use during implementation to ensure projects are within prioritized areas.	Yes, the GIS data for priority areas will be provided to the partnership as a part of the final project deliverable. No changes made to plan content.

Comment Number	Commenter	Page Number	Section	Comment	Response
27	Wright SWCD	131, 151		<p>The City of Monticello is currently reviewing and evaluating streambank erosion within. These projects were included in our original outputs. However, since the city could adopt the plan and apply for competitive grants themselves, we suggest adding the City of Monticello as an additional lead LGU for these projects in both the Otsego Creek (page 151) and Silver Creek-Otter Creek (page 131) management zones. Additionally, the location for these projects should be updated to specify the Mississippi River in both management zones. The Silver Creek-Otter Creek should also list Otter Creek as a location (page 131). Priority implementation areas should remain as locations for both management zones.</p>	<p>Added City of Monticello as a Supporting Entity for the streambank projects within the Otsego Creek and Silver Creek-Otter Creek management zones since only entities committed to adopting the Plan should be listed as Lead Entities. If the City has indicated that they intend to adopt the Plan, this can be updated. All other changes were incorporated as requested.</p>
28	Wright SWCD	118, 171		<p>An additional capital improvement project came to our attention from the Minnesota DNR. This project is different than others listed as examples. We suggest adding "Dam removal" to the list of capital improvement examples on page 171, section 5.2. Additionally, we suggest adding a section to Clearwater River Implementation Schedule on page 118. This section would be streams</p>	<p>Added this information to page 118, ID CWR-07.</p>
29	MN DNR		Outreach	<p>The plan addresses many of our stated priorities, particularly in the "Surface Water" and "Habitat and Natural Resources" sections. While the plan effectively targets public outreach and education regarding its implementation, we believe there may be an opportunity to further enhance it by addressing recreational opportunities. Increased public access to natural resources can foster greater public support and stewardship. We encourage the inclusion of additional strategies or language to promote recreational activities, as outlined in our priority letter found in the appendix of the plan.</p>	<p>Added the following narrative to page 92, Habitat and Natural Resources: "The Partners will work with local parks departments; state partners, such as the DNR; and federal partners such as USFWS, to acquire additional easements that protects habitat, as well as partnering on efforts to encourage sustainable use practices within parks and natural areas in the Watershed and to restore resources enhancing recreational benefits." and on page 175 under Community Engagement added the following bullet point, "Promote outdoor recreation in the Watershed's natural resources".</p>

Comment Number	Commenter	Page Number	Section	Comment	Response
30	Sherburne SWCD	78		Table 3.2: Lake Julia has a 2015 TMDL with a long-term TMDL TP reduction estimate, can this be added to Table 3.2?	Added 2015 TMDL, 37.65 lbs per year to Table 3.2 under the Long-Term TMDL TP Reduction Pounds per Year column.
31	Sherburne SWCD	85	SW Issue 2, Goal 1	Appreciate the addition of language in Appendix D that describes how water storage was calculated. Is it possible to produce a list of all practices that SAM derived water storage amounts from? The partnership needs to develop a way to track storage in order to meet this goal so needs to be aware of what practices we need to compute this metric for. SAM might be the best way to calculate our storage totals, but if other calculators are used we need to make sure we are calculating storage for all applicable practice types.	SAM BMP reduction efficiencies, which includes flow reductions, was added to the end of the Issue Framework Document in Appendix D for use during implementation. It is recommended that site designs for any given water storage BMP be used to track actual storage amounts versus SAM values during implementation. However, accounting for flow reductions for it is understood that if there are discrepancies the SAM values provided by ISG can be referenced.
32	Sherburne County	23	Stormwater BMPs	What are "96 stormwater BMPs". This term shows up twice in the document and it is not clear what this is referencing.	Clarity will be added to this narrative to state that this is a count of the "Urban BMPs" from the implementation tables.
33	Sherburne County	37		Please explain why the ownership of the watershed is considered unique.	The distribution of ownership being 2.6% federal land, 2.8% state land, and 94.6% locally owned makes the watershed unique. Removed unique as a description to avoid confusion.
34	Sherburne County	40	MS4s	Sherburne County is a designated MS4. It is unclear how future MS4s were identified. Please clarify where the information is coming from.	MPCA has an internal list of MS4s that exceeded or have approached the 5,000 population threshold in the latest Decennial Census

Comment Number	Commenter	Page Number	Section	Comment	Response
35	Sherburne County	40	MS4s	Please add Haven Township as an MS4. Portions of the township are currently classified as an MS4.	Per MPCA, Haven Township is not currently a regulated MS4, so this change was not made.
36	Sherburne County	40	MS4s	Figure 1.4 should include a timeframe for anticipated change.	The MPCA MS4 program staff coordinate directly with the future MS4s, and will be sending them a letter by the end of 2024. A webinar will also be provided that will explain the process to follow for future MS4s to reply to those letters. Future MS4s that confirm they have conveyance system in regulated areas or discharges to impaired waters will be formally brought into the program with the issuance of the next MS4 General Permit (anticipated to be issued in November of 2025). General language was added to page 40 regarding this process.
37	Sherburne County	40	MS4s	Should "Baldwin Township" be changed to "Future City of Baldwin"	Changed Baldwin Township to Future City of Baldwin.
38	Sherburne County	45		Why is Rusty Crayfish featured? It is an invasive species.	Removed Rusty Crayfish image, this was an error.
39	Sherburne County	50		Curious about rationale behind using EPA ecoregion classification vs the DNR's ecological classification system? The EPA's version was completed at the national scale vs more local. The DNR's appears to have more accurate boundaries, is more accurate and more familiar for local ecologists. "Ecoregions were digitized at 1:250,000 scale and are intended for large geographic extents (i.e. states,	Updated Figure 1.8 to use DNR's ecological classification system and updated narrative to match.

Comment Number	Commenter	Page Number	Section	Comment	Response
40	Sherburne County	57		References DNR's ecological classification system. In Table 1.12 "Protected Species by County" the categories are unclear if both federally and state endangered species and threatened species were reviewed as it only states/defines END as federal, whereas, the state has endangered species categories as well.	This was a mistake on our end, all information reviewed was based on state law. Updated END to state.
41	Sherburne County	92		Please explain the methodology used for the habitat part. If a "1" was assigned for part of the Wildlife Action Network and a "0" if it is not. Presumably the higher priority areas need less protection than the areas that have less of the existing habitat/wildlife areas?	The methodology is based on building, expanding, and protecting corridors, so the subwatersheds with more Wildlife Action Network areas (WAN) will be prioritized due to greater opportunity being available. Additionally, enhancements and active management of habitats are considered forms of protecting, so activities to manage the threat of invasives and similar activities would also be directed to areas with existing habitat corridors. These areas would also be candidates for zoning language changes to protect existing resources. Addition of text to address comment #5 also addresses adding clarity to Plan narrative for this comment.
42	Sherburne County	111		Explain why the area between Rush Lake and Elk Lake are listed as opportunity vs high priority.	The small area between Rush Lake and Elk Lake had between 3 - 5 MBA layers overlapping this area. Specifically, this included the "Anoka Sand Plain", "Pollution Sensitivity", "Township Nitrate Results", a small fraction of "Wildlife Action Network", "Landscape Stewardship Plan",
43	Sherburne County	159		Table 4.20 Data, Studies, and Monitoring: St Francis River - SFR-15 may want to list Baldwin City as they oversee the Shoreland rules for the majority of Little Elk Lake.	Added City of Baldwin as a supporting entity.
44	Sherburne County	170	Fee Discounts	Fee Discounts - in theory this is a good idea, however, the Planning and Zoning Department is dependent on fees collected to support the office and provide staff to permit and monitor projects. The Planning and Zoning Department is a	To our knowledge, there are not grant programs available to offset this policy. Added the following narrative to the end of the existing narrative under Fee Discounts: "An existing example of fee discounts

Comment Number	Commenter	Page Number	Section	Comment	Response
45	Sherburne County	181	Shoreland Management	Should Baldwin City be listed as having shoreland authority. At a minimum there should be a stateemnt added that other entities may have shoreland authority, aside from counties.	Added the following sentence, "Some cities within the Watershed also have shoreland management ordinances". Since cities are not individually listed throughout the rest of this section, and the goal is to highlight entities within the Partnership, we kept the reference here more general.
46	Sherburne County	199		There is a large deficit between funding and cost of implementation of this plan. A statement should be made that if adequate funding is not obtained through grants the ability for the entities to meet goals may be severely impacted.	Added the following narrative to the bottom of the second paragraph on page 198, "Plan implementation and achievment of Plan goals may be impacted by the amount of funding the Partners are able to obtain through state and federal grants and local contributions."
47	ISG - Paul	116	Implementation Tables	Review internal IT spreadsheet for all formulas that aggregate efforts and reductions for errors and to be consistent with pdf report	Will be completed following SC meeting and approval of any changes.
48	ISG	93		Add Wildlife Action Network to map.	Added the Wildlife Action Network to the map on page 93 (Figure 3.4).

Comment Number	Commenter	Page Number	Section	Comment	Response
49	ISG	120	Supporting Programs Tables	Remove exclamation point descriptions	Removed exclamation point priority descriptions from supporting programs tables where this system was not used.