Appendix A
Minnesota DNR WHAF Major Watershed Summaries
Appendix A-1
UPSC Watershed Summary Sheet

People and Places:

**Watershed Population:**
- 2000 census - 2,701
- 2010 census - 2,920

**Largest Cities - Population:**
- Askov - 364
- Saint Johns Landing Camp - None
- Cloverdale - None
- Markville - None
- Duxbury - None

**Counties - % of watershed:**
- Pine - 100 %

Watershed Area:

**Watershed size:**
- 347,720 acres
- 543 square miles

**Watershed Surface Area:**
- Percent Land - 99 %
- Percent Water - 1 %

**HUC8 ID:**
- 07030001

**Basin Name:**
- St. Croix (0703)

Land Use:

**Percent of watershed area by land cover type:**

- Water
- Crop
- Pasture/Hay
- Forest
- Wetland
- Developed
Appendix A-2
Kettle River Watershed Summary Sheet

People and Places:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Watershed Population:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000 census - 19,335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010 census - 21,694</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Largest Cities - Population:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sandstone - 2,849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moose Lake - 2,751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnum - 613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahtowa - 613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sturgeon Lake - 439</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Counties - % of watershed:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pine - 53 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlton - 34 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aitkin - 10 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kanabec - 3 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Watershed Area:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Watershed size:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>672,926 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,051 square miles</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Watershed Surface Area:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent Land - 97 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Water - 3 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HUCB ID:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>07030003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basin Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>St. Croix (0703)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Land Use:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent of watershed area by land cover type:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Cover Class</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Forest</th>
<th>Wetland</th>
<th>Developed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Watershed</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Board of Water and Soil Resources
Appendix A-3
Snake River Watershed Summary Sheet

People and Places:

Watershed Population:
2000 census - 26,322
2010 census - 29,253

Largest Cities - Population:
Mora - 3,571
Pine City - 3,123
Hinckley - 1,800
Brunswick - 1,333
Grass Lake - 1,038

Counties - % of watershed:
Kanabec - 48 %
Pine - 21 %
Aitkin - 20 %
Mille Lacs - 10 %
Isanti - 1 %
Chisago - 0 %

Watershed Area:

Watershed size:
643,544 acres
1,006 square miles

Watershed Surface Area:
Percent Land - 90 %
Percent Water - 2 %

HUC8 ID:
070300004

Basin Name:
St. Croix (0703)

Land Use:

Percent of watershed area by land cover type:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Cover Class</th>
<th>Percent of Watershed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>2 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crops</td>
<td>28 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park/Parkland</td>
<td>4 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest</td>
<td>35 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed</td>
<td>27 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Stillwater Watershed Summary Sheet

#### People and Places:

| Watershed Population: |  
|----------------------|---|
| 2000 census          | 137,033 |
| 2010 census          | 158,712 |

| Largest Cities - Population: |  
|-----------------------------|---|
| Forest Lake                | 18,375 |
| Stillwater                  | 18,225 |
| East Bethel                 | 11,626 |
| North Branch                | 10,125 |
| Lake Elmo                   | 8,069  |

| Counties - % of watershed: |  
|------------------------------|---|
| Chisago                      | 47 %  |
| Washington                   | 29 %  |
| Pine                         | 9 %   |
| Anoka                        | 8 %   |
| Isanti                       | 7 %   |
| Ramsey                       | 0 %   |

#### Watershed Area:

- **Watershed size:** 585,737 acres  
- **915 square miles**

#### Land Use:

- **Watershed Surface Area:**
  - Percent Land: 93 %
  - Percent Water: 7 %

- **HUC8 ID:** 07030005

- **Basin Name:** St. Croix (0703)
Appendix B
BSA 6 Major Watershed National Wetland Inventory Summaries
## Appendix B-1
**UPSC National Wetland Inventory Summary Sheet**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Watershed Size (Ac)</th>
<th>Wetland Acres</th>
<th>% Wetlands per Watershed</th>
<th>Emergent</th>
<th>Forested</th>
<th>Scrub Shrub</th>
<th>Unconsolidated Bottom</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>347,719</td>
<td>111,908</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B-2
Kettle River National Wetland Inventory Summary Sheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Watershed Size (Ac)</th>
<th>Wetland Acres</th>
<th>% Wetlands per Watershed</th>
<th>Emergent</th>
<th>Forested</th>
<th>Scrub Shrub</th>
<th>Unconsolidated Bottom</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>672,924</td>
<td>220,581</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B-3
Snake River National Wetland Inventory Summary Sheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Watershed Size (Ac)</th>
<th>Wetland Acres</th>
<th>% Wetlands per Watershed</th>
<th>Emergent</th>
<th>Forested</th>
<th>Scrub Shrub</th>
<th>Unconsolidated Bottom</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>643,542</td>
<td>186,050</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Wetland Classifications
- EM
- FO
- SS
- UB

Snake River Watershed Boundary

[Map Image]
Appendix C
Stakeholder Involvement
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Present at 2/18/17 Meeting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Washington SWCD</td>
<td>Jay Riggs</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jay.riggs@mnwcd.org">jay.riggs@mnwcd.org</a></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chisago SWCD</td>
<td>Craig Mell &amp; Cassey</td>
<td><a href="mailto:craig.mell@mn.nacdnet.net">craig.mell@mn.nacdnet.net</a></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knabec SWCD</td>
<td>Deanna Pomije</td>
<td><a href="mailto:deanna.pomije@mn.nacdnet.net">deanna.pomije@mn.nacdnet.net</a></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pine SWCD</td>
<td>Robin Poppe</td>
<td><a href="mailto:robin.poppe@co.pine.mn.us">robin.poppe@co.pine.mn.us</a></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlton SWCD</td>
<td>Laura Christianson</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lchristensen@carltonswcd.org">lchristensen@carltonswcd.org</a></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isanti SWCD</td>
<td>Todd Kulaf</td>
<td><a href="mailto:todd.kulaf@mn.nacdnet.net">todd.kulaf@mn.nacdnet.net</a></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mille Lacs SWCD</td>
<td>Suasan Shaw</td>
<td><a href="mailto:susan.shaw@co.mille-lacs.mn.us">susan.shaw@co.mille-lacs.mn.us</a></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aikin SWCD</td>
<td>Steve Hughes</td>
<td><a href="mailto:hughes.aikinswcd@gmail.com">hughes.aikinswcd@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anoka SWCD</td>
<td>Becky Wozney</td>
<td><a href="mailto:becky.wozney@anokaswcd.org">becky.wozney@anokaswcd.org</a></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfort Lake Forest Lake WD</td>
<td>Mike Kinny</td>
<td><a href="mailto:michael.kinney@clflwd.org">michael.kinney@clflwd.org</a></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunrise WMO</td>
<td>Jamie Shurbon</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jamie.schurbon@anokaswcd.org">jamie.schurbon@anokaswcd.org</a></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chisago Lake LID</td>
<td>Susanna Wilson</td>
<td><a href="mailto:susanna.wilson@chisagocounty.us">susanna.wilson@chisagocounty.us</a></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnelian Marine St. Croix WD</td>
<td>Jim Shaver</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Browns Creek WD</td>
<td>Karen Kill</td>
<td><a href="mailto:karen.kill@mnwcd.org">karen.kill@mnwcd.org</a></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valley Branch WD</td>
<td>John Hanson</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jhanson@barr.com">jhanson@barr.com</a></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Washington WD</td>
<td>Matt Moore</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mmoore@ci.woodbury.mn.us">mmoore@ci.woodbury.mn.us</a></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle St. Croix WMO</td>
<td>Mike Isensee</td>
<td><a href="mailto:misensee@mnwcd.org">misensee@mnwcd.org</a></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Croix River Association</td>
<td>Deb Ryun</td>
<td><a href="mailto:debryun@scramail.com">debryun@scramail.com</a></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Croix River Association</td>
<td>Monica Zachay</td>
<td><a href="mailto:monicaz@scramail.com">monicaz@scramail.com</a></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Croix River Association</td>
<td>Natalie Warren</td>
<td><a href="mailto:nataliew@scramail.com">nataliew@scramail.com</a></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chisago County Environmental</td>
<td>Jeff Fertig</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jafertig@co.chisago.mn.us">jafertig@co.chisago.mn.us</a></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
St. Croix Drainage Basin (Bank Service Area 6) Stakeholder Meeting Agenda
February 28th 12 PM
6355 379th St, North Branch, MN 55056

12:00 PM

- Introductions

- What is an In-Lieu Fee Program?
  - Compensatory Planning Framework (CPF)
  - Importance of local stakeholder input

- How will we develop the CPF?
  - BWSR will analyze current vs historic watershed conditions, sources of impairment and threats using publically available data sets.
  - We will ask for your input on appropriate data sources and local plans.
  - BWSR will identify specific watershed goals that will guide the prioritization of wetland restorations.
  - What you think are the most important watershed goals that should guide the prioritization of wetland restorations.

- How final product will be used, and who will use it.
  - How used by the road program.
  - How used by the private sector as they seek to develop commercial banks.

- Proposed timeline for completion.

- Next Meeting

1:30 Adjourn
St. Croix Basin ILF Program Stakeholder Meeting

What is an ILF Program
- Fee based wetland mitigation program based on a watershed approach

ILF Approval Process
- Based in Federal Rule
  - Federal approval necessary no State approval process
- Agreement between Corps and Sponsor to allow Sale of Advance Credits
  - Pre-approved plan on how mitigation will occur

ILF and Banks
- Advanced vs Released Credits
  - Advanced are like Loan
  - Released or on the landscape
- Non-Profits or Government Agencies Only
  - Removed the drive for profit
  - Outcome driven better mitigation
- Watershed approach selection of projects
  - Banks are opportunity based

Current State of Mitigation

Two Components of ILF Program
- Instrument
  - Program Establishment and Operation
    - Costs and Fees of Credits
    - Accounting Procedures
    - Long Term Management
    - Land Protection
    - Reporting
- Compensatory Planning Frame Work (CPF)
  - How and Where Mitigation Will Occur

6.6 Credits Remaining
Compensatory Planning Framework (CPF)

- Prioritizes Wetland Restoration to Meet Watershed Goals

Stakeholder Input

- Federal Rule Requires Stakeholder Input
  - Nothing replaces local knowledge
- Input on Appropriate Data Sources (State and Local)
- Lead Us Through Your Local Plans
- ID Your Most Important Watershed Goals

CPF Development

- Initial Analysis using GIS to Determine
  - Wetland Loss
  - Changes in Perennial Cover
  - Changes in Landscape
  - Changes in Hydrologic Storage
  - ???

- Identify Sources of Impairment and Threats
  - Wide ranging in St. Croix Basin
  - Ag Intr Development
  - TMDL/STV Loss of Habitat

CPF Development Initial Data Sources

- Watershed Health Assessment Framework
  - [http://arcgis.dnr.state.mn.us/ewr/what@look/4](http://arcgis.dnr.state.mn.us/ewr/what@look/4)
  - Website that provides a comprehensive overview of the ecological health of Minnesota’s watersheds
- Provides:
  - Watershed Report Card
  - Ecological Context Report
  - Downstream GIS Data on Watersheds and Catchments

CPF Development Initial Data Sources

- Restorable Wetland Prioritization Tool
  - [http://www.mnwetlandrestore.org](http://www.mnwetlandrestore.org)
  - ATRx
    - Predicts likely locations for restorable wetlands using 10m DEM resolution
    - Locates stressed areas in need of water quality and habitat improvement
    - Prioritizes areas that are most likely to result in high functioning sustainable wetlands
    - Refines output based on your priorities
- Provides
  - Downloadable GIS data at the 30 meter pixel resolution
  - Focus on Nitrogen, Phosphorus, Habitat
CPF Development
Share and Present Data

1. Present Analysis of Data
   - Maps
   - Tabular data
   - Our thoughts on threats
   - Our Thoughts on Goals

2. Solicit Information from you
   - What local data you may have
   - What you perceive as threats
   - Your watershed goals

Final Step in CPF Development

Goals

PRiORiTiES

1. 
2. 
3.

Use of CPF

- Road Program Access to Advance Credits
  - Prevent closure of program in service areas
  - Guide for future road banks
  - Can act as an economic catalyst to share credits with private sector needs

- Private Commercial Banks
  - Bankers and use CPF to locate potential bank sites
  - CPF credits will have more value than non-CPF credits (New WCA Rules)
  - Will grandfather existing banks

Use of CPF

- Non-Regulatory Conservation Groups
  - BWSR RIM
  - CREP

- Watershed District Plans and Projects
  - Direct project location for regulatory and non-regulatory uses

- SWCD Projects
  - Work with county or landowners is developing more effective projects

Time Line

- Prospectus
  - Second Stakeholder meeting
  - Draft Instrument
  - Final Instrument
  - March 2017

Goal of Next Meeting

1. Present Analysis of Data
   - Maps
   - Tabular data
   - Our thoughts on threats
   - Our Thoughts on Goals

2. Solicit Information from you
   - What local data you may have
   - What you perceive as threats
   - Your watershed goals
Appendix C-2
January 2018 Stakeholder Meeting
# BSA 6 Stakeholder List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Present at 1/22/18 Meeting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Washington SWCD</td>
<td>Jay Riggs</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jay.riggs@mnwcd.org">jay.riggs@mnwcd.org</a></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chisago SWCD</td>
<td>Craig Mell &amp; Cassey</td>
<td><a href="mailto:craig.mell@mn.nacdnet.net">craig.mell@mn.nacdnet.net</a></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knabec SWCD</td>
<td>Deanna Pomije</td>
<td><a href="mailto:deanna.pomije@mn.nacdnet.net">deanna.pomije@mn.nacdnet.net</a></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pine SWCD</td>
<td>Robin Poppe</td>
<td><a href="mailto:robin.poppe@co.pine.mn.us">robin.poppe@co.pine.mn.us</a></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlton SWCD</td>
<td>Laura Christianson</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lchristensen@carltonswcd.org">lchristensen@carltonswcd.org</a></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isanti SWCD</td>
<td>Todd Kulaf</td>
<td><a href="mailto:todd.kulaf@mn.nacdnet.net">todd.kulaf@mn.nacdnet.net</a></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mille Lacs SWCD</td>
<td>Suasan Shaw</td>
<td><a href="mailto:susan.shaw@co.mille-lacs.mn.us">susan.shaw@co.mille-lacs.mn.us</a></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aikin SWCD</td>
<td>Steve Hughes</td>
<td><a href="mailto:hughes.aitkinswcd@gmail.com">hughes.aitkinswcd@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anoka SWCD</td>
<td>Becky Wozney</td>
<td><a href="mailto:becky.wozney@anokaswcd.org">becky.wozney@anokaswcd.org</a></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfort Lake Forest Lake WD</td>
<td>Mike Kinny</td>
<td><a href="mailto:michael.kinney@clflwd.org">michael.kinney@clflwd.org</a></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunrise WMO</td>
<td>Jamie Shurbon</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jamie.schurbon@anokaswcd.org">jamie.schurbon@anokaswcd.org</a></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chisago Lake LID</td>
<td>Susanna Wilson</td>
<td><a href="mailto:susanna.wilson@chisagocounty.us">susanna.wilson@chisagocounty.us</a></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnelian Marine St. Croix WD</td>
<td>Jim Shaver</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Browns Creek WD</td>
<td>Karen Kill</td>
<td><a href="mailto:karen.kill@mnwcd.org">karen.kill@mnwcd.org</a></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valley Branch WD</td>
<td>John Hanson</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jhanson@barr.com">jhanson@barr.com</a></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Washington WD</td>
<td>Matt Moore</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mmoore@ci.woodbury.mn.us">mmoore@ci.woodbury.mn.us</a></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle St. Croix WMO</td>
<td>Mike Isensee</td>
<td><a href="mailto:misensee@mnwcd.org">misensee@mnwcd.org</a></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Croix River Association</td>
<td>Deb Ryun</td>
<td><a href="mailto:debryun@scramail.com">debryun@scramail.com</a></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Croix River Association</td>
<td>Monica Zachay</td>
<td><a href="mailto:monicaz@scramail.com">monicaz@scramail.com</a></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Croix River Association</td>
<td>Natalie Warren</td>
<td><a href="mailto:nataliew@scramail.com">nataliew@scramail.com</a></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chisago County Environmental</td>
<td>Jeff Fertig</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jafertig@co.chisago.mn.us">jafertig@co.chisago.mn.us</a></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
12:00 PM

- Compensatory Planning Framework (CPF) Overview
  - Baseline Conditions
    - Description of Data Used
  - Cumulative Impact Analysis
    - What we found
  - Description of Threats to the BSA

- Vulnerability Assessment
  - Purpose of Assessment and what it does for the CPF

- Site Selection Criteria
  - Solicit input from Stakeholders

- Next Steps

2:00 Adjourn
BSA 6 Stakeholder Meeting

Today’s Goals
1. Describe CPF components
2. Review data used in CPF
3. Discuss and select site selection criteria

CPF Components
1. Geographic Service Area
2. Baseline Data
3. Cumulative Impact Analysis
4. Description of Threats
5. Prioritization Strategy

Geographic Service Areas
• Defines the scale of area involved and provides General descriptions
  - Population
  - Land area
  - Land use
  - Ecological classifications
  - Precipitation
  - Water discharge rates
  - Pre-settlement vegetation
  - Topography

Baseline Data
• Analysis of Current Conditions
  1. Wetlands
  2. Lakes and water courses
  3. Altered Water courses
  4. Water quality
  5. Land cover and perennial cover
  6. Sensitive species
  7. Sector 204 permitting

Baseline Data
1. Wetlands
   a. Acres and Types per Major Watershed
   b. Acres ditched per major and minor watershed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Watershed</th>
<th>Stillwater</th>
<th>Kettle River</th>
<th>Snake River</th>
<th>UPSC</th>
<th>BSA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acres</td>
<td>585,735</td>
<td>672,924</td>
<td>643,542</td>
<td>347,719</td>
<td>2,249,920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetland</td>
<td>102,843.8</td>
<td>220,581.5</td>
<td>186,050.2</td>
<td>111,908.4</td>
<td>621,383.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Wetlands</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>32.8%</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottom</td>
<td>31,695.5</td>
<td>11,909.3</td>
<td>34,206.4</td>
<td>4,343.7</td>
<td>82,154.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Bottom</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topography</td>
<td>52.6%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>42.5%</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topography</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>42.7%</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td>38.0%</td>
<td>33.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topography</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
<td>32.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topography</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Baseline Data

2. Lakes and Water Courses
   a. Acres of lakes
   b. Miles of stream per watershed

Baseline Data

3. Altered Water Courses
   a. Miles of altered, natural, impounded, no-definable channel
   b. Index Scores at Minor watershed scale
      (ratio of length of altered watercourse to the total length of water course scaled vector)

Baseline Data

4. Water Quality
   a. Miles of impaired Streams per major watershed
   b. Acres of impaired lakes per major watershed
   c. Degree and results of TMDL Studies

Baseline Data

5. Land Cover
   a. Trends of Loss and Gains per major watershed

Baseline Data

6. Sensitive Species

Baseline Data

5. Perennial Cover
   1. Per major Watershed
   2. Subset of land cover data
Baseline Data

7. Section 404 Permitting Analysis

Summary of Baseline Conditions

- Consistent and significant degradation from north to south
  - Northern Watersheds (Northern Kettle & UPSC)
    - Riparian and aquatic resources are more intact
  - Central Portion (Southern Kettle and Snake)
    - Changes from forested to agricultural with higher degree of disturbance
  - Southern Portion (Stillwater)
    - Most degraded and urbanized

Cumulative Impact Analysis

- Summary of the loss of aquatic resources
  1. Wetland Loss
  2. Ditched Wetlands
  3. Wetland Banking Analysis

Cumulative Impact Analysis

- (Wetland Loss WHAT Data Using SSURGO and STATSGO)

Cumulative Impact Analysis

- Wetland Loss
  (Wetland Loss WHAT Data Land Use Hydro-Salts)

Cumulative Impact Analysis

- Ditched Wetlands
  - Correlate landuse to wetland alteration
**Cumulative Impact Analysis**

- Wetland Mitigation
  - Status of banking program in BSA
  - How or where replacement occurs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Wetland Banks</th>
<th>Total Credits Generated</th>
<th>Current Available Credits</th>
<th>Federally Approved Credits</th>
<th>State-Only Approved Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>769.3</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>43.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description of Threats**

- Based on data what we identify as threats to the aquatic resources of the BSA.
  1. Loss of hydrologic storage
  2. Population growth
  3. Declining water quality

**Description of Threats**

1. Loss of Hydrologic Storage (WMAF)
   - Loss of wetlands
   - Miles of altered streams
     - Placed on a scale of 1-50

**Description of Threats**

2. Population and Urbanization
   - Loss of perennial cover
   - Artificial drainage
   - Fragmentation of habitats
   - Increase in impervious surfaces
   - MPCA Phosphorus stress layer used to predict anthropogenic stress on water quality

**Description of Threats**

3. Water Quality Impairments
   - Land-use changes
   - Urbanization

**Prioritization Strategy**

- Strategic site selection using a watershed approach
  1. Watershed vulnerability/condition analysis
     - Assess the condition of each major watershed
  2. Identification of priority minerals within each major
     - Purpose is to identify areas within a major watershed where mitigation opportunities should be prioritized
  3. Site selection criteria
     - Develop a list of specific site selection criteria to select and rank individual projects
1. Watershed vulnerability analysis:
   - Select data to assess vulnerability of each major watershed
   - Normalize data (adjust values of different scales to a common scale)
   - Reclassify to derive an index (e.g., score 1-10)
   - Evaluate vulnerability based on index scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Watershed</th>
<th>Wetland Loss</th>
<th>Modified Wetland Loss</th>
<th>Population Density</th>
<th>Impaired Wetlands</th>
<th>Impaired Watercourses</th>
<th>Impaired Streams</th>
<th>Impaired Lakes</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Snake</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kettle</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stillwater</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Identification of priority minors within each major:
   - Minor watershed proposed to be studied using a process similar to the vulnerability assessment based on the following data sets:
     - MNDNR WMAF Sedimentation Potential
     - MNDNR WMAF Perennial Cover
     - MNDNR WMAF Altered Water Connectivity
     - Declined Wetlands
     - Altered Watercourses
     - Impaired Streams
     - Impaired Lakes

   Used to:
   - Recognition as a Priority Area for Wetland Restoration Projects in Local Water Management Plans
   - Recognition as a Project Implementation Area in an Approved TRCA Plan
   - Other High Priority Areas Recognized under the Wetland Conservation Act

3. Site Selection Criteria:
   - Prioritize wetland restoration opportunities by developing specific criteria to select preferred sites
   - Restorable Wetland Inventory
     - Baseline for identifying potential restoration opportunities
RE: BSA 6 ILF Stakeholder Meeting Summary

This memo summarizes the In-Lieu Fee (ILF) Compensation Planning Framework (CPF) stakeholder meeting held on 1/22/18. The goal of this meeting was to cover the completed components of the CPF and to elicit site selection criteria from the stakeholders.

Presented to the group was a description of the individual components of the CPF with the focus on baseline information and the condition assessment. After the stakeholder group had obtained a good understanding of the CPF, the focus moved to mitigation site selection criteria. The last step remaining is to have the stakeholders rank these criteria for use in the prioritization process. The following criteria were identified as important for site selection in BSA 6 by the stakeholders present at the meeting.

- Number of Landowners per restoration site, the fewer the better
- Connectivity of parcels along with their riparian corridors, examples include
  - Natural or wildlife corridors identified in local or state plans
  - Parks and open space
  - County Biological Survey areas
  - Areas with both state and federal sensitive/T&E species
- Variable size requirements depending on where you are in the BSA. The closer to the metro the smaller the size requirement should become
  - Stillwater 5-Acres
  - Kettle 40-Acres
- Sites that act as buffers between agricultural lands and other aquatic resources, or that have direct discharge to other aquatic resources
- Cost of procuring the rights to perform restoration activities
- Sites located within priority wetland restoration areas identified by LGUs, SWCDs, watershed districts or other aquatic resource agencies
- Proximity to other conservation projects
  - CREP
  - RIM
  - Stream restoration projects
- Sites located in areas where additional flood storage has been identified as a local watershed need
- Restorable wetlands fully or partially drained by ditches
• Prioritize private systems over public systems, as private systems can be altered much easier than public systems
  ➢ Restorable wetlands which are fully or partially drained by tile
    • Lack of tile maps makes this difficult
  ➢ Costs related to implementing a restoration plan, such as earth moving, ditch plugs, or tile removal
  ➢ Water quality functional lift
    • Restorable wetlands directly adjacent to impaired waters with direct discharge
    • Restorable wetlands not directly adjacent to impaired water, but have inferred indirect discharge to those waters
  ➢ Drained forested wetlands identified in local water plans or LGUs
  ➢ Avoid areas where future land use is designated for urbanization
  ➢ Ground water sensitive and recharge areas designated by local or state plans