



Nine Mile Creek Watershed District
12800 Gerard Drive
Eden Prairie, MN 55346
(952) 204-9690
ninemilecreek.org

December 20, 2024

Mr. Lewis Brockette
Wetlands Policy Coordinator
MN Board of Water & Soil Resources
Lewis.Brockette@state.mn.us
bwsr.wcarulemaking@state.mn.us

Dear Mr. Brockette:

The Nine Mile Creek Watershed District (NMCWD) is the Local Government Unit responsible for administering the Minnesota Wetland Conservation Act (WCA) for NMCWD. This letter provides feedback in response to the preliminary draft WCA rule:

- 8420.0100 **Purpose**. Please provide a reference for determination of wetland quality and biological diversity, and values identified in A.- D. of this subpart.
- 8420.0111 Definitions.
 - Subpart. 26. **Fill**. – Please consider adding fences or fencing to the description of what fill does not include. This is a common question from applicants and would be helpful to provide clarification. Suggested edit highlighted in red as follows: Fill does not include posts and pilings for linear projects such as bridges, elevated walkways, **fences**, or powerline structures, or structures traditionally built on pilings such as docks and bathhouses.
 - Subpart. 51. **Permanently and semipermanently flooded area of a wetland**.
 - Please consider switching “aquatic” and “terrestrial” around to read: ...commonly the point where the natural vegetation changes from predominantly **terrestrial** to predominantly **aquatic**.
 - Note that the terms terrestrial and aquatic are also used in the definition of a wetland (Subpart. 72). Further clarification of the definition for permanently and semipermanently flooded would be helpful, such as a dominance of obligate vegetation species, since terrestrial and aquatic are very generalized terms and are being used to define two different boundaries.

Understanding Our Urban Watershed

BOARD OF MANAGERS: Grace Butler • Bob Cutshall • Peggy Kvam • Chris-Ann Lauria • Larry Olson

- 8420.0330 Replacement Plan Applications. Subpart. 3 **Application contents**. Will the Joint Application Form be revised at the same time as the updated rules are in place? Note that there are several items in this list that are not included in the current Joint Application Form, specifically, (5) information known to the applicant or readily available concerning the special considerations criteria in part 8420.0515 and (6) a list of all other known local, state, and federal permits and approvals required for the activity.
- 8420.0330 **Replacement Plan Applications**. Subpart. 3 **Application contents**. Will the Joint Application Form be revised at the same time as the updated rules are in place? Note that there are several items in this list that are not included in the current Joint Application Form, specifically, (5) information known to the applicant or readily available concerning the special considerations criteria in part 8420.0515 and (6) a list of all other known local, state, and federal permits and approvals required for the activity.
- 8420.0522 **Replacement standards**. Subpart 1. **General requirement**. H. Provide a reference for determination of wetland functions and values listed in A.- G. of this subpart.
- 8420.0522 Subpart 4. **Replacement ratios**. Will impacts to non-public water deepwater habitat have the same replacement requirements as wetland impacts? How will that be tracked for replacement credits? Will HGM classifications be used, or will deepwater have its own category?
- 8420.0522 Subpart 7. **Siting of replacement**.
 - C. (2) Currently the rule is proposing to remove this statement: “The cost of replacement credits alone is not sufficient reason to conclude that reasonable, practicable, or environmentally beneficial replacement opportunities are not available.”
 - Note that many NMCWD and many metro LGUs have their own replacement siting sequencing that prioritizes local replacement, including opportunities for project-specific replacement.
- 8420.0526 **Actions eligible for credit**.
 - Subpart 2 C. This appears to provide a higher amount of credit for upland buffer vegetation restoration for protection of rare natural communities than the current typical percentages for ENRV crediting to establish native vegetation in a wetland to protect a rare natural community. If this proposed 50% crediting for upland buffer is allowed, then we would suggest increasing the current percentages for ENRV crediting to match. For example, ENRV crediting for establishment of native vegetation within wetland areas that protect rare natural communities is often only 12.5% to 25%. It doesn’t make sense to provide higher wetland crediting in upland areas than in wetland areas for the same credit actions.

- Please consider adding actions for wetland restoration in coordination with stream bank mitigation.
- 8420.0528 Subpart. 3. **Design considerations.** C. measures should be taken to manage hydrologic bounce such that the wetlands' function, value, and sustainability are maintained. The reason for the change is listed as replacing outdated guidance with an implementable standard. What is the implementable standard? Will new standards be developed by BWSR?
- 8420.0810 Subpart 4 **Timing and duration of monitoring.** The way this is written assumes that five growing seasons is sufficient for restoration. Note that some monitoring plans are planned for more than five growing seasons to achieve restoration goals. Especially if the site includes restoration of forested wetland communities which typically require longer timeframes. Monitoring may also be planned to occur every other year for communities that take longer to establish. We would recommend referring to the approved monitoring plan, similar to the way Subpart. 5 was re-written for monitoring reports.
- 8420.0900 **Enforcement procedures.** Please consider including procedures for the LGU and SWCD to collaborate with the landowner to achieve voluntary restoration in lieu of cease and desist, restoration, and replacement orders.
- 8420.0705 **Establishing a wetland bank site.** Subpart 3 **Application procedures.** Should there be a statement added to these timelines to document that Section 15.99 statute timelines are not applicable to this section?

Thank you for offering an opportunity to comment on the draft WCA rule. Please contact us if you have any questions or need clarification on these comments.

Sincerely,



Erica Sniegowski
Administrator

Cc: Zach Stafslie, Janna Kieffer, Karen Wold