Cottonwood-Middle Minnesota Watershed CWMP

Formal Review Draft: Comments and Responses



					Material	Editoral	Vote	Change Needed	
#	Commenter	Section	Page	Comment	Ma	Edi	No	(Y/N)	Resolution
1	USFWS	2	N/A	Table 2-1: Are the WPA acres being counted twice: once in their category, and again as part of the USFWS lands below? Page 4-4 last paragraph, "Implementing agricultural and urban conservation	х			Y	Upon review of the GIS data, the WPAs line up with the USFWS areas that are also WPAs so they are being counted twice, and are reflected in the USFWS lands acres as well as their own line. WPA line will be removed to avoid duplication.
2	Cottonwood SWCD	4	N/A	practices" later in same paragraph, "implementing agricultural and urban conservation"		×		Υ	Text revised as recommended
3	Cottonwood SWCD	4	N/A	Page 4-14 last paragraph after "rain gardens and stormwater ponds", and non structural BMPs such as urban forestry and vegetated swales.		x		Y	Text revised as recommended
	Cottonwood SWCD	5	N/A	Page 5-7, 5-13, and 5-29 LC WU7 Stormwater management practices Add urban forestry to the list of practicesstormwater ponds and infrastructure, urban forestry.		х		Y	Text added as recommended so LGUs can apply to other sources of funding dealing with EAB. Added to all actions.
5	мрса	General		The planning effort was responsive to the MPCA's priorities, concerns and comments throughout the effort. The Steering Committee incorporated all of the MPCA priorities, and successfully addressed the comments and revisions as part of the CWMP. The MPCA is appreciative that the Watershed Approach documents (Monitoring & Assessment, Stressor ID, Total Maximum Daily Loads [TMDLs] and Watershed Restoration and Protection Strategy [WRAPS]) were utilized in this process.			x	N	Comment noted, with thanks!
	MOU	LWRN	N/A	Page 2-12, third paragraph, second sentence – remove number of water suppliers. Recommend editing "Of the 31 public water suppliers in the watershed" to "Of the community public water suppliers in the watershed"				Y	Tout revised as seen manufact
7	MDH MDH	Goals	N/A	Page 4-9, first paragraph, second sentence - recommend editing "or have high nitrate testing results" to "or have nitrate testing results above the drinking water standard."		x		Y	Text revised as recommended Text revised as recommended
8	DNR	Implementation	31	Row R1 DNR is listed as the lead entity for quantifying the volume and temporal variability of stormwater runoff entering rivers. While DNR works with USGS, MPCA and other entities to maintain the Cooperative Stream Gaging network throughout the state, this action would require additional input that may be outside of our current ability. DNR will continue to assist with this effort as possible, however, please remove DNR as the lead entity for these efforts.		x		Υ	DNR removed as lead and added as partner
٥	DNR	Programs	Table 6-1	Row 7 Water level/flow. DNR maintains a network of groundwater monitoring wells, including 56 in the Cottonwood River watershed. Please include "GW" in this row under the "DNR" heading.	x			Y	GW added to DNR column
,		11.05.0110		Stream Habitat and Connectivity - lists maintenance of in-stream debris as a medium-priority issue, but no action or funding are addressed on page 5-8. Please note that woody debris plays a significant role in providing habitat for aquatic organisms, however, we also understand that significant impacts to infrastructure and stream bank stability can occur in excess debris situations. If any debris removal is proposed, please incorporate considerations for aquatic habitat into the				•	New collaborative action item added in Education and Outreach action table: "Collaborate with DNR, MPCA, Federal partners, and cities to effectively manage debris balancing flooding and impacts of infrastructure with water quality, aquatic habitat and hydrology."
10	DNR	Issues, Goals	3-8. 4-12	decision-making process.	х			Υ	Partner funding added.
1.	DND	Implementation and		Capital Improvement Projects (CIP) – Table on 5-32 includes several bridge replacements and a drainage improvement project. We suggest that criteria should be included within the Capital Improvements section on page 6-7 to				,,	All bridge replacement projects removed (89509, 89510, 89565, L6539). Drainage improvement project description expanded to summarize the water quality components of drainage management and drainage management planning efforts. Include flood water retention / water quality enhancements with
11	DNR	Programs	5-32, 6-7	clarify when a CIP would be eligible for funding under this plan.	х			Υ	the replacements. CSAH 4 Dam will remain.

					<u>a</u>	<u></u>		Change	
					Material	Editoral	Note	Needed	
#	Commenter	Section	Page	Comment	Σ	ñ	ž	(Y/N)	Resolution
				- Francisco incolorantation and Table 4.2 and including about 10 and 10					
				Funding- implementation cost Table 1-3 not including other (non-state) funds appearing that all goals can be met without non-state funding.					
				This should be comprehensive and not just showing what can be					Title revised to "Baseline + State Funding" and Level 3 will be
12	BWSR	Executive Summary	Table 1.2	accomplished with potential Funding.		×		Υ	further expanded to include partner / federal costs.
12	DWSK	Executive Summary	Table 1-3	Insure all Medium Priority Issues have an associated Measurable Goal i.e.	-	Х		Ť	Turther expanded to include partner / rederar costs.
12	BWSR	3- Priority Issues	N/A	Debris	x			Υ	See response to Comment #10
13	DWSK	3- Filolity issues	IN/A	Stream Habitat and Connectivity			1	'	See response to comment #10
14	BWSR	4- Measurable Goals	N/A	o Maintenance of debris should have a measurable goal tied to this.	x			Υ	See response to Comment #10
F	511511	1 Medsarable doub	1,,,,	Table 5-1- The use of WBIF watershed-based implementation Funding:	<u> </u>			·	See response to comment #20
				suggest using state funding label instead of WBIF					Title revised to "Baseline + State Funding" and Level 3 will be
15	BWSR	5- Implementation	N/A	o No source or amount of partner funds.	х			Υ	further expanded to include partner / federal costs.
				·					Partner funding added to projects as able with a visual at the end
1				Action tables not having dollar amount for partner funds for watershed wide					of the plan communicating resource benefits of additional
16	BWSR	5- Implementation	N/A	and each planning region.	х			Υ	sources of funding.
									Correct, this summary is for "Baseline + State Funding". Title will
				Table 5-2 indicates cost to meet goals is \$24.09 Million over 10 years but is					be revised accordingly. Other sources of funding also added as
17	BWSR	5- Implementation	N/A	missing non-state funding.			х	Υ	column.
				Capital Improvements Page 5-32					
				o Project 89509, 89510, 89565, L6539 & CSAH 4 Dam					
				Should identify plan goals to be addressed					All bridge replacement projects removed (89509, 89510, 89565,
				o Project JDI8CM					L6539). Drainage improvement project description expanded to
				 Needs to be clear on plan goals to be addressed and 103E definition of 					summarize the water quality components of drainage
18	BWSR	5- Implementation	N/A	"drainage improvement".	Х			Υ	management.
		7.81							
10	BWSR	7- Plan Administration	N1/A	Funding Table 7-1 suggest funding level 2 to be called Baseline + State				· ·	Title revised to "Baseline + State Funding" and Level 3 will be
19	BWSK	and Coordination	N/A	Funding and Level 3 to have a better estimate of amount.	Х	-		Y	further expanded to include partner / federal costs.
									Language added to emphasize that this budget estimate is
									looking backwards on how the "Baseline" was calculated, rather
		7- Plan Administration		Table 7-2 \$0.00 for federal? They have been doing work here what is the					than forwards. Replace \$0 in Federal column with "partner
20	BWSR	and Coordination	N/A	estimate for the future.	x			Υ	funding with a variable annual amount"
F		7- Plan Administration	,						
21	BWSR	and Coordination	N/A	Page 7-5 state funding include WBIF language		х		Υ	WBIF language added to "State Funding" paragraph
		7- Plan Administration		Page 7-6 Suggest adding examples of collaborative partner grants pursued					Collaborative partner grant examples included in "Additional
22	BWSR	and Coordination	N/A	and funded prior to plan adoption i.e. Water Storage.		х		Υ	Funding" paragraph as suggested
		7- Plan Administration							
23	BWSR	and Coordination	N/A	Table 7-3 include WBIF funding under BWSR		х		Υ	Funding added as suggested
		7- Plan Administration							
24	BWSR	and Coordination	N/A	Page 7-9 include paragraph on WBIF	<u> </u>	х	<u> </u>	Y	Paragraph about WBIF added as suggested
1				Plan Amendments page 7-11					
1				o Suggest removal of first paragraph		1		1	Amendments section simplified and clarified as suggested with
l		7.01		o Second paragraph sentence 5 remove state statue reference.					statute language removed. Amendments may be proposed by
١	DIAKED	7- Plan Administration	21/2	O Make sure the use of Amendment is clear, don't interchange revision and				.,	member LGU. Bylaws will also clarify amendment process about
25	BWSR	and Coordination	N/A	amendment.	х	 	<u> </u>	Υ	what committee initiates.
1				Section 7-Table 7-3 (pg. 120) In addition to the current MDA programs listed,		1			
1				please add the MDA's "Soil Health Financial Assistance Program Grant". The					
				Soil Health Financial Assistance Grant provides cost-share for the purchase					
				and retrofit of soil health equipment. Adopting soil health practices often					
		7- Plan Administration		requires expensive and specific pieces of equipment, creating a need for a					
26	MDA	and Coordination	Table 7-3	cost-share opportunity to offset those costs.		x		Y	Funding program added to table with thanks
ںے			TUDIE 123	1	1	^			0, 10, 10, 11, 11, 11, 11, 11, 11, 11, 1