

DRAFT
Second Generation Plan TAG Meeting Minutes
Bassett Creek Water Management Commission
October 22, 2001

A. Attendance: Fred Moore (chair), Jim Larson, Carlton Moore, Guy Johnson, John Barten, Lisa Goddard, Al Lundstrom, Ed Silberman, Connie Fortin, Tom Mathisen, Don Maxwell, Jennifer Posma, Bob Mayeron, Terrie Christian, Shane Missaghi, Jason Westbrook, Karen Chandler

B. Agenda

1. Review September meeting minutes
2. Q & A
3. Review TAG Recommendations
4. Set next meeting

C. Welcome and Introduction

Fred Moore welcomed the group and previewed the evening's meeting.

D. Review of August 27 Meeting Minutes

Recommendation #13 was revised to include rainwater gardens as a way to reduce runoff volume.

E. Review of TAG Recommendations

After the last meeting, John Barten requested a discussion on water quality in redevelopment projects. His concern is that it is possible for a large redevelopment project to meet all of the NURP requirements and still result in higher phosphorus loading to a water body than presently exists. For example, if a residential area is redeveloped into an industrial complex, treated runoff from the site could still be of poorer water quality than what came off of the residential site. His recommendation is for a policy that will require redevelopments to either meet NURP requirements or result in non-degradation of water quality; whichever is more restrictive.

Discussion:

This is only possible in cases where there is a change in land use.

The group reached consensus on this recommendation.

Recommendation: The Commission should have a policy that will require redevelopment projects to either meet NURP requirements or result in non-degradation of water quality; whichever is more restrictive.

Recommendation #25: If we have to sacrifice water bodies as a result of development, Bassett Creek water quality should be improved since it flows to the Mississippi River and therefore becomes part of a larger ecosystem.

Discussion: The group reached consensus that this recommendation was covered in Recommendation #20.

Recommendation #26: Separate water quality classifications from their required treatment levels.

Discussion: The group reached consensus that this recommendation was covered in Recommendation #19.

Recommendation #27: A good goal for Wirth Lake is to acquire land for BMPs if it becomes available.

Discussion:

This recommendation was made because some lakes cannot meet their goals because land for treatment facilities is not available.

The City of Plymouth could have acquired the peninsula on Medicine Lake, but it did not meet their requirements for a park. If they had a water quality policy such as this recommendation, the city could have purchased the land. (Don Maxwell)

By keeping the water quality treatment level at 30mg/L we are constantly looking for ways to improve water quality. (Fred Moore)

The Commission is continuously looking for BMPs to help a water body achieve its goals. This includes land acquisition. (Len Kremer)

This is something that would have to be included and budgeted for in the CIP. (Tom Mathisen)

Typically one does not set aside money until a specific measure of action has been identified. (Len Kremer)

The group agreed that the 30mg/L goal would encourage the future implementation of BMPs.

Recommendation #28: Determine the treatment levels for incoming stormwater on an individual basis.

Discussion: The group reached consensus that this recommendation was covered in Recommendation #19.

Recommendation #29: Include the most recent water quality data in the Plan.

Discussion: This information will be included in an appendix to the Plan.

Recommendation #30: We should set goals for the maximum attainable use for each of the water bodies.

Discussion:

The goals were set by the perceived uses of the public, Commission, and government agencies.

The group reached consensus to drop this recommendation.

Recommendation #31: The Commission should discuss the financial implications of each proposed Water Quality Management Plan.

Discussion: This topic will be covered in the November 13 CIP workshop.

This recommendation is also partially addressed in Recommendation #22.

The group reached consensus on the revised recommendation.

Recommendation #31: The Commission should prioritize water quality improvement projects based on the projects that create the most benefit for the money.

Recommendation #32: The Commission should itemize out solutions that can be attained through prevention and other non-structural measures.

Discussion:

These should be higher priority items. (Connie Fortin)

All plans should have an education component and that should be the top priority. (Len Kremer)

The Commission should look at prevention first, especially where it can be most effective.

The group reached consensus on the recommendation without revision.

Recommendation #33: The Commission should attempt to use their authority to make comments to make ordinances from different member cities very similar.

Discussion:

Maybe the Commission should prepare model ordinances. (Fred Moore)

The group agreed that this was a good idea and it met the intention of the recommendation.

Recommendation #33: The Commission should prepare model ordinances where appropriate.

Recommendation #34: The Plan should identify which issues are not currently being regulated.

Discussion:

This is the purpose of the Plan.

The group reached consensus to drop this recommendation.

Recommendation #35: The Commission should emphasize enforcement of its policies (such as improperly installed silt fence).

Discussion:

This is currently the responsibility of the cities. The Commission does have an inspection program to remind the cities that is basically an audit program.

The intent of the recommendation is to make the Commission more proactive. (Don Maxwell)

The Commission should develop a report for listing the BMPs done by the cities that they could report to the Commission.

The group reached consensus on this corollary recommendation.

Recommendation: The engineer will compile a list of things the member cities should look for and the city will prepare a report to the Commission.

The group then reached a consensus on the language of Recommendation #35.

Recommendation #35: The Commission should ensure the enforcement of its policies through a reporting process from the cities.

Recommendation #36: Policies need to be rewritten with an emphasis on redevelopment.

Discussion: The group reached consensus that this topic was covered in the first discussion initiated by John Barten's recommendation at the beginning of the meeting.

Recommendation #37: There needs to be an agency that monitors groundwater to ensure that the water supply is not depleted.

Discussion: The group agreed that this discussion was covered in a previous meeting.

Recommendation #38: The Commission should have a policy encouraging communities to do a wetland inventory -- was agreed upon by the group.

Recommendation #39: The Commission should set standards for functional assessments so all wetland inventories look similar -- was agreed upon by the group.

Recommendation #40: The Commission should get involved in requiring setbacks and buffer zones for wetlands.

Discussion: The group agreed that this was covered in Recommendation #15.

Recommendation #41: The Commission should attempt to make wetland setback requirements similar across all member cities.

Discussion: The group agreed that this recommendation was covered in Recommendation #33.

Recommendation #42: The BCWMC should support any legislation that would abandon the public ditches and allow all drainage to be managed by the latest adopted plan.

Discussion: The group agreed that this recommendation was covered in Recommendation #10.

Recommendation #43: The Plan should include a guide to help prioritize erosion problems that require attention.

Discussion:

The PAG has a recommendation to classify erosion problems in the creek. They recommend that the Commission finance volume related erosion problems. (Len Kremer)

We first need to classify the creek. If we are going to correct problems in the stream then the stream should first be classified to understand the evolution of the stream so the problems are corrected properly. (Connie Fortin)

It was agreed that classification would be part of the design process for the erosion repair.

Recommendation #44: The overall Plan should give directive to the member cities to look for problems in the tributaries to the creek and estimate sediment loads from the creek.

The group reached consensus to add inspection of the stream to the report that will be requested from the cities (see #35).

Recommendation #45: The Commission should inventory the worst erosion problems in the watershed and create an annual budget for these specific projects.

Discussion: This will be part of the CIP discussion.

Recommendation #46: The Commission should take a position to react to recommendations from other agencies on the issue of Fish and Wildlife.

Discussion:

Fish and Wildlife issues are not the purpose of the Commission by the Joint Powers Agreement.

The Commission will react to agency permit requirements for Commission projects.

Recommendation #47: The Plan should encourage bigger buffers to reduce goose habitat.

Discussion: The group agreed that this recommendation is covered in the water quality recommendations.

Recommendation #48: Make Bassett Creek canoeable from Medicine Lake to the intake.

Discussion:

There are several main obstructions to canoeing the main stem of Bassett Creek:

- 1) Wisconsin Avenue crossing
- 2) Highway 100 crossing
- 3) Private property including golf courses
- 4) Highway 55

How many people would this benefit? Is it worth the cost? (Tom Mathisen)

The communities need to decide they want the creek to be canoeable. Then they must make a policy to make structures accommodating to canoers. (Len Kremer)

The group reached consensus on this issue.

Recommendation #48: New structures crossing the creek should consider the canoeability of the creek.

Recommendation #49: The top three major issues are erosion and sediment control, wetlands and funding.

Discussion: The group agreed to this.

Recommendation #50: The Commission should use culverts that would simulate the natural channel of the creek, with a wide flat bottom that would expand wider at the top.

Discussion:

Can we expand the recommendation to include all crossings, no matter the size? We should attempt to increase the integrity of the streams. (Connie Fortin)

This can be done by over sizing culverts and dropping them lower than necessary to create a natural bottom. (Len Kremer)

What kind of habitat are we helping? (Tom Mathisen) Frogs, turtles and toads to name a few. (John Barten)

A natural creek is made up of pools and riffles. A pipe crossing is not much different than a pool and riffle. (Ed Silberman)

The group did not reach consensus on this recommendation.

Recommendation #51: The Commission should expand their monitoring program to include chlorides from road salt.

The BCWMC is participating in a Metropolitan Council 2-year continuous monitoring program that is monitoring pollutants other than phosphorus. (Fred Moore)

The BCWMC does a biota survey every four years. An impact from chlorides is not currently being experienced by the biota in the stream. (Len Kremer)

Chloride removal through ponding is approximately 40% (John Barten)

The group reached consensus to add chlorides to the pollutants it currently monitors.

Recommendation #51: The Commission should add chlorides to the pollutants it currently monitors.

F. Next Meeting

The next TAG meeting will be announced when draft plan materials are prepared.