

Second Generation Plan TAG Meeting Minutes

Bassett Creek Water Management Commission

September 24, 2001

A. Attendance: Fred Moore (chair), Jim Larson, Carlton Moore, Guy Johnson, John Barten, Lisa Goddard, Jeff Oliver, Ed Silberman, Connie Fortin, Tom Mathisen, Katie Heinz, Don Maxwell, Pat Wrase, Jason Westbrook, Karen Chandler

B. Agenda

1. Review August 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

The minutes for the August meeting were accepted without revision.

E. Review of TAG Recommendations

The group continued their discussion based on a handout containing the ongoing list of recommendations. The discussion started with recommendation #13.

Recommendation #13: Need a policy to reduce impervious surfaces.

Discussion:

The recommendation should be reworded to "encourage the reduction of impervious surfaces."

What is happening in our cities now? Are cities moving more toward only putting sidewalks on one side of the street or making narrower trails? Are they thinking about reducing impervious surfaces? (Connie Fortin)

Is there a difference between a parking lot and a mowed lawn? Apparently unmaintained green space results in the greatest reduction in runoff and mowed lawns are almost as impervious as a parking lot because of compaction below the topsoil. (Don Maxwell)

We should try to get developers to till compacted soil before placing topsoil (John Barten).

The cities need flexibility in the limitations and would rather see the impervious reduction issue addressed through education.

The group agreed to this statement.

- 13) The Commission should encourage the reduction of impervious surfaces and in the watershed through education and expand the list of Best Management Practices to include things such as turf overflow parking and rainwater gardens to reduce runoff volume.

Recommendation #14: The plan should attempt to get people involved. A good way to do this would be to combine the water quality monitoring with public education.

The public education plan prepared by the Citizens Advisory Group addresses this item.

Recommendation #15: The Commission should require a buffer adjacent to water resources.

Discussion:

The attorney for the BCWMC feels this will be a difficult requirement to enforce unless it is done in conjunction with development and/or redevelopment.

In northern Minnesota, people can get permits to expand their cabins if they agree to extend the buffer back. Can the Commission do something similar? (Connie Fortin)
Typically, this could only be done if City Council action is required, no just an administrative review.

Shoreland ordinances are now tied to new building permits.

We need to keep a broader view when discussing buffers. We should be thinking about creating wildlife corridors rather than just pockets of buffers (Lisa Goddard).

Plymouth currently has a new buffer requirement.

The City of Apple Valley is currently buying land adjacent to ponding areas up to the 100-year flood level. Can the BCWMC do this and use the land as a buffer? (Pat Wrase)
This is a possibility, but the landowner would have to be compensated for the land and it would create a maintenance headache.

Can the cities tie the buffer width requirement to the classification of the water resource?

The plan needs to include a definition of a buffer.

The group all agreed that cities should consider improvements to water quality when they receive variance applications.

The group agreed to the following buffer requirements:

- 16) The Commission should require a buffer adjacent to water resources for new developments and redevelopments.

Recommendation: The Commission should promote rainwater gardens and natural swales rather than traditional curb and gutter.

Discussion:

There is a place for both curb and gutter and for swales and ditches. It is dependent on soil conditions and traffic. Typically, property owners do not like ditches in their front yards and have a tendency to try to fill them.

Curb and gutter increases the useful life of roads.

What happens when homeowners fill their rainwater gardens?

Rainwater gardens need a maintenance plan.

Anything we can do to prevent water from getting to our storm drains, whether 1% or 99%, is an improvement.

The group agreed to drop the reference to curb and gutter and combine this recommendation with #13 to reduce runoff volume.

Recommendation #17: The Commission should write an annual State of the Watershed report that includes water quality test results rather than an Annual Report.

Discussion: This recommendation will be covered in the CAG's public education plan.

Recommendation #18: The plan should reference options for pervious alternatives for things such as driveways.

Discussion: This recommendation will be covered in recommendation #13.

Recommendation #19: The Commission should consider classifying streams according to the downstream receiving water body.

Discussion: This is how the stream is currently classified.

Recommendation #20: The Commission should consider changing its Level I nutrient target from 30 micrograms per liter to 38 micrograms per liter.

Discussion:

At a TP of 38 mg/L, you meet the needs of 75% of lake users. Is the additional treatment economically worthwhile?

Having a water body experience an algae bloom for 60% of the summer is unacceptable.

The group agreed to keep the existing treatment level for phosphorus at 30 mg/L.

Recommendation #21: Twin Lake should be a higher priority water body.

Discussion: By the current scoring system, Medicine Lake received a score of 44 points and Twin Lake scored 30 points.

The original intent of the comment was to preserve the lake as much as possible.

Preservation is less costly than restoration.

The group agreed that the Commission should strive to maintain the current water quality in Twin Lake.

Recommendation #22: The Commission should focus on the recommended projects that remove the largest percentage of nutrients.

Discussion:

The group agreed that the recommendation should be reworded to say:

- 22) The Commission should prioritize water quality projects by those that can make the largest advancement toward reaching the water quality goals.

Recommendation #23: Rather than setting blanket target nutrient concentrations, the Commission should look at requiring developments to meet or exceed existing downstream water quality.

Discussion:

This recommendation is covered in a previous discussion that requires the same treatment of stormwater across the watershed.

Recommendation #24: The Commission needs a Level 0 standard of treatment.

Discussion:

The comment was made out of concern to road salt and other pollutants are not currently being measured. The Level 0 would expand the pollutants that are tracked and treated.

We can expand our treatment of pollutants without adding a new level of treatment.

The group agreed to add the discussion of road salt to the end of the list of recommendations and to keep the existing number of treatment levels.

F. Next Meeting

The next TAG meeting will be Monday, October 22nd. The only item on the agenda is to continue discussing the ongoing list of recommendations made by the group.