

Second Generation Plan TAG Meeting Minutes
Bassett Creek Water Management Commission
March 26, 2001

A. Attendance: John Barten, Terrie Christian, Pat Wrase, Jeff Oliver, Tom Mathisen, Fred Moore, Jack Frost, Lisa Goddard, Shane Missaghi, Bob Mayeron, Carlton Moore, Jennifer Posma, Connie Fortin, Vince Vander Top, Ed Silberman, Joel Settles, Don Maxwell, Jason Westbrook, Karen Chandler, Len Kremer

B. Agenda

1. Review Statement of Purpose and Strategy
2. Review Major Issues
3. Identify Other Issues
4. Prioritize Issues
5. Review Flood Control Policies

C. Meeting Handouts

1. Map of Watershed

D. Welcome and Introduction

Fred Moore started the meeting with a welcome statement and a review of the evening's agenda.

E. Review of Statement of Purpose and Strategy

Fred Moore facilitated the discussion on the statement of Purpose and Strategy. Karen Chandler said the new statement is essentially a reflection of what the Commission is already doing. She went on to say that the new statement includes outcome based goals for the Commission and member cities, more emphasis on education and public involvement, and more emphasis on the implementation of water quality improvement projects.

Comment: A bill was introduced at the State Ag meeting that would ban phosphorus in the seven county metro area. The bill included funding for a public education program.

Comment: There is also a bill that would ban the application of phosphorus on turfed surfaces. This bill is not likely to pass. (Fred Moore)

Comment: The Statement says the Commission adopts policies and leaves it up to the member cities to implement. (John Barten). Karen Chandler added that the Commission is also there to resolve conflicts between the member cities.

John Barten was unclear about the statement "Management activities include recommendations for land-use controls, plans for integrated water resource management (parks/nature centers, etc.)..." He wanted to know whether there are any actual plans for

integrated water resource management for the parks and nature centers. Karen Chandler said the statement was only intended to give examples of management activities.

F. Review of Major Issues

Karen Chandler and Len Kremer facilitated the review of 12 major issues.

Comment: Overall, the issues are very broad and vague. Will the plan be vague or will it have concrete goals? There really needs to be a list of action items (Connie Fortin)

Karen Chandler explained that the issues need to be broad and vague because the goals are set once the issues are identified.

Groundwater

Joel Settles discussed the background behind the County Groundwater Plan and commented that it will probably remain unapproved.

Comment: The County Groundwater Plan does identify potential groundwater contamination sources, but a better source for that same information would be a wellhead protection plan if any of the cities have done them. (Joel Settles)

Comment: The Commission should encourage cities to start a wellhead protection planning process before they are required to do one. (Fred Moore)

Question: Is groundwater monitoring information available? (Connie Fortin) Fred Moore said that it is available and it is reported.

Comment: How will groundwater appropriation be assessed? The Plan should at least comment on DNR permits. (Joel Settles)

Comment: I do not understand why the Commission would concern itself with groundwater issues except when groundwater is surface discharged. It only broadens the scope.

Karen Chandler responded to the comment saying that groundwater is listed as one of the purposes of a Water Management Organization.

Water Quality

Question: Have the issues identified in the individual city been incorporated into our list of Major Issues?

Question: Why are issues B14 and B15 included in our list of major issues? (Lisa Goddard)

Karen Chandler's response was that those issues came directly out of letters received from the agencies.

Question: There are a lot of things we can do to improve water quality such as reduce impervious surfaces. Why are these items not included in our list of issues.

Len Kremer responded. He said that the Commission has written plans and identified implementation practices for the water bodies that are recreationally important and is now in the process of prioritization and identifying responsibility. The plans identify how to reduce the pollutant inflows enough to meet the recreational needs of the water bodies.

Comment: Things that are already in place are not being implemented, for example the State of Minnesota Best Management Practices. On Medicine Lake, in order to put a trail along the lake they removed the buffer. (Terrie Christian)

Len Kremer summarized by saying that the issue would be if the cities are not going to require a buffer zone then should the Commission require a buffer adjacent to surface water resources.

Comment: Issue B16 that recommends the Commission develop a water quality-monitoring program should be combined with public education. Attempt to get people out doing their own programs. (Lisa Goddard)

Flooding

Comment: Structures built in the flood plain should be removed. (Connie Fortin)

Len Kremer said that there are only about 30 structures in the flood plain and most or all of those are in Golden Valley. The City is currently looking at removing some of them.

Comment: The 1990 Plan is inconsistent with city plans on the topic of pond design.

Comment: The Commission should change its thinking and attempt to retain water as long as possible rather than getting it downstream as quickly as possible. (Don Maxwell)

Len Kremer said that the current flood control policies and projects are the result of development occurring from downstream to upstream.

Wetlands

Comment: The Commission should promote rainwater gardens and natural swales rather than traditional curb and gutter. (Connie Fortin)

Comment: There should be a buffer requirement to protect wetlands (Jack Frost)

Comment: The Plan should reference member city buffer ordinances. (Jennifer Posma)

Public Ditches

Comment: The original purpose of the county ditch system was agricultural drainage. Now the ditches are being used more as storm sewers. Watershed districts were required to take over responsibility for the ditches, but WMOs were given the option of whether

they wanted responsibility or not. Hennepin County will do anything possible to get the ditches off of their roles.

WMC/City Evaluation, Accountability and Enforcement

Comment: The Commission should discuss the financial implications of each proposed Water Quality Management Plan. (Jeff Oliver)

Public Education and Involvement

Comment: The Commission should write an annual State of the Watershed report including water quality testing results rather than writing an Annual Report (Connie Fortin)

Comment: The Commission should identify specific target audiences that need watershed education and then identify who will do an education program for that specific audience.

Comment: Options for pervious alternatives to things such as driveways should be more available to the public (Connie Fortin)

Len Kremer and Jack Frost responded by saying that the Metropolitan Council BMP manual for small sites is coming soon.

Planning Process

Comment: Issue A14 talks about structural solutions. The Commission should itemize out solutions that can be attained through prevention or other alternative methods (Connie Fortin)

Question: How will the plan fit with city plans? (Shane Missaghi)

Len Kremer answered by saying that the Commission will look at city controls to determine if they meet Commission standards.

Erosion Control

Comment: The Commission should attempt to use their approval authority to make comments that attempt to make ordinances from the different member cities very similar to each other. (Joel Settles)

WMC/City Responsibilities

No comments were raised.

Funding

No comments were raised.

G. Identify New Issues

New Issue: (Submitted by Dave Stack) Len Kremer summarized the issue by saying that there is interest in making Bassett Creek canoeable from the outlet at Medicine Lake to

the diversion. Currently, flood control structures prevent the free passage of canoes through this stretch of creek.

New Issue: (Submitted by Don Maxwell)

The relative contribution of street maintenance and other materials to lake and stream pollution is unknown. Some road sand is ground into fine particles by traffic. Some is collected by sweeping. The remainder enters the watershed. Would increased budgeting for road sweeping or other changes in road maintenance make significant contributions to water body improvement? Data on quantities of road maintenance materials distributed by various agencies should be collected and amount recovered by sweeping estimated.

BCWMC can coordinate gathering of data on materials usage and recovery by sweeping, and prepare a material balance on sand, salt, and other materials distributed on streets in the watershed to estimate contribution to lake and stream pollution and sedimentation.

New Issue: (Submitted by Don Maxwell)

There is now general recognition that mowed lawns and other heavily tended yard areas have absorption characteristics not much different from what is now classified as impervious. Existing permitting procedures overly restrict build areas while not providing for unmowed areas that have desirable water retention characteristics.

BCWMC should work to get municipalities to revise ordinances and procedures to recognize and encourage retention and creation of untended land areas, particularly near water bodies and on private property. The contribution of such areas to flood control and pollution reduction should be emphasized.

H. Issue Prioritization

There were 12 poster boards placed around the meeting room that listed the major issues by topic. The members of the TAG were given 10 stickers and were asked to place a sticker next to the 10 issues they feel are high priority issues.

I. Review of Flooding Policies

Discussion on flooding policies was tabled until next meeting.