

Second Generation Plan TAG Meeting Minutes

Bassett Creek Water Management Commission

June 25, 2001

A. Attendance: Ken Gothberg, Pat Wrase, Jeff Oliver, Ed Silberman, Shane Missaghi, Don Maxwell, Connie Fortin, Joel Settles, Lisa Goddard, Doug Snyder, John Barten, Guy Johnson, Jennifer Posma, Tom Mathisen, Jason Westbrook, Len Kremer

B. Agenda

1. Review May Meeting Minutes
2. Q & A
3. Review TAG Recommendations
4. Finish water quality discussion -- prioritization, costs of projects, stream water quality
5. Discuss wetland controls, goals and issues
6. Discuss public ditches
7. Preview next meeting

C. Welcome and Introduction

Len Kremer welcomed the group and previewed the evening's meeting.

D. Review of May 21 Meeting Minutes

There were no comments or recommended corrections for the May minutes.

E. Review of TAG Recommendations

One small editorial change was recommended by Ed Silberman.

F. Water Quality

Water Body Prioritization

Are any other water bodies in the watershed that should make the Commission's prioritization list?

Since most of the water bodies that have recreational potential have already been considered, no recommendations were made to add water bodies.

The Commission should consider classifying streams according to the downstream receiving water body (Connie Fortin).

When is the cost too high for the benefit received?

We may have our nutrient target set too low. The MPCA recommends setting the Level I phosphorus target at 38 micrograms per liter. The current target is 30 micrograms per liter. Is there enough benefit from removing the extra 8 µg/l to justify the cost? (John Barten)

There are actual downfalls to clearer water because clearer water allows light to penetrate deeper which can cause more weeds to grow which creates the perception of a polluted lake. (Len Kremer).

What is an alum treatment plant? (Lisa Goddard). An alum treatment plant is different from a one-time in-lake alum treatment in that it treats water flowing into a water body with alum to remove phosphorus. It is generally used in areas where ponding is not available. (Len Kremer)

It is difficult to compare costs and benefits without comparing the costs to other current needs for money. (Ed Silberman)

Wirth Lake and Medicine Lake made the MPCA Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) list. The Creek may make the list soon. This will require certain treatment and removal rates.

A prioritized list is still going to depend on local funding because of the WMO structure. How do we determine the cost share percentage for projects? (Tom Mathisen)

The current prioritized looks good except Twin Lake is too far down. Twin Lake is an absolute jewel of a resource and we need to protect it. (Jeff Oliver)

All of the improvements recommended in the memo are structural. Is there an education component? (Connie Fortin) Yes, the education programs are outlined in the individual watershed and lake management plans. (Len Kremer)

The Commission should focus on the recommended projects that remove the largest percentage of nutrients (Lisa Goddard). Some of the projects that show 0% removal of nutrients actually clean a pollutant other than phosphorus. (Len Kremer) We need a bigger picture of the improvement relative to the goal for pollutants other than phosphorus. Add another column to the table that explains the project and the target pollutant to be removed (Don Maxwell). Also, the cutoff point for reporting nutrient removal may not be low enough. There is a difference between treating 0% and 0.5%. (Don Maxwell).

Stormwater Quality

At the last meeting we decided we wanted all stormwater in the watershed treated to the Level I standard. Is there any further discussion on this and is there any other current policy that needs to be changed?

It will be difficult to defend level I treatment of all stormwater to developers. (Jeff Oliver) NURP standards require different dead storage volumes for treatment ponds depending on the receiving water body.

No one has the right to degrade water quality. Rather than set standards, set a requirement to meet existing water quality downstream. That way there is no increase in nutrients and the developer knows he has to demonstrate and build whatever it takes to

achieve this goal. (John Barten) The requirement should be to reduce nutrient loads in order to improve water quality. (Ken Gothberg)

We must be careful in what we require. There are a lot of issues packaged into this requirement. We cannot disregard that development contributes to the tax base. We need to do the best we can to protect our resources and balance that against all of the other public needs. (Jeff Oliver)

We need a Level 0 standard of treatment. We are not doing enough to get the best water quality possible (Connie Fortin)

You have to pick what resources you want to protect. Something will degrade or you can't develop. (John Barten) That is why prioritization is so important. Through prioritization people can justify spending big money on the real gems. (Jeff Oliver)

Bassett Creek should remain unaffected. We need to look beyond where we swim and boat and look at the entire ecosystem. If we were charged for all of the nutrients we put into the Mississippi we would have a different approach. (Connie Fortin)

What about maintenance?

We need to make sure the ponds are maintained to keep the residence times they were originally designed for. (Joel Settles)

Is there a good understanding of the maintenance required for treatment ponds? (Len Kremer) Plymouth does not have a regular scheduled maintenance plan for its ponds.

Regional detention ponds are probably more favorable from a maintenance standpoint. (Len Kremer)

How will life change with upcoming requirements such as the Met Council Load Restrictions, TMDL program and NPDES program?

The natural progression is a mandated program with required maintenance. (John Barten)

The Commission will be involved in helping member cities get their municipal permits. (Joel Settles)

Currently the cities are responsible for maintenance. The Commission only does inspections and goes to the cities with their recommendations. (Len Kremer)

There does not appear to be a consensus on the level of treatment for stormwater. We will spend time discussing the issue at the next meeting and possibly vote on recommendations. (Len Kremer)

G. Wetland Controls, Issues and Goals

The agencies are urging the Commission to get more involved in wetland management.

Current 2nd Generation Plans requires a wetland inventory. (Doug Snyder)

Golden Valley has done a wetland inventory. The table shows that they have not. (Jeff Oliver)

The Commission should have a policy encouraging communities to do a wetland inventory. (Ed Silberman)

The Commission should set standards for a functional assessment so all consultants writing plans for member cities use the same standards. (Joel Settles)

The Commission could start with the Minnesota _____ and narrow down the standards from 12 to 5.

Should the Commission require a buffer around all wetlands?

Not all wetlands are created equal. The buffer requirement should vary according to the management class of the wetland – like Plymouth’s plan. (Doug Snyder)

What is the definition of restoration? What requirements can be imposed upon us if we do a wetland inventory? (Tom Mathisen)

Yes, the Commission should get involved in requiring setbacks. (Don Maxwell)

The Commission should attempt to make wetland setback requirements similar across all member cities.

H. July Meeting

The next meeting will be Monday, July 23. The agenda items will be public ditch issues, fish and wildlife issues and PAG recommendations.

The meeting adjourned at 6:10 p.m.