



## Bassett Creek Watershed Management Commission

### Commission Workshop on Next Generation Watershed Management Plan Meeting Minutes

4:00 – 6:00 p.m.

Monday August 11, 2014

Hennepin County Library Golden Valley Branch 830 Winnetka Ave, N; Golden Valley MN 55427

**Attendees:** Plan Steering Committee (PSC) Chair Linda Loomis, Commission Chair de Lambert, Commissioner Black, Commissioner Hoschka, Commissioner Carlson, Commissioner Mueller, Alternate Commissioner Goddard, Alternate Commissioner Crough, Alternate Commissioner Tobelmann, Alternate Commissioner McDonald Black; TAC members Oliver, Francis, Eberhart; Administrator Jester, Engineer Chandler, Steve Christopher (BWSR), Rachel Olmanson (MPCA), Karen Jensen and Emily Resseger (Met Council), Randy Anhorn (Hennepin County), Jim Prom (Plymouth City Council)

#### 1. Welcome and Introductions

Chair de Lambert opened the meeting at approximately 4:00, welcomed the group, and thanked Plan Steering Committee members for their work, especially committee Chair Linda Loomis. Introductions were made around the table.

#### 2. Review Progress of Plan Development

Administrator Jester gave an overview of progress made to date during previous workshops including finalizing goals for the Plan. She noted that many policy sections were close to being completed and that the Plan Steering Committee (PSC) had a joint meeting with the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) shortly after the last workshop to discuss the possibility of using MIDS as the Commission's water quality standards in the Plan. She noted that after considerable discussion, there was consensus that the MPCA's Minimal Impact Design Standards (MIDS) should be used and that revised policies for consideration tonight include that recommendation. She noted that after one more workshop in late September or early October, the draft Plan should be ready for a 60-day review in November. She reminded the group that only policies highlighted in orange would be discussed at the meeting unless someone "pulled" a different policy for discussion (similar to a consent agenda).

#### 3. Review Draft Policies in Water Quality and Flooding and Rate Control Sections

Engineer Chandler reminded the group that at the last workshop (in April) the group discussed the question of using MIDS but ultimately sent the issue back to the Plan Steering Committee and the TAC. During a joint meeting of the PSC and the TAC, there was consensus to use MIDS. The policies in need of discussion and approval at this workshop reflect that recommendation. There was some discussion about the pros and cons of using MIDS. Engineer Chandler noted that although the requirements were more stringent than current policies, there was also flexibility built into the standards and that many sectors and experts had jointly developed the standards. Ms. Jensen noted that the MIDS language that provides different standards for linear projects should be included in the Commission policies. The group agreed that was an oversight and to add this language.

Policy #13: Will add language regarding linear projects

Policy #24: Okay as written

Policy #46: Engineer Chandler noted that this policy requires the MIDS infiltration standards so it's included in the rate and flood control policy section. She noted the language regarding linear projects would also need to be added to this policy. Administrator Jester noted that further details on MIDS would be included in the Requirements Document. Mr. Oliver asked how this policy compares with current rate and volume control requirements. Engineer Chandler reported there is currently a requirement for conformance with the flood control project system design and that draft policy #45 includes a requirement for cities to manage stormwater runoff so that future and peak flow rates leaving development and redevelopment sites are equal to or less than existing rates. Alternate Commissioner Goddard noted that policy #45 (or at least the Requirements Document) should indicate which events require the rate control (e.g. 2-year, 10-year, and 100 year storms).

Ms. Jensen asked if the Minnesota Stormwater Manual is referenced for design guidance (to protect groundwater from infiltrating through contaminated materials). Engineer Chandler noted it was referenced in policy #67. The group agreed draft policy #46 is okay as written with the addition of linear project language.

Policies #58 and 59: Engineer Chandler noted these policies were recent additions in order to address the approved goal related to climate change. There were no comments on the draft policies; approved as written.

#### **4. Review Draft Erosion and Sediment Control Policies**

Engineer Chandler noted that the group had not yet seen the Erosion and Sediment Control policies but that most were not controversial and the requirements would stay the same from the 2004 plan.

Policy #74: There was consensus that the policy was appropriate. Okay as written.

Policy #79: Engineer Chandler noted that some member cities hoped this Plan would address end-of-pipe sediment sources and controls. This policy works to address these issues on a case by case basis. There was some discussion about what was included in possible Commission funding including sampling and testing. Ultimately, the group decided the phrase "may fund removal" implies total costs.

#### **5. Review Draft Stream Restoration and Protection Policies**

Policy #82: The group discussed how soft armoring of streambanks doesn't always allow the preservation of riparian trees and how residents' desires often dictate what would be done for streambank restoration in a particular area. The group agreed more education to residents is needed regarding streambank restoration and protection. Administrator Jester noted it could be added as a message in the Education and Outreach Plan. Commissioner Mueller recommended that a fact sheet noting the benefits of soft armoring be developed for use with landowners. Ms. Jensen noted that soft armoring can improve aquatic habitats and reminded the group that the MPCA is looking at standards that effect aquatic life. The policy is okay as written.

Policy #95: Some in the group indicated that a 10-foot buffer requirement doesn't do enough to protect streambanks. Mr. Oliver noted that often the streambanks in need of protection are in backyards without a lot of space. He indicated it was a fair starting point and a good compromise. There was discussion about the trigger used to require the buffer which is proposed to be the same as the trigger for requiring

MIDS. After further discussion the group agreed a lower trigger was appropriate and decided on the trigger used to require erosion and sediment control: 10,000 sq. ft. of disturbed area or 200 cubic yards of cut or fill. The policy will be revised to reflect this trigger.

## **6. Review Draft Wetland Policies**

Policy #96: Little discussion; group agreed the policy is reasonable and allows flexibility. Okay as written.

Policy #97: There was some discussion about wetlands currently used for stormwater treatment. The group agreed that those wetlands would not be classified as Preserve or Manage 1 and thus would not require the protections in ordinance. Policy is okay as written.

Policy #99: There was some discussion about previous development around wetlands, the triggers for requiring buffers and which types of wetlands should require buffers. Commissioner Black noted the importance of the policy and that eastern Plymouth would be redeveloping in the next 20 years. Mr. Oliver noted that regulations need to “walk the fine line” between economic opportunity and resource protection. Ultimately, the group agreed the policy was okay as written.

Policy #104: There were some questions about the accessibility of wetlands for inspection. The group agreed that if a wetland was inaccessible due to private property, then the “when feasible” clause would come into play. There was some discussion about terrestrial invasive species and what different cities are doing to combat them. It was noted that controlling invasive species could be included in the Education and Outreach Plan. Policy is okay as written.

## **7. Review Draft Ditch Policies**

Policy #107: There was some discussion about the process for transferring ditch authority. Engineer Chandler noted that the policy only encourages cities to request taking ditch authority and noted that the process under MN Statute 383B.61 is refined and simple. Mr. Anhorn noted that it’s the County that holds a public hearing rather than the city. One minor edit was discussed: the addition of the words “is transferred” in the last sentence, after the phrase “Until authority over public ditches.” The policy is okay as revised.

## **8. Next Steps and Adjourn**

Administrator Jester reminded the group that another workshop would be needed in September or October. The meeting adjourned at 5:35 p.m.