



Bassett Creek Watershed Management Commission

Next Generation Plan Steering Committee Meeting Notes

4:30 p.m ~ Monday March 10, 2014
Golden Valley City Hall

Attendees: Committee Chair Linda Loomis; Commissioner Clint Carlson; Alternate Commissioners Pat Crough, Dave Tobelmann, and Lisa Goddard; TAC members Derek Asche and Joe Fox; Engineers Karen Chandler and Jim Herbert; Administrator Laura Jester

1. Call Meeting to Order

Chair Loomis called the meeting to order at approximately 4:35 p.m.

2. Approve Meeting Notes from February 11, 2014 Plan Steering Committee Meeting

There were no suggested changes to the notes from the March 11, 2014 meeting. Consensus to accept the notes as presented.

3. Discuss Commission Water Quality Standards and Triggers

Engineer Chandler reminded the group the TAC recommends the following:

- Trigger (for application of BCWMC water quality standards):
 - For all commercial, industrial and institutional development and redevelopment: 1 acre of disturbed area
 - For all residential development and redevelopment: 2 acres of disturbed area and 4 units
- Standard: Level 1 standards for all development and redevelopment

Engineer Chandler indicated that the Commission Engineer's recommendation was to adopt the Minimal Impact Design Standards (MIDS) as the Commission's new water quality standards and triggers. She noted these are more stringent requirements that would result in a reduction of polluted runoff from many sites in the watershed. Engineer Herbert reported that in looking at the past two years of development reviews by the Commission, 21 projects were required to implement best management practices to meet the Commission's current (Level 1) water quality treatment standards. If MIDS had been in place, 12 additional projects would have been required to meet water quality treatment standards (MIDS).

The group reviewed the MIDS provisions. Engineer Chandler noted the many "off ramps" in the guidance that allow for flexibility if certain criteria cannot be met including where infiltration will not work due to soils or contamination. MIDS requires certain pollutant removals (primarily through infiltration) when new and/or fully redeveloped cumulative impervious area is equal to or greater than one acre. Mr. Asche reported he liked the MIDS guidance and was hoping to use the guidance city-wide if it was compatible with all four of Plymouth's watershed organizations'

standards. He indicated MIDS was developed with much input from various stakeholders over several years and is being used by other entities in the Metro Area. Mr. Asche noted MIDS is flexible but he believes it's a better approach than requiring pollutant reductions from sites smaller than one acre. Plymouth currently requires pollutant reductions from development on sites ½ acre or larger. Mr. Asche believes the smaller practices (like small individual raingardens) are difficult to maintain and the small amount of pollutant removal accomplished may not be worth the costs of administration and maintenance of these practices. He also noted the calculator used in MIDS that "levels the playing field" as all MIDS users would be using the same assumptions and calculations.

Alternate Commissioner Tobelmann asked if there were any drawbacks to using MIDS. Mr. Asche indicated MIDS is more stringent (requires more pollutant removal) but is also more flexible. He noted MIDS relies more on infiltration but provides off ramps that end up being close to current Commission standards. Alternate Commissioner Goddard noted that MIDS helps capture redevelopment where stormwater improvement opportunities cannot be missed. Chair Loomis noted that some developers will drop a project if regulations are too onerous. She noted that the opportunity for improvement is completely lost at that point.

Mr. Fox indicated he agreed with Mr. Asche; that MIDS should work in Golden Valley and seems like a reasonable approach for the Commission. Administrator Jester shared comments from Commissioner Welch that were provided via email in support of MIDS but with a lower trigger than one acre. Mr. Asche noted that if a lower trigger was used, he would request that the Commission review these projects but that the city probably would not. The group continued a discussion about appropriate triggers including one acre vs. ½ acre and impervious surface vs. disturbed land area. In the end, they agreed that the current MIDS guidance is the most appropriate approach. Mr. Asche noted that water quality standards are only one piece of a three-pronged approach that also included education and CIP projects. He noted CIP projects can be used to more regionally treat runoff from small sites that are not captured by MIDS.

The group discussed the possibility of charging smaller developments/redevelopments fees to put towards more regional treatment systems. Engineer Chandler noted that one of the MIDS off ramps includes collection of fees if nothing else can be done onsite. Mr. Fox wondered if it was appropriate to cap the costs of best management practices at a certain percentage of total project costs. Alternate Commissioner Goddard asked if cities other than Minneapolis offer stormwater utility credits for BMPs. Mr. Asche reported that Plymouth does this; Golden Valley does not at this time.

It was noted that since the watershed is already almost fully developed, that any improvement in runoff is a change in the right direction. The group also agreed the MIDS guidance is consistent with the Commission's approach to water quality improvements. The group agreed to recommend use of MIDS (with no changes) as the Commission's water quality standards and triggers.

4. Review Re-revised Draft Policies for Water Quality and Flooding and Rate Control

Policy #10: Deleted as noted

Policy #13: Will be re-drafted by staff to be consistent with using MIDS as Commission standards and triggers.

Policy #18: Buffer standards will be addressed at the next Committee meeting

Policy #25: This policy needs to be discussed with the Commission at a future workshop and should be updated with use of MIDS

Policies #31 – #34: These policies depend on Commission discussion of the results of the Flood Control Project Long Term Maintenance and Replacement study.

Policy #59: This is a new policy; okay as written (will be moved to Administrative Section)

5. Review Final Policies for Erosion and sediment Control and Groundwater

Policy #61: Minor change of “water management” to “stormwater management.”

Policy #64: Some discussion about the reporting that would be required of cities on erosion control inspections. It was noted that the annual MS4 reporting provided by cities to the State should suffice for reporting to the Commission. (The policy was not meant to be onerous for cities.) The group decided to broaden the language to allow for flexibility in the future by adding the phrase “or as requested by the Commission” at the end of the policy.

Policy #77: Minor change to add “To protect groundwater quality” at the beginning of the policy.

Policy #80: Okay as written

6. Plan Next Plan Steering Committee Meeting and Commission Workshop

Administrator Jester reviewed a list of agenda items for discussion at a Commission Workshop. The group agreed the workshop should not be scheduled adjacent to (or with) a Commission meeting. The dates of April 21 and April 24 will be presented to the Commission as possible workshop dates with a meeting time late in the afternoon, to hopefully accommodate both Commissioners’ work schedules and review agency schedules.

The next Plan Steering Committee Meeting is scheduled for Monday March 24, 2014, 4:30 p.m. The meeting adjourned at 6:35 p.m.