



Bassett Creek Watershed Management Commission

Meeting Notes of the
Watershed Plan Steering Committee
November 6, 2024 @ 8:30 a.m.
Brookview, Golden Valley

Meeting Attendees:

Committee Chair Kennedy; Commissioners Hauer and Pentel; Alternate Commissioner Harwell; TAC Members Eckman and Scharenbroich; Community Member Loomis; Administrator Jester; Commission Engineers Chandler, Williams, and Johnson

1. WELCOME

Committee Chair Kennedy opened the meeting at 8:50 a.m.

2. REVIEW OCTOBER 2 MEETING NOTES

There was a consensus that the meeting notes were appropriate as presented.

3. REVIEW PLAN DEVELOPMENT PROGRESS TRACKER

Staff briefly reviewed the progress of plan development. Staff reported they would bring a schedule for the remaining plan development tasks to the December PSC meeting. Chair Kennedy noted he would like the group to start reviewing the potential costs of implementing activities.

4. REVIEW UPDATED MONITORING PLAN

Commission Engineer Johnson reminded committee members that at the October meeting the group briefly discussed the monitoring plan and requested additional information on parameters being monitored in Wirth Lake by MPRB. Since then, Commission Engineers updated the monitoring plan to include the additional vegetation surveys in Wirth Lake. Staff confirmed that all other regular BCWMC monitoring parameters and protocols are already performed by MPRB for Wirth Lake. For all lakes, staff recommended removing the practice of collecting and analyzing data for AIS suitability parameters as a cost saving measure and because we have already collected AIS suitability data for each lake and the analyses are not changing from year to year. Plus, there are no practical management responses that tie to results. Staff also noted the addition of examples of when carp monitoring may be desired within the monitoring program to the text of the monitoring plan.

Engineer Johnson reminded committee members that the group had also requested recommendations for any additional program adjustments that staff may recommend as the Commission moves into its next 10-year plan. Engineer Johnson noted a suggestion to add two more early season sampling events in each lake. She noted that currently there is a long gap between the ice-out sample and the next sample in June. She reviewed the typical sample collection time periods of one just after ice out, one in June, one in July, two in August, one in September, and winter monitoring for chloride. Engineer Johnson noted that the recommendation would be for these two additional samples to include water quality and phytoplankton. For cost saving purposes, staff do not recommend additional zooplankton sampling during these events; zooplankton sampling up to one time per month should be sufficient. There was discussion about ice-out timing, the timing of turnover in a lake, the reasons for adding sample dates, and that most other organizations collect several more samples during the year. The group reviewed likely costs associated with additional samples and noted the need for additional flexibility in the timing of sample collection. The committee agreed to accept the Commission Engineer's recommendations for two additional sample collection time periods during the open water season.

5. REVIEW LINEAR PROJECT STANDARDS AND DISCUSS POTENTIAL CHANGES

Commission Engineer Chandler reported that the Commission's water quality standards are different for linear projects than for non-linear projects and she reviewed the timeline of how the Commission standards have changed over the years along with the new standards included with the MPCA's latest MS4 permit. Engineer Chandler reported that the Commission has been tracking linear projects and how different standards would

have applied to each project. There have been 47 linear projects since 2015. Of those projects, only 1 project triggered the current Commission standard while 34 of the projects would have triggered the 2015 standard.

Engineer Chandler reviewed the MS4 permit standards for linear projects which must be followed by all nine member cities. She noted that while the standard is very similar to the Commission's 2015 standard, the MS4 permit standard includes some vague language. She advocated for the development of guidance or a checklist to help compare linear projects across different cities. Engineer Chandler reviewed her recommendation for a revision to the Commission's linear project standard. She noted that if it were in place, the recommended standard would have triggered water quality improvements on 10 (21%) of the 47 projects installed since 2015. She noted that many other watersheds have similar review triggers and standards.

There was discussion about how a checklist might work and/or if "other documentation" is an appropriate requirement. Committee member Eckman noted that the current MS4 permit language is actually equitable across cities because it allows flexibility. He noted that each city is different and has different capacity, resources, soils, funding, etc. to meet strict standards. He also noted that the Minnesota Cities Stormwater Coalition is still working on developing a checklist. There was further discussion about the advantages and drawbacks to having more prescriptive standards or a checklist. There was also discussion about potential redundancy in reviews with both state and watershed reviews. There was also a question about whether cities would get credit for past BMPs installed to offset development.

Committee members Scharenbroich and Eckman agreed that the BCWMC having the same standards as the MS4 permit would be okay but worried that cities might be told they aren't doing enough to treat stormwater in linear projects. They also agreed that the Commission Engineer's recommended standard was likely appropriate but would like more time to review the rate control standard. It was noted a graphical timeline of varying linear project standards (including prior MS4 permit requirements) would be helpful to view.

There was consensus on the committee that the Commission Engineer's recommendation for revised linear project standards should be discussed at an upcoming TAC meeting.

6. DISCUSS POTENTIAL CHLORIDE REDUCTION STRATEGIES

Administrator Jester noted that chloride reduction is a high priority goal but that most chloride reduction strategies involve training on best practices and raising public awareness. She reviewed potential options for regulating chloride use or requiring certain activities involving winter maintenance or low salt design including:

- Requiring or providing funding for city staff to take the low salt design workshop and/or requiring or developing a checklist for considering low salt design techniques with each development
- Developing specific requirements for appropriate snow and salt storage for development projects that meet certain parameters
- Requiring that certain developments develop and file a winter maintenance plan

Committee member Eckman reported that Golden Valley requires chloride management plans from developers when stormwater management agreements are in place. Committee member Scharenbroich noted that Plymouth and likely Minneapolis also have chloride management plan requirements. Committee member Hauer noted it would be helpful to know how other cities are addressing chloride pollution. There was some discussion about low salt design workshops, their cost, and potential proprietary materials.

There was consensus on the committee that potential chloride reduction strategies should be discussed at a TAC meeting. Items to discuss at that meeting should include a review of Golden Valley and Plymouth requirements for chloride management, options for less expensive alternatives for learning about and incorporating low salt design ideas, and reviewing MS4 permit chloride regulations.

7. REVIEW UPDATED EDUCATION & ENGAGEMENT PLAN

Due to time limitations, this item will be discussed at the December meeting.

8. DISCUSS PLANS FOR NEXT COMMISSION WORKSHOP ON EDUCATION AND ORGANIZATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

GOALS - The group agreed that four small discussion groups would be appropriate for the November workshop as small groups have worked well for previous workshops. Staff will develop workshop materials.

9. ADJOURN – The meeting adjourned at approximately 10:32 a.m.