

# Stormwater Program Review Focus Group

## Note taker form

Name: Stormwater Program Review notes Dale Thompson

Date: 9/12/07

Time: 1:30 pm

Location: Conf. Rm. 2A

\*Note taker: Please write down common themes that you hear. We don't want you to transcribe the conversation.

Attending: Don Kyser, Tim Larson, Anne Gelbman Bill Dunn, Greg Gross, Melissa Wenzel, Jeff Risberg, Troy Johnson, Nancy Drach

1. React to this **vision statement** about storm water management. It is apparent from the statement it will take all of our efforts to accomplish.

MPCA does not have control over that or the most important factors related to it- more LGU control is needed

Science to accomplish that is not there yet- gap exists- years to get there

Make the goal more personal to people- so they care-

How/when/where do you measure that goal?

Go to higher quality- improvement in quality

Pre and post development enters where? Existing development can/should be viewed different than new development

---

End result should be in line with the resource/use

---

Issues with the definition/use/path that of some of the terms take-

---

Address sustainability for the future

---

Urban vs agricultural runoff should there be a vision for both?

---

Stormwater ponds are a collection concentration point

---

Prevention not included

2. As you consider stormwater management in Minnesota, **what is going well** that you **wouldn't** want to change/lose/

Some locations land-use are on track already- don't mess that up

---

Energy and dedication of a group SSC is great- not to lose

---

Momentum on some local shoreland improvements is good

---

Push beyond for better design, still end of pipe-pond approach is still dominant

---

Public awareness of stormwater system is improving

---

Growth in the program is encouraging, coordination with other programs

---

Reasonable expectations and timeline for increasing requirements

---

Communication statewide improving, conferences happening/including stormwater

---

Local conditions vary and let local control determine need- has shifted to local in some places- may not exist where it is needed most.

---

3. What currently is **not working** the way you would like or what issues/opportunities do you see? Developing areas not able to respond appropriate to the needs for good management, don't take ownership, don't set up to win if it legal or financially. Staff resources and ordinances with good BMPs at local level are missing; result in missed opportunities on current development. Motivate the community to develop and implement good ordinances. Is there more we can do to promote good development/mgmt- too late when it gets to us. Early in process is responsibility of local and not happening-not working well. Is enforcement an effective tool to get change in local policy? Concern that the science is so far behind that all waters will be Impaired before we figure out effectiveness of BMPs. Is structural treatment needed? Good monitoring of stormwater parameters helps to focus on solutions. Putting limits on discharge of stormwater discharge from industrial ex. Ethanol plants. Expired industrial permit has caused some setback/lost opportunities. Missing opportunities with smaller-subMS4 communities- will have to suffer the impacts; look at potential impacts to sensitive waters to target efforts. Huge savings on economy of scale- show both good pictures and bad-disasters from poor management.

4. What didn't we ask you that you want to tell us?

Severe lack of technical resources/expertise of small communities can cause the poor development. Can the state raise the bar statewide? Set specific minimum requirements at state level. Require a stormwater plan for redevelopment. Some cities make innovative BMPs more difficult to use; some LGUs say stormwater not my problem-some other unit/level of government. Opportunities to improve stormwater during street improvements not being made if it costs more money. Remove confusion due to multiple layers of permitting- duplication. Surcharging for increase contribution of stormwater to discharge like WWTP does- Met Council. Cities are not thinking ahead on capital needs for stormwater- far out into the future- money to manage and improve stormwater. O&M not funded also. Are stormwater utility fees being properly directed/used? Need an extension service/private/public advocate for stormwater like we have for wastewater. Development agreements have the potential to set the standards/direction steer toward a better management; also can deal with long term management responsibilities. May be easier than passing an ordinance. Stormwater hierarchy like we have for stormwater like did for Solid Waste. Need to have some proof that innovative methods will work for both permitting or sell the concept to users. What is the tolerance for risk on new designs; are we stifling innovation.