

Stormwater Program Review

Focus Group Notes

Name: Brian Livingston (presenter); Kris Van Amber (facilitator);
Dave Richfield, Brian Livingston (themes); Mary Lynn (note taker)

Date: 10/11/07

Time: 9:30 – 11:30

Location: Minnesota Chamber of Commerce,

Attendees: MN Chamber of Commerce, Water Quality Sub-Committee,
Stormwater Task Force

- Tony Kwilas, MN Chamber of Commerce
- Loren Larsen, Caltha LLP
- Paul Schwinghammer, Red Barn Ridge
- Bob Evans, Excelsior Energy Inc.
- Fred Corrigan, Aggregate Ready Mix Association of MN
- Pat Bergin, Cemstone Products Company
- Dave Skolasinski, Cleveland - Cliffs
- Keith Hanson, Barr Engineering
- Kodi Jean Church, Great River Energy
- Eric Silvola, Great River Energy
- Sharon Sarrapo, Excel Energy
- Lisa Frenette, Builders Association of MN (came in late - participated in voting only)

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

1. React to this vision statement about stormwater management. It is apparent from the statement it will take all of our efforts to accomplish.
 - Confusing terms, what does volume mean; rate of discharge? Need definition.
 - How does it relate to permit (volume)?
 - All – should include individual households, agricultural runoff
 - High quality should apply to lakes, streams, rivers, groundwater
 - Stormwater – too many different methods / variations in sampling – how do you make the judgment of quality?
 - Term high quality is relative. Need definition.
 - Who is vision for – technical audience or the public?
 - Stormwater impacts need to include groundwater, not just surface water.
 - If to meet goal of vision, statewide must go after ALL point and nonpoint sources; specifically including agricultural.
2. As you consider stormwater management in Minnesota, what is going well that you wouldn't want to change/lose?
 - Emphasis on vegetation; ponding and on-site retention to reduce flooding;
 - Flexibility in resolving stormwater issues.
 - In metro area – watershed districts dealing with volume issues.

- General permits.
 - Outreach; the Agency is doing this fairly well right now.
 - The Agency starting down outreach avenue; need to do more on nonpoint side.
 - Huge variation in what cities are doing under the MS4 permit.
 - Discussion of MS4 permit minimum control measures, vehicle maintenance areas.
 - Outreach – need time, funding.
3. What currently is not working the way you would like or what issues/opportunities do you see?
- CSW permit is meaningless, redundant, serves no purpose for mine sites, aggregate sites. CSW permit or general permit? Construction never really ends.
 - Redundancy in permitting process; MPCA, watershed permits.
 - Within an MS4 area, how to deal with industrial facilities
 - Permits – money maker, fundraiser for Agency programs.
 - Need consistency in permits across the Agency (e.g. solid waste, water requirements in air permits); tank requirements in multiple permits when regulated under another program.
 - General permits vs individual permits – requirements so cumbersome in general permits that they are becoming individual permits.
 - Things in general permits that should be addressed in rulemaking.
 - Stormwater Manual being cast to cover all stormwater; doesn't address industrial.
 - Need flexibility in BMPs; how we design systems to address stormwater.
 - Good guidance needed in order to address consistency issue in sampling.
 - Need good sampling, good data, and good end use of data.
4. What didn't we ask you that you want to tell us? (What one thing to leave us with?)
- Water quality – need flexibility in general permits. ISW it's about BMPs and quality of discharge at outfall.
 - Don't want to spend a lot of money on monitoring for data that is useless.
 - Need consistency in requirements across state.
 - Agency shoe-horns changes into existing regulatory structure – get out of programmatic tower and deal with issues horizontally.
 - If stormwater is addressed in another NPDES program or through other regulatory mechanism, no need to address under another program.
 - Would like industry specific permit – aggregate.
 - Water is extremely regulated, multiple agencies. Stormwater is rain and snowmelt - other issues get pulled into stormwater (e.g. fugitive dust).
 - Concerned with sampling and timing of sampling. Also, information that needs to be included in SWPPPs, level of detail, will be very challenging to keep updated.
 - Redundancy of permitting.
 - Need to get good data to work with – need good guidance.
 - Need consistency in processes and enforcement; multiple levels (state and local) need more help. Agency web site is phenomenal; but need people in the room.
 - ISW permit – look to other states; may not need to include everything...
 - Timeliness and consistency are most important.
 - Agency doing great job with education and outreach.