

## **Stormwater Steering Committee**

### **March 15, 2007**

Attendees: Steven Pedersen, Cindi Kahrman, Joel Schilling, Andrea Hendrickson, Brian Livingston, Jack Frost, Paul Smith, Steve Klein, Jay Riggs, Cliff Aichinger, Gary Oberts, Jim Hafner, John Gulliver, Stephanie Berkland, Mac Cafferty, Nick Tiedeken, Nate Duoss, Art Persons, Don Jakes, Beth Neuendorf, John Chapman, Remi Stone, Paul Drotos, Julie Johnson, Jason Moeckel, Dan McLean, Jim Anderson, Steve Woods

Chair Report: Steven gave a brief introduction to the website Dan McLean has created for the SSC and OPS committees and workgroups. The site will be used as a work management tool, one in which information can be uploaded from workgroup projects and also as an administrative tool to update the SSC and OPS committees on workgroup activities. Workgroup leads are asked to take the leadership role for their groups; to seek to learn the work and needs of other workgroups. Steven introduced the “Stormwater Management Roadmap” and Brian Livingston elaborated on the Roadmap. Lisa Thorvig (MPCA), at the January SSC meeting, made a request to the SSC for help in identifying the resource needs for stormwater management in Minnesota, to look at the state’s needs as a whole. Steven said that the OPS is working to define those needs and over the next two months will take the framework as laid out in the hand-out, populate it with information and then send it to committee members. Discussions and guidance will then be sought from the SSC. A draft framework is expected in May of 2007. Spring of 2008 is the expected date for approval of a 10-year Stormwater Management Roadmap. It is hoped that the Roadmap will be used as a basis for the MPCA stormwater management budget for 2009. Joel Schilling suggested that Industry and MS4s should be a bullet item in section 3 of the framework handout. Because of limited resources, ways must be found to cover the most ground with the resources that are available. The vision and goal statement of the SSC may be looked at for possible revision as an outcome of the Roadmap work. Concerns were expressed over the short timeline of the project. The consensus was that it is a work in progress and it must move forward. It will be important to carry the work being done outside of the SSC to other entities and leaders to inform and educate.

Stormwater Infrastructure Needs Survey (SWINS) – Jim Anderson: Jim presented a handout defining the SWINS Survey. The previous survey, Wastewater Infrastructure Needs Survey (WINS), is a required survey by the state but not SWINS. The goal of the survey is to compile comprehensive information on the combined impact of the stormwater management needs and costs to municipalities, townships, to capture what entities are spending on stormwater management, and help inform decision makers on resource needs. It looks at capital improvements, operations, maintenance costs, education, and infrastructure costs. It is also a tool that can help communities posture themselves for grants. Jim posed the question: Is there a cycle of needs in Stormwater Management, Wastewater Management and TMDLs among communities, municipalities, and universities? The SSC was provided a draft of the survey questions at the meeting and will be shown another draft before it goes to the public. The draft questions are attached. Comments from the SSC should be sent to Jim before mid July.

Team Web Site – Dan McLean: Dan shared a handout on how to access the site and some of its features. He demonstrated how to access your workgroup, the method to look at activity that has taken place within a group, how to upload changes and to notify SSC members (all or some) by posting and sending messages. Dan will email members and provide a username and password to access the site for the first time. He is available to work with workgroup chairs on their needs and to meet with the workgroups to familiarize them with the site. Work Group chairs are encouraged to meet with Dan to plan out how best to use this tool to meet their needs.

## **Workgroup Group Reports**

Education: Brian spoke for Ron Struss who had retired as the chair of the workgroup. They are interviewing for his replacement at University Extension and hope to be hiring someone to fill the position soon. Not much activity has taken place. One program underway is the Blue Thumb program. It has about 30 partners and can be found at [www.bluethumb.org](http://www.bluethumb.org). Washington Conservation District has applied for funding for a MS4 educational toolkit .

LID Workgroup: Anne Gelbmann could not attend the SSC meeting, but the group plans to meet the week of March 19<sup>th</sup>.

Manual Workgroup: Brian spoke on behalf of Judy Sventek. The group is moving forward and plans to present the new manual and its revisions on June 7<sup>th</sup> from 8:00 to 12:00 at the MPCA office.

Monitoring and Research Workgroup: Bruce Wilson distributed the Stormwater Management Practice Assessment Project from the University of Minnesota and a draft Scoping of Needs for Stormwater Management. The centerpiece of the work is the partnership with the University of Minnesota. John Gulliver stated that outreach is a large part of the development of this project. He has been visiting around the state and country to learn about BMPs. Four pilot projects of needs will be the focus of the document and work:

1. Industrial: To develop case studies with up to six facilities, onsite cooperators to monitor sampling equipment with the hope to create an onsite study with the information
2. Municipal: Develop a clearinghouse for BMP information from around the state. There is a growing need for a database (Met Council maintains one presently). Need to develop a model for monitoring to implement BMPs for trout stream management. Pervious pavement monitoring is a huge growing BMP area.
3. Construction: Low Impact Design study (large 5-7 year study)
4. Research and Development: Need particle size sampling; there is no particle size information for Minnesota. Group may partner with Wisconsin on PAH study as WI is already in the process of doing a study. Andrea has done a great job of advancing the TP40 issue. Finding funding to get this activity started is still a critical priority.

The total package represents a core of needs to advance over the next three years. Joel expressed concerns over the cost to the MS4s and wondered where the funding will come from. Bruce and Don Jakes said that the MPCA will put forward requests for funding in the 2008 budget. Bruce felt that funds will also be found from the Met Council, EPA, MnDot, [Local Road Research Board \(LRRB\)](#), DNR, and other business groups and entities. He estimated that \$400,000 will

be needed over the next four years from the MPCA for these projects. The goal is to get a two for one match on monies. Bruce asked the SSC for its approval to move forward with the workgroup's proposals. A motion was made and passed. All efforts will be made to partner and leverage dollars to do these programs. In four months Bruce will come back to the SSC to address the issues of needs and more concrete funding sources for the pilot projects.

Industrial Workgroup: Cindi Kahrmann said the group is developing a draft Industrial permit. They have worked on concepts for monitoring and are testing those ideas within the MPCA. They are having good participation from their membership. Next they will develop concepts for nondegradation and impaired waters. They have tried hard to get environmental participation into the group. She stated that there was representation from the MPCA at the last meeting and it resulted in a very constructive meeting. The next meeting will be April 6<sup>th</sup>.

Legislative Report: Remi Stone stated that though the House and Senate have different timetables, in general, by March 23<sup>rd</sup> most policy will have been presented and by April 2<sup>nd</sup> money bills should be done and on their way for discussion. In her conversations with legislators, a wetlands bill will be passed.

Construction Workgroup: [There have been no meetings since the January Stormwater Steering Committee meeting. Subgroups are working on projects to bring back to the workgroup in April.](#)

Office of Legislative Auditors Report – Soil and Water Resources – Steve Woods (BSWR): Passed out a handout from the Office of the Legislature Auditor. The highlights of the report were two-fold. 1. Change the BWSR board so it will become one of an advisory board rather than its current position of policy making. 2. The work of BWSR should be more oversight in nature. BWSR agrees with the report as far as the needs of more oversight, but not with the structural changes the Auditor has inflicted on the BWSR board. In January BWSR sent the legislature a written response to the Report.

Watershed Management Report: Gary Oberts (Emmons & Olivier Resources) said they had an advisory board meeting and five more are scheduled. They have finished their focus group sessions, a survey went out to the Metro MS4 communities to look at their costs associated with the MS4 program, and work has started on the pilot area selection process; six have indicated interest, two will be chosen. He stated that others could participate but at their own expense which would be approximately \$10,000.

Miscellaneous Business: Steven assured the group that SSC members will automatically have access to the new website. Workgroup leads will need to work with Dan to get access for their members. Work will continue on the Roadmap project. John [Chapman](#) informed the committee of new and upcoming manuals and workshops. Cliff Aichinger said the Ramsey and Washington Watershed Management District will be hosting a tour in the district on May 28<sup>th</sup> and 29<sup>th</sup> of this year.

Meeting adjourned 4:00.

DRAFT OUTLINE OF SWINS – STORMWATER INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS SURVEY –  
INITIAL SURVEY INFORMATION NEEDS/REQUESTS  
March 15, 2007

1. Name of Community (*city, township or watershed district*)
2. Contact person for Stormwater Planning & Management  
(*If different from the contact listed in your SWPPP or your most recent MS4 annual report*)
3. Total area & land and water surface area of community in acres  
(*Where watersheds share stormwater management responsibilities with cities and/or townships land and water surface area “overlap(s)” and assignments of responsibilities should also be provided.*)
4. Percent of land surface area served by storm sewer system
5. Miles of storm sewers and number and type of ponds (*A list of pond types to choose from will be provided. This category would be expanded in future surveys to provide more comprehensive detail on types and numbers of BMPs and would also include the SWPPP Plan map scheduled to be completed in 2008.*)
6. For each capital (structural) and non-structural project:
  - Name of Project, Project type and Brief Description
  - What is the need and/or what will be accomplished by the project
  - Identification of estimated project cost & date of cost estimate
  - Designation of timeframe/schedule for addressing need (i.e. 0-5 yrs, 5-10 yrs, 10-20 yrs)
  - Categorization of need according to water quality / water quantity  
(*May involve multiple determinations for individual projects*)
7. Indication of current annual expenditure on operation and maintenance of stormwater management system including labor, materials, equipment, etc., itemized by major categories (e.g., street sweeping, pond cleanouts, etc.)

**Draft Monitoring, Research and Development**

## **Scoping of Needs for Industrial, Municipal and Construction Stormwater Management**

### **Approach**

- 2007 – 2010 MPCA Budget Proposal (not including other cooperators, below)
- Key work elements identified with refinement needed by committee
- Linkage of monitoring data to models, development of mass balances for watershed management.

### **I. Industrial**

Develop case studies with up to 6 representative facilities to document good BMP performances. Onsite cooperators to monitor sampling equipment, change sample containers etc. Outcome: case studies with general mass balance assessment that can be used for similar industries, downstream impacts assessments and MPCA permit condition review.

### **II. Municipal**

1. **Clearinghouse - Inventory of BMPs** – website tabulation of BMPs, locations, available summary information (e.g. case study).
2. **Monitoring Database** – Metropolitan Council's computer data base for intensive datasets (continuous logged data) in Metro area. No cost for first two years.
3. **Trout stream thermal management** – St. Anthony Falls Lab to perform thermal load study of Miller Creek (Duluth) and Vermillion River.
4. **Infiltration** – longer term study to be initiated (multiple goals, perhaps with LID).
5. **Pilot use of Assessment Levels 1- 4.**
6. **Pervious pavement monitoring**
7. **Proprietary device testing (very limited, most cost to be borne by manufacturer for Wisconsin and MN.)**

### **III. Construction**

1. **Low Impact Design study (5-7 years, paired study design.)**

### **IV. Research and Development (needed for one or more above categories)**

1. **Particle size sampling – needed for all above categories**
2. **Updating of TP40 Precipitation Intensity**
3. **Cooperative PAH study with WDNR/USGS.**
4. **Urban forestry – development of NURP criteria for urban forestry (preliminary contracts underway).**
5. **Refinement of urban models (contract underway for P8).**
6. **Disease vectors - Mosquito Control District –leverage with other cooperators.**
7. **Satellite remote sensing – rapid growth zones .**