

LMRWD – 5th Generation Watershed Management Plan Phase 2 – What Do We Want

Workshop Notes

Tuesday, March 17, 2009

10am – 2:00pm

Chaska City Hall – Council Chambers

Facilitated by Della Young

HDR Engineering, Inc

Workshop Overview

- Welcome and Introductions
- Review the purpose statement of Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)
- Review ground rules established at the January Meeting

Workshop Overview (Con't)

10-min Speed Chat Session

After each slide (Phase 1 – Recap and Survey Results), TAC members were directed to get in groups, and address the following questions.

Questions

1. What items have we missed?
2. What challenges would LMWRD face implementing some of these items?
3. Which of the suggestions are the highest priority? Why?

Answers to these questions were documented on slides labeled 'Workshop Notes'

Workshop Attendees

- Jack Gleason, DNR
- Jeremy Rivord, DNR
- Laura Jester, Dakota SWCD
- Tim Sundby, Carver County
- Dan Edgerton, Bonestroo
- Bryan Gruidl, Bloomington
- Larry Samstad, LMRWD Manager
- Jack Frost, MCES
- Stacy Sass, PLSLWD
- Gerry Shimek, USFWS
- Bill Monk, Chaska
- Len Kremer LMRWD Manager
- Lisa Lund, USACE
- Pete Beckius, Scott SWCD
- Clint Gergen, CHS Inc
- Brad Wozney, BWSR
- Susie Carlin, MRB
- Terry Schwalbe, LMRWD
- Joan Ellis, LMRWD
- Mike Johnson, HDR
- Dan Murphy, HDR
- Della Young, HDR

Assessment, Inventory and Monitoring Recap from Phase 1

- Natural resources inventories coordination
- Continued investigation of sedimentation of the river
- Continue or expand water monitoring
- Monitoring

Natural Resource Inventories Coordination (Survey Results)

- Develop written agreements with partnering organizations
- Serve as the coordinating agency among cities and counties to complete the inventories
- Provide incentive fund to have inventories completed
- Connect with land managers to prioritize needs
- Provide funding or in-kind assistance
- Potential projects: Refuge Bio Blitz, Invert surveys, exotic mapping

Workshop Notes - Natural Resource Inventories Coordination

- Missing Items
 - Coordinate with other districts and WMOs
 - Inventory existing data
 - Validate data / QA/QC
 - Determine gaps
- Challenges
 - Numerous groups/entities
 - Funding
- Priorities
 - None identified

Continued investigation of sedimentation of the River (Survey Result)

- Approach USGS to study watershed yield/ river flows on an annualized basis (past and present)
- Identify areas of high inflow and look for sources that assist with BMPs
- Bluff Creek is a big source

Workshop Notes - Continued

investigation of sedimentation of the River

- **Missing Items**
 - Incorporate players from MN River Watershed Study (performed by EQB, COE and USGS)
 - Make past studies available
 - Synthesize various studies
 - Others can assess sedimentation
 - Consider coring studies in partnership with University of Minnesota
- **Challenges**
 - Sediment balance could be difficult or impossible due to system dynamics
 - Data quality
- **Priorities**
 - Participate in existing studies
 - Flood and siltation studies
 - Continued investigation of sedimentation is a low priority
 - Analysis of monitoring data
 - Need to understand what is driving sediment balance issue (sediment loads in vs. sediment loads out)

Monitoring (Survey Results)

- Effect of Audubon Road on groundwater recharge to Assumption Creek
- For TMDLs
- Review existing monitoring effort and identify gaps in data collection

Workshop Notes - Monitoring

- **Missing Items**
 - Appropriate assessment of water bodies
 - Develop a focused monitoring program
 - Groundwater monitoring in the fens
 - Data analysis
 - Data sharing/ coordination with neighboring agencies
 - Add additional monitoring sites and define parameters
 - Review results and recommendations of TMDL studies
 - Stay informed of highway projects to monitor pre-, post- and during construction
- **Challenges**
 - Funding
 - Cooperation with Mn/DOT
- **Priorities**
 - Develop monitoring plans
 - Monitor fens, trout streams and floodplain lakes

Education and Outreach Phase 1 - Recap

- Water education
- Coordinate education/develop education plan
- Public education
- Public Awareness recognition of resources and coordinate with others
- Implement an education program cooperatively with partners

Workshop Notes – Education and Outreach

- Missing items
 - Identify current programs
 - Evaluate current programs
 - Identify target audiences
 - Youth
 - Public at large
 - Agency technical staff
 - MS4 communities
 - Prioritize education items
 - Coordinate with MS4 communities
 - Consider alternative tools
 - Internet
 - Blogs
- Challenges
 - Integrating activities with other organizations
 - Education coordinator funding
 - Public access to information
 - Public knowledge of resources
- Priorities
 - Continue River Tour
 - Use existing cost-effective tools
 - Blue Thumb
 - NEMO

Channel Maintenance Phase 1 - Recap

- Develop beneficial usage of dredge material
- Manage channel
- Manage sediment
- Find other dredge material sites
- Removing dredge material from placement sites

Develop beneficial usage of dredge material (Survey Result)

- Develop relationships with contractors
- Work with MPCA on testing and marketing
- Locate potential upland sites
- Educate others on what the material consists of
- Give material away until they know who and why it is being used, then charge for it. Contact local entities to see if there is a need. Send a yearly newsletter to local contractors notifying of availability.
- Explore use of dredge material on farm fields.

Workshop Notes - Develop beneficial usage of dredge material

- Missing
 - Communicate with Mn/DOT
 - Connect with mining industry to manage and sell material
 - Determine dredge material characteristics
 - Build a public use
 - Negotiate with MPCA and legislature
- Challenges
 - Liability (LMRWDC becomes a part of the chain of custody when they receive the material) and MPCA
 - Pollution laws
 - Needs for clean bill of health (boron a potential problem)
 - Determine if Mn/DOT can use
 - Proposed impact on funding
 - Hauling or dewatering the material (COE can move 4 miles without additional cost)
 - MPCA standards
 - Determining local uses
 - Identify contaminants
 - Cost of transportation
 - Role of disposal sites in floodplain management
 - Built up silt in floodplain
 - Acquiring funding specifically for MN River (COE spends \$150K per year)
- Priorities
 - Work with MPCA
 - Find viable local uses
 - Develop management strategy for spoils sites
 - Locate additional sites (one usable site – COE and one for Private)
 - Maintain channel all the time
 - ID characteristics of the material

Role in managing 9-foot channel (Survey Result)

- A lead role
- Army Corps should have lead role w/ LMRWD pushing for more than min. maintenance
- Technical advisor
- LMRWD's role is local sponsor which requires LMRWD to acquire suitable placement sites. LMRWD could support the Corps funding for the MN River and ask for congressional funds for developing placement sites.
- Isn't it in the charter?

Workshop Notes – Role in managing 9' channel

- Opening Discussion Questions
 - What is the local cooperative agreement (LCA) between the COE and LMRWD?
 - How can the LMRWD go from where they are now to where things are on the Mississippi where the COE is responsible for everything?
 - How does the LMRWD address accessibility to sites it desires for spoil disposal?
- Missing
 - Possibility of disposing in old quarries
 - Consider use as fill in the metro area
 - Can the LMRWD just say 'No' to finding dredge spoil sites?
 - Potential the COE will stop dredging and commercial users would have the problem
 - Violates original charter
 - Find additional partners
 - Lobby congress to find out what the best use should be
 - Determine pre-settlement history of river. i.e. Could it have handled this barge traffic?
- Challenges
 - Consider as refuse
 - Floodplain management
 - Locations to stockpile until used
- Priorities
 - According to Charter = Local sponsor as required to find suitable sites
 - National benefits = national funding
 - Lobby with/for the COE to get funding

Role in managing sediment

(Survey Result)

- Possible monitoring to quantify problem
- Voice to improve erosion control upstream
- Technical advisor
- Understand sedimentation processes
- Assist landowners in projects to control sediment

Workshop Notes – Role in Managing Sediment

- Opening Discussion
 - This question was redundant because it was covered in investigation of sedimentation topic previously covered.

Find other dredge material sites (Survey Result)

- Corps and LMRWD need to work on Dredge Material Management Plan (DMMP) for area below I-35W to identify additional placement sites
- Notes
 - One exists for the area above I-35W..use as a reference guide (March 2007 – contact Lisa Lund)
 - ID'ing the sites in the DMMP adds power to the discussion
 - LMRWD Involvement w/ the development of the plan – they were stakeholders

Remove dredge material from placement sites (Survey Result)

- Work with parties to establish management plan which could keep a steady supply of material into the construction market
- Combine greenway connections w/ dredge placement
- Be part of restoration plans
 - (Need to investigate* - floodplain/wetland)
- Build access road into the Cargill East River placement site and hire a trucking contractor to remove the material

Workshop Notes - Remove dredge material from placement sites

- Opening Comments
 - “Work with parties to establish management plan which could keep a steady supply of material into the construction market” should be modified by removing ‘steady’
- Missing
 - Improve unloading facilities at both sites
 - Find local group to take material
 - Determine if there is competition from commercial contractors
- Challenges
 - Properties of the dredged material
- Priorities
 - None identified

Partnering and Coordination Phase 1 - Recap

- How to coordinate with other entities
- Leverage existing public land managers
- Boundaries set at immediate inflows
- Build partnerships
- Coordinate with upstream entities
- Actively engage TAC and CAC throughout plan development and implementation

Workshop Notes – Partnering and Coordination

- “In what specific ways can LMRWD coordinate with your organization?”
 - City of Chaska
 - Partner to implement educational component of MS4 obligations
 - MN Wildlife Refuge
 - Managing natural habitat
 - Public use/access
 - Natural resources restoration
 - Education
 - Monitor natural resource issues
 - Springs
 - Wetland water quality
 - Groundwater contaminants study
 - Partner w/ University of MN and City of Bloomington
- “How should LMRWD coordinate with upstream organizations?”
 - How do we strengthen MN Water Law to protect downstream landowners?
 - Send mailers to adjacent watershed districts to inform them about the impacts they may have on water quality in the district
 - Can LMRWD file lawsuits against upstream entities to reduce water quality impacts from upstream if partnering and coordination do not work?
 - Can the LMRWD use the Lake Pepin TMDL as a means to enforce upstream sources of sediment?

Workshop Notes – Partnering and Coordination

- “Should the LMRWD change its boundaries to include any watershed areas outside of its current jurisdiction?”
 - Can ask the question a different way: “Should the district be dissolved and the upstream districts come all the way to the river?”
 - Arguments against:
 - District should work with abutting watersheds. The LMRWD is a catalyst for improving quality of its unique resources. (Chaska)
 - Forming a watershed at a large scale will not work. LMRWD is what works for this situation (Met Council)
 - A watershed district at the scale of the Minnesota River is too big to be functional and LMRWD should work with upstream partners.
 - Arguments for:
 - District is set up to fail given the lack of control
 - There are so many things that are going on outside the District beyond its jurisdiction
 - Can the WSD be organized as a Navigation Authority so it can focus on this role?