Minnesota River Urban Sector Meeting Summary

April 25, 2007

Minnesota Pollution Control Agency
What are the issues?

1. What are the major contributions of the urban sector to the improvement of the Minnesota River?

2. What does the urban sector believe are the critical issues to be faced while moving forward?
What are the major contributions of the urban sector to the improvement of the Minnesota River?

Enhanced Wastewater Improvements
Historical Good Housekeeping Techniques
Controlled Runoff Management Practices
Established Local Regulations
Participation and Education
Enforcement of Local & State Regulations
Enhanced Water Improvements

WWTF currently upgrading treatment facility

Waste water treatment plant upgrades & extensions
Historical Good Housekeeping Techniques

- Street sweeping
- Committed street sweeping program
- Active street sweeping program
- Cities/counties providing household hazardous disposal sites
- Compost program for leaves & yard waste. WQ pond for runoff
- Started leaf and solids clean up with our streets program. Cooperation/education
- Ravine stabilization projects
- Street stabilization projects

Cooperation/education
Controlled Runoff Management Practices

- Started implementing Phase I requirements with the large cities (over 100,000) in 1991
- Building structural BMPs
- Continued construction of storm water detention ponds (both wet & dry) specifically for new development
- Regional ponding for storm water treatment
- Implemented BMPs
- Controlled additional discharges to river
- Implementing flow rate controls
- We have minimized our volume to MN River by installing basins that are capable of holding the 100 yr event for a watershed
- Construction of storm water quality ponds
- Required WQ treatment 75 acres Since 1997
- Created city-wide storm water model
Established Local Regulations

- Developed a storm water ordinance and made the effort to implement
- Implemented Storm water Management Ordinance 1997
- Publicized fines about businesses that have illegally dumped waste into the river
- Implemented permit requirements in advance of SWPPP requirements and permit all ROW activities
- Writing MS4 SWPPP
- Enforcing & complying with sediment control regulation
- Developed ordinances to protect river
- Produced ordinances to protect river
- Hold individuals (like residents) accountable for small activities like grass, sediment from activities over 120 sq. ft.
Awareness education

Raised awareness to public

Participated In Minnesota River Board activities

Media doing stories about clean-up groups

Worked with MPCA & MET Council to monitor the river

Participation & Education
Improved the Redwood River Bypass. This controlled flow thru the city’s drainage basin. Using project Inspectors, we help control impact on receiving waters during major construction projects. Last 10 yrs have been a growing period. Actively sought opportunities to create environmental win-win scenarios w/ development.

Restored and maintained disturbed area’s immediately following reconstruction. Controlled construction activities. Having taken some farmland in the flood plain and stopped farming operations.

Design sumps in all new storm sewer structures. Trained city staff on BMPs related to design & inspection of construction projects. Attempted compliance with NPDES construction permits.

Understanding & complying with NPDES storm water requirements for construction activity.
What does the urban sector believe are the critical issues to be faced while moving forward?

- Public Education and Participation
- Cost Effective Solutions
- Shared Responsibility & Commitment
- Basinwide Compliance
- Resource Enhancement
- Science Based Strategy
Increased commitment to achieve the goal

People buy into what is trying to be achieved

Promote public education on the water quality issues in our drainage basins

Education of the public

Everyone makes a difference and sometimes you can only do so much

Public Education & Participation

Education

Population adjustment
Impact vs. perceived impact

Funding challenge

Obstacle: lack of funding

Increases in land and crop values vs. BMP space needs

Money

Time

Cost Effective Solutions
Shared Responsibility & Commitment

- Shared responsibility - equal vs. fair: Who does what?
- Uniting the AG component
- Steam-line fix-it strategies
- Bringing Municipalities & Ag Community to a common focus
- Bringing the rural contributors of pollutants to rivers into the water quality battle
- Shared perception of the MN River as defined by the term water quality standards
- Consensus building toward an outcome
- Accepting responsibility
- Willingness to change
Increased penalties
money

Enforcement

Increased restrictions
-land use

Control development
to protect environmentally sensitive areas

Mutual timelines
for compliance and enforcement

**Basinwide Compliance**
Opportunity tools

Opportunity: pass clean water down-stream

Do our part to the MEP

Resource Enhancement

We have something worth saving
Identify the problem.

Identify the source.

Mitigate at the source.

Will it always be a muddy river?

Identify realistic clean river levels. Identify cost effective methods to reach levels.

Obstacle: lack of clear link from efforts to results.

Identify the problem. Identify the source. Mitigate at the source.

Know what the end result is and have a path.

Accurate science.

Science Based Strategy.

Obstacle: lack of clear link from efforts to results.

Science Based Strategy