

LMRWMO TAC Meeting Notes #1
June 3, 2021

Attendees:

Curt Coudron – Dakota SWCD PM
Krista Spreiter – MH NR technician
Foster Otten – WR Eng from WSB (Sunfish Lake)
Joe Mulcahy - MC
Ross Beckwith – WSP PW/Parks director
Jordan Donatell – MPCA watershed project manager
Melissa King – BWSR BC
Valerie Grover – Dakota County
Joe Barten – Dakota SWCD and LMRWMO Administrator
Greg Williams – Barr Engineering Co.

Notes

Discussion about which resources to prioritize:

Curt - ones on the cusp; barely or nearly impaired.

Jordan – MPCA has some products internally to pass along to consider trend information and nearly barely assessments. Knowing that these waterbodies are in stressful areas, would want to keep waterbodies that are off the list, still off the list, and improve those that are impaired. Smaller watersheds with developed areas are under a lot of stress.

MH – Valley Creek is a priority resource, addressing increasing erosion issue, newer and larger cuts. Extensive gullies. Getting Augusta off the impaired list.

WSP – Thompson lake is biggest priority in WSP. Mud Lake residents want it to be more like a lake, but it functions more like a wetland. At odds with expectations. DNR like its current function. Lily Lake is next priority. Not sure what current status is.

JM – MC – focus on lakes with high recreational value. Thompson and Seidl's. Maximize recreational opportunities for citizens. Even passive/external uses.

WSP – talk about putting a trail around Mud Lake. City owns perimeter for trail.

Valerie – in northern Dakota County, Mn is only GWQ concern. Pretty hard to do anything for it. Free well testing.

Chloride is a priority in the Dakota County GW plan. See higher levels near roads and stormwater ponds. Addressing stormwater is an avenue to address that.

Joe – Recommend developing a matrix of data to prioritize waterbodies:

- Impairment

LMRWMO TAC Meeting Notes #1
June 3, 2021

- WQ (nearly barely)
- Recreational use/access/adjacent parks
- Rate/volume control or potential for flood control
- Size of the watershed (tributary area)
- Land use/land ownership
- Intercommunity drainage areas
- Presents of AIS (aquatic invasive species)
- Downstream resource (where it drains)

KS – it can be hard to balance between restoration/protection/pollution prevention. AIS can be correlated to WQ with carp, CLP, in other instances it is recreation related. Maybe keep it as a separate issue.

JB – from a WQ perspective, AIS issues affecting WQ would be observed in the WQ results.

KS – lots of programs for addressing shoreline; fewer resources for open spaces/upland areas that affect WQ. Hard to provide support for residents.

CC – restoring upland areas is important, and very hard to quantify the benefits of converting turf grass to deep rooted prairie, for example.

KS – “lawns to legumes” was a successful program with respect to interest.

JM – MC; worth establishing a connection, if not quantified, to expand to upland areas (pollinator gardens, RWG, etc.). Prioritize upland areas related to whether waterbody is impaired, nearly/barely, good quality. Seen more interest in street sweeping.

KS - MH doesn't have its own street sweeper- most bang for buck.

More from the WMO –

WSP – likes when the WMO goes out and gets money for projects (SP very happy with that too – grant administration, managing \$\$, make grant acquisition a priority for municipal partners).

CC – plan process is best way to line up projects for funding. Be specific and prioritized.

JM – always encourage people to put projects in their plans (city projects too) even if there is no hope for funding.

PM – assisting in planning grants for private development (private-public partnerships).

MS4 assistance – role for the WMO in MS4 assistance doesn't seem needed/apparent; KS is already helping with meeting lower Mississippi TMDL WLA; education in general; PM – as a phase 1, St. Paul is a little different. City always looking for grant funding for equipment upgrades and/or staff training.

JB – more monitoring of outfalls to the MS river, and how to we tease out MS River accomplishments, versus waterbodies within the watershed. Board has debated the balance between the MS and smaller waterbodies.

JM – that might involve more regional planning efforts.

LMRWMO TAC Meeting Notes #1
June 3, 2021

JM – look at previous plan. What went well, what didn't. What was successful, and what was not accomplished?

CC – keep a priority on education. Lower Miss is more developed (some growing areas in IGH). What opportunities exist may be restoration/private practice. So education is going to be influential. Opportunities with private landowners.

JB – consider overlay zones within the WMO for additional volume/WQ standards.

MK – in prioritizing, there may be opportunities to consider equity.

JM – lots of reports of rising water tables (flood concerns in new areas, roads inundated).

JB – those issues exist at Seidl's Lake and Lake Augusta

KS – HOA meeting with Lake Augusta led to discussions of landlocked status/update

JM – Curlyleaf pondweed (CLP) may be an issue in SFL

VG – Dakota County has an AIS plan that identifies an IGH lake.