

elm creek Watershed Management Commission

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE
3235 Fernbrook Lane • Plymouth, MN 55447
PH: 763.553.1144 • email: judie@jass.biz
www.elmcreekwatershed.org

Technical Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes | April 9, 2025

I. A meeting of the **Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)** of the Elm Creek Watershed Management Commission was called to order at 10:33 a.m., Wednesday, April 9, 2025, in the Plymouth Community Center, 14800 34th Avenue North, Plymouth, MN, by Chair Derek Ashe.

Present: Steven Touney, Champlin; Lauren Letsche, Corcoran; Josh Accola, Stantec, Dayton; Derek Ashe, Maple Grove; Ben Scharenbroich, Plymouth; Mike Albers, Rogers; Kevin Ellis, Hennepin County Environment and Energy (HCEE); Diane Spector and Erik Megow, Stantec; and Judie Anderson, JASS.

Not represented: Medina.

II. Motion by Accola, second by Touney to approve the **April 9, 2025, meeting agenda**. *Motion carried unanimously.*

Motion by Scharenbroich, second by Touney to approve the **minutes of the March 12, 2025, meeting**. *Motion carried unanimously.*

III. **2025 CIP.**

Included in the meeting packet is the **preliminary CIP*** reflecting comments received to date.

The City of Dayton has proposed a revision to a project added to the CIP for 2025: a Diamond Lake drawdown/alum treatment. The revision eliminates the option for a whole lake drawdown and focuses only on alum treatment and associated SAV management and monitoring.

The City of Maple Grove requests consideration of a project to restore a reach of Rush Creek from Rush Creek Hollow to Fernbrook Lane. This is adjacent to the Rush Creek at Rush Creek Hollow project ordered in 2024.

The City of Corcoran has requested adding to the 2025 CIP cost share to purchase a new street sweeper. The Commission's Cost Share Policy allows this if the equipment provides enhanced street sweeping as a BMP.

If the Commission proceeds according to the CIP as submitted, the potential levy in 2025 would be \$1.1 million, exceeding the annual \$750,000 maximum guideline. At a minimum, Staff recommends no levy in 2025 for the cost share programs as those have adequate fund balances. That would reduce the proposed levy to \$960,000. An option to consider is levying the Diamond Lake project over two years. This would reduce the levy to \$630,000, as shown in the 2025 Recommended column in Staff's memo.

These CIP revisions would require a Minor Plan Amendment.

Motion by Scharenbroich, second by Letsche to recommend the projects in the 2025 Recommended Column for the 2025 levy and that the Commission proceed with the Minor Plan Amendment process at the May 14, 2025, meeting. *Motion carried unanimously.*

IV. FOURTH GENERATION WATERSHED MANAGEMENT PLAN.*

A. A **second draft** of the plan and the appendices is available and has been uploaded to the website at elmcreekwatershed.org/watershed-management-plan.html. There are a few odds and ends to finish but at this time it is anticipated that the draft plan should be ready to be sent out to the cities for INFORMAL review at the May meeting. This is an opportunity for cities to submit comments for consideration before the formal 60-Day Review period begins in June. Staff are also prioritizing obtaining public review and input in April-May. Members are asked to take time before the May meeting to read through the documents and note their questions and comments. They can be forwarded to the Administrative office at any time.

B. Rules. Two TAC members volunteered to review the proposed housekeeping changes to the Rules and pointed out provisions that they'd like to discuss further. They are included in Staff's April 3, 2025, memo. The marked-up rules are available at [Minutes & Meeting Packets - Elm Creek Watershed](#).

1. Thresholds for land disturbance adjacent to or containing a lake, wetland or watercourse or floodplain – any size or exempt single family homes? It was agreed to refine the definition of a development activity to disturbances over one acre.

2. Should single family homes not part of common development be exempt from watershed rules altogether? *Unless constructing a single family home is disturbing more than one acre, it is already exempt. There are two cases where SFH disturbing less than one acre could trigger the rules: where there are potential floodplain impacts and development containing or adjacent to wetlands, lakes, or streams. There was discussion that floodplain impacts are already regulated under Rule F and removing the mandatory application of Rule D for sites less than one acre will exempt them from Rule D requirements. Similarly, Rule G would apply to sites disturbing less than 1.0 acre without triggering Rule D.*

3. If Rule E (erosion control) is the only rule triggered should the Commission defer review to the city? *Erosion rule is only triggered if stormwater rule is triggered. However, there are cases such as grading-only reviews that don't require any other BMPs.*

4. Should abstraction details, low elevation details, etc., be moved out of the rules and into a design standards document? *There was support for creating a design standards document, but concern it would be considered "guidance" rather than "requirements."*

C. Rules regarding Floodplain.

1. Use of the "Commission's flood study" and how and why do we use it and should we? It appears to refer to 2007 modeling done by SEH. Is that superseded by the HUC-8 model?

2. Should floodplain compensatory storage be computed and provided at each contour of fill? *Discussion consensus was that the current guidance is adequate, but cities are free to*

require a stricter interpretation.

3. Revisit the rules revised in 2022 regarding minimum low floor/low opening elevations for properties adjacent to ponds or waterbodies where there is not regulatory-defined floodplain. Dig up Ross' old flow chart? *Discussion consensus was that the current guidance is adequate.*

4. How does the applicant demonstrate floodplain alteration or filling does not cause a net decrease in storage or alter timing of flooding unless it can be shown that if everyone did something similar there would not be new flooding or high water or restricted flows? *Discussion consensus was that the current guidance is adequate.*

D. Rules regarding Wetland Buffers.

1. There is a lot of language in the wetland buffer rule regarding short- and long-term maintenance and encroachment that is better suited to the cities to enforce. Can it be removed and just leave the 'this is what constitutes an acceptable buffer'? *There was support for creating a design standards document, but concern it would be considered "guidance" rather than "requirements."*

2. Since most wetland replacement plans are purchases of wetland credits and very rarely mitigation, should the rules specify that is the preferred method and delete all the mitigation language and sequencing? *Consensus was to leave the language in as mitigation is still legally available, even if rarely practiced.*

E. Other Rules.

1. Eliminate requirement for the maintenance agreement to indemnify the Commission from claims arising because of the project review? *Yes.*

2. Eliminate references to "encourage the use of natural resources for storing runoff." *Yes.*

F. CAC Meetings

Staff have met with the Dayton Parks and Recreation Commission. Five more meetings are scheduled in April, with the final meeting scheduled for May 13 in Medina. CAC members are encouraged to use the comment form on the website to convey questions and input.

G. Public Survey

As part of the public outreach for the Plan, an online survey will be made available. Included in the meeting presentation is a rough draft of some survey questions. There is a limit of ten questions when using the free version of Survey Monkey. Members were asked to review and suggest revisions or other questions for inclusion. Many valuable comments were made and additional questions suggested at the meeting.

V. OTHER BUSINESS.

A. Website Platform. Discussion on this topic has been rescheduled to the May meeting.

B. The next meeting of the Technical Advisory Committee is scheduled for Wednesday, May 14, 2025.


elm creek Watershed Management Commission

TAC Meeting Minutes | April 9, 2025

Page 4

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 11:33 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Judie A. Anderson

Recording Secretary

Z:\Elm Creek\TAC\2025\April 9, 2025 TAC Minutes.docx