Question 1: What challenges do you encounter in resp		
Participant comment Asking about alternatives that could be acceptable and not getting direction	Participant-identified Category Alternative design	Freshwater Category
Knowing exactly what is required of me in satisfying the rules		
Main challenge is how to communicate such highly technical information to the "layperson" on why stormwater mgmt features are necessary		
Navigating who to talk with, who is the decisions-maker on water projects People do not know who the watershed district is		
Pinning various regulators against each other vs. collaborating	Communication	
Relaying to residents why watershed rules are necessary and they must comply - expensive to residents		
Telling our story - the "why" of rules and projects		
Understanding the intent of the requirements Understanding the link of standards to the water resource		
Communication between all parties flawed, especially when implementing designs on-site Communication protocol/standards		
Conveying the importance or relevance of the requirements	Communication issues	
Requirements NOT always well communicated Acronyms	Consistency with city requirements	
Three-way communication between BCWD, applicants, and engineers	Cost/expectations	Communication challenges
Residents view WD rules as a taking or overly zealous Private - individual education	Design and regulation Education	
Summary of rule changes - consistancy throughout watershed	Education	
Communication challenges - lakc of understanding between orgs/depts.		
Conflict between municipality and WD - Road reclaim projects and engineering costs	Lack of clarity surrounding water governance	
Explaining to a property owner what is a watershed district and why are they bugging me - as a municipal		
offical Collaboration between other agencies	Miscellaneous	
Justification Lack of magningful communication with clients on rule changes sonar		
Lack of meaningful communication with clients on rule changes sonar	Process/communication	
Lack of transparency; poor communication during rule review process - not all stakeholders invited What is the genesis of the revised rules?		
Preconceptions/mis-reading of question	Resistance/push back	
Where can I find the rule?	Rules - what for and why pre-settlement	
Changing standards by inspectors	Arbitrary inspections, 1 inspector = A, another = D	
Climate change - erosion control in giant rain, review process, inspectors nitpicking		
	BCWD is the most difficult watershed to work with	
Overly complicated and unclear	- complicated, inconsistent, inflexible	
Changing requirements Moving the goal line	Changing/modifying requirements	
Awareness of changes to rules	Communication	
Navigating who to talk with, who is the decisions-maker on water projects Not having a brainstorm with pre-concept meetings to get creative solutions	Communication	Complexities in meeting requirements
Thought they had it done, then watershed decided it had to be redesigned BCWD are unsually and excessively complex	Consistency with city requirements	
Complexity	Design standards (MIDS)	
Modeling complexities Need simplified modeling requirements. MIDS or similar		
Construction Erosion Control requirements and inspections are difficult Changing requirements and uniformity of regulations	ESC Inspections expectations	
Amount of time it takes to get a WD permit - # of submittals and re-submittals	Governance/representation Linear Projects/redevelopment	
Changing the requirements Availability of public right-of-way	Rules - what for and why pre-settlement	
Impact to land available for development	Development impacts	
Physical space to develop response Watershed requirements inhibit available land for development	·	
Encourage County/Oak Parks/Stillwater coordinated team to hire engineering firm to design comprehensive stormwater system to protect Long Lake based on plan future development	Education	Design constraints
One size doesn't fit all		
Pre-settlement is impossible in a developed area Working together to solve the site contraints	Feasibility	
Pre-settlement is too restrictive		
The BCWD Board is NOT responsible to the electorate, passes vague rules with no recourse Who has the authority?	Balancing cost/burden Changing/modifying requirements	
Concerns that WD have taxing authority as appointed - not elected - officials Pinning various regulators against each other vs. collaborating	Communication	
15.99 MN STAT is NOT followed by BCWD	Compliance	
Requiring an applicant to demonstrate rule compliance prior to a hearing violates 15.99 (MN-STAT) the	Feasibility	Governance
purpose of any hearing should only to be to discuss variances or deviations from the rules		
Can the rules be rescinded with a new board?	Governance/representation	
Make sure the Board represents all facets of the community (professional guidance e.g. engineer, developer) Why/who decides there is aneed for rule changes?	Process/communication	
Acceptance of rules (ex WCA over 20 years)	Resistance/push back	
Cost of compliance The additional costs to get approved projects	Balancing cost/burden	
Time is money for developers and cities		
Relaying to residents why watershed rules are necessary and they must comply - expensive to residents	Communication	
Cost Cost to implement		
Cost to WD/developers of not meeting the bar (req't) right away	Cost	
Cost/benefit		
The cost of stormwater management is high. Most eng. Review/plan is spent on water management BCWD approval timelines are too long		
Cost	Cost and time of process	
Protect timelines Sufficient space	esse and time of process	
Cost of advice	Continues	
Increase costs engineering changes to plans No appeals process for engineering review from watershed = Big \$\$	Cost/expectations	
Cost of compliance Higher costs associated with meeting requirements		
More maint. requirements and costs	Costs - Eng, const, land acquisition, maint	
Needing to acquire more land to meet requirements Resources available to maintain		High cost
Designing (and getting approved) stormwater BMPs that work and that are feasible cost-wise i.e. feasible		
technically and financially Why are we discouraging redevelopment and placing even more regulation on redevelopmen	Design and regulation	
Why is 10,000 sq. ft. disturbed the "magic" size? We are rural and large buildings are constructed often		
Impact to economic development for redevelopment/development	Development impacts	
Going above the industry standards for rate/WQ/volume standards w/o participating in costs Amount of time it takes to get a WD permit - # of submittals and re-submittals	Feasibility	

Amount of time it takes to get a WD permit - # of submittals and re-submittals

Security of the page of the pa		7	
Leading a filter of an and an arriang process are on please and an battery or a count in transition. Linear in continuous Mission of the county of the cou	Burden on individual landowners for culvert size engineering Concern that trigger lowering to 10,000 sq. ft. creates too many costs and hindrances	Linear Projects/redevelopment	
Additional consequences and processes and additional and personal and additional additional and additional additional additional additional and additional additio	Resizing culverts on road crossings based on new hydration due to larger rain events - cost for townships to		
The contraction of the contract of the contrac	Additional maintenance responsibilities	Maintenance	
The control of the co			
The state of the compared of this care of the colors of th		,	
The committee of the content of the	Thinking of water management at the end of the design	,	
The control of the process of the control of the co	Permit application Time - understand, brainstorming, concept, whole process	Time	
incomparing prices above the CRI period above on the CRI period above of the CRI period of the CRI per	Timing of how to go through process with multiple regulatory agencies		
Six demands and an description of a till measure content process and beliance or contents young and wheeleash beliance or contents young and the progression of the progress of the progre	Climate change - erosion control in giant rain, review process, inspectors nitpicking	Arbitrary inspections, 1 inspector = A, another = D	
The control production of the control based of the	Infiltrating in areas where the MS4 permit advises not to MN stormwater manual - development of a stormwater treatment train is an iterative process that balances	-	
The comparignations with efficient way. The comparignation was the effect of the comparignation of the compar	site constraints, project goals, and available budget	Compliance	
The contraction of the Section of th	Too many jurisdictions with different rules	Conflicting multiple goals	
Extra Standard and MEDIC Color the conversal contention of the Color o	•	Consistency with city requirements	
Figure to the search and the control of the control	BCWD should adopt MIDS to be more consistent and make design easier. It's good enough	Design standards (MIDS)	
Managed of the Party Personal Control (Control Control	'	Education	
Clarge a speciment and antimoration requirement control of the con	Summary of rule changes - consistancy throughout watershed Going above the industry standards for rate/WO/volume standards w/o participating in costs		Inconsistency
To maint bases of water fraces. With city, see. The comment bases of water fraces. With city is the comment of		,	
Toward the first first included and the company of	Conflict between municipality and WD - Road reclaim projects and engineering costs	Lack of clarity currounding water governance	
Tread softwards (country of the built of the built on the built of the built or one of the built		Lack of clarity surrounding water governance	
Littlicrosity of prices proteons was rather delinities: Impact of the top to the proteon with multiple regulation generor. Internation of the top to the proteon with multiple regulation generor. Internation of the proteon with the proteon of t	Road authorities (county, city, twp) need to be able to do their job w/o over reach	Linear Projects/redevelopment	
Times of the tap of hereigh process or the closed regulators regulated and process or the closed to acceptance and experience of the closed to acceptance and experience or the closed to acceptance and experience and experience or the closed to acceptance and experience an	Brown's Creek rules are more restrictive than MIDS. There is no consistency Uniformity of rules between watershed districts	Process/communication	
injugator fundamental and control accordance			
Into having plantation to design where rules are recovered to the control of the	Inpector turnover and cost	•	
The favoring contractive colorings were interested to except the contractive coloring accordance in the coloring colorin	Asking about alternatives that could be acceptable and not getting direction Not having alternatives to design when rules aren't feasible		
The proposed in an occurrence control anternatives to infill resistance or positive ground in the property of	Not having alternatives to design when rules aren't feasible	Alternative design	
Advantages to inflictation in unique development development density Unrealistic expectations for the site for development density Conflicting multiple goost Friedrich of the site for development density Conflicting multiple goost Conflicting multiple goos	Why not use MIDS alternatives like everyone else? Don't pretend that volume control alternatives to infiltration can be as effective as infiltration		
UNU is the most difficulty variative for the con for development density Consistency of particulars of the control of development density Consistency of particulars of the control of development density Conflicting multiple goals Conflicting multiple	Excessive modeling requirements to consider alternative designs. Too expensive	Alternatives to infiltration	
Univalidic espectation for the site for everlopment density Cities meet to the side to decide from to lotest procest groundwater. Alternatives, is inflitration—DWSMA6. Conflicting multiple goals This region is provided by the side of the decided or to lotest procest groundwater. Alternatives, is inflitration—DWSMA6. This region is provided by the side of the s	Need "off ramps" (flexible treatment options) where infiltration is infeasible or unwise	DCM/D is the most difficult watershed to work with	
Cities need to be able to decide how to best protect groundwater. Alternatives to infiltration - PWSMAs. FOOTING of audit issued office trumps all others Consequences of the control of t	Unrealistic expectations for the site for development density		
increases of exercise content course of the recognition of exercise from			
Interesting the angular moment and on more requirements. (Cost) = Peg, const, and acqualition, many (MIXO) are usually and executively complex. (MIXO) are usually and executively and executively complex. (MIXO) are usually and executively a	Cities need to be able to decide how to best protect groundwater. Alternatives to infiltration - DWSMAs Priority of water issues often trumps all others	Conflicting multiple goals	
Rigidity of a clarif through development review process (COVID 20 or unally and decisively complete Design and rigidation Design standards (MIDS) Horizon an practitionism abanded may vin the foodbile or appropriate for linear or commercial projects Horizon day and filter future to the resources and measurable Horizon day and filter future to the resources and measurable Horizon day and filter future to the resources and measurable Horizon day and filter future to the resources and measurable Horizon day and filter future to the properties approved without the off rames Bibliancing priorities. Lack of feedbility, rigid Pre-stelling in the resources and MO and/or control and through the resources of	No appeals process for engineering review from watershed = Big \$\$		Inflexibility
Meeting a presettlement standard may not be feasible or appropriate for linear or commercial projects More do we first her visit to be reaposable and measurable More reported that the control of the	Rigidity of staff through development review process		
Meeting a presettlement standard may not be feasible or appropriate for linear or commercial projects (Meeting pre-estiment conditions) (Meeting pre-estiment is bor restrictive and provides approved without the off ramp) (Meeting pre-estiment is 500 restrictive) (Meeting meeting is 600 restrictive) (Meeting meeting meeting is 600 restrictive) (Meeting meeting is 600 restrictive) (Meeting meeting is 600 restrictive) (Meeting meeting meeting is 600 restrictive) (Meeting meeting is 600 restrictive) (Meeting meeting meeting is 600 restrictive) (Meeting meeting meeting is 600 restrictive) (Meeti	BCWD are unsually and excessively complex	Design standards (MIDS)	
Meeting pre-settlement conditions Not respecting others time to get projects approved without the off ramps Balancing priorities Lake of Flexibility, rigid Pre-settlement is too restrictive Lake of flexibility, rigid Pre-settlement is too restrictive Lake of flexibility, rigid Pre-settlement is too restrictive Lake of flexibility was a contrained staff or the page to project suppressed without the off ramps Lake of flexibility was executioned project. Lake of flexibi	Meeting a presettlement standard may not be feasible or appropriate for linear or commercial projects		
Not respecting attents time to get projects approved without the off ramps believing proteins. Lack of finability, rigid. Peaulishment is no extinctive Lack of finability and "Being resonable" Lack of finability and the resonable and of circle relational projects of feeders opened to the constitution stuff and the control of the	Meeting pre-settlement conditions		
Lack of finability, rigid Pre-estelement is not restrictive Lack of finebility and "being reasonable" Lack of line alternative treatment options, MIDS has a FTO chart to help this issue Lack of line alternative treatment options, MIDS has a FTO chart to help this issue Linear Projects/redevelopment Are rules working? For wair outcomes measured? Design partners and WD and/or consider to the restriction of the restriction o	Not respecting others' time to get projects approved without the off ramps	reasibility	
Lack of flexibility and "being reasonable" Lack of car alternative treatment options, MIDS has a F1O chart to help this issue Linear Projects/redevelopment Are rules working 1/10 was no ductiones measured? Lack of invokelage of technical aspects Treatstrion with inapperent appets and regulation alternatives Linear Projects/redevelopment Treatstrion with inapperent appets Linear Projects/redevelopment Miscellaneous Development linearcts Development linearcts Linear Projects/redevelopment Linear Projects/redev	Lack of flexibility, rigid	Flexibility	
Liack of clear afternative treatment options, MIDS has a FTO chart to help this issue Lack of knowledge of technical aspects Tust of Ministry own or uncome sensured? Lack of knowledge of technical aspects Tust of Ministry own or uncome sensured? Lack of knowledge of technical aspects Tust of Ministry own of the property of the prope	Pre-settlement is too restrictive	Interactions between applicants and WD and/or	
Are rules working? It was are outcomes measured? And of innoweding of technical aspects Frustration with inexperienced consultant staff - not enough authority and inagination to consider site of evaloper and their contractor following the Brown's Creek rules/their commitments to prevent muddy interactions between applicants and WD and/or consultants staff Linear Projects/redevelopment Uniformeting Brown's Creek Watershed asset (streams, ponds) Rispercing lacks understanding of water quality BMP design Rispercing lacks understanding lacks and the general part of the requirements is progressing to the progressing lacks and the general part of the requirements of the water water and the goals - people engage when it impacts them directly Lack of interest by public until impacted Public Lack of buy-in Process/communication Rispercing design and regulation Rispercing design and regulation Rispercing design developers Rispercing design and regulation Rispercing design and regulat	Lack of flexibility and "being reasonable"	<u> </u>	
Frustration with inexperienced consultant staff - not enough authority and imagination to consider alternatives is the developer and their contractor following the Brown's Creek Integrated assets (streams, ponds) in the projects/redevelopment and WD and/or consultant projects assets (streams, ponds) in the projects/redevelopment and plant projects assets (streams, ponds) in the projects/redevelopment assets (streams, ponds) in the projects/redevelopment assets (streams, ponds) in the projects/redevelopment assets (streams) in the projects (stream	Are rules working? How are outcomes measured?		
alternatives site developer and their contractor following the Brown's Creek rules/their commitments to prevent muddy funorf entering Brown's Creek Watershed assets (streams, ponds) [Inear Projects/fedevelopment		<u> </u>	
is the everepher and their contractor notion gine relivans receive treaty free commitments to prevent moosy under exercise prevent moosy inclinear Projects/redevelopment under free projects and seases (streams, ponds) inclinear projects	alternatives	consultant staff	Knowledge gaps
Richowledge/Comprehension Technical		Linear Projects/redevelopment	intownedge gaps
Developers/engineers on't submit copmiete submittal/plans - try to get by with meeting part of the requirements requirements. Developers/engineers don't want to address all the requirements - ask questions like "which requirement is often protective in the protec			
Development impacts most important?* Soling above the industry standards for rate/WO/volume standards w/o participating in costs: We have the responsibility to not make the water worse People don't value the resources or understand the goals - people engage when it impacts them directly Lack of interest by public until impacted Push back from developers Not following erosion control plans Barriers to technology Mort following erosion control plans Barriers to technology Mort Value as taking or overly zealous Why are we discouraging redevelopment and placing even more regulation on redevelopmeni Why is 10,000 sq. ft. disturbed the "magic" size? We are rural and large buildings are constructed often increased setbacks Burden on individual landowners for culvert size engineering independency "lands rights" Burden on individual and unclear Knowing exactly what is required of me in satisfying the rules Resistance/push back BCWD is the most difficult watershed to work with - complicated, inconsistent, inflexible Knowing exactly what is required of me in satisfying the rules Requirements NOT always well communicated Knowing exactly what is required of me in satisfying the rules Requirements NOT always well communicated Communication Requirements NOT always well communicated Conflicting multiple goals Conflicting multiple goals Conflicting multiple goals Conflictions with different rules Conflictions with different rules Conflictions with different rules Conflictions with different rules Conflictions well personal and wonder Considerations What triggers the buffer (weltand) requirements? Three-way communication between BCWD, applicants, and engineers What triggers the buffer (weltand) requirements? Interactions between applicants and WD and/or	Developers/engineers don't submit copmlete submittal/plans - try to get by with meeting part of the	recrifical	
most important?" We have the industry standards for rate/MQ/volume standards w/o participating in cost: We have the responsibility to not make the water worse People don't value the resources or understand the goals - people engage when it impacts them directly Lack of Interest by public until impacted People don't value the resources or understand the goals - people engage when it impacts them directly Resistance/push back Process/communication Resistance/push back Not following design	·	Development impacts	
We have the responsibility to not make the water worse People don't value the resources or understand the goals - people engage when it impacts them directly Lack of interest by public until impacted Resistance/push back Not following design Not following resons control plans Barriers to technology Don't let treatments work Residents wise WD rules as a taking or overly zealous Why are we discouraging redevelopment and placing even more regulation on redevelopment Increased setbacks Balance between protecting resources and property rights Burden on individual androwners for culvert size engineering Independence/ "lands rights" Overly complicated and unclear Knowing exactly what is required of me in satisfying the rules Requirements NOT always well communicated Requirements	most important?"		
People don't value the resources or understand the goals - people engage when it impacts them directly Lack of interest by public until impacted Resistance/push back Resistance/push back Not following design Not following design Not following design Not following erosion control plans Barriers to technology Miscellaneous Bon't let treatments work Process/communication Haiving no independent land for own projects Residents view WD rules as a taking or overly zealous Why are we discouraging redevelopment and placing even more regulation on redevelopment Why is 10,000 sq. ft. disturbed the "magic" size? We are rural and large buildings are constructed often increased setbacks Balance between protecting resources and property rights Burden on individual landowners for culvert size engineering Independence/ "lands rights" Resistance/push back Overly complicated and unclear Knowing exactly what is required of me in satisfying the rules Requirements NOT always well communicated Rule clarifications Rule clarifications Rule clarifications Rule clarifications Communication issues Rule larifications Confiscing multiple goals Confiscing multiple goals Confiscing multiple goals Confiscing of rule implementation Too many jurisdictions with different rules Confiscing of rule implementation Thought they had it done, then watershed decided it had to be redesignee Three-way communication the tween BCWD, applicants, and engineers What triggers the buffer (wetland) requirements? Design and regulation Inclear requirements Unclear requirements Inclear requirements Unclear requirements Process/communication between applicants and Wand/or	Going above the industry standards for rate/WQ/volume standards w/o participating in costs We have the responsibility to not make the water worse	Feasibility	Lack of buy-in
Lack of interest by public until impacted Push back from developers Not following design Not following erosion control plans Barriers to technology Don't let treatments work Haiving no independent land for own projects Process/communication Technical Residents view by Drules as a taking or overty zealous Why are we discouraging redevelopment and placing even more regulation on redevelopment Universe destables Burden on individual landowners for culvert size engineering Burden on individual to the most difficult watershed to work with -complicated, inconsistent, inflexible Complicated and unclear Knowing exactly what is required of me in satisfying the rules Communication issues Rule clarifications Rule clarifications Rule clarifications Communication issues Rule clarifications Communication issues Rule clarifications with different rules Conflicting multiple goals Conflicting multiple goals Consistency with city requirements Consistency with city requirements Consistency with city requirements For interevance more ended exided it had to be redesignec Three-way communication externed and word of or the implementation For interestions expectations Unclear requirements Interactions between applicants and WD and/or	People don't value the resources or understand the goals - people engage when it impacts them directly	Process/communication	
Push back from developers Not following erosion control plans Barriers to technology Don't let treatments work Having no independent land for own projects Technical Residents view MD rules as a taking or overly zealous Why are we discouraging redevelopment and placing even more regulation on redevelopmen! Design and regulation Why is 10,000 sq. ft. disturbed the "magic" size? We are rural and large buildings are constructed often Increased setbacks Burden on individual landowners for culvert size engineering Independence/ "lands rights" Resistance/push back BCWD is the most difficult watershed to work with - complicated, inconsistent, inflexible Knowing exactly what is required of me in satisfying the rules Requirements NOT always well communicated Requirements NOT always well communicated Requirements NOT always well communicated Conflusion of rule implementation Thought they had it done, then watershed decided it had to be redesignec Three-way communication between BCWD, applicants, and engineers What triggers the buffer (wetland) requirements? Inspections calling out items that don't have an impact on WQ. (Erosion and sed. Control): Technical Riscallaneous Process/communication Technical Riscallaneous Other Technical Riscallaneous Other Technical Riscallaneous Design and regulation Property impacts BCWD is the most difficult watershed to work with - complicated, inconsistent, inflexible Communication issues Requirements NOT always well communicated Communication issues Requirements NoT always well communicated Conflicting multiple goals Conflicting multiple goals Consistency with city requirements Three-way communication between BCWD, applicants, and engineers Cost/expectations Unclear requirements Unclear requirements	Lack of interest by public until impacted	Resistance/push back	
Not following erosino control plans Barriers to technology Don't let treatments work Process/communication Having no independent land for own projects Residents view WD rules as a taking or overly zealous Why are we discouraging redevelopment and placing even more regulation on redevelopment Why is 10,000 sq. ft. disturbed the "magic" size? We are rural and large buildings are constructed often increased setbacks Balance between protecting resources and property rights Burden on individual landowners for culvert size engineering Independence/ "lands rights" BCWD is the most difficult watershed to work with - complicated, inconsistent, inflexible Coverly complicated and unclear Knowing exactly what is required of me in satisfying the rules Requirements NOT always well communicated Rule clarifications Rule clarifications Rule clarifications Rule clarifications Commonication between presettlement) Con omany jurisdictions with different rules Confusion of rule implementation Thought they had it done, then watershed decided it had to be redesigned Three-way communication between BCWD, applicants, and engineers What triggers the buffer (wetland) requirements? Inspections calling out items that don't have an impact on WQ (Erosion and sed. Control; Inspections between applicants and WD and/or	Not following design		
Don't let treatments work Having no independent land for own projects Residents view WD rules as a taking or overly zealous Why are we discouraging redevelopment and placing even more regulation on redevelopment Why is 10,000 sq. ft. disturbed the "magic" size? We are rural and large buildings are constructed often Increased setbacks Balance between protecting resources and property rights Burden on individual landowners for culvert size engineering Independence/ "lands rights" Resistance/push back BCWD is the most difficult watershed to work with - complicated, inconsistent, inflexible Knowing exactly what is required of me in satisfying the rules Requirements NOT always well communicated Rule clarifications Rule clarifications Rule clarifications Rule clarify (volume and presettlement) Too many jurisdictions with different rules Confusion of rule implementation Thought they had it done, then watershed decided it had to be redesigned Three-way communication between BCWD, applicants, and engineers What triggers the buffer (wetland) requirements? Inspections calling out items that don't have an impact on WQ (Erosion and sed. Control); Interactions between applicants and WD and/or	Not following erosion control plans		
Residents view WD rules as a taking or overly zealous Why are we discouraging redevelopment and placing even more regulation on redevelopment Why is 10,000 sq. ft. disturbed the "magic" size? We are rural and large buildings are constructed often Increased setbacks Balance between protecting resources and property rights Burden on individual landowners for culvert size engineering Independence/ "lands rights" Resistance/push back BCWD is the most difficult watershed to work with - complicated, inconsistent, inflexible Knowing exactly what is required of me in satisfying the rules Requirements NOT always well communicated Rule clarifications Rule clarifications Rule clarifications Rule clarifications Rule implementation Thought they had it done, then watershed decided it had to be redesigned Three-way communication between BCWD, applicants, and engineers What triggers the buffer (wetland) requirements? Inspections calling out items that don't have an impact on WQ (Erosion and sed. Control) Property impacts Design standards (MIDS) Linear Projects/redevelopment BCWD is the most difficult watershed to work with - complicated, inconsistent, inflexible Communication Requirements NOT always well communicated Communication Compliance Compliance Compliance Conflicting multiple goals Conflicting multiple goals Consistency with city requirements Design and regulation Unclear requirements Unclear requirements	Don't let treatments work	Process/communication	Other
Why are we discouraging redevelopment and placing even more regulation on redevelopment Why is 10,000 sq. ft. disturbed the "magic" size? We are rural and large buildings are constructed often Increased setbacks Balance between protecting resources and property rights Burden on individual landowners for culvert size engineering independence/ "lands rights" Resistance/push back BCWD is the most difficult watershed to work with - complicated, inconsistent, inflexible Why is 10,000 sq. ft. disturbed the "magic" size? We are rural and large buildings are constructed often Design and regulation Property impacts Property impacts BCWD is the most difficult watershed to work with - complicated, inconsistent, inflexible Communication Requirements NOT always well communicated Rowling exactly what is required of me in satisfying the rules Requirements NOT always well communicated Rule clarifty (volume and presettlement) Too many jurisdictions with different rules Confusion of rule implementation Thought they had it done, then watershed decided it had to be redesigned Three-way communication between BCWD, applicants, and engineers What triggers the buffer (wetland) requirements? Design and regulation Unclear requirements Interactions between applicants and WD and/or	Having no independent land for own projects Residents view WD rules as a taking or overly zealous	Technical	
Increased setbacks Balance between protecting resources and property rights Burden on individual landowners for culvert size engineering Independence/ "lands rights" Resistance/push back BCWD is the most difficult watershed to work with - complicated, inconsistent, inflexible Knowing exactly what is required of me in satisfying the rules Knowing exactly what is required of me in satisfying the rules Communication Requirements NOT always well communicated Rule clarifications Rule clarify (volume and presettlement) Too many jurisdictions with different rules Conflicting multiple goals Confusion of rule implementation Thought they had it done, then watershed decided it had to be redesigned Three-way communication between BCWD, applicants, and engineers What triggers the buffer (wetland) requirements? Inspections calling out items that don't have an impact on WQ (Erosion and sed. Control) Interactions between applicants and WD and/or	Why are we discouraging redevelopment and placing even more regulation on redevelopment	Design and regulation	
Increased setbacks Balance between protecting resources and property rights Burden on individual landowners for culvert size engineering Independence/ "lands rights" Resistance/push back BCWD is the most difficult watershed to work with - complicated, inconsistent, inflexible Knowing exactly what is required of me in satisfying the rules Knowing exactly what is required of me in satisfying the rules Communication Requirements NOT always well communicated Rule clarifications Rule clarify (volume and presettlement) Too many jurisdictions with different rules Conflicting multiple goals Confusion of rule implementation Thought they had it done, then watershed decided it had to be redesigned Three-way communication between BCWD, applicants, and engineers What triggers the buffer (wetland) requirements? Inspections calling out items that don't have an impact on WQ (Erosion and sed. Control) Interactions between applicants and WD and/or	Why is 10,000 sq. ft. disturbed the "magic" size? We are rural and large buildings are constructed often		Dranarty imposts
Burden on individual landowners for culvert size engineering Independence/ "lands rights" Resistance/push back BCWD is the most difficult watershed to work with - complicated, inconsistent, inflexible Knowing exactly what is required of me in satisfying the rules Requirements NOT always well communicated Rule clarifications Rule clarifications with different rules Compliance Compliance Conflicting multiple goals Confusion of rule implementation Thought they had it done, then watershed decided it had to be redesigned Three-way communication between BCWD, applicants, and engineers What triggers the buffer (wetland) requirements? Inspections calling out items that don't have an impact on WQ (Erosion and sed. Control) Interactions between applicants and WD and/or	Increased setbacks		Property impacts
BCWD is the most difficult watershed to work with - complicated, inconsistent, inflexible Knowing exactly what is required of me in satisfying the rules Communication Requirements NOT always well communicated Communication issues Rule clarifications Compliance Rule clarity (volume and presettlement) Compliance Confusion of rule implementation Thought they had it done, then watershed decided it had to be redesigned Three-way communication between BCWD, applicants, and engineers What triggers the buffer (wetland) requirements? Inspections calling out items that don't have an impact on WQ (Erosion and sed. Control) BCWD is the most difficult watershed to work with - complicated, inconsistent, inflexible Communication Communication Communication issues Compliance	Burden on individual landowners for culvert size engineering	, , ,	
Overly complicated and unclear Knowing exactly what is required of me in satisfying the rules Requirements NOT always well communicated Requirements NOT always well communicated Rule clarifications Rule clarity (volume and presettlement) Too many jurisdictions with different rules Conflicting multiple goals Confusion of rule implementation Thought they had it done, then watershed decided it had to be redesigned Three-way communication between BCWD, applicants, and engineers What triggers the buffer (wetland) requirements? Inspections calling out items that don't have an impact on WQ (Erosion and sed. Control) Interactions between applicants and WD and/or	inuependence/ lands rights"		
Knowing exactly what is required of me in satisfying the rules Requirements NOT always well communicated Requirements NOT always well communicated Rule clarifications Rule clarify (volume and presettlement) Too many jurisdictions with different rules Conflicting multiple goals Confusion of rule implementation Thought they had it done, then watershed decided it had to be redesigned Three-way communication between BCWD, applicants, and engineers What triggers the buffer (wetland) requirements? Inspections calling out items that don't have an impact on WQ (Erosion and sed. Control) Unclear requirements Unclear requirements	Overly complicated and upclear		
Rule clarifications Rule clarify (volume and presettlement) Too many jurisdictions with different rules Conflicting multiple goals Confusion of rule implementation Thought they had it done, then watershed decided it had to be redesigned Three-way communication between BCWD, applicants, and engineers What triggers the buffer (wetland) requirements? Inspections calling out items that don't have an impact on WQ (Erosion and sed. Control) Design and regulation Interactions between applicants and WD and/or Unclear requirements	Knowing exactly what is required of me in satisfying the rules		
Rule clarity (volume and presettlement) Too many jurisdictions with different rules Conflicting multiple goals Confusion of rule implementation Thought they had it done, then watershed decided it had to be redesigned Three-way communication between BCWD, applicants, and engineers What triggers the buffer (wetland) requirements? Inspections calling out items that don't have an impact on WQ (Erosion and sed. Control) Unclear requirements Unclear requirements	Requirements NOT always well communicated Rule clarifications		
Confusion of rule implementation Thought they had it done, then watershed decided it had to be redesigned Three-way communication between BCWD, applicants, and engineers What triggers the buffer (wetland) requirements? Unclear requirements Unclear requirements Unclear requirements	Rule clarity (volume and presettlement)	· ·	
Three-way communication between BCWD, applicants, and engineers What triggers the buffer (wetland) requirements? Inspections calling out items that don't have an impact on WQ (Erosion and sed. Control) Inspections calling out items that don't have an impact on WQ (Erosion and sed. Control) Interactions between applicants and WD and/or			
What triggers the buffer (wetland) requirements? Inspections calling out items that don't have an impact on WQ (Erosion and sed. Control) ESC Inspections expectations Interactions between applicants and WD and/or			
Interactions between applicants and WD and/or Unclear requirements	Three-way communication between BCWD, applicants, and engineers	(OST/AVNACTATIONS	
	What triggers the buffer (wetland) requirements?	Design and regulation	
	What triggers the buffer (wetland) requirements?	Design and regulation ESC Inspections expectations	Unclear requirements

Too many layers of water rules - WD, city, etc.	Lack of clarity surrounding water governance
How does the district define "reasonableness" in the SONAR	Process/communication
Justification	
Until you begin to implement the rules it's hard to determine the impacts	
Are there any rules? Expectations? Conditions?	Rules - what for and why pre-settlement
Are variations allowed?	
Satisfying pre-settlement requirements	
What are the rules - pre-settlement	
Information on "how" to meet rules	Technical
Overcoming vagueness of watershed rules or ordinances	