Question 1: What challenges do you encounter in responding to water management requirements?

Participant comment	Participant-identified Category	Freshwater Category
Asking about alternatives that could be acceptable and not getting direction	Alternative design	Communication challenges
Knowing exactly what is required of me in satisfying the rules	Communication	
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		
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 issues	
Communication protocol/standards		
Conveying the importance or relevance of the requirements		
Requirements NOT always well communicated		
Acronyms	Consistency with city requirements	
Three-way communication between BCWD, applicants, and engineers	Cost/expectations	
Residents view WD rules as a taking or overly zealous	Design and regulation	
Private - individual education	Education	
Summary of rule changes - consistancy throughout watershed		
Communication challenges - lakc of understanding between orgs/depts.	Lack of clarity surrounding water governance	
Conflict between municipality and WD - Road reclaim projects and engineering costs		
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	Process/communication	
Lack of meaningful communication with clients on rule changes sonar		
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	Complexities in meeting requirements
Climate change - erosion control in giant rain, review process, inspectors nitpicking		
Overly complicated and unclear	BCWD is the most difficult watershed to work with - complicated, inconsistent, inflexible	
Changing requirements	Changing/modifying requirements	
Moving the goal line		
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		
Thought they had it done, then watershed decided it had to be redesigned	Consistency with city requirements	
BCWD are unsually and excessively complex	Design standards (MIDS)	
Complexity		
Modeling complexities		
Need simplified modeling requirements. MIDS or similar		
Construction Erosion Control requirements and inspections are difficult	ESC Inspections expectations	
Changing requirements and uniformity of regulations	Governance/representation	
Amount of time it takes to get a WD permit - # of submittals and re-submittals	Linear Projects/redevelopment	
Changing the requirements	Rules - what for and why pre-settlement	
Availability of public right-of-way	Development impacts	Design constraints
Impact to land available for development		
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	
One size doesn't fit all	Feasibility	
Pre-settlement is impossible in a developed area		
Working together to solve the site contraints		
Pre-settlement is too restrictive		
The BCWD Board is NOT responsible to the electorate, passes vague rules with no recourse	Balancing cost/burden	Governance
Who has the authority?	Changing/modifying requirements	
Concerns that WD have taxing authority as appointed - not elected - officials	Communication	
Pinning various regulators against each other vs. collaborating		
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 purpose of any hearing should only to be to discuss variances or deviations from the rules	Feasibility	
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	Balancing cost/burden	High cost
The additional costs to get approved projects		
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	
Cost to implement		
Cost to WD/developers of not meeting the bar (req't) right away		
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 and time of process	
Cost		
Protect timelines		
Sufficient space		
Cost of advice	Cost/expectations	
Increase costs engineering changes to plans		
No appeals process for engineering review from watershed = Big $$		
Cost of compliance	Costs - Eng, const, land acquisition, maint	
Higher costs associated with meeting requirements		
More maint. requirements and costs		
Needing to acquire more land to meet requirements		
Resources available to maintain		
Designing (and getting approved) stormwater BMPs that work and that are feasible cost-wise i.e. feasible technically and financially	Design and regulation	
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		
Impact to economic development for redevelopment/development	Development impacts	
Going above the industry standards for rate/WQ/volume standards w/o participating in costs	Feasibility	
Amount of time it takes to get a WD permit - # of submittals and re-submittals		

Burden on individual landowners for culvert size engineering	Linear Projects/redevelopment	
Concern that trigger lowering to 10,000 sq. ft. creates too many costs and hindrances		
Resizing culverts on road crossings based on new hydration due to larger rain events - cost for townships to do hydraulic studies could this be done on a county-wide basis		
Additional maintenance responsibilities	Maintenance	
Ongoing maintenance		
Funding	Money	
Review costs are high		
Transition period for implementing rules	Process/communication	
Thinking of water management at the end of the design	Technical	
Permit application	Time	
Time - understand, brainstorming, concept, whole process		
Timing of how to go through process with multiple regulatory agencies		
Climate change - erosion control in giant rain, review process, inspectors nitpicking	Arbitrary inspections, 1 inspector = A, another = D	Inconsistency
Infiltrating in areas where the MS4 permit advises not to	Compliance	
MN stormwater manual - development of a stormwater treatment train is an iterative process that balances site constraints, project goals, and available budget		
They don't follow the MN Stormwater Manual stormwater treatment train		
Too many jurisdictions with different rules	Conflicting multiple goals	
Implementation of rules for "What is road construction"	Consistency with city requirements	
Inconsistency with decisions on meeting standards x3 people		
BCWD should adopt MIDS to be more consistent and make design easier. It's good enough	Design standards (MIDS)	
Conflicts between WD rules and standards and provisions of the MS4 General Permit		
Follow the state stormwater manual	Education	
Summary of rule changes - consistancy throughout watershed		
Going above the industry standards for rate/WQ/volume standards w/o participating in costs	Feasibility	
Changing requirements and uniformity of regulations	Governance/representation	
Conflict between municipality and WD - Road reclaim projects and engineering costs	Lack of clarity surrounding water governance	
Too many layers of water rules - WD, city, etc.		
Road authorities (county, city, twp) need to be able to do their job w/o over reach	Linear Projects/redevelopment	
Brown's Creek rules are more restrictive than MIDS. There is no consistency	Process/communication	
Uniformity of rules between watershed districts		
Timing of how to go through process with multiple regulatory agencies	Time	
Inpector turnover and cost	Unrealistic expectations for esc site conditions from extreme events	
Asking about alternatives that could be acceptable and not getting direction	Alternative design	Inflexibility
Not having alternatives to design when rules aren't feasible		
Not having alternatives to design when rules aren't feasible		
Why not use MIDS alternatives like everyone else?		
Don't pretend that volume control alternatives to infiltration can be as effective as infiltration	Alternatives to infiltration	
Excessive modeling requirements to consider alternative designs. Too expensive		
Need "off ramps" (flexible treatment options) where infiltration is infeasible or unwise		
Unrealistic expectations for the site for development density	BCWD is the most difficult watershed to work with - complicated, inconsistent, inflexible	
Cities need to be able to decide how to best protect groundwater. Alternatives to infiltration - DWSMAs	Conflicting multiple goals	
Priority of water issues often trumps all others		
No appeals process for engineering review from watershed = Big $$	Cost/expectations	
Needing to acquire more land to meet requirements	Costs - Eng, const, land acquisition, maint	
Rigidity of staff through development review process	Design and regulation	
BCWD are unsually and excessively complex	Design standards (MIDS)	
Meeting a presettlement standard may not be feasible or appropriate for linear or commercial projects		
How do we fix the rules to be reasonable and measurable	Education	
Meeting pre-settlement conditions	Feasibility	
Not respecting others' time to get projects approved without the off ramps		
Balancing priorities	Flexibility	
Lack of flexibility, rigid		
Pre-settlement is too restrictive		
Lack of flexibility and "being reasonable"	Interactions between applicants and WD and/or consultant staff	
Lack of clear alternative treatment options, MIDS has a FTO chart to help this issue	Linear Projects/redevelopment	
Are rules working? How are outcomes measured?	Design and regulation	Knowledge gaps
Lack of knowledge of technical aspects	Education	
Frustration with inexperienced consultant staff - not enough authority and imagination to consider alternatives	Interactions between applicants and WD and/or consultant staff	
Is the developer and their contractor following the Brown's Creek rules/their commitments to prevent muddy runoff entering Brown's Creek Watershed assets (streams, ponds)	Linear Projects/redevelopment	
Engineering lacks understanding of water quality BMP design	Miscellaneous	
Knowledge/comprehension	Technical	
Developers/engineers don't submit copmlete submittal/plans - try to get by with meeting part of the requirements	Development impacts	Lack of buy-in
Developers/engineers don't want to address all the requirements - ask questions like "which requirement is most important?"		
Going above the industry standards for rate/WQ/volume standards w/o participating in costs	Feasibility	
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	Process/communication	
Lack of interest by public until impacted	Resistance/push back	
Push back from developers		
Not following design	Technical	
Not following erosion control plans		
Barriers to technology	Miscellaneous	Other
Don't let treatments work	Process/communication	
Having no independent land for own projects	Technical	
Residents view WD rules as a taking or overly zealous	Design and regulation	Property impacts
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	Design standards (MIDS)	
Balance between protecting resources and property rights	Linear Projects/redevelopment	
Burden on individual landowners for culvert size engineering		
Independence/ "lands rights"	Resistance/push back	
Overly complicated and unclear	BCWD is the most difficult watershed to work with - complicated, inconsistent, inflexible	Unclear requirements
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)		
Too many jurisdictions with different rules	Conflicting multiple goals	
Confusion of rule implementation	Consistency with city requirements	
Thought they had it done, then watershed decided it had to be redesigned		
Three-way communication between BCWD, applicants, and engineers	Cost/expectations	
What triggers the buffer (wetland) requirements?	Design and regulation	
Inspections calling out items that don't have an impact on WQ (Erosion and sed. Control)	ESC Inspections expectations	
Too "nit picky"	Interactions between applicants and WD and/or consultant staff	

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		