

## MEETING MINUTES

Mid Moraine Water Quality Collective Meeting

Thursday October 27, 2016

10:00 A.M. – 2:00 P.M.

Jackson Village Hall

N168 W20733 Main St, Jackson

Lower Level Conference Room



### Participants

David Arnott – Ruekert Mielke, Inc.  
 Matt Bednarski - GRAEF  
 Jeremy Baerenwald – City of West Bend Sewer Utility  
 Joseph Britt – Sand County Foundation  
 Bill Cording – Village of Newburg  
 Ray deBruijn – Village of Saukville  
 Jeff Deitsch – Village of Jackson  
 Dave Fowler – Town of Grafton  
 Mark Gruber – Village of Campbellsport  
 Eric Hackert – City of Cedarburg  
 Ray Hartmann – Saukville Waste Water Utility  
 Bryan Hartsook – WDNR  
 Mike Heili – Village of Newburg  
 Bill Hess – Village of Campbellsport  
 Andy Holschbach – Land and Water Management  
 Brian Kober – Village of Jackson  
 Andy LaFond – Village of Thiensville  
 Jen Linse – River Revitalization Foundation

Kristen Lundeen – City of Mequon  
 Maureen McBroom – Ruekert Mielke, Inc.  
 Ruth Mueller – City of West Bend  
 George Muth – Washington County Farm Bureau  
 Cheryl Nenn – Milwaukee River Keeper  
 Tim Nennig – Village of Grafton  
 Greg Olson – Sand County Foundation  
 Geof Parish – GRAEF  
 Ben Propson – Village of Kewaskum  
 Steve Randall – City of West Bend Sewer Utility  
 Linda Reid – Southeastern Wisconsin Watershed Trust  
 Paul Sebo – Washington County  
 Roger Strohm – Village of Fredonia  
 Kaity Taylor – SWWT  
 Nick Tecca – GRAEF  
 Amber Thomas – Village of Grafton  
 Aaron Volkening – Town of Grafton  
 Tom Wiza – City of Cedarburg

### 1. Introductions and Thoughts about TMDL:

- a. How will the TMDL effect budgets? Who will pay for projects? *(repeated 4x)*
- b. Hope the MMWQC allows an increase in efficiency of addressing water quality issues.
- c. Interested in how different land uses are treated in the TMDLs.
- d. How do you get credit for stream restoration projects?
- e. How are TMDL transferred to permits?
- f. TMDL are an opportunity to look at water quality differently
- g. What are the impacts to the WWTF? *(repeated 4x)*
- h. How will consistent reliable monitoring be performed to prevent issues in data?
- i. Excited about working at a watershed level rather than isolate areas.
- j. Excited about everyone working collaboratively.
- k. What are the impacts to the MS4?
- l. Can there be clarification on “banking” phosphorus credit?
- m. Is there a multi-discharge variance?
- n. It would be great to hear success stories.
- o. What exactly needs done by the municipality?
- p. Sand County Foundation wants to see how they can help out.

- q. Concerned that the data used to create the TMDL is outdated. WWTP have better, more current data. Current data may show different impairment level.
- r. Concerned with how a non-MS4 community will be impacted.
- s. Concerned municipality may have to own land outside municipal border.

**Goals of MMWQC:**

- 1. Improve water quality
- 2. Stewardship of taxpayer and rate payer dollars
- 3. Create collaboration opportunities and provide a unified voice in the watershed

**2. TMDL Timeline**

- a. There are 9 different MS4 permits within the MMWQC. May be able to consolidate efforts.
- b. TMDL approval is anticipated in 2017.
- c. Municipalities need to have plan to meet WLA completed and modeling by 2021.
- d. WWTF have a more compressed schedule.
- e. WWTF - 2017 evaluate plant operations
- f. WWTF - 2018 alternative analysis
- g. WWTF - 2019-2020 develop compliance plan
- h. WWTF - 2023-2025 achieve compliance
- i. WWTF compliance schedules are different for east municipality. The relative timing for each step is similar.

**3. SWWT**

- a. Goal of SWWT is to create useable waterways
- b. SWWT facilitates meetings between groups that may not otherwise meet
- c. SWWT survey indicates that public opinion towards water quality is shifting favorably
- d. Question was asked if SWWT was seeing the population being both willing and able to pay for water quality.

**4. TMDL Map**

- a. Map shows municipalities by MS4, WWTF, or both. Includes impaired waterways, sub-watersheds, and reachsheds. Maps shows municipalities that are both part of and not part of MMWQC.
- b. There is potential to expand the MMWQC to include additional municipalities.
- c. Expansion creates greater opportunities for collaboration and cost sharing.

**5. Monitoring Data Overview**

- a. Data was sent from communities

- b. Data shows variation throughout watershed, is not official data
- c. Data can be provided to SWERPC and MMSD if requested.
  - i. Communities are getting lots of requests from different agencies working on different things. Can the MMWQC Team provide this data to requesting agencies? Yes.
  - ii. MS4's and WWTF's should keep the MMWQC Team updated on meetings, agency requests, etc. Keeping the team updated will allow us to be efficient in responses or represent the entire group when needed/warranted/requested
  - iii. NGO's will also provide feedback on meetings, opportunities, and requests to keep this entire group well informed.
- d. Adding data to DNR database may be beneficial
- e. Questions on how the current data compares to data used in TMDL report
- f. Concerns that monitoring data doesn't seem to have a direct bearing on permits. Municipalities frustrated that they spent time/effort/expense on monitoring and don't see a result.
- g. SEWRPC is very interested in gathering more data
- h. DNR would like the data to be resilient through time. Data is good for the collected purpose and good decision making.
- i. WWTF's would appreciate direct guidance on exactly how to collect data. An on-site work shop of where the data should be collected, etc.
  - a. Matt to coordinate with DNR on sample collection and possible workshops and site meetings for guidance.
- j. WWTF's are currently required to report data to DNR monthly. Frustrated that their data is never used for planning.
- k. SWIMs and NWIS databases are great resources for additional data.
- l. State has not provided a funding mechanism for municipalities to achieve compliance.

#### **6. UNPS Grant Update**

- a. All communities benefit from grant, no one has to pay for study.
- b. Looking beyond municipal boundaries for reduction credit potential.
- c. Cost can be prohibitive to remove phosphorus from stormwater, easier to prevent it from getting into the stormwater
- d. Idea is sites will be identified around the community.
  - a. Will summarize how much phosphorus needs reduced to meet TMDL
  - b. Will provide a menu of options of potential projects to meet compliance.
- e. Integrate R&M results with EVAAL results from other entities
- f. The Grant includes time to present results at individual municipal meetings.
- g. Suggested to overlaid Green Seams data

- h. Suggested to included trade ratios to data table
- i. A draft report is expected by mid-December. DNR review is in the first quarter of 2017. GRAEF and Ruekert-Mielke will schedule meetings with individual communities after DNR review.

**7. WWTF Limits Calculator Spreadsheet**

- a. It is a tool created to calculate effluent concentration required to meet TMDL compliance at different flows.

**8. Future Potential Activities**

- a. Multi-community GIS tool to track projects and track project credits
- b. Intranet site for MMWQC to use for data sharing
- c. Website for public education
- d. Potential group MS4 permit – combine different timelines and requirements to allow for easier collaboration
- e. Grants – collaboration increases opportunities. WDNR Urban Nonpoint Source Planning Grant, Fund for Lake Michigan Grant, WDNR Targeted Runoff Management Grant, Sweet Water Mini-Grants, etc.
- f. Ordinance Language Standards – potential to create uniform language such that all stormwater standards are the same. Creates a level playing field for economic development.

**9. 2017 Budgets**

- a. TMDL and phosphorus related work should have a budget line item of \$5000 to provide money for group meetings and collaborative opportunities.
- b. An updated time and material contract will be sent to each community
- c. Large dollar projects are not on the horizon ; there is a long timeline to meet goals.
- d. In the future, it may be better logistically to discuss municipal budgets earlier in the year. Many budgets were due in August, discussion in June would be desirable.

**General Closing Thoughts**

- a. Has anyone given thought to a group response to the TMDL before the public comment period ends?
- b. It would be beneficial to add grant discussions about 319 funding in conjunction with 9-Key Element Plans at future meetings.