**COON CREEK WATERSHED DISTRICT**

Request for Board Action

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEETING DATE:</th>
<th>April 13, 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AGENDA NUMBER:</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITEM:</td>
<td>Andover Local Water Plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**POLICY IMPACT:** Policy
**FISCAL IMPACT:** Budgeted

**REQUEST**
Adopt findings and approve the Andover Local Water plan with attached clarification of the above issues.

**BACKGROUND**
On February 11 the City of Andover submitted a Draft of its Local Surface Water Management Plan (LWP). The plan is required under Minnesota Statute 103B.235 Subd. 3. The city is required to “submit its water management plan to the watershed management organization for review for consistency with the watershed plan.”

The District has 60 days to review the plan and then shall approve or disapprove the local plan or parts of the plan. If the organization fails to complete its review within the prescribed period, the local plan shall be deemed approved unless an extension is agreed to by the local unit. The 60 days end today.

Staff discussed the plan with Andover staff April 2 and 3.

The District review focused on the following:
1. Plan content
2. Assessment of Existing or Potential Problems
3. Assessment of Implementation
4. Implementation Priorities
5. Implementation Program
6. Coordination with the District

**NOTE 1:** The current Comprehensive Watershed Plan addressed the review and approval of Local Water Plans by referencing the statutory requirements, but sought to recognize that the cumulative effect of State and Federal requirements, on Cities in particular, is to emphasize planning and to manage water through study and analysis. The District’s plan sought to simplify the planning process and focus on implementation and leverage as much as possible work and requirements satisfied in the City’s SWPPP and stormwater chapter of its Comp Plan as well as reference to the District’s Plan. The Staff’s review has sought to honor this approach in order to focus on results and actions.
ISSUES/CONCERNS

**Anoka Conservation District:** ACD’s review made several suggestions that focused on the LRRWMO.

**Anoka County Highway Department:** Anoka County comments focused on clarifications and making wording and criteria consistent with the City’s well head protection plan and infiltration requirements within well head protection areas and drinking water supplies.

**Lower Rum River WMO:** The Lower Rum WMO made 7 comments and suggested corrections to the plan. While all of the comments were legitimate, none of the corrections or comments indicated significant variations from either LRRWMO or CCWD plans or policies. In fact the suggestion (#3) concerning water quality treatment standards should be considered in light of the pending TMDL and subwatershed implementation plans being developed for Coon Creek.

**Met Council Comments:** The MC comments note a suggested word change to reinforce the goal of nondegradation for the receiving waters in Andover.

REVIEW

**Plan Content:** All requirements present

**Assessment of Existing or Potential Problems:** The problems cited in section 6 reflect the problems identified by the District but are tailored to the specifics of the City. Issues identified include:

1. Need for increased volume control
2. Declines in surficial groundwater levels
3. Water quality in Crooked Lake including AIS & impairment of Coon Creek

**Assessment of Implementation:** All potential problems are addressed in the implementation section

**Implementation Priorities:** The method used for determining priorities is unclear.

**Implementation Program:** Implementation program addresses specific ordinances, policies and programs that will be changed to address problems. The implementation program only includes actions up to 2016. The City is in the process of updating its Capital Improvement Plan and 5 years of stormwater activities and improvements will be included.

**Coordination with the District:** The plan adequately addresses and references the roles and goals of the District relative to water management in the District.
FINDINGS
The Andover 2015 Local Water Plan:

1. Substantially complies with the plan content requirements of M.S. 103B.

2. Needs to clarify the method used for determining water management priorities

3. Needs to correct and note that Crooked Lake has good water quality but does have an AIS problem

4. Should note that the Coon Creek Watershed District has and is updating an AIS plan for the Watershed

5. Adequately addresses the actions to address and manage those problems

6. Addresses the roles and goals of the Coon Creek Watershed District in managing and assisting the City of Andover in addressing the water and related resource concerns within the city until the City’s Comprehensive Plan is updated.

7. The City should involve the District in the development and review of its Capital Improvement Plan as it relates to water and related resource investments.

Needed Clarifications
The City of Andover should clarify the following:

1. Clarify the method used for determining water management priorities.
2. Crooked Lake has good water quality but does have an AIS problem
3. The District has and is updating an AIS plan for the Watershed.
4. The City should involve the District in the development and review of its Capital Improvement Plan as it relates to water and related resource investments.

On April 7 the District received the attached Technical Memo clarifying all of the above.

RECOMMENDATION
Adopt findings and approve the Andover Local Water plan with attached clarification of the above issues.
## TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM

**Date:** April 7, 2015  
**Subject:** Response to Coon Creek Watershed District Comments on City of Andover’s Third Generation Surface Water Management Plan  
**Prepared For:** Dave Berkowitz, PE, Director of Public Works/City Engineer, City of Andover  
**Prepared By:** Kent Brander, PE

### A. INTRODUCTION

Comments by the Coon Creek Watershed District (CCWD) on the City of Andover’s Third Generation Surface Water Management Plan (SWMP) were received. This technical memorandum lists those comments along with the manner in which the City will address them in the final version of its SWMP.

### B. The CCWD identified the following 4 items requiring specific action and modification of the SWMP.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Requiring Clarification</th>
<th>How Item Will Be Addressed</th>
<th>SWMP Section(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Clarify the method used for determining water management priorities.</td>
<td>The following paragraph will be added: “Currently, the implementation items in the SWMP are part of the City’s ongoing surface water management program, and specific issues that arise within the program are addressed on a routine basis. Additional priorities identified in the plan have been determined through a series of meetings with City staff as well as Watershed District and Watershed Management Organization representatives. City staff members with involvement in these areas meet on a regular basis, and specific water management priorities (outside of the normal program) are brought to discussion. Management priorities are determined based on public safety, compliance with Agency requirements and City policy, water resources protection, and resident concerns.” The items regarding Crooked Lake</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2., 6.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Crooked Lake has good water quality but does have an AIS problem.

3. The District has and is updating an AIS plan for the Watershed.

4. The City should involve the District in the development and review of its Capital Improvement Plan as it relates to water and related resource investments.

Information on the AIS will be added.  

The importance of involving the CCWD in the CIP process will be clarified.