

18681 Lake Drive East Chanhassen, MN 55317 952-607-6512 www.rpbcwd.org

Riley Purgatory Bluff Creek Watershed District Permit Application Review

Permit No: 2023-055

Considered at Board of Managers Meeting: October 4, 2023

Application Received complete: September 18, 2023

Applicant: Ron Clark Construction, Mike Waldo

Consultant: Campion Engineering Service Inc., Marty Campion

Project: Ridgewood Ponds development– The applicant proposes the demolition of an existing single-family home and the construction of eleven residential single-family homes and associated stormwater infiltration basins.

Location: 18116 Ridgewood Road in Minnetonka, MN

Reviewer: Scott Sobiech, PE, Barr Engineering

Proposed Board Action

Manager ______ moved and Manager ______ seconded adoption of the following resolutions based on the permit report that follows and the presentation of the matter at the October 4, 2023 meeting of the managers:

Resolved that the application for Permit 2023-055 is approved, subject to the conditions and stipulations set forth in the Recommendations section of the attached report;

Resolved that on determination by the RPBCWD administrator that the conditions of approval have been met, the RPBCWD president or administrator is authorized and directed to sign and deliver Permit 2023-055 to the applicant on behalf of RPBCWD.

Upon vote, the resolutions were adopted, _____ [VOTE TALLY].

Applicable Rule Conformance Summary

Rule	Issue	Conforms to RPBCV	VD Rules?	Comments	
С	Erosion Control	Yes			
	Plan				
D	Wetland and Creek	See Comment		See rule-specific permit condition D1	
	Buffers			related to recordation of buffer	
				maintenance declaration.	
J	Stormwater	Rate	Yes		
	Management	Volume	See	See stipulation #6 related to	
			Comment	infiltration testing during	
				construction.	
		Water Quality	Yes		
		Low Floor Elev.	Yes		

Page | 1

Rule	Issue	Conforms to RPBC	ND Rules?	Comments
		Maintenance	See comment.	See rule-specific permit condition J1related to recordation of stormwater facility maintenance declaration.
		Chloride Management	See Comment	See stipulation #7 related to providing the chloride management before project close-out.
		Wetland Protection	Yes	
L	Permit Fee Deposit	Yes		\$3000 received August 21, 2023. As of September 29, 2023 the amount due is \$2,798.
М	Financial Assurances	See Comment		The financial assurance is calculated at \$200,135.

Project Description

The applicant proposes the subdivision of an existing single family home parcel into an eleven-lot singlefamily residential development with associated sewer and utilities, and the construction of two infiltration basins for stormwater management. The project also includes the removal of an existing home and driveway. The applicant proposes two infiltration basins to provide volume control, water quality, and rate control.

The water resources within the project site or downgradient of the proposed activities are summarized in the following table.

Water Resource	Projected resource impacts
Wetland 1	A Wetland Conservation Act-protected wetland onsite and downgradient from proposed land- disturbing activities.
Wetland 2	An on-site Public Water Wetland (27-820-W) downgradient from proposed land-disturbing activities.
Wetland 3	A Wetland Conservation Act-protected wetland onsite and downgradient from and disturbed by proposed land-disturbing activities.

Water resource impacted by proposed project

The project site information is summarized below:

Project Site Information	Area (acres)
Total Site Area	23.73
Existing Site Impervious	0.84
Proposed Site Impervious Area	1.47
Change in Site Impervious Area	0.63 (75% increase)
Disturbed Impervious Area	0.84 (100% disturbed)
Total Disturbed Area	4.2

Exhibits:

- Permit Application received August 18, 2023 (The applicant was notified on September 8, 2023 that the submittal was incomplete; materials completing the application were received on September 18, 2023)
- Stormwater Management Plan dated August 17, 2023 (revised September 14, 2023 and September 19, 2023)
- 3. Wetland Buffer exhibit dated July 19, 2023 (revised September 6, 2023 and September 16)
- 4. Grading Plan dated August 17, 2023
- 5. Construction Plan Set dated September 16, 2023 (including updated grading plan, revisions received September 20, 2023)
- 6. Existing and proposed conditions HydroCAD model received September 18, 2023 (revised September 20, 2023)
- 7. Existing and proposed conditions P8 model received September 18, 2023 (revised September 20, 2023)
- 8. Wetland Delineation report dated September 26, 2022 (including MnRAMs)
- 9. Minnesota Wetland Conservation Act Notice of Decision for the wetland type and boundary dated November 3, 2023
- 10. Geotechnical Evaluation Report dated January 17, 2023
- 11. Addendum 1 to the geotechnical evaluation report dated August 29, 2023
- 12. Cost Estimate date September 18, 2023
- 13. Response to review comments received September 20, 2023

Rule Specific Permit Conditions

Rule C: Erosion and Sediment Control

Because the applicant proposes to alter 4.2 acres of land-surface area, the project must conform to the requirements in the RPBCWD Erosion and Sediment Control rule (Rule C, Subsection 2.1).

The erosion control plan prepared by Campion Engineering Service Inc. includes installation of silt fence perimeter control, rock construction entrance, inlet protection, weekly inspection, placement of a minimum of 6 inches of topsoil with 5 percent organic content, decompaction of areas compacted during construction, and retention of native topsoil onsite. The construction drawing list Kevin Trujillo with Ron Clark Construction (612-363-2772; KevinT@ronClark.com) as the individual responsible for erosion control at the site. The proposed project conforms to the RPBCWD Rule C requirements.

Rule D: Wetland and Creek Buffers

Because the proposed work triggers a permit under RPBCWD Rule J and the three onsite wetlands are downgradient from the proposed construction activities, Rule D, Subsections 2.1a and 3.1 require buffer along the edge of Wetlands 1 and 2 downgradient of the activities. Because the city of Minnetonka, the

local government unit responsible for administering the Wetland Conservation Act, allowed the excavation of 6-inches of material from the wetland, Rule D subsection 3.1b requires wetland buffer around the entirety of Wetland 3.

The MnRAM analyses indicate that Wetland 1 is low value, while Wetlands 2 and 3 are medium value. Rule D, Subsection 3.2.a.iii requires wetland buffer with an average of 40 feet from the delineated edge of the wetland, minimum 20 feet for medium value wetlands. Rule D, subsection 3.2.a.iv, requires a 20-foot average, 10-foot minimum width buffer along the downgradient edge of Wetland 1. The buffer widths are summarized in the table below.

Wetland ID	RPBCWD Wetland Value	Required Minimum Width (ft)	Required Average Width (ft)	Required Area (sq ft)	Provided Area (sq ft)	Provided Minimum Width (ft)	Provided Average Width (ft)
Wetland 1	Low	10	20	7,060	13,532	20	38.3
Wetland 2 (DNR Public Wetland 27-874W)	Medium	20	40	73,361	73,643	25	40.1
Wetland 3	Medium	20	40	13,034	15,002	20	46.0

The plans require revegetating disturbed areas within the proposed buffer with native vegetation, thus conforming to Rule D, Subsection 3.3. The engineer's review of plan sheets shows that buffer markers will be placed per District criteria (Subsection 3.4).

A note is included on the plan sheet indicating the project will be constructed so as to minimize the potential transfer of aquatic invasive species (e.g., zebra mussels, Eurasian watermilfoil, etc.) to the maximum extent possible conforming to Rule D, Subsection 3.6.

To conform to the RPBCWD Rule D the following revisions are needed:

D1. Before any work subject to District permit requirements commences, buffer areas and maintenance requirements, including locations of buffer markers, must be documented in a declaration recorded after review and approval by RPBCWD in accordance with Rule D, Subsection 3.5.

Rule J: Stormwater Management

Because the project will disturb 4.2 acres of land-surface area, the project must meet the criteria of RPBCWD's Stormwater Management rule (Rule J, Subsection 2.1). The criteria listed in Subsection 3.1 apply to the entire project site and all impervious area because the applicant proposes to disturb 100% of the existing impervious surface and increase the imperviousness of the entire site by 75% percent (i.e., more than 50 percent; Rule J, Subsection 2.3). The applicant proposes two infiltration basins to provide volume control, water quality, and rate control.

Rate Control

In order to meet the rate control criteria listed in Subsection 3.1.a, the 2-, 10-, and 100-year post development peak runoff rates must be equal to or less than the existing discharge rates at all locations where stormwater leaves the site. The Applicant used a HydroCAD hydrologic model to simulate runoff rates for pre- and post-development conditions for the 2-, 10-, and 100-year frequency storm events using a nested rainfall distribution, and a 100-year frequency, 10-day snowmelt event. The existing and proposed 2-, 10-, and 100-year frequency discharges from the site are summarized in the table below.

Modeled Discharge Location	2-Year Discharge (cfs)		10-Year Discharge (cfs)		100-Year Discharge (cfs)		10-Day Snowmelt (cfs)	
	Ex	Prop	Ex	Prop	Ex	Prop	Ex	Prop
Wetland 2	4.0	1.8	8.1	7.6	19.2	17.7	1.0	0.8
Wetland 3	1.4	0.6	2.4	1.5	4.5	3.9	0.4	0.3

The proposed stormwater management plan will provide rate control in compliance with the RPBCWD requirements for the 2-, 10-, and 100-year events. Thus, the proposed project meets the rate control requirements in Rule J, Subsection 3.1a.

Volume Abstraction

Subsection 3.1.b of Rule J requires the abstraction onsite of 1.1 inches of runoff from all regulated impervious surface on the site. An abstraction volume of 5,880 cubic feet is required from the 1.47 acres (64,149 square feet) of regulated impervious area within the project site. Plans indicate pretreatment for runoff entering the infiltration facilities is provided by vegetated yards and sump manholes, thus the proposed project conforms with RPBCWD Rule J, Subsection 3.1b.1.

Eleven soil borings in the Geotechnical Evaluation Report by Bruan Intertec indicate the site is predominately poorly graded sands. Groundwater was encountered at six of the borings. The subsurface investigation information summarized in the table below shows that groundwater is at least 3 feet below the bottom of the proposed infiltration basin (Rule J, Subsection 3.1.b.2.a).

Proposed BMP	Boring ID	Boring is within footprint?	Groundwater Elevation (feet)	BMP Bottom Elevation (feet)	Separation (feet)
Infiltration Basin 1	ST-5	Yes	889.5	896.0	6.5
Infiltration Basin 2	PZ-2	Yes	889.9	893.0	3.1

Based on the presence of poorly graded sand, the applicant used a design infiltration rate of 0.8 in/hr for infiltration basin 1 and 0.45 in/hr for infiltration basin 2 based on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's recommended design infiltration rates for the underlying soils. The engineer finds that under these presumed design infiltration rates, the infiltration stormwater management facilities will draw down within 48 hours (Rule J, subsection 3.1biii). The geotechnical report does not contain infiltration or hydraulic

conductivity testing results at the infiltration stormwater management facilities as required by Rule J, subsection 3.1.b.ii.C. To confirm the design presumptions and ensure the applicant has incorporated abstraction in accordance with Rule J, subsection 3.1.b, supporting information in the form of infiltration or hydraulic conductivity testing at the proposed infiltration stormwater management facilities must be provided before the proposed BMPs are constructed. If infiltration capacity is less than needed to conform with the volume abstraction requirement in subsection 3.1.b for the proposed infiltration stormwater management facilities or there is less than three feet of separation to groundwater, design modifications to achieve compliance with RPBCWD requirements to maximize the abstraction will need to be submitted (in the form of an application for a permit modification or new permit).

The applicant has maximized the two proposed infiltration basin to provide a total abstraction volume of 7,550 cubic feet which is greater than the required equivalent volume of 1.1" off the impervious surface. However, because the engineer concurs that the existing sanitary sewer location and depth combined with the grades required to connect to the existing street presents existing site restrictions limiting the ability to route the runoff from 0.039 acres of street to the proposed infiltration basin, the abstraction standard in Subsection 3.1 of Rule J cannot practicably be met and the site is considered restricted. For restricted sites, Subsection 3.3 of Rule J requires rate control in accordance with Subsection 3.1a and that abstraction and water quality protection be provided in accordance with the following sequence: (a)Abstraction of 0.55 inches of runoff from site impervious surface determined in accordance with paragraphs 2.3, 3.1 or 3.2, as applicable, and treatment of all runoff to the standard in paragraph 3.1c; or (b) Abstraction of runoff onsite to the maximum extent practicable and treatment of all runoff to the standard in paragraph 3.1c; or (c) Offsite abstraction and treatment in the watershed to the standards in paragraph 3.1b and 3.1c.

Required	Required	Provided	Provided
Abstraction	Abstraction	Abstraction	Abstraction
Depth	Volume	Depth	Volume
(inches)	(cubic feet)	(inches)	(cubic feet)
1.1	5,880	1.06	

The table below summarizes the volume abstraction for the site.

With the conditions noted above, the engineer concurs with the submitted information and finds that the proposed project will conform with Rule J, Subsection 3.3.a.

Water Quality Management

Subsection 3.1.c of Rule J requires the Applicant to provide for at least 60 percent annual removal efficiency for total phosphorus (TP), and at least 90 percent annual removal efficiency for total suspended solids (TSS) from site runoff, and no net increase in TSS or TP loading leaving the site from existing conditions. The Applicant is proposing to use two infiltration basins to achieve the required TP and TSS removals.

The P8 modeling results of runoff from the site summarized in tables below show the annual TSS and TP removal requirement is achieved and that there is no net increase in TSS and TP leaving the site. The

engineer concurs with the modeling and finds that the proposed project is in conformance with Rule J, Subsection 3.1.c.

Pollutant of Interest	Regulated Site Loading (lbs/yr)	Required Load Removal (lbs/yr)	Provided Load Reduction (lbs/yr)	
Total Suspended Solids (TSS)	11,637	10,473 (90%)	10,721 (92.1%)	
Total Phosphorus (TP)	37.8	22.7 (60%)	34.4 (91.0%)	

Annual TSS and TP removal summary

Pollutant of Interest	Existing Site Loading (lbs/yr)	Proposed Site Load after Treatment (lbs/yr)	Change (Ibs/yr)				
Total Suspended Solids (TSS)	8,913	916	-7,997				
Total Phosphorus (TP)	29.2	3.4	-25.8				

Summary of net change in TSS and TP leaving the site

Low floor Elevation

All new buildings must be constructed such that the lowest floor is at least two feet above the 100-year high water elevation of a stormwater facility or waterbody or one foot above the emergency overflow of a stormwater-management facility according to Rule J, Subsection 3.6a. In addition, a stormwatermanagement facility must be constructed at an elevation that ensures that no adjacent habitable building will be brought into noncompliance with this requirement according to Rule J, Subsection 3.6b.

The low floor elevations of the proposed houses and the 100-year high water elevation of the infiltration basins and wetlands are summarized below. Because the low floor elevations of the proposed structures on Lots 2-8, 10, and 11 are more than two feet above the 100-year high water elevation of the stormwater facility or waterbody, the proposed project is in conformance with Rule J, Subsection 3.6, as to those parcels. Because the low floor elevation of Lots 1 and 9 are less than 2 feet above the 100-year high-water elevation, an alternative low floor analysis was conducted as outlined in Rule J, Appendix J.1 – Low-Floor Elevation Assessment. The results of the low floor analysis using *Appendix J1 Plot 2: Minimum Depth to Water Table for No Further Evaluation* is summarized in the above table. The results demonstrate the provided separation is greater than the minimum required, thus meeting the habitable structure requirements in Rule J, Subsection 3.6.

Lot	Waterbody or Stormwater Facility	100-year Event Flood Elevation of Feature (feet)	Lowest Floor Elevation of Building (feet)	Freeboard provided (feet)	Distance from Building to Adjacent Facility (ft)	Seasonal Water Table Elevation (ft)	Minimum Permissible Depth to Water Table (ft)	Provided Depth from Low Floor Elevation to Water Table (ft)
Lot 1	Infiltration Basin 1	899.2	894.8	-4.4	98	894.3	0.24	0.5
Lot 2	Wetland 2	891.0	897.6	6.6	-	-	-	-
Lot 3	Wetland 2	891.0	900.1	9.1	-	-	-	-
Lot 4	Wetland 2	891.0	900.1	9.1	-	-	-	-
Lot 5	Wetland 2	891.0	899.6	8.6	-	-	-	-
Lot 6	Wetland 2	891.0	899.4	8.4	-	-	-	-
Lot 7	Wetland 2	891.0	899.6	8.6	-	-	-	-
Lot 8	Infiltration Basin 2	895.2	897.2	2.0	-	-	-	-
Lot 9	Infiltration Basin 1	899.2	898.0	-1.2	49	891.5	0.19	6.5
Lot 10	Wetland 3	896.0	898.0	2.0	-	-	-	-
Lot 11	Wetland 3	896.0	898.5	2.5	-	-	-	-

Maintenance

Subsection 3.7 of Rule J requires the submission of a maintenance plan. All stormwater management structures and facilities must be designed for maintenance access and properly maintained in perpetuity to assure that they continue to function as designed.

J1. Permit applicant must provide a maintenance and inspection declaration. A maintenance declaration template is available on the permits page of the RPBCWD website.
(http://www.rpbcwd.org/permits/). A draft declaration must be provided for District review and approval prior to recording.

Chloride Management

Subsection 3.8 of Rule J requires the submission of chloride management plan that designates the individual authorized to implement the chloride management plan and the MPCA-certified salt applicator engaged in implementing the plan. The RPBCWD chloride-management plan requirement applies to the streets and common areas of the project site, but not the individual single-family homes. To close out the permit and release the \$5,000 in financial assurance held for the purpose of chloride management, the permit applicant must provide a chloride management plan that designates the individual authorized to implement the chloride management plan and the MPCA-certified salt applicator engaged in implementing the plan for the common areas (e.g., streets) at the site.

Wetland Protection

Because runoff from the redeveloped site is tributary to onsite, low and medium value wetlands, the project must comply with RPBCWD's wetland protection criteria in Rule J, subsection 3.10. In accordance

with Rule J, subsection 3.10a, the proposed land-disturbing activities will not increase the bounce in water level, duration of inundation, or change the runout elevation in the subwatershed, for the receiving wetland. Because the applicant's HydroCAD model results demonstrate, and the engineer concurs, that the proposed flow rate and volumes flowing towards the wetlands are less than the under existing conditions, the bounce and inundation will not increase, thus the project meets the Bounce and Inundation criterion.

Rule J, Subsection 3.10b requires that any discharge to low- or medium-value wetlands be treated to the water quality treatment criteria in Rule J, subsection 3.1c. The applicant provided P8 modeling as summarized in the following tables demonstrating the runoff from the disturbed areas tributary to the wetlands will be treated in conformance with Rule J, Subsection 3.10b.

Wetland	Wetland Value	Required TSS Removal	Required TP Removal	Provided TSS Removal	Provided TP Removal
Wetland 1	Low	90%	60%	92.3	91.4
Wetland 2	Medium	90%	60%	92.1	91.0
Wetland 3	Medium	90%	60%	92.3	91.4

Rule L: Permit Fee Deposit:

The RPBCWD permit fee schedule adopted in February 2020 requires permit applicants to deposit \$3,000 to be held in escrow and applied to cover the \$10 permit-processing fee and reimburse RPBCWD for permit review and inspection-related costs and when a permit application is approved, the deposit must be replenished to the applicable deposit amount by the applicant before the permit will be issued to cover actual costs incurred to monitor compliance with permit conditions and the RPBCWD Rules. A permit fee deposit of \$3,000 was received on August 21, 2023 . The applicant must replenish the permit fee deposit to the original amount due before the permit will be issued. Subsequently, if the costs of review, administration, inspections and closeout-related or other regulatory activities exceed the fee deposit amount, the applicant will be required to replenish the deposit to the original amount or such lesser amount as the RPBCWD administrator deems sufficient within 30 days of receiving notice that such deposit is due. The administrator will close out the relevant application or permit and revoke prior approvals, if any, if the permit-fee deposit is not timely replenished.

L1. The applicant must replenish the permit fee deposit to the original amount due before the permit will be issued. As of September 29, 2023 the amount due is \$2,798.

	Unit	Unit Cost	# of Units	Total
Rule C: Erosion Control				
Silt Fence	LF	\$2.50	5,682	\$14,205
Inlet Protection	EA	\$100	4	\$400

Rule M: Financial Assurance:

	Unit	Unit Cost	# of Units	Total
Rock Entrance	EA	\$250	1	\$250
Restoration of disturbance	Ac	\$2,500	4.2	\$10,500
Rule D: Wetland Buffer	LS	\$5,000	1	\$5 <i>,</i> 000
Rule J: Stormwater Management Infiltration basin: 125% of engineer's opinion of cost (\$117,269)	EA	125% OPC	1	\$146,586
Chloride Management Plan	LS	\$5,000	1	\$5,000
Contingency (10%)		10%		\$18,194
Total Financial Assurance				\$200,135

Applicable General Requirements:

- 1. The RPBCWD Administrator and Engineer shall be notified at least three days prior to commencement of work.
- 2. Construction must be consistent with the plans, specifications, and models that were submitted by the applicant that were the basis of permit approval. The date(s) of the approved plans, specifications, and modeling are listed on the permit. The grant of the permit does not in any way relieve the permittee, its engineer, or other professional consultants of responsibility for the permitted work.
- 3. The grant of the permit does not relieve the permittee of any responsibility to obtain approval of any other regulatory body with authority.
- 4. The issuance of this permit does not convey any rights to either real or personal property, or any exclusive privileges, nor does it authorize any injury to private property or any invasion of personal rights, nor any infringement of federal, state, or local laws or regulations.
- 5. In all cases where the doing by the permittee of anything authorized by this permit involves the taking, using or damaging of any property, rights or interests of any other person or persons, or of any publicly owned lands or improvements or interests, the permittee, before proceeding therewith, must acquire all necessary property rights and interest.
- 6. RPBCWD's determination to issue this permit was made in reliance on the information provided by the applicant. Any substantive change in the work affecting the nature and extent of applicability of RPBCWD regulatory requirements or substantive changes in the methods or means of compliance with RPBCWD regulatory requirements must be the subject of an application for a permit modification to the RPBCWD.
- 7. If the conditions herein are met and the permit is issued by RPBCWD, the applicant, by accepting the permit, grants access to the site of the work at all reasonable times during and after construction to authorized representatives of the RPBCWD for inspection of the work.

Findings

1. The proposed project includes the information necessary, plan sheets and erosion control plan for review.

2. The proposed project will conform to Rule C, D, and J if the Rule Specific Permit Conditions listed above are met.

Recommendation:

Approval of the permit contingent upon:

- 1. Financial Assurance in the amount of \$200,135.
- 2. Receipt in recordation a maintenance declaration for the operation and maintenance the wetland buffer areas and stormwater management facilities. Drafts of all documents to be recorded must be reviewed and approved by the District prior to recordation and proof of recordation must be provided to RPBCWD.
- 3. The applicant must replenish the permit fee deposit to the original amount due before the permit will be issued. As of September 29, 2023 the amount due is \$2,798.

By accepting the permit, when issued, the applicant agrees to the following stipulations:

- 1. Continued compliance with General Requirements
- Per Rule J Subsection 4.5, upon completion of the site work, the permittee must submit as-built drawings demonstrating that at the time of final stabilization, all the stormwater facilities conform to design specifications and function as intended and approved by the District. As-built/record drawings must be signed by a professional engineer licensed in Minnesota and include, but not limited to:
 - a. the surveyed bottom elevations, water levels, and general topography of all facilities;
 - b. the size, type, and surveyed invert elevations of all stormwater facility inlets and outlets;
 - c. the surveyed elevations of all emergency overflows including stormwater facility, street, and other;
- 3. Providing the following additional close-out materials:
 - a. Documentation that disturbed pervious areas remaining pervious have been decompacted per Rule C.2c criteria
- 4. The work on the Ridgewood Ponds development under the terms of permit 2023-055, if issued, must have an impervious surface area and configuration materially consistent with the approved plans. Design that differs materially from the approved plans (e.g., in terms of total impervious area) will need to be the subject of a request for a permit modification or new permit, which will be subject to review for compliance with all applicable regulatory requirements.
- 5. Replenish the permit fee deposit to the original amount or such lesser amount as the RPBCWD administrator determines sufficient within 45 days of receiving notice that such deposit is due in order to cover continued actual costs incurred to monitor compliance with permit conditions and the RPBCWD Rules.
- 6. Per Rule J, Subsection 3.1.b.ii measured infiltration capacity of the soils at the bottom of the infiltration BMPs must be provided. The applicant must submit documentation verifying the infiltration capacity of the soils and that the volume control capacity is calculated using the measured infiltration rate. In addition, subsurface soil investigation is needed to verify adequate

separation to groundwater (Rule J subsection 3.1.b.2). If infiltration capacity is less than needed to conform with the volume abstraction requirement in subsection 3.3b or there is inadequate separation to groundwater, design modifications to achieve compliance with RPBCWD requirements will need to be submitted (in the form of an application for a permit modification or new permit).

7. To close out the permit and release the \$5,000 in financial assurance held for the purpose, the permit applicant must provide a chloride management plan that designates the individual authorized to implement the chloride management plan and the MPCA-certified salt applicator engaged in implementing the plan at the site.





















