



Bassett Creek Watershed Management Commission

BCWMC Capital Improvement Program Prioritization Committee

Wednesday, January 9, 2018

8:30 – 10:00 a.m.

Council Conference Room, Golden Valley City Hall

Committee Members: Commissioners Welch, Prom, Harwell, Carlson; Alternate Commissioners Monk, McDonald Black; TAC Members Scharenbroich and Eckman

AGENDA:

1. Review/Approve Notes from 12/5/18 Committee Meeting – attached
2. Discuss Re-Revised Ranking Matrix – matrix attached in email; pre-project fact sheets attached below

At the last meeting the committee reviewed and discussed a revised matrix. There was consensus that a few items should be changed, moved, or added to the matrix. The attached matrix incorporates the following changes:

- A. Reorganizes and groups the columns according to priority
 - a. Primary Benefit Factors (those related to water quality and flooding benefits)
 - b. Jurisdiction Factors (“gatekeeper” and other criteria from policy 110)
 - c. Opportunity Factors (including coordination with redevelopment/infrastructure projects and partnerships with funding)
 - d. Secondary Benefit Factors
- B. Changes the range of points for “target TP reduction area” from 0-2 to 0-4
- C. Rewords the “redevelopment” column to include cooperation with city/agency infrastructure projects
- D. Changes the “increase infiltration” column to “reduce volume”
- E. Changes “protect and enhance fish and wildlife habitat” to “protect and enhance riparian or upland wildlife habitat” because any improvement to water quality improves fish habitat. This criterion now distinguishes upland/riparian improvements as added benefits.

The attached matrix also has scores for four completed CIP projects with information known at the time it was added to the 5-year CIP (PRE-PROJECT) and again after the project was complete (POST PROJECT). Pre-project information was based on the project fact sheet submitted during 5-year CIP development. Fact sheets for the projects scored in the matrix are attached below.

As you can see from the ranking, the scores increased as much as 35% once the total project impact was known. This may prompt the Commission and project proposers to more fully develop pre-project concepts, or it may inhibit good projects from being properly ranked because not enough information is known. Further, it may promote “over promising” at the pre-project phase if project components are included in the initial concept that cannot ultimately be incorporated.

3. Working with Cities to Identify Commission CIP Projects

At the December meeting, staff was directed to develop ideas for how to work with cities to identify areas for Commission-driven projects. Staff has the following recommendations:

- TAC members should understand where the Commission is seeking projects and what type of projects the Commission is prioritizing.
- Commission staff and TAC members should develop, discuss, and give substantial thought (just short of analysis) to each project idea. This is likely to elongate the 5-year CIP development process. Project ideas should be brought forward and discussed in November or December of the year prior to 5-year CIP development.
- The Commission and TAC should hold a joint workshop where potential concepts are discussed and presented. A joint decision should be made on what projects to consider for the 5-year CIP. [Alternatively, the Commission could create a CIP Committee to complete this initial process and bring recommendations to the full Commission.]
- The Commission and the individual TAC members need to understand each member cities' internal processes regarding redevelopments – when/how do they hear about them, do they seek out projects, what is the typical timeline from concept to approval/construction, etc.
- City staff that are involved in redevelopments (from the beginning) also need to be aware of the potential for BCWMC participation in projects (this may require involvement by individual TAC members, at least in the beginning).
- If warranted, Commission staff (administrator and engineer) could be involved in key points in the cities' redevelopment processes. Depending on the redevelopment opportunity and the stage of the process, this could be a phone call, email or in-person meeting.

4. Discuss if CIP maintenance should be considered for CIP funding

5. Set next meeting and adjourn



Bassett Creek Watershed Management Commission

BCWMC Capital Improvement Program Prioritization Committee

Meeting Notes

Wednesday, December 5, 2018

8:30 – 10:00 a.m.

Council Conference Room, Golden Valley City Hall

Committee Members and Others Present: Commissioners Welch, Prom, and de Lambert; Alternate Commissioners Monk, Crough, and McDonald Black; TAC Members Scharenbroich and Eckman; Commission Engineers Chandler and Williams; Administrator Jester

AGENDA:

1. Review/Approve Notes from 11/5/18 Committee Meeting – There was consensus that the notes from the November 5th meeting were appropriate.
2. Discuss Revised Ranking Matrix
Administrator Jester reviewed components of a revised ranking matrix that included scores for existing (current and future) CIP projects. Engineer Chandler noted the matrix still includes points for CIP gatekeeper questions. Administrator Jester noted it was sometimes difficult to score a project due to so many unknowns. She noted that perhaps proposed projects should be less conceptual when they are considered for inclusion on the 5-year CIP.

There was some discussion about how this matrix still doesn't help find the best project but it could be used as a screening tool to help justify decisions. It was noted that it shouldn't necessarily be the responsibility of a project proposer (such as a city) to "gather points" for project scoring in the matrix – that this would be more like a grant application.

Additional comments/discussion included:

- The Commission needs to determine its priorities.
- The matrix is very specific and might help understand merits of a project but may be difficult to use as actual determinant.
- The matrix helps one to know how projects stack up against each other.
- City reps on the committee agree the matrix provides clarity with what the Commission is looking for and would help the city focus.
- Matrix can be a useful tool but shouldn't be used as final answer to whether a project moves forward or not because projects change and we don't know all the project components before feasibility study phase.
- Commissioner Welch noted he would like the Commission itself to develop project ideas rather than only reacting to city and/or developers' ideas. He would still like to see a geographic focus.
- Matrix cannot include cost per pound total phosphorus removal because we don't have that level of detail at 5-year CIP stage.
- Pollutant hot spots should be given more weight in scoring.
- Wondering if there's enough weight to what's important.

- Engineer Williams suggested scoring completed projects two ways for comparison: at 5-year CIP stage and after project is complete.

There was further discussion. Commissioner Welch asked if the matrix would help cities focus and find projects. Mr. Eckman stated “yes.” He noted the matrix columns regarding partnerships, redevelopment and hot spots would definitely help cities focus. He noted cities haven’t had that kind of direction from the Commission in the past and that this would help find priority projects. [It was noted that “redevelopment” means public or private projects.]

Mr. Scharenbroich noted that Plymouth is working on better partnerships with redevelopers and is also reinvesting in public lands including going “above and beyond” with stormwater management. He noted public projects are planned much further in advance than private redevelopment projects.

There was discussion about the actual ranking numbers. Alt. Commissioner McDonald Black indicated that phosphorus removal should be the highest priority. There were further discussions about scores and/or ranges for particular criteria.

3. Receive Information on Grant Programs

Administrator Jester reviewed information about the Nine Mile Creek WD grant program and the Mississippi Watershed Management Organization grant program. She noted NMCWD was offering funding to non-profits and other organizations for conceptual design assistance to develop cost share projects. They focused only on sites 2.5 acres or greater. Recently they received a State grant to identify high priority sites for BMPs on non-profit or faith-based community sites and then perform outreach to those entities.

MWMO grants funding for large green infrastructure or innovative projects that go above and beyond city stormwater standards. Only fund projects on 3+ acre sites. No quantifiable ranking system – just working with project proposers to fully understand commitment and potential. Only funded about 25% of proposed projects over life of program (3 years).

Administrator Jester indicated her desire to have funds available for redevelopers so that crucial opportunities aren’t missed. There was some discussion about the potential impact of such a program on the Commission’s levy and how \$50,000 doesn’t seem like enough to offer a redeveloper to go above and beyond. Commissioner Welch recommended the Commission first focus on refining its own CIP program and setting aside the grant program idea for now.

Commissioner Welch asked if the Commission has the data and staff time to cultivate CIP project where the Commission wants them. There was further discussion about how the matrix does point to where the Commission priorities lie and send a message to cities that this is where and what we want to see in potential projects. Mr. Scharenbroich and Mr. Eckman agreed.

Engineer Chandler noted that Commission staff could connect more strongly with city staff (or park district staff) in developing a list of potential projects. Staff were directed to develop ideas for how to work with Cities to identify areas for Commission-driven projects.

The committee agreed that the matrix needs a bit more work and that completed CIP projects should be scored. This should come back to a committee meeting in early January. They also agreed the TAC should weigh in on committee recommendations before they go to the full Commission.

4. Set next meeting and adjourn – The next meeting was set for January 9th at 8:30 a.m.