



Bassett Creek Watershed Management Commission

BCWMC Capital Improvement Program Prioritization Committee

Tuesday, April 24, 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 Asche and Eckman

AGENDA:

1. Why are we here? What is the objective of the committee's work?

The committee's primary purpose is to determine if and how capital projects in the watershed can be further prioritized for targeted implementation so that the best project gets built in the best location at the best time.

Secondarily, since there is only so much public land available for implementing capital projects, the committee could consider how to engage private businesses in the implementation of water quality best practices. This may be particularly important when development or redevelopment is planned. Should the Commission pro-actively work with private entities to help them go "above and beyond" existing requirements? Is a grant program warranted to financially incentivize this activity?

2. How are BCWMC CIP projects currently scheduled? What processes and guidance are currently in place?
 - a. 2015 – 2025 CIP List: Table 5-3 in Watershed Management Plan (attached)
 - b. Policy #110 in Watershed Management Plan
The BCWMC will consider including projects in the CIP that meet one or more of the following "gatekeeper" criteria.
 - *Project is part of the BCWMC trunk system (see Section 2.8.1, Figure 2-14 and Figure 2-15)*
 - *Project improves or protects water quality in a priority waterbody*
 - *Project addresses an approved TMDL or watershed restoration and protection strategy (WRAPS)*
 - *Project addresses flooding concern*

The BCWMC will use the following criteria, in addition to those listed above, to aid in the prioritization of projects:

- Project protects or restores previous Commission investments in infrastructure
- Project addresses intercommunity drainage issues
- Project addresses erosion and sedimentation issues
- Project will address multiple Commission goals (e.g., water quality, runoff volume, aesthetics, wildlife habitat, recreation, etc.)
- Subwatershed draining to project includes more than one community
- Addresses significant infrastructure or property damage concerns

The BCWMC will place a higher priority on projects that incorporate multiple benefits and will seek opportunities to incorporate multiple benefits into BCWMC projects, as opportunities allow.

- c. TMDL Implementation Plans which lay out projects and programs needed to address a particular pollutant for impaired waterbodies.
 - [Sweeney Lake](#)
 - [Medicine Lake](#)
 - [Metro-wide Chloride TMDL](#)
 - [Upper Mississippi River Bacteria TMDL](#)
- d. 5-year “rolling” CIP list starts with TAC recommendations based on
 - Opportunity
 - Readiness
 - Fairness
- e. As a reminder, the Commission spent considerable time prioritizing its waterbodies during development of the Watershed Management Plan. See Table 2-6 from the Watershed Management Plan below (with details in [Appendix C](#))

Table 2-6 BCWMC Management Classifications for Priority Waterbodies

BCWMC Classification	Waterbodies
Priority Streams	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Main Stem Bassett Creek • North Branch Bassett Creek* • Plymouth Creek • Sweeney Lake Branch Bassett Creek
Priority 1 Deep Lakes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Medicine Lake • Parkers Lake • Sweeney Lake • Twin Lake • Wirth Lake
Priority 1 Shallow Lakes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Northwood Lake • Westwood Lake
Priority 2 Shallow Lakes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cavanaugh (Sunset Hill) Pond • Crane Lake • Lost Lake

* Includes Bassett Creek Park Pond

3. How do other organizations prioritize projects?

The attached tables summarize how other watershed organizations and cities prioritize projects:

- Table 1 lists each entity and the factors/considerations they use to prioritize projects
- Table 2 compares the factors/considerations for project prioritization among entities

4. What level of annual effort feels right for prioritization exercises in the BCWMC?

Low Effort = Qualitatively assess projects similar to current practice with some slight modifications for the Commission or a committee to more formally review the projects recommended by the TAC.

Medium Effort = Semi-quantitative assessment of certain criteria – perhaps assigning “low, medium, or high” in addressing criteria for each project. Criteria could include items such as those listed as other considerations in Policy 110 (found in #2 above).

High Effort = Quantitative assessment – develop a range of possible numeric scores for a variety of criteria, score each potential project relative to each criterion, and prioritize projects based on their relative total scores. The range of scores developed for each criterion may be based on objective or subjective measures.

5. Set next meeting and adjourn

Future agenda items:

- Presentation from Minnehaha Creek Watershed District on partnerships with private businesses
- Review of grant programs implemented by other watersheds (Shingle Creek WMC, Mississippi WMO)

Table 1. Summary of factors considered in project prioritization by selected entities			
Factor Type¹: Benefit, Cost, or Opportunity	Prioritization Factors/Considerations (organized by entity)	Factor Assessment²: Quantitative (QT), Semi-quantitative (SQT), or Qualitative (QL)	Does Entity have a ranked/tiered prioritization?
Riley Purgatory Bluff Creek Watershed District			
Benefit	Alignment with District goals	SQT	Yes - quantitative/semi-quantitative factors (highlighted) are used to create a project score; projects are grouped with those above "X" score threshold implemented, and below "X" deferred; implementation schedule is based on qualitative factors (non-highlighted)
Benefit	Sustainability	SQT	
Benefit	Volume management	QT	
Benefit	Pollutant management	QT	
Benefit	Habitat restoration	SQT	
Benefit	Shoreline/streambank restoration	QT	
Benefit	Watershed benefits	QT	
Benefit	Partnership opportunities	SQT	
Benefit	Public access and education	SQT	
Opportunity	Funding availability	QL	
Opportunity	Coordination with other planned activities	QL	
Opportunity	Timing of partnerships/cost-sharing	QL	
Opportunity	Access/land ownership	QL	
Cost	Cost-effectiveness	QL	
City of Richfield			
Benefit	Flood Risk: Structures within 100-year floodplain	QL	Yes - Projects are grouped as High, Medium, or Low priority based on qualitative assessment of factors
Benefit	Flood Risk: Structures within 1 foot of 100-year floodplain	QL	
Cost	Cost-benefit	QL	
Benefit	Necessity for regulatory compliance (e.g., MS4 permit, TMDL)	QL	
Benefit	Public safety risk if not-performed	QL	
Opportunity	Coordination with other planned activities	QL	
Valley Branch Watershed District			
Opportunity	Commitments from previous years	QL	No - Projects are prioritized without a numeric ranking or tier system
Opportunity	Funding availability	QL	
Opportunity	Timing of partnerships/cost-sharing	QL	
Benefit	Project benefit	QL	
Cost	Cost-effectiveness	QL	
Benefit	Waterbody priority classification	QL	
Benefit	Water quality relative to action levels	QL	
Benefit	TMDL or WRAPS implementation item	QL	
Benefit	Project/program consistency with the Plan	QL	
Cost	Feasibility	QL	
Cost	Risk/liability of inaction	QL	
Ramsey-Washington Metro Watershed District			
Cost	Feasibility/cost effectiveness	QL	Yes - Projects are ranked as Tier 1, Tier 2, or Tier 3 based on qualitative assessment of factors
Cost	Risk/liability of inaction	QL	
Benefit	Waterbody priority classification (impaired, at-risk, stable)	QL	
Opportunity	Educational opportunity	QL	
Benefit	Social vulnerability (starting to be factored into their cost share program)	QL	
Benefit	Flood Risk: Flood-prone area next to District-managed waterbody	QL	
Benefit	Flood Risk: Flood-prone area next to District-managed facility	QL	
Benefit	Flood Risk: Number of impacted/potentially impacted structures	QT	
Benefit	Flood Risk: Flood prone areas upstream of at-risk/impaired waterbodies	QL	
Benefit	Flood Risk: Street Flooding	QL	

Table 1. Continued.....

Factor Type ¹ : Benefit, Cost, or Opportunity	Prioritization Factors/Considerations (organized by entity)	Factor Assessment ² : Quantitative (QT), Semi-quantitative (SQT), or Qualitative (QL)	Does Entity have a ranked/tiered prioritization?
Nine Mile Creek Watershed District			
Benefit	Progress towards completing and/or implementing a UAA or assessment	QL	Yes - Projects are grouped as High, Medium, or Low priority based on qualitative assessment of highlighted criteria; within each group, projects may be prioritized based on the non-highlighted factors
Benefit	Flooding impacts (regional vs local)	QL	
Benefit	TMDL or WRAPS implementation item	QL	
Benefit	Improve/enhance past watershed projects	QL	
Benefit	Improve water resource above level achieved by compliance with regulatory cont	QL	
Opportunity	Supported by city	QL	
Benefit	Progress towards Plan water resource goals	QL	
Benefit	Improve and protect water quality	QL	
Benefit	Reduce rate/volume of stormwater runoff	QL	
Benefit	Prevent erosion and reduce sedimentation	QL	
Benefit	Protect against or reduce damage from flooding on Nine Mile Creek	QL	
Benefit	Protect or restore high quality wetlands	QL	
Benefit	Improve water resource habitat for wildlife	QL	
Opportunity	Maximize cost-effectiveness and efficiency through collaboration (cost-share)	QL	
Opportunity	Demonstrate/test innovative technology or techniques	QL	
Benefit	watershed wide or multijurisdictional benefits	QL	
Benefit	Address impairment that is subject of a TMDL or WRAPS	QL	
Cedar River Watershed District (non-Metro)			
Benefit	Flood risk reduction benefit	SQT	Yes - projects are sequentially ranked based on a total score based 50% on the highlighted factors and 50% on the non-highlighted factors
Benefit	Water quality benefit	SQT	
Benefit	Ecology/habitat benefit	SQT	
Benefit	Groundwater benefit	SQT	
Opportunity	Public land/willing landowners	SQT	
Benefit	Addresses a water quality impairment	SQT	
Opportunity	Cost share opportunities	SQT	
Cost	Impacts to public waters (permitting restrictions)	SQT	
Opportunity	Positive exposure, project visibility	SQT	
Cost	Cost effectiveness	SQT	
Benefit	Upstream location in watershed	SQT	
Benefit	Diversity of project location	SQT	
City of Bloomington			
Opportunity	Projects in areas with planned street/infrastructure construction/reconstruction	QL	Not currently - Local water plan includes prioritization as a upcoming implementation item
Opportunity	Projects that leverage redevelopment or grant funding mechanisms	QL	
Benefit	Projects that protect emergency routes or high-value public infrastructure	QL	
Benefit	Projects that address both a water quantity and quality goal	QL	
Benefit	Projects that address regional flooding issues	QL	
Benefit	Projects that mitigate flooding of extended durations or significant ponding depth	QL	
Benefit	Projects in areas that have not benefited from previous flood mitigation projects (leveraging Social Vulnerability Index)	QL	
Mississippi Watershed Management Organization (cost-share program)			
Benefit	Benefits to downstream waters (water quality, rate/volume, habitat, and/or eros	Details about how these factors are scored was not available during the development of this table	Details about how these factors are scored was not available during the development of this table
Opportunity	Public vs private property for project location		
Benefit	Highly visible/educational value		
Opportunity	Innovative methods		
Cost	Project expected lifetime		
Cost	Project operation and maintenance cost		
Cost	Project funding sources		
Cost	Project implementation schedule		
Benefit	In MWMO Priority Management area		
Bassett Creek Watershed Management Commission (based on Policy 110)			
Benefit	Project is part of the BCWMC Trunk System	QL	TBD
Benefit	Project improves/protects water quality in a priority waterbody	QL	
Benefit	Project addresses an approved TMDL or WRAPS	QL	
Benefit	Project addresses flooding concerns	QL	
Benefit	Project addresses intercommunity drainage issue	QL	
Benefit	Project addresses erosion and sedimentation issue	QL	
Benefit	Project addresses multiple Commission goals	QL	
Benefit	Project includes intercommunity watersheds	QL	
Benefit	Project addresses significant infrastructure or property damage concerns	QL	

(1) Factors have been assigned to categories for discussion purposes only; categories include **benefits** (e.g., reduced flood risk, improved water quality), **costs** (e.g., capital cost, cost-effectiveness), and **opportunities** (e.g., coordination with other programs).

(2) The method of assessment is based on how the entity evaluates each factor/ consideration; **quantitative** factors are assigned a numeric score based on a standard unit of measure (e.g., dollars, lbs of pollutant); **semi-quantitative** factors are assigned a numeric value based on best professional judgement or an entity-defined scale (e.g., 1 to 7); **qualitative** factors are considered subjectively and/or are not assigned a score as part of prioritization.

Table 2. Comparison of factors/considerations for project prioritization between entities

Factor Type ¹ : Benefit, Cost, or Opportunity	Prioritization Factors/Considerations (grouped)	Method of Assessment by Entity ²								
		Riley Purgatory Bluff Creek Watershed District	Valley Branch Watershed District	Ramsey-Washington Metro Watershed District	Nine Mile Creek Watershed District	Cedar River Watershed District (non-Metro)	City of Richfield	City of Bloomington	Mississippi Watershed Management Organization (for cost- share)	Bassett Creek Watershed Management Commission
Benefits	Project addresses multiple goals	QL	QL		QL	SQT		QL		QL
	Water quality benefit	QT	QL		QL	SQT		QL	???	QL
	Wetland/habitat benefit	SQT			QL	SQT			???	
	Erosion/sedimentation benefit	QT			QL				???	QL
	Stormwater volume/rate benefit (non-flooding)	QT			QL				???	
	Flood risk reduction (to structures)		QL	QL	QL	SQT	QL	QL		QL
	Flood risk reduction (to infrastructure)		QL	QL	QL			QL		QL
	Education benefit	SQT		QL		SQT			???	
	Public access	SQT				SQT				
	Entity waterbody classification (e.g., priority resources)		QL	QL					???	QL
	Consistency with TMDL or WRAPS		QL	QL	QL	SQT				QL
	Maintain/restore past entity projects/infrastructure			QL	QL					QL
	Regulatory compliance						QL			
	Social vulnerability			QL				QL		
	Project location in watershed (upstream/downstream)	QT			QL	SQT				
	Project location relative to past efforts	QL				SQT				
Regional/intercommunity issues				QL			QL		QL	
Cost	Risk/liability if not implemented		QL				QL			
	Cost								???	
	Cost-effectiveness/cost-benefit	QL	QL	QL	QL	SQT	QL			
	Feasibility		QL	QL						
Opportunities	Partnership availability	QL		QL						
	Funding availability via cost-share/grants	QL		QL		SQT		QL		
	Coordination with other planned activities	QL	QL	QL			QL	QL		
	Innovative methods				QL				???	
	Public land/willing landowners	QL				SQT			???	
	Local (city/resident) support	QL			QL					

(1) Factors have been assigned to categories for discussion purposes only; categories include **benefits** (e.g., reduced flood risk, improved water quality), **costs** (e.g., capital cost, cost-effectiveness), and **opportunities** (e.g., coordination with other programs).

(2) The method of assessment is based on how the entity evaluates each factor/ consideration; **quantitative** factors are assigned a numeric score based on a standard unit of measure (e.g., dollars, lbs of pollutant); **semi-quantitative** factors are assigned a numeric value based on best professional judgement or an entity-defined scale (e.g., 1 to 7); **qualitative** factors are considered subjectively and/or are not assigned a score as part of prioritization.