



Bassett Creek Watershed Management Commission

Technical Advisory Committee Meeting

Friday, January 10, 2020

9:00 a.m. – 11:00 a.m.

Council Conference Room, Golden Valley City Hall

1. CALL TO ORDER

2. ELECTION OF COMMITTEE CHAIR

3. COMMUNICATIONS

4. BUSINESS

A. Finalize Recommendations on BCWMC Water Monitoring Program – See spreadsheet attached

At the October TAC meeting, the group received a [presentation](#) on the BCWMC's current monitoring program, the history of the program, and information on the monitoring programs of some other watersheds. The TAC also brainstormed a list of goals for the BCWMC monitoring program and then prioritized the importance of those goals as low, medium, or high.

At the November TAC meeting, the group reviewed and discussed a [detailed memo](#) relaying how the BCWMC monitoring program aligns with or meets the goals and objectives considered a high or medium priority. In some areas, there were gaps identified where the current program does not fulfill the goal, and in other cases the program was found to exceed the goal.

Key points from the discussion at the November TAC meeting include:

- Acknowledgement that items/activities that affect monitoring costs the most = number of waterbodies sampled, frequency of monitoring, reporting. Further, the new stream monitoring program raised monitoring costs considerably.
- Reaffirming that the monitoring program should meet the BCWMC goals, including collecting data useful in determining where CIP projects are needed, evaluating the impact of already-constructed CIP projects, and "telling the story" about our waters.
- Consensus on avoiding duplication of monitoring efforts and on continuing close coordination and collaboration with cities and other organizations.
- Lake Monitoring:
 - Currently Priority 1 lakes are monitored once every 3 years; Priority 2 lakes are monitored once every 5 years. Question about changing monitoring frequency to once every 5 years for both Priority 1 and Priority 2 lakes. (Volunteer CAMP monitoring does help fill in some monitoring gaps, but is not reliable and doesn't collect data on vegetation, chlorides, phytoplankton or zooplankton.) **Consensus of TAC: if monitoring frequency changed to 5 years for Priority 1 lakes, it would be more difficult to detect an issue, so keeping existing schedule is appropriate.**
 - Discussion about only performing vegetation surveys during every other monitoring year (i.e., once every 6 years for Priority 1 lakes; once every 10 years for Priority 2 lakes).

Consensus of TAC: it's beneficial to keep vegetation monitoring scheduled concurrent with water quality monitoring because every other monitoring year is too long between vegetation surveys.

- Current lake monitoring program collects 6 samples per year (1 ice out + 5 summer samples). MPCA protocol only requires 4 summer samples and no ice out sample). Determined ice out sample is important for collecting TP data needed for modeling and assessment. **TAC asked the Commission Engineer to calculate savings resulting from removing one summer sample.** (See results below and spreadsheet attached.)
- Stream Monitoring:
 - **Consensus of TAC: BCWMC stream monitoring program should be aligned with WOMP monitoring as much as possible.**
 - We collect some parameters that don't have State standards and aren't as critical for assessing water health including alkalinity, organic carbon, sulfate, chemical oxygen demand. **TAC asked the Commission Engineer to calculate savings resulting from removing these parameters.** (See results below and spreadsheet attached.)
 - We do not currently collect instantaneous DO or pH and there are State standards for these parameters. **TAC asked the Commission Engineer to calculate additional costs resulting from adding these parameters.** (See results below and spreadsheet attached.)
 - We do not currently collect 4-day continuous DO to determine DO flux although there is a State standard. **TAC asked the Commission Engineer to calculate additional costs resulting from adding this parameter.** (See results below and spreadsheet attached.)
 - We only collect about 15 bacteria (E. coli) samples over 2 years while about 54 E. coli samples are collected at the WOMP station over 2 years. Our sample numbers do meet State protocols, however. **Consensus of TAC: keep E. coli sampling unchanged.**
- Lake Level Monitoring: **TAC asked the Commission Engineer to ensure our lake level monitoring program does not duplicate the DNR's program.** It appears that Medicine Lake and Parkers Lake levels may be measured by the DNR but very little information on the program could be attained online. The most recent Medicine Lake measurement online was 8/28/2019; Parkers Lake most recent measurement was 5/9/2018. No changes to our program are recommended, although gathering more information on the DNR's program is warranted.
- Assessing Stormwater Ponds: **Consensus of the TAC: assessing the effectiveness of stormwater ponds is a city role.**

Most recent annual cost of water quality monitoring program costs:

2020: \$102,600 (4 lake sites + 1 stream site + general WQ work)

2019: \$78,000 (2 lake sites + 1 stream site + general WQ work)

2018: \$80,700 (2 lake sites + 1 stream site + extra stream biomonitoring site + general WQ work)

Average over 3 years: \$87,100

Possible scenarios and budget implications (reference spreadsheet attached):

- Remove one lake monitoring event to **save** \$1,700/lake/year or \$3,400 to \$5,100 per year depending on number of lakes or 4% - 6% of total budget (average \$4,250 or 5% of total budget).
- Remove alkalinity, sulfates, organic carbon, and chemical oxygen demand from stream monitoring to **save** \$821/year or 1% of total budget.
- Add instantaneous DO and pH to stream monitoring to **add** \$2,700/year or 3% of total budget.
- Add 4-day continuous DO to stream monitoring to **add** \$2,800/year or 3.2% of total budget.
- Do all of the above to **add** \$429 (on average) to total budget.

B. 2022 – 2026 Capital Improvement Program List – Use attached CIP Fact Sheet Template

See CIP scoring matrix and pollutant hot spot map from [November TAC meeting materials](#) (lower left of page). Also see current [2021 – 2025 CIP list](#).

Please bring your ideas and completed fact sheets for projects to consider for the 2022 – 2026 CIP list.

C. Channel Maintenance Funds – See attached 2020 Channel Maintenance Fund Memo

Another \$25,000 will most likely be transferred from the 2019 Operating Budget to the Channel Maintenance Fund, increasing available funds for cities with part of the trunk system.

D. BWSR Performance Review and Assistance Program (PRAP)

The BCWMC will go through a [Level II PRAP assessment](#) by BWSR staff later this year. (This should happen about once every ten years; unsure when/if BCWMC has gone through this assessment in the past.) Now is a good time to make sure the Watershed Plan is being fully implemented and that local plans and official controls are in alignment with BCWMC requirements.

E. Training Opportunities

The BCWMC has 2 chloride reduction or turf maintenance workshops remaining through a 319 grant to Fortin Consulting. TAC members should let me know if they think a training such as Smart Salting Level 1 (Roads or Parking lots and sidewalks), Smart Salting for Property Management, Smart Salting Level 2, or Turfgrass Maintenance with Reduced Environmental Impacts would be helpful this year. The BCWMC staff and city staff would be required to help recruit participants. And, BCWMC would provide venue, food and beverages. The grant ends August 31st.

5. ADJOURN

Future TAC Meeting Agenda items: Chloride model ordinances and contracts; CIP Maintenance Funding Needs