



# Bassett Creek Watershed Management Commission

## Technical Advisory Committee Meeting

Thursday July 29, 2021

10:30 a.m.– 12:00 p.m.

Wirth Lake Room, Brookview Golden Valley

1. CALL TO ORDER
2. COMMUNICATIONS
3. BUSINESS

### A. Discuss XPSWMM Model Update and Adoption

BCWMC staff and commissioners seeks input from the TAC regarding the benefits and appropriate timing for updating and formally adopting a new BCWMC H&H model and to start using it as the BCWMC jurisdictional floodplain.

Discussion/Recommendations:

The BCWMC adopted the (Phase 2) XPSWMM model as its jurisdictional model in 2017. This is the model that BCWMC shares with the cities upon request. The Phase 2 model is based on data current through 2015. To create the new FEMA model, the BCWMC Engineer started with the Phase 2 model and updated it to include survey data and other changes through approximately 2018. The BCWMC does not share the FEMA model with the member cities, as it has not been adopted by the BCWMC.

The BCWMC engineer recommends that the BCWMC update the FEMA model (“storage maintained” version) starting in 2021, and then adopt the revised/updated model in 2022 as the BCWMC’s jurisdictional model. The BCWMC approved the proposed 2022 budget that includes this work. Does the TAC agree with this recommendation?

If the TAC agrees, the BCWMC Engineer will request current data (2018 – present) from the member cities soon, compile the changes in 2021, and complete the model update in 2022. Staff expects the Commission would then formally adopt the updated model later in 2022.

If the TAC does not agree with the BCWMC Engineer’s recommendation, what alternate recommendations would the TAC make for the timing of model update and adoption?

Once the BCWMC adopts the updated model, the BCWMC Engineer recommends performing a model update every 2 – 3 years (every year is too often, every 5 years seems too long). What recommendations does the TAC have on the timing of regular updates? To help streamline the update process, the BCWMC Engineer also recommends that the BCWMC make an annual request to the member cities to provide data regarding recently completed projects that might warrant inclusion in the XPSWMM model. Would the TAC members prefer an annual, smaller request or a larger, less frequent request?

### B. Discuss Four Seasons Mall CIP and Redevelopment Future

The City of Plymouth recently purchased the Four Seasons Mall property and is exploring the idea of constructing some or all of the [previously approved stormwater BMPs](#) including multiple ponds (one with an IESF and one with a forebay), underground filtration, and wetland restoration. All combined, the BMPs were

expected to remove approximately 130 pounds of TP, which was 101 pounds “above and beyond” the required TP removal for the proposed redevelopment project. The BCWMC had approved an agreement with the previous redevelopment company to utilize CIP funds (approximately \$800,000) to capture at least 100 pounds of TP above and beyond requirements.

The city proposes to enter an agreement with the BCWMC to design and construct the stormwater BMPs and complete the wetland restoration, similar to the normal BCWMC CIP process. Construction would likely begin in spring of 2022. The city would take on maintenance of all of the BMPs. It’s anticipated that a redevelopment proposal will be submitted for city review in fall 2022, but may be several years out. However, if the BMPs are constructed now, the downstream waters (Northwood Lake and the North Branch of Bassett Creek) could start seeing benefits right away.

The city requests that a future developer be allowed to use any TP removal over the 100 pounds created by the BMPs and wetland restoration to meet BCWMC water quality requirements for the redevelopment.

While this isn’t a typical situation, it may help to think about a similar situation without the CIP project component involved. BCWMC requirements do not prohibit a developer from utilizing a previously built city-owned BMP to meet requirements.

#### **C. Consider Thresholds for Commission Pre-Review of Certain Projects (if time allows)**

The TAC could discuss whether certain types or sizes of projects should be brought to the Commission’s attention ahead of a formal project application. The recent Hollydale project is one case in point; complex and possibly controversial projects near the stream in Minneapolis are other examples. For some projects that are large, complex, or may request a variance, it may streamline Commission project review and discussions if the project proposers touch base with the Commission earlier in the process, prior to project submittal. (It should be noted that costs for Commission staff time used before a formal application cannot be recouped through the review fees and would be paid with BCWMC operating funds.)

Is guidance on thresholds for pre-submittals needed or desired by cities? Or should these situations be handled on a case-by-case basis?

#### **4. ADJOURN**