



Item 6D.
 BCWMC 3-19-15
 CIP table and project sheets
 included in 6Di.

Memorandum

To: Bassett Creek Watershed Management Commission
From: Technical Advisory Committee
Subject: March 5, 2015 Technical Advisory Committee Meeting
Date: March 10, 2015

The Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) met on March 5, 2015. The following TAC members, city representatives, BCWMC commissioners, and BCWMC staff attended the meeting:

City	TAC Members/Alternates	Other City Representatives
Crystal	Wayne Houle	
Golden Valley	Jeff Oliver	Eric Eckman
Medicine Lake	Commissioner Clint Carlson	
Minneapolis	Lois Eberhart	
Minnnetonka	Liz Stout	
New Hope	Bob Paschke	Chris Long
Plymouth		
Robbinsdale	Richard McCoy	
St. Louis Park	Erick Francis	
BCWMC Staff & Others	Karen Chandler and Jim Herbert (Barr Engineering), Laura Jester (Administrator), Alternate Commissioner Pat Crough	

The meeting opened at approximately 1:37 p.m. Introductions were made around the table. Liz Stout announced that Minnetonka Director of Engineering, Lee Gustafson, is leaving the City for employment with a consulting firm. There were no other communications by TAC members. The Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) forwards the following recommendations and information to the Commission.

1. Finalize 2017 – 2021 CIP List and Develop More Detail for 2022 – 2025 CIP List

The TAC reviewed changes to Table 5-3 of the draft Watershed Management Plan that were made according to discussions at the last TAC meeting and additional cost estimates developed by the Commission Engineer. Commission Engineer Chandler reported that some cost estimates were derived using TMDL implementation plans; others were estimated from previous similar projects. The Commission Engineer noted that these figures are simply good faith estimates to be used as a starting point in the table. There was discussion about the “total estimated costs” line in the table. It was noted that this “total” line does not necessarily reflect what the Commission would levy through the County, but instead indicates how much funding would be spent on improvement projects throughout the watershed over the life of the Plan. It was noted the cost to the Commission for each project could be different from the total project cost due to the use of city funds (such as

in the case of the 2016 projects), grants, funding from developers, and the use of funds left over from previous projects (closed project account funds). Administrator Jester noted the Commission recently approved changes to some of its fiscal policies and did not set a particular desired levy amount but stated that the levy amount should be relatively stable from year to year. The Commission also recently acknowledged that its usual \$1 million levy is not likely to cover the costs of typical projects in the future.

Ms. Eberhart asked that a project be added to the table to improve and stabilize the historic Bassett Creek channel in Minneapolis. The group decided to add this project to the CIP for the year 2020 for \$500,000. Mr. Eckman asked that two main stem streambank stabilization projects in Golden Valley be added to the CIP: one project between Hwy 169 and Hwy 55 and the other between Bassett Creek Drive and Golden Valley Road. He noted this second reach is a higher priority because it's adjacent to Rice Lake and Mary Hills Nature Areas. The group agreed to add this project to the CIP for the year 2021 for \$500,000. He also noted the first reach is a lower priority and could be implemented in a later year (i.e., after 2021); the project will be added to Table 5-3.

Regarding other revisions needed for Table 5-3, the group wondered if projects levied but not yet constructed should be somehow so noted in the table. Staff will work on making those revisions with the Plan Steering Committee when considering other revisions to the draft Plan.

Recommendations

The TAC recommends the attached list of projects and estimated project costs (Table 1) for the Commission's Capital Improvement Program 2017 – 2021.

2. Finalize Recommendations for XP-SWMM Phase II Project

Administrator Jester reminded the group of the discussion on this item at the February 2, 2015 TAC meeting and indicated she hoped to get a decision regarding this project – either to delay the start of the project indefinitely, begin the project this year using Flood Control Project Long Term Maintenance Funds, or plan to begin and budget for the project in 2016.

Mr. Oliver noted that examples of the need for an accurate and detailed model come up regularly in Golden Valley and Minneapolis; the Blue Line LRT being the most important example right now. Ms. Eberhart agreed and noted a complete watershed model is the responsibility of the whole Commission. There was discussion about how the Commission can use the model inputs that the Met Council uses for the Blue Line project to gain some efficiency and cost savings in the development of a Commission XP-SWMM model in the downstream end of the watershed. There were questions about the usefulness of the current model. Commission Engineer Chandler noted that an updated and more detailed model (Phase II) would be reliable for generating real numbers (rather than relative values). She reminded the group that unrealistic inputs had to be used in the current model due to significant problems calibrating the model. She reported the Phase II model could be submitted to FEMA (if the Commission chose to do so) and could eventually be approved as the new floodplain model that all agencies would use. After a question about ongoing model maintenance costs, Commission Engineer Chandler reported that she expected costs to be similar to the annual P8 model maintenance (depending on the year and the amount of change in the watershed) and could be around \$10,000 - \$15,000/year.

Recommendations

Through an official motion by Ms. Eberhart with a second by Mr. Oliver and unanimously approved by those present: The TAC recommends that the Commission begin the XP-SWMM Phase II project in 2015 using Flood Control Project Long Term Maintenance Funds; to seek additional funding for the project from other sources; and to complete the project in as short a time frame as possible (with 2 years being preferred). Upon a vote, the motion passed unanimously.

3. Discuss Communication Protocols Among Cities, Developers, and Commission

Commission Engineer Herbert distributed and reviewed a flow chart describing the flow of communication during Commission project and development reviews. Administrator Jester also reminded the committee of the flow chart provided by Mr. Ashe that's used in the City of Plymouth for questions related to storm water requirements. Mr. Oliver noted that there is occasionally a problem with developers contacting the Commission before talking to the city. He noted the city wants to stay in communication and to learn of developer's plans before they talk to the Commission. Administrator Jester noted that the BCWMC website was recently changed to better instruct developers to first contact their cities regarding proposed projects. She also noted when she fields calls from developers she always directs them to the city staff. Commission Engineer Herbert said, based on previous BCWMC direction, they sometimes answer basic questions from developers or send a general response email (if correspondence is via email) outlining BCWMC requirements and referring applicants to also contact the City. He noted the Commission Engineer will change the practice to first direct developers or other project proposers to contact city staff. Although the intent of the communication flowchart was for the TAC discussion, the group suggested some changes to Commission Engineer Herbert's flow chart and discussed whether an organizational chart, communication chart, or FAQ sheet should be drafted for developers and project proposers. Administrator Jester and the Commission Engineer agreed to continue making sure city staff are contacted by developers and others before Commission staff.

Recommendations

The TAC recommends that Commission staff work on developing a communication flow chart and/or "frequently asked questions" for use by developers and project proposers; and that Commission staff make sure that when developers and project proposers contact the Commission, they are first directed to the appropriate city staff person.

The TAC meeting adjourned at approximately 3:30 p.m.

Future TAC Meeting agenda items:

1. Developing guidelines for annualized costs per pound pollutant removal for future CIP projects
2. Agreements with cities to get credit for Commission education programs in MS4 permits
3. Revisions needed for Requirements Document
4. Stream identification signs at road crossings
5. Look into implementing "phosphorus-budgeting" in the watershed – allow "x" pounds of TP/acre.