



Item 6E.
BCWMC 2-19-15

Memorandum

To: Bassett Creek Watershed Management Commission
From: Technical Advisory Committee
Subject: February 2, 2015 Technical Advisory Committee Meeting
Date: February 10, 2015

The Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) met on February 2, 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	
Minnetonka	Liz Stout	
New Hope	Bob Paschke	Chris Long
Plymouth	Derek Asche	
Robbinsdale	Richard McCoy	
St. Louis Park	Erick Francis	
BCWMC Staff & Others	Karen Chandler (Barr Engineering), Laura Jester (Administrator), Rachael Crabb (Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board (MPRB), Alternate Commissioner Dave Tobelmann, Alicia Uzarek (Friends of the Mississippi River) – partial attendance	

The meeting opened at approximately 1:30 p.m. Introductions were made around the table. There were no communications by members. The Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) forwards the following recommendations and information to the Commission.

1. Presentation on Blue Star Award Program for Cities

Alicia Uzarek with Friends of the Mississippi River (FMR) distributed a presentation (on paper) and provided an overview of the Blue Star Award Program. The program is a certification and award program that offers cities positive public recognition if they excel in stormwater management. Cities can also learn from each other about what is working and what is not working in their areas. FMR works with cities that don't score high enough to receive the award, assisting them with understanding where practices can be improved.

Mr. Asche said he completed the assessment (which was simple and did not take too much time) and Plymouth received the award. Ms. Uzarek indicated some cities use interns to complete the assessment. There was some discussion about how the award is not currently used in reporting on MS4 permits or in grant applications.

Recommendations

This was an informational item only. No TAC recommendations to report.

2. Develop 2017 – 2021 Capital Improvement Program List

Administrator Jester reported that the TAC should recommend to the Commission a CIP list for projects in 2017 – 2021 and that she would like this list to be aligned with Table 5-3 (Capital Improvement Program) from the draft Watershed Plan. She presented the current 2016 – 2020 CIP list and noted changes that were made to accommodate the high costs of the 2016 projects. The group discussed various projects, their potential costs, and ideal timing for each project. Administrator Jester noted that the Commission realizes costs are rising and that the annual levy request is likely to exceed \$1M although the Commission would like to see a stable (non-fluctuating) levy request from year to year. All of the projects discussed were in Golden Valley, Plymouth and Minneapolis. Administrator Jester asked each of the other cities if there were potential CIP projects in their cities within the next 5 years. Each of the other cities reported there were not projects slated in their cities within the BCWMC.

Administrator Jester asked if there was a way to address chloride pollution with the CIP. There was some discussion about whether CIP funding could be used to purchase or retrofit winter road/parking lot maintenance equipment. Administrator Jester said she would ask Counsel LeFevere.

Administrator Jester noted the comment letter on the draft Watershed Plan from the MN Board of Water and Soil Resources indicated more detail was needed in Table 5-3 with regards to each project and that projects should be slated for the whole life of the plan. She noted the TAC may need to assist with revising Table 5-3 at a future meeting or through other correspondence.

Administrator Jester and Engineer Chandler will refine the 2017 – 2021 list with the changes discussed and will bring another version to the next TAC meeting.

Recommendations

There are no recommendations at this time. The TAC will revisit this topic at their March 5th meeting.

3. Develop Recommendations for XP-SWMM Phase II Project

Administrator Jester reminded the group of past discussions about the potential for developing a second, more detailed watershed-wide XP-SWMM model (phase II). She noted that last year the TAC recommended a place holder of \$65,000 in the 2015 budget in case the Commission decided to move ahead with beginning the project but that the Commission ultimately did not include the place holder funding. She indicated there were still ways to pay for beginning this work in 2015 if the Commission decided to move forward.

The group discussed pros and cons of the phase II project. Mr. Asche indicated he still was not in favor of this being a Commission project and that it was originally indicated that individual cities could perform more detailed modeling on their own if they so choose and he favors this approach. He indicated it was an expensive project to do now and to maintain the model going forward, and he did not see the usefulness for such a large expense when development and capital improvement projects could add the additional detail to the model. Some TAC members wondered if the current model (phase I) could be updated when development or projects come along. Others indicated it would be difficult to integrate the models if they are completed by different firms at different times. Engineer Chandler reminded the group that Phase I simply converted the older HEC model to XP-SWMM and that due to the large watershed size, unrealistic inputs were used in phase I to

calibrate the model; more detail is needed for accuracy. She noted the phase I model is only useful to find relative changes in water levels and flow rates, not absolute levels. She also noted that the phase I model does not incorporate all of the ponding that's currently in the watershed, so even if additional details (e.g., ponds) are added to the model going forward, we wouldn't have the current features (like ponds) in the model.

The group discussed how the Bottineau (Blue Line) light rail line design (which is beginning now) would need a more detailed and accurate model and that huge flood risks exist within the rail corridor. Mr. Oliver noted that Met Council consultants would be working on the model very soon and indicated frustration that the Commission didn't have its own detailed model already completed. Mr. Asche noted that the Met Council would be doing a model and that it could simply be provided to the Commission and integrated into the existing model. The group wondered if there could be a partnership with the Met Council for a partial development of the Phase II XPSWMM model in this area. Mr. Oliver noted that downstream communities like Golden Valley and Minneapolis are often making decisions in the floodplain and that a detailed model is needed. Ms. Eberhart noted that the Commission is responsible for the Flood Control Project and should remain proactive in modeling and planning. The group wondered if Phase II could be considered a CIP project that uses levy funding. Administrator Jester said she would ask Counsel LeFevre. The group also wondered if detailed modeling could be built into the cost of CIP projects for the subwatershed area in which the project exists. Ms. Eberhart noted the Commission budget should include an annual line item to maintain and update the model and integrate models that might be done by other entities. The group also wondered if surcharges to development reviews could help pay for model upkeep. Mr. Asche indicated he didn't think development of a Phase II model would change how land is currently being developed.

TAC members Oliver, McCoy and Houle departed for another meeting. The TAC will discuss again at a future meeting and will develop a recommendation to the Commission.

Recommendations

There are no recommendations at this time. The TAC will revisit this topic at their March 5th meeting.

4. Discuss BCWMC Budget and Ideas for Organizational Efficiencies

Administrator Jester reported that staff and the Budget Committee would be developing the 2016 budget in the coming months. She asked TAC members to think about projects or programs the Commission should consider funding (or disbanding) in 2016. Due to questions from Mr. Asche, Engineer Chandler explained the new line item in the 2015 budget for "Non-fee and Preliminary Reviews." She noted it is intended to better track expenses incurred for reviewing projects that do not pay review fees (such as EAWs, MnDOT projects and the Bottineau LRT) and for time spent answering preliminary questions from developers or cities regarding the Commission's requirements and review process (some of which are eventually charged to the project).

Mr. Asche wondered if all developers/project proposers were following the proper procedure of first contacting and working with city staff before going to the Commission. He noted that city staff should be answering questions about the watershed requirements. Ms. Eberhart disagreed and said she and her staff cannot be expected to answer specific questions about the Commission's requirements and review process. There was further discussion. Mr. Eckman noted that he reminds developers not to contact the Commission first and to instead work through city processes. Engineer Chandler and Administrator Jester indicated they do and would continue to make sure any developers calling are first asked if they have worked through city processes. The group agreed to remind developers to follow procedures, work with the city, and review the Commission's Requirements Document before contacting the Commission.

Recommendations

There are no recommendations at this time. TAC members will contact Administrator Jester with any ideas for the 2016 budget and will comment on the draft budget once available.

5. Review Letters of Interest Proposals for Technical and Engineering Services for Commission

Administrator Jester reported that proposals were received from Barr Engineering and Wenck & Associates and that she had distributed the proposals via email that morning. There was a brief discussion. The group agreed the current engineer does a very good job and has decades of history with the Commission. There was consensus that there was no reason to change engineering firms at this time.

Recommendations

The TAC recommends that the Commission continue to use Barr Engineering as the Commission Engineer.

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.