

# Memorandum

**To:** Bassett Creek Water Management Commission  
**From:** Barr Engineering Company  
**Subject:** Items on the Commission September 18, 2003 Meeting Agenda  
**Date:** September 11, 2003  
**Project:** 23/27 051

## 1. Plat Review Procedure

The city of St. Louis Park recently submitted a plan for review and comments. Periodically, we receive a plan that involves a “gray area” of how the Commission would like Barr to review the plan. These plans are presented to the BCWMC to ensure review is consistent with the BCWMC’s directive. The referenced plan will be reviewed following the general plat review discussion.

The BCWMC receives approximately 40 to 50 development plans each year from the member communities to review. As directed by the BCWMC, some of these plans are reviewed “administratively” by Barr Engineering and some of the plans are presented to the Commission for formal review. The purpose of this discussion is to explain which plans are presented for formal review and which plans are reviewed administratively based on previous direction provided by the BCWMC.

Typically, Barr reviews the following plans administratively.

- ? **Construction erosion control plans:** development proposals that will result in 200 cubic yards of cut or fill or more than 10,000 square feet of grading. These projects are typically exempt from the BCWMC water quality management policy. (Example: building addition resulting in greater than 10,000 square feet of grading/disturbed area.)
  
- ? **Grading, drainage and erosion control plans:** commercial, industrial, institutional, residential or public development proposals, redevelopment proposal and expansion/addition proposals that are designed with adequate water quality ponding to meet the BCWMC’s Water Quality Management Policy. The majority of the submittals are included in this category. (Example: commercial development, including strip malls and office building; residential development.)

- ? **Maintenance plans :** including bituminous overlays, minor filling of settled areas, culvert repairs etc. (Example: parking lot reconstruction, minor filling of settled areas of golf courses or parks.)
- ? **Road construction/reconstruction plans :** road plans that involve a site less than 5 acres of land. (Example: street realignment project; milling and overlay of the existing road)

Following an administrative review, Barr sends a letter of recommendation or a letter of approval to the applicable city. A letter of recommendation would require a revised submittal showing that all modifications have been completed. A brief report of these items is provided to the Commission under "For Information Only" in the BCWMC monthly memorandum.

Barr presents the following plans for formal review by the BCWMC:

- ? **Floodplain:** Any development proposal that involves work in the floodplain including grading, filling, construction, etc. (Example: commercial or residential development that includes filling and mitigation in the floodplain.)
- ? **Streambank Protection Plans:** plans that involve streambank protection or alteration. (Example: riprap protection plan.)
- ? **Street and Utility Crossings:** any project that involves excavation or construction across the creek channel. (Example: new bridge, sanitary sewer crossing.)
- ? **Road construction/reconstruction plans :** road plans that involve a site greater than 5 acres of land. (Example: new street project; highway expansion plan.)
- ? **Potentially controversial developments:** (Example: high profile projects such as new stadiums.)
- ? **Other projects:** other projects that Barr is unsure how to handle. (Example: following park improvement plans.)

Following a formal review, the BCWMC Chair sends a letter of recommendation or a letter of approval to the applicable city. A letter of recommendation would require a revised submittal showing that all modifications have been completed. Resubmittals would typically be reviewed and approved "administratively" by Barr staff.

To: Bassett Creek Water Management Commission  
From: Barr Engineering Company  
Subject: Items on the Commission September 18, 2003 Meeting Agenda  
Date: September 11, 2003  
Project: 23/27 051  
Page: 3

---

## 2. Shelard Park Renovation: St. Louis Park

### Summary

**Proposed Work:** Park Improvement Plan

**Basis for Commission Review:** For Discussion

**Recommendation:** Conditional Approval

Background: The following plan was submitted by the city of St. Louis Park for review. Typically, similar plans that include maintenance filling and other minor modifications would be reviewed administratively.

Barr Engineering has been directed by the Commission to review and provide comments directly to the city

The city of St. Louis Park has requested review of a preliminary park renovation plan for the above-referenced project. The park is located along Ford Road at the Shelard Park Complex in the northwest quadrant of I-394 and Highway 169. The project includes adding 990 cubic yards of fill and regrading approximately 1.4 acres of land. The applicant indicated that the area has settled over 3 feet during the previous 20 years. The project also includes reducing 2,700 square feet of impervious surface by removing an existing tennis court; overlaying an existing trail and eliminating 800 square feet of trail surface; and replacing a play structure. Grading will occur on 1.4 acres of the 6.8-acre site. The city intends to complete the work with its own crews after approval by the BCWMC. We contacted the city to discuss appropriate best management practices (BMPs) that could be incorporated into the site. Staff indicated that a depression will be graded around the existing catch basin to promote infiltration. It was also emphasized that approximately 3,500 square feet of impervious surface will be eliminated as a result of the project.

Note: Typically a similar project would be reviewed administratively as a maintenance project. However, since the actual site is greater than 5 acres, it could be argued that this is a redevelopment and subject to the requirements of the water quality policy. The Water Quality Policy states: “A *public redevelopment is defined as a project involving a site of more than 5 acres of land where the public development currently exists.*” Review as a public redevelopment would require construction of a water quality pond or other treatment facility. The plan does not appear to meet the intent of the “public redevelopment” since only 1.4 acres of the site will be graded, and the grading essentially fills the area to its existing grades.

Recommendation: Barr request feedback from then BCWMC on how to handle similar submittals. Shall similar submittals be reviewed “administratively” as maintenance projects or be required to meet the Commission’s water quality management policy and submitted to the BCWMC for formal review.

Approval, contingent on following modifications:

- a. Silt fence details and rock construction access details should be provided on the erosion control plan.
- b. Grading plan shall be revised to show depression storage around the catch basin inlets.
- c. Revised grading and erosion control plan must be provided for review and approval.

### **3. For Information Only**

- a. Spirit of Hope Church: Golden Valley

A grading, drainage, and erosion control plan was reviewed for the proposed site expansion. A letter of recommendation was sent to the city of Golden Valley.

- b. South Medicine Lake Trail: Wetland and floodplain mitigation: Plymouth

A revised plan was reviewed at Clifton French Regional Park. A letter of recommendation was sent to the city of Plymouth.

- c. New Hope Sinclair Station: New Hope

A grading, drainage, and erosion control plan was reviewed for the proposed project. A letter of recommendation was sent to the New Hope.

- d. Bridgeport Hills: Plymouth

A grading, drainage, and erosion control plan was reviewed for the proposed project. A letter of approval was sent to the Plymouth.