

# Bassett Creek Watershed Management Commission

## Minutes of the Meeting of September 21, 2006

### 1. Call to Order

The Bassett Creek Watershed Management Commission was called to order at 11:30 a.m., Thursday, September 21, 2006 at Golden Valley City Hall by Chair Welch. Ms. Herbert conducted roll call.

#### Roll Call

<i>Crystal</i>	Commissioner Pauline Langsdorf	<i>Counsel</i>	Charlie LeFevere
<i>Golden Valley</i>	Commissioner Linda Loomis, Treasurer	<i>Engineer</i>	Karen Chandler
<i>Medicine Lake</i>	Commissioner Cheri Templeman	<i>Recorder</i>	Amy Herbert
<i>Minneapolis</i>	Commissioner Michael Welch, Chair		
<i>Minnetonka</i>	Commissioner Bill Yaeger, Vice Chair		
<i>New Hope</i>	Alternate Commissioner Vincent VanderTop (arrived after roll call)		
<i>Plymouth</i>	Commissioner Ginny Black, Secretary		
<i>Robbinsdale</i>	Alternate Commissioner Erik Hansen		
<i>St. Louis Park</i>	Not represented		

Also present: Jeannine Clancy, Public Works, city of Golden Valley  
Dave Clark, WCL Associates  
Paul DeVetter, CSM  
Dan Lessor, Landform Engineering  
Steve Lillehaug, Minnetonka  
Tom Mathisen, BCWMC Technical Advisory Committee, city of Crystal  
Richard McCoy, BCWMC Technical Advisory Committee, city of Robbinsdale  
Shane Missaghi, BCWMC Technical Advisory Committee, city of Plymouth  
Bob Moberg, city of Plymouth  
John O'Toole, Alternate Commissioner, city of Medicine Lake  
Liz Stout, city of Minnetonka  
Clark Wicklund, Alliant Engineering  
Brian Wood, Alliant Engineering

### 2. Approval of Agenda and Consent Agenda

Chair Welch removed the financial statements from the Consent Agenda. Ms. Black moved to approve the modified Consent Agenda. Ms. Loomis seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

### 3. Administration

- A. Presentation of the August 17, 2006 minutes. The minutes were approved as part of the Consent Agenda.
- B. Financial Statements.

A revised financial statement was handed out at the meeting. Prior to this revised statement, the

statements showed plat review costs being charged against "review municipal plans". Barr Engineering reports plat review as a separate item and charges these costs against the "technical services" budget so permit fee costs (revenue) can be tracked against plat review costs. The revised financial statement shows the corrected status of the budget. Ms. Loomis moved to receive and file the financial statements. Ms. Black seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

The general and construction account balances reported in the September 2006 Financial Report are as follows:

<u>Checking Account Balance</u>	<u>290,989.29</u>
<i>TOTAL GENERAL FUND BALANCE</i>	<i>290,989.29</i>
<u>Investment Balance</u>	<u>1,468,328.95</u>
<u>Commercial Paper (due 09/21/06)</u>	<u>993,956.67</u>
<u>Commercial Paper (due 09/20/06)</u>	<u>494,009.44</u>
<i>TOTAL CONSTRUCTION ACCOUNT BALANCE</i>	<i>2,956,295.06</i>

**C. Presentation of Invoices for Payment Approval.**

**i. Kennedy & Graven – Legal Services**

Ms. Black moved to approve payment of the Kennedy & Graven invoice. Ms. Loomis seconded the motion. By call of roll, the motion carried unanimously [City of St. Louis Park not present for vote].

**ii. Barr Engineering Company – Engineering Services**

Mr. Welch asked Ms. Chandler who the applicant is for the North Hennepin Regional Trail project. Ms. Clancy responded that the applicant is always the city. The Commission clarified that cities are subject to the permit review fee. Ms. Black moved to approve payment of the Barr Engineering invoice. Ms. Loomis seconded the motion. By call of roll, the motion carried unanimously [City of St. Louis Park not present for vote].

**iii. Amy Herbert – Administrative Services**

Ms. Loomis moved to approve payment of the Amy Herbert invoice. Mr. VanderTop seconded the motion. By call of roll, the motion carried unanimously [City of St. Louis Park not present for vote].

**D. Project Budget for Medicine Lake Water Quality Ponds and City of Plymouth Invoice. Ms. Black requested this item be moved to the October BCWMC meeting. Item deferred to October meeting.**

**4. Communications**

**A. Chairman:**

- i. Chair Welch asked the commissioners about their experiences with training for their role on the Commission and asked for their comments on training they would like or need. Ms. Templeman responded that she would find training helpful and would appreciate a tour of the watershed. Chair Welch said all new members of the Commission should be offered a copy of the most recent Watershed Management Plan. Mr. LeFevere pointed out the plan is also available on the Bassett Creek Watershed Management Commission Web site. Ms. Templeman requested a CD-ROM copy of the**

Plan. Mr. Welch asked the city council members their experiences with receiving training from their cities. Mr. LeFevere mentioned that the other watersheds he works with do not have formal training programs in place. He said he has conducted presentations for those groups about legal issues such as conflict of interest. Mr. LeFevere suggested the Commission put together some of its important documents such as the Joint Powers Agreement, the Surface Water Management Act, the Watershed Management Plan, and the organizational table to have available for new members. He also mentioned that Mr. Kremer of Barr Engineering gave a presentation recently in Plymouth about the background and history of the Bassett Creek Watershed Management Organization and said that would be good information for members to have. Chair Welch directed Barr Engineering to create a list of important Bassett Creek WMO materials and to include the list in the October meeting packet. Chair Welch directed Ms. Herbert to add the discussion of this index to the October meeting.

- ii. Chair Welch announced that the request for letters of interest proposals will be published September 25<sup>th</sup> and that the deadline for receipt of the letters is November 10<sup>th</sup>.
  - iii. Chair Welch requested that TAC add to its agenda a discussion of basic Commission functions and ideas of integrating those functions into their cities' operations.
  - iv. Chair Welch reported that Ms. Herbert is working on the General Issues Project Tracking List and that it will be included in the October meeting packet.
  - v. Chair Welch said the Commission is working on the two grant applications to the Board of Water and Soil Resources for Clean Water Legacy funding of the Medicine Lake and Wirth Lake projects. He commented that the applications will be submitted by the September 30<sup>th</sup> deadline.
- B. Citizen Input on Non-Agenda Items: No citizen input.**
- C. Counsel: No communications.**
- D. Commissioners:**
- i. Ms. Black mentioned she was on the tour given by Minnesota Erosion Control Association for low-impact development, and she passed around an educational piece "Create Your Own Rain Garden."
  - ii. Mr. VanderTop stated that the city of New Hope will be submitting a cooperative agreement application to MnDOT for the storm sewer that comes from Highway 169 into Northwood Lake. He said the sewer receives runoff from Highway 169 as well as from Plymouth. Mr. VanderTop explained that the pipe has been investigated and a settlement in the pipe was discovered.
- E. Engineer:**
- i. Ms. Chandler reported that Barr Engineering will be sending on behalf of the Commission a letter of support for the city of Golden Valley's application for MnDOT money for the Wirth project.

## 5. New Business

- A. **West Health Parcel E: Plymouth.** Ms. Chandler explained the project is located near Highway 494 and Highway 55. Ms. Chandler said this project is proposing an alternative treatment. She said the applicant is proposing to provide water quality treatment in an underground vault. Ms. Chandler said that this may be the first time the Commission has been asked to review a project with this form of treatment. Ms. Chandler reported that both the city and the Commission engineer have some concerns. Ms. Chandler said the proposal does provide the correct amount of water quality treatment volume in the vault but the concerns are guaranteeing the method will work and accessing the vault. Mr. Yaeger asked how treatment method works.

Ms. Loomis commented it is a cistern. Ms. Chandler explained it is like an underground ponding area. Ms. Black said it overflows to a storm drain. Ms. Chandler said underground vaults are not used that often. Ms. Chandler said the site is just less than five acres and the project will entail a change in impervious surface of 3.68 acres. She explained the site is in the Medicine Lake watershed and is subject to the Level I treatment standards. She said there is an existing shallow pond on the site. Ms. Chandler stated it is unknown how much treatment the existing pond provides but it is assumed the amount is very low. Ms. Chandler explained the existing pond is there because this undeveloped parcel is part of a larger development scheme for the West Health Campus. She said she thought the pond was created in anticipation of future development.

Ms. Chandler said the Commission engineer found that the vault in the original plan submitted was undersized and there was an error in the computations. She reported that the consultants indicated to the Commission engineer that the plan would be revised to increase the size of the vault to treat the appropriate size impervious area draining to the vault. Ms. Chandler said the revised plan has not been received and the consultants indicated they were trying to address a lot of issues with the city and were trying to address all issues in one revision.

Ms. Chandler said normally the Commission would recommend conditional approval but said it is up to the Commission based on how comfortable it has been with granting conditional approvals in the past. She said based on what the consultants have told the Commission engineer, the engineer expects the consultants to deliver the information needed about the vault, but the engineer has not received that information yet.

Ms. Loomis asked what rain event the vault is sized for. Mr. Wicklund of Alliant Engineers summarized the project. He said the existing pond was built in 1983 to collect runoff. He said the pond has a mean depth of approximately one foot, is filled with vegetation, and does not have much wet storage room. He said they found the pond had dead storage for approximately the 1.7-inch rainfall event. Mr. Wicklund said his firm is proposing to reroute some of the area into the pond. Mr. Wicklund commented that as a result of that, the vault structure would need to be increased. He said it is his firm's understanding that it doesn't have an obligation to provide treatment for offsite runoff. He said they propose to provide it anyhow and increase the size of the vault structure to accommodate a 2.5-inch rainfall event to a Level I standard for not only the site but also additional area. He stated that they propose to increase the depth of the existing pond from about 1 foot to 1.7 feet. He said there was severe short circuiting with the existing pond because the inlets and outlets of the pond were only approximately 9 feet apart. He explained that they estimate the existing pond had a phosphorus removal rate of approximately 20% and that with the proposed updates to the pond, the removal rate would increase to 46%. He stated it is not their obligation to take care of the existing pond system but are proposing to do so, which will provide additional treatment to this area [he pointed area out on the display board of the site] and

will improve the efficiency of the treatment twofold on another part of the site [area pointed out on display board].

Mr. Wicklund stated that the cost of increasing the cistern is roughly \$30,000 but they see the benefit to the watershed, the city of Plymouth, and themselves to take care of this. He said they have read the comments on the project made by Jim Herbert of Barr Engineering and they agree they can make the modifications for the eight conditions cited in the Engineer's Memo. Mr. Wicklund said they are looking for approval of the project today and they will provide information required by those conditions to Barr at a later date.

Ms. Black asked when a rain event is over and the excess water has flowed out, is there a pond of water sitting underground? Mr. Wicklund said the cistern will retain a wet volume no different than a wet pond would and would function no different than a NURP pond except for the difference that there can be a visual inspection of how the pond is performing.

Ms. Chandler said the Commission engineer was concerned about the sitting water losing oxygen concentration because it is covered. She said the consultants would need to reassure the Commission engineer that there is some way to get air down into the vault so the water doesn't get anoxic and cause the release of phosphorus. Mr. Wicklund said this is the first time he has heard of this concern but he proposes providing open grates in the four corners of the structure.

Ms. Black said when water sits in detention ponds long enough, it would eventually evaporate or sink into the ground. She said in this case that will not happen since it is in a concrete structure. Mr. Wicklund said there would be about six feet of water in the bottom of the structure. He said they proposed having a gravel bottom to allow for any infiltration that could possibly occur. Mr. Yaeger asked how the structure would be cleaned. Mr. Wicklund said it would be manual labor and would be an onerous task to clean it out but the maintenance agreement would be worked out with the city and the watershed. Mr. Welch asked Mr. Wicklund if his firm has built these before. Mr. Wicklund replied that they don't do a lot of vault structures. He said they do a number of underground structures, which is what they originally proposed for this project. However, he said, modeling can't be done for underground structures to show the amount of phosphorus removal, whereas the type of vault they are proposing here can be modeled to show the phosphorus removal.

Mr. Mathisen said that a gravel bottom would be a maintenance nightmare. He said some type of vacuum would need to be used to clean out the sediment from the structure and it would vacuum out all the gravel, which would mean the gravel would need to be replaced. He asked why they wouldn't just leave a clay bottom if they are not counting on percolation. Mr. Mathisen also asked if there is documentation on the treatment that underground vaults provide. He commented that the maintenance of an underground structure is a different working environment than something that is open to the surface and can be seen.

Mr. Welch said maintenance comes up at every meeting and if there is anything that needs to be addressed in a third generation plan, it is maintenance.

Mr. O'Toole brought up the issue of mosquito control for the proposed vault. Ms. Black said the Metropolitan Mosquito Control District comes out and puts briquettes in sump manholes in the city of Plymouth and she said she assumes the District would do the same in this case. Mr. O'Toole asked how the District would know the structure is there. Ms. Black said it would have to be part of the maintenance agreement.

Ms. Black moved to approve the proposal. Ms. Loomis seconded the motion. Mr. Welch asked Ms. Black to clarify her motion. Ms. Black moved to approve the proposal contingent on comments A through H in the September 14<sup>th</sup> Engineer's Memo. Ms. Black said there are still a lot of questions about this project but she thinks the questions can be largely resolved and if not, the city of Plymouth will not approve it. Chair Welch asked if Level I treatment standards will be achieved. Ms. Chandler said yes, if it is built they way they propose to build it.

Ms. Black requested that the Commission talk at a future meeting about the non-degradation policy.

The motion carried with seven commissioners voting in favor of the motion and one voting against the motion (Mr. Yaeger, city of Minnetonka). City of St. Louis Park was not present for the vote.

- B. REMAX Results: Plymouth.** Ms. Chandler said the Commission saw a proposal for this project at the August meeting but this is being considered as a New Business item since the Commission denied the proposal and required the consultant to submit a new application and fee with its proposal. Ms. Chandler said that because the Commission engineer did receive a new set of information and it has taken more review time, the Commission engineer does not recommend returning that application fee. She said that after the September 14<sup>th</sup> Engineer's Memo was written, the Commission engineer received a revised proposal that addressed all but one of the Commission Engineer's comments listed in the August 10, 2006 Engineer's Memo.

Ms. Chandler explained the total site is 1.5 acres. She said 1.35 acres are treated on site by rain gardens and 0.15 acres are directed offsite to a regional pond. Ms. Chandler reminded the Commission that at the August meeting the Commission wanted the proposal to include revisions and documentation showing that rain gardens provide water quality treatment consistent with that of a Level 1 pond. Ms. Chandler said the new proposal does include such revisions. She commented that the revised proposal shows pretreatment through vegetated swales and grit chambers. She said rock chambers will be put in for the construction entrance. Ms. Chandler said comments A through C from the Engineer's Memo have been addressed and comment D about the maintenance agreement still needs to be addressed. She said the Commission engineer recommends approval contingent on the remaining comment in the Engineer's Memo.

Ms. Black moved to approve the proposal contingent on the comment in the Engineer's Memo. Mr. Yaeger seconded the motion. Ms. Loomis asked how much of the site the rain gardens are treating. Ms. Chandler responded 1.35 acres of the 1.5 site. Ms. Loomis asked whether the rest of it is going to the regional pond. Ms. Chandler responded yes. Ms. Loomis said the pond does not treat to a Level 1 standard according to the Engineer's Memo. Ms. Chandler said that is correct. Ms. Chandler said the computations that were submitted show that there is a net of at least Level 1 treatment for the entire site. She explained the rain gardens provide slightly better than Level 1 treatment and the regional pond provides slightly less than Level 1 treatment.

The motion carried with seven commissioners voting in favor of the motion and one voting against the motion (Ms. Loomis, city of Golden Valley). City of St. Louis Park was not present for the vote.

- C. 20-Year Inspection of Bassett Creek Phase I and II Tunnels.** Chair Welch asked how a submerged tunnel is inspected. Ms. Chandler responded that stoplogs (temporary dams) are placed at the river end of the tunnel and then water is pumped out of the tunnel. Mr. Mathisen said it probably isn't that complicated and probably doesn't take more than a couple of days. Ms. Chandler said the plan is not in place yet. Chair Welch said the issue in front of the Commission

today is authorizing the planning of the inspection.

Ms. Chandler said that the Commission included in its 2006 budget \$8,500 for inspecting flood control features and included in its 2007 budget \$18,500. Ms. Chandler said the Commission engineer would need to work with the city of Minneapolis to prepare a cost estimate for inspecting the tunnel. Chair Welch said that the next step after authorizing the planning of the inspection would be at a future meeting authorizing the plan, the cost estimate, and the contract to do the work. Ms. Chandler said yes. She said that the city of Minneapolis would either do the work or subcontract the work out.

Ms. Black asked if the Commission is heading up the project and coordinating with the other entities. Ms. Chandler said yes, if the Commission authorizes going ahead with the inspection planning, the Commission engineer would be working with the city of Minneapolis to develop the cost estimate.

Mr. O'Toole asked whether the cost estimate includes just the cost of the inspection or if it includes cost for minor repairs deemed necessary during the inspection. Ms. Chandler said authorization of repairs would have to be a separate process and authorization.

Ms. Loomis moved to authorize the initiation of the planning the coordination of the inspection. She stated that the Commission is not authorizing repairs but is authorizing an inspection. Chair Welch said the Commission is actually authorizing planning an inspection. Ms. Black seconded the motion. Ms. Templeman asked if the cost estimate could be done in a tier system, where costs for a minor repair could be included to avoid having to block off and pump out the tunnel again. Ms. Black asked what would be a minor repair. Mr. Mathisen said \$20,000 would be a minor repair. Mr. LeFevere said that would be assuming they have the work force to do the repair at that time. Chair Welch said the staff can take that into consideration in the plan. Ms. Chandler said an example of a minor repair would be removing logs. Ms. Loomis said the motion is just authorizing the plan and does not say anything about repairs. Ms. Black said the question is could the Commission include planning for a potential minor repair along with the inspection. Ms. Loomis said that would be a separate motion. Chair Welch said the motion on the floor is to authorize staff to plan the inspection only and not to include planning for any possibility of minor repairs within the same timeframe as when the inspection takes place.

Chair O'Toole asked if there is serious risk of damage to the tunnel from construction of the stadium over top of it. He said if there is a serious risk it might be prudent to take some photographs so there is documentation of before and after. The motion carried unanimously.

## **6. Old Business**

- A. **Minneapolis Local Surface Water Management Plan (LSWMP).** Ms. Chandler reported that the city of Minneapolis revised its plan and made revisions in line with the comments from the Commission. She stated there are a few minor things left that the city should have no trouble addressing and she recommends the Commission approve the LSWMP with the understanding the city will make these minor revisions.

Ms. Chandler said the city did not understand the Commission's nondegradation policy. She explained the nondegradation policy requires no increase in phosphorus load from redevelopment projects that result in increased in impervious surface. Ms. Chandler said there is no de minimis meaning there is no point at which Commission review is triggered. She said the policy requires any increase in impervious surface to be reviewed. She said the city needs to understand this

Commission policy and acknowledge it in its LSWMP. Ms. Chandler said the Commission needs to be aware of this absence of a de minimis and she recommends the TAC discuss at what point does it make sense for this policy to come into play. She said the TAC could discuss at what point does it make sense to implement best management practices.

Ms. Chandler said the LSWMP has a table that includes Bassett Creek WMO's requirements but some minor revisions need to be made to that table. She said another issue that arose during review of the LSWMP was jurisdiction between the city of Minneapolis and the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board because the Park and Rec Board is not party to the Joint Powers Agreement but is the landowner of certain features. Ms. Chandler said the city responded to her inquiry by saying the city's charter delegates full responsibility to the Park and Rec Board and the city doesn't have legal authority.

Ms. Loomis commented that if that is what the city charter says then shouldn't the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board have its own surface water management plan. Mr. LeFevere said he has not looked into this in detail but at this point he would look at the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board as a property owner in Golden Valley and subject to regulations. Mr. LeFevere said Golden Valley should talk it over with its city attorney.

Ms. Loomis says she read the city of Minneapolis' remarks per the write up in the Engineer's Memo as the city of Minneapolis saying its charter states the Park Board is the legal entity, which is more than just a property owner, it would essentially mean it is the local governmental unit.

Mr. LeFevere said he interprets the city of Minneapolis saying the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board is a separate agency that just happens to have the word Minneapolis in it and the city of Minneapolis does not have the authority to regulate it. Ms. Loomis asked if the city of Minneapolis has the authority to regulate the area in the city of Minneapolis owned by the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board. Mr. LeFevere said he would have to look at the charter.

Chair Welch directed counsel to look into the status of the jurisdictions of the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board and lands.

Chair Welch said he thought the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board should be represented on the TAC and that potentially the county should be as well. Mr. LeFevere said the TAC is formally set up under the bylaws of the Bassett Creek WMO and the member cities have the authority to appoint members to that advisory committee. Mr. LeFevere said the other parties are not part of the Joint Powers Agreement. He said there is no reason they should not be asked to participate to the extent that it is helpful but not as voting members of the TAC.

Ms. Chandler said the Commission engineer had a lot of discussion with the city regarding the ownership of the Bassett Creek tunnel. She said she would like the city to acknowledge the ownership of the tunnel in the LSWMP and make it clear that the city is the owner but through the Commission's 2004 Watershed Management Plan the Commission has taken over responsibility for maintaining the tunnel. She said she also recommends that the Commission pass a resolution approving the LSWMP to be consistent with how the Commission has taken such action in the past.

Mr. Welch moved to approve the city of Minneapolis' LSWMP and directed staff to prepare a resolution stating same for the October BCWMC meeting. Ms. Black seconded the motion with the friendly amendment that the final LSWMP document incorporates the minor revisions discussed. Chair Welch accepted the friendly amendment. The motion carried unanimously.

**B. TAC Recommendation on Daylighting Streams Project and Update on July TAC Meeting.** Ms. Black commented that the May 12, 2006 TAC memo included in the packet mentions Cedar Avenue. Chair Welch said it should state Cedar Lake Road.

Mr. Mathisen remarked that the May TAC memo lists the proposed daylighting sites and also lists the TAC concerns:

- i. The cost to the city or will someone else pick up the cost.
- ii. There are many other unfunded mandates for required water quality improvements so there could be a crush for funds. Daylighting should be part of the broader picture of water quality and the cost of daylighting should be weighed against other water quality projects.
- iii. There are areas tributary to the creek that could be improved and could be a better cost benefit return.

Mr. Mathisen said this is the gist of the comments the TAC wanted the Commission to send to the county regarding its position on the daylighting project. Mr. Yaeger commented that only the people who live along the daylighted portions of the creek would really benefit from the project and that there are better places to put time and money.

Chair Welch said the Commission can make a decision whether to send a letter or not. He commented that the TAC has recommended the Commission send this letter voicing the discussed concerns. Mr. VanderTop asked about the current status of the project. Ms. Clancy said she thought the plan was submitted to the county board but she did not know if funding is available. Chair Welch said the Commission could ask staff to make a brief inquiry of Hennepin County to see if the daylighting project is moving forward. Ms. Black said she has a meeting tomorrow with Hennepin County Commissioner Steele and she could inquire on the status of the daylighting project. Chair Welch commented that if the Commission communicates information to the county, it should be done on a more formal basis. He directed Ms. Black to make an inquiry as to the status of the project and to report any information at the next meeting. Chair Welch said the Commission could make a decision at that time whether to send a letter to the county.

Ms. Clancy said there was a great deal of frustration when the daylighting project was presented to the TAC. She commented that millions of dollars were spent ten years ago to deal with the project that already took place at the proposed-for-daylighting Golden Valley site. Ms. Clancy said there was some frustration within the TAC because there are water quality projects that cities can't find funds to implement. Chair Welch directed Ms. Black to inquire about the status of the daylighting project and directed Ms. Herbert to include the report from Ms. Black in the October BCWMC meeting.

**C. Education and Outreach Subcommittee Update.** Ms. Langsdorf said the Education and Outreach Subcommittee met last Thursday, September 14, and thoroughly reviewed the grant proposal. She reported that the Subcommittee strongly recommended keeping the funding of CAMP, RiverWatch, and WaterShed partners separate from the grant program. She said the Subcommittee feels the Commission receives a lot of benefits from these groups and that by continuing to fund these groups the Commission receives a lot of bang for its buck.

Ms. Langsdorf says the Subcommittee proposes going ahead with the grant program as it was proposed in August. She commented that if the program is approved, then the Subcommittee and Commission could see how the program is going and if there are improvements that people want

to incorporate, the Commission could add them in 2008.

Chair Welch noted that the Subcommittee's recommendations would not mean a change in the 2007 budget amount and he asked counsel for direction on to what degree the budget would need to be revised to reflect the redistribution of funds under the Demonstration/ Education Grants line item.

Mr. LeFevere responded he did not think the Commission would need to revise the budget unless the Commission wants to do so to track the money more easily. Chair Welch said the Subcommittee's recommendation would mean the Commission would have approximately \$5,000 in 2007 for the grant program to give to someone other than the three entities Ms. Langsdorf previously named. Chair Welch commended Ms. Langsdorf and the Education and Outreach Subcommittee for their hard work. Ms. Langsdorf said the entire Subcommittee has been very diligent and mentioned that the commissioners may not be familiar with Subcommittee member Margie Vigoren, who is staff at the city of Plymouth and who has been invaluable to the Subcommittee.

Mayor Loomis moved to adopt the recommendations from the Subcommittee about the application and the grant process procedures. Ms. Langsdorf seconded the motion. Chair Welch asked the Subcommittee to discuss at its next meeting a recommendation for the Commission on who the Commission lets know the grant funds are available and how the Commission lets them know.

The motion carried unanimously.

Ms. Black mentioned another item of Subcommittee business. She reported that the Subcommittee had a joint meeting with Shingle Creek Education and Public Outreach Committee (EPOC). She said there was a discussion about the kind of work they do. She reported that EPOC has an annual budget of \$57,000 split from two watersheds and that they have two staff working on EPOC. She said their annual grant budget has just been doubled to \$12,000. Ms. Black stated that she was not at the end of the meeting but knows there was a suggestion that there be joint meetings between the education groups of the three watersheds every other month. Ms. Black reported that the next joint education meeting is scheduled for November 14.

- D. **Request for Funds for Green Roofs for Sustainable Cities Conference.** Chair Welch said this topic was briefly discussed at the August BCWMC meeting and that the commissioners raised some questions at that time. He reported that with direction of the Commission he had several conversations and e-mail exchanges with Minneapolis council member Lisa Goodman, who had sent the funding request to the Commission.

Chair Welch said two options have surfaced. He mentioned that one is the straight up sponsorship of the conference, which includes having a booth at the conference and an ad in the newsletter. Chair Welch said that the other option is to contribute to the development of something that is long lasting and broadly applicable to this region such as an online greenroof site or database of greenroofs that could be used as a learning tool by the watershed districts. He said this could be done by the watersheds going in together on such a project on the occasion of the event of the Green Roofs Conference for the larger purpose of the Commission's education and outreach goals. Chair Welch said the Commission could also entertain the idea of paying for commissioners to go to this event.

Chair Welch said another variation of this option would be that the watershed districts go in

together to sponsor a rain garden tour by underwriting the tour and make the tour free for those attending the tour.

Ms. Langsdorf asked who would maintain the database. Chair Welch responded that probably Minneapolis Public Works since its staff is already compiling the beginnings of a database of greenroofs.

Ms. Black commented that she would lean toward the second option. Chair Welch asked commissioners if they would be more interested in a tour underwritten by the commission or in a printed brochure. Ms. Black said a tour would be fine but it should be a west metro tour.

Chair Welch said he is not hearing opposition to the idea of him exploring development of a proposal and participating in a meeting.

- E. **Watershed Projects' Aesthetic Elements.** Mr. O'Toole stated that a lot of the Commission's structures are functional and while they are functionally operable they also are seen by the public. He said the Commission has had one noteworthy success in regard to a structure that incorporated aesthetic elements to it and that structure is the Medicine Lake Dam. He said the overall cost of the project was \$50,000 and at that time there was an interest to make sure the structure was done in such a way to make it more aesthetically pleasing.

Mr. O'Toole said many of our structures are purely functional and some of those are hidden, but he would like the Commission to pay more attention to the aesthetics of those structures that will be viewed by the public. He feels this is necessary because when a city or organization puts forward a project, money is always tight and the technical or physical problem is addressed but it is hard to think of anything beyond that. Mr. O'Toole said if the Commission makes the aesthetic element a requirement, it would give permission to people to incorporate aesthetic elements for an incremental cost.

Mr. O'Toole said his idea is to give the engineers or proponents of the project permission to consider aesthetic elements as a line item. He remarked that the Commission would need to provide guidance about what aesthetic considerations mean. Mr. O'Toole commented that the aesthetic element should be developed with the setting in mind, for example for projects that are located in rustic settings color could be added to a concrete structure to make it more earth tone.

Mr. O'Toole said the Commission would need to be prepared to spend an incremental cost such as in the range of 10% - 15% of the project cost.

Chair Welch suggested the aesthetic element could be incorporated into feasibility studies for new CIP projects. Mr. LeFevere remarked that the Commission should bring the cities in as a partner on the aesthetic element early in the process and the cities might be willing to help.

Ms. Chandler mentioned that the Watershed Management Plan anticipated trying to keep in mind aesthetic elements and that the Commission does have a couple of policies related to aesthetic elements. She said the policies are mostly in the stream restoration section but the sense is there in the Plan.

Ms. Loomis said the CIP projects are mostly ponds that have landscape structures. She commented she has a problem with the Commission dictating what the community should look like. She said that if the community wants to pay for nicer design, that is fine, but to require the community to do that when the community may not want to pay for that and the Commission has

no involvement is an entirely different thing. She said, however, if the Commission is involved that would be different.

Ms. Clancy stated that in terms of ponds and community acceptance of water quality ponds, there is a lot more than just letting the grasses grow around the ponds. She said the Commission may want to think about funds not just for that first, initial construction but for a three- to five-year commitment because it takes three to five years to establish the ponds and the wildflowers and landscaping.

Mr. O'Toole mentioned that most of the ponds do have inlet or outlet structures. Mr. VanderTop mentioned the option of using stone other than limestone for riprap. Ms. Black said it takes three to five years to establish wildflowers, at a cost of approximately \$5,000 per year for maintenance.

Mr. Yaeger asked how the Commission should move forward and if the Commission could direct staff to address aesthetics in each CIP project the Commission gets involved in. Chair Welch said the Commission should address aesthetics in the feasibility studies of CIP projects and could ask the TAC for ideas.

## **7. October Meeting**

The following agenda items are currently scheduled for the Commission's October 19, 2006 meeting:

- A. **Project Budget for Medicine Lake Water Quality Ponds and City of Plymouth Invoice (Administration item).**
- B. **Update on Conversation with Commissioner Steele about Daylighting Streams status (Commissioner Communication item).**
- C. **Resolution Approving the City of Minneapolis' Local Surface Water Management Plan**
- D. **Commission Documents Index**
- E. **Education and Outreach Subcommittee Update**

## **8. Adjournment**

Ms. Black moved to adjourn the meeting. Ms. Loomis seconded the motion. The meeting adjourned at 1:45 p.m.

---

Michael Welch, Chair

---

Amy Herbert, Recorder

---

Ginny Black, Secretary

Date: \_\_\_\_\_