



Bassett Creek Watershed Management Commission

Technical Advisory Committee Meeting

Friday February 3, 2017

9:00 – 11:00 a.m.

Council Conference Room, Golden Valley City Hall

1. CALL TO ORDER

2. APPOINTMENT of CHAIR

3. COMMUNICATIONS

4. BUSINESS

A. XP-SWMM Phase II – see Figures and Table 3-7 attached

Jen Koehler will present more detailed information on the results of the XP-SWMM Phase II project. The TAC was directed to consider several items related to the model:

Link to [Draft XP-SWMM Report Excerpt](#) (5 MB; 23 pages)

Link to [Draft XP-SWMM Report – Full Document](#) (16 MB; 87 pages)

1. The BCWMC directed the TAC to review the new flood elevations presented in draft Table 3-7 based on the BCWMC Phase 2 XPSWMM Model – Atlas 14 and provide recommendation to adopt the new elevations to the BCWMC.
 - The BCWMC directed the TAC to consider how to handle locations where the Phase 2 XPSWMM flood elevations are lower than existing flood elevations listed in the BCWMC plan or potentially lower than the elevations in the current Flood Insurance Study for Hennepin County (i.e. should BCWMC adopt lower elevations or maintain existing elevations at these locations)
2. The BCWMC directed the TAC to review draft Table 3-7 and identify or “ground-truth” locations of significant change that may require additional review or explanation by the Commission Engineer.
 - Please identify if there are any specific areas within the model where you have specific questions or would like further information based on your review of the results summarized in draft Table 3-7. We have already reviewed many of the locations where we are seeing the most significant changes in the XPSWMM modeling results based on the information we have for the area (GIS data/plans provided by the Cities/past modeling, etc.).
 - Attached are figures (first 4 pages) showing the Atlas 14, 100-year flood inundation mapping based on the draft flood elevations and MnDNR LiDAR elevation data. Also highlighted on the figures are structures potentially impacted based on the inundation mapping (using building information included in the MnDNR LiDAR data). It should be noted that these figures are preliminary and only intended to assist the TAC in understanding the impacts of the Phase 2 model results. This is a desktop analysis, so just because a structure is shown as potentially

being impacted, an actual survey should be completed to determine if a structure is at-risk of flooding. However, these figures may be helpful for the TAC in the “ground trothing effort”.

- We see significant increases in the flood elevations at the New Tunnel inlet (see pages 5 and 6 of figures). This is consistent with the results of the recently developed North Minneapolis XP-SWMM model, which was reviewed by City staff. The BCWMC Phase 2 XPSWMM modeling was closely coordinated with the City’s effort. See the figures summarizing the flood elevations and flow rates at the new tunnel inlet and the inundation mapping in the New and Old Tunnel areas, to be discussed at the TAC meeting.
3. Would the TAC recommend that the Commission go through the extensive FEMA review process to approve the Phase 2 XPSWMM model (either a letter of Map Revision (LOMR) process or physical map revision (PMR))? This would require a significant effort beyond the current modeling project and would include interagency hydrology review (DNR, USGS, USACE), review of the XPSWMM model, modeling of the 10-, 50-, 100-, and 500-year events, performing floodway analyses, and updates to the FEMA map panels and the Flood Insurance Study (FIS). The process could take 18 months (or potentially longer). There may be grants available through the MnDNR but may not sufficiently cover the entire process.

B. 5-YEAR Capital Improvement Program – see current 2019 – 2023 CIP and proposed projects from Plymouth and Medicine Lake attached

The TAC should start discussing the CIP projects for construction in 2019 through 2023. Please see the attached CIP list for 2018 – 2023 that has been updated with current expenses for projects and actual levy amounts through 2017.

- Are there any projects currently shown for 2019 – 2023 that should be moved or removed?
- What additional projects can/should be added to these years? (Please see the proposed projects from Plymouth and Medicine Lake attached).
- Please note the Commission would like to keep the levy amount fairly steady, around \$1.2 - \$1.3 M.

C. Requirements for Updates to Ordinances and Local Water Management Plans – see ordinance/LWMP checklist

As a reminder to cities: local controls must be implemented within 2 years of adoption of the BCWMC Plan (September 2017). Two BCWMC policies require specific ordinances:

Policy 4.2.2-39: The BCWMC requires member cities to maintain ordinances that are consistent with BCMWC floodplain standards. Member cities must submit ordinances to the BCWMC for review.

Policy 4.2.8-80: The member cities are responsible for shoreland regulation and are required to adopt MDNR-approved shoreland ordinances, in accordance with the MDNR’s priority phasing list.

Other ordinances/controls may also be needed to appropriately implement other BCWMC policies. Please see the first section of the checklist.

The second section of the checklist includes items required in your local water management plan which is due with your comprehensive plan in 2018. A third section of the checklist (beginning on page 5) has further detail on specific policies with color coding indicating whether the policy or action is required, is in collaboration with the BCWMC, or contains a performance standard.

As for what needs to come to the Commission for review and the timing of that review, please note two policies in the Watershed Plan:

Policy 4.2.10-106. The BCWMC will review local water management plans for compliance with this Plan's goals and policies.

113. Member cities must inform the BCWMC regarding updates to city ordinances or comprehensive plans that will affect stormwater management. Stormwater management elements of the member cities' comprehensive plans must conform to the BCWMC Plan.

Although the Plan does not require it, cities may wish to submit draft ordinances for review by the Commission before they are formally adopted. Ideally, this process of BCWMC review and approval would be complete by 9/30/2017. Similarly, the Plan does not require that LWMPs be submitted for review/approval by the Commission prior to submittal to the Met Council. However again, it makes sense for cities to submit draft LWMPs for Commission review prior to submittal to the Met Council to make sure watershed requirements are met.

5. ADJOURNMENT

Future TAC Meeting Agenda items:

1. Stream identification signs at road crossings
2. Consider adding maintenance of CIP projects to BCWMC responsibilities – e.g. Wirth Lake outlet, water quality ponds