



Item 5Bi.  
BCWMC 11-20-13

## Memorandum

**To:** Bassett Creek Watershed Management Commission  
**From:** Technical Advisory Committee  
**Subject:** November 7, 2013 Technical Advisory Committee Meeting  
**Date:** November 12, 2013

The Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) met on November 7, 2013. The following TAC members, city representatives, BCWMC commissioners, and BCWMC staff attended the meeting:

City	TAC Members/Alternates	Other City Representatives
Crystal	Tom Mathisen	
Golden Valley	Jeff Oliver, Joe Fox	
Medicine Lake	Absent	Commissioner Clint Carlson
Minneapolis	Lois Eberhart	
Minnetonka	Liz Stout	
New Hope	Bob Paschke	Alt. Commissioner Pat Crough
Plymouth	Derek Asche	
Robbinsdale	Richard McCoy	
St. Louis Park	Perry Edman	
BCWMC Staff & Others	Karen Chandler (Barr Engineering), Laura Jester (Administrator), Linda Loomis (Plan Steering Committee Chair)	

Asche opened the meeting at 1:32 p.m. There were no communications by members to report.

The Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) forwards the following recommendations and information to the Commission for its consideration (and to the Plan Steering Committee for item #2 below). This memorandum presents the TAC's recommendations and information relating to 1) the initiation of CIP Projects for 2016 - 2020; 2) a list of criteria for ranking and selecting CIP projects for the Next Generation Watershed Management Plan; 3) refined definition of the trunk system; and 4) maintenance of flood control project elements.

### 1. Initiation of Capital Projects for 2016 - 2020

Asche reminded the group that in November or December each year, the TAC begins discussing the next 5-year CIP and that approximately \$1M is requested to be levied by the County for capital projects. Engineer Chandler also recommended that TAC members think about finalizing the 2016 CIP list. Eberhart indicated she would make sure Minneapolis' proposed project is still on track for 2016 implementation. Asche indicated the same for Plymouth's proposed project. Oliver reported the Honeywell project is on schedule and should be kept on the CIP list for 2016 implementation.

At the request for further information from Commissioner Carlson, there was discussion about TMDLs, how projects get on the CIP list and what types of projects are typically considered. Commissioner Carlson asked if dredging in Medicine Lake would be an eligible project to consider for the CIP. The group discussed that TMDLs are usually addressed with activities and best management practices installed in the watershed of the impaired waterbody and that dredging within Medicine Lake would not address the TMDL for Medicine Lake. Engineer Chandler reminded the group that projects within the Medicine Lake watershed (and in the lake itself) were some of the first capital projects performed by the Commission because it is a high priority waterbody. Commissioner Carlson asked that the group consider the “quality of the experience” for lake users as a factor when choosing CIP projects. The group agreed that dredging within the lake (such as at public boat launches) may be a possible Commission project. The group noted that CIP projects are proposed by the cities and asked that if it was the wish of the City of Medicine Lake, that the city bring forth a project proposal with estimated costs so it could be considered for addition on the 2016 – 2020 CIP list.

Oliver noted the city of Golden Valley would likely have streambank restoration projects to propose for the 2020 CIP list.

### **Recommendations**

No TAC recommendations at this time. TAC members will develop possible projects for the 2016 – 2020 CIP list and will recommend a proposed CIP list to the Commission in early 2014.

## **2. Criteria for Ranking and Selecting CIP Projects for the Next Generation Watershed Management Plan**

At their meeting on October 28, 2013, the Next Generation Plan Steering Committee discussed the need for a set of criteria to be used in comparing, ranking, and ultimately selecting projects for inclusion in the Watershed Management Plan’s CIP list and future CIP lists. At the TAC meeting, the group discussed a list of possible criteria and had some additional suggestions. Mathisen noted these criteria may lead to the Commission becoming involved in activities not typical of historic Commission activities. The group agreed certain criteria should be weighted more than others if a ranking exercise is created. Additionally, as in Shingle Creek WMO, it was suggested that perhaps some projects (like those along the trunk system) are funded 100% by the Commission but other projects (or projects benefitting only one city) are funded less than 100%.

### **Recommendations**

The TAC recommends the following list of CIP project criteria to the Next Generation Plan Steering Committee and Commission. Additionally, the TAC offers to assist with developing weighting criteria and/or cost sharing formulas at a future meeting.

- i. Project protects or restores previous Commission investments in infrastructure
- ii. Project is part of the trunk system
- iii. Project improves water quality in a priority waterbody (Commission will establish a list of priority waterbodies)
- iv. Project addresses an approved TMDL
- v. Project addresses intercommunity drainage issues
- vi. Project addresses flooding concern
- vii. Project addresses erosion and sedimentation issues

- viii. Estimated costs per pound of pollutant removal are within Commission guidelines (project could score higher for lower estimated costs)
- ix. Project will address multiple Commission goals (e.g., water quality, runoff volume, wildlife habitat, aesthetics, recreation, etc.) [*The TAC noted that a criteria table would automatically indicate if multiple Commission goals were being addressed.*]
- x. Subwatershed draining to project is XX acres
- xi. Subwatershed draining to project includes more than one community

Paschke wondered if the criteria should include something about improving wildlife habitat or making sure projects to not have a negative impact on habitat. The group agreed each commission goal (including improving wildlife habitat) would ultimately be listed in the criteria table and that possible negative impacts to habitat should be addressed in the feasibility study phase.

### **3. Refined Definition of Trunk System**

Engineer Chandler described the current trunk system, as shown on the map provided to the TAC. The group discussed how currently, only projects along the trunk system are included in the CIP. The group wondered why the map did not show Medicine Lake as part of the trunk system. (*Upon further review of the trunk system definition in the 2004 Plan after the TAC meeting, Engineer Chandler found that Medicine Lake is already considered part of the trunk system.*) Oliver asked if FEMA-mapped floodplains or intercommunity drainage areas with flooding concerns (e.g. DeCola Ponds area) should be added to the trunk system.

### **Recommendations**

The TAC recommends including Medicine Lake in the defined Commission trunk system, but no other changes to the map (*however, as noted above, Medicine Lake is already part of the trunk system*). The TAC recommends the CIP selection criteria include “project is part of the trunk system” (and thus added to the list in #2 above).

### **4. Maintenance of Flood Control Projects**

Engineer Chandler indicated she and Engineer Herbert had reviewed several agreements and documents regarding the construction, cost share, and future maintenance of the flood control project components. She noted the Commission is responsible for maintenance per the 2004 Watershed Plan, but there are many gray areas where the documents (including the Plan) lack clarity between city responsibilities and commission responsibilities. Administrator Jester asked if the current system of inspections and routine maintenance is currently working. TAC members agreed it is working but that as the system ages, more issues will arise and clarity is needed regarding inspections, routine maintenance, larger maintenance and replacement. The TAC indicated the paper trail should be followed to determine who is responsible for what. Then, a distinct list of roles and responsibilities should be developed so that all members and the Commission are aware of current and future obligations. Asche noted that the following scenario should be avoided: there is major failure of a flood control component resulting in hundreds of thousands of dollars in repair and it is not clear who is to pay for the repair.

Engineer Chandler reminded the group that (at the Commission’s request) Barr is developing a proposal to study the future maintenance needs, repair, replacement and possible costs. This will be considered at the November Commission meeting.

There was further discussion about maintenance and inspection of the system. It was agreed that the trunk system and flood control system benefits all cities and hence, there is a role for the Commission. Some

possible scenarios were discussed, but ultimately the TAC decided all historic documents should be found and reviewed. In particular, the TAC would like to see the agreement or other document that turned over the maintenance responsibility for the flood control project features from the cities to the Commission.

Asche discussed the fact that Hennepin County owns the Medicine Lake dam and therefore should be responsible for inspection and future maintenance. However, he doubts any inspections are taking place. He agreed to contact the County to discuss the matter.

## **Recommendations**

The TAC has no recommendations at this time. They asked that Barr, recording secretary Herbert, legal counsel LeFevere and city staff look for pertinent documents and agreements so that this subject can be discussed at a future meeting.

## **5. Appointment of TAC Chair**

Asche indicated he would like to step down as TAC Chair. He noted that although this was not an official position, his work included helping with coordination of agendas and meeting dates, running the TAC meetings, and presenting the TAC recommendations at Commission meetings. He asked that someone else begin performing these tasks as his availability is limited.

After several TAC members indicated they did not wish to be chair or did not have the time, Joe Fox volunteered for the Chair position and was thus appointed.

## **6. Channel Maintenance Fund**

Administrator Jester distributed a memo regarding available channel maintenance funds for 2014. She asked TAC members to forward requests to her for the Commission's consideration at a future meeting. Eberhart asked if these funds could be used for the current 2012 Main Stem Bassett Creek Project if the project runs over budget. Engineer Chandler said she didn't know but would look into it. Administrator Jester noted the city could request a budget amendment with use of Closed Project Funds.

The TAC meeting adjourned at 3:25 p.m.

## **Future TAC Meeting agenda items:**

1. Developing guidelines for annualized costs per pound pollutant removal for future CIP projects (Commissioner Carlson wondered if this was a more pressing item in light of the City of Plymouth's recent issues with the Four Season's Mall Area Water Quality Project. The TAC agreed there are more pressing issues dealing with the Watershed Management Plan right now, but that this item would definitely be addressed as soon as time allowed.)
2. Stream identification signs at road crossings
3. Blue Star Award for cities
4. Look into implementing "phosphorus-budgeting" in the watershed – allow "x" pounds of TP/acre.
5. Discuss issues/topics arising Next Generation Plan process.