



Memorandum

To: Bassett Creek Watershed Management Commission
From: Technical Advisory Committee
Subject: July 29, 2013 Technical Advisory Committee Meeting
Date: August 1, 2013

The Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) met on July 29, 2013. The following TAC members, city representatives, BCWMC commissioners, and BCWMC staff attended the meeting:

City	TAC Members/Alternates	Other City Representatives
Crystal	Absent	Alt. Commissioner Guy Mueller
Golden Valley	Jeannine Clancy, Jeff Oliver, Joe Fox	
Medicine Lake	Absent	
Minneapolis	Lois Eberhart	
Minnetonka	Absent	
New Hope	Chris Long	Alt. Commissioner Pat Crough
Plymouth	Derek Asche	Alt. Commissioner Dave Tobelmann
Robbinsdale	Richard McCoy	
St. Louis Park	Perry Edman	
BCWMC Staff	Jim Herbert, Laura Jester, + Rita Weaver (Barr Engineering for first half of meeting)	

Asche opened the meeting at 1:35. There were no communications by members to report. Introductions were made around the table. Golden Valley staff introduced their new Water Resources Engineer, Joe Fox.

The Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) forwards the following recommendations to the Commission for its consideration. This memorandum presents the TAC's recommendations relating to 1) development review fees; 2) the watershed-wide XP-SWMM model second phase and schedule; 3) P8 models updates and schedule; and 4) feasibility study process improvement.

1. Development Review Fees

Asche provided some background and indicated the Commission's review fees are flat fees despite the time it actually took for review. Therefore the review of some projects subsidizes the review of

others. Engineer Herbert added more background reminding the group that collection of review fees cannot be a revenue generator. He indicated that in some years, fees cover the costs appropriately, and in other years fees fall well short of covering costs. He also indicated the public agency projects fee of \$1000 and single family lot fee of \$300 usually does not cover the costs of that review (because those reviews are often triggered by complex floodplain issues or new crossings), but that the Commission had made a decision not to burden homeowners and member cities with high fees.

There was discussion about charging fees by disturbed area rather than parcel size. (Examples were discussed where a church or a non-profit organization or a commercial business performed minor improvements, but since they owned over 20 acres of land, were subject to the maximum review fee. In one case, the majority of the parcel was undevelopable wetland). It was decided, however, that determining the amount of disturbed area may be inconsistent and difficult and take even more time to track and review. Therefore it was decided to continue applying the fee based on parcel size.

There was discussion about components of the fee schedule that are rarely, if ever, used including the variance escrow and the wetland fees. There was consensus to leave these in the schedule in case they were needed in the future. There was also discussion about large complex projects that are reviewed in the preliminary stages that often don't pay any fees such as the Southwest LRT project, TH 55 scoping document; regional trail projects and Bottineau transit project, . It was suggested that review for these large projects should have a separate line item in the annual budget as fees are not collected for these reviews. Engineer Herbert reported that another time consuming task associated with project reviews includes submittals that require reviewing historical development activities to ensure conformance to original BCWMC approvals. This is difficult to pin down and predict when and where historical research will be needed.

Other time consuming reviews include those that involved work in the floodplain, creek crossings, and the use of best management practices other than those listed as approved in the current policy. There was discussion about including "add-on" fee (above the flat fee) for projects with these components. There was understanding that rates for single family lots with work in the floodplain could have a fee more than twice the current fee.

Recommendations

The TAC recommends the following with regards to updating the development review fees. (See the proposed 2014 rate schedule attached.)

1. Raise all flat fees in the current fee schedule by 10% (rounded to appropriate value).
2. Include additional fees for projects that include work in the floodplain, creek crossings, and/or the use of best management practices other than those listed in the current policy.
3. These rate increases should take effect at the beginning of fiscal year 2014.

2. XP-SWMM Model: Second Phase Development and Schedule

Rita Weaver with Barr Engineering walked through the draft memo summarizing the results of the XP-SWMM model that would go to the Commission from the TAC. The group discussed the importance of a robust, detailed and complete hydrologic model and the fact that the current model still needs more detail. There was consensus that the more detailed model is a critical and useful tool for cities which can help them appropriately develop and redevelop in the future. It was also mentioned that the completion of this model is a perfect example of the role and benefit of the Commission as an individual city could not undertake this project alone.

The group discussed what its recommendations would be to the Commission with regards to updating the model (funding and timing of updates), and additional gaging data that may be needed. It was noted the memo should include a description of the limitations of the current model and a reminder of the original proposal for model development. Barr will revise the memo as discussed and ask for TAC feedback before it goes to the Commission at their August or September meetings.

Recommendations

TAC Recommendations regarding the XP-SWMM model will be forthcoming at a future Commission meeting.

3. P8 Model Updates and Schedule

The group briefly discussed the timing of MS4 reporting requirements and agreed that cities should forward information on projects or development/redevelopment sites that would impact the model to the Commission Engineer by the end of each calendar year (December 31st).

Recommendations

1. Member cities will forward information on projects or development/redevelopment sites that would impact the model to the Commission Engineer by the end of each calendar year (December 31st).

4. Feasibility Study Process Improvement

Asche described the project timeline or flowchart used for determining activities needed to shepherd a project through the entire process from approval of the CIP by the Commission to project completion. The group discussed how cities would like to maintain the ability to hire a consulting firm of their choice from the Commission's pool of firms (currently WSB, SEH, Wenck and Barr). There was consensus that the "Request for Proposals" process was cumbersome and costly and may not result in a less expensive project in the long run. The group also agreed that cooperation between the Commission and cities is paramount and that all parties are in favor of installing the best project and getting complete review and acceptance by Commissioners. It was noted that cities have professional staff that consider multiple issues and angles when seeking feasibility studies and designs for a given project.

It was noted that there are no criteria by which to evaluate a feasibility study. This is something the Commission could develop for consistent expectations for all studies.

There was also discussion about the use of public money (that levied by Hennepin County) and entrusted to the Commission to spend the funding wisely and on well-studied and designed projects. Administrator Jester reported her understanding that some Commissioners don't feel they have enough of a voice in the process nor time to review feasibility studies. She thought there was room for improvement in the current system that could satisfy the needs of all parties including asking for input from Commissioners on expectations or possible alternatives that should be considered in the feasibility study.

Recommendations

1. Commission staff should present and discuss the CIP flowchart (project timeline) with the Commission to determine where and when additional input from the Commissioners would be appropriate (see CIP Flowchart and Project Timeline attached).
2. The Commission should consider developing standard criteria for feasibility studies for Commission projects.

The TAC meeting adjourned at 3:30p.m.

Future TAC Meeting agenda items:

1. Developing guidelines for annualized costs per pound pollutant removal for future CIP projects
2. Stream identification signs at road crossings
3. Blue Star Award for cities
4. Emerald Ash Borer and how ash tree removal should be considered during restoration projects (Rainbow Tree Care has offered to give a presentation)
5. Look into implementing "phosphorus-budgeting" in the watershed – allow "x" pounds of TP/acre.
6. Discuss issues/topics arising Next Generation Plan process.