



Memorandum

To: Bassett Creek Watershed Management Commission
From: Technical Advisory Committee
Subject: June 6, 2013 Technical Advisory Committee Meeting
Date: June 11, 2013

The Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) met on June 6, 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	Jeannine Clancy, Jeff Oliver	
Medicine Lake	Absent	
Minneapolis	Lois Eberhart	
Minnetonka	Lee Gustafson	
New Hope	Guy Johnson, Chris Long	Alt. Commissioner Pat Crough
Plymouth	Derek Asche	Commission Chair, Ginny Black
Robbinsdale	Richard McCoy	
St. Louis Park	Perry Edman	
BCWMC Staff	Karen Chandler, Laura Jester, + Rita Weaver and Greg Wilson (Barr Engineering for second half of meeting)	

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) the 2014 Commission budget and Roles and Responsibilities Document; and 2) the watershed-wide XP-SWMM and P8 models.

This memorandum also presents other communications shared by the TAC members during the meeting: Administrator Jester informed the group about letters recently sent to the Hidden Lake Homeowners Association from the Commission. These letters were in response to resident questions/concerns about the outlet of Sweeney Lake and in response to a request for more information about the possible alum treatment on Twin Lake and the public hearing on June 20th on the Watershed Plan Amendment.

1. 2014 Commission Budget and Roles & Responsibilities Document

Asche requested a frank and open discussion about the budget. Several specific budget items were discussed:

- A. **Water Quality Monitoring:** Engineer Chandler reviewed what monitoring had occurred in the last few years and how the Commission got off their regular monitoring schedule. It was noted that Three Rivers Park District will be monitoring Medicine Lake in 2014. The group agreed that additional monitoring on Medicine Lake in 2014 was not warranted and recommended monitoring only Sweeney and Twin in 2014 for an estimated \$45,000.
- B. **Watershed Inspections:** There was considerable discussion about Commission vs. city inspections of construction sites for erosion and sediment control measures. When the Commission started this inspection program, cities were not required to inspect construction sites. Now the cities are required to inspect sites weekly. The Commission inspects sites monthly. Eberhart indicated that she sometimes appreciated the watershed's inspection reports because some projects such as road projects seem to take reports from watershed organizations more seriously. (Watershed inspections add credibility to their inspection program.) She mentioned that the City of Minneapolis could pay for individual inspections, as needed, in the future.

There was also discussion about County highway and MnDOT project inspections. There may be a need to continue these inspections by the watershed. Additionally, there may need to be some oversight of each city's inspection program. The group agreed to recommend leaving \$1,000 in the watershed inspections line for inspections or oversight needs that may arise.

- C. **Plat Reviews:** TAC members indicated they thought development review fees should come closer to covering the costs of those reviews. (Currently, review fees cover approximately 80% of the cost to review development projects.) There was discussion about restructuring the way those fees were shown in a financial report, either by project or as a separate fund. The TAC members indicated that the member cities' funds (Commission funds) should not be used to subsidize private development; development should pay for itself. There was also discussion surrounding the fact that cities also pay project review fees (although those are flat fees), and that MnDOT does not pay any review fees for their projects. At the end of the discussion, some cities indicated they could continue to pay review fees if all fees were raised or restructured to capture more revenue to cover a greater percentage of the costs for reviews on private developments.
- D. **TMDL Implementation Reporting/P8 Model Updates:** TAC members discussed that 2014 will be the first year of the Commission reporting on TMDL implementation. Some TAC members wondered why the Commission would be reporting to the MPCA as that is a role of individual cities/MS4s and not a requirement for the Commission. There was discussion

about how the Commission could collect the BMP information from the cities, update the P8 model with the new BMP information, and make that information/report available to the cities for submission to the MPCA. This item remains an unknown due to the first year of this activity. The group agreed to recommend \$20,000 in the budget, with approximately \$15,000 for P8 model updates and \$5,000 for reporting.

- E. Technical Services: TAC members discussed possible overlap between the Administrator and the Engineer on items such as communications and day-to-day operations of the Commission. Administrator Jester agreed that Engineer Chandler was asking her to do more and more administrative tasks and these should increase over time. She also noted, however, that there are often technical components to many communications and other Commission issues that she cannot address and will need continued “technical services” from the Engineer. Eberhart noted that an administrator increases the capacity of the organization to do more activities and be more involved in partnerships, etc. Commissioner Black indicated she would like to see the Engineer’s technical services go down over time and/or get more information on the tasks completed under that line item. Mathisen indicated this Commission still offers a good “return on investment.” It was agreed that the Administrator and Engineer should avoid duplication of effort and work towards more organizational efficiencies. The group agreed to recommend \$120,000 (same as 2013).

- F. Annual Flood Control Project Inspections: TAC members discussed the type of work that is performed as part of this item. Engineer Chandler noted that the item includes the annual inspection of the flood control project, plus, in 2013 it includes a sediment survey of Bassett Creek Park Pond, and in 2014 it includes an inspection of the double box culvert. The group questioned why the budget for the item needed to be so high, when the actual spent was so much less than the budget. Engineer Chandler indicated that the actual spent amounts did not look right, as she believed the actual spent amounts were very close to the budget amounts; she said she would look into it.

- G. Road Salt Inspections: The group briefly discussed the issue of inspections of road salt storage facilities. Inspections of these facilities are required within MS4 permits so there is no need for the Commission to perform these inspections.

Recommendations

- 1. 2014 Budget:
 - a. Water Quality Monitoring: \$45,000 (line 9). The TAC recommends performing water quality monitoring on Twin and Sweeney Lakes in 2014.

- b. Watershed Inspections: \$1,000 (line 12). The TAC recommends suspending the current inspection program because cities are already performing this function and at a higher frequency than the Commission.
 - c. Plat (Project) Reviews: \$65,000 (line 6). The TAC recommends increasing review fees to cover the costs of the project review program. Income from project review fees would increase on the revenue side of the budget document.
 - d. TMDL Implementation Reporting/P8 Model Updates: \$20,000 (line 44). The TAC recommends including \$20,000 in this line item in 2014 and monitoring the activities and expenses during the year.
 - e. Technical Services: \$120,000 (line 5). The TAC recommends leaving the technical services line item at the same level as the current year.
2. Roles and Responsibilities: The TAC did not recommend any changes to the Roles and Responsibilities document due to revisions since the May Commission meeting.

2. Presentation of XP-SWMM and P8 Models

Rita Weaver and Greg Wilson with Barr Engineering arrived and were introduced to the group. Engineer Chandler indicated she wanted feedback from the TAC on the memos before they were finalized and submitted to the Commission.

Weaver walked through the memo reporting the results of the watershed-wide XP-SWMM model, describing the inputs to the model and uses of the model. TAC members agreed the model is extremely useful to them and it's good to have a watershed-wide model to use. There was some discussion about how and when the model should be refined. Weaver noted that Atlas 14 numbers could be used to run the model again, and that the model should be calibrated to another event to better refine the numbers. Weaver explained that the XP-SWMM model in its current form can be used to determine the relative differences in flood levels for proposed projects (e.g., the project will result in a 0.5-foot increase in the flood level), but should not be used to report the absolute flood levels resulting from proposed projects (e.g., the project will raise the flood level from 862.0 to 862.5). There was some discussion about further model refinements, including the addition of greater detail to the model (e.g., more subwatersheds), in 2014 or 2015.

Wilson presented the results of the watershed-wide P8 model, noting there was much more detail used in this model, including 11 years of water quality data – mostly from the WOMP station. He reported that the P8 model results should be used for targeting and prioritizing practices, and sedimentation rates are useful for identifying where maintenance is likely needed. He noted that the model will need to be updated as practices are installed, which dovetails into the TMDL Implementation reporting.

Recommendations

1. The TAC recommends forwarding the memo reporting the results of the XP-SWMM model to the Commission along with a simplified fact sheet or memo – probably at the July Commission meeting.
2. The TAC recommends periodic updates to the XP-SWMM model and the addition of greater detail to the model as the budget allows.
3. The TAC recommends forwarding the memo reporting the results of the P8 model to the Commission along with a simplified fact sheet or memo – probably at the July Commission meeting.
4. The TAC recommends that the Commission develop a clear framework for updating the P8 model.

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.