



Memorandum

To: Bassett Creek Watershed Management Commission
From: Technical Advisory Committee
Subject: April 4, 2013 Technical Advisory Committee Meeting
Date: April 10, 2013

The Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) met on April 4, 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	Mitch Hoeft, Justin Klabo (SEH)
Medicine Lake	Absent	
Minneapolis	Absent	
Minnetonka	Liz Stout	
New Hope	Chris Long	
Plymouth	Derek Asche	
Robbinsdale	Richard McCoy	
St. Louis Park	Jim Vaughan	
BCWMC Staff	Karen Chandler, Laura Jester	

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 Lakeview Park Pond project; 2) the process to finalize and present results of the XP-SWMM and P8 models; and 3) possible sites to visit during the upcoming watershed tour.

1. Lakeview Park Pond Project

TAC member Jeff Oliver and the consultant working on the project, Justin Klabo (SEH) reported on the preliminary design results for the Lakeview Park Pond project in Golden Valley. This project is included in the Commission's 2014 CIP for \$196,000. Golden Valley is contributing an additional \$50,000 to the project. This project aims to 1) reduce the flooding that occurs regularly in Lakeview Park, often affecting surrounding homes, and 2) provide Level I (BMWMC standards) water quality treatment for currently untreated runoff from two adjacent neighborhoods that ultimately drain to Medicine Lake.

Jeff Oliver reported that the 2004 feasibility report (updated in 2011) for this project was a "high level" analysis and it did not evaluate the various challenges with this site. Dealing with these

challenges has greatly increased the estimated cost of the project. SEH modeled four different options for various projects at this site including 1) parallel trunk storm sewer system; 2A) a “partial-build” option that would construct a smaller pond that would only treat runoff from one neighborhood, and would include a berm to protect homes from flooding; 2B) a “full-build” option that would construct a larger pond that would treat runoff from both neighborhoods (a larger watershed), and would include a berm to protect homes from flooding; and 3) home buyouts and larger pond construction. Options 1 and 3 were considered too expensive and are not considered viable. The city of Golden Valley prefers option 2B so that maximum treatment can be attained to help improve water quality in Medicine Lake (and address the Medicine Lake TMDL). **See attached memo from SEH for more details about the site challenges, design options, phosphorus removal and costs.**

The TAC recommended that the Commission approve construction of option 2B, based on the increased phosphorus removal and the annual cost per pound of phosphorus removed. The Commission already levied for this project, via a September 2012 levy request to Hennepin County for collection in 2013 (Resolution 12-09). The TAC discussed how the Commission could obtain the necessary extra funds for the additional project costs, including requesting an additional tax levy or using the Commission’s Closed Project Account funds, even if that meant allowing the account balance to dip below the Commission’s desired \$250,000 minimum.

Recommendations

1. The TAC recommends that the Commission order construction of Option 2B (larger pond with berm), and that the additional funds needed for the project (approximately \$215,800) come from the Closed Project Account.

2. Process to Finalize/Accept the XP-SWMM and P8 Models

Engineer Chandler reported that the models are complete; future updates to the models will be performed as needed. There was some discussion about how and when the models would be updated and what information would be useful to cities. The TAC agreed annual updating could be dovetailed into TMDL reporting.

Recommendations

1. The TAC recommended that Barr present the results of the models at the June 6, 2013 TAC meeting and then bring the models before the Commission in a report format with a presentation to the Commission at a subsequent Commission meeting. The final report should include information about how the models can be used and how/when they would be updated.

3. Improving the BCWMC Finance/Budget Reporting

Administrator Jester reported that although she had met with both Deputy Treasurer Virnig and Derek Asche, she needed to better understand the types of changes the TAC would like to make to the annual budget and/or monthly financial statements. The TAC agreed that the new CIP budget document should be helpful. There was discussion about carry-over in particular budget line items,

including documentation of the carry-overs, and where funds from underspent items go.

Administrator Jester explained that funds from underspent budget items within the operating budget stay within the general fund of the Commission (i.e., go into the budget reserve), just as funds for overspent items come from the general fund of the Commission (i.e., taken from the budget reserve). For more significant expenditures, the Commission may wish to take official action to “carry over” an underspent amount into the next fiscal year (as they recently did for completion of the XP-SWMM and P8 models). However, the budget should only rarely be officially amended, when there are major changes to the budget.

The TAC agreed that additional explanation on expenditures and remaining balances of dedicated accounts aside from the operating budget would be helpful to the TAC on a monthly basis, especially the Flood Control Long Term Maintenance Fund and the Channel Maintenance Fund. Additionally, Deputy Treasurer Virnig should be notified when a “final payment” is made for a particular project so that the CIP project account can be closed and underspent funds placed into the Closed Project Account.

Administrator Jester and Engineer Chandler agreed to work with Deputy Treasurer Virnig to further refine the reporting on dedicated accounts.

Recommendations

1. No Commission action required.

4. Possible Watershed Tour Sites

The TAC discussed possible tour sites including:

1. Watershed Outlet Monitoring Program (WOMP) station,
2. Tunnel entrance,
3. Wirth Lake Outlet (post-construction site),
4. Sweeney Lake Outlet (post-construction site),
5. Stream restoration projects (either before, during or after construction depending on the wishes of the Commission),
6. Four Seasons Mall site (pre-construction),
7. Schaper Pond (site of future project),
8. Church parking lot near Turtle Lake that uses porous asphalt (although this may be too far away from other sites), and
9. Crystal Lake treatment plant (although outside of the watershed, it may be of interest for possible future application in this watershed).

The 2011 and 2009 tours each included six site visits.

Administrator Jester reported that so far only Commission staff and TAC members had answered the poll regarding possible tour dates; no Commissioners or Alternate Commissioners had yet responded to the poll. TAC members agreed that the date chosen for the tour was really up to the Commission; cities should be able to send staff on any day and time chosen.

Recommendations

1. The TAC recommended the Commission choose 5 or 6 of the above sites for the 2013 watershed tour.

5. TAC Communications

There were no additional communications from TAC members.

6. Next TAC Meeting

Next TAC meeting: June 6, 2013. Agenda items include:

1. Receive results of XP-SWMM and P8 models, discuss their future uses, updating schedule, and presentation of results to Commission

Future TAC Meeting agenda items:

1. Look into implementing “phosphorus-budgeting” in the watershed – allow “x” pounds of TP/acre.
2. Discuss issues/topics arising from Next Generation Plan process.