



## Memorandum

**To:** Bassett Creek Watershed Management Commission  
**From:** Technical Advisory Committee  
**Subject:** March 6, 2014 Technical Advisory Committee Meeting  
**Date:** March 10, 2014

The Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) met on March 6, 2014. The following TAC members, city representatives, BCWMC commissioners, and BCWMC staff attended the meeting:

City	TAC Members/Alternates	Other City Representatives
<b>Crystal</b>	Tom Mathisen	
<b>Golden Valley</b>	Jeff Oliver, Joe Fox	Commissioner Stacy Hoschka
<b>Medicine Lake</b>	Absent	
<b>Minneapolis</b>	Absent	
<b>Minnetonka</b>	Absent	
<b>New Hope</b>	Bob Paschke, Chris Long	Alt. Commissioner Pat Crough
<b>Plymouth</b>	Derek Asche	Plymouth Councilmember Jim Prom
<b>Robbinsdale</b>	Absent	
<b>St. Louis Park</b>	Phil Elkin	
<b>BCWMC Staff &amp; Others</b>	Karen Chandler (Barr Engineering), Rita Weaver (Barr Engineering), Laura Jester (Administrator), Rachael Crabb (Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board (MPRB))	

Fox opened the meeting at 1:30 p.m. Introductions were made around the table. 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. This memorandum presents the TAC's recommendations and information relating to 1) the CIP project list for 2016 - 2020; 2) adding local agencies to TAC meeting invitations; and 3) the implementation and funding of XP-SWMM Phase 2.

### 1. Develop CIP Project List for 2016 - 2020

Engineer Chandler reminded the group that the 2015 Main Stem Restoration Project Feasibility Study is estimated at \$1.3 - \$1.6 million. She asked if projects should be shifted to accommodate for that cost by splitting the project across multiple years. Mr. Oliver noted that the final cost of the project will depend greatly on landowner willingness and the type of restoration completed at each site. He noted the city would like to stay within the \$1 million budget and any areas not restored during this project will be added to a list of sites for completion through a separate future project. Additionally, Mr. Oliver noted that Golden Valley continues to look for alternatives to the Lakeview Park Pond project and asked that it be kept on the CIP list. Mr. Asche requested that the Plymouth Creek restoration project (2016CR) be shifted into 2017 and that the project in New Hope to construct a pond in the Northwood Lake watershed (NL-1) be moved up from 2017 to

2016. The group discussed how this action would shift funding among years. Mr. Paschke noted that New Hope is committed to the pond project to benefit Northwood Lake and has no problem moving that project to 2016. The group agreed to recommend switching 2016CR with NL-1 in the list of projects.

Mr. Oliver requested the addition of a pond project in Medley Park to the CIP list for 2020. This project would benefit Medicine Lake. Although an estimated cost of the project is currently unknown, he recommended including \$500,000. Further investigation of the project can be done this year so a better estimate can be included in the CIP list next year.

### **Recommendations**

- The TAC recommends that the 2016 – 2020 Capital Improvement Plan include the projects previously on the list for 2016 – 2019 (with the exception of the Lancaster Lane project which was removed from the CIP list by the Commission last year and the timing switch of the Plymouth Creek project with the pond construction near Northwood Lake), and the addition of the Medley Park Pond Project in 2020. Please see the proposed 2016 – 2020 CIP list, project fact sheets, and maps.

## **2. TAC Meeting Invitees**

The TAC discussed inviting other agency representatives to the future TAC meetings. TAC meetings are now regularly attended by Water Resources Supervisor with the Minneapolis Park and Rec Board (MPRB), Rachael Crabb. This benefits both the TAC and the MPRB. The group thought it would be appropriate to begin also inviting Randy Anhorn, the new Land and Water Supervisory with Hennepin County, and a representative with the Three Rivers Park District for their input and perspective on local issues and to help identify possible areas of collaboration.

### **Recommendations**

- The TAC recommends that the Commission invite Hennepin County and Three Rivers Park District representatives to future TAC meetings.

## **3. XP-SWMM Phase 2 Implementation and Funding**

At the February 20, 2014 Commission meeting, the Commission asked for the TAC to comment on technical aspects of the XP-SWMM model and provide guidance on the next steps regarding a possible phase 2 implementation and funding. Some specific questions by TAC members and Commissioners at the meeting were addressed in the TAC agenda. Since the Commission meeting, Mr. Fox and Commissioner Hoschka reviewed the XP-SWMM model with Rita Weaver to get further details on the model.

There was some discussion about the possibility of new models coming out and the use of 2D models. Engineer Weaver indicated that XP-SWMM has a 2D module that could be used for small areas and noted that model software is updated each year so it is never outdated. The group agreed the XP-SWMM model was the most appropriate model right now. Engineer Weaver distributed a map showing subwatershed divides used in the current XP-SWMM model and the smaller subwatershed divides used in the P8 model (which would also be used for the phase 2 of XP-SWMM). She noted that not a lot of fieldwork or surveying would be needed to complete phase 2 but that some model calibration would require field work. She noted the current model uses curve numbers to calculate relative runoff rates. More precise runoff estimates would be used in the phase 2 model.

Mr. Elkin commented that not all cities have the capability to run the model. Mr. Asche indicated his reservations about proceeding right now with development of phase 2 when cities have not yet had a chance to use the current model. He noted that the Commission and cities may not even know what “to ask for” in the development of a phase 2 model right now. He thought it was premature to move forward at this point.

Mr. Mathisen noted that calibration for the first phase was tough, indicating the model needs more detail, especially with storm patterns changing. He noted that a good and detailed model is important for redesigning infrastructure and benefits smaller projects.

Engineer Weaver demonstrated portions of the model and described the data that went into the model.

Mr. Mathisen and Mr. Oliver recommended moving forward with phase 2 this year. Mr. Elkin asked what could be answered with phase 2 that cannot be answered now. Engineer Weaver answered that development reviews would be better; engineers could feel more comfortable with proposed changes due to a particular development. Phase 2 would also be useful for mapping floodplains to answer questions from FEMA.

Mr. Elkin was a proponent of waiting on the development of phase 2 until more is known about the usefulness of the current model. Mr. Paschke said he was neutral but leaning towards waiting.

Administrator Jester offered a compromise to include a placeholder in the 2015 budget for beginning the development of phase 2 (as the 2015 budget will be in development soon) and to revisit the question after cities have had a chance to use and understand the current model and to better understand the appropriate needs for the second phase. It was further recommended that Barr Engineering prepare a detailed proposal for development of phase 2 (first year only).

The group also addressed the policy question of who can or should have access to the existing model besides the cities. The group agreed that model integrity needed to be maintained and that only cities or their representatives through the cities should have access to the model.

### **Recommendations**

- The TAC recommends that the Commission include a placeholder of \$65,000 in its 2015 budget for the development of the XP-SWMM Phase 2 model to allow cities to use and better understand the current model during 2014. The TAC further recommends that a final decision on the development of Phase 2 come later in 2014 and that Barr Engineering prepare a detailed proposal for the 2015 portion of the Phase 2 project.
- The TAC recommends that only cities or their representatives through the cities should have access to the XP-SWMM model.

The TAC meeting adjourned at 3:10 p.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. Look into implementing “phosphorus-budgeting” in the watershed – allow “x” pounds of TP/acre.
5. Discuss issues/topics arising from Next Generation Plan process.