



Memorandum

To: Bassett Creek Watershed Management Commission
From: Technical Advisory Committee
Subject: January 7, 2014 Technical Advisory Committee Meeting
Date: January 8, 2014

The Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) met on January 7, 2014. 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, Eric Eckman	
Medicine Lake	Absent	Commissioner Clint Carlson
Minneapolis	Lois Eberhart	
Minnetonka	Liz Stout	
New Hope	Bob Paschke	Alt. Commissioner Pat Crough
Plymouth	Derek Asche, Ben Scharenbroich	Commissioner Ginny Black
Robbinsdale	Richard McCoy	
St. Louis Park	Perry Edman	
BCWMC Staff & Others	Karen Chandler (Barr Engineering), Jim Herbert (Barr Engineering), Laura Jester (Administrator), Rachael Crabb (Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board (MPRB))	

Fox opened the meeting at 2:45 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 (and to the Plan Steering Committee for item #3 below). This memorandum presents the TAC's recommendations and information relating to 1) developing CIP project list for 2016 - 2020; 2) requests for use of 2014 Channel Maintenance Funds; and 3) possible changes to Commission standards and triggers for the next generation Watershed Management Plan.

1. Develop CIP Project List for 2016 - 2020

The group continued their discussion of the possible projects to include on the 2016 – 2020 CIP project list that began at the November 7, 2013 TAC meeting.

Oliver brought up two new projects that Golden Valley would like to be considered for the CIP:

- One would be located in Medley Park, in the Medicine Lake subwatershed. The city will be re-purposing space in the park (e.g., moving ball fields) and the city wants to investigate adding a water quality improvement project in the park. Ideally, this project would be implemented in 2016,

when the city will be reconstructing streets in the area, but the project could be implemented in a later year, if need be.

- The second project would be located in the Sweeney Lake subwatershed, south of Highway 55 (and south of/tributary to Schaper Pond). The city is considering re-routing the Sweeney Branch through an existing pond and making pond improvements (e.g., dredging). However, the potential benefits need to be evaluated before adding this project to the CIP project list.

Oliver noted the city does not have any cost estimates yet for the projects.

Chandler noted that the draft 2016 CIP project list already includes projects that total over \$1 million for that year.

The TAC needs to complete their final draft recommended CIP list so it can be reviewed by the Commission at the March Commission meeting, with final Commission approval in April. The TAC recommends that they meet in March to develop their final draft recommended CIP list.

Recommendations

The TAC recommends that the Commission direct the TAC to meet in March to develop their final draft recommended CIP list.

2. Review Requests for Use of 2014 Channel Maintenance Funds

Cities were asked to submit requests for use of the 2014 Channel Maintenance Funds allocated to them. The City of Minneapolis submitted the attached request. Eberhart explained Minneapolis' funding request – MPRB and Minneapolis are working on a stream restoration project stemming from the upcoming redevelopment of the Glenwood Inglewood site (see memo from Lois). Tough access issues prevented this work from inclusion in the Commission's 2012 CIP Main Stem project (Cedar Lake Rd to Golden Valley Rd), but now there is an opportunity to add this unanticipated work to the 2012 Main Stem project. Channel maintenance funds (that often go unused) would be a good fit for this project. An engineer's cost estimate is not available right now, but Minneapolis is requesting one from the MPRB's consultant for the 2012 Main Stem project. Eberhart noted this is phase I of this project, with more work expected in 2017.

The TAC approved recommending the City of Minneapolis' requested use of these Channel Maintenance Funds to the Commission for consideration.

Recommendations

The TAC recommends the Commission approve the City of Minneapolis' requested use of its allocated Channel Maintenance Funds (\$26,747.50) to perform stream restoration work on the Main Stem in the Glenwood Inglewood area.

3. Discuss Possible Changes to Commission Standards and Triggers for Watershed Management Plan

At the November 18, 2013 Next Generation Plan Steering Committee meeting, the Committee discussed and considered possible changes to the Commission's water quality standards and triggers for development and projects. The committee asked for TAC input on the issue.

Chandler distributed revised tables comparing the current BCWMC water quality standards and triggers with the new MS4 permit, the NPDES general construction stormwater permit and Minimal Impact Design Standards (MIDS) guidelines. The revised tables include more details about the BCWMC triggers for redevelopment review and application of the BCWMC's "nondegradation" standard, which can be much lower (i.e., smaller parcel size) than other BCWMC triggers. With the exception of the details regarding the BCWMC triggers for redevelopment review, the same information was discussed at the Plan Steering Committee meeting. Herbert noted that the triggers for redevelopment review and application of the BCWMC's "nondegradation" standard were developed for the BCWMC's revised "Requirements Document."

Eberhart noted that because Minneapolis is covered by an individual NPDES Stormwater Permit (Phase I city), the city does not have a volume control requirement, but they do need to turn in a volume control plan soon. Eberhart noted that the MIDS guidance includes a decision tree regarding volume requirements that use total phosphorus (TP) and total suspended solids (TSS) as volume surrogates when volume control cannot or should not be implemented. She is not sure if it's appropriate for the Commission to adopt the MIDS guidance. Eberhart is not in favor of a BCWMC volume control requirement and recommends holding off on volume control requirements until other agencies "catch up" (e.g., U.S. Environmental Protection Agency). Oliver agreed with Eberhart's recommendation, especially since BWSR does not require that the Commission have a volume control requirement. Eberhart stated that if the Commission adopts a volume control requirement, they should pay close attention to exemptions and cautions. She is not opposed to volume control where it works, but there are many places where it does not work or is not appropriate. Chandler stated that the Plan Steering Committee has already been talking about situations where volume control may or may not be appropriate; policies are already drafted with those caveats (similar to MIDS off-ramps). Eberhart said that Minneapolis does not need to be exempt from a volume control requirement, but would rather that the Commission not have such a requirement at all.

The group discussed the current BCWMC review triggers and how all of the BCWMC member cities, other than Minneapolis, have to meet volume control requirements through their MS4 permits. Construction projects (including those in Minneapolis) also have to meet the volume control requirements of the NPDES general construction stormwater permit.

Asche said that he likes the MIDS approach, as it provides consistency and flexibility. He noted that the best place to obtain water quality improvements is in redevelopment. Asche is interested in further exploring MIDS and Plymouth is considering adopting MIDS. Eberhart cautioned that some watershed organizations are adopting the MIDS volume control standards but not the whole package, which creates problems because it eliminates flexibility.

Asche noted that the complexity of multiple agency review has been an issue for him for a long time. He likes MIDS because it's complete and covers all of the bases. He wondered if Plymouth adopts MIDS, if that would satisfy the Commission's current or future requirements.

The group discussed the option of collecting funds (one of the MIDS off-ramps) from developers that can't meet requirements in order to install more regional water quality improvement measures.

Jester asked the group about overlaps or gaps/opportunities—e.g., what is or is not working right now?

Eberhart recommended that the Commission triggers stay the same. Eckman noted that the cities would still have to make sure that MS4 and NPDES requirements are being met.

Herbert asked if the redevelopment (trigger) exemptions should be eliminated.

The group discussed what the triggers and water quality treatment standards should be used for BCWMC review. A main point of discussion was whether the trigger should be as low as ½ acre. The group concluded that a trigger less than 1 acre often results in the implementation of “dysfunctional” BMPs and developers “walking away” from projects. The group also discussed whether the trigger should be based on parcel size, disturbed area, or new impervious surface, and agreed it should be based on disturbed area. After further discussion, the group agreed on the following triggers and standards for the Plan Steering Committee to consider:

- Trigger (for application of BCWMC water quality standards):
 - For all commercial, industrial and institutional development and redevelopment: 1 acre of disturbed area
 - For all residential development and redevelopment: 2 acres of disturbed area and 4 units
- Standard: Level 1 standards for all development and redevelopment

The group noted that these recommended triggers and standards would be simpler than the Commission’s current triggers and standards and would eliminate the confusion over development vs. redevelopment vs. expansion (as defined in the current “Requirements” document). The group also acknowledged that there will likely be situations where a developer will not be able to meet the Level 1 requirements, but they could go through the Commission’s variance process. Although the TAC does not recommend a volume reduction requirement, it should be listed as an option in the Requirements document and the document should be updated to include more “approved” volume reduction practices.

Recommendations

The TAC recommends that the Plan Steering Committee consider the following triggers and standards for the next generation Watershed Management Plan:

- Trigger (for application of BCWMC water quality standards):
 - For all commercial, industrial and institutional development and redevelopment: 1 acre of disturbed area
 - For all residential development and redevelopment: 2 acres of disturbed area and 4 units
- Standard: Level 1 standards for all development and redevelopment

Should the Plan Steering Committee approve the TAC’s recommendations, the TAC further recommends that the Plan Steering Committee forward these recommendations on to the full Commission for their consideration.

4. Other Items

Jester requested that the cities prepare project fact sheets for current CIP projects. She will also make the request via email.

Carlson requested that the TAC further discuss XP-SWMM Phase II funding and timing.

The TAC meeting adjourned at 4:41 p.m. Next meeting is likely for March 6, 2014.

Future TAC Meeting agenda items:

1. Developing guidelines for annualized costs per pound pollutant removal for future CIP projects
Stream identification signs at road crossings
2. Blue Star Award for cities
3. Look into implementing “phosphorus-budgeting” in the watershed – allow “x” pounds of TP/acre.
4. Discuss issues/topics arising from Next Generation Plan process.



**Department of
Public Works**

Steven A. Kotke, P.E.
City Engineer
Director

350 South 5th Street - Room 203
Minneapolis MN 55415

Office 612 673-2352
Fax 612 673-3565
TTY 612 673-2157

Date: December 30, 2013

To: Laura Jester, Administrator, Bassett Creek Watershed Management Commission

From: Lois Eberhart, BCWMC TAC Member, City of Mpls. Water Resources Admin.

Cc: Andrea Weber and Cliff Swenson, Minneapolis Park & Recreation Board

Subject: Channel Maintenance Funds Request

The City of Minneapolis requests channel maintenance funds in the amount of \$26,747.50. These funds will supplement the existing \$856,000 grant for the Bassett Creek Main Stem Erosion Control Project. Redevelopment of the Glenwood Inglewood site was recently announced. This presents an unanticipated opportunity to carry out work in this area which was identified in the Main Stem Erosion Control Project Feasibility Study, but has access issues (see map below) which had been thought to impede work in this site. Access via the Glenwood Inglewood site may allow more feasible access to the Fruen Mill site as well, thus allowing the opportunity to work on both sites.

The timing is excellent because the additional work to be funded by the \$26,747.50 in Channel Maintenance Funds can be added with ease to the existing project being carried out in 2014 by the Minneapolis Park & Recreation Board, eliminating expenses that would be involved for a stand-alone project. The work will be guided by the Feasibility Study and subsequent engineering, and may include grading and shaping of banks, stabilization/removal or repair of existing retaining walls, limited use of boulders or rip rap where needed in the waterfall/riffle areas, vegetative stabilization, as well as temporary stabilization measures during construction.

Thank you for consideration of this request.

