



## Bassett Creek Watershed Management Commission

### Minutes of Regular Meeting March 19, 2015 Golden Valley City Hall, 8:30 a.m.

Commissioners and Staff Present:

Crystal	Commissioner Guy Mueller, Vice Chair	Robbinsdale	Alternate Commissioner Michael Scanlan
Golden Valley	Commissioner Stacy Hoschka, Treasurer	St. Louis Park	Commissioner Jim de Lambert, Chair
Medicine Lake	Commissioner Clint Carlson	Administrator	Laura Jester
Minneapolis	Alternate Commissioner Lisa Goddard	Attorney	Charlie LeFevere, Kennedy & Graven
Minnetonka	Alternate Commissioner Patty Acomb	Engineer	Karen Chandler, Barr Engineering Co.
New Hope	Commissioner John Elder	Recorder	Amy Herbert
Plymouth	Alternate Commissioner David Tobelmann		

*Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Members/ Other Attendees Present:*

Derek Asche, TAC, City of Plymouth	Linda Loomis, Chair, Plan Steering Committee
Sandy Baine, Friends of Northwood Lake Assoc.	Richard McCoy, TAC, City of Robbinsdale
Steve Christopher, BWSR	Jane McDonald Black, Alternate Commissioner, City of Golden Valley
Pat Crough, Alternate Commissioner, City of New Hope	Patrick Noon, Alternate Commissioner, City of St. Louis Park
Eric Eckman, TAC, City of Golden Valley	Bob Paschke, TAC, City of New Hope
Erick Francis, TAC, City of St. Louis Park	Jim Prom, Councilmember, City of Plymouth
Christopher Gise, Golden Valley Resident	Liz Stout, TAC, City of Minnetonka
Jere Gwin-Lenth, Friends of Northwood Lake	Robert White, New Hope Resident
Mary Gwin-Lenth, Friends of Northwood Lake	Pete Willenbring, WSB & Associates
Gary Holter, Alternate Commissioner, City of Medicine Lake	Doug Williams, Friends of Northwood Lake

**1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL**

On Thursday, March 19, 2015, at 8:39 a.m. in the Council Conference room at Golden Valley City Hall, Chair de Lambert called to order the meeting of the Bassett Creek Watershed Management Commission (BCWMC) and asked for roll call to be taken.

**2. CITIZEN FORUM ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS**

No items were raised.

**3. AGENDA**

Chair de Lambert announced that item 6B - Consider Approval of 50% Design Plans for 2015 Main Stem Restoration Project (CR2015) - would be moved to later in the agenda. Commissioner Mueller moved to approve the agenda as amended. Commissioner Elder seconded the motion. Upon a vote, the motion carried 9-0.

**4. CONSENT AGENDA**

Administrator Jester added to the agenda payment of the invoice to Finance & Commerce in the amount of \$94.15 for publication of the BCWMC’s public hearing notice. She also noted the revised financial statement to include the invoice. Chair de Lambert noted that the minutes of the February 19, 2015, BCWMC meeting should be corrected to indicate that Alternate Commissioner Tobelmann was not present. Commissioner Goddard moved to approve the consent agenda as amended. Alternate Commissioner Tobelmann seconded the motion. Upon a vote, the motion carried 9-0. [The following items were approved as part of the Consent Agenda: the February 19, 2015, Commission Meeting minutes, the monthly financial report, the payment of the invoices, Approval to Execute Agreement with Hennepin County for 2015 River Watch Program Pending Approval by Commission Legal Counsel, Appointment of Commissioner Ginny Black to Budget Committee and Administrative Services Committee, Set Public Hearing on 2015 BCWMC Watershed Management Plan for May 21, 2015, and Set TAC Meeting for April 2, 2015]. The general and construction account balances reported in the Fiscal Year 2015 Financial Report prepared for the March 19, 2015, meeting are as follows:

Checking Account Balance	\$841,880.89
<b>TOTAL GENERAL FUND BALANCE</b>	<b>\$841,880.89</b>
<b>TOTAL CASH &amp; INVESTMENTS ON-HAND (3/11/15)</b>	<b>\$3,408,178.97</b>
CIP Projects Levied – Budget Remaining	(\$2,674,767.87)
Closed Projects Remaining Balance	\$733,411.10
2013 Anticipated Tax Levy Revenue	\$1,465.41
2014 Anticipated Tax Levy Revenue	\$7,886.48

---

Anticipated Closed Project Balance

\$742,762.99

---

## 5. PUBLIC HEARING

### A. Receive Comments from Public on Proposed Major Plan Amendment

- Revising the Northwood Lake Water Quality Improvement Project (NL-1) in the Capital Improvement Program (CIP) from the construction of two stormwater ponds (NB-35A, B, C and NB-29A, B) to the construction of one pond just upstream (west) of Northwood Lake and the construction of a stormwater reuse system with bioretention basins in Northwood Park near the east end of the lake).
- Adding to the CIP the Honeywell Pond Expansion Project (BC-4) to provide stormwater quantity and water quality improvements, divert currently untreated stormwater to the pond, and provide opportunities for reuse of water from the pond.

Administrator Jester summarized the proposed Major Plan Amendment. Chair de Lambert opened the public hearing and called for comments. Jere Gwin-Lenth of the Friends of Northwood Lake stated that the group has been meeting with the City of New Hope for a long time and there is lots of neighborhood involvement with the proposed Northwood Lake Water Quality Improvement Project. He said that the Friends of Northwood Lake is very supportive of the project.

Administrator Jester reported that staff submitted a Clean Water Partnership grant application to the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA) for this project for the maximum grant amount of \$300,000. She said that the Commission will hear the MPCA's grant award decision by the end of April.

Chair de Lambert called for comments two more times. Upon hearing no additional comments, Chair de Lambert closed the public hearing.

## 6. BUSINESS

### A. Receive Update on Comments and Responses for Draft Watershed Management Plan

Administrator Jester reminded the Commission that the 60-day review of the BCWMC's draft Watershed Management Plan ended in the end of January. She said that the Commission received comments from all of the reviewing state agencies and others, and that staff and the BCWMC Plan Steering Committee are working through the comments and drafting responses. Administrator Jester announced that the Plan Steering Committee's next meeting is Monday, March 23 at 4:30 p.m. She said that the draft responses to comments should be ready for the Commission's review at its April meeting.

### B. Consider Approval of 50% Design Plans for 2015 Main Stem Restoration Project (CR2015)

This item was deferred to later in the meeting.

### C. Consider Approval of Twin Lake In-Lake Alum Treatment Project Plans

Administrator Jester stated that last November the Commission approved an agreement with the City of Golden Valley to implement this project. She announced that tonight the City of Golden Valley is holding a public information meeting about this project. Administrator Jester explained that staff is looking for Commission approval to implement the project as specified in the plans presented in the meeting packet.

Engineer Chandler provided details about the alum application. She said that a barge is used to apply the alum to the lake, and the application needs to be done when the water is within a certain temperature range. She said that permitting is a pretty simple process through the MPCA, and the permitting should be done in time for the alum application to be done in April. Engineer Chandler explained that one of the key factors that needs to be monitored as part of the alum application process is the lake water's pH level, which needs to be within the range of 6.5 and 9. She reminded the Commission that one of the reasons that the application is recommended to be done in two parts, two to three years apart, is because it is difficult to apply the full dosage of alum without causing the pH level to drop too low and adversely affect aquatic life. She noted the pH will be continually measured in the lake during the treatment. She provided more details about the weather conditions that could affect the timing of the application including wind and rain. She responded to questions. Administrator Jester noted that she would inform Commissioners and TAC members the date and time planned for the application as some may want to observe. (Although it was also noted there may not be a good viewing area.)

Alternate Commissioner Goddard moved to approve the Twin Lake alum treatment plans as presented. Commissioner Hoschka seconded the motion. Upon a vote, the motion carried 9-0.

#### **D. Consider Approval of Technical Advisory Committee Recommendations**

Erick Francis reported that the TAC recommends that the Commission approve the Commission's 2017-2021 CIP as presented in the attachment to the TAC memo. Additionally, he reported that the TAC recommends the Commission begin the XP-SWMM Phase II project in 2015 using Flood Control Long-term Maintenance Funds and to seek additional funding for the project from other sources, and to complete the project in as short a time frame as possible. Mr. Francis reported that the TAC also recommends that staff continue working to develop a flow chart and frequently asked questions sheet to streamline the communication process between cities, developers, and the Commission. The Commission discussed each recommendation separately:

##### **2017-2021 CIP**

Alternate Commissioner Goddard raised the issue of flooding that has occurred in Wirth Park and along Wirth Lake Parkway and the possibility that accumulated sediment in the channel could have contributed to the flooding. She asked why that project is listed in the CIP as so many years out. Mr. Francis said it may have to do with the expected timeframe for permitting the project and the anticipated issues with contaminated soils. Administrator Jester noted that no TAC members had raised that particular issue in relation to that project.

Administrator Jester pointed out an error in the CIP table and said that the final cell should total \$7,699,000. There was discussion about the proposed increase in the Commission's annual levy request to more than \$1,000,000 for many of the upcoming years as listed in the 2017-2021 CIP table. Administrator Jester reminded the group that Commission fiscal policies were recently revised to indicate a desire to maintain a relatively stable level of levy request, but that the Commission understood that a \$1 million levy was unlikely to suffice for the large projects needed in the watershed.

Chair de Lambert said that he would like to see the table corrected for math errors and that he is a little concerned about the proposed levy for 2017 as listed. There was discussion about possibly splitting some of the proposed projects over two years. Chair de Lambert recommended that staff correct the errors in the table, that the TAC look at this proposed table again at its next meeting and bring options back to the Commission at their April meeting, with the goal of keeping the total levy amount more uniform across years. The Commission agreed.

## **XP-SWMM Model**

Administrator Jester provided a history of the Commission and TAC's discussions of this item. She reported that the TAC recommends that the Commission move forward with the XP-SWMM Phase II, and she reminded the Commission that it did not budget for this work in its 2015 administrative budget.

Mr. Asche said that he knows that some cities want this next phase of the XP-SWMM model and that those cities would find value in it, but he does not support it. He said that a \$250,000 model update is a significant project needing thoughtful consideration. Mr. Asche noted how in 2011 the Commission discussed the idea that cities and others could update the model and that the Commission wouldn't need to update the model. Mr. Asche also commented that the \$250,000 proposed to be spent on this project will not reduce phosphorous in the cities. Mr. Asche stated that the decision today is not whether the model should be updated but whether the model should be updated through the Commission or updated as originally discussed through the cities and other projects in the watershed.

Ms. Stout said that she recalls that the Commission discussed the Commission Engineer being the keeper of the model so that there would be continuity within the model, which cities and developers would be welcome to use. She reminded the Commission that it was founded as a flood management organization, and flooding still impacts downstream communities. Ms. Stout said that she thinks it would be wrong for the Commission not to undertake the modeling update.

There was discussion. Engineer Chandler noted that the original cost of converting the two existing models into the XP-SWMM model was \$70,000. She explained that back in 2011 Barr Engineering had stated that cities could update the model and then turn the work back in to the Commission Engineer to review and ensure the quality of the model.

Mr. Eckman stated that flooding is an important issue for the City of Golden Valley and that it sounds like from what Lois Eberhart said at the TAC meeting that it is an important issue for the City of Minneapolis as well. He described how there are homes in the City that are at risk of flooding. Mr. Eckman provided some real-world examples of work proposed in the City of Golden Valley that could have flooding impacts, and he described the value of being able to use a model in determining the specifications for such projects. He said that the City of Golden Valley thinks it is important to have an XP-SWMM model that's updated and coordinated with the Commission Engineer. Commissioners Hoschka and Goddard spoke in favor of the Commission completing the model update noting the difficulties with multiple firms or cities updating different portions of the model and the coarseness of the current model.

Mr. LeFevere said that it seems if the Commission is going to do this model update it will have to front-end the cost. He added that to the extent that this model would be useful in Commission project reviews for its own capital projects, the Commission could charge the cost back to the CIP projects and could charge developers through fees.

Chair de Lambert commented that he thinks it is time for the Commission to figure out what additional information, if any, is needed in order to make a decision. He said he thinks the staff's recommendation to develop a scope and timeline is a good start. Commissioner Tobelmann said that he would like to understand the pros and cons of this project. Engineer Chandler said that in order to develop a project timeline, the Commission would need to decide if the project would start this year or next year. Chair de Lambert recommended developing the timeline as if the project would start this year.

Commissioner Hoschka moved to approve staff's recommendation to begin the XP-SWMM Phase II process with staff developing a project scope and timeline for the project to start this year. Alternate Commissioner

Scanlan seconded the motion. Mr. Asche asked if the Commission is only asking the Commission Engineer for this scope or if the Commission is going to get something for comparison. Chair de Lambert indicated that this was not a proposal from the Commission Engineer but simply more information about the potential project needed for the Commission to make a more informed decision. Upon a vote, the motion carried 9-0. Ms. Chandler clarified that the Commission also wants information on pros and cons, and the Commission indicated yes.

### **Communication Protocols Among Cities, Developers, and Commission**

Administrator Jester said that the TAC recommends staff create a communication flow chart and a frequently asked questions document. She described the protocols that have been put in place including that contractors and developers are first directed by Commission staff to the appropriate city staff person.

## **E. Consider Approval of Education Committee Recommendations**

### **i. Approval of 2015 Education and Outreach Budget and Work Plan; Approval to Execute Contract with University of Minnesota to Participate in 2015 Non-point Education for Municipal Officials (NEMO) Program Pending Approval by Commission Legal Counsel**

Administrator Jester reported that the Education Committee met on March 9th and recommended for approval the 2015 Education and Outreach Budget and Work Plan as presented in the meeting materials. She noted that this budget is in line with the education/outreach budget included in the 2015 Administrative Budget. She highlighted new items and stated that the Committee decided not to fund Blue Thumb for 2015 because Blue Thumb and Metro Blooms are merging and the Commission already provides funds to Metro Blooms. She said that the funds budgeted for Blue Thumb have been taken out of the presented budget.

Administrator Jester communicated that the Committee recommends funding the Children's Water Festival in the amount of \$350 and the Freshwater Society's Water Stewardship Program in the amount of \$1,000. She reported that the Committee recommends budgeting \$1,000 for reimbursing Commissioners for training. She said for example reimbursing Commissioners for registration fees, not travel expenses, on a pre-approval basis. She explained that the Committee recommends supporting NEMO at a funding level of \$750 plus her time to help plan the workshops. Administrator Jester said that if the Commission approves this funding, the Commission will need to execute an agreement with the University of Minnesota for the NEMO program, and the draft contract is in the meeting packet. She said that the Commission's Legal Counsel requested a change to that contract and is working it out with the University.

Alternate Commissioner Scanlan moved to approve the 2015 Education and Outreach Budget and Work Plan and the contract with the University of Minnesota for the NEMO program with the Commission's Legal Counsel's review. Commissioner Elder seconded the motion. Upon a vote, the motion carried 9-0.

### **ii. Approval to Develop and Execute Contract with HDR for Website Redesign Project**

Administrator Jester described the Education Committee's proposal review process, and she presented the Committee's recommendation to contract with HDR for the website redesign project. Alternate Commissioner Tobelmann moved to approve staff working with HDR, and the Commission's Legal Counsel to develop a contract to bring in front of the Commission at its April meeting. Commissioner

Elder seconded the motion. Upon a vote, the motion carried 9-0.

## **6B. Consider Approval of 50% Design Plans for 2015 Main Stem Restoration Project (CR2015)**

Commissioner Hoschka announced that she now works for WSB & Associates, and she described her discussion with the Commission's legal counsel on how to avoid possible conflict of interest issues. She said that she won't work on Commission projects at WSB and she won't vote on WSB projects as a Commissioner.

Mr. Eckman said that the 2015 Main Stem Restoration Project comprises almost two miles of streambank restoration. He stated that the project is estimated to reduce total phosphorous by 61 pounds per year and to reduce total suspended sediment loading by 140-200 pounds per year. Mr. Eckman explained that the project's approach is a combination of bioengineering and hard armoring. He noted that the City has received input from residents through two open houses and direct contact. He said that the majority of the project work will be on private property.

Mr. Eckman explained that these 50% design plans reflect information from the feasibility study, input from residents, and further field evaluation.

Engineer Chandler asked why these design plans didn't include more of the bioengineering methods mentioned in the feasibility study, such as root wads, rock vanes, and VRSS (Vegetated Reinforced Soil Slope). Mr. Eckman said that these items will be further evaluated to see if they could be incorporated into the project. Pete Willenbring of WSB & Associates described some of the considerations that go into the decisions of what method to use in each location, such as effects the methods would have on the cross section of the channel and impacts to the flood stage.

Engineer Chandler asked about areas C and D, which were identified in the feasibility study as having continuous riprap installed as part of the project. She pointed out that these design plans call for intermittent riprap in these areas. She asked for an explanation for the change and voiced concerns that intermittent riprap could lead to future problems, such as erosion. Mr. Willenbring said that soft armoring is a focus for the City of Golden Valley with this project, but he agrees that these areas need to be reviewed. Engineer Chandler also asked about a change from the feasibility study regarding stabilizing a bank. She noted that the feasibility study showed either VRSS or a nine-foot tall boulder wall, and now the plans show something much less. Engineer Chandler said that the concern is whether the new proposed technique for this area provides enough stabilization. Mr. Willenbring said that they can look into it. Engineer Chandler summarized the rest of the Commission Engineer's comments.

Administrator Jester asked what kind of feedback the City received at the public open houses. Mr. Eckman described the feedback received, noting that staff continue to work with individual landowners regarding their thoughts and desire for the project.

Commissioner Muller moved to approve the Commission Engineer's recommendation of approving the 50% design plans conditionally and to authorize the City of Golden Valley to move ahead with final design plans and contract documents. Commissioner Carlson seconded the motion. Upon a vote, the motion carried 9-0.

## **7. COMMUNICATIONS**

### **A. Administrator:**

- i. Administrator Jester noted that her report is in the meeting packet.

### **B. Chair:**

- i. Chair de Lambert announced that the Commission will be participating in the Plymouth Home Expo and asked for volunteers for the event.

**C. Commissioners:**

- i. Commissioner Tobelmann reported that he recently attended a road salt symposium, and he provided insights about chloride. He provided information and his thoughts regarding implications for the Commission including the need for a watershed strategy.

**D. TAC Members:** No TAC Communications

**E. Committees:** No Committee Communications

**F. Legal Counsel:** No Legal Communications

**G. Engineer:** No Engineer Communications

**8. INFORMATION ONLY (Available at <http://www.bassettcreekwmo.org/Meetings/2015/2015-March/2015MarchMeetingPacket.htm>)**

- A. CIP Project Update Chart
- B. Grant Tracking Summary and Spreadsheet
- C. Metro WaterShed Partners and Clean Water MN 2014 Report

**9. ADJOURNMENT**

Chair de Lambert adjourned the meeting at 10:48 a.m.

---

Amy Herbert, Recorder

Date

---

Secretary

Date