



Item 6G.
BCWMC 10-16-14

Memorandum

To: Bassett Creek Watershed Management Commission
From: Technical Advisory Committee
Subject: October 2, 2014 Technical Advisory Committee Meeting
Date: October 6, 2014

The Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) met on October 2, 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	
Medicine Lake	Commissioner Clint Carlson	
Minneapolis	Lois Eberhart	
Minnetonka	Liz Stout	
New Hope	Bob Paschke	
Plymouth	Derek Asche	
Robbinsdale	Richard McCoy	
St. Louis Park	Erick Francis	
BCWMC Staff & Others	Karen Chandler and Jim Herbert (Barr Engineering), Laura Jester (Administrator), Rachael Crabb (Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board (MPRB), Alternate Commissioners Dave Tobelmann and Pat Crough	

The meeting opened at approximately 1:30 p.m. Erick Francis was appointed as chair of the TAC. There were no communications by members to report.

The Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) forwards the following recommendations and information to the Commission regarding 1) Implementation Plan for updated watershed management plan; 2) revisions needed for the Commission's "Requirements Document;" 3) development of guidelines for annualized cost per pound pollutant removal for CIP projects; and 4) stream identification signs at road crossings.

1. Provide Input on Draft Implementation Plan for Updated Watershed Management Plan

Administrator Jester reviewed Table 5-1 (Project Costs Eligible for BCWMC Reimbursement) of the draft Next Generation Watershed Plan, noting that it was discussed at a previous Commission workshop and a final version was approved by the Plan Steering Committee. There were no questions or comments on Table 5-1. Engineer Chandler presented Table 5-3 (BCWMC Capital Improvement Projects) and asked the group if any projects should be added, deleted or changed. The following items were discussed:

Ms. Eberhart noted that BC-5 and BC-6 are the same project (i.e., water quality improvement site at Main Stem in Minneapolis and wetland and creek restoration in Bryn Mawr Meadows, including daylighting of Bassett

Creek). After some discussion the group decided the word “daylighting” should be changed to “enhancing” and that more information should be added to the table. When asked about the timing and funding needed for BC-5/6, Ms. Eberhart indicated she had no way to estimate project costs until a feasibility study is done. After more discussion the group agreed to list \$500,000 in 2018 as a place holder for this project in Table 5-3.

There was discussion about how to estimate project costs for the Table 5-3 and what was included in project costs. Engineer Chandler noted that total project costs are listed in the table and include the cost of feasibility studies, design, construction, administrative costs (a percentage going back to Commission’s general fund), Commission Engineer reviews and legal needs. She noted it was very difficult to include a good estimate in the CIP table because a feasibility study hasn’t been done to refine options and costs. She noted that past Commission practice was to choose an option from the feasibility study and then pay the total project costs. However, the group noted the new Table 5-1 (Project Costs Eligible for BCWMC Reimbursement) would allow the Commission to pay for some project costs but not necessarily for every component of the project.

The group asked that Table 5-3 include a footnote that figures in the table are only estimated costs.

The group discussed project BCP-2 (deeper dredging of Bassett Creek Park Pond and construction of forebay for water quality treatment). Mr. Mathisen noted the pond has been accumulating sediment for 20 years and needs dredging. He noted it was part of the original Flood Control Project and the proposed project included both water quality improvements and flood control improvement. Engineer Chandler distributed a potential project from Commissioner Mueller in the same location and with some of the same components as BCP-2. The group agreed more information was needed to determine how the project should be listed and titled.

Engineer Chandler noted that several projects were slated to be removed from the table for various reasons. The group agreed with these except Commissioner Carlson asked that ML-14 be kept in the table for possible future shoreland restoration programs. Mr. Asche noted the City of Plymouth had completed such a program several years ago. Commissioner Carlson noted that perhaps not all lakeshore owners had known about the program and/or been able to take advantage of it at the time. The group agreed it should stay in the table with the understanding it would be a project within the City of Medicine Lake or to be administered by the Commission for all lakeshore properties. Mr. Asche asked that ML-13 be removed from the table because the project had been accomplished and that project and ML-19 be removed because there were no more Plymouth Creek restorations needed. Mr. Asche also recommended changing ML-17 to read “Alum treatment...” rather than “In-lake alum treatment.”

There was discussion about future TMDLs and how the Commission could address chloride and bacteria TMDLs. Various ideas were discussed including upgrading snow and ice removal equipment to match new technologies. Cities noted that many projects/programs to reduce chlorides were included in their MS4 permits. The group asked that be changed to “chloride and bacteria TMDLs” be included with “future TMDLs” in the table.

Ms. Crabb indicated that project BC-7 (dredging of accumulated sediment in Main Stem Bassett Creek just north of Highway 55) was a project the Park and Rec Board appreciated being in the CIP. She noted this project was on their wish list for a long time. The group noted contaminated sediments were likely in this area and wondered if the project would actually improve water quality or just aesthetics. Engineer Chandler said she would look to see if the project was included in the current Main Stem project’s feasibility study.

There was some discussion about how to fill in the rest of Table 5-3 with estimated costs and years. The TAC agreed they should see the final draft of the table before it goes out in the draft Plan for official review.

Table 5-4 review: The group briefly discussed how special projects or studies would be completed if they weren’t in the table. Engineer Chandler noted they could be completed under existing program areas including

“surveys and studies” or “water quality.” She noted the Commission has the flexibility to add funding to programs already listed in the table.

Tables 5-5 and 5-6: The group noted the tables should indicate these past accomplishments are only since 2004.

Recommendations

The TAC recommends that the Commission Engineer make the changes noted above for Tables 5-3, 5-5, and 5-6 for discussion at the October 8, 2014 Commission Workshop and that the TAC review the final draft of Table 5-3 before submittal for the 60-day review.

2. Discuss Revisions Needed for “Requirements Document”

Engineer Chandler distributed a draft table of contents with expected changes to reflect new policies in the updated Watershed Management Plan. She noted the revised Requirements Document would not be part of the Plan but would be referenced in the Plan. It was noted that revisions to the Requirements Document should be complete by the time the updated Plan is adopted next year. Engineer Chandler noted there were no major changes needed until section 4 and no changes to the floodplain standards. The use of MIDS as the water quality standard and buffer standards were the most significant changes. The group briefly discussed MIDS, the timing of revisions to the Requirements Document and changes needed in their own local controls. Engineer Chandler noted the revisions would take a series of TAC meetings and discussions with the Commission to finalize.

Recommendations

The TAC recommends that the Commission Engineer bring recommended changes to the Requirements Document and related discussion items to future Commission meetings and TAC meetings.

3. Begin Developing Guidelines for Annualized Costs per Pound Pollutant Removal from CIP Projects

Engineer Chandler reviewed questions the Commission Engineers were considering including which types of costs are included in calculating annualized costs. TAC members noted it is sometimes a complicated task to get these numbers and wondered how annualized costs were being used by the Commission. Staff noted Commissioners use the figures to distinguish among options within a feasibility study but not necessarily the outcomes of different projects. Staff noted a “level playing field” would be good with all feasibility studies using the same methods for calculating annualized costs. Alternate Commissioner Tobelmann noted that cost per pound pollutant removal is not the only component of a project or option considered by the Commission.

Mr. Francis wondered if it was possible to develop a simplified process to calculate costs like a spreadsheet with dropdowns for different options. The group also indicated the Commission Engineer should be able to report when a method or process used by a consultant was not rigorous enough to calculate reliable numbers.

Recommendations

The TAC recommends that the Commission Engineer develop draft guidance for methods to use in future feasibility studies for review and discussion at a future TAC meeting.

4. Discuss Idea of Stream Identification Signs at Road Crossings

Administrator Jester noted that if the public knew the location of creeks in their communities, it might promote more stewardship of these resources. She wondered if city crews would be willing and able to construct, install and maintain signs at creek crossings under major roadways. Mr. Oliver indicated he liked the idea and it may be feasible in some areas. He noted there are strict guidelines for sign construction and that the city was working to remove signs wherever possible. Ms. Eberhart also indicated she liked the idea but could not comment on its feasibility in Minneapolis. Administrator Jester noted there was no real budget for this project in 2015. She said she would bring a list of possible road crossing locations for discussion with individual cities and would consider the project for the 2016 budget.

Recommendations – No TAC recommendations at this time.

5. Watershed Map Distribution

Administrator Jester asked that TAC members take watershed maps for display at their city halls or other facilities.

Recommendations – No TAC recommendations.

6. November Commission Meeting Date

Recommendations

The TAC recommends to the Commission that, as in the past, the November Commission meeting be set for the third Wednesday (11/19) to allow TAC members to attend the American Public Works Association conference on the third Thursday and Friday of November.

The TAC meeting adjourned at approximately 3:30 p.m.

Future TAC Meeting agenda items:

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