



Bassett Creek Watershed Management Commission

Technical Advisory Committee Meeting

Thursday, October 1, 2020

10:30 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.

Via Zoom

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/88601867819>

1. CALL TO ORDER

2. COMMUNICATIONS

- A. Reminder to submit completed maintenance records addressing Flood Control Project 2019 inspections

3. BUSINESS

- A. Initial Discussion on 2023 – 2027 CIP (See resources: [Existing 2022 – 2026 CIP](#) and [10-year CIP 2015 – 2025](#) from Watershed Plan and attached CIP matrix)

At their meeting in February 2019, the Commission approved recommendations from the TAC and the CIP Prioritization Committee for developing the 5-year CIP. The outcomes of that action are listed below and the complete memo to the Commission with background and recommendations can be found [here](#).

At this meeting, the TAC should review and discuss potential focus areas for new CIP projects including TMDL implementation activities that have not been completed, areas with likely redevelopment in pollutant hotspots ([see Figure 5](#)), areas prone to flooding ([see Figure 4](#)), projects to address significant impairments, etc.

1. The Commission should use the new matrix (attached) to score potential CIP projects to help the Commission prioritize projects for implementation; but the outcome of the matrix should not be an absolute determination of whether a project should be added to the CIP list.
2. The matrix, pollutant hotspot maps, and flood potential maps will be used by city staff to focus potential CIP projects.
3. The Commissioners and Commission staff become more involved in the initial development of the 5-year CIP list by incorporating some or all of the following practices:
 - a. TAC members understand where the Commission is seeking projects and what type of projects the Commission is prioritizing.
 - b. Commission staff and TAC members develop, discuss, and give substantial thought (just short of analysis) to each project idea.
 - c. The Commission and TAC hold a joint workshop (or within a Commission meeting) where potential concepts are discussed and presented. A joint decision would be made on what projects to consider for the 5-year CIP.
 - d. The Commission and the individual TAC members understand each member cities' internal processes regarding redevelopments.
 - e. City staff that are involved in redevelopments (from the beginning) also need to be aware of the potential for BCWMC participation in projects.
 - f. If warranted, Commission staff could be involved in key points in the cities' redevelopment processes.

B. Review of CIP Project Timelines

TAC Chair, Mark Ray, recommends the TAC review the various timelines for past CIP project implementation to better understand the reason for inconsistencies.

Typical timeline (using 2021 projects as an example):

September 2020 = Project is official ordered

September/October 2020 = Agreement with implementing city is executed

Winter 2020 – Spring/Summer 2021 = Project design

Summer/Fall 2021 – Varies = Project construction

The following are examples of projects that did not follow the typical timeline:

- Four Seasons Mall Water Quality Improvement Project:
 - September 2012 = Original project ordered Sept 2012
 - Original project cancelled after 90% designs due to resident opposition
 - 2017 = Agreement with Rock Hill management and approval of 90% designs
 - Project not implemented; private developer could not secure land ownership
 - 2020 = Agreement with Dominion and approval of 90% designs
 - Project not yet under construction
- Lakeview Park Pond Project:
 - Prior to 2013 = Project ordered
 - June 2013 = Project determined not feasible after some design
 - September 2019 = Officially removed project from CIP and moved funds to Closed Project Account
- Bryn Mawr Meadows Water Quality Improvement Project:
 - September 2019 = Project ordered; no agreement for implementation in place (although progress is being made)
- Jevne Park Stormwater Improvement Project:
 - September 2019 = Project ordered; no agreement for implementation in place (and no progress to date)

C. Actions/Needs for Reducing Chloride Use This Winter

The TAC should discuss city needs and Commission roles for assisting with chloride reduction programs this winter. Here are some ideas:

- There are several [online trainings](#) for sidewalks and parking lots and for property managers in October and early November. How can we promote these? Should we try to schedule our own online training?
- Do city councils need education on this topic? Should the Commission develop and/or present information for this audience?
- Have cities used the [model ordinance](#) language or [model snow and ice policy](#) language available on the MPCA website? Is there a role for the Commission in promoting, educating, or facilitating ordinance or policy updates at cities?

- How can education to residents or large properties be expanded?
 - Articles for city newsletters
 - Greater distribution of “salt cards” (may not be possible right now)
 - Direct outreach to schools, churches, large property owners
- Are there ideas for how to more strongly support the limited liability legislation?
- What are your experiences in using the MPCA’s Smart Salting Assessment Tool? Have you used it? If so, was it useful? If not, why not?
- Staff is considering a recommendation to include language in Commission development project approval/review memos that strongly encourages property managers to implement a chloride management plan. Would cities support that recommendation?

D. Planning for Next 10-year CIP

The TAC should discuss ideas on how to best develop the 10-year CIP for the next watershed management plan (2025 – 2035). Some planning efforts would require long lead time to develop and may need to get underway in the next year. Some ideas include:

- Perform subwatershed analyses
- Develop TMDLs where impairments exist without a TMDL
- Use current data and models to target and prioritize projects
- Consider new criteria including climate resiliency and equity

E. Update on 2020 Water Monitoring Activities

4. ADJOURN

BCWMC Project Prioritization Scoring Matrix

| | | Primary Benefit Factors | | | | | "Jurisdiction" Factors | | |
|--|--|--|---|---|----------------------------------|---|------------------------|---|--------------------------|
| Project Name | | Protects/improves water quality of priority waterbody (reduces phosphorus loading) | Located in a total phosphorus loading "hot spot": 0 pt for <0.15 mg/L 1 pt for 0.15 - 0.20 mg/L 2 pt for 0.20 - 0.25 mg/L 3 pt for 0.25 - 0.30 mg/L 4 pt for >0.3 mg/L | Protects/improves WQ of priority waterbody by reducing chloride loading 1 point = reduction of impervious surface; 2 points = significant reduction of impervious surface; 3 points = project with the aim of reducing chlorides | Addresses approved TMDL or WRAPS | Addresses a flooding concern: 1 pt reduces local flooding <5 structures 2 pt reduces local flooding >5 structures 3 pt reduces intercommunity flooding <5 structures 4 pt reduces intercommunity flooding >5 structures | Part of Trunk System | Protects/restores previous BCWMC investments in infrastructure (CIP projects and Flood Control Project) | Intercommunity watershed |
| Score | Range | 2 | 0-4 | 2 | 2 | 1-4 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| DeCola Pond F flood storage and diversion | 2025 & 2026 Portions of BC-2, 3, 8, 10 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| SEA School flood storage | | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Medley Park Stormwater Treatment Facility | ML-12 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Mt. Olivet Stream Restoration Project | ML-20 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Dredging of accumulated sediment in Main Stem Bassett Creek just north of Hwy 55, Wirth Park | BC-7 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Parkers Lake Drainage Improvement Project | PL-7 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Bassett Creek Main Stem Restoration - Regent Ave to Golden Valley Rd | 2021-CR_M | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Bassett Creek Park Water Quality Improvement Project | BC-11 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

BCWMC Project Prioritiza

| | Opportunity Factors | | Secondary Benefit Factors | | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|---|----------------------|---|--|-------------|
| Project Name | Partnership with significant stakeholders (% funding threshold from non-BCWMC/City?) | Coordinated with redevelopment or City/agency infrastructure projects | Protect and enhance riparian or upland wildlife habitat as a secondary benefit | Increase quality and quantity of wetlands | Reduce runoff volume | Public education or demonstration value is emphasized through specific project elements | Minimize the spread and impact of AIS as a secondary benefit | Total Score |
| Score Range | 1 | 1 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 | |
| DeCola Pond F flood storage and diversion | 1 | 0 | 0.5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11.5 |
| SEA School flood storage | 1 | 1 | 0.5 | 0 | 0 | 0.5 | 0 | 11 |
| Medley Park Stormwater Treatment Facility | 0 | 1 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0 | 0.5 | 0 | 12.5 |
| Mt. Olivet Stream Restoration Project | 1 | 0 | 0.5 | 0 | 0 | 0.5 | 0 | 6 |
| Dredging of accumulated sediment in Main Stem Bassett Creek just north of Hwy 55, Wirth Park | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.5 | 0 | 7.5 |
| Parkers Lake Drainage Improvement Project | 1 | 0 | 0.5 | 0 | 0 | 0.5 | 0 | 8 |
| Bassett Creek Main Stem Restoration - Regent Ave to Golden Valley Rd | 1 | 0 | 0.5 | 0 | 0 | 0.5 | 0 | 10 |
| Bassett Creek Park Water Quality Improvement Project | 1 | 1 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0 | 0.5 | 0 | 5.5 |