



## MINUTES March 30, 2020

A virtual meeting of the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) of the Shingle Creek and West Mississippi Watershed Management Commissions was called to order by Chairman Richard McCoy at 1:06 p.m., Monday, March 30, 2020.

Present were: Andrew Hogg, Brooklyn Center; Mitch Robinson, Brooklyn Park; Mark Ray, Crystal; Liz Stout and Shahram Missaghi, Minneapolis; Megan Hedstrom, New Hope; Ben Scharenbroich, Plymouth; Richard McCoy and Marta Roser, Robbinsdale; Ed Matthiesen, Diane Spector, and Erik Megow, Wenck Associates, Inc.; and Amy Juntunen and Judie Anderson, JASS.

Not represented: Champlin, Maple Grove, and Osseo.

Also present: Tim Olson and Kevin Kielb, Bolton--Menk.

- I. Motion by Ray, second by Stout to **approve the agenda.**\* *Motion carried unanimously.*
- II. Motion by Ray, second by Hogg to **approve the minutes\*** of the February 13, 2020 meeting. *Motion carried unanimously.*
- III. **2020 CIP and Minor Plan Amendment.\***

Typically, the TAC hears feasibility studies for proposed projects and makes a recommendation to the Commissions in April of each year as to which projects to consider for that year's CIP and whether any minor plan amendments are necessary. This all goes to the Commissions, which then set the maximum levies and forward that information to Hennepin County. The County then goes through its public hearing and maximum levy setting process that is usually done by the end of June. The process then goes back to the Commissions to hold public hearings on proposed projects and set a final levy.

Included in Staff's March 25, 2020 memo are the current draft CIPs for each Commission. They reflect the Minor Plan Amendments approved in 2019 and the rescheduling of some projects to future years. Shown are the potential projects for consideration in 2020 and the associated estimated levies.

In 2019 the Commissions amended their Management Plan to raise the annual voluntary maximum levy to \$750,000. As proposed, Shingle Creek would exceed that \$750,000 voluntary cap. Both the Cost-Share program and the Partnership Cost Share program have balances, currently about \$120,000 (plus an additional \$100,000 to be received this year) and \$150,000 (plus \$50,000) respectively. The Commission could get by without certifying levy for either of these programs in 2020 if need be. The Shingle Creek Commission would also expect to submit grant applications for the Meadow Lake and two stream projects, and there will be another round of Watershed-Based Funding from BWSR that could also provide funding for these projects.



The members discussed options for proceeding with a proposed levy that exceeds the voluntary cap of \$750,000. The cost share of Plymouth’s enhanced street sweeper and the three capital projects are all TMDL implementation projects that will be of benefit to the lakes/streams and make required phosphorus and sediment load reductions. Grant applications for two of the three projects were pursued in the past but were not funded. Additional grant funding can be pursued for all three of the projects in 2020. The cities also expect to continue to make use of both the public and private cost share funds. The TAC recommends to the Commissions that the 2020 maximum levies be approved as shown below:

Shingle Creek Project	Total Estimated Cost	City/Private	Grant	Commission Share	Total Levy
Cost share (city projects)	\$200,000	\$100,000	0	\$100,000	\$106,050
Connections II Stream Restoration	400,000	0	0	400,000	424,200
Plymouth Street Sweeper	350,000	275,000	0	75,000	79,540
Meadow Lake Management Plan	300,000	0	0	300,000	318,150
Bass Creek Restoration	400,000	0	0	400,000	424,200
Partnership cost share (private projects)	100,000	50,000	0	50,000	\$53,025
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>\$1,750,000</b>	<b>\$425,000</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$1,325,000</b>	
<b>5% additional for legal/admin costs</b>				<b>66,250</b>	
<b>Subtotal</b>				<b>1,391,250</b>	
<b>TOTAL LEVY (101% for uncollectable)</b>				<b>\$1,405,165</b>	<b>\$1,405,165</b>

West Mississippi Project	Total Estimated	City/Private	Grant	Commission Share	Total Levy
Cost share (city projects)	\$100,000	\$50,000	0	\$50,000	\$53,025
River Park Stormwater Improvements	485,000	363,750		121,250	128,585
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>\$585,000</b>	<b>\$413,750</b>	<b>\$ 0</b>	<b>\$171,250</b>	
<b>5% additional for legal/admin costs</b>				<b>8,560</b>	
<b>Subtotal</b>				<b>179,810</b>	
<b>TOTAL LEVY (101% for uncollectable)</b>				<b>\$181,610</b>	<b>\$181,610</b>

#### IV. Cost Share Program.\*

The City of Brooklyn Park has submitted an application for cost share funding in the West Mississippi watershed. The project, called **River Park**, is located at 81st Avenue and Mississippi Lane. The total project cost in \$2,600,00; \$660,000 of that amount is stormwater basin costs. A stormwater pond is proposed near the exiting 60” piped outlet to the river and would be designed to have a natural feel, with slight drops in elevation from one cell to the next, slowly sloping to the river. Other sources of funding for this project include a Hennepin County Grant (\$100,000) and a State of Minnesota Legacy Heritage Grant (\$250,000). Construction is expected to begin in summer 2020.

The TAC discussed the project. Staff noted that the Watershed-Based Funding resources were allocated by the Commission to the Cost Share Program as a convenience for disbursement, and are really just pass-through grant funds similar to other grants the Commission receives that are then passed-through to the cities. The members agreed that allocating the WBF funds currently residing in the Cost Share Program account to the River Park project would not violate the limitation on receiving both Cost Share and CIP funds from the county levy and recommended that the Commission authorize the allocation of the \$35,422 Watershed Based Funding to Brooklyn Park’s River Park stormwater basin.



**V. Effectiveness of the Preserver and the SAFL Baffle.\***

Staff's February 20, 2020 memo discusses the effectiveness of the Preserver and the SAFL Baffle in removing and retaining suspended sediment in sumps. In summation, both devices are effective in removing suspended sediment from sump inflow, but their performance differs based on flow rate and sediment particle size. The choice between the two devices should depend on predicted flow rates and sediment size in the sump and other construction, installation, and maintenance logistics.

Members had been asked to describe their experiences with these devices. Derek Asche from the City of Maple Grove responded,

Our experience with at least one Preserver, is that the energy dissipater is fine and allows for maintenance with a vac truck, but the skimmer has been difficult to install and has been crushed, blocking the outlet pipe. We are concerned there may be some design or material strength issues with the Preserver skimmer when the inlet and outlet are not "in-line" with each other.

The SAFL baffle has been easy to install and we can maintain easily with a vac truck.

I suspect in lab testing they are similar when it comes to trapping material, however, when it comes to practical details in the field such as how pipes come into manholes, as well as maintenance, there could be differences in performance.

Given Maple Grove's standard operating procedure to regularly vac sump manholes (many with SAFL baffles) and inspect all outfalls, the SAFL baffle works better in our community.

**VI. Other Business.**

**VII. Next Meeting.**

The next Technical Advisory Committee meeting is scheduled for 8:30 a.m. Thursday, April 30, 2020. It will be a virtual meeting.

The meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Judie A. Anderson".

Judie A. Anderson  
Recording Secretary

Z:\Shingle Creek\TAC\2020 TAC\March 30 2020 TAC minutes.docx