

elm creek Watershed Management Commission

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE
3235 Fernbrook Lane
Plymouth, MN 55447
PH: 763.553.1144
FAX: 763.553.9326
Email: judie@jass.biz
www.elmcreekwatershed.org

TECHNICAL OFFICE
Hennepin County DEE
701 Fourth Ave S Suite 700
Minneapolis, MN 55415-1600
PH: 612.596.1171
FAX: 612.348.8532
Email: Ali.Durgunoglu@co.hennepin.mn.us

Meeting of Technical Advisory Committee AGENDA

January 11, 2017

1. Approve Agenda.*
2. Approve Minutes of October 12, 2016 TAC meeting.*
3. Old Business. *These items were discussed at prior TAC meetings with a goal to move them forward.*
 - a. Model Manure Management Ordinance.
 - 1) Facilitate transition from agricultural to rural residential land use.
 - 2) What BMPs should be used when animals are present?
 - 3) How are load reduction credits quantified?
 - b. Buffer inspection/enforcement requirements.
 - 1) *The JPA does not give the Commission permission to perform inspections, unless requested by the member cities, and grants the Commission no enforcement authority, excepting when serving as the LGU for the WCA. These duties could be assumed by the Commission through a Memorandum of Understanding with each individual city. Staff has prepared a draft MoU* (Item A) apprising the cities that this service is available.*
 - 2) *In discussing the Hy-Vee project the developer's engineer requested an interpretation of the Commission's 25-foot average/10-foot minimum for a buffer when a retaining wall is used to minimize wetland impacts. Would the Commission still require a 10-foot minimum below the retaining wall, thus impacting more wetlands, or would it accept an area to be mitigated elsewhere on the parcel? Item B* provides one perspective regarding this application.*
 - c. Measuring phosphorus reductions from land conversion.
 - d. Commission rules pertaining to filtration infiltration and abstraction during stormwater management review. *Staff was directed to draft a comprehensive list of sequencing guidelines. A minor plan amendment may be required to revise this language. Item C* is Ramsey-Washington Watershed District's Rule C, which includes more formal sequencing requirements.*
 - e. Cost share Policy.
 - 1) At the October 12, 2016 TAC meeting the following action was approved: *Subwatershed assessments shall be identified in areas outside of the MUSA, be supported by the City in which the SWA is located, be undertaken at the discretion of the Commission, should have a \$15,000 maximum cap (grant or Commission funding), and the cost should be shared by the City at a 20% match.* Staff was directed to draft a minor plan amendment if necessary.
 - 2) However, Appendix G of the Third Generation Plan includes the following language under the heading TMDL Implementation: *The Commission will share 50% of the cost of*

elm creek Watershed Management Commission

Technical Advisory Committee Meeting

January 11, 2017

feasibility studies and subwatershed assessments. Again, a minor plan amendment may be required to revise this language to match the intent of the action above.

f. **Prioritizing special projects other than SWAs.**

A list of criteria identified by other watershed organizations includes the following: (Item 15 was added by the Elm Creek TAC.)

- | | |
|------------------------------|---|
| 1) Total cost | 2) On priority list (CIP?) - Developed by whom? |
| 3) Total impacted area | 4) City request |
| 5) No. of impacted cities | 6) Commission-derived schedule |
| 7) Load reductions | 8) Included in Operating Budget |
| 9) Timing of project | 10) Grant opportunity |
| 11) In city's CIP | 12) Result of regulatory mandate. |
| 13) Multiple benefits | 14) Go beyond city management activities |
| 15) Potential load reduction | |

4. **New Business.**

- a. Call for additions/revision to Commission's CIP. *A copy of the current CIP is attached.**
- b. Call for 2017 CIPs.

5. **Other Business.**

- a. Next TAC meeting _____.

Enclosure provided*

Z:\Elm Creek\Meetings\Meetings 2017\01 TAC Agenda.doc

**MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING/COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT
FOR WETLAND BUFFER INSPECTION SERVICES
BETWEEN ELM CREEK WATERSHED MANAGEMENT COMMISSION
AND THE CITY OF _____.**

THIS AGREEMENT is made as of this _____ day of _____, 2017, by and between the Elm Creek Watershed Management Commission, a Minnesota joint powers watershed management organization (hereinafter the “Commission”), and the City of _____ (hereinafter the “City”).

WHEREAS, the Commission has been established through a Joint Powers Agreement (“Agreement”) pursuant to the authority of Minn. Stat §§ 471.59 and 103B.201, et seq.; and

WHEREAS, the Agreement provides that the Commission may exercise all other powers necessary and incidental to the implementation of the purposes and powers set forth therein and as outlined and authorized by Minn, Stat. §§ 103B.201, et seq.; and

WHEREAS, the City is a member of the Commission; and

WHEREAS, under state law and the Agreement, the City may request assistance from the Commission in the administration of the Minnesota Wetland Conservation Act (“WCA”) by the City as the Local Government Unit (“LGU”); and

WHEREAS, the Commission has the resources and capabilities to provide the assistance; and

NOW, THEREFORE, ON THE BASIS OF THE MUTUAL COVENANTS AND AGREEMENTS HEREINAFTER SET FORTH, THE PARTIES AGREE AS FOLLOWS:

1. Upon request by the designated employees of the City as the LGU under the WCA, Commission staff will inspect specified properties for compliance with the buffer requirements established by the WCA and other state laws.
2. Following that inspection, the Commission staff will provide a report detailing the findings and outlining any recommendations for correcting any issues identified.
3. Upon request, the Commission staff will provide additional assistance to the City in obtaining compliance with legal requirements.
4. The City will compensate the Commission upon invoicing for the services provided consistent with the Commission’s adopted fee schedule
5. The term of this agreement shall be in effect from the date of its execution and shall continue in effect until terminated in accordance with the provisions herein.
6. Either party may terminate this agreement upon thirty (30) days written notice to the other party.
7. At all times, Commission employees and agents will remain the responsibility of the Commission for wage, insurance, liability and related purposes.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties have caused this agreement to be executed by their duly authorized officers on behalf of the parties as of the day and date first above written.

**ELM CREEK WATERSHED
MANAGEMENT COMMISSION**

By: _____

Its Chair

And: _____

Its Administrator

CITY OF _____

By: _____

Its _____

And: _____

Its _____

FEE SCHEDULE

HyVee

This happens pretty infrequently so it would be rare to call it out in rules and standards. The purpose of a buffer is twofold: prevent encroachment into the wetland, and filter runoff. A retaining wall effectively limits encroachment. If there will be minimal sheetflow over the retaining wall into the wetland (and there should be no to minimal for structural reasons) then we'd consider limited to no buffer on the top of the wall. If there will be incidental flow down a slope, we'd suggest a minimum 10' native buffer to encourage abstraction. Most importantly, we'd (Shingle Creek and West Mississippi WMOs) consider it a formal variance from the buffer requirement with findings documenting the unique circumstances.

Rule C: STORMWATER MANAGEMENT

1. **POLICY.** It is the policy of the Board of Managers to:
 - (a) Reduce runoff rates to levels that allow for stable conveyance of flow through watersheds in the District.
 - (b) Require rate control practices on development to preserve runoff rates at a level that shall not cause the degradation of the watershed.
 - (c) Limit runoff volumes by utilizing site designs that limit impervious surfaces or incorporate volume control practices such as infiltration.
 - (d) Minimize connectivity of impervious surfaces to the stormwater system.
 - (e) Require the use of effective non-point source pollution reduction BMPs in development projects.

- (f) Protect and maintain downstream drainage systems to provide permanent and safe conveyance of stormwater. Reduce the frequency and/or duration of potential downstream flooding.
 - (g) Reduce the total volume of stormwater runoff to protect surface water quality and provide recharge to groundwater.
 - (h) Remove sediment, pollutants, and nutrients from stormwater to protect surface water quality.
2. **REGULATION.** No person or political subdivision shall commence a land disturbing activity or the development of land one acre or greater, unless specifically exempted by Paragraph 5 below, without first obtaining a permit from the District that incorporates and approves a stormwater management plan for the activity or development.
3. **CRITERIA.** Stormwater management plans must comply with the following criteria:
- (a) **Hydrograph Method.** A hydrograph method based on sound hydrologic theory shall be used to analyze runoff for the design or analysis of flows and water levels. Reservoir routing procedures and critical duration storm events shall be used for design of detention basins and outlets.
 - (b) **Runoff Rate.** Runoff rates for the proposed activity shall not exceed existing runoff rates for the 2-year, 10-year, and 100-year critical storm events, using Atlas 14 precipitation depths and storm distributions or as approved by the District. Runoff rates may be restricted to less than the existing rates when the capacity of downstream conveyance systems is limited.
 - (c) **Runoff Volume.** Stormwater runoff shall be retained onsite in the amount equivalent to 1.1 inches of runoff over the impervious surfaces of the development. The required stormwater runoff volume shall be calculated as follows:

Required Stormwater Runoff Volume (ft³) = Impervious surfaces (ft²) x 1.1 (in) x 1/12 (ft/in)

 - (1) For infiltration of the required stormwater runoff volume, the following requirements must be met:
 - (i) Infiltration volumes and facility sizes shall be calculated using the appropriate hydrological soil group classification and design infiltration rate from Table 1. Select the design infiltration rate from Table 1 based on the least permeable soil horizon within the first five feet below the bottom elevation of the proposed infiltration BMP.

- (ii) The required stormwater runoff storage volume shall be provided below the invert of the low overflow outlet of the BMP.
- (iii) Runoff infiltrated during a rain event will not be credited towards the volume reduction requirement.
- (iv) The applicant may complete double-ring infiltrometer to the requirements of ASTM D3385 or other District approved infiltration test measurements at the proposed bottom elevation of the infiltration BMP. The measured infiltration rate shall be divided by the appropriate correction factor selected from the Minnesota Stormwater Manual. This test must be completed by a licensed soil scientist or engineer.

Table 1. Design Infiltration Rates			
Hydrologic soil group	Infiltration rate (inches/hour)	Soil textures	Corresponding Unified Soil Classification
A	1.63	gravel sandy gravel silty gravels	GW - well-graded gravels, sandy gravels GP - gap-graded or uniform gravels, sandy gravels GM - silty gravels, silty sandy gravels SW - well-graded gravelly sands
A	0.8	sand loamy sand sandy loam	SP - gap-graded or uniform sands, gravelly sands
B	0.45		SM - silty sands, silty gravelly sands
B	0.3	loam, silt loam	MH - micaceous silts, diatomaceous silts, volcanic ash
C	0.2	Sandy clay loam	ML - silts, very fine sands, silty or clayey fine sands
D	0.06	clay loam silty clay loam sandy clay silty clay clay	GC - clayey gravels, clayey sandy gravels SC - clayey sands, clayey gravelly sands CL - low plasticity clays, sandy or silty clays OL - organic silts and clays of low plasticity CH - highly plastic clays and sandy clays OH - organic silts and clays of high plasticity

Source: Minnesota Stormwater Manual

- (v) The infiltration area shall be capable of infiltrating the required volume within 48 hours for surface and subsurface BMPs.
- (vi) Infiltration areas shall be limited to the horizontal areas subject to prolonged wetting.
- (vii) Areas of permanent pools tend to lose infiltration capacity over time and shall not be accepted as an infiltration practice.
- (viii) Stormwater runoff must be pretreated to remove solids before discharging to infiltration areas to maintain the long term viability of the infiltration areas. Additional information on

sizing and approaches can be found in application guidance materials.

- (ix) Design and placement of infiltration BMPs shall be done in accordance with the Minnesota Department of Health guidance called “Evaluating Proposed Stormwater Infiltration Projects in Vulnerable Wellhead Protection Areas.”
- (x) Specific site conditions may make infiltration difficult, undesirable, or impossible. Some of these conditions are listed in Table 2 and may qualify the applicant for Alternative Compliance Sequencing. The applicant may also submit a request to the District for Alternative Compliance Sequencing for site conditions not listed below. All requests shall indicate the specific site conditions present and a grading plan, utility plan, and the submittal requirement listed in the table below.

Table 2. Alternative Compliance Site Conditions*		
MPCA has limitations for constructing infiltration BMPs if it will receive discharges from or be constructed in these areas of concern. These conditions will apply to this permit.		
Type	Specific Site Conditions	Infiltration Requirements
Potential Contamination	Potential Stormwater Hotspots (PSHs)/Industrial Facilities	Prohibited
	Contaminated Soils	Prohibited
	Vehicle Fueling and Maintenance Areas	Prohibited
Physical Limitations	Low Permeability (Type D Soils)	Restricted- Soil borings required
	Bedrock within 3 vertical feet of bottom of infiltration area	Restricted- Soil borings required
	Seasonal High Groundwater within 3 vertical feet of bottom of infiltration area	Restricted- Soil borings required
	Karst Areas	Restricted- Soil borings required
Land Use Limitations	Utility Locations	Concerned- Site Map with detailed utility locations
	Adjacent Wells	Restricted- Well Locations

* Alternative Compliance is allowed for the volume reduction portion of Rule C only.

- (2) **Alternative Compliance Sequencing.** To the maximum extent practicable, the volume reduction standard shall be fully met onsite. If it is not possible because of site conditions listed above, the following Alternative Compliance may be achieved by any combination of the sequence below but shall be explored in the order presented.

- (i) First, the applicant shall comply or partially comply with the volume reduction standard to the maximum extent practicable onsite through alternative volume reduction methods as listed below and in the application guidance materials or as approved by the District. If the applicant meets these requirements, the project is compliant, and no further Sequencing steps are necessary.
- If filtration of the water quality volume is deemed necessary through alternative compliance sequencing, the “required stormwater runoff volume” shall be multiplied by 1.82 (i.e. 55% filtration credit) and the filtration BMP shall provide this storage volume below the invert of the low overflow outlet of the BMP (perforated drain pipes for filtration will not be considered the low overflow outlet).
 - If iron-enhanced sand is used as a filtration media, the “required stormwater runoff volume to be infiltrated” shall be multiplied by 1.25 (i.e. 80% filtration credit) and the filtration BMP shall provide this storage volume below the invert of the low overflow outlet of the BMP (perforated drain pipes for filtration will not be considered the low overflow outlet).
 - Iron-enhanced media shall include a minimum of 5% of iron filings by weight and shall be uniformly blended with filtration media.
 - Other enhanced filtration media may be considered and credited at the sole discretion of the District.
 - Stormwater reuse systems shall be allowed at an approved credit as calculated by the Stormwater Reuse Calculator found in the application guidance materials, or other approved calculator.
- (ii) Second, for the remaining volume reduction required to fully meet the standard, the applicant shall comply or partially comply with the volume reduction standard at an offsite location or through the use of qualified banking credits as determined by Rule C – 3.c.4. If the applicant meets these requirements, the project is compliant, and no further Sequencing steps are necessary.
- Volume reduction may be accomplished at another site outside of the project area or through the use of banked credits as long as it yields the same volume reduction benefit, and is approved by the District prior to construction. When possible, offsite compliance and banking credits shall be achieved in the same drainage area or sub-watershed as the project site. Projects that propose to construct stormwater BMPs to achieve

volume reduction credits require District permit application, review and approval.

(iii) Third, as a last alternative, for the remaining volume reduction required, the applicant shall pay into the District's Stormwater Impact Fund to cover the cost of implementing equivalent volume reduction elsewhere in the watershed. The required amount to contribute to the Stormwater Impact Fund shall be set by the Board annually.

- Money contributed to the Stormwater Impact Fund from a local government unit shall be spent within that local government unit's jurisdiction to the extent possible.
- Money contributed to the Stormwater Impact Fund shall be allocated to volume reduction projects by the District according to the Stormwater Impact Fund Implementation Plan as approved by the District Board. The volume reduction achieved by these projects shall offset the volume reduction that was not achieved on the permitted development.

(3) Volume reduction provided in excess of the 1.1-inch requirement may be banked for use on another project. Excess banked volume reduction amounts shall not exceed the volume of two inches over the impervious surfaces of the drainage area to the BMP or the volume provided within the BMP, whichever is less. Transfer of banked volume credits between applicants is allowed. Applicants shall submit a letter to the District outlining the conditions of the transfer and confirming the volume of the transfer. The District must review and approve all credit transfers.

(4) If an applicant determines during the course of planning, design or construction of a linear project that the required volume reduction cannot be achieved onsite and the applicant does not possess sufficient excess volume reduction credits to offset the volume required, the District may allow the applicant to defer the construction of volume reduction BMPs to a future identified project that the applicant will complete within two years of the date of the permit application. Failure to provide the required volume reduction by that date would obligate the applicant to pay into the stormwater impact fund at the rate applicable at the time payment is made into the fund.

(d) **Water Quality.** Developments shall incorporate effective non-point source pollution reduction BMPs to achieve 90% total suspended solids removal from the runoff generated by a NURP water quality storm (2.5" rainfall). Runoff volume reduction BMPs may be considered and included in the calculations showing compliance with achieving the 90% TSS removal

requirement. Water quality calculations, documentation and/or water quality modeling shall be submitted to verify compliance with the standard.

- (1) Drainage areas that directly discharge to a wetland shall meet the water quality standard onsite.
 - (2) For linear projects utilizing offsite locations, banking credits, or the stormwater impact fund to meet the volume reduction standard:
 - (i) If any portion of the development falls within a Special Interest Subwatershed as shown on the map in the application guidance materials, the development shall meet the water quality standard onsite. Offsite or banked BMPs located within the same Special Interest Subwatershed as the development may be considered.
 - (ii) If the entire development falls outside of a Special Interest Subwatershed, the water quality standard shall be met onsite to the maximum extent practicable as determined by the District. At a minimum, BMPs shall be placed in each drainage area of a development to remove gross pollutants.
- (e) For linear projects, costs specific to satisfying the volume reduction and water quality standards shall not exceed a cost cap which will be set by the Board annually. The cap shall apply to costs directly associated with the design, testing, land acquisition, and construction of the volume reduction and water quality stormwater BMPs only. Unit costs for construction costs shall be set by the Board annually and shall be used to determine the cost of the volume reduction and water quality BMPs. The District may contribute the amount above the cap in order to meet the volume reduction and water quality standards or it may allow the applicant to partially comply with the standards when the cap is met.
- (f) **Maintenance.** All stormwater water management structures and facilities, including volume reduction BMPs, shall be maintained to assure that the structures and facilities function as originally designed. Applicants shall submit a site specific plan, schedule and narrative for maintenance of the proposed stormwater management BMPs. The maintenance responsibilities must be assumed by either the municipality's acceptance of the required easements dedicated to stormwater management purposes or by the applicant executing and recording a maintenance agreement acceptable to the District. Documentation of the recorded agreement must be submitted to the District prior to issuance of permit. Public developments shall require a maintenance agreement in the form of a Memorandum of Agreement or an approved Local Water Management Plan that details the methods, schedule and responsible parties for maintenance of stormwater management facilities for permitted development. A single Memorandum of Agreement for each local government unit may be used to cover all stormwater management structures and facilities required herein, including volume reduction BMPs, within the LGU's jurisdiction.

4. **EXHIBITS.** The following exhibits must accompany the permit application. One set reduced to 11"x17" and a copy of all submittals in electronic .pdf format.
- (a) Property lines and delineation of lands under ownership of the applicant.
 - (b) Delineation of the drainage areas contributing runoff from off-site, proposed and existing sub-watersheds onsite, emergency overflows, and drainage ways.
 - (c) Aerial photo showing the locations of water bodies downstream of site.
 - (d) Proposed and existing stormwater facilities location, alignment, and elevation.
 - (e) Delineation of existing onsite wetland, marshes, shoreland, and floodplain areas.
 - (f) Identification of existing and proposed normal, ordinary high and 100-year water elevations onsite.
 - (g) Identification of existing and proposed site contour elevations with at least a 2-foot contour interval including offsite contours where overflows are directed.
 - (h) Construction plans and specifications of all proposed stormwater management facilities, including design details for outlet control structures.
 - (i) Stormwater runoff volume and rate analysis for the 2-year, 10-year, and 100-year critical storm events, existing and proposed.
 - (j) All hydrologic, water quality and hydraulic computations completed to design the proposed stormwater management facilities.
 - (k) Narrative addressing incorporation of stormwater BMPs.
 - (l) For non-linear projects, a site specific plan, schedule, and narrative for ongoing maintenance of the proposed stormwater management BMPs.
 - (m) Onsite soil borings indicating soil type for purposes of infiltration area design.
 - (n) For applications proposing infiltration area(s), information shall include identification, description (soil group and texture), and field evaluation of soil permeability in accordance with ASTM 3385 procedure and delineation of site soils to determine existing and proposed conditions suitable for percolation of stormwater runoff from impervious areas.
 - (o) For applications proposing alternative compliance sequencing, the required exhibits listed in Table 2.

- (p) All plan sheets shall be signed by a Minnesota licensed professional appropriate for the project.

5. EXCEPTIONS.

- (a) Rule C and its requirements shall not apply to land disturbing activity or the development of land that post construction creates 100% pervious surfaces unless the land disturbing activity or the development of land alters the drainage boundaries shown in the District's Watershed Management Plan.
 - (b) Rule C and its requirements shall not apply to development less than 1 acre in size for all land uses unless part of a common plan of development or sale that will ultimately exceed one acre in size.
 - (c) Rule C and its requirements shall not apply to construction on individual lots within a residential subdivision approved by the District, provided the activity complies with the original common plan of development.
 - (d) Rule C and its requirements shall not apply to bridges.
 - (e) Rule C and its requirements shall not apply to annually cultivated land used for farming, research, or horticulture.
-

Table 4.5. Elm Creek Third Generation Plan Capital Improvement Program.

Description	Location	Priority	Est Proj Cost	Partners	Funding Source(s)	Estimated Commission Cost					
						2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020-2024
Special Studies											
TMDL implementation special study	Watershed	H	225,000	Cities, HCEED	Operating budget	0	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	125,000
Stream segment prioritization	Watershed	H	20,000	Cities, HCEED, TRPD	Operating budget	10,000	0	0	0	10,000	0
High Priority Stream Restoration Projects											
Elm Cr Reach E	Plymouth	H	1,086,000	Commission, Plymouth	County Levy	250,000	Levied in 2015				
CIP-2016-RO-01 Fox Cr, Creekview	Rogers	H	321,250			0	80,312	0	0	0	0
Mississippi Point Park Riverbank Repair	Champlin	M	300,000			0	75,000	0	0	0	0
Elm Creek Dam	Champlin	H	7,001,220			0	187,500	0	0	0	0
Tree Thinning and Bank Stabilization Project	Watershed	H	50,000			0		50,000	50,000	50,000	250,000
Fox Cr, Hyacinth	Rogers	M	360,000			0	0	90,000	0	0	0
Fox Cr, South Pointe, Rogers	Rogers	M	90,000			0	0	22,500	0	0	0
Other High Priority Stream Project	Watershed	H	500,000			0	0	0	125,000	125,000	250,000
CIP-2016-MG-02 Rush Creek Main	Maple Grove		1,650,000				75,000	75,000	75,000	25,000	
CIP-2016-MG-03 Rush Creek South	Maple Grove		675,000								
High Priority Wetland Improvements											
DNR #27-0437	Maple Grove	L	75,000	Cities	Cities, Commission	0	0	0	0	0	18,750
Stone's Throw Wetland	Corcoran	M	450,000			0	0	112,500	0	0	0
Other High Priority Wetland Projects	Watershed	L	100,000			0	0	0	0	0	25,000
CIP-2016-MG-01 Ranchview Wetland Restoration	Maple Grove		2,000,000					250,000			
Lake TMDL Implementation Projects											
Mill Pond Fishery and Habitat Restoration	Champlin	H	5,000,000	Cities, lake assns.	Cities, Comm, grants, owners	0	0	250,000	0	0	0
Other Priority Lake Internal Load Projects	Watershed	M	100,000			0	0	0	0	0	25,000
CIP-2016-MG-04 Fish Lake Alum Treatment-Phase 1	Maple Grove	H	300,000	City, TPRD, Comm, lake assn	City, TRPD, grants, Comm, county levy, lake assn		75,000				
Stonebridge	Maple Gr	M	200,000			0		50,000	0	0	0
Rain Garden at Independence Avenue	Champlin	L	300,000			0		75,000	0	0	0
CIP-2016-CH-01 Mill Pond Rain Gardens	Champlin	M	400,000			0	0		100,000	0	0
Other Priority Urban BMP Projects	Watershed	L	200,000			0	0	0	0	0	50,000
Other											
Livestock Excl, Buffer & Stabilized Access	Watershed	M	50,000	Cities, owners, U Extension, NRCS	Cities, owners, Comm, NRCS	0	0	0	50,000	0	50,000
Agricultural BMPs Cost Share	Watershed	H	50,000	Cities, owners, U Extension, NRCS	Cities, owners, Comm, NRCS	0		50,000	50,000	50,000	100,000
CIP-2016-RO-04 Ag BMPs	Rogers				Operating budget						
CIP-2016-RO-03 Downtown Pond Exp & Reuse	Rogers		406,000						101,500		
Hydrologic & Hydraulic Modeling	Watershed	L	25,000	HCEE	Commission	0	0	0	25,000	0	0
Fourth Generation Plan	Watershed	H	70,000		Commission	0	0	0	0	0	\$70,000
TOTAL STUDIES			245,000		COMM SHARE TOTAL STUDIES	10,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	35,000	125,000
TOTAL CIPS			\$21,759,470		COMM SHARE TOTAL CIPS	\$250,000	\$492,812	\$1,025,000	\$576,500	\$250,000	\$838,750

EXHIBIT A

**Elm Creek Watershed Management Commission
Capital Improvement Project Submittal**

*(This submittal will be rated on its completeness and adherence to the goals of the Commission.
A second page may be used to provide complete responses.)*

City		
Contact Name		
Telephone		
Email		
Address		
Project Name		
	1. Is project in Member's CIP? () yes () no	Proposed CIP Year =
	2. Has a feasibility study or an engineering report (circle one) been done for this project? () yes () no	
		Amount
	Total Estimated Project Cost	\$
	Estimated Commission Share (up to 25%, not to exceed \$250,000)	\$
	Other Funding Sources (name them)	\$
		\$
	3. What is the scope of the project?	
	4. What is the purpose of the project? What water resource(s) will be impacted by the project?	
	5. What is the anticipated improvement that would result from the project? (Include size of area treated and projected nutrient reduction.)	
	6. How does the project contribute to achieving the goals and programs of the Commission?	
0/10	7. Does the project result from a regulatory mandate? () yes () no How?	
0/10/20	8. Does the project address one or more TMDL requirements? () yes () no Which?	
0/10/20	9. Does the project have an educational component? () yes () no Describe.	
0/10	10. Do all the LGUs responsible for sharing in the cost of the project agree to go forward with this project? () yes () no Identify the LGUs.	
10/20	11. Is the project in all the LGUs' CIPs? () yes () no	
1-34	(For TAC use) 12. Does project improve water quality? (0-10) 13. Prevent or correct erosion? (0-10) 14. Prevent flooding? (0-5)	15. Promote groundwater recharge? (0-3) 16. Protect and enhance fish and wildlife habitat? (0-3) 17. Improve or create water recreation facilities? (0-3)
TOTAL (poss 114)		Adopted April 11, 2012