

# 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](mailto:judie@jass.biz)  
[www.elmcreekwatershed.org](http://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](mailto:Ali.Durgunoglu@co.hennepin.mn.us)

### Meeting of Elm Creek Technical Advisory Committee

#### AGENDA

February 10, 2016

1. Use of Tire Derived Products.\*
2. Expiration Date Policy – Project Reviews.
3. City restrictions within their zoning laws.
4. Model manure management ordinance.\*
5. Buffer inspection/enforcement requirements.
6. Easement ownership – information only.\*
7. Consideration of CIP Submittals.\*
  - a. 2016-CH-01 Mill Pond Rain Gardens.\*
  - b. 2016-MG-01 Ranchview Wetland Restoration.\*
  - c. 2016-MG-02 Rush Creek Main – Stream Restoration.\*
  - d. 2016-MG-03 Rush Creek South – Stream Restoration.\*
  - e. 2016-MG-04 Fish Lake Alum Treatment – Phase 1.\*
  - f. 2016-RO-01 Fox Creek Stream Bank Stabilization – Segment 2, Creekview Drive.\*
  - g. 2016-RO-02 Rush Creek and Fox Creek Monitoring Stations.\*
  - h. 2016-RO-03 Downtown Rogers Pond Expansion and Reuse.\*
  - i. 2016-RO-04 Agricultural Best Management Practices.\*

Enclosure provided\*

Z:\Elm Creek\Meetings\Meetings 2016\02 TAC Agenda.doc



# Beneficial use of tire derived products

## Background

After World War II, the United States experienced a huge surge in the demand for tires as a result of an expanding auto industry, a greatly improved system of highways, and an increase in the economy which provided for a better standard of living and an increase in leisure time. This increase in the demand for tires in turn led to an increase in the problems associated with the disposal of waste tires. Many of the waste tires that were generated were either burned or landfilled, but a significant portion of the waste tires were collected and dumped on private properties. These waste tires – sometimes numbering in the millions – were often owned by persons who had no viable plan to dispose of them. In 1984, Minnesota became the first state to regulate the disposal of waste tires and encourage the abatement of waste tire dumps. This Minnesota waste tire legislation provided funding and technical assistance to help businesses properly recycle waste tires and to help property owners clean up waste tire dumps.

As a result of the waste tire legislation, waste tires generated in Minnesota were diverted from landfills into a number of different processing options. While most of the waste tires were shredded and utilized as a fuel source for power plants and other permitted facilities, shredded tires were also used as a material for construction purposes, primarily as “lightweight fill” for roads constructed through unstable soils. To date, over 40 million tires have been removed from the waste stream and reused for some other purpose.

Although lightweight fill was a major use of the tire-derived products (TDP), the marketplace for TDP was new and the potential uses for the material kept growing because of its perceived value to the project engineers to build better projects. To address the growing demand, and to address public concerns that TDP posed environmental problems or was being disposed of in the land without a viable plan, the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA) established guidelines for several different uses of the TDP. These uses could include road-bed construction, building construction, utility construction and rehabilitation, and landscaping. Since there were no rules specifically governing the use of TDP, the MPCA requested persons proposing projects involving the use of TDP in the ground to submit a proposal to the MPCA for technical review. The proposal was to contain the following information:

- methods of construction
- quantity of tire shreds to be used
- depth to water table
- maps, diagrams and cross-sections to show construction details

In general, the proposal was to identify that:

- the proposed construction was above the water table
- measures were taken to limit infiltration of surface water
- measures taken to eliminate exposure of tires to the environment

In addition, the MPCA requested documentation that the project represented a “beneficial use” of the TDP, and that it was not simply an inexpensive method of disposal. The MPCA also requested the proposer to illustrate why the TDP was a better alternative to traditional construction methods. In all instances, the proposer was required to obtain local zoning approvals from city, township or county officials prior to beginning the construction project.

Based upon the submittals, the MPCA approved a number of projects, but because there was no standard for approval, it was difficult for the MPCA to determine whether the project represented a genuine beneficial use, and the resulting approvals were inconsistent. In addition, some projects still took place without MPCA knowledge or approval. In early 2004, the MPCA adopted rules governing the use of wastes. In an effort to encourage persons to use waste-based materials, the rules allowed for certain uses of specific solid wastes, including TDP, without the need for prior MPCA staff review and approval. The rule also established a process for approval of proposed waste uses that did not meet the specified categories of uses that do not require MPCA approval. TDP was allowed to be used in three specific situations without prior MPCA approval and is discussed in the Standing Beneficial Use Determination (BUD) section.

## Purpose

This guidance document is intended to: 1) encourage a wider acceptance by the general public for using TDP in construction projects; 2) provide guidance on acceptable uses for TDP; and 3) reduce the number of violations and enforcement actions involving uses of TDP that do not conform to the beneficial use rules. This guidance document supersedes all other previous MPCA fact sheets and publications relating to the beneficial use of TDP. This guidance document is not a rule. The MPCA will not use this guidance document to determine compliance in a particular case. Persons who disagree with the suggested interpretations in this guidance document are free to assert alternative interpretations in a particular case.

## Compliance

The MPCA encourages the use of TDP. However, the MPCA will consider the excessive use of TDP in any project to be disposal as stated in Minn. R. 7035.2860, subpart 2, item E. This could result in an enforcement action against the contractor and/or property owner, and could potentially result in fines and an order to remove the TDP and dispose of the materials at a permitted facility.

## Terminology

Certain terms used in the beneficial use rules are not defined. Where terms are not defined, the MPCA looks to commonly accepted industrial/commercial definitions to arrive at a reasonable interpretation of the rule. Other terms commonly used within the industry, such as tire-derived aggregate (TDA), are not used in this document and are not included in the list of definitions. While respecting the right of a party to assert a different definition is appropriate in a specific case, the MPCA believes that the following are reasonable definitions of terms used in the beneficial use rule and in this guidance document:

**Conventional aggregate** is rock, sand or gravel recovered from a natural deposit or made from crushed stone. Aggregates are classified by particle size, source, and other criteria based on the specific performance that is required for an engineering application, as specified by an engineer.

**Crumb rubber** consists of tire shreds that are processed to a fine consistency that is typically less than 3/16 of an inch in size with the fabric and metal removed.

**General construction fill or clean fill** is material that is placed and compacted in an area for the purpose of filling a hole or depression or raising the grade, where the material properties aren't critical to the project.

**Lightweight fill** is any material used to replace a heavier in situ soil to reduce the load on subgrade soils and/or structures thereby eliminating or reducing long term soil settlement.

**Public roads** are roads that are under the jurisdiction of, and maintained by, a public authority, and which are open to public travel.

**Tire chips** are pieces of waste tires that are generally smaller than twelve inches in length and that have most of the exposed metal removed. Actual dimensions should be specified by the design engineer or design professional based on the specific performance criteria needed for the project.

**Tire shreds** are pieces of scrap tire which have removed at least one sidewall and have generally been reduced to a size that ranges between two to twelve inches.

**Tire derived products (TDP)** are materials that are obtained by processing waste tires into products such as tire shreds, tire chips, crumb rubber, etc.



Photo courtesy of Blake Nelson, MnDOT

## Beneficial Use Determinations

The beneficial use rule establishes a procedure for determining when the use of solid waste is classified as a beneficial use. The Standing BUDs have been determined to be approved uses of solid waste by the MPCA. The Case-Specific BUD section applies to all other proposed beneficial uses of solid waste.

### Standing Beneficial Use Determination

Minn. R. 7035.2860, subp. 4 addresses Standing BUD and in part reads as follows:

*Subp. 4. Standing beneficial use determinations. A standing beneficial use determination means that the generator or end user of a material can do so in accordance with this subpart without contacting the agency. Only those specific solid wastes and the uses designated in items A to Q have been given standing beneficial use determinations. Any other uses of the solid waste are not authorized and must follow the procedure outlined in subpart 5.*

Of the items listed in this subpart, items F, G and H address the utilization of TDP. Subpart 4; item F of the beneficial use rules states the following:

*F. Crumb rubber when used in asphalt paving or applications where it is used as a substitute for rubber or similar elastic material.*

Since crumb rubber is generally used in a manufacturing process or in surface applications that require relatively small sizes of TDP, this guidance document does not address this material.

Subpart 4, item G states:

*G. Tire shreds when used as lightweight fill in the construction of public roads in accordance with Minnesota Statutes, section 115A.912, subdivision 4.*

This item specifically addresses the use of tire shreds in the design and construction of public roads. The rule requires the user to comply with Minn. Stat. § 115A.912, and must be consistent with the current lightweight tire fill engineering practices as developed for roadways by the Minnesota Department of Transportation (MnDOT). The statute, and the "Official MnDOT Standard of Engineering Practice for the Use of Shredded Tires in Roadways," require the design and project description to be developed by a registered professional engineer with experience in geotechnical projects, geotextile encapsulation surrounding the tire shreds, and adequate cover soil to compact the shreds, as well as other requirements. Users are encouraged to consult the MnDOT requirements prior to commencing any project.

Finally, subpart 4, item H states:

- H. *Tire chips when used as a substitute for conventional aggregate in construction applications when the ratio of this substitution is no greater than one to one by volume. This does not include use of tire chips as general construction fill or clean fill.*

It is this standing use that has generated the most difficulty in interpretation. The remainder of this guidance document addresses this use. In general, the MPCA will evaluate the "item H" uses against the language of the rule and also the general beneficial use standard in Minn. R. 7035.2860, which states:

*Subp. 2. Beneficial use standards. To constitute a beneficial use under this part, the following standards must be met:*

- A. *the solid waste must not be stored in anticipation of speculative future markets;*
- B. *the solid waste must be adequately characterized in accordance with part 7035.2861;*
- C. *the solid waste must be an effective substitute for an analogous material or a necessary ingredient in a new product;*
- D. *the use of the solid waste does not adversely impact human health or the environment; and*
- E. *the solid waste must not be used in quantities that exceed accepted engineering or commercial standards. Excess use of solid waste is not authorized by this part and is considered disposal.*

## Case-Specific Beneficial Use Determination

The MPCA strongly recommends that the user apply for a Case-Specific BUD for any project for which compliance with the Standing BUD is uncertain before proceeding with the project. This includes projects which entail a new use of the TDP or where the design deviates from industry standards. For example, mixing tire chips with soil has not been sufficiently evaluated in Minnesota and would need to be approved under the Case-Specific BUD.

The process of applying for a Case-Specific BUD is set out in subpart 5 of the beneficial use rules. Additional information, including how to submit a proposal, can be found on the MPCA's Solid Waste Utilization/Case-Specific BUD webpage at: <http://www.pca.state.mn.us/sbiz860>.

## Frequently asked questions

What is a "tire chip"?

As noted above, the rule does not define "tire chip." The Statement of Need and Reasonableness that supported the rule indicates that "tire chips" are generally smaller than twelve inches in size. In general, the size of the tire chip should be consistent with the proposed use as supported by industrial standards or research.

What is a "construction application"?

A construction application is one where the tire chip is being used for its engineering properties, and not just as "general construction fill" or "clean fill." Tire chips have many beneficial engineering qualities. For instance, they are lightweight, do not degrade under most construction applications and, if properly sized, may promote drainage, stabilize embankments, reduce lateral loading, eliminate capillary action (pumping), and have large void spaces that can be utilized in various applications.

Finally, a project meeting the beneficial use standard utilizes the properties of tire chips for a specific benefit to a project, and not just as fill to elevate a particular area.

### Is geotextile fabric encapsulation required?

Yes and no, based on the specific item under the Standing BUD rule which applies. The use of a geotextile fabric is mandatory when tire shreds are used as a lightweight fill in the construction of public roads under item G. However, when used as an aggregate replacement under item H, the use of a geotextile fabric is at the discretion of the user. While not a requirement, the use of geotextile encapsulation will help ensure that the desired construction properties of the tire chip are maintained throughout the life of the project by separating the tire chips from the soil. In addition, geotextile encapsulation will help avoid a potential larger disposal problem in the event the project requires repair or replacement at some future date.

### What is a "one to one substitute for conventional aggregate"?

Item H allows the use of tire chips as a substitute for conventional aggregate when the ratio of this substitution is no greater than one to one by volume.

The MPCA will expect that a design engineer/professional who is using waste tire chips under this standing beneficial use will be able to justify the volume used on the basis of the construction application. The design engineer/professional should have a clear understanding of why the waste tire chips are being used, and what volume is required for the specific purpose to be achieved. The volume of material may not exceed what would have been required if conventional aggregate was utilized, even if more use of waste tire chips is considered desirable. The rule specifically prohibits the use of tire chips for fill, even if aggregate might have been used for that purpose. The design engineer/professional should study the site proposed for use (soil physical properties, water table, climate, etc.) to ensure that the volume of tire chips does not exceed the volume that is necessary for the particular project.

In general, the design engineer/professional should be able to support the volume based on engineering analysis, including calculations based on the site conditions and the engineering properties of the particular tire chip to be used. Where engineering analysis is available from published literature for certain sizes of tire chips, the user can rely on the literature's conclusions as support for the project. However, the MPCA will not accept that a particular volume is consistent with the one-to-one substitution solely because that volume is consistent with a prior project, particularly if that project was completed many years ago on a different site.

### Is a TDP considered a solid waste?

According to the beneficial use rules, a material (including TDP) remains a solid waste until it is incorporated into a manufactured product or utilized in accordance with a standing or a case-specific BUD. Until that time, the material must be stored and managed as a solid waste. For more information regarding the proper storage of a solid waste, please refer to Minn. R. 7035.2855.

## Final considerations

The MPCA encourages the public to consider utilizing TDP products under the conditions set forth in this guidance document. When using TDP, the MPCA also strongly encourages the user to communicate with local governmental units and nearby residents of the proposed project to inform them of the scope of the project and of the benefits of using TDP.

**From:** Dusty Finke [mailto:Dusty.Finke@ci.medina.mn.us]  
**Sent:** Monday, May 13, 2013 2:16 PM  
**To:** Judie Anderson  
**Cc:** Debra Peterson; Scott Johnson  
**Subject:** RE: Manure Management Ordinance Request from Elm Creek Watershed

Judie,  
Liz asked that I forward the City's manure management regulations.

The only ordinance the City has related to manure management are:

- 1) Animal Density standards (2 grazable acres for first animal unit and 1 grazable acre per animal unit thereafter). The density standards allow additional animals with a CUP if best management practices are followed.
- 2) Commercial horse facilities are held to the following standard by CUP: the subject site shall construct a concrete manure containment or composting area, the design of which shall be consistent with the recommendations of the University of Minnesota Extension Service. Owners of a feed lot shall provide a schedule for removal of manure or compost from affected sites, subject to the approval by the City.

In addition to these ordinances, the City has approved a manure management policy. I have attached the policy for reference. This policy is what we use when reviewing CUPs for large barns, etc. and our annual inspection program is based on the policy.

Dusty Finke  
City of Medina

**From:** Scott Johnson  
**Sent:** Monday, May 13, 2013 8:15 AM  
**To:** Dusty Finke  
**Cc:** Debra Peterson  
**Subject:** Manure Management Ordinance Request from Elm Creek Watershed

Hi Dusty,

Elm Creek has requested a copy of the cities manure management ordinance. We have the regulations under 826.25 sub 8 and 826.98 sub 2 (o). Are there any other sections that should be sent to Elm Creek?

Scott

Z:\Pioneer-SarahCreek\Model Ordinances\Medina\_manure management.docx

## 80.10 – Manure Management Policy

### Purpose:

To prevent large manure stockpiles from becoming a public nuisance and to proactively protect the natural environment and neighboring properties pursuant to City Code Section 825.15: “*No... air pollution, liquid, solid wastes...or other such adverse influences shall be permitted in any district that will in any way have an objectionable effect upon any property.*”

### Policy:

- 1) The City shall require manure best management practices (BMPs) on the approval of conditional use permits (CUP) or other land use applications which indicates the stabling or housing of animals. The required BMPs shall be based on resources available from the University of Minnesota Extension Service and Minnesota Pollution Control Agency.
- 2) The City shall inspect the manure management practices of the following properties a minimum of one time per year:
  - a) A property for which a CUP has been approved subject to clause (1) of this policy;
  - b) A property on which a commercial horse facility is operated;
  - c) A property which, because of past concerns or violations, the City determines should require annual inspections.
- 3) Owners of property which are inspected annually shall maintain records of manure disposal and provide such documentation upon request.
- 4) The City may require the implementation of manure BMPs on a property which is not subject to a CUP under clause (1) of this policy.
- 5) The City shall take necessary enforcement actions as provided by ordinance or procedure should a property be determined to be in violation of the manure BMPs required as part of an approved CUP, or are otherwise determined to constitute a public nuisance. These actions may include, but are not limited to, the following: corrective orders, misdemeanor citation, or revocation of conditional use permit approval. If violations are not corrected within a timely matter, and the City determines that the violation threatens the public health or safety, the City Council take necessary actions to abate the nuisance and certify the costs to the subject property pursuant to City Code section 330.25.

From: Joel Jamnik [<mailto:Jjamnik@ck-law.com>]  
Sent: Tuesday, January 19, 2016 11:09 AM  
To: James C Kujawa <[James.Kujawa@hennepin.us](mailto:James.Kujawa@hennepin.us)>  
Subject: RE: Elm Creek WMC easement information

The Commission as a JPA is not perpetual, and depends on the voluntary memberships of its cities. Consequently, title in property, or ownership of any interest in property should be in the name of an entity (member city) that exists in perpetuity, or for which the law provides for a transfer of interest upon annexation or other boundary adjustment, consolidation or dissolution. For instance when Greenfield withdrew from the JPA, if the JPA owned property or easements in Greenfield, there would likely be the need to not process the withdrawal, but also a series of deeds transferring easements or other interests from the Commission to the JPA. But our authorizing legislation would allow the JPA to be amended to allow transfer of drainage systems and

The provision in Article 10 prohibiting ownership is 10% and 90% practical in origin, and is consistent with most if not all JPAs that I am familiar with. The watershed districts that have been created under the old Ch. 112 authorizations have a different statutory authorization and structure, and are much more permanent and set in existence. And frankly, have much more history in the operational and ownership side of things than the 103B organizations which are more rooted in planning and coordinating efforts among and between their members.

Joel J. Jamnik  
CAMPBELL KNUTSON, P.A.  
Grand Oak Office Center I  
860 Blue Gentian Road, Suite 290  
Eagan, MN 55121  
\* (651) 234-6219 • Fax: (651) 234-6237  
\* [jjamnik@ck-law.com](mailto:jjamnik@ck-law.com)<<mailto:jjamnik@ck-law.com>> • [www.ck-law.com](http://www.ck-law.com)<<http://www.ck-law.com>>

From: James C Kujawa [<mailto:James.Kujawa@hennepin.us>]  
Sent: Tuesday, January 19, 2016 9:50 AM  
To: Joel Jamnik  
Cc: [judie@jass.biz](mailto:judie@jass.biz)<<mailto:judie@jass.biz>>; Ali Durgunoglu  
Subject: FW: Elm Creek WMC easement information

Hi Joel.  
The city of Corcoran was questioning why the Commission wasn't the grantee for a conservation easement needed from a developer in their city to comply with our water volume requirements. I sent them our JPA, but was wondering if there were specific MN statutes that also came into play for this being in our JPA??

Thanks  
Jim  
James C. Kujawa  
Hennepin County Public Works  
Department of Environment and Energy  
701 Fourth Avenue South, Suite 700  
Minneapolis, MN 55415  
Direct Phone: 612-348-7338  
Email: [james.kujawa@co.hennepin.mn.us](mailto:james.kujawa@co.hennepin.mn.us)<<mailto:james.kujawa@co.hennepin.mn.us>>

From: James C Kujawa  
Sent: Tuesday, January 19, 2016 9:42 AM  
To: 'Kendra Lindahl, AICP' <[klindahl@landform.net](mailto:klindahl@landform.net)<mailto:klindahl@landform.net>>  
Subject: Elm Creek WMC easement information

Kendra

Here is the information in the Commission's JPA on their rights to easements and land interests that you requested. I will check with our attorney to see if there are any specific MN statutory restraints that led to this being in the JPA.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Jim

Section 7.7 of the ECWMC Joint Powers Agreement (page 11) Land Acquisition. The Commission shall not have the power of eminent domain. The Member governmental units agree that any and all easements or interests in land which are necessary will be negotiated or condemned in accordance with Minn. Stat. Ch. 117 by the unit wherein said lands are located, and each Member agrees to acquire the necessary easements or right-of-way or partial or complete interest in land upon order of the Board of Commissioners to accomplish the purposes of the improvement. All reasonable costs of said acquisition shall be considered as a cost of the improvement. If a Member government unit determines it is in the best interests of that Member to acquire additional lands, in conjunction with the taking of lands for storm and surface drainage or storage, or some other purpose, the costs of said acquisition will not be included in the improvement costs of the ordered project. The Board in determining the amount of the improvement costs to be assessed to each Member governmental unit may take into consideration the land use for which the additional lands are being acquired and may credit the acquiring municipality for said land acquisition to the extent that it benefits the other Members to this Agreement. Any credits may be applied to the cost allocation of the improvement project under consideration or the Board if feasible and necessary may defer said credits to a future project.

If any Member unit refuses to negotiate or condemn lands as ordered by the Board, any other Member may negotiate or condemn outside its corporate limits in accordance with Minn. Stat. Ch. 117. All Members agree that they will not condemn or negotiate for land acquisition to pond or drain storm and surface waters within another Member's corporate boundaries within the Watershed except upon order of the Board of Commissioners.

James C. Kujawa  
Hennepin County Public Works  
Department of Environment and Energy  
701 Fourth Avenue South, Suite 700  
Minneapolis, MN 55415  
Direct Phone: 612-348-7338  
Email: [james.kujawa@co.hennepin.mn.us](mailto:james.kujawa@co.hennepin.mn.us)<mailto:james.kujawa@co.hennepin.mn.us>

Disclaimer: If you are not the intended recipient of this message, please immediately notify the sender of the transmission error and then promptly delete this message from your computer system.

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
<b>Special Studies</b>											
TMDL implementation special study	Watershed	H	50,000	Cities, HCEED	Operating budget	0	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	125,000
Stream segment prioritization	Watershed	H	10,000	Cities, HCEED, TRPD	Operating budget	10,000	0	0	0	10,000	0
<b>High Priority Stream Restoration Projects</b>				Cities, TRPD	Cities, TRPD, county levy, grants						
Elm Cr Reach E	Plymouth	H	1,086,000	Commission, Plymouth	County Levy	250,000					Levied in 2015
<b>CIP-2016-RO-01 Fox Cr, Creekview</b>	Rogers	H	150,000 321,250		NOTE: 25% = \$80,312	0	37,500 214,166	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	0	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
<b>CIP-2016-MG-02 Rush Creek Main</b>	Maple Grove		1,650,000				250,000				
<b>CIP-2016-MG-03 Rush Creek South</b>	Maple Grove		675,000		CIP Yr 2013-2014	168,750					
<b>CIP-2016-RO-02 Rush &amp; Fox Ck Mon Stations</b>	Rogers		32,000		NOTE: 25% = \$8,000		20,000				
<b>High Priority Wetland Improvements</b>				Cities	Cities, commission						
DNR #27-0437	Maple Grove	L	75,000			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
<b>CIP-2016-MG-01 Ranchview Wetland Restor</b>	Maple Grove		200,000		CIP Yr 2013	50,000					
<b>Lake TMDL Implementation Projects</b>				Cities, lake assns.	Cities, Comm, grants, owners						
Mill Pond Fishery and Habitat Restoration	Champlin	H	5,000,000			0	0	250,000	0	0	0
Other Priority Lake Internal Load Projects	Watershed	M	100,000			0	0	0	0	0	25,000
<b>CIP-2016-MG-04 Fish Lake alum treatment-Phase 1 (2017) and Phase 2 (2020 or after)</b>	Maple Grove	H	300,000	City, TPRD, Comm, lake assn	City, TRPD, grants, Comm, county levy, lake association			75,000			37,500
Stonebridge	Maple Gr	M	200,000			0	50,000	0	0	0	0
Rain Garden at Independence Avenue	Champlin	L	300,000			0	75,000	0	0	0	0
<b>CIP-2016-CH-01 Mill Pond Rain Gardens</b>	Champlin	M	400,000			0	0	100,000	100,000	0	0
Other Priority Urban BMP Projects	Watershed	L	200,000			0	0	0	0	0	50,000
<b>Other</b>											
Livestock Exclus, Buffer & Stabilized Access	Watershed	M	50,000	Cities, owners, Extension, NRCS	Cities, owners, commission, NRCS	0	0	0	50,000	0	50,000
Agricultural BMPs Cost Share	Watershed	H	50,000	Cities, owners, Extension, NRCS	Cities, owners, commission, NRCS	0	50,000	50,000	0	50,000	100,000
<b>CIP-2016-RO-04 Ag BMPs</b>	Rogers		50,000		NOTE: 25% = \$12,500		30,000				
<b>CIP-2016-RO-03 D'town Pond Exp &amp; Reuse</b>	Rogers		406,000		NOTE: 25% = \$101,500				210,000		
Hydrologic & Hydraulic Modeling	Watershed	L	25,000	HCEED	Commission	0	0	0	25,000	0	0
Fourth Generation Plan	Watershed	H	70,000		Commission	0	0	0	0	0	\$70,000
<b>TOTAL</b>			\$16,617,220			\$260,000	\$550,000	\$875,000	\$275,000	\$260,000	\$963,750
			\$20,101,470			478,750	1,026,666	625,000	585,000		1,001,250

## 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	CHAMPLIN	
Contact Name	TODD TUOMINEN	
Telephone	763-923-7120	
Email	ttuominen@ci.champlin.mn.us	
Address	11955 Champlin Drive Champlin MN 55316	
Project Name	Mill Pond Rain Gardens	
	1. Is project in Member's CIP? ( <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ) yes CIP-28	Proposed CIP Year = 2017- <b>2018</b>
	2. Has a feasibility study or an engineering report (circle one) been done for this project? ( <input type="checkbox"/> ) yes ( <input type="checkbox"/> ) no	Amount
	Total Estimated Project Cost	\$400,000
	Estimated Commission Share (up to 25%, not to exceed \$250,000)	\$100,000
	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? ( <input type="checkbox"/> ) yes ( <input type="checkbox"/> ) no How?	
0/10/20	8. Does the project address one or more TMDL requirements? ( <input type="checkbox"/> ) yes ( <input type="checkbox"/> ) no Which?	
0/10/20	9. Does the project have an educational component? ( <input type="checkbox"/> ) yes ( <input type="checkbox"/> ) 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? ( <input type="checkbox"/> ) yes ( <input type="checkbox"/> ) no Identify the LGUs.	
10/20	11. Is the project in all the LGUs' CIPs? ( <input type="checkbox"/> ) yes ( <input type="checkbox"/> ) no	
1-34	<p>(For TAC use)</p> <p>12. Does project improve water quality? (0-10)</p> <p>13. Prevent or correct erosion? (0-10)</p> <p>14. Prevent flooding? (0-5)</p> <p>15. Promote groundwater recharge? (0-3)</p> <p>16. Protect and enhance fish and wildlife habitat? (0-3)</p> <p>17. Improve or create water recreation facilities? (0-3)</p>	
TOTAL (poss 114)		

Adopted April 11, 2012

## 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		Maple Grove	
Contact Name		Rick Lestina	
Telephone		763-494-6354	
Email		rlestina@ci.maple-grove.mn.us	
Address		12800 Arbor Lakes Parkway, Maple Grove, MN 55398	
Project Name		Ranchview Wetland Restoration	
1. Is project in Member's CIP? ( <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ) yes ( <input type="checkbox"/> ) no		Proposed CIP Year = 2013	
Amount			
	Total Estimated Project Cost	\$200,000	
	Estimated Commission Share (not to exceed \$250,000)	\$50,000	
	Other Funding Sources (name them)	\$	
	City of Maple Grove	\$150,000	
		\$	
	2. What is the scope of the project? ? The City is proposing to restore the hydrology and plant community of a 55 acre wetland located between 101 <sup>st</sup> and 105 <sup>th</sup> Streets and west of Ranchview Lane in Maple Grove.		
	3. What is the purpose of the project? What water resource(s) will be impacted by the project. The project is intended to restore much of the lost function of the wetland including: flood and stormwater attenuation; vegetative diversity and integrity; wildlife, amphibian and invertebrate habitat; aesthetic, recreational and educational values; and a groundwater recharge area.		
	4. What is the anticipated improvement that would result from the project? Stormwater would be significantly attenuated which will help alleviate some of the downstream flooding and stream bank erosion that is currently occurring in Rush Creek and Elm Creek. Restoration of the previously mentioned wetland values is another significant improvement		
	5. How does the project contribute to achieving the goals and programs of the Commission? This project will assist with improving water quality in both Rush and Elm Creeks that are currently listed as impaired.		
0/10	6. Does the project result from a regulatory mandate? ( <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ) yes ( <input type="checkbox"/> ) no      How? The Rush and Elm Creeks are impaired water courses. This project will satisfy at least one of the implementation BMPs once the Elm Creek watershed TMDL is approved.		
0/10/20	7. Does the project address one or more TMDL requirements? ( <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ) yes ( <input type="checkbox"/> ) no      Which? The TMDL implementation plan will certainly address stormwater volume as an issue. This project will address this issue.		
0/10/20	8. Does the project have an educational component? ( <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ) yes ( <input type="checkbox"/> ) no      Describe. The restoration of such a large basin such as this will serve as an aesthetic, recreational and educational site for the study of native systems.		
0/10	9. Do all the LGUs responsible for sharing in the cost of the project agree to go forward with this project? ( <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ) yes ( <input type="checkbox"/> ) no      Identify the LGUs. Maple Grove		
10/20	10. Is the project in all the LGUs' CIPs? ( <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ) yes ( <input type="checkbox"/> ) no		
1-34	<p>(For TAC use)</p> <p>11. Does project improve water quality? (0-10)  12. Prevent or correct erosion? (0-10)  13. Prevent flooding? (0-5)</p> <p>14. Promote groundwater recharge? (0-3)  15. Protect and enhance fish and wildlife habitat? (0-3)  16. Improve or create water recreation facilities? (0-3)</p>		
TOTAL (poss 114)		Z:\Elm Creek\CIPs\2016 submittals\MG-01_Ranchview Wetland Restoration.docx	

## 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	Maple Grove		
Contact Name	Rick Lestina		
Telephone	763-494-6354		
Email	rlestina@ci.maple-grove.mn.us		
Address	12800 Arbor Lakes Parkway, Maple Grove, MN 55398		
Project Name	Rush Creek, Main - Stream Restoration		
	1. Is project in Member's CIP? ( <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ) yes ( <input type="checkbox"/> ) no	Proposed CIP Year = 2016	
			Amount
	Total Estimated Project Cost	\$1,650,000	
	Estimated Commission Share (not to exceed \$250,000)	\$250,000	
	Other Funding Sources (name them)	\$	
	City of Maple Grove	\$1,400,000	
		\$	
	2. What is the scope of the project? The City of Maple Grove is proposing a project to stabilize and restore approximately 11,000 feet of Rush Creek east of I-94 and west of Fernbrook.		
	3. What is the purpose of the project? What water resource(s) will be impacted by the project? Decrease the potential for further bank instability that likely would occur subsequent to the development of the watershed and restore the channel with native vegetation for additional stability and habitat purposes.		
	4. What is the anticipated improvement that would result from the project? Subsequent to development, it is likely that stormwater discharge from the adjacent and upstream watershed will increase. This project will significantly reduce the potential for bank erosion and sediment transport downstream. The restoration of native vegetation will provide a habitat for wildlife and a natural area for aesthetic value and study.		
	5. How does the project contribute to achieving the goals and programs of the Commission? This project improves the water quality within Rush Creek and reduces the amount of sediment and nutrients reaching Elm Creek. This project will increase the oxygenation of water discharged to Elm Creek.		
0/10	6. Does the project result from a regulatory mandate? ( <input type="checkbox"/> ) yes ( <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ) no How? There is no mandate for the City to undertake this project. However, this project will assist with meeting the water quality goals for Elm Creek.		
0/10/20	7. Does the project address one or more TMDL requirements? ( <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ) yes ( <input type="checkbox"/> ) no Which? Although no formal implementation plan has been approved, projects that address stream bank stability will be critical in meeting the water quality goals for Elm Creek.		
0/10/20	8. Does the project have an educational component? ( <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ) yes ( <input type="checkbox"/> ) no Describe. The project will involve the establishment of a native grass channel and retention of some quality forest buffer. The area will serve as a City demonstration in regards to the value of a buffer for water quality and wildlife purposes.		
0/10	9. Do all the LGUs responsible for sharing in the cost of the project agree to go forward with this project? ( <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ) yes ( <input type="checkbox"/> ) no Identify the LGUs. Maple Grove		
10/20	10. Is the project in all the LGUs' CIPs? ( <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ) yes ( <input type="checkbox"/> ) no		
1-34	(For TAC use) 11. Does project improve water quality? (0-10) 12. Prevent or correct erosion? (0-10) 13. Prevent flooding? (0-5)		14. Promote groundwater recharge? (0-3) 15. Protect and enhance fish and wildlife habitat? (0-3) 16. Improve or create water recreation facilities? (0-3)
TOTAL (poss 114)			

## 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	Maple Grove	
Contact Name	Rick Lestina	
Telephone	763-494-6354	
Email	rlestina@ci.maple-grove.mn.us	
Address	12800 Arbor Lakes Parkway, Maple Grove, MN 55398	
Project Name	Rush Creek, South – Stream Restoration	
	1. Is project in Member's CIP? ( <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ) yes ( <input type="checkbox"/> ) no	Proposed CIP Year = 2013-2014
		Amount
	Total Estimated Project Cost	\$675,000
	Estimated Commission Share (not to exceed \$250,000)	\$168,750
	Other Funding Sources (name them)	\$
	City of Maple Grove	\$506,250
		\$
	2. What is the scope of the project? The City of Maple Grove is proposing a project to stabilize and restore approximately 4500 feet of Rush Creek north of 101 <sup>st</sup> Avenue.	
	3. What is the purpose of the project? What water resource(s) will be impacted by the project? Decrease the potential for further bank instability that likely would occur subsequent to the development of the watershed and restore the channel with native vegetation for additional stability and habitat purposes.	
	4. What is the anticipated improvement that would result from the project? Subsequent to development, it is likely that stormwater discharge from the adjacent and upstream watershed will increase. This project will significantly reduce the potential for bank erosion and sediment transport downstream. The restoration of native vegetation will provide a habitat for wildlife and a natural area for aesthetic value and study.	
	5. How does the project contribute to achieving the goals and programs of the Commission? This project improves the water quality within Rush Creek and reduces the amount of sediment and nutrients reaching Elm Creek. This project will increase the oxygenation of water discharged to Elm Creek.	
0/10	6. Does the project result from a regulatory mandate? ( <input type="checkbox"/> ) yes ( <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ) no     How? There is no mandate for the City to undertake this project. However, this project will assist with for meeting the water quality goals for Elm Creek.	
0/10/20	7. Does the project address one or more TMDL requirements? ( <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ) yes ( <input type="checkbox"/> ) no     Which? Although no formal implementation plan has been approved, projects that address stream bank stability will be critical in meeting the water quality goals for Elm Creek.	
0/10/20	8. Does the project have an educational component? ( <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ) yes ( <input type="checkbox"/> ) no     Describe. The project will involve the establishment of a native grass channel and retention of the some quality forest buffer. The area will serve as a City demonstration in regards to the value of a buffer for water quality and wildlife purposes.	
0/10	9. Do all the LGUs responsible for sharing in the cost of the project agree to go forward with this project? ( <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ) yes ( <input type="checkbox"/> ) no     Identify the LGUs. Maple Grove	
10/20	10. Is the project in all the LGUs' CIPs? ( <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ) yes ( <input type="checkbox"/> ) no	
1-34	<p>(For TAC use)</p> <p>11. Does project improve water quality? (0-10)</p> <p>12. Prevent or correct erosion? (0-10)</p> <p>13. Prevent flooding? (0-5)</p> <p>14. Promote groundwater recharge? (0-3)</p> <p>15. Protect and enhance fish and wildlife habitat? (0-3)</p> <p>16. Improve or create water recreation facilities? (0-3)</p>	
TOTAL (poss 114)		

## 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	Three Rivers Park District	
Contact Name	Rich Brasch	
Telephone	763-694-2061	
Email	RBrasch@threeriversparkdistrict.org	
Address	12615 Rockford Road, Plymouth, MN 55441	
Project Name	Fish Lake alum treatment-Phase 1	
	1. Is project in Member's CIP? (X) yes ( ) no	Proposed CIP Year = 2017 (Phase 1), 2020-22 (Phase 2)
	2. Has a feasibility study or an engineering report (circle one) been done for this project? (X) yes ( ) no	
		Amount
	Total Estimated Project Cost	\$300,000
	Estimated Commission Share (up to 25%, not to exceed \$250,000)	\$75,000
	Other Funding Sources (name them) TRPD, City of Maple Grove, possibly FLARA	\$75,000
	Clean Water Legacy Grant (anticipated, not yet applied for)	\$150,000
	<p><b>3. What is the scope of the project?</b> The project will involve carrying out a batch alum treatment in Fish Lake to combat internal phosphorus loading. We anticipate that the application would be carried out in two phases, separated by 3-5 years depending on the results of an interim assessment to determine the effectiveness of the initial phase in controlling phosphorus released from the lake's bottom sediments. It is expected that internal load control efforts will be combined with long-term efforts to further reduce watershed loading as well through separate efforts by the City of Maple Grove and TRPD.</p>	
	<p><b>4. What is the purpose of the project? What water resource(s) will be impacted by the project?</b> The purpose of the project is to control internal loading in Fish Lake to a sufficient degree so that the lake consistently meets the applicable state water quality standards for eutrophication over the long term. The TMDL work completed for Fish Lake indicates that almost 70% of the phosphorus load driving surface water quality in the lake comes from internal sources. Fish Lake will be the main water body impacted by the project, but Rice Lake which lies immediately downstream will also be benefitted to a minor degree.</p>	
	<p><b>5. What is the anticipated improvement that would result from the project? (Include size of area treated and projected nutrient reduction.)</b> The project will be the initial phase in a 2 phase project to provide long-term control of internal phosphorus loading in Fish Lake. Up to 135 acres of lake sediment would be treated during the project. It is expected that the alum treatment will be sufficient to allow the lake to meet the target in-lake water quality standards for at least 30 years.</p>	
	<p><b>6. How does the project contribute to achieving the goals and programs of the Commission?</b> The project is being driven in part by the Elm Creek Watershed Management Commission Watershed TMDL (expected to be approved in 2016). The State of Minnesota has listed Fish Lake as impaired for nutrients, and the proposed alum treatment is consistent with the TMDL implementation strategy for restoring water quality in the lake so that Fish Lake consistently meets the state water quality standards for eutrophication.</p>	
0/10	7. Does the project result from a regulatory mandate? (X) yes ( ) no    How? The project responds to directives in the Elm Creek watershed TMDL and the State of Minnesota's and the U.S. EPA's TMDL program.	
0/10/20	8. Does the project address one or more TMDL requirements? (X) yes ( ) no    Which? Addressing the nutrient impairment for Fish Lake.	
0/10/20	9. Does the project have an educational component? (X) yes ( ) no    Describe: The project will include in-kind efforts to educate watershed residents-including those owning shoreline on the lake-on what they can do to foster the longevity of the alum treatment	
0/10	10. Do all the LGUs responsible for sharing in the cost of the project agree to go forward with this project? (X) yes ( ) no    Identify the LGUs. Three Rivers Park District, City of Maple Grove	
10/20	11. Is the project in all the LGUs' CIPs? ( ) yes (X) no    The City of Maple Grove is in the process of incorporating this project into its CIP. TRPD has already done so by setting aside funds in its CIP to cover its anticipated cost-share.	
1-34	<p>(For TAC use)</p> <p>12. Does project improve water quality? (0-10)</p> <p>13. Prevent or correct erosion? (0-10)</p> <p>14. Prevent flooding? (0-5)</p> <p>15. Promote groundwater recharge? (0-3)</p> <p>16. Protect and enhance fish and wildlife habitat? (0-3)</p> <p>17. Improve or create water recreation facilities? (0-3)</p>	
TOTAL (poss 114)		
Z:\Elm Creek\CIPs\2016 submittals\MG-04_Fish Lake alum treatment.doc		

## 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	ROGERS	
Contact Name	ANDREW SIMMONS	
Telephone	(763) 428-8580	
Email	<a href="mailto:asimmons@ci.rogers.mn.us">asimmons@ci.rogers.mn.us</a>	
Address	22350 South Diamond Lake Road, Rogers, MN 55374	
Project Name	Fox Creek Stream Bank Stabilization – Segment 2 (Creekview Drive)	
Is project in Member's CIP? ( <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ) yes ( <input type="checkbox"/> ) no		Proposed CIP Year = 2016
	Amount	
Total Estimated Project Cost	\$ 321,250	
Estimated Commission Share (not to exceed \$250,000)	\$ 214,166	
City of Rogers Storm Water Utility, Grants	\$ 107,083	
	\$	
<p>1. What is the scope of the project?  This project will provide stabilization and protection along 1,285 feet of stream bank</p>		
<p>2. What is the purpose of the project? What water resource(s) will be impacted by the project?  The segment of Fox Creek near Creekview Drive currently experiences erosion and stream bank failure from periodic high flow velocities. This project will provide stabilization for the stream banks and reduce sediment transport along Fox Creek and ultimately the Crow River.</p>		
<p>3. What is the anticipated improvement that would result from the project?  Habitat enhancement, protection for wooded upland areas, water quality improvement (Sediment Load Reduction: 21-42 tons/year, Phosphorus Load Reduction 21-42 lbs/year)</p>		
<p>4. How does the project contribute to achieving the goals and programs of the Commission?  This project will reduce erosion and improve water quality.</p>		
0/10	<p>6. Does the project result from a regulatory mandate? (<input type="checkbox"/>) yes (<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>) no    How?</p>	
0/10/20	<p>7. Does the project address one or more TMDL requirements? (<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>) yes (<input type="checkbox"/>) no    Which?  North Fork Crow River Turbidity and Dissolved Oxygen TMDL</p>	
0/10/20	<p>8. Does the project have an educational component? (<input type="checkbox"/>) yes (<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>) no    Describe.</p>	
0/10	<p>9. Do all the LGUs responsible for sharing in the cost of the project agree to go forward with this project?  (<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>) yes (<input type="checkbox"/>) no    Identify the LGUs. City of Rogers</p>	
10/20	<p>10. Is the project in all the LGUs' CIPs? (<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>) yes (<input type="checkbox"/>) no</p>	
1-34	<p>(For TAC use)</p> <p>11. Does project improve water quality? (0-10)  12. Prevent or correct erosion? (0-10)  13. Prevent flooding? (0-5)</p> <p>14. Promote groundwater recharge? (0-3)  15. Protect and enhance fish and wildlife habitat? (0-3)  16. Improve or create water recreation facilities? (0-3)</p>	
Total (poss 114)		

## 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	ROGERS		
Contact Name	ANDREW SIMMONS		
Telephone	(763) 428-8580		
Email	<a href="mailto:asimmons@ci.rogers.mn.us">asimmons@ci.rogers.mn.us</a>		
Address	22350 South Diamond Lake Road, Rogers, MN 55374		
Project Name	Rush Creek and Fox Creek Monitoring Stations		
Is project in Member's CIP? ( <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ) yes ( <input type="checkbox"/> ) no		Proposed CIP Year = 2016	
			Amount
	Total Estimated Project Cost		\$ 32,000
	Estimated Commission Share (not to exceed \$250,000)		\$ 20,000
	City of Rogers Storm Water Utility, Grants		\$ 12,000
			\$
	<p>1. What is the scope of the project?  The City of Rogers is interested in monitoring the water quality within the City. Adding monitoring stations on Rush Creek and Fox Creek will provide the opportunity to ensure that the streams are responding positively to additional BMP implementation.</p>		
	<p>2. What is the purpose of the project? What water resource(s) will be impacted by the project?  Fox Creek which drains a large portion of Rogers has never been monitored for water quality and with stream stabilizations on Fox Creek within the CIP there is a great opportunity to monitor the quality of future projects. Fox Creek drains to the Crow River which has a turbidity and dissolved oxygen TMDL. Rush Creek also drains large portions of Rogers, which are largely undeveloped, agricultural fields. With development quickly approaching this sub-watershed, stream monitoring will provide an excellent example of how change land use effects water quality.</p>		
	<p>3. What is the anticipated improvement that would result from the project?  Improvements from this project will provide additional data that can be used to measure future implementation of water quality projects, especially for the Fox Creek sub-watershed.</p>		
	<p>4. How does the project contribute to achieving the goals and programs of the Commission?  This project will gather additional information on the health of the streams in the Elm Creek Watershed. As Rogers continues to develop it will be a great measuring stick for the 3<sup>rd</sup> Generation Rules</p>		
0/10	<p>6. Does the project result from a regulatory mandate? (<input type="checkbox"/>) yes (<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>) no    How?</p>		
0/10/20	<p>7. Does the project address one or more TMDL requirements? (<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>) yes (<input type="checkbox"/>) no    Which?  Provides monitoring for the North Fork Crow River Turbidity and Dissolved Oxygen TMDL and the Future Elm Creek Watershed TMDL</p>		
0/10/20	<p>8. Does the project have an educational component? (<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>) yes (<input type="checkbox"/>) no    Describe.  The collection of water quality data always provides the opportunity for educational purposes. Monitoring the streams within the City of Rogers will be an excellent method to show residents the current health of streams and provide useful information to the Commission.</p>		
0/10	<p>9. Do all the LGUs responsible for sharing in the cost of the project agree to go forward with this project?  (<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>) yes (<input type="checkbox"/>) no    Identify the LGUs. City of Rogers</p>		
10/20	<p>10. Is the project in all the LGUs' CIPs? (<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>) yes (<input type="checkbox"/>) no</p>		
1-34	<p>(For TAC use)</p> <p>11. Does project improve water quality? (0-10)  12. Prevent or correct erosion? (0-10)  13. Prevent flooding? (0-5)</p>		<p>14. Promote groundwater recharge? (0-3)  15. Protect and enhance fish and wildlife habitat? (0-3)  16. Improve or create water recreation facilities? (0-3)</p>
TOTAL (poss 114)			

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	ROGERS	
Contact Name	ANDREW SIMMONS	
Telephone	(763) 428-8580	
Email	<a href="mailto:asimmons@ci.rogers.mn.us">asimmons@ci.rogers.mn.us</a>	
Address	22350 South Diamond Lake Road, Rogers, MN 55374	
Project Name	Downtown Rogers Pond Expansion and Reuse	
Is project in Member's CIP? ( <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ) yes ( <input type="checkbox"/> ) no		Proposed CIP Year = 2018
Amount		
Total Estimated Project Cost	\$ 406,000	
Estimated Commission Share (not to exceed \$250,000)	\$ 210,000	
City of Rogers Storm Water Utility, Grants	\$ 196,000	
	\$	
<p>1. What is the scope of the project?            This project will expand the current capacity for stormwater in downtown Rogers. The project will alleviate future redevelopment of downtown and provide an opportunity for water reuse for landscaping.</p>		
<p>2. What is the purpose of the project? What water resource(s) will be impacted by the project?            This project will address water quantity and quality issues the downtown area of Rogers will be facing as redevelopment continues per our 2030 Metropolitan Council approved plan.</p>		
<p>3. What is the anticipated improvement that would result from the project?            Major water quality improvements are anticipated with this project for TP and TSS reductions. The pond expansion will also feature a stormwater reuse for the irrigation of nearby parks. The additional storage area will reduce flooding within the Downtown Rogers Area.</p>		
<p>4. How does the project contribute to achieving the goals and programs of the Commission?            This project will reduce erosion, conserve water, and improve water quality.</p>		
0/10	<p>6. Does the project result from a regulatory mandate? (<input type="checkbox"/>) yes (<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>) no    How?</p>	
0/10/20	<p>7. Does the project address one or more TMDL requirements? (<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>) yes (<input type="checkbox"/>) no    Which?            North Fork Crow River Turbidity and Dissolved Oxygen TMDL</p>	
0/10/20	<p>8. Does the project have an educational component? (<input type="checkbox"/>) yes (<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>) no    Describe.</p>	
0/10	<p>9. Do all the LGUs responsible for sharing in the cost of the project agree to go forward with this project?            (<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>) yes (<input type="checkbox"/>) no    Identify the LGUs. City of Rogers</p>	
10/20	<p>10. Is the project in all the LGUs' CIPs? (<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>) yes (<input type="checkbox"/>) no</p>	
1-34	<p>(For TAC use)</p> <p>11. Does project improve water quality? (0-10)            12. Prevent or correct erosion? (0-10)            13. Prevent flooding? (0-5)</p>	<p>14. Promote groundwater recharge? (0-3)            15. Protect and enhance fish and wildlife habitat? (0-3)            16. Improve or create water recreation facilities? (0-3)</p>
TOTAL (poss 114)		

## 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	ROGERS	
Contact Name	ANDREW SIMMONS	
Telephone	(763) 428-8580	
Email	<a href="mailto:asimmons@ci.rogers.mn.us">asimmons@ci.rogers.mn.us</a>	
Address	22350 South Diamond Lake Road, Rogers, MN 55374	
Project Name	Agricultural Best Management Practices	
Is project in Member's CIP? ( <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ) yes ( <input type="checkbox"/> ) no		Proposed CIP Year = 2016
		Amount
	Total Estimated Project Cost	\$ 50,000
	Estimated Commission Share (not to exceed \$250,000)	\$ 30,000
	City of Rogers Storm Water Utility, Grants	\$ 20,000
		\$
	<p>1. What is the scope of the project?  This project will reach out to farmers within the City of Rogers and work with them to implement best management practices. The City of Rogers has long been an agricultural community, as development continues to spread west, agricultural fields are being taken out of rotation but will remain a major land use for the foreseeable future. The City of Rogers would like to work with farmers and provide them tools to promote water quality and soil conservation.</p>	
	<p>2. What is the purpose of the project? What water resource(s) will be impacted by the project?  This project will address water quality issues and potentially impact a number of different water resources including, Lake Cowely, Lake Sylvan, Fox Creek, and Rush Creek.</p>	
	<p>3. What is the anticipated improvement that would result from the project?  Major water quality improvements are anticipated with this project for TP and TSS reductions. With a large agricultural land use within the City of Rogers the implantation of agricultural BMPs is critical to protecting downstream water quality.</p>	
	<p>4. How does the project contribute to achieving the goals and programs of the Commission?  This project will reduce erosion, conserve water, and improve water quality.</p>	
0/10	<p>6. Does the project result from a regulatory mandate? (<input type="checkbox"/>) yes (<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>) no    How?</p>	
0/10/20	<p>7. Does the project address one or more TMDL requirements? (<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>) yes (<input type="checkbox"/>) no    Which?  North Fork Crow River Turbidity and Dissolved Oxygen TMDL and the Future Elm Creek TMDL</p>	
0/10/20	<p>8. Does the project have an educational component? (<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>) yes (<input type="checkbox"/>) no    Describe.  The education potential for this project is unlimited. Connecting with farmers in the area and discussing potential solutions is a step in the right direction. Open lines of communication and a willingness to work with farmers rather than against them will build a trust and a strong relationship for future projects.</p>	
0/10	<p>9. Do all the LGUs responsible for sharing in the cost of the project agree to go forward with this project?  (<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>) yes (<input type="checkbox"/>) no    Identify the LGUs. City of Rogers</p>	
10/20	<p>10. Is the project in all the LGUs' CIPs? (<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>) yes (<input type="checkbox"/>) no</p>	
1-34	<p>(For TAC use)</p> <p>11. Does project improve water quality? (0-10)  12. Prevent or correct erosion? (0-10)  13. Prevent flooding? (0-5)</p> <p>14. Promote groundwater recharge? (0-3)  15. Protect and enhance fish and wildlife habitat? (0-3)  16. Improve or create water recreation facilities? (0-3)</p>	
TOTAL (poss 114)		