October 3, 2018

Representatives
Elm Creek Watershed Management Commission Hennepin County, MN

The meeting packets may be found on the Commission’s website:
http://elmcreekwatershed.org/minutes--meeting-packets.html

Dear Representatives:

A regular meeting of the Elm Creek Watershed Management Commission will be held on Wednesday, October 10, 2018, at 11:30 a.m. in the Mayor’s Conference Room at Maple Grove City Hall, 12800 Arbor Lakes Parkway, Maple Grove, MN.

Please email Tiffany at tiffany@jass.biz to confirm whether you or your Alternate will be attending the regular meeting.

Thank you.

Regards,

[Signature]

Judie A. Anderson
Administrator
JAA:tim
Encls: Meeting Packet

cc: Alternates
   Joel Jamnik
   TRPD
   HCEE
   Diane Spector
   BWSR
   Met Council
   Clerks
   Official Newspaper
   MPCA
   DNR
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Watershed Management Commission

AGENDA
Regular Meeting
October 10, 2018

1. Call Regular Meeting to Order.
   a. Approve Agenda.*

2. Consent Agenda.
   a. Minutes last Meeting.*
   b. Treasurer’s Report and Claims.**

3. Open Forum.

4. Action Items.
   a. Project Reviews – see Status Report.*
   b. Fish Lake Alum Treatment RFP.*

5. Old Business.


7. Local Plans.
   a. Dayton.
      1) City response to comments.*
      2) Commission review – update.*

8. Communications.
   a. Livestock Policy.*

9. Education.
   a. WMWA Update.**

10. Grant Opportunities and Updates.
    a. Hennepin County Natural Resources Grants.*
    b. BWSR Watershed-Based Funding – update.*
    c. Fish Lake Internal Phosphorus Loading Control.
    d. FEMA Floodplain Mapping – see Staff Report.
    e. Diamond Lake SWA Grant Application – see Staff Report.
    f. North Fork Rush Creek SWA Implementation - see Staff Report.

11. Project Reviews – also see Staff Report.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>12. Project Reviews. (See Staff Report.*)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*in meeting packet
**available at meeting
12. Other Business.

I. A regular meeting of the Elm Creek Watershed Management Commission was called to order at 11:35 a.m., Wednesday, September 12, 2018, in the Mayor’s Conference Room, Maple Grove City Hall, 12800 Arbor Lakes Parkway, Maple Grove, MN, by Chairman Doug Baines.

Present were: Gerry Butcher, Champlin; Sharon Meister, Corcoran; Doug Baines, Dayton; Joe Trainor, Maple Grove; Elizabeth Weir, Medina; Fred Moore, Plymouth; Kevin Jullie, Rogers; James Kujawa, Jason Swenson, and Kirsten Barta, Hennepin County Dept. of Environment and Energy (HCEE); Brian Vlach, Three Rivers Park District (TRPD); Jeff Weiss, Barr Engineering; and Judie Anderson, JASS.

Not represented: none.

Also present: Todd Tuominen, Champlin; Kevin Mattson, Corcoran; Mark Lahtinen, Maple Grove; Catherine Cesnik and Ben Scharenbroich, Plymouth; Andrew Simmons, Rogers; Marilyn Arnlund Maple Grove Arbor Committee; and Justin Klabo, AEZS, for project review 2018-030.

A. Motion by Weir, second by Trainor to approve the revised agenda.* Motion carried unanimously.

B. Motion by Moore, second by Meister to approve the minutes* of the August 8, 2018, regular meeting. Motion carried unanimously.

C. Motion by Moore, second by Weir to approve the September Treasurer’s Report and Claims* totaling $11,123.13. Motion carried unanimously.

II. Open Forum.

No one wished to speak regarding items not on the agenda.

[The regular meeting was suspended at 11:37 a.m.]

III. Public Hearing.*

On April 11, 2018, the Elm Creek Watershed Management Commission, upon recommendation of the Technical Advisory Committee, approved a motion to move forward with a Minor Plan Amendment (MPA) to its Third Generation Watershed Management Plan to revise the Capital Improvement Program (CIP). The MPA would revise Table 4.5 of the Commission’s Third Generation Plan CIP in order to add eight projects and shift funding on two existing projects to future years. These new projects and project updates were submitted by the member cities. Following a public meeting conducted by the Commission on May 9, 2018, the Commission adopted Resolution 2018-01 Adopting a Minor Plan Amendment.

Doug Baines, representative from Dayton and Commission chair, was present at a meeting of a Committee of the Hennepin County Board on July 10, 2018, to answer questions regarding the amendment.
The County Board approved the Minor Plan Amendment and adopted a 2018 maximum levy of $462,500 for the Elm Creek Commission on July 24, 2018.

The projects for which the levy will be certified are:

Project 2018-01 Rush Creek Main Stem Stream Stabilization Project Phase 3, Maple Grove, $75,000
Project 2018-02 Elm Creek Stream Restoration Reach D, Plymouth, $212,500
Project 2018-03 Elm Creek Stream Restoration Phase III, Champlin, $100,000
Project 2018-04 Downs road Trail Rain Gardens, Champlin, $75,000

The Commission called for a public hearing to be held on September 12, 2018 to consider these projects. Member cities and the County have been notified and notice has been duly published. The purpose of the public hearing is to present the proposed projects and proposed financing and to take comment from the member cities and the public.

[The public hearing was opened at 11:38 a.m.]

No comments were received from the reviewing agencies. No comments were received from the member cities.

[The public hearing was closed at 11:39 a.m.]

A brief discussion was conducted by the Commissioners.

Motion by Weir, second by Butcher to adopt Resolution 2018-03 Ordering the 2018 Improvement Projects ... and Designating Commission Cost-Share Funding.* Motion carried unanimously.

Motion by Weir, second by Butcher to approve the Cooperative Agreements* with the cities of Champlin, Plymouth, and Rogers. Motion carried unanimously.

[Julie arrived 11:40 a.m.]

[The regular meeting resumed at 11:40 a.m.]

IV. Action Items.

A. Project Review 2018-007 Copper Creek of Nottingham, Maple Grove. This is a 4.03 acre in-fill project in the Nottingham development section of Maple Grove. It is located about 1/4 mile northeast of the intersection of Nottingham Parkway at Bass Lake Road along 73rd Place/Xene Lane cul-de-sac. Nine new single family residential lots are proposed. The current site plans dated February 12, 2018, do not meet the Commission’s standards for water quality, abstraction and erosion controls. Staff’s review and findings were sent to the City and applicant on March 6. The decision deadline per MN Statute 15.99 expired on June 20, 2018. Staff notified the applicant and the City that the site plans do not meet the Commission’s requirements and unless an extension to the 15.99 deadline is received by August 15, 2018, the application will be denied. Having received no new in formation by the August 15 deadline, motion by Weir, second by Meister to deny this project. Motion carried unanimously. A new application will be required in order for this project to move forward.

B. Project Review 2018-032 Encore, Corcoran. This project is located west of Brockton Lane (101) and south of Steig Road, with a portion located north of Steig Road. The project includes a combination of residential and commercial development on 226 acres, including 398 lots and 13 acres of commercial area. Plans were received for the project on July 13, 2018. A wetland replacement plan for filling and mitigating 0.4263 acres of impacts was also submitted with the application.

Staff provided Commissioners with a verbal update on the wetland issues: A Technical Evaluation Panel (TEP) held on August 23 found the replacement and mitigation proposed from the wetland...
replacement plan application to be consistent with the MN WCA chapter 8420 rules with the exception of using wetland 7 as a source of irrigation for the project. The applicant is requesting a no-loss certificate from the LGU for excavating an irrigation pond in wetland 7. The TEP felt that using wetland 7 for irrigation can, in effect, be considered drainage impacts to this wetland if not managed properly. The issues that come into play for this irrigation pond are: a) the increase in the amount of water entering this basin because of the changes in land use and water volumes from the development, b) the well water used to augment the normal water elevation in the wetland because it will affect the bounce in the irrigation pond and the surrounding wetland area, c) the timing, bounce and duration of the irrigation drawdown, and d) the outlet control structure to the wetland will affect the duration of the saturation on this wetland basin.

The TEP requested hydrology modeling and management information - information that would maintain the wetlands normal water elevations and duration of saturation similar to the pre-existing conditions to their satisfaction. As the LGU for WCA, the Commission considers the proposed usage to be a wetland impact, trumping the abstraction issue. An update and recommendation on the wetland replacement plan and irrigation management plan (no-loss request for wetland 7) will be provided to the Commission at a future meeting.

C. Project Review 2018-038 Vincent Woods, Rogers.* This is a 19-acre parcel that was previously approved by the Commission in 2015 for eight apartment buildings. The new site plans propose two apartment buildings with 4.25 acres of impervious areas. The project includes two stormwater ponds to provide water quality treatment, and a filtration bench has been proposed in one of the ponds to meet the abstraction requirements which were not in place at the time of the last project approval. Staff is also considering a request for permission to begin grading prior to formal Commission approval. Motion by Weir, second by Trainor to approve Staff’s findings dated September 12, 2018, with two conditions. Motion carried unanimously.

D. Project Review 2018-039 Greenway North, Plymouth.* This 27-acre site consists of 5 rural single family lots south of CR 47 and west of Troy Lane. Pulte Homes is proposing to develop the area in two phases into 37 single family residential lots and 103 townhomes. This development was reviewed for compliance to the Commission rules D, E, F, and I. In their findings dated September 12, 2018, Staff recommended approval of this project pending their approval of the floodplain fill accounting. Motion by Weir, second by Butcher to approve Staff’s recommendation. Motion carried unanimously.

E. In their July 26, 2018 letter to the Commission,* the City of Maple Grove is requesting funding assistance from the Commission to complete a subwatershed assessment for Fish Lake. The SWA will consist of hydrologic and water quality models to verify existing watershed conditions for the lake. The City’s consultant, WSB & Associates, estimates the cost to complete the SWA to be $35,000. Staff will contact WSB to request specific budget numbers so that Maple Grove’s request can be considered at the October meeting. [The Commission’s Cost Share Policy was amended in 2016 to include a 20% match by the city requesting the SWA.]

V. Old Business.

Barta presented the final draft of a Recommended Livestock Management Policy.* Mattson expressed his City’s concerns regarding inconsistencies between this and his City’s current policy and also the fact that Corcoran’s Local Plan has been submitted for Commission review prior to adoption of this policy. Motion by Weir, second by Trainor to adopt this recommended policy. Motion carried unanimously. Staff will distribute the policy to the member cities.
VI. New Business.

In an email* dated September 11, 2018, Vlach is requesting Elm Creek watershed partners to complete an online survey at www.letstalkthreerivers.org. Results from the survey will be instrumental in the development of TRPD’s 2040 System Plan and continued growth of partnerships.

VII. Watershed Management Plan.

A. Included in the meeting packet was a copy of Commission’s August 16, 2018 comments* on the City of Dayton’s Local Water Management Plan. To be in full conformance with MN Rules Part 8410.0160 Staff provided four comments:

2. As pertains to adherence to the Commission’s Rules and Standards, adjust the vague language as it pertains to carrying out and achieving goals.
3. Include a specific plan for adopting and enforcing a livestock manure management ordinance similar to the Commission’s newly adopted policy.
4. Modify or clarify responses to comments and recommendations provided by the Met Council in their June 29, 2018 correspondence.*

Staff recommends no action at this time.

B. The deadline for Commission review and approval of members’ local plans is December 31, 2018.

VIII. Water Quality.

IX. Grant Opportunities and Updates.

A. FEMA Floodplain Mapping. Staff continues its collection of and preparation of background data in GIS to use in the preparation of the hydology and hydraulics modeling. Staff is also working on ensuring the models selected for use are working correctly at this time and working out a few bugs. Actual work products should start to become available at the Commission’s meeting in October.

B. Diamond Lake Subwatershed Assessment. Hennepin County added this as their recommendation for a SWA to the Metro Conservation District SWA grant and it was submitted. Staff expect to hear back on all BWSR grant proposals in early December 2018.

C. North Fork Rush Creek SWA Implementation: Staff applied for a Clean Water Fund grant from BWSR to implement the recently completed SWA. $142,110.00 was requested from the state, with a required match of $35,527.50. The Rural Conservationist will take the lead on recruiting and implementing projects if the grant application is successful.

D. The City of Corcoran has requested that grant finding be sought for a South Fork Rush Creek Subwatershed Assessment. It was decided not to include this project on the SWA request that Hennepin County sent in for the Metro Conservation District grant because no implementation has been done to date on the North Fork SWA.

X. Education - West Metro Water Alliance (WMWA).

A. WaterLinks. Subscribe to WaterLinks at westmetrowateralliance.org/contact.html. The next issue will be out in early October and feature autumn and winter-related content.
B. **Education and Outreach Events.** Educators are currently scheduling and making fall classroom visits. They are also are available to table at city and school events. Contact Amy Juntunen at amy@jass.biz. The series of Resilient Yards workshops that WMWA sponsored around the four watersheds through Metro Blooms had 194 attendees. Thirty-four participants took advantage of WMWA’s offer to split the $100 cost of an onsite consultation. Several Farmers Markets in the watersheds have expressed willingness to host native plant sales through the Minnesota Native Landscaping’s Pollinator Response Vehicle, but scheduling difficulties resulted in no sales being scheduled this year.

C. **Ten Things Brochure.** WMWA is updating and refreshing the popular *Ten Things You Can Do* brochure that was first developed in 2009. The cities in the four watersheds use this brochure extensively and it is part of the fourth-grade curriculum of Watershed PREP. It is also widely reprinted statewide. Hennepin County provides the layout graphics and prints the brochures at no cost to the four watersheds and cities. The update would add an item about proper use of salt and deicers, refocus the Use Your Runoff item on water conservation and reuse, and consolidate the fertilizer and chemical products into a single item. Items 6-10 would remain the same. The text panel starting “Minnesota is known for its abundance of water resources” would be refocused around the tagline “We All Have Shoreline Property” and emphasize not only the link between an individual’s property and water resources, but also the potential consequences for the 18 million people who obtain their drinking water from the Mississippi River.

D. **Website/Social Media.** Social media has been slow due to staff vacations. A short monitoring video will be posted soon.

E. The next WMWA meeting is scheduled for 8:30 a.m., Tuesday, October 9, 2018, at Plymouth City Hall.

XI. Communications.

XII. Other Business.

A. The following *projects* are discussed in the September Staff Report.* ("W" denotes wetland project.)

2. 2014-015 Rogers Drive Extension, Rogers.
3. 2015-004 Kinghorn Outlet A, Rogers.
4. 2015-030 Kiddiegarten Child Care Center, Maple Grove.
5. 2016-002 The Markets at Rush Creek, Maple Grove.
6. 2016-005W Ravinia Wetland Bank, Corcoran.
8. 2016-047 Hy-Vee Maple Grove #1, Maple Grove.
9. 2016-052 The Woods at Rush Creek, Maple Grove.
10. 2017-014 Laurel Creek, Rogers.
12. 2017-017 Mary Queen of Peace Catholic Church, Rogers
14. 2017-021 Hindu Society of MN Staff Housing, Maple Grove.
15. 2017-029 Brayburn Trails, Dayton.
16. 2017-034 Plymouth Memory Care, Plymouth.
17. 2017-037 L-80 Lift Station MCES, Corcoran.
18. 2017-038 Bass Lake Estates, Corcoran.
19. 2017-039 Rush Creek Apartments, Maple Grove.
20. 2017-044 Reserve at Medina 2nd Addition, Medina.
22. 2018-001 Rush Creek Commons, Maple Grove.
23. 2018-004 Rush Creek Restoration Project, Maple Grove.
24. 2018-005 Sundance Greens, Dayton.
25. 2018-007 Copper Creek of Nottingham, Maple Grove.
27. 2018-014 Refuge at Rush Creek (Fehn Meadows Second Addition), Corcoran.
30. 2018-021 113th Lane Extension & Brockton Lane/CSAH 101 Intersection, Rogers.
32. 2018-023 King Solutions Distribution Center Addition, Dayton.
33. 2018-025W Watten Wetland Delineation/Replacement Plan, Corcoran.
34. 2018-026 Windrose, Maple Grove.
35. 2018-027 CR 202 Elm Creek Bridge Replacement, Dayton.
40. 2018-032 Encore Development, Corcoran.
41. 2018-033 Cloquet Island Estates, Dayton.
42. 2018-034W NE Trunk Sanitary Sewer, Corcoran.
43. 2018-035 Edgewater East, Maple Grove.
44. 2018-037 Elm Creek Restoration Reach D, Plymouth.
46. 2018-039 Greenway North, Plymouth.
47. 2018-040 Rush Creek Commons Phase II, Maple Grove.
49. 2018-042 Olstrom Hills, Maple Grove.
50. 2018-043 Bee Hive Homes, Maple Grove.
51. 2018-044 OSI Phase II, Medina.

B. **Adjournment.** There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 1:06 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

[Signature]

Judie A. Anderson  
Recording Secretary

JAA:tim
STAFF REPORT
October 3, 2018

2014-015 Rogers Drive Extension, Rogers. This project involves improvements along Rogers Drive from Vevea Lane to Brockton Lane. The project is located east of I-94, south of the Cabela development. The total project area is 8.0 acres; proposed impervious surfaces total 5.6 acres. Site plans received July 1, 2014 meet the requirements of the Commission with the exception of the nutrient control. The Commission approved the site plan contingent upon the City deferring 4.6 lbs. of phosphorus for treatment in future ponding opportunities as the easterly corridor of Rogers Drive develops. 2.3 lbs. will be accounted for in the Kinghorn Spec. Building site plan, with 2.3 lbs. still outstanding. This item will remain on the report until the total deferral is accounted for.

2015-004 Kinghorn Outlot A, Rogers. This is a 31-acre site located between the Clam and Fed Ex sites on the west side of Brockton Road and I-94. The proposed site will have two warehouse buildings with associated parking and loading facilities. In June 2015 the Commission approved this project with three conditions. Revisions have yet to meet the Commission’s approval conditions. This project was extended by the City of Rogers earlier this year. It will remain active on the Staff Report.

2016-005W Ravinia Wetland Replacement Plan, Corcoran. In December 2016 the Commission approved Staff’s findings and recommendations on this wetland replacement plan. Final wetland impacts are 1.22 acres. Wetland credits created on site will be 4.01 acres. Excess credits of 0.75 acres are proposed to be used on Lennar’s Laurel Creek development in Rogers (2017-014). All approval contingencies have been met and construction completed. Vegetation planting and management took place throughout 2017. Barr Engineering will provide monitoring starting in 2018, to ensure the replacement meets the performance standards of the approved plans.

2016-040 Kinghorn 4th Addition, Rogers. This is a 13.7-acre parcel located in the northwest corner of the intersection of Brockton Lane and Rogers Drive. An industrial warehouse with 8.8 acres of new impervious area is proposed for the site. The plan includes the use of a NURP pond and a biofiltration basin to meet Commission requirements for rates, water quality and abstraction. The adjacent site is likely to be developed in the near future and some of the stormwater features were oversized to accommodate future development. In November 2016 the Commission approved the project conditioned on: 1) approval of only this phase; future phases will need additional review and approval; 2) final modifications to the hydrologic modeling; 3) additional details are provided for a proposed water re-use system; 4) an O&M Plan for the pond and biofiltration basin is completed and recorded on the final plat; 5) modification of the storm sewer system to maximize the area draining to the NURP pond; and 6) receipt and review of wetland-related documentation if wetlands are present. Condition #1 required no action, so has been met. Condition #2 has been met for the current design; however, any future design modifications will require additional review. Conditions #3-6 remain outstanding and are expected to be addressed during final design. Staff has discussed the project with the City and been in contact with the project engineer to receive an update, but no new information has been provided.

2016-047 Hy-Vee North Maple Grove. The applicant is proposing to disturb 13 acres of a 20.4-acre site located at the northeast corner of Maple Grove Parkway and 99th Avenue for the purpose of constructing a grocery store, fuel station, convenience store and parking facilities. Staff sent preliminary review comments and requested revisions on December 14. In their findings dated January 10, 2017, Staff recommended approval of this project subject to 1) receipt, approval, and recordation of an Operations and Maintenance Plan for the pond and the iron-enhanced
Staff Report
October 3, 2018
Page 2

filtration system, 2) revisions for items relating to buffer requirements and erosion and sediment control as enumerated in the findings, and 3) receipt of a signed and dated final plan set. The Commission approved Staff’s recommendations at their January 11, 2017 meeting with the additional requirement that the Commission receive and comment on a WCA impact notice. No new information has been received to date.

2017-039 Rush Creek Apartments, Maple Grove. This project is located in the southwest quadrant of the intersection of Bass Lake Road (CSAH 10) and Troy Lane (CSAH 101). The project area is 8.2 acres in size and includes two phases of construction. Phase I is 236 apartment units located on 6.0 acres; Phase II is a future 76-unit apartment building located on 2.2 acres in Outlot C of this development. The Commission will review this project for conformance to rules D, E and I. Findings with no recommendations dated November 15, 2017, were provided to the applicant and City. The applicant requested and was granted an extension of the deadline (per MN statute 15.99) to December 31, 2018.

2017-050W Ernie Mayer Wetland/floodplain violation, Corcoran. The Commission was informed of a potential wetland violation occurring on four parcels in Corcoran. Initial site inspection appears to confirm the wetland violation. An access road was constructed from Larkin Road into these parcels. The road appears to be constructed in MN Wetland Conservation Act jurisdictional wetlands within the Rush Creek floodplain. A Technical Evaluation Panel (TEP) met onsite on December 11 to advise the Local Government Unit (the Commission) as to the extent of any violation and the development of a restoration order for any violation that has occurred on this site. An informational meeting with the TEP and applicant was held on January 30, 2018. Another TEP was held May 22, 2018, for the field investigation. In addition to the road work wetland filling, extensive ditching and drain tile installation was verified on site. All this work appears to be in violation of Commission permitting and WCA requirements TEP findings were provided to all parties concerned. Mayers requested another TEP to provide additional information to the panel. The TEP meeting was held on July 20. Some revisions to the impacts were accepted by the TEP, but the TEP found the original violations to the WCA still existed. A restoration order was issued to Mayers giving him until September 15 to respond or restore the violation areas to their original conditions. A request from Mayer’s attorney for an extension to November 1, 2018 has been granted by the DNR.

2018-004 Rush Creek Restoration Project, Maple Grove. The City is proposing to restore 2,400 feet of Rush Creek just north of Territorial Road adjacent to the Enclave on Rush Creek development. This is within the Three River Parks corridor that was obtained when the development was platted and is being reviewed for compliance with the Commission’s grading and floodplain requirements. Staff has completed its review. This item was pulled from the agenda at the Commission’s June meeting due to concerns from a partner agency. No further progress or communication has occurred and this project will not be brought forward for the Commission’s review until the parties have reached agreement on proceeding. Staff will be checking in with new City staff to determine how to best move this project forward.

2018-005 Sundance Greens, Dayton. This site consists of seven parcels totaling 310 acres. Approximately half is the Sundance Golf course and the other half is agricultural land. The applicant is proposing a long term, phased residential development with 665 residential units while maintaining a portion (9 of the 18 holes) of the golf course. Total new impervious area will be 71 acres. This review will cover Commission Rules D, F, and I. Only the Sundance Greens West (phase I grading) erosion and sediment control plans are being reviewed at this time for the Commission’s requirements for erosion control. Future phasing of the grading plans must be submitted separately for the Commission’s review for Rule E and consistency with other approvals from the Commission. The decision deadline per MN 15.99 was extended to December 9, 2018. In their findings dated October 3, 2018, Staff approved the grading and erosion control plans for Sundance West. No other action is requested at this time for the rest of the site pending (1) receipt of final erosion control plans for each phase as they develop; (2) fulfillment of Stormwater management requirements per item #11 of their findings; (3) receipt of wetland buffers plans meeting the Commission’s requirements; and (4) receipt of floodplain mitigation plans meeting Commission’s requirements.

2018-007 Copper Creek of Nottingham, Maple Grove. This is a 4.03 acre in-fill project in the Nottingham development section of Maple Grove. It is located about 1/4 mile northeast of the intersection of Nottingham Parkway at Bass Lake Road along 73rd Place/Xene Lane cul-de-sac. Nine new single family residential lots are proposed. The current site developments are noted.
plans dated February 12, 2018 do not meet the Commission’s standards for water quality, abstraction and erosion controls. After numerous requestes to the City and the applicant, no new information has been received. Staff notified the applicant and the City that the site plans do not meet the Commission’s requirements and unless an extension to the 15.99 deadline is received by August 15, the application will be denied and a new application will have to be provided in order for this project to move forward. This project was denied at the Commission’s September 12, 2018 meeting. It will be removed from the agenda.

2018-014 Refuge at Rush Creek (formerly Fehn Meadows 2nd Addition), Corcoran. The site is currently a 63-acre agricultural property located west of Cain Road on CR 117. The applicant proposes to subdivide the site into 14 residential lots. Public road and trail access will impact two wetland basins, totaling 16,537 SF of type 1 wetland impacts. Replacement at a 2:1 ratio in Bank Service Area (BSA) 7, Major Watershed 20 (Metro Mississippi), is proposed. The wetland replacement plan has been noticed per WCA requirements. The Commission approved this project with conditions at their August meeting: (1) Certification from MN BWSR that 0.7593 acres of wetland banking credits from account #1643 have been transferred for use on this site or an escrow of $90,000 is received from the applicant, (2) Preservation and buffer areas meet the Commission and City requirements for buffer and preservation, (3) $4,000 per acre escrow is secured by the ECWMC for buffer/preservation compliance and 5-year monitoring plan, and (4) operation and maintenance plans for stormwater ponds are approved by the Commission and City and recorded on the property title. No new information has been received as of this update.

2018-020 North 101 Storage, Rogers. This is an existing 3-acre lot in the northwest corner of Highway 101 and CR144. The current land use is a combination of mini-storage units and outdoor storage. The site is proposed for complete demolition and the construction of new mini-storage buildings. Site plans must comply with Rules D and E. Because the project is disturbing over 50% of the site area (100% actual), Staff review will be the same as for a new development and stormwater management plans must comply with all impervious areas. At their July meeting the Commission approved Staff findings dated July 9, 2018, pending four items relating to abstration requirements and the infiltration system. No new information has been received as of this update.

2018-021 113th Lane Extension/Brockton/101, Rogers. The City is proposing to extend 113th Lane to provide a second access to the proposed second phase of the Laurel Creek development. The proposed road will extend from Brockton Lane to the development entrance. It will include a 4-lane divided roadway; an off-road trail north of 113th Lane; and construction of an intersection meeting County turn-lane requirements. The project will create 2.13 acres of new impervious surface. The project was conditionally approved at the July Commission meeting. The conditions include submittal of signed final plans and finalization of the wetland mitigation plan. The project has been delayed until 2019, so submittals to meet the conditions have not yet been received.

2018-025 Watten Wetland Delineation/Replacement Plan, Corcoran. This is an application for a wetland boundary/type determination, wetland replacement plan, and the sequencing analysis of the replacement plan. This is a vacant 5-acre residential flag lot on CR 10. Kjolhaug Environmental Services did the wetland delineation on December 12, 2017 with a follow-up visit on May 2, 2018. Anderson Engineering completed the wetland replacement plan for construction of a residential gravel driveway (12’ wide) for access to the buildable area. 4,422 SF (0.1015 acres) of one wetland basin will be impacted. 0.2030 acres of wetland banking credits are proposed to be purchased from B. Engstrom bank account 1643 (major watershed #20, BSA 7) for replacement of the impacts. At their August meeting the Commission approved this project pending receipt of BWSR certification of 0.2030 acres of wetland credits transfer for 0.1015 ac. of impacts. BWSR certification was received September 19, 2018. This item will be removed from the report.

2018-027 CR202 Bridge, Dayton. This is a replacement bridge on Elm Road in the Elm Creek Park Reserve. Staff has been working with the DNR and Hennepin County on the floodplain issues as they relate to the replacement. Staff review is for conformance with rules E and F. In their findings dated July 24, 2018, Staff recommended approval of this project subject to a number of minor plan revisions and receipt of the project review fee. The project review fee has been received. Staff is awaiting submittal of the revisions as of the preparation of this memo.
**2018-032 Encore Development, Corcoran.** This project is generally located west of Brockton Lane (101) and south of Steig Road, with a portion located north of Steig Road. It includes a combination of residential and commercial development on 226 acres, including 398 lots and 13 acres of commercial area. Plans were received on July 13, 2018. A wetland replacement plan for filling and mitigating 0.4263 acres of impacts was also submitted with the application.

Wetland Issues. A Technical Evaluation Panel held on August 23 found the replacement and mitigation proposed from the wetland replacement plan application to be consistent with the MN WCA chapter 8420 rules with the exception of using wetland 7 as a source of irrigation for the project. The applicant was requesting a no-loss certificate from the LGU for excavating an irrigation pond in wetland 7. The TEP felt that using wetland 7 for irrigation can, in effect, be considered drainage impacts to this wetland if not managed properly.

The TEP felt that updated hydrology modeling and management information providing a NWL on wetland 7 at 928.25 would maintain the wetland’s normal water elevations and duration of saturation similar to the pre-existing conditions. In their findings dated October 3, 2018, Staff recommends approval pending (1) approval of the Encore Phase I site plan, (2) receipt of an escrow of $45,000 provided by the applicant for the LGU to use in case the wetland replacement banking and no-loss are not met per the approved conditions, and (3) maintenance of Wetland 7 normal water elevation at 928.25 or higher during the irrigation season.

**2018-033 Cloquet Island Estates, Dayton.** This is a proposal to develop approximately 77 acres of farmland near the intersection of North Diamond Lake Road and Dayton River Road. It will include the construction of 193 single-family homes and increase imprevious area by approximately 24.4 acres. Stormwater will be managed through seven wet detention ponds, one filtration bench, and one new infiltration bench. *The site plan was revised in September and a summary of findings and recommendation will be provided at the October meeting.*

**2018-034W NE Trunk Sanitary Sewer, Corcoran.** This is an application from the City for a wetland determination of no-loss for temporary impacts to wetlands associated with installing this sewer line from the City of Rogers/Maple Grove/Dayton/Corcoran corner to the Encore development at Steig Road. *Staff issued a no-loss certificate for temporary impacts based on the site plans meeting the WCA requirements. This item will be removed from the report.*

**2018-035 Edgewater East, Maple Grove.** This is a 43-lot residential subdivision located on approximately 27 acres. The project is located near the northwest corner of Bass Lake Road and Brockton Lane. An incomplete application was submitted on July 16, 2018. The applicant was notified that the application was considered incomplete on July 17, 2018. *No new information has been received to date.*

**2018-037 Elm Creek Restoration Reach D, Plymouth.** This project proposes to implement stream restoration along 3,850 feet of Elm Creek. Plans were received on July 25, 2018. Staff is working to complete its review and will bring forward a recommendation to the meeting if it is available. *Staff has reviewed the plans and is approving the plans administratively with two items to be addressed to complete the approval.*

**2018-038 Vincent Woods, Rogers.** This is a 19-acre parcel that was previously approved for eight apartment buildings by the Commission in 2015. The new site plans propose two apartment buildings with 4.25 acres of impervious areas. The project includes two stormwater ponds to provide water quality treatment, and a filtration bench has been proposed in one of the ponds to meet the abstraction requirements which were not in place as of the last project approval. *The Commission approved the project at their September meeting subject to the submittal of minor revisions. Staff is working with the applicant on these items. Staff approval to begin grading prior to final approval was also provided.*

**2018-039 Greenway North, Plymouth.** This a 27-acre site consists of five rural single family lots south of CR 47 and west of Troy Lane. Pulte Homes is proposing to develop the area in two phases into 37 single family residential lots and 103 townhomes. This development was reviewed for compliance to the Commission rules D, E, F, and I. At the September meeting this project was approved by the Commission pending Staff’s final approval of the floodplain fill accounting. *Updated floodplain fill calculations were received and approved by Staff on September 13, 2018. This item will be removed from the report.*
2018-040 Rush Creek Commons, Phase II, Maple Grove. Maple Grove is proposing to reconstruct approximately 1,600 feet of Brockton Lane, converting Brockton Lane from a rural roadway to an urban section with curb and gutter and storm sewer. The project will also construct a trail for approximately 1,300 feet on the south side of Bass Lake Road and will add curb and gutter for approximately 500 feet along a currently rural segment of Bass Lake Road. The project will disturb 3.8 acres. The proposed project is a linear project that will create less than one acre of new impervious surface but is considered to be an extension of the adjacent Rush Creek Commons development and is, therefore, required to be reviewed by the Commission. Staff administratively granted grading permit approval to begin grading prior to the Commission taking formal action on the project at the applicant’s risk **Staff will be recommending approval of this project at the October meeting.**

2018-041W Homestead Trail Wetland Delineation, Savoie property, Corcoran. This is a wetland boundary and type review on a 16-acre rural residential lot. It has been noticed and reviewed per WCA requirements. **Staff reviewed the report and visited the site and found the delineation to be accurate. A notice of the wetland delineation approval was issued on September 1, 2018. This item will be removed from the report.**

2018-042 Ostrom Hills, Maple Grove. This is a 10-acre site along Lawndale Lane and 68th Avenue. 15 single family residential lots are proposed. **The applicant was notified that the site plans are not complete. The applicant requested that this project be withdrawn from consideration for review and the review fees be returned. This item will be removed from the report and all but the application fee returned to the applicant.**

2018-043 BeeHive Homes, Maple Grove. This is a 2.9 acre lot on Weaver Lake Road at W. Fish Lake Road (across from Medtronic). It is proposed to be developed into two single story senior housing buildings. **Site plans were reviewed for conformance to the Commission rules D and E. Staff recommends approval contingent on an approved stormwater system operation and maintenance plan being recorded on the property title or the City of Maple Grove accepting O&M plan responsibility.**

2018-044 OSI Phase II, Medina. OSI is a proposed new office building located on the company’s existing commercial/industrial property located at the intersection of MN Highway 55 and Arrowhead Road. The project involves the construction of a new building and associated parking and landscaped areas as well as utilities to serve the building and site. It will be reviewed for compliance to Commission rules D, E, F, and I. **Current plans do not meet the Commission standards. If available, an updated review and recommendations will be provided the Commission at their meeting.**

2018-045 Weinard Ditch Cleaning, Corcoran. This is an existing ditch that has filled in over the years. **The applicant is requesting permission to clean out the ditch to its previous elevations. Staff reviewed the site and aerial photos and will issue a no-loss determination to the applicant for this work**

2018-046, Graco Expansion, Rogers. This project is the expansion of an existing building. The site is located in an area that has regional ponding provided for rate control purposes, but does need to account for water quality and abstraction requirements on site prior to discharging offsite as part of the improvements. **Staff is working to complete this review, and will bring forward a recommendation to the meeting if available.**

**Final recordings are due on the following projects:**

2013-046 Woods of Medina. Medina. In January 2015 the Commission approved this project with two conditions. **This project remained active throughout this period with the final plat recently approved by the City. No significant changes were made to the original plans. The two conditions were 1) compliance to the WCA requirements and 2) final approval and recording of the O & M plans. The WCA condition has been met with only the O&M plan condition remaining.**

2015-030 Kiddiegarten Child Care Center, Maple Grove. Approved December 9, 2015. If the City does not take over the operation and maintenance of the underground system and the sump catch basins, an O&M agreement for the underground trench/pond system must be approved by the Commission and the City and recorded with the title.
2016-002 The Markets at Rush Creek, Maple Grove. This is a proposal to develop 40 acres of a 123-acre planned unit development located in the southwest quadrant of the intersection of CSAH 101 and CSAH 10. In May 2016 the Commission granted Staff authority to administratively approve the project and report any updates. Updated plans with some minor layout revisions were reviewed by Staff and administratively approved on July 24, 2018, contingent upon the Operation and Maintenance Plan approval and recordings.

2016-052 The Woods at Rush Creek, Maple Grove. At their March 2017 meeting, the Commission approved Staff’s findings and recommendations dated February 15, 2017. Outstanding items are the biofiltration pond, O & M plans, and recording.

2017-014 Laurel Creek, Rogers. In June 2017 the Commission approved this project with four conditions. All contingency items have been provided with the exception of the O&M agreement which is being negotiated by the City as to whether the City or the HOA will be responsible for the operation and maintenance of the stormwater management facility. On August 31, 2017, Andrew Simmons responded that the O&M agreement is still being negotiated.

2017-016 Territorial Woods, Maple Grove. Approved at the September 13, 2017 Commission meeting contingent upon receipt of an O & M agreement meeting the Commission’s rules. The agreement was approved by the City and is in the process of being recorded.

2017-017 Mary Queen of Peace Catholic Church, Rogers. In June 2017 the Commission granted Staff approval authority pending satisfactory compliance with Staff’s findings. All items from the findings have been completed with the exception of the O&M agreement for the stormwater facilities. On June 7, 2018 Andrew Simmons reported that the Church is in the process of revising the stormwater management plan for the site to include water reuse instead of biofiltration pond. The Commission should receive a revised application in near future. There are also underlying utility easement issues with this project that are holding up the final recording of the plat against which to record the maintenance agreement.

2017-019 Medina Senior Community, Medina. This item was approved at the Commission’s September 2017 meeting subject to conditions. All of the conditions have been met with the submission of revised plans, with the exception of the final recordings of the O&M agreements and easements. On June 6, 2018, city staff reported that the applicant is anticipated to be recording documents and starting construction in the summer.

2017-021 Hindu Society of MN, Maple Grove. At their June 14, 2017 meeting, the Commission approved this project per Staff’s recommendations. All the recommendation have been met with the exception of the O&M plan agreements.

2017-029 Brayburn Trails, Dayton. At their August 2017 meeting the Commission approved Staff’s findings dated August 2, 2017 with five conditions. All of the conditions have been met with the submission of revised plans, with the exception of the final recordings of the O&M agreements and easements. On March 7, 2018, the City reported: final plat approval has not been granted, easements will be recorded as plats are approved. Ponds will be maintained by the City of Dayton. An agreement, and additional easement, will be required for a water re-use system within one of the ponds (between the City and HOA). This system is not part of the first addition – the timing of said improvements/agreement is unknown. Construction is expected to start in 2018.

2017-034 Plymouth Memory Care, Plymouth. This project was approved by the Commission at its September 2017 meeting subject to the receipt of an O&M agreement acceptable to the Commission. On June 7, 2018, city staff reported that the applicant is working with them to finalize the maintenance agreement.

2017-037 Corcoran L-80 Lift Station, Corcoran. Staff recommended the Commission approve this project contingent upon the project meeting the Commission wetland buffer requirements. This item was approved by the Executive Committee of the Commission in October 2017. Revised plans meet the Commission’s buffer requirements with the exception of the final easement recordings. On March 6, 2018, city staff informed the Commission that they are working with a land surveyor and will complete the recordings before construction is completed.
2017-038 Bass Lake Estates, Corcoran. This is a proposed residential development consisting of 55 single family lots and one commercial lot on a 40-acre site. At their March 14, 2018 meeting, the Commission approved Staff’s findings which recommended approval contingent upon the applicant recording the maintenance agreements and easements within 90 days of final plat recording.

2018-001 Rush Creek Commons, Maple Grove. Approved at the February 14, 2018 meeting contingent upon meeting the Commission’s operation and maintenance requirements on the stormwater facilities, i.e., all ponds and biofiltration basins must have drainage and utility easements and operation and maintenance agreements over them. These must be recorded on the property title and a copy of the recordations must be provided to the Commission within 90 days after final plat approval.

2018-018 Summers Edge Phase III, Plymouth. This is a 15-acre parcel located at the northeast corner of the intersection of Brockton Lane and Medina Road. The proposed development consists of 45 single-family homes on a vacant parcel. The Commission approved Staff’s recommendations at their June 13, 2018 meeting, subject to receipt of final easements over the wetland buffers within 90 days of final platting in a format acceptable to the Commission.

2018-026 Windrose, Maple Grove. This proposed 8.5-acre townhome site is in the east quadrant of CR 101 and Bass Lake Road. The Commission approved Staff’s finding and recommendations dated July 20, 2018. Final plan approval is contingent upon verification of the wetland approvals by the City of Maple Grove and the approval and recording of the operation and maintenance plan on the filter basins.

2018-028 Tricare Third Addition, Maple Grove. This is a 2.1-acre area that will be split out of an 85-acre parcel north of CR 30 at 96th Avenue and Dunkirk Lane. An 18,000 SF commercial retail building with associated parking and utilities are proposed. In their findings dated August 7, 2018, Staff recommended approval contingent on approval and recording of the operations and maintenance plan on the filter basins. The Commission further recommended that the City of Maple Grove consider an oil/debris type of separator in the parking lot manhole.

**LOCAL PLANS**

Maple Grove Draft Surface Water Management Plan. Staff reviewed the City of Maple Grove’s Draft Surface Water Management Plan dated January 2018. Their comments were included in their letter to the City dated March 7, 2018.

Dayton Surface Water Management Plan. Staff recommends approval of the revised Dayton LSWMP dated October 2018. See memo in packet.

**FEMA FLOODPLAIN MAPPING**

Elm Creek Floodplain Mapping: Staff continues its collection of and preparation of background data in GIS to use in the preparation of the hydrology and hydraulics modeling. Staff is also working on ensuring the models selected for use are working correctly at this time and working out a few bugs. Actual work products should start to become available at the Commission’s meeting in October.

**CLEAN WATER FUND GRANTS**

North Fork Rush Creek SWA Implementation: Staff applied for a Clean Water Fund grant from BWSR to implement the recently completely SWA. $142,110.00 was requested from the state, with a required match of $35,527.50. The Rural Conservationist will take the lead on recruiting and implementing projects if the grant is successful.

Diamond Creek SWA: Hennepin County added this as their recommendation for a SWA to the Metro Conservation District SWA grant and it was submitted. Staff expect to hear back on all BWSR grant proposals in early December 2018.
memo

Date: 10/4/2018

To: Elm Creek Watershed Management Commission

From: Brian Vlach
Senior Manager of Water Resources
Three Rivers Park District

Subject: Fish Lake Alum Treatment

Three Rivers Park District is seeking approval from the Elm Creek Watershed Management Commission to pursue the formal bidding process (Request for Bids) for the second alum treatment on Fish Lake.

Fish Lake has been meeting the MPCA water quality standards since the first alum treatment was completed in September of 2017. Sediment samples collected in 2018 suggest that a second alum treatment at a similar dosage of 40 g Al/m² will be necessary in order to further increase alum effectiveness as well as continue to meet the state’s water quality standards for delisting from the Impaired Water’s list. The second alum treatment is proposed for the spring of 2019.

The cost of alum has been increasing so it is critical to get bid estimates early to determine whether additional funds are needed to complete the project.
To: Judie Anderson, Administrator, Elm Creek WMC  
Jim Kujawa, Technical Services for ECWMC, Hennepin County Public Works

From: Tom Berry, Senior Planner, Wenck Associates, Inc.

Date: September 26, 2018

Subject: Dayton Local Water Management Plan comments and approval

This memo is in response to comments received by both the Elm Creek Watershed Management Commission (ECWMC) and the Metropolitan Council during the 60-day public comment period for the draft Dayton Local Water Management Plan. The following are our responses in italics to both ECWMC and Met Council’s comment letters. An updated Plan is attached.

**ECWMC Comments**

1. The city’s future land use plans shows complete development (build-out) by 2040. We recommend the city update its 2008 comprehensive stormwater management plan taking into account the updated land use information while also updating the infrastructure maps, costs, ECWMC and NPDES 1.1 abstraction requirements and Atlas 14 rainfall data analysis.

   *The City is committed to revisiting the model, updating it and the Comprehensive Stormwater Management Plan. That effort has been identified to occur in 2019 and is now referenced in the Plan in Sections 1.2.4, 3.4.4, 5.1 (Goal 2), 6.21 and Tables 6-1 and 6-2.*

2. The plan generally follows the ECMWC rules and standards and appears to be in compliance. Complete compliance is hard to discern based on the wording in some of the sections... In addition, most of the other goals and policies method the terms “shall” and “preferred” as they related to policy to carry out said goals. This seems to be vague and allows for greater variation in actually carrying out and achieving your goals.

   *Noted. We have reviewed all references to goals, policies and sections pertaining to carrying out the requirements of state and local agencies including those of the ECWMC. Some specific areas of refinement including references to updating the Comprehensive Stormwater Management Plan and model as mentioned above, stating the City will administer and enforce a manure management ordinance in 2019, initiate a septic system program enhancement (grant funded) and a number of water quality initiatives on Diamond and French Lakes (also grant funded). Please be apprised that the term “shall” in the Plan has the same meaning as “must”.*

3. The Commission would like to see a specific plan for adopting and enforcing a livestock manure management ordinance similar to the ECMWC model ordinance guidelines.

   *Noted. We intend to draft, administer and enforce a manure management ordinance in 2019, pert ECMWC requirements.*
4. The Commission requests the modifications or clarifications of the comments and recommendations provided by the Metropolitan Council in their June 29, 2018 correspondence. 
See responses to the Metropolitan Council comments below.

**Metropolitan Council comments**

1. **Table 3.2 2010 Land Use in the City of Dayton, needs to be updated from 2010 to current land use information.**
   Noted. The table has been updated to reflect the most current available data (2016). Further, the City of Dayton will complete the 2040 Comprehensive Plan by December 31, 2019, which will reflect the current data available.

2. **Diamond Creek is shown as discharging from French Lake on Figures 3.1 and 3.5, but it is not shown discharging from Diamond Lake on Figures 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, and 3.6. These figures should be corrected to show consistency.**
   Noted. The discrepancy was based on the type of basemap that was incorporated into the image. All noted figures have been updated.

3. **The Plan includes by reference a trunk stormwater system map which is provided on the city’s website. This map shows drainage area boundaries, flow paths, and existing and proposed conveyance infrastructure. However, the map was last updated in 2007. Assuming changes have been made to the stormwater system since 2007, this map needs to be updated to reflect current conditions.**
   The 2007 map referenced in the Plan and illustrated on the City’s website is the most updated information available at this time. However, the City is committed to revisiting the model, updating it and the Comprehensive Stormwater Management Plan. That effort has been identified to occur in 2019 and is now referenced in the Plan in Sections 1.2.4, 3.4.4, 5.1 (Goal 2), 6.21 and Tables 6-1 and 6-2.

4. **The Plan is required to have a description of volumes and rates per Minnesota Rules 8410.0160. The plan includes by reference a hydraulic model, which was created in 2008. The Plan states that this model can be used to identify drainage areas, volumes, rates and flow paths. This hydraulic model should be updated to current conditions and the use of Atlas 14 precipitation frequency curves. Providing more detailed information in the Plan about the hydraulic model would be helpful to the user.**
   Noted. As stated previously, City is committed to revisiting the model, updating it and the Comprehensive Stormwater Management Plan. The existing 2008 Local Surface Water Management Plan includes a city-wide hydrologic and hydraulic model to guide city planning efforts for its storm sewer infrastructure. Truck storm sewer, regional ponds and lift stations were primarily sized, site and priced with information produced in the model. The model was developed in HydroCAD and calculated in accordance with SCS TR-20 methodology. The model has been used by developers to properly size development in terms of volume, rate and flow. That Plan includes 136 drainage areas (at the catchment level) including drainage area associated with each catchment, volumes, rates and flow paths. We have selected to not reference specific details regarding the volumes and rates in this updated Plan since the new Comprehensive Stormwater Management Plan and model will be updated to reflect Atlas 14 precipitation frequency curves.
5. The rules also require area and elevations for stormwater storage adequate to meet performance standards or official controls. The model should be updated to Atlas 14 rainfall event frequency curves and 2040 land use conditions.

Noted. The Comprehensive Stormwater Management Plan will have a model updated to Atlas 14 performance standards.

6. Atlas 14 is referenced once in the Plan (Policy 2.5 for Goal 2): stormwater sewer design for the 10-year event. Atlas 14 should also be incorporated into the Goals and Policies (section 5) for calculating precipitation amounts and stormwater runoff rates beyond just storm water design and the 10-year event (for example, policies 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.7).

Noted. The Comprehensive Stormwater Management Plan and model update scheduled for 2019 is now reflected in Sections 1.2.4, 3.4.4, 5.1 (Goal 2), 6.21 and Tables 6-1 and 6-2, and references to Atlas 14 have been added to Policies 2.1, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 2.6 and Table 6.2.

7. The Implementation Actions table (Table 6.2) needs to provide a schedule, estimated costs, and funding sources for each item. The items in the Implementation Actions table need to be prioritized as well. These items need to be provided in the Plan per Minnesota rules 8410.0160.

Noted. The Implementation Actions table now includes a schedule, estimated cost, funding source and priority. Further, the process by which the City prioritized action items within Table 6.2 are described in Section 6.1.

8. The Plan is required to provide a section titled “Amendments to Plan”, per Minnesota Rules 8410.0160, that establishes the process by which amendments may be made.

Noted. This was an oversight. A new Section 8.0 Plan Updates has been added to the Plan which includes an "Amendment to Plan" subsection.

9. The roles of the City and the Elm Creek Watershed Management Commission are not clearly defined in the Plan with respect to carrying out the implementation actions plan including the implementation of WRAPS and TMDLs. These roles need to be clearly defined in the Plan.

Noted. Several Sections of the Plan have been reviewed, modified or expanded to clarify the roles including Sections 1.3.4, 2.25, 2.3, Table 4.1, Goal 1- Policies 1.5, 1.6, Goal 8- Policy 8.1, Section 5.2, 6.2.1, 6.2.3, 6.3.1, Table 6.2, Sections 7.1, 8.1, 8.2 and 8.3.

Next Steps
I have attached an updated Dayton Local Water Management Plan that includes all the noted corrections, modifications and additions. If you find our comments and subsequent Plan updates satisfactory, we request that the Elm Creek Watershed Management Commission approves the Dayton Local Water Management Plan. Please keep me apprised of when you believe the matter could be added to the ECWMC agenda.

We anticipate bringing the Plan before the Dayton City Council after ECWMC has approved the Plan, tentatively scheduled for October 24, 2018.

If you have any questions, please call or email me at 952-837-3306 or tberry@wenck.com
DATE: SEPTEMBER 28, 2018
TO: ELM CREEK WATERSHED COMMISSION
FROM: JIM KUJAWA
RE: CITY OF DAYTON COMPREHENSIVE SURFACE WATER MANAGEMENT PLAN

Background

Commission staff reviews member Community Storm Water Management Plans for conformance with the Commission’s 3rd Generation Stormwater Management Plan. The review focuses on the requirements of the communities as outlined in MS 103B.231 and .235.

Updates to the local stormwater management plans are expected to include:

- Updated land use, hydrologic, and hydraulic data, and existing or potential water resource related problems that may have changed since the last LWMP.

- An explanation of how the member city will help to implement the actions set forth in the Commission’s Plan, including specifically addressing adoption and enforcement of a manure management ordinance.

- Show how the member city will take action to achieve the load reductions and other actions identified in and agreed to in TMDL Implementation Plans.

- Updated Implementation Plan identifying the specific structural, nonstructural, and programmatic solutions to the problems and issues identified in the LWMP.

- Set forth an implementation program including a description of adoption or amendment of official controls and local policies necessary to implement the Rules and Standards; programs; policies; a capital improvement plan; and estimates of cost and funding mechanisms.

Information

Staff received the draft Dayton Stormwater Management Plan for review and comment in the spring of 2018. Staff comments along with comments from the Metropolitan Council were provided to the city for their consideration on August 16th, 2018.
The City has revised their plans to address these comments and resubmitted a final Local Stormwater Management Plan dated October 2018.

Attached please find our original correspondence and with the City’s response.

Based on staff’s review of the final draft plan we offer the following comments on the City of Dayton’s Local Surface Water Management Plan.

1) The updated plan provides clear and more concise language that is consistent with the Commission’s 3rd Generation Plan goals and policies

2) The plan identifies and updates its implementation plan to conform more to the Elm Creek Watersheds WRAPS/TMDL studies, including updated CIP plans.

3) The plan commits the city to update its livestock ordinance to comply with the Commission’s guidelines.

4) The plan addresses costs and funding sources in its implementation action plans.

5) The plan addresses the concerns expressed by the Metropolitan Council.

**Action**

Commission staff recommends approval of Dayton’s Local Surface Water Management Plan as updated in October 2018.

JCK
To: Judie Anderson, Administrator, Elm Creek WMC  
Jim Kujawa, Technical Services for ECWMC, Hennepin County Public Works

From: Tom Berry, Senior Planner, Wenck Associates, Inc.

Date: September 26, 2018

Subject: Dayton Local Water Management Plan comments and approval

This memo is in response to comments received by both the Elm Creek Watershed Management Commission (ECWMC) and the Metropolitan Council during the 60-day public comment period for the draft Dayton Local Water Management Plan. The following are our responses in italics to both ECWMC and Met Council’s comment letters. An updated Plan is attached.

ECWMC Comments

1. The city’s future land use plans shows complete development (build-out) by 2040. We recommend the city update its 2008 comprehensive stormwater management plan taking into account the updated land use information while also updating the infrastructure maps, costs, ECWMC and NPDES 1.1” abstraction requirements and Atlas 14 rainfall data analysis.

   Noted. We have reviewed all references to goals, policies and sections pertaining to carrying out the requirements of state and local agencies including those of the ECWMC. Some specific areas of refinement including references to updating the Comprehensive Stormwater Management Plan and model as mentioned above, stating the City will administer and enforce a manure management ordinance in 2019, initiate a septic system program enhancement (grant funded) and a number of water quality initiatives on Diamond and French Lakes (also grant funded). Please be apprised that the term “shall” in the Plan has the same meaning as “must”.

2. The plan generally follows the ECMWC rules and standards and appears to be in compliance. Complete compliance is hard to discern based on the wording in some of the sections… In addition, most of the other goals and policies method the terms “shall” and “preferred” as they related to policy to carry out said goals. This seems to be vague and allows for greater variation in actually carrying out and achieving your goals.

   Noted. We have reviewed all references to goals, policies and sections pertaining to carrying out the requirements of state and local agencies including those of the ECWMC. Some specific areas of refinement including references to updating the Comprehensive Stormwater Management Plan and model as mentioned above, stating the City will administer and enforce a manure management ordinance in 2019, initiate a septic system program enhancement (grant funded) and a number of water quality initiatives on Diamond and French Lakes (also grant funded). Please be apprised that the term “shall” in the Plan has the same meaning as “must”.

3. The Commission would like to see a specific plan for adopting and enforcing a livestock manure management ordinance similar to the ECMWC model ordinance guidelines.

   Noted. We intend to draft, administer and enforce a manure management ordinance in 2019, pert ECMWC requirements.
4. The Commission requests the modifications or clarifications of the comments and recommendations provided by the Metropolitan Council in their June 29, 2018 correspondence.

See responses to the Metropolitan Council comments below.

Metropolitan Council comments

1. Table 3.2 2010 Land Use in the City of Dayton, needs to be updated from 2010 to current land use information.
   Noted. The table has been updated to reflect the most current available data (2016). Further, the City of Dayton will complete the 2040 Comprehensive Plan by December 31, 2019, which will reflect the current data available.

2. Diamond Creek is shown as discharging from French Lake on Figures 3.1 and 3.5, but it is not shown discharging from Diamond Lake on Figures 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, and 3.6. These figures should be corrected to show consistency.
   Noted. The discrepancy was based on the type of basemap that was incorporated into the image. All noted figures have been updated.

3. The Plan includes by reference a trunk stormwater system map which is provided on the city’s website. This map shows drainage area boundaries, flow paths, and existing and proposed conveyance infrastructure. However, the map was last updated in 2007. Assuming changes have been made to the stormwater system since 2007, this map needs to be updated to reflect current conditions.
   The 2007 map referenced in the Plan and illustrated on the City’s website is the most updated information available at this time. However, the City is committed to revisiting the model, updating it and the Comprehensive Stormwater Management Plan. That effort has been identified to occur in 2019 and is now referenced in the Plan in Sections 1.2.4, 3.4.4, 5.1 (Goal 2), 6.21 and Tables 6-1 and 6-2.

4. The Plan is required to have a description of volumes and rates per Minnesota Rules 8410.0160. The plan includes by reference a hydraulic model, which was created in 2008. The Plan states that this model can be used to identify drainage areas, volumes, rates and flow paths. This hydraulic model should be updated to current conditions and the use of Atlas 14 precipitation frequency curves. Providing more detailed information in the Plan about the hydraulic model would be helpful to the user.
   Noted. As stated previously, City is committed to revisiting the model, updating it and the Comprehensive Stormwater Management Plan. The existing 2008 Local Surface Water Management Plan includes a city-wide hydrologic and hydraulic model to guide city planning efforts for its storm sewer infrastructure. Truck storm sewer, regional ponds and lift stations were primarily sized, site and priced with information produced in the model. The model was developed in HydroCAD and calculated in accordance with SCS TR-20 methodology. The model has been used by developers to properly size development in terms of volume, rate and flow. That Plan includes 136 drainage areas (at the catchment level) including drainage area associated with each catchment, volumes, rates and flow paths. We have selected to not reference specific details regarding the volumes and rates in this updated Plan since the new Comprehensive Stormwater Management Plan and model will be updated to reflect Atlas 14 precipitation frequency curves.
5. The rules also require area and elevations for stormwater storage adequate to meet performance standards or official controls. The model should be updated to Atlas 14 rainfall event frequency curves and 2040 land use conditions. **Noted. The Comprehensive Stormwater Management Plan will have a model updated to Atlas 14 performance standards.**

6. Atlas 14 is referenced once in the Plan (Policy 2.5 for Goal 2): stormwater sewer design for the 10-year event. Atlas 14 should also be incorporated into the Goals and Policies (section 5) for calculating precipitation amounts and stormwater runoff rates beyond just storm water design and the 10-year event (for example, policies 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.7). **Noted. The Comprehensive Stormwater Management Plan and model update scheduled for 2019 is now reflected in Sections 1.2.4, 3.4.4, 5.1 (Goal 2), 6.21 and Tables 6-1 and 6-2, and references to Atlas 14 have been added to Policies 2.1, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 2.6 and Table 6.2.**

7. The Implementation Actions table (Table 6.2) needs to provide a schedule, estimated costs, and funding sources for each item. The items in the Implementation Actions table need to be prioritized as well. These items need to be provided in the Plan per Minnesota rules 8410.0160. **Noted. The Implementation Actions table now includes a schedule, estimated cost, funding source and priority. Further, the process by which the City prioritized action items within Table 6.2 are described in Section 6.1.**

8. The Plan is required to provide a section titled "Amendments to Plan", per Minnesota Rules 8410.0160, that establishes the process by which amendments may be made. **Noted. This was an oversight. A new Section 8.0 Plan Updates has been added to the Plan which includes an "Amendment to Plan" subsection.**

9. The roles of the City and the Elm Creek Watershed Management Commission are not clearly defined in the Plan with respect to carrying out the implementation actions plan including the implementation of WRAPS and TMDLs. These roles need to be clearly defined in the Plan. **Noted. Several Sections of the Plan have been reviewed, modified or expanded to clarify the roles including Sections 1.3.4, 2.25, 2.3, Table 4.1, Goal 1- Policies 1.5, 1.6, Goal 8- Policy 8.1, Section 5.2, 6.2.1, 6.2.3, 6.3.1, Table 6.2, Sections 7.1, 8.1, 8.2 and 8.3.**

**Next Steps**
I have attached an updated Dayton Local Water Management Plan that includes all the noted corrections, modifications and additions. If you find our comments and subsequent Plan updates satisfactory, we request that the Elm Creek Watershed Management Commission approves the Dayton Local Water Management Plan. Please keep me apprised of when you believe the matter could be added to the ECWMC agenda.

We anticipate bringing the Plan before the Dayton City Council after ECWMC has approved the Plan, tentatively scheduled for October 24, 2018.

If you have any questions, please call or email me at 952-837-3306 or tberry@wenck.com
October 1, 2018

Member Cities
Elm Creek Watershed Management Commission (via email)
Hennepin County Minnesota

Re: Elm Creek Watershed Management Commission
Livestock Management Policy

Dear Members:

At its September 13, 2018 regular meeting, the Elm Creek Watershed Management Commission approved a Livestock Management Policy. Development of a model ordinance to regulate the placement of new small nonfood animal operations was listed as a primary goal in the Commission’s Third Generation Watershed Management Plan’s Implementation Plan.

The Livestock Management Policy is attached, along with the Exhibits referenced in Item 5 of the policy. This document should be approved at your next City Council meeting and integrated into your city’s policies and ordinances.

Questions regarding the policy should be directed to Hennepin County Rural Conservationist, Kirsten Barta, (o) 612-543-3373 (c) 612-382-3956 (e) Kirsten.barta@hennepin.us.

Regards,

[Signature]

Judié A. Anderson
Administrator

JAA:tim
Attachments

Cc w/encls. via email: Commissioners
TAC Members
Staff

2:\Elm Creek\Livestock Management Policy\_conveying approved policy to cities.doc
1. The primary goal of this policy is to improve water quality by reducing phosphorus runoff from livestock-associated facilities.

2. This policy applies to new facilities or the expansion of existing facilities based on the City’s Conditional Use Permit (CUP) provisions for livestock.

3. Feedlots and manure storage areas are prohibited within the shireland of any lake, perennial stream, intermittent stream, or protected wetland without a CUP or in areas like ditches that drain directly to wetlands, lakes or streams.
   a. In the case of feedlots and manure storage areas for which a CUP is required, the CUP shall only be issued if a Nutrient and Management Plan (NMP) specific to that operation, and which has been prepared and implemented within the timeframe specified by the City, is in place.
   b. The NMP must meet the standards of the University of Minnesota Extension Service or the United States Department of Agriculture Natural Resources and Conservation Services (NRCS).

4. Definitions.
   a. Animal Density. Allowable animal density shall be based on the net area of the parcel that can be grazed in its entirety. This area excludes wetlands, woodland, farmsteads, feedlots, parking lots, and other areas where grazing cannot or should not occur.
   b. Animal Feedlot. A lot or building or combination of lots and buildings intended for the confined feeding, breeding, raising or holding of animals and specifically designed as a confinement area in which manure may accumulate, or where the concentration of animals is such that a vegetative cover cannot be maintained within the enclosure. Open lots used for the feeding and rearing of poultry (poultry ranges) shall be considered to be animal feedlots. Manure storage areas off the site of the feedlot are considered as feedlots.
   c. Animal Unit. The definition of “animal unit” shall be determined by the City. The City may also refer to Minnesota Rules part 7020.0300.
   d. Conditional use. Land use or development as defined by ordinance that would not be appropriate generally but may be allowed with appropriate restrictions as provided by official controls upon a finding that certain conditions as detailed in the zoning ordinance exist, the use or development conforms to the comprehensive land use plan of the community, and the use is compatible with the existing neighborhood.
   e. Manure storage facility. Any site or area specifically designed and/or constructed for the purpose of storage or holding of animal waste and manure. This includes any storage facility previously designed and installed meeting the NRCS Technical Guidelines current at the time of installation, any commercial-prefabricated storage facility, concrete slabs, earthen dugouts, dikes or any other area intended for the storage of animal manure, no matter how small that accumulation may be or how long the manure may be stored.
f. **Pasture.** Areas where grass or other growing plants are used for grazing and where the concentration of animals is such that a vegetative cover is maintained during the growing season except in the immediate vicinity of temporary supplemental feeding or watering devices. Those areas of supplemental feeding or watering devices within a pasture do not constitute a feedlot.

g. **Shoreland.** Land located within 1,000 feet from the ordinary high water level of a lake, pond, or flowage; 300 feet from a river or stream; or the landward extent of a floodplain designated by ordinance on a river or stream, whichever is greater.

5. **Exhibits.**

The following documents are attached and may be reviewed for content.

a. **Exhibit A.** 80.10 Manure Management Policy, City of Medina

b. **Exhibit B.** Manure Management-Related Ordinances, City of Medina.

c. **Exhibit C.** Ordinance 2016-02 Amending City Code Section 152.071(G) as it pertains to livestock and domestic farm animals, City of Greenfield.
EXHIBIT A

City of Medina Policy, Procedure and Program Manual

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.

80.10 Manure Management Policy
Approved July 1, 2008
Exhibit B

Manure Management-Related Ordinances – City of Medina

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.
EXHIBIT C

CITY OF GREENFIELD
ORDINANCE NO. 2016-02

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING CITY CODE SECTION 152.071 AS IT RELATES
TO PERFORMANCE STANDARDS FOR RESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS

The City Council of the City of Greenfield, Minnesota does ordain:

That Section 152.071(G) Livestock and domestic farm animals, be amended as follows:

(G) Livestock and domestic farm animals.

(1) Applicability. Provisions of the ordinance codified herein that apply to the owner
of animals apply equally to any person having the custody or possession of that animal.

(2) Definitions. For the purpose of this section, the following definitions shall apply
unless the context clearly indicates or requires a different meaning.

(a) ANIMAL UNIT. A unit of measure comparing the size of domestic farm animals
as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Animal</th>
<th>Animal Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One cow, llama, horse, ostrich or similar animal</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One hog, sheep, goat, alpaca or similar animal</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One domestic fowl or similar animal</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(b) DOMESTIC FARM ANIMAL/LIVESTOCK. Cattle, hogs, horses, bees, sheep,
goats, chickens and other animals and fowl commonly kept for food production.

(c) AT-LARGE. Off the premises of the owner or person responsible for the
livestock.

(3) General provisions. The following shall apply to §152.056 Agricultural Preserve
and §152.055 Rural Residential Zoning Districts:

(a) Where the principal use is a single-family dwelling, livestock at a maximum
density of 1 animal units per the first 1-1/2 acres of land and 1 additional animal unit per each
additional acre of land thereafter. Property owners shall be responsible for management and
proper disposal of animal waste. This shall include:
1. All regulations imposed by the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA) relating to the keeping of livestock or domestic farm animals shall be adhered to, and such regulations shall be considered the minimum safeguard necessary to prevent pollution of natural sensitive areas or the creation of a health hazard;

2. Land application of manure will need to be compliant with the Minn. Rules 7020.2225;

3. Keeping from wells and septic systems. Keeping animal waste storage or composting of areas a minimum of 75 feet away from wells and primary and secondary septic systems, and

3. Structures or buildings used to house animals shall meet all applicable setback requirements for accessory structures as stated in City Code Chapter 152.

4. Concrete manure containment areas or composting areas must be constructed, the design of which shall be consistent the recommendations of the University of Minnesota Extension Service, and setbacks in compliance with those stated for accessory structures in City Code Chapter 152.

(a) The site shall install runoff retention and vegetative infiltration systems, consistent with the recommendations of the University of Minnesota Extension Service, down slope from the manure containment area.

(b) Diligent effort shall be made to prevent the cribbing of trees in or near pastures, and efforts to maintain grass in the pastures by limiting use thereof as appropriate and by providing supplemental feed to prevent over grazing by instituting a pasture management program in accordance with the recommendation of the University of Minnesota Extension Service.

5. Violations.

a. Complaint process. Any resident who believes there is property located within the corporate limits of the city which had excessive odors or other nuisances related to manure in violation of this section, shall make a written complaint signed, dated and filed complaint with the City Administrator-Clerk or Minnesota Pollution Control Agency.

b. Notice of violations. The Mayor or his or her authorized designee shall make an inspection within 3 days of a complaint location to determine if a violation of this section has occurred. Written notification in the form of a destruction order shall be forwarded to the property owner. The written notice shall be sent by certified mail, return receipt requested. Within 10 days after the mailing of the notice, the property owner shall remove the manure. The city may cause the manure to be removed following the 10 day period.
c. Appeals. The property owner may appeal by filing written notice of objection with the City Administrator-Clerk within the 5 days of the notice. It is the property owner’s responsibility to demonstrate that the matter in question is not in violation of this section and should not be subject to destruction under this section.

d. Liability. Property owners shall be liable for all costs of removal of noxious manure. The city shall bill the property owner for employees hourly rate, equipment and supplies that may be used. The City Council shall assess the property owner any amount unpaid 90 days after the date of the invoice.

Passed by the City Council this 3rd day of May, 2016.

Mayor Brad Johnson

Attest: Bonnie Ritter, City Administrator-Clerk

Published in the official newspaper on 19th day of May, 2016. Effective the 20th day of May, 2016.
Hennepin County
Natural Resources Grants

Hennepin County offers grants to landowners for projects that preserve and restore the county’s natural resources. The goal of the program is to support projects that preserve and restore natural areas and reduce the amount of nutrients and sediment going into county’s lakes, streams and rivers while engaging residents in natural resource management issues.

This grant program has two options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Good Steward grant</th>
<th>Opportunity grant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primarily for smaller projects that improve water quality, enhance natural areas and promote environmental stewardship to the community.</td>
<td>Primarily to help partners take advantage of opportunities to implement larger projects that improve water quality or preserve, establish or restore natural areas.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Eligible recipients

| Landowners, including individuals, non-governmental organizations, local government agencies, non-profit organizations and businesses in Hennepin County. |

Guidelines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Good Steward grant</th>
<th>Opportunity grant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Ideal for smaller community-based or single applicant projects.</td>
<td>• Ideal for larger scale projects seeking to leverage multiple funding sources from more than one partner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Typical projects include constructing rain gardens, stabilizing stream banks, restoring native vegetation installing vegetated filter strips and other best management practices.</td>
<td>• Ideal for projects documented as priorities in the applicant’s management plans (e.g. comprehensive plan, watershed management plan).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Eligible expenses

| Environmental or engineering consulting fees, materials, supplies, labor and inspection fees. |

Application timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Good Steward grant</th>
<th>Opportunity grant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Apply once per year in the fall.</td>
<td>• Applications are accepted at any time; however, funds are limited and awarded on a first-come, first-serve basis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Successful applicants are determined through a competitive selection process.</td>
<td>• A pre-application meeting to discuss project details is highly recommended.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amount of funding available per grant

| Maximum of $25,000 per project. | Up to $100,000 per project. |
| Typical awards range from $5,000 to $15,000. | Typical projects range from $25,000 to $50,000. |

Matching funds

| Grant funding can cover up to 75% of total eligible project costs. | No match is required. |
| The landowner is responsible for contributing the remaining 25% of the project costs, which can be cash or in-kind. | Funds are often used for required match for other leveraged funds. |

Project timeline

| 12 to 24 months to complete project. | |
| All practices must be designed and maintained for at least 10 years. |

Reporting requirements

| Each project must enter into a formal project agreement with the county. | |
| Submit a project work plan with budget and design, operation and maintenance plans. | |
| Submit final report with invoices and project outcomes. |

Contact us today

Our staff is available to answer questions and offer resources to:
• Evaluate the natural resources on your property with Hennepin County’s natural resources interactive map
• Provide technical assistance on water quality and erosion control issues
• Help develop a suitable project
• Provide follow-up and ongoing assistance

For more information:
• Visit www.hennepin.us – search natural resources grants
• Contact Jim Kujawa at 612.348.7338 or James.Kujawa@hennepin.us
Watershed Based Funding Focus Group: Watershed Management Organization Meeting Summary

September 13, 2018 at Capitol Region Watershed District

Outcomes
• Prepare representatives for forum discussions.
• Promote discussion and group prioritizations.
• Increase buy-in and support.
• Have a transparent process.

Ground Rules
• Listen with an open mind
• Ask questions
• Take care of you
• Step forward, step back
• Look forward & make change

Agenda

Welcome
• Introductions
• Today’s Overview
• Roles & Ground Rules

Background
• Pilot Process
• Feedback/Survey Results
• Process Details

Breakouts

Representative Selection
Next steps/Closing Remarks

Plus/Delta
Roles & Responsibilities

**Meeting Facilitators:** Jen Kostrzewski, Emily Resseger, Sara Smith, Lanya Ross, Judy Sventek

**BWSR Representatives:** Kevin Bigalke, Marcey Westrick

**Attendees:** Joe Barten, Ashley Gallagher, Todd Haas, Diane Spector, Mark Zabel, Bryan Gruidl, Amy Juntunen, Paul Moline, Karen Chandler, Doug Snyder, Stephanie McNamara

**Forum Representatives:** Mark Zabel (Vermillion River Watershed JPO), Laura Jester (Bassett Creek WMC), 1st Alternate = Doug Snyder (Mississippi WMO), 2nd Alternate=Paul Moline (Carver WMO)

**Background**

BWSR is gathering input about the Watershed Based Funding (WBF) Program for the Twin Cities metropolitan area.

An electronic survey was sent out to 279 entities from the metro area, and survey responses were then used to shape the design of four stakeholder workshops:

1. Cities & Townships
2. Watershed Districts
3. Watershed Management Organizations
4. Counties & SWCDs

Each workshop provides stakeholders an opportunity to provide deeper input into how they would propose BWSR move forward with the WBF Program.

Following the four stakeholder workshops, a forum will be held to bring together representatives of from all stakeholder groups.

**Meeting Summary**

The participants were engaged throughout the meeting, and in general, the conversation was lively and thoughtful. Representatives from 15 of the 19 watershed management organizations attended.

After the introductions and overview, Kevin Bigalke explained how the WBF Pilot Program worked in the 7 counties and provided some feedback from the pilot.

**Table 1: Watershed Based Funding Pilot Program Funding Allocation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Allocation</th>
<th>Total Dollar Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anoka</td>
<td>$125,000 for stormwater education Remaining funds allocated by formula based on:</td>
<td>$826,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Land area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Water resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carver</td>
<td>All funds allocated by formula based on:</td>
<td>$749,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Land area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Funding Allocation Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Allocation</th>
<th>Total Dollar Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dakota</td>
<td>$100,000 for Dakota SWCD&lt;br&gt;$50,000 as base funding for each WD/WMO&lt;br&gt;$618,000 allocated by formula based on:&lt;br&gt;  - Land area&lt;br&gt;  - Property value</td>
<td>$1,018,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hennepin</td>
<td>$102,240 for chloride education&lt;br&gt;Remaining funds allocated by formula based on:&lt;br&gt;  - Land area&lt;br&gt;  - Tax capacity</td>
<td>$1,018,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramsey</td>
<td>$44,200 for Ramsey County (formerly RCD)&lt;br&gt;Remaining funds allocated by formula based on land area</td>
<td>$442,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>$100,000 for county-wide collaborative projects&lt;br&gt;$75,000 as base funding for each WD/WMO&lt;br&gt;$349,200 allocated by formula based on:&lt;br&gt;  - Land area&lt;br&gt;  - Assessed value</td>
<td>$749,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Equal allocation for each of the 10 entities</td>
<td>$787,600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kevin also shared results of a survey that was sent to 279 entities from the metro area. There were 39 responses. The top comments from the survey touched on:

- BWSR Flexibility vs Funding Requirements
- Not enough time
- Not enough money
- Eligibility of certain projects and organizations
- Allocation of funds

These comments helped BWSR and Metropolitan Council to shape the focus group breakout questions for the day.

Lastly, Kevin shared information about the current engagement process. It is being independently facilitated by the Metropolitan Council to assist BWSR with gathering input about the Watershed Based Funding Pilot. The survey was the first round of engagement. The next round is a series of focus groups. There will be four focus groups for each stakeholder category:

1. Cities & Townships
2. Watershed Districts
3. Watershed Management Organizations (this meeting)
4. Counties & SWCDs

Each focus group is being run in a consistent manner to provide the stakeholders an opportunity to provide deeper input into how they would propose going forward with the WBF Program.
the end of the focus group, the attendees will have the opportunity to select 2 representatives and 1 alternate to attend the stakeholder forums.

The forums will be in mid to late October and they will provide the space for discussion between the stakeholder representatives to come to some consensus about Program recommendation(s) by the end of 2018. These recommendation(s) will be used in combination with input from the Local Government Water Roundtable, BWSR staff teams, the Metro Forum, pilot areas, and other stakeholder feedback/guidance to be evaluated by BWSR committees. Eventually, the recommendation(s) will be put before the BWSR Board in 2019.

Breakout Sessions
Attendees were split into two different breakout groups that addressed the same three questions:

1. At what scale should decision-making occur (metro-wide, major watershed, county, WD/WMO, Other)?
2. How should funds be allocated (Competitive, Equal Distribution, Proportional/Formula, Project Prioritized, Other)?
3. In an ideal world, which LGUs/organizations or projects should be eligible for this funding?

For the first two questions, participants were asked to identify at least one benefit (Pro) and one drawback (Con) for each option. The last question was included to identify the participants’ thoughts about the range and breadth of the program.
### Question 1: At what scale should decision-making occur?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Pros</th>
<th>Cons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Metro-Wide  | - Collaboration with other organizations  
- More consistency metro wide- same rules throughout  
- Large pool of projects, comprehensive list for the metro area  
- Commonality of messaging  
- Matches boundary of state laws/metro planning act  
- Opportunity to focus on something metro-wide: big projects  
- More funding for individual projects  
- Less time on the process  
- Open to all LGUs  
- Metro area have similar issues |
|             |                                                                                                                                                                                                  | - All players not on equal playing field  
- Potential to become competitive grants  
- Take more time  
- Smaller individual project funding  
- Bigger areas are positioned better  
- Lack of knowledge  
- Variance in priorities of organizations  
- Different parts of the metro are at different stages of development  
- Difficult to coordinate/reach consensus  
- Too big  
- Urban vs. rural have different project costs  
- There will always be a loser |
| Major Watershed | - Can fund the most effective BMPs, regardless of location  
- Focus on watershed goals  
- Large scale resources (including receiving waters) would be the focus  
- Best outcomes for the watershed needs  
- Absorb more than individual organizations  
- The LG round table set the 81 major watershed as the max scale (#orgs and area)  
- PCA is used to working at this scale already  
- Addresses true intent of the program  
- Matches greater MN  
- Mississippi connection could have large (geographic) benefit  
- Ability to have conversations at larger scale while still meeting local issues. |
|             |                                                                                                                                                                                                  | - Too large: won’t reach all areas  
- Projects further away from major resource will be lower program priorities  
- Doesn’t match other scales for planning (lack of land use/resources)  
- Doesn’t match w/water supply  
- Coordination at this size is hard and we’re not used to working at this scale  
- Doesn’t address individual impaired waters  
- Some majors are arbitrary  
- River focus vs. lakes and wetlands  
- Create a new level of government  
- Outstate issues: organizations on the fringe will need to work with the metro and non-metro process |
| County      | - Known boundaries by all  
- Manageable size for decision-making  
- Easier to collaborate between a smaller group  
- Recognized differences across the metro (E-W, N-S)  
- Feasible planning level  
- Follows state funding model for other fields (like transportation)  
- Match SWCD  
- GW planning is at county scale  
- Includes many players |
|             |                                                                                                                                                                                                  | - Doesn’t match the scale of issues  
- Takes more time to collaborate/prioritize  
- Doesn’t match watershed management- artificial resource boundaries  
- Doesn’t match with TMDL programs  
- Creates additional planning process when watersheds cross county boundaries  
- Chops funding into odd pieces (one watershed grants from 2 counties)  
- Brings politics into decisions |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Watershed Districts/ Watershed Management Organizations</th>
<th></th>
<th>Watershed Districts/ Watershed Management Organizations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Better match for existing regulatory/planning structure √</td>
<td>• State already requires decision-making at this level (8410)</td>
<td>• Doesn’t match greater Minnesota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• State already requires decision-making at this level (8410)</td>
<td>• Relationships already exist √</td>
<td>• Gets away from the true intent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Not competing against other WMOs</td>
<td>• Everyone gets guaranteed funding</td>
<td>• Pots of money would be too small and given out too often to be effective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Everyone gets guaranteed funding</td>
<td>• Direct correction to existing plans - no new plans</td>
<td>• Penalize underfunded/under-organized WMOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will take a short time to distribute funds</td>
<td>• Know what you are getting</td>
<td>• Lack of staff to coordinate some WMOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Decision-making at scale with most knowledge of water issues</td>
<td>• Equitable across metro (big/small budget both have autonomy)</td>
<td>• Small watersheds would probably get less money</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Equitable across metro (big/small budget both have autonomy)</td>
<td>• Longevity has led to comfort from politicians</td>
<td>• Some WMOs don’t have capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Longevity has led to comfort from politicians</td>
<td>• Already have specific priorities</td>
<td>• Too many</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Already have specific priorities</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Doesn’t encourage collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A blend of these</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Lose large scale projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Even smaller scale</td>
<td>• Good collaboration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Equitable distribution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Very specific priorities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Lose collaboration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 2: How should funds be allocated?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Allocation</th>
<th>Pros</th>
<th>Cons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Competitive</td>
<td>• Best projects (in concept) √</td>
<td>• Must be skilled at grant writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Equal opportunity</td>
<td>• Metrics dictating allocation may not be appropriate for all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Saves times because processes already exists</td>
<td>• Not predictable- can’t count on funding during planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Reporting to Legislature is easier (leading to more $$)</td>
<td>• Bigger players tend to win</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Allows larger projects</td>
<td>• Not matching prioritized need</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Incentivizes planning</td>
<td>• Not watershed focused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Stimulates collaborations</td>
<td>• Tend to fund comfortable- not innovative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• More through pre-project process (already needs feasibility study)</td>
<td>• Takes effort to continually compete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• More successful projects</td>
<td>• Lots of effort that may be for nothing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• More creativity</td>
<td>• Organizations may never get funded if they need projects that are</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• not competitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Projects that are most likely to be built may not be funded if they</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• are less cost effective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Inherently biased</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Murky process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Biases towards certain projects (TP/TSS, not habitat)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Organizations have different priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Always have $$ ceilings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal Distribution</td>
<td>• Simple- know what you get √</td>
<td>• Isn’t equitable- doesn’t reflect differences such as size or resource√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Everyone gets some and the same $ amount</td>
<td>• Small $ amount limits what can be done and may not get enough to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Predictable</td>
<td>• do large projects √</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Smaller and less organized organizations are incentivized to plan</td>
<td>• Assumes existing boundaries are the right boundaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Allows advanced planning</td>
<td>• Doesn’t take existing priority projects into account √</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportional/Formulaic</td>
<td>• Feels fair √</td>
<td>• Depends on a formula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Predictable</td>
<td>• Too small amount too frequently</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Opportunity for greater equity</td>
<td>• Doesn’t account for local priorities √</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Easy</td>
<td>• Too small-doesn’t allow for larger projects √</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Directs funding where needed</td>
<td>• Rural vs. urban- will allocation be focused on urban when rural has</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Can be based on resource, land area, property boundary, etc.</td>
<td>• different issues?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Doesn’t promote collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• More equitable but smaller organizations will still probably get less</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• How is equity defined?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Project Prioritization | • Encourages collaboration  
• Aligns priorities and allows highest priority projects to be addressed  
• Allows organizations to think bigger  
• Organizations can combine funds  
• Can be resource based  
• Forces planning  
• Less parochial  
• Organizations can get appropriate funding when they need it  
• Meets the intent of Watershed Based funding policy  
• Pushes decisions to locals  
• Can develop metrics for work in a local area | • Scale matters- collaboration if scale is too big  
• Difficult to coordinate diverse stakeholders  
• Can be exclusive depending on criteria  
• Can still introduce bias  
• Could become competitive and then would have those same concerns  
• Rewards the squeaky wheel  
• Time-consuming to develop prioritized plan  
• Don’t always know if $ will still exist  
• Differing definition of priority  
• How do you set comparable metrics |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Blend</td>
<td>• Proportional to a certain scale, then collaborative at a smaller scale</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 3: In an ideal world, which LGUs/organizations or projects should be eligible for this funding?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eligible</th>
<th>Not Eligible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>LGUs/Organizations</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Watersheds ✓</td>
<td>• Hennepin GW should not be eligible because it has no adopted plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Cities-but so many this process may be difficult o Tied to their plans or watershed plans?</td>
<td>• State agencies shouldn’t be directly eligible for funding (but can receive funds through partnership with eligible org)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Anyone with an approved plan (including county-gw)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Pilot eligibly was good- 103B, but also include SWCDs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Any organization should be able to work through an eligible organization (for non-103B orgs), but not receive watershed based funding directly ✓ o Transparent o Consistent o Hard to pass through funding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Depends on allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Projects/Programs</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• In a watershed plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Base funding for core watershed services o Monitoring/equipment ✓ o Research ✓ o Feasibility studies o Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Maintenance o Will make projects work better o Cities can’t/aren’t enforcing maintenance agreements o Fund maintenance when added to a project, but not maintenance programs</td>
<td>• MS4 requirements o Disincentives local ownership/responsibility o Political issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Quantity and quality projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Opportunities for creativity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other comments:**

- Uncertainty of program funding continuing.
- Scale depends on allocation.
- Formulaic could be on a rotation. You’d know when you will get the money, but everyone organization doesn’t receive funds in the same year.
  - Divide WMO/WD into subgroups. Each subgroup gets money for a year. Then rotate
- Dollar overall for the metro may be too small- retrofits are more expensive. Metro has to focus on retrofit.
- Should have the ability to bank funds over several year.
- A local competitive process is really prioritization.
- Criteria are bias: What plans? Adopted? By whom?
- Scale matters!
- Eligibility criteria matter!
- What is the impact of ceilings on funding?
Priority Voting

After the report back from the breakout sessions the group was asked to participate in ranked-choice voting to select their 1st, 2nd, and 3rd choices in both scale and allocation. This was done with private ballots.

Results

Scale

1: Watershed district/Watershed management organization
2: County
3: Major watershed

Funding

1: Proportional/formulaic
2: Project prioritization
3: A blend: Proportional to a certain scale, then collaborative at a smaller scale

Meeting Take Away

The watershed management organization participants actively participated in all discussions in a thoughtful way. Generally, there was a consensus that watershed organizations might be the better scale to make the WBF decision-making, and if not at that scale, the county or major watershed would be the best scale. The allocation preference favored Proportional/Formulaic with Project Prioritization List behind it. There was also support for a blend of both Proportional/formulaic and Project prioritization, depending on the scale of decision making. Participants were clear that watershed district/watershed management organizations should be eligible for funding, as well as other 103B entities with plans, like counties. There was not clear consensus on whether cities should be directly eligible. Participants believe funds should cover more than just projects and that core watershed activities like monitoring, research, and feasibility studies should be eligible, but permit required activities like MS4 work and maintenance should probably not.

During the plus/delta the group appreciated the organization of the event, including good facilitation and opportunities for discussion, but would have preferred more time.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization Represented</th>
<th>Email Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joe Barten</td>
<td>Lower Mississippi River WMO</td>
<td><a href="mailto:joe.barten@co.dakota.mn.us">joe.barten@co.dakota.mn.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashley Gallagher</td>
<td>Eagan-Inver Grove Heights &amp; North Cannon River WMOs</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ashley.gallagher@co.dakota.mn.us">ashley.gallagher@co.dakota.mn.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todd Haas</td>
<td>Lower Rum River WMO</td>
<td><a href="mailto:t.haas@andovermn.gov">t.haas@andovermn.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diane Spector</td>
<td>Single Creek &amp; West Mississippi WMOs</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dspector@wenck.com">dspector@wenck.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Zabel</td>
<td>Vermillion River Watershed JPO</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mark.zabel@co.dakota.mn.us">mark.zabel@co.dakota.mn.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryan Gruidl</td>
<td>Richfield-Bloomington WMO</td>
<td><a href="mailto:bgruidl@bloomingtonMN.gov">bgruidl@bloomingtonMN.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Juntunen</td>
<td>Elm Creek &amp; Pioneer-Sarah Creek WMCs</td>
<td><a href="mailto:amy@jass.biz">amy@jass.biz</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Moline</td>
<td>Carver County WMO</td>
<td><a href="mailto:pmoline@co.carver.mn.us">pmoline@co.carver.mn.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Chandler</td>
<td>Bassett Creek WMC &amp; Black Dog WMO</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kchandler@barr.com">kchandler@barr.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doug Snyder</td>
<td>Mississippi WMO</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dsnyder@mwmo.org">dsnyder@mwmo.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie McNamara</td>
<td>Vadnais Lakes Area WMO</td>
<td><a href="mailto:stephanie.o.mcnamara@vlawmo.org">stephanie.o.mcnamara@vlawmo.org</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sundance Greens

DAYTON, PROJECT #2018-005

**Project Overview:** This site consists of 7 parcels that total 310 acres. Approximately ½ is the Sundance Golf Course and the other ½ agricultural land. The applicant is proposing a long term phased residential development with 665 residential units while maintaining a portion (9 of the 18 holes) of the golf course. Total new impervious area will be 71 acres. The Commission will review this site for Stormwater Management (Rule D), Erosion and Sediment Control (Rule E), Floodplain Alteration (Rule F), and Buffer Strips (Rule I).

**Applicant:** Sundance Development, LLC, Attn. Mr. Tom Dehn, 11261 Fernbrook Lane N., Maple Grove, MN 55369. Phone: 612-328-2215. Email: tom.dehn@powerlodge.com.

**Agent/Engineer:** Campion Engineering Services, Inc., Attn. Marty Campion, 1800 Pioneer Creek Center, Maple Plain, MN 55359. Phone: 763-479-5172. Email: mcampion@campioneng.com

**Exhibits:**
1) ECWMC Request for Project Review and Approval, received February 2, 2018.
2) Request from Agent/Engineer for project extensions to October 10, 2018.
3) Project review fees for a low density (<40% impervious area) new development with floodplain impacts ≥ 100 cubic yard. $6550.
4) Preliminary Street and Storm Sewer Plan Sheets 18 to 21 of 45 received July 31, 2018.
5) Preliminary Grading Plan Sheets 23 to 27 of 45 received July 31, 2018.
6) Wetland Buffer and Impact Plan Sheets 33 to 37 of 45 received July 31, 2018.
7) Details Sheets 44 and Outlet Control Structure Details sheet 45 of 45, received July 31, 2018.
8) Preliminary Plans for; Sundance Greens by Campion Engineering, dated January 5, 2018, no signature. (1-11x17 set and 1-electronic submittal)
   a) Sheet 1 of 45, Cover Sheet
   b) Sheets 2-6 of 45, Existing Conditions.
   c) Sheet 7 of 45, Phasing Exhibit,
   d) Sheets 8-12 of 45, Preliminary Plat
   e) Sheets 13-17 of 45, Preliminary Sanitary Sewer & Watermain Plan
   f) Sheets 18-22 of 45, Preliminary Street and Storm Sewer Plan
   g) Sheets 23-27 of 45, Preliminary Grading Plan (updated July 31, 2018)
   h) Sheets 28-32 of 45, Preliminary Storm Water Pollution Plan
   i) Sheets 33-37 of 45, Preliminary Wetland Impact & Buffer Exhibit (updated July 31, 2018),
Findings:

1) A complete application was received February 2, 2018. The decision deadline per MN Statute 15.99 has been extended by the Agent/Engineer to December 9, 2018.

2) The complete site consists of 310 acres. The Sundance Golf Course is approximately 160 acres of the site with the remaining areas being agriculture fields (~122 acres) with approximately 20 acres of woods and small areas of farmsteads and wetlands. Rush Creek Parkway was constructed through the SE parcel in 2014 for access to the Sundance Woods Development (EC #2013-025).

3) The developer proposes to reconfigure the golf course from an 18-hole to a 9-hole course (approximately 80 acres of the site). The remaining areas will be phased in over several years, creating 472 single family lots, 92 multiple family homes and a senior housing facility (665 total residential units).

4) This review will cover the overall stormwater management, wetland buffer, floodplains and grading plans. Only the Sundance Greens East and West (phase I grading) erosion and sediment control plans are being reviewed at this time for the Commission’s requirements for erosion control (Rule E). Future phasing of the grading plans must be submitted separately for the Commission’s review for Rule E and consistency with other approvals from the ECWMC.
Floodplain
5) There is a large zone A (no base flood elevation determined) floodplain complex that extends through this site. Technical Memo dated September 12, 2016 from Civil Methods Inc. models the 100 year floodplain in this area at an elevation of 907.9.
6) This memo and supporting documentation should be submitted to the MNDNR and FEMA for a letter of map amendment.
7) Using 907.9 as the 100 year elevation throughout this site floodplain impacts will occur at the following locations;
   a) The west edge of block 9,
   b) The access road (Street 2) to and portions of Block 7
   c) The west portion of Block 1. Updated floodplain exhibit dated 9/27/18 provides for 887 cy of fill vs 1019 cy cut in the floodplain for this area mitigation.

Stormwater Management Plan
8) The project proposes to manage storm water through the use of 10 NURP and pre-treatment ponds, 5 biofiltration basins and one infiltration pond. Phase I grading will have 2 biofiltration basins, one infiltration and two pre-treatment/NURP ponds.
9) There are three main discharge points from this development.
   a) This flows to the southwest through a wetland/floodplain complex before it discharges into Rush Creek approximately ½ mile away.
   b) This flows to the south where it discharges in two areas from this property traveling about 500’ before entering Rush Creek. *Note: Subcatchement 11 is more critical for runoff and volume controls because of its proximity to the creek and the lack of any restriction of flow like wetlands prior to this water getting to the creek.
   c) This runs to the east/northeast ¾ of a mile where it discharges into Powers Lake which flows into the floodplain/wetland complex and meanders ½ of a mile before it hits Elm Creek.
10) Pre and post-development flow rates for the 2, 10 and 100 year storm events are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2-Year (2.9”) Runoff Rate (cfs)</th>
<th>10-Year (4.3”) Runoff Rate (cfs)</th>
<th>100-year (7.3”) Runoff Rate (cfs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-Dev</td>
<td>Post-Dev</td>
<td>Pre-Dev</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#1-Southwest</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>69.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2- South</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Subcatchement/pond 11</em></td>
<td>9.85</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>24.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3-East/Northeast</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>49.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11) Total treatment volume requirements for 70.9 acres of new impervious areas = 283,104 cubic feet prior to any volume credit. With volume credits (disconnected flows) 269,872 (6.195 acre feet) cubic feet of abstraction is required for this site.
   a) The golf course parking area in subcatchement 3b will have channelized flows coming off of the north end of it. This area cannot be claimed as disconnected.
   b) Total abstraction, with available disconnection credits on this site will be 282,346. Actual filtration volume will be 238,628 cubic feet on 5 biofiltration ponds and an
additional 43,718 cubic feet of water will be abstracted in the infiltration pond. 
(required abstraction = 269,872 cubic feet)
c) All biofiltration ponds will draw down within 48 hours or less.
d) For infiltration basin 11, exfiltration will have to be modeled per MPCA 
guidelines based on the soils in place. We recommend percolation tests or similar 
analysis for determining exfiltration potentials. NOTE; because this area is on a 
fill slope, a pond liner on the south side of the basins is highly recommended.
e) Pond 11 outlet control structure shows drain tile in the structure. No drain tile is 
shown on the site or storm sewer plans.
f) Infiltration pond 11 does not show pre-treatment of the storm sewer run that ends 
at FES 25.
g) The landscaping plans do not show seeding for the biofiltration basins themselves, 
just the slopes leading into the biofiltration basins.
h) To properly establish native vegetation, a long term maintenance plan is essential. 
We highly recommend a 3 to 5 year vegetation maintenance plan on all of the 
native vegetation planting areas.
i) If the City of Dayton does not accept the responsibility for operating and 
maintaining the storm sewer system on site, all stormwater facilities must have 
Operation and Maintenance plans and agreements meeting the City and 
Commission’s requirements recorded on the property title to this project.
12) Based on P8, pre and post development phosphorus and TSS loads meet the Commission 
standards.
   a) TP before development = 200.9 lbs/year
   b) TP after development = 75.9 lbs/year
   c) TSS before development = 200,491 lbs/year
   d) TSS after development = 8,285 lbs/year.
13) Pre-treatment is needed on basins 11P (where FES 25 pipe run dumps into the filter basin) 
and 12P (drainage area and heavy use requires more than just one sump MH. We 
recommend sump MH’s on CBs 79, 80, 81 and sump MH with SAFL Baffle on MH 82)
14) A good opportunity exists to enhance wetland 5 for a more aesthetic pleasing wetland basin 
for the future residents.
Erosion and Sediment Controls
15) Final grading plans for Phase I (Sundance Greens East and West) were submitted on 
September 13, 2018, with updated plans for Sundance West submitted on September 27, 
2018.
   a) Sundance East
      i. The majority of the drains to the south central section of this parcel 
      (permanent basins #11). The SWPPP plan must provide a specific 
      sequencing plan for this area and show how erosion and sediment will be 
      controlled at that discharge point.
         1. A detail of the temporary sediment basin must be provided
         2. Interim drainage from this site into this temporary sediment basin 
            must be planned for and provided on the SWPPP.
         3. Temporary outlet control pipes must be provided until the storm 
            sewer is installed. This must be shown in the SWPPP.
         4. Protection of the infiltration basin must be outlined on the sequencing 
            plan for the temporary/permanent stormwater basins.
5. All infiltration and filtration ponds must be kept off line until vegetation is established on site. This must be addressed in the SWPPP.
   ii. The same items will be necessary for the drainage going towards permanent basin 12.
   iii. Please address how the water and storm sewer at the southerly terminus of street 12 at Block 9 will be handled.

b) Sundance West.
   i. Grading and erosion control plans for Sundance West meet the Commission Standards. Administrative approval of the grading is granted by the ECWMC staff with the understanding the applicant and agent accept responsibility for any changes necessary for final site approval by the ECWMC.

Wetland Buffers
16) Wetland buffer monumentation must be placed per the Commission’s standard of;
   a) A maximum spacing of 200 feet
   b) As necessary to accurately define the edge of the buffer strip and
   c) At each parcel line where it crosses a buffer strip.

17) Some wetland buffers are shown at less than 25’ (as examples, see wetlands 4, 6 and 7 at greens 3, 4, 5 and 7 and tee 6). Commission rules allow a minimum of 10’ wide buffer with an average of 25’ buffer strip. Please show where the average is made up in these areas.

18) 25’ buffers encroach into many back and side yard areas on this site. Many of these areas can utilize the 10’ minimum width/25’ average to provide better usable spaces in back yard areas (as examples wetlands 8, 9, 10, 13, 15 and 21-all of these wetlands have areas that can minimize buffer in yard areas by placing additional buffer square footage outside of back yard areas).

19) Wetland Buffer plans for Sundance West as submitted on September 27, 2018, meet the Commission Standards.

**Recommendation:** No recommendation provided to the ECWMC at this time.
Grading and erosion control plans for Sundance West meet the Commission Standards and are administratively approved by ECWMC staff with the understanding the applicant and agent accept responsibility for any changes necessary for final site approval by the ECWMC.
No other approvals are recommended on the rest of the site at this time. Additional information necessary for future approvals will be;
   • Final erosion control plans for each phase as they develop,
   • Stormwater management requirements per item#11,
   • Wetland buffers plans must meet the Commission’s requirements.
   • Overall floodplain mitigation plans must meet the Commission’s requirements.

Hennepin County
Department of Environment and Energy
Advisor to the Commission

[Signature]

October 3, 2018
Date
Encore 1st Addition Wetland Replacement Plan
Corcoran, Project #2018-32W

Project Overview: This is a 398 lot residential subdivision proposed on 226 acres. Plans were received for the first addition of the project on July 13, 2018. The 1st Addition is approximately 53 acres in size that includes 78 homes and their associated infrastructure. This review will limit its discussion to the wetland replacement plan submitted as part of the 1st Addition. The overall PUD site plan will be reviewed in a separate findings report. The replacement plan requested review and approval for filling 0.4263 acres (18,570 sq. ft.) of wetlands in four separate wetland locations. In addition, a no-loss determination is requested for temporary impacts for utility line installation and for excavation of a 4.95 acre irrigation pond in a type I/II wetland basin.

Applicant: Pulte Group, Attention Paul Heuer, 7500 Flying Cloud Drive, Suite 670, Eden Prairie, MN 55344. Phone: 952-229-0722. Email; paul.heuer@pultegroup.com

Agent: Kjolhaug Environmental Services, Attention Melissa Barrett. 2500 Shadywood Drive, Suite 130, Orono, MN 55331. Phone; 952-401-8757. Email; melissa@kjolhaugenv.com

Exhibits:
1) ECWMC Request for Plan Review and Approval and associated fees received July 12, 2018.
2) Encore 1st Addition Wetland Permit Application by Kjolhaug Environmental Services, dated July 19, 2018, including;
   a. Joint Application for Activities Affecting Water Resources in MN
   b. WCA Notice of approval on the wetland delineation
   c. Approved Jurisdictional Determination (ACOE)
   d. MnRAM Output Results
   e. Grading Plan
   f. City of Corcoran Staging Map
   g. Wetland Banking purchase agreement documents.
3) ECWMC Wetland Conservation Act Notice of Application for a wetland replacement plan, sequencing and no-loss determination, dated July 24, 2018
   a. WCA Notice of Application extension dated September 13, 2018.
4) Sathre-Bergquist Memo dated August 20, 2018, Regarding Bellwether 1st Wetland 7 Proposed Irrigation Pond.
5) ECWMC project 2017-047W, Newman Property Wetland Delineation project file
6) August 23, 2018 Technical Evaluation Panel findings report
7) Encore Irrigation Pond Stormwater Reuse Analysis by Advanced Engineering and Environmental Services, dated August 29, 2018.
   a. Updated memo dated September 17, 2018
   b. Email from AE2S dated September 20, 2018

Findings:
1) A complete application was received on July 19, 2018. The initial 60-day decision period was extended to October 17, 2018 by the ECWMC.
2) The wetland boundaries and types were approved and noticed by the ECWMC, per WCA requirements, under project 2017-047W on December 28, 2018.
3) The applicant is requesting the ECWMC approve their:
   a. Sequencing analysis
   b. Replacement plan
   c. No-Loss Determination.
4) The applicant is also requesting a no-loss determination for excavation in a type I/II wetland which they would like to use the water from the excavated pond for irrigating 57 acres of homeowner’s association property.
5) On August 23, 2018 a technical evaluation (TEP) panel was held to discuss the sequencing analysis, replacement plan and no-loss application submitted by Kjolhaug Environmental dated July 19, 2018. The following findings were determined by the TEP at this meeting and subsequent follow-up meetings and discussions.

Sequencing Plan.
1) MN WCA Rule 8420.0325 pertains to sequencing plans. It states;
   a. An applicant must provide written documentation of the project’s compliance with the sequencing standards in part 8420.0520, including project purpose and a detailed description of the project and alternative considered.
2) The technical evaluation (TEP) panel felt the project purpose, goals, avoidance alternatives, minimization, impact rectification and replacement meets the rules and intent of the WCA sequencing rules based on the following items.
   a. Feasible and prudent alternative project designs were evaluated to avoid and/or minimize wetland impacts to the extent possible.
   b. Based on safety considerations for the access road and other considerations, the TEP believed the proposed impacts on the four separate basins meet the intent of the WCA rules. Total permanent impacts will be;
      i. 560 sq. ft. in wetland 7 for excavation of a type 3 cattail marsh in the proposed pond excavation area.
      ii. 2,793 sq. ft. in wetland 11 because of hydrology impacts that couldn’t be avoided based on the development layout and design that would leave it isolated and of minimal value.
      iii. 13,700 sq. ft. for impacts to wetland 14 because of roadway access requirements and safety consideration.
      iv. 1,517 sq. ft. of impacts to wetland 15 because of a berm construction and setback requirements for the commercial area it is located in.
Encore 1st Addition Wetland Replacement Plan
2018-032W, Corcoran
October 3, 2018

hydrology would also be impacted by the site layout/development and leave this wetland isolated and of minimal value.

c. See no-loss discussion below for pond excavation, irrigation and temporary impacts from utility work.

Replacement Plan

1) MN WCA Rules 8420.0500 to 8420.0544 pertain to replacement plans. They state;
   a. No person may impact a wetland without having a wetland replacement plan approved by the local government unit.
   b. Wetland replacement must replace the public value of wetlands lost as a result of an impact.
   c. The minimum replacement ratio must be 2:1 for wetland banking replacement within the same major watershed.

2) The applicant proposes to replace his 18,570 sq. ft. of wetland impacts by purchasing 18,570 sq. ft. of banked wetland from account 1427 in Anoka County and 18,570 sq. ft. of banked wetland from account 1518 in Hennepin County (Dayton).
   a. Wetland impacts and replacement banking accounts are in BWSR major watershed 20 (Metro Mississippi Watershed).
   b. 1:1 ratio of the replacement will occur in Hennepin County in the Elm Creek Watershed (Dayton)

3) The TEP agreed that the replacement plan meets the rules and intent of the WCA replacement plan requirements.

No-Loss Determination-Storm Sewer and Sanitary Sewer construction impacts

1) WCA rules pertaining to this work are;
   a. MN WCA Rule 8420.0410 states; No-loss means no permanent loss of, or impacts to, wetlands that qualify for a no-loss. Temporary impact that is rectified by repairing, rehabilitating, or restoring the affected wetland. No-loss under this item only applies if all of the following conditions are met; (1) the physical characteristics of the affected wetland, including ground elevations, contours, inlet dimensions, outlet dimensions, substrate, plant communities, and hydrologic regime, are restored to preproject conditions sufficient to ensure that all preproject functions are restored; (2) the activity is completed and the physical characteristics of the wetland are restored within six months of the start of the activity, (3) the landowner provides sufficient financial assurance acceptable to the LGU and (4) a no-loss has not been approved under this item for a particular site within a wetland with the previous ten year.

2) The applicant is requesting a no-loss determination on 10,316 sq. ft. of wetlands for temporary impacts required for a sanitary sewer line and stormwater pipe installation.

3) The TEP and ECWMC staff believe the site plans and subsequent site details submitted by the applicant meet the conditions of MN Rule 8420.0410
   a. The applicant has provided a wetland replacement escrow of $45,000 to the ECWMC that can be used as a financial assurance for the no-loss determination.
   b. Temporary impacts will be restored to pre-existing conditions.
No-Loss Determination, Excavation in wetland 7 and irrigation water use on 57 acres from wetland 7.

1) The applicant is requesting to excavate 216,011 sq. ft. (4.96 acres) from wetland 7 for aesthetic purposes and irrigation water use.

   a. To help supplement water in the pond during dry periods a private well will be constructed to augment the water in the wetland.

2) WCA rules pertaining to the excavation work;

   a. MN WCA rule 8420-0105 Scope: *Wetlands must not be impacted unless replaced by restoring or creating wetland areas of at least equal public value.* This chapter regulates the draining or filling of wetlands, wholly or partially, and excavation in the permanently and semi-permanently flood areas of type 3, 4, or 5 wetlands and in all wetlands types if the excavation results in filling, draining, or conversion to non-wetland.

      i. Excavation in wetland basin 7 is a type I/II wet meadow basin that does not fall within the scope of the wetland conservation act.

      ii. 560 sq. ft. of a type III wetland in the excavation work does fall within the scope of the WCA as an impact and is taken into account in the replacement plan findings above.

3) WCA issues pertaining to irrigation water use from the excavated pond;

   a. The TEP held extensive discussions on this part of the proposed site plans. The TEP believes irrigation is in effect, a drainage issue on wetland #7 if it is not planned and managed properly. At their August 23, 2018 technical evaluation panel meeting the TEP recognized that wetland 7’s hydrology and saturation periods will be effected by the following;

      i. the increase in the amount of water entering this basin because of the changes in land use and water volumes from the development,

      ii. the well water used to augment the normal water elevation in the wetland because it will affect the bounce in the irrigation pond and the surrounding wetland area,

      iii. the timing, bounce and duration of the irrigation drawdown, and

      iv. The outlet control structure to the wetland will affect the duration of the saturation on this wetland basin.

   b. To address these concerns, the applicant’s consultant provided various hydrology model runs that set the elevations of the normal water level for the wetland at 927.0, 928.0 and 928.25. This would be the elevations that the water in wetland 7 would be at when supplemental water from the adjacent well would be used to add water to the wetland, meaning the water elevation in wetland 7 would never fall below that elevation during the time the irrigation system was in service (generally from May to October). The TEP felt that setting the NWL on wetland basin #7 would not constitute a drainage effect based on the following findings;

      i. The TEP reviewed the existing wetland ground elevations in the vicinity of the excavation work, they range from 928.7 to 931.5. Generally the lower area of the wetland basin varies from 298.5 to 929.0. The existing wetland areas outside of the excavation area range from 928.2 to 934.5.
Encore 1st Addition Wetland Replacement Plan  
2018-032W, Corcoran  
October 3, 2018

ii. Although no historic wetland hydrology monitoring has occurred on this site, The TEP reviewed available Google Earth and Hennepin County historical photos from 1940 to 2018 of this wetland area. Generally the photos show little to no water in the basin during the irrigation season (generally May to October). Before the growing season (photos in Google Earth taken in April of the year) shows wetter conditions on approximately half of the photos. This is most likely based on the seasonal fluctuations from rainfall and snowmelt runoff events and frost levels. Using existing elevations of the basin as a benchmark, the water elevations in the spring, prior to the growing season, seems to be generally around 929.0 to 929.5.

iii. Based on existing wetland elevations, aerial photo analysis and hydrology modeling, the TEP would be comfortable with the normal elevation set at 928.25 if the applicant did not begin using irrigation water until May 1st or later.

1. During the non-irrigation season, normal seasonal fluctuations will occur on this site.
2. During the irrigation season, runoff events from the increased impervious areas, along with the augmented water, should keep wetland 7 at its existing normal water conditions or higher.

iv. The TEP encourages the applicant to monitor the wetland elevations with piezometer throughout the basin. If the applicant can determine a more accurate NWL on the wetland, the TEP can reconsider this elevation at the applicant's request.

**WCA Recommendation:** Approval of the wetland replacement plans pending: 1) approval of the Encore Phase I site plan, 2) An escrow of $45,000 is provided by the applicant for the LGU to use in case the wetland replacement banking and no-loss are not met per the approved conditions, and 3) Wetland 7 normal water elevation be maintained at 928.25 or higher during the irrigation season.

Hennepin County  
Department of Environment and Energy  
Advisor to the Commission  

[Signature]  
October 3, 2018
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Minnesota Wetland Conservation Act
Notice of Decision

Local Government Unit (LGU)
Elm Creek Watershed Management Commission
Address
3235 Fernbrook Ln N, Plymouth, MN 55447

1. PROJECT INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant Name</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Date of Application</th>
<th>Application Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Corcoran</td>
<td>Corcoran NE Trunk Sanitary Sewer Project</td>
<td>July 16, 2018</td>
<td>2018-034W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin Mattson</td>
<td>Public Works Director</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attach site locator map.

Type of Decision:

- [ ] Wetland Boundary or Type
- [x] No-Loss
- [ ] Exemption
- [ ] Sequencing
- [ ] Replacement Plan
- [ ] Banking Plan

Technical Evaluation Panel Findings and Recommendation (if any):

- [ ] Approve
- [ ] Approve with conditions
- [ ] Deny

2. LOCAL GOVERNMENT UNIT DECISION

Date of Decision: September 13, 2018

- [ ] Approved
- [x] Approved with conditions (include below)
- [ ] Denied

LGU Findings and Conclusions (attach additional sheets as necessary):

This is a linear sanitary sewer project that will disturb a corridor of approximately 6,700 feet long by 200 feet wide starting near the intersection of the Corcoran/Maple Grove/Rogers/Dayton boarder (NE ¼ Section 1, T119N R23W) and running south under Stieg Road, terminating at the far SW corner of SE corner Section 1, T119N, R23W. This route will run the sewer line through 5 wetland basins resulting in 10.45 acres of impacts during construction. Per MN WCA rules, the NE Trunk Sanitary Sewer project plans dated May 15, 2018 as updated via email to ECWMC on 8/13 and 9/4/18 meets the criteria for a no-loss based on rule 8420.0415 Paragraph H; a temporary impact that is rectified by repairing, rehabilitating, or restoring the affected wetland. No-loss under this item only applies if all of the following conditions are met: (1) the physical characteristics of the affected wetland, including ground elevations, contours, inlet dimensions, outlet dimensions, substrate, plant communities, and hydrologic regime, are restored to preproject conditions sufficient to ensure that all preproject functions are restored; (2) the activity is completed and the physical characteristics of the wetland are restored within six months of the start of the activity, (3) the landowner provides sufficient financial assurance acceptable to the LGU and (4) a no-loss has not been approved under this item for a particular site within a wetland with the previous ten year.

Wetlands may not be impacted until all applicable conditions have been met!
LGU Authorized Signature:

Signing and mailing of this completed form to the appropriate recipients in accordance with 8420.0255, Subp. 5 provides notice that a decision was made by the LGU under the Wetland Conservation Act as specified above. If additional details on the decision exist, they have been provided to the landowner and are available from the LGU upon request.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>James C Kujawa</td>
<td>Technical Advisor to the LGU</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Signature

Date: September 13, 2018

Phone Number and E-mail: 612-348-7338, James.Kujawa@hennepin.us

THIS DECISION ONLY APPLIES TO THE MINNESOTA WETLAND CONSERVATION ACT. Additional approvals or permits from local, state, and federal agencies may be required. Check with all appropriate authorities beforecommencing work in or near wetlands.

Applicants proceed at their own risk if work authorized by this decision is started before the time period for appeal (30 days) has expired. If this decision is reversed or revised under appeal, the applicant may be responsible for restoring or replacing all wetland impacts.

This decision is valid for three years from the date of decision unless a longer period is advised by the TEP and specified in this notice of decision.

3. APPEAL OF THIS DECISION

Pursuant to MN Rule 8420.0905, any appeal of this decision can only be commenced by mailing a petition for appeal, including applicable fee, within thirty (30) calendar days of the date of the mailing of this Notice to the following as indicated:

Check one:

- Appeal of an LGU staff decision. Send petition and $0 fee (if applicable) to:
  Elm Creek Watershed Management Commission
  3235 Fernbrook Ln N
  Plymouth, MN  55447

- Appeal of LGU governing body decision. Send petition and $500 filing fee to:
  Executive Director
  Minnesota Board of Water and Soil Resources
  520 Lafayette Road North
  St. Paul, MN 55155

4. LIST OF ADDRESSEES

- SWCD TEP member: (email only) Stacey. Lijewski@co.hennepin.mn.us
- BWSR TEP member: (email only) Ben Carlson (ben.carlson@state.mn.us).
- LGU TEP member (if different than LGU Contact):
- DNR TEP member:
- DNR Regional Office (email only) Becky.Horton@state.mn.us
- WD or WMO (if applicable):
- Applicant: City of Corcoran, kmattson@ci.corcoran.mn.us, Wenck Associates; Mark J. Schroeder <mschroeder@wenck.com, msummers@wenck.com
- Members of the public who requested notice (notice only)
- Corps of Engineers Project Manager (notice only) mvp-reg-inquiry@usace.army.mil
- BWSR Wetland Bank Coordinator (wetland bank plan applications only)

6. ATTACHMENTS

In addition to the site locator map, list any other attachments:
- Project SWPPP sheet C201
PROJECT INFORMATION

ADJACENT TO EACH WASHOUT FACILITY THAT REQUIRES SITE PERSONNEL TO UTILIZE EROSION AND SEDIMENT CONTROL

PROJECT NAME: 2018 NE SEWER DISTRICT IMPROVEMENTS

PROJECT LOCATION: CITY OF CORCORAN

PROJECT TYPE: SANITARY SEWER CONSTRUCTION

WITHIN 7 DAYS AFTER THE CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITY IN THAT PORTION OF THE SITE HAS CUMULATIVE IMPERVIOUS SURFACE/PERMANENT STORMWATER MANAGEMENT REQUIREMENTS:

THE PROPOSED AREA OF IMPERVIOUS IS ±0.3 ACRES RESULTING IN A ±0.0 ACRE NET INCREASE IN IMPERVIOUS SURFACE.

GENERAL SWPPP NOTES

BUFFER STRIPS, HORIZONTAL SLOPE GRADING, AND OTHER CONSTRUCTION PRACTICES IMPAIR WATER FOR AQUATIC LIFE AND AQUATIC RECREATION. THERE ARE CURRENT EPA APPROVED TMDLS FOR THE WATERBODY FOR DISSOLVED OXYGEN, E. COLI, FISHES

THE CONSTRUCTION PLANS INCLUDE SEEDING AND MULCHING OF PROJECT AREAS FOR PERMIT AS NECESSARY TO INCLUDE ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS TO CORRECT PROBLEMS IDENTIFIED OR ADDRESS SITUATIONS PER PART III.B. OF THE PERMIT.

TEMPORARY OR PERMANENT ENERGY DISSIPATION WITHIN 24 HOURS OF CONNECTION TO A SURFACE WATER.

CITY OF CORCORAN

CONTACT: KEVIN MATTSON

CONTACT PHONE: (763) 400-7028

CONTACT EMAIL: KMATTSON@CI.CORCORAN.MN.US

TBD - CONTRACTOR SHALL PROVIDE A CHAIN OF RESPONSIBILITY WITH ALL OPERATORS ON THE GENERAL PERMIT TO INCLUDE TEMPORARY SEDIMENT BASINS. BASINS SHALL BE SITE FOR INCORPORATION INTO THIS SWPPP DOCUMENT TO ENSURE THAT THE SWPPP WILL BE ACRE OF CONTRIBUTING DRAINAGE AREA. BASIN OUTLETS SHALL BE DESIGNED TO OF PERSONNEL TRAINING IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE PERMIT FOR INCORPORATION INTO THIS

PROJECT.

SPECIFIED VEGETATIVE TIME SCHEDULE. FINAL STABILIZATION WILL OCCUR WHEN THE CONTROL BMPS (SUCH AS SILT FENCE) MUST BE REMOVED AS PART OF THE SITE FINAL

STABILIZATION. ALL SEDIMENT MUST BE CLEANED OUT OF CONVEYANCES AND TO MINIMIZE SEDIMENTS FROM ENTERING SURFACE WATERS:

- IF INLET PROTECTION DEVICES APPEAR PLUGGED WITH SEDIMENT, ARE FILLED TO 1/3 REPLACE THE ENTRANCE OR ADD ADDITIONAL GRAVEL WITH 24 HOURS OF DETECTION OR NOTIFICATION.

- IF SEDIMENT FROM THE SITE IS OBSERVED ON ADJACENT STREETS OR OTHER PROPERTIES, THE INSPECTOR SHALL IDENTIFY THE SOURCE AND DISCHARGE LOCATION AND CORRECT THE SOURCE OF SUCH MATERIALS AS DIRECTED BY THE INSPECTOR

- INSPECT CONSTRUCTION ENTRANCES FOR SEDIMENT TRACKING ONTO PUBLIC STREETS.

- RECORD RECOMMENDED REPAIRS AND MODIFICATIONS TO EROSION AND SEDIMENT CONTROLS.

- INSPECTIONS AT THE SITE WILL BE COMPLETED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE PERMIT AS FOLLOWS:

DEFECTS

WITHIN 24 HOURS OF DETECTION OR NOTIFICATION.

INSPECTION LOG AND SWPPP MUST BE KEPT ON-SITE FOR THE DURATION OF THE CONSTRUCTION

MAINTENANCE RECORDS MUST BE KEPT ON-SITE DURING CONSTRUCTION; THE CONSTRUCTION DRAWINGS ARE INCORPORATED HEREIN BY REFERENCE, AND A COPY OF THE SWPPP, ALL CHANGES TO IT, AND INSPECTION AND RECORD RETENTION - THE SWPPP, ALL CHANGES TO IT, AND INSPECTION AND CORRECTION RECORDS FOR THE PERMIT AS INCORPORATED INTO THIS SWPPP DOCUMENT.

THE PROJECT WILL TEMPORARILY IMPACT WETLANDS. ADVERSE IMPACTS WILL BE MITIGATED ONSITE. ALL DISTURBED WETLAND AREAS WILL BE FULLY RESTORED WITHIN SIX MONTHS FROM THE START OF DISTURBANCE. IF THIS TIMELINE CANNOT BE

THE FOLLOWING GUIDELINES WILL BE USED TO DETERMINE IF POLLUTION CONTROL

THE FOLLOWING MEASURES WILL BE TAKEN AS SEDIMENT CONTROL PRACTICES IN ORDER TO MINIMIZE SEDIMENTS FROM ENTERING SURFACE WATERS:

- RECORD RECOMMENDED REPAIRS AND MODIFICATIONS TO EROSION AND SEDIMENT CONTROLS.

- INSPECT CONSTRUCTION ENTRANCES FOR SEDIMENT TRACKING ONTO PUBLIC STREETS.

- RECORD RECOMMENDED REPAIRS AND MODIFICATIONS TO EROSION AND SEDIMENT CONTROLS.

- INSPECT CONSTRUCTION ENTRANCES FOR SEDIMENT TRACKING ONTO PUBLIC STREETS.

- RECORD RECOMMENDED REPAIRS AND MODIFICATIONS TO EROSION AND SEDIMENT CONTROLS.

- INSPECT CONSTRUCTION ENTRANCES FOR SEDIMENT TRACKING ONTO PUBLIC STREETS.

- RECORD RECOMMENDED REPAIRS AND MODIFICATIONS TO EROSION AND SEDIMENT CONTROLS.

- INSPECT CONSTRUCTION ENTRANCES FOR SEDIMENT TRACKING ONTO PUBLIC STREETS.

- RECORD RECOMMENDED REPAIRS AND MODIFICATIONS TO EROSION AND SEDIMENT CONTROLS.

- INSPECT CONSTRUCTION ENTRANCES FOR SEDIMENT TRACKING ONTO PUBLIC STREETS.

- RECORD RECOMMENDED REPAIRS AND MODIFICATIONS TO EROSION AND SEDIMENT CONTROLS.

- INSPECT CONSTRUCTION ENTRANCES FOR SEDIMENT TRACKING ONTO PUBLIC STREETS.

- RECORD RECOMMENDED REPAIRS AND MODIFICATIONS TO EROSION AND SEDIMENT CONTROLS.

- INSPECT CONSTRUCTION ENTRANCES FOR SEDIMENT TRACKING ONTO PUBLIC STREETS.

- RECORD RECOMMENDED REPAIRS AND MODIFICATIONS TO EROSION AND SEDIMENT CONTROLS.

- INSPECT CONSTRUCTION ENTRANCES FOR SEDIMENT TRACKING ONTO PUBLIC STREETS.

- RECORD RECOMMENDED REPAIRS AND MODIFICATIONS TO EROSION AND SEDIMENT CONTROLS.

- INSPECT CONSTRUCTION ENTRANCES FOR SEDIMENT TRACKING ONTO PUBLIC STREETS.

- RECORD RECOMMENDED REPAIRS AND MODIFICATIONS TO EROSION AND SEDIMENT CONTROLS.

- INSPECT CONSTRUCTION ENTRANCES FOR SEDIMENT TRACKING ONTO PUBLIC STREETS.

- RECORD RECOMMENDED REPAIRS AND MODIFICATIONS TO EROSION AND SEDIMENT CONTROLS.

- INSPECT CONSTRUCTION ENTRANCES FOR SEDIMENT TRACKING ONTO PUBLIC STREETS.

- RECORD RECOMMENDED REPAIRS AND MODIFICATIONS TO EROSION AND SEDIMENT CONTROLS.

- INSPECT CONSTRUCTION ENTRANCES FOR SEDIMENT TRACKING ONTO PUBLIC STREETS.

- RECORD RECOMMENDED REPAIRS AND MODIFICATIONS TO EROSION AND SEDIMENT CONTROLS.

- INSPECT CONSTRUCTION ENTRANCES FOR SEDIMENT TRACKING ONTO PUBLIC STREETS.

- RECORD RECOMMENDED REPAIRS AND MODIFICATIONS TO EROSION AND SEDIMENT CONTROLS.

- INSPECT CONSTRUCTION ENTRANCES FOR SEDIMENT TRACKING ONTO PUBLIC STREETS.

- RECORD RECOMMENDED REPAIRS AND MODIFICATIONS TO EROSION AND SEDIMENT CONTROLS.

- INSPECT CONSTRUCTION ENTRANCES FOR SEDIMENT TRACKING ONTO PUBLIC STREETS.

- RECORD RECOMMENDED REPAIRS AND MODIFICATIONS TO EROSION AND SEDIMENT CONTROLS.

- INSPECT CONSTRUCTION ENTRANCES FOR SEDIMENT TRACKING ONTO PUBLIC STREETS.

- RECORD RECOMMENDED REPAIRS AND MODIFICATIONS TO EROSION AND SEDIMENT CONTROLS.

- INSPECT CONSTRUCTION ENTRANCES FOR SEDIMENT TRACKING ONTO PUBLIC STREETS.

- RECORD RECOMMENDED REPAIRS AND MODIFICATIONS TO EROSION AND SEDIMENT CONTROLS.

- INSPECT CONSTRUCTION ENTRANCES FOR SEDIMENT TRACKING ONTO PUBLIC STREETS.

- RECORD RECOMMENDED REPAIRS AND MODIFICATIONS TO EROSION AND SEDIMENT CONTROLS.

- INSPECT CONSTRUCTION ENTRANCES FOR SEDIMENT TRACKING ONTO PUBLIC STREETS.

- RECORD RECOMMENDED REPAIRS AND MODIFICATIONS TO EROSION AND SEDIMENT CONTROLS.

- INSPECT CONSTRUCTION ENTRANCES FOR SEDIMENT TRACKING ONTO PUBLIC STREETS.

- RECORD RECOMMENDED REPAIRS AND MODIFICATIONS TO EROSION AND SEDIMENT CONTROLS.
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- RECORD RECOMMENDED REPAIRS AND MODIFICATIONS TO EROSION AND SEDIMENT CONTROLS.
Elm Creek Restoration Phase D
Plymouth, Project #2018-037

Project Overview: The City of Plymouth proposes a stream restoration project located north of TH 55 and west of Peony Lane, primarily on Wayzata High School property, west of the school campus. The project proposes to restore approximately 4,400 linear feet of Elm Creek using a variety of methods, such as root wads, vegetated rip rap, log vanes, boulder cross vanes, and small areas of non-vegetated rip rap. This will restore areas with eroded banks or sheer slopes, little attachment to the floodplain, incision of the channel, and limited native habitat. A streambank improvement project was completed in 2016 at this project northern end (ECWMC Project #2014-045). The Commission’s standards require a review under Rule D, Stormwater Management, Rule E, Erosion and Sediment Control, Rule F, Floodplains, Rule Wetland Alterations, and Rule I, Buffer Strips.

Applicant: City of Plymouth, c/o Ben Scharenbroich, Plymouth City Hall, 3400 Plymouth Boulevard, Plymouth, MN 55447. Phone: 763-509-5527. Email: bscharenbroich@plymouthmn.gov

Agent/Engineer: Wenck Associates, Inc, c/o Luciuss Jonett, 1800 Pioneer Creek Center, Maple Plain, MN 55359. Phone: 763-479-4254. Email: ljonett@wenck.com

Exhibits:
1) ECWMC Request for Plan Review and Approval received July 25, 2018
2) No project fee was submitted at the time of application.
3) Complete plan was received on July 25, 2018.
4) WCA Notice of Application of Exemption, Dated August 21, 2018.
5) Construction plans, dated 9/19/2018, totaling 22 pages, including the following:
   a. G101…Title Sheet and Index
   b. G102…Legend and Notes
   c. C100 Site Access and Erosion Control Plan
   d. C101-C105…Existing Conditions and Removals
   e. C111-C116…Plan and Profiles, Impact Figures
   f. ALT 1… (2 Pages), Pages 1 and 2
   g. ALT 2…Page 1
Findings:

6) The project proposes the restoration of approximately 4,400 linear feet of Elm Creek, located to the west of the Existing Wayzata High School.

7) No project fee was submitted at the time of application. A fee of $550 should be submitted.

8) The following channel/side slope modifications are proposed;
   a. 1268 square feet of log toe and root wad protection
   b. 0.66 acres of vegetated rip rap shorelines
   c. 2,670 cubic feet of traditional rip rap at storm sewer outlets and side channels
   d. 810 square feet of cross vanes
   e. 135 square feet of boulder vanes
   f. 148 square feet coir logs
   g. 0.36 acres of bank grading

9) This stream segment is located immediately upstream of a reach where work was finished in 2016, based on work in a 2014 feasibility report. This project is using similar methods and means in this segment of Elm Creek to obtain similar results and to meet the same objectives, namely the reduction of sediment and phosphorous leaving the area through streambank erosion.

10) Stabilization of stream banks will reduce the transport of sediment-attached phosphorus from this channel section to downstream wetlands, Rice Lake and ultimately into the Mississippi River.

11) The project is exempt from the requirements of Rule D, as no impervious surfaces are proposed to be added to the project area.

12) The project plans provide an Erosion control plan and SWPPP meeting the ECWMC Rule E requirements.

13) The project proposes significant work within the 100 year floodplain of Elm Creek. However, a review of all the project elements and installation methods shows that there will be no increase or decrease in floodplain storage as a result of the project. Similarly, there will not be increases or decreases in the 100 year base flood elevation through this reach. As such, the project meets the requirements of ECWMC Rule F.

14) Rule G: Project impacts to Elm Creek are regulated by permits by the Minnesota DNR and US Army Corps of Engineers. The applicant has made application to both the relevant agencies and shall comply with their permitting requirements. The project as proposed meets the requirements of Rule G.
15) Rule I: Buffer Strips: As proposed, the project will enhance the existing buffer areas through the installation of the various streambank restoration methods. The applicant’s narrative indicates the City will place the area under a protective drainage and utility easement and create a maintenance plan for the area affected by the project.

a. The applicant shall record the easement and maintenance plan in a form acceptable to the ECWMC.

Decision:

- Staff approves this project subject to receiving final easements in a form acceptable to the ECWMC over the wetland buffers and submittal of the appropriate fee.

Hennepin County
Department of Environment and Energy

October 3, 2018

Jason Swenson, P.E.
Technical Advisor to the Commission

Site Location
Site Aerial
Rush Creek Commons Phase 2
Plymouth, Project #2018-040

**Project Overview:** The Rush Creek Commons Phase 2 project consists of the reconstruction of Brockton Lane between Bass Lake Road (County Road 10) and Troy Lane (County Road 101). The project will result in the construction of less than 1 acre of new impervious surfaces, however since it is tied to the adjacent residential development (Rush Creek Commons, ECWMC 2018-001), this work is considered to be an additional phase of Rush Creek Commons project, and as a result is required to comply with the requirements of Rule D, Stormwater Management.

The general location of the project is at the southwest corner of Bass Lake Road (County Road 10) and Troy Lane (County Road 101) in the City of Maple Grove. Drainage from the site generally discharges to the east, entering County Ditch 16 / Maple Creek.

The proposed work will result in the conversion of Brockton Lane from a rural road section to an urban road section with trails. Construction is proposed to disturb approximately 3.8 acres, and will result in the construction of approximately 0.5 acres of new impervious cover. Our review will be for compliance to the Commission’s 3rd generation standards and rules D and E and previous project reviews in the area.

**Applicant:** City of Maple Grove, c/o Jupe Hale, 12800 Arbor Lakes Parkway North, Maple Grove, MN 55369. Phone: 763-494-6350. Email: jhale@maplegrovemn.gov

**Agent/Engineer:** SRF Consulting Group, c/o Jeremy Nielsen, 1 Carlson Parkway North, Suite 150, Minneapolis, MN 55447. Phone: 763-267-6611. Email: JNielsen@srfconsulting.com

**Exhibits:**

1) ECWMC Request for Plan Review and Approval received August 14, 2018
2) Project review fee of $550 received on August 14, 2018.
3) Complete plan was received on August 14, 2018.
4) Overall project narrative, dated August, 2018.
5) Construction plans for the Rush Creek Commons Phase 2 Project, dated 8/7/2018, totaling 69 pages, prepared by SRF Consulting
6) ECWMC Project File 2018-001, Rush Creek Commons
7) ECWMC Project File 2009-004, Markets at Rush Creek
Findings:

8) The application was submitted on August 14, 2018, and deemed complete on August 14, 2018. The 60 day review period for the project expires on October 13, 2018.

9) As previously discussed, the improvement of Brocton Lane is tied to the construction of the Rush Creek Commons project previously reviewed and approved as ECWMC project 2018-001.

10) As proposed, the project proposes to reconstruct 1500 linear feet of Brockton Lane, 1300 linear feet of trail on the south side of Bass Lake Trail, and some additional curb and gutter along Bass Lake Trail. The reconstruction will disturb approximately 3.8 acres and result in 0.52 acres of new impervious surfaces being added.

11) For stormwater treatment, the applicant is proposing one biofiltration basin near the intersection of Brockton Lane and Bass Lake Road, along with the other treatment already proposed with the Bass Lake Commons Project, namely a water quality pond at the intersection of Brockton Lane and Troy Lane (Pond 6). The trail portion of the project drains through another pond (Pond 5) that is internal to the Bass Lake Commons project.

12) The City of Maple Grove will provide the long term operation and maintenance on the biofiltration feature in the project, and the other ponds are covered under O&M agreements from the previous project in the area.

13) Abstraction Volume meets the Commission standard. Total new impervious area for the site is 0.52 acres, requiring 2076 cubic feet of volume to be infiltrated or filtered to meet 1.1” from all new impervious surfaces. Infiltration is not being used on the site due to poor clay soils, and instead, a biofiltration area is being proposed. The actual volume being proposed to be filtered is 3,485 cubic feet, exceeding the required volume. Pretreatment is provided by sump manholes. Drawdown in the biofiltration area is proposed to be less than 48 hours, as required.

14) Nutrient and TSS loads meet the Commission’s requirements, as demonstrated in the previous project approvals and submitted in this project package. The additional biofiltration area provides additional removals above and beyond what was previously approved for both Phosphorus and Sediment loads.

15) Rate Controls meet the Commission’s standards. Rates discharging from ponds 5 and 6 are in accordance with previous project approvals. The discharge to the north of Bass Lake Road is reduced slightly from the previous analysis through the use and inclusion of the proposed biofiltration area. These are all in conformance with prior approvals.

16) There are no floodplains in the project site.

17) No additional wetland impacts are proposed as part of the project work.
18) No additional buffers above those required for the Rush Creek Commons project are required as a result of this proposed work.

19) Rule E. Erosion and Sediment Controls: An erosion control plan and SWPPP meeting commission standards was reviewed and it meets ECWMC requirements and MPCA NPDES permit requirements.

Recommendation:

- Staff Recommends approval of this project with no conditions.

Hennepin County
Department of Environment and Energy

October 4, 2018

Jason Swenson, P.E.
Technical Advisor to the Commission
Site Location
# Minnesota Wetland Conservation Act

## Notice of Decision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Government Unit (LGU)</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elm Creek Watershed Management Commission</td>
<td>3235 Fernbrook Ln N, Plymouth, MN 55447</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**1. PROJECT INFORMATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant Name</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Date of Application</th>
<th>Application Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Terry Savoie</td>
<td>21801 Homestead Trail (PID2811923430007)</td>
<td>August 15, 2018</td>
<td>2018-041W</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- ☑️ Attach site locator map.

**Type of Decision:**

- ☑️ Wetland Boundary or Type
- ☐ No-Loss
- ☐ Exemption
- ☐ Sequencing
- ☐ Replacement Plan
- ☐ Banking Plan

**Technical Evaluation Panel Findings and Recommendation (if any):**

- ☐ Approve
- ☐ Approve with conditions
- ☐ Deny

**2. LOCAL GOVERNMENT UNIT DECISION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of Decision:</th>
<th>Approved</th>
<th>Approved with conditions (include below)</th>
<th>Denied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>September 19, 2018</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LGU Findings and Conclusions (attach additional sheets as necessary):**

Anderson Engineering of MN, LLC completed a wetland investigation on June 5, 2018 within the project area located at 21801 Homestead Trail (PID: 2811923430007) in Corcoran, Hennepin County, Minnesota. (Section 28, Township 119 North, Range 23 West) The wetland delineation was completed per MN WCA protocols. Two areas meeting wetland criteria, were identified within the investigation extent. Boundaries were reviewed and field verified by ECWMC staff the latter part of August. All wetland boundaries were found to be delineated in accordance to the ECWMC requirements. The Wetland delineation report by Anderson Engineering of MN, LLC for 21801 Homestead Trail dated June 13, 2018 is hereby approved as delineated.

---

**Wetlands may not be impacted until all applicable conditions have been met!**
LGU Authorized Signature:

Sign and mailing of this completed form to the appropriate recipients in accordance with 8420.0255, Subp. 5 provides notice that a decision was made by the LGU under the Wetland Conservation Act as specified above. If additional details on the decision exist, they have been provided to the landowner and are available from the LGU upon request.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>James C Kujawa</td>
<td>Technical Advisor to the LGU</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Signature**

**Date**

September 19, 2018

**Phone Number and E-mail**

612-348-7338

James.Kujawa@hennepin.us

---

THIS DECISION ONLY APPLIES TO THE MINNESOTA WETLAND CONSERVATION ACT. Additional approvals or permits from local, state, and federal agencies may be required. Check with all appropriate authorities before commencing work in or near wetlands.

Applicants proceed at their own risk if work authorized by this decision is started before the time period for appeal (30 days) has expired. If this decision is reversed or revised under appeal, the applicant may be responsible for restoring or replacing all wetland impacts.

This decision is valid for three years from the date of decision unless a longer period is advised by the TEP and specified in this notice of decision.

---

### 3. APPEAL OF THIS DECISION

Pursuant to MN Rule 8420.0905, any appeal of this decision can only be commenced by mailing a petition for appeal, including applicable fee, within thirty (30) calendar days of the date of the mailing of this Notice to the following as indicated:

Check one:

- **Appeal of an LGU staff decision.** Send petition and $0 fee (if applicable) to:
  - Elm Creek Watershed Management Commission
  - 3235 Fernbrook Ln N
  - Plymouth, MN 55447

- **Appeal of LGU governing body decision.** Send petition and $500 filing fee to:
  - Executive Director
  - Minnesota Board of Water and Soil Resources
  - 520 Lafayette Road North
  - St. Paul, MN 55155

---

### 4. LIST OF ADDRESSEES

- **SWCD TEP member:** (email only) Stacey. Lijewski@co.hennepin.mn.us
- **BWSR TEP member:** (email only) Ben Carlson (ben.carlson@state.mn.us)
- **DNR TEP member:**
- **DNR Regional Office** (email only) Becky.Horton@state.mn.us
  - WD or WMO (if applicable):
- **Applicant:** (email only) terry@buyashed.com
- **City of Corcoran:** Brad Marten bmartens@ci.corcoran.mn.us
- **Members of the public who requested notice (notice only)** Anderson Engineering bhodapp@ae-mn.com
- **Corps of Engineers Project Manager (notice only)** mvp-reg-inquiry@usace.army.mil
- **BWSR Wetland Bank Coordinator (wetland bank plan applications only)**

---

### 6. ATTACHMENTS

In addition to the site locator map, list any other attachments:

- **Cover Page, Location Map, Delineation Map from Wetland Investigation Report, Savoie Property, 21801 Homestead Trail by Anderson Engineering dated June 13, 2018.**
Wetland Investigation Report

Savoie Property
21801 Homestead Trail

PID: 2811923430007
Corcoran, Minnesota

AE Comm. #15031

June 13, 2018

Anderson Engineering of Minnesota, LLC

13605 1st Avenue North
Plymouth, MN 55441
763-412-4000 Main
763-412-4090 Fax

A Service-Disabled Veteran-Owned Small Business
21801 Homestead Trail
PROJECT LOCATION
SOURCE: MN DNR, USDA, ESRI, TIGER, Bing, Hennepin Co., Anderson Engineering

Legend
- Project Parcel
- Hennepin Co. Parcels
- Ditch
- Wetland Field Delineated 6/5/2018
- Sample Point
- Culvert
- Flow Path

1 in = 200 feet

1. Wetland 2
   - PABG/EMC/B
   - Type 2/3/4
   - Fresh (Wet) Meadow/
   - Shallow Marsh/
   - Deep Marsh
   - 5.63 Ac.

2. Wetland 1
   - PEM1Bd
   - Type 2
   - Fresh (Wet) Meadow
   - 0.46 Ac.

PROJECT LOCATION
Hennepin County
State of Minnesota

City of Corcoran
Hennepin County, MN

ANDERSON ENGINEERING
ENGINEERING • ARCHITECTURE • LAND SURVEYING
ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES • LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE
Anderson Engineering of Minnesota, LLC
13605 1st Avenue North
Suite 100
Plymouth, MN 55441
763-412-4000 (o) 763-412-4090 (f)
www.ae-mn.com

AE Comm.# 15031 Date: 5/31/2018 By: JLA

DELINEATION - FIGURE 5
SAVOIE PROPERTY
Beehive Homes Maple Grove

Maple Grove, Project #2018-043

Project Overview: This is a 2.9 acre lot on the SW corner of Weaver Lake Road at W. Fish Lake Road (across from Boston Scientific). It is proposed to be developed into two single story senior housing buildings and their required infrastructure. The site is being reviewed for conformance with Rule D (Stormwater Management) and Rule E (Erosion and Sediment Control).

Applicant: Hilbig Holdings, Attn. Craig Hilbig, 4681 Station Place, Meridian, Idaho 83646. Phone; 208-559-7220. Email; chilbig@beehivehomes.com

Agent: AMI Engineering, Attn. Eli Rupnow, 3640 Talmage Circle, Vadnais Heights, MN 55110. Phone; 651-428-7265. Email; eli.rupnow@amiengineers.com

tyler.johnson@stantec.com

Exhibits:
1) ECWMC Request for Plan Review and Approval, received August 20, 2018
   a. Project fees of $750 received August 27, 2018.
   b. City authorization received October 1, 2018.
2) Preliminary Site plans, dated October 2, 2018 (no signature)
   a. Sheet T1.0, Title Sheet
   b. Sheet T1.1, Project notes
   c. Sheet C1.0, Demolition Plan
   d. Sheet C2.0 & C2, Site Plan
   e. Sheet C3.0, Grading Plan
   f. Sheet C4.0 to 4.2, Utility Plan
   g. Sheet C5.0 & 5.1, Storm Management Plan
   h. Sheet C6.0 to 6.2, Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP)
   i. Sheets EX1 & EX2, Existing and Proposed Drainage Areas
   j. Sheets L1.0 & L2.0, Landscape Plan (dated August 13, 2018)
3) Existing and Proposed MIDS Worksheets dated August 13 and 27, 2018 respectively.
4) Stormwater Management Plan by AMI dated October 2, 2018
5) Preliminary Stormwater review from WSB to City dated August 30, 2018 (redline response to comments received from agent on Oct. 2, 2018.)
**Findings:**

1) A complete set of plans was received on October 1, 2018. The ECWMC 60-day decision deadline per MN Statute 15.99 expires November 30, 2018.
2) The existing site generally drains west to east toward West Fish Lake Road. Storm sewer runs the water south through two wetland basins before it runs into Fish Lake.
3) The project proposes to construct two senior housing facilities along with their accompanying support infrastructure.
4) The new facility will add 1.23 acres of new impervious areas. To offset the increase in runoff rates and nutrient/TSS loads, the applicant is proposing to install two on-site biofiltration basins.

**Stormwater Management Plan (Rule D)**

5) **Abstraction Volume:** Total new impervious area for the site is 1.23 acres, requiring 4,911 cubic feet of volume to be infiltrated or filtered to meet the 1.1” requirement from all new impervious surfaces. Infiltration is not being used on the site due to poor clay soils, and instead, two bio-filtration ponds are being proposed. They will provide 10,638 cubic feet of water volume storage that will be routed through 2 feet of engineered soils into a 6” PVC drain tile below the sand filter.
   a. If the City of Maple Grove does not provide the long term operation and maintenance on the stormwater basins, the applicant must provide their own long term O & M plans and agreement, approved by the City and ECWMC and it must recorded on the land title.

6) **Nutrient and TSS loads:** Nutrient and TSS loads were modeled with the MPCA MIDS program.
   a. Pre-development phosphorus loads = 1.44 lbs/year
   b. Post-development phosphorus loads = 1.54 lbs/year
   c. Pre-development TSS loads = 262 lbs/year
   d. Post-development TSS loads = 70 lbs/year

**Stormwater Management Summary:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>TP Load (lbs/yr)</th>
<th>TSS Load (lbs/yr)</th>
<th>Abstraction (cu. ft.)</th>
<th>Filtration (cu. ft.)</th>
<th>Annual Volume (ac. ft.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-development (baseline)</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-development without BMPs</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>566</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>4,911</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-development with BMPs</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>10,638</td>
<td>1.1**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Change</td>
<td>+0.1*</td>
<td>-192</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>+5,727</td>
<td>N/A**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Within modeling error
**assumes up to 1.1” rainfall volume will remain on site. Filtration does not accomplish that.
7.) **Rate Controls** meet the Commission’s standards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2-yr (cfs)</th>
<th>10-yr (cfs)</th>
<th>100-yr (cfs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Development Rates</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>7.66</td>
<td>16.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Development Rates</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>10.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.) The City of Maple Grove is the LGU in charge of administering the Wetland Conservation Act on this site. No wetlands or buffers are necessary based on the site plans.

Erosion and Sediment Controls, (Rule E)

9) Erosion and Sediment Controls meet the Commission standards.

**Recommendation:** Approval contingent an approved stormwater system operation and maintenance plan being recorded on the property title or the City of Maple Grove accepting O&M plan responsibility.

Hennepin County
Department of Environment and Energy

[Signature]

October 2, 2018

James C. Kujawa
Technical Advisor to the Commission
Beehive Homes
Maple Grove, Project 2018-043
October 2, 2018
Site Plan
Open Systems International (OSI) Phase II
Medina, Project #2018-044

Project Overview: This is a 28.5 acre site located just north of their existing building at the NW intersection of Highway 55 and Arrowhead Drive (across from the Hennepin County PW facility) in Medina. The proposed plan is to construct a new building with its associated parking, landscaping and utilities to serve the site. This project will disturb the southerly ½ of the site. The northerly area will remain undisturbed for potential future expansion. Our review is for compliance to the Commission standards for stormwater management (Rule D), erosion and sediment controls (Rule E), wetland buffers (Rule I) and potential floodplain impacts (Rule F).

Applicant: Open Systems International, Inc., 4101 Arrowhead Drive, Medina, MN 55340. Phone: 763-404-4337. Email; mkuklok@osii.com

Agent: Hakanson-Anderson, Attention, Adam Thiele, 3601 Thurston Ave., Anoka, MN 55303. Phone: 763-852-0489. Email: adamt@haa-inc.com

Exhibits:
1) A complete ECWMC Request for Plan Review and Approval, received September 19, 2018.
2) Stormwater Management Plan by Hakanson-Anderson dated September 21, 2018,
   a. Sheet A000, Cover
   b. Sheets 1-3 of 3, Site Survey
   c. Sheet 1 of 1, Preliminary Plat
   d. Sheet C1,
   e. Sheet C2, Removals and Tree Preservation
   f. Sheet C3, Site & Signage Plan
   g. Sheet C4, Grading & Drainage Plan
   h. Sheet C5, Erosion Control Plan
   i. Sheet C6, Utility Plan
   j. Sheet C7, Sanitary Sewer Plan & Profile
   k. Sheets C8 to C11, Details
   l. Sheet L1.1, Preliminary Landscape Plans
   m. Sheet L1.2, Landscape Details & Notes
   n. Sheets A200 to A330, Architectural Plans
   o. Sheet E101, Electrical Plans
Findings:

1) A complete application was received September 19, 2018. The initial decision period deadline per MN Statute 15.99 is November 18, 2018.

2) The existing drainage flows in two directions; Four (4) acres in the southeasterly portion drains into the a wetland that runs under Arrowhead Drive then into the floodplain that corresponds to Lake Medina, then into Elm Creek. The remaining area flows west into a large wetland/floodplain complex that flows north, eventually entering Rush Creek just north of Corcoran near CR 10.

3) This site plan require compliance on the ECWMC rules for, stormwater management (Rule D), Erosion and Sediment Control (Rule E), Floodplain (Rule F) and Buffer Strip (Rule I)

Stormwater Management

4) For stormwater treatment, the applicant is proposing a wet (NURP) pond with a filter bench and a filter basin to provide rate, volume, water quality treatment of the stormwater runoff controls.

5) The outlet control structure detail for the filter basin is needed in the detail sheets.

6) Long term operation and maintenance on the permanent stormwater basins for this site must be provided by the landowner. An approved O & M agreement must be recorded on the property title with the recorded document provided to the Commission.

7) Abstraction volume;
   a. The total new impervious area for the site is 5.71 acres (248,510 sq. ft.) = 22,780 cubic feet of abstraction required.
   b. Combined filtration volumes for the two basins are 31,600 cubic feet, 29,000 cubic feet on the westerly pond through a 15 foot filter bench and an additional 2,900 cubic feet from a filter basin on the easterly portion of the site.
   c. Pre-treatment for Pond 1 is the dead storage area in the pond itself.
   d. Pre-treatment for Basin 1 is one 3’ deep sump manhole. We recommend a SAFLE Baffle weir or similar be incorporated into CBMH 43 for additional protection from sediment flowing into the filter basin.
   e. Drawdown and drain tile discharge for each basin has not been provided. This must be included as part of rate flow calculations and for determination of the maximum requirement to drawdown filter basins within 48 hours or less.

8) Nutrient and TSS loads.
   a. Commission standards require post development TP and TSS loads to be equal to or less than pre-development. One of the following models must be used for our review of pre and post development nutrient/TSS loads; P8, MIDs, or Elm Creek standard criteria.
9) Stormwater Management Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition (based on 17.0 acres)</th>
<th>TP Load (lbs/yr)</th>
<th>TSS Load (lbs/yr)</th>
<th>Abstraction (cu. ft.)</th>
<th>Filtration (cu. ft.)</th>
<th>Annual Volume (ac. ft.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-development (baseline)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-development without BMPs</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>22,780</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-development with BMPs</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td>31,600</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Change</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td>+8,820</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Assumes up to 1.1” rainfall volume will remain on site. Filtration does not accomplish this.

a. Rate Controls.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2-yr (cfs)</th>
<th>10-yr (cfs)</th>
<th>100-yr (cfs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>East</td>
<td>West</td>
<td>East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Development Rates</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>16.06</td>
<td>7.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Development Rates*</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>12.76</td>
<td>7.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note; Post development rates must include drain tile discharges.

Wetland Buffers.

10) The Commission requires 25’ average, 10’ minimum buffers around all wetland basins (stormwater pond slopes can be considered in the buffer areas). Where any disturbed slope exceeds 6:1, an additional 5’ buffer width for each 1’ increase in vertical drop is required (i.e. 5:1=30’, 4:1=35’ etc.)

11) Wetland buffer monumentation must be provided per Commission standards.

Floodplain

12) There are two floodplain areas that impact this development.
   a. On the west site of the site there is the Elm Creek Watershed Plan Upland flood storage area 12 with a flood elevation of 981.7. This is also designated by FEMA as a Zone A (no flood elevation determined), and
   b. In the far southeast corner of the site a small portion of Elm Creek comes up to this property, but does not appear to enter it. The Elm Creek Management Plan elevation for this area is 981.2. FEMA has this area designated as a Zone A (no flood elevation determined)

13) No floodplain impacts are proposed in the plans received.

14) Drainage easements are proposed over all floodplain areas.

Erosion and sediment control plans

15) No SWPPP plan was submitted with the application or on the erosion control plans.
a. Details on construction sequencing of erosion and sediment control practices are necessary per MPCA NPDES permit and ECWMC requirements. Note that special construction sequencing is necessary for the filter basin and bench areas.

**Recommendation:** None at this time. See items 5, 7, 8, 9a, 10, 11 and 15a

Hennepin County
Department of Environment and Energy
Advisor to the Commission

September 27, 2018

Date

Location Map