April 20, 2020

Technical Advisory Committee
Elm Creek Watershed Management Commission
Hennepin County, MN

Dear Members:

A meeting of the Elm Creek Watershed Management Commission Technical Advisory Committee will be held on **Thursday, April 23, 2020, at 1:00 p.m.** This will be a virtual meeting.

Until further notice, all meetings will be held online to reduce the spread of COVID-19. To join a meeting, click [https://zoom.us/j/990970201](https://zoom.us/j/990970201) or go to [www.zoom.us](http://www.zoom.us) and click **Join A Meeting.** The meeting ID is **990-970-201.**

If your computer is not equipped with audio capability, you need to dial into one of these numbers:

- +1 929 205 6099 US (New York)
- +1 312 626 6799 US (Chicago)
- +1 669 900 6833 US (San Jose)
- +1 346 248 7799 US (Houston)
- +1 253 215 8782 US
- +1 301 715 8592 US

Meetings remain open to the public via the instructions above.

Please email me at judie@jass.biz to confirm whether you will be attending this meeting.

Thank you.

Judie A. Anderson
Administrator
JAA:tim
AGENDA
Technical Advisory Committee
April 23, 2020 • 1:00 p.m.

Until further notice, all meetings will be held online to reduce the spread of COVID-19. To join a meeting, click https://zoom.us/j/990970201 or go to www.zoom.us and click Join A Meeting. The meeting ID is 990-970-201.

If your computer is not equipped with audio capability, you need to dial into one of these numbers:

+1 929 205 6099 US (New York)   +1 312 626 6799 US (Chicago)
+1 669 900 6833 US (San Jose)    +1 346 248 7799 US (Houston)
+1 253 215 8782 US              +1 301 715 8592 US

1. Call TAC meeting to Order.
   a. Approve agenda.*
   b. Approve Minutes of last TAC meeting.*

2. Consider policy for non-structural practices.
   a. SCWM Policy.*
   b. Street Sweeper – additional information.*
   c. Eligible for CIP?
      1) Bring recommendations to Commission.

3. Review CIP* and Exhibits.
   a. Updated spreadsheet* and Exhibits* for CIPs being considered for levy in 2020.
      1) Recommend Commission call for public meeting.

4. Project Review History.
   a. 2019 Project Summary Costs.*
      1) 2020 Project Review Activity.*
      1) Draft revisions.*
   c. 2020 Operating Budget – project review portion.*
      1) Recommendation for adjustment in 2021.

5. Other Business.

6. Next meeting ________________.

7. Adjourn meeting of TAC.

*in meeting packet
**available at meeting
Technical Advisory Committee Meeting
Minutes – April 8, 2020

I. A virtual meeting of the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) for the Elm Creek Watershed Management Commission was convened at 10:34 a.m., Wednesday, April 8, 2020.

In attendance: Todd Tuominen, Champlin; Kevin Mattson, Corcoran; Nico Cantarero, Wenck Associates, Dayton; Derek Asche, Maple Grove; Kaci Fisher, Hakanson-Anderson, Medina; Ben Scharenbroich and Amy Riegel, Plymouth; Andrew Simmons, Rogers; Kris Guentzel, and Kirsten Barta, Hennepin County Dept. of Environment and Energy (HCEE); Jim Herbert, Barr Engineering; James Kujawa, Surface Water Solutions; Brian Vlach, Three Rivers Park District (TRPD); and Amy Juntunen and Judie Anderson, JASS.

A. Motion by Scharenbroich, second by Simmons to approve the agenda.* Motion carried unanimously.

B. Motion by Scharenbroich, second by Simmons to approve the minutes* of the January 8, 2020 Technical Advisory Committee meeting. Motion carried unanimously.

II. Capital Improvement Projects.

The members reviewed the CIP spreadsheet* and reported the status of each project. Three projects were added, specificity was added to two placeholder projects, and one project was removed.

Discussion occurred regarding the Enhanced Street Sweeper (Line 43). Information will be gathered and the Committee may develop a policy for this and similar practices. Similarly, the members will continue to discuss the Ranchview Wetland Restoration (Line 19).

III. The next meeting of the TAC is scheduled for 1:00 p.m., Thursday, April 23. This will be a virtual meeting. The agenda will include finalizing the CIP and calling for a Public Meeting, consideration of a policy for non-development practices, and review of the project review schedule v. current expenses.

IV. Other Business.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 11:40 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Judie A. Anderson
Recording Secretary
JAA:tim
Shingle Creek and West Mississippi Watershed Management Commissions
Cost Share Policy for Capital Improvements
Adopted 8/8/19

The Shingle Creek and West Mississippi Watershed Management Commissions share the cost of watershed-priority capital improvements and demonstration projects through the Commissions’ Capital Improvements Program (CIP). High-priority watershed capital improvements are those activities that go above and beyond general or routine city management activities to provide a significant improvement to the water resources in the watershed. This Cost Share Policy establishes the basis for and amount of Commission contribution to qualifying projects.

Capital Improvements

High priority activities that result in Wasteload Allocation reductions toward a TMDL, help solve a regional flooding problem, or are otherwise determined by the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) and Commissions to be high priority are eligible to receive up to 25 percent of the final improvement cost in Commission cost-share, funded by the county ad valorem tax levied on all property in the watershed. The balance of the improvement cost, less any grant or other funds received, must be funded by the local government(s) participating in or benefitting from the improvement. The Commissions’ minimum share is $50,000. There is no maximum share; the maximum is limited by the amount the Commission is willing/able to certify as a levy.

Eligible improvements include both structural and nonstructural activities. Routine maintenance or localized improvements are not eligible for cost share. Thus, a local street flooding issue is not of watershed priority, but a local flooding issue that creates significant erosion and sedimentation impacting a downstream resource may be a watershed priority. Capital equipment that has been demonstrated to reduce loading of TMDL pollutants such as TP, TSS, or chloride, may be eligible if: 1) the equipment is new or an upgrade and not simply a replacement of existing equipment; 2) the equipment is to allow the member city to undertake a new or expanded load-reducing activity; 3) use of the equipment for the load reductions is supported by academic or governmental research; and 4) the city agrees to document for at least five years the effectiveness of the capital equipment in achieving the load reductions. The demonstrated effectiveness, or lack thereof, of a particular item of capital equipment in achieving load reductions may affect the eligibility of such equipment for funding in the future. Examples of equipment purchase that may be eligible include equipment to begin or expand pre-wetting or anti-icing, or adding or upgrading to a regenerative air street sweeper. Only the incremental cost of such an upgrade would be eligible for cost share.

The Commissions have developed a set of criteria by which proposed activities may be scored, with only those that pass screening questions advancing to a prioritization stage by the Technical Advisory
Committee (TAC). Prioritization will be based on cost effectiveness, amount of improvement achieved, and regional significance.

**Activities of Watershed-Wide Benefit**

The capital cost of activities addressing TMDL Load Allocation reductions and projects of watershed-side benefit may be funded 100 percent by the ad valorem tax levy. These types of activities include but are limited to:

- **Lake Internal Load Reduction Actions**
  - Alum treatments
  - Rough fish management
  - With Hennepin County and DNR concurrence, initial, whole-lake invasive aquatic vegetation management treatments performed for water quality, excluding those for recreation, aesthetics, or navigation

- **Stream Internal Load Reduction Activities**
  - Channel narrowing or creation of a low-flow channel to reduce sediment oxygen demand
  - Projects to increase DO at wetland outlets

- **Non-TMDL Parameters (actions required by TMDLs not associated with a pollutant for which a numerical reduction of improvement can be specified)**
  - Restoration or enhancement of in-stream habitat
  - Increases in channel roughness to enhance DO
  - Removal or bypass of barriers to connectivity
  - Streambank restoration below the top of the bank

- **Other Watershed Benefiting Improvements as Recommended by the TAC**

**Guidelines**

1. Capital improvements must be for water quality or ecological integrity improvement, and must be for improvement above and beyond what would be required to meet Commission rules or common practice. Only the cost of “upsizing” a BMP above and beyond is eligible.
2. Preexisting routine maintenance activities are not eligible.
3. The effectiveness of any proposed nonstructural improvements must be supported by literature or academic/practitioner experience and documentation.
4. The applicant must agree to document the effectiveness of any proposed nonstructural improvements and report those results to the Commissions for at least five years.
5. The standard Commission/Member Cooperative Agreement will executed prior to BMP implementation. This Agreement will specify the type and adequacy of effectiveness reporting.
The City of Plymouth submitted a proposal to add an Enhanced Street Sweeper to the 2020 CIP list for $75,000 in spring 2019. The Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) and Commission discussed the addition and it was added to the Commission’s CIP. At the April 8th, 2020 meeting, the Elm Creek Watershed Management Commission Technical Advisory Committee reviewed existing and new Capital Improvement Projects. Questions regarding the proposed Enhanced Street Sweeper were brought forward by member cities. Below are a couple of discussion points that should be useful during the April 23rd, 2020 TAC meeting:

- Street and parking lot sweeping is recognized by the MPCA as an approved BMP. It’s effective for reducing solids (gravel, sand & trash), nutrients (phosphorus and nitrogen) and chlorides from entering water bodies throughout the city

- The regenerative air sweeper is more effective at collecting fine sediment, salt, and small debris that isn’t effectively collected by standard mechanical sweepers.

- The sweeper would allow for winter sweeping, respond to salt spills and early thaw pre-collection of salt in key areas

- Increased street sweeping is listed in the Elm Creek Watershed TMDL/WRAPS as one practice to help meet water quality goals. Enhanced sweeping could also assist with future Chloride TMDLs

- Street sweeping is a cost effective BMP compared to other types of BMPs such as ponds, erosion repair & stream restorations. The City of Edina conducted a study and estimated the cost per pound of phosphorus recovered to be between $150/lb. to $190/lb. depending on sweeping frequency. Below are examples of projects within the Elm Creek Watershed and their proposed cost per pound TP reductions from the CIP submittal document
  - Stormwater Pond & Erosion Repair (Hickory Drive Stormwater Improvement) $11,575 per lb. TP/ year
  - Stream Restoration (Elm Creek – Reach D) $5,560 per lb. TP / year

- Street Sweeping fits the watershed goals of:
  - Improve Total Phosphorus concentration in the impaired lakes by 10% over the 2004-2013 average by 2024
  - Maintain or improve water quality in the lakes and streams with no identified impairments
  - Foster implementation of priority TMDL and other implementation projects by sharing in their cost and proactively seeking grant funds

In addition to these points, I will be able to speak to the City of Plymouth past findings on sweeper effectiveness and the plan for utilizing the sweeper going forward.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proj</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Starting Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Levy Amount</th>
<th>CIPS Total</th>
<th>Total Studies</th>
<th>Community Share</th>
<th>City, County, Other Partners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2019-01</td>
<td>Storm Drain Improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-02</td>
<td>Strengthen Harmful Algae Bloom Mitigation Efforts</td>
<td>Champlin</td>
<td>2019-03</td>
<td>2018-03</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL COMM STUDIES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **TOTAL STUDIES** | | | | | | | | | 154,271

**Total CIPS** $2,774,362

**Levy Amount** $150,000

**Total Levy** $2,924,362

**Total Community Share** $1,940,362

**Total City, County, Other Partners** $1,784,000
EXHIBIT A
Elm Creek Watershed Management Commission
Capital Improvement Project Submittal
(This submittal will be rated on its completeness and adherence to the goals of the Commission.
A second page may be used to provide complete responses.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Hennepin County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contact Name</td>
<td>Kirsten Barta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>612-543-3373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Kirsten.barta@hennepin.us">Kirsten.barta@hennepin.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>701 4th Ave S, Suite 700, Minneapolis, MN 55415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Name</td>
<td>Livestock Exclusion, Buffers, Stabilizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Location</td>
<td>Rush Creek Subwatershed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Is project in Member's CIP? (x) yes ( ) no

2. Has a feasibility study or an engineering report (circle one) been done for this project? (x) yes ( ) no

3. What is the scope of the project?
   There are several potential projects these funds will be split up between along the N Fork of Rush Creek, a feedlot moved out of the floodplain, some tributary hydrologic restorations, wetlands restoration, and other ag practices

4. What is the purpose of the project? What water resource(s) will be impacted by the project?
   The purpose is to reduce sediment, bacteria, nutrient, and other pollutant loads into Rush Creek

5. What is the anticipated improvement that would result from the project? (Include size of area treated and projected nutrient reduction.)
   Depending on the projects installed, there could be very large benefits from removing an active feedlot from the stream and reducing a large sediment load to Jubert Lake

6. How does the project contribute to achieving the goals and programs of the Commission?
   These projects will help meet Elm Creek TMDL goals, Rush Creek is specifically called out as impaired in the TMDL as well as the IBI stressor ID report MPCA wrote.

0/10 7. Does the project result from a regulatory mandate? ( ) yes ( ) no  How?

0/5 8. Does the project address one or more TMDL requirements? (x) yes ( ) no  Which? TSS, Nutrients, bacteria

0/10 9. Does the project have an educational component? (x) yes ( ) no  Describe. Landowners who contact us are educated on a variety of conservation measures and the County hosts education field days at the site of large projects that may be of interest to other landowners.

10/20 10. Do all the LGUs responsible for sharing in the cost of the project agree to go forward with this project? (x) yes ( ) no  Identify the LGUs. BWSR has already given the funds to Hennepin

10/20 11. Is the project in all the LGUs’ CIPs? (x) yes ( ) no

(For TAC use)
12. Does project improve water quality? (0-10)
13. Prevent or correct erosion? (0-10)
14. Prevent flooding? (0-5)
15. Promote groundwater recharge? (0-3)
16. Protect and enhance fish and wildlife habitat? (0-3)
17. Improve or create water recreation facilities? (0-3)

TOTAL (poss 114)
Adopted April 11, 2012 Revised May 2019
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**EXHIBIT A**

**Elm Creek Watershed Management Commission**

**Capital Improvement Project Submittal**

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Hennepin County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contact Name</td>
<td>Kirsten Barta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>612-543-3373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Kirsten.barta@hennepin.us">Kirsten.barta@hennepin.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>701 4th Ave S, Suite 700, Minneapolis, MN 55415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Name</td>
<td>Ag BMPs Cost Share</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Location</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Is project in Member’s CIP? (x) yes ( ) no</td>
<td>Proposed CIP Year = 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Has a feasibility study or an engineering report (circle one) been done for this project? (x) yes ( ) no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total Estimated Project Cost | $500,000 |
| Estimated Commission Share (up to 25%, not to exceed $250,000) | $50,000 |
| Other Funding Sources (name them) – BWSR CWF grant | $142,000 |
| Hennepin County + state cost share funds and landowner match | $308,000 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. What is the scope of the project?</th>
<th>Series of projects in the Rush Creek subwatershed on private lands – generally ag practices like grassed waterways, drainage management, manure storage, etc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. What is the purpose of the project? What water resource(s) will be impacted by the project?</td>
<td>Proposed projects will reduce sediment, nutrient, and bacteria loads to the N Fork of Rush Creek. Projects on the S Fork will also be considered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. What is the anticipated improvement that would result from the project? (Include size of area treated and projected nutrient reduction.)</td>
<td>Varies greatly depending on the projects implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. How does the project contribute to achieving the goals and programs of the Commission?</td>
<td>Reduces pollutant loads in the largest tributary to Elm Creek</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

0/10 | 7. Does the project result from a regulatory mandate? ( ) yes (x) no | How? |

0/10/20 | 8. Does the project address one or more TMDL requirements? (x) yes ( ) no | Which? |

0/10/20 | 9. Does the project have an educational component? (x) yes ( ) no | Describe. Many landowners contacted for the project are receiving advising even if they are not getting a project installed |

0/10 | 10. Do all the LGUs responsible for sharing in the cost of the project agree to go forward with this project? (x) yes ( ) no | Identify the LGUs. Hennepin County (BWSR already gave funds) |

10/20 | 11. Is the project in all the LGUs’ CIPs? (x) yes ( ) no |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1-34</th>
<th>(For TAC use)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12. Does project improve water quality? (0-10)</td>
<td>15. Promote groundwater recharge? (0-3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Prevent or correct erosion? (0-10)</td>
<td>16. Protect and enhance fish and wildlife habitat? (0-3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Prevent flooding? (0-5)</td>
<td>17. Improve or create water recreation facilities? (0-3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL (poss 114) |  |

Adopted April 11, 2012 Revised May 2019
**EXHIBIT A**

**Elm Creek Watershed Management Commission**

**Capital Improvement Project Submittal**

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Plymouth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contact Name</td>
<td>Ben Scharenbroich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>763-509-5527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td><a href="mailto:bscharenbroich@plymouthmn.gov">bscharenbroich@plymouthmn.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>3400 Plymouth Blvd, Plymouth, MN 55447</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Project Name | Enhanced Street Sweeper |

1. Is project in Member’s CIP? (X) yes ( ) no  
   Proposed CIP Year = 2020

2. Has a feasibility study or an engineering report (circle one) been done for this project? ( ) yes (X) no

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Estimated Project Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Commission Share (up to 25%, not to exceed $250,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Funding Sources (name them)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Plymouth</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. What is the scope of the project?

   The City is looking to purchase a high-efficiency street sweeper to improve street sweeping efficiency and reduce pollutant loading to Elm Creek.

4. What is the purpose of the project? What water resource(s) will be impacted by the project?

   Street sweeping is one of the most cost effective best management practices for improving water quality and reducing pollutant loading to Elm Creek and Rice Lake. Plymouth is bringing our street sweeping program in-house in 2019 and is committed to expanding our street sweeping program to address water quality concerns.

5. What is the anticipated improvement that would result from the project? (Include size of area treated and projected nutrient reduction.)

   There are 44 centerline (88 curb miles) in the City of Plymouth within the Elm Creek Watershed. As such, the following are the estimated pollutant removals from this practice based on the Minnesota Stormwater Manual.

   - Phosphorus = 65 pounds per sweep or 260 pounds per year
   - Nitrogen = 435 pounds per sweep or 1,740 pounds per year
   - Chloride = 11 pounds per year or 44 pounds per year.

   The City will also analyze its sweeping frequencies as recommended by the Minnesota Stormwater Manual and make adjustments as necessary.

6. How does the project contribute to achieving the goals and programs of the Commission?

   The goal of this purchase is to help reduce pollutant loading to Elm Creek and eventually Rice Lake to work towards TMDL goals. A secondary goal would be to expand public education regarding street sweeping.

   **0/10**

7. Does the project result from a regulatory mandate? (X) yes ( ) no  
   How? TMDL for Elm Creek and Rice Lake

8. Does the project address one or more TMDL requirements? (X) yes ( ) no  
   Which? Rice Lake – Nutrient/Eutrophication

9. Does the project have an educational component? (X) yes ( ) no  
   Describe.

   The City is committed to educating the public on the benefits of street sweeping for water quality...
through our website, newsletters and videos. Plymouth would also include graphics on the street sweeper to promote the benefits of street sweeping and can include the Elm Creek Watershed Management Commissions logo on the sweeper.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0/10</th>
<th>10. Do all the LGUs responsible for sharing in the cost of the project agree to go forward with this project? (X) yes ( ) no Identify the LGUs.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10/20</td>
<td>11. Is the project in all the LGUs’ CIPs? (X) yes ( ) no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-34</td>
<td>(For TAC use)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12. Does project improve water quality? (0-10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13. Prevent or correct erosion? (0-10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14. Prevent flooding? (0-5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15. Promote groundwater recharge? (0-3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16. Protect and enhance fish and wildlife habitat? (0-3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17. Improve or create water recreation facilities? (0-3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>(poss 114)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adopted April 11, 2012
## 2019 Elm Creek Project Review Activity

| A | B | C | D | E | F | G | H | I | J | K | L | M | N | O | P | Q | R | U |
| 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | 2018-033 | Cloquet Island Estates | Dayton | 3,883.00 | x | x | x | x | 7,014.00 | 3,673.50 |
| 3 | 2018-053 | Elm Creek Stream Restoration Project (Champlin) | Champlin | 550.00 | x | x | x | x | 1,000.00 | 700.00 |
| 4 | 2019-001 | Fernbrook View Apartments | MG | 542.50 | x | x | x | | | |
| 5 | 2019-002 | Parkside Villas | Champlin | 747.00 | x | x | x | | | |
| 6 | 2019-003 | Rogers High School Tennis Court | Rogers | 777.50 | x | x | x | | | |
| 7 | 2019-004 | Rogers Middle School Chiller Units | Rogers | 372.50 | x | x | x | | | |
| 8 | 2019-005 | I-94 UGBL (Internal Review) | Rogers | | | x | x | x | | |
| 9 | 2019-006 | Hickory Drive Street & Utility Improvement | Medina | 400.00 | x | x | x | | | |
| 10 | 2019-007 | Westin Ridge | Plymouth | 2,570.00 | x | x | x | | 2,452.00 |
| 11 | 2019-008 | Residences on Elm Creek | Medina | 550.00 | x | x | x | | |
| 12 | 2019-009 | Beacon Ridge | Plymouth | 780.00 | x | x | x | | 1,464.00 | 15,116.50 |
| 13 | 2019-010 | Hindu Temple Solar Array Installation | MG | 200.00 | x | x | x | | |
| 14 | 2019-011 | Ravinia 11th Addition | Corcoran | 329.70 | x | x | x | | |
| 15 | 2019-012 | Brockton Lane Reconstruction Project | Plymouth | 50.00 | x | x | x | | |
| 16 | 2019-013 | Boston Scientific Parking Expansion | MG | 327.50 | x | x | x | | |
| 17 | 2019-014 | Bellwether 2nd Addition (Encore 2018-032) | Corcoran | x | x | x | | |
| 18 | 2019-015 | Timbers Edge | Plymouth | 948.00 | x | | | | 1,336.50 |
| 19 | 2019-016 | Rogers Retail Development | Rogers | 400.00 | x | x | x | | |
| 20 | 2019-017 | French Lake Industrial Center - Liberty Trust | Dayton | 2,875.00 | x | x | | | 2,740.50 |
| 21 | 2019-018 | Peony Lane N Trailhead | Plymouth | 1,575.00 | x | x | x | | |
| 22 | 2019-019 | Promrose School of Rogers | Rogers | 625.00 | x | x | x | | 1,579.50 |
| 23 | 2019-020 | CSAH 50 and CSAH 30 Culvert Replacement | Corcoran | 50.00 | General permit | x | x | | |
| 24 | 2019-021 | Bretly Meadows | Rogers | 394.50 | x | x | x | | |
| 25 | 2019-022 | Comlink Midwest (CML Holdings LLC) | Corcoran | 4,185.00 | x | x | x | | |
| 26 | 2019-023 | 99th Avenue Apartments | MG | 2,155.00 | x | x | x | | |
| 27 | 2019-024 | Boston Scientific Weaver Lake Rd Bldg 2 East Addition | MG | 575.00 | x | x | x | | |
| 28 | 2019-025 | Dayton Parkway Interchange | Dayton | 3,500.00 | x | x | x | | 4,525.00 |
| 29 | 2019-026 | Interstate Power Systems | Rogers | 2,550.00 | x | x | x | | |
| 30 | 2019-027 | Havenwood of Maple Grove | MG | 1,495.00 | x | x | x | | |
| 31 | 2019-028 | Howell Meadows | MG | 650.00 | x | x | x | | |
| 32 | 2019-029 | South Prominence | MG | 1,150.00 | x | x | x | | |
| 33 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 34 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 35 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 36 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 37 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 38 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 39 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 40 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 41 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 42 | TOTAL 2019 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 43 | as of 11/01/2019 | 31,055.40 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 44 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 45 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 46 | AVERAGE COST | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 47 | Barr - two projects | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 48 | Henn Co - 28 projects | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| A | B | C | D | E | F | G | H | I | J | K | L | M | N | O | P | Q | R | S | T | U | V |
| 1 | Project Reviews - 2020 invoicing | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | 27-Mar | Barr | Subconsult | Expenses | $ Total | Subconsultant | March | Feb | Jan | $ Total | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | 2019-001 Fernbrook View Apts | Job 100 - technical services, TAC and Reg meeting attendance, pre-project review, | 3,891.00 | 1,650.00 | 35.65 | 5,576.65 | 2019-028 Howell Meadows | 50 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | 2019-031 Hassan Sand & Gravel | Ravina wetland monitoring, General admin tasks (invoicing, project set-up) | 3,891.00 | 1,650.00 | 35.65 | 5,576.65 | 2019-032 OSI HQ Addition | 100 | 1,000 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6 | 2020-001 Markets at Rush Creek Outlot L | Job 200 - other assistance - MTDs - review technical submittal, task group | 1,127.00 | 10.35 | | 1,137.35 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9 | 2020-002 Project 100 | Participation (share w/Bassett Creek) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 10 | 2020-003 Palisades at Nottingham | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 11 | 2020-004 Elm Road Area | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12 | 2020-005 Territory Development, Rogers | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13 | 2020-006 Zachary Villas | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 14 | 2020-007 Pineview Oakview Lane | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 15 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 16 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 17 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 18 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 19 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 21 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 22 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 23 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 24 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 25 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 26 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 27 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 28 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 29 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 30 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 31 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 32 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 33 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 34 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 35 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 36 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 37 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 38 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 39 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 40 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 41 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 42 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 43 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 44 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
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Elm Creek Watershed Management Commission
Request for Plan Review and Approval

for Commission use only

Project No. ____________________

Date Received ____________________

Fee Received ____________________

Date: ____________________

Fee Submitted: $ __________

Please Print Clearly

Applicant:
Address: __________________________________________
City: ______________________ Zip Code: __________
Phone: ( _______ ) __________ Fax: ( _______ ) __________ Email: __________________________

Agent:
Address: __________________________________________
City: ______________________ Zip Code: __________
Phone: ( _______ ) __________ Fax: ( _______ ) __________ Email: __________________________

[ ] Residential Development
[ ] Commercial/Industrial Development
[ ] Issuance of General Permit
[ ] Other (explain) __________________________
[ ] Floodplain Alteration
[ ] Drainage Alteration
[ ] Road Construction
[ ] Pond Excavation

Project Name: ______________________________________

Project Location - City or Town: ________________________ PID#: ________________________

Total Acres: ______________________ Acres Disturbed: ______________________

Acres Impervious Before Development: ______________________

Acres Impervious After Development (incl. gravel roads and parking areas): ______________________

For Residential Developments: Number of Lots: ______________________

Anticipated Project Start Date: ______________________

Remarks: ______________________________________

Applicant's Signature:
Print Name: ______________________ x ______________________

In order for a project to be considered by the Commission, a complete application packet must be received in the Commission’s administrative office at least TEN BUSINESS DAYS prior to the Commission’s next regular meeting. Action by the Commission will be predicated on factors such as completeness of the application documents and complexity of the project, etc. The Commission normally meets on the second Wednesday of the month.

Submit this form to the City along with one paper and one electronic copy of the required plans and the appropriate fee (check made payable to “Elm Creek Watershed Management Commission”).

The City will forward these documents and the fee payment to the Commission. The Commission will transmit a letter to the applicant following approval.

Submittal requirements, this form and the fee schedule can be downloaded from:
http://www.elmcreekwatershed.org/project-reviews-overview.html
Elm Creek Watershed Management Commission
Project Review Fee Schedule and Worksheet
Effective July 28, 2015

| I. No applications will be reviewed until the Commission receives a completed application form, all appropriate materials, and fees. |
| Amount Due |
| II. Application Fee |
| $ 50.00 |
| III. Project Reviews |
| A. New Development - Area is the Site Area |
| 1 Residential |
| a. High density - more than 40% impervious area |
| 0 to 20 acres = Area x $100 |
| 21 to 100 acres = $2,000 + (Area -20) x $75 |
| 101 + acres = $8,000 + (Area - 100) x $20 |
| maximum fee = $10,000 + application fee |
| b. Low density - less than 40% impervious area |
| 0 to 100 acres = Area x $50 |
| 101 to 150 acres = $5,000 + (Area -100) x $20 |
| maximum fee = $6,000 + application fee |
| 2 Commercial / Industrial / Institutional / governmental agency development project |
| 0 to 40 acres = Area x $250 |
| 41 + acres = $10,000 + (Area - 40) x $75 |
| maximum fee = $12,250 + application fee |
| B. Re-development |
| 1 For Re-development use the "New Development" rates above but use Disturbed Area (in acres) instead of Site Area |
| Note: If more than 50% of the site is disturbed for a Re-development project, use the New Development fee formula with Site Area |
| C. Development / Re-development with mapped floodplains on site |
| 1 No impact or impacts < 100 cubic yards. |
| $ 100 |
| 2 Impacts > 100 cubic yards. |
| $ 500 |
| D. Linear Projects |
| 1 1.0 - 2.0 acres new impervious surface = $500 |
| 2 Over 2.00 acres new impervious surface = $500 + (new impervious area - 2) x $250 |
| maximum fee = $5,000 + application fee |
| E. Drainage alterations - Any culvert installation or replacement, bridge construction, stream cross-section alteration, or activity requiring a DNR Waters Permit |
| 1 on Elm, Rush, North Fork Rush, or Diamond Creeks |
| $ 500 |
| 2 on all other tributaries within the watershed |
| $ 100 |
| F. Water appropriation permits (two years) |
| $ 50 |
| IV. Wetland Project Fees |
| G. Wetland fees apply in the communities (Champlin and Corcoran) where the Commission is the LU for the Wetland Conservation Association (WCA) and are in addition to the project fees. |
| 1 Exemption certificates |
| $ 100 |
| 2 Determinations |
| $ 100 |
| 3 Delineation review |
| $ 250 |
| 4 Pond Excavations |
| $ 100 |
| 5 Wetland replacement plans <10,000 SF impact on single basins or <1/4 acre impact for private driveways |
| $ 400 |
| 6 All other replacement plans |
| $ 2,500 |
| 7 Replacement plan in conjunction with wetland banking |
| a. All other wetland banking applications |
| $ 3,500 |
| Additional wetland replacement plan and banking application escrows and sureties are determined on a site-specific basis. (See page 2.) |
| V. Failure to make application and receive approval prior to beginning work results in doubling of fees |

| Total fees 1 |
| Double Fee If V. applies 2 |
| Total due (Line 1 or 2) |

1 The following projects require review: Any land disturbing activity or the development or re-development of land as listed in Rule D. 2. (Appendix O).
2 Density = number of units per buildable area prior to development. Buildable area = Site Area excluding wetlands and floodplains. Rights-of-way are included in buildable area. Acresage is based on total Site Area unless noted.
3 Impervious area includes any compacted gravel surface such as road shoulders, parking lots and storage areas.
4 Sidewalks and trails that do not exceed twelve feet in width, are not constructed with other improvements, and have a minimum of five feet of vegetated buffer on both sides are exempt from Stormwater Management requirements (RULE D), but has to comply with Erosion and Sediment Control requirements (RULE E).
The following projects require review: Any land-disturbing activity or the development or redevelopment of land as listed in Rule D.2. of Appendix O of the Commission's Watershed Management Plan. The review period will not begin until the Commission has received a completed application form bearing city authorization to proceed, all appropriate materials, and fees.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I. Application Fee</th>
<th>Amount Due</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$ 50.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: When calculating acreage, round up to nearest whole no. Example, 31.35 acres = 32 acres.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>II. Project Reviews</th>
<th>Amount Due</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Residential</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 to 100 acres</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101 + acres</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maximum fee</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75</td>
<td>application fee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. New Development - Area is the Site Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 to 20 acres = Area x $100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 to 100 acres = $2,000 + (Area minus 20 acres) x $75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101 + acres = $8,000 + (Area minus 100 acres) x $20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maximum fee = $10,000 + application fee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B. Re-Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 to 40 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 + acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maximum fee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C. Development / Re-development with mapped floodplains on site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. No impact or impacts ≤ 100 cubic yards. $ 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Impacts &gt; 100 cubic yards. $ 500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D. Linear Projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalks and trails that do not exceed twelve feet in width, are not constructed with other improvements, and have a minimum of five feet of vegetated buffer on both sides are exempt from Stormwater Management requirements (Rule D), but have to comply with Erosion and Sediment Control requirements (Rule E). Impervious area includes any compacted gravel surface such as road shoulders, parking lots and storage areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. 1.0 - 2.0 acres new impervious surface = $500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Over 2.0 acres new impervious surface = $500 + (new impervious area minus 2.0 acres) x $250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maximum fee = $5,000 + application fee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E. Drainage alterations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Any culvert installation or replacement, bridge construction, stream cross-section alteration, or activity requiring a DNR Waters Permit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. on Elm, Rush, North Fork Rush, or Diamond Creeks $ 500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. on all other tributaries within the watershed $ 100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F. Water appropriation permit (two years)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$ 50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>III. Failure to make application and receive approval prior to beginning work results in doubling of fees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total fees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Double Fee if III. applies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total due (Line 1 or 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Site Area = new development area. (Acreage is based on Site Area)
Buildable Area = site area excluding wetlands and floodplains. Rights-of-way are included in buildable area. Acreage is based on total Site Area unless noted.
Disturbed Area = any change in existing land surface.
Density = number of units per buildable area prior to development.

Date Application Received by Commission

Project No.

Fee Received

Effective September 1, 2019
# Elm Creek Watershed Management Commission - Proposed 2021 Operating Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>AT</th>
<th>AV</th>
<th>AW</th>
<th>AX</th>
<th>AY</th>
<th>AZ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2018 Budget</td>
<td>2018 Audit</td>
<td>2019 Budget</td>
<td>2019 pre-Audit</td>
<td>2020 Budget</td>
<td>Proposed 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>GENERAL OPERATING BUDGET</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Operating Expenses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Project Reviews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Technical - HCEE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>95,000</td>
<td>92,477</td>
<td>97,400</td>
<td>70,473</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Technical - HCEE - Floodplain modeling 2018=A/R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>46,386</td>
<td>46,386</td>
<td>39,360</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Technical Support - Consultant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>37,553</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>20,389</td>
<td>185,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Admin Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>13,543</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>8,542</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>167,386</strong></td>
<td><strong>143,573</strong></td>
<td><strong>173,786</strong></td>
<td><strong>99,404</strong></td>
<td><strong>239,360</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Wetland Conservation Act</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>WCA Expense - HCEE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17,750</td>
<td>15,886</td>
<td>18,200</td>
<td>3,710</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>WCA Expense - Legal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>500</td>
<td>683</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>WCA Expense - Admin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>3,388</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>19,750</strong></td>
<td><strong>19,957</strong></td>
<td><strong>20,700</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,165</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,500</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Project Review Fees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>73,305</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>45,874</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>WCA Fees- Forfeited/Reimbursed Sureties, Reimbursement from LGUs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,733</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>655</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>76,038</td>
<td>84,000</td>
<td>46,529</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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