

elm creek Watershed Management Commission

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

Technical Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes | October 12, 2022

I. A meeting of the **Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)** of the Elm Creek Watershed Management Commission was called to order at 10:35 a.m., Wednesday, October 12, 2022, in the Aspen Room, Plymouth Community Center, 14800 34th Avenue North, Plymouth, MN, by Chair Derek Asche.

Present: Heather Nelson, Champlin; Kevin Mattson, Corcoran; Nico Cantarero, Stantec, Dayton; Derek Asche, Maple Grove; Matt Danzl, Hakanson-Anderson, Medina; Ben Scharenbroich, Plymouth; Andrew Simmons, Rogers; Diane Spector and Erik Megow, Stantec; James Kujawa, Surface Water Solutions; Kris Guentzel and Kevin Ellis, Hennepin County Dept. of Environment and Energy (HCEE); and Judie Anderson, JASS.

Also present: Ken Guenther, Corcoran; and Doug Baines, Dayton.

II. Motion by Simmons, second by Nelson to approve the **agenda**. * *Motion carried unanimously.*

III. Motion by Danzl, second by Nelson to approve the **minutes*** of the May 18, 2022, meeting. *Motion carried unanimously.* Since the sign-in sheet has been misplaced, Anderson is asking members to confirm their attendance at the May meeting. The May 18 minutes will be updated accordingly.

IV. **Boundary Revisions.***

A. As discussed at the September regular meeting, the Commission has been notified by the Shingle Creek and West Mississippi WMOs (SCWM) that they are in the process of updating their hydrologic and legal boundaries and are requesting review and concurrence from the adjoining watershed organizations, including Elm Creek. The original legal boundary was established in the early 1980s using the best information available at that time, which included basic H & H modeling and USGS 10-foot topographic mapping. Since that time, finer resolution topography has become available, as has more refined hydrologic and hydraulic (H&H) modeling and storm sewer/drainage network information to establish the hydrologic boundaries more accurately.

B. There are many locations where the newer hydro boundary does not match the original hydro boundary. The West Mississippi WMO never established a hydro boundary; the legal boundary just followed the Elm boundary. In addition, the legal boundaries were drawn to parcel boundaries, and many of the larger agricultural parcels have since been subdivided, leaving many parcels on the edges of the watersheds in the wrong watershed.

Reasons it is desirable to have legal boundaries that match hydro boundaries as closely as possible include:

1. The annual operating budget is funded primarily from city assessments, and each individual city's share of those assessments is based on its share of the taxable market value of property in the watershed. Hennepin County computes these numbers by adding up the taxable market value of every parcel within each city in the watershed, so assigning each parcel to its proper watershed makes for a fairer division of assessments between cities.

2. Each of the affected watersheds annually certify capital project levies, which are spread as a special district tax over all the property in the watershed. Assigning each parcel to its proper watershed helps to assure that property owners are being taxed for the projects in the watershed to which it drains.

C. The SCWM engineer has used the recent HUC 8 study and other H&H modeling as well as storm sewer network and project review plans to propose a revised hydro boundary. The cities in Elm Creek that are also in the Shingle Creek and West Mississippi watersheds have already been working with the SCWM engineer to ground-truth the boundaries. The new proposed legal boundary conforms closely to the hydro boundary. However, the engineer developed certain rules to guide how that boundary is drawn to smooth the lines, follow parcel and right of way boundaries, and handle various oddball situations. As a result, there will be some differences between the proposed hydro and legal boundaries. The draft boundaries can be viewed at: [SCWM Legal Boundary Review - PUBLIC \(arcgis.com\)](#)

The SCWM Commissions have asked Elm Creek to review the proposed boundaries and issue a formal resolution of concurrence by November 30, 2022. Staff recommends that the cities that abut SCWM review and finalize those proposed boundaries so that the Commission can review and consider such a resolution at the November 10, 2022, meeting. Staff will send an email to the TAC members with a link so that they forward this information on to the appropriate persons in their cities.

V. WBIF Priority Assessments.*

A. During the WBIF process there was \$92,274 in remaining funds that were designated for “priority assessments.” To date, only two assessments were proposed by cities: Corcoran proposed completing the South Fork Rush Creek subwatershed assessment (SWA) similar to the previous Rush Creek Headwaters SWA and Dayton proposed further investigating the feasibility of a natural channel restoration of the Diamond Lake outlet channel to Diamond Creek. The estimated cost of the SWA, based on the cost of the Headwaters SWA, is \$65,000. An estimate of the cost for the channel restoration feasibility study has not been prepared. No other assessments were advanced by cities.

B. If the TAC and Commission elect to go forward with the South Fork SWA, the grant would fund \$59,090 of the project, leaving a balance \$33,184 to be allocated. The Diamond Creek SWA included a high-level estimate of cost for construction of the project (\$400,000 excluding land) based on a conceptual design, but more detailed survey and design work has not been completed. The \$33,184 is likely more than what would be required for another project.

During the discussion, Staff posed the following questions:

1. Are you comfortable recommending going forward with the South Fork SWA?
2. Do you wish to pursue the proposed Diamond Lake outlet channel study?
3. Do you want to add a stream condition assessment component to the South Fork SWA?
4. Are there any other assessments such as stream assessments, lake internal load or rough fish studies that you want to explore?
5. How do you want to proceed?

C. Simmons proposed re-meandering Rush Creek between CR 116 and Brockton Lane near Stieg Woods in the City of Rogers as another possible project.

VI. 16630/16750 Dayton River Road.*

In early September representatives from the Commission, County, and the City of Dayton met with two property owners on Dayton River Road, where the County will be doing roadwork, replacing several culverts and stabilizing ravines in 2023. Runoff from an area south of the road across from their

houses is conveyed to the north side by a culvert under the roadway. The County plans on widening the road, replacing the culvert and extending and adding pipe. The property owners' concern is the existing channel degradation on the intermittently flowing pipe and the expectation that it may get worse as development across from their properties increases runoff to the culvert.

It is the Staffs' conclusion that the culvert extension itself likely will not increase flow, but it will direct it into the opposite bank and increase the efficiency of flow. There are several feet of fall to the River, so with future increased flow continued head-cutting will occur, increasing erosion and sedimentation to the River. Hennepin County does not intend to include stabilization of this private channel in its project but would be willing to contribute financially to the cost of stabilizing this channel which, by quick estimate, would be about \$50,000. The City of Dayton has agreed to take the lead on this project and would like to request cost share funds from the Commission. The City would like to have its engineering consultant prepare a design and cost estimate to submit to the Commission and County for cost share.

The purpose of this discussion is to avoid conflicts of interest up front and request approval of the TAC and Commission to complete this work. Since Erik Megow will likely be working with Dayton City Engineer Jason Quisberg, a Stantec employee, on this project, Staff would ask Jim Kujawa or Rebecca Carlson to review the work and cost share application and make a recommendation to the Commission.

Motion by Nelson, second by Simmons recommend this project to the Commission for Cost-Share funding using the process described above. *Motion carried unanimously.*

[Mattson arrived 11:09 a.m.]

VII. Chloride.*

Commissioner Cesnik attended the 2022 Salt Symposium and found the presentations informative. Many of those presentations were high-level research or policy or were specifically oriented toward cities and counties and other road maintenance operators. There are other chloride-related topics that have come up recently that the TAC could explore or discuss further.

A. For some of the recent project reviews the Commissioners have asked that a provision be added recommending the developer or some other party consider developing a **salt management plan** to reduce potential chloride impacts. There are some watershed organizations in the Metro that do require this with their stormwater permits, with mixed success. In addition, the **Hennepin County Chloride Initiative (HCCI)** has developed voluntary salt management plan templates that are available for use by WMOs, cities, private parties, etc. The Commission has not yet reviewed those templates or discussed how they might be used.

B. The HCCI is just finishing up development of its marketing campaign **Low Salt No Salt Minnesota**. In addition to the logo and tag, there are short videos and other marketing materials. The intent was to first target HOAs and faith-based groups, but this is information that is more broadly applicable. As that campaign moves to implementation, the TAC and Commissioners can discuss future roles and responsibilities.

C. It was a consensus that this discussion be held at the Commission level regarding how to proceed, providing big picture guidance to MS4 permittees -- hear what the Commissioners have to say in order not to burden the cities. *Query: Should the Commission take the follow-up responsibility regarding salt management plans?*

[Scharenbroich arrived 11:19 a.m.]

VIII. PRAP Response.*

Several months ago, a small group of TAC representatives met to discuss the comments that were in the BWSR PRAP performance review.

1. Develop clear prioritized, targeted, and measurable actions for future watershed management plan
2. Complete an internal analysis of the Commission's Capital Improvement Program
3. Conduct a review of the Commission's regulatory program requirements and standards
4. Assess and develop a coordinated communication and outreach strategy for engaging individual landowners

The small group recommended documenting the status and processes for comments 2 and 4, then focus on comment 1, mainly as to the Third Generation Plan's water quantity goals. The concern was that, as the Commission sets the stage for development of the Fourth Gen Plan in 2024, we need to develop some way to measure and document progress towards goals A1 and A3 (below). Goals A2 and A4 are perhaps over ambitious and are proving difficult to achieve given the soils in the watershed. Some thought should be given to recrafting those goals or developing some other metrics. This is not a time-sensitive activity and could be completed in 2023 as we start thinking about the Fourth Gen Plan.

- A.1. Maintain the post-development 2-year, 10-year, and 100-year peak rate of runoff at predevelopment level for the critical duration precipitation event.
- A.2. Maintain the post-development annual runoff volume at pre-development volume.
- A.3. Prevent the loss of floodplain storage below the established 100-year elevation.
- A.4. Reduce peak flow rates in Elm, Diamond, and Rush Creeks and tributary streams to the Crow and Mississippi and preserve conveyance capacity.

This item will be tabled to a future meeting.

IX. **Paul Stewart** has left his position at the County. It had been recommended at the September regular meeting that the Commission write a letter to the County recommending that this position be made full-time. Guentzel reported that, currently, the position is being filled using funds from a BWSR grant as compensation. Staff will seek the name of the individual at the County to whom a letter should be sent recommending this position become full time in the future.

X. The next Technical Advisory Committee meeting is tentatively scheduled for November 9, 2022.

XI. There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 11:32 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Judie A. Anderson
Recording Secretary
JAA:tim