Riley-Purgatory-Bluff Creek Watershed District
Board of Managers Monthly Meeting and Public Hearing

Wednesday, February 19, 2014 – 5:30pm
Eden Prairie City Center
Heritage Room
8080 Mitchell Rd
Eden Prairie, MN 55344

Tentative Agenda

1. Call to Order

2. Approval of the Agenda  Action

3. Reading and approval of minutes  Action

   Board of Manager Budget Workshop and Regular Meeting January 8, 2014

4. Rules and Regulation Workshop  Action

5. Stormwater Ponds  Information

6. Hearing and discussion of matters of general public interest  Information

Anyone wishing to address the Board of Managers on an item not on the agenda may come forward at this time. The chair will recognize the speakers one by one. Speakers are requested to state their name and address for the record. Comments will be limited to 5 minutes per speaker.

7. Board Action
   a. Lake Lucy Spent Lime TO  Action
   b. Bluff Creek Fish Passage and Streambank Restoration TO  Action
   c. WOMP TO  Action
   d. NEMO TO  Action

8. Manager’s Discussion  Information
b. Full-time Staff Hire

c. Aquatic Invasive Species

d. Upcoming board agenda

9. Upcoming Events

• **Board Meeting**, Wednesday, March 5, 2014, Council Chambers, 7:00pm
• **Native Plant Landscaping**, March 26, 2014, Minnetonka Community Room, 7:00pm
• **Evening with the Watershed**, Thursday, April 3, 2014, Chanhassen American Legion, 7:00pm

10. Adjournment
MEETING MINUTES
Riley-Purgatory-Bluff Creek Watershed District
January 8, 2014, Board of Managers Monthly Meeting and Public Hearing

PRESENT:
Managers: Jill Crafton, Treasurer
Perry Forster, President
Ken Wencl, Secretary
Leslie Yetka
Administrator: Claire Bleser
Staff: Scott Sobiech, Engineer (Barr Engineering Company)
Louis Smith, Attorney (Smith Partners)
Recorder: Amy Herbert
Other attendees: Prezmek Bajuer, University of Minnesota
Joey Lechelt, University of Minnesota
Tom Lindquist, CAC
Sharon McCotter, CAC
Dennis Saeger, CAC
Bill Satterness, CAC
Pat Sorensen, University of Minnesota
Laurie Susla, LLCA, CAC

1. Call to Order
President Forster called the RPBCWD Board of Manager’s Wednesday, January 8, 2014, Board of Managers Monthly Meeting and Public Hearing to order at 7:09 p.m. in the Council Chambers at Eden Prairie City Center 8080 Mitchell Road, Eden Prairie, MN 55344.

2. Approval of the Agenda
Manager Yetka requested that the Board add to the Managers Discussion a review of the District’s Cost Share Program. President Forster requested the addition to the Managers Discussion a brief discussion of Red Rock and Mitchell lakes. Manager Crafton moved to approve the agenda as amended. Manager Wencl seconded the motion. Upon a vote, the motion carried 4-0 [Manager Bisek absent from vote].

3. University of Minnesota – Research Update
Mr. Prezmek Bajuer and Mr. Pat Sorensen of the University of Minnesota provided an update on the carp research and program at Staring Lake and the Purgatory Creek Park Area (PCPA). Mr. Bajuer provided an overview of the carp species and their range, showed a brief video demonstrating how carp dig in the bottom of waterbodies, and explained that such behavior is precisely why carp are so damaging. He stated that the digging stirs up the sediments, making the water more turbid, and disturbs the plants. Mr. Bajuer also described how the carp behavior transports nutrients from the lake bottom into the water column.

Mr. Bajuer provided a PowerPoint presentation. He said that there is a need for carp management in Staring Lake, which has approximately 170 carp per acre. He explained that the carp are so abundant in Staring Lake because the
lake is connected to the PCPA, which is a perfect nursery for carp. He reviewed the movement of the carp between Staring Lake and the PCPA and the data from 2012 detailing the movements. Mr. Bajuer discussed management options that have been tested to date, such as winter draw-down in PCPA, winter seining in Staring Lake, and a stream barrier. He commented that he estimates there was 40% mortality due to the winter draw-down in 2013. Mr. Bajuer gave more details about the winter seining that occurred in 2011, 2012, and 2013, and he estimated that one-third of the carp population, or 13,000 carp, were removed by commercial fisherman.

Mr. Bajuer provided more information on the management technique of the stream barrier placed to stop the carp that were trying to move upstream. He described how the 2012 barrier design did not work and how the 2013 barrier collapsed after the second storm. He summarized that 80% to 90% of the carp move from Staring Lake to the PCPA each year to spawn, the little carp are present in the PCPA every year in numbers of 100,000 or more, approximately 3 out of 1,000 carp move out of the PCPA in the first year of life, and many migrate at age 2. Mr. Bajuer talked about the model that the team developed to simulate plausible management scenarios including winter seining, draw-down, and out-migration barrier and various combinations of these management techniques. Using the PowerPoint slides, he showed the results of the model and the results that the model has predicted. He touched on the future of the program, noting that the 2014 year is the last year of the current program, and described what work would be done in 2014 including that they would monitor the draw-down and determine how it could be improved, would continue with the seining – hopefully next week – and would update the model.

Mr. Bajuer advocated that the program continue for at least a few more years since the team has uncovered a lot of answers about the carp and now would like to get the carp removal work done. He added that this project is a valuable study for other watersheds and noted that there may be matching funds from the Invasive Species Center as well as equipment.

He opened the floor for questions and managers asked about the commercial fisherman, and discussed the barrier, the draw-down and techniques for making these more effective. President Forster said that he is in favor of the draw-down plus the seining and recommended that Mr. Bajuer set up a meeting of the stakeholders in the next two weeks to discuss options. Mr. Baujer said that would be happy to do so. President Forster thanked Mr. Baujer and Mr. Sorenson for the update.

### 4. 2014 Organizational Actions

- **a. Election of Officers**
  
  Manager Crafton moved to re-elect the RPBCWD’s current slate of officers. Manager Yetka seconded the motion. Upon a vote, the motion carried 4-0 [Manager Bisek absent from vote].

- **b. Appointment of Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)**
  
  Manager Crafton moved to approve the existing TAC membership for 2014. Manager Yetka seconded the motion. Upon a vote, the motion carried 4-0 [Manager Bisek absent from vote].

- **c. Designation of Official Depository**
  
  President Forster said that Klein Bank has been the District’s official depository. Manager Crafton moved that the District retain Klein Bank as the official depository. Manager Yetka seconded the motion. Upon a vote, the motion carried 4-0 [Manager Bisek absent from vote].

- **d. Designation of Official Publications**
  
  Administrator Bleser said that the District uses five papers to cover all of its cities. Manager Yetka moved
to approve continuing with the same official publications. Manager Crafton seconded the motion. Upon a vote, the motion carried 4-0 [Manager Bisek absent from vote].

e. List of CAC Members
Administrator Bleser asked if the Board would reappoint the current Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC) members for the 2014 year in order to maintain continuity in the work being done on subcommittees and groups such as with the rules and AIS (Aquatic Invasive Species). She said that there are two openings from the 12 CAC members appointed last year and there could potentially be more openings if any current members are not interested in being reappointed. Administrator Bleser said that these openings could be filled by interested citizens. She said that this is not an action item tonight because she wanted feedback from the managers. Manager Yetka requested that the District and Administrator Bleser do some outreach to fill the open seats with members of cities that are not currently represented.

5. Reading and Approval of Minutes

a. November 11, 2013, RPBCWD Meeting Minutes
Manager Wencl moved to approve the minutes of the November 11, 2013, RPBCWD meeting as presented. Manager Yetka seconded the motion. Upon a vote, the motion carried 4-0 [Manager Bisek absent from vote].

b. December 3, 2013, RPBCWD Meeting Minutes
Manager Crafton moved to approve the minutes of the December 3, 2013, RPBCWD meeting as presented. Manager Yetka seconded the motion. Upon a vote, the motion carried 4-0 [Manager Bisek absent from vote].

c. December 9, 2013, Shallow Lake Workshop Minutes
Manager Crafton moved to approve the minutes of the December 3, 2013, RPBCWD meeting as presented. Manager Yetka seconded the motion. Upon a vote, the motion carried 4-0 [Manager Bisek absent from vote].

6. Correspondence

Administrator Bleser reported that the District is undergoing the auditing process.

7. Citizen Advisory Committee

a. Aquatic Invasive Species (AIS) Subcommittee
CAC Advisor Sharon McCotter requested the AIS subcommittee have the opportunity to preview the AIS recommendation as it stands. There was discussion of the status of the AIS recommendation, concerns about releasing the recommendation prior to Board action, and different processes that could take place to get the recommendation reviewed by the interested parties. President Forster directed Administrator Bleser to review the draft recommendation upon receipt and if she thinks the recommendation is fit to be distributed then she should distribute it as a draft to the Board and the AIS subcommittee at the same time for review and to discuss at the February meeting.

8. Hearing and Discussion of Matters of General Public Interest
President Forster announced that anyone wishing to address the Board of Managers on an item not on the agenda may come forward at this time, and he will recognize the speakers one by one. He explained that speakers are requested to state their name and address for the record and comments will be limited to five minutes per speaker. There were no matters raised.

9. Treasurer’s Report

Manager Crafton moved to accept the Treasurer’s Report as submitted. Manager Wencl seconded the motion. Upon a vote, the motion carried 4-0 [Manager Bisek absent from vote].

Manager Crafton moved to pay the bills. Manager Wencl seconded the motion. Upon a vote, the motion carried 4-0 [Manager Bisek absent from vote].

10. Engineer’s Report

President Forster noted that the Engineer’s Report is in the meeting packet. Manager Yetka raised a question about woodchip bioreactors, listed in the report under General Services item H and asked Engineer Sobiech for more details. He provided more details describing a woodchip bioreactor as a trench filled with woodchips that is allowed to go anaerobic and does a good job of removing nitrates as well as 70% to 80% of phosphorous from a system. Engineer Sobiech said that the woodchip bioreactor has the potential to be a new, innovative BMP (Best Management Practice). He answered questions about the technology, and the Board requested that Administrator Bleser arrange for a future meeting a presentation on the technology. Manager Yetka also asked for more details on the Green Path Certified Development designation that is listed in the report under the Plan Review of Eden Garden. Engineer Sobiech explained that the designation was developed by the Builder’s Association, is a new term, and is a little less robust that the LEED Certified designation.

Manager Yetka moved to accept the Engineer’s Report as submitted. Manager Wencl seconded the motion. Upon a vote, the motion carried 4-0 [Manager Bisek absent from vote].

11. Administrator’s Report

President Forster noted that the Administrator’s Report is in the meeting packet. Manager Yetka had a question on the stormwater monitoring program and requested an analysis of the project be presented to the Board at a future meeting include information on what the District will accomplish with the program and how the collected data will be used. Administrator Bleser said that staff can do a presentation on it at a future meeting.

Administrator Bleser reported that all seven diffusers on Rice Marsh Lake are working. Manger Yetka moved to accept the Administrator’s Report. Manager Wencl seconded the motion. Upon a vote, the motion carried 4-0 [Manager Bisek absent from vote].

12. Board Action

a. Lotus Lake Conservation Alliance Request

Administrator Bleser said that at the beginning of December the managers received a letter from the Lotus Lake Conservation Alliance (LLCA) requesting to be allocated a share of the funds that the District was reimbursed from the City of Chanhassen for the 2012 AIS inspection program. She provided background on the issue, reminding the Board that in 2012 the District allocated $25,000 to each Eden Prairie and Chanhassen for AIS inspections and in 2013 there was the expectation that the District would provide
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$25,000 to the City of Chanhassen for the inspections and the City would provide a $10,000 match. She described that in 2012 the City of Chanhassen put in approximately $2,500 and received a Department of Natural Resources (DNR) grant in the amount of $7,500. Administrator Bleser explained that the City of Chanhassen in 2013 requested from the District $17,500 instead of $25,000, which reflects an action by the City to deduct the amount it received from the DNR grant from the amount the City requested from the District. Administrator Bleser reported that the LLCA is requesting an allocation of that $7,500 based on the amount that the LLCA and the District contributed the City of Chanhassen toward the total cost of the AIS inspections in Chanhassen in 2012.

There was a lengthy discussion. Manager Yetka asked if the portion of money were directed to the LLCA, would the LLCA be willing to commit the funds to AIS inspections. Ms. McCotter said yes 100%. Manager Wencl moved that the Board hold this issue over until next month’s meeting. Manager Crafton seconded the motion. Upon a vote, the motion carried 4-0 [Manager Bisek absent from vote].

b. City of Chanhassen Cost-Share
Administrator Bleser described the cost-share grant application submitted by the City of Chanhassen and said that the City would use the grant for brining equipment for the City’s salt trucks. She said that the proposed use of the funds is in compliance with the District’s cost-share program. Administrator Bleser provided more information on the funds budgeted for the cost-share program, the funds that have been allocated to date, and the budget that is available. She recommended that the Board approve the cost share to the City of Chanhassen in the amount of $6,709 using funds from the District’s 2013 cost-share program. She responded to questions and there was a short discussion. Administrator Bleser said that she could forward to the City the Board’s questions about the GPS, temperature sensors, and Mn/DOT recommendations.

Manager Yetka moved to approve the cost-share grant to the City of Chanhassen contingent on confirmation that using the funds for the as proposed is the best use of the funds. Manager Crafton seconded the motion. Upon a vote, the motion carried 4-0 [Manager Bisek absent from vote].

c. Major Plan Amendment
Administrator Bleser reminded the Board that in December the District held a public hearing on the Major Plan Amendment and now the District moves into the second phase of the process, which is submittal to the Minnesota Board of Water and Soil Resources and Plan Reviewers for the 90-day comment period. She explained that the resolution is to approve moving into the second phase of the process and authorizing Administrator Bleser submitting the Major Plan Amendment Request to BWSR and the Plan Reviewers. President Forster read the resolution aloud. Manager Crafton moved to approve the resolution. Manager Wencl seconded the motion. By call of roll, the motion carried 4-0:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manager</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crafton</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forster</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wencl</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
13. Manager’s Discussion

a. Rules
Administrator Bleser reported about the December rulemaking/Technical Advisory Committee meeting and gave a status update on the rulemaking. She said that the rulemaking committee hopes that by mid-January it will have a complete draft rules and procedures document completed including the SONAR (Statement of Need And Reasonableness). She mentioned that the CAC has not reviewed the draft procedures. Administrator Bleser recommended that as soon as the draft document is complete, the rulemaking committee send it to the Board and at the same time to the CAC.

She said that the timeline is that action on the rules and procedures will be on the Board’s February meeting and then on the day after the meeting open the public comment period. She provided more details about the timeline and possible dates to hold the public hearing. There was discussion about the timeline. President Forster said that he would be in favor of holding the public hearing at the March 5th meeting. The Board agreed.

b. District Policies and Procedures (update)
Administrator said that one idea is to delay the adoption of the District’s policies in order to have it at the same time as the employee handbook. She said that the employee handbook is still being worked on.

c. Upcoming Board Agenda
   i. 2013 Budget Review
Administrator Bleser said that the Bylaws subcommittee has incorporated into the draft bylaws the idea of conducting an annual budget review. She said it would make sense to conduct the review in February since that is when the year-end treasurer’s report will be available. She said she wants to put this review on the Board’s radar for the February meeting.

   ii. AIS
Administrator Bleser reported that the document was just completed and the AIS recommendation will be an upcoming Board agenda item.

   iii. Riley Creek Chain of Lake Fish Management
Administrator Bleser said that there will be a presentation on this topic at an upcoming meeting.

   iv. SWLRT (Southwest Light Rail Transit)
Administrator Bleser reported that a member of the SWLRT from the Metropolitan Council will be coming to talk at an upcoming Board meeting. President Forster said that he would like the Board to investigate the cost of getting an estimate of the impact in a quantitative basis between the Southwest Station and City Hall. He said that the District needs this data. Administrator Bleser said that the District does have reserve funds that could be used for this work. Manager Wencl asked who would do the work, and President Forster responded that Barr could do the work.

   v. Red Rock Lake and Mitchell Lake
President Forster commented that the Board cannot lose sight of Red Rock and Mitchell lakes and ideas of what can be done there for this coming year. Administrator Bleser provided an update with the District’s meeting last Friday with the City of Eden Prairie and discussion of the District’s actions in 2011, 2012, and 2013 for Red Rock and Mitchell lakes and discussion of harvesting and treatment. She brought up the idea of a plant management plan, and she said that more meetings need to be coordinated and more information collected. Manager Yetka provided comments and said she thinks it would be a good idea for the District to see what, in general, is its policy on managing vegetation and managing shallow lakes. There was discussion of chemical treatment of curlyleaf pondweed, the movement of coontail within a lake, and obtaining information from expert sources. Mr. Bill Satterness commented that he supports the idea of having the experts come in and give their suggestions. Administrator Bleser said that she will follow up.

[Manager Wencl departs the meeting]

vi. Cost-Share Program
Manager Yetka recommended that now or at a future meeting the Board reviews its cost-share program and its guidelines and requirements. President Forster said that it should be part of a future meeting. Administrator Bleser suggested that she put together an evaluation describing what has and has not worked. The Board agreed.

14. Upcoming Events
The Board set a special meeting to be held on February 19, 2014.

- Board Meeting, Wednesday, February 5, 2014, Heritage Room, Eden Prairie City Center, 7:00 p.m.

15. Adjournment
Manager Crafton moved to adjourn the meeting. Manager Yetka seconded the motion. Upon a vote, the motion carried 3-0 [Managers Bisek and Wencl absent from the vote]. The meeting adjourned at 9:22 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

________________________
Ken Wencl, Secretary
This Task Order is issued pursuant to Section 1 of the above-cited engineering services agreement between the Riley Purgatory Bluff Creek Watershed District (District) and BARR Engineering Company (Engineer) and incorporated as a part thereof.

1. **Description of Services:**
   Barr will complete the engineering and design of a spent lime stormwater treatment system in the Lake Lucy watershed (Subwatershed LU-A3.4), including refinement of the conceptual design in consultation with RPBCWD and City stakeholders, preliminary engineering and hydraulic analysis, preparation of construction plans and specifications, and construction administration. The 2013 *Lake Lucy and Lake Ann Use Attainability Analysis Update* (UAA Update) identified SubwatershedLU-A3.4 as a targeted location within the Lake Lucy watershed to reduce the phosphorus loading and improve the water quality of Lake Lucy and downstream Lake Ann. Runoff from approximately 80 acres drains through the wetland in Subwatershed LU-A3.4 and discharges to Lake Lucy, comprising nearly 20% of the total watershed phosphorus load to Lake Lucy under existing land use conditions.

The UAA Update identified a need to target soluble phosphorus removal and recommended an innovative spent lime treatment system within the right-of-way just east of Utica Terrace to treat discharge from the upstream wetland and tributary area. Spent lime, a byproduct of the drinking water treatment process, consists of calcium and carbonate and has properties that allow it to bind with phosphorus. When water with dissolved phosphorus contacts the lime material, calcium from the lime binds with phosphorus and forms calcium phosphate which is a solid material and does not dissolve in the storm water, thus remaining within the treatment system. The conceptual design from the UAA Update includes diverting low flows from the upstream wetland to a subsurface, multi-chambered concrete structure (approximately 50 feet long) partially filled with spent lime material and an underdrain system. The proposed system will be designed with a goal of removing at least 11 pounds of phosphorus per year, based on the modeling from the UAA Update.

Use of spent lime to remove phosphorus from stormwater is a new and innovative technique. While the one other spent lime treatment system installed in Minnesota has demonstrated significant potential for phosphorus removal, this project would represent only the second installation of a spent lime BMP in Minnesota and as such comes with some uncertainty about the BMP’s possible life span. The spent lime system proposed for this site is unique in that the spent lime will be in an underground concrete chamber to allow the BMP to be constructed within the City of Chanhassen right-of-way; the one other system installed in Minnesota is a shallow surface basin that receives runoff from a nearby roadway. The following design constraints will be considered as part of the preliminary and final design process:

- Installation should remain within the City right-of-way and/or stormwater easement
- Spent lime treatment chamber must be constructed in close proximity to and in conjunction with the existing storm sewer system
• Impacts to recently-reconstructed Utica Terrace and nearby trees and utilities should be minimized
• System must be designed to avoid excessively long contact times with the spent lime for a range of flow rates, to avoid discharges with excessive pH
• System must be designed to divert and treat enough flow to achieve the phosphorus removal goals, while maintaining sufficient high-flow capacity to avoid increases in the 100-year flood elevation of the upstream wetland
• System must be designed for reasonable maintenance access

2. **Scope of Services:**

   Engineer’s services under this task order shall include:

   **Task 1. Preliminary Engineering and Stakeholder Involvement**

   The proposed spent lime treatment system is highly innovative and would represent only the second such installation in Minnesota. Therefore, it is essential that the Board of Managers, RPBCWD staff, and interested stakeholders understand the potential system effectiveness and the unknowns related to this innovative BMP. Because the proposed project is located on City of Chanhassen right-of-way (ROW) it is critical to obtain City concurrence with the design concept before proceeding into detailed design. Therefore the following subtasks have been included as part of the preliminary engineering and stakeholder involvement task.

   • Preliminary Design Concept Presentation – Present preliminary design concept to the Board of Managers, RPBCWD staff, and interested stakeholders, including background on use of spent lime, its effectiveness, and identification and discussion about risks and risk mitigation measures associated with the proposed project. This subtask includes preparing conceptual sketch(es) and presentation materials.

   • Design Meeting – Participate in preliminary design meeting with City and RPBCWD staff to refine design concept based on stakeholder feedback on project constraints (for example, maintenance, wetland impacts, water level fluctuations, resident concerns). This meeting would result in an agreed upon layout that can be carried forward into design.

   • Hydraulics Review – The hydraulics of the proposed spent lime treatment system within the Utica Terrace right-of-way and associated wetland outlet modifications will require careful consideration and design. The design goal will be diversion of low-flows for treatment to meet our phosphorus removal goal, while maintaining sufficient capacity in the existing or “high-flow” storm sewer that conveys runoff from the upstream wetland and keeping changes to wetland hydrology within acceptable limits. Therefore the applicable portion of the RPBCWD’s SWMM hydrologic and hydraulic model will be updated with recently-published Atlas 14 precipitation estimates to accommodate additional flows, as necessary, to determine an adjusted 100-year flood elevation for the LU-A3.4 wetland.

   • Phosphorus Removal Review – Estimate phosphorus removal from preliminary and final designs using P8 modeling (from UAA Update). Recommendations for future monitoring of the treatment system will be made to evaluate actual pollutant removal effectiveness post-construction.
• Preliminary Design Memorandum – A brief summary memo will be prepared to summarize the final design concept resulting from the stakeholder design meeting, design concepts considered, design constraints, design assumptions, and anticipated phosphorus removals.

Task 2. Final Engineering and Design

The final engineering and design will involve the preparation of a site survey, construction drawings, technical specifications, an engineer’s opinion of cost, and construction bid package. The following services will be provided for Task 2.

• Site Survey – A detailed site survey will be performed to collect location and elevation data for all features within the anticipated construction limits. Utility locates will be requested prior to the site survey so that the underground utilities can be located and avoided during the detailed design process.

• Soil Borings – Since the project site is located adjacent to a wetland complex, underground soil conditions must be determined to understand constructability issues and minimize the potential for structure settlement in the future. We have included costs associated with collecting two soil borings of sufficient depth to identify good, non-organic soil conditions.

• Construction Drawings – Development of detailed design drawing for the proposed spent lime treatment system, including an erosion control plan, stormwater water pollution prevention plan (SWPPP), removals plan, and site restoration. The drawing set is anticipated to consist of approximately six drawings.

• Technical Specifications – Develop technical specification sections using Construction Specifications Institute (CSI) format including all “upfront” sections such as general conditions, supplementary conditions, summary of work and those related to bidding and contracting. Barr assumes specifications will be in CSI format with Engineers Joint Contract Documents Committee (EJCDC) general conditions. Barr reserves the right to modify budget if technical specification format is other than stated in this paragraph.

• Engineer’s Opinion of Cost – To assist the County/BWSR with project budgeting, Barr will provide an engineer’s opinion of cost for the defined design elements in this agreement. The opinion of cost will be based on costs from similar projects and previous Barr project experience.

• Permitting – Permitting assistance, including preparation of permitting submittals and communication with applicable agencies. The following agency reviews and/or permits are anticipated:
  o MN DNR Public Waters
  o City of Chanhassen

Barr assumes that a Wetland Conservation Act (WCA) permit will not be needed, as attempts will be made to keep project construction outside of the wetland boundary.

• Bid Package – Preparation of bid package and bid administration including advertising the bid, preparing the bid form, attendance at mandatory pre-bid meeting and response to bid questions

Task 3. Construction Administration and Observation

Task 3 includes construction administration, including conducting bid opening and bid review, review of submittals, contract award, coordination with contractor, construction observation, and
review and submittal of pay applications and change orders, as necessary. It is anticipated that the construction phase will extend for a period of about three months from September through November, 2014, with active construction ongoing for approximately four weeks. Services provided as part of the construction administration and support includes the following:

- **Bid Award and Pre-construction Meeting** – Meeting with all parties involved with the construction including but not limited to RPBCWD Administrator, contractor, and subcontractors, utility companies, and City of Chanhassen. It is assumed that two persons from Barr will attend the office meeting and that a site visit will occur immediately following to review site conditions and discuss construction issues.

- **Engineer Site Visits** – An engineering representative will be onsite to observe the construction during key times. This consists of on-site support and observation during the anticipated four months of construction to observe and document contractor’s work, attend site meetings, and coordinate engineering issues with the contractor, owner and engineer. We have assumed one Barr staff on-site for 4 hours per visit for an average of three visits per week during the active construction period.

- **Construction Administration Support** – Interpreting contract documents and design intent, review of technical submittals, address requests for information and general project communication between contractor or Barr’s onsite staff.

Upon completion of the project construction, the following documentation will be provided:

- **Record Drawings** – Barr will develop record drawings to document the construction. Record Drawings will include updating certain drawings from the Construction Drawing set with information from the post construction survey such as locations and elevations of structures.

- **Final Construction Memorandum** – This task will include appending the design memo to reflect design changes or modifications during the Construction Phase of the project. Addendums to the report will include such items as formal approved technical submittals, responses to requests for information from the contractor and maintenance information.

**Task 4 (Optional). Final Construction Memorandum**

Task 4 includes appending the preliminary design memo (Deliverable- Task 1) to summarize final design assumptions and performance expectations and design changes or modifications during the Construction Phase of the project. The construction memorandum will also compile such items as formal approved technical submittals, responses to requests for information from the contractor and maintenance information, construction photos, field notes, pay applications, change orders (if applicable), and record construction drawings.

We have made several assumptions in preparing the scope of work for each work item in this agreement. Assumptions relating to individual work tasks are listed along with the detailed description. However, additional assumptions that do not correspond with a single work task are listed below:

- **City will provide Barr with any previous existing soil boring information in the area. Soil borings and associated testing may be needed and is included the anticipated services.**

- **No property acquisition will be needed for the project. If property acquisition is needed, those services will be coordinated with the District Administrator on a time and expense basis.**

The proposed budget includes costs for mileage reimbursement for site visits and site observation.
Deliverables:
The following deliverables will be prepared and provided to the RPBCWD:

Task 1: Preliminary Engineering and Stakeholder Involvement
- Conceptual sketch(es) of proposed treatment system
- Meeting minutes from design meeting
- Brief design memorandum summarizing concepts considered, design constraints, design assumptions and anticipated phosphorus removal estimates
- Presentation to RPBCWD Board and staff
- Monthly progress updates

Task 2: Final Engineering and Design
- 60% construction plans submittal
- 90% construction plans submittal
- Specifications and special provisions
- Applicable permitting submittals
- Final contract documents
- Engineer’s opinion of cost
- Preparation of addenda, as necessary
- Monthly progress updates

Task 3: Construction Administration and Observation
- Monthly construction progress updates
- Engineer site visits
- Record Construction drawings

Task 4 (Optional): Final Construction Memorandum
- Final construction memorandum, including documentation of design assumptions and anticipated performance, field notes and documentation during site visits, submittals, requests for information (RFIs), field memorandum and deviations, construction photos, and record drawings

3. Budget:
Services under this Task Order will be compensated for in accordance with the engineering services agreement and will not exceed $76,100 (including a recommended but optional final construction memo), without written authorization by the Administrator. Barr understand the importance of working as efficiently as possible while providing the services needed for design and construction. Therefore we will look for cost saving during the entire design and construction process, such as looking to the City of Chanhassen to supply any existing topographic and soil boring information of the area in an effort to avoid unneeded duplication of past efforts. The following table provides a breakdown of the anticipated cost for major tasks associated with scope of services describe above.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Task Description</th>
<th>Anticipated Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Preliminary Engineering and Stakeholder Involvement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preliminary Design Concept Presentation</td>
<td>$3,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Design Meeting</td>
<td>$1,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hydraulics Review</td>
<td>$1,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phosphorus Removal Review</td>
<td>$1,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preliminary Design Memorandum</td>
<td>$2,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Task 1 Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>$11,800</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Final Engineering and Design</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Site Survey</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Soil Borings</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construction Drawings</td>
<td>$19,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technical Specifications</td>
<td>$6,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Engineer’s Opinion of Cost</td>
<td>$1,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Permitting</td>
<td>$2,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bid Package/Bid Opening/Recommendation to the Board</td>
<td>$4,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Task 2 Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>$43,900</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Construction Administration and Observation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bid Award and Pre-construction Meeting</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Engineer Site Visits</td>
<td>$6,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construction Administration Support</td>
<td>$4,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Record Drawings</td>
<td>$2,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Task 3 Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>$16,400</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Optional: Final Construction Memorandum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Task 4 Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Task Order Total without Optional Task 4</strong></td>
<td><strong>$72,100</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Task Order Total with Optional Task 4</strong></td>
<td><strong>$76,100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. **Schedule and Assumptions Upon Which Schedule is Based**

The following proposed schedule is based on construction during September-October 2014:

**Project initiation - March 2014**

**Task 1: Preliminary Engineering and Stakeholder Involvement:**
- Presentation to RPBCWD Board and stakeholders- Mid-March, 2014
- Preliminary design meeting- Late-March, 2014
- Finalize design concept layout- Mid-April, 2014

**Task 2: Final Engineering and Design:**
- 60% construction plans submittal- May, 2014
- 90% construction plans submittal- June, 2014
- 100% plans and specifications, Board approval of project and advertise for bids- July, 2014
- Bid opening- Late-July, 2014
- Board approval of bid, Notice of Award- Aug. 6, 2014

**Task 3: Construction Administration and Observation:**
- Contract award, review of submittals, Notice to Proceed- September, 2014
- Construction completion- Late-October, 2014
- Record drawings- December, 2014

**Task 4 (Optional): Final Construction Memorandum:**
- Final Construction memorandum- December, 2015

**IN WITNESS WHEREOF,** intending to be legally bound, the parties hereto execute and deliver this Agreement.

**CONSULTANT**

By_________________________  
Its__ Vice President__________

**RILEY PURGATORY BLUFF CREEK WATERSHED DISTRICT**

By_________________________  
Its_________________________

Date:_______________________  

**APPROVED AS TO FORM & EXECUTION**
TASK ORDER No. 4
Pursuant to Agreement for Engineering Services
Riley Purgatory Bluff Creek Watershed District and BARR Engineering Company.
February 19, 2014

This Task Order is issued pursuant to Section 1 of the above-cited engineering services agreement between the Riley Purgatory Bluff Creek Watershed District (District) and BARR Engineering Company (Engineer) and incorporated as a part thereof.

1. Description of Services:
Barr will work with District staff to complete the engineering and design to provide a ramped rock riffle structure at the downstream end of the Southwest Regional trail, and to stabilize an adjacent eroding bank. Habitat fragmentation was identified in the MPCA approved Bluff Creek TMDL as adversely impacting the Bluff Creek fishery because the large drop at the downstream end of the regional trail culvert interrupts the connectivity of Bluff Creek. This interruption of connectivity prevents passage of fish between upstream and downstream reaches of Bluff Creek. Design and construction of a fish ramp structure at the culvert outlet was recommended in the TMDL to provide fish passage, thus removing the habitat fragmentation stressor in Bluff Creek. The ramp will be constructed of natural rock material as it would offer greater flexibility, be less susceptible to scour or undercutting, and would be more aesthetically appealing. The eroding left stream bank (looking downstream) immediately downstream of the culvert outlet will be stabilized at the time of ramp construction, likely with vegetated reinforced soil slope (VRSS), which is a bio-engineering approach that is well suited to steep banks.

The work will include development of construction documents and oversight of construction activities. Barr’s activity is divided into two phases:

   Phase 1: Design and Permitting;
   Phase 2: Construction Administration Services.

Project Management and Meetings will be required in both phases. The proposed tasks are described below.

2. Scope of Services:
Engineer’s services under this task order shall include:

   Task 1. Project Management and TMDL Implementation

Project management and meetings will be necessary for both Final Design and Permitting as well as during Construction Administration. Careful project management and conducting meetings at appropriate project milestones will help to ensure the work meets the expectations of District staff and other stakeholders, and that it is completed in a satisfactory manner, within the project timeline and within the agreed-upon budget.

A project kickoff meeting will be scheduled immediately following notice-to-proceed. The meeting purpose will be to define project roles and responsibilities, clarify expectations, scope, schedule, and administrative procedures. This meeting will also provide an opportunity to discuss the participation of other key stakeholders, such as the City of Chanhassen, and decide when stakeholder meetings should be scheduled.
As stated above, one of the main drivers for this project is the habitat fragmentation identified in the TMDL; therefore it is essential that the final project design be focused on addressing aspects of the impairment. Members of Barr’s Bluff Creek TMDL team (notably Greg Wilson) will be involved with project oversight and in the design process to coordinate the design with the intent of the TMDL.

Throughout the project, Barr will provide updates to the project team that document project progress and coordinate tasks. Topic-specific meetings and conference calls will be held on an as-needed basis. We will provide monthly progress reports and budget status updates as part of the monthly invoicing process. We will solicit feedback from you on an ongoing basis to ensure clear and timely communication.

**Phase 1. Design and Permitting**

Design and permitting includes multiple tasks in order to ensure the project is designed properly; and key stakeholders (RPBCWD, City of Chanhassen) can provide input and feedback and regular intervals in the design process. These tasks are described below.

**Task 2. Topographic Survey**

A detailed topographic survey of the proposed project area is necessary in order to complete a final design. Limited survey will be carried downstream of the project area in order to provide basic information on the stream characteristics which will help form the basis for design. We will supplement the detailed survey with available LIDAR data to provide a general sense of the surrounding topography.

**Task 3. Vegetation Inspection and Design Input**

A landscape ecologist from Barr will conduct an investigation of existing vegetation, including trees, and provide recommendations for vegetation components to preserve and/or incorporate into the design. The recommendations will help ensure the preserved and/or installed vegetation complements the restoration efforts and enhances the local ecology along the restored channel banks and adjacent valley slope.

**Task 4. Geotechnical Survey and Design Input**

A geotechnical engineer will inspect the eroded valley slope and provide input to the stabilization design. Factors that may be considered include the soil type, slope, presence of groundwater, and constructability. We have assumed that other than possible hand augers, no soil boring will be conducted.

**Task 5. Preliminary Design, Cost Estimate, and Meeting**

Barr will utilize the survey data and conduct hydraulic modeling to complete a preliminary fish passage and slope stabilization design (30 to 40 percent design level). The preliminary design will be presented in AutoCAD format drawings, and conveyed to District staff for review and approval. The hydraulic model will be used to design a rock riffle structure that will withstand anticipated creek flows while not impacting adjacent private properties, and to adequately stabilize the lower slope of the valley wall where it is eroding.

Upon completion of the preliminary design Barr will prepare a preliminary-level opinion of probable costs for the proposed work in order to determine if it fits within the desired
construction budget. Conditions that have significantly worsened since the 2008 inspection, major structural repairs to the culvert or other unknowns could increase the project cost significantly.

Barr will schedule a meeting with RPBCWD staff (and other stakeholders as necessary) to discuss the preliminary plans and any new findings from Tasks 2, 3, and 4. Barr will solicit feedback on the preliminary design and cost estimate to ensure the project goals will be met within an acceptable budget.

**Task 6. Final Engineering and Design**

Upon review and approval of the preliminary design by District staff, we will complete the final design of the fish passage and stabilization measures. Advanced design drawings will be developed for review by the District prior to issuance for bid. Final design drawings will be signed by a registered Professional Engineer (Minnesota).

At the 90% design phase, Barr staff will submit plans and an updated cost estimate to the District for review. We will schedule another meeting with District staff and interested stakeholders to discuss the design and plan sheets. Comments from this meeting will be incorporated into the plans and the plan sheets will be finalized and prepared for final approval by the District and the bidding.

**Task 7. Engineers Opinion of Probable Cost**

As discussed in Tasks 5 and 6, preliminary cost estimates will be developed during the design phase. Once final designs are complete, the cost estimate will also be finalized into an Engineers Opinion of Probable Cost. This cost estimate will accompany the finished plan set for final approval by the District.

**Task 8. QA/QC Review**

For our stream and river restoration projects, Barr has developed an internal design checklist to help assure high quality analysis and design. This checklist provides a comprehensive list of project design steps and portions of the checklist are utilized at various points throughout the design process to ensure the design is on the right path. Guided by client input, the checklist assures that Barr staff systematically consider all aspects of the project, from biology to hydraulics, and that stakeholder input, permitting and responding to comments are part of the project timeline. This approach simplifies project planning and provides the framework for designing and building a high-quality stream restoration project.

**Task 9. Technical Specifications and Construction Documents**

Barr will provide technical specifications and a project bidding form for the project. Barr will develop technical specification sections using Construction Specifications Institute (CSI) format including all “upfront” sections such as general conditions, supplementary conditions, summary of work and those related to bidding and contracting. Barr assumes specifications will be in CSI format with Engineers Joint Contract Documents Committee (EJCDC) general conditions. Barr reserves the right to modify budget if technical specification format is other than stated in this paragraph.

**Task 10. Permitting Assistance**
Barr will complete permit applications for the project, including the development of a stormwater pollution prevention plan (SWPPP). It is assumed that MN DNR and US ACE permits may be required, as well as local permits. It is assumed permit fees would be paid for by the District. The permitting process typically requires six to eight weeks; permitting will start following completion of final design. It is assumed that an EAW will not be required for this project based on the project length, but this should be reviewed. We assume Barr will complete the submittal of permit applications and permit fees will be paid directly by the District.

This task includes two meetings with the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources (DNR). The first meeting will take place during the preliminary design phase shortly after the first meeting with District staff to discuss preliminary plans. The goal of the first meeting with DNR will be to obtain their support for the design approach and ensure their requirements for permitting the project are well understood. The second meeting with DNR will occur shortly after the second meeting with District staff to discuss 90% plans. The goal of this meeting will be to solicit feedback so comments can be addressed prior to the permitting process. Other stakeholders (such as the City of Chanhassen) will also be invited to these meetings.

**Task 11. Design Memorandum**

Barr will complete a design memorandum to document the various components and assumptions that influenced the final design. Key components are anticipated to include project purpose and objectives, documentation from many tasks listed above, design criteria, and any assumptions made to complete the design.

**Phase 2. Construction Administration**

Phase 2 includes the tasks associated with bidding the project and completing construction. Task numbering is continued from Phase 1, and the individual tasks are described below.

**Task 12. Bidding Assistance**

Barr will conduct a pre-bid meeting and site visit (if warranted), prequalification of bidders if appropriate, review of bids, and follow-up inquiries with bidders. Bidding dates will be coordinated with District Administrator.

We will prepare recommendations on contractor selection, if requested.

**Task 13. Pre-Construction Meeting**

Barr will conduct a preconstruction meeting with the selected contractor to discuss critical aspects of the restoration project. Safety and erosion control are always key components of the preconstruction meeting. Additional items on the agenda will likely include site access, construction limits, hours of operation, and utilities in the area.

**Task 14. Construction Administration and Documentation**

Barr will provide construction planning and coordination with District and contractor(s); as well as to develop final construction sequencing and schedule. We will review construction access and equipment/material staging areas with contractor(s) and District staff.

Barr will act as general liaison between contractor and District during the construction process, providing construction oversight as necessary to confirm that all work adheres to the approved
plan. We will schedule site visits by design team members, review work progress, and document quality and compliance through ground photos and field notes during construction. We will review pay requests and change orders as needed. We assume the total construction time will be approximately two weeks, and Barr staff will be on site to provide oversite and guidance for a portion of every day work is occurring. The project budget assumes a total of 34 hours of time to complete the various aspects of this task.

**Task 15. Post-Construction Memorandum**

Barr will complete a memorandum to document key aspects about the construction process, including design changes, any unanticipated obstacles or hinderances to construction, key field notes, and final construction costs. We assume a post-construction survey will not be completed.

**Assumptions**

We have made several assumptions in preparing the scope of work for each work item in this agreement. Assumptions relating to individual work tasks are listed along with the detailed description. However, additional assumptions that do not correspond with a single work task are listed below:

- We have assumed that other than possible hand augers, no soil boring will be conducted.
- We have assumed than an intermediate design review (60% design) will not be necessary.
- We have assumed that post-construction survey and record drawings will not be completed.
- We assume the preliminary design will include one meeting with District staff to discuss the plans and cost estimate.
- We assume the final design will include one meeting with District staff to discuss the 90% plans and cost estimate and one presentation for the District Board prior to final approval prior to bidding the project.
- We assume meetings with the DNR other stakeholders will last approximately 1 hour and will be held at Barr’s Edina office.
- Total time required to complete construction administration and documentation will not exceed 34 hours, based on an assumed total construction timeframe of two weeks.
- No property acquisition will be needed for the project. If property acquisition is needed, those services will be coordinated with the District Administrator on a time and expense basis.
- The proposed budget includes costs for mileage reimbursement for site visits and site observation.
- The District will provide all available and applicable GIS and CAD files to Barr in an electronic format.

3. **Deliverables:**

The following deliverables will be prepared and provided to the RPBCWD:

**Task 1: Project Management and Meeting**

- Regular email updates about project progress.
- Communications with District staff if unforeseen issues arise with any aspect of the project, including the technical scope of work, project budget, stakeholder involvement, or project schedule.
- Project invoices approximately monthly.
Phase 1: Design and Permitting

- Preliminary plans (approximately 30-40% complete).
- Preliminary Engineer’s Opinion of Probable Cost.
- Meeting agenda
- Meeting minutes and a summary of the discussion with District staff and stakeholders
- 90% plans.
- Meeting agenda to discuss 90% plans
- Meeting minutes and a summary of the discussion with District staff and stakeholders
- Final plans with revisions based on input from 90% review.
- Final Engineer’s Opinion of Probably Cost to accompany final plans.
- Technical specifications and provisions
- Contract documents for the bid process
- All materials needed to complete all necessary permit applications.
- Draft design memorandum for District review
- Final design memorandum

Phase 2: Construction Administration

- Advertisement for Bid
- Pre-bid meeting agenda (if necessary)
- Bid tab following bid submittals
- Meeting agenda
- Meeting minutes
- Regular updates to District staff about construction progress
- Construction photos and field notes
- Pay applications from contractor(s)
- Change orders (if necessary)
- Draft post-construction memorandum for District review
- Final post-construction memorandum

4. Budget:

Services under this Task Order will be compensated for in accordance with the engineering services agreement and will not exceed $45,900, without written authorization by the Administrator. The following table provides a breakdown of the anticipated cost for major tasks associated with scope of services describe above.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Task Description</th>
<th>Anticipated Budget</th>
<th>Anticipated Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Project Management and TMDL Implementation</td>
<td>$6,200</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Topographic Survey</td>
<td>$2,900</td>
<td>June 30, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Vegetation Survey and Design Input</td>
<td>$900</td>
<td>July 15, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Geotechnical Review and Design Input</td>
<td>$1,100</td>
<td>July 15, 2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Preliminary Design and Cost Estimate</td>
<td>$7,500</td>
<td>August 15, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Final Design</td>
<td>$5,400</td>
<td>September 30, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Engineer’s Opinion of Cost Estimate</td>
<td>$800</td>
<td>September 30, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>QA/QC Review</td>
<td>$1,400</td>
<td>September 30, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Technical Specifications</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>September 30, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Permitting</td>
<td>$3,400</td>
<td>September 30, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Design Memorandum</td>
<td>$2,400</td>
<td>October 15, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phase 1 Subtotal</td>
<td>$29,800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Phase 2: Construction Administration**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Bidding Assistance/Bid Opening/Recommendation to the Board</td>
<td>$2,900</td>
<td>October 15, 2014 – December 15, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Pre-Construction Meeting</td>
<td>$1,100</td>
<td>January 7, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Construction Administration and Observation</td>
<td>$3,800</td>
<td>January 7, 2015 - February 15, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Post-Construction Memorandum</td>
<td>$2,100</td>
<td>May 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phase 2 Subtotal</td>
<td>$9,900</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Task Order 4 Total**

|   | Total                                                                 | $45,900|                               |

---

1 – Total construction time is assumed to be approximately 2 weeks and would occur within a 2-3 week window of time within the time frame included.

5. **Schedule and Assumptions Upon Which Schedule is Based**

The proposed schedule (above) is based on the substantial construction occurring during January-February 2015, with final site restoration being completed April-May 2015. The schedule outlined above assumes project initiation will occur in June 2014. The schedule may be modified depending on actual initiation of project work.

**IN WITNESS WHEREOF**, intending to be legally bound, the parties hereto execute and deliver this Agreement.

**CONSULTANT**

By _____________________________  
Its  Vice President

By _____________________________  
Its

Date: _____________________________

**RILEY PurgaTORY BLUFF CREEK WATERSHED DISTRICT**

**APPROVED AS TO FORM & EXECUTION**
TASK ORDER No. 6
Pursuant to Agreement for Engineering Services
Riley Purgatory Bluff Creek Watershed District and BARR Engineering Company.
February 19, 2014

This Task Order is issued pursuant to Section 1 of the above-cited engineering services agreement between the Riley Purgatory Bluff Creek Watershed District (District) and BARR Engineering Company (Engineer) and incorporated as a part thereof.

1. Description of Services:

TASK A
Perform operation and maintenance tasks related to the Purgatory Creek Monitoring Station located at Pioneer Trail in Eden Prairie (Pioneer Tr Station). The Pioneer Tr Station is enrolled in Metropolitan Council’s (MCES) Watershed Outlet Monitoring Program (WOMP). As part of the WOMP, the District will work with MCES in a cooperative effort to collect flow, rainfall, and water quality data at the Pioneer Tr Station. The District has a contract with MCES to act as the cooperator for 2014-2015.

TASK B
Phase I: Perform tasks as described below to rehabilitate the Monitoring Station on Purgatory Creek at Valley View Road in Eden Prairie (Valley View Rd Station) to restore station functionality. The Station has not been operational for the last few years.

Phase II: Perform operation and maintenance, data management, and project management tasks related to the Valley View Rd Station. (Note: the Valley View Rd Station will not be enrolled in MCES’S WOMP, so this station will be the sole responsibility of the District).

2. Scope of Services:

TASK A – Pioneer Trail Station
The District Engineer will perform operation and maintenance tasks for the Pioneer Tr Station as requested by the MCES WOMP Coordinator and approved by the District Administrator. These tasks will include:

a) Collecting grab samples at the station on a monthly basis during non-event or baseflows periods (i.e. not during storm events) and delivering these samples to the MCES lab located on Childs Rd., St. Paul, MN.

b) Setting sample activation parameters (i.e. activation level and volume) to trigger the station’s auto-sampler during storm events. Collecting storm event composite samples for significant events (i.e. rainfall > ½ in.) and delivering these samples to the MCES lab located on Childs Rd., St. Paul, MN.

c) Performing routine maintenance of the equipment at the station; including verifying/calibrating water quality sensors, clearing debris from sensors, changing out desiccants, prepping the station for spring monitoring, and winterizing the station.

d) Troubleshooting equipment issues, as needed. The MCES will rely on the District Engineer to assess equipment problems if they arise. The amount of troubleshooting in any given year is unpredictable. Therefore, the maintenance portion of the budget has included up to 20 hours of time to troubleshoot equipment issues. If additional time
beyond what has been assumed in the budget below is needed the troubleshooting effort will be coordinated with the District Administrator. The assumed time allocated for troubleshooting equipment will not be exceeded without prior authorization by the District Administrator.

e) Performing stage-discharge measurements for development, verification and/or updating of the rating-curve equation (i.e., the relationship between stream flow and water level that is developed based on manual measurements at a monitoring station).

f) Managing of continuous water quality, rainfall, and flow data; including downloading and reviewing data, and assisting MCES with year-end data QA/QC and summary.

NOTE: As part of the WOMP contract, the MCES responsibilities include all laboratory work/fees associated with the sampling, data management (year-end QA/QC, summarizing, storing in database), major maintenance costs (i.e. replacement cost of equipment, subcontractor fees for repair, etc.), and project management/coordination tasks.

TASKB – Valley View Road Station

Phase I: The District Engineer will perform the following tasks to rehabilitate the Valley View Rd Station:

a) Clean the station’s shelter interior and equipment, which have been soiled by mice.

b) Evaluate the condition of the existing equipment at the station; including the datalogger, water level sensor, stream temperature sensor, conductivity sensor, rain gage, and autosampler. The evaluation will include a field test for each piece of equipment.

c) Replace or repair non-functioning equipment. Order new equipment from vendors where needed. It is anticipated that the water level sensor, conductivity sensor, and temperature sensor will need replacement.

d) Order new turbidity sensor. Turbidity has not been measured continuously at the station in the past, but many similar stations in the area are doing so, including the WOMP Pioneer Tr Station.

e) Setup and bench test all existing and new equipment associated with this monitoring station at the District Engineer’s field office.

f) Revise datalogger program where needed; for example, if a new water level sensor is added, new code lines will need to be inserted in the program.

g) Remove any existing cables, conduits, and sensor fixtures, which are no longer useable.

h) Install all equipment, cables, conduits, and sensor fixtures.

i) Hook-up all equipment and field test it. Commission station when all equipment is working properly.

Phase II: After the Valley View Rd Station is commissioned, the District Engineer will operate the station for the remainder of the year. This includes the following tasks:

a) Collecting grab samples at the station on a monthly basis during non-event or baseflows periods (i.e. not during storm events) and delivering these samples to a certified laboratory for testing.

b) Setting sample activation parameters (i.e. activation level and volume) to trigger the station’s auto-sampler during storm events. Collecting storm event composite samples for significant events (i.e. rainfall > ½ in.) and delivering these samples to a certified laboratory for testing.
c) Performing routine maintenance of the equipment at the station; including verifying/calibrating water quality sensors, clearing debris from sensors, changing out desiccants, and winterizing the station.

d) Troubleshooting equipment issues, as needed. The amount of troubleshooting in any given year is unpredictable. Therefore, the maintenance portion of the budget has included up to 10 hours of time to troubleshoot equipment issues. If additional time beyond what has been assumed in the budget below is needed the troubleshooting effort will be coordinated with the District Administrator. The assumed time allocated for troubleshooting equipment will not be exceeded without prior authorization by the District Administrator.

e) Performing stage-discharge measurements for development, verification and/or updating of the rating-curve equation (i.e., the relationship between stream flow and water level that is developed based on manual measurements at a monitoring station).

f) Downloading and reviewing monitoring data (i.e. stage, flow, conductivity, temperature, rainfall, turbidity) throughout the monitoring period. Performing year-end data management tasks including QA/QC and summarization.

g) Managing and coordinating project.

Note: A certified laboratory will provide the lab work services. A budget has been set for lab fees based on typical analyte costs.

3. **Deliverables:**

   **TASK A:**
   The water quality, flow, and rainfall data collected at the Pioneer Tr Station will be stored in a database maintained by MCES. The District and the District Engineer will have access to this data either through the MCES website or per request to the MCES WOMP coordinator.

   **TASK B:**
   Phase I - The Valley View Rd Station will be fully functional.
   Phase II - QA/QC’d water quality, flow, and rainfall data will be summarized and stored per the District Administrator’s instruction (for example, in an MS Excel, Access, or EQuIS database).

4. **Budget:**

   Services under this Task Order will be compensated for in accordance with the engineering services agreement and will not exceed $51,750 (Note: the District will be reimbursed $5,000 through a State Grant Agreement with MCES), without written authorization by the Administrator. Table 1 provides a summary of the anticipated cost for major tasks associated with scope of services describe above. Attachment 1 provides additional detail of the anticipated cost for each task and subtask, schedule, and laboratory costs.
Table 1. Summary of Task Order 6 Anticipated Cost for Major Tasks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Labor Costs¹</th>
<th>Other Expenses²</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td>Operate and Maintain the Purgatory Cr. WOMP Station at Pioneer Trail in Cooperation with MCES for 2014</td>
<td>$18,500</td>
<td>$2,100</td>
<td>$20,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Reinstate Purgatory Cr. Monitoring Station at Valley View Rd.</td>
<td>$6,800</td>
<td>$7,550</td>
<td>$14,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Operate and Maintain the Purgatory Cr. Monitoring Station at Valley View Rd for 2nd half of 2014</td>
<td>$12,300</td>
<td>$4,500</td>
<td>$16,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Task Order 6 Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$51,750</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Labor costs will be billed on an hourly rate per time spent on each task, but will not exceed amount shown without written authorization.
2. Other expenses billed as costs incur, including purchase of new equipment, mileage, equipment rental if needed, and supplies as necessary.

5. **Schedule and Assumptions Upon Which Schedule is Based**
   a) TASK A: The project schedule is included in the above table. The Pioneer Tr Station is operated and maintained year-round.
   b) TASK B: The project schedule is inserted in the tables above. This schedule is weather dependent; for example, a late spring and ice conditions could push back Mar-2014 tasks to April-2014.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, intending to be legally bound, the parties hereto execute and deliver this Agreement.

**CONSULTANT**

RILEY PURGATORY BLUFF CREEK WATERSHED DISTRICT

By __________________________  By __________________________

Its __________________________  Its __________________________

Date: __________________________  Date: __________________________

APPROVED AS TO FORM & EXECUTION

__________________________
## Attachment 1: Breakdown of Services for Task Order 6 including Anticipated Cost and Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task/Phase</th>
<th>Subtask</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Labor Costs</th>
<th>Other Expenses</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Task A</strong></td>
<td>Task 1</td>
<td>Monthly grab samples: collect grab samples during non-event or baseflow periods (costs are based on 12 samples).</td>
<td>$4,500.00</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>Jan to Dec-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Task 2</td>
<td>Storm event samples: collect composite samples during storm events (assumes sampling begins in March and 15 sampleable storm events of &gt; 0.5&quot; of rain occur).</td>
<td>$6,000.00</td>
<td>$600.00</td>
<td>$6,600.00</td>
<td>Mar to Nov-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Task 3</td>
<td>Maintenance: sensor verification/calibration, troubleshoot problem issues as necessary, spring preparations for monitoring season, and winterize station.</td>
<td>$3,000.00</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td>$3,500.00</td>
<td>Jan to Dec-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Task 4</td>
<td>Rating Curve: perform stage-discharge measurements to verify rating curve is accurate and update rating curve if needed.</td>
<td>$3,000.00</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td>$3,500.00</td>
<td>Jan to Dec-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Task 5</td>
<td>Data management: download and review data throughout monitoring period. Assist MCES with year's end data QA/QC and summary.</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
<td>Jan to Dec-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Task A Subtotals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$18,500.00</td>
<td>$2,100.00</td>
<td>$20,600.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Task B - Phase 1</strong></td>
<td>Task 1</td>
<td>Purchase new radar water level sensor to replace old ultrasonic sensor. Radar sensor make and model: Campbell Scientific, Inc., Model # OBS500.</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$2,400.00</td>
<td>$2,400.00</td>
<td>Mar-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Task 2</td>
<td>Purchase new temperature/conductivity sensor to replace old one. Temp/Cond sensor make and model: Campbell Scientific, Inc., Model # CS547A</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$650.00</td>
<td>$650.00</td>
<td>Mar-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Task 3</td>
<td>Purchase new turbidity sensor. Turbidity Sensor make and model: Campbell Scientific, Inc., Model # CS4500.</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$3,800.00</td>
<td>$3,800.00</td>
<td>Mar-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Task 4</td>
<td>Project management: communications and meetings, purchase new equipment and supplies, manage schedule and budget, and administrative tasks.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Task 5</td>
<td>Test existing equipment at station: test datalogger, ultrasonic water level sensor, temperature/conductivity sensor, rain gage, and autosampler.</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
<td>Jan to Dec-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Task 6</td>
<td>Setup and bench test equipment: setup new and &quot;good&quot; existing equipment on bench, revise datalogger program, and test equipment prior to installation.</td>
<td>$450.00</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td>Mar-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Task 7</td>
<td>Equipment installation: removal of existing cables and conduits, installation of new and &quot;good&quot; existing sensors with cables and conduits, installation of Isco autosampler.</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
<td>$350.00</td>
<td>$2,350.00</td>
<td>May to Jun-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Task 8</td>
<td>Commission station: hook-up sensors and autosampler to datalogger, verify all equipment are working properly, commission station.</td>
<td>$850.00</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
<td>$900.00</td>
<td>Jun-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Task B - Phase 1 Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$6,800.00</td>
<td>$7,550.00</td>
<td>$14,350.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Task B - Phase 2</strong></td>
<td>Task 1</td>
<td>Monthly grab samples: collect grab samples during non-event or baseflow periods (assumes monitoring begins in July, costs are based on 6 samples).</td>
<td>$2,400.00</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
<td>$2,650.00</td>
<td>Jul to Dec-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Task 2</td>
<td>Storm event samples: collect composite samples during storm events (assumes monitoring begins in July and 8 sampleable storm events of &gt; 0.5&quot; of rain occur).</td>
<td>$3,200.00</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
<td>$3,500.00</td>
<td>Jul to Dec-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Task 3</td>
<td>Maintenance: sensor verification/calibration, troubleshoot problem issues as necessary, and winterize station.</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
<td>$1,750.00</td>
<td>Jul to Dec-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Task 4</td>
<td>Rating curve: perform flow measurements to verify rating curve accuracy, modify rating curve if necessary.</td>
<td>$3,000.00</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
<td>$3,300.00</td>
<td>Jul to Dec-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Task 5</td>
<td>Data management: download and review data throughout monitoring period and complete a year's end data QA/QC and summary.</td>
<td>$2,200.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$2,200.00</td>
<td>Jul-14 to Feb-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Task B - Phase 2 Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$11,300.00</td>
<td>$1,100.00</td>
<td>$13,400.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Task B - Phase 2 Subtotals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$18,100.00</td>
<td>$8,650.00</td>
<td>$26,750.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Analyte Test Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analyte</th>
<th>Lab Test Cost</th>
<th>No. of Sample</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alkalinity</td>
<td>$15.07</td>
<td>$14.00</td>
<td>$210.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bacteria, E. Coli</td>
<td>$34.10</td>
<td>$6.00</td>
<td>$206.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbon, Total Organic</td>
<td>$25.57</td>
<td>$14.00</td>
<td>$357.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical Oxygen Demand</td>
<td>$11.90</td>
<td>$14.00</td>
<td>$166.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chloride</td>
<td>$22.57</td>
<td>$14.00</td>
<td>$315.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chlorophyll-a</td>
<td>$19.40</td>
<td>$6.00</td>
<td>$116.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conductivity (Specific Conductance)</td>
<td>$30.14</td>
<td>$14.00</td>
<td>$421.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardness</td>
<td>$10.31</td>
<td>$14.00</td>
<td>$144.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metals</td>
<td>$43.20</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td>$86.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitrogen, Ammonia</td>
<td>$9.91</td>
<td>$14.00</td>
<td>$138.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitrogen, Kjeldahl and Total Phosphorus</td>
<td>$19.82</td>
<td>$14.00</td>
<td>$277.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitrogen, Nitrate+Nitrite</td>
<td>$8.25</td>
<td>$14.00</td>
<td>$115.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phosphorus, orthophosphate</td>
<td>$19.00</td>
<td>$6.00</td>
<td>$114.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solids, Total and Volatile Suspended</td>
<td>$15.46</td>
<td>$14.00</td>
<td>$216.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulfate</td>
<td>$19.00</td>
<td>$14.00</td>
<td>$266.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turbidity</td>
<td>$12.00</td>
<td>$14.00</td>
<td>$168.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Lab Testing Cost Subtotal** | | | | $3,400.00 |

**Task Order 6 Total** | | | | $51,750.00 |

1 Labor costs will be billed on an hourly rate per time spent on each task, but will not exceed amount shown without written authorization.

2 Other expenses billed as costs incur, including purchase of new equipment, mileage, equipment rental if needed, and supplies as necessary.
Minnesota Northland NEMO Program

2014 WEST METRO REGION WATERSHEDS NEMO PLAN

The NEMO program in partnership with watershed organizations in the west metro region will design and deliver specific workshops and programs that will provide educational and skill building programming to elected and appointed officials and community leaders that increases their knowledge about the connection of land use and management decisions to water quality and natural resources. NEMO will provide non-regulatory, researched-based education that emphasizes natural resources based planning, application of low impact best management practices (BMPs), and adoption or revision of policies that collectively supportive community desires and needs to maintain and improve clean water resources and minimize impact.

WEST METRO WATERSHED PARTNERS INCLUDED IN THIS NEMO WORK PLAN:

- Minnehaha Creek Watershed District
- Nine Mile Creek Watershed District
- Riley-Purgatory-Bluff Creek Watershed District
- Carver Water Management Organization
- (not confirmed) Elm Creek, West Mississippi, Shingle Creek, Bassett Creek

NEMO will work in partnership with watershed education staff and other key individuals to provide the following specific programs in 2014.

NEMO PROGRAM PRIORITIES & DELIVERABLES

1. (2) NEMO 101 workshops – Linking Land Use to Clean Water Target: May

   Workshops will focus on introductory land use and land management principals and how they influence water quality and quantity, nonpoint source pollution, tools in the toolbox for both protection & restoration, rules & requirements 101, the role of local municipal leaders, resources including technical, financial, training, and education. Workshops may include a capstone or attractive keynote presentation. (2) locations will be considered: Edina (east, May 7th or 8th) and Minnetonka (west, May 13th).

2. NEMO Workshop-on-the-water Target: Mid July

   A NEMO workshop on Lake Minnetonka that focuses on bringing elected and appointed officials and community leaders out on a representative water resource to build their knowledge and provide skills that will assist them in making informed decisions for water resource protection & restoration. This is a very effective NEMO delivery method that has been used several times focused on training on-the-water for leaders. Although the program occurs on Lake Minnetonka, all cities within the participating watersheds will be invited and the content will be applicable to local community lakes and streams. (Potential target dates include July 21-24, 23, & 28)

3. NEMO Workshop: Lessons Across the Landscape Target: September

   This NEMO workshop will continue building knowledge and increasing skills through an interactive, bus-lour program that will focus on bringing local leaders to project, issue, and opportunity locations where content will focus on planning, practices, and policy tools and resources used for addressing water issues in the community. Locations to be determined but will include example and representative situations within the partner watersheds where lessons learned will be valuable to any and all communities and leaders who participate.

4. Other deliverables include the Clean Water Summit and other program support tbd
INTERNAL PLANNING TEAM SPECIFICS

1. **(2) NEMO 101 workshops – Linking Land Use to Clean Water**

   **Target: May**

   Workshops will focus on introductory land use and land management principals and how they influence water quality and quantity, nonpoint source pollution, tools in the toolbox for both protection & restoration, rules & requirements 101, the role of local municipal leaders, resources including technical, financial, training, and education. Workshops will include a capstone or attractive keynote presentation. (2) locations will be considered: Edina (east, May 7th or 8th) and Minnetonka (west, May 13th).

   **EAST**
   - **Date(s):** 1st choice: May 7th 2nd choice: May 8th
     - Claire: Is there a RPBC watershed meeting the 7th?
     - Avoid the 8th if possible (MCWD Board meeting)
   - **Location:** Edina @ BARR Engineering
     - Claire will check with Bob Obermeyer at BARR regarding availability, cost, and reservations.

   **WEST**
   - **Date:** May 13th
     - **Location:** Southshore Community Center (Shorewood) or Bayview
     - John/Leslie/ (Telly) needs to check on costs for each. Southshore probably is better financially.
   - **Time:** 5:30-8:30pm (registration and dinner starting at 5pm)

**Preliminary Agenda**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Presenter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5:30-5:45</td>
<td>Introductions-workshop goals, objectives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:45-6:30</td>
<td>NEMO 101</td>
<td>John Bilotta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:30-7:00</td>
<td>Rules, Regulations, and Assistance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:00-7:30</td>
<td>Watershed Resource Fair – Networking time (title tbd)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wall-map exercise?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:30 – 8:15</td>
<td>Capstone presentation on groundwater</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:15 – 8:30</td>
<td>Evaluation, next steps, participant input for summer on-the-water program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Learning Objectives:** Local leaders (participants) ....

- **NEMO 101:** An introductory land use and land management practices, how they influence water quality and quantity, nonpoint source pollution, impervious surfaces, and tools in the toolbox for both protection & restoration (plans, practices, and policies), the role of municipal leaders. Presentation will include local, recent case studies or projects.

- **Rules & Regulations:**
  - Description: Provide an overview of rules and regulations for cities within the watersheds, tracking from the Clean Water Act (Federal) level, to state level (multiple rules & regulations) to the watershed level. Somehow, present an overview of watershed rules without going into individual watershed unit details (provide for that during the networking time – see below). Provide overview of the current city ordinances and the possibilities. The rules and regulations for local city leaders. Encouragement to connect with watersheds during network time.

- **Assistance:**
INTERNAL PLANNING TEAM SPECIFICS

Briefly cover the variety of assistance available to cities to help them meet or achieve clean water goals, including technical, financial, education, and training assistance. Introduction to options available and introductions to the main staff contacts that can help you. Encouragement to connect with watersheds during network time.

Resource Fair/Watershed Network time (title tbd):
Idea is to have specific areas for each of the watershed districts to have a booth set up with multiple staff and resources that participants can then visit with. Can be 1-2 tables, booths, materials, 1-3 staff, etc.

Wall-map interactive: Idea is to create a large map of the cities, watersheds, and resources from approximately Carver-Waconia-St.Boni (west side) to Edina-Minneapolis-Bloomington region. Constructed in 3-4 vertical panels (36" wide plotter paper). Claire is checking with BARR to see they could construct and print the maps. Map would be available during the workshop (esp resource fair time) and participants could place Post-it notes on it. What, if any, information do we want from participants? Identifying important water or natural resource features? Problem sites? Opportunities? We need to work on this.....

Capstone or keynote presentation: Employing an effective NEMO program concept used in the past, provide a capstone or keynote presentation that draws the participants in and addressed a critical, timely and important topics concerning water and communities. Desired theme: Groundwater

Ideas include:
- Patrick Sweeney, Freshwater Society
- Todd Peterson, DNR
- Barb Larsadi, USGS
- Shawn S, St. Croix Research Station
- Ray Walla, BARR Engineering
- Robert Tipping, USGS-MGS

NEMO Program Reviewers: Select staff and local leaders to review and offer suggestions for the various NEMO workshops. John would contact each of these as a participant pre-assessment piece.
- Scott Zerbie, City Council Member, City of Shorewood
- Patty Accomb, City Council Member, City of Minnetonka
- Jim Hublin, Mayor, City of Edina
- Josh Sprang, City Council Member, City of Edina
- Jo Colleran, staff, City of Minnetonka
- Ross Bitner, staff, City of Edina
- Terry Jeffrey, staff, City of Chanhassen
- Derek Asche, staff, City of Plymouth
- * Randy Neepwash, MCSC – reference for MS4 rules and regulations section.

2/3/2014 Next steps & tasks
- JB – write notes, write learning objectives
- JB – check on proposed dates
- ALL – final check on May dates for any conflicts
- JB & Leslie – check on Southshore Community Centers and Bayview or Maynards
- Claire – check with BARR on conference room and map making potential
- JB – work on capstone presenter
- JB invitation by March 1st
- Next meeting date is February 20th 11am-1pm at 9 Mile Creek offices
2. **NEMO Workshop-on-the-water**  
   Target: Mid July

A NEMO workshop on Lake Minnetonka that focuses on bringing elected and appointed officials and community leaders out on a representative water resource to build their knowledge and provide skills that will assist them in making informed decisions for water resource protection & restoration. This is a very effective NEMO delivery method that has been used several times focused on training on-the-water for leaders. Although the program occurs on Lake Minnetonka, all cities within the participating watersheds will be invited and the content will be applicable to local community lakes and streams.  

*(Potential target dates include July 21-24, 23, & 28)*
POSITION TITLE: District Technician/Compliance Officer

REPORTS TO: Administrator

STATUS: Full time, exempt (from Fair Labor Standards Act)

PRIMARY OBJECTIVE:
The District Technician/Compliance Officer reports directly to, and is supervised by, the District Administrator. The Position will also work closely and assist the Water Quality and Outreach Coordinator. The position will assist in the collection, analysis, and reporting of the data on water quality within the District. The position will also assist in the inspection and maintenance of District properties, capital projects, and other facilities as assigned, as well as assist in the inspection and enforcement of District rules and policies.

(The examples given below are intended only as illustrations of various types of work performed and are not necessarily all-inclusive. This position description is subject to change as the needs of the employer and requirements of the position change.)

ESSENTIAL FUNCTIONS:

1. Implement District’s monitoring program and other water quality projects. (70% of time). This will include but is not limited to:
   a. Install and maintain the District’s network of flow meters, samplers, and rain gauges.
   b. Collect water samples in lakes, streams and other water features.
   c. Conduct stream surveys.
   d. Monitor the health and stability of the District’s streams.
   e. Develop Monitoring plan including preparing annual water quality /quantity monitoring plans, identify water quality parameters and work with district Engineer to define sampling locations.
   f. Enter data into District database.
   g. Assist in the analysis and interpretation of the monitoring data and preparation of the annual monitoring reports.
2. Serve as the primary point of contact for the public on lake and stream issues. (20% of time). This will include but is not limited to:

   a. Inspect District facilities and capital projects to identify maintenance needs and perform small scale natural resource restoration and maintenance tasks.
   b. Perform field inspections to assure compliance with District regulations, land covenants and easements.
   c. Prepare activity reports, coordinate and attend meetings with required Local Government Units.
   d. Assist in the processing and enforcement of District regulations.
   e. Maintain and update Operations & Maintenance and Permit databases.
   f. Other duties as assigned.

3. Other duties (Priority B – 10% of time). This will include but is not limited to:

   a. Manage the District’s aeration unit.
   b. Other.

MINIMUM QUALIFICATIONS

   a. A BA/BS degree in natural resource science, conservation biology, plant ecology, or another applicable field with at least 1 year of professional experience in natural resource management; OR three (3) years professional experience with multiple phases of natural resource restoration and management or a related field;
   b. General knowledge of watershed management, wetland ecology, and soil science;
   c. Ability to work and conduct surveys outdoors and under adverse weather conditions;
   d. Ability to occasionally lift articles weighing up to 50-pounds and frequently lift and/or carry objects up to 25 pounds, such as heavy tools and file boxes;
   e. Ability to walk and stand on rough terrain and the use of power tools or mechanical equipment;
   f. Ability to oversee field projects and to train and direct the activities of other field staff;
   g. A valid driver's license;
   h. Ability to work some evenings and weekends.

DESIRED QUALIFICATIONS
Experience in one or more of the following is desired: wetland and prairie restoration and management, upland and wetland invasive species control, identification of native and invasive plants of Central Minnesota, the Minnesota Wetland Conservation Act, wetland delineation training, erosion control certification, and watershed based regulation. Management of aeration units. Experience using ArcGIS software to create maps and analyze spatial data.

**SALARY RANGE**
The starting salary is $34,000.
Water Quality and Outreach Coordinator

Riley-Purgatory-Bluff Creek Watershed District
8080 Mitchell Rd
Eden Prairie, MN 55346
952-294-5976

POSITION TITLE: Water Quality and Outreach Coordinator

REPORTS TO: Administrator

STATUS: Full time, exempt (from Fair Labor Standards Act)

PRIMARY OBJECTIVE:
The Water Quality and Outreach Coordinator reports directly to, and is supervised by, the District Administrator. The position will collect, analyze, and report data on water quality within the District, manage the District’s water quality management program, and coordinate with stakeholders groups related to water quality. The position will also establish and maintain partnership with the municipalities, appropriate groups and other organizations (Partners) to implement outreach programs to protect, restore and improve water resources.

(The examples given below are intended only as illustrations of various types of work performed and are not necessarily all-inclusive. This position description is subject to change as the needs of the employer and requirements of the position change.)

ESSENTIAL FUNCTIONS:

1. Implement District’s monitoring program and other water quality projects. (70% of time). This will include but is not limited to:
   a. Analyze and interpret data and prepare annual monitoring reports.
   b. Install and maintain the District’s network of flow meters, samplers, and rain gauges.
   c. Collect water samples in lakes and streams.
   d. Monitor the health and stability of the District’s streams.
   e. Arrange for lab analysis by outside contractors.
   f. Develop Monitoring plan including preparing annual water quality /quantity monitoring plans, identify water quality parameters and work with district Engineer to define sampling locations.
   g. Enter data into District database and enter data into statewide database.
2. Serve as the primary point of contact for the public on lake and stream issues. (10% of time). This will include but is not limited to:
   a. Provide technical expertise for organized lake associations.
   b. Provide technical expertise at public meetings.

3. Other duties (Priority B – 20% of time). This will include but is not limited to:
   a. Develop Outreach Materials.
   b. Manage annual water quality intern.

MINIMUM QUALIFICATIONS

a. Bachelor degree in the fields of biology, chemistry, environmental studies, or related area with coursework emphasis in hydrology, water chemistry, and/or aquatic biology/ecology.
b. 3 years of field experience with at least 1 year of experience in implementing and managing a surface water monitoring program.
c. Knowledge of technical and regulatory water quality and stormwater issues.
d. Demonstrated written, verbal, and presentation skills (including PowerPoint and publishing software).
e. Demonstrated networking, team-building, research, coordination, and multi-tasking skills. Ability to work with a diverse public audience.
f. Must have reliable vehicle and valid US drivers license with no recent suspensions.
g. Ability to work and conduct surveys outdoors and under adverse weather conditions.
h. Familiar with winter ice safety and safety measures during field season.
i. A valid driver's license.
j. Ability to work some evenings and weekends.
k. Ability to oversee field projects and to train and direct the activities of other field staff.

DESIRED QUALIFICATIONS
Master Degree in water resources or relevant field. Project WET certified. Experience using ArcGIS software to create maps and analyze spatial data. Experience with information programs and working with mass media. Experience with non-formal, non-traditional teaching settings (e.g., outside of classroom, adult learners). Previous experience with small local units of government, secondary education and water resources education experience. First-aid certified

SALARY RANGE
The starting salary is $41,000.
Capitol Region Watershed District

SALARY ADMINISTRATION POLICY

I. OBJECTIVES

A. To establish and maintain salary structures which will enable the watershed district to attract and retain qualified and competent personnel essential to function effectively and achieve its stated objectives for quality, consistent service.

B. To encourage continual improvement in performance and the ongoing development of ability in each employee through a sound, well-administered salary and performance review program.

C. To follow the principle of equal pay for equal work and maintain salary relationships among positions within the organization which are internally consistent in recognizing significant differences in position responsibilities and requirements, and in compliance with applicable government requirements and regulations.

D. To establish and maintain salary levels which compare favorably with salaries paid by well-established employers in the various market areas from which the district recruits.

E. To provide flexibility within the salary program to meet changing economic and competitive conditions of the market areas from which the district recruits.

F. To provide a salary program which can be readily understood by, and communicated to, all parties involved.
II. **SALARY STRUCTURES AND PRINCIPLES OF APPLICATION**

A. **Salary Structures**

1. To facilitate effective administration, a salary structure covering all positions has been established.

2. The salary structure consists of base salary ranges, which progress in an orderly arrangement from lowest to highest.

   Sufficient grade levels have been established to recognize important relative differences in position responsibilities and requirements.

B. **Salary Ranges**

All salary ranges are divided into three Zones: Zone One is 25%, Zone Two is 50% and Zone Three equal to 25% of the range dollars.

C. Each part of any Salary Range is defined as follows:

1. **Minimum Salary** - The salary normally paid an individual hired for or promoted to a given position.

2. **Zone 1** - The pay zone for individuals new in a position and/or who are acquiring the experience needed to perform effectively in all areas for which accountable. Employee skills are sufficient to perform at an entry level in the position.

3. **Zone 2** - The pay zone for individuals who are fully qualified for the position and have proven ability to perform effectively in all areas for which accountable. Employees at this level are experienced and skilled in relation to the expectations for the position.

4. **Zone 3** - The pay zone reserved for individuals who perform assigned accountabilities and responsibilities in a consistently "outstanding" manner over a significant period of time. Employees at this level are highly experienced and highly skilled in relation to the expectations for the position.

5. **Maximum Salary** - The highest salary which can be justified under normal circumstances, for a position within a given grade level.

D. The salary structure will be reviewed periodically and adjustments made, when justified, to ensure competitiveness on an ongoing basis.
III. ADMINISTRATION PROCEDURES

A. Performance Discussions

1. Performance Reviews

   a. Performance reviews will be conducted by the administrator for the purpose of communicating performance expectations and what, if any, salary adjustment is to be made for an individual. Salary actions will be based on the organization’s ability to pay, evaluation of performance and the individual's current position in the salary range.

   b. All employees will have an annual performance review and salary discussion. Such reviews will be scheduled in relation to date of hire, transfer, promotion or last performance review date.

   c. If the administrator determines that a salary adjustment has not been earned based on performance, a special off-cycle performance review should be scheduled. At that time, performance should be reevaluated, and if justified, a salary adjustment made at that time.

   d. Salary Actions Taken In General

       Salary actions are based primarily on performance reviews and position in salary range. Responsibility for initiating salary actions is delegated to the administrator.

1. Salary actions will not be communicated to an employee until the administrator, and if required, the Board of managers has approved it.

2. Salary actions will be approved only after performance reviews are conducted in accordance with established procedures.
3. Approved salary actions will normally be made effective as of the beginning of the first pay period following the anniversary date of the employee.

4. Salary actions shall be made only when earned, based on identifiable, satisfactory performance or better, and supported by the recommendation of the immediate supervisor for final approval. Salary actions for employees whose salaries are at or above the maximum for their salary range will normally not be allowed.

5. In rare circumstances, the administrator may approve an above-guidelines salary adjustment based on outside market conditions in order to maintain a competitive salary relationship.

6. The administrator may approve a special salary adjustment in cases where an employee has successfully completed acquisition of pre-approved skills or certifications.

7. Changes in grade assignment (either an increase or a decrease) for a position will require approval by the Board of Managers.

   e. **Salary Actions Related To Promotion**

   When an employee is promoted to a position in a higher grade level, a salary action is normally taken to bring the employee's salary up to at least the minimum rate of the new range. Such an action is normally taken at the time of promotion. Promotions will require approval by the Board of Managers.

B. **Job Evaluation and Grade Assignment**

   1. **General**

   Each position under this program is assigned a salary range and appropriate grade level.

   2. **Job Evaluation Process**

   a. Existing, new and revised positions are evaluated by the administrator using an analysis of comparable positions and salary survey data.

   b. When substantial changes in position responsibilities have occurred, or when creation of a new position is contemplated, a new or revised position
description will be prepared for evaluation by the administrator and submitted to the Personnel Committee of the Board for approval.

c. The Personnel Committee will meet as needed to address evaluation and grade assignment of new or revised positions in the organization.

IV. ADMINISTRATION ACCOUNTABILITY

A. The administrator should be accountable for maintaining the salary program in a current status and for coordinating the interpretation and administration of the established salary program policies.

The administrator will be responsible for:

1. Ensuring that employees are notified of upcoming performance reviews and salary actions for employees under their jurisdiction.

2. Reviewing all salary actions and approving those actions or seeking Personnel Committee approval in cases of an increase or decrease in grade level.

3. Working with staff to maintain accurate job descriptions. This includes following through to ensure an accurate job description is prepared for each new or revised position.

4. Preparing and finalizing salary structure adjustments on at least a biannual basis.

5. Monitoring the program to maintain the quality and effectiveness of performance reviews.

6. Annually reporting staff salaries to the Board in advance of the budgeting process. Making periodic analyses and summarizations of the status of the salary program as scheduled or requested by the Personnel Committee or the Board of Managers.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FLSA</th>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>Job Classification</th>
<th>Zone 1</th>
<th>Zone 2</th>
<th>Zone 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Program Manager III</td>
<td>$65,600-$73,800</td>
<td>$73,801-$90,200</td>
<td>$90,201-$98,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Program Manager II</td>
<td>$54,600-$61,400</td>
<td>$61,401-$75,100</td>
<td>$75,101-$82,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Education &amp; Outreach Specialist III</td>
<td>$49,800-$56,000</td>
<td>$56,001-$68,500</td>
<td>$68,501-$74,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Education &amp; Outreach Specialist II</td>
<td>$42,400-$47,700</td>
<td>$47,701-$58,300</td>
<td>$58,301-$63,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Administrative Assistant IV</td>
<td>$39,200-$44,100</td>
<td>$44,101-$53,900</td>
<td>$53,901-$58,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Administrative Assistant III</td>
<td>$34,400-$38,700</td>
<td>$38,701-$47,300</td>
<td>$47,301-$51,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Exempt</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Administrative Assistant II</td>
<td>$30,800-$34,600</td>
<td>$34,601-$42,400</td>
<td>$42,401-$46,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-exempt</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Administrative Assistant I</td>
<td>$25,200-$28,400</td>
<td>$28,401-$34,600</td>
<td>$34,601-$37,800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## Performance Based Pay Increase Guideline Chart

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Category</th>
<th>ZONE 1 12-Month Reviews</th>
<th>ZONE 2 12-Month Reviews</th>
<th>ZONE 3 12-Month Reviews</th>
<th>OVER MAX. 12-Month Reviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I Outstanding</td>
<td>6-7%</td>
<td>5-6%</td>
<td>4-5%</td>
<td>2-3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II Exceeds Requirements</td>
<td>4-5%</td>
<td>3-4%</td>
<td>2-3%</td>
<td>1-2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III Satisfactory</td>
<td>3-4%</td>
<td>2-3%</td>
<td>1-2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV Needs Improvement</td>
<td>0-2%</td>
<td>0-1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V Unacceptable</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Represents approximately 3.5% overall base salary increase.