



Downtown Long Lake Feasibility – Informational Meeting

June 26, 2025

Questions and Responses

The Minnehaha Creek Watershed District (District) issued a request for proposals (RFP) for a Feasibility Study in Downtown Long Lake. Interested proposers were allowed to submit questions relating to the RFP by Tuesday, June 24, 2025. Below is a list of all the questions and the District's response. Similar questions are grouped together and given a single answer.

Stakeholders

1. Do the project partners anticipate any stakeholder meetings? Could MCWD share the preliminary list of stakeholders if it has been developed?
2. Is there any community engagement desired as part of the scope?
3. Could you outline expectations for public and stakeholder meetings as well as presentations and/or meetings with the City of Long Lake City, including City Council or Planning Commission, Minnehaha Creek Watershed District, including the Board, or the Partnership as a group.

At this time, we do not anticipate stakeholder engagement, public meetings, or meetings with City of Long Lake staff as part of the feasibility study process. While the City of Long Lake is a project partner and supportive of the District's efforts, due to staff capacity, they have elected a limited role in the feasibility process. We do expect to provide the City with the final feasibility report and presentation for their review and feedback, but broader community engagement or stakeholder meetings are not included in the current scope.

Data

4. Are there any hydrology and hydraulics models for the area beyond those described in the RFP or its attachments or the 2019 City of Long Lake WRMP and will they be made available?
5. Has a H+H model been developed for this watershed/subwatershed? If so, is it available for use?
6. Is any pond bathymetry information available for Kenobi Pond, the Highway 12 ROW basin, the retention basin south of City Hall, or the Nelson Lakeside ponds?
7. Have any pond surveys been conducted in the project area and if so, will data be provided?
8. Is there any recent survey information for the ravine areas south and southeast of Holbrook Park or the stream channel leading from City Hall to Nelson Lakeside Park?
9. Will any water quality modeling updated for the assessments reported in the Stantec 1-24-23 memo be made available?
10. Project evaluation is to address the goals, so will assess volume and phosphorus reduction benefits. Would MCWD share prior to the proposal deadline GIS shapefiles for existing model (SWMM and P8) catchments for the DMU to inform the extent to which subwatershed discretization may be required?
11. Is the P8 model available for use in the feasibility study?

We collaborate with public and private partners to protect and improve land and water for current and future generations.



12. Is storm sewer data (size, elevation) available in GIS format?
13. Will the calibrated BATHTUB model be made available to the project team?
14. Is there site-specific survey data for any of the focus areas? Or is all design analysis to be done using LiDAR data?

We will make all modeling and shapefiles that have been completed available to the selected firm, including:

- Calibrated P8 models from the watershed assessment
- H&H model (we are also developing a 2D H&H model for our climate action framework that should be available for limited use around October 2025)
- MCWD stream assessment
- Desktop USLE analysis to characterize erosion throughout Long Lake Creek
- Standardized stormsewer datasets (municipal, county, and state)
- MCWD's XP-SWMM model
- Nelson Lakeside Pond survey (other ponds and ravines do not have surveyed bathymetry)
- BATHTUB model for Long Lake

15. Are further data collection efforts (such as utility locating, topographic survey, and geotechnical investigation, etc.) anticipated to be conducted as part of this work or does the District feel like existing available data is sufficient for the level of detail anticipated? If further investigation is needed, should the associated cost be included as part of the response?

We would expect existing data to be sufficient to assess potential opportunities. If further investigation of site-specific opportunities is needed, and desired in advance of design, we could consider a contract amendment or separate work order to complete the needed investigation, which is not uncommon as we drill down on feasible project opportunities.

16. Flooding is noted in the RFP as a 'consideration'. Is site-scale stormwater quantity modeling anticipated as part of the 'multi-benefit opportunity' assessment?

Under various modeled scenarios (say 2, 10, 100 yr) we would hope to identify areas that are prone to flooding (e.g. intersections, ponds, parkland, etc). The 2D model that the District is still in the process of developing may be granular enough for a study like this; however, it will not be completed by the start of the feasibility process.

17. Are geotechnical reports available for any of the focus areas?

None that we have in hand, however given the recent construction of a few apartment complexes in downtown Long Lake, there may be existing reports or soil data that either our permitting team or City staff could provide.

We collaborate with public and private partners to protect and improve land and water for current and future generations.



Kenobi Pond

18. What is the scope of the planned Kenobi Pond maintenance and when will it occur?
19. What is the extent of maintenance planned in the "coming months" for Kenobi Pond? Is it possibly too late to consider pond retrofits to enhance performance concurrently with the maintenance project?

The City of Orono is responsible for the management and maintenance of Kenobi Pond. They are planning ditch improvements on the North and West sides of the pond and a slight pond expansion, with that work anticipated to occur later this year (fall 2025). If the outcomes of the feasibility study identify opportunities related to Kenobi Pond, further coordination with the City would be necessary to align efforts and explore potential enhancements.

City/Private Land

20. Does the City have a long-range improvement plans for any of the areas of interest? The RFP materials state that there is no immediate plan for the road, but what about other facilities such as parks?

The City has limited funds available for park improvement projects, however they do list a handful of trail and park improvement goals on their [website](#), which includes goals at Nelson Lakeside Park and Holbrook Park.

21. We understand that the project is not limited to public lands. Are the project partners aware of imminent private redevelopment areas? With respect to the cost-benefit analysis, does the MCWD have a standard method for estimating landowner agreements / easement acquisition costs?

We are not aware of imminent private redevelopment areas at this time but will continue to communicate with the City on any opportunities that arise. City staff may have more up-to-date information, which we can acquire during feasibility work. There is a city-owned parcel on the corner of Wayzata Blvd and Lake Street within the "Lakeview" focus area that used to be a gas station. The site has been cleaned up and is presently for sale.

Typically, we would anticipate costs for the project to be specific to design, construction, contingency and life cycle O/M. The cost for any agreements and easement/acquisition are not projected as part of feasibility and would be led by MCWD staff if a project opportunity is pursued.

22. MCWD Rules may require stormwater management for redevelopment. If a project is identified on private lands to be redeveloped wouldn't the project need to be above-and-beyond permit requirements to be considered?

We collaborate with public and private partners to protect and improve land and water for current and future generations.



If a parcel redevelops, we expect it to meet MCWD rules. There may be regional stormwater opportunities on private lands within the areas of interest for this feasibility study. A permitting scan of proposed project opportunities is an expected deliverable.

Other

23. Please clarify whether proposals should provide 3 references for each member of the primary team or 3 references for the project team in total.

Three references for the team as a whole are suitable.

24. Is there any flexibility with the 6-month schedule identified in the RFP?

The 6-month schedule included in the RFP is intended to provide general expectations for project duration and keep the process moving efficiently. While there is some flexibility, we encourage proposals to align with that timeframe to maintain project momentum.

25. Is an anticipated budget for this project? It would be helpful to determine level of analysis expected.

We have not specified an anticipated budget for this project, as we expect to see a range of proposed costs that reflect each consultant's approach, understanding of the project scope, and level of detail. Partners did receive a state grant of \$175,000 to aid in feasibility and design, but the grant does not assign proportions of dollars to each phase. Rather than assign a portion of the grant funds to feasibility, we wanted to gage consultant teams and have proposers develop budgets that are responsive to the scale of the project area and the feasibility-level analysis described in the RFP.

We collaborate with public and private partners to protect and improve land and water for current and future generations.