

**Six Mile Marsh Load Management Assessment
RFP Informational Meeting
October 1, 2026
Questions and Responses**

Questions pertaining to data availability and analysis:

- 1. Will there be additional/new 2026 data, and what data will be provided? If so, what format will the data be provided in, and will it include raw flow and concentration data?**
- 2. Beyond the datasets identified in Appendix E, have additional monitoring programs, phosphorus studies, treatment evaluations, or technical analyses been completed since preparation of the RFP that MCWD expects to make available to the selected consultant?**
 - Answer (1 & 2): Data identified in Appendix E can be provided in its raw form. Additional data not included in Appendix E that can be made available to the selected consultant team includes:
 - Longitudinal concentrations: one discrete grab-sample event to evaluate change in concentrations at multiple points from Halsted Bay to Highland Road.
 - Bathymetry: a bathymetric survey of the defined channel of Six Mile Marsh
 - Continuous phosphorus concentrations: estimated concentrations developed through statistical modeling
- 3. Will MCWD provide updated calculated data such as phosphorus load calculations/load-duration information, or should it be assumed that development of this information from raw data should be included in the scope?**
 - The proposal should identify what calculated datasets are needed to complete the proposed work and how those datasets would be utilized. If the consultant determines one or more calculated datasets is critical to the work, development should be incorporated into the proposed scope.
- 4. The RFP indicates that consultants may recommend additional data collection. Would this data be collected by MCWD staff, or should any recommended new sampling/jar testing/treatability testing be included within the \$60k-\$80k base scope?**
 - If the consultant determines that an additional data collection effort or survey is critical to meeting the project objectives, it should be included in the proposed scope, along with a rationale for why it is necessary. The proposal should also describe the anticipated timing and duration of the effort, including how any seasonal data needs or other timing considerations relate to the overall project schedule.

- 5. Prior studies evaluate the loading and phosphorus dynamics of the wetland. Can you comment on the need or level of effort that should be considered for the phosphorus loading assumptions, such as updating with the recent monitoring data?**
- MCWD is confident in the previous conclusion that the Six Mile Marsh is acting as an independent source of phosphorus to Halsted Bay. However, MCWD does not have a prescribed approach for how the existing phosphorus loading information should be updated or incorporated into the consultant's evaluation. The proposal should identify what level of effort is appropriate to establish assumptions needed to meet objectives. If the consultant determines that updated calculations or analysis are critical to the evaluation, that work should be incorporated into the proposed scope.
- 6. Where is the continuous flow data collected?**
- Sensor is placed at the Highway 7 Bridge, referred to as the "Six Mile Creek Inlet" station in Appendix E.

Questions pertaining to coordination:

- 7. Does MCWD expect direct pre-application coordination with MPCA, DNR, MCES, the City of Minnetrista, or other regulatory agencies as part of this scope, or is the regulatory evaluation intended to be desktop-level based on the consultant's experience?**
- MCWD will lead any coordination with regulatory agencies and does not expect the consultant to include a separate budget for this work. However, MCWD expects the consultant to use its professional experience with the applicable agencies and/or similar projects to assess and characterize the likely regulatory pathway, including constraints that could affect project advancement.
- 8. How active or involved have MCWD's project partners, Three Rivers Parks District, City of Minnetrista, etc., been on this project to date? Should coordination with these partners be included in the scope?**
- MCWD will lead coordination with its partners and the consultant does not need to include a separate budget for this work. To date, TRPD and Minnetrista staff are aware and tracking the water quality goals, the potential project opportunity along the Marsh, and the purpose and objectives of this current technical assessment. This is an early-stage technical exploration of the opportunity and MCWD recognizes that additional policy, partnership, and other considerations will need to be evaluated before determining whether the project warrants further pursuit.
- 9. Will MCWD be providing updates for the public and project partners related to this assessment, and should development of supporting materials be included in the scope?**
- MCWD anticipates engaging with its partners during and following the technical assessment. At this stage, MCWD anticipates that the technical report, evaluation matrix, and conceptual design will provide the information needed to support these initial conversations.
- 10. What level of staff participation does MCWD envision at project decision points?**
- MCWD desires a high degree of collaboration throughout the process. Staff want to understand the rationale and tradeoffs leading up to key decision points and play

an active role in stress-testing findings and conclusions. MCWD expects the consultant to design a process to engage MCWD staff throughout the assessment rather than only presenting findings at the end.

Questions pertaining to scope and approach:

- 11. Would MCWD like the feasibility assessment to explicitly identify fatal flaws or threshold conditions that could limit project advancement regardless of treatment performance, cost, or facility configuration?**
 - Yes. MCWD wants the assessment to identify these things as early as possible. Identifying these early could allow for the project team to adapt the evaluation approach and avoid unnecessary effort where appropriate.
- 12. The RFP shows a smaller lot size than depicted in the 2018 massing study (Appendix D). Should the adjacent lots be included in the evaluation? Prior studies also reference other locations. Should alternate locations be evaluated when considering alternate load management strategies?**
 - MCWD wants to understand the opportunity associated with the current boundaries of its Farmhill Circle property. At the same time, MCWD wants to understand how that opportunity compares to the broader potential of the load management strategy if a constraint such as site area were to be removed. This could include consideration of expanding the site, an additional site, or alternative location(s). The intent is not to develop detailed alternatives for endless other properties, but to help understand whether the Farmhill Circle property represents a meaningful opportunity as is or whether resources and energy should be put toward removing a space constraint.
- 13. Has MCWD established a minimum phosphorus-reduction objective, cost-effectiveness threshold, or other quantitative criterion for determining whether an offline facility provides a meaningful benefit? Or does MCWD expect the consultant to develop and recommend those decision thresholds?**
 - MCWD does not have a standard cost-benefit threshold for evaluating project feasibility. Multiple factors are typically considered and put in context of natural resource and community goals. MCWD expects the consultant to help establish and present the relevant facts, metrics, tradeoffs, and considerations associated with the alternatives evaluated. MCWD envisions working collaboratively with the consultant team to interpret those findings and determine how the alternatives should be framed as they move through the progressive gates of the project.
- 14. Has MCWD identified a likely owner or operator, or should alternatives be evaluated without assuming a specific operating entity?**
 - MCWD does not want the consultant to assume a specific ownership or operating role. Instead, MCWD would like the consultant to characterize the roles, expertise, resources, and ongoing activities that would be required to operate such a facility.
- 15. The RFP references “changes in the regulatory environment”. What are the specific changes that are referenced?**
 - No specific regulatory change was intended to be implied or referenced. However, anecdotal information suggests that previously implemented offline systems in Minnesota may face a more challenging or different regulatory pathway if pursued today.

16. With the collaborative and exploratory nature of this project, there could be “side pathways” that are worth examining but would use a significant portion of the budget. How do we factor this additional thinking into something with a specific budget?

- MCWD would like the consultant to work progressively through the scope, using collaborative checkpoints along the way to recalibrate approach as-needed. Both parties should remain adaptable as technical understanding comes together.

17. Can you speak to the parcel ownership dynamic at Farmhill Circle among MCWD, TRPD, and Minnetrista, and whether those partner-owned parcels represent opportunities or constraints?

- The site was collectively acquired and subsequently divided between MCWD and TRPD. The City of Minnetrista owns space for a future utility corridor through TRPD’s property. MCWD has a strong working relationship with both agencies and the adjacent properties in their ownership should be viewed as a potential opportunity for coordination and partnership.