



Bassett Creek Watershed Management Commission

Regular Meeting

8:30 a.m. – 10:00 a.m.

Thursday December 19, 2013

Council Conference Room, Golden Valley City Hall

7800 Golden Valley Rd., Golden Valley MN

AGENDA

1. CALL TO ORDER and ROLL CALL

2. **CITIZEN FORUM ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS** - *Citizens may address the Commission about any item not contained on the regular agenda. A maximum of 15 minutes is allowed for the Forum. If the full 15 minutes are not needed for the Forum, the Commission will continue with the agenda. The Commission will take no official action on items discussed at the Forum, with the exception of referral to staff or a Commissions Committee for a recommendation to be brought back to the Commission for discussion/action.*

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

4. CONSENT AGENDA

- A. Approval of Minutes – November 20, 2013 Commission Meeting
- B. Approval of Financial Report
- C. Approval of Payment of Invoices
 - i. Keystone Waters, LLC – November 2013 Administrator Services
 - ii. Barr Engineering – Engineering Services
 - iii. Amy Herbert – November 2013 Secretarial Services
 - iv. Kennedy & Graven – October Legal Services
 - v. Kennedy & Graven – November Legal Services
 - vi. Wenck – November WOMP Station Operation
- D. Approval of Reimbursement Request from City of Crystal for North Branch Erosion Control Project
- E. Approval of Proposal for 2013 Audit

5. NEW BUSINESS

- A. Set January 2014 TAC Meeting
- B. Direct Staff to Send Letter to MPCA Requesting Wirth Lake Delisting
- C. Conduct Performance Evaluation of Administrator

6. OLD BUSINESS

- A. Consider Proposal for Development of Watershed Map
 - i. Hoshal Advertising Proposal
 - ii. Hedberg Maps Proposal

7. COMMUNICATIONS

- A. Administrator's Report
- B. Chair
- C. Commissioners
- D. Committees

8. INFORMATION ONLY (Information online only)

- A. WCA Notices of Decision, Plymouth
- B. Grant Tracking Summary and Spreadsheet

9. ADJOURNMENT

Future Commission Agenda Items list

- Develop fiscal policies
- Develop a post-project assessment to evaluate whether it met the project's goals
- Medicine Lake rip-rap issue over sewer pipe
- Presentation on joint City of Minnetonka/ UMN community project on storm water mgmt
- State of the River Presentation
- Presentation by Claire Bleser and Kevin Bigalke on Chloride

Future TAC Agenda Items List

- Develop guidelines for annualized cost per pound pollutant removal for future CIP projects
- Stream identification signs at road crossings
- Blue Star Award for cities
- Look into implementing "phosphorus-budgeting" in the watershed – allow "x" pounds of TP/acre.



Bassett Creek Watershed Management Commission

Minutes of Regular Meeting November 20, 2013 Golden Valley City Hall, 8:30 a.m.

Commissioners and Staff Present:

Crystal	Commissioner Guy Mueller	Robbinsdale	<i>Not represented</i>
Golden Valley	Commissioner Stacy Hoschka, Treasurer	St. Louis Park	Commissioner Jim de Lambert, Vice Chair
Medicine Lake	Commissioner Clint Carlson	Administrator	Laura Jester, Keystone Waters LLC
Minneapolis	<i>Not represented</i>	Attorney	Charlie LeFevre, Kennedy & Graven
Minnetonka	Commissioner Jacob Millner, Secretary	Engineer	Karen Chandler, Barr Engineering Co.
New Hope	Alternate Commissioner Pat Crough	Recorder	Amy Herbert
Plymouth	Commissioner Ginny Black, Chair		

Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Members/ Other Attendees Present:

Derek Asche, TAC, City of Plymouth	Chris Long, TAC, City of New Hope
Jeannine Clancy, TAC, City of Golden Valley	Linda Loomis, BCWMC Next Generation Plan Steering Committee Chair
Perry Edman, TAC, City of St. Louis Park	Tom Mathisen, TAC, City of Crystal
Joe Fox, TAC, City of Golden Valley	Richard McCoy, TAC, City of Robbinsdale
Larry Founest, Golden Valley City Council	Jeff Oliver, TAC, City of Golden Valley
Christopher Gise, Golden Valley Resident	Erich Schroeder, Plymouth Resident
David Hanson, Alternate Commissioner, City of Golden Valley	David Stack, Friends of Bassett Creek, Minneapolis
Gary Holter, Mayor, City of Medicine Lake	Liz Stout, TAC, City of Minnetonka
Ted Hoshal, Hoshal Advertising	David Tobelmann, Alternate Commissioner, City of Plymouth
Dorothy Jordan, Hedberg Maps (Minneapolis)	

1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

On Wednesday, November 20, 2013, at 8:32 a.m. in the Council Chambers at Golden Valley City Hall, Chair Black called to order the meeting of the Bassett Creek Watershed Management Commission (BCWMC) and asked for roll call to be taken. The cities of Golden Valley, Minneapolis, Minnetonka, New Hope, and Robbinsdale were absent from the roll call.

2. CITIZEN FORUM ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS

[Alternate Commissioner David Hanson arrives.]

David Stack, resident of Minneapolis, requested on behalf of the Friends of Bassett Creek that a representative of the BCWMC give a presentation in either the Harrison or Bryn Mawr neighborhoods about projects that will be happening in Minneapolis from Highway 55 downstream to the tunnel. Chair Black recommended that the BCWMC Administrator contact the BCWMC's Commissioner and Alternate Commissioner for Minneapolis to have them get in touch with Mr. Stack about coordinating a presentation.

[Commissioners Stacy Hoschka, Jacob Millner, and Pat Crough arrive.]

3. AGENDA

Commissioner Stacy Hoschka requested that agenda item 5D – Approval of Resolution of Appreciation for Services of Commissioner David Hanson – be moved ahead in the agenda to 5A. Commissioner Millner moved to approve the agenda as amended. Commissioner Millner seconded the motion. Upon a vote, the motion carried 7-0 [Cities of Minneapolis and Robbinsdale absent from vote].

4. CONSENT AGENDA

Administrator Jester requested the addition of an invoice payment in the amount of \$55.80 to the Minnesota Bookstore for a December 2012 public hearing notice publication in the *State Register*. She also noted that she had passed around a revised financial report reflecting the additional invoice. The Commission indicated approval of the addition. Commissioner de Lambert moved to approve the Consent Agenda. Commissioner Mueller seconded the motion. Upon a vote, the motion carried 7-0 [Cities of Minneapolis and Robbinsdale absent from vote]. Mr. Mathisen thanked the Dispute Resolution Committee for all of the work it put into the process and in developing the recommendations.

[The following items were approved as part of the Consent Agenda: the October 17, 2013, BCWMC meeting minutes, the October 17, 2013, BCWMC Workshop minutes, the monthly financial report, payment of the invoices, Approval of the Reimbursement Request from the City of Minneapolis for the Main Stem Project, Approval of the Reimbursement Request from the City of Golden Valley for the Sweeney Lake Outlet Project, Approval of the Reimbursement Request from the City of Golden Valley for the Wirth Lake Outlet Project, Approval of the Reimbursement Request from the City of Crystal for the North Branch Erosion Control Project, Approval of the Dispute Resolution Committee Recommendations, and the Setting of the December meeting of the BCWMC's Executive Committee.]

The general and construction account balances reported in the Financial Report prepared for the November 20, 2013, meeting are as follows:

Checking Account Balance	\$519,081.91
TOTAL GENERAL FUND BALANCE	\$519,081.91
TOTAL CASH & INVESTMENTS ON-HAND (11/13/13)	\$2,275,120.37
CIP Projects Levied – Budget Remaining	(\$3,012,765.67)
Closed Projects Remaining Balance	(\$737,645.30)
2013 Anticipated Tax Levy Revenue	\$494,829.94
Anticipated Closed Project Balance	\$652,184.64

5. NEW BUSINESS

A. Approval of Resolution of Appreciation for Services of Commissioner David Hanson

Chair Black introduced Resolution 13-07 - A Resolution of Appreciation for Services of David Hanson to the Bassett Creek Watershed Management Commission, and she read the resolution aloud. Commissioner Hoschka moved to adopt Resolution 13-07. Commissioner Carlson seconded the motion. Commission, TAC, and Staff members as well as members of the public expressed remarks of appreciation for the contributions that David Hanson has made to the BCWMC. Upon a vote, the motion carried 7-0 [Cities of Minneapolis and Robbinsdale absent from vote].

B. Consider Proposal for Development of Watershed Map.

Ted Hoshal of Hoshal Advertising introduced Dorothy Jordan of Hedberg Maps. He provided a summary of the discussions he had with the BCWMC's Education Committee, and he outlined the proposed project including cost, deliverables, and timeline. Administrator Jester added details on the meetings of the Education Committee, the funds that the Commission has available for a map project, and noted that this project is included in the Commission's 2011 Education and Outreach Plan. She noted that the Education Committee discussed the possibility of finding a corporate sponsor.

Commissioners de Lambert and Hoschka spoke in favor of the BCWMC undertaking the map project, indicating it had been planned for some time but there had been no action. There was discussion about the final map product, companion components to the map like a large map for the BCWMC education display, a possible separate project of making an online interactive map, and when the map would be completed. Chair Black commented that it seems like the Commission is in favor of the project and just needs to work out the details of the project.

Commissioner Carlson asked for further information on where the project funding would come from out of the Commission's budget. Chair Black said that it would come out of the Education budget. Administrator

Jester replied that the cost would come out of the Education and Public Outreach budget item. She noted that if cost of the project exceeds what the Commission has budgeted for the project, the Commission would need to discuss its options such as being over-budget in 2014 for that line item, using fund balance to cover the overage, or taking budget from another line item. She said that it is possible that the project costs will exceed the budgeted amount by a few thousand dollars, up to \$6,000. There was discussion of the budget for the project and about how the Commission's operating budget and CIP projects are funded.

Commissioner Mueller moved to authorize staff to work out the final details, to add a component to produce a large laminated map, and to negotiate the agreement with Hoshal and Hedberg Maps and bring it back in front of the Commission or the Executive Committee. Commissioner de Lambert seconded the motion. He noted that he is in favor of expediting this project, and if it is possible he would like the Executive Committee to take action on it at the Committee's December meeting. Upon a vote, the motion on the table carried 7-0 [Cities of Minneapolis and Robbinsdale absent from vote].

The Commission discussed its meeting for December and whether it would hold an Executive Committee meeting and a Special Meeting. Attorney LeFevere offered comments on each type of meeting and the public notice requirements. He said that he will work with staff on the meeting notices.

C. TAC (Technical Advisory Committee) Recommendations

i. Memo from November 7, 2013, TAC Meeting

a. Possible 2016 – 2020 CIP Projects

Mr. Asche reminded the group that the CIP process begins in November or December each year and then in the following April the Commission approves the CIP program. He stated that the Commission is beginning its CIP process for the 2016 -2020 CIP. Mr. Asche reminded the Commission and the TAC that now is the time for Commissioners and TAC members to be discussing with each other and their cities possible future CIP projects. He said that no decisions were made at the past TAC meeting about the 2016-2020 CIP, but the TAC will be discussing it at the January 2014 TAC meeting.

b. CIP Selection Criteria

Mr. Asche reported that the TAC received some guidance from the Plan Steering Committee with regard to possible project characteristics that should be included when CIP projects are being reviewed and prioritized. He explained that the purpose of this selection and prioritization process is to have a system in place for when there may be more projects than funds available; the process would provide a way to prioritize projects. He commented that the TAC agreed with the recommendations that came from the Plan Steering Committee and the TAC added a couple of items, all of which are listed in the TAC memo.

Administrator Jester reiterated that the list in the TAC memo is not yet a final or complete list and the Plan Steering Committee has had a lot of good discussion about the items and will discuss it again at its next meeting. Mr. Asche added that the TAC has offered to assist with developing the weighting criteria if requested.

c. Redefined Trunk System

Mr. Asche explained that the TAC briefly discussed the trunk system. He said that the Commission's current watershed management plan defines the trunk system and in the past there has been some prioritization of projects in favor of those that were part of the trunk

system. Mr. Asche expressed that in the end, there was no recommendation for changing the definition of the trunk system.

d. Maintenance of Flood Control Projects

Mr. Asche told the Commission that there was extended discussion by the TAC on this topic. He explained that as the characteristics of the watershed and the approach of the watershed have changed from just flood control to water quality and as projects have been done across the watershed, questions have arisen over which entities are responsible for particular activities, like inspections and maintenance. He reported that the TAC suggests more research be done to locate and understand documents and agreements with regards to the Flood Control Project.

Mr. Asche reported that TAC member Joe Fox has agreed to take on the role of TAC Chair.

ii. Memo with Summary of XP-SWMM Model and Recommendations (additional technical memo available online)

Mr. Asche provided a brief overview of the purposes of the XP-SWMM model and the P8 model. He described ways that the current XP-SWMM model could be refined and what types of additional detail could be added. Mr. Asche explained that the current model could be used for general assumptions whereas by refining the model and adding detail to it, the model would provide more absolute-type data, which would be a better tool for decision making. Chair Black clarified that the proposed cost is \$246,000. There was discussion of the model and uses of it at different levels of detail.

Mr. Asche noted that the updating of the model is work that could be pieced together over time as budget allows. Mr. Asche added that the Commission has a consultant pool and could request proposals for the work, but he doesn't know if the Commission would see any differences. He noted that most watersheds have the kind of information that would be provided by updating the XP-SWMM model, and he said that the information is extremely valuable and the TAC supports it in whichever way that the Commission wants to proceed.

There was a discussion of Atlas 14 and flood elevations as well as ways that the model would be updated and budget line items that could be used to fund the XP-SWMM update work. Commissioner Carlson asked if the Phase 2 XP-SWMM work was included in the Commission's budget. Chair Black replied no, it's not included in the 2014 budget unless the Commission takes action to amend its 2014 budget. Engineer Chandler commented that the Phase 1 work was funded from the Commission's Long-Term Maintenance fund. She also explained that the order of Phase 2 tasks as listed in the Engineer Memo on this topic is the order in which the Phase 2 updates should take place.

Mr. Oliver said that in regards to the idea of the Commission going out for proposals for the Phase 2 work, he recommends that it be considered very carefully. He said that the Commission Engineer has institutional knowledge and is familiar with the assumptions that are in the background models that will be converted and the Commission Engineer has knowledgeable resources within its company. Mr. Oliver said that he thinks that if the Commission goes out for the XP-SWMM Phase 2 work, the Commission will be paying for a learning curve for the contractor to go back to the Commission Engineer for answers to questions.

Chair Black summarized that it has been suggested that staff come back to the January or February

meeting with more details on what pieces would be undertaken first, second, and third, if there is a possibility of taking some of the cost out of the Commission's reserve fund, and if there is a possibility of going out to the cities with a letter and description of justifications. She said that there seems to be consensus that the Commission move ahead with the project. Chair Black directed staff to come back to the Commission with the information at either the January or February meeting, based on the readiness of the information.

Administrator Jester raised the topic of a possible XP-SWMM tutorial by the Commission Engineer for the Commission and TAC members. She said that the cost will be \$2,000 and that \$996 of that cost could come from the Surveys and Studies budget and the rest could come from the Technical Services budget. Chair Black directed staff to conduct a Doodle poll to arrange a time for the tutorial. Commissioner Carlson requested that the tutorial occur before the topic is brought in front of the Commission for decision.

Administrator Jester reiterated that the direction to staff by the Commission is that staff will put together funding options for Commission consideration at its January or February meeting, will do a prioritizing of pieces, and options would include amending the 2014 budget, waiting until 2015, funding from the long-term fund, going out for an RFP (Request for Proposal) and/or getting more detail from Barr Engineering on its proposal, and will set up a Doodle poll for the entire Commission regarding scheduling an XP-SWMM tutorial. The Commission agreed to the summary of the direction to staff.

D. Consider Proposal for Study of Long-Term Maintenance and Replacement Needs for Flood Control Project

Engineer Chandler reminded the Commission that it directed the Commission Engineer to develop a proposal in response to the Commission's discussion and questions about long-term maintenance and replacement needs for the Flood Control Project. She summarized the six tasks included in the proposal, as listed in the November 12th Engineer Memo "Proposal for Study of Long-Term Maintenance and Replacement Needs for Flood Control Project":

1. Estimate of cost to replace the Bassett Creek Flood Control project;
2. Funding options for replacing Flood Control Project features;
3. Estimated maintenance and repair costs for Flood Control project;
4. Options for funding emergency repairs and long-term maintenance of Flood Control Project;
5. Locate and review previous agreements for the Flood Control Project; and
6. Prepare technical memorandum.

She said that the estimated cost of the work is \$16,500 and that at the time of its discussion at the workshop, the Commission indicated that the costs could come out of the Long-Term Maintenance fund. Engineer Chandler said the goal would be to complete the work by the end of February, but that timeline would be dependent on getting information back from the Minnesota Department of Transportation and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. Chair Black suggested that the Commission consider the Administrator taking on task 2 "funding options for replacing Flood Control project features" and task 4 "Options for funding emergency repairs and long-term maintenance of Flood Control Project."

Chair Black moved that the Commission authorize the Commission Engineer to perform tasks 1, 3, 5, and 6. Commissioner Hoschka seconded the motion. There was discussion of how the work would be funded. Chair Black said that the Commission has been discussing funding the work from the Long-Term Maintenance fund. Commissioner de Lambert clarified that the Commission is authorizing an estimated budget of \$13,500. Chair Black agreed with the clarification. Administrator Jester added that the budget would come from the Long-Term Maintenance fund. Upon a vote, the motion carried 7-0 [Cities of Minneapolis and Robbinsdale absent from vote].

6. OLD BUSINESS

A. Receive Update on Next Generation Plan Development

Chair Loomis reported that the cost of the Plan update is pushed right up against what was budgeted for this year. She said that it has been a lot of work with a lot of discussions, such as discussions about the policies. Administrator Jester added that work on the policy section is continuing, but the budget has been expended including the budget that had been saved from previous Plan Update project tasks that were completed under budget. She said that the projected budget overrun is estimated to be about \$8,000, but there could potentially be savings on future tasks.

Chair Black commented that she hopes that there would be future cost savings, but as the process moves forward, the issues will get more detailed, and she doesn't anticipate there being future cost savings. Chair Loomis provided an update of recent Plan Steering Committee discussions. Administrator Jester announced that the next Plan Steering Committee meeting is December 16th. Committee Chair Loomis said that the Commission should forward to Administrator Jester any comments about the draft list of CIP project weighting criteria as included in the November 12, 2013 TAC memo.

B. Approval to Amend Agreement with Golden Valley for 2015 Main Stem Project Feasibility Study

Mr. Oliver said that in order to appropriately involve the public earlier in the project's implementation, and due to conversations with the Commission Engineer, the City of Golden Valley decided that it would be best to modify the contract between the Commission and the City of Golden Valley and between the City and WSB to have public participation as part of the feasibility report rather than following the feasibility report. He said that the 2015 project could see a rather significant tree removal, depending on the methods chosen, and the City would like to have conversations with the residents before coming to the Commission with 50% plans.

Commissioner Mueller moved to approve the amendment. Commissioner Crough seconded the motion. Alternate Commissioner Tobelmann asked where the extra \$8,000 will come from. Mr. Oliver said it is in the project budget. Upon a vote, the motion carried 7-0 [Cities of Minneapolis and Robbinsdale absent from vote].

C. Update on Medicine Lake Water Level Issue

Administrator Jester mentioned the newspaper articles and e-mails that have been circulating regarding this issue. She handed out a written recommendation and asked the Commission to consider moving forward with the items identified in her recommendation, including:

- The Commission continues to play a facilitation role in this issue;
- The Commission acknowledges its role as a facilitator; and,

- The Commission acknowledges that ultimately it might not be the implementer or the funder of potential future projects.

Administrator Jester listed potential actions that she recommends the Commission undertake, including sending a letter to stakeholders, continuing to gather information from stakeholders, directing the Commissioner Engineer to pull together information to determine components of a study on possibly altering the outlet structure and a “ballpark” cost estimate for that work, and hosting a large meeting of all of the stakeholders early next year (facilitated by a third party) in order to share ideas and information, dispel miscommunication, and to hear from experts about the different issues of concern to the stakeholders.

Mr. Oliver mentioned that the City of Golden Valley constructed and operates a variable-quantity weir on Wisconsin Avenue as part of the original Flood Control Project. He said that the City would be happy to provide information on the City’s experience with operating that weir.

Alternate Commissioner Tobelmann commented that the Commission needs to know who has the jurisdiction on the issues and the process and noted that if Administrator Jester is facilitating the process, then it could be interpreted that she is the leader.

[Commissioner Hoschka departs the meeting.]

There was discussion of the issues and ways for the Commission to proceed.

[Commissioner Millner departs the meeting.]

Medicine Lake Mayor Gary Holter spoke about Medicine Lake’s value as a key resource and about his concerns on behalf of property owners around Medicine Lake. He stated that those property owners would be willing to put up resources to make the quality of life better there. Chair Black said that lake property owners should be part of the stakeholder group but stated that the group is hard to get hold of. Mayor Holter agreed that the facts need to be identified such as how to proceed, who to talk to, who controls what issues and said that this is what they have been asking for. He brought up their previous request for a study being done and brought up the petition that was signed by 600 people indicating that more people than those that live on Medicine Lake are interested in the issues affecting the lake. Chair Black said that she would like to hear from those stakeholders about what issues concern them. Mayor Holter said that all that they are asking for is a study taking a look at the dam and the possibility of a controllable weir.

Administrator Jester reminded the Commission that one of her recommendations is that the Commission Engineer pull together a list of components of such a study and a high-level cost estimate for such a study. Chair Black said that in order to pull together that information, the Commission Engineer would need to know the specific topics of the study and therefore the issues need to be identified by the stakeholders and compiled. She said that the responses from the stakeholders should come back at the January or February meeting as well as a list of components that would be needed in preparation of a larger meeting.

Chair Black asked the Commission what it would like to do about Administrator Jester’s recommendations. Mr. Oliver said that the downstream cities would like the impacts of a controllable weir on downstream cities to be included in the study. Administrator Jester recommended that the Commission take action to acknowledge its role as a facilitator in this issue and that the Commission might not be the implementer or the funder of potential future projects and to send a letter communicating that information to stakeholders. Commissioner Crough moved to approve the recommendation. Commissioner Muller seconded the motion. Upon a vote, the motion carried 5-0 [Cities of Golden Valley, Minneapolis, Minnetonka, and Robbinsdale absent from vote].

Chair Black directed Administrator Jester to be the signatory on the letter.

D. Four Seasons Area Water Quality Project – Response to 90% Plan Comments and Alternatives Analysis

Mr. Asche provided background on the project and its process to date. He added that the plan set is available with the meeting packet. He also said that the packet included the City's responses to the Commission Engineer's comments on the 90% plan set. Mr. Asche referenced the City of Plymouth's November 12, 2013, memo "Four Seasons Drainage Improvement Alternatives" also included in the meeting packet. He said that the Table 1 in the memo summarizes the existing alternatives examined through the project feasibility study and Table 2 is a brief analysis of additional alternatives. He provided more detail about the information in the memo and recommended that this topic be tabled until January in order to provide an opportunity for residents to have a chance to speak about the alternatives.

Chair Black had questions about the phosphorous removal estimates for some of the alternatives, and Mr. Asche answered her questions and gave more information on the different alternatives. There was a short discussion of the tree removal proposed in the project's original plan, and Engineer Chandler asked if the original plan included the clearing of 1,000 trees. Chair Black said yes, but that plan included the stormwater pond and this plan is just the rip rap of the channel and no pond. Mr. Asche asked the Commission to remember that this is a big project at three-fourths of a mile long. Engineer Chandler pointed out that the City's memo recommends two items that are years out from now, including a possible partnership with the Four Seasons Mall property owner and work in context with an approved TMDL (Total Maximum Daily Load) study.

Mr. Asche answered specific questions about the project alternatives, and he commented that a great discussion for the Commission to have is how to weigh the projects with regards to phosphorous removal.

Mr. Asche said that he would like to have further discussion with the Commission at its January meeting when residents could attend and hear the discussion. He said he then would like the opportunity to go back to the residents and get input from them. Engineer Chandler clarified that the Commission Engineer will not be reviewing the plan set sent over by the City since this item has been tabled for now. Chair Black said that this item will be added to the Commission's January meeting and asked Mr. Asche to notify the Commission about when he will be meeting with the residents and for Commissioners to RSVP for that meeting through Administrator Jester so that the meeting could be public noticed.

7. COMMUNICATIONS

- A. Administrator:** Written report was included in meeting packet.
- B. Chair:** No Communications
- C. Commissioners:** No Communications
- D. Committees:** No Communications
- E. Legal Counsel:** No Communications
- F. Engineer:** Engineer Chandler announced that she has the MPCA's (Minnesota Pollution Control Agency) draft 2014 list of water body impairments – mostly including chloride impairments - and the Commission can contact her for it. She also reported that there is a public hearing in January for nutrient criteria

standards for streams.

**8. INFORMATION ONLY (Available at
<http://www.bassettcreekwmo.org/Meetings/2013/2013-November/2013NovemberMeetingPacket.htm>)**

- A. Schaper Pond Diversion Project Impact Analysis Memo to MPCA and DNR
- B. Grant Tracking Summary and Spreadsheet
- C. BWSR Grants Quarterly Newsletter October 2013
- D. WCA Notice of Decision, Plymouth
- E. WCA Notice of Decision, Plymouth

9. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Black adjourned the Bassett Creek Watershed Management Commission Regular Meeting at 11:25 a.m.

Amy Herbert, Recorder

Date

Secretary

Date

BEGINNING BALANCE	13-Nov-13	519,026.11
-------------------	-----------	------------

ADD:

General Fund Revenue:

Interest (Bank Charges)	(6.93)
-------------------------	--------

2013-14 Assessments:

Minnetonka assessment \$28,464 - paid \$24,920
remaining balance due \$3,544

Reimbursed Construction Costs	55,175.29
-------------------------------	-----------

Total Revenue and Transfers In	55,168.36
--------------------------------	-----------

DEDUCT:

Checks:

2589	Barr Engineering	Nov Engineering	23,420.54
2590	Amy Herbert LLC	Nov Secretarial Services	1,524.65
2591	Kennedy & Graven	Oct/Nov Legal	2,225.63
2592	Keystone Waters LLC	Nov Administrator	3,575.00
2593	State Register	Legal Notices	96.60
2594	Wenck Associates	Nov Outlet Monitoring	806.81
2593	City of Crystal	Final-North Branch	54,419.79
Total Checks			86,069.02

Outstanding from previous month:

2581	Kennedy & Graven	Sept Legal	3,184.00
2587	City of Minneapolis	Main Stem	30,718.11
Total Expenses			86,069.02

ENDING BALANCE	13-Nov-13	488,125.45
----------------	-----------	------------

	2013/2014 BUDGET	CURRENT MONTH	YTD 2013/2014	BALANCE
OTHER GENERAL FUND REVENUE				
INTEREST EARNED (BANK CHARGES)		(6.93)	(61.42)	
ASSESSMENTS	515,045.00	0.00	511,502.00	3,543.00
PERMIT REVENUE	48,000.00	0.00	50,100.00	(2,100.00)
REVENUE TOTAL	563,045.00	(6.93)	561,540.58	1,443.00
EXPENDITURES				
ENGINEERING				
TECHNICAL SERVICES	120,000.00	9,960.50	111,752.24	8,247.76
PLAT REVIEW	60,000.00	3,880.00	61,858.78	(1,858.78)
COMMISSION MEETINGS	14,250.00	1,455.00	15,032.15	(782.15)
SURVEYS & STUDIES	10,000.00	278.50	9,282.50	717.50
WATER QUALITY/MONITORING	40,000.00	2,566.50	30,699.61	9,300.39
WATER QUANTITY	11,000.00	1,149.26	8,322.46	2,677.54
WATERSHED INSPECTIONS	7,000.00	0.00	4,790.12	2,209.88
ANNUAL FLOOD CONTROL INSPECTIONS	15,000.00	0.00	3,024.45	11,975.55
REVIEW MUNICIPAL PLANS	2,000.00	0.00	0.00	2,000.00
ENGINEERING TOTAL	279,250.00	19,289.76	244,762.31	34,487.69
PLANNING				
WATERSHED-WIDE SP-SWMM MODEL	0.00	0.00	488.00	(488.00) A
WATERSHED-WIDE P8 WATER QUALITY MODEL	0.00	0.00	9,967.00	(9,967.00) B
NEXT GENERATION PLAN	40,000.00	3,325.24	33,992.73	6,007.27
PLANNING TOTAL	40,000.00	3,325.24	44,447.73	(4,447.73)
ADMINISTRATOR	50,000.00	3,575.00	41,306.39	8,693.61
LEGAL COSTS	18,500.00	2,225.63	14,345.69	4,154.31
AUDIT, INSURANCE & BONDING	15,225.00	0.00	13,000.00	2,225.00
FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT	3,045.00	0.00	0.00	3,045.00
MEETING EXPENSES	2,750.00	0.00	1,702.50	1,047.50
SECRETARIAL SERVICES	40,000.00	1,574.69	27,896.65	12,103.35
PUBLICATIONS/ANNUAL REPORT	2,000.00	0.00	1,947.50	52.50
WEBSITE	2,500.00	0.00	201.00	2,299.00
PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS	3,000.00	96.60	1,867.41	1,132.59
WOMP	17,000.00	806.81	9,805.75	7,194.25
EDUCATION AND PUBLIC OUTREACH	14,775.00	0.00	3,728.57	11,046.43
WATERSHED EDUCATION PARTNERSHIPS	15,000.00	0.00	7,600.00	7,400.00
EROSION/SEDIMENT (CHANNEL MAINT)	25,000.00	0.00	0.00	25,000.00
LONG TERM MAINTENANCE (moved to CF)	25,000.00	0.00	0.00	25,000.00
TMDL STUDIES (moved to CF)	10,000.00	0.00	0.00	10,000.00
GRAND TOTAL	563,045.00	30,893.73	412,611.50	150,433.50

	Current	YTD
Construct Exp	55,175.29	1,402,583.12

Total	86,069.02	1,815,194.62
-------	-----------	--------------

A: 1/17/13 Commission action to carryover \$490.57 from 2012 unspent funds for this line item into 2013 expenses

B: 1/17/13 Commission action to carryover \$9,968.42 from 2012 unspent funds for this line item into 2013 expenses

Cash Balance 11/13/13			
Cash		1,270,321.59	
Investments: RBC - Federal National Mortgage - 0.85% - Callable 5/23/14		1,004,798.78	
Total Cash & Investments			2,275,120.37
Add:			
Interest Revenue (Bank Charges)		(32.71)	
Investment Interest		4,250.00	
Tax Levy		480,728.02	
Total Revenue			484,945.31
Less:			
CIP Projects Levied - Current Expenses - TABLE A		(54,871.29)	
Proposed & Future CIP Projects to Be Levied - Current Expenses - TABLE B		0.00	
Total Current Expenses			(54,871.29)
Total Cash & Investments On Hand	11/13/13		2,705,194.39
Total Cash & Investments On Hand		2,705,194.39	
CIP Projects Levied - Budget Remaining - TABLE A		(2,957,894.38)	
Closed Projects Remaining Balance		(252,699.99)	
2013 Anticipated Tax Levy Revenue - TABLE C		15,330.79	
2014 Anticipated Tax Levy Revenue - TABLE C		895,000.00	
Anticipated Closed Project Balance		657,630.80	
Proposed & Future CIP Project Amount to be Levied - TABLE B		0.00	

TABLE A - CIP PROJECTS LEVIED

	Approved Budget	Current Expenses	2013 YTD Expenses	INCEPTION To Date Expenses	Remaining Budget
Plymouth Creek Channel Restoration (2010 CR)	965,200.00	0.00	135.00	933,688.61	31,511.39
Wisc Ave/Duluth Street-Crystal (2011 CR)	580,200.00	0.00	484,658.40	537,729.85	42,470.15
North Branch-Crystal (2011 CR-NB)	834,900.00	54,419.79	487,919.63	713,240.29	121,659.71
Wirth Lake Outlet Modification (WTH-4)(2012)	202,500.00	451.50	167,950.06	198,091.94	4,408.06
5/13 Increase Budget - \$22,500					
Main Stem Irving Ave to GV Road (2012 CR)	856,000.00	0.00	41,582.92	135,375.05	720,624.95
Lakeview Park Pond (ML-8) (2013)	196,000.00	0.00	2,461.95	7,539.50	188,460.50
Four Seasons Mall Area Water Quality Proj (NL-2)	990,000.00	0.00	10,406.30	81,035.49	908,964.51
2014					
Schaper Pond Enhance Feasibility/Project (SL-1)(SL-3)	612,000.00	0.00	19,019.54	63,225.00	548,775.00
Briarwood / Dawnview Nature Area (BC-7)	250,000.00	0.00	6,477.29	6,630.09	243,369.91
Twin Lake Alum Treatment Project (TW-2)	163,000.00	0.00	13,678.55	15,349.80	147,650.20
	5,649,800.00	54,871.29	1,234,289.64	2,691,905.62	2,957,894.38

TABLE B - PROPOSED & FUTURE CIP PROJECTS TO BE LEVIED

	Approved Budget - To Be Levied	Current Expenses	2013 YTD Expenses	INCEPTION To Date Expenses	Remaining Budget
2015					
Main Stem 10th to Duluth	0.00	0.00	1,358.75	1,358.75	(1,358.75)
2015 Project Totals	0.00	0.00	1,358.75	1,358.75	(1,358.75)
Total Proposed & Future CIP Projects to be Levied	0.00	0.00	1,358.75	1,358.75	(1,358.75)

TABLE C - TAX LEVY REVENUES

	County Levy	Abatements / Adjustments	Adjusted Levy	Current Received	Year to Date Received	Inception to Date Received	Balance to be Collected	BCWMO Levy
2014 Tax Levy	895,000.00		895,000.00	-			895,000.00	895,000.00
2013 Tax Levy	986,000.00		986,000.00	479,499.15	970,669.21	970,669.21	15,330.79	986,000.00
2012 Tax Levy	762,010.00		762,010.00	631.66	3,413.09	757,825.45	4,184.55	762,010.00
2011 Tax Levy	863,268.83	(2,871.91)	860,396.92	197.67	442.84	855,075.82	5,321.10	862,400.00
2010 Tax Levy	935,298.91	(4,927.05)	930,371.86	146.85	158.70	927,513.77	2,858.09	935,000.00
2009 Tax Levy	800,841.30	(8,054.68)	792,786.62	96.15	162.59	792,894.98	(108.36)	800,000.00
2008 Tax Levy	908,128.08	(4,357.22)	903,770.86	156.54	320.25	904,044.53	(273.67)	907,250.00
				<u>480,728.02</u>			<u>922,312.50</u>	

BCWMC Construction Account

Fiscal Year: February 1, 2013 through January 31, 2014

(UNAUDITED)

December 2013 Financial Report

OTHER PROJECTS:

	Approved Budget	Current Expenses / (Revenue)	2013 YTD Expenses / (Revenue)	INCEPTION To Date Expenses / (Revenue)	Remaining Budget
TMDL Studies					
TMDL Studies	135,000.00	0.00	1,815.00	107,765.15	27,234.85
Sweeney TMDL	119,000.00	0.00	0.00	212,222.86	
Less: MPCA Grant Revenue		0.00	0.00	(163,870.64)	70,647.78
TOTAL TMDL Studies	<u>254,000.00</u>	<u>0.00</u>	<u>1,815.00</u>	<u>156,117.37</u>	<u>97,882.63</u>
Annual Flood Control Projects:					
Flood Control Emergency Maintenance	500,000.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	500,000.00
Flood Control Long-Term Maintenance	573,373.00	0.00	0.00	13,566.33	559,806.67
Sweeney Lake Outlet (2012 FC-1)	250,000.00	304.00	164,665.13	176,313.28	73,686.72
Annual Water Quality					
Channel Maintenance Fund	250,000.00	0.00	0.00	59,718.10	190,281.90
Total Other Projects	<u>1,827,373.00</u>	<u>304.00</u>	<u>166,480.13</u>	<u>405,715.08</u>	<u>1,421,657.92</u>

Cash Balance 11/13/13	1,178,555.27
Add:	
Transfer from GF	0.00
MPCA Grant-Sweeney Lk	0.00
Less:	
Current (Expenses)/Revenue	(304.00)
Ending Cash Balance 11/13/13	<u><u>1,178,251.27</u></u>
Additional Capital Needed	<u><u>(243,407)</u></u>

Bassett Creek Construc

	Total	2010	2011	2011	2012	2012	2013	2013	2014	2014	2014
	CIP Projects Levied	Plymouth Creek Channel Restoration (2010 CR)	Wisc Ave (Duluth Str)- Crystal (GV)	North Branch - Crystal (2011 CR-NB)	Wirth Lake Outlet Modification (WTH-4)	Main Stem Irving Ave to GV Road (Cedar Lk Rd) (2012CR)	Lakeview Park Pond (ML-8)	Four Seasons Mall Area Water Quality Project (NL-2)	Schaper Pond Enhancement Feasibility / Project (SL-1) (SL-3)	Briarwood / Dawnview Water Quality Improve Proj (BC-7)	Twin Lake In-Lake Alurn Treatment Project (TW-2)
Levy/Grant Details											
2009/2010 Levy	902,462	902,462									
2010/2011 Levy	576,100		160,700	415,400							
2011/2012 Levy	762,010				83,111	678,899					
2012/2013 Levy	986,000						162,000	824,000			
2013/2014 Levy											
Construction Fund Balance	1,300,728	62,738	419,500	419,500	21,889	177,101	34,000	166,000			
BWSR Grant- BCWMO	504,750	212,250			75,000	217,500					
Total Levy/Grants	5,032,050	1,177,450	580,200	834,900	180,000	1,073,500	196,000	990,000			
		BWSR Final									
BWSR Grants Received		4/8/13			67,500	108,750					

Bassett Creek Construction Project Details

Other Projects

Total					2012		
Other Projects	TMDL Studies	Sweeney Lake TMDL	Flood Control Emergency Maintenance	Flood Control Long-Term Maintenance	Sweeney Lake Outlet (FC-1)	Channel Maintenance	Totals - All Projects
1,647,373.00	105,000.00	119,000.00	500,000.00	748,373.00 (250,000.00)	250,000.00	175,000.00	7,274,673.00 22,500.00
163,870.64		163,870.64					163,870.64
180,000.00	30,000.00			75,000.00		75,000.00	180,000.00
6,949.19				3,954.44		2,994.75	637.50
10,249.09	637.20			9,611.89			6,949.19
113,141.44	23,486.95	89,654.49					10,249.09
117,455.33	31,590.12	47,041.86				38,823.35	113,141.44
76,184.64	31,868.63	44,316.01					138,409.58
45,375.25	15,005.25	25,920.00			4,450.00		85,504.59
12,656.65	168.00	5,290.50			7,198.15		147,821.08
21,094.00	3,194.00					17,900.00	1,000,387.64
166,480.13	1,815.00				164,665.13		357,621.46
569,585.72	107,765.15	212,222.86		13,566.33	176,313.28	59,718.10	1,402,128.52
							3,262,850.09
1,421,657.92	27,234.85	70,647.78	500,000.00	559,806.67	73,686.72	190,281.90	4,378,193.55

Total					2012		
Other Projects	TMDL Studies	Sweeney Lake TMDL	Flood Control Emergency Maintenance	Flood Control Long-Term Maintenance	Sweeney Lake Outlet (FC-1)	Channel Maintenance	Totals - All Projects
223,967.19	104,888.70	94,948.17		9,549.32	14,581.00		586,814.40
5,907.54	1,164.30	2,902.59		24.75	1,461.15	354.75	20,026.59
180,811.13					160,271.13	20,540.00	830,144.84
38,823.35						38,823.35	30,718.11
3,992.26				3,992.26			949,860.21
101,598.10		101,598.10					665,295.13
14,486.15	1,712.15	12,774.00					7,892.26
							101,598.10
							14,486.15
							56,014.30
569,585.72	107,765.15	212,222.86		13,566.33	176,313.28	59,718.10	3,262,850.09

Total				2012		
Other Projects	TMDL Studies	Sweeney Lake TMDL	Flood Control Emergency Maintenance	Flood Control Long-Term Maintenance	Sweeney Lake Outlet (FC-1)	Channel Maintenance
163,870.64		163,870.64				
60,000.00	10,000			25,000		25,000
60,000.00	10,000			25,000		25,000
60,000.00	10,000			25,000		25,000
343,870.64	30,000	163,870.64		75,000		75,000

Totals - All Projects
902,462
636,100
822,010
1,046,000
1,300,728
504,750
5,212,050



North Branch Bassett Creek Erosion Control Water Quality Project – Final Payment Request

Item 4D.
BCWMC 12-19-13

FROM: Tom Mathisen, Public Works Director & City Engineer

TO: Ginny Black, Chair – Bassett Creek WMO

DATE: December 5, 2013

RE: Request for Final Payment Funds – Crystal Project #2010-23

Per Resolution No. 10-08, dated September 23, 2010, the North Branch Bassett Creek Project was ordered and the City of Crystal was designated as the agent in charge. By that same resolution, \$834,900 was set aside for project construction. Of this amount, \$419,500 is to be paid from the Commission's Closed Project Account, and up to \$415,400 is to be paid from funds received from a county tax levy collected in 2011.

The work is now 100% complete. Below is a summary of relevant billings paid from January 17 through July 31 by the City of Crystal. Also attached is the invoice for Pay Request #2 and copies of related billings. Please note there are three WSB & Associates billings from the prior period that were missed when Pay Request #1 was prepared. A final project closeout pay request will be issued in December.

Summary of Final Pay Request #3 Billings

Contractors	\$54,419.79
-------------	-------------

Total Final PR #3	<u>\$54,419.79</u>
-------------------	--------------------

Fund Summary: \$834,900 - \$177,815.30 (PR1) - \$433,060.04 (PR2) - \$54,419.79
= \$142,414.82 (Project End Budget Surplus)

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Tom Mathisen'.

Thomas Mathisen
Crystal City Engineer/DPW

Request To Generate Accounts Receivable Invoice

Requested by: Tom Mathisen

Date of Request: December 5, 2013

Authorized by: Tom Mathisen

Department: Engineering

Bill To: Customer #: _____

Name: Bassett Creek Watershed Commission

Attn: Ginny Black, Chair

Address: 4700 West 77th Street, Edina 55435-4803

Date(s) of service: July - November 2013

Account #: 0515-4902

Amount:

Account #: 0515-1305

Amount: \$54,419.79

Account #: _____

Amount: _____

Total Amount to Invoice: \$54,419.79

Description to appear on invoice:

North Branch Bassett Creek Erosion Control Improvement Project per Bassett Creek Watershed Agreement Pay Request #3

This is Final Pay Request closing out the project.

(If more room is needed, use back of form)

Please attach any supporting documents and indicate here if they should accompany the invoice and any CC's:

Copies of project invoices to accompany AR invoice.

Billing Details:

Include attached memorandum

**No. Branch Bassett Creek Project (Crystal serving as lead agency for BCWMC)
Expenses incurred by City of Crystal From 8-1-13 through 11-15-13**

<u>Do Ty</u>	<u>G/L</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Vendor</u>	<u>Explanation -Remark-</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Invoice Number</u>
Expensed in 2013 / Reimbursement requested in 2013						
PV		11/15/2013	SUNRAM CONSTRUCTION INC	BASSET CRK EROSION CONTROL>SEP	54,419.79	RFP #7 - BASS CRK
					<u>54,419.79</u>	



Owner: City of Crystal
4141 Douglas Dr No
Crystal, MN 55422-1609

Date: 10/1/2013

For Period: 6/23/2013 to 9/30/2013

Request No.: 7

Contractor: Sunram Construction
20010 75th Avenue North
Corcoran, MN 55340

FINAL

Pay Voucher

CRYS - North Branch of Bassett Creek Erosion Control Project

Client Contract No.:

Project No.: 01726-01

Client Project No.:

Project Summary			
1	Original Contract Amount		\$655,385.00
2	Contract Changes - Addition	\$0.00	
3	Contract Changes - Deduction	\$0.00	
4	Revised Contract Amount		\$655,385.00
5	Value Completed to Date		\$570,859.79
6	Material on Hand		\$0.00
7	Amount Earned		\$570,859.79
8	Less Retainage		\$0.00
9	Subtotal		\$570,859.79
10	Less Amount Paid Previously		\$516,440.00
11	Liquidated Damages		\$0.00
12	AMOUNT DUE THIS PAY VOUCHER NO. 7		\$54,419.79

THIS IS TO CERTIFY THAT THE ITEMS OF WORK SHOWN IN THIS CERTIFICATE OF PARTIAL PAYMENT HAVE BEEN ACTUALLY FINISHED FOR THE WORK COMPRISING THE ABOVE MENTIONED PROJECTS IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE PLANS AND SPECIFICATIONS HERETOFORE APPROVED.

Recommended for Approval by:
WSB & Associates, Inc.

[Signature]

Approved by Contractor:
Sunram Construction

Ryan M. Sunram 10/15/13

Construction Observer:

[Signature]

Approved by Owner:
City of Crystal

[Signature]

Specified Contract Completion Date:

Date: 11-12-13

Comment:

*MM
11-12-13
0515-1305*



Item 4E.
BCWMC 12-19-13

PRINCIPALS

Thomas M. Montague, CPA
Thomas A. Karnowski, CPA
Paul A. Radosevich, CPA
William J. Lauer, CPA
James H. Eichten, CPA
Aaron J. Nielsen, CPA
Victoria L. Holinka, CPA

December 11, 2013

To the Board of Commissioners and Management of the
Bassett Creek Watershed Management Commission
City of Golden Valley
7800 Golden Valley Road
Golden Valley, MN 55427

Dear Board of Commissioners and Management:

We are pleased to confirm our understanding of the services we are to provide for the Bassett Creek Watershed Management Commission (the Commission) for the year ended January 31, 2014. We will audit the financial statements of the governmental activities, each major fund, and the budgetary comparison for the General Fund, including the related notes to the financial statements, which collectively comprise the Commission's basic financial statements as of and for the year ended January 31, 2014. Accounting standards generally accepted in the United States of America provide for certain required supplementary information (RSI), such as Management's Discussion and Analysis (MD&A), to supplement the Commission's basic financial statements. Such information, although not a part of the basic financial statements, is required by the Governmental Accounting Standards Board (GASB) who considers it to be an essential part of financial reporting for placing the basic financial statements in an appropriate operational, economic, or historical context. As part of our engagement, we will apply certain limited procedures to the Commission's RSI in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America. These limited procedures will consist of inquiries of management regarding the methods of preparing the information and comparing the information for consistency with management's responses to our inquiries, the basic financial statements, and other knowledge we obtained during our audit of the basic financial statements. We will not express an opinion or provide any assurance on the information because the limited procedures do not provide us with sufficient evidence to express an opinion or provide any assurance. The Management's Discussion and Analysis is required by accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America and, if presented, will be subjected to certain limited procedures, but will not be audited.

We will perform the required State Legal Compliance Audit conducted in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America and the provisions of the *Legal Compliance Audit Guide*, promulgated by the State Auditor pursuant to Minnesota Statute § 6.65, and will include such tests of the accounting records and other procedures we consider necessary to enable us to conclude that, for the items tested, the Commission has complied with the material terms and conditions of applicable legal provisions.

Our services will not include an audit in accordance with the Single Audit Act Amendments of 1996 and the U.S. Office of Management and Budget Circular A-133, which would only be required if the Commission expended \$500,000 or more in federal assistance funds during the year. If the Commission is required to have a Single Audit of federal assistance funds, this engagement letter would need to be modified.

Malloy, Montague, Karnowski, Radosevich & Co., P.A.

5353 Wayzata Boulevard • Suite 410 • Minneapolis, MN 55416 • Telephone: 952-545-0424 • Telefax: 952-545-0569 • www.mmkr.com

Audit Objectives

The objective of our audit is the expression of opinions as to whether your basic financial statements are fairly presented, in all material respects, in conformity with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America and to report on the fairness of the supplementary information referred to in the second paragraph when considered in relation to the financial statements as a whole. Our audit will be conducted in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America and the standards for financial audits contained in *Government Auditing Standards*, issued by the Comptroller General of the United States, and will include tests of the accounting records of the Commission and other procedures we consider necessary to enable us to express such opinions. We cannot provide assurance that unmodified opinions will be expressed. Circumstances may arise in which it is necessary for us to modify our opinions or add emphasis-of-matter or other-matter paragraphs. If our opinions on the financial statements are other than unmodified, we will discuss the reasons with you in advance. If, for any reason, we are unable to complete the audit or are unable to form or have not formed opinions, we may decline to express opinions or to issue a report as a result of this engagement.

We will also provide a report (that does not include an opinion) on internal control related to the financial statements and compliance with the provisions of laws, regulations, contracts, and grant agreements, noncompliance with which could have a material effect on the financial statements as required by *Government Auditing Standards*. The reports on internal control and compliance will each include a paragraph that states that the purpose of the report is solely to describe the scope of testing of internal control over financial reporting and compliance, and the result of that testing, and not to provide an opinion on the effectiveness of internal control over financial reporting or on compliance, and that the report is an integral part of an audit performed in accordance with *Government Auditing Standards* in considering internal control over financial reporting and compliance. The paragraph will also state that the report is not suitable for any other purpose. If during our audit we become aware that the Commission is subject to an audit requirement that is not encompassed in the terms of this engagement, we will communicate to management and those charged with governance that an audit in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America and the standards for financial audits contained in *Government Auditing Standards* may not satisfy the relevant legal, regulatory, or contractual requirements.

Management Responsibilities

Management is responsible for the basic financial statements and all accompanying information as well as all representations contained therein. As part of the audit, we will assist with preparation of your financial statements and related notes. You will be required to acknowledge in the management representation letter our assistance with preparation of the financial statements and that you have reviewed and approved the financial statements and related notes prior to their issuance and have accepted responsibility for them. You agree to assume all management responsibilities for any nonaudit services we provide; oversee the services by designating an individual, preferably from senior management, who possesses suitable skill, knowledge, or experience; evaluate the adequacy and results of the services, and accept responsibility for them.

Management is responsible for establishing and maintaining effective internal controls, including evaluating and monitoring ongoing activities, to help ensure that appropriate goals and objectives are met; for the selection and application of accounting principles; and for the preparation and fair presentation of the financial statements in conformity with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America.

Management is also responsible for making all financial records and related information available to us and for ensuring that management and financial information is reliable and properly recorded. You are also responsible for providing us with (1) access to all information of which you are aware that is relevant to the preparation and fair presentation of the financial statements, (2) additional information that we may request for the purpose of the audit, and (3) unrestricted access to persons within the Commission from whom we determine it necessary to obtain audit evidence.

Your responsibilities include adjusting the financial statements to correct material misstatements and for confirming to us in the written representation letter that the effects of any uncorrected misstatements aggregated by us during the current engagement and pertaining to the latest period presented are immaterial, both individually and in the aggregate, to the financial statements taken as a whole.

You are responsible for the design and implementation of programs and controls to prevent and detect fraud, and for informing us about all known or suspected fraud affecting the Commission involving (1) management, (2) employees who have significant roles in internal control, and (3) others where the fraud could have a material effect on the financial statements. Your responsibilities include informing us of your knowledge of any allegations of fraud or suspected fraud affecting the Commission received in communications from employees, former employees, grantors, regulators, or others. In addition, you are responsible for identifying and ensuring that the Commission complies with applicable laws, regulations, contracts, agreements, and grants for taking timely and appropriate steps to remedy any fraud, violations of contracts or grant agreements, or abuse that we may report.

You are responsible for the preparation of the supplementary information in conformity with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America. You agree to include our report on the supplementary information in any document that contains and indicates that we have reported on the supplementary information. You also agree to include the audited financial statements with any presentation of the supplementary information that includes our report thereon OR make the audited financial statements readily available to users of the supplementary information no later than the date the supplementary information is issued with our report thereon. Your responsibilities include acknowledging to us in the written representation letter that (1) you are responsible for presentation of the supplementary information in accordance with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America; (2) that you believe the supplementary information, including its form and content, is fairly presented in accordance with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America; (3) that the methods of measurement or presentation have not changed from those used in the prior period (or, if they have changed, the reasons for such changes); and (4) you have disclosed to us any significant assumptions or interpretations underlying the measurement or presentation of the supplementary information.

Management is responsible for establishing and maintaining a process for tracking the status of audit findings and recommendations. Management is also responsible for identifying for us previous financial audits, attestation engagements, performance audits or other studies related to the objectives discussed in the Audit Objectives section of this letter. This responsibility includes relaying to us corrective actions taken to address significant findings and recommendations resulting from those audits, attestation engagements, performance audits, or other studies. You are also responsible for providing management's views on our current findings, conclusions, and recommendations, as well as your planned corrective actions, for the report, and for the timing and format for providing that information.

Audit Procedures – General

An audit includes examining, on a test basis, evidence supporting the amounts and disclosures in the financial statements; therefore, our audit will involve judgment about the number of transactions to be examined and the areas to be tested. An audit also includes evaluating the appropriateness of accounting policies used and the reasonableness of significant accounting estimates made by management, as well as evaluating the overall presentation of the financial statements. We will plan and perform the audit to obtain reasonable rather than absolute assurance about whether the financial statements are free of material misstatement, whether from (1) errors, (2) fraudulent financial reporting, (3) misappropriation of assets, or (4) violations of laws or governmental regulations that are attributable to the Commission or to acts by management or employees acting on behalf of the Commission. Because the determination of abuse is subjective, *Government Auditing Standards* do not expect auditors to provide reasonable assurance of detecting abuse.

Because of the inherent limitations of an audit, combined with the inherent limitations of internal control, and because we will not perform a detailed examination of all transactions, there is a risk that material misstatements may exist and not be detected by us, even though the audit is properly planned and performed in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America and *Government Auditing Standards*. In addition, an audit is not designed to detect immaterial misstatements or violations of laws or governmental regulations that do not have a direct and material effect on the financial statements. However, we will inform the appropriate level of management of any material errors, any fraudulent financial reporting, or misappropriation of assets that come to our attention. We will also inform the appropriate level of management of any violations of laws or governmental regulations that come to our attention, unless clearly inconsequential. Our responsibility as auditors is limited to the period covered by our audit and does not extend to later periods for which we are not engaged as auditors.

Our procedures will include tests of documentary evidence supporting the transactions recorded in the accounts, and may include tests of the physical existence of inventories, and direct confirmation of receivables and certain other assets and liabilities by correspondence with selected individuals, funding sources, creditors, and financial institutions. We will request written representations from your attorneys as part of the engagement, and they may bill you for responding to this inquiry. At the conclusion of our audit, we will require certain written representations from you about the financial statements and related matters.

Audit Procedures – Internal Controls

Our audit will include obtaining an understanding of the Commission and its environment, including internal control, sufficient to assess the risks of material misstatement of the financial statements and to design the nature, timing, and extent of further audit procedures. Tests of controls may be performed to test the effectiveness of certain controls that we consider relevant to preventing and detecting errors and fraud that are material to the financial statements and to preventing and detecting misstatements resulting from illegal acts and other noncompliance matters that have a direct and material effect on the financial statements. Our tests, if performed, will be less in scope than would be necessary to render an opinion on internal control and, accordingly, no opinion will be expressed in our report on internal control issued pursuant to *Government Auditing Standards*.

An audit is not designed to provide assurance on internal control or to identify significant deficiencies or material weaknesses. However, during the audit, we will communicate to management and those charged with governance internal control related matters that are required to be communicated under AICPA professional standards and *Government Auditing Standards*.

Audit Procedures – Compliance

As part of obtaining reasonable assurance about whether the financial statements are free of material misstatement, we will perform tests of the Commission's compliance with the provisions of applicable laws, regulations, contracts, agreements, and grants. However, the objective of our audit will not be to provide an opinion on overall compliance and we will not express such an opinion in our report on compliance issued pursuant to *Government Auditing Standards*.

Engagement Administration, Fees, and Other

We understand that your employees will prepare all cash or other confirmations we request and will locate any documents selected by us for testing.

The assistance to be supplied by your personnel, including the preparation of schedules and analysis of accounts, typing all cash or other confirmations we request, and locating any invoices selected by us for testing, will be discussed and coordinated with you.

We will provide copies of our reports to the Commission; however, management is responsible for distribution of the reports and the financial statements. Unless restricted by law or regulation, or containing privileged and confidential information, copies of our reports are to be made available for public inspection.

The audit documentation for this engagement is the property of Malloy, Montague, Karnowski, Radosevich & Co., P.A. (MMKR) and constitutes confidential information. However, pursuant to authority given by law or regulation, we may be requested to make certain audit documentation available to a regulatory agency or its designee, a federal agency providing direct or indirect funding, or the U.S. Government Accountability Office for purposes of a quality review of the audit, to resolve audit findings, or to carryout oversight responsibilities. We will notify you of any such request. If requested, access to such audit documentation will be provided under the supervision of MMKR personnel. Furthermore, upon request, we may provide copies of selected audit documentation to the aforementioned parties. These parties may intend, or decide, to distribute the copies or information contained therein to others, including other governmental agencies.

The audit documentation for this engagement will be retained for a minimum of five years after the report release date or for any additional period requested by the regulatory agency. If we are aware that a federal awarding agency, pass-through entity, or auditee is contesting an audit finding, we will contact the party(ies) contesting the audit finding for guidance prior to destroying the audit documentation.

William J. Lauer, CPA is the engagement partner and is responsible for supervising the engagement and signing the report or authorizing another individual to sign it. Our fees for these services will be based on the actual time spent at our standard hourly rates. We will also bill you for travel and other out-of-pocket costs such as report production, typing, and postage. Our standard hourly rates vary according to the degree of responsibility involved and the experience level of the personnel assigned to your audit. Our invoices for these fees will be rendered each month as work progresses and are payable upon presentation. Unless additional work is requested, or circumstances require additional work, we estimate the basic audit fees to be \$9,600.

The fee is based on anticipated cooperation from your personnel and the assumption that unexpected circumstances will not be encountered during the audit. If we find that additional audit procedures are required, or if additional services are requested by the Commission, those services will be billed at our standard hourly rates. Additional audit procedures may be required for certain accounting issues or events, such as new contractual agreements, transactions and legal requirements of new bond issues, new funds, major capital projects, new tax increment districts, if there is an indication of misappropriation or misuse of public funds, or if significant difficulties are encountered due to the lack of accounting records, incomplete records, or turnover in the Commission's staff.

With regard to the electronic dissemination of audited financial statements, including financial statements published electronically on your website, you understand that electronic sites are a means to distribute information and, therefore, we are not required to read the information contained in these sites or to consider the consistency of other information in the electronic site with the original document.

If you intend to publish or otherwise reproduce the financial statements, and make reference to our firm name, you agree to provide us with printers' proofs or masters for our review and approval before printing. You also agree to provide us with a copy of the final reproduced material for our approval before it is distributed.

When requested, *Government Auditing Standards* require that we provide you with a copy of our most recent external peer review report and any letter of comment, and any subsequent peer review reports and letters of comment received during the period of the contract. Our most recent peer review report accompanies this letter.

We appreciate the opportunity to be of service to the Commission and believe this letter accurately summarizes the significant terms of our engagement. If you have any questions, please let us know. If you agree with the terms of our engagement as described in this letter, please sign the enclosed copy and return it to us.

Sincerely,

MALLOY, MONTAGUE, KARNOWSKI, RADOSEVICH & CO., P.A.



William J. Lauer, CPA
Principal

WJL:kch

Response:

This letter correctly sets forth the understanding of the Bassett Creek Watershed Management Commission.

By: _____

Title: _____

Date: _____



HOSHAL ADVERTISING, INC.
6960 MADISON AVENUE WEST
MINNEAPOLIS, MINNESOTA 55427
(763) 541-1140, FAX (763) 541-0223

Item 6Ai.
BCWMC 12-19-13

November 13, 2013

Ms. Laura Jester
Administrator
Bassett Creek Watershed Management Commission
4700 West 77th Street
Minneapolis, MN 55435-4803

Dear Ms. Jester:

On behalf of Hoshal Advertising, Inc., I am happy to provide for the Bassett Creek Watershed Management Commission a proposal for creative, administrative and project management services to create a printed Bassett Creek Watershed map.

Over the course of the past two months, it has been my pleasure to conduct two preliminary meetings with the Commission's Education and Outreach committee, who have been tasked with guiding this project over the coming months. At this time, I have received substantial direction that has lead me on a search for a production partner, where I was able to advance some preliminary cost estimates for this project.

Attached with my Hoshal Advertising proposal is an additional proposal from Hedberg Maps of Minneapolis to include project design and printing. Hedberg Maps is a long established custom map developer who I believe offers strong design and production skills that can deliver a map of exceptional production and character. Hedberg samples show a wide scope of execution and depth of knowledge. I think they're a partner that can deliver a new and exciting watershed map for the Commission—a communications piece that will take you well beyond simply finding a direction home.

The Bassett Creek watershed has a story to tell. And what I've already discovered, it's a fascinating one at that. A good map can help bring that story to life. I think Hedberg Maps is just the right fit for the Commission project.

Please review the two attached proposals and attached preliminary project calendar. It is difficult to arrive at a hard cost number at this time, so we are both offering a range of costs of services. Those numbers will become more clear if and when we reach the preliminary design stage.

Thank you for the opportunity to present these proposals for the Commission's consideration!

Sincerely,

Ted Hoshal
HOSHAL ADVERTISING, INC.

Enclosures
cc Ginny Black, Chairperson



HOSHAL ADVERTISING, INC.
6960 MADISON AVENUE WEST
MINNEAPOLIS, MINNESOTA 55427
(763) 541-1140, FAX (763) 541-0223

December 19, 2013

PROPOSAL FOR CREATIVE AND PROJECT MANAGEMENT SERVICES

Project: Bassett Creek Watershed Map & Guide

Working Title: *Secrets of the Bassett Creek Watershed: From Discovery to Recovery*

A cooperative project of Hedberg Maps of Minneapolis
and Hoshal Advertising of Golden Valley

Estimated delivery date: March 31, 2014

Hoshal Advertising Scope of Services

• Creative Direction

Hoshal Advertising, Inc. ("Hoshal") shall provide preliminary creative and concept direction, copy and supporting research to Hedberg Maps based on guidance received from members of the Bassett Creek Watershed Management Commission Education Committee (by those members present) and shall not rely solely on a committee quorum to advance project related direction. Members of the Education Committee shall act as a project steering committee on behalf of the Commission in assisting the project to completion and may be assigned certain duties or tasks in support of completing the project. Hoshal Advertising may rely on consensus of the Education Committee for project direction. However, Hoshal Advertising shall not present preliminary designs, copy and other content to the greater Commission prior to final design approval unless otherwise requested.

• Project Management

Hoshal shall oversee general direction of the project. Hoshal shall provide periodic project updates to the Education Committee and Administrator. Hoshal shall act as liaison between Hedberg Maps and the Committee to as great an extent as possible while directing document changes and sourcing content.

• Facilitation

Hoshal Advertising shall facilitate up to six meetings of the Education Committee (project steering committee) necessary to advance the project according to the preliminary project schedule attached. This may include meetings to review the preliminary design work at no fewer than three stages along the design process. Hoshal shall supply meeting materials to include supporting documents, copy drafts, exercises, gannt charts, agendas and other such information necessary to advance project direction. Additional meetings will be billed at \$250 per meeting plus documented expenses.

- **Research**

Hoshal Advertising shall conduct a limited search of secondary research sourcing existing periodical digitized databases and library files to glean possible milestone events, place names, grand plans and other items of interest that have occurred in the watershed over time.

- **Compilation & Photo Sourcing**

Hoshal Advertising shall create, with the assistance of the Education Committee members, a project file workbook of proposed copy, art and photographic content for Hedberg Maps that will be used in arriving at a preliminary concept and final design. Hoshal will work with an independent photographer to review photos and make appropriate selections.

Compensation

Creative services and direction (concept and copywriting) will be charged at an estimated project cost of **\$2,000 to \$2,500**. Project management, facilitation, research, compilation and photo sourcing will be charged at an estimated project cost of **\$800 to \$1,700**. The anticipated range of total compensation under this agreement is from **\$2,800 to \$4,200** and will not exceed **\$4,200** without prior authorization of the Commission. All work, including any additional work authorized by the Commission that is beyond the scope of this agreement or for project work completed but otherwise terminated for convenience of the Commission will be compensated at the rates of: **\$110 per hour** for creative services and direction, and/or; **\$75 per hour** for all other services as outlined above, or; as otherwise noted herein.

Other Associated Terms and Conditions

- **Extent of Project**

This proposal is for the production and delivery of a full color printed map, of which a final design, print size, fold, paper type and quantity are subject to final selection. The project does not include the adaptation and/or conversion to digital content. Those costs are subject to additional estimates and are not included as part of this project.

- **Photography and Other Licensed Imaging**

Where possible, Hoshal Advertising shall rely on free established local artwork or photographic content as available through independent, amateur, semi-professional and/or professional sources or as retained by the Commission and its member cities. All photographic images will be assigned credit adjacent to the image. The Commission understands that it may be necessary to pay licensing fees for photography, artwork, or other artistic content that is approved by the Commission. It is anticipated that the costs of such licensing fees will not exceed **\$1,500**. Such charges shall be billed to the Commission independently by the licensing party. Licensing charges exceeding this amount shall be granted only on written request and approval by the Commission or Administrator.

- **Cooperative Access**

Hoshal may freely contact the Commission administrator in request of supporting data, information, reports, research, archives, photography, artwork and other associated content as owned or retained by the Commission, its member cities or supporting contract service providers that may be considered useful or relevant to project production. The Administrator shall assist in gaining and securing Commission permission for any image, design or photograph as may be protected by copyright.

- **Approvals**

The Administrator or any other person so assigned will act as agent to the Commission for all project approvals. Approvals (initialed modifications, signed and dated) will be required for the preliminary design, subsequent design revisions, final proofs and press proofs. Final proof and press proofs may require short notice visits to Hedberg Maps or their print service provider.

- **Independent Contract**

The Commission shall contract independently with Hedberg Maps for the design and print production costs associated with this project. The Commission will direct in writing its intent by client signature and return to Hedberg Maps with additional copy to Hoshal Advertising.

- **Base Map Availability**

The Commission shall make freely available the existing electronic files in native application of its existing Bassett Creek watershed map as currently developed. Content features as expressed in selected layers will be transferred to Hedberg Maps and converted for use and modification in Adobe Illustrator. To facilitate the transfer, the Commission's consulting engineer and Hedberg Maps may do so directly upon furnished contacts.

- **Contract Termination**

The Commission shall contract with Hoshal Advertising and Hedberg Maps independently. The Commission may terminate this agreement for cause or for convenience on 10 days' written notice. In the event the Commission terminates this agreement for convenience, any and all documented time and expenses incurred to date of notice shall be paid to Hoshal Advertising at the rate specified above under "Compensation".

- **Electronic Proofs and Sourcing**

All preliminary working design proofs, copy concepts and supporting research shared with members of the Education Committee, Administrator, Hedberg Maps or other engaged party shall be made available in Adobe .pdf file format whenever possible. Photographs will be made available in .jpg file format.

- **Execution and Fulfillment**

Hoshal shall make all reasonable efforts to advance this project according to the preliminary schedule and budget. However, Hoshal reserves the right to shorten or extend or otherwise modify project completion intervals or the greater project term. It may do so without written notice due to unforeseen or unplanned delays in content availability, licensing, meeting availability or other means beyond its control.

Payment

The sum ***One Thousand Five Hundred Dollars (\$1,500.00) down payment*** is payable upon execution of this agreement. The project balance will be payable within 15 days of receipt of final invoice either at time of signed final pre-press proof or upon itemized invoice for accrued work completed prior to termination.

With my signature, I accept this proposal on behalf of the Bassett Creek Watershed Management Commission, and direct that the project begin according to the scope of services, terms, conditions and estimated costs set forth herein.

Client Signature: _____ Date: _____

Hoshal Advertising, Inc. _____ Date: _____

Please sign and return a copy of this proposal to Hoshal Advertising, Inc., 6960 Madison Avenue West, Suite 2, Golden Valley, MN 55427-3627. 763-541-1140 / 763-541-0223(f)
Thank you!

Client: Bassett Creek Watershed Management Commission
Contact: Laura Jester
4700 W 77th St
Minneapolis, MN 55435-4803
Phone: 952-270-1990
Email: laura.jester@keystonewaters.com

Project: **Bassett Creek Watershed Map & Guide**

Content: Side 1: Bassett Creek Watershed Area Map. Base map includes watershed boundaries, city boundaries, and street network with arterial streets labeled. Interpretive data and images as supplied by Client.

Side 2: Educational data and images as supplied by Client. May include history, timeline, population growth, water quality and conservation information and helpful tips for citizens, area recreation and other points of interest.

Specs: Approximately 27" x 18" folding to 4" x 9", 2-sided, 4-color. The map will also be delivered as an electronic file for online display. Final size and fold TBD. FSC and 30% post-consumer waste paper with soy-based ink. Anticipated start date December 2013, with printed maps delivered in March 2014.

Design Cost: Design/Cartographic Production work shall be billed by Hedberg Maps to Client at a rate of \$125/hourly. Consulting/project management/research/proofing and time spent in meetings shall be billed at a rate of \$60/hourly. The total of these project-related costs will not exceed \$10,000 without prior authorization by the Client. Design work includes custom mapping with labeled points of interest as directed by Client, cover design (logo and text supplied by Client), overall publication layout, and two rounds of changes. Additional rounds of change and change in scope will be billed in addition at the same rates outlined above.

Hedberg Maps proposal to
Bassett Creek Watershed Management Commission

Print Cost*:	Map Qty:	2,500	5,000	7,500	10,000	20,000
	Cost:	\$2,565	\$3,195	\$3,585	\$4,155	\$6,015

*Print cost includes press and bindery checks. Freight and applicable taxes billed in addition. Prices are valid for 90 days

Terms:

1. Payment: \$5,000 upon commencement and the balance upon approval of final proof.
2. Copyright: Hedberg Maps reserves copyrights to the map images. Client-provided text and images shall remain copyright of Client or original source.
3. Perpetual License: Client and its member cities are granted a non-transferable perpetual license for use of map image.
4. Indemnity: Client agrees to hold harmless Hedberg Maps, Inc., their officers and employees for any damages incurred as a result of reliance on the map. Nothing herein shall be deemed a waiver by Client of the limitations of liability set forth in Minnesota Statutes, Chapter 466.
5. Right of Publicity: Hedberg maps may post the map in the custom mapping section of its website and/or printed materials that promote Hedberg Maps' custom mapping services.
6. Delay of Work: If project is not completed within 45 days of signed agreement, Hedberg Maps reserves the right to bill for work-to-date at the rates specified under "Design Cost".

For Client: _____ Date: _____

For Hedberg Maps: _____ Date: _____

*Please sign and return to Hedberg Maps via mail, email or fax (612-706-9704).
Thank you.*



Bassett Creek Watershed Management Commission

MEMO

Date: December 11, 2013
From: Laura Jester, Administrator
To: BCWMC Commissioners
RE: **Administrator's Report**

Since the November Commission meeting, I have spent time coordinating and attending various meetings, and responding to issues including correspondence and coordination for the following:

- Responding to resident concerns regarding the Sweeney Lake Outlet Structure
- Responding to Friends of Bassett Creek request for presentation and information
- Meeting with Three Rivers Park staff, along with Plymouth and Medicine Lake Commissioners and Plymouth staff regarding issues in Medicine Lake
- Writing and distributing Commission letter to Medicine Lake stakeholders
- Drafting Plan Steering Committee meeting minutes, preparing agenda and materials for December committee meeting
- Meeting with Recording Secretary to discuss website improvements
- Assisting with coordinating XP-SWMM model tutorial
- Preparing for December Commission meeting including meeting format, minutes review, invoice review, gathering and coordinating materials

The following table provides detail on my activities November 1 - 30.

Administration – Correspondence, informational meetings, general administration: Phone and email correspondence with various Commissioners, TAC members, consultants and other partners including: S. Virnig, J. Oliver, K. Chandler, A. Herbert, B. Wozney (BWSR), J. Anderson (WMWA), C. LeFevre, Chair Black, D. Asche, J. de Lambert, M. Welch, C. Carlson, residents, developers, Friends of Bassett Creek, state agencies Coordination of various projects, meetings and programs including Medicine Lake: surveying stakeholders, distributing letter from resident, responding to questions and comments; Dispute Resolution Committee recommendations; responding to resident concerns of erosion on Twin Lake; drafting letter from resident in response to questions regarding Sweeney Lake TMDL implementation; distributing Schaper Pond analyses results to state agencies; reviewing channel maintenance fund; etc.
Administration – Meeting attendance: 11-7-13 TAC Meeting 11-7-13 Education Committee Meeting 11-11-13 WMWA Meeting 11-20-13 Commission Meeting
Administration – Preparing agendas, meeting materials, meeting notes, follow up: Develop meeting agendas and materials and review relevant documents for BCWMC meeting, review meeting notes, email follow up tasks; develop agendas and materials, review documents and draft TAC memo for TAC meeting; assist with coordination of Education Committee meeting

Administration – Document review and development:

Review invoices, flood control project documents, budget and financial documents

Administration - Watershed Management Plan Development:

Review draft policies; develop and distribute agenda and meeting materials; attend 11-18-13 Plan Steering Committee meeting and draft meeting notes; revise waterbody classification table; review and comment on standards and triggers comparison tables

In the coming month, I plan to work on the following items:

- Assist with preparations and follow up tasks for Commission and committee meetings
- Plan for and attend January TAC meeting, prepare TAC memo
- Research other organizations' budget carry over policies and prepare recommendation for Commission policy
- Assist with XP-SWMM tutorial
- Work on fiscal year-end items with Deputy Treasurer
- Continue gathering input of Medicine Lake issues and work towards hosting a large stakeholder meeting
- Work to post pertinent Watershed Plan Development materials online
- Continue to gather and post materials for new Commissioners
- Begin developing financial policies
- Begin developing a policy or process for transferring and documenting CIP payment information to the Deputy Treasurer and onto Commissioners and TAC members