

# Bassett Creek Watershed Management Commission

## Minutes of the Meeting of November 14, 2007

### 1. Call to Order

The Bassett Creek Watershed Management Commission (BCWMC) was called to order at 11:35 a.m., Wednesday, November 14, 2007 at Golden Valley City Hall by Chair Welch. Ms. Herbert conducted roll call.

#### Roll Call

<i>Crystal</i>	Commissioner Pauline Langsdorf	<i>Counsel</i>	Charlie LeFevere
<i>Golden Valley</i>	Commissioner Linda Loomis, Treasurer	<i>Engineer</i>	Len Kremer
<i>Medicine Lake</i>	Commissioner Cheri Templeman	<i>Recorder</i>	Amy Herbert
<i>Minneapolis</i>	Commissioner Michael Welch, Chair		
<i>Minnetonka</i>	<i>Not Represented</i>		
<i>New Hope</i>	<i>Not Represented</i>		
<i>Plymouth</i>	Commissioner Ginny Black, Vice Chair		
<i>Robbinsdale</i>	Commissioner Karla Peterson		
<i>St. Louis Park</i>	Commissioner Richard Johnson		

Also present: Laura Adler, BCWMC Technical Advisory Committee, City of St. Louis Park  
Brooke Asleson, Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA)  
Jeannine Clancy, City of Golden Valley  
Jack Frost, Metropolitan Council  
Tom Mathisen, BCWMC Technical Advisory Committee, City of Crystal  
Bob Moberg, BCWMC Technical Advisory Committee, City of Plymouth  
Jeff Oliver, BCWMC Technical Advisory Committee, City of Golden Valley  
Stu Stockhouse, Alternate Commissioner, City of Crystal  
Liz Stout, BCWMC Technical Advisory Committee, City of Minnetonka  
Elizabeth Thornton, Alternate Commissioner, City of Plymouth

### 2. Approval of Agenda and Consent Agenda

Chair Welch announced the addition of agenda item 3D - the League of Minnesota Cities Insurance Trust Waiver and agenda item 8biv – the Joint Education and Public Outreach survey and request for public funding. Ms. Black moved to approve the amended agenda. Ms. Peterson seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously [City of Minnetonka and City of New Hope were absent from the vote]. Chair Welch removed the financial report from the Consent Agenda. Ms. Black moved to approve the amended Consent Agenda. Mr. Johnson seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously [City of Minnetonka and City of New Hope were absent from the vote].

### 3. Administration

A. Presentation of the October 18<sup>th</sup> meeting minutes. The October 18<sup>th</sup> minutes were approved as part of the Consent Agenda.

B. Presentation of the Financial Statement. Chair Welch requested that the financial report be

modified to show the income from the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA) as it is received by the BCWMC and redistributed into the Operating Budget.

Ms. Loomis moved to direct the Commission Engineer to speak to Deputy Treasurer Sue Virnig regarding how to modify the financial report to accurately reflect TMDL expenditures and receipts. Ms. Black seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously [City of Minnetonka and City of New Hope were absent from the vote].

Ms. Black proposed that the projects that have been completed be removed from the project analysis spreadsheet of the financial report. Mr. Kremer suggested that Ms. Herbert work with Deputy Treasurer Sue Virnig to correct the budget figure on the Westwood Lake project and to create a new spreadsheet that captures the historic project analysis information for the completed projects so that information can be removed from the current projects analysis spreadsheet. Chair Welch directed Ms. Herbert to communicate with Ms. Virnig about the changes and to take the "For Information Only" Capital Improvement Project update section out of the memo since that information is now included as a table on the project analysis spreadsheet.

Chair Welch checked the status of the 2007 budget and asked Mr. Kremer if he has any concerns about the status of the 2007 budget to-date. Mr. Kremer commented that the budget seems to be in good shape.

The general and construction account balances reported in the November 2007 Financial Report are as follows:

<u>Checking Account Balance</u>	<u>341,615.53</u>
<i>TOTAL GENERAL FUND BALANCE</i>	<i>341,615.53</i>
<u>Investment Balance</u>	<u>0</u>
<i>TOTAL CONSTRUCTION ACCOUNT BALANCE</i>	<i>2,763,547.35</i>
<u>-Less: Reserved for CIP projects</u>	<u>2,563,804.73</u>
<i>Construction cash/ investments available for projects</i>	<i>199,742.62</i>

C. Presentation of Invoices for Payment Approval.

Invoices:

- i. Kennedy & Graven – Legal Services - invoice for the amount of \$2,265.48.
- ii. Barr Engineering Company – October Engineering Services - invoice for the amount of \$16,601.67.
- iii. Barr Engineering Company – October Services for Twin’s Stadium – invoice for the amount of \$3,196.50.
- iv. Amy Herbert – October Recording Administrator Services - invoice for the amount of \$2,612.50.

Ms. Black moved to approve all of the invoices. Ms. Peterson seconded the motion. By call of roll, the motion carried (The cities of Minnetonka and New Hope were absent from the vote).

- D. League of Minnesota Cities Insurance Trust Liability Coverage Waiver. Mr. LeFevere recommended the BCWMC authorize the Chair to notify the LMCIT that the BCWMC does not waive the monetary limits on its liability coverage. Ms. Black moves to authorize Chair Welch to notify the LMCIT that

the BCWMC does not waive the monetary limits on the liability coverage. Ms. Loomis seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously [City of Minnetonka and City of New Hope were absent from the vote].

- E. BCWMC Contract with the MN Ballpark Authority and the BCWMC Invoice through October 26, 2007 for Submission to the MN Ballpark Authority. Chair Welch asked if the BCWMC is close to the \$25,000 limit set in the contract. Mr. Kremer said there should be about \$2,000 to \$3,000 still available after the current invoice and there will still be a charge for the post-construction tunnel inspection. He said the tunnel inspection costs should be less than \$3,000. Ms. Black moved to approve the contract with the MN Ballpark Authority and submission of the invoice. Ms. Loomis seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously [City of Minnetonka and City of New Hope were absent from the vote]. Mr. Kremer recommended modifying the invoice to include the legal costs. Ms. Black recommended sending the invoice as it is and adding the legal costs to the December invoice to the MN Ballpark Authority. Chair Welch directed staff to add the legal costs to-date associated with the Twins Stadium construction to the next BCWMC invoice to the MN Ballpark Authority. The motion carried unanimously [City of Minnetonka and City of New Hope were absent from the vote].

#### **4. Communications**

A. Citizen Input on Non-agenda Items: No Citizen Input.

B. Chair

- i. Chair Welch announced that Ms. Herbert filled out and returned a short demographic survey about the BCWMC. He explained the survey was sent out by the Board of Water and Soil Resources to all Watershed Management Organizations regarding Board member demographics.
- ii. Chair Welch announced that the BCWMC Commissioner from Golden Valley, Mayor Linda Loomis, was re-elected as mayor of Golden Valley.
- iii. Chair Welch stated that on November 20<sup>th</sup> the City of Plymouth will be holding a meeting on the West Medicine Lake Park pond project. Chair Welch said it would make sense to have commissioner representation at the meeting but that he did not feel that staff needed to attend.
- iv. Chair Welch reported that he had recently seen a presentation on the hydrologic cycle and asked if commissioners were interested in bringing the presentation in front of the Commission. Chair Welch volunteered to contact the presenter and find out what it would cost.

C. Commissioners: No communications.

D. Committees:

- i. Education and Outreach Committee - Ms. Langsdorf announced that the next meeting will be held December 11<sup>th</sup> at 9:00 a.m. at Golden Valley City Hall in the Manager's Conference Room.
- ii. Administrator Services Committee – Ms. Black said only she and Chair Welch out of the five Committee members could attend the last meeting. She said she and Chair Welch discussed whether it could be a good idea before hiring someone to have an individual or a consulting firm evaluate the process flow of the BCWMC. She said the

idea behind the evaluation would be that the BCWMC could see how Commission business currently works, which would help the BCWMC determine what it wants the Administrator to do to make the work process smoother and more efficient. Ms. Black asked the commissioners for their thoughts on the idea.

Mr. Johnson asked if part of that evaluation would be determining where the cost savings will be brought forth by the addition of an Administrator. Ms. Peterson said the cost savings will likely be anecdotal and that a specific dollar amount probably can't be attached. Mr. Johnson said it would be important to know where the cost savings are coming from. Ms. Black said the Commission does know that cost savings will be coming from the first item in the Barr invoice [Technical Services]. Ms. Peterson said she thought it would be worthwhile that the evaluation include coming up with a discussion of where the cost savings will come from. She said that information would be one more tool individual commissioners can use when bringing the Administrator idea back to the cities.

Chair Welch said he sees the evaluation like an interim step. He also said that the BCWMC may see some cost overlap with the Administrator but that he does not see that hiring a person to handle the Commission's administrative stuff is principally a cost savings measure.

Ms. Black asked if the Commission is in favor of going forward with a pre-look on how it functions presently and how the Commission could work with a staff person in place? The Commission indicated consent. Chair Welch said that the committee needs to look at this idea again and needs to schedule another meeting. He also commented that a February 2008 start date for the Administrator is overly ambitious.

E. Counsel: No communications.

Engineer: Mr. Kremer said the Commission received a letter from Watershed Partners and asked if the Commission wants Ms. Herbert to forward that information to the Education Committee for its recommendation to the Commission. Chair Welch directed Ms. Herbert to send the information to Ms. Langsdorf.

## 5. Public Hearing

Ms. Black moved to open the public hearing on the channel restoration of the upper reach of the Sweeney Lake Branch of Bassett Creek. Ms. Loomis seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously [City of Minnetonka and City of New Hope were absent from the vote]. Chair Welch opened the public hearing.

Mr. Kremer pointed out that the meeting packet included the feasibility report on the project. He said the report was done by WSB and Associates for the City of Golden Valley. Mr. Kremer added the proposed restoration is for the upper 1,000 feet of the Sweeney Lake Branch of Bassett Creek. He said the problem of that reach is that a lot of erosion is occurring and the creek is meandering back and forth in the flood plain causing sediment to be deposited in downstream ponds. He said the proposal is to reshape the channel, rip rap at certain locations such as at the outside of bends, to install four rock veins to reduce the slope of the channel to decrease channel velocity, to remove accumulated sediment in the channel and areas downstream, and, finally, to revegetate the channel and the areas in the flood plain that have been disturbed. Mr. Kremer said the estimated cost of the project is \$497,840.

Chair Welch commented that the feasibility report contains two project options that have two different total project costs. He said one option is more of a hybrid and the other option is more rip rap heavy.

Ms. Loomis stated that the BCWMC is doing a TMDL on Sweeney Lake downstream. She said she assumed that this particular branch will have a load assigned to it. Ms. Loomis asked what the channel project will do to the load allocation and asked if the BCWMC is too far ahead of the game with this Sweeney Branch channel restoration project. Ms. Loomis also asked what the role is of Mn/DOT in the channel restoration project because the channel reach is a drainage area for Highway 394. Ms. Loomis asked if Mn/DOT is going to participate in this project.

Mr. Kremer said it is highly unlikely that a load would be assigned to this channel reach as a result of the Sweeney Lake TMDL. He said the sediment from this reach is being settled in the ponding areas between the reach and Sweeney Lake. He said some of the phosphorus would travel down to Sweeney Lake but in comparison to the loadings occurring from other parts of the watershed, the load from this reach would be very small. He said the TMDL will not be so detailed that it could determine a load from this particular reach of Bassett Creek. He said there will be a minor decrease in the sediment loading of Sweeney Lake due to this channel restoration project but the decrease will be very minor.

Mr. Kremer said at the upstream end of this reach there is an outlet pipe that serves to drain a very long reach of Highway 394 so there is a very significant contribution of runoff from Highway 394 to this particular reach of the channel. He said that at this point there isn't a proposal to have Mn/DOT contribute to this project. Mr. Kremer explained that the Sweeney Lake TMDL will show what the total phosphorus load is from the various MS4s. He remarked that when the BCWMC develops the implementation plan for the Sweeney Lake TMDL, the BCWMC will target features where a significant load reduction can be achieved. He said the point behind determining who is responsible for what loads is to determine whether to ask other MS4s to contribute to the cost of implementing the features selected as part of the TMDL. Mr. Kremer said the load from the Sweeney Lake Branch channel is so small in comparison to the total load that he doesn't think it is worth at this point asking Mn/DOT to contribute to the project.

Chair Welch asked if the relevant MS4s get credit for whatever reduction this channel restoration project achieves, however minor. He also asked what is the potential that this channel restoration project will solve Mn/DOT's load contribution to Sweeney Lake and therefore take Mn/DOT out of the picture for the Sweeney Lake load allocations.

Mr. Kremer said the features an MS4 typically installs to mitigate the potential impacts of water quality for highways or streets reduce the loadings much more significantly than repairing the reach of this channel.

Mr. LeFevere remarked that the feasibility report has water quality elements to it. He said the BCWMC will be called upon to order a project. He said the proposed action would be for the Commission to adopt a resolution ordering a project and then to enter into a contract with the city. Mr. LeFevere said the project needs to be defined and the Commission needs to specify option A or option B as listed in the feasibility project and needs to address the dredging of the duck pond also as discussed as an option in the feasibility report.

Mr. Kremer said the recommended option is 2, which is the hybrid option and includes the excavation of Duck Pond.

Ms. Clancy said the pond that is recommended being dredged is because the sedimentation in the pond is due to the erosion of the streambank so there is a direct correlation.

Mr. Oliver said the recommendation on page 10 of the feasibility report clearly calls for the hybrid option, option 2.

Ms. Asleson commented that she would be happy to help with any permitting issues with this project since it is tributary to an impaired water.

Chair Welch called for additional comments [no more comments were offered.] Ms. Black moved to close the public hearing. Ms. Peterson seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously [City of Minnetonka and City of New Hope were absent from the vote].

## **6. New Business**

- A. **Resolution Ordering Sweeney Branch Channel Improvements and Cooperative Agreement.** Ms. Black moved to approved the resolution 07-12 A Resolution Ordering 2007 Improvement and Designating Member Responsible for Construction with additional language specifying the option 2 as recommended in the feasibility report. Ms. Langsdorf seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously [City of Minnetonka and City of New Hope were absent from the vote]. Chair Welch asked if the Commission needs a separate motion to approve the cooperative agreement for the project. Mr. LeFevere responded that the approved Resolution 07-12 authorizes the cooperative agreement.
- B. **1334 Spring Valley Road: Golden Valley.** Mr. Kremer said this project is a proposed shoreline restoration along Sweeney Lake. He said it is in front of the Commission because it is work in a floodplain above Sweeney Lake and the work would be below the flood level. He said the project plans to restore 170 feet of shoreline, remove an existing timberwall and replace it with a combination of rock and native vegetation. Ms. Black moved to approve the project. Ms. Loomis seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously [City of Minnetonka and City of New Hope were absent from the vote].
- C. **Waterford Office Development: Phase 2: Plymouth.** Mr. Kremer explained that right now in the existing Waterford Park Plaza there are two existing buildings that were built in 1987. He said that as part of that project a large water quality treatment pond was built. Mr. Kremer stated that the project proposal is to build two additional office buildings on the land just northwest of the existing buildings. He said that in order to build part of a parking lot they are encroaching flood plain level and there will be some wetland disturbed. Mr. Kremer said the project proposes to replace that wetland loss with wetlands adjacent to the hill. He said there will also be other wetlands being disturbed, which will be mitigated with a wetland adjacent to the creek. Mr. Kremer reported that the compensating volume storage they are providing is more than what they are filling, which meets the Commission's requirements. He said the volume does not include the compensation storage volume added with the reconstruction of the wetland. He said the Commission Engineer had four recommendations regarding this plan in the Engineer's Memo but said the developer has submitted revised plans since then that meet all the Engineer's recommendations. Mr. Kremer said the Commission Engineer's recommendation is approval of the project.

Ms. Loomis moved to approve the project. Ms. Langsdorf seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously [City of Minnetonka and City of New Hope were absent from the vote].

## 7. Old Business

- A. **Medicine Lake TMDL Work Plan.** Mr. Kremer stated that the memo from Barr Engineering included in the meeting packet [memo dated November 8, 2007) addresses the four questions about the Medicine Lake TMDL Work Plan asked by Commissioner Black at the October BCWMC meeting. He said he shared this memo with John Barten, Three Rivers Park District, who had another meeting today and couldn't be here at the Commission meeting. Mr. Kremer said Mr. Barten commented that he would propose that workplan be changed so that the stakeholder participation process include only one group that would include both the technical and nontechnical groups. Mr. Kremer said the current workplan splits the stakeholders into the technical and nontechnical groups.

Chair Welch asked if there will be a revised scope put together in time for the December meeting and if that will give the Commission enough time to get the workplan to the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA) in time for their deadlines. Mr. Kremer said yes, the revised scope will be put together and will be ready for Commission review at its December meeting.

Ms. Black said she had questions about the P-8 model. She said the workplan proposes to update the p-8 model from a DOS program to a Windows program. Mr. Kremer explained that more importantly the new version of the model has much more capacity to evaluate BMPs (Best Management Practices) than the old model. He said because of the limitations of the model at the time of the original model, the watershed was modeled in three different pieces. Mr. Kremer said it will be more important now to model the BMPs separately rather than in aggregate. He said one of the things done when there is a limitation on the size of the model is that some of the BMPs are aggregated. Mr. Kremer said now with the additional capacity of the model, that aggregation doesn't need to be done. He said that with the Commission's desire to evaluate loads from individual MS4s, the MS4s will want to know that the model has acknowledged the capability of existing BMPs.

Ms. Black said she understands that the data from the old model needs to be re-entered by hand into the new model. She said the original model used data from the years 2001- 2004 and the workplan proposes to use that data and add the data from 2005, 2006, and 2007. Ms. Black asked how much will be entered into the model, since the data entry is a time issue, and how much data is needed to provide and accurate calibration of the model to get the kind of information the Commission needs.

Ms. Black said she understands the new model can model up to 250 subwatersheds and 75 BMPs. Ms. Black said there are 150 stormwater ponds in the Plymouth Creek subwatershed. She asked if the workplan proposes to use the new model to do the whole Medicine Lake or if the model will have to be broken into different components.

Chair Welch said he is concerned about not having all the partners in this TMDL on board with the workplan and wondered if the Commission has the time to revise the workplan to get the plan to that place where all the partners are on board.

Ms. Asleson said the MPCA has this project as a December 1<sup>st</sup> deadline for receiving the workplan but a one-month delay is not a problem. She said they do want to make sure that the funds dedicated for a fiscal year are spent in that fiscal year. She said the work plans for projects funded with 319 money do need to be reviewed and approved by the Environmental Protection Agency [Ms. Asleson later clarified that the work plans for projects funded by the Clean Water Legacy Act only need to be reviewed and approved by the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency]. She said

once the contract is approved, an amendment can be filed for changes. She said as long as the project is not going over budget, changes to the workplan are a possibility.

Mr. Kremer said the workplan as it is described is the broadest project the Commission could have and that it would be very unlikely that the Commission would ask for a broader scope. He said the question is can the Commission back down from the current scope and reduce the total cost. Mr. Kremer said that as he stated in the Barr memo about the workplan [November 8, 2007 memo], if the Commission is going to be assigning loads per MS4, a revised model would be a better tool than the existing model.

Ms. Asleson said the MPCA is recommending an actual waste load allocation be determined for each MS4, such as cities and Mn/DOT, because then that number can be put into the stormwater permit.

Mr. Moberg said that for the TMDL for Medicine Lake there are seven political entities that are MS4s. He said there will be a great deal of scrutiny brought into the modeling that is done. He commented that the more transparent the Commission will be able to be about the modeling, the better off the Commission will be. Mr. Moberg also brought up the fact that the Three Rivers Park District could be considered an MS4, which brings up his concern about the degree of transparency the Three Rivers Park District brings to the table.

Ms. Black asked if there would be a contract between the Commission and Barr Engineering if Barr does the work for the Medicine Lake TMDL. Ms. Clancy asked if the City of Plymouth is managing the contract with the MPCA or if the Commission would be managing the contract. Chair Welch said his understanding is that it would be just like the Sweeney Lake TMDL process where the Commission manages the contract.

Chair Welch said the letter of response from the Three Rivers Park District to the Commission's request that the TRPD lead the public stakeholder process states that it would participate in the TMDL by leading the stakeholder process but that it reserves a position at the table as a stakeholder as well.

Mr. Kremer said in response to Commissioner Black's question about the degree of calibration necessary for the model, he thinks the model will be scrutinized very carefully by Mn/DOT. Ms. Black asked how much data would need to be used. Mr. Kremer said the people at Barr who work with the models say that all the data should be used. Chair Welch said that in his mind the worst case scenario is that the Medicine Lake TMDL is done and the EPA says its not good enough. Ms. Asleson said the MPCA is willing to review and comment on plan regarding what is or is not necessary in the plan.

Ms. Peterson asked if the MPCA could do a preliminary review of the plan. Ms. Asleson said yes. Ms. Clancy reminded the Commission that the Sweeney Lake TMDL workplan went through about six iterations and that the process of developing a TMDL work plan includes a lot of review and give and take.

Mr. LeFevere said the calibration of the model seems to be a fairly large issue in the Commission's discussion. He said a lay explanation of the model is that you start with a model and then it is supposed to predict reality. He stated that the model is imperfect, but every time the model gets real numbers it is a better model for the actual real-world situation. Mr. LeFevere explained that the only reason not to use all the data available is cost because the more you calibrate the model the better it gets. Mr. LeFevere said that at some point there is probably a point of diminishing returns and so the question is at what point is the model good enough. He asked if the workplan



allows for an ongoing evaluation of that question since it can't be answered today. Mr. LeFevere asked if the process can be set up so the model can be evaluated as an ongoing process.

Chair Welch remarked in response to Commissioner Black's earlier question about whether the Commission would have a contract with Barr that no. He said there would be one contract between the Commission and the MPCA for a scope of work allocated to entities. He said if the Commission has TMDL Engineering costs it would have to go through the Commission's budget. He said the Commission could bid out the project in order to get the best price for the work.

Ms. Black recommended that the Commission forward the workplan and that perhaps comments from the MPCA technical staff can help straighten out the calibration issue. She also recommended that the Commission remove the Three Rivers Park District from leading the stakeholder process and insert language into the workplan that says "to be determined" for the consultants.

Mr. Kremer said he can revise the workplan based on today's comments and resubmit the plan to the MPCA for their comments. He said the Commission can consider the MPCA's comments at the December meeting. He said he will modify the two stakeholder groups into one group and remove the references in the plan to the Three Rivers Park District and Barr Engineering so the Commission can determine who will do the work at a later date.

Chair Welch made a motion to the effect of Mr. Kremer's latest comments. Ms. Loomis seconded the motion. Chair Welch asked to add a direction to staff to notify the Three Rivers Park District about the Commission's course of action. Ms. Loomis accepted the addition to the motion. The motion carried unanimously [City of Minnetonka and City of New Hope were absent from the vote].

## **B. BCWMC Education Committee.**

- i. Authorization for funds up to \$1,200 for second exhibit. Chair Welch moved to approve the authorization of the funds up to \$1,200 for the exhibit. Ms. Black seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously [City of Minnetonka and City of New Hope were absent from the vote].
- ii. Authorization of \$1,000 grant for joint raingarden workshop with MetroBlooms. Ms. Loomis moved to approve the \$1,000 grant to MetroBlooms for the joint raingarden workshop. Ms. Black seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously [City of Minnetonka and City of New Hope were absent from the vote].
- iii. Grant Criteria Revisions. Deferred to future meeting.
- iv. Additional Funds for the Joint Survey. Ms. Langsdorf said the request is for an additional \$875 for the joint survey by Decision Resources because the survey questions increased in number from 50 questions to 66. Ms. Langsdorf said even with the increase the cost of the survey is still less than the amount the Commission approved to spend on the survey. Ms. Peterson moved to approve the additional \$875 for the joint survey. Ms. Loomis seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously [City of Minnetonka and City of New Hope were absent from the vote].

## **C. Request for Final Reimbursement by City of New Hope – St. Joseph's Regional Pond**

#248537 v1

(2005 Northwood Lake Project). Ms. Loomis moved to approve the reimbursement. Ms. Black seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously [City of Minnetonka and City of New Hope were absent from the vote].

**D. TAC Recommendations**

- i. Letter to City of Minnetonka regarding its Nondegradation and Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan. Ms Loomis moved to send the letter with the comments in the TAC memo to the City of Minnetonka. Ms. Black seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously [City of Minnetonka and City of New Hope were absent from the vote].
- ii. Proposed work plan for revising BCWMC's *Requirements for Improvements and Development Proposals*. Deferred to December meeting.
- iii. Medicine Lake Dredging as Potential CIP Project. Deferred to December meeting.

**8. Adjournment**

Ms. Black moved to adjourn the meeting. Ms. Loomis seconded the motion. The meeting adjourned at 2:20 p.m.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Michael Welch, Chair                          Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Amy Herbert, Recorder                          Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Pauline Langsdorf, Secretary                          Date