1. Call to Order

The Bassett Creek Watershed Management Commission (BCWMC) was called to order at 11:35 a.m., Wednesday, November 17, 2010, at Golden Valley City Hall by Chair Loomis. Ms. Herbert conducted roll call.

Roll Call

Crystal
Commissioner Pauline Langsdorf, Secretary

Golden Valley
Commissioner Linda Loomis, Chair

Medicine Lake
Commissioner Ted Hoshal

Minneapolis
Not represented

Minnetonka
Commissioner Bonnie Harper-Lore

New Hope
Commissioner John Elder

Plymouth
Commissioner Ginny Black, Vice Chair

Robbinsdale
Commissioner Wayne Sicora

St. Louis Park
Commissioner Jim deLambert

Also present:
Laura Adler, BCWMC Technical Advisory Committee, City of St. Louis Park
Caroline Amplatz, Caroline’s Kids Foundation
Derek Asche, BCWMC Technical Advisory Committee, City of Plymouth
Sean P. Bohan, Advanced Engineering
Rebecca Forman, Braun Intertec
Jack Frost, Metropolitan Council Environmental Services
Kari Geurts, Caroline’s Kids Foundation
Christopher Gise, Golden Valley Resident
Dave Hanson, Alternate Commissioner, City of Golden Valley
Tom Mathisen, BCWMC Technical Advisory Committee, City of Crystal
Richard McCoy, BCWMC Technical Advisory Committee, City of Robbinsdale
Aaron Morrissey, Menard, Inc.
Joseph O’Brien, Citizen
Jeff Oliver, BCWMC Technical Advisory Committee, City of Golden Valley
Jason Quisberg, City of New Hope
Stu Stockhaus, Alternate Commissioner, City of Crystal
Bill Wilson, Sweeney Lake Shoreowners Association President

2. Approval of Agenda and Consent Agenda

Chair Loomis requested the removal of the minutes from the Consent Agenda. Commissioner Black moved to approve the Consent Agenda as amended and to approve the Agenda. Commissioner Elder seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously with eight votes in favor [City of Minneapolis absent from vote].
3. Citizen Input on Non-Agenda Items

Ms. Rebecca Forman, Braun Intertec, made a request to the Commission to put on a future meeting agenda information about the aeration system on Sweeney Lake. Ms. Forman said that there were a couple of reports written for Hidden Lakes residents and that Braun would like the opportunity to present that information. The Commission directed staff to put the item on a future Commission meeting. Administrator Nash commented that the Commission would want to receive the reports that Ms. Forman mentioned and would want to be able to include the reports in the meeting packets distributed as part of the monthly meeting communications. Ms. Forman asked how much lead time the Commission would need for receiving the reports for them to be part of the meeting materials. Ms. Herbert said the first Thursday of the meeting month. Ms. Amplatz mentioned that one of the reports is filled with more technical data about the study and the other report provides more of a summary of the findings. She said that she is willing to share both reports but would like the opportunity for the information to be shared to the Commission by an expert. Ms. Herbert asked if they would provide both reports to the Commission and Ms. Amplatz agreed. Ms. Forman stated that they would provide the final reports once the item is on the Commission’s agenda and they would try to give as much lead time as possible for people to review the reports and once the item is on the agenda the Commission has permission to share the reports as part of its meeting materials. She also said that Braun Intertec is scheduled at the DNR in the spring to provide a formal verbal presentation to contest the permit for the aeration to continue in the summer. Chair Loomis said that staff would be in touch regarding when the item is scheduled noting that the December, January, and February meetings get filled up with administrative items related to the end of the Commission’s calendar and fiscal years and its annual organizational meeting and perhaps the item may not be scheduled until the March 2011 agenda.

4. Administration

A. Presentation of the October 21, 2010, BCWMC meeting minutes. Chair Loomis requested the addition of the following sentence to the end of the paragraph for item 7Bvi, “There was no objection by the Commission.” Commissioner Black moved to approve the minutes as amended. Commissioner Harper-Lore seconded the motion. The motion carried with seven votes in favor [City of New Hope abstained since he did not attend the October 21st BCWMC meeting and City of Minneapolis was absent from the vote].

B. Presentation of the Financial Statement.

Commissioner Elder moved to receive and file the November financial report. Commissioner Black seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously with eight votes in favor [City of Minneapolis absent from vote].

The general and construction account balances as reported in the November 2010 Financial Report:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Account Description</th>
<th>Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Checking Account Balance</td>
<td>485,652.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL GENERAL FUND BALANCE</td>
<td>485,652.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Account Cash Balance</td>
<td>2,693,038.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment due 5/13/2015</td>
<td>508,918.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL CONSTRUCTION ACCOUNT BALANCE</td>
<td>3,201,956.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Less: Reserved for CIP projects</td>
<td>3,846,341.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction cash/ investments available for projects</td>
<td>(644,384.79)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C. Presentation of Invoices for Payment Approval.

Invoices:

i. Kennedy & Graven – Legal Services through August 31, 2010 - invoice for the amount of $1,838.60.


iii. Watershed Consulting, LLC – Administrator Services through September 30, 2010 – invoice for the amount of $3,458.73.

iv. Amy Herbert – September Administrative Services - invoice for the amount of $2,701.63.

v. D’amico Catering – October BCWMC Meeting Catering – invoice for the amount of $416.87.

vi. D’amico Catering – November BCWMC Meeting Catering – invoice for the amount of $443.15.

Commissioner Black moved to approve payment of the invoices. Commissioner Harper-Lore seconded the motion. By call of roll, the motion carried unanimously with eight votes in favor [City of Minneapolis absent from vote].

D. Authorization for Publication of Request for Letters of Interest for Contracted Professional Services including Legal, Engineering and Technical, and Watershed Administrator Services. Direction for Commission Procedure for Review of Responses. Mr. LeFevere commented that the request is mandated by statute but that the Watershed Administrator does not fall under the professional services dictated by the statute. Commissioner Black moved to authorize the publication of the request for letters of interest for legal and engineering and technical services in the Minnesota State Register and to discuss at the December meeting other possible resources the Commission would use for the publication of the request. Commissioner Harper-Lore seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously with eight votes in favor [City of Minneapolis absent from vote]. The Commission agreed that Administrator Nash should be the staff person to receive the letters. Chair Loomis said that at a future meeting the Commission will create a committee to review the letters.

5. New Business

A. Permit Review – Menards Project: City of Golden Valley. Ms. Chandler said the project is located northeast of the intersection of Highways 394 and Louisiana Avenue and is in the Sweeney Lake subwatershed. She said the project is a total redevelopment of a twelve-acre site, which currently has no water quality treatment on the site. She said the Commission’s requirements call for this type of project, redevelopment greater than five acres, to meet Level 1 water quality treatment standards. Ms. Chandler explained that the project is in front of the Commission because the plans call for treatment via underground sand filters. She said that the Commission considers the sand filter method an approved type of BMP but the Commission’s policy is to review plans utilizing underground treatment devices. Ms. Chandler said that there has been a lot of communications going back and forth between the City of Golden Valley, the Commission Engineer, and the Menards staff to get the plans to the point they are at currently.

She explained that there are no flood plain issues and no wetland issues. Ms. Chandler said the
stormwater flows carry the water offsite and eventually to Sweeney Lake. She said two sets of BMPs are being proposed to treat water onsite. Ms. Chandler reported that one set of BMPs are the bioretention areas and the other set includes the stormwater chambers, also referred to as underground sand filters. She explained that approximately one-fourth of the site will drain to and be treated by the bioretention areas and the rest of the site will drain to and be treated by the underground chambers/sand filters. Ms. Chandler said the chambers are designed to meet the Commission’s requirement of treating one inch of runoff from the impervious areas. She passed around photos of chamber installation at another project and technical drawings of the chambers. Ms. Chandler reiterated that the project will meet Level I requirements with the designed systems in place. She said erosion and sediment control measures include silt fencing that would be installed all the way around the site and at the stormwater inlets, erosion control mat on slopes steeper than a three-to-one ratio, a construction entrance will be established, and the areas that will become the bioretention basins will be used during the construction phase as sediment basins.

Ms. Chandler stated that the Commission Engineer recommends conditional approval based on the four comments listed in the November 10, 2010, Engineer’s memo about the Menards project:

1. The sequencing of construction must be updated to include the following construction notes for the bioretention basins.
   a. To the extent possible, the bioretention basins must be constructed after the remaining site and tributary area has been graded and stabilized.
   b. After final grading, the bioretention basin floor must be tilled to a depth of at least 6 inches to provide a well-aerated, porous surface texture. Six inches of compost must be tilled in at this time.
   c. The bottom and side slopes of the basin must be stabilized with appropriate plants within seven days following construction.

2. The sequencing of construction must be updated to include the following construction notes for the storm chambers.
   a. Sand must be placed uniformly to prevent formation of voids that could lead to short-circuiting and prevent damage to the underlying under-drain system. To the extent possible, voids between the trench walls and the geotextile fabric must be avoided.
   b. Mechanical compaction of the sand filter should be avoided. The sand bed can be stabilized by wetting the sand periodically, allowing it to consolidate, and then adding extra sand. This process can be repeated until consolidation is complete.

3. A maintenance agreement for the bioretention basin and storm chambers must be established between the applicant and the City of Golden Valley. Discussions with the applicant indicate that the maintenance plan for the storm chambers will allow them to be serviced so that the functionality of the facilities extends to the life of the pavement. When the pavement would be replaced, the sand filters would be replaced. In the interim, the Isolator Rows of the storm chambers (which are used for pretreatment and remove a large portion of the sediment) will have sediments removed on a frequent basis.

4. The plan sheets that show the dimensions, number of chambers, lengths, and sizes of the Storm Chambers must be submitted for review.

Ms. Chandler added that after the Engineer’s memo had been sent to the Commission in the meeting packet, the Engineer received the Operation and Maintenance Manual for the underground storm chambers. She recommended changing the language of condition number.
three. Ms. Chandler said she recommends that the first sentence of condition number three remain as it is and the rest of it would be replaced with the following additional language: Include in the maintenance agreement with the City of Golden Valley the following items:

- the StormTech Operation and Maintenance Manual and the condition that there would be at the minimum an annual inspection;
- Replace the sand filter at the same time that the pavement is being replaced at the site; and,
- Incorporate the bioretention maintenance requirements in accordance to the BCWMC’s 
  Requirements for Improvements and Development document;

Ms. Chandler explained that the chambers have been designed to last as long as the pavement on the site.

Mr. Mathisen inquired about the process of removing deposited sediment out of the chambers. Mr. Bohan of Advanced Engineering described the process and the use of inspection ports to track the amount of sediment that has accumulated and the use of jetvac vacuums to remove the sediment. Commissioner Harper-Lore asked if the sand ever needs to be replaced. Mr. Bohan discussed the calculations he used to derive the amount of sediment that would accumulate in the chambers and that the accumulation would be approximately 5,000 pounds of sediment accumulated per year from the eight-acre site. He said the chambers were designed to last approximately 20 years and were designed so sediment wouldn’t clog the chambers or render them ineffective. Mr. Mathisen asked if the roof drains runoff goes to the underground filtration. Mr. Bohan said yes. Commissioner Sicora spoke up in favor of the inspection ports, spoke of some of his professional experiences with such systems, and asked several technical questions about the drawdown time, the maintenance, and the soils of the site.

Commissioner Black asked if Menards had considered a green roof for the store. Mr. Morrisey of Menards, Inc. said Menards had tried one green roof and had some problems with it but for this site it came down to economics and Menards instead focused on meeting the Level I standards.

[Commissioner Elder departs meeting.]

Commissioner deLambert asked what happens in the case that the chambers don’t work. Ms. Chandler responded that the water would go to overflows and would go downstream untreated. Commissioner deLambert asked if the Commission would know whether that overflow happens. Ms. Chandler said that issue would be part of the maintenance agreement with the City.

Commissioner Black asked if the overflow is being designed to be able to handle all of the runoff from the site in the unlikely event that none of the chambers are working or if water would back up onto the site in that case. Mr. Bohan replied that in large storm events, such as larger than a 10-year storm event, water will back up onto the site.

Chair Loomis said the Commission Engineer informed the City of Golden Valley that these chambers are in use at the Menards store in Coon Rapids so the City of Golden Valley is requesting a copy of the Coon Rapids maintenance agreement with Menards to be incorporated into the City of Golden Valley’s maintenance agreement with Menards on this project. Mr. Bohan stated that the chambers are also in use at the Menards store site in Eden Prairie.

Mr. LeFevere recommended the Commission revise its condition about replacing the chambers so that the language states that the chambers are replaced no less frequently than once every 20 years unless the City of Golden Valley approves a longer period.

Commissioner Black moved to approve the permit with the Engineer’s conditions as stated in the
memo with the changes to condition number three as described by Mr. LeFevere about the chambers being replaced at least once every 20 years unless the City of Golden Valley authorizes a longer period and the changes described by Ms. Chandler regarding the maintenance agreement that must be established between the City of Golden Valley and Menards, which must incorporate the StormTech Operations and Maintenance Manual and incorporate the bioretention treatment maintenance agreement. Commissioner deLambert seconded the motion. Ms. Chandler emphasized that condition number three should also specifically say that beyond the first year there should be at least one annual inspection. Commissioner Black and deLambert considered Ms. Chandelier's addition a friendly amendment to the motion. By call of roll the motion carried with seven votes in favor [Cities of Minneapolis and New Hope absent from vote].

B. Discuss Obstructions in Bassett Creek as a Result of Soo Line Railroad Bridge Modifications. Ms. Chandler said that the location being discussed is just east of Douglas Drive and is where the Soo Line crosses the Main Stem of Bassett Creek. Ms. Chandler reported that the railroad replaced the bridge and when doing so they left in old pile bents, which obstruct water flow and catch debris and even lead to conditions for erosion to the streambank due to turbulence. Ms. Chandler said the Commission Engineer recommends that the Commission Engineer and the Commission Attorney work together to write and send a letter to the railroad requesting that the debris and pile bents be removed and to also copy the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources on the letter. Commissioner Black suggested that the letter request that either the pilings be removed or decreased in height to such a level that they would not be an obstruction and would not trap debris. Commissioner Sicora recommended that the Commission direct the Engineer and Attorney to work together on the appropriate wording of the letter. The Commission agreed. Chair Loomis directed the Engineer and Attorney to write and send the letter as discussed.

6. Old Business

A. TAC Update.
   i. New Hope Channel Maintenance Fund Request. Administrator Nash reported that New Hope had submitted a channel maintenance fund request for a project to remove sediment in a reach of the creek that is located west of Winnetka Avenue. He reported that the TAC recommended approval since the project would improve the flow of the creek and is located along the trunk system. Mr. Quisberg of New Hope added that the project is a maintenance project to remove accumulated sediment in the North Branch of Bassett Creek.

   ii. Hydrologic and Water Quality Modeling. Ms. Chandler said two memos were presented and discussed by the TAC on this issue. She stated that one of the memos provided information about all of the different kinds of hydrologic and hydraulic models that have been prepared on behalf of the Commission. She said the other memo was about the water quality models that have been prepared for TMDL purposes or lake watershed management plans.

   Ms. Chandler said that the TAC was discussing the fact that there isn’t a model, either hydrologic or water quality, that covers the watershed as a whole. She explained that the TAC agreed in general that it seemed like a good idea to have a model of the entire watershed but they wanted to know what the costs would be for creating such a model. Ms. Chandler said there were some concerns by the TAC regarding how detailed the model would be since TAC members did not think the model should be so detailed as to go down to the catch basin level.

   She said one possibility is that the Commission could take ownership or responsibility of a
watershed model that is of the trunk system and is less detailed and the cities could take on the cost or responsibility if they wanted additional detail and then the information could be brought into a model that the cities and the Commission could use.

Ms. Chandler said that regarding the water quality model, Barr Engineering provided information regarding the status of the P8 modeling that has been done. She said that for both the water quality modeling and the hydrologic modeling the TAC recommends that at a future TAC meeting the Commission Engineer come back with information on possible upgrades on a future model. She said the TAC recommended that the Commission Engineer prepare a map showing the status of the modeling and the watersheds in the model, the options of the level of detail that could be incorporated into the model, a draft task list, costs for the different options, and information on what parts of the models are up-to-date and don’t require revision. She said it would be up to the Commission to decide if it is interested in having the Commission Engineer proceed with the TAC’s recommendations.

Mr. Sicora commented that the topic falls into place in relation to the Commission’s work with TMDLs and its Next Generation Plan and said that he would like more detail. Ms. Black agreed with the TAC’s recommendations.

Commissioner Black moved to approve the TAC’s recommendations from the November 8, 2010, memo from the TAC to the Commission. Commissioner Harper Lore seconded the motion. The recommendations included:

1. The New Hope Channel Maintenance Project deals with improving the flow in the creek that is part of the trunk system and the TAC recommends approval of the fund request.

2. The Commission Engineer provide the following information regarding upgrades to the hydrologic and water quality models: Map showing the status of the existing modeling, including the watersheds in the models; Options for level of detail/ number of watersheds to model; Task list for each option; Cost estimates to complete the work for each option; Note the parts of the hydrologic models that are up-to-date and would not require revision; Check the performance of the hydrologic model using recent flow data; Discuss the information at the January 6, 2011, TAC meeting.

The motion carried unanimously with seven votes in favor [Cities of Minneapolis and New Hope absent from vote]. The Commission set the January 6, 2011, TAC agenda to include the annual CIP review, the Next Generation Plan issues discussion, and the modeling item just discussed. Commissioner Sicora volunteered to be the Commission liaison at the January 6, 2011, TAC meeting.

iii. Next Generation Plan Update. Administrator Nash said that the report on this item can wait until agenda item 6D – Next Generation Plan Work Session.

B. TMDL Updates.

i. Sweeney Lake TMDL. Administrator Nash reported that Ms. Brooke Asleson, MPCA, has communicated to the Commission that the TMDL has been submitted to the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) or is imminently going to be sent to the EPA.
ii. Wirth Lake TMDL. Administrator Nash reported that the Wirth Lake TMDL has been approved by the EPA.

iii. Medicine Lake TMDL. Administrator Nash stated that the Commission received comments about the TMDL from the Minnesota Department of Transportation (Mn/DOT) and the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources (DNR) along with Ms. Asleson’s responses to the those comments.

Ms. Chandler mentioned that the Commission would want to keep in mind for 2012 budget consideration that the Commission agreed to take on the lead entity role for the Medicine Lake TMDL in terms of it being a categorical TMDL. She said that those responsibilities have not been detailed yet but it is something for the Commission to keep in mind.

C. Web Site Domain Name. Administrator Nash explained that the Web site domain name www.bassettcreekwmo.org is currently owned by Barr Engineering. He also said that Barr Engineering hosts the site and he recommended that Barr continue hosting the site. The Commission agreed that Barr Engineering would continue to host the Web site. Administrator Nash stated that if the Commission would like to take ownership of the domain name it needs to do so through the Internet Registrar. Administrator Nash said there is no charge to transfer the name but there is a registration fee that can be paid annually or on a longer-term basis, which would provide slight cost savings on terms of five years or more. Ms. Black moved to approve the Commission transferring the domain name from Barr Engineering to the Bassett Creek Watershed Management Commission and to continue paying the registration fee on an annual basis. Commissioner Sicora seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously with seven votes in favor [Cities of Minneapolis and New Hope absent from vote].

Ms. Herbert brought up the idea of working with the Education Committee to follow through with some of the Committee’s previously discussed and requested updates to the Web site. The Commission agreed. Commissioner Langsdorf asked Ms. Herbert to provide the Committee a copy of the Education Committee’s notes on the Web site.

D. Next Generation Plan Work Session. Ms. Chandler explained the agenda item’s handout, which was a flowchart that illustrated the process for the BCWMC’s 2004 Watershed Management Plan. She described how the process was directed by the Commission and she explained the different committees involved in the last planning process. She stated that the committees included the Steering Group, the Citizens Advisory Group, the Technical Advisory Group, and the Policy Advisory Group. Ms. Chandler summarized the last planning process and its timeline.

Administrator Nash added that Brad Wozney of the Minnesota Board of Water and Soil Resources (BWSR) advised him that the BCWMC should go forward slowly in its revision process so that the BCWMC doesn’t get ahead of the BWSR’s rules revisions, which aren’t expected to be finalized until sometime between August and December of 2012.

Ms. Chandler stated that the formal review process for the draft plan will take approximately ten months and that the Commission should allow two years for the entire planning process, concluding with the Commission’s adoption of the final plan. Mr. Frost of the Metropolitan Council Environmental Services said that the draft of BWSR’s revised rules should be out by early next year and will allow the Commission to see what changes are coming in the revised rules. Administrator Nash reported that Brad Wozney will be giving a presentation in January 2011 to the Shingle Creek Watershed Management Organization and is willing to come speak with the BCWMC in January or later as well. Administrator Nash recommended that the Commission have Mr. Wozney come give his presentation. Commissioner Black agreed. The Commission agreed. Ms. Chandler said that the only part of BWSR’s revised rules that she has seen that would
be a process change is a rule that would have the Commission contact agencies early in the process to solicit comments about issues.

Commission Sicora added that Shingle Creek will be reviewing its Joint Powers Agreement (JPA) as part of its watershed management plan revision process and suggested that the BCWMC allow for time in the process to consider public questions about its JPA rules.

Mr. LeFevere said that he doesn’t see any reason for the Commission to hold up its process on the next generation plan.

The Commission discussed the Hennepin County Board of Commissioners’ interest in researching different funding options for watershed management organizations. Commissioner Sicora asked if the Commission could get an update on the memo put together by Joel Settles of Hennepin County on the topic of funding options and the “Lakes” report. He said the Commission saw a draft and wondered if there was a final draft. Administrator Nash said he will check on the status of that memo but that he thought the version he had distributed was the final draft. The Commission talked about a recent article in the Star Tribune that discussed the Hennepin County Board of Commissioners’ interest in looking into different funding options. Commissioner Sicora announced that Channel 12 recently conducted an interview on the same topic and that he has a link to the interview. Commissioner Black asked for the link. Commissioner Sicora suggested that members of the Commission notify the Commission if they have been contacted by the media.

The Commission discussed in more detail the process from the 2004 Plan. Commissioner Black asked about the role of the steering committee and the Commission discussed its decision from a couple of months ago that for now, in lieu of a steering committee, the Commission would operate its planning committee as a committee of the whole. Commissioner Black noted that the Commission kicked off its planning process for the 2004 Plan with a public forum and commented that it didn’t seem like the Commission needed the public forum in the beginning of the process this time and that the public meeting may be more effective down the line after the Commission had identified issues. Commissioner Black commented that the Commission should pull together the big issues and should gather information from the Commission’s TMDLs, CIP, policy manual, and put it in draft form in order to provide something for the agencies to review.

Administrator Nash commented that he thinks the Commission should continue on the path it is on and should continue identifying issues. Chair Loomis recommended that Administrator Nash conduct an identical process for issue identification by the Commission that he has been conducting with the TAC. Administrator Nash said that he would send out the issue identification memos again to the Commission. He reminded the Commission that last time he sent them out as information only but this time the Commission can comment on the issues by typing directly into the Word documents and can send them back to him with their name on the forms.

Ms. Chandler mentioned that the Commission will start its 2012 budget discussions in April 2011 and suggested that the Commission have some decisions made by that time regarding its Plan revision process so that it knows how to budget for the process. Chair Loomis recommended that the Commission set aside time at each of the Commission meetings, for now, to discuss the Next Generation Plan. The Commission directed Ms. Chandler and Administrator Nash to put together for the December Commission meeting a draft planning process and timeline.

### 7. Communications

**A. Chair:** No Communications but she asked for the City of Plymouth and City of Golden Valley to provide CIP project updates.
i. Mr. Asche updated the Commission on the Plymouth Creek channel restoration project. He said that he will be providing the project’s final plans and specs to the Commission. He reported that bid opening will be on December 7th and that the City hopes to award a contract by mid- to late-December. Mr. Asche explained that the City has held dozens of meetings with property owners to explain the project and to discuss tree removal. He said residents are very excited about the project and about improvements to the creek and the corridor. Mr. Asche commented that the schedule calls for the majority of the channel restoration work to be complete by the end of February 2011 and for the vegetation restoration to be in place by June 1st. Ms. Chandler asked about whether the Commission would receive a response to its comments on the project. Mr. Asche said the response is coming likely this week. Ms. Chandler said the Commission Engineer had some concerns that the project was moving forward without the City responding to the Commission’s comments. Mr. Asche said that the project plans were just finalized last week and that he will check on the status of the City’s response to the Commission’s comments.

ii. Mr. Oliver reported on the Main Stem restoration project in Golden Valley. He said the archeological review has been completed, the City will be awarding the contract soon, and work is anticipated to begin in the end of December.

B. Administrator: Administrator Nash reviewed his Administrator’s Report with the Commission.

i. Administrator Nash noted that he submitted on behalf of Metro Blooms an application to Conservation Corps Minnesota for labor to work on establishing approximately 30 rain gardens in the metro area. He added that Metro Blooms would be handling the process from here on out.

ii. Administrator Nash reported that he met with Lee Gustafson of BCWMC’s TAC from the City of Minnetonka regarding revisions to the BCWMC’s financial report. Administrator Nash said that they would continue to work on a draft and then it would go to the Administrative Services Committee.

iii. Administrator Nash said that he met with Commissioner Welch to discuss the policy manual and the draft will go to the Administrative Services Committee soon.

iv. Administrator Nash brought up the Caroline’s Kids Foundation report created by Braun Intertec. Mr. LeFevere said the report is a public document but he recommends that the Commission not make copies of the report until permission is given.

v. Administrator Nash said that Brooke Asleson of the MPCA contacted him to request time at the December BCWMC meeting for a presentation on the work plan for the Twin Cities metro chloride project. The Commission directed Administrator Nash to arrange for Ms. Asleson to give the presentation to the Commission at the December meeting. Administrator Nash reported that Ms. Asleson also asked if a member of the Commission would want to participate in the project’s TAC. Mr. Frost remarked that the project will be going through a long process so the Commission shouldn’t feel rushed to hear or make decisions about the project. Commissioner Sicora mentioned that some members of the BCWMC are also members of the Shingle Creek WMO and he reminded the Commission that Shingle Creek conducted a chloride TMDL and so those members have quite a bit of experience with the topic of chlorides.

C. Commissioners:

i. Commissioner Langsdorf stated that she received an e-mail from Commissioner Hoshal with some recommended changes to the salt brine recipe in the salt-use brochures that were
discussed at last month’s BCWMC meeting. She said that the brochures had been printed prior to Commissioner Hoshal submitting his comments and that the brochures are ready for distribution to the cities that ordered the brochures. The Commission discussed possible actions. Chair Loomis said that she had heard from TAC members that the TAC would like to review the brochures before the Commission authorizes them to go out for publication. The Commission agreed that the cities would be given the brochures that they ordered, the city staff who ordered the brochures would be contacted via a letter written by Administrator Nash and Chair Loomis and would be told about the issue with the salt brine recipe and would be given the choice of using the brochures as they are, using the stickers created by Pauline, or not using the brochures. Commissioner Sicora recommended that the brochure be removed from the BCWMC’s Web site until the BCWMC’s TAC reviews the brochure and that the information on the salt brine recipe that Commissioner Hoshal provided to Commissioner Langsdorf should be forwarded from the Commission to the West Metro Watershed Alliance (WMWA). Commissioner Langsdorf said it sounds like the Commission wants the TAC to review brochures in the future and it wants significant changes to the salt brochure.

ii. Commissioner Harper-Lore reported that she recently attended the Minnesota-Wisconsin conference on invasive species. She said she learned that one of the biggest problems in Minnesota and Wisconsin is reed canary grass and that the message from the conference was that the species should not be planted and is expensive to remove. Commissioner Harper-Lore commented that the Bassett Creek watershed should have an inventory of what is in the watershed now in order to keep track of its diversity. Chair Loomis commented that the cities do natural resource inventories.

D. Committees:
   i. Commissioner Langsdorf announced that the Education Committee will be setting its next meeting and that the next WMWA meeting will be on December 14, 2010, at 8:30 a.m. at Plymouth City Hall.

E. Counsel: No communications

F. Engineer:
   i. Ms. Chandler reported on the preliminary draft of the South Metro Mississippi River Total Suspended Solids TMDL, which will be out for public review in late November or early December.

9. Adjournment

Chair Loomis adjournd the meeting at 2:29 p.m.