



## **Bassett Creek Water Management Commission**

# **A g e n d a**

**Thursday, July 15, 2004  
12:00 Noon**

### **NOTE CHANGE OF MEETING LOCATION**

**Plymouth Creek Center – Plymouth Room  
14800 34<sup>th</sup> Avenue North, Plymouth MN 55447**

**Call to Order  
Presentation of June 17, 2004 Minutes  
Presentation of Financial Statements  
Presentation of Invoices for Payment Approval**

#### **Communications**

**Chairman**  
• **Citizen Input on Non-Agenda Items**  
**Counsel**  
**Commissioners**  
**Engineer**

#### **New Business**

- **Central Water Treatment Plant: Plymouth**
- **Plymouth Public Safety Addition: Plymouth**
- **1120 & 1130 Angelo Drive: Golden Valley**

#### **Old Business**

- **Administrative Options Subcommittee Report**
- **Website Improvements**
- **Sweeney Lake Outlet Status Report**
- **BCWMC Second Generation Plan Update**
- **Set Public Hearing for New Hope Project and 2005 Projects**

#### **August Meeting**

- **Engineering Evaluation Subcommittee**
- **Admin Options Subcommittee**

#### **Adjournment**

## **“Bassett Creek Watershed Orientation”**

# **Bassett Creek Water Management Commission**

## **Minutes of the Meeting of June 17, 2004**

### ***Call to Order***

The Bassett Creek Water Management Commission was called to order at 12:00 Noon, Thursday, June 17, 2004, at the City of Golden Valley City Hall by Chair O'Toole.

### ***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 John O'Toole, Chair       | <i>Recorder</i> | Pat Schutrop     |
| <i>Minneapolis</i>    | Commissioner Michael Welch, Vice Chair |                 |                  |
| <i>Minnetonka</i>     | Commissioner Bill Yaeger, Secretary    |                 |                  |
| <i>New Hope</i>       | Commissioner Mary Gwin-Lenth           |                 |                  |
| <i>Plymouth</i>       | Commissioner Elizabeth Thornton        |                 |                  |
| <i>Robbinsdale</i>    | Commissioner Karla Peterson            |                 |                  |
| <i>St. Louis Park</i> | Alternate Commissioner Sally Velick    |                 |                  |

**Also present:** David Hanson, Alternate Commissioner, city of Golden Valley  
Lisa Goddard, Alternate Commissioner, city of Minneapolis  
Lee Gustafson, BCWMC Technical Advisory Committee, city of Minnetonka  
Ron Quanbeck, BCWMC Technical Advisory Committee, city of Plymouth  
Laura Adler, BCWMC Technical Advisory Committee, city of St. Louis Park  
Jeannine Clancy, BCWMC Technical Advisory Committee, city of Golden Valley  
Kelly MacIntyre, BCWMC Technical Advisory Committee, city of Minneapolis  
Sue Virnig, BCWMC Deputy Treasurer, city of Golden Valley  
Ginny Black, City Council Member, city of Plymouth  
Brad Wozney, Minnesota Board of Water & Soil Resources  
Mike and Donna Wolsted, 215 King Creek Road, Golden Valley

### ***Approval and/or Correction of Minutes***

The minutes for the May 20, 2004 meeting were presented. Mayor Loomis asked that the word "final" be stricken from the minutes (page 2, #1, Presentation of Invoices to be Paid) concerning the invoice received from Malloy Montague Karnowski Radosevich & Co., P.A. Ms. Thornton moved and Ms. Langsdorf seconded the motion to approve the minutes with the correction noted. Carried unanimously.

### ***Financial Statements***

1. Mayor Loomis presented the Treasurers Report as of June 17, 2004. The current balances are as follows:

|   |                       |
|---|-----------------------|
| <u>Checking Account Balance</u>           | <u>\$288,225.22</u>   |
| <i>TOTAL GENERAL FUND BALANCE</i>         | <i>\$288,225.22</i>   |
| <br>                                      |                       |
| <u>Construction Account Balance</u>       | <u>\$485,303.85</u>   |
| <u>Commercial Paper (due 8/17/04)</u>     | <u>1,496,797.50</u>   |
| <i>TOTAL CONSTRUCTION ACCOUNT BALANCE</i> | <i>\$1,982,101.35</i> |

Ms. Thornton moved and Mr. Yaeger seconded the motion to receive the Treasurers report and order it to be filed. Carried unanimously. The Treasurers report was accepted as presented and ordered to be filed subject to audit.

2. It was reported at the May 20<sup>th</sup> meeting that Hennepin County released the first half of the tax reimbursement. Ms. Virnig said cities typically receive tax levy dollars in early July of each year. Chair O'Toole asked Ms. Virnig to notify him if the money is not received at the expected time.

### ***Presentation of Invoices to be Paid***

The following invoices were presented for approval:

1. A final invoice was received in the amount of \$1,600 from Malloy Montague Karnowski Radosevich & Co. P.A., for the preparation of the annual audit report.

Ms. Langsdorf moved and Ms. Gwin-Lenth seconded approval for payment of claims as set forth on the invoice. Upon call of the roll, the vote was unanimously carried.

2. An invoice was received from Barr Engineering Company for professional services during the period May 8, 2004 through June 4, 2004, in the amount of \$21,518.03.

Mr. O'Toole moved and Ms. Peterson seconded approval for payment of claims as set forth on the invoice. Upon call of the roll, the vote was unanimously carried.

3. An invoice was received from Pat Schutrop for administrative services during the period of May 8, 2004 through June 4, 2004, in the amount of \$2,295.00

Ms. Thornton moved and Mr. Welch seconded approval for payment of claims as set forth on the invoice. Upon call of the roll, the vote was unanimously carried.

### ***Communications***

*Chairman:*

1. Chair O'Toole introduced Mr. Brad Wozney, Minnesota Board of Water & Soil Resources. Mr. Wozney attended the Commission meeting to introduce himself and to become aware of the Commission's activities and procedures. Mr. Wozney is helping the Commission through the Second Generation Plan approval process. As background, Mr. Wozney worked for Wright County for nine years and been with BWSR for the past six months.
2. A meeting notice was received announcing the Plymouth Environmental Quality Committee meeting scheduled for Wednesday, June 9, 2004.
3. Correspondence was received from the city of Minneapolis Water Quality Task Force requesting the Commission to consider becoming a voting member. Mr. Welch has attended the meetings on behalf of the Commission and believes it is a worthwhile effort. The idea is to achieve a higher level of

coordination of entities that have a stake in maintaining water quality in the city of Minneapolis. At the last meeting, the various watershed organizations (Shingle Creek WMO, Minnehaha Creek Watershed District, and Mississippi WMO) made presentations of the work being done by these organizations. The ongoing focus is communication of beach closures, water quality problems and crises, and coordinating water quality improvement efforts. Mr. Welch added the idea of the Commission becoming a voting member makes the time spent more worthwhile.

Mr. Welch is willing to be the delegate representing the BCWMC to serve as a voting member on the task force along with the Minneapolis' alternate commissioner, Lisa Goddard, to serve as an alternate voting member.

Ms. Thornton asked about financial obligation required by the Commission. Mr. Welch said at this point the task force is not requesting any funding from the Commission. Mr. Kremer added that Jeff Lee, from Barr's water quality staff, attended the meetings (at no charge to the Commission). When Mr. Lee worked with the city of Minneapolis, he essentially coordinated all the water quality data collection programs for the city of Minneapolis. Mr. Lee has also been getting more involved with the Commission's water quality work. Mr. Welch expressed appreciation to Barr for allowing Mr. Lee to attend the meetings because of his expertise in the water quality areas in the city of Minneapolis.

Mr. Yaeger moved and Ms. Velick seconded the motion to appoint the city of Minneapolis's commissioner and alternate commissioner as delegate and alternate delegate representing the Commission on the Minneapolis Water Quality Task Force. Carried unanimously.

Ms. Gwin-Lenth and Mayor Loomis would like to receive notice when the meetings take place.

4. Correspondence was received from the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources submitting comments concerning the 45-day review of the draft second generation plan.
5. Correspondence was received from the Minnesota Board of Water & Soil Resources submitting comments concerning the 45-day review of the draft second generation plan.
6. Correspondence was received from the city of St. Louis Park submitting comments concerning the 45-day review of the draft second generation plan.
7. Correspondence was received from the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency submitting comments concerning the 45-day review of the draft second generation plan.

*Citizen Input on Non-Agenda Items:*

1. Ms. Ginny Black, city council member for the city of Plymouth, referenced the letters included in the meeting packet that address the erosion problem impacting the Three Rivers Park District property north of Rockford Road and east of Northwest Boulevard. The Three Rivers Park District will be attending the upcoming Plymouth city council meeting to discuss solutions to correct the problems.

*Counsel:*

1. Mr. LeFevere asked that the Commission discuss later in the meeting the steps necessary to include the capital project costs in the 2005 tax levy in anticipation of adopting the second generation plan and the capital improvements program.

*Commissioners:*

1. Ms. Langsdorf announced two workshops that may be of interest to the Commission:
  - ? Aquatic Plant Identification Workshop – July 15-16 in Eden Prairie
  - ? Wetland Plant Identification Workshop – July 30-31 in Eagan
2. At the May 20<sup>th</sup> Commission meeting, Ms. Langsdorf volunteered to attend the 2004 School-Community Partner Organizations on Environmental Science Education in Minneapolis Schools. Ms. Langsdorf informed the Commission she is unable to attend after all.
3. Mr. Welch expressed interest for some type of report to be presented to the Commission concerning the Wetlands Conservation Act and how the WCA has affected the BCWMC. Mr. Welch will discuss possible presenters with the Commission engineer and possibly with Mr. Wozney of BWSR.

*Engineer:*

No communications.

## ***New Business***

1. Subcommittees to Review Engineering and Legal Proposals. Every two years, the Commission is required to advertise for engineering and legal proposals. The advertisement was placed in the June 14<sup>th</sup> edition of the *Minnesota State Register*. Deadline to receive proposals is July 30, 2004. The purpose for setting up the subcommittees is to review the proposals received and make a recommendation to the Commission for approval at the September 16<sup>th</sup> meeting.

### Engineering Subcommittee

The following commissioners volunteered to serve on the engineering subcommittee: Commissioners Loomis, Peterson, Gwin-Lenth, and Langsdorf.

Discussion followed. The subcommittee would set up the criteria for assessment of proposals. The advertisement requested “letters of interest” and there was some confusion as to what is meant by “letters of interest” versus a full proposal. The request is addressed to professional and legal consultants to submit letters of interest that typically include statements of qualifications for services to the Commission.

Ms. Black said a letter of interest is different than a request for proposal and that she received a phone call asking what specifically to send the Commission. She added the Commission would most likely get varying degrees of detail because of how the advertisement is worded and therefore uniform information will not be received to adequately judge the proposals. Ms. Langsdorf recommended an additional notice be printed that addresses clearly what the Commission expects to receive. She is not sure how to procedurally accomplish this since the advertisement has been published.

Chair O’Toole said the Commission could prepare a more detailed description of the statement of qualifications expected by the Commission to distribute to consultants who might request more information. Another option is to automatically send the criteria to consultants submitting letters of interest. Chair O’Toole added that consultants familiar with providing these types of services would know what is expected. Ms. Langsdorf is concerned that only affects consultants submitting letters of interest and not giving a clear message to those who read the *State Register*. Ms. Langsdorf proposes the Commission place another advertisement in the *State Register* with a clear explanation of the Commission’s expectations and include a phone number for consultants to call to request additional information.

Mr. Kremer said the Commission could ask BWSR to provide a list of consultants qualified to provide the necessary services and send a letter to those consultants communicating additional detail for consideration in preparing their proposals. Mr. LeFevere added watershed management organizations are required to advertise every two years and the process varies among the WMOs. The Commission could conduct a two-step process where the Commission may want to review the letters of interest received and request additional information from possible candidates.

Mr. Welch asked if there is strict timeframe within the two-year cycle and if not, the Commission should take the time it needs to perform the review to its satisfaction. He also thinks the subcommittee currently formed could develop a process for presentation to the Commission at the July meeting for continued discussion. Mr. Welch said the subcommittee formed in 2002 determined that the process was not as complete as the subcommittee would have liked it to be, but because the Commission was in the midst of preparing the second generation plan, the subcommittee recommended the Commission not spend the time and money on a more concerted effort to solicit proposals until after the second generation plan process was near completion.

Ms. Thornton asked when a Request for Proposals (RFPs) was requested by the Commission. Chair O'Toole does not recall an RFP generated. In the past, statements of qualifications were received versus a complete RFP. Ms. Black pointed out that the address in the 2002 advertisement was Barr's address causing some consultants not to submit proposals because it was being submitted to a competitor's address. Ms. Black added that the Admin Options Subcommittee is currently reviewing the possibility of hiring an executive director or something similar and questions how that subcommittee's recommendation to the Commission will affect this process. Ms. Black does not recall the RFP process discussed at a previous meeting and is concerned that this discussion could have been avoided if the Commission discussed it in more detail at an earlier meeting.

Ms. Velick compared this process with the process the city of St. Louis Park conducts when it is looking to replace service providers within the city. The city typically contacts only those firms that have known experience in providing the services the city needs. Ms. Velick asked if the Commission could conduct a similar process by scaling down the process and contact qualified and known firms to provide an RFP versus placing a new ad in the *State Register* or sending additional criteria to those that submit letters of interest.

Ms. Black suggested the Commission continue through the process and not act on the letters of interest received until after the Admin Options Subcommittee has made its recommendation to the Commission. The Commission could then determine if a more detailed RFP process should be conducted. Ms. Thornton added that the Admin Options Subcommittee is evaluating the services that the engineering consultant would be providing and that could make a difference in qualifications submitted.

Chair O'Toole said the response to the letters of interest received could be that the Commission is not making a decision at this time or inform them about process the Commission is going through and give an expected time when the Commission will contact them again.

Mr. Welch asked the Commission to consider requesting the engineering subcommittee to discuss the various options and make a recommendation to the Commission at its July meeting. Mr. Yaeger agrees and recommends the Commission set a date in 2005 when the Commission will actually request RFPs. Mr. LeFevere said the Commission may have more information available to make a decision at the August meeting and the topic can be discussed again at that meeting. The advertisement can be reissued at any time. The only requirement is that the organization solicits interest proposals every two years for legal, engineering, and technical consultant services.

Chair O'Toole summarized the consensus developing that the letters of interest will be received for discussion at the August meeting, the Admin Options Subcommittee will continue its evaluation, and

the Commission does not have to take specific action at this time. Chair O'Toole asked if the Commission wants to go through the effort of developing criteria to distribute to responders that may want more information.

Mr. Yaeger sees that the engineering subcommittee would be the group to evaluate and come back to the Commission with a recommendation as to the next steps to be made by the Commission. The subcommittee could expand the scope to evaluate and consider future RFP requests for engineering consultants and what the criteria would be in order to meet the need of the Commission.

Mr. Welch added that during the 2002 RFP process, the Commission received four letters of qualifications with Barr's statement of qualifications offering the most complete level of detail. Mr. Welch recommended the Commission have a direction. Mr. Kremer said it is not uncommon for a watershed organization to send a letter to qualified consultants requesting a proposal that includes specific qualifications.

Ms. Black said it might be appropriate to keep the letters of interest received and notify them that the Commission is going through a re-evaluation process and the letters submitted will be kept on file until the Commission has made a decision. In response, Mr. Yaeger said that the Commission could look to the subcommittee to acquire the list of consultants from BWSR and notify the responders that more detail will be available after the re-evaluation process is completed.

Ms. Langsdorf said it is difficult for consultants to submit letters of interest if they don't know what the Commission is specifically looking for. Mr. Yaeger added that at this time, the Commission does not know what it is expecting until the Admin Options Subcommittee has completed its task.

The Commission has complied with the state statute by placing the advertising and from there the Commission can handle the process as fits the Commission and what it anticipates. Mr. Gustafson stated a letter could be sent to the responders informing them that the Commission has delayed the process until a complete evaluation has been completed as to the needs of the Commission and expectations are defined as necessary to be provided by a consultant. Chair O'Toole said that would be appropriate to make that type of decision at the August meeting, but is concerned about the course of action for the Commission at today's meeting.

Ms. Thornton moved and Mr. Yaeger seconded the motion to table the discussion and Commission action concerning letters of interest received for engineering services. Carried with one nay (city of Minneapolis).

Ms. Thornton recommended the legal subcommittee be established and conduct its review since the Admin Options Subcommittee is evaluating the engineering services provided only. Mr. LeFevere said it is not unusual for a small number of letters of interest submitted for legal interest.

#### Legal Subcommittee

Ms. Thornton moved and Mr. Welch seconded the motion to form a subcommittee to review letters of interest received for legal services and stay on the schedule with the subcommittee making a recommendation to the Commission at its September 16<sup>th</sup> meeting. Carried unanimously.

Subcommittee volunteers include: Commissioners Thornton, Goddard, Gwin-Lenth, and Loomis.

Mr. Welch recommended the subcommittee consider using email and a brief summary of letters received to simplify the process. Mr. LeFevere added that a meeting notice would need to be posted prior to any formal meeting of the subcommittee. However, if a subcommittee time and place is announced at a public meeting, a special meeting notice of the subcommittee is not necessary.

Ms. Thornton recommended the legal subcommittee meet at 11:30 am prior to the August 19<sup>th</sup> meeting at the city of Golden Valley in the second floor conference room. The legal subcommittee agreed with Ms. Thornton's recommendation.

2. **Hillside Terrace: New Hope.** A request was received from the city of New Hope to review the grading, drainage, and erosion control plan for this residential development. The development includes the property subdivided from the St. Joseph Church parcel discussed during the BCWMC's July 17, 2003 meeting. Stormwater runoff from the site will be directed to the proposed New Hope Regional Pond BC-P2.3 (BCWMC Pond NB-36A). The regional pond is part of the BCWMC's capital improvement program and is proposed to be constructed by New Hope during the fall of 2004 after the Second Generation Plan is adopted or another funding mechanism is approved by the Commission. The city of New Hope requests approval to proceed with the project prior to completion of the regional pond. The city requests to delay water quality improvements for residential development until the regional pond is constructed in late 2004. Approval is recommended contingent on conditions stated in the engineer's memorandum to the Commission. Mr. Kremer stated the Commission has given this type of conditional approval in the past (e.g., Bassett Creek Park project).

Mr. Yaeger moved and Ms. Gwin-Lenth seconded the motion to approve the plan contingent on the recommendations stated in the engineer's memorandum to the Commission. Carried unanimously.

## **Old Business**

1. **Final 2005 Budget.** A copy of the final 2005 budget was included in the meeting packet. The 2005 budget was approved at the May 20<sup>th</sup> meeting; however, an accounting correction was made to the column formerly called "Estimated Balance Year-End 1/31/05 (over) / under" and renamed to "Amended 2004 Budget." The change was made to better account for the erosion/sediment and long-term maintenance fund line items.

Ms. Thornton moved and Ms. Velick seconded the motion to approve the Amended 2004 Budget. Carried unanimously.

2. **2004 Channel Maintenance Fund.** A request was received from the city of Golden Valley applying for funds from the BCWMC channel maintenance fund for stream channel maintenance at the Mike and Donna Wolsted property at 215 King Creek Road in Golden Valley. The property is on the Sweeney Lake branch of Bassett Creek. The Wolsteds attended the February 19, 2004 meeting and asked the Commission for funding assistance in repairing erosion at their property. The cost for the repair is approximately \$6,000.

The Commission directed its Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) to consider criteria and recommend a policy for application of these funds for the member cities and how the funds would be allocated. It was recommended by the TAC, and approved by the Commission, to allocate the funds to cities based on the percentage of the trunk system located within their city and their need. Fifty percent of the funds will be allocated to the communities based on their percentage of the overall trunk system and 50 percent of the funds will be distributed based on need. Member cities received a copy of the channel maintenance fund criteria and notice of the application deadlines. Application deadlines are as follows:

- ? June 1, 2004 – for funding consideration during the 2004 construction season
- ? October 1, 2004 – for funding consideration during the 2005 construction season

The process set up by the Commission was to receive applications and have the TAC review the applications and make a recommendation to the Commission. Since only one application has been received, the Commission can opt to not refer the application to the TAC and make a decision by the

Commission. The cost for this project to the Commission would be \$3,000 from the channel maintenance fund. The fund currently has \$75,000.

Mr. LeFevere added if the Commission is prepared to move ahead and approve the application, the Commission will need to direct staff to establish an agreement between the city and the Commission setting up reimbursement to the city up to 50% of the total project costs (approximately \$3,000).

Mr. Welch said by directing the TAC to consider the application and getting them involved in the process even though only one application was received might help to stimulate proposals from their cities for next year.

Ms. Black said one reason to ask the TAC to review the proposal is to verify that the riprapping on one side of the creek is not redirecting the water and creating a problem downstream. Mr. Kremer agrees; however, in this case, there is a large storm sewer outlet where the flow is diverted into the bank and the riprapping of the bank at this location will alleviate transporting the flow downstream.

Mayor Loomis moved and Mr. Welch seconded the motion to approve the project and establish an agreement between the city of Golden Valley and the Commission setting up reimbursement to the city up to 50% of the total project costs (approximately \$3,000). Carried unanimously.

3. Met Council Environmental Services 2002 Stream Monitoring Report Summary. Mr. Kremer addressed some noteworthy areas of interest from the report. In 1992, a station was established at the same location as the current Watershed Outlet Monitoring Program (WOMP) station. The variables compared as follows:

| Variable                   | 1992 Data (mg/L) | 2002 Data (mg/L) |
|----------------------------|------------------|------------------|
| Total suspended solids     | 26               | 29               |
| Total phosphorus           | 0.10             | 0.13             |
| Total dissolved phosphorus | 0.03             | 0.05             |
| Total nitrate nitrogen     | 0.45             | 0.36             |

Comparing with other watersheds using information collected by the Metropolitan Council revealed the following information:

| Variable               | Riley-Purgatory | Browns Creek | Minnehaha Creek |
|------------------------|-----------------|--------------|-----------------|
| Total suspended solids | 386 mg/L        | 153 mg/L     | 14 mg/L         |

| Variable         | Minnehaha Creek | Browns Creek | Bevens Creek |
|------------------|-----------------|--------------|--------------|
| Total phosphorus | 0.17 mg/L       | 0.26 mg/L    | 0.72 mg/L    |

The report is a favorable report because the current data is consistent with past information with no significant changes observed. Mayor Loomis asked with the number of treatment ponds (200 to 300 ponds) that have been constructed, why is there not significant improvement to the water quality. Mr. Kremer said the purpose of the treatment ponds is to mitigate development that is occurring and the data shows that the pond development has been effective in mitigating impacts.

Ms. Langsdorf asked about the increase shown for total nitrate nitrogen in 2001 (0.63 mg/L) compared with the 2002 (0.36 mg/L) data. Mr. Kremer said the data is somewhat consistent if the 1992 data (0.45 mg/L) is included in the comparison. The Vermillion River is at 4.03 mg/L nitrate nitrogen. Nitrate nitrogen is a nutrient similar to phosphorus that comes from animal waste, debris, fertilizer, wastewater, etc.

4. **Administrative Options Subcommittee Report.** The subcommittee met again on Monday, June 14. Subcommittee minutes were distributed at today's meeting. The subcommittee remains in the information-gathering stage in order to understand the administrative expenses and how they are broken out. A presentation was given at the meeting by Consultants Mary DeMers and Ian Greenwood to help look at possible changes in the administration of the BCWMC. A preliminary proposal was received from Ms. DeMers for the subcommittee to review. The total proposal came to \$34,000 and Mr. Yaeger said the subcommittee will review the proposal and scale down to the needs of the subcommittee. The subcommittee will most likely request funding from the Commission to move ahead, but is unsure of the amount at this time.

Chair O'Toole said since no budget has been planned to provide for this activity in 2005, the funds would need to come from another budget line item. Ms. Thornton said an important issue for the Commission to consider is that of how to best serve the cities with public funds. The Commission may have to spend the money to save money.

Ms. Gwin-Lenth asked how many and what type of consultants the subcommittee has been considering to help them through this process. Ms. Peterson said the consultants specialize in reviewing engineering proposals and the work conducted by the firms. Mr. Yaeger said only one consultant has been contacted at this time. Mr. Welch suggested using BWSR as a source of information for comparison and contrast in the different watershed organizations.

The subcommittee will tentatively meet again at 6:00 p.m. on Monday, July 12<sup>th</sup>.

5. **Public Involvement and Information Subcommittee Report.** Nothing to report at this time. Ms. Langsdorf will inform the Commission recorder when a subcommittee report needs to be added to future agendas.
6. **Revisit Website Improvements.** A list of possible website improvements was prepared for the Commission's consideration. Mr. Kremer said the website was established in 2000 for the purpose of disseminating information to stakeholders. It was created with the intent of saving Commission money by referring requests by people for technical information to the website. As a result, the website has grown to provide more information for public interest and to expose the activities of the Commission to a wider audience. The website is used extensively by the public – averaging 40 visitors a day and the average stay is about 18 minutes per visit. Statistics for another watershed district website showed about 2,000 total visits for the first year and averaging 3 minutes per stay.

There is about \$3,200 budget remaining to make changes to the website. Possible improvements include: an improved navigation structure, adding a search function, online functionality allowing applicants to complete and submit applications online, add a "what's new" feature, and adding a "for the public section." The website is updated on a regular basis by the Commission recorder. The Commission needs to determine if the website should be updated and what improvements should be made.

Ms. Velick agrees the website is a worthwhile investment and suggests the search feature would be a good option to improve the site.

Ms. Black asked who owned the web address and who hosts the site. Mr. Kremer said Barr owns the address and hosts the site at no charge to the Commission. Mr. Kremer added that Barr is willing to turn over ownership of the site address to the Commission through a document drawn up by the Commission attorney if the Commission wishes.

Mr. Kremer said Ms. Black made a suggestion some time ago to contact the website developer for the city of Plymouth to see if some of the improvements can be done less expensively. The Commission could direct the Commission recorder, Ms. Schutrop, to contact the city of Plymouth's web developer to discuss the possibility of saving some costs associated with the website. Chair O'Toole said since the amount of budget remaining is small, he is not sure the savings would be great enough for the effort.

Ms. Thornton recommended the list of possible website improvements be prioritized according to the budget remaining. Mayor Loomis would like to know the cost associated with each improvement listed. Chair O'Toole asked for an estimate of installing the search function and a rough estimate of the other improvements listed.

Mr. Welch also suggested the commissioners visit the website and examine the site using the list of possible improvements to determine what improvements they feel would be most beneficial. Ms. Black previously emailed a list of watershed management organizations and watershed district websites for the commissioners to view. Mr. Kremer said the Minnesota Association of Watershed Districts has links to all of the WMOs and watershed districts and also hosts many watershed district websites.

7. **Second Generation Plan Update.** The deadline for the 45-day review of the draft plan ended on June 11<sup>th</sup> and the Commission received comment letters from all the plan reviewers except the Minnesota Department of Health and the Minnesota Department of Agriculture. BWSR submitted a final comment letter on the draft plan.

Mr. LeFevere distributed a chronology of steps necessary for the Commission to apply for the 2005 county tax levy for the 2004 and 2005 capital projects on the plan's capital improvements program. Mr. LeFevere briefly walked through the timeline with the Commission. Mr. LeFevere emphasized the need to identify the CIP projects and costs to be included to the county for the tax levy, public hearings necessary for the CIP projects, resolutions to adopt for the plan and amending the CIP for the projects that changed years, etc. The capital projects scheduled for construction in 2005 are the New Hope, Wirth Lake, and Twin Lake projects totaling \$375,000, which is included in the 2005 budget.

At today's meeting, the Commission needs to identify the capital projects (New Hope, Wirth Lake, and Twin Lake) and direct staff to communicate the intent to fund those projects by a tax levy to Hennepin County, and direct or arrange for preparation of feasibility reports.

Chair O'Toole asked where the responsibility lies for preparing the feasibility reports. Mr. Kremer said New Hope will prepare the feasibility study for the New Hope project and Golden Valley will most likely prepare the feasibility study for Twin Lake and possibly the Wirth Lake feasibility study. Mr. LeFevere suggested the Commission direct the engineer to discuss the preparation of the feasibility reports with the cities. The feasibility reports would need to be completed by the time the public hearing is held in September.

Chair O'Toole directed the engineer to contact the respective cities to discuss the feasibility reports.

Mayor Loomis asked about the deadline to the County in order to have the levy considered and will the Commission need to request an extension date. Mr. LeFevere said the Commission has until September 30 to submit the tax notice.

8. **Stream Flow Measurements at WOMP Station.** There was some erosion at the site at the location of the WOMP station where the channel has been ripped up by the city of Minneapolis to minimize further erosion. As a result, a new rating curve is necessary at that location. Mr. Kremer requested

authorization by the Commission to send a technician to the site to gage (measure discharges) at several different elevations. The cost will be approximately \$2,500 and the funds will come from the Surveys and Studies budget line item.

Since there was no objection, Chair O'Toole directed staff to re-establish the rating curve for the WOMP site.

9. Legal Education. After the meeting was adjourned, Mr. LeFevere spoke informally regarding the Gifts to Public Officials Law.

## ***July Meeting***

The following agenda items are currently scheduled for the Commission's July meeting:

- Meeting will be held at the Plymouth Creek Center
- Admin Options Subcommittee Report
- Orientation

## ***Adjournment***

It was moved by Mr. Yaeger and seconded by Ms. Thornton to adjourn the meeting. Chair O'Toole adjourned the meeting at 2:10 p.m.

\_\_\_\_\_  
John O'Toole, Chair

\_\_\_\_\_  
Pat Schutrop, Recorder

\_\_\_\_\_  
Bill Yaeger, Secretary

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

:::ODMA\PCDOCS\DOCS\244215\1