



Bassett Creek Water Management Commission

A g e n d a

**Thursday, July 17, 2003
12:00 Noon**

**Golden Valley City Hall
7800 Golden Valley Road**

PUBLIC MEETING

Call to Order

Presentation of June Minutes

Presentation of Financial Statements

Presentation of Invoices for Payment Approval

Communications

Chairman

- **Citizen Input on Non-Agenda Items**

Counsel

Corps of Engineers

Commissioners

Engineer

New Business

- **Pump House 14 & 15: Plymouth**
- **6515 Plymouth Avenue: Golden Valley**
- **Annapolis Office Park: Plymouth**

Old Business

- **St. Joseph Church Expansion & New Hope Regional Pond BC-P2.3: New Hope**
- **Second Generation Plan Update**

August Meeting

- **Public Hearing – Minor Plan Amendment for city of Plymouth**
- **Informal Commission Review of Draft Second Generation Plan**

Adjournment

Bassett Creek Water Management Commission

Minutes of the Meeting of June 19, 2003

Call to Order

The Bassett Creek Water Management Commission was called to order at 12:05 p.m., Thursday, June 19, 2003, at the City of Golden Valley City Hall by Chair O'Toole.

Roll Call

<i>Crystal</i>	Commissioner Pauline Langsdorf
<i>Golden Valley</i>	Commissioner, David Hanson, Treasurer
<i>Medicine Lake</i>	Commissioner John O'Toole, Chair
<i>Minneapolis</i>	Commissioner Michael Welch, Vice Chair
<i>Minnetonka</i>	Not represented, Secretary
<i>New Hope</i>	Commissioner Vincent Vander Top
<i>Plymouth</i>	Commissioner Elizabeth Thornton
<i>Robbinsdale</i>	Commissioner Karla Peterson
<i>St. Louis Park</i>	Commissioner Paul (PJ) Andersen

Counsel: Charlie LeFevere
Engineer: Len Kremer
Recorder: Pat Schutrop

Also present:

- Karla Anderson, Alternate Commissioner, city of Plymouth
- Mary Gwin-Lenth, Alternate Commissioner, city of New Hope
- Jan LeSuer, Alternate Commissioner, city of Golden Valley
- Ron Quanbeck, BCWMC Technical Advisory Committee, city of Plymouth
- Carlton Moore, BCWMC Technical Advisory Committee, city of St. Louis Park
- William Deblon, BCWMC Technical Advisory Committee, city of Robbinsdale
- Guy Johnson, BCWMC Technical Advisory Committee, city of New Hope
- Kelly MacIntyre, BCMWC Technical Advisory Committee, city of Minneapolis
- Jeannine Clancy, BCWMC Technical Advisory Committee, city of Golden Valley
- Ginny Black, City Council Member, city of Plymouth
- Phil Belfiori, Minnesota Board of Water & Soil Resources
- Jay Pomeroy, Anderson Johnson Associates
- Mike Perniel, Minneapolis Park & Recreation Board
- Terrie Christian, Association of Medicine Lake Area Citizens

Approval and/or Correction of Minutes

The minutes of the May 15, 2003 meeting were presented with the following correction noted:

?? Page 5, New Business, item #1, 6th paragraph should read as follows: Ms. Langsdorf agreed with Ms. Thornton that the work being done is worthwhile and the fact that it has a long history., ~~but she is not sure this is how the Commission should spend dollars at this time.~~

Mr. Hanson moved and Mr. Andersen seconded the motion to approve the minutes with the above change noted. Carried unanimously.

Financial Statements

Mr. Hanson presented the Treasurers Report as of June 19, 2003. The current balances are as follows:

Checking Account Balance	\$356,290.67
Investment Account	0.00
<hr/>	
TOTAL GENERAL FUND BALANCE	\$356,290.67
Construction Account Balance	\$847,958.56
Commercial Paper (due 9/16/03)	298,832.33
Commercial Paper (due 8/29/03)	97,991.18
Commercial Paper (due 8/29/03)	97,991.18
Commercial Paper (due 8/29/03)	97,991.18
Commercial Paper (due 8/29/03)	97,991.18
Commercial Paper (due 8/29/03)	97,991.18
Commercial Paper (due 7/16/03)	199,259.22
<hr/>	
TOTAL CONSTRUCTION ACCOUNT BALANCE	\$1,836,006.01

The Treasurers report was accepted as presented and ordered to be filed subject to audit.

Presentation of Invoices to be Paid

The following invoices were presented for approval:

1. The second and final invoice was received from Malloy Montague Karnowski Radosevich & Co., P.A. in the amount of \$1,040 for preparation of the annual audit report.

Mr. Hanson moved and Ms. Thornton 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 3, 2003 through June 6, 2003, in the amount of \$25,007.66.

Mr. Hanson 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 the Metropolitan Council for the 2003 citizen volunteer monitoring program (CAMP) in the amount of \$2,750.

Mr. Hanson moved and Mr. Vander Top 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 Phil Belfiori, Minnesota Board of Water & Soil Resources. Mr. Belfiori replaced Doug Snyder, former Board Conservationist for BWSR. Mr. Belfiori has worked with BWSR for the past seven years and works with all the watershed districts and WMOs statewide as well as the metro area. He commended the Commission for making the transition to citizen commissioners and for keeping key links to city councils and staff.

Mr. Belfiori said the Minor Plan Amendment was received. BWSR will most likely wait until the 45-day review period is ended before formally responding to the Commission.

The Second Generation Plan is required under the state's Surface Water Management Act, which is the statute that drives financing for water quality projects in the plan. Mr. Belfiori offered to act as a mediator, if necessary, to help resolve some of the funding differences and objections associated with the capital improvements program of the plan. He also encouraged the Commission to rely on their staff and commended Mr. LeFevere and Mr. Kremer for their knowledge statewide in helping to settle concerns associated with the plan. BWSR is interested in having successful organizations at the local level and Mr. Belfiori praised the Commission as being one of those organizations.

2. A request for city council action from the Minneapolis Department of Public Works regarding a resolution recommending that Bassett Creek Water Management Commission fund its capital projects through an ad valorem tax was received from the city of Minneapolis.
3. Correspondence was received from the Metropolitan Council stating the Minor Plan Amendment for Medicine Lake projects is consistent with the Council's *Water Resources Management Policy Plan*. The Council also made note of completion of the Commission's Second Generation Plan later this year.
4. The Metropolitan Council submitted two intergovernmental agreements for the Chair's signature for the 2003 volunteer lake monitoring program (CAMP).
5. Correspondence was received from Hennepin County Department of Environmental Services notifying the Commission of its 2003 Waste Abatement Incentive Grants.
6. The Minnetonka Part I Wellhead Protection Plan was received in electronic format. The commissioners can contact Mr. Kremer if they would like to see a copy.
7. An e-mail communication was received from Mr. Yaeger stating that the city of Minnetonka supports the ad valorem tax for capital projects. Mr. Yaeger was unable to attend the meeting and wanted to communicate that Minnetonka would vote in favor of the tax should the Commission vote on the funding issue for the capital improvements program at this meeting.

Citizen Input on Non-Agenda Items:

1. Ms. Christian said there is an opportunity to attend a free education program sponsored by the Metropolitan Council concerning population growth, development, and storm water runoff. The program will take place on Wednesday, June 25. Ms. Christian will forward the e-mail announcement to the Commission recorder if anyone is interested in attending.
2. Ms. Christian shared statistics on total suspended solids from a letter from the Association of Medicine Lake Area Citizens (AMLAC) that was submitted to the city of Plymouth concerning the planned construction of the wet detention ponds BC-98 and BC-107 on Medicine Lake. She believes because these two projects are on the Commission's draft capital improvements program that will be included in the Second Generation Plan, the Commission should help fund them whether it be through the ad valorem tax or not. Ms. Christian also mentioned that the city of Plymouth has funded almost 50% of the total costs of the Commission over the past 20 years and believes the Commission should be mindful of that commitment.
3. Ms. Christian distributed the AMLAC spring newsletter that includes an article of the sedimentation span that is occurring at the Highway 169 runoff area. AMLAC has kept a photo journal from 1996 through 2003 that shows the sedimentation span from this area. Ms. Christian said that about 47,000 pounds of suspended solids goes into Medicine Lake every year from BC-107.

Counsel:

1. A news release was received from the National Park Service called "This Boat is for the Birds!" announcing the National Park Service Birding Boat tours. The Birding Boat departs from Boom Island in Minneapolis on June 11, July 9, August 27, and September 27. In St. Paul, the Birding Boat will leave Harriet Island on May 31, July 14, August 10, August 13, and September 24. For more information contact National Park Ranger Charlie Maguire at 651-290-3030, ext. 230.
2. The National Park Service newsletter, *National River News*, was received for information purposes.

Corps of Engineers:

No communications.

Commissioners:

No communications.

Engineer:

1. Correspondence was received from the Minnesota Department of Transportation to the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency in response to the action the MPCA is taking on the Highway 100 erosion control issues. Mn/DOT indicates in the letter that the contractor was responsible for obtaining the permit. This was the first contract where Mn/DOT made it the contractor's responsibility to apply for a NPDES/SDS general storm water permit. The permit application was not completed by the contractor and Mn/DOT was not aware that the contractor did not apply for the permit.
2. A flyer was received from the Sensible Land Use Coalition announcing a presentation called "Stormwater: All We Are Wet?" to be given on June 25, 2003. The presentation will address views from the regulated and the regulators.
3. An e-mail communication was received from the Metropolitan Council Environmental Services concerning funding for the WOMP program. During previous meetings, the Commission was informed that MCES no longer had funds available to continue with the WOMP program. At that time, the Commission decided to continue monitoring the station. Additional funding has been made available to the MCES for this program that may reduce the Commission's costs for 2003 and 2004.
4. The Minnesota Lakes Association June issue of the *Lake Bulletin* was received. The bulletin discusses permitting issues, shoreline alteration, lake clarity study, and results of a homeowners' survey.
5. An article posted in the *Duluth News Tribune* called "Water quality affects land use" discusses a lake clarity study on lakes in north-central Minnesota.
6. A copy of the TMDL Challenge agenda sponsored by the Minnesota Environmental Initiative announcing that Governor Pawlenty has been added to the agenda. Mr. Welch will be attending the conference and will give a brief update to the Commission at the next meeting.
7. Correspondence was received from the Legislative Commission on Minnesota Resources (LCMR) stating that after further consideration the funding request submitted for the Wirth Lake Improvement is denied. This grant was applied for to help fund the Wirth Lake capital improvement project as shown on the draft Second Generation Plan capital improvements program in the amount of \$150,000. There were three main features that included two water quality ponds (one on Mn/DOT

property and one on Minneapolis Park property) and treatment of the lake sediment. Several stakeholders were involved in the project. Initially, the Commission was awarded the grant; however, the state legislature cut budget dollars going to the LCMR. After additional consideration, the LCMR cut the Wirth Lake grant largely due to the fact that all of the stakeholders could not commit financially to the project because of similar budget cuts. The Wirth Lake project will therefore remain in the Second Generation Plan capital improvements program timeline. Wirth Lake is on the impaired waters list which is the focus of the MPCA TMDL program and it is possible that funds may become available through that program.

New Business

No items to report.

Old Business

1. **Breck School Synthetic Turf Fields.** This project is proposed by Breck School to modify their existing athletic fields. The area is located along Highway 100 at the South Fork of Bassett Creek, just upstream of Sweeney Lake. This area is located within the floodplain and is a site that was designed by the city of Golden Valley for temporary flood storage as part of the mitigation for drainage improvements made during the Interstate 394 construction. Over the years, many modifications have been made to this area (school expansion, ballfields, etc.) and the city of Golden Valley and Breck School have worked to minimize the impacts of those improvements on the water quality of Bassett Creek.

The current proposal is a result of the school's experiences with the athletic fields that become inundated with water and the length of time it takes for the fields to drain and become useable. The school is proposing to install synthetic turf, which will allow the fields to be used more quickly after the water drains. Breck's consultants have designed the synthetic turf so that it is not an imperious surface.

Mr. Jay Pomeroy, Landscape Architect with Anderson Johnson Associates, consultant to Breck for the project, further described the project. The soils in the project area are heavy soils. The objective is not to make the area dry out faster, but provide a turf that is able to account for the water that falls on it faster.

Mr. Kremer added the plan has been reviewed and the project will not have any adverse impacts on the floodplain and recommends approval contingent on modifications shown in the memorandum prepared for the Commission. Mr. Welch asked if there are maintenance or life span issues associated with the turf. Mr. Pomeroy said the maintenance is minimal and there is an 8-year warranty on the product so if puddling occurs, it will be a warranty issue. These types of turf fields have only been in existence for about 6 years.

Mr. Hanson moved and Mr. Andersen seconded the motion to approve the project contingent on the modifications shown in the engineer's memorandum to the Commission. Carried unanimously.

2. **Budget Committee Report.** The budget committee met for a second time on Thursday, May 29, 2003, and consensus was reached within the committee to propose a budget amount of \$376,656 for 2004. Mr. Kremer gave the following details associated with the budget:

- ?? Overall, the 2003 budget and expected expenditures will be in balance in 2003; however, there is a projected \$30,000 budget deficit in Planning by year-end 2003 due to overruns in preparation of the Second Generation Plan. It is expected that about \$90,000 for Planning will be spent during 2003.
- ?? The amount budgeted for erosion/sediment (maintenance project) in 2003 is \$50,000 and it is projected that \$25,000 would not be spent during 2003.
- ?? The 2003 contingency budget amount of \$15,000 will most likely not be spent.

The first budget proposed was \$480,000. The budget committee set a goal to establish the 2004 budget as close to the 2003 assessment (\$358,000) as possible. Therefore many areas in the first budget proposal were reduced or eliminated.

- ?? Water Quality: The largest item modified was water quality where four lakes were proposed to be monitored in 2004 for a cost of about \$50,000. This monitoring was eliminated.
- ?? Planning: The Second Generation Plan formal review will take place in 2004 for a projected total of \$45,000.
- ?? The budget for legal services was reduced in both Planning and Administrative areas.
- ?? Website improvements and Watershed Partners were added to the Public Relations budget item.
- ?? Demonstration Projects was reduced to \$1,000 from \$5,000.
- ?? Contingencies were reduced to \$10,000 from \$15,000.

The principal difference in funds that were available in 2003 and that will not be in 2004 was the \$66,500 transferred from the construction account to the administrative account in 2003. Historically, the construction account borrowed money from the administrative account during the flood control project. The administrative account has been fully reimbursed so the Commission no longer has those funds available to help fund the administrative budget. Traditionally, the Commission has also held a budget reserve of \$100,000. Parenthetically, Mr. O'Toole believes an organization like the Commission would be served best if it had six months of its annual expenditures and considers the \$100,000 on the low side.

The budget committee did not include budget for water quality monitoring in 2004 and the committee agreed to discuss the water quality item with the Commission. Although dollars are allocated for programs such as the CAMP, WOMP, River Watch, and Watershed Partners that contribute to water quality, Mr. Welch would like to see some amount budgeted for water quality in 2004 to keep it in the forefront of the budget. Mr. Welch suggested moving \$5,000 from the contingency budget to the water quality monitoring line item. Ms. Langsdorf shares Mr. Welch's concern and is in favor of moving \$5,000 from the contingency line item to fund water quality monitoring in 2004. Moving some of the contingency budget to water quality monitoring will mean there will not be as much money available for unforeseen events. Mr. Kremer said there were three lakes (Northwood, Sweeney, and Twin lakes) proposed to be monitored in 2004. If there were \$10,000 in the water quality monitoring budget, one of the three lakes and possibly two of the lakes could be monitored if the level of sampling was reduced. Mr. Andersen asked why not move all of the contingency dollars (\$10,000) into water quality if there is a reserve amount in place that is not assigned a specific line item. Mr. LeFevere clarified the need for some budget to remain in the contingency line item. It is an amount set aside to cover unexpected expenses without invading the reserve and hopefully the contingency amount will be enough so that the reserve will not have to be used and can be carried over to the next year.

Ms. Ginny Black, Plymouth city council member, commented that all budgets of the member cities will be reduced in 2004 thereby reducing the amount of effort the member cities will be contributing toward water quality monitoring. Ms. Black added that the proposed 2004 budget does not reflect what is taking place in the watershed with respect to water quality projects and that the Commission needs to have a broader perspective that includes what the cities may also be doing.

Mr. LeSuer said cities are cutting back and eliminating some programs and he is not sure it makes sense at this time to put dollars into water quality for an eventuality. Mr. Welch is suggesting moving dollars to the water quality line item because the Commission's essential mission is to improve water quality. The Commission has been lengthening the monitoring cycle of the lakes in an effort to save funds. Mr. Kremer said the water quality programs mentioned earlier (WOMP, CAMP, River Watch, Watershed Partners) are educational and it is possible that the \$5,000 water quality budget item might be best used in collaborating with communities that are collecting data or supplementing community programs.

Mr. Welch moved and Ms. Langsdorf seconded the motion to amend the proposed 2004 budget by reducing the 2004 contingency budget item to \$5,000 (originally \$10,000) and moving \$5,000 to water quality monitoring and adopt the administrative budget and assessment total of \$376,656 for 2004. Carried unanimously.

3. **Governance Study Subcommittee.** Ms. Thornton recommended that the Commission adopt a resolution encouraging the member cities of the Commission to study the issue of governance for the BCWMC versus a subcommittee set up by the Commission. Ms. Peterson agrees there is a conflict of interest for the Commission to conduct the study itself.

Mr. LeFevere said the only way the Joint Powers Agreement can be changed is through a unanimous decision by the member cities. The cities are free to meet and decide to change the JPA without a resolution by the Commission.

The three options for discussion are: (a) the Commission forms a subcommittee, (b) the cities initiate the governance study, or (c) the Commission adopts a resolution encouraging the cities to study the governance issue. Ms. Black said Plymouth has talked with the cities of Golden Valley, Minnetonka, New Hope, Robbinsdale, and Minneapolis asking them if they would be interested in discussing the governance of the Commission. Ms. Black made it clear that the reason for the meeting among the cities is for discussion purposes only and not to come to agreement on any proposed changes at this time. It is Ms. Black's preference that the concerns could be resolved within the Commission and feels it is important for the commissioners to be involved in the member cities' meeting.

Mr. LeSuer said there is an opportunity for the Commission to be included in the discussions if the Commission initiates the study by adopting a resolution encouraging the member cities to study the governance issue and stated that including the Commission in those discussions could be made part of the resolution.

Ms. Langsdorf added that after discussions with Crystal's city council, Crystal indicated that although they would want to be involved in the discussion, they would not look favorably upon a change in the JPA.

After talking with New Hope's Mayor Peter Enck, Mr. Vander Top said Mayor Enck believes it needs discussion and would like to see the Commission involved in those discussions.

Because of the shortage of time, Mr. Welch proposed to table a decision on the governance study until the next Commission meeting and asked Mr. LeFevere and Mr. Belfiori to give feedback concerning this issue and should the cities come to a impasse, what would happen to the Commission.

Mr. LeFevere said a deadlock vote does not disband the Commission, only if the member cities agree unanimously to dissolve the BCWMC. If the Commission is disbanded by the member cities, Hennepin County will then form a watershed district and appoint managers to the district. Regarding a change in governance, there are other JPA WMOs that have different voting structures. Mr. LeFevere recommends that the Commission not be put in a position of taking responsibility for the outcome of the governance discussions by the member cities. The Commission can acknowledge that a change has to be made at the local level and if there are discussions, ask that the cities respectfully consider including interested members of the Commission.

Mr. Hanson asked if the governance issue is tabled, maybe the Commission should consider tabling the capital improvements program funding discussions also because they are tied together. Mr. Belfiori said the minor plan amendment would need to be resubmitted for formal review if the funding mechanism is changed from the ad valorem tax. BWSR also requires a compliant and signed joint powers agreement be submitted prior to the second generation plan approval because the JPA allows the authority to implement the capital improvements program, financing, etc. If the Commission is contemplating a change in the joint powers agreement, this process can coincide with the formal approval process of the Second Generation Plan.

Ms. Thornton moved and Mr. Vander Top seconded the motion to prepare and adopt a resolution encouraging the member cities of the BCWMC Joint Powers Agreement to study the governance of the BCWMC and that members of the Commission be included in the discussions. Upon a call of the roll, the motion failed with four cities (Golden Valley, New Hope, Plymouth, and Robbinsdale) in favor of the motion, four cities (Crystal, Medicine Lake, Minneapolis, and St. Louis Park) against the motion, and one not represented (Minnetonka).

Chair O'Toole asked if the member cities would consider inviting him to the meeting when the member cities discuss the governance issue.

4. **Second Generation Plan – Capital Improvements Program Funding.** At the previous meeting, the commissioners were charged to discuss the funding mechanism for the CIP with their respective cities and get agreement on using the ad valorem taxing authority through the county or assessing the member cities. The current recommendation made to the Commission by the Steering Committee is to use the ad valorem tax through the county. The member cities offered the following comments:

- ?? New Hope submitted a resolution in support of 100% Commission funding using the ad valorem tax.
- ?? Plymouth city council voted no to the ad valorem tax.
- ?? Crystal city council supports the ad valorem tax because of extreme financial pressures on the city.
- ?? Robbinsdale city council voted against the ad valorem tax.
- ?? St. Louis Park city council voted in favor of the ad valorem tax.
- ?? Golden Valley city council voted no to the ad valorem tax.
- ?? Medicine Lake city council voted in favor of the ad valorem tax.
- ?? The Minneapolis Department of Public Works submitted a request for city council committee action approving a resolution in support of 100% Commission funding using the ad valorem tax.
- ?? Minnetonka (not represented at this meeting) submitted their position by e-mail in support of the ad valorem tax.

The JPA does not allow for proxy votes. The Commission's vote on the funding mechanism only directs the Commission's engineer to identify the funding mechanism for CIP in the Second Generation Plan and move the plan forward.

Mr. Vander Top moved and Mr. Andersen seconded the motion that the Second Generation Plan capital improvements program be funded by the BCWMC and that the funding source be levied through the Hennepin County ad valorem tax. Upon a call of the roll, the motion was passed with five yes votes (Crystal, Medicine Lake, Minneapolis, New Hope, and St. Louis Park) and three no votes (Golden Valley, Plymouth, and Robbinsdale), and one not represented (Minnetonka).

Mr. Kremer asked who should receive a copy of the draft plan. The Commission directed the engineer to send the draft plan to the Commission, the Technical Advisory Committee, the Policy Advisory Group, and to post the plan on the website. The Commission will discuss the draft Second Generation Plan at the Commission's August meeting and decide if more informal input is necessary or if the plan is ready to be sent out and begin the formal review process.

[At this point, Chair O'Toole left the meeting and turned the discussion over to Vice Chair Welch to continue and conclude the meeting.]

5. **Minor Plan Amendment – Medicine Lake.** At the direction of the Commission, the Commission engineer submitted a minor plan amendment to BWSR and other review agencies for the Medicine Lake projects that is intended to allow county tax levy funding to be used for the project. Mr. LeFevere outlined three procedures to follow simultaneously:

?? **The plan amendment procedure.** The Commission approved the submission of the minor plan amendment submitted on May 23, 2003 to the review agencies. After the 45-day review period, it will be decided if it complies with the requirements of state statutes for a minor plan amendment. If the plan amendment is denied, the projects continue in the Second Generation Plan CIP process.

A Public Meeting notice is issued 14 and 7 days prior to the meeting. The public meeting is to explain the minor plan amendment. The meeting could occur as early as the Commission's July meeting. In order for an amendment to qualify as a minor plan amendment, it has to be approved by the Hennepin County Board.

?? **A Public Hearing is scheduled.** The public hearing procedure is necessary in order to receive legal authority to send the bill to the county. Subsequently, the county will hold its own public hearing. A public hearing notice will again be required to be issued prior to the Commission's public hearing. After this hearing, the Commission has the authority to adopt findings of fact and certify to the county the tax levy.

?? **A second Public Hearing is required** under the Joint Powers Agreement with public notice only to the member cities.

The two public hearings can take place at the same time. The county may take action at their August 5th meeting allowing the Commission to conduct the two hearings at its August 21st meeting and adopt the necessary resolutions at that time. Mr. LeFevere said the Commission will need to first decide when to conduct the public meeting.

Mr. Welch asked how taking the Medicine Lake projects from the current draft CIP will affect the disbursement of payments from the total CIP. Mr. Kremer said that removing the Medicine Lake projects from the current CIP amounts to about \$800,000 of future obligations and using an ad valorem tax levy to pay for the projects. Plymouth would be reimbursed by the county in October 2004.

Ms. Thornton said Plymouth’s city council voted in favor of the minor plan amendment, but opposed the method of funding. However, Ms. Black said that Plymouth wants the project done and will accept the ad valorem tax as a way of funding and reimbursement of this project only in order to move the project ahead.

Ms. Christian stated that, speaking as a citizen, whether the project is funded by the ad valorem tax or not, Plymouth citizens have funded almost 50% of the Commission’s budget since its inception. She said it appears that the funds for the Medicine Lake projects will be funded through an ad valorem tax whether Plymouth agrees with it or not therefore the city of Plymouth is still paying for their own project because of the high percentage it contributes toward the Commission.

Mr. Vander Top moved and Ms. Thornton seconded the motion to set the Public Meeting for July 17, 2003, and direct Commission staff to arrange for the proper publications. Carried unanimously.

July Meeting

1. The following agenda items are scheduled for the Commission’s July meeting:
 - Public Meeting – Minor Plan Amendment

Adjournment

It was moved by Mr. Hanson and seconded by Ms. Thornton to adjourn the meeting. Vice Chair Welch adjourned the meeting at 2:30 p.m.

John O’Toole, Chair

Pat Schutrop, Recorder

Bill Yaeger, Secretary

Date: _____