



# **Bassett Creek Water Management Commission**

## **Minutes of the Meeting of August 21, 2003**

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

The Bassett Creek Water Management Commission was called to order at 12:00 Noon, Thursday, August 21, 2003, 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, David Hanson, 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 Vincent Vander Top	
<i>Plymouth</i>	Commissioner Elizabeth Thornton	
<i>Robbinsdale</i>	Commissioner Karla Peterson	
<i>St. Louis Park</i>	Commissioner Paul (PJ) Andersen	

**Also present:** Jan LeSuer, Alternate Commissioner, city of Golden Valley  
Karla Anderson, Alternate Commissioner, city of Plymouth  
Tom Mathisen, BCWMC Technical Advisory Committee, city of Crystal  
Ron Quanbeck, BCWMC Technical Advisory Committee, city of Plymouth  
William Deblon, BCWMC Technical Advisory Committee, city of Robbinsdale  
Kelly MacIntyre, BCMWC Technical Advisory Committee, city of Minneapolis  
Alison Fong, BCWMC Technical Advisory Committee, city of Minneapolis  
Jeannine Clancy, BCWMC Technical Advisory Committee, city of Golden Valley  
Jeff Oliver, BCWMC Technical Advisory Committee, city of Golden Valley  
Carlton Moore, BCWMC Technical Advisory Committee, city of St. Louis Park  
Lee Gustafson, Steering Committee Chair, city of Minnetonka  
Ginny Black, City Council Member, city of Plymouth  
Mayor Linda Loomis, city of Golden Valley  
Nancy Azzam, Golden Valley League of Women Voters  
Jack Frost, Metropolitan Council  
David Donnelly, Hennepin Conservation District  
Paul Fry, citizen  
Paul Thomas, Pioneer Engineering

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

The minutes of the July 17, 2003 meeting were presented. Ms. Langsdorf moved and Ms. Thornton seconded the motion to approve the minutes. Carried unanimously.

## **Financial Statements**

Mr. Hanson presented the Treasurers Report as of August 21, 2003. The current balances are as follows:

<u>Checking Account Balance</u>	<u>\$285,353.15</u>
<b>TOTAL GENERAL FUND BALANCE</b>	<b>\$285,353.15</b>
Construction Account Balance	\$652,103.93
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 9/16/03)	298,832.33
Commercial Paper (due 12/26/03)	99,000.00
Commercial Paper (due 12/26/03)	99,000.00
Commercial Paper (due 12/26/03)	99,000.00
Commercial Paper (due 01/26/04)	99,000.00
<u>TOTAL CONSTRUCTION ACCOUNT BALANCE</u>	<u>\$1,836,892.16</u>

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

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

Prior to the presentation of invoices, Chair O'Toole asked that future invoices from the Commission staff break out fees associated with the proposed 1990 water management plan amendment to track expenses for reimbursement that are currently allocated from the Commission's administrative budget and paid for the proposed Medicine Lake water quality improvement project as outlined in the minor plan amendment. Mr. LeSuer asked the Commission to continue to maintain scrutiny as the costs associated with the minor plan amendment come up.

The following invoices were presented for approval:

1. An invoice was received from Barr Engineering Company for professional services during the period July 5, 2003 through August 8, 2003, in the amount of \$31,979.41.

Mr. Hanson moved and Mr. Andersen 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 Kennedy and Graven for professional services during the Second Quarter 2003 (through June 30, 2003) in the amount of \$7,378.95.

Mr. Hanson 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. Correspondence was received from Hennepin County Department of Environmental Services summarizing the Board's directives regarding the implementation process and anticipated activities concerning the provision of conservation services in Hennepin County.
2. Correspondence was received from the City of Minneapolis concerning the creation of a water quality task force. Minneapolis is asking for a representative to participate on the task force. The time commitment would be attending 6 to 10 meetings over the next year.

Chair O'Toole asked Mr. Welch (or perhaps Mr. McRoberts, alternate commissioner) if he would attend an early meeting or two to determine how much involvement would be beneficial for the Commission and the Commission staff. If the Commission decides that it would be beneficial for engineering staff to participate, Mr. Kremer would recommend Jeff Lee, a former city of Minneapolis Parks and Recreation Board staff person, to attend the task force. Mr. Lee was essentially the water quality expert for the city of Minneapolis. The cost to the Commission would be approximately \$1,000 to have engineering staff attend.

Mr. Welch would like to contact Pat Wrase, city of Minneapolis, to gather more information concerning the schedule and report back to the Commission at the September meeting.

Chair O'Toole requested Mr. Welch to find out more about the time commitment and meeting scheduling to determine whether Mr. Welch could attend on behalf of the Commission.

*Citizen Input on Non-Agenda Items:*

No communications.

*Counsel:*

1. Mr. LeFevere attended a meeting with a number of Hennepin County staff people (e.g., county attorney, county auditor, county administrator, etc.) to determine the procedure for implementation of the watershed district tax associated with the minor plan amendment funding with an ad valorem tax. The county is ready to move ahead should the Commission decide to use the tax levy to fund the project.

*Corps of Engineers:*

No communications.

*Commissioners:*

1. Ms. Anderson informed the Commission of an environmental education event sponsored by the Association of Medicine Lake Area Citizens that will take place on September 6, from 4:00 p.m. to sunset, at the Medicine Lake East Beach.
2. Ms. Anderson introduced David Donnelly, new Vice Chair of the Hennepin Conservation District.
3. Mr. Welch met with a teacher from Anwatin Middle School who was interested in connecting the school's environmental education program with the Commission's activities.
4. Mr. Welch reported that the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency has a new water quality data website. He will send the website link to the Commission recorder to be routed with the next meeting packet.

5. Mr. Welch updated the Commission on the progress of the impaired waters stakeholder process. The core group has expanded to 16 members and is on track to produce a policy framework in January/February 2004 to present to the state legislature. Mr. Steve Morse, former Winona legislator, is the contracted facilitator for the work.

Mr. Kremer reviewed the list of impaired waters and noted that at one time both Wirth Lake and Medicine Lake were on the list. Medicine Lake has been removed and Plymouth Creek has been added. The process discussed by the core group mentioned by Mr. Welch will direct the MPCA how to handle the impaired waters. Ms. Ginny Black added that AMLAC requested the MPCA reconsider Medicine Lake for phosphorus levels to see if the lake could be added to the list and possibly qualify the lake for grant money, if available, to help fund the lake improvements.

Chair O'Toole asked if the Commission should take a position on AMLAC's request for Medicine Lake to be reconsidered by the MPCA. Ms. Thornton suggested gathering more information before voicing a position for or against Medicine Lake being added. Mr. Yaeger suggested the Commission investigate what the value is for a lake to be included on the impaired waters list.

Mr. Kremer said the MPCA takes the data from a program that stores all state water quality data provided by Hennepin Parks. The data is then reviewed according to the MCPA cutoff requirements. Mr. Kremer thought the requirements for phosphorus was an average of 40 mg/L over a year. In the past, phosphorus levels in Medicine Lake were higher than the 40 mg/L; however, over the last couple of years Medicine Lake measured below that number. Mr. Kremer said there could be a number of reasons for the decrease (e.g., drought). In the case of Wirth Lake, the city of Minneapolis collected the data and submitted to the MPCA. The levels in Wirth Lake also were higher than the cutoff qualifying it as impaired water. Mr. Kremer said the Commission would have many more water bodies considered impaired if the data were submitted to the MPCA (i.e., Sweeney Lake and several smaller lakes). Some believe that the information should be made available to the MCPA in order to access grant money if it becomes available. Others believe that there may be a set of rules required by the MPCA in order to collect grant money and therefore do not want to submit their data to the MPCA.

Ms. Langsdorf asked what the cities interests are and would there be a difference in property value if a lake is on the impaired list? Ms. Black said that although AMLAC made the request to add Medicine Lake to the impaired waters list, that may not be the position of the city of Plymouth. The Commission has been collecting data on the lakes every 3 or 4 years of the past 20 years. This data might be 3 to 5 years old, but it is available. Mr. Kremer stated that the TMDL process is not yet known. In the past, there was very little grant funds available and if a lake was on the impaired waters list, there was a chance that an organization would be given a schedule as to when the impaired water had to be addressed without resources given to help. The process for the current program has not been defined and it is not known at this time if a time frame will be part of the policy framework.

Mr. Quanbeck reported that there was not a schedule given to the Shingle Creek WMO as to when to address the chloride issue, but Shingle Creek offered to do it now to help shape the TMDL process. Many WMOs and watershed districts that have lakes on the impaired waters list have taken the initiative to study and determine how to restore the lake in order to control the process.

Mr. Yaeger is not in favor of submitting the Bassett Creek WMO's water quality data to the MPCA if it could possibly add the MPCA as a third party to the decision making process as to when a water quality improvement has to be done.

Ms. Thornton added since Plymouth Creek has been added to the impaired waters list and it is the biggest source into Medicine Lake, that may allow for the possibility of funding should any become available. Impaired biota is the reason Plymouth Creek was added to the impaired waters list.

The Commission decided not to take any further action as this time.

6. Mr. Andersen pointed out that the MPCA is requiring a construction stormwater permit for projects disturbing 1 acre or more. This is a change from the past requirement where a permit was required for construction disturbing 5 acres or more.

*Engineer:*

1. A draft copy of the June 24-25, 2003 rainfall report was discussed at the Commission's July meeting. A final version of the report was included in the meeting packet for this meeting. The report was discussed later in the meeting.

## ***New Business***

No New Business items.

## ***Old Business***

1. **Medicine Lake Water Quality Ponds: Plymouth.** The city of Plymouth has reviewed alternatives for its water quality ponds along the southwest shore of Medicine Lake that are part of the minor plan amendment to the *Bassett Creek Water Management Plan (1990)*. Questions were raised regarding the size of the pond (BC-107) and whether it could be enlarged. Plymouth requested its consultant to look at several additional options in an effort to increase the effectiveness of the pond located adjacent to the city's East Beach Park. The city found that it is feasible to use part of the parking lot and increase the size of the pond to improve the amount of material that can be removed. Plymouth city council supports the expansion of the pond and would like to incorporate this into the plan amendment as long as the process of amending the plan is not delayed.

The costs would be the main concern. At this point, Mr. LeFevere was reluctant to increase the amount requested from Hennepin County (\$880,100). Costs added to the project costs included Commission legal, engineering, and administrative expenditures plus the cost of dredging at the outlets of these storm sewers going into the lake. There may be some flexibility in the project total costs if the dredging costs were removed and done as a future project. In addition, Mr. Kremer talked with Mr. Quanbeck about other possible contributors to the project.

In the past, when State Highway 169 was a county highway (Co. Rd. 18), the cities of Plymouth and Golden Valley and Hennepin County contributed money to remove the sediment that had accumulated at the outlets in Medicine Lake. Mr. Kremer recalled that Hennepin County paid 50% of the costs and the cities paid the other 50%. The Commission's involvement included writing the letter to Hennepin County requesting their participation.

In a current discussion with Mr. Quanbeck, Mr. Kremer asked if Plymouth had contacted the Minnesota Department of Transportation (because County Road 18 is now State Highway 169) about a possible contribution from Mn/DOT to at least remove the sediment and also to consider the possibility of a contribution toward the ponds. Mr. Quanbeck is in the process of setting up a meeting with Mn/DOT to discuss these two items.

Looking at the options presented in Plymouth's recent amendment to the minor plan amendment, Mr. Quanbeck said that four options were originally looked at. Three additional options were reviewed by the city. Initially, Option 3 was selected because Plymouth's budget was \$600,000 and this option was the most cost-effective option for the city. After evaluating the total phosphorus removed and associated costs, the city favored Option 8 because it would remove more sediment at a lower cost than Option 3 and because the funds will be raised outside of Plymouth's budgeted amount, Plymouth would like to do the most cost-effective and efficient removal option as possible.

Chair O'Toole asked Mr. LeFevere what these variations will have on the minor plan amendment. Mr. LeFevere said that the environmental staff of Hennepin County will be accommodating of minor changes and recommends changes be communicated to the county.

Mr. Yaeger asked why the other options were not proposed before the minor plan amendment was drafted and would personally not be in favor of making changes to the minor plan amendment. Mr. Kremer likens the changes proposed to changes that will occur from the time a feasibility study is prepared to the preparation of the final project plans and specifications. The county is aware that these types of changes will most likely occur and will readily accept if the project costs remain under the total project costs given to them. Ms. Black added that she personally believes the Plymouth's city council would be open to consider a partnering arrangement with the dredging portion of the project. Ms. Thornton pointed out that Medicine Lake is the headwaters for Bassett Creek and that Highway 169 is the boundary for Plymouth and the sediment coming into the new pond will be coming from both sides of the highway.

Mr. LeSuer asked that it be noted that the first thing discussed on the project was the difference in whether the local government is more scrupulous and paying attention to costs versus the wider organization. With an organization such as the Commission, there is a collective body of wisdom and points of view to help fine tune decisions.

Assuming the Commission moves ahead, Chair O'Toole asked the Commission staff to report on how the details of the project administration, etc. will work out. Mr. LeFevere said many details would need to be worked out within the framework of a contract with the city of Plymouth. The concept is that Plymouth will front-end construction expenses and will not be reimbursed until the tax settlement is received in the fall of 2004. That is when the Commission and Plymouth will be reimbursed for project expenses incurred. Mr. Kremer added that the Commission has contracted with a number of the cities (Golden Valley, Plymouth, and Minneapolis) in the past to do water quantity work and those contracts can be reviewed to develop an outline of the process for the next Commission meeting.

2. **Draft Resolution for the Minor Plan Amendment.** The draft resolution was presented for the Commission's consideration and discussion. This is the next step in the implementation process of the water quality projects as outlined in the minor plan amendment. The Minnesota Board of Water and Soil Resources, Hennepin County, and the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources has approved the minor plan amendment. Mr. Yaeger asked if the dredging portion of the project will be included as part of the project as described in the minor plan amendment resolution that will be adopted today. Mr. LeFevere clarified that the resolution adopting the minor plan amendment identifies the water quality projects, the cost, and that the costs will be paid for by a county tax levy in the watershed.

Mr. Gustafson added that the dredging option is included in Plymouth's feasibility study and could be included as part of the bid costs so that the Commission will have an idea what dredging costs will be to help determine if a delay of the dredging is necessary.

Mr. Welch said one of the benefits of formulating a collaborative process with the affected cities and on a watershed-wide basis is the best product in treating water quality. Mr. Kremer said Plymouth's feasibility study did examine costs per ton of removal and focused on efficiency. Mr. Quanbeck restated that it is his understanding that the city of Plymouth can move ahead with the design of the project and, assuming the project is ordered by the Commission at the public heading in September, the costs of that design will be included as part of the projects costs and be reimbursed to the city. Mr. LeFevere does not believe there is a ban against Plymouth moving ahead with the project design. A two-thirds vote of the Commission will be necessary to go ahead with the project and reimbursement will be subject to a negotiated contract, but advises those kinds of preliminary expenses can be reimbursed as part of the project costs. Chair O'Toole asked the city to be conscientious of the costs.

Ms. Thornton moved and Mr. Yaeger seconded the motion to approve the minor plan amendment resolution. Carried unanimously.

Chair O'Toole asked Commission staff to set up a meeting with the Minnesota Department of Transportation to discuss the rationale with Mn/DOT concerning financial contributions toward the project. Mr. Quanbeck will also attend the meeting with Mn/DOT.

3. **June 24-25, 2003 Rainfall Event.** A draft memorandum was prepared by Barr Engineering and distributed at the Commission's July meeting outlining the performance of many of the features constructed during the Flood Control Project. A final version of the memorandum was included in the August meeting packet for the Commission's information. Mr. Kremer suggested that a letter be sent to the Flood Control Project partners indicating that a flood event occurred that was greater than the design criteria of the Flood Control Project and the system performed well.

Chair O'Toole directed the Commission engineer to prepare letters under the Chair's signature informing the project partners that the features constructed as part of the Flood Control Project performed as designed and include a copy of the rainfall memorandum with the letters.

4. **Common Bond/Wesley Commons Creek Bank Stabilization: Golden Valley.** The city of Golden Valley requested a review of a bank stabilization and erosion control plan along the Main Stem of Bassett Creek. The Commission previously reviewed the overall Wesley Commons and Common Bond projects in June 2000 and September 2001. The current request is for approval of the bank stabilization plan along Bassett Creek adjacent to the area identified as "future area" upstream of Winnetka Avenue. The project includes installation of a concrete gabion system (modular concrete block wall) to protect a severely eroded stream bank. Riprap is not appropriate for this site due to the steep slopes that require protection and due to an existing adjacent retaining wall that supports the Common Bond development.

The city of Golden Valley discussed the aesthetics of the gabion system with the project developer and requested that the color of the gabion system blend in with the existing retaining wall.

Mr. Kremer said the peak discharges are minimized in this particular reach with the construction of the Wisconsin Avenue control structure. Because this volume has been discharged through this reach of the creek over a long period of time, the velocity of the discharge can be predicted along the wall. Bedding material will be placed behind the gabion system to further deter erosion transferring to other locations of the channel. In addition, Mr. Oliver added that the proximity of the project to Winnetka Avenue further reduces the risk of transferring erosion scour to the other side of the bank or downstream.

Mr. Andersen moved and Mr. Yaeger seconded the motion to approve the project contingent on the conditions stated in the Commission engineer’s memorandum to the Commission. Carried unanimously.

5. Meeting Time Discussion. Until 1983, the Commission met at 7:00 p.m. at the city of Golden Valley. When the Commission found that it was difficult getting a meeting quorum during the evening, the Commission decided to change the meetings to 12:00 Noon and changed the meeting location to the Minneapolis or Golden Valley Golf Club for lunch to encourage attendance. In 1996, the Commission moved the noon hour meetings to the city of Golden Valley. There were also some occasional special meetings held around 5:00 p.m.

Meeting options for the Commission to consider are:

- ? 6:00 p.m. or 7:00 p.m.
- ? 11:30 a.m.
- ? 12:00 Noon - status quo
- ? 4:00 p.m.
- ? Shorten meeting procedure (e.g., cover more items administratively)

Mr. Mathisen chairs the Shingle Creek WMO and said Shingle Creek currently meets at noon and is reconsidering the meeting time. Mr. Quanbeck added that Elm Creek Watershed District recently changed its meeting time to later in the afternoon.

Mr. LeSuer said when the Commission held the public hearing for the floodproofing project in Golden Valley, he was concerned that it was difficult for many of the homeowners to attend the Commission meeting at noon. Since the Legislature changed the conditions of the Commission from staff to public participation, Mr. LeSuer asked if evenings may be a better option for citizen representatives.

Mr. Yaeger added that since he became a part of the Commission in February 2001, he does not recall not having a quorum while meeting at noon and does not think the time has been a detriment to the business of the Commission. Mr. Yaeger sees meeting at noon as an opportunity to conduct the meetings more efficiently versus meeting in the evenings, when there could be a tendency to run the meeting later.

Mr. Kremer stated that prior to the legislative change in representation on the Commission, the representatives were generally split 5/4 where the 5 members were city council members or citizens (e.g., Golden Valley, New Hope, Medicine Lake, etc.). Ms. Thornton thinks that the availability of citizens willing to participate on the Commission would be greater if the Commission met later in the day. Ms. Langsdorf suggests the commissioners be polled for their availability to attend meetings at a different time of day. Chair O’Toole agreed it is difficult to predict the best time for the meetings to take place because there will be tradeoffs.

Commissioner	Meeting Time Preference
Dave Hanson	Noon
Karla Peterson	Later afternoon (4:00 p.m.)
PJ Andersen	Noon or 4:00 p.m.
Vince Vander Top	Noon or later afternoon (not past 6:00)
Michael Welch	Noon (the only time he can attend)
Pauline Langsdorf	4:00, but willing to stay at noon to keep participation
Liz Thornton	4:00, but flexible
Bill Yaeger	Noon
John O’Toole	Noon

Mr. Vander Top noted that representatives on the Commission are generally involved in other volunteer organizations. Ms. Azzam expressed concerned about public participation attending a noon meeting and that the Commission does not seem transparent enough to see that, especially with the possibility of an ad valorem tax utilized without public input and understanding. Ms. Anderson added that she is able to attend the noon meeting because she is currently not working and is concerned about city councils trying to find commissioners and alternates to serve. Mr. Jack Frost, Metropolitan Council, is part of the Ramsey-Washington Watershed District that meets monthly at 6:00 p.m. Ramsey-Washington has a \$2 million annual budget and utilizes the ad valorem tax. It is Mr. Frost's observation that in the 10 years he has served on the board, there has been very little citizen participation.

Mr. LeFevere added that one of the reasons the Technical Advisory Committee was formed was to assist the commissioners and the time of the meeting may also affect the attendance from that committee. Mr. Mathisen said that Shingle Creek WMO is leaning toward an afternoon meeting, but he agrees with Mr. Frost's comments concerning the lack of citizen involvement regardless of the meeting time. Mr. Mathisen added that the public hearings will be held that further encourage citizen input concerning projects. He also feels that it is beneficial for city staff to attend the Commission meetings and evening meetings are more burdensome with their other responsibilities.

Chair O'Toole can be reasonably flexible and is concerned about losing any commissioner that absolutely cannot attend at a different time than 12:00 noon. Chair O'Toole also acknowledges the desire to get more public participation and that a noon meeting may not be the most convenient. One possibility is to test the 4:00 p.m. time slot and schedule a meeting at that time sometime in the future.

The consensus of the Commission is to keep the meeting time at 12:00 Noon for the time being.

6. **Second Generation Plan Update.** At the July meeting, the Commission requested a review of the plan content, the plan process, and policies included in the current Second Generation Plan prior to the start of the formal review process. A memorandum outlining the formal review process was distributed at the July meeting for the Commission's information.

Because of time restraints, Chair O'Toole suggested deferring the presentation to the September meeting. Ms. Thornton asked if it would be beneficial to create a subcommittee that pulled together cities' comments and make suggestions to the Commission. Mr. Kremer said that once the formal review process begins, comments will be received from numerous sources and at that time a process will need to be in place in order for the Commission to assimilate and prepare responses to the comments.

Volunteers for the Second Generation Plan Review Subcommittee include: Commissioners Thornton, Hanson, and Yaeger.

Mr. Gustafson suggested the Commission consider including some TAC members and commissioners to get a full perspective in the process. Mr. Andersen also suggested one or two Steering Committee members be part of the subcommittee.

Chair O'Toole requested establishment of the Second Generation Plan Response Subcommittee be listed on the September meeting agenda. Mr. Welch challenged the duplication of effort by the Commission because of the need for the commissioners to review the plan and then also review the subcommittee's efforts. Chair O'Toole said work sessions could also be a way for the Commission to

review and discuss the plan as a whole. Mr. Andersen thought that conducting work sessions after each review period might be a good idea.

Mr. Kremer suggested the Commission review the comments submitted from Plymouth representatives (Ms. Thornton, Ron Quanbeck, and Ginny Black). The comments were based on a thorough review of the plan from their perspective and prior to the Commission making a decision on the comment review process, the commissioners may want to review Plymouth’s letter to get an idea of the type of responses that will be received from the review agencies. Ms. Thornton added that the letter is not the official response from the city of Plymouth.

Mr. Welch does suggest a review structure that is efficient and at an adequate level of input. Chair O’Toole agreed that additional discussion is necessary for the Commission to determine the review process that will be effective and suggests it be discussed again at the September meeting. Mr. Hanson urged the commissioners to submit comments in writing to the Commission.

Mr. LeFevere said several levels of comments will be received and that it will be beneficial for the Commission to have a well thought-out screening process in place.

### **September Meeting**

The following agenda items are scheduled for the Commission’s September meeting:

- Public Hearing – Proposed Improvements Contained in the Minor Plan Amendment to the *Bassett Creek Water Management Plan*
- Commission Informal Review of Second Generation Plan
- Second Generation Plan Response Process

### **Adjournment**

It was moved by Ms. Langsdorf and seconded by Ms. Peterson to adjourn the meeting. Chair O’Toole adjourned the meeting at 2:05 p.m.

\_\_\_\_\_  
John O’Toole, Chair

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

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

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