



Bassett Creek Watershed Management Commission

Minutes of Regular Meeting September 18, 2014 Golden Valley City Hall, 8:30 a.m.

Commissioners and Staff Present:

Crystal	Guy Mueller, Vice President	Robbinsdale	<i>Not represented</i>
Golden Valley	Commissioner Stacy Hoschka, Treasurer	St. Louis Park	Commissioner Jim de Lambert, Chair
Medicine Lake	Commissioner Clint Carlson	Administrator	Laura Jester
Minneapolis	Commissioner Michael Welch	Attorney	Charlie LeFevere, Kennedy & Graven
Minnetonka	Commissioner Jacob Millner, Secretary	Engineer	Karen Chandler, Barr Engineering Co.
New Hope	Alternate Commissioner Pat Crough	Recorder	Amy Herbert
Plymouth	Commissioner Ginny Black		

Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Members/ Other Attendees Present:

Derek Asche, TAC, City of Plymouth	Laura Leonhardt, New Hope
Daniel Baine, New Hope Resident	Linda Loomis, Chair, Plan Steering Committee
Sandy Baine, New Hope Resident	Shawn Markham, City of New Hope,
Chris Call, Landform	Tom Mathisen, TAC, City of Crystal
David Comb, Golden Valley Resident	Richard McCoy, TAC City of Robbinsdale
LeighAnn Comb, Golden Valley Resident	Jane McDonald Black, Alternate Commissioner, City of Golden Valley
Manfred Deutsch, New Hope Resident	Mr. McKenna, City of New Hope
Marjorie Deutsch, New Hope Resident	Tony Miller, WSB & Associates
Eric Eckman, TAC, City of Golden Valley	Jake Newhall, WSB & Associates
Andrea Feldman, New Hope Resident	Jeff Oliver, TAC, City of Golden Valley
Harvey Feldman, New Hope Resident	John O'Toole, Alternate Commissioner, City of Medicine Lake
Erick Francis, TAC, City of St. Louis Park	Bob Paschke, TAC, City of New Hope
Christopher Gise, Golden Valley Resident	Tory Peterson, Perpich Center for the Arts

Jim Prom, City of Plymouth

David Tobelman, Alternate Commissioner, City of Plymouth

Brad Schleeter, Stantec

Bernie Weber, City of New Hope

Jim Spevacek, New Hope Resident

Robert White, Northwood Lake; New Hope Resident

Liz Stout, TAC, City of Minnetonka

Pete Willenbring, WSB & Associates

1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

On Thursday, September 18, 2014, at 8:36 a.m. in the Council Chambers at Golden Valley City Hall, Chair de Lambert called to order the meeting of the Bassett Creek Watershed Management Commission (BCWMC) and asked for roll call to be taken. The Cities of Minneapolis and Robbinsdale were absent from the roll call.

2. CITIZEN FORUM ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS

No items were raised.

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Commissioner Black moved to approve the agenda. Commissioner Mueller seconded the motion. Upon a vote, the motion carried 7-0 [Cities of Minneapolis and Robbinsdale absent from vote].

4. CONSENT AGENDA

Commissioner Black moved to approve the Consent Agenda. Commissioner Mueller seconded the motion. Upon a vote, the motion carried 7-0 [Cities of Minneapolis and Robbinsdale absent from vote].

[The following items were approved as part of the Consent Agenda: the August 11, 2014, Commission Workshop minutes, the August 21, 2014, Commission Meeting minutes, the monthly financial report, the payment of the invoices, Approval to set Technical Advisory Committee meeting for October 2, 2014, and Approval of Winnetka Commons Project, New Hope.]

The general and construction account balances reported in the Financial Report prepared for the September 18, 2014, meeting are as follows:

Checking Account Balance	\$602,004.10
<hr/>	
TOTAL GENERAL FUND BALANCE	\$602,004.10
<hr/>	
TOTAL CASH & INVESTMENTS ON-HAND (9/09/14)	\$3,056,153.98
<hr/>	
CIP Projects Levied – Budget Remaining	(\$2,740,073.12)
<hr/>	
Closed Projects Remaining Balance	\$316,080.86
<hr/>	

2013 Anticipated Tax Levy Revenue	\$8,756.59
2014 Anticipated Tax Levy Revenue	\$428,419.50
Anticipated Closed Project Balance	\$753,256.95

5. PUBLIC HEARING

Administrator Jester reminded the Commission that at its June 2014 meeting it approved the final feasibility study for this 2015 project to restore 1.8 miles of Bassett Creek in Golden Valley. She explained that today's public hearing is to receive public comments on the proposed project.

Chair de Lambert opened the public hearing.

Pete Willenbring of WSB & Associates said he assisted the City of Golden Valley in the development of the feasibility report for the 2015 Bassett Creek Main Stem Restoration Project. He summarized that the project is similar to other Bassett Creek restoration projects that the Commission has undertaken. He said the project runs 9,400 linear feet of creek channel from a location just west of the Golden Valley Country Club and it continues east to Douglas Drive, on the west side of Highway 100.

Mr. Willenbring described the inspection of the channel and the findings of bank failures as well as tree and canopy growth along the channel, which prevented vegetation from growing along the banks in some locations. He explained that the feasibility study provided two options for the project, depending on the restoration location. Mr. Willenbring described the first option as a soft armoring approach where the project would try to allow for more sunlight to penetrate along the creek channel and use more of a vegetative stabilization practice. He stated that the second option is more of a hard armoring approach, using more rock, which would be more present in areas where there is limited ability to shape the bank and very steep side slopes and less ability to provide light.

Mr. Willenbring said that residents need to be involved in the final design to provide input on their preferences between the two options for locations on or near their property.

Mr. Willenbring reported that right now the focus is on the option of doing soft armoring throughout the channel except in areas where light can't be provided. He said that in those areas a hybrid would be implemented and in no case is the project looking at only hard armoring without some type of vegetation.

Chair de Lambert called for additional comments. Hearing none, Chair de Lambert closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Black asked how residents are being informed about the tree removal that is part of the proposed project. Mr. Willenbring said that a public meeting with relatively good turnout was held, although not all of the residents attended that are along that reach of the channel. He said that at the meeting all of the objectives and options were presented, including the objective of removing all of the trees that are falling in or at risk of falling in to the creek. Mr. Willenbring said that those trees have been identified. He also reported that WSB and the City have just started the process of walking the properties along the channel with the residents.

Commissioner Black asked for more information on the estimated project cost, which is indicated to be between 1.3 and 1.6 million dollars. Mr. Willenbring stated that access to the sites in channel restoration projects is difficult for the contractors and the ease or difficulty of the access can vary a lot from one part of

the creek to another. Mr. Willenbring explained the bidding process can help refine the project budget. He noted that the contract documents are drafted in such a way as to provide that type of flexibility.

Commissioner Mueller asked if the project will be reviewed by any other agency. Administrator Jester responded that the Commission Engineer will review and the Commission will see the 50% plans and the 90% plans and that a permit is required for the project so the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources will comment on the plans. She added that the Commission is not taking action today because there will be a public hearing on the project at the Commission's October meeting for the cities to comment.

6. BUSINESS

A. Consider Resolution Approving Major Plan Amendment to Include 2015 CIP Project

Administrator Jester explained that in order to put the 2015 Bassett Creek Restoration Project in the Commission's CIP, the Commission went through a major plan amendment process. She reported that the Minnesota Board of Water and Soil Resources approved the Major Plan Amendment at its meeting in August. Administrator Jester stated that the final step is for the Commission to approve the Major Plan Amendment.

Commissioner Black moved to adopt Resolution 14-04 Approving Watershed Plan Amendment.

Commissioner Hoschka seconded the motion. Upon a vote, the motion carried unanimously 7-0 [Cities of Minneapolis and Robbinsdale absent from vote].

B. Consider Resolution Making Findings Pursuant to Minnesota Statutes, Section 103B.251 and Certifying Costs to Hennepin County

Commissioner Black asked how the Commission is planning to cover the costs of the upcoming CIP projects. Administrator Jester said that the Commission's precedent has been to levy for its capital projects at an amount of approximately \$1,000,000. She noted that the cost estimate for the 2015 Bassett Creek Restoration Project is \$1,300,000 - \$1,600,000 and although a more exact figure won't be known until later, it is likely that this project will be more than \$1,000,000. Administrator Jester explained that in the past in order to pay for projects and bring the levy down, the Commission has used funds from its Closed Project Account, which has an estimated balance of more than \$700,000. She added that the Commission likes to keep \$250,000 in its closed project account but not more than that amount. Administrator Jester recommended spending down the closed project account to \$250,000 and if the 2015 Bassett Creek Restoration Project funds aren't fully used, the balance would stay in the Closed Project Account.

She commented that the next two agenda items are also expensive, more than the Commission had anticipated, so the Commission may consider leaving more money in its Closed Project Account to pay for other projects. There was discussion.

Commissioner Black moved to direct staff to certify to Hennepin County the levy of \$1,000,000 for 2015 projects as laid out by the Resolution 14-05 and to approve the transfer of up to \$503,000 from the Closed Project Account as needed for the 2015 CIP project. Alternate Commissioner Crough seconded the motion.

Attorney LeFevere said that the Commission is just earmarking those Closed Project Account funds rather than transferring them. He explained that at next month's meeting, the Commission will take action on the 2015 Bassett Creek Main Stem Project and consider entering into an agreement with the City, which will identify the total reimbursable cost. Commissioner Black and Alternate Commissioner Crough indicated agreement to amending the motion to remove the direction to transfer the Closed Project Account funds. Upon a vote, the motion carried unanimously 7-0 [Cities of Minneapolis and Robbinsdale absent from vote].

C. Review Draft Feasibility Report for Northwood Lake Improvement Project (NL-1)

Administrator Jester explained that the Commission is on an accelerated timeline for its 2016 projects in order to dovetail the Golden Valley project with a street reconstruction project. She introduced New Hope Director of Public Works Bob Paschke, who introduced Brad Schleeter of Stantec.

Engineer Chandler reminded the Commission that it approved the project as part of its 2016 – 2020 CIP and that there are two separate components to this project, one on the east side of Northwood Lake and one on the west side. She said that the original total estimated cost for the two parts together was \$595,000.

Mr. Schleeter provided information on the three concepts proposed in the feasibility report for the Northwood Lake Improvement project. He explained Concept A as a combination of stormwater best management practices (BMPs). Mr. Schleeter stated that the proposal is to redirect existing storm sewer from Boone Avenue, install additional storm sewer along Boone Avenue, install an underground storage tank for runoff, and provide pretreatment through a structural stormwater BMP upstream of the tank to remove the bulk of the larger sediment coming through the storm sewer. He noted that the stormwater directed to the underground tank would be stored and ultimately pumped to irrigate approximately 0.64 acres of existing ball and soccer fields on the east side of Boone Avenue. Mr. Schleeter provided details on the process handling overflow from the tank and talked about installing a sump feature.

He explained that this concept will provide high pollutant removal benefits including removal of total phosphorous (TP) and total suspended solids (TSS) as well as providing volume reduction benefits. He spoke about the aesthetic benefits to this concept and the water conservation benefits. Mr. Schleeter noted that this concept utilizes innovative practices and is the sort of project that would be favorable to grants. He said the downside of the project is the cost, which is high due to the storm sewer rerouting, the cost of the tank, and the cost of the piping for the irrigation of the ball fields.

Mr. Schleeter introduced Concept B, which similar to Concept A is located in Northwood Park. He said this concept includes the construction of a water quality pond in a portion of the park. Mr. Schleeter remarked that it would be a standard water quality pond that would remove TP and TSS from the stormwater. He said the City would be familiar with the maintenance associated with the stormwater pond. He explained the drawbacks to this concept include no volume control benefits and the lack of public support due to use of parkland for a pond.

Mr. Schleeter reported that Concept C is located on the west side of Northwood Lake adjacent to Jordan Avenue. He said it includes the construction of a water quality pond for approximately 19 acres of drainage. Again he said that the pond would be effective in reducing TP and TSS and the City is familiar with maintenance needs of a stormwater pond. Mr. Schleeter said that there isn't necessarily an aesthetic benefit to the pond since there aren't any trails going around the pond.

Mr. Schleeter went through Tables 4, 5, and 6 from the draft feasibility report detailing the maintenance costs, the 30-year costs and associated phosphorous removal numbers, and potential funding sources. He said that they identified maintenance costs, spread over a 30-year lifespan, for Concept A as \$531,000, maintenance costs of Concept B as \$435,000, and maintenance cost of Concept C as \$350,000.

Administrator Jester pointed out that on page 2 of the Barr Engineering memo there is a table that summarizes the design costs and the phosphorous removal at an annualized cost per benefit.

There was discussion of the costs of the three concepts and the timing of the city applying for and finding out about grants. Engineer Chandler pointed out that the Commission isn't eligible to apply for Clean Water Fund grants this round because of the status of its watershed management plan. She said that the City can apply for

a BWSR Clean Water Fund grant, the applications are due in approximately a week, and decisions are made in approximately December.

[Commissioner Welch arrives]

Commissioner Black asked about the timing of the Commission's action with this proposed project.

Administrator Jester said that if the Commission wants to participate in this project, the Commission needs to get the project on its CIP by going through the plan amendment process. She said the Commission can't initiate the plan amendment process until it decides which option to pursue.

There was extensive discussion of the options, combination of options, and costs versus benefits.

Commissioner Tobelmann commented that he likes the innovation of Concept A and thinks the Commission needs to be innovative, but he also noted that Concept A provides a lot of benefit to the City of New Hope. He wondered if the City is willing to put up a greater share of the cost for Concept A. Mr. Schleeter said it is something that he could raise to the New Hope City Council.

A resident commented on the runoff coming from 169 and asked if a project would happen on the other side of 169. Commissioner Black responded that the project on the west side of 169 has been delayed because of residents' objections to taking so many trees out of that area where the creek runs through, but the City of Plymouth is meeting with residents and working to decide what can be done. Mr. Asche provided more details about the project located in Plymouth. He explained that it treats a different drainage area than the Northwood Lake project, meaning that both projects will reduce phosphorous and will benefit Northwood Lake but the timing of the two aren't correlated.

There was discussion of funding the Northwood Lake project and the project in the City of Plymouth.

Administrator Jester remarked that the Commission has already levied for the project in the City of Plymouth.

Commissioner Welch commented that the City of New Hope needs to look at the cost-sharing structure and investigate how the funding of this project could be different. Commissioner Tobelmann asked if there is a way to quantify the benefits of the project so that the Commission can review and decide which benefits it is willing to pay for and at what level. He added that he thinks the Commission needs to encourage innovative projects and he doesn't want to walk away from Concept A for this project.

A resident commented that the park has aesthetic value to New Hope, and she didn't want to lose park space. A different resident spoke in favor of Concept A because it is innovative, allows the park to maintain maximum useful space, and optimizes the low space in the park that now can't optimally be used.

Commissioner Carlson moved to approve the draft feasibility report without any limitations and to request that the City of New Hope provide information on project funding to be supplied from other sources besides the Commission. Commissioner Mueller seconded the motion. There was discussion.

Commissioner Welch commented that at some point the Commission is going to need to make a choice, and he made an amendment to the motion to direct that the Commission Engineer's comments are incorporated. Commissioner Black seconded the motion.

Commissioner Hoschka asked how long the water is held in the storage tank after a storm event. Mr. Schleeter responded two weeks. Commissioner Hoschka wondered how it works during wet periods in which the fields wouldn't need irrigation. Mr. Schleeter stated that it was sized to hold two weeks of irrigation at an inch and one-half of irrigation per week from mid-April to mid-October and was calculated to accommodate the anticipated dry and wet periods within those months. There was discussion.

Engineer Chandler announced that she would like to add one more recommendation to its list of

recommendations for the draft feasibility study. She said she would like the feasibility report to include a definition of what's included in indirect costs.

Chair de Lambert asked if anyone objects to including the additional Engineer recommendation to the recommendations included in Commissioner Welch's motion. Upon hearing no objections, Chair de Lambert announced that the additional recommendation is included in Commissioner Welch's motion. Chair de Lambert asked if there was any additional discussion for the motion on the table. Upon hearing none, Chair de Lambert called for a vote. Upon a vote, the motion to amend the motion carried unanimously 8-0 [Cities of Robbinsdale absent from vote].

There was discussion on Commissioner Carlson's motion.

Commissioner Black suggested looking at the funding mechanism used by the Shingle Creek WMO. She said that it is critical to unpack the costs and benefits of the proposed Northwood Lake project and to identify who should be the primary payer of those costs.

Mr. McCoy asked if a TMDL has been done on Northwood Lake. He asked if there is internal loading in the lake and if so, how much it's contributing to the problem. Mr. McCoy asked if it would be prudent to get the TMDL done to accurately determine the pollution sources. Ms. Chandler responded that a TMDL has not been done, but Northwood Lake is an impaired water. She explained that in 1994 the watershed did a lake study on Northwood Lake and identified a number of projects to reduce the phosphorous loading including one of the project locations being considered along with other work the watershed has considered and New Hope has implemented.

There was further discussion.

Commissioner Black moved to amend Commissioner Carlson's motion by directing the costs and the benefits of the project to be unpacked particularly for Concept B (read: A), limiting the Commission's involvement in the project to \$595,000, looking at how the remainder of the costs can be covered, and bringing into the discussion the Shingle Creek model for paying for the project. Commissioner Mueller seconded the motion. Administrator Jester noted that the TAC and the Commission have previously talked about the Shingle Creek model and decided that it is easier for the Commission to pay for the projects in full. Commissioner Black said that it was discussed a long time ago and now projects cost more and it is worth looking at again.

Upon a vote, the motion to amend Commissioner Carlson's motion carried unanimously 7-0 [City of Robbinsdale absent from vote. City of Minneapolis abstained from vote].

Upon a vote, Commissioner Carlson's motion carried unanimously 7-0 [City of Robbinsdale absent from vote. City of Minneapolis abstained from vote].

Chair de Lambert called for a 10-minute recess.

[Commissioner Millner departs the meeting]

D. Review Draft Feasibility Report for Honeywell Pond Expansion (BC-4)

At 10:55 a.m. Chair de Lambert called the meeting back to order. Mr. Oliver reported that this project is proposed to be done in conjunction with the City of Golden Valley's and Hennepin County's reconstruction of Douglas Drive between Medicine Lake Road and Trunk Highway 55. He said the intent of the request for Commission funding when this project was placed in the Commission's CIP was to help the City go above and beyond the water quality requirements of the project.

Mr. Oliver said there are a lot of moving parts to the project and a menu of options available. He provided the example that the City has to acquire right-of-way from Honeywell for the roadway project, so some of the

options may or may not be feasible depending on how those negotiations proceed. He reported that the City has applied for a grant for converting the learning center's fields into a soccer complex, which is the impetus for the project's proposal for irrigation. Mr. Oliver noted that if the City doesn't receive that grant, then that part of the project comes off the table.

Mr. Oliver said that the City's budget for the overall storm sewer and water quality is \$900,000. He stated that at this point in time, the estimate is \$375,000 for the cost of the storm sewer work as well as water quality improvements in other locations, which leaves the City with \$525,000 available in its budget for additional water quality improvements. Mr. Oliver remarked that with the BCWMC funding, there is \$810,000 available for water quality improvements.

Mr. Oliver provided information about the existing Honeywell Pond and briefly introduced the different improvements that have been considered for this project.

Ms. Chandler asked for clarification about whether the cost estimate included costs for hazardous material disposal. Mr. Willenbring responded that for the "muck" excavation, the project estimates a cost of \$30 per yard, or total estimate of \$180,000. He said that the estimate is based on the belief that the soils will be mostly clean with maybe a little bit of contamination since most of the excavation is in the upland area. Ms. Chandler asked if the cost could increase if contaminated soils are found. Mr. Willenbring responded that the excavation cost could go upwards of \$60 per yard for contaminated soils. He pointed out that a 25% contingency cost is built into the project cost.

Mr. Willenbring responded to questions and spoke about how the project ties in with the road reconstruction project. He displayed a map of the proposed project. Mr. Oliver reported on their communications with Honeywell and residents.

Administrator Jester asked how the estimated pounds of phosphorous removed per year was calculated and if the Commission's models were used. Mr. Willenbring said that two models were used in this feasibility report to estimate some of the benefits of the project. He said that one model was the BCWMC's hydrologic model, and he explained the process used. There was discussion. Administrator Jester brought up recommendation No. 8 in the Commission Engineer's memo, which states that the feasibility study should provide more information about the methodology used to estimate the total phosphorous removed for each of the actions. She asked Engineer Chandler to elaborate on that recommendation.

Engineer Chandler said that she understands that the P8 model was used for one or two of the options but that model or another methodology should be used and laid out in the feasibility study in order to be able to better judge the different options. She noted that the results or benefits of combined options aren't always additive, so modeling the scenarios would give an accurate picture of the anticipated results.

Mr. Willenbring explained that a P8 model wasn't used to model the other scenarios because those scenarios include use of a pump to irrigate ball fields, or perhaps Honeywell could use it on their site, or perhaps a water gallery system that could be part of the project on the west side of Douglas Drive. He said that this type of pumping isn't something that is modeled in P8. He said that the phosphorous removal in these cases can be determined through a calculation and is predicated by how much water is taken off. There was discussion.

Mr. Oliver requested that the City and WSB work with the Commission Engineer and discuss the issues raised and table this feasibility study for a month.

Commissioner Black moved to table this discussion until the Commission's October meeting. Commissioner Hoschka seconded the motion. Administrator Jester asked if that motion includes bringing a revised draft feasibility study to the Commission for its October meeting. There was consensus from the Commission and

Mr. Oliver. Commissioner Welch recommended that the Commission Engineer and the feasibility study engineer sit down and work on the issues that have been raised.

[Commissioner Crough departs the meeting]

Upon a vote, the motion carried unanimously 6-0 [Cities of Minnetonka, New Hope, and Robbinsdale absent from vote.].

E. Order Submittal of Plan Amendment to BWSR for 2016 Projects

Administrator Jester announced that this item should be tabled until the Commission has more information on the Northwood Lake projects and the Honeywell Pond expansion project. She said that this item will come back to the Commission at its October meeting.

F. Consider Approval of Briarwood/ Dawnview Water Quality Improvement Project 90% Plans (BC-7)

Administrator Jester stated that this is a 2014 CIP project and construction is slated to start soon. She reminded the Commission that the project treats stormwater from 184 acres of residential area. Administrator Jester pointed out that the option that the Commission chose, the iron-enhanced sand filter, is now estimated to remove less phosphorous than was previously estimated and presented to the Commission.

Commissioner Black said that there are a number of recommendations identified in the Commission Engineer's memo and asked if recommendations are an issue for the project. Engineer Chandler responded that all of the comments are important details but the Commission Engineer does not have issues with the design of the project.

Commissioner Black moved to approve the project with the inclusion of the Commission Engineer's recommendations. Commissioner Hoschka seconded the motion.

There was discussion about the location of the closest house to the pond. Commissioner Welch commented about the huge change in design between the 50% plans and the 90% plans. He said that the option that the Commission selected is not the option that is designed to be built. There was a long discussion. Administrator Jester noted that the process needs to involve residents earlier.

Upon a vote, the motion carried 5-1 [Cities of Crystal, Golden Valley, Medicine Lake, Plymouth, and St. Louis Park in favor; City of Minneapolis opposed; Cities of Minnetonka, New Hope, and Robbinsdale absent from vote.].

G. Consider Moving Forward with Twin Lake Alum Treatment

Item was deferred to the Commission's October meeting.

H. Receive Update on Next Generation Watershed Management Plan Development: Plan Steering Committee Meeting Notes from 7/28/14; Input Needed to Update Implementation Tables; Plans for Upcoming Workshop (slated for 10/9/14)

Administrator Jester announced that the Commission needs to set a date for another workshop. The Commission discussed and agreed to hold the workshop October 8th from 4 p.m. to 6 p.m. Administrator Jester listed the items that need to be discussed at the workshop.

7. COMMUNICATIONS

A. Administrator: No Administrator Communications

B. Chair: No Chair Communications

C. Commissioners:

- i. Commissioner Welch announced that the bid opening on the creek project in Minneapolis is on October 1.
- ii. Commissioner Hoschka reported on Golden Valley Arts and Music Festival and the Commission's participation in the event.
- iii. Commissioner Mueller reported on participating in the Walk-about along Medicine Lake.
- iv. Commissioner Carlson noted that the City of Medicine Lake has appointed him as the City's representative on the BCWMC TAC until such time as another candidate is appointed.

D. TAC Members: No TAC Communications

E. Committees: No Committee Communications

F. Legal Counsel: No Legal Communications

G. Engineer:

- i. Engineer Chandler reported that the 8410 Rule amendment is in process again. She said that if the BWSR Board approves it then on October 6 there will be a publication of the proposed rule amendment in the State Register. She explained that if there is no objection, such as in the form of a contested public hearing, then the amendment could be promulgated by the end of the year. Engineer Chandler pointed out that one of the big changes would be that the city local water management plans no longer would be tied into the schedule of the watershed management plans but to their comprehensive planning schedule.

8. INFORMATION ONLY (Available at <http://www.bassettcreekwmo.org/Meetings/2014/2014-September/2014SeptemberMeetingPacket.htm>)

- A. Grant Tracking Summary and Spreadsheet
- B. WMWA June 2014 Meeting Minutes
- C. WCA Notices, Plymouth

9. ADJOURNMENT

