

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING  
OF THE  
BOARD OF MANAGERS  
OF THE  
NINE MILE CREEK WATERSHED DISTRICT**

**WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 17, 2018**

**Call to Order**

Chair Kloiber called the meeting of the Board of Managers of the Nine Mile Creek Watershed District to order at 7:00 p.m., Wednesday, January 17, 2018, at the Nine Mile Creek Watershed District Office, 12800 Gerard Drive, Eden Prairie, MN 55346.

Managers Present: Hunker, Kloiber, Sheely and Peterson

Managers Absent: Twele

Advisors Present: Randy Anhorn, Louis Smith, Michael Welch, Bob Obermeyer, Janna Kieffer, Erica Sniegowski, and Gael Zembal

**Agenda**

Administrator Anhorn requested to move the Friendship Village senior community center pre-permit Presentation to follow Correspondence.

**Manager Peterson moved, seconded by Manager Sheely, to approve the agenda as amended. Upon a vote, the motion carried.**

**Reading and Approval of Minutes**

The Chair called for review of the minutes of the Regular Meeting of December 20, 2017. Chair Kloiber noted that minor typo corrections have already been submitted to staff. There were no substantive edits suggested.

**Manager Peterson moved, seconded by Manager Sheely, to approve the minutes with the noted corrections. Upon a vote, the motion carried.**

**Correspondence**

Administrator Anhorn provided information on the Board of Water and Soil Resource's (BWSR) Watershed-Based Funding Pilot Program. He stated that per recommendations from a Local Governmental Roundtable workgroup report, BWSR was implementing a pilot program to provide performance-based, non-competitive, grants to local units of government inside the seven-county Twin Cities Metro Area (TCMA) and within an approved One Watershed One Plan area. He stated that for fiscal year 2018, roughly \$5,600,000 of the total \$8,700,000 will go

to the seven counties within the TCMA to be distributed to the eligible local units of government including watershed management organizations (WMO), cities and others. He said that while Hennepin County received roughly \$1,000,000 to be distributed, but it may be difficult to come to a consensus on who gets funds for what, because of the number of eligible recipients including 11 WMOs and 45 municipalities. He further said that if the group cannot come to a consensus, then the county funds would be distributed through a competitive grant process for applicants from within the county, which could also include other metro counties that can't come to a consensus as well. He stated that while he attended an informational meeting on the pilot program a couple weeks earlier, he would be attending a meeting the next week led by BWSR and Hennepin County to discuss what the best options would be for those eligible within Hennepin County. He said that he would continue to attend any additional meetings on the subject and would keep the board informed at its monthly meetings.

Administrator Anhorn then passed out letter from Redpath, detailing the initiation of the District's annual audit.

### **Pre-Permit Application Presentation**

#### **Friendship Village Senior Community Center in Bloomington**

Administrator Anhorn introduced representatives from the Friendship Village senior community center and stated that they were here this evening for a pre-permit application presentation to the Board on an upcoming project. He said that he and the District Engineer had already had a couple of pre-permit application meetings with the group and because they would be asking for a variance to the District's buffer rule, he thought it would be to everyone's benefit to provide the managers with as much information on the project as early as possible. He said that due to the project impacting the on-site wetland, they would be going before the Bloomington City Council, the Wetland Conservation Act (WCA) local governing unit, for approval of their sequencing and replacement plan, which has the support of the WCA technical evaluation panel. He further stated that as a result of the placement of the proposed building and resulting wetland impacts, they would not be able to fully meet the District's wetland buffer rule.

Ryan Bluhm from Westwood Professional gave a short presentation showing the existing and proposed conditions of the site and went through how they proposed to meet the District's erosion and sediment control, wetland management and stormwater management rules for the project. He said to meet the District's stormwater management rule, they propose to raze two existing townhomes to enlarge the existing on-site wetland. Underground chambers would be constructed to catch and pre-treat stormwater, that is currently not receiving treatment, prior to discharging to the wetland.

Mr. Bluhm said that under the District's buffer rule for a medium value wetland, a 40-foot average, 20-foot minimum buffer would be required around the wetland. He stated that as a result of the wetland fill and building placement, they would not have any buffer along the back side of the building. He said that while they initially had planned on constructing the building further away from the wetland, in which case there would have been room for the establishment of a buffer, the City required a road in the front of the building and emergency access in the back

area which resulted in the proposed placement. He said that they thought that this was a better alternative than filling in more wetland to establish a buffer.

Attorney Smith asked Mr. Bluhm to compare the proposed buffer area with the amount of buffer required by the District's rule.

Mr. Bluhm said that he didn't fully understand the question.

Attorney Smith said that given the absence of buffer near the building, where a variance would be needed due to it not meeting the minimum buffer amount, in total, around the entire wetland how close does the project come to meeting the 40-foot average requirement.

Kelly Kunst from Westwood Professional said that the existing buffer, and not in very good condition, averages roughly 20 to 30 foot in width, and in total is 44,342 square feet. She further stated that the proposed project would increase the buffer area to 48,502 square feet and would include the control of invasives as part of the overall vegetation management plan for the establishment of the buffer, resulting in a better quality buffer. Mr. Anhorn asked if the applicant could identify the amount of shortfall from the required buffer under the rule, and Mr. Bluhm said that he could provide that information in the future.

President Kloiber asked if the project design would capture stormwater and treat it before it flows to the pond, and Mr. Bluhm confirmed that such treatment would be provided.

Manager Sheely asked if they could get more buffer if they removed another townhome and made the wetland area bigger. Mr. Bluhm said that the removal of the first two townhome was controversial and was a tough decision to make, so the removal of another was not likely an option.

Manager Sheely stated that for the Board to make any decision in the future, they would have to show how close they are to meeting the full 40-foot average requirement around the wetland not just comparing the proposed buffer to what is existing.

### **Hearing and Discussion of Matters of General Public Interest**

There were none

### **Consent Agenda**

- A. **Permit #2017-93A: Budget Truck/Car Rental – 305 American Boulevard; Grading and land alteration permit: Bloomington**
- B. **~~Permit #2017-128: Bridge Reconstruction – I-35W over the Minnesota River; Grading and land alteration permit: Bloomington~~ (moved to Hearing of Permit Applications B below)**
- C. **Permit #2017-129: Hopkins Pavilion – 2018 Improvements – 1100 Excelsior Boulevard; Grading and land alteration permit: Hopkins**

- D. Permit #2017-131: T.H. 494 Concrete Median Barrier Construction between East and West Bush Lake Roads; Grading and land alteration permit: Bloomington**
- E. 2018 Annual Business Items and Designations**
  - I. Adoption of Schedule of Board of Managers and CAC Meetings**
  - II. Appointment of CAC Members**
  - III. Naming of District Bank and Permit Security Depository**
  - IV. Naming of Official Newspaper**
  - V. Review of Permit Fees and Financial Assurances**
  - VI. Insurance Coverage**
  - VII. Review Employee Policy and Governance Manual**

Administrator Anhorn asked for application for permit number 2017-128, the I-35W Bridge reconstruction over the Minnesota River, be removed from the Consent Agenda and added to the Hearing of Permit Applications section.

Manager Peterson asked about the influence of the old landfill site and groundwater mounding described in the engineer's review memo for Permit 2017-129. Engineer Obermeyer stated that similar to discussion held before the Board a few months back on the Luther Parking Lot permit application, mounding occurs in areas where infiltrating water intersects a groundwater table; the concern is that in areas where there are contaminants, the contaminants could be mobilized by infiltration. In this case the proposed infiltration is beyond the established safety distance from the contamination, so the mobilization of contaminants will likely not occur. Mr. Obermeyer noted that the engineers reports for Permits 17-131 and 17-129 had been revised and distributed at the meeting.

**Manager Sheely moved, seconded by Manager Peterson, to approve the Consent Agenda with the change noted by Mr. Anhorn to remove Permit 17-128. Upon a vote, the motion carried.**

**Hearing of Permit Applications**

- A. Permit #2017-128: Bridge Reconstruction – I-35W over the Minnesota River; Grading and land alteration permit: Bloomington**

Engineer Obermeyer presented the permit request and proposed plans. He stated that this was a linear project that transected both Nine Mile Creek watershed and Lower Minnesota River watershed. The land-disturbing area with Nine Mile Creek watershed is 11 acres as compared to approximately 120 acres in Lower Minnesota River watershed. He further stated that because it is a linear project and at this time does not propose to create one-acre or more of new or additional impervious surface the project would only require an erosion and sediment control permit. He said, in fact, they propose to reduce the total amount of impervious by 0.2 acres. He said that while MN DOT does not plan to undertake the project for some time, it is a design-build project that they are seeking a permit now, even though they do not have full designs for the District's review. MN DOT is trying to provide as much information needed to comply with the District rules when they put it out to bid.

Administrator Anhorn stated that in review of the permit application, staff has had internal discussion on how to handle it. He said that while they could simply conditionally approve the permit contingent on a submittal of full set of plans for review once they are ready, and then actually issue the permit once the engineer is satisfied, staff is still in discussion with MN DOT on what they really need to go forward. He said staff was concerned if issuing a permit without a full set of plans for review now, but contingent on their submittal in the future, would be precedent setting.

Administrator Anhorn stated that staff is recommending extending the review period for an additional sixty (60) days, in order for the staff to bring something back to the board in February.

**Manager Peterson moved, seconded by Manager Sheely, to extend the permit review period for an additional 60 days. Upon a vote, the motion carried.**

**B. Permit #2017-132: T.H. 62 Mill and Overlay and Miscellaneous Repair Work from Beach Road to Tracy Avenue; Grading and land alteration permit: Eden Prairie/Edina**

Engineer Obermeyer presented the permit request and proposed plans. He reviewed the District's wetland buffer rule and advised that the MN DOT is the LGU administering the Wetland Conservation Act for this project. He advised that there are no alterations of the wetlands proposed within this project corridor therefore MN DOT would be issuing a no loss determination. In accordance with section 3.2.2a of the District rules, the District's buffer requirement does not apply. He stated that bottom line is that there will not be any change in buffer area from what is there now, because all work is within the road right-of-way. He said that it is a linear project and it is an erosion and sediment control permit that would be required and recommended approval of the permit.

Chair Kloiber stated that realistically, MN DOT already uses their seed mix along their corridors, so really, anything that could be buffered is already buffered.

Attorney Welch asked if, as a result of the mill overlay project, it will reduce the runoff to the wetland by use of catch basins. Engineer Obermeyer confirmed that by diverting water into the catch basins and into the storm sewer, it is preventing scouring from occurring and down into the wetlands that are in the center medians, and it will improve the existing conditions.

**Manager Hunker moved, seconded by Manager Peterson, to approve the permit on the conditions presented in the engineer's report. Upon a vote, the motion carried.**

**Treasurer's Report**

The Treasurer submitted the report. Administrator Anhorn provided clarification on certain items included in the report. He also provided a highlight of the year end financials.

**Manager Sheely moved, seconded by Manager Hunker, to approve the Treasurer's Report and pay the bills. Upon a vote, the motion carried.**

## **Education & Outreach Program Report**

The Chair called for the report of the Citizens Advisory Committee.

### **A. General Updates**

Education and Outreach Coordinator Zembal reported that two of the January events were rescheduled because of the January weather. She stated that a memorial sign for Barbara Kaerwer had been hung in the interpretive room and invited the Managers to look at it following the meeting.

Administrator Anhorn stated that a short video was created with images and information on Barbara that is played on the front electronic screen when the District holds events.

### **B. Discovery Point Restoration Update**

Program and Project Manager Sniegowski stated that a request for quotes (RFQ) was included in the Board packet for the landscape restoration of the southwest section of Discovery Point. She stated that a neighborhood meeting was held tonight in response to comments that had been received as part of the District's request to amend their development agreement with the City of Eden Prairie. She stated that the main comments that were received this evening, were in regard to the tree clearing and plantings. She stated that District staff focused on the reasons for removing those trees, noting that the trees that were removed were diseased or invasive. She stated that it seemed that the residents understood why the trees were removed after the meeting and were more satisfied. She felt that the additional neighborhood meeting was beneficial. She stated that the planting plan and site wide maintenance details were included in the RFQ. She highlighted the activities that may occur on the southwest section before plantings would occur. She noted that this will be used as an educational opportunity to show property owners how they can manage invasive species on their own properties. She advised that two options will be shown for how to manage woodland areas. She noted that another comment brought up at the neighborhood meeting was screening, as some people feel that there could be more screening of the District site. She stated that staff has presented a screening plan that would mix trees and shrubs. She noted that additional comments were made regarding the desire for larger trees and shrubs to provide that screening quicker and therefore larger sizes are recommended. She reported that the engineer's estimate is \$59,072.50. She stated that the previous year the bid came in lower than the engineer's estimate but noted that she cannot confirm that would happen again this year.

Manager Sheely stated that she found it fascinating to listen to the landscape representative from Barr Engineering earlier tonight at the neighborhood meeting. She stated that there were comments from the neighbors that the freeway noise is much louder now that the trees were removed. She stated that another comment was made regarding the slope of the path.

Program and Project Manager Sniegowski stated that the City of Eden Prairie has stated that they are willing to plant on their side of the trail. She acknowledged that the comment made

regarding the freeway noise arose from a resident that has a higher elevation than the District property. She stated that she encouraged the resident to reach out to her for further discussion.

Chair Kloiber stated that timing is a factor as well because the leaves are off the trees right now.

Manager Sheely noted that she noticed a change in the freeway noise when the repaving occurred.

Chair Kloiber stated that in his personal experience with prairie restorations, invasive species will creep in. He asked what staff is thinking about in terms of long-term maintenance of the invasive species.

Program and Project Manager Sniegowski stated that the District will be using a mix of four grasses, which is a simple mix that will make the application of herbicide easier. She stated that they will also rely on mowing to help keep the invasive species out. She noted that while the prescribed burn was left out of this RFQ, the activity could be an option for the future.

Manager Peterson asked whether pollinator friendly plantings will be considered.

Program and Project Manager Sniegowski provided additional details on the plantings that are planned. She stated that as this is more established, and the buckthorn is under control, more diversity could be added.

Engineer Obermeyer stated that he would speak with other staff at Barr Engineering to determine if the comments regarding the highway noise could be strategically addressed.

Program and Project Manager Sniegowski reviewed the proposed action before the Board and the proposed timing for the project. She confirmed the total budget for this item within the budget and additional expenses that may arise during the year for the project.

**Manager Peterson moved, seconded by Manager Sheely, to authorize the Administrator to issue the request for quotes for the second phase of the Discovery Point restoration work and execute, with the advice of counsel, a contractor for work with a qualified contractor submitting the lowest price quote, not to exceed the engineer's estimate by ten percent, issue the notice to proceed and execute change orders amounting in aggregate to no more than ten percent of the contract price. Upon a vote, the motion carried.**

## **Unfinished Business**

### **A. Rules**

Administrator Anhorn stated that a staff memo has been provided that described the few changes that were made following the December meeting. He stated that Attorney Welch also

prepared a Memorandum Supporting and Providing Explanation of Proposed Revisions of the Nine Mile Creek Watershed District Rules for their review.

Manager Sheely asked for clarification on who would be required to submit a chloride management plan.

Administrator Anhorn stated that in addition to private property owners, cities and MN DOT would also be included as the practice would be in line with what is required by their MS4 permits. Public entities can comply by submitting the information once per year.

Manager Sheely stated that before the draft rules go out for comment, page numbers should be added. She also stated that she also had some edits to the Memorandum Supporting and Providing Explanation of Proposed Revisions of the Nine Mile Creek Watershed District Rules document, noting that she found some of the language too friendly and not formal enough.

Administrator Anhorn stated that the goal tonight is to authorize staff to issue the rules and the Memorandum Supporting and Providing Explanation of Proposed Revisions of the Nine Mile Creek Watershed District Rules for 45-day review.

Attorney Welch stated that historically the Board has exceeded the requirements to provide opportunities for review of proposed rules. He stated that page numbers have been added and issues, such as tone, can be addressed. He stated that the proposal from staff would be to issue the rule changes and plan amendment for comment at the same time.

Administrator Anhorn asked if the Board is comfortable with the Memorandum Supporting and Providing Explanation of Proposed Revisions of the Nine Mile Creek Watershed District Rules with the comments from Manager Sheely addressed.

Attorney Welch noted that the Memorandum Supporting and Providing Explanation of Proposed Revisions of the Nine Mile Creek Watershed District Rules provides explanation of the changes.

Administrator Anhorn noted that the Board could authorize the Memorandum Supporting and Providing Explanation of Proposed Revisions of the Nine Mile Creek Watershed District Rules and rules to go out for comment with the discussed changes.

Attorney Welch suggested that staff review the changes that were made following the Board discussion at the December meeting.

Administrator Anhorn noted that the changes were highlighted in green in the draft rules document provided in the managers' packet to make it easier for Managers to identify the proposed changes.

Attorney Welch noted that staff had a difficult time articulating why, based on past discussions with the managers, applicants would need to provide compensatory storage for fill of surface constructed stormwater facilities, but not for underground facilities.



Engineer Kieffer provided additional details on the rules' proposed requirement that fill in constructed stormwater facilities would need to be replaced.

Manager Hunker stated that she would agree with the language as described by Engineer Kieffer applying the requirement to all constructed facilities.

Chair Kloiber stated that he believed the original intent was to protect the flood storage around water bodies and that addition of constructed facilities to the scope of the requirement could have unknown effect on property owners' ability to redevelop. He stated that his concern would be that if someone puts in a subsurface storage facility under the parking lot of Target, that would then prevent grading because of the floodplain that would exist around that underground facility.

Manager Hunker stated that it is her interpretation that there would need to be compensation for the storage removed from either an underground or a surface facility.

Attorney Welch noted that the managers' agreed when discussing flood-storage compensation that requiring compensatory storage for incidental or casual storage areas, such as streets or parking lots that were not constructed for the specific purpose of storing flood waters, was going too far. But the managers directed that the language apply to constructed stormwater facilities, but not underground facilities. He stated that Edina has been very concerned with redevelopment in the upper watershed increasing flow in the downstream watershed and the impact that has on property owners and the downstream resources – primarily the creek. He stated that a few options were developed and provided additional details, noting that it was decided that the requirement would apply to only to surface-level facilities.

Engineer Kieffer recognized the concern that Chair Kloiber is sharing on unintended flood storage areas.

Chair Kloiber provided additional details on the concern he would have with unintended consequences. He stated that he agrees that if an underground facility, that was intended for storage, was going to be filled, that should be replaced.

Attorney Welch stated that this is the chance for the Board to make a proposal and put it out for comment to see the type of comments that are received. He stated that if the Board is expanding the definition to include constructed facilities above ground, but not underground facilities, an explanation for the distinction should be provided.

The Board and staff provided different examples and discussed how the proposed change could apply to those situations.

Administrator Anhorn provided clarity noting that at the November board meeting, the decision was made to exempt underground storage facilities. He stated that could be adhered to for the comment period and the Board could then wait to see the type of comments that come in.

Chair Kloiber stated that he does not have any other comments. He stated that he would support the exemption for underground storage at this time but recognized there could be a concern if someone is using an underground facility for flood storage.

Engineer Kieffer replied that she is not aware of anyone having constructed an underground facility for flood storage. She noted that perhaps someone is using an underground facility for rate control. She stated that her issue is that the topic could come forward in the future.

Manager Peterson stated that she would suggest using the language “constructed facility” and not making a distinction.

Manager Hunker stated that she would be comfortable with the change suggested by Manager Peterson but recognized the concern that Chair Kloiber has.

Manager Sheely asked if the memorandum can be revised to reflect the language is drafted as proposed by Manager Peterson.

Attorney Welch stated that if the Board would like to include underground facilities, that should be included in the rules that would be sent for comment. He stated that it is easier to make things less stringent and not as easy to make things more stringent after the comment period. He stated that the memorandum would not have to explain the exemption for underground facilities if it is removed from the proposed amendments.

Chair Kloiber confirmed the consensus of the Board to use the language constructed facility.

Administrator Anhorn distributed the minor plan amendment information that would incorporate the new rules into the plan. He reviewed the proposed schedule moving forward.

Attorney Welch stated that staff has suggested putting the rules and the Memorandum Supporting and Providing Explanation of Proposed Revisions of the Nine Mile Creek Watershed District Rules out to more than the required parties, such as developers that have had multiple recent permits, to gain additional input.

**Manager Peterson moved, seconded by Manager Sheely, to authorize staff to release the rules, the Memorandum Supporting and Providing Explanation of Proposed Revisions of the Nine Mile Creek Watershed District Rules, and minor plan amendment for a 45-day comment period. Upon a vote, the motion carried.**

Administrator Anhorn suggested postponing the Pentagon Park/Border Basin Study until a later date because of the time constraints.

Chair Kloiber confirmed the consensus of the Board to defer that item to the February meeting.

**B. Amendment to Discovery Point Development Agreement with City of Eden Prairie and Posting and Hire of a New Position**

Administrator Anhorn reported that staff participated in a public hearing at Eden Prairie on January 2<sup>nd</sup> to amend the development agreement with the city to raise the limit of full-time employees from three to five and increasing the number of night meetings from 16 to 20. He asked for authorization for the Chair to sign those agreements. He stated that he drafted a job description for a potential position and asked for authorization to eventually post that in order to continue with hiring a new employee.

Chair Kloiber stated that he is excited with the news.

Manager Sheely asked if this position has been budgeted for.

Administrator Anhorn confirmed that this item was included in the budget.

**Manager Sheely moved, seconded by Manager Hunker, to approve the amendment to the Discovery Point Development Agreement with the City of Eden Prairie and authorize the Chair to execute the agreement. Upon a vote, the motion carried.**

Chair Kloiber confirmed that approval is not needed from the Board for the Administrator to post the job description.

**New Business**

**~~A. — Pentagon Park/Border Basin Study~~**

**B. Review of Upcoming City Water Resources Management Plans**

Administrator Anhorn noted that there are six communities within the District and each municipality will be required to submit their Water Resources Management Plan to the District for review and approval. He noted that Barr Engineering has participated in some capacity in the development of four of those Water Resources Management Plan and asked for direction on the Board on whether Barr Engineering should be allowed to review those plans. He noted that in the past, the board had requested Barr to do the reviews of the cities' plans even if Barr participated in there completion. He said that generally there has been somewhat of a firewall approach, where the person or persons from Barr that we involved in the plan development was not the same person or group that was involved in the review on behalf of the District. He said that he was simply seeking board direction on if they felt comfortable continuing that approach, or if they would like him to seek quotes from other consultants to review the plans.

Chair Kloiber stated that it is his recollection that in the past, even though Barr Engineering prepared the plans, the District still allowed Barr Engineering to review the plans. He noted the there was a difference in the staff member that drafted the plan and the staff

member from Barr Engineering that reviewed the plan. He stated that he would be okay with either option.

Manager Peterson stated that she would be okay with either option.

Chair Kloiber stated that there are other agencies reviewing the plans, the District is not the only agency reviewing the plans.

Manager Hunker received confirmation that Engineer Obermeyer has not been developed in the creation of any of the local plans and therefore could be the person to review those plans.

Chair Kloiber stated that Engineer Obermeyer has the most extensive knowledge of the District and therefore would most likely be the best person to review the plans.

Manager Sheely asked if the decision could be delayed to the February meeting.

Engineer Kieffer provided additional details on the timing.

Manager Sheely stated that she did not hear the advantages and disadvantages of either option. She recognized that Engineer Obermeyer would have the most extensive knowledge of the District rules.

Chair Kloiber stated that the main difference is that if the District keeps the review within Barr Engineering with the firewall approach, they are able to tap into the knowledge and expertise of the engineer. He stated that the main benefit of going outside of Barr Engineering is to ensure that you would have objectivity. He stated that it has never really been a problem in the past.

Administrator Anhorn agreed that it has not been a problem in the past and acknowledged the benefit that would be received through the expertise and knowledge held by Engineer Obermeyer.

Chair Kloiber stated that he would prefer to use Engineer Obermeyer and felt confident that he would not go easy on the review.

Manager Peterson stated that she would prefer to have Engineer Obermeyer complete the review because of the knowledge possessed on the rules and the time that would be needed for another engineer to come up to speed.

**Manager Sheely moved, seconded by Manager Peterson, to select Barr Engineering, and more specifically Engineer Obermeyer, to review the Water Resources Management Plans submitted by the member cities. Upon a vote, the motion carried.**

### **Engineer's Report**

- A. Bush Lake Outlet Project: Status Report**
- B. Eden Prairie Lakes Water Quality Improvement Project: Status Report**
- C. Edina Creek Stabilization Project: Status Report**
- D. Normandale Lake Water Quality Improvement Project: Status Report**
- E. Pentagon Park Storm Water Management**
- F. Status of Construction Projects**

Engineer Kieffer stated that she would be glad to answer any questions to the written report.

Manager Peterson asked for an update on contact that was made with Ray Newman.

Engineer Kieffer provided additional details on the communication that occurred, noting that it seemed that Mr. Newman was open to the idea.

Chair Kloiber stated that if there is a value to the management efforts at Normandale Lake, perhaps funding could be made available to secure Mr. Newman's help.

Administrator Anhorn provided an update on the communication with the Army Corps and MN DNR.

Chair Kloiber stated that the MN DNR does have a shallow lakes program. He stated that there are additional shallow lakes in the District and perhaps it would be worth it to have a conversation with the MN DNR about that program.

Manager Sheely asked, and received confirmation, that signage is still a focus for the Normandale Lake project.

Engineer Obermeyer provided an update on the Edina Creek project and the recent progress of the contractor. He stated that if the weather holds, the contractor should be done the second week of February with the exception of reaches 11 and two.

Manager Hunker asked why the Edina City Council work session was canceled that was going to discuss Pentagon Park.

Engineer Kieffer provided additional details, noting that it is not as important for Edina to be proactive in a regional treatment option. She noted that there are multiple reasons why this has been moved down on the priority level.

Administrator Anhorn stated that although flooding is a focus, the City is not as interested in fixing a problem for someone else.

Engineer Kieffer stated that one of the comments that was made by an Edina staff person to the Hillcrest developer, was that they should convince staff and the decision makers that they should contribute.

**Attorney's Report**

Attorney Smith had nothing further to report.

**Administrator's Report**

Administrator Anhorn had nothing further to report.

**Managers' Report**

The Chair called for reports.

Manager Peterson stated that she attended the Metro MAWD meeting and there was discussion of the grant process.


**Task Summary Report & Manager's Calendar**

The Managers reviewed and updated the task report.

**Adjournment**

**It was moved by Manager Peterson, seconded by Manager Sheely, to adjourn the meeting at 9:35 p.m. Upon a vote, the motion carried.**

Respectfully submitted,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Grace Sheely, Secretary

ATTACHMENTS:  
Treasurer's Report