

45 **CONSENT AGENDA**

46

47 Manager Blixt requested discussion of resolution 15-015, approval of cost-share funding
48 for Promenade of Wayzata. Michael Welch noted a revision to the language of
49 Resolution 15-014 to authorize the administrator to enter an agreement with Irish Titan
50 for interactive web mapping, not hiring Irish Titan. Mr. Welch said minor typographical
51 errors in the minutes of February 12 can be revised after approval by the managers.

52

53 *Manager Miller moved, seconded by Manager Calkins, to approve the consent agenda,*
54 *consisting of: approval of the check register for the surety account and the general*
55 *checking account, the latter including checks 35330 through 35408 for a total of*
56 *\$432,272.55, payroll direct deposits totaling \$109,744.50 and electronic fund*
57 *withdrawals totaling \$25,278.02 for a total expense amount for the period February 1*
58 *through February 28 of \$567,295.07; acceptance of the 325 Blake Road checking*
59 *account report; and adoption of the following resolutions:*

60

61 **Resolution 15-013, Request to approve Minnehaha Creek Watershed District Sign**
62 **Master Plan and Sign Templates**

63

64 *NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Minnehaha Creek*
65 *Watershed District Board of Managers approves the Minnehaha Creek*
66 *Watershed District sign master plan and sign templates.*

67

68 **Resolution 15-014, Authorization to Hire Irish Titan for Interactive Web Map**
69 **Project**

70

71 *NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Minnehaha Creek*
72 *Watershed District Board of Managers authorizes the District*
73 *Administrator to enter an agreement with Irish Titan for the interactive*
74 *web map project for an amount not to exceed \$20,290.*

75

76 **Resolution 15-016, Approval of the 2014 Pay Equity Report**

77

78 *NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Minnehaha Creek*
79 *Watershed District Board of Managers has received the 2014 Pay Equity*
80 *Implementation Report; approves the findings and directs Springsted to*
81 *submit the results to the MN Department of Management and Budget.*

82

83 *Upon vote, the motion carried 5-0. (Manager Shekleton absent from the vote.)*

84

85 **REGULAR AGENDA**

86

87 **Board, Committee and Task Force Reports**

88

89 Manager White, for her president's report, said that the District has some retreat
90 opportunities coming up, and she asked managers for suggestions for topics. She said
91 long-term organizational goals could be the focus of a retreat and that the Board has April
92 30 on the calendar as a fifth Thursday retreat, but she suggested that perhaps long-term
93 goals would be best discussed in a Saturday retreat. She said that the Executive
94 Committee will meet March 26, because the audit will be ready for review. For the
95 purpose of that meeting, the committee will consist of the president, vice president and
96 secretary. Finally, she noted that former Interim Administrator Jeff Spartz left a memo
97 for the managers on the mediation process that she commended to everyone's attention.
98

99 Manager Calkins reported on the Policy and Planning Committee meeting of February
100 19, stating that the bulk of the meeting was devoted to the review of criteria for the cost-
101 share program, which the committee passed forward with a resolution recommending
102 approval to the Board of Managers. He said the committee's next topics will be related to
103 the comprehensive plan, then it will turn again to subwatersheds.
104

105 Manager Miller added a report on the Southwest Light Rail Transit Task Force, stating
106 that the task force is meeting periodically now and that the project has advanced ahead
107 against federal criteria for funding. He said it also appears that the litigation with regard
108 to the crossing over the Cedar-Isles lagoon appears to be coming to resolution.
109

110 Manager Calkins added a report noting that he has seen some new legislation that has
111 come out of the blue, authored by Senator Tom Saxhaug, providing funding for urban and
112 community forestry. He said that he thinks the legislation reflects a growing awareness of
113 the role of trees in managing stormwater in urban areas.
114

115 **PUBLIC HEARINGS AND PRESENTATIONS**

116

117 **Highway 101/Bushaway Road Causeway Reconstruction Project**

118

119 James Wisker and Tiffany Schaufler presented background on the proposed funding of
120 shoreline stabilization and stormwater management improvements for the reconstruction
121 of Bushaway Road in Wayzata. Mr. Wisker said no action is being requested of the
122 Board of Managers tonight. Manager White asked staff to review the cost-share project
123 generally and options for the Grays Bay side of the causeway in particular before the
124 managers hear comments during the public hearing. Ms. Schaufler reviewed three
125 different scenarios for shoreline and wetland mitigation along the Grays Bay side of the
126 causeway, noting that the Wayzata Bay side restoration is the same under each of the
127 three scenarios. She said that staff-recommended approach is restoration of shoreline in
128 select areas along the causeway where there is enough land to support it. She said staff

Minutes of the Regular Meeting
Minnehaha Creek Watershed District
Board of Managers
2-26-2015

129 supports this option because it comes at a reasonable cost, can be permitted by the
130 various regulatory entities and provides ecological value. She also noted that a plan
131 amendment would be required for some of the other options presented because of
132 increased cost.

133

134 In response to a question from Manager Blixt, Ms. Schaufler stated that in addition to
135 willow live stakes, the plan would also call for dogwood and other species. In response to
136 a question from Manager Calkins, Ms. Schaufler said areas for which no shoreline
137 restoration is planned could become barren. Mr. Wisker added that there is limited ability
138 to establish plants under the cantilevered walkway along this side of the reconstructed
139 roadway. He said these areas will be seeded. Ms. Schaufler added that the soils in this
140 area do not provide a high-quality medium for planting. Mr. Wisker stated that there
141 definitely will be impacts from the road reconstruction, but site conditions preclude or at
142 least make it very difficult to preserve high-quality aesthetic and ecological conditions
143 without encroaching into the bay with fill, which would very likely not be permitted by
144 either the Department of Natural Resources or the United States Army Corps of
145 Engineers. In response to a further question from Manager Blixt, Ms. Schaufler said that
146 additional shoreline restoration does not provide benefit at a cost that staff feels is viable.
147 Mr. Wisker pointed out that while habitat and better visual enhancement of the area could
148 be achieved they would come at the price of additional filling in public waters, which is
149 not consistent with District goals. He said such restoration also would not provide any
150 water-quality benefit and would not provide the necessary dissipation of wave action. In
151 response to a question from Manager Blixt about why there is no option for filtering
152 runoff from the road, Mr. Wisker said that the causeway is very constrained spatially. He
153 pointed out that there will be curb and cutter and treatment of stormwater in other parts of
154 the project where there is no treatment now. (*Manager Shekleton arrived, 7:15 p.m.*) In
155 response to another question, Mr. Wisker said that chloride will go off the road into the
156 embankment and ultimately to the lake as it does now. In response to a question from
157 Manager Casale regarding whether there are plants that could be planted in the littoral
158 zone adjacent to the causeway, Ms. Schaufler stated that the water depth in the area is 5
159 to 7 feet and emergent plants cannot achieve those heights. Mr. Wisker stated that the
160 proposed work, including the proposed floodplain and wetland mitigation, will cost an
161 estimated \$1.6 million for design, construction and construction oversight.

162

163 Mr. Wisker reviewed the wetland and floodplain mitigation work to take place on
164 Jennings Bay in Minnetrista. He said the city plans to convey the mitigation site to the
165 District and showed a site plan of the area. In response to a question from Manager
166 Miller, Ms. Schaufler said if the land is not conveyed in fee, the District will still have an
167 easement. Mr. Wisker reiterated that the estimated cost for the whole project is
168 \$1,604,308. The benefits to the District are promotion of biostabilization and
169 bioengineered stabilization measures on shorelines and erosion and sediment control. He
170 said the current plan is to have the Board of Managers order the project at the March 12
171 meeting, which will allow staff to begin the design process. In response to questions
172 about opportunities to further enhance the Jennings Bay restoration work, Mr. Wisker

Minutes of the Regular Meeting
Minnehaha Creek Watershed District
Board of Managers
2-26-2015

173 stated that the area is a historical floodplain that was dredged and filled. The depth
174 expected for the design was chosen to optimize both floodplain storage and wetland
175 restoration potential, and site conditions preclude adding more floodplain mitigation or
176 wetland enhancement.

177

178 Bill Bushnell appeared before the Board of Managers and offered comments on behalf,
179 he said, of residents along the Jennings Bay near the restoration area. He said that
180 generally he wishes to convey a very positive reception for the proposed project and that
181 the residents generally feel very good about the work being in the District's hands. He
182 also emphasized the need to preserve trees in the wetland restoration area because the
183 trees are holding the land area together. He said that at the public meeting the District
184 held on the project there was not much of a need to educate attendees about the problems
185 in the area because there have become self-evident over the years. He said that there is an
186 opportunity in the project for the District to do more than is planned. He noted that the
187 Jennings Bay site is at the mouth of Painter Creek and that the channel in the area is very
188 badly overgrown and degraded. He said he would like to see more trees in the area and
189 shoreline restoration to stabilize the area and prevent eroding upland. He said trees would
190 also provide screening. He said he has provided a letter of support for the project signed
191 by a number of residents. The managers thanked Mr. Bushnell for his comments.

192

193 In response to a question from Manager Miller, Mr. Wisker stated that the restoration
194 work at the Jennings Bay site accounts for approximately \$200,000 of the project price.
195 In response to a question from Manager Blixt, Ms. Schaufler stated that technically the
196 creek through this area is navigable but as a practical matter it is not. Manager Blixt
197 encouraged staff to look at opportunities to enhance the restoration work in the Jennings
198 Bay area to ensure that the District doesn't need to come back and do further work and
199 remobilize for that work later. Mr. Wisker said staff would investigate opportunities.

200

201 Ron Anderson, 660 Bushaway Road, appeared and said that he has lived in this area of
202 Bushaway Road for 20 years and that it is a great privilege to live in an area that he
203 counts as among the most beautiful on the lake. But he said it has been difficult for
204 residents to negotiate with the city and county and district to get improvements to
205 Bushaway Road reconstruction. He said residents met roughly 150 times in seven years as
206 a task force for on the project and that Manager Casale attended a number of the
207 meetings. The group is very much in favor of the District being involved in the
208 restoration work. He said the support that has been expressed in the letter he wrote to the
209 city council on the project was based on information he understood to represent the
210 District's restoration plans for the area, and he was surprised to see now that staff is
211 supporting an approach on the Grays Bay side that does not involve full restoration. He
212 said that there needs to be greater attention to the aesthetics of the area. He said that if
213 cost is the issue, there are ways to address that but that the job should not be less than
214 what residents in the area have been expecting. He stated that he would like to see the
215 District continue to work with the neighborhood and city and county representatives to

Minutes of the Regular Meeting
Minnehaha Creek Watershed District
Board of Managers
2-26-2015

216 continue the discussion to improve the design. He believes the area has the potential to
217 remain among the most beautiful on the lake.
218 Mr. Wisker clarified that staff's recommendation is to mitigate the use of the seawall to
219 stabilize the road bed on the Wayzata Bay side of the causeway and the mitigation plan
220 calls for the use of vegetated reinforced soil slopes. The landscaping in the area is of
221 utmost importance but the value of filling the lake verses aesthetics does not tip toward
222 the latter. He said staff's recommendation is to minimize filling of the lake and the
223 associated ecological impact. It is not impossible to do more in the area but it would not
224 be cost effective. Manager White clarified with Mr. Wisker that under the District's
225 agreement with Hennepin County, restoration on the Grays Bay side was only going to be
226 untaken if possible. Mr. Wisker answered further questions from Mr. Anderson about the
227 currently untreated areas north of the causeway that will be treated under the plans. Mr.
228 Anderson again emphasized that there be further efforts to negotiate with the city and
229 enhance the project. Mr. Wisker stated that staff does intend to continue to work on and
230 improve the design, and that the purpose of tonight's presentation is to get public
231 feedback on the concepts that will be pursued. He noted the plan is consistent with what
232 staff has presented previously and he believes is the best job possible of mitigating effects
233 of the reconstruction.

234
235 In discussion with Manager Casale, Mr. Wisker emphasized that while the design could
236 evolve and additional elements can be presented as the design evolves, staff's current
237 thought is to pursue detailed designs of the concepts that have been presented this
238 evening.

239
240 Peter Flom appeared and said that he lives in Woodland but has had houses along
241 Bushaway Road in his family for a number of years. He said that he is the developer of
242 the Locust Hills subdivision in the area. He offered that he is very thankful that the
243 District has taken an interest in and is planning to expend funds in this area.

244
245 Mike Kelly, engineer for the City of Wayzata, appeared and thanked the managers for the
246 partnership on the project and said he is very encouraged by the ideas that have been
247 presented. He said that if there is interest in pursuing emergent plants where there are no
248 live stakes along the causeway the city will endeavor to partner on that and look for
249 opportunities. Seeing no other commenters, Manager White closed the public hearing.

250
251 Manager Miller stated that he does not wish to sacrifice blue environment for green, and
252 that the District needs to be very careful about modifying its plans from what staff has
253 presented. Manager Calkins confirmed with Mr. Wisker that the District does not regulate
254 the placement of toe boulders and other riprap on a shoreline or streambank as floodplain
255 fill. He stated his continuing disagreement with that policy, and said that the stabilization
256 techniques used on the causeway will affect flooding downstream and on the lake. He
257 said that the District should count riprap as floodplain fill even if others do not have to do
258 so under the District rules. Noting that the District is spending \$1.4 million on the
259 causeway, Manager Calkins asked what the county's contribution to the project is. Mr.

260 Wisker said \$30,000 toward shoreline stabilization. Manager Calkins went on to describe
261 what he felt was a confusing set of exhibits presented in the Board packet for hearing and
262 said he understood how interested parties could be confused about what District was
263 pursuing at this location. Mr. Wisker stated that perhaps staff will bring back a policy on
264 project hearing materials for Board review. Manager Calkins stated that he understands
265 residents' strong interest in the causeway restoration and feels that the District should do
266 as much as it can to use green stabilization techniques. He said that the MNDoT seed mix
267 that is likely to be used in causeway is fine, but much depends on the medium into which
268 it is planted. He said staff should work closely with the county to ensure that the seed
269 used has a good chance of getting established. In response to a question from Manager
270 White, Manager Calkins said he doesn't think the District should take on other sections
271 but rather should work with other partners to ensure that the restoration is conducted in a
272 sustainable way.

273
274 Manager Casale pointed out that the Jennings Bay restoration area appear to present
275 erosion issues similar to those the District dealt with at Big Island on Lake Minnetonka.
276 He said the District has experience with stopping erosion along banks and should try to
277 translate that experience to this location. He also agrees that the documents in the packet
278 and drawings present some confusion but at the same time he believes it is critical for the
279 District to go ahead and order the project in early March. He said that the District has
280 ordered projects before with some design details to be determined and that may need to
281 be the case here. Manager Shekleton agreed that with regard to the seeding and soil along
282 the causeway the District should push some of its partners to do the best possible work
283 and spend the money necessary to ensure the success of the project. Manager White
284 thanked all members of the public who spoke and said staff will present its refined
285 recommendation at the March 12 meeting and answer questions raised this evening. She
286 said that the District will provide public notice of that meeting.

287

288 **ACTION ITEMS**

289

290 **Cost-Share Grant Agreement with Presbyterian Homes for Promenade of Wayzata**

291

292 Mr. Wisker presented the proposed cost-share contribution to the Presbyterian Homes
293 Promenade project in Wayzata. He said the managers are very familiar with the project,
294 having reviewed it and had presentations on it several times in recent years. He said he
295 did not wish to go over all those details again but rather would respond to the board's
296 reasons for pulling the matter from the consent agenda for discussion. He said staff's
297 recommendation, as shown in the request for board action, is a commitment of \$307,290,
298 with a possible additional dedication of \$15,000 toward enhanced signage and other
299 education and outreach opportunities.

300

301 Manager Blixt said she missed the meeting at which the project was last presented and
302 has questions about the District's process and developing the project for approval. She's
303 principally concerned about the fact that the funding proposed and recommended by staff

Minutes of the Regular Meeting
Minnehaha Creek Watershed District
Board of Managers
2-26-2015

304 is 40 percent of the cost-share budget for the year. Her concern is that there may be other,
305 higher priority projects that will come along after this and sufficient funding will not
306 remain available for them. She wondered whether the cost-share projects shouldn't
307 perhaps be reviewed at the same time so they can be prepared and choices can be made in
308 light of all of opportunities that can be identified. Manager White noted that she was
309 surprised to hear the structure of the cost-share program under discussion since the
310 program structure has been approved and the criteria have been developed and are on the
311 agenda this evening for approval. Mr. Welch noted as a point of information that is one of
312 the tenets described in the plan amendment establishing the program, that the District will
313 pursue opportunities as they come up on the timeline presented by the developers of these
314 projects. Manager Miller added that he believes for planning purposes it would be better
315 if all projects were reviewed at the same time, but for delivering projects of best quality
316 he recommends that the District continue to evaluate opportunities as they come up.
317 Manager Calkins said he went back to the history of the program and the project and he
318 wonders when the planned unit development was approved by the city for this project,
319 and what was required to comply with city ordinances. Mr. Wisker stated that best
320 management practices and rate control were the only requirements. In the packet for this
321 evening's meeting, he added, staff provided a comparison of the project against these
322 standards as well as against the District's current stormwater management standards. In
323 response to a further question from Manager Calkins, Mr. Kelly from Wayzata appeared
324 and said that in 2008 the city's requirements were significantly simpler, and now are
325 focused on reduction of phosphorus and total suspended solids. He noted that the project
326 far exceeds the city standards used at the time it was approved and far exceed today's
327 standards as well. Manager Calkins thanked him for his view and information.

328
329 Manager Blixt said her concern is not so much about how the project fares against the
330 District's criteria as it is about blowing the District's cost-share budget for the year on a
331 project that is getting approved after the construction has been completed. She stated that
332 perhaps the funding for this project could be dedicated later so the District can budget for
333 it. She said there is also a need to discuss the public-notice process for projects such as
334 this because she believes that the current practices, while compliant with state law, are
335 not adequate.

336
337 Manager Shekleton said that he shares the concern about spending 40 percent of the cost-
338 share budget for the year on one project, but the project is now better than it was when
339 originally presented and well worth the investment. He said that the treatment provided
340 and stormwater technology may not be the highest value, but it is very innovative and it
341 is important the District provide funding for it. Mr. Wisker pointed out that the cost-share
342 budget has never been fully utilized and that in the program recommendations coming
343 forward later on the agenda financing of projects to ensure the cash flow in the District
344 program will be discussed. But right now it is not a concern. Mr. Wisker also clarified
345 with counsel that the structure proposed by staff and as stated in the resolution on this
346 evening's agenda is compliant with the public purposes doctrine. Mr. Welch concurred.
347 In response to questions from the managers, Mr. Welch clarified the history of board

348 review, discussion and action on the project, and noted that this history is provided in
349 relevant detail in the resolution before the managers. He noted, though, that the District
350 has never consummated a commitment to funding the project.

351
352 Manager Calkins noted that it has been a struggle to understand this project and the
353 process has been messy. He said the location does not present the highest, best
354 opportunity to demonstrate stormwater management since it is on the cleanest part of
355 Lake Minnetonka and it would be better if tied to a specific water resources problem.
356 But, he said, it is a wonderful project. ***Manager Calkins moved, seconded by Manager***
357 ***Miller, to adopt resolution 15-015, providing up to \$322,290 for the Promenade in***
358 ***Wayzata. Upon vote, the motion carried 5-1, Manager Blixt voting against.*** Manager
359 Blixt noted that she is not opposed to the project but voted against because she believes
360 there are unresolved process questions.

361
362 Cost-Share Program Criteria

363
364 Brett Eidem presented the proposed new cost-share criteria. Mr. Eidem said that the
365 existing criteria are not suited to the larger, more multi-dimensional projects that the
366 program is seeking to pursue. He described the three categories of projects that the
367 program will fund using the new criteria: the homeowner, community engagement and
368 green infrastructure categories. He said staff's proposal is to report back to the board on
369 the success of the new structure one year after the criteria have been put into place. He
370 reviewed with the managers the evaluation system utilizing the new criteria that will be
371 applied to new cost-share opportunities. He said that staff will be emphasizing early
372 engagement in projects to assure the maximum benefit available from District
373 involvement, turning away from relying on incentivizing late-stage design revisions with
374 cost-share dollars. He said staff will be working with cities in the watershed to develop
375 stormwater standards for specific projects, identifying what's feasible on a specific site
376 and working with the developer to ensure that opportunities are maximized.

377
378 In response to a question from Manager White, Mr. Eidem stated that staff would be
379 looking for cost-share project engagement opportunities from all departments of the
380 District and that departments would be collaborating to develop projects. He said staff
381 was working on creating a list of priority opportunities and helping staff in other
382 departments develop opportunities from information coming in the door.

383
384 Manager Miller stated that he very much appreciated the work staff put into this proposed
385 structure – especially the fact that the proposal adopts and utilizes the terminology of the
386 Balanced Urban Ecology framework that the managers have developed for the next
387 watershed plan. Mr. Welch pointed out that the program will retain a fundamental
388 characteristic of providing funding only for stormwater treatment performance that is
389 beyond regulatory requirements. Following from questions from Manager Calkins, Mr.
390 Eidem explained that applicants would not see completed cost-share project evaluation
391 forms but would see the forms such that project proponents would have an understanding

392 of what the District is looking to support and fund. Manager Calkins asked whether when
393 a project obtains a score of 75 percent or higher on the evaluation form, staff would
394 automatically recommend it for funding. Mr. Eidem said yes, because a project scoring
395 that high would show great opportunities for meeting District program and watershed
396 goals. But, he said, when a project scores a lower percentage there still may be
397 opportunities for staff to work with the proponents to enhance and develop the project.
398 Manager Calkins emphasized that it is important for applicants to understand, and that the
399 form should potentially be modified to make it clear, that a score does not automatically
400 lead to approval funding by the Board of Managers, but that the board always retains the
401 authority to elect to fund a project or not. Mr. Eidem concurred. Finally, Manager Calkins
402 asked about overlap between the Cynthia Krieg grant program and the community
403 engagement branch of the cost-share program, noting that there appeared to be a lot of
404 overlap in the kind of work they fund. Mr. Eidem said that there is overlap conceptually,
405 but the cost-share program funding and effort will always be tied to the implementation
406 of a stormwater best management practice. He said that the Krieg program is more
407 directly focused on educational work and curricula. He said he would continue to work
408 with education and outreach staff because some projects may qualify for both cost-share
409 funding and Cynthia Krieg funding. ***Manager Miller moved, seconded by Manager***
410 ***Casale, to adopt the Resolution 15-015, adopting the proposed cost-share criteria.***
411 ***Upon vote, the motion carried 6-0.***

412

413 Great River Greening Partnership Proposals and Grant Application

414

415 Ms. Schaufler again appeared before the managers and noted that they had asked to be
416 advised any time staff sees an opportunity to apply for a grant. This is the case here and
417 follows from the memorandum of understanding that the managers authorized execution
418 of in December with Great River Greening. The resolution this evening, recommended by
419 staff, authorizes staff in collaboration with Great River Greening to apply for Outdoor
420 Heritage Fund and Environmental and Natural Resources Trust Fund grants. ***Manager***
421 ***Miller moved, seconded by Manager Calkins, to adopt resolution 15-019, authorizing***
422 ***staff to apply for grants in collaboration with Great River Greening. Upon vote, the***
423 ***motion carried 6-0.***

424

425 Minneapolis Policy Liaisons

426

427 Manager Miller noted that he meant to add an item to the agenda for the evening, namely
428 his recommendation that the managers delegate to the Policy and Planning Committee the
429 authority to represent the District to Minneapolis policymakers for purposes of
430 communicating District views on conservation and management of the creek. In response
431 to an inquiry from Manager Blixt, the managers discussed whether she, as the sole
432 Minneapolis resident on the board, shouldn't be among the liaisons to the city
433 policymakers. The managers discussed the fact that Manager Blixt is a staff member at
434 the City of Minneapolis complicates the matter and that these liaison roles have grown
435 out of specific work that the committee has undertaken. Manager Blixt agreed that it was

Minutes of the Regular Meeting
Minnehaha Creek Watershed District
Board of Managers
2-26-2015

436 fine for others to serve as the liaisons however she wished to be kept in the loop on
437 developments. ***Manager Miller moved, seconded by Manager Shekleton, to recommend***
438 ***that the president appoint Managers Calkins, Shekleton and Miller as liaisons to***
439 ***Minneapolis policymakers along the creek on development of communications and***
440 ***concepts along the creek. Upon vote, the motion carried, 6-0.*** Manager White made the
441 recommended appointments.

442

443 Administrator's Report

444

445 Lars Erdahl stated that the comprehensive plan kick-off meetings in recent weeks have
446 gone well and he thanked the managers for their participation. He said that 53 people
447 came to the meeting February 18 during the day and nine in the evening. There is one
448 more meeting coming up Tuesday March 3, and 15 people are registered already.

449

450 He said that construction of the Long Lake Creek project is under way and progressing
451 well, and a prescribed burn has been conducted. Earthwork will start next week.

452

453 Staff and several managers are monitoring developments with legislation affecting the
454 state aquatic invasive species programs. The District has been represented at committee
455 meetings and hearings, with more to come.

456

457 Mr. Erdahl discussed several new hires that have been made and others in process.
458 Manager Blixt asked why Erik Dahl, the former planning assistant, is just being replaced
459 now, 14 months after he left. In light of his recent engagement at the District, Mr. Erdahl
460 deferred to Mr. Wisker, who reported that the hire was thought to be needed for the Six
461 Mile Creek project, but that project isn't ready to go yet, so the position just hired will be
462 the one discussed recently with the board to support development of the comprehensive
463 plan. Manager Miller said staff works more efficiently now because department silos
464 have been broken now.

465

466 Mr. Welch mentioned that legal counsel continues to work with the Board of Water and
467 Soil Resources on its revision of the watershed planning rules, and that the revised rules
468 should be finalized in late April or May.

469

470 Manager Blixt said the managers would benefit from a review of the multiyear capital
471 project plan. Given the long cycle for assessment of feasibility and the public process for
472 ordering, she would like to be reoriented on the District's capital project plans.

473

Minutes of the Regular Meeting
Minnehaha Creek Watershed District
Board of Managers
2-26-2015

474 **ADJOURNMENT**

475

476 There being no further business, the regular meeting of the Minnehaha Creek Watershed
477 District Board of Managers adjourned at 10:20 p.m.

478

479 Respectfully submitted,

480

481

482

483

484 Jeff Casale

485 Secretary

486

DRAFT