

MEETING MINUTES

Riley-Purgatory-Bluff Creek Watershed District

May 7, 2014, Board of Managers Monthly Meeting and Public Hearing

PRESENT:

Managers: Mary Bisek, Vice President
Jill Crafton, Treasurer
Perry Forster, President
Ken Wencl, Secretary
Leslie Yetka

Administrator: Claire Bleser

Staff: Scott Sobiech, Engineer (Barr Engineering Company)
Louis Smith, Attorney (Smith Partners)
Michael Welch, Attorney (Smith Partners)

Recorder: Amy Herbert

Other attendees:	Josh Anderson, Chanhassen resident	Larry Koch, Chanhassen resident
	Kevin Atkinson, Chanhassen resident	Jack M.
	Lisa Atkinson, Chanhassen resident	Joshua Maxwell, RPBCWD
	Greg Fletcher, Chanhassen resident	Scott Mayer, Chanhassen Resident
	Kevin Greiber, Chanhassen Resident	Rod Rue, City of Eden Prairie
	Mark Hedge, Chanhassen Resident	Anders Sandler, Chanhassen Resident
	Sue Huberty, Chanhassen Resident	Dennis Seeger, CAC
	Tom Huberty, Chanhassen Resident	Bob Shurson, CAC, Mitchell Lake
	Terry Jeffery, City of Chanhassen	Liz Stout, City of Minnetonka
	Michelle Jordan, RPBCWD	Laurie Susla, Chanhassen Resident

1. Call to Order

President Forster called the RPBCWD Board of Managers Wednesday, May 7, 2014, Board of Managers Monthly Meeting and Public Hearing to order at 7:04 p.m. in the Council Chambers at Eden Prairie City Center, 8080 Mitchell Road, Eden Prairie, MN 55344.

2. Approval of the Agenda

Administrator Bleser requested the Board add an action item on Cost Share Grants as item E under Board Action Manager Crafton moved to approve the agenda as amended. Manager Yetka seconded the motion. Upon a vote, the motion carried 5-0.

3. Reading and Approval of the Minutes

Corrections to the March 5, 2014, meeting minutes were requested by Manager Crafton and Manager Yetka. Manager Yetka moved to approve the minute as amended. Manager Crafton seconded the motion. Upon a vote, the motion carried 5-0.

Manager Crafton requested an edit to the spelling of a name in the April 3, 2014, meeting minutes. Manager Crafton moved to approve the minutes as amended. Manager Bisek seconded the motion. Upon a vote, the motion carried 5-0.

President Forster requested the correction of a date, Manager Crafton requested a grammatical edit, and Attorney Welch requested the revision of a sentence in the April 16, 2014, meeting minutes. Manager Crafton moved to approve the minutes as amended. Manager Wencil seconded the motion. Upon a vote, the motion carried 5-0.

4. Hearing and Discussion of Matters of General Public Interest

There were no matters raised.

5. CAC

CAC Advisor Dennis Seeger stated that the CAC would like to review the comments that the Board received regarding the proposed rules and also would like to review the proposed changes to the rules. President Forster said that such a review could be part of the CAC's May 19th meeting. Mr. Seeger reported that at its last meeting, the CAC elected a Chair and a Recorder and that the CAC reviewed two proposals for District Cost-Share grants. He said that the CAC recommended approval of both of those projects.

6. Treasurer's Report

Administrator Bleser noted that at its last meeting, the Board discussed fund transfers to cover the operations cost of the new office space and the new employees but did not take action, so tonight she is requesting that the Board take action to formalize the transfers.

She described the specifics of the transfer, including \$30,000 from the Data Collection Fund, \$5,000 from the Stormwater Fund, and \$5,000 from the Education and Outreach Fund. She explained that these transfers would cover the costs for the new hires. Administrator Bleser said that to cover the costs of the new office space and the new vehicle, she proposed transferring \$50,000 from the District's Reserve Fund and \$50,000 from the District's Bluff Creek Fund. She explained that the Bluff Creek funds are available because the District received a grant for the project.

Manager Crafton moved that the Board approve the transfer of \$40,000 from the Bluff Creek Project, \$30,000 from the Data Collection, \$5,000 from Stormwater, and \$5,000 from Education and Outreach to cover salary and benefits for new staff in 2014. Manager Bisek seconded the motion. Upon a vote, the motion carried 5-0.

Manager Crafton moved to approve transferring \$50,000 from the Bluff Creek Project and \$50,000 from Reserve Funds for operations expense with the new office space and purchase of a vehicle in 2014. Manager Yetka seconded the motion. There was a short discussion of the type of vehicle that the District is planning to purchase. Upon a vote, the motion carried 5-0.

Manager Crafton moved to pay the bills as presented. Manager Bisek seconded the motion. Upon a vote, the motion carried 5-0.

Manager Crafton moved to accept the Treasurer's Report. Manager Yetka seconded the motion. Upon a vote, the motion carried 5-0.

7. Engineer's Report

Manager Crafton asked Engineer Sobiech how the subwatershed divide process worked out. Engineer Sobiech said that it is in process and the review has revealed some areas that need to be corrected as well as a few areas that need more detail. There was a brief discussion of the Eden Garden project and a possible cost share opportunity. Manager Crafton moved to accept the Engineer's Report as submitted. Manager Bisek seconded the motion. Upon a vote, the motion carried 5-0.

8. Administrator's Report

a. MAWD Summer Tour

Administrator Bleser announced that the MAWD (Minnesota Association of Watershed Districts) tour will be June 18-20 in Stillwater, MN and asked the Board members to let her know if they are interested in attending.

b. Eden Lake Elementary School

Administrator Bleser described her work earlier that day presenting to 120 5th graders at Eden Lake Elementary School about protecting water resources.

c. New RPBCWD Staff

Administrator Bleser introduced Michelle Jordan, the District's new Water Quality and Outreach Coordinator, and Josh Maxwell, the District's new Technician.

d. Annual Report

Administrator Bleser summarized the RPBCWD's annual report, as included in the meeting materials, and asked that the managers submit any comments to her as soon as possible so that she can finalize the report and submit it to the Minnesota Board of Water and Soil Resources. Manager Bisek commented on her appreciation that the report includes fact sheets on the District's water bodies. Administrator Bleser noted that CAC member Sharon McCotter suggested the development of the fact sheets.

e. Upcoming NEMO Workshops

Ms. Susla requested that Administrator Bleser provide an update on the upcoming NEMO workshops. Administrator Bleser provided details on the May 8th and May 14th workshops.

f. Plant Management

Administrator Bleser reported that the District has been working on the plant management plan and has held the first of three workshops for Lake Lucy, Mitchell Lake, and Red Rock Lake. She said that the workshop was well-attended by residents and that in about six weeks the next set of workshops will take place.

Manager Yetka moved to accept the Administrator's Report. Manager Crafton seconded the motion. Upon a vote, the motion carried 5-0.

9. Board Action

a. Rulemaking

President Forster described the process the District has undertaken with the rulemaking process. He requested that staff present the information in the memo and said that after the information is presented there will be an opportunity for discussion and public comment.

Attorney Welch summarized the draft rules process that has been undertaken since the release of the draft rules for comment in February. He mentioned the District's public hearing on the rules on March 19th and the close of the comment period on April 7th. He explained that the memo is the result of the District's brief discussion of the rules at its April meeting. Attorney Welch said that staff is seeking guidance from the managers on the next steps including direction on specific changes to the proposed rules in response to the comments, on directing the work products to support the changes, and the schedule.

Attorney Welch presented options for how the District could set the effective date for the rules. He provided staff's recommendation of adopting the rules and setting an effective date such as October 1st. He explained that the effective date would provide for a process whereby people who have projects underway and have made substantial progress in those projects prior to the effective date could bring in the project plans to the District to discuss on a case-by-case basis the application of the rules and compliance required. President Forster raised the topic of the Highway 101 project and the Highway 61/ Flying Cloud Drive projects that are currently underway. Administrator Bleser noted that the District received comments from the City of Eden Prairie regarding the Highway 101 project and potential effects of the proposed rules on the project and that the District did not receive comments from the County. Attorney Welch said it sounds like the Board agrees on the direction the staff recommended regarding adopting the rules and setting an effective date of October 1. He said that staff will draft a resolution that will come in front of the Board for review in a couple of months.

Rule D

Attorney Welch said that the District Engineer, Administrator, and Legal Counsel discussed the comments received regarding buffer widths and talked about ways that the District might modify those to respond to comments. Attorney Welch explained that the comments came in two different forms, one requesting more consistency such as with the requirements of the Nine Mile Creek Watershed and the other requesting the District to reconsider the widths, especially the wetland buffers, as they were greater in size than desired.

Attorney Welch described the three options, options a, b, and c, that staff came up with in response to the comments. He explained that options a and c could be pursued jointly and so could options b and c. There was a discussion of the wetland category labeled Exceptional Wetland. Engineer Sobiech commented that with the current proposed rule, the buffer for an Exceptional Wetland would be 100 feet and option a would change that buffer width to 80 feet. He added that changing the current proposed rule to align with Nine Mile's Creek's buffer rules would reduce the buffer widths from the current proposed rules. Engineer Sobiech went into more detail about Nine Mile's categories of high, medium, and low-grade wetlands and the correlating buffer widths of 60, 40, and 20 feet. Administrator Bleser commented that the District has not done a full inventory of its wetlands but said that there aren't that many Exceptional Wetlands.

Manager Yetka said that she is in favor of having a greater buffer width adjacent to Exceptional Wetlands. Manager Crafton agreed.

Administrator Bleser described the current proposed rule about single family residential property. She said that the rule states that the buffer width will be the greater of 25% of the distance between the closest habitable structure and the edge of the regulated feature or 30 feet. Administrator Bleser explained the triggers for the buffer requirement, such as the current proposed stormwater buffer, and explained that single family homes that are not changing their landscape or footprint as described in the current proposed rules are not required to do the buffer.

The managers discussed the options, including talking about how option c is designed to give the applicant flexibility, how options a and c could work together, and how applicants would be encouraged to come talk to the District Engineer before starting their projects so that they could discuss the rules and their projects. The Board agreed that for 3.1, the Board would like to move forward with options a and c together.

The discussion moved to section 3.1d. Attorney Welch described what would trigger the rule and talked about the provisions. He said that staff came up with options a, b, and c to try and address the common themes of the comments received on this section of the proposed rules. Attorney Welch noted that staff prefers option c.

He explained that staff has removed the mowing provision for the turf grass buffer so that it is consistent with Minnetonka's ordinance that requires that turf grass buffer not be mowed.

President Forster talked about how the buffer rule gets triggered. He said first of all if a single-family residential property owner does no work to the property then the rules are not triggered and no buffers need to be added on the property. He said that if the single-family residential property owner did work within the existing footprint of the structure then the rule is not triggered. President Forster continued by saying if that property owner does work beyond the existing footprint of the current structure but the work disturbs less than 5,000 square feet and disturbs fewer than 50 cubic yards then the buffer rule is not triggered. He said that the buffer rule is triggered when the work on the single-family residential property disturbs more than 5,000 square feet or more than 50 cubic yards, which he explained 50 cubic yards is approximately equivalent to carrying capacity of three dump trucks.

President Forster brought up the topic that had been raised in a different discussion about whether resodding a lawn would be considering a disturbance. He commented that first of all 5,000 square feet would be a big resodding project. He added that his thought it that exclusively putting in new sod would not be a disturbance and would not trigger the rule.

Public Comments

Mr. Anders Sandler of Chanhassen commented that whether or not he would do any work that would trigger the rules as proposed, he believes that fundamentally there is still a loss of value of his property due to the rules. He said that the more restrictive the rules, the more damage is done financially when his family tries to sell their house. Mr. Sandler brought up the question of how the rules would apply to association outlots and if they would be considered single family residential or not.

Attorney Welch said that staff has not integrated a specific definition for outlots into the rule provisions. He said that generally outlots are plotted at the same time as the lots and his first reaction is that outlots

would be treated the same as single-family residential lots in the same subdivision.

Mr. Sandler asked if the actions of the homeowners would trigger the rule requirement on the outlot. He noted that in his neighborhood there are homes that have two separate property IDs, with one ID having the residence and the other ID having the lakeshore and the two IDs are divided by a road. Mr. Sandler asked if disturbance on the property ID having the residence trigger the buffer rule on the property ID that is the actual lakeshore. There was discussion about how contiguous property IDs under one owner would be treated as a single property, but how in this case the properties are not contiguous. President Forster said that in such a case, work done on the non-lakeshore property would not trigger the buffer rule. Mr. Sandler asked if the steep slope provision applies to single family homes. Attorney Welch responded no.

Mr. Josh Anderson of Chanhassen introduced himself as the president of the Lotus Lake Dock and Trail Association. He said that his association has a seven-household dock and asked if repairs or replacement of the dock would be affected or regulated by the proposed rules. Manager Yetka said no and that the Department of Natural Resources regulates docks. He said that his association sought attorney counsel about the District's proposed rules, and the attorney advised the association that when those homeowners bought their homes, they bought them without restrictions and titled them without restrictions. Mr. Anderson said that the District's proposed rules will destroy the full value of their homes after the fact and it is a condemnation of the homes. He said that the attorney advised that if the District's rules move forward then the Watershed District should buy the homes.

Attorney Welch responded that the District's rules do not condemn the properties but apply water resources protection rules that this watershed is obligated to impose under state law.

Mr. Tom Huberty of Chanhassen said if it diminishes the value of the property then it is condemnation. He said he thinks that adding rules is completely out of line. He said that he wants no changes to what has been in place. Mr. Huberty expressed his displeasure in the District's rulemaking process. President Forster reiterated the public process that the District has undertaken during the rulemaking process. President Forster said that people want clean water and that with these rules the District is attempting to maintain the lakes at a certain condition. There was a lengthy discussion between Mr. Huberty and the Board members. Attorney Welch pointed out that the Statement of Need and Reasonableness (SONAR) is on the District's website.

Mr. Scott Mayer of Chanhassen said that he was a founding member of the Lotus Lake clean water committee and has participated as a citizen advisor to the RPBCWD. He said that he is a proponent of clean water and that progress in those efforts was made through collaborative processes. He said that there seems to be confusion over the possible gain achieved from the proposed rules, and it is unknown how property values will be affected by them. Mr. Mayer said that it sounds like a fair amount of change will be necessary to trigger the buffer rules and he doesn't see how the potential positive impact to the lake through the rules could offset the potential negative impacts to the properties. He described the potential loss to the City of Chanhassen's tax basis as a multi-million dollar loss due to the decrease in property values from the rules. Mr. Mayer said that he would like to see a study on what the impact would be if property values went down 5% and how that cost would compare to the District spending one million dollars to acquire a property and put in a holding pond.

Ms. Lisa Atkinson of Chanhassen described her work as a relator and a current Lotus Lake lakeshore property she has listed. She talked about how the house has been appraised and can't be sold at less than

the appraised value, but the District's rules could affect the selling price, leaving the listing family in a difficult situation.

Mr. Mark Hedge asked about the evolution of the rules and whether changes to the rules would occur after their adoption or not. Mr. Hedge said that his main concern would be any evolution of the triggers. President Forster said it is the District's position to maintain the rules as adopted for a long time unless someone with authority over the watershed, like the Minnesota Board of Water and Soil Resources or the state, mandates changes.

Mr. Kevin Atkinson referred to the research paper "Potential Contributions of Mature Prairie and Turf Grass to Phosphorous in Urban Runoff" that he had reviewed. He summarized that the research was a quantitative analysis of nitrogen injection from native plants and turf. He asked the Board and staff if they thought that native plants or turf injected more nitrogen and said that he assumed that the turf grass would inject more nitrogen. He said that his point in raising this research study is that he would like a quantitative analysis on the proposed rule so that the science behind what the District is proposing can be reviewed. He said he wants to understand what would be the best techniques to achieve the desired goals.

Ms. Laurie Susla of Chanhassen asked if the rules include a definition of the word disturbance and in particular as the word relates to the surface area. President Forster said that disturbance is where someone comes along, does something to it where pervious surface is changed to impervious surface. Attorney Smith said that the current definition of land-disturbing activity in the District's proposed rules covers more than simply converting pervious to impervious. He said that site preparation activities such as grading and grubbing and so on would be considered disturbance. Attorney Welch added that land-disturbing activity is defined in the rules and he read the definition. Attorney Smith said that it was raised earlier whether resodding project of greater than 5,000 square feet would trigger the rule or not, and he stated that the Board discussion was that it would not absent the project including some other activity such as re-grading. Ms. Susla said that she thinks that pretty strict attention needs to be paid to what the rules say instead of interpretations of the rules. Ms. Susla asked how the proposed rule about steep slopes works for a tear-down on a steep slope. Administrator Bleser said regarding the buffer the single-family lot rules would apply. Ms. Susla also clarified that the District did not receive comments from 190 people but received 190 comments. President Forster said that he had said that the District received 170 comments. Ms. Susla said that she is concerned that there are a lot of people that don't know about these proposed rules. Ms. Susla said that there is a lot of information still not known, like how much of the external loading is coming from surrounding neighborhoods and storm sewers. She said that the questions need to be asked and information known about what results are expected before families are asked to make a pretty big sacrifice.

Administrator Bleser pointed out the benefits of buffers include strengthening the shoreline so that there is less erosion and less sediment entering the lakes. Attorney Welch said that the rules do focus consistently on performance and establishing performance standards. He said the rules seek to protect negative effects on water resources.

Mr. Larry Koch of Chanhassen said that he has already spoken in front of the Board with comments on the rules and has submitted several pages of comments. Mr. Koch said that the rules lack definition and he doesn't think enough people understand the effects of the rules. He said that he wants rules that make sense and wants people to understand how the rules work. He provided details about the dimensions of his lot and backyard and discussed how the rules would affect his use of the backyard. Mr. Koch said that

he doesn't believe that the people can appreciate the impact of the proposed rules until they can go and imagine and know what would happen to these properties under those rules. He said that for this reason he proposes that all existing properties be grandfathered. Mr. Koch said that it is the lack of definition and ambiguity in the rules that concerns him that these rules could be applied to require him to put in a thirty-foot buffer if he resods the lawn even if everyone here says that the resodding shouldn't trigger the rule. Mr. Koch said that as a lawyer it is his view that what President Forster said is not in the rules. Mr. Koch said that if what President Forster has described about resodding and what would and would not trigger the buffer rules are actually written into the rules, then it would go a long way toward alleviating people's concerns. President Forster said that the Board is discussing a 15-foot buffer. Manager Crafton said that the 15-foot buffer has been part of tonight's discussion. Mr. Koch said that he is very appreciative of what the managers say and if it is 15 feet, he would love to see it in the rule. Mr. Koch said that he would appreciate everyone making a case if this ends up in a dispute. He said he doesn't want to be there; he wants reasonable rules. Mr. Koch said he wants people to put themselves in the place of the people who live around these lakes before the Board passes these rules, especially based upon what he heard tonight about the science or the lack of the science. He said that due to the lack of definition to these rules and what is and is not included in them, he hopes that the Board would give serious consideration before passing these rules. Mr. Koch said that these rules are as complicated as anything that he has ever read. He said that in the rules there is the definition of "rehabilitation" which talks about if one replaces 50% of the impermeable surface area. He asked what impact does that have and will that trigger the rules. Mr. Koch reiterated that he does not believe that what Mr. Forster said is in the rules and if they want to write into the rules 15 feet, it would be a great start with existing properties. However, Mr. Koch said, he doesn't see any reason why anybody should have to put in 15 feet when 96% of the effluent that goes into the lake goes in untreated. President Forster asked him if he heard the description earlier clarifying all of the criteria that would need to be in place before the buffer rule would go into effect. Mr. Koch responded that he heard what President Forster said but they are not in the rules. Mr. Koch said that this is so complex that he proposes that the time is taken to work through the rules and make sure everyone understands them. He said that he doesn't think enough people understand exactly what's going to happen with these rules. Mr. Koch said that it would go a long way if they put everything that they literally said into the rules, but, he added, they aren't the rules. He said that he won't be dealing with these managers in 10 to 15 years, he'll be dealing with a whole new batch of people.

President Forster asked if Engineer Sobiech or Attorney Welch or Attorney Smith had any comments. Attorney Welch commented that he is not sure which portion of President Forster's review of the rule provisions that Mr. Koch is referring to. Attorney Welch said that regarding President Forster's description of the when the rules are triggered and when they are not triggered, that is how the rules work. Mr. Koch assured the Board that what Attorney Welch described isn't all that President Forster said about when the rules apply. Mr. Koch reiterated that he would be happy if all of President Forster's comments about re-turfing and rebuilding on the same site were in the rules. Mr. Koch said that what Attorney Welch read about land-disturbing activities is directly contrary to what President Forster said. He said that the rules are a great idea and it absolutely is something that should be done, but he wants rules that make sense and are understandable. Mr. Koch said that he believes that the people who make the decisions and impose them do not understand the rules the same way as even counsel understands them. Mr. Koch said that he thinks time should be taken to walk through the rules so that everyone understands how they work. Mr. Koch said that he has proposed including with the rules a set of charts that he developed that he

thinks will help people understand the rules. Mr. Koch suggested taking the time to make sure the rules say what has been said tonight, for example that one could reconstruct one's house on the same footprint. He said if that is a rule, then let's say it, because he doesn't see that in the rules.

President Forster asked Mr. Koch if he saw the flow charts presented by Engineer Sobiech because the flow charts went through exactly what President Forster described tonight. Mr. Koch responded that the flow charts did not cover the same items that President Forster discussed about sodding, grading, removal of one's house, changing one's house, and changing the impervious area. Mr. Koch said that he was at that meeting, he listened, and he read the charts. He said that they are fabulous charts but they don't answer all of the questions.

Mr. Tom Huberty said that he is still unclear about what an Exceptional Wetland is. President Forster said that there is a specific definition of Exceptional Wetland. He said that what would need to happen is that someone would need to come out to see what Mr. Huberty has in terms of wetlands.

Attorney Welch added that there are four categories of wetlands established and there is a methodology for identifying them.

Administrator Bleser asked for direction from the Board regarding section 3 and described again options a, b, and c. There was Board discussion. Ms. Laurie Susla requested that the Board charge Engineer Sobiech with figuring out what the buffer will do or else explain why to people who are concerned what that is not necessary.

President Forster said that he is inclined to move forward with option c, the required buffer width extend 15 feet. There was discussion. President Forster remarked that the cost of prevention is a lot cheaper than the cost of correction.

Rule J

Attorney Welch said that the District received a lot of helpful comments on this rule from the technical and engineering community. He explained that Engineer Sobiech will work to develop a way for the buffer and the stormwater provisions to work together. Attorney Welch discussed the memo prepared by staff and the work products listed in section 1c that staff proposes to develop, including a white paper that will address the issues.

President Forster said that he is totally in favor with moving to MIDS [Minimum Impact Design Standard] standards. Attorney Welch recommended that the District incorporate MIDS to the degree that they allow the District rules to be as simple and straightforward with triggers and criteria. He said that MIDS has a complicated outlot of alternatives analysis and his recommendation is that the District not incorporate all of MIDS. President Forster said fine. Manager Crafton said that she agrees.

Timeline

President Forster went through the upcoming workflow for the rules process. He said that the Board will meet with the District's TAC Committee on May 19th, which is the same day that the CAC meets. President Forster said that in both cases the Board will be sharing the comments on the rules and the draft response to comments. He said that later in May the managers and District staff will be meeting with the Carver County Commissioners. President Forster said that at June 4th District Board meeting, the final revised rules, responses, and comments and supplemental SONAR will be reviewed. He said that at that time the District will adopt a rules and resolution-setting schedule. Attorney Welch commented that the

schedule set out in the memo was aggressive and noted that likely it would be in the managers' best interest for the work products from the staff to be completed before many more meetings take place. He said that there is missing information from and misinformation about the rules and staff's first task is to address those two issues as best that the staff can.

The Board clarified that it is in favor of holding an additional public information session prior to the rules adoption.

b. Office Lease

Administrator Bleser provided an update and said that she is waiting for the bank's lawyers to draft documents. She reminded the Board that it agreed to the term sheets presented at the Board's April 3rd meeting. She asked the Board to authorize the District's legal counsel to review the lease agreement and to authorize President Forster to sign the agreement contingent on legal counsel's review and approval of the agreement.

Manager Bisek moved that the Board authorize legal counsel to review the lease agreement and to authorize President Forster to sign the agreement if it is in concert with the previously approved terms. Manager Crafton seconded the motion. Upon a vote, the motion carried 5-0.

[Attorney Welch departs the meeting.]

c. Vehicle Purchase

Administrator Bleser described the vehicle, which is a four-door Dodge RAM pick-up truck, and said that the District will purchase it through the State of Minnesota's Cooperative Purchase Venture. She reported that the total cost including license and taxes is \$23,695.07. Administrator explained that the District would need to purchase additional insurance from the League of Minnesota Cities at a cost of \$300 per year. She noted that the truck would have a towing package already installed on it. Manager Bisek said that they talked about having a cleaning facility on the truck. Administrator Bleser described the idea of also purchasing a portable decontamination station to install on the truck, which would be used to decontaminate the District boat. She said this would be a way of preventing AIS spread as the boat moves from water body to water body. She said that the cost of the decontamination station and retrofitting the truck for the portable station is close to \$3,000. There was discussion of funding, and Administrator Bleser said that if the District was interested in moving forward with the decontamination station, then she would need to look at the District's data collection funds. Manager Bisek moved that the Board authorize an expenditure amount of up to \$28,000 for the purchase of the truck and associated license and tax costs and the purchase and retrofitting for the decontamination unit, with the funds to come for that additional unit to come from the AIS fund and/ or another fund. Manager Crafton seconded the motion. Upon a vote, the motion carried 4-0 [Manager Wencil absent from the vote]. Administrator Bleser responded that at the District's next Board meeting she will confirm with the Board where the source of the additional funds for the decontamination unit.

d. CAC New Member

Administrator Bleser said that the Board had all received a copy of the CAC application from Dorothy Peterson, who is in the Silver Lake Watershed in the City of Shorewood. Administrator Bleser requested that the Board appoint Ms. Peterson as an additional member of the District's Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC). Manager Yetka moved to appoint Dorothy Peterson to the CAC. Manager Crafton seconded the motion. Upon a vote, the motion carried 4-0 [Manager Wencil absent from the vote].

e. Cost-Share Grants

Administrator Bleser said that the Board members should have all received a table with the cost-share grants. She described the applications received, including one from the City of Chanhassen, one from the City of Eden Prairie, one from Minnetonka resident Dennis Yonkers, one from Michael and Elizabeth Halverson, and one from Tom and Marilyn Tolkeson. There was discussion, including Manager Yetka's comment that she doesn't think that the cost-share grants should be awarded for work that has already started. Manager Yetka said that she is not in support of providing grant funds for two different applications on a single property. She also said that unless there is a tie-in with water quality, she is not in favor of using cost-share grant funds for projects that are exclusively native plant restorations. Manager Bisek added that she is not in favor of using cost-share grant funds for projects that just manage invasive species on properties. Manager Yetka said that in the future it would be nice to know more technical information about the projects in the applications, such as quantitative information on the anticipated benefits of the projects. The Board reached consensus that it would approve the Dennis Yonkers application for cost-share grant funding and that Administrator Bleser would bring back to the Board next month additional information on the other projects in the applications.

Manager Yetka moved to approve the Dennis Yonkers application for cost-share grant funding. Manager Crafton seconded the motion. Upon a vote, the motion carried 5-0.

f. Auditor's Report and Annual Report

Manager Yetka moved to approve amending the agenda to include a review of the Auditor's Report and the District's Annual Report. Manager Bisek seconded the motion. Upon a vote, the motion carried 5-0.

Manager Crafton moved to accept the Auditor's report. Manager Yetka seconded the motion. Upon a vote, the motion carried 5-0.

Manager Crafton moved to accept the District's Annual Report. Manager Yetka seconded the motion. Upon a vote, the motion carried 5-0.

Manager Crafton moved to authorize staff to submit the annual report to the Minnesota Board of Water and Soil Resources. Manager Wencil seconded the motion. Upon a vote, the motion carried 5-0.

10. Manager's Discussion

a. Spent Lime Treatment

Administrator Bleser said that she has handed out tonight a memo on the feasibility study and that there will be a public hearing on the project at the Board's June meeting.

11. Upcoming Events

- **Board Meeting**, Wednesday, June 4, 2014, Eden Prairie City Hall, 7:00 p.m.

12. Adjournment

Manager Crafton moved to adjourn the meeting. Manager Yetka seconded the motion. Upon a vote, the motion carried 5-0. The meeting adjourned at 10:41 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Ken Wencil, Secretary