

**Prior Lake-Spring Lake Watershed District  
Monthly Meeting  
June 8, 2004**

Members Present: Craig Gontarek, William Kallberg, Larry Mueller, Roger Wahl,  
William Schmokel

Staff Present: Bryce Huemoeller, District Attorney  
Ed Matthiesen, District Engineer  
Shannon Lotthammer, District Administrator  
Jim Eggen, District Technician  
Yolanda Coleman, Office Assistant

Others Present: Jim Peterson

1. CALL TO ORDER: Meeting called to order by President Kallberg at 7:00 PM.
2. PUBLIC COMMENT: President Kallberg asked if there were any public comments or questions regarding subjects that are not already on the Agenda for later in the meeting. There were none.
3. CONSENT AGENDA: President Kallberg asked the Board if there were any items on the consent agenda they wanted to pull for further discussion. Manager Gontarek requested the monthly minutes be pulled. The Monthly Permit Report was also pulled for discussion.
4. ITEMS REMOVED FROM CONSENT AGENDA

A) Approve monthly minutes. Craig Gontarek noted that in the May 11, 2004 Monthly Meeting Minutes, page 2; Motion to approve Permit Application #04.01 the name of the Manager making the motion was omitted. Manager Wahl noted that on page 2 heading Technician's Report the word Technician was misspelled.

**Motion by William Schmokel to approve the May Monthly Meeting minutes with the two above noted items corrected. Second by Roger Wahl. Motion passed 5 ayes.**

**Motion by Roger Wahl to approve the May 5, 2004 Special Meeting Minutes. Second by Larry Mueller. Motion passed 5 ayes.**

B) Approve Claims: Shannon Lotthammer explained the list was revised because some invoices had not been received when the first list was prepared.

**Motion by William Schmokel to approve Claims #04-144 through 04-187 in the amount of \$43,738.14. Second by Roger Wahl. Motion passed 5 ayes.**

C) Monthly Permitting Report: Jim Eggen made reference to the Jeffers Pond project and said that the notation under the Compliance Status column should be removed and explained that the non-compliance letter had not yet been sent. President Kallberg asked what the letters COC represent. Jim Eggen said they stand for Certificate of Completion. President Kallberg asked if there were any other comments or questions regarding the permit status report. There were none.

**Motion by Craig Gontarek to approve the 6/3/04 Permit Status report. Second by Larry Mueller. Motion passed 5 ayes.**

5. TECHNICIAN'S REPORT:

Jim Eggen said there were no applications to be presented at this time. He said there are some being processed, but are not complete at this time. He said Shannon Lotthammer had asked him to give an update on some of the infiltration projects and referred the Managers back to his permit status report. He said there are six projects he is evaluating; Jeffers South, Shepherds Path, Whispering Oaks, Timber Crest, Red Cedar Heights and Regal Crest. He said that he has sent out letters and/or talked to the people on the telephone to inform them that the infiltration basins were not working adequately or at all and to please check the situation and respond within 30 days. He said he has received a call back from Timber Crest and he and Ed Matthiesen intend to meet with them next Wednesday. He said that today he received a call from Nick Polta, the engineer for Wensmann, regarding the infiltration basin at the Jeffers South site. He said that he, Ed and Shannon would need to meet with some of these people to help them find a solution for some of these non-functional basins.

Manager Schmokel noted that some of the projects listed on the report are listed as "complete" and asked if that meant satisfaction to the point of releasing their bonds, or complete by the developers standards but the District has not yet checked the infiltration. Jim Eggen said that those marked complete are complete by developer's standards, but the certificates of completion are sometimes hard to obtain from the developers. He also said that upon inspection, even after receiving a certificate of completion, he some times finds erosion problems, etc. Manager Schmokel said he feels the developer and developer's engineer must accept responsibility for the completion of the project as stated in their plans, and not just allow the District to take their bond and do the work. He said he does not want the District to become "repairmen" on these projects. President Kallberg asked if the COC triggers the final inspection or if the final inspection has to be made to get the COC. Jim Eggen said that when the developer is satisfied that everything is done and working satisfactorily, they send in the COC and then Jim does the inspection. He said he does find sometimes that there are still problems or incomplete work and so advises the developer that the COC is not accepted and the bond will not be released until corrections are done. When it is, the permit will be closed. President Kallberg noted that the report does not have "security released" information. Shannon Lotthammer said the list is just of active permits, and if the permit is closed and security released it will not be on this list. Jim Eggen said he is following up on the projects as he has prioritized them. President Kallberg asked if there were any more questions or comments. There were none.

## 6. ENGINEER'S REPORT:

A) Muhlenhardt Project Scope and Budget. Ed Matthiesen referred to the memo and budget that he distributed. He said he felt that maybe they could take this on as a general contractor and talked to Jim Eggen and Shannon Lotthammer to see if this is something they could do. He said they have a grant from the Met Council for 1000 feet of the Muhlenhart property. He said that if they could do this as a general contractor, and District Staff has time available, the District might be able to save some money. He said they would have to have sub-contractors hired and supervised by the District. He said if the District does this, they would not be putting it on specifications but would be directing it from the plan sets. He said he doesn't know if they really would save money by using District Staff time or if they should just go with traditional bid documents and proceed from there. He said they could do the project either way. He said he laid out a budget if the District does it as the general contractor, but could not put in an amount for construction management until they decide if the District should do it or it should be bid. He reviewed some other items in the budget and asked the Board which way they thought the project should be handled. He said if the District acted as general contractor it would be about a six week project and require about 4 to 6 hours a day of Jim Eggen's time.

Manager Gontarek asked how much the District might save as the contractor. Ed Matthiesen said he is not sure there would be much savings due to staff time required and the District accepting more responsibilities, such as maintenance, etc. Manager Mueller said he feels if the District takes on a project of this size and time requirement, then something else could suffer. Manager Schmokel said he prefers to see these projects handled in the conventional manner. He said he thinks this project is small enough that the bid or quotation documents could be simplified. He said he does not know what this project cost estimate is but feels it might be within the \$50,000.00 for quotes rather than a full-fledged bid process. Ed Matthiesen said he thinks it will be over \$50,000.00 and mentioned the items that will be needed. Ed said from what he is hearing the Board does not feel the District should act as general contractor. He said he will meet with Staff and bring an update to the next meeting.

B) Update on Infiltration/Storage Site Study: Ed Matthiesen said this should be finished in time for the next meeting.

C) Outlet Box Preliminary Design: Ed Matthiesen said Rich Greenlee is putting together a concept design. Manager Gontarek asked if the legal question had been resolved. Shannon said she does not have an answer yet and asked Manager Gontarek to recap the question for the Board and Staff. Manager Gontarek said he wants to know what rights those shoreland property owners have below the Ordinary High Water elevation. Attorney Huemoeller said the property owners rights extend to the low water line. He said that if the proposed outlet box exceeds 15 feet in width the District would need a wider easement from Dean Morlock and an appraiser would need to decide if there is a decrease in the value of his property and the need for compensation. Attorney Huemoeller said the alternative is to push the structure down further and out further into the lake. He asked if they can merge this topic with the next item on the agenda; 7 A). The Board agreed.

## 7. OTHER OLD/NEW BUSINESS:

A) Morlock Easement: Attorney Huemoeller said that he has finished the draft revision of Dean Morlock's easement and will send it to Shannon Lotthammer and Ed Matthiesen and whoever else wants to review it. He said once it has been reviewed it will be given to Dean Morlock. He said with the easement there are some risks and opportunities. He summarized the District's interest in a new outlet and Mr. Morlock's interest in a revised easement to allow building over the outlet pipe. He said the District's concept has been to confine their easement to the subsurface area that will allow Mr. Morlock to build directly over the top of it, which is a value to Mr. Morlock. He said this might be an opportunity to approach Mr. Morlock with the generalized concept design for the revised outlet including an expanded easement and also with the revised documents that give him additional rights that he would not have otherwise. He said this is a request that benefits the District and an offer that benefits Mr. Morlock so this might be the start of a good deal. Manager Kallberg asked that before this outlet revision came up, what was the benefit to the District of Mr. Morlock building over the easement. Attorney Huemoeller said the District's fundamental benefit was an improved access for the purpose of long-term operation and maintenance of the outlet. President Kallberg asked what Mr. Morlock has now and what his expectation is of what he will get. Attorney Huemoeller said that now he has a lot with his house on it and a lot with a utility easement running right down the middle of it and the City's utility easement over the top of it, and what he may get is a subsurface easement with the right to build over the top of it. He said they are at the point of deciding what Mr. Morlock's rights and the District's rights are going to be and defining the long-term purposes of the easement.

Manager Schmokel said there are benefits to be gained by both sides. He said Mr. Morlock owns a piece of property and bought some more that is northerly of the existing pipe. He said if he puts those two pieces of property together and obtains the right to build over the District's pipe, he has a nice lot. He said the District has an easement coming down the hill and that there used to be a roadway "not dedicated to public use" that came down to Mr. Morlock's property. He said the District can access the outlet by coming right down the easement, but if Mr. Morlock intends to build on his lot, then the District would lose the ability to drive over it. He said if the District can gain access through the old sub-division it would be to their benefit even if they agree to have a gate to the access and a key for it. He summarized options for the new outlet design that would not exceed the 15-foot easement. He said this would change the design from a circular structure to a long and narrow one and he feels they can get the weir length needed. He said he would like Attorney Huemoeller to ask Mr. Morlock if he would be averse to widening the easement at the last few feet so the District could put in the weir and outlet structure as designed, or if the District must redesign the new outlet to stay within the easement. He said that Courts have ruled that in effect the property owner owns from the upland (in this case 904) down to the low water mark with the right of the State to determine what can be done between the ordinary high and low water mark. He said the State has not historically given a permit wider than the existing easement. He said this is a unique situation and they need to get it all in writing. Attorney Huemoeller said one issue is going to be the perception of how that enhanced weir is going to affect capability to build on that lot. He said if Mr. Morlock views the outlet weir as being unsightly or somehow impeding a sale of the property, he is going to want something in return. He said the District needs to be aware of this and how they are going to deal with it in the design and financially. He said both the District and Mr. Morlock have

needs and both have something to offer and that they should be able to successfully come to some reasonable understanding within a 30-90 day period. Manager Schmokel pointed out that the lot is not buildable or marketable without the aid of the District and the City making a deal with him. The Managers and Staff discussed cost and modifications of easements.

President Kallberg said the original question was “Can they make the structure wider than the easement?” and the answer is “no”, unless it is below the ordinary low water, which is not the case. Attorney Huemoeller said that private ownership goes down to the low water mark and it is State-owned lake bed from there. He said that Dean Morlock will get a legal opinion that he owns the deed title down to the low water level and if the District wants to go wider than 15 feet they need to amend the easement or modify the existing easement. President Kallberg said the decision is whether to keep the structure within the easement or modify the easement. Attorney Huemoeller said the Board should decide and if they are going to widen the easement and materially change the outlet structure, they should have a good idea of what they are going to do, have drawings and a reasonable depiction of how it will look so a nice, logical package can be given to Mr. Morlock that would look acceptable to him and to a potential buyer of the property.

Ed Matthiesen said that before continuing with the rest of the items under #7, he would like to update them on the West Spring Lake Change Order. He said he talked to the project manager who said it was signed and mailed, but he has not yet received it.

B) Pike Lake Easement: Shannon Lotthammer referred to the picture of the work that Ed Matthiesen and Wenck had put together and circulated at the last Board meeting. She said the next step is for her to meet with Dean Gavin of Huemoeller, Bates and Gontarek and go over the data again and review the plans for moving forward. She said the next step after that will be to coordinate a meeting with Ed Matthiesen, Dean Gavin and Evergreen Land Services to basically put together a work plan. She said they will also begin to get a feel for the costs for the easements so they can eventually get a cost to the Board for authorization. She said there is not a budget item in the 2004 budget for Pike Lake easements. She said however there is a budget for easements in Segments 1 and 2, so there is some funding they can switch over to acquire the Pike Lake easements. She said she and Ed discussed that while they are looking at the Pike Lake easement needs it would probably be a good time to get a sense for what they will need for Channel easements as well so they could have the conversations with the landowners at the same time as in some cases it is the same landowner. She said there will be more to report at the next meeting.

C) Jeffers Project Update: Shannon Lotthammer said she and Ed Matthiesen met with Steve Albrecht the City Engineer for the City of Prior Lake to discuss the design plans. She said Mr. Albrecht told them the project has started to move forward again and the developer hopes to begin grading in the fall. She said they still need to complete an EAW; some of that work was done last year. She said they also still need to go through the City’s preliminary plat approval process. Ed Matthiesen said they have presented the City with some drawings for construction but have not yet received any comments back from them. Manager Schmokel asked about easements. Shannon Lotthammer said it is her understanding that easements will be gotten through the City’s development process. She said the City requires easements to the 100 year flood plain. She said they have not yet seen the revised plans but in previous plans most of the land they are talking about adjacent to the channel was park land. Attorney Huemoeller said the Jeffers Estate did state that if

they wanted to start work before the plats are finalized they will grant, without cost, temporary easements, but would not agree to give the District permanent easements. He said the reason is because they want to use the easements that they give along the water course as part of the park land and if they first give the District permanent easements, there is no residual value for their park dedication. He said temporary easements would be given so the District can do their project and then the Estate will work out the permanent easements with the City. Attorney Huemoeller said that City Ordinances require that existing water courses be dedicated to the public. He said the attorney for the estate, Paul Oberg, said that if the District needs to do work to clean or maintain the channel, they will be able to get whatever temporary easement they need. He said the presumption is that certain areas are going to be dedicated to the public somehow. Manager Schmokel said he is a little fearful of the word temporary if the District is in there working and they haven't made arrangements, and knowing the ordinances of the City, you can't count the area below the 100 year flood plain as acreage towards parks, lots, etc. Attorney Huemoeller said they may be able to make a back up agreement with Mr. Oberg. He said if there are things the District needs to get done now, he thinks they will get cooperation through temporary easements. Manager Kallberg noted that even though they have the easement to do the work now they need the extra width, but they do not need extra width to have the channel. He asked if the work they are doing will help with the maintenance of the channel. Ed Matthiesen said the channel is pretty efficient, but there is some bank failure, etc. and if the District was not doing a project now, the developer would have to do a project to keep the banks from giving out. He said as the channel gets further downstream from Lower Jeffers, the channel is going to tend to migrate and if the developer wants to build there, they will have to do something to keep the channel banks in place. Shannon Lotthammer said she and Attorney Huemoeller had worked on a letter to the Jeffers Estate back when development was stalled, to take steps to obtain the easements. She said one of their arguments for this was that if the easements were given to the District now instead of later or given to the City later, and the District could do their work now instead of later, they would not be in there doing construction while the developer was trying to sell lots.

D) Outlet Channel EAW and JPA: Shannon Lotthammer said regarding the EAW that she and Paul Nelson met with the wetland regulatory authorities to discuss potential wetland impact along the channel. She said that when the channel was all connected and improved the Wetlands Conservation Act (WCA) did not exist, so they did not have to consider WCA in the original project and they did have a Corps of Engineers Permit. She said now it is different and they will have to address the WCA. She said the Corps of Engineers is also getting more actively involved in this area than in the past. She summarized the permitting needs for the project and also discussed long-term maintenance. She said they have discussed soliciting proposals to do a wetlands delineation for the Jeffers stretch and for the Muhlenhardt stretch as those are the two parts the District is hoping to do within the next year. She said a component of that would also be for whoever is doing the delineations to also work with the District to develop a wetlands permitting plan or permitting approach for the rest of the channel. She said she is looking for authority to draft an RFP and put it out for solicitation. She said this would go to the list of ecological service providers, and additional firms that have a back-ground in wetlands permitting issues. She said they need to complete the delineations and have the EAW done before they can submit any of the applications. She said if they can get the delineations done in July and August and the EAW done yet this month or the first part of next month in time for a 30 day notice, then the Board can act on the EAW in August, and they can submit the permit application. She said if the wetlands do not require individual ACOE

permits, they should have the permits by the end of the year. She said she has two questions for the Board. 1) Are they comfortable with Staff drafting the RFP and putting it on notice, or would the Board want to see it first. She said if the Board wants to see it first it can be brought to the July meeting. 2) She said there is a chance they could have the EAW completed and ready to go on notice before the next Board meeting and if that happens can they put it on notice or bring it to the Board for review and comments before it goes on notice. After discussion the Board decided it was okay to go ahead with the RFP, but they wanted to review and comment on the EAW before it goes on public notice.

Shannon Lotthammer said she and Attorney Huemoeller discussed his comments on the JPA. She said he provided a lot of good direction regarding the focus of the JPA. She said the outlet was constructed and the channel was connected to allow overall flow from Prior Lake. She said now it is being contemplated to be used more by the Cities of Shakopee and Prior Lake as a part of their storm water conveyance system. She said she is working on revising the draft of the JPA that will focus more on the current and long-term use of the channel and less on the Outlet and Channel Improvement Project. She said she is also working with the Cities to get updated runoff modeling to use in finalizing the cost shares. She said she spoke to Bruce Loney of the City of Shakopee and he indicated they needed to update their storm water models before they can give information to the District to update its outlet system model. She said Bruce Loney will go to the Shakopee City Council on July 6, 2004 for authorization to contract out that work.

Shannon Lotthammer said she also met with the Staff of the Sioux Community and they are also in the process of completing a model for their storm water flow. She said the Sioux Community is also in the pre-proposal stage of consideration of construction of a wastewater treatment plant for the Community and would include the Mystic Lake Casino. She said the concept is that the water will be treated to the standard of being used as irrigation for the Lone Pine Golf Course, and when not being used for irrigation the water would follow a conveyance that would ultimately end up in the outlet channel.

She said the concept for the JPA was to put in a formula for how the cost share would be derived at but not actually put the numbers in for segments 4 through 6 as that information is not yet available. She said if they are close to obtaining those numbers, the parties may want to wait on the JPA until they actually have the numbers.

Shannon said that to continue to move forward on the Outlet Channel Project, especially with the Jeffers segments, they might want to consider doing an interim agreement with the City of Prior Lake. She said she has not yet discussed this idea with the City of Prior Lake.

E) Permitting and Rules – Coordination, Rule Revisions and Equivalency Process. Shannon Lotthammer said she would summarize the status of the Watershed Rule Revisions. She said a related element is that Scott County has put together an Erosion Control Advisory Team to develop a program framework to implement the erosion control requirements of the Scott WMD Plan. She said Scott County and a couple of the townships are involved. She said she is sitting in on the meetings to coordinate with what the Prior Lake-Spring Lake Watershed District is doing.

Shannon said they are also trying to coordinate on the equivalency process. She said now that the Scott WMO is constituted and they have their water resources management plan approved, they are in the process of writing the rules for that watershed. She said Paul Nelson is writing the rules for them and using Prior Lake-Spring Lake Watershed District rules as a model. She said that soon the Cities will be in the position of having the rules of two watershed districts to follow. She said the Cities in the Prior Lake-Spring Lake Watershed District have expressed interested in establishing equivalency so they can take over permitting. She said they are also interested in doing the same with the Scott WMO. She said she has been meeting with Dawn Tracy, the Natural Resources Manager of Scott County and also acting as Administrator for the Scott WMO, on a periodic basis to be sure they stay coordinated and the Cities only have to go through the equivalency process once. She said since the Board had started looking at volume management and the infiltration rules, one of her question is does the Board want more time to consider that within the District as they are actually looking at a rule revision before moving forward with the equivalency process.

Shannon said she has met with Staff of the Minnehaha Creek Watershed District as they have gone through this equivalency process several times with cities within their district. She said she received a lot of helpful information from them including the importance of putting together a memorandum of understanding or agreement and including annual reporting so the District has a check to see that the rules are being followed.

Attorney Huemoeller said that controversies are always going to arise and maybe part of the memorandum of agreement new ideas and understanding should also outline how to deal with new policies that the Board develops in their annual comprehensive plan. Manager Schmokel said that there are periodically going to be changes on volume control and infiltration and they will need to put in a mechanism to incorporate changes and get them to the Cities. Attorney Huemoeller asked how long it might take to organize equivalency testing. Shannon said she does not really have a handle on that at this time. She said it is a matter of finding a time to discuss where the Cities ordinances are and whether or not the ordinances are in place before the District provides equivalency. Manager Schmokel said the County is going through a change in their handling of green areas for dedication as parks, green ways, wetlands, etc. and that densities are going to go down. The Staff and Attorney Huemoeller discussed infiltration and equivalency. Attorney Huemoeller summarized that there is an existing philosophy in the cities that allows other things to get in the way of an infiltration policy and if the District wants equivalency with infiltration they need to start changing that philosophy while they are developing their criteria. He said the City Staff will have to have a roll in developing the concept so that they will support it. He said the thing to do is to outline a strategy with a time table and bring in the concepts of how they will handle the changes to the rules and the equivalency process. Shannon Lotthammer said she thinks they should work with the City to build a solution together. The Board discussed and agreed.

F) 2005 Budget Assumptions & Goals: Shannon Lotthammer said this is a follow-up to the Board Workshop discussion regarding the goals and where the programs are at. She said the next step is to look at the goals for 2005. She said at the last Board Meeting they talked about holding a workshop or special meeting to talk about existing programs, project reviews and goals and also new projects and goals. She referred to the copy of the Capital Improvement Plan and said it should be updated as part of the budgeting process for this year. She referred to the graph that was distributed and explained it was a graph of what the Watershed District Levy has been for the past five years. She

said this is just background for the Board to consider for the overall levy for 2005. She said they could discuss further or schedule a workshop to discuss in more depth. The Board agreed to have a workshop. Shannon said she would schedule the work shop for late June or early July and said they would need to schedule a Technical Advisory Committee meeting first.

G) Loan of ISCO Samplers to SWCD: Shannon Lotthammer said the District has three ISCO automated samplers that are not being used at this time. She explained that these units can be set to automatically take a water sample and that the District does not have the flashy hydrographs that requires use of this type of sampling equipment at this time. She said the SWCD is looking to set up some monitoring on the Vermillion River and do more stream monitoring within the County. They heard the District has these units and asked if the District would be willing to loan or sell them to SWCD. Shannon said that maybe someday the District may need them, so she recommended loaning them to SWCD. She also recommended a letter of agreement that would state that at the beginning of each year the District could reevaluate to determine if they may need them and let the SWCD know by a certain date so they can plan accordingly. The Board discussed and agreed to loan them to the SWCD.

H) Updates: EQIP Participation, Shoreland Workshop, Fish Lake Management Plan. Shannon Lotthammer said regarding the EQIP Participation, she is waiting to hear from the SWCD as to what level of participation they want with the District and feedback about the Resolution the Board passed about providing incentives. She said regarding the Shoreland Workshop, they have 24 RSVPs so there will be a full house. She said the City of Prior Lake received a mailing list for the Prior Lake Association and sent notifications to them, so there may be more people who will RSVP. She said she will prepare a waiting list and if there is enough interest they can have a second workshop later in the summer. She said the DNR has an application open for shoreland restoration funds. She said the Board may want to consider a joint application for some cost share funds, to provide some cost share for restoration on private land, such as; 50% for the owner and 50% for the grant, and maybe the City and District can put in some in-time for grant administration. Shannon said for the Fish Lake Management Plan, The Kestrel Design Group is getting started with aquatic plant management component and the next step is to convene a stakeholders meeting, probably in July. She said they would want that group to stay together over the next year to put together an overall management plan.

President Kallberg asked about the additional hand-outs. Shannon Lotthammer referred to the E-mail received from Brad Lindaman regarding the County Road 12 Reconstruction. She said she made copies for the Board since the Watershed District is mentioned. She said the comment in the e-mail indicates the feeling of the sender that the County and City of Prior Lake should get the Watershed District involved in the project. She said Jim has been sitting in on some project team meetings so Staff is aware of the project and has had the opportunity to make the project team aware of District Rules.

Shannon Lotthammer said the other article handed out about rain gardens appeared in the Minnesota Conservation Volunteer's magazine. President Kallberg suggested that copies should be made available at the Shoreland Workshop.

Shannon Lotthammer said they have received comments about the Watershed Tour. She said Pat Lynch from the MN DNR conveyed his thanks for the opportunity and keep up the good work. She said Jerry Hennen, one of the County Commissioners, also called and complimented the work that the Watershed District is doing and is impressed with the passion and commitment of the Board. President Kallberg said the Board thanks and compliments the Staff for their work organizing the tour. Manager Schmokel said that all of the County Commissioners made favorable comments to him. Manager Mueller told Shannon that she did a great job on the presentation during the tour.

President Kallberg referred to the letter and performance review form for the District Administrator. He asked that these be completed and mailed to him at the District marked “confidential”.

8. ADMINISTRATIVE:

A) Financial Report: Shannon Lotthammer reviewed the Financial Report.

Shannon said the audit is about to get under way. She said they have the last grant report done through last year.

President Kallberg asked if there were any other comments or questions before adjourning.

Jim Peterson, representative from the City of Prior, asked how to determine if infiltration systems work. Shannon Lotthammer the water should infiltrate within 72 hours of a storm. The Board and Staff identified common causes of basin failure.

ADJOURN:

**Motion to adjourn by William Schmokel. Second by Craig Gontarek. Motion passed 5 ayes.**

---

William Kallberg, President

---

Larry Mueller, Secretary