

# elm creek

## Watershed Management Commission

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE  
3235 Fernbrook Lane  
Plymouth, MN 55447

PH: 763.553.1144  
email: judie@jass.biz  
www.elmcreekwatershed.org

### MINUTES Regular Meeting | April 12, 2023

**I. CALL TO ORDER.** A meeting of the Elm Creek Watershed Management Commission was called to order at 11:33 a.m., Wednesday, April 12, 2023, in the Plymouth Community Center, 14800 34th Avenue North, Plymouth, MN, by Chair Doug Baines.

Present were: Gerry Butcher, Champlin; Ken Guenther, Corcoran; Doug Baines, Dayton; Joe Trainor, Maple Grove; Terry Sharp, Medina; Catherine Cesnik, Plymouth; and David Katzner, Rogers.

Also present: Kevin Mattson, Corcoran; Derek Asche, Maple Grove; Ben Scharenbroich, Mike Payne, and Jacob Zea, Plymouth; Diane Spector and Erik Megow, Stantec; James Kujawa, Surface Water Solutions; Kris Guentzel and Kevin Ellis, Hennepin County Environment and Energy (HCEE); Brian Vlach, Three Rivers Park District; and Judie Anderson, JASS.

**A.** Motion by Cesnik, second by Sharp to approve the **agenda**.\* *Motion carried unanimously.*

**B.** Motion by Butcher, second by Cesnik to approve the **Minutes**\* of the March 8, 2023, regular meeting. *Motion carried unanimously.*

[Trainor arrived 11:36 a.m.]

**C.** Motion by Guenther, second by Cesnik to approve the April **Treasurer's Report and Claims**\* totaling \$36,766.77. *Motion carried unanimously.*

**II. OPEN FORUM.**

**III. ACTION ITEMS.**

**A. Project Review 2023-01 Chankahda Trail Reconstruction Phase 2, Plymouth.\*** Hennepin County and the City of Plymouth are proposing to reconstruct approximately four miles of Chankahda Trail over the next few years. Phase 2 of the reconstruction extends from approximately 300 feet east of Peony Lane/Maple Grove Parkway to roughly 100 feet east of Vicksburg Lane. This project triggers Commission Rules D, E, F and H. In their findings dated April 3, 2023, Staff recommends approval of this project with three conditions: (1) final escrow fee reconciliation; (2) receipt of an operation and maintenance plan that is approved by the City of Plymouth; and (3) receipt of an updated compensatory storage plan that is separated from groundwater and hydraulically connected to the floodplain. Scharenbroich noted that the second requirement is moot. Motion by Guenther, second by Cesnik to approve this project with the remaining two conditions. *Motion carried unanimously.*

**B.** Motion by Guenther, second by Butcher to accept the Commission's **2022 Annual Activity Report** pending final clerical review. *Motion carried unanimously.* The report will be forwarded to the Board of Water and Soil Resources by the April 30, 2023, deadline.

**C. Hennepin County 2023 Services Agreement.\*** The 2023 cooperative agreement between the County and the Commission includes Attachment A\* which outlines technical services and Rush Creek and Diamond Creek BMP cost share, including all reimbursable expenses, not to exceed \$317,963.00. Motion

RULE D - STORMWATER MANAGEMENT  
RULE E - EROSION AND SEDIMENT CONTROL  
RULE F - FLOODPLAIN ALTERATION

RULE G - WETLAND ALTERATION  
RULE H - BRIDGE AND CULVERT CROSSINGS  
RULE I - BUFFERS

\*indicates enclosure

CHAMPLIN - CORCORAN - DAYTON - MAPLE GROVE - MEDINA - PLYMOUTH - ROGERS

by Trainor, second by Butcher to approve and authorize the Chair to sign the agreement. *Motion carried unanimously.*

**D. 10-Year Watershed-wide TMDL Review.\*** The Commission and Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) are interested in reviewing progress toward achieving the goals of the Elm Creek Watershed TMDL (Total Maximum Daily Load) study. At the last March meeting members reviewed the TMDL findings and a framework for potential approaches to such a review. They also requested more information about monitoring data in the watershed, which is outlined in Staff’s April 4, 2023, memo. The goal of this discussion is to obtain input and guidance from the TAC and Commissioners on how to proceed.

The Elm Creek Watershed TMDL process was completed in phases over several years, starting with additional monitoring and data gathering in 2009-2010, analysis and development of the TMDL in 2012-2014, and final completion of the TMDL document and accompanying Watershed Restoration and Protection Strategies (WRAPS) document in 2015. The final reports were approved by the MPCA and EPA in 2016.

The Elm Creek TMDL study addresses (1) seven lake *nutrient* impairments; (2) four stream *E. coli* impairments; (3) three stream *DO* impairments; and (4) four stream fish and macroinvertebrate impairments, with primary stressors *total phosphorus (TP)* and *total suspended solids (TSS)*.

Since completion of the TMDL, additional impairments have been designated or are pending in the watershed.

1. Elm Creek and the lower reach of South Fork Rush Creek are impaired for excess *chloride*.
2. The MPCA is processing two new impairments: *TSS* in Elm Creek and *fish biotic integrity (F-IBI)* in Fish Lake.
3. The nutrient impairment for Fish Lake is proposed for “delisting” as the lake now meets state standards.

The MPCA does not have a formal process or guidance for undertaking reviews of progress toward meeting TMDLs. Entities such as cities and counties that are MS4s are required to annually report certain TMDL implementation activities that they undertake in the watershed, but that is not a comprehensive assessment and does not include actions taken within the waterbodies such as stream restorations, lake alum treatments, or rough fish management.

When Staff have undertaken other TMDL reviews of progress, they have considered the following analytical steps:

1. Update watershed runoff and pollutant loading and lake response modeling to reflect most current land use information and monitoring data.
2. Collect new monitoring and other data to fill data gaps.
3. Collect data on BMPs undertaken since the TMDL baseline year(s) to estimate progress toward meeting the identified pollutant load reductions and non-numeric requirements.
4. Evaluate monitoring data to determine water quality trends and progress toward meeting the standards.
5. Review implementation strategies and recommend any course corrections for the coming period.

**Modeling.** Updating the various models used to quantify pollutant loading can range from simple to very detailed. Generally, this step is considered only when there has been significant land use change

---

RULE D - STORMWATER MANAGEMENT

RULE E - EROSION AND SEDIMENT CONTROL

RULE F - FLOODPLAIN ALTERATION

RULE G - WETLAND ALTERATION

RULE H - BRIDGE AND CULVERT CROSSINGS

RULE I - BUFFERS

\*indicates enclosure

or where new data is available, for example, updating a lake response model to use measured sediment phosphorus release rates rather than literature values. While there has been development in the watershed, Staff don't think it is significant enough to warrant the expense and effort to update the watershed pollutant loading models. **Recommendation:** Do not include updated modeling in the Progress Review.

**Lakes.** The Commission has been annually monitoring four sentinel lakes – Fish, Weaver, Diamond, and Rice – and occasionally monitoring other lakes on a rotating basis. While the sentinel lakes have a good set of data available, it would be helpful to obtain more data on Henry, Jubert, Dubai, Laura, and French, where there is very little data. The cost of monitoring those lakes for two consecutive years would be about \$8,000 per year. The annual budget includes monitoring the sentinel lakes and two additional lakes, which in 2023 will likely be Sylvan and either Henry or Cowley. It has been the Commission's practice to obtain at least two years' worth of data in the event the first year is non-representative of conditions, so those lakes would likely be repeated in 2024.

**Streams.** In addition to the partnership with the USGS to monitor flow and water quality on Elm Creek in the regional park, the Commission currently routinely monitors flow and water quality at three sites in the watershed: Elm Creek at its crossing of the Medicine Lake Regional Trail in Maple Grove; Rush Creek at Territorial Road; and Diamond Creek. Some additional data is available at other sites in the watershed, most of it collected during the development of the TMDL. There is also a good data set at Highway 55 and CR 101 in Plymouth. It may be helpful to collect additional data to help with the trend analysis. The Commission currently budgets \$10,020 annually for stream monitoring; adding another site would be an estimated \$3,500 annually. **Recommendation:** Monitor up to five additional lakes and one additional stream site in 2024-2025. The estimated cost to do both would be about \$11,500 per year, or \$23,000 total.

**Biological.** The Commission has completed a minimal amount of biological (fish and macroinvertebrates) monitoring in the streams. There is 2010 and 2020 data at a few sites on each stream completed by the MPCA and/or the DNR, and the 2023 budget includes funding to undertake sampling at a few sites. It is Staff's recommendation that the Commission focus this review on quantifying chemical parameters and in the review develop a plan for more systematically undertaking biological monitoring for evaluation during the next progress review.

**BMP Data Collection.** This task is compiling information about the BMPs undertaken in the watershed and estimating the pollutant load reductions achieved by each. Cities have been collecting and reporting watershed load reductions, including any structural BMPs or nonstructural such as enhanced street sweeping. In addition, load reduction data is estimated for development and redevelopment activity that requires a Commission project review. This data could be collected, assembled, and geolocated to document and summarize load reductions by receiving water. For example, the TMDL established TP load reductions for the entire length of Elm Creek; the individual cities through which Elm Creek flows are reporting data just for what occurs in their cities.

There are also other types of actions that the cities are not required to report in their NPDES permit annual reports. These may include lake internal load reductions from an alum treatment, or habitat improvements achieved through stream restoration. These should also be documented as progress toward achieving the goals established in the TMDL.

The compiled BMP data would be helpful in identifying the need for additional stream monitoring. There has been quite a bit of development in the watershed since the TMDL monitoring was completed. If the BMP compilation suggests there has been a significant load reduction from that land use conversion, it may be interesting to see if that is reflected in the in-stream data.

---

RULE D - STORMWATER MANAGEMENT

RULE E - EROSION AND SEDIMENT CONTROL

RULE F - FLOODPLAIN ALTERATION

RULE G - WETLAND ALTERATION

RULE H - BRIDGE AND CULVERT CROSSINGS

RULE I - BUFFERS

\*indicates enclosure

Depending on how much data is available, how it is organized, and the number of BMPs for which removals would need to be calculated, this could be a simple GIS exercise, or it may be more extensive. Staff estimate the level of effort to be in the \$5,000-8,000 range. **Recommendation:** Include the BMP collection and load reduction compilation by drainage area task in Phase 1 of the Progress Review.

**Evaluate Monitoring Data.** Three Rivers Park District has been collecting and maintaining data for many years, and the annual report includes figures and tables showing water quality by year. It may be interesting to run some trend analysis statistics where there is a good data set to determine if there are any statistically significant trends. This might be a \$2,000-3,000 effort. **Recommendation:** Include this task in Phase 1 of the Progress Review.

**Review Implementation Strategies and Report.** This task includes compiling the information developed in the previous tasks to provide an overall summary of actions taken and progress made to date. The WRAPS report, which is the “implementation plan” of the TMDL, identified a universe of potential actions the various stakeholders could take to make progress toward the TMDL. This task would identify what has been successful and what not so successful and develop a prioritized action plan for the next several years. This, then, could be rolled into the Commission’s Fourth Generation Watershed Management Plan that will be underway at about the same time. This progress review would become an appendix to the Watershed Plan and likely be an \$8,000-10,000 effort. **Recommendation:** Summarize the results in a report that includes an assessment of progress and evaluation of the implementation strategies set forth in the WRAPS. Include this task in Phase 1 of the Progress Review.

**Summary and Recommendations.** It is likely that this TMDL 10-year Progress Review would be about a \$40,000 effort, depending on how much additional monitoring is desired. Staff recommend that the Commission consider proceeding in two phases:

1. **Phase 1:** Collect and map BMPs completed to date to estimate progress toward achieving both the watershed and internal load reductions identified in the TMDL. Perform trend analysis on lake and stream data. Use the results of both these tasks to refine a monitoring program for 2024-2025. Summarize the results in a report that can be used to inform the Fourth Generation Plan. This phase would be about \$16,000-20,000.

2. **Phase 2:** Collect additional lake and stream data in 2024 and 2025. Update the monitoring data trend analysis in 2026 and adjust the implementation plan as desired. This phase would be about \$18,000-20,000.

**Discussion.** Staff were requested to include a story map with this project. It was also noted that MPCA is becoming more interested in researching biotic impairments. Staff were also requested to provide more definitive costs for the 2024-2025 budget process. Motion by Guenther, second by Cesnik to proceed with the 10-year Progress Review. *Motion carried unanimously.*

**WBIF-Funded Feasibility Assessments.\*** The BWSR Watershed-Based Funding grant awarded to the Elm Creek basin includes \$92,774 allocated to the Commission to help complete high-priority feasibility and subwatershed assessments. The Commission has identified three potential studies: (1) South Fork Rush Creek Subwatershed Assessment (SWA) primarily in Corcoran but also covering portions of Medina and Maple Grove; (2) North Fork Rush Creek stream re-meandering in Rogers; and (3) Diamond Lake outlet channel re-meandering in Dayton. Detailed proposed scopes of work for the first two studies are included in Staff’s memo dated March 30, 2023, as Attachments One and Two.

---

RULE D - STORMWATER MANAGEMENT

RULE E - EROSION AND SEDIMENT CONTROL

RULE F - FLOODPLAIN ALTERATION

RULE G - WETLAND ALTERATION

RULE H - BRIDGE AND CULVERT CROSSINGS

RULE I - BUFFERS

\*indicates enclosure

Based on a review of the work done to assess options for the Diamond Lake outlet channel as part of the Diamond Creek SWA, at this time Staff do not recommend that the Commission proceed with any additional work to flesh out a potential project. The SWA included a generalized design and cost estimate (Attachment Three of the memo) that is a reasonable assumption in the absence of a redevelopment proposal.

The \$92,774 grant requires a minimum 10% match from local sources. The approved work plan specifies a minimum of \$10,000. Table 1 shows the total estimated cost of the two studies, which is \$1,127 more than the funds available from the grant and the required minimum \$10,000 match.

**Table 1. Scope of work estimated cost and funding sources.**

Study	Cost/ Funding	Notes
<i>COST</i>		
S Fork SWA	\$66,351	(includes optional Open House)
N Fork Remeander	\$37,550	
TOTAL	\$103,901	
<i>FUNDING</i>		
Grant Funds	\$92,774	
Match	\$10,000	Minimum required
TOTAL	\$102,774	
No source identified	\$1,127	Additional match to fully fund

The Commission has a policy requiring affected cities to share 25% in the cost of SWAs, which is detailed in Table 2. The City of Corcoran has confirmed that they are aware of and have budgeted for their share of the SWA. The 2/3 - 1/3 split between the cities was suggested by Corcoran.

**Table 2. S Fork Rush Creek SWA financing.**

Project cost	\$66,351		
Grant	\$59,716		
Match	\$6,635		
ECWMC contribution		\$4,976	75% of total match
LGU contribution		\$1,659	25% of total match
Corcoran			\$1,111 2/3 of LGU match
Medina/MG			\$548 1/3 of LGU match

The Commission does not have a policy regarding the local match for feasibility studies such as the North Fork Rush Creek Remeandering.

**Table 3. N Fork Rush Creek Remeander financing.**

Project cost	\$37,550	
Grant	\$33,058	(\$92,774 total grant - \$59,716 allocated to SWA)
Match	\$4,492	

**Recommendation.** It is Staff’s recommendation that the Commission proceed with both the subwatershed assessment and the stream remeandering feasibility study. As of the 2021 Audit, there was a balance of \$181,817 available in the account Fund Balance Assigned for Studies and Projects. Table 4 details the recommended financing of the two studies.

RULE D - STORMWATER MANAGEMENT

RULE E - EROSION AND SEDIMENT CONTROL

RULE F – FLOODPLAIN ALTERATION

RULE G - WETLAND ALTERATION

RULE H – BRIDGE AND CULVERT CROSSINGS

RULE I – BUFFERS

\*indicates enclosure

**Table 4. Total cost and recommended financing for 2023 WBIF-funded special studies.**

Study	Cost/ Funding	Source
<i>South Fork Rush Creek SWA</i>		
Total cost	\$66,351	
Grant	\$59,716	WBIF Grant
Match	\$6,635	
Commission	\$4,976	Assigned funds for projects and studies
Cities	\$1,659	Cities
TOTAL	\$103,901	
<i>North Fork Rush Creek Remeander</i>		
Total Cost	\$37,550	
Grant	\$33,058	WBIF Grant
Match	\$4,492	Assigned funds for projects and studies

Motion by Guenther, second by Katzner to approve and proceed with the two projects, the South Fork Rush Creek SWA, and the North Fork Rush Creek remeander, as shown in Table 4. *Motion carried unanimously.*

F. Motion by Trainor, second by Butcher to approve the **Cooperative Agreement\*** between the Commission and Three Rivers Park District to undertake the **CSAH12/Dayton River Road Ravine Stabilization project**. *Motion carried unanimously.* This project is listed as a project on the Commission’s 2023 CIP with a total revised cost of \$1,329,408; the Commission’s cost-share is \$110,000. The Park District and Hennepin County are among the other cost-share partners.\*

**IV. OLD BUSINESS.**

**V. NEW BUSINESS.**

A. Staff’s April 4, 2023, memo includes the Commission’s **preliminary CIP\*** reflecting comments received to date. The Commission requests that cities submit proposed revisions to the CIP by April 28, 2023, so any required minor plan amendments may be initiated at the May meeting.

There is one proposed revision that can be completed without a plan amendment. The CSAH 12/Dayton River Road Ravine Stabilization project (Item III.F., above) cost estimate was updated based on final design, and the City of Dayton requests that the Commission’s share be increased from \$95,500 to \$110,000. The Third Generation Plan provides that no plan amendment is necessary to either reschedule projects from year to year or if the cost estimate increases by less than 125%.

Members are reminded that smaller projects, where the Commission’s share is \$50,000 or less, should be directed to the Cost Share program rather than the CIP.

Currently, prior to the revision noted above, the CIP shows total project costs/Commission shares as follows:

2023 (pay 2024)	\$4,378,000	\$775,750
2024 (pay 2025)	\$7,421,250	\$867,813
Future	\$3,250,000	\$525,000

B. Based on discussion above, Item III.D., it is the intent of Staff to identify a volunteer to monitor Henry, Jubert, Dubai, Laura, or French Lake through **Metropolitan Council’s CAMP program** (Citizen Assisted

RULE D - STORMWATER MANAGEMENT  
 RULE E - EROSION AND SEDIMENT CONTROL  
 RULE F - FLOODPLAIN ALTERATION

RULE G - WETLAND ALTERATION  
 RULE H - BRIDGE AND CULVERT CROSSINGS  
 RULE I - BUFFERS

\*indicates enclosure



Monitoring Program). Guenther volunteered to seek out a volunteer to monitor Lake Jubert. This action was approved by consensus.

**VI. Communications.** The following communications were received in March:

**A. Staff Report.\*** Staff reports provide updates on the development projects currently under review by Staff. The projects listed in the table beginning on page 8 of these minutes are discussed in the April 4, 2023, report.

**B. Hennepin County Staff Report.\***

**1.** The report referenced the annual **cooperative agreement** between the County and the Commission. The agreement was approved earlier in this meeting (Item III.C.).

**2.** The report also included a map showing the **location of County projects** in the Elm Creek watershed.

**3. Diamond Hills Stables** has been approved for EQIP funding, through NRCS, to cover some installation costs for fencing, waterers, and shelters for rotational grazing which are expected to reduce erosion and nutrient runoff. It's anticipated EQIP funding won't fully fund installation costs, so County staff are considering utilizing cost-share funds to help complete these projects, and to possibly add on others such as diversion drainage around key feedlots. Hennepin County would like the opinion of the Commission of potentially utilizing CIP and WBIF funds in addition to County cost-share dollars to cover the remaining balance for implementation. It was the consensus that this and similar projects could be likened to the 2020 CIP, Agricultural BMP Cost Share. The County will submit an Exhibit A for this project.

**4.** The County will hold an **Open House** on April 13, 2023, at the Hamel Community Building to inform landowners of the rural conservation and related financial and technical services available.

**5. The County is selling trees** for restoring and improving woodland areas and increasing wildlife habitat. Deadline to order is April 20.

**6.** Conservation staff at Hennepin County are seeking input for a **proposal to preserve agricultural land**. Currently, there aren't good options for farmers or farmland owners wishing to avoid development in Hennepin County. Conservation staff are seeking feedback on the best ways to fill this gap. Farmers and landowners in Hennepin County enrolled in Green Acres, Agricultural Preserve, or those with an interest and involvement in agriculture are being asked to take a survey to inform the proposal, [hennepin.us/ag-preservation-survey](https://hennepin.us/ag-preservation-survey). A printed survey with a return envelope is available from Kevin Ellis, [kevin.ellis@hennepin.us](mailto:kevin.ellis@hennepin.us), 612-382-3956.

**C. Conservation Project Tracking.\*** A second memo from the County provides a summary of project progress, cost, and benefit for projects anticipated to be installed in 2023. Funding options and current status of projects are recited. Table 1 of the memo outlines project installation costs encumbered and still available. Projects listed in Table 2 are all those the County is actively developing which, based on landowner willingness and project development progress, are likely to be implemented in 2023. As staff continue to engage landowners and develop projects, more are anticipated to be added to Table 2, or may be removed should they become infeasible. Project work is currently focused on the priority subwatersheds of the Rush Creek Headwaters and Diamond Creek, which each have completed subwatershed assessments and state and local funding to support project installations. Eight projects in the Rush Creek headwaters and two projects in the Diamond Creek subwatershed are described in more detail in the report. Staff anticipate this information will be included in future monthly staff reports.

---

RULE D - STORMWATER MANAGEMENT

RULE E - EROSION AND SEDIMENT CONTROL

RULE F - FLOODPLAIN ALTERATION

RULE G - WETLAND ALTERATION

RULE H - BRIDGE AND CULVERT CROSSINGS

RULE I - BUFFERS

\*indicates enclosure

D. **Mississippi River–Twin Cities Watershed assessment and trends update,\*** Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA).

E. Copy of Commission Letter of support\* for the **City of Champlin Brown Property Acquisition.**

F. Copy of Commission Letter of support\* for placing the **constitutional rededication of lottery proceeds** to the Environment and Natural Resources Trust Fund on the ballot in 2024.

G. Invitation\* to the **State of the (Three Rivers) Parks**, April 19, 2023.

H. **2022 Lake Water Quality Summary,\*** Metropolitan Council.

**VII. Education and Public Outreach.**

A. The **Conservation Education and Implementation Partnership Program** will be coordinated by a new limited-duration education and outreach coordinator shared with Hennepin County, WMWA, and the Richfield-Bloomington WMO. Watershed-Based Implementation Funding (WBIF) to help fund the program has been approved by the Board of Water and Soil Resources (BWSR). The Hennepin County Board approved the new position and County Staff are in the process of working through the hiring process. Over 100 applicants expressed interest in the position. The coordinator is proposed to be in place by Earth Day.

B. The **West Metro Water Alliance (WMWA)** will meet via Zoom at 8:30 a.m., May 9, 2023.

**VIII. Grant Opportunities and Project Updates.**

**IX. Other Business.**

X. **Adjournment.** There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 1:03 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Judie A. Anderson  
Recording Secretary

JAA:tim

Z:\Elm Creek\Meetings\Meetings 2023\April 12 2023 Regular meeting minutes.docx

Project No.	Project Name
W=wetland	
2014-015	Rogers Drive Extension, Rogers.
2015-030	Kiddiegarten Child Care Center, Maple Grove.
2016-005W	Ravinia Wetland Bank Plan, Corcoran.
2017-014	Laurel Creek, Rogers.
2017-050W	Ernie Mayers Wetland/floodplain violation, Corcoran.
2018-046	Graco, Rogers.
2019-021	Brenly Meadows, Rogers.
2019-026	Interstate Power Systems, Rogers.
2020-009	Stetler Barn, Medina.
2020-017	Meadow View Townhomes, Medina.
2020-032	Enclave Rogers - Commerce Boulevard, Rogers.
2020-033	Weston Woods, Medina.
2020-036	Balsam Pointe, Dayton.

RULE D - STORMWATER MANAGEMENT

RULE E - EROSION AND SEDIMENT CONTROL

RULE F - FLOODPLAIN ALTERATION

RULE G - WETLAND ALTERATION

RULE H - BRIDGE AND CULVERT CROSSINGS

RULE I - BUFFERS

\*indicates enclosure

**CHAMPLIN - CORCORAN - DAYTON - MAPLE GROVE - MEDINA - PLYMOUTH - ROGERS**



**elm creek Watershed Management Commission**

Regular Meeting Minutes | April 12, 2023

Page 9

2021-007	Birchwood 2nd Addition, Rogers
2021-016	Territorial Lofts, Rogers.
2021-020	Crew Carwash, Maple Grove.
2021-021	Territorial Triangle, Dayton.
2021-023	Maple Grove Medial Office Building (MOB).
2021-024	Riverwalk, Dayton
2021-025	Hackamore Road Reconstruction, Medina/Corcoran.
2021-027	Xcel Energy Elm Creek Substation, Maple Grove
2021-029	Tri-Care Grocery / Retail, Maple Grove
2021-031	Cook Lake Edgewater, Maple Grove
2021-034	BAPS Hindu Temple, Medina.
2021-035	Mister Car Wash - Rogers
2021-036	D & D Service, Corcoran.
2021-037	Marsh Pointe, Medina.
2021-039	1-94 Logistics Center, Rogers.
2021-040	Napa Auto, Corcoran.
2021-041	Carlson Ridge, Plymouth.
2021-043	Northwood Community Church Maple Grove.
2021-044	Balsam II Apartments, Dayton.
2021-047	CR 10 Box Culvert Replacement, Corcoran
2021-050	Evanswood, Maple Grove.
2021-051	Fields of Nanterre Drainage Improvements, Plymouth.
2021-052	Norbella Senior Living, Rogers.
2021-053	Towns at Fox Creek, Rogers.
2021-055	Morningside Estates 6th Addition, Champlin.
2022-002	Summerwell, Maple Grove.
2022-003	Fox Briar Ridge East, Maple Grove.
2022-006	Hamel Townhomes, Medina.
2022-008	Bechtold Farm, Corcoran.
2022-009	Dunkirk Lane Development, Plymouth.
2022-011	Arrowhead Drive turn Lane expansion,
2022-012	Graco Building 2, Dayton.
2022-013	Dayton 94 Industrial Site, Dayton.
2022-014	Aster Mill, Rogers.
2022-015	County Road 47 Phase I Reconstruction, Plymouth.
2022-016	Rogers Activity Center, Rogers.
2022-017	City Center Drive, Corcoran.
2022-018	Big Woods, Rogers.
2022-019	Grass Lake Preserve, Dayton.
2022-020	Skye Meadows Extension, Rogers.
2022-022	Cook Lake Highlands, Corcoran.
2022-023	Asguard, Rogers.
2022-024	Bridge No. 27J70, Maple Grove.
2022-025	Harvest View, Rogers.
2022-026	Archway Building, Rogers
2022-027	Edison at Maple Grove Apartments.
2022-028	Elsie Stephens Park, Dayton.

RULE D - STORMWATER MANAGEMENT

RULE E - EROSION AND SEDIMENT CONTROL

RULE F – FLOODPLAIN ALTERATION

RULE G - WETLAND ALTERATION

RULE H – BRIDGE AND CULVERT CROSSINGS

RULE I – BUFFERS

\*indicates enclosure

**CHAMPLIN - CORCORAN - DAYTON - MAPLE GROVE - MEDINA - PLYMOUTH - ROGERS**

## elm creek Watershed Management Commission

Regular Meeting Minutes | April 12, 2023

Page 10

2022-029	Hayden Hills Park, Dayton.
2022-030	Garages Too, Corcoran.
2022-031	Corcoran II Substation.
2022-033	Pet Suites, Maple Grove.
2022-034	CSAH 101 Improvements, Maple Grove.
2022-035	Rush Hollow, Maple Grove.
2022-036	West French Lake Road Improvements, Maple Grove.
2022-037	CSAH13 CR203 Culvert Replacement, Dayton.
2022-038	Tavera North Side, Corcoran.
2022-039	Garland Commons, Maple Grove.
2022-040	Karinieimi Meadows, Corcoran.
2022-041	Elm Creek Swim Pond Culvert, Maple Grove.
2022-042	Walcott Glen, Corcoran.
2022-043	Meander Park and Boardwalk, Medina.
2022-044	Trail Haven Road Bridge Replacement, Corcoran.
2022-045	Corcoran Water Treatment Plant.
2022-046	CSAH12 Culvert and Guardrail Replacement, Dayton.
2022-047	Suite Living of Maple Grove.
2022-048	Hassan Elementary Pavement Renovation, Rogers.
2022-049	Connexus Energy South Dayton Substation.
2023-001	Chankahda Trail Reconstruction Phase 2, Plymouth.
2023-002	Lynde Greenhouse Fire Damage Repair, Maple Grove.

---

RULE D - STORMWATER MANAGEMENT

RULE E - EROSION AND SEDIMENT CONTROL

RULE F - FLOODPLAIN ALTERATION

RULE G - WETLAND ALTERATION

RULE H - BRIDGE AND CULVERT CROSSINGS

RULE I - BUFFERS

\*indicates enclosure

**CHAMPLIN - CORCORAN - DAYTON - MAPLE GROVE - MEDINA - PLYMOUTH - ROGERS**