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TIM O'DONNELL, SR.: It's about a minute after 7:00, and so in the interest of folks who have joined us already, let's go ahead and begin our hearing. Council Member Peter Lindstrom, can you kick us off?

PETER LINDSTROM: Absolutely.

Good evening everybody. I am happy to kick us off this evening and welcome. Welcome to the Metropolitan Council Environmental Services Public Hearing. I am Dan Peter Lindstrom, a Metropolitan Council member from District 10. I'm also the chair of the Met Council's Environmental Committee which deals with matters involving the Met Council Environmental Services division. You will hear us use the acronym MCES from time to time this evening. That refers to this division of the Met Council.

Before we begin our Public Hearing tonight, I would like to welcome a few local officials. Tim, could you announce those local officials?

TIM O'DONNELL, SR.: Yes. We
have with us tonight Deb Barber, the Met
Council member from District 4, and that's
all I see at this point.

PETER LINDSTROM:  Fantastic.
Welcome, Deb.  I'm glad you could join us.
Let me go over --  First of all, I would
like to call this Public Hearing to order,
and I will quickly go over how you can
submit comments or questions throughout our
upcoming presentation.  Computer and mobile
app users may have to click the Options
button.  After you type in your comment,
please choose to send it to all panelists
and click the Send button.  If you would
like to make a comment or ask a question out
loud during the public comment time, you may
raise your hand in the participant's box by
clicking on the hand in the lower right
corner.  We will unmute you when it is your
turn to speak.

Phone users are encouraged to text
comments to 952-960-7765 or e-mail to
comments@MCESLakeMtka.com.

Next slide, please.  Our MCES staff
joining me tonight to present the Draft
Facility Plan and to present comments are Tim O'Donnell, Sr. Information Coordinator and Project Citizen Liaison; Dan Fick, a Principal Engineer and Project Manager; and Chris Remus, an Assistant Manager at Interceptor Engineering.

The subject of this Public Hearing is the MCES Draft Facility Plan. This plan outlines our recommendations for the Lake Minnetonka Area Sewer Improvements Project. With this project, we propose to rehabilitate and upgrade our regional sanitary sewer facilities at five locations in the cities of Orono, Deephaven, Shorewood, and Excelsior. These projects will help us to continue providing sufficient and reliable wastewater selection for this part of the region. Our staff will provide more details during the presentation.

The purpose of this Public Hearing is to summarize the Proposed Regional Sanitary Sewer Improvements Project and explain alternative approaches that we evaluated, answer any questions you may have.
about the proposed project, and receive your comments for the public record. Our staff will provide more details during the presentation.

The purpose of this Public Hearing is to summarize the Proposed Regional Sanitary Sewer Improvement Project and explain alternative approaches that we evaluated, and answer any questions you may have about the proposed project, and receive your comments for the public record.

In addition, we have a transcriber recording the proceedings tonight for our official public record. The transcription and video recording of the presentation will be posted on the project website in early January.

As we conduct this Public Hearing, there are a few things that I would like to point out. All interested persons may present comments or opinions as they relate to the Draft Facility Plan. We will read your comments and questions posted in the Q&A text box in the order that they are entered. If you like to speak out loud, we
will call on you and unmute your microphone in the order you have clicked your raised hand symbol. We ask that you state and spell your full name each time you speak. Also, please include your address and the organization you represent, if any. Individuals will have three minutes to offer their remarks. Designated representatives of groups or organizations will have five minutes. We also welcome written comments, and we provide you instructions on how to submit them. We also will read into the public record any comments we have received prior to tonight's Public Hearing.

Next slide, please. For the last several weeks, a paper copy of the Draft Facility Plan has been available for the public to review at the Excelsior Library and the Orono City Hall. We also tried to have copies available at the City Halls in Deephaven, Shorewood, and Excelsior, but they are temporarily closed due to the Covid-19 pandemic. An electronic copy of the Draft Facility Plan is available on our project webpage on the Metropolitan Council
website. We will continue to have the Draft Facility Plan available for review through December 28, 2020, which is the end of the public comment period.

On the screen, you can see the various ways that you can submit comments in addition to commenting during this Public Hearing tonight. We will show you this again at the end of the hearing.

Our Project Implementation Schedule includes these key dates and time frames. We published a Legal Notice for the Public Hearing in the Star Tribune on November 15. We mailed the Public Hearing Notice on November 18 to property owners in the proposed project areas, as well as numerous government and community stakeholders. We sent e-mail invitations and did social media posts in December. We are holding the Public Hearing this evening. The Metropolitan Council review and adoption of the Final Facility Plan is scheduled for January and February 2021. In March 2021, we will submit the plan to the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency and will include
our application to be included on a priority funding list. This funding will be in the form of low interest loans that MCES would pay off over a twenty-year period.

At this time I would like to turn it back to Tim to begin our presentation.

TIM O'DONNELL, SR.: Thank you, Council Member Lindstrom. Again, my name is Tim O'Donnell. That's spelled T-i-m O-'-D-o-n-n-e-l-l, and I am on the staff of the Metropolitan Council Environmental Services or MCES. I would like to begin our presentation with a brief overview of the Regional Wastewater System and our service area and facilities. Then we will zero in on the improvements we are planning for our Regional Sanitary Sewer Facilities in the Lake Minnetonka area.

The Regional Wastewater system is run by the Metropolitan Council Environmental Services. We are an operating division of the Metropolitan Council.

The map you see on your screen is of the seven-county Twin Cities Metro area and shows the wastewater service area and
regional sanitary sewer facilities that we are in charge of. The color shading on the map shows the areas that we serve. It's basically the urban and suburban portions of the Metro area. Each color shaded area responds to one of our nine Regional Wastewater Treatment plants.

Our wastewater collection system consists of approximately 640 miles of regional sanitary sewers which we also call interceptor sewers, as well as 61 pump stations and 190 meter stations. These intersecting sewers intersect the flow of wastewater from 110 communities in the Metro area that we serve, and they carry it to the treatment plants. In addition to the regional sewers that MCES operates, these 110 communities combine to operate more than 5,000 miles of local sanitary sewer pipes.

The icons that you see on the map indicate our wastewater treatment plants. The nine plants combined treat 250 million gallons of wastewater every day. They discharge the resulting clean water back into the environment via the Mississippi,
Minnesota, and St. Croix Rivers. To put this volume of wastewater into some kind of perspective -- 250 million gallons would easily fill the Empire State Building every day.

The wastewater from the Lake Minnetonka area which is shaded blue on the map in the southwest Metro 202, the wastewater from this area flows through a series of regional sanitary sewers to our Blue Lake Wastewater Treatment Plant located in Shakopee.

Now, it's important to point out that MCES's primary role is collecting and treating wastewater, also known as sewage. So basically it's everything that goes down your drains. Your cities handle drinking water treatment and distribution, as well as storm water management, and the Cities have their local wastewater collection system. We run the largest system on behalf of the region.

We are often asked in Public Hearings like this how the MCES finances the regional wastewater system. What we do is,
we bill the 110 communities that are connected to the system to pay for our operation, maintenance, and capital improvement costs. The Cities in turn bill these costs and their local costs to their property owners connected to their local system. What happens next is, about 60 percent of your sewer bill comes to MCES to pay for the regional system costs and about 40 percent of your sewer bill or your payment stays in your community and supports your local sewer system costs.

The sewer user fees that we collect at MCES are enough to fund the regional wastewater system without the need for tax dollars. We also do not levy special assessments on properties that are near the sewer projects that we are talking about here tonight. These projects have a much broader public benefit and so their costs are paid for region-wide.

So now after this broad overview into who we are and what we do for the region, I would like to turn it over to my colleague, Dan Fick, and he will focus on
our plans for the Lake Minnetonka area.
Dan.

DAN FICK: Thank you, Tim.
Hello, everyone, and thank you for
participating in this Public Hearing
tonight. Once again, my name is Dan Fick,
and for the record that's spelled D-a-n F-i-
c-k. I am the Project Manager for this
Facility Plan.

To get started, I would like to
explain a little bit more about just what a
Facility Plan is. A Facility Plan is a
document that MCES uses to plan for the
future of our systems in a specific area.
In this case, it's the Lake Minnetonka area.

It also serves a number of other
purposes. It summarizes the state of the
MCES system. It identifies any needed
improvements. It includes any environmental
impact documentation that is required for
any of the improvement projects that are
identified. And it recommends a course of
action for each of the identified projects.

The schedule below shows that we are
in the third of four phases of this Facility
Plan. We are at the Public Hearing phase, and as we said earlier, after this Public Hearing, we will complete our public comment period, and in 2021 we will finalize the Facility Plan and submit it to the -- adopt it and submit it to the Pollution Control Agency.

All right. Next slide, please. As I describe the project and Facility Plan, I will be using some terms that may not be familiar to you. So here are some of the definitions that may help you understand those terms better.

Wastewater sewer system as opposed to say a storm water sewer system is simply a system of underground pipes and other facilities that carry away our wastewater. As Tim O'Donnell had said earlier, both cities and MCES have these systems. The difference between the two is that a city system receives flow from individual properties while the MCES regional system receives the flow from the individual cities, similar to how a freeway would collect local traffic. We would be the
And MCES Interceptor is an underground pipe that makes up part of the regional system. These pipes can be either gravity pipes or forcemains. So a gravity pipe is a sloped pipe that carries wastewater by gravity without any mechanical assistance. It just flows downhill. The forcemain is a pipe that carries wastewater that has been pumped or forced uphill as opposed to flowing by gravity.

We had mentioned meter stations earlier. So a flow meter is a device that MCES uses to measure the quantity of wastewater that each of our City customers sends to the regional system, similar to how your City water meter measures your water usage in your home.

A lift station is another word for a pumping station which is simply a facility that pumps wastewater from a low point in the system up to a higher point where again it can flow by gravity pipes.

There are three alternatives that we look at for each of our projects. First is
what we call the status quo alternative. In
this alternative, we simply continue
operating and maintaining the system as is
and defer any improvements into the future.
Later in the presentation, we will show
capital costs for this alternative, and that
number represents the cost of that deferred
future project. So I just wanted to explain
that so there isn't confusion later.

The other alternative that we look
at is relocation for replacement alternative
which is basically building new
infrastructure.

Other is the rehabilitation
alternative which involves repair or other
work that extends the life of the existing
infrastructure so that it lasts longer.

Next slide, please. Based on --
excuse me. Based on condition assessments
and capacity analysis of the Lake Minnetonka
system, five projects have been identified
in this Facility Plan. All of these
projects are condition-driven, and none of
the projects were identified due to
insufficient flow carrying capacity. These
five projects are the Orono Interceptor 7113 Project. The 7113 in this project name reflects simply our name for the pipe. It's just an identifier for us.

The second project is the Orono Lift Stations L46 and L49 Projects. Those are one project that involve both of those lift stations. The third is the Deephaven Lift Station Project. The fourth is the Shorewood and Excelsior Lift Station L20 Project. And the fifth is the Shorewood Lift Station L21 Project.

The primary goals of these projects are to maintain reliability and to preserve the assets, to improve operational flexibility and efficiency and in some cases worker safety, to protect the environment and the health, safety, and welfare of the customers, and to partner with our customers on the construction projects where possible. Oftentimes our partner cities will have infrastructure improvements that they want to make at the same time. So we take those opportunities to partner with them.

Our combined schedule for the five
projects altogether is shown at the bottom of this slide here. Note that some of these projects were previously identified in the 2009 Facility Plan for the Lake Minnetonka area. Therefore, some of that design work is already in progress.

In 2021 we anticipate only design taking place on these projects. Between 2021 and 2023, some of the projects will start to go into the construction phase. By the end of 2023, we anticipate that all of the design work will be complete. And by the end of 2025, we expect that all the construction will be complete.

Next slide, please. This plan shows the location of each of the five projects, and I will talk about each of them in more detail, including each project's scope and a comparison of the different alternatives that we looked at and also the recommended alternative. You can see that two of our projects will be in Orono on the north side of Lake Minnetonka and the other three projects are located on the south side.

Next slide, please. So Project #1
is the Interceptor 7113 Project. The main drivers for this project are the age of the equipment and the pipes, the environmental sensitivity of the corridor, and this is one of those projects where the safety of our maintenance personnel is particularly important because County Road 15 or Shoreline Drive is a very, very busy and narrow corridor.

Next slide, please. So the rehabilitation alternative would make mechanical and structural improvements to Lift Station L59 (ph) shown in green there, and the alternative would also align the inside of the existing forcemain pipe using the construction method called cured in place pipe or CIPP. When CIPP a tube is inserted into the host pipe, then the tube is filled with hot water. The heat from that hot water hardens or cures the resin and that results in a strong waterproof lining that is bonded to the inside of the host pipe, and it extends the life of the pipe significantly. A big advantage of CIPP is that the work causes very little surface
disturbance so there is less construction impact, and it moves along quite quickly. The photo in the lower left is intended to show what a CIPP process looks like, and what you're seeing there is you are seeing that fabric sock that's been saturated in resin being sent down a maintenance hole where it is then being inserted into the host pipe, and then once that entire sock has been put in there, then they will continue the curing process.

You will notice on the map that there is a gap in the project at the Tanager Lake channel (ph). This gap represents the county's Tanager Lake replacement project, and because there is already some forcemain work going on in this area, there is no need to do any work in that area of the corridor.

Next slide, please. So the relocation alternative would make the same mechanical improvements to L59, but instead it will replace the existing forcemain pipe with a new pipe, and we are anticipating that pipe would be installed using a construction method called hydraulic
directional drilling or HDD, and with HDD a pilot hole is drilled underground along the path of the new pipe. And once that pilot hole is completed, then the new pipe is pulled back through that pilot hole. And similar to CIPP, the advantage of HDD is that it causes very little surface disturbance and also can go very quickly. The photo you see in the lower left there shows a pilot hole being drilled by the drill rig there.

Next slide, please. So we evaluated the status quo, rehabilitation, and the relocation alternatives against the nonmonetary impacts, and those are the operability and maintainability of the system, the implementation of the projects, and the environmental impacts due to the projects, and also the constructability of the project. So at the far right you see our conclusion based on evaluation of each alternative against these criteria, and you can see that the forcemain relocation alternative is recommended.

Next slide, please. So we also
compare the alternatives based on monetary or capital costs and O&M costs, and as you can see at the far right, the forcemain replacement alternative is the lower cost of the three. And just another note on the status quo, so here again is where you see the capital cost, the $19,950,000, that is not money that would be spent as part of this plan. That would be the cost of a future project that would be deferred into a future plan.

Next slide, please. So the recommended alternative is a relocation alternative. The goals are to improve the efficiency and reliability of the system in the area, to reconstruct the forcemain away from the Lake Minnetonka shoreline, and to maintain the connection with the City facilities that currently are connected to the in-place pipe. The project is currently under design, and we anticipate design to be completed in 2022, and we anticipate construction to be between 2023 and 2025.

Next slide, please. Project #2 is the L46 and L49 Project. As you can see,
this project has some additional alternatives, and I will explain those in more detail as we go. The project drivers for this project are the age of the lift station equipment and pipe, the reliability of the facilities, and the repair frequency that we have been seeing.

Next slide, please. So Alternative #1 involves relocating the lift station L49 shown in green in the lower left to a parcel of land southwest of the existing location and on the other side of Shadywood Road. It would also rehabilitate lift station L46 as shown further to the -- up and to the left. This alternative would also rehabilitate -- excuse me -- I said that. It would also reconstruct the existing forcemain between those two lift stations.

Next slide, please. So this alternative, which was similar to the previous one, relocates L49 to a different location which is southeast of the existing L49 location. It also rehabilitates the station L46, and it also reconstructs the forcemain that's between those two lift
stations. So the difference between these two is just the location of the relocated L49 facility.

Next slide, please. So with this alternative, we would combine L46 and L49 into one lift station and build in a new location, and that would be in that location that's on the other side of Shadywood Road. It would also construct a new gravity pipe between those two lift stations, and this alternative would install that pipe using that HDD hydraulic drilling method similar to what I described in the 7113 Project.

Next slide, please. So this slide and the previous slide again are very similar. So in this alternative, we would again combine lift stations L46 and L49, but the new location would be again on that location on the other side of Shadywood Road. The main difference here is that the new gravity pipe between the two lift stations would be constructed using open-cut excavation.

Just a word on open-cut excavation. You have probably seen this. With this
method, a trench is dug in the street or wherever the pipe corridor needs to be. The pipe is then placed into the trench, and the trench is backfilled, and then the roadway, or the grass or wherever the original topography was, is then restored. Due to their precise slopes, gravity pipes are often constructed using this open-cut method, and the photo in the lower left just shows what -- about the size and scope of what an open-cut construction trench looks like.

Next slide, please. So for the nonmonetary impact, the relocation alternative that relocates L49 to a point southeast of the existing location is the recommended alternative.

Next slide, please. And based on costs, again the southeast relocation alternative is the lowest cost alternative.

Next slide, please. So in conclusion, the recommended alternative is the relocation alternative to that point southeast of the existing lift station. But the goals are to improve the efficiency and
reliability of this system, condition-driven rehabilitation and replacement rather than reconstruction, rehabilitation of both -- or of L46, and then replacement of L49 on the new site, and then the forcemain would be reconstructed as well. Design has already begun on this project and is anticipated to be complete in 2022. We anticipate construction between 2023 and 2025.

Next slide, please. Project #3 is the L48 Lift Station Rehabilitation and Forcemain Replacement Project. The drivers for this project are the age of the L49 equipment and the condition of the pipe, and the lift station liability and repair frequency.

Next slide, please. So the rehabilitation alternative would make pump and vault improvements to L48, and then it would line the existing forcemain pipe using CIPP, similar to what we had discussed before. The gravity pipe which begins where the project turns at Ridgewood Road, from that portion to the end, that piece of the
gravity pipe would be replaced by open-cut construction and that leg of red construction footprint you see in the upper right, that represents the path where some temporary conveyance piping would be placed. That would be temporary piping, and it would convey the flow while work on the permanent pipe was going on.

Next slide, please. The replacement alternative would make those same pump and vault improvements to L48, but it would replace the existing forcemain with the new pipe using HDD installation. The gravity pipe would also be replaced similar to the previous alternative and again with open-cut.

Next slide, please. Looking at the nonmonetary impacts, the replacement alternative is the recommended alternative.

Next slide. And then based on cost, again the replacement alternative is the lower cost alternative.

Next slide. So this plan will recommend that the replacement alternative be pursued on this project. The goals are
to replace aging gravity and forcemain pipes and construct new pipes to improve system efficiencies and system reliability and rehabilitation of lift station L48. Construction and -- I'm sorry -- design began in year 2020, and we anticipate that design to be completed in 2021, and we anticipate construction occurring between 2021 and 2023.

Next slide, please. The L20 project is Project #4, and alternatives for this project were already evaluated in the previous Facility Plan that we did in 2009, and at that time the replacement alternative was the chosen one. So that and the status quo will be the only two alternatives we will be looking at in this Facility Plan. The drivers for the project are system reliability and repair frequency and overall manpower and electrical efficiency of this system.

Next slide, please. So this alternative will replace the existing lift station L20 shown at the bottom of the map with a gravity pipe that will then convey
that flow to another MCES lift station called L19 which is at the upper left of the map. That gravity pipe would be constructed using open-cut construction. Once that pipe is in place, the old lift station would be removed, and its forcemain would be decommissioned and left in place. The old forcemain is the solid blue line that runs to the right past Galpin and Mud Lakes. Some improvements will also be made to L19 to accommodate new flows. These include a new flow meter, improvements to the pump and HVAC systems, and some other miscellaneous work necessary to make the flow change.

Next slide, please. Based on the nonmonetary impacts, it's agreed with, that the previous Facility Plan had said in that the replacement was recommended over the status quo alternative.

Next slide. And looking at costs again, the replacement is overall lower cost than the status quo alternative.

Next slide. So in summary, at this time will move forward with the project as it was recommended in the previous Facility
Plan. The goals are to improve efficiency and reliability. That efficiency comes from taking an electrical powered lift station and replacing that with just a gravity pipe so that there is no need to maintain that facility and use that power.

So finishing up with the goals to add the gravity pipe, and to decommission L20 and its forcemain, and to replace flow meter M417 (ph) to accommodate the new pipe configuration. And on this particular project, the City of Excelsior has quite a number of infrastructure improvements that they want to build at the same time. So this is one of those partnering projects where the city's and our work will go on at the same time so that there is a minimum of disruption to the community while work is being done. Design work started on this project in 2019, and we anticipate the design work will be completed in 2021, and we anticipate construction between 2022 and 2024.

Next slide, please. Project #5 is the L21 project and just a note on L21.
Typically a force (ph) lift station only has a single forcemain that it discharges into. L21 is a little different. It has two forcemains that pump flow to two different destinations. So L20 (ph) is a little bit different in our system. But the drivers for the L21 project are the age of the equipment and operational flexibility and how we use that second forcemain.

Next slide, please. So the rehabilitation alternative would make pump metering and mechanical improvements to L21 and install a new meter on L21's secondary forcemain. That would be that meter identified as M439A (ph).

Next slide, please. The replacement alternative would replace L21 with a new lift station on the same site, and similar to the rehabilitation alternative, it would install that new meter on the secondary forcemain.

Next slide, please. So nonmonetary impacts the rehabilitation alternative as the recommended alternative.

Next slide. And based on costs, the
rehabilitation alternative is also lower.

Next slide. So to summarize, the rehabilitation alternative is recommended. It improves system reliability and operational flexibility. It provides new flow meters on the forcemain so that both can be metered now, and that improves the accuracy of our metering data. Design will start in 2021, and we anticipate that being complete in 2022, and then we anticipate construction between 2022 and 2023.

Next slide. So the table you see shows a summary of the costs -- the upfront capital costs for all the recommended alternatives. So the total capital expenditure would be $37,987,000 $36,980,000. And now I will hand it off to Chris Remus who will talk a little bit more about cost impacts, construction impacts, and schedule.

CHRIS REMUS: Thank you and good evening everyone. My name is Chris Remus, and for the record that's C-h-r-i-s R-e-m-u-s. And I am one of the assistant managers in the MCES Interceptor Engineering group. So from the previous slide, Dan had shared
the cost summary for the five projects proposed in the Lake Minnetonka Facility Plan, and that total was $36.98 million dollars. I just wanted to briefly review how that cost impacts the sewer rates. MCES is going through a Facility Plan approval process and application to receive via PFA loans (inaudible). Loans for these projects are paid for from two funding sources.

The first one shown is the Municipal Wastewater Charge which is known as the MWC, and this is the MCES portion of your sewer bill. The second item shown is the Sewer Availability Charge, also known as SAC. And this is a one-time charge for new connections to the regional system. So the impact to the rates from the $36.98 million dollars in loans from these projects -- the first one of $1 is equal to the amount included on the annual sewer billing per household, and currently that amount is $188 annual average MCES wholesale rate charged to the communities. The second, the $46.43 is the amount paid per year over the 20-year term from the SAC Fund per new household
connections, and as noted below, these figures show the relative impact on the lakes and how the project will be paid for over time.

Next slide, please. So after the submittal of the Facility Plan and approval by the MPCA, MCES and our consultants will begin the design phase for these respective projects. And below is noted some of the items that will be considered during the design phase.

More engineering studies will investigate impacts of detours for traffic and trails and how they relate to local neighborhoods, schools, businesses, and other items affected and adjacent to the project, topography challenges, how much up and down there is and that may affect the alignment of the proposed pipe and methodology of construction, buildings and utilities and other obstacles would obviously affect the alignment, and we may have to change or move slightly through the design process. Coordination with local city projects and Dan had referenced the one
in Excelsior/Shorewood where we may partner with local communities that also have public works improvements and enter into cooperative agreements to minimize disturbance to the region.

Location of schools and understanding the schedules that they operate under would affect the potential phasing of the project and when it starts and where the work is done at certain times of the year, and understanding and knowing the community members in groups needing special accommodations within the community. Some examples of that may be Metro Mobility pickups, bus stops, emergency management such as fire and police. And we will also be looking to include comments noted from the Facility Plan process to identify those folks and groups.

While items on the right side of that page cannot be a hundred percent avoided, we tried to be mindful of these and other items when considering construction methods to minimize impacts. Those listed are noise and dust, vibrations, bright
lighting, traffic closures and trail closures, and the detours and how that affects the community ingress and egress. We do work with the local communities and follow their local ordinances and guidelines with respect to these items and look for ways to begin to minimize the impacts of the construction.

Additionally, during the design phase, further meetings will be held with the neighborhood during this design phase to review a more developed plan and gather further feedback to consider as the team works toward final plans and construction.

Next slide, please. So what are our next steps? After tonight's Public Hearing, there are several important dates for the team to meet for submitting the Facility Plan to the MPCA. December 28 is the deadline for public comments on the Draft Facility Plan that we are presenting this evening, and that is available for review as previously noted.

After that date, the team will work to prepare the final Facility Plan which
will be brought to the Metropolitan Council for adoption in February of 2021. After that adoption date, in March of '21 the team will submit the plan to the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency along with application for the Clean Water Revolving Fund priority list.

And with that, I would like to turn the presentation back to Council Member Lindstrom so that he can share information on how you can offer comments to the Public Hearing. Council Member --

PETER LINDSTROM: Thank you very much. This is Council Member Peter Lindstrom. And Tim, Dan, and Chris, thank you so much for your presentations. Now I would like to open it up. I would like to hear your comments and questions on the Draft Facility Plan. And I would like to remind you to state and spell your full name each time you speak. Also, please include your address and your organization that you represent, if any, for the record. You can follow the instructions now appearing on the screen.
So I will keep an eye out on the Q&A section here for any sort of questions, and we will be looking for raised hands as well, and my colleagues are going to be helping me on this.

TIM O'DONNELL, SR.: I would like to jump in here real quick, Council Member Lindstrom. This is Tim O'Donnell again with MCE -- staff. I just wanted to note for the record a couple more local officials and staff joining us at the Public Hearing tonight. One is State Senator Steve Cwodzinski from District 48, and from the Hennepin County staff we have Joseph Scalla and Mike Olmstead.

PETER LINDSTROM: Fantastic. Welcome. I am so glad that you could join us this evening. Did I see we have our first question from Andrew Erickson, 300 Oak Street in Excelsior? And Andrew's question is, "Can you expand further on infrastructure improvements that the City of Excelsior would like to make for the L20 Project?" Great question. Is there someone from our staff who can address that?
DAN FICK: This is Dan Fick. I can address that. I am the Project Manager for that L20 Project. So the City is making water main improvements for a large portion of that project corridor. The City is also making some roadway improvements too -- they will be changing some of the geometrics of the roads through there. There is also some miscellaneous work. They will be doing some repaving on Grathwol Lane that is a nearby street, and they will be doing some additional work on William Street beyond the intersection of Oak and William. I don't have all of the specific information right in front of me right now. But what we will be doing is, we will be having an open house for that project specifically later on in 2021, probably in March or April. So we will have a lot more detailed information available at that time, and we would be happy to answer your question in more detail.

PETER LINDSTROM: Excellent (ph). Thank you. Other questions? I don't see any in the Q&A section. Any raised
hands out there?

(Off the record discussion.)

PETER LINDSTROM: Tim O'Donnell, did we receive any questions or comments prior to the Public Hearing that should be read out loud at this time?

TIM O'DONNELL, SR.: Yes, we did. We have three questions and one lengthy comment. So I will go ahead and read those into the Public Hearing record now. Again, this is Tim O'Donnell. And while I am doing this, if there is anybody else in the audience that has a question that comes to mind, certainly feel free to put that into the Q&A text box or in the attendee list, raise your hand and we will recognize you after I read these comments.

The first is a question that we received in advance by e-mail from Kate Murray. K-a-t-e M-u-r-r-a-y. She lives at 3449 Crystal (inaudible) Place in Orono. Ms. Murray asked us, "What is the size of the new L49 lift station? It sits right in front of my house and will potentially block the view of the lake affecting my property
value." We responded to Ms. Murray. "Thank you for your question about the size and location of the proposed new L49 lift station in your neighborhood in Orono. The enclosed map shows your property marked with the pink dot and two potential locations for the new lift station marked with yellow dots. These are on Met Council or MCES vacant properties at 2259 Shadywood Road and at 3447 Crystal Bay Road." And Dan Fick noted in his presentation, "We are still studying where to locate the lift station and should be making a decision during 2021. The lift station will be a single story building with a gable roof and measure about 15' by 20'. We will hold additional public information meetings for you and your neighbors as we get further into the design of our project and again before beginning construction which we estimate could be in 2024. Please let us know if you have further questions."

Question #2 came in in advance of the Public Hearing by e-mail from Alexis Beckman spelled A-l-e-x-i-s B-e-c-k-m-a-n,
and she is with Minnetonka Schools. Her question is, "Is there a timeline for this project yet and is there a direct contact for this project?" We responded to Ms. Beckman, "Thank you for reaching out to the project team. We currently have five projects included in our Lake Minnetonka Facility Plan. Our Deephaven lift station L48 and forcemain project is the closest of our projects to the City of Minnetonka. But let us know if you would like information about any of our other four projects. We have attached our information sheet about the L48 project for you. Our current timeline is to finalize the design in the first part of 2021 and then start construction in late 2021 through 2023. Tiffany Troudt will be our project manager." We also provided Ms. Beckman with the contact information for our project manager and our project website address.

The third question we received in advance is by a phone call from Alidia Dyer spelled A-l-i-d-i-a, last name D-y-e-r. She lives at 6520 Astor Trail in Victoria. Ms.
Dyer asked for more information about the project involving lift station L21 there in Lake Virginia. More specifically, she asks, "Will the building get bigger with the project?" We responded to Ms. Dyer by phone, "Yes. The building will get a little bit bigger. We will be adding a stairwell to the west side of the building."

The fourth item we received was a set of comments by e-mail today from Ralph Kempf spelled R-a-l-p-h, last name K-e-m-p-f, who lives at 3675 Togo Road in Orono. Mr. Kempf comments on the plans for lift stations L46 and L49 in Orono. His comments state, "Plan alternatives three and four -- both consolidating L46 and L49 at the L49 site -- call for the removal of lift station L46 at the corner of Togo Road and Shadywood Road.

Togo Road residents support either of these solutions for three reasons. First is, it would be a means to resolve a difficult intersection layout. Number two is, a reduction in the number of future maintenance sites, with L46 being a
difficult site to maintain. Point three resulting in the remaining lift station L49 being in a less conspicuous and high traffic location than the existing Togo Road (ph) location."

Mr. Kempf goes on to explain his three points a little bit further. To his first point about the difficult intersection layout, Mr. Kempf comments, "Togo Road is four feet wide gutter to gutter and presently adjoins Shadywood Road at a very acute angle coming from the south. You are already aware of the issues at that intersection that the perpendicular creates. In this case, traffic from the south onto Togo often comes around the corner at a pretty good clip. With the current situation, maintenance vehicles sit out on the fourteen foot wide pavement of Togo Road while servicing L46 with traffic from the south approaching quickly and discovering the roadway blocked at the last minute. In addition, traffic coming from Togo onto Shadywood Road during maintenance is squeezed onto the remaining pavement, making
the roadway impassable. I have watched numerous dangerous scenarios unfold in that situation."

Also to his first point, "Another issue is with the angular intersection which involves traffic coming from Togo Road and turning north onto Shadywood or from Shadywood onto Togo Road. A vehicle of any size simply cannot make that corner on the existing pavement. If you explore the south edge of Togo Road, you will see that it is deeply rutted where vehicles routinely plow through the soft earth to make the corner. And coming from the north turning onto Togo Road also requires traffic of any size vehicle to turn wide into the lane of oncoming traffic to make the corner. Removing L46 lift station would allow for bringing this difficult intersection into a more perpendicular configuration by expanding the roadway into the area of the existing Togo lift station." To Mr. Kempf's second point about reducing the number of future maintenance sites, he comments that, "By combining the lift stations, it would
hopefully lower long-term maintenance costs by eliminating a maintenance site as well as having all future maintenance taking place at the existing traffic at the L49 location. There is also more space at the L49 location."

To Mr. Kempf's third point about the lift station L49 being in a less conspicuous and less high traffic location than the existing L46 Togo Road site, Mr. Kempf comments that, "L46 is located in a highly visible residential location. Removing it would be an improvement to the view of those driving through our Lake Minnetonka neighborhood as well as removing an industrial-looking cluster from the more residential setting for those of us who live here. Thank you for your consideration."

We will respond to Mr. Kempf to thank him for his comments, and we will let him know that we will consider them as we finalize our plans.

That concludes the comments and questions that we have received prior to the Public Hearing.
PETER LINDSTROM: Outstanding. Thank you. This is Peter Lindstrom again. We have received a question from Rita Johnston at 4370 Wyndhill Circle in Deephaven. And Rita's question is, "Will we have an L48 meeting where we will get detailed descriptions of the project construction which will impact our backyard?" Great question. Could one of our team members address that?

DAN FICK: This is Dan Fick. Yes. We will be having an open house for that project. As we said, Tiffany Troudt is the project manager for that project. I don't know when that open house has been scheduled, if it has been scheduled yet. But we will be having an open house for the project to answer questions like that.

PETER LINDSTROM: Fantastic. Peter Lindstrom again. I would suspect that you would say that a good way to stay in touch on this project for that open house information would be to subscribe to the -- to pay attention to the website and to subscribe to any sort of announcements from
the Met Council. Is that right, Mr. Fick?

DAN FICK: This is Dan Fick again. Yes. That's correct.

PETER LINDSTROM: Super.

TIM O’DONNELL, SR.: This is Tim O'Donnell, too. I will add, Ms. Johnston, that we will show the address of our project website once we have finished the question and answer session here, and once you are on that site, there are instructions for how you can subscribe to e-mail and text alerts anytime we post a new update or Public Meeting notice on that website. So we invite you to take a look at that.

PETER LINDSTROM: Very good. I do not see any other questions. I do see a raised hand from Cindy Marr. Go ahead. I think you are off mute.

CINDY MARR: Thank you. Can you hear me? I live at 6015 Chaska Road in Shorewood. And I'm looking at your map. It's a little confusing. But it looks like you are going to have sewer come down Chaska Road again on that L20 project, is that correct?
PETER LINDSTROM: Great question. Could one of our team members address that question?

DAN FICK: Yes. This is Dan Fick. There is an existing pipe in Chaska Road -- a Met Council pipe in Chaska Road. We won't be adding to that pipe. What happens is that flow from Chaska Road comes toward Highway 7 and then it flows east of our lift station at Galpin Lake Road. When we construct the gravity pipe, it will bring that flow back to the west a bit so that we can cross under Highway 7 near the Water Street intersection. But we will not bring the pipe back as far as Chaska Road.

CINDY MARR: So Chaska Road will not be disrupted from this?

DAN FICK: Correct.

CINDY MARR: Okay. We lived through eighteen months of the build of Shorewood Landings. So not having the road tore up again --

PETER LINDSTROM: I feel your pain absolutely. And this is Peter Lindstrom again. Andrew Erickson has a
question from the chat (ph), 300 Oak Street, Excelsior, and the question is, "Will a recording of this meeting and presentation be made available online?"

TIM O'DONNELL, SR.: This is Tim O'Donnell. I can answer that question. Andrew, we will make a recording of the presentation and this Public Hearing available on our project website. It should be available in early January. So take a look for that.

PETER LINDSTROM: Outstanding. Okay. Looking for any other raised hands. I see none and see no more questions in the chat (ph). I will say one last call. Anybody out there that wishes to speak to this matter?

TIM O'DONNELL, SR.: We have a call-in user identified on the list as user _952396 (ph) is the start of their number. We will unmute you if you have a question or a comment at this time. Would you like to speak to this matter? We don't want to put you on the spot. If you care not to, that's fine, too.
PETER LINDSTROM: Okay. Well, very good. I don't believe there are any further comments or questions. I would like to remind you that this Public Hearing record will remain open until 5:00 p.m. on Monday, December 28, and you are welcome to submit comments through any of the methods that we have available now showing on the screen; e-mail, postal mail, by the Council's public comment line, or by the TTY text telephone.

Next slide, please. Here is how you can review a copy of the Draft Facility Plan.

Next slide. From now through the next several years is, we design and construct our projects. You can visit this webpage for specific contact information and links to the latest project information.

So I will make a final call. Is there anyone else out there who wishes to speak on this important matter tonight? All right. Seeing no further comments, we will adjourn the Public Hearing.

Thank you everybody for
participating tonight. Thanks for the presentations. Your input is just supercritical and I really appreciate you taking the time to learn more about this sewer improvements facility plan and provide your feedback. Thank you and enjoy the rest of your evening.

(At approximately 8:15 p.m., the proceedings concluded.)
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MCES project manager Dan Fick amended the transcript to correct typographical errors and spellings of names and figures on the following pages:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page #</th>
<th>Line #</th>
<th>Correction Made</th>
<th>Reason for Correction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Changed Tim O'Donnell’s name and title</td>
<td>Sr. was being use as part of his name, instead of his title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Removed “SR.” from Tim O'Donnell’s name</td>
<td>“SR.” is not part of his name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Changed “Dan” to “Peter”</td>
<td>Peter Lindstrom was speaking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Removed “SR.” from Tim O'Donnell’s name</td>
<td>“SR.” is not part of his name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Removed comma</td>
<td>Not needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Removed “SR.” from Tim O'Donnell’s name</td>
<td>“SR.” is not part of his name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Removed “202”</td>
<td>Typo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Changed $37,987,000 to $36,980,000</td>
<td>This dollar amount was incorrect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Removed “SR.” from Tim O’Donnell’s name</td>
<td>“SR.” is not part of his name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Removed “SR.” from Tim O’Donnell’s name</td>
<td>“SR.” is not part of his name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Removed “SR.” from Tim O’Donnell’s name</td>
<td>“SR.” is not part of his name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Removed “SR.” from Tim O’Donnell’s name</td>
<td>“SR.” is not part of his name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Removed “SR.” from Tim O’Donnell’s name</td>
<td>“SR.” is not part of his name</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>