Minnesota Wetland Conservation Act Technical Evaluation Panel Findings Report

Date(s) of Site	September 4, 2019		LGU:	MCWD				
Visit/Meeting: County:	Hennepin		LGU Contact:	Erin Manlick				
Project Name:	W19-18 2740 White Oak Circle		Phone #:	952-641-4586				
Location of Project: (attach map if possible)	2740 White Oak Circle, Orono		Email Address:	EManlick@minnehahacreek.org				
TEP ATTENDEES: LGU: Erin Manlick, MCWD		THER ATTENDEES: Mark Kjolhaug - Kjolhaug Environmental	<u>o</u>	THER ATTENDEES:				
SWCD: Stacey Lijewski		Tim Johnson - Livit Site + Structure						
BWSR: Ben Carlson		Karen Berrell - Property Owner						
DNR: N/A								
PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND PURPOSE OF MEETING: The Applicant submitted a boundary and type application dated August 13, 2019 for the above referenced property. The TEP met on-site to review two wetland boundaries in the field as well as discuss a proposed landscaping plan to prevent flooding on the property.								
TYPE OF MEETING: Check of Or	n-Site	Phone Conference	E-Mail	Other:				
TEP FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS 1:								
The TEP found that the two wetlands identified in the delineation report met criteria for wetland characteristics and both boundaries located were confirmed. It was agreed upon that Wetland 1 may have encroached westward in recent years and that a no-loss status might be claimed by the property owner as a result of incidental wetland. The TEP agreed that supporting materials, including historical aerial imagery and evidence of altered drainage upstream, would be needed to prove an incidental wetland. Next steps to be taken by the property owner and/or their representatives are to modify the existing, or submit a new, WCA application requesting a no-loss determination for incidental status of Wetland 1.								
SIGNATURES .								
			Ben Con	9/10/19	ı <u> </u>			
SWCD Representative		Date	BWSR Representative	Date				
Do not concur			Do not concur					

¹ TEP Findings should be a meaningful concise summary detailing the project conditions, technical data, and what rules apply. The TEP recommendation should be clear, based on rule and best professional judgement.

			_
LGU Representative	Date	DNR Representative	Date
Do not concur		Do not concur	

¹ TEP Findings should be a meaningful concise summary detailing the project conditions, technical data, and what rules apply. The TEP recommendation should be clear, based on rule and best professional judgement.