CITY OF MINNETRISTA

CITY COUNCIL BUSINESS ITEM 6A

Subject:	**Early Grading Request for the development North Pointe at Halsted Bay**
Prepared By:	**Nickolas Olson, Senior City Planner**
Through:	**David Abel, Community Development Director**
Meeting Date:	**November 17, 2025**

Issue: Robert Bauman & Pine Financial Group, Inc. (the "Applicants") have made a request for an early grading agreement to allow for site work and tree removal for the development North Pointe at Halsted Bay.

Background: The Applicants received conditional preliminary plat approval back on August 4th, 2025. Under the terms of that approval, the Applicants have until January 31, 2026 to submit for final plat approval.

Discussion: The Applicants desire to begin preliminary site work and tree removal prior to the approval of the final plat. In order for the City to allow such work, a preliminary grading agreement between the Applicants and the City would need to be approved first. It should be noted that the City is not required to approve such an agreement if it does not feel it makes sense to do so. The request presents many challenges and risks to the City. These include the timing of the request not being ideal from the City's perspective, the lack of approvals from the City of Mound and other agencies, the numerous comments from the City's engineering department regarding the construction plans, and the proximity to the deadline to apply for final plat approval.

Conclusion: Staff would not recommend the City Council proceed with a preliminary grading agreement in this instance due to the many complications and risks it would present to the City. The Applicants attention should really be focused upon submitting a complete final plat application by the deadline set forth in the preliminary plat approval. However, if the City Council feels differently, the City Council should direct staff to proceed with a preliminary grading agreement with the understanding that the Applicants will be required to provide a letter of credit in the amount of 150% of the engineers estimate for the improvements and payment of the required tree preservation fee which, based on current submittal, would be $402,400.00.

Recommended Action: Motion to deny the Applicants' request for an early grading permit for the development North Pointe at Halsted Bay.

6701 County Road 110W & Adjacent Properties

1 in = 400 Ft

- City Boundary
- City Mask
- Address Labels
- Parcels

N

April 24, 2025

Map Powered By Datafi

wsb

DJR
333 Washington Avenue North
Suite 210 | Minneapolis MN 55401
612.676.2700 | www.djrarch.com

November 3, 2025

North Pointe at Halsted Bay

Written Statement – Early Grading Permit

A. Contact list:
    1. Owners – See land use application.
    2. Architect – DJR Architecture, Inc.: Sheldon Berg, 651.329.4558, sberg@djr-inc.com
    3. Civil Engineer – Stark Engineering: Wayne Stark, 320.249.2611, waynes@starkengineer.com
    4. Surveyor – Bogart, Peterson & Associates: Christopher Gray, 763.262.8822, cgray@bogart-pederson.com
B. Site Data
    1. Address – 6710 & 6750 Halstead Avenue, 6701 CR No 110 W,
    2. Current Zoning – R-2 Low Medium Density Single Family Residential
    3. Parcel Size – Approximately 361,516 SF (8.3 acres) + Public Road area (+/-2.0 acres)
    4. PID Numbers - 2211724430042, 2211724430002, 2211724430003, 2211724430004
    5. Legal Description – See attached.
C. Narrative of Early Grading Permit Request:
    a. Scope – The extent of the work to be associated with this early grading permit will be restricted to:
        i. Clearing and grubbing of trees
        ii. Site improvements for utility connections to the Beach Club (on city of Mound property,) but serviced by utilities in city of Minnetrista Roadway before they interlink with Mound utilities.
    b. Rationale - The project aims to begin this work on site this year on site as we await final plat of the proposed development in Minnetrista and entitlement approvals in Mound. The project has already received preliminary plat approval in Minnetrista and the design team has also submitted the updated civil engineering plans responding to comments generated during the preliminary plat including: refined grading, storm water, utilities and utility

profile sheets. The early grading permit will allow the project to begin the clearing the property for the single-family home and condominium sites as well as for road improvements. The reason for the early grading is to get the site work started and prepped for the follow-on work in the spring. The project has already received dozens of interested inquiries for homes and units within the project, so starting now will pay off in the spring where we can look to do site grading in earnest and install private utilities before going vertical with the buildings. Work now on the site with tree clearing will also be better suited as hardened ground is easier to maneuver with tree removal and will mean less potential erosion.

November 12, 2025

Mr. Nickolas Olson
City Planner
City of Minnetrista
7701 County Road 110 West
Minnetrista, MN 55364

Re: Halstead Bay Estates
Grading Permit Review
ML No. 25008

Dear Mr. Olson:

We have completed our review of the grading permit application submittal for the proposed Halstead Bay Estates project. There are two primary concerns with the applicant's request for a grading permit:

1. Time of year. There is likely limited time until the ground is frozen and grading operations would cease. Sediment control measures would need to be installed before snow covers the ground.
2. There are four Stormwater Management and Storm Sewer comments in this review that staff recommends be addressed prior to grading operations:
    - #4 The property owner, MCWD and Hennepin County are ok with the proposed orifice restriction on the north side of CR 110. The developer submitted a document that was included in the 8/4/2025 city council packet indicating that the property owners are amenable to this however staff recommends that this agreement be in place prior to any ground disturbing activities. The orifice will cause increased water levels on the private property and overtopping on CR 110.
    - #15 Maintenance agreement with existing Lots 12 and 13 of Halsted Park for the storm outfall. The developer submitted a document that was included in the 8/4/2025 city council packet indicating that the property owners are amenable to this however staff recommends that this agreement be in place prior to any ground disturbing activities because the proposed grading directs all runoff to this outfall.
    - #16 Soil borings required near the stormwater basins to verify that infiltration can occur as shown on the plan. If the soils aren't conducive to infiltration the stormwater basins will need to expand to meet storage requirements, which affects lot layout and grading.
    - #20 More detail needs to be provided to show how the infiltrating stormwater will not impact the low floors and footings of the adjacent structures. This is of particular concern for Basin C and the structure on Block 3, Lot 2 as the low floor is proposed below the bottom of the infiltration basin.
3. The current grading plan lacks a great deal of information. Some was provided with the July version of the plans and removed with this version, much of it has not been provided to date. The grading plan should include at minimum:
    a. All drainage and utility easements

701 XENIA AVE S | SUITE 300 | MINNEAPOLIS, MN | 55416 | 763.541.4800 | WSBENG.COM

b. Proposed elevations and all property corners, high points, swales, etc.

c. Emergency Overflow (EOF) locations, elevations and routes for all low points in the development
    i. Lowest opening elevations (LOEs) of proposed buildings and building pads must meet minimum freeboard requirements with EOFs

d. Drainage to be directed away from all building pads

e. Drainage from one lot to another requires additional drainage and utility easement

f. Minimum 2% and maximum slope requirements

g. Inlet and rim elevations for all structures

h. Material and construction details of the large riprap discharge swale south of Halstead Avenue

i. See additional redline comments on the submitted grading plan

Background

The project involves grading, parking lot paving, storm sewer and stormwater BMP construction, watermain and sanitary sewer construction, and appurtenant work. The application materials were reviewed against the City's design requirements. The following items were submitted for review:

- Preliminary Plat for Estate Property Development for Halsted Bay Estates, Dated 6/30/2025
- Civil Plans for Halsted Bay Estates, dated 10/20/2025
- Storm Sewer Design Calculations, dated 10/20/2025
- Stormwater Report for Halsted Bay Estates, dated June 2025
- Architectural Plans for Halsted Bay Estates Development, dated 6/30/2025
- Geotechnical Report, dated 1/22/2016
- Tree Preservation Plan for Halsted Bay Estates, not dated

Comments from the previous reviews are included in *italics*, noting whether the comment has been addressed, has not been addressed, or no longer applies. We request that the developer provides a response letter with the next submittal to ensure that comments have been addressed.

Preliminary Plat

1. *City code requires the private road to be in an outlot that's 50' wide- currently it's shown at ~25'.* **This comment has been addressed.**

2. The final plat must include a drainage and utility easement that extends minimum of 10' on each side of a public utility. Based on the current layout this comment applies to Lots 2 and 3 Block 1 (sanitary sewer) and Lot 7 Block 2 (storm sewer).

   This comment is modified as follows: The final plat must include a drainage and utility easement that extends minimum of 10' on each side of a public utility. Based on the current layout this comment applies to Lot 7, Block 1 (storm sewer). Show the drainage and utility easements on the utility plan in order to confirm that adequate easements are proposed for the utilities in Blocks 2 and 3.

Grading Plan

1. *The proposed low-floor elevations need to be shown to determine if there's a conflict with the high-water elevations and emergency overflow elevations. This is of particular concern for Lots 4 -6, Block 2 and Lots 2 -4, Block 3.* **This comment has been addressed.**
2. *Note the NWL and HWL of the stormwater basins on the plan. If these correspond to the "top" and "bot." elevations shown on the plan, then the elevations shown for "Stormwater Basin B" are incorrect.* **This comment has been addressed.**
3. *The existing contours on Lot 6 Block 2 are not shown correctly: the 952 contour extends to the north and bisects the 953, 954 and 955 contours.*

   This comment has been addressed
4. *The proposed 954 and 956 contour tie into the same existing contour on Lot 6, Block 2.* **This comment has been addressed**
5. *The proposed 952 contour at "Stormwater Basin B" ties into itself and there's no tie into the existing 952 contour on Lot 6, Block 2.* **This comment has been addressed.**
6. *Proposed retaining walls should be shown on the plans. Several lots will require retaining walls which will cross property lines and in my experience, residents are best served if these walls are owned and maintained by an HOA.* **This comment no longer applies.**
7. Label more of the proposed contours.
8. It would be easier to read the grading plan if the existing grading was changed to 2' contour intervals.
9. *A thorough QA/QC on the grading plan is needed to ensure that the proposed grades tie into existing. For example:*
   a. *The proposed 967' and 968' contours north of the proposed 24-unit building tie into each other.*
   b. *Near the northwest corner of the proposed 24-unit building, the existing 968' contour crosses the proposed 970' contour.*
   c. *The existing 966' contour crosses the proposed 968' contour.*
   d. *The existing 976' contour crosses the proposed 978' contour at Stormwater Basin D. Based on the current configuration of Stormwater Basin D correcting this will require regrading the hill down towards the 9 unit building.*
   e. *The existing 950' contour crosses the proposed 950' contour on Lot 2 Block 3.*
   f. *The existing 954' through 966' contours northeast of the proposed 12 unit building don't tie into a proposed contour.*

   This comment has been addressed
10. *Provide detail on how drainage will be directed away from:*
    a. *The proposed 9 and 12 unit buildings.*
    b. *The low opening on Lot 1 Block 2*
    c. *The homes between:*
       i. *Lots 2 and 3 Block 1*
       ii. *Lots 4 and 5 Block 1*
       iii. *Lots 5 and 6 Block 1*

iv. *Lots 6 and 7 Block 1*
v. *Lots 1 and 2 Block 2*
vi. *Lots 2 and 3 Block 2*
vii. *Lots 3 and 4 Block 2*
viii. *Lots 4 and 5 Block 2*
ix. *Lots 5 and 6 Block 2*

This comment has been addressed

11. *Install drain tile stubs to lots that drain from the back to the front.* **This comment has been addressed**
12. *Install storm sewer in the rear yards of Lots 2 through 6 Block 2 and install inlets between Lots 2 and 3 and Lots 4 and 5.* **This comment has been addressed.**

Sanitary Sewer and Watermain

The following comments shall be incorporated in the final plan and profile utility plans:

1. *The watermain connection at CR 110 will require a 10" to 8" reducer.*
2. *In lieu of a 90º bend in the watermain at CR 110 and Halstead, install two, 45º bends.*
3. *The watermain connection at Cardinal Cove Drive will require the installation of an 8" x 8" x 8" tee and two, 8" gate valves.* **Comment Partially addressed. Only one 8-inch gate valve added**
4. *Where hydrants are installed, label all fittings: 8" x 6" tee, 6" lead, hydrant assembly.* **This comment has been addressed**
5. *Ensure that hydrants are installed at the high point(s) of the water system. Watermain elevations may need to be adjusted.* **This comment has been addressed**
6. *The watermain layout includes an interconnect with Mound. A meter is required at the interconnect and the agreement between Minnetrista and Mound needs to be amended.* **This comment has been addressed**
7. According to the City's GIS information the existing water service stub to the proposed 24-unit condominium building is 1" diameter, therefore the 6" C-900 service would require a wet tap. **This comment is not addressed, wet tap not called out.**
8. The sanitary sewer services for the proposed 24-unit condominium building and Lot 1, Block 2 should connect to the sewer pipe, not the manhole.
9. Identify potential conflicts between the proposed storm sewer and the sewer and water services to the lots.
10. Sewer and water on the south side of the proposed 12 unit building should be moved to the north so that they do not lie within the sideslopes of Basin C.
11. Watermain shall be extended within the entirety of the east-west portion of Halstead Avenue. **Comment not addressed.**
12. Install water services to the existing properties on the south side of Halstead Avenue. **Comment not addressed.**
13. Clarify details of removal/abandonment of existing sanitary sewer facilities from lots

Stormwater Management and Storm Sewer

1. *The City requires rate control for the 1-, 10-, and 100-year storm events. Calculations were submitted for the 2-year event, but not the 1-year event. Additionally, rate control is required at each discharge point; please provide a table for each discharge point (to west, to dry creek bed, to lake).* ***This comment has not been fully addressed. HydroCAD results for the 1-year event were included in 5/22/2025 resubmittal, but a rate control table, including all outflows, was not.***

   The table below details the discharge rates at each location. Include a similar table if future submittals are needed in which the discharge rates change. This comment has been addressed.

Discharge Point	1-year (cfs)		10-year (cfs)		100-year (cfs)	
	Existing	Proposed	Existing	Proposed	Existing	Proposed
To West (1E/N/A)	0.05	0	0.56	0	2.17	0
To Dry Creek Bed (6R/7R)	7.99	7.30	17.87	11.48	36.69	36.17
To Lake (5E/S5)	0.80	0.75	3.59	3.05	12.51	8.11

2. *Update the proposed pervious curve numbers/land uses in the HydroCAD model. No landscaping or restoration plan was provided, but "Open space, grass cover > 75%" is likely a better fit.* **This comment has been addressed. The model has been updated to reflect a more accurate proposed condition pervious curve number.**

3. *Verify impervious areas are consistent between the narrative, plans, and Stormwater Report. For example:*

   a. *The narrative states 3.7 acres (161,258 sf) of proposed impervious, however the HydroCAD model only includes 128,588 sf of impervious.*

   b. *Drainage Area S3.1 has 9,966 sf of impervious modeled in HydroCAD, but building area on plans is 14,875 sf.*

   This comment has not been addressed. The narrative states an impervious surface area of 4.52 acres. The post development site drainage summary describes an impervious area of approximately 5.0 acres.

   This comment has been addressed.

4. *Include offsite drainage areas that drain though the site. For example: drainage area to the existing 18" CMP under CR 110 that will connect to proposed MH #13.* ***Offsite area has been included (6E/S6), however the pervious area is all modeled as woods or woods/grass combination, but a significant portion of the drainage area is row crops. Update HydroCAD to accurately model this increased runoff.***

   This comment has been addressed.

   a. ***The lowest invert of Existing Basin A (Pond Node BA) should be 964.15, not 954.15.***

      This comment has been addressed.

b. ***In proposed conditions, this Existing Basin (Pond Node BE) has a 12" vertical orifice at a 966.5 elevation. This increases the HWL on private property in all storm events, which is unacceptable.***

The developer has submitted a document indicating that the private landowners are amenable to the orifice. Please provide a document that is signed by the landowners and notes that the proposed conditions will result in an increase in water levels for the 100-year event (table below for reference). Provide documentation with the final plat submittal that MCWD and Hennepin County (due to road overtopping) approve this restriction. If approved, this area should be in a drainage and utility easement.

	HWL		
	1-year	10-year	100-year
Existing (Node BA)	966.62	969.58	970.30
Proposed (Node BE)	969.03	969.86	970.56

5. *The water quality volume provided can only be claimed for the area below the outlet in the infiltration basins. Provide HydroCAD stage-storage tables for each basin to verify water quality volumes.* **This comment has not been addressed. Stage-Storage tables not included with 10/20 submittal.**

6. *All new and reconstructed impervious areas should be routed to a BMP. Water quality volume provided can only be claimed for the area of impervious draining to that BMP.*

   a. *Pond B could claim water quality volume for the area below its outlet (between 950.0 and 951.8 per Comment #4), approximately 7,000 cf. However, only 9,966 sf of impervious area is routed to it in the HydroCAD model. Therefore, the allowable water quality volume would be 9,966 sf * 1 in / (12 in / 1 ft) = 830 cf.* ***This comment has not been fully addressed. Additionally, modeled subbasin from Block 2 (Subbasin S3) shows the entire subbasin routed to "Stormwater Basin B" (Pond Node BB). Grading plan shows portions of impervious flow from Block 2 would be routed directly to Halstead Avenue, without proposed lot contours being shown.***

   This comment has been partially addressed. However, it appears that drainage from Lots 5-6, Block 2 still flows to Halstead Ave and CBMH#1 and ultimately the Dry Creek Bed without any treatment.

7. *Infiltration basins must drawdown in 48 hours. Per the Minnehaha Creek Watershed District, drawdown times should be calculated as follows. Provide verification that the drawdown time is met for each basin.*

$$Drawdown = \frac{treatment\ \ volume}{area\ of\ basin\ bottom} * \frac{1}{infiltration\ rate}$$

Draw down times were stated in the comment response memo, but HydroCAD stage-storage tables are required to verify drawdown times. HydroCAD tables/ draw down not included in subsequent submittal.

8. *Submit storm sewer design calculations. Currently, storm sewer sizing, velocity, and inlet design flow cannot be verified*. **This comment has not been addressed. The City requires that calculations be submitted with preliminary plans. The calculations have been**

included. Pipe run between 13.2 to 13, 11.1 to 11, and 11 to 10 exceed maximum allowable pipe velocity. Pipe run between storm structure 7 and 6 is 394 feet.

a. *Include manhole sizes; the oblique (~32-degree angle) between two 18-inch storm sewer pipes at STMH #3 requires a 96-inch diameter manhole to accommodate the pipes.*

   i. ***Oblique storm sewer angle (~60 degrees) at CBMH #13 requires 72-inch diameter structure***

   ii. ***Oblique storm sewer angle (~36 degrees) at CBMH #1 with 21-inch and 18-inch storm sewer pipes cannot be constructed with precast structure, due to required leg width.*** **24-inch and 21-inch pipe now proposed at structure at 45-degree angle. Proposed 72-inch structure does not have adequate leg width.**

b. *Include sump elevations on plans.* **This comment has not been addressed.**

Comment addressed.

9. *Provide details for the outlet control structures. See the City Standard Plates (STO-12 and STO-13). The proposed structures may differ slightly given infiltration basins are proposed rather than ponds, but adhere to standards as much as possible.*

   a. *MH #5 (OCS from Pond A) and MH #9 (OCS from Pond C): Minimum of 5' diameter due to weir wall with 6" orifice. Model top of weir wall in addition to orifice. Increase top grate size to 60".*

   b. *MH #4 (OCS from Pond B): Minimum 4' diameter; increase grate size in HydroCAD to 48".*

   This comment response memo indicates that these will be submitted with final plans. This is acceptable, however, please note the size requirements indicated above as they differ from what was stated in the comment response memo.

10. *What is the minimum opening of the proposed 9-unit condo building? Ensure it is at least 3 ft above the 100-year HWL of Pond C (976.95).* ***This comment has not been fully addressed. The minimum opening of proposed 9-unit building is currently shown as 973.00 the "Stormwater Basin D" 100-yr HWL is 975.85. See also comment #20.***

    The minimum opening adjacent to the Stormwater Basin is stated as 980.0. This meets freeboard requirements.

11. *Is MH #13 a manhole or catch basin; does it receive overland drainage?*

    a. *Verify the drainage area for Pond A. The storm sewer routing differs between the Civil Plans and the HydroCAD drainage area map. If the Civil Plans are accurate, the Pond A drainage area should not include the runoff that drains to MH#12 (or MH #13 if it's a drop inlet).* ***This comment has not been addressed. Previously labeled MH #13 has been renumbered to MH #19.***

    This comment has not been fully addressed. MH#19 is an inlet, however the drainage area to it should be modeled separately from the drainage area to the culvert under CR 110 with the 15" orifice restriction.

12. *BMPs are labeled as stormwater ponds on the plans while they are designed as infiltration basins.* **This comment has been addressed.**

13. *Redesign Pond A and/or its inlet. Currently, the 10-year HWL will back up approximately 87 feet in the storm pipe (toward Pond C). The 100-year HWL will back up farther and CBMHs*

#11-12 will be surcharged (water elevation exceeds rim elevations). **This comment has been reasonably addressed. The 10-year HWL will back up approximately 60 feet in the pipe, however CBMHs will no longer surcharge in the 100-year event.**

14. *A maintenance agreement with existing Lot 13 of Halsted Park is required for the proposed drainage outfall improvements.* **This comment is modified as follows: maintenance agreements with existing Lots 12 and 13 of Halsted Park are required for the proposed drainage outfall improvements. The maintenance agreement shall be drafted by the development team and is subject to review by City staff.**

15. *Submit the soil borings referenced on page five of the Stormwater Report.* ***This comment has not been fully addressed. Soil boring logs and geotechnical report were included on the 5/9/2025 submittal but not the 5/22/2025 submittal. The boring and Geotech report is dated 1/22/2016. The soil borings performed in the report do not include a boring in the bottom of the stormwater basin B or D. While there are borings nearby, the geotechnical report states that due to historic mining and overburden fill replacement, the fill varies significantly across the site. With significant subsurface variation, the infiltration rates cannot be confirmed at the proposed infiltration basin locations without borings showing material type.***

    Additionally, the soil borings near the bottom of basins A and C (SB-5 and SB-11 respectively) show a confining layer of sandy lean clay below the bottom of the proposed basins. Per the Minnesota Stormwater Manual, sandy lean clay is Hydrologic Soil Group D, which is not conducive to infiltration. BMPs shall be changed to filtration basins unless a field test of infiltration rates is completed per Minnesota Stormwater Manual guidelines (https://stormwater.pca.state.mn.us/index.php?title=Infiltration_design_guideline_-_determining_site_infiltration_rates).

    This comment has not been addressed. Provide details on the plans for the excavation required to remove the layers of sandy lean clay below the proposed bottoms of Basins A and C. Provide soil borings at the locations of Basins B and D.

16. *Storm sewer would need to be installed for the proposed private road in Outlot B. It seems this would change the drainage pattern (the private road would drain to "Stormwater Basin B") which may change the footprint of "Stormwater Basin B").* **This comment has been addressed.**

17. *Provide existing and proposed drainage area maps, with aerials, that show the full extents of the drainage areas modeled.* **This comment has been addressed.**

18. *The storm sewer within Halstead Avenue should be aligned to maintain 10' horizontal separation from the watermain and crossings should occur at 90º wherever possible.* **This comment has been addressed.**

19. *Show the emergency overflow location (EOF) and elevation for each Stormwater Basin.*

    a. *Basin D presents a concern based on the steep grade that the EOF would discharge to, and inevitably be directed toward Lots 2 and 3 Block 3. This may require a piped emergency overflow*

    b. *Ensure that the lowest opening elevations of adjacent structures are at least 1.0 foot above the EOF. If the EOFs are set approximately at the top of each basin, this requirement is not met for any of the proposed basins.*

    c. *Demonstrate that the EOF has capacity to overflow water at an elevation below the lowest building opening at a rate not less than three times the 100-year peak discharge*

rate from the basin or the anticipated 100-year peak inflow rate to the basin, whichever is higher.

This comment has not been addressed. The EOF routes are shown however EOF capacities need to be analyzed per comment 20.c.

20. *Minimum building openings must be at least 3 feet above the 100-yr HWL of adjacent waterbodies, including stormwater/infiltration basins. These conditions are not met for any of the proposed basins. Alternatively, 2 feet will be allowed provided the following conditions are met:*
    a. *Flood storage volume within the freeboard area is at least 50% of the flood storage volume below the 100-yr HWL; and*
    b. *25% outlet obstruction does not increase the 100-yr HWL by more than 1 foot; and*
    c. *Adequate EOF from basin to provide assurance that 1 foot freeboard will be maintained for proposed low opening.*

    Adequate separation between the building openings and HWLs has been provided. However, for Basins A and C, please provide a description and detail in the plans to keep the infiltrating stormwater from impacting the low floors and footings of the adjacent structures. This is of particular concern for Basin C and the structure on Block 3, Lot 2 as the low floor is proposed below the bottom of the infiltration basin.
21. Lawn and landscape irrigation systems within the development cannot be connected to city water per Section 500.31 Subd. 4 of City Code. The lawn and landscape irrigation needs of the development can be served by the installation of a separate irrigation system supply pipes connected to the storm water ponds.
    This comment has not been addressed.
22. The pipe cover between CBMH 3 and CBMH 4 appears to be less than allowable, 2.5 ft.
23. Storm sewer profile run from MH#2 to CBMH#1 not included in profiles.
24. Storm sewer plan and profiles from Lot 1 Eastern 9-unit and 4-unit buildings/parking lot not included. Inlet upstream of CBMH #16 not included in plan/profile.
25. Include plan note to tie three pipe sections upstream of FES outlets.

Sincerely,
WSB

Alyson Fauske, P.E. (MN)
(612) 263-1736
afauske@wsbeng.com