ROLL CALL

Present: President Patricia Preiner, 2nd Vice-Pres. John Waller, and Treasurer Steve Wagamon.

Absent: 1st Vice-Pres. Barbara Haake (with prior notice) and Secretary Harley Ogata (with prior notice).


Consultants: District Engineers Mark Deutschman and Nancy Stowe, Houston Engineering, Inc. (HEI); District Attorney Louis Smith from Smith Partners.

Visitors: Martin Harstad, Jim Hafner, Mark Smith.

CALL TO ORDER

President Preiner called the meeting to order, a quorum being present, at 9:00 a.m.

SETTING OF THE AGENDA

District Administrator Belfiori requested under Board Action to move number 5 to number 2 and adding a new number 3 – Consider permit application 40-001 for Mark Smith.

Motion by Manager Wagamon, seconded by President Preiner to adopt the agenda as amended.

Motion carried 2-1 (Manager Waller).

READING OF THE MINUTES AND THEIR APPROVAL

Minutes of the February 26, 2014, Board of Managers Regular Meeting.

District Attorney Smith requested the following corrections:

Line 134, Page 7, “correcting” drainage system records.

Line 204, Page 8 “unit” costs.

Manager Waller requested the following corrections:
Page 11, when they were talking about drainage ditch 6, during Schmidt’s report, he recommended number 6 be deleted off of the list. Inspector Schmidt recommended they hand it over to Forest Lake and he recommended that be changed and a different ditch system be chosen in Ramsey County.

President Preiner requested staff locate Manager Waller’s comments and add these comments to the Minutes.

**Motion by Manager Wagamon, seconded by Manager Waller, to approve the minutes as amended. Motion carried 3-0.**

**APPOINTMENT OF ACTING SECRETARY**

**Motion by Manager Waller, seconded by Manager Wagamon, to appoint Manage Waller as the Acting Secretary. Motion carried 3-0.**

**CONSENT AGENDA**

The following applications have been reviewed by the District Engineer and Staff and will be acted upon without discussion in accordance with the Engineer’s Recommendation unless a Manager or the Applicant or another interested person requests opportunity for discussion:

**Table of Contents**

**PERMIT APPLICATIONS REQUIRING BOARD ACTION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Plan Type</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14-002</td>
<td>City of Lino Lakes</td>
<td>Lino Lakes</td>
<td>Street &amp; Utility Plan</td>
<td>CAPROC 8 items</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Permit Coordinator/Wetland Specialist Tomczik stated this morning they passed out an amended document based on last minute submittals by the applicant. He stated the main changes were adjustments to the wetland impact amount. He noted the other adjustments were just clarification on the first recommendation.

**Motion by Manager Wagamon, seconded by Manager Waller, to CAPROC permit 14-002 as outlined in the above Table of Contents in accordance with RCWD staff and District Engineer's Findings and Recommendations, dated March 4, 2014. Motion carried 3-0.**

**Motion by Manager Wagamon, seconded by Manager Waller, to recess the regular meeting for the Public Hearing on the Clear Lake Water Quality Treatment Project. Motion carried 3-0.**

**PUBLIC HEARING: CLEAR LAKE WATER QUALITY TREATMENT PROJECT**

President Preiner stated this was a public hearing for funding of the proposed Clear Lake Water Quality Treatment Project. She indicated the purpose of the hearing was to hear comments and take testimony from parties having an interest in the proposed project to be constructed in partnership with the City of Forest Lake. She asked Water Resource Specialist Axtell to provide a summary of the proposed project.

Water Resource Specialist Axtell stated this was a joint project with the City of Forest Lake at the new City Hall and Public Services Facility. He stated Clear Lake was a Tier 1, high priority lake in the District. He noted the Clear Lake Association had been very active. He stated some of the past studies and reports done for this project. He noted later in the meeting there was a Resolution and intergovernmental agreement for the Board approval.
President Preiner noted the purpose of the hearing was to receive comments from interested parties and not to get into a discussion with the Board members. The Board members were to hear the comments only. She asked each person when they approached the podium to state his or her name and their address for the record.

There were no comments made during the public hearing.

Motion by Manager Wagamon, seconded by Manager Waller, to close the public hearing and open the regular meeting. Motion carried 3-0.

Motion by Manager Wagamon, seconded by Manager Waller, to close the regular meeting and open the Public Hearing for Anoka County Ditch 53-62 Branch 1 Repair Report. Motion carried 3-0.

PUBLIC HEARING: ANOKA COUNTY DITCH 53-62 BRANCH 1 REPAIR REPORT

President Preiner welcomed the members of the public attending the hearing. She stated under consideration today is the designation of a repair area for Anoka County Ditch 53-62. The purpose of this hearing is to receive comments from the public on the District's proposed designation of the areas adjacent to the drainage system that are reasonably necessary to be occupied and effected in order for the Drainage Authority to carry out its statutory repair obligations.

She stated to facilitate comments at today's hearing, mailed notice was given to the owners of all properties directly impacted by the repair of the drainage system. The direct notice included a copy of a map indicating the portion of each property within with repair area where equipment operation, tree removal and spoil disposal, will occur. General notice of the proceedings was provided to each owner within the drainage area of the drainage system and to the general public by published notice.

She stated the proceedings were being recorded.

She indicated the order of business for this hearing will be as follows: The District's Drainage Attorney will provide a summary of the proceedings to date. The District's Engineer will present information regarding the proposed repair areas, including a description of the work proposed to be accomplished along various reaches of the drainage system.

After the initial presentation, she indicated she would open the hearing for public comment. She stated Board would like to hear public comments and concerns regarding the proposed repair area. She indicated the Board's decision must be based on the legal requirements related to the repair of the drainage system, taking into consideration and unique characteristics of property that would justify an alternative repair design or alteration of repair methods.

She indicated the Board had already adopted the Order directing the repair of Branch 1 of ACD 53-62. Comments directed on the repair itself and not the work area are not appropriate for this hearing.

She noted the Board was aware of the public concern related to a proposal to develop property in the northeast quadrant of the Interstate 35W and Lexington Avenue interchange for a Wal-Mart. The Board's consideration of work area for the repair of Branch 1 of ACD 53-62 was based on the requirements of Minnesota Statutes Chapter 103E and the Board's obligation, as Drainage Authority, to maintain the public drainage system. She stated the Board, in its role as Managers of the Rice Creek Watershed District, has commented on the Environmental Assessment Worksheet for the proposed development and had notified the developer of the requirements of the District's administrative rules related to stormwater management – especially the rate and volume control requirements, requirements to continue adjacent drainage and water quality requirements.
She indicated this was not a proper forum to discuss the development. Issues related to the proposed development would be addressed during the District’s permitting process.

After the initial presentation, she stated she would open the hearing for public comment.

She stated during the public hearing, managers may ask questions of staff making presentations and of commenters, in order to clarify testimony.

She noted if a member of the public asked a question and a manager believed that a response from District staff or a District consultant could readily resolve the question or enrich the testimony, the manager might ask me to have the appropriate staff member or consultant speak to the question. She stated she would exercise her judgment as to whether to allow such discussion.

She indicated managers’ expression of their positions and general discussion concerning the subject of the public hearing should be avoided during the public hearing. Board discussion would occur after all members of the public have had a chance to speak and the public comment period had been closed. Board discussion might occur at this or a subsequent meeting, as the Board decides.

She stated if a member of the public wanted to make a comment, to come up to the podium when she recognizes them, speak into the microphone and state their name and address for the record. If someone had a specific question concerning the proposed repair area, they might ask the administrator, engineer or legal counsel to respond. She stated if they had anything in writing to submit, that could be provided to her during the public comments and she would note its receipt in the record.

To ensure that all wishing to comment on the proposed repair area have time to speak, she indicated she might limit the time any single speaker may comment to five minutes. She asked that comments not be redundant or have repetitive comments.

District Administrator Belfiori highlighted the project status and the types of work to be completed. He noted the 53-62 Branch 1 system ordered for repair was located in Blaine, which flowed from north to south. He stated the branch 1 system ended to the west of Lexington Avenue. He stated it was largely open channel in nature. He noted what had been done on the project so far and what still needed to be completed.

District Engineer Nancy Stowe noted the types of work that was expected to occur within the designated area. She indicated the ditch would be excavated, trees removed, replacement of culverts, and vegetation removal. She noted they had looked for special considerations in the ditch during construction. She stated they had designed eight works types needed to complete the work. She noted they needed the reasonable necessary areas for construction for equipment access, completion of the work, placement of the excavated materials and vegetation removal. She indicated bridges would be removed and replaced at the owners risk with no financial compensation if they break. She recommended the landowners remove the bridges prior to construction. She stated the post construction spoil and future maintenance would be where the spoil would be smoothed out; they would be seeding with native/upland seed and not turf grass; and they would use herbicide for maintenance and to prevent tree growth. They would encourage the residents to leave the native grasses and not mow to the ditch and to remind them that have all fences and sheds needed to stay outside of the right-of-way.

President Preiner asked if any of the homeowners came out during the site visit. District Engineer Nancy Stowe responded one homeowner came out who had a culvert running under his driveway who had some questions, but this area had been taken care of previously.
District Administrator Belfiori noted the tentative schedule for moving forward with March 2014 having the completion of the draft construction plans; March through April 2014 permit acquisition; March 2014 completion of final construction plans; April through May 2014 bid letting; between June through September, 2014 the construction would begin; and December 2014 the construction would end.

President Preiner asked the Manager if they had any questions. There were no questions asked.

President Preiner asked if there were any comments from the public.

Martin Harstad, stated he had a significant amount of property along Branch 1, Lateral 1 where the proposed Walmart was being located which was approved by the City recently. He noted this was a complex area and he appreciated everyone’s works and desires to get everything done. He stated his property was unique. He had owned the property for 30 years and he had seen over the years that his wetlands had increased and it was a significant clean out on their end of the ditch. He stated they had worked with staff to donate land for the reroute of the DNR wetland adjoining his property. He stated his greatest concern was about the spoils that were coming out. He stated there would be a pretty sizeable amount of spoil removed. He stated the last thing he wanted to do was to remove the silt out of the ditch and put it on the side of the ditch and all of a sudden, his wetland would become greater. He noted they needed some daylight in there and staff has assured him that he would be able to be onsite and visit with the contractor as this was being done. He stated if need be, he offered to get a dump truck in there himself to remove the material. He believed staff had addressed this properly and just wanted to get it on record.

There were no other comments received.

Motion by Manager Wagamon, seconded by Manager Waller, recess the hearing to the Board’s regular meeting on March 26; and open the regular Board meeting. Motion carried 3-0.

OPEN MIKE – LIMIT 12 MINUTES. Any RCWD resident may address the Board in his or her individual capacity, for up to three minutes, on any matter not on the agenda. Speakers are requested to come to the podium, state their name and address for the record. Additional comments may be solicited and accepted in writing. Generally, the Board of Managers will not take official action on items discussed at this time, but may refer the matter to staff for a future report or direct that the matter be scheduled on an upcoming agenda.

There were no comments made at Open Mike.

ITEMS REQUIRING BOARD ACTION

1. Consider modifications to RCWD Surety Schedule (Nick Tomczik)

   Permit Coordinator/Wetland Specialist Tomczik explained this item and resolution was based on the discussion of the Board to date. He stated the Board previously adopted all three of the items (fee schedule, surety schedule, variance policy) at one time and they were all interrelated, so if they move one, they should move them all together regardless of the changes. He stated the Board could take individual action on cases, but it was more legally defensible to look at the issue as a whole; determining the appropriateness of the given schedule. He noted what staff had changed on the fee schedule; cap of $10,000 for stormwater. He noted that the board should consider that a cap would prevent a higher fee for a stadium or other large development.
He stated if this was approved, the schedule was retroactive and would refund the fee amounts on the permits affected by the change. He noted it would affect four permits under Rule C, since adoption of the current fee schedule, for a total refund of $58,680.00.

Motion by Manager Wagamon, seconded by President Preiner, to approve Resolution 2014-13, Adopting Revised Permit Fee and Surety Schedules and Permit Variance Guidance.

Permit Coordinator/Wetland Specialist Tomczik noted Mr. Smith and Jim Hafner were in attendance at the meeting also.

Jim Hafner, Stormwater Manager for the City of Blaine, thanked staff and the Board for letting him attend the workshop meeting to express the City's concerns. He corrected a previous statement he made saying that he thought the sureties of the City were close to what the District would charge for the Western Woods project, but he said that in error. He stated those sureties had not been calculated at this time. He stated there was some concern on the part of the City that both the City and the Watershed District were charging fees for the same things and when it came down to actually doing repair work, they would not be spending the same money to do the same thing so they believed they could find a way to hopefully reduce fees to contractors by not being redundant on the fees charged them. When the city looks at these projects, we take a look at what the actual bid cost are for doing the earth moving work and then we add 25% to that. So our surety is reflected in 125% of what those cost. He stated the City did not complete projects, but rather stabilized them. He requested the Board keep the fees reasonable for the developers.

Manager Waller stated that during the recent workshop discussion he had suggested the City follow a similar process as the City of Hugo who acted as the permit authority. He stated this would be a one stop shopping deal and the City did most of the managing as well as the lead on the rules and regulations. That way costs would be saved and there would not be double fees charged. He believed this type of a situation would work well.

Jim Hafner stated this was something the City could look at going forward. He noted currently the City did rely on the District for stormwater management regulation as well as erosion control and wetland regulation. He stated they were required to have their regulations up to par with the District's rules. He stated they were open to working with the District going forward.

District Administrator Belfiori thanked the City and their staff for their continued partnership.

Mark Smith, 2120 Otter Lake Drive, Lino Lakes, stated he appreciated the Board taking the time to find a resolution to this situation. He stated his project had 9,000 yards of material they were moving. He noted they needed the material. He stated there was talk about phasing the project, but working with the City they wanted water coming from the west side of Lexington and they needed to remove the fill from the west side to bring to the east side so they were not able to do any phasing on the project. He stated it was impossible to convince a bank to do a surety with these numbers. As Jim Hafner from the City of Blaine explained, the city charges a 125% charge of actual costs. When he does a project, he shows the city his bids so the city can verify them. On this bid sheet, Mr. Smith stated he is paying $2.35 a cubic yard, actually $1.70 per cubic yard to remove, but the bid he is using is $2.35. The bank is willing to finance 125% of the estimated cost, but not willing to do something that is ten times as much, such as basing it on the district surety schedule either at $50 or $23. He stated this created a huge hardship with the bank in securing a letter of credit. He stated that these numbers might work for most projects, but he asked if the Board could look at his project independently with a more reasonable number.
President Preiner asked if they could approve this today and continue working on the issue. Permit Coordinator/Wetland Specialist Tomczik responded yes. He stated his thoughts would be it was appropriate to adopt the schedule and if they wanted to deal with one particular project, the applicant would apply for a variance. If the Board feels overall that the $23 per cubic yard is still too high or any other portion of the surety schedule is substantially high, the Board could further revise the schedule.

Manager Waller stated he did not support changes to the fees and schedules at the workshop and he did not support this Resolution 2014-13. He stated there was no need to do this at that time.

**ROLL CALL:**
Manager Waller – Nay
Manager Haake – Absent
Manager Ogata – Absent
Manager Wagamon – Aye
President Preiner – Aye

Manager Waller stated he believed this was an issue that should be before the full Board and not just three Managers. He believed this had been reflected in the previous minutes of their meeting when Manager Ogata was worried about whether or not the District was going to have enough protection on the issue. He stated he did not support the change.

Manager Wagamon agreed that the entire Board should be involved, but he believed they needed to do this for the people in front of them now and that they can look at it as a full Board again. He believed it was critical that this was looked at again because he believed they needed to be covered insurance wise for the tax payers, but it also should not be punitive to the applicants coming before them for permits.

Manager Waller noted Mr. Smith seemed to feel the adopted resolution at $23 was too high and it was suggested he come in for a variance. He stated that Mr. Smith’s concern existed even before they changed the surety schedule from $50 to $23 by Resolution today. However Mr. Smith could have come in for a variance before this meeting.

Permit Coordinator/Wetland Specialist Tomczik stated at this time staff had presented the CAPROC engineer’s report and it was ready for their consideration. If it was approved, it is what it is and if Mr. Smith wanted to contest it, he would bring a variance request to the District.

**Motion carried 2-1.**

2. **Consider Modification of permit application fee for permit 13-068 (Nick Tomczik)**
   Discussed under previous item number 1.

3. **Consider Permit Application 14-001 for Mark Smith**
   Mark Smith stated if he needed to request a variance, he would proceed by doing that. He stated he was not sure if he should have the permit approved now, or wait until he files for a variance.

Manager Wagamon asked if they could get the schedule done before the next Board meeting. Manager Waller noted all of the Managers would not be in attendance until April. Permit Coordinator/Wetland Specialist Tomczik stated in order to adjust the surety schedule further, they needed some direction from the Board as to
what they wanted staff to do. He stated if they passed this and if Mr. Smith could not obtain the surety, this
would not do him any good. The Board could consider the variance application however. He stated there was
limited time before the next meeting and unlikely enough for the applicant to submit a variance application and
the District to review it.

District Attorney Smith stated Mr. Smith had the ability to request a variance whether they acted on his permit
today or not and the 60-day variance that ran could also be unilaterally extended by the District for whatever
reason they state as long as they had a reason. It appeared it was Mr. Smith’s want to have a variance request as
soon as possible and the Board could consider it. The key thing was that they needed to establish a policy on the
sureties and to make sure the cost exposure was protected if the project was not constructed and to set a policy
that did that, but any applicant was free to come before the Board for a variance, but an economic hardship alone
was not a good reason to request a variance.

Manager Waller stated he had faulty information at the workshop and he thought they were very close to the
range of the actual cost plus 25 percent and that was what he was using, but they don’t know that and he wanted
to relook at this. He stated they picked a number out of the air and that was not right. They needed a number
where they were covered, but not being unreasonable to the developers.

Permit Coordinator/Wetland Specialist Tomczik stated the $23 was based on an HEI analysis of projects and was
not picked out of the air and he believed the number was a solid number. Manager Wagamon apologized and
said that was not what he was insinuating. He was thinking they were at cost plus 25 percent.

Permit Coordinator/Wetland Specialist Tomczik stated he was not entirely familiar with the municipality
methods and he was not sure how the dirt work portion they were looking at tied into the infrastructure interests
of the City has so the actual cost might be difficult to compare those to.

Manager Wagamon stated the $23 might be the final number, but he wanted the opportunity to look at this
again.

District Engineer Deutschman stated some of what they were seeing was a timing matter and he believed some of
the developer did not even have the total costs set yet if the Board was going to wait for a bid number to establish
a surety they could run into a timing issue. He stated this was a challenging matter, but they needed to decide
the route they wanted to go. He stated the numbers they came up with had a lot of costs involved in it.

Permit Coordinator/Wetland Specialist Tomczik stated the 60th day was April 19, which was after the workshop
and the next meeting. He suggested this be brought forward to the workshop on April 7 and hear the results and
look at this again on April 9, but that would not address if Mr. Smith had some deadlines he was looking at.

Mr. Smith responded he could work with those dates and if necessary, they could look at the 60-day rule at that
time.

Motion by Manager Waller, seconded by President Preiner, to table permit 14-001 to April 9 Board meeting
and look at that time to see if a 60-day extension was needed. Motion carried 3-0.

Permit Coordinator/Wetland Specialist Tomczik asked for guidance on what the Board wanted with respect to
the surety schedule. President Preiner stated she wanted it based on real numbers.
Permit Coordinator/Wetland Specialist Tomczik stated they would further determine what the real cost was and it was up to the Board to determine what risk level they wanted to protect against with the surety. Manager Waller stated he wanted to see one stop shopping with this and he wanted staff to talk to the City of Blaine to see if something could be worked out with them also.

Manager Wagamon asked staff to show what the City of Blaine was looking at versus what the District was looking at so they could justify the difference. Permit Coordinator/Wetland Specialist Tomczik responded they could explore what the City utilized and what they viewed as well as the District’s numbers.

Manager Waller stated he wanted to know what the actual cost was for the letter also. He noted the actual money should be considered.

Manager Wagamon stated it was not the cost, but it was what it did for the ability of the applicant to obtain the credit.

Mr. Smith stated there was two parts to this. The cost was that they would charge 2-3 percent for the letter of credit, but they would not get the letter until an asset could be provided which was 1.5 times more. They looked at this like cash so they had to make sure he had an asset. The issue was when the numbers did not make sense to them such as this case.

Manager Waller stated he realized equity needed to be established and the banks had the same interest as the District did that the work was completed. He stated the issue was if the work was not done and the District had to sue for it to get done. He stated they were in the same position was bank was and they had to have that kind of a surety.

District Engineer Deutschman asked if it was their intent to find historic bid tabs from similar type of project and go through the tabs and review those to develop a surety estimate. He stated if this was the case, did they want this by project time as the cost would vary by type as well. He stated they were willing to support this, but it would not be a low level of effort and if they wanted this done that they do it correctly.

Permit Coordinator/Wetland Specialist Tomczik stated they would compare this to the Cities methods and compare it to what they did as well as look at the cost of obtaining the surety itself from the bank. He asked if they should bring this back to the March 26 meeting as a presentation so staff could get feedback for the workshop meeting.

President Preiner stated those Managers should watch the recording to get them up to speed.

4. Consider Ordering the Clear Lake Water Quality Treatment Project and Authorizing the District Administrator to Execute the Intergovernmental Agreement (Phil Belfiori)

District Administrator Belfiori explained in September, 2013 the Managers authorized staff to collaborate with the City of Forest Lake regarding submittal of a Clean Water Fund grant application for the Clear Lake Water Quality Treatment Project. He noted a $382,000 BWSR Clean Water Fund grant was awarded to the City to construct the project. The District and the City are each required by the grant agreement to split the match requirements for the grant. He indicated the District cannot commit levied funds to a project until a public hearing had been properly noticed and conveyed and the Board has ordered the project be implemented. He stated the public hearing was scheduled for March 12, 2014.
He recommended approval of the Resolution ordering the Clear Lake Water Quality Treatment Project and authorizing the District Administrator to execute the intergovernmental agreement.

**Motion by Manager Waller, seconded by Manager Wagamon, to approve Resolution 2014-10, Ordering the Clear Lake Water Quality Treatment Project Pursuant to Minnesota Statutes §103B.251.**

**ROLL CALL:**
Manager Waller – Aye
Manager Haake – Absent
Manager Ogata – Absent
Manager Wagamon – Aye
President Preiner – Aye

Motion carried 3-0-2.

3. Consider Curlyleaf Pondweed Treatment in Bald Eagle and Reshanau Lakes, Spring 2014 (Phil Belfiori)

District Administrator Belfiori stated costs were similar to previous years for this work for $15,500 and staff was recommending approval of the treatment projects.

**Motion by Manager Wagamon, seconded by Manager Waller, to approve entering into agreement with DNR for Aquatic Invasive Species control grants on Bald Eagle and Reshanau Lakes, and authorizes the Administrator to Execute the necessary contracts and to approve entering into professional services contract/s for chemical treatment of Reshanau and Eagle Lakes (not to exceed $47,000), and authorizes the RCWD Administrator to sign the necessary contracts. Motion carried 3-0.**

4. Consider Anoka County Abatement for three common element parcels certified for the Anoka County Ditch 53-62. (Phil Belfiori)

District Administrator Belfiori stated staff was recently notified by Anoka County that three of the parcels certified for the ACD 53-62 charges were common element parcels and needed to be abated. He recommended the Board approve the Resolution.

**Motion by Manager Wagamon, seconded by Manager Waller, to approve Resolution 2014-11, Abatement of Charges ACD 53-62 Water Management Districts.**

**ROLL CALL:**
Manager Waller – Aye
Manager Haake – Absent
Manager Ogata – Absent
Manager Wagamon – Aye
President Preiner – Aye

Motion carried 3-0-2.
5. Consider programmatic agreement for maintenance for City permitted projects (Phil Belfiori)
District Administrator Belfiori stated this related to the Programmatic Stormwater Maintenance Agreement, which would allow a public permittee to execute a single agreement to memorialize the maintenance obligations of all stormwater facilities associated with RCWD permits. He recommended approval of the Resolution.

Motion by Manager Waller, seconded by Manager Wagamon to approve Resolution 2014-12, Programmatic Maintenance Agreement Municipal Stormwater Management Facilities.

ROLL CALL:
Manager Waller – Aye
Manager Haake – Absent
Manager Ogata – Absent
Manager Wagamon – Aye
President Preiner – Aye

Motion carried 3-0-2.

6. Consider Check Register dated 3/12/2014, in the amount of $33,871.29, prepared by HLB Tautges Redpath.
Motion by Manager Wagamon, seconded by Manager Waller, to approve check register dated March 12, 2014 in the amount of $33,871.29, prepared by HLB Tautges Redpath. Motion carried 3-0.

ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION AND INFORMATION

1. District Engineer’s Report and Timeline
District Engineer Deutschman stated they had some task orders ready to go to establish the as-constructed, but Manager Waller brought up Washington County Ditch 6. In that task order, they were going to determine the alignment of County 6, but not the grade. He asked if they should not do anything at all, or did they want to do the minimum amount (alignment) so when they decided what to do with it they knew what they were doing.

Motion by President Preiner, seconded by Manager Wagamon, to do the basics on Washington County Ditch number 6 so they know what the alignment was. Motion carried 2-1 (Manager Waller).

2. Manager’s Update
There were no comments made.

ADJOURNMENT
Motion by Manager Waller, seconded by Manager Wagamon, to adjourn the meeting at 10:35 a.m. Motion carried 3-0.