REGULAR MEETING OF THE RCWD BOARD OF MANAGERS
Wednesday, February 22, 2017

Approved Minutes

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

ROLL CALL
Present: President Patricia Preiner, 2nd Vice-Pres. John Waller, Treasurer Steve Wagamon and Secretary Michael Bradley.

Absent: 1st Vice-Pres. Barbara Haake (with prior notice).

Staff Present: Administrator Phil Belfiori, Permit Coordinator/Wetland Specialist Nick Tomczik, Water Resource Specialist Kyle Axtell, District Technician Samantha Berger, Lake and Stream Specialist Matt Kocian, Regulatory Assistant Patrick Hughes, Office Manager Theresa Stasica.

Consultants: District Engineers Chris Otterness and Garrett Monson, Houston Engineering, Inc. (HEI); and, District Attorney Chuck Holtman from Smith Partners

Visitors: Larry Lanoux, Lisa Paddock, Bob Zick, Patrick Antonen.

SETTING OF THE AGENDA
District Administrator Belfiori added under Board Action item 2: By-Laws Subcommittee Appointment; and under Items for Discussion and Information a new item 2: Follow Up Discussion from 2/6/17 ACD 53-62 Branch 2 Repair Report and WMD Informational Meeting.

Motion by Manager Waller, seconded by Manager Wagamon, to adopt the agenda as amended. Motion carried 4-0.

READING OF THE MINUTES AND THEIR APPROVAL
Minutes of the February 6, 2017 Board Workshop. Motion by Manager Wagamon, seconded by Manager Waller, to approve the minutes as presented. Motion carried 4-0.
Minutes of the February 8, 2017 Board Meeting. Minutes of the February 8, 2017 Board of Managers Meeting. Motion by Manager Wagamon, seconded by Manager Waller, to approve the minutes as presented. Motion carried 4-0.

CONSENT AGENDA
The following items will be acted upon without discussion in accordance with the staff recommendation and associated documentation unless a Manager 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>16-052</td>
<td>BSREP II Simply</td>
<td>New Brighton</td>
<td>Street &amp; Utility Plan</td>
<td>CAPROC 9 items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Storage Acquisitions, LLC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Permit Coordinator/Wetland Specialist Tomczik indicated an adjustment to Item 17-003. The adjustment is on page 49 of the packet, the second block of text after the table, the first line should be struck from the ER and insert “Existing basin 1P was constructed by Fridley ISD #14 in 2010 with a portion of the funding coming from the District Cost Share Program. Since basin 1P has been constructed for over five years Fridley ISD #14 is not under a maintenance obligation with the District and the owner of the basin. Existing basin 2P was constructed by the District under a clean water partnership grant in 2011. The applicant is expanding the size of basin 2P resulting in an improvement to water quality treatment and does not affect District Grant obligations.” He stated the rest of the text would follow in the original text except for the final sentence of the third block of text “The remaining capacity of basin 1P was not used to meet permit water quality requirements.”

Permit Coordinator/Wetland Specialist Tomczik stated the additional text is to clarify the grant program versus the regulatory program.

Manager Bradley indicated he had a few questions. The first was in regards to 16-052, there is a sentence on page 33 of the packet that he would prefer to be a stipulation of the approval that the applicant is required to confer rather than just a sentence in the packet. He thought this should be under the recommendation or as a stipulation that they will confer. He stated when there is an issue of contamination, they have an obligation to advise the PCA. Permit Coordinator/Wetland Specialist Tomczik stated as a matter of their typical practice they give a courtesy email to the PCA that the District has taken action and that they have been advised there is contamination in the area. That typical procedure fulfills Manager Bradley’s statement. The other part about stipulation or CAPROC item he could see it going either way but preferred it to be a stipulation because then it follows with the permit all the way through.

District Attorney Holtman asked as clarification to the proposed stipulation what the Board would like to see, for example a written communication back to the District that contact was made. Manager Bradley stated that was correct. He would like to see some sort of evidence that they have fulfilled that obligation of conferring.

District Attorney Holtman stated this is a situation that does come up and they have had staff discussions with the engineer about what is the best standard way to address this. The comments the Board makes and shares will be incorporated into the standard practice.
Manager Waller stated he did not have a disagreement with the stipulation point of view because it makes it much stronger and he agreed that when they are brought to the notice of the Board, there is an obligation to forward this on. It may not affect the particular permit they are looking at but anytime there is something like this there should be a stipulation added. Manager Wagamon agreed and was glad to hear that the PCA was notified also.

Manager Belfiori stated this could be reviewed further at a workshop.

Manager Bradley stated this should be done on a case by case basis and they are not the PCA. It is not their obligation to stand in the shoes of some other agency but it is their responsibility to report issues of contamination to the PCA and that is all he wants them to do.

District Engineer Otterness asked for clarification on whether the proposed stipulation would use the word “confer” versus “inform,” because the word choice may alter the applicant’s ability to comply with the stipulation. If the Board is expecting the applicant to confer with the MPCA, the applicant may not be able to accomplish this as it requires action by the MPCA that the applicant has no control over. If it is the Board’s intent simply to inform the MPCA, that is a reasonable expectation and seems to represent a due diligence that it is currently being performed. Manager Bradley stated he was picking up the language that was existing in the write up by staff. He agreed that inform is a better term than confer and it is up to the PCA to do its job.

Permit Coordinator/Wetland Specialist Tomczik stated then he thought it would be better to be situated as a CAPROC item then that way if the PCA does respond to the applicant noting issues the District knows that is taking place before they issue a permit to break ground.

It was moved by Manager Bradley and seconded by Manager Waller, to approve 16-052 as CAPROC with the additional CAPROC that the applicant is required to inform the PCA and any other agency with regards to the contaminated land. Motion carried 4-0.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Plan Type</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16-115</td>
<td>City of Lino Lakes</td>
<td>Lino Lakes</td>
<td>Final Site Drainage Plan</td>
<td>CAPROC 6 items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-002</td>
<td>Bald Eagle Erectors</td>
<td>Lino Lakes</td>
<td>Final Site Drainage Plan</td>
<td>CAPROC 6 items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-003</td>
<td>Fridley ISD #14</td>
<td>Fridley</td>
<td>Final Site Drainage Plan</td>
<td>CAPROC 6 items</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Manager Bradley stated on pages 38-39, there is a table which states there is 2.5 inch NURP volume requirement and on the next page on the top it states per Rule 6.C6-C1, water quality requirement is 2.2 inches. He wondered why there was a difference. Permit Coordinator/Wetland Specialist Tomczik stated the 2.2 is defining the water quality standard based on the rule. When a NURP (National Urban Runoff Program) pond is being designed, it must be sized for the 2.5 inch runoff from the contributing area. One is the standard, the second is the method by which the pond is being designed in order to have it function correctly.

It was moved by Manager Bradley and seconded by Manager Wagamon, to approve the consent agenda as outlined in the above Table of Contents in accordance with RCWD District Engineer’s Findings and Recommendations, dated February 13 & 15, 2017. Motion carried 4-0.
### PERMIT APPLICATION 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>16-107</td>
<td>Mahtomedi ISD #832</td>
<td>Mahtomedi</td>
<td>Street &amp; Utility Plan</td>
<td>CAPROC 7 items</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Permit Coordinator/Wetland Specialist Tomczik stated this item was tabled at the last meeting. He stated a revised engineer’s report was emailed out yesterday and provided this morning. He reviewed district expectation that landowners will coordinate with any other regulating body. The district rule only considers contamination in regards to sequencing for the feasibility of infiltration on a project site and ultimately with the presence of contamination; the applicant determines the method of stormwater treatment suited for the site. The jurisdiction of the district is in regards to stormwater is water quality and rate control. He stated that when the PCA is involved in contamination, there are restrictive covenants recorded on the property. In this case a portion of the project 16-107, a short trail segment, is located on a parcel with restrictive covenants.

District Engineer Otterness summarized the specific changes that were made since the previous ER document. He stated the first change was on page 3. The applicant provided additional information that identifies the contamination location. Further down the page, the ER addresses a comment from the last meeting identifying the depth of the proposed water treatment features, which vary from 6.4 to 15 feet. The reason why they vary that much is because the ground slopes while the treatment features are on a consistent level.

District Engineer Otterness noted on page 4 of the Engineer’s report that the runoff from the site is collected and isolated from the ground water. The other note identifies that one portion of the project, a trail segment, is the only portion of the project that is within one of the land parcels that is subject to the restrictive covenant for the contamination. There are no project BMP’s that are located within the parcels that contain contamination.

District Engineer Otterness stated even if the contamination were identified on portions of the site that did have the BMP’s, it would not change how the District views the application nor would it change their recommendation for CAPROC of the site. The District Engineer is recommending that this application be CAPROC’ed.

Manager Bradley asked if the water will flow to the west, away from the contaminated site. District engineer Otterness indicated that was correct.

Permit Coordinator/Wetland Specialist Tomczik stated he did email the boundary in the area to the PCA and the response he received shows on a photo marked up showing the trail going into the restricted boundary which brings them full circle back to the comments of District Engineer Otterness and District Technician Berger.

Manager Bradley requested the same change be made with this item that was made on item 16-052, that a CAPROC requirement be added that the applicant informs the PCA of this project.

District Attorney Holtman stated there was discussion about the District’s jurisdiction at the last meeting and what it bases its permitting decision on. He stated the District and watershed districts generally do not insert themselves into the local land use decision of what types of developments occur in what parts of a city. What the District looks at is to make sure that whatever is built from a stormwater perspective.
does not contribute additional pollution, does not contribute to flooding problems and does not impair
the overall ecology associated with the water resources. What that means is that when they turn to the
District’s stormwater management rule it is oriented on those purposes and the Board’s decision is
based on the criteria set forth in the rule, and has the proposal met those criteria. As Permit
Coordinator/Wetland Specialist Tomczik mentioned those criteria do concern management of pollutants
in the stormwater itself. There is not a connection to the conditions in the subsurface except to the
extent that the District’s rules have an initial preference for infiltration when soils or groundwater
elevations do support that. The District recognizes that if there is contamination on a property it is not
in the best interest of the property or the landowners’ liability to be introducing stormwater into the
ground water and in that case if the applicant presents that fact of contamination or potential
contamination on the site and for that reason chooses not to go forward with infiltration, the District
will not require infiltration.

Permit Coordinator/Wetland Specialist Tomczik stated he reached out to different agencies as
requested by the Board at the last meeting and he received some response. He stated generally the
different agencies are aware of the site and are aware of the different developments that are occurring
or intended in the area. In his email he stated to the PCA, which was directed to Mr. John Betcher,
MPCA Hydrologist 3, and Mr. David Knight, Environmental Specialist 4, "I’d ask that you please confirm
the content of this communication I’ve understood from the various MPCA phone calls and correct as
needed any issues or offer up anything you think might be helpful and I’ll share it with the RCWD
Board." In his email he then offered the following summary:

* Property parcels with known contamination have a restrictive covenant recorded against the
property. The restrictive covenant prohibits soil disturbance or alteration below two feet without prior
written approval by the MPCA Commissioner and requires the maintenance of a protective soil cover,
performance of routine inspections and necessary repair of the soil cover, and proper management of
irrigation water to the athletic fields to minimize the amount of infiltration through the cover.

* These restrictive covenants often result in inquires and communications with MPCA as funding
institutions want security in their lending and investment.

* The Mahtomedi School site, north of Stillwater Road running roughly from Ideal Ave on the west to
Jamaca Ave N on the east has areas represented on the What’s in My Neighborhood? ("contamination")
page of the MPCA and those parcels have recorded restrictive covenants.

Permit Coordinator/Wetland Specialist Tomczik noted part of the response was to take his image and
identify the parcels with the restrictive covenants for the District. He continued with the email he
received.

* The Mahtomedi Middle and High school are to the west of the known contamination and it is
likely those parcels do not have restrictive covenants.

* There are members of the public expressing concern regarding the placement and operation of
the Wildwood Elementary school on the east. The environmental investigation and
redevelopment plan of the Wildwood elementary was approved by the MPCA VIC program.

* Some members of the public continue to express concern of health risks at Wildwood
Elementary school. Although no indications exist that human risks exist at the school, the MPCA
has coordinated with MDH to evaluate the site. The evaluation has not been completed.
* An EAW is currently out for comment with the EQB for an ice arena to the west of the elementary school. MPCA is aware of the proposed project and involved as necessary under MPCA jurisdiction.

* An applicant’s excavation, grading and construction undertaken for compliance with RCWD regulations must be presented by the landowner/consultants as part of proposed work on a given site and for MPCA’s examination when contamination is present.

* RCWD emails the MPCA to share RCWD permit actions when there is known contamination; RCWD continues this communication practice for clarity and to promote landowner compliance with regulations.

Permit Coordinator/Wetland Specialist Tomczik stated from these points he made statements and sometimes the PCA inserted information. Their understanding of the area was more broad then what was requested.

Manager Bradley thanked staff for the report and indicated that based on the fact there is an EAW on the ice arena indicates the PCA is well aware of what is going on. He will ask at the appropriate time that the CAPROC be amended to address the applicant’s obligation to inform the PCA in this particular project.

Manager Waller thanked staff for their additional work. He stated one of the things that caught his attention was the stormwater sewer pipe they are going to empty into goes down into Lake Washington and he knows in the past they have extensive records of the size of the plume and how it goes up and down over the years and he has not heard that kind of a description of the record going on here so he does not know if the contaminated area has a plume, what the size of the plume is and does the plume then go along the outside of the stormwater pipes down to their resource of concern. He did not know if the PCA has a protocol and if so, has it been enacted to take a look at this contamination. Could the District Lake and Stream Specialist work with the PCA and put in a monitoring station at the end of the pipe near Lake Washington that way in the future they would have a way to detect how this affects the resources of concern. He stated they were notified by the citizens at the last meeting of a potential problem at this location so therefore they should take some precautions.

Manager Bradley asked if Manager Waller was suggesting they approve this item but bring back to a workshop a report by staff monitoring efforts they could do downstream. Manager Waller stated that was correct and did not see that the permit would be impacted but he did believe the notice by the citizens have told them of a problem and the District needs to take further action. Permit Coordinator/Wetland Specialist Tomczik stated he had a phone conversation with Yata Clemens with the MN Dept of Health in regards to the plume and she participated in some initial well testing in the vicinity and at that time nothing was found and she has not been involved since that time. Manager Bradley asked if there was any knowledge of when the test was done. Permit Coordinator/Wetland Specialist Tomczik indicated he did not know. If the Board wished to explore the idea, he was not sure that the District is the expert in measuring what contamination is or if it would test the water on its own.

Manager Wagamon wondered if they were getting into something that is not their area of expertise. He wondered what staff thought of Manager Waller’s idea. President Preiner thought they could look at that further but she did not know if they should continue discussing it now. Manager Bradley suggested this come back to a workshop for further discussion after staff has reviewed it.
President Preiner asked if anyone in the audience would like to speak with new information.

Mr. Larry Lanoux, Councilmember for the City of Grant that approved this permit to this point. He stated he sent the Board information via email and one of the concerns he has is the documentation given to the Board which indicates that the PCA is involved in it and are aware. Through the documentation, he provided and if it was reviewed the information they were provided was provided by the School District, Landmark Environmental did the phase 2 study, they drilled six to eight feet deep for their core drilling. It was not until recently when rink 2 decided that they wanted to find out how far they had to dig that they determined that the garbage dump was not ten to fifteen feet as the MPCA has indicated and has based all of their studies and permits on. The garbage is actually twenty to thirty feet deep. He stated he has provided a copy of the warranty deed which states there is a covenant and they did not have the right to do the drilling. They did not remove the covenant when the drilling was done. They have drilled through the top two feet and broken the seal and they have drilled through the bottom, probably beyond the thirty feet and have probably gone down forty feet to establish how far they have to go down to get a footing.

Mr. Lanoux stated at that point the documentation the MPCA has given the District is false and inaccurate whether it is by design when they said they did the environmental testing to determine that strip and the twelve feet of contamination. If they go all the way to the east beyond where the elementary school is located is where they did the three test strips. They were done within twenty-thirty feet of each other. Although it followed the letter of the law required to do the test strip. He thought the intent was to do three test strips along the thousand foot area to determine where the contaminated soil was at. He stated if they go to the furthest part east they know that is where they did not do the dumping. They know by the documentation in the MPCA documents that the water table flows to the west so they went to the furthest east where they do not believe it is contaminated. One thing the MPCA is not addressing and has been asked for at many SWPPP meetings is did this contamination allow the contaminants to travel into Lost Lake. He stated he was concerned because nobody was addressing the question if they contaminated the lake.

Mr. Lanoux stated the documentation given to the District has a sheet from the Washington County Water Legacy Program. There is line in it where Lost Lake would have been there in 2010, it is not listed. They put this line through contaminated soil against the Department of Labor and Industry denial four times but eventually gave into the School District as this body probably will at this meeting. When they did that, it allowed the contamination to travel. The only thing anyone can put in is monitoring wells and if the property is walked there is not a single monitoring well to be found. That property was approved for athletic fields only by the Attorney General. He asked this time to have the District request more documentation from the Department of Health and MPCA before approving this item.

Mr. Lanoux stated he did not have an issue with the District approving a permit allowing them to tear up blacktop, replace blacktop but he did not want the infiltration pond put in right next to the parking area because the contaminants are to the east. He asked if the District is inviting itself into litigation with the knowledge they have now that they allow that without further testing because they are organizing with the citizen by Lost Lake, White Bear Lake and an attorney in California who is ready to take on the case.

Manager Waller asked where the pond is located that Mr. Lanoux is requested be removed. Permit Coordinator/Wetland Specialist Tomczik stated the current permit application being considered does
not have an infiltration feature. What Mr. Lanoux is referring to could be associated with a future ice rink, he did not know.

Mr. Lanoux was not sure if there was a pond in this plan but at the last meeting there was a request to place the same orange containers under the parking lot to collect the rain. If it has been taken out of this he applauded the applicant for doing that and what he was hoping they would do. He would also request, as a body, that the District go out and establish where the plume is at and establish the boundary of it because from the documentation he has shows they are already concerned the plume is 200 feet south of Cty Road 12. He requested the District find where the bodies are before they allow these to travel.

Ms. Lisa Paddock, resident in Grant, stated if this permit has been modified and it does not include the holding pond she applauds that and hopes it is just a parking lot going over because that was her concern. She stated her concern for today was that this permit was going to be tapping into that vein of contaminants and the water flow would be contaminated and going into Lost Lake and White Bear Lake. She shared with the District a previous experience she had with a Superfund site and stated they need to be cautious with these contaminants when they are known to be toxic, carcinogenic and they already have hot spots exceeding residential levels. She advised the District to be very cautious with anything to do with storm water and how it may be disturbed there and how it may be transferred to other community areas. They need to be cautious and continue to monitor this and continue to hold them to standards of monitoring and keep residents informed.

Manager Bradley stated on page three of the application there is a list of the BMP’s and he asked for clarification on what a sump catch basin is on the north and south side and whether that is an issue of concern. Permit Coordinator/Wetland Specialist Tomczik stated a sump catch basin is where the stormwater comes off the parking lot and goes through the grate, the manhole has a greater depth to the bottom than the outlet so that the sediment within the stormwater collects in the sump and can be captured and removed.

Mr. Bob Zick, Inside News hour, commended the Board on the way they conduct their meetings and the thorough manner in which they do their minutes, they are totally complete. He stated he says this in contrast to the Mahtomedi School District that excludes and bans the press from meetings that they hold secretly that should be open to the public. He stated he has followed this entire process from the time the School District bought the Bellaire Sanitation former Superfund site in 2004. He followed the phase one review determination by STS Engineering and the phase two consultants, Landmark Environmental process and their purpose was to secure the permitting and they used Braun engineering and Mr. Lanoux mentioned that the core samples were done to the depth of six feet when in fact the engineering information shows the dump went to a level of thirty feet deep. He hears the phrase “when there is no contamination present”, when he hears that he puts that in context of they have all heard the phrase “fake news”, “alternative facts”, there is one more that needs to be added to that list which is “the lie of omission”. This School District is excellent in invoking the lie of omission. They have documented that over and over again. They use selective facts and they take them in a manner, selective facts and selective areas in the dump site and is very misleading.

Mr. Zick stated this last process, at the Grant City Council meeting, he believed the figure that was brought up was this parking lot with creating the holding pond underneath it with storage facilities and they are going to remove fifty thousand cubic yards of dirt. They have consistently disturbed the soil in
there, they have consistently broke those barriers that were meant to be a seal. He wondered who was
monitoring that plume. They see what happened in Lake Elmo and what needed to be done there. They
see that the people had to actually give up their wells and had to bring in City water. This is what is
going on here and for what purpose. Is it so the School District can create a magnificent complex. That
is not the purpose. The kids that are there have immune systems that are just being developed. Those
immune systems are very subject to the contaminants in the ground. To see the extent of the
deviousness of that School District, down at the State Legislature there were two bills being introduced,
one was that schools could not be built within a quarter mile of one of these dump sites and the other
bill was parental notification of parents. The Mahtomedi School District was there killing both of those
bills. The District has the responsibility for the health and safety and the protection of the citizens.

President Preiner asked if the present application has been modified from an initial application to
eliminate a proposed holding pond. District Engineer Otterness stated the application has not changed
and doesn’t include a holding pond. The structures included on the table on page 3 of the Engineers
report includes an underground filtration system that is not an infiltration system. It is meant to hold
the water and direct it off site via stormsewer, it is not intended to get into the ground and there is a
liner that is being proposed.

District Attorney Holtman stated there is a small element of the present project that will lie on one of
the parcels that is subject to the restrictive covenant, which is a trail segment about eighty-five feet in
length. There are no storm water management facilities associated with that. It is a surface feature
with whatever work would be provided for the bed for that trail. There is no subsurface excavation
beyond that on the parcel that is subject to the restrictive covenant.

District Engineer Otterness stated there are pervious pavers but they do not involve subsurface
drainage. Manager Waller stated his understanding was there was eighty-five feet of trail and they did
not expect any water disturbance by the trail. Permit Coordinator/Wetland Specialist Tomczik stated his
understanding is there is an existing gravel trail in that location. The plans reflect a light bituminous
material to be placed there and thought there would be some use of the existing gravel there.

Manager Waller felt what was presented shows the District of what the current permit request is and
they have been notified of the danger and they will be vigilant to work with the MPCA in establishing
protocol and make certain that the resources of concern that the Watershed District is worried about
are not contaminated from this site. He noted the District has a similar protocol already with Arden Hills
and the arsenal there.

It was moved by Manager Bradley and seconded by Manager Waller, to approve Permit 16-107
amending it to include as a CAPROC requirement that the applicant inform the PCA of this
project and that they bring back to a workshop meeting the discussion of whether they should
include adding monitoring wells as part of the District responsibility of protecting the
downstream waters that are within their jurisdiction in accordance with RCWD District
Engineer’s Findings and Recommendations, dated February 1, 2017.

Manager Waller asked if in regards to the monitoring wells would they be working in
coordination with the MPCA. Manager Bradley agreed.

Motion carried 4-0.
Permit Coordinator/Wetland Specialist Tomczik stated they currently have other permit applications in the area. The ice arena that was mentioned is subject to an environmental assessment worksheet that is on the EQB website and available for comment. They have applied to the District for a permit subject to their jurisdiction, Permit 17-008. He stated the Wildwood School project is looking for adjustment, project file 11-001, both of which will be brought back to the Board for consideration.

PUBLIC HEARING ON URBAN STORMWATER REMEDIATION COST-SHARE REQUESTS FROM CITIES OF CIRCLE PINES, FRIDLEY, HUGO, MAHTOMEDI, AND ROSEVILLE

President Patricia Preiner read the following statement of the Watershed District President.

PUBLIC HEARING ON 2017 RCWD URBAN STORMWATER REMEDIATION COST-SHARE PROGRAM PROJECT FUNDING

The regular Board meeting is now recessed and the public hearing is opened on the Rice Creek Watershed District’s proposed selection of projects for funding through the District’s Urban Stormwater Remediation Cost-Share Program.

The purpose of this hearing is to receive comments from the public on the projects that the Board is considering for cost-share assistance in the Cities of Circle Pines, Fridley, Hugo, Mahtomedi and Roseville.

Before the watershed district can provide funds for the capital work of these communities, state law requires that the board of managers hold a public hearing, receive public comments and make a judgment that each selected project is a sound and cost-effective project to help fulfill our water resource goals. That is the purpose of today’s hearing. In accordance with state law, notice of this hearing was published for two successive weeks in the St. Paul Pioneer Press and mailed to all cities within the watershed district, as well as the district’s four counties.

First, I would ask Kyle Axtell, our Water Resource Specialist, to give a brief presentation of the proposed projects. When his remarks are completed, the floor will be open for any members of the public who wish to address the board. At that time, if you wish to comment, please come forward to the podium and state your name and address for the record. If you have a written copy of your statement, or any other documents that you would like to submit, please give them to Theresa Stasica, our meeting clerk.

During public comment, managers are welcome to ask questions of commenters to clarify their remarks. I also may ask Mr. Axtell or representatives of project applicants to respond to any
technical questions raised. Managers will hold their own comments about the project until the public hearing is closed. At that time, the board will have the opportunity to discuss the projects.

Kyle, would you like to proceed?

Water Resource Specialist Axtell presented the cost share program goals and guidelines. He then proceeded to summarize the applications that were received. The applications were:

Manager Bradley stated as he was reading the City of Mahtomedi application he thought he saw that they indicated they were going to remove sixty percent of the total phosphorus and seventy-seven percent of the TSS (Total Suspended Sediment) for 4.64 acres’ drainage area. He thought they did provide the District with the information requested. Water Resource Specialist Axtell stated the numbers they provided are literature values. There was no assessment of what the actual load is from the drainage area, which is something they look for. All of the other applications were able to come up and provide the number of pounds of phosphorus per year. There is no load provided so it is impossible for them to compare this project to the other applications based on the information provided.

President Preiner asked if they indicated they wanted to move forward and provide the information to the District. Water Resource Specialist Axtell indicated they have not gotten to that point yet.

Manager Waller asked if these applications were filled out by a different person rather than the one that used to fill them out. Could it be an experience problem there. Water Resource Specialist Axtell indicated to his knowledge it was the same staff working on them. Manager Waller asked if this was brought to their attention. Water Resource Specialist Axtell stated he has not brought this particular issue to their attention as of yet.

City of Circle Pines – Golden Lake Iron-Enhanced Sand Filter

This project proposes to construct a pump-controlled Iron-Enhanced Sand Filter to treat runoff from ACD 53-62 to Golden Lake, the subject of a nutrient TMDL. The Anoka Conservation District has received a $468,000 Clean Water Fund grant to help fund this project and the City is requesting that the RCWD share the local match requirement. 40 pounds of total phosphorus is expected to be removed annually. The total project cost is $585,000 and the applicant’s cost-share request is $50,000.
City of Fridley – Moore Lake Biofiltration Basin Rehabilitation

This project proposes to recommission an existing defunct project known as the “Biologically Activated Sand Filtration Unit” or “BASFU” that was built by the City of Fridley and University of Minnesota in the early 1980’s. The system will be converted into a modern iron-enhanced sand filter that will treat runoff to East Moore Lake, the subject of a nutrient TMDL. 3.4 pounds of total phosphorus is expected to be removed annually. The total project cost is $176,200 and the applicant’s cost-share request is $50,000.

City of Fridley – Civic Complex Redevelopment

This project proposes to expand upon RCWD-required water quality treatment (large NURP pond), incorporating IESF technology, re-use irrigation, alum treatment, hydrodynamic separators, pervious pavement, etc. to turn the City’s proposed new civic complex into a regional example of advanced stormwater management. Education is a primary focus of the applicant. Runoff from the site drains to Lower Rice Creek. 26 pounds of total phosphorus is expected to be removed annually in addition to 6.25 tons of sediment. The total project cost is $721,000 and the applicant’s cost-share request is $360,000.

City of Hugo – County Road 8 Stormwater Reuse

This project proposes installation of a new lift station and irrigation lines for 6.3 acres of public right-of-way along CSAH 8 in Hugo. The area is currently served by a municipal water supply for irrigation. The stormwater reuse supply will come from a pond on Branch 3 of AWJD3 and will reduce potable water use for irrigation by 4,000,000 gallons annually and remove 22 pounds of phosphorus from runoff to Peltier Lake, the subject of a nutrient TMDL. The total project cost is $440,000 and the applicant’s cost-share request is $63,000.

City of Mahtomedi – Edgecumbe Drive Storm Drainage Improvements

This project proposes to provide a new storm sewer outlet for a land-locked neighborhood that experiences routine flooding. A new in-line treatment device at the end of the new storm sewer will also be installed. Existing raingardens in the neighborhood will see improved function due to the project limiting ponding depths. 1.02 pounds of total phosphorus and 492 pounds of sediment are expected to be removed annually from runoff to Lost Lake. The total project cost is $240,000 and the applicant’s cost-share request is $50,000.

City of Mahtomedi – Glendale Park BMP

This project proposes to provide a new storm sewer bypass for a neighborhood that experiences routine flooding. A new biofiltration BMP will also be installed at the end of the bypass in Glendale Park, adjacent to an existing pond. Runoff to White Bear Lake will be treated, although specific pollutant reduction estimates were not
provided by the applicant. The total project cost is $325,000 and the applicant’s

cost-share request is $50,000.

City of Roseville – Gluek Lane Underground Storage

This project proposes installation of an underground pipe gallery to provide

additional storage in a routinely flood-prone area of the City. The project is

proposed in concert with road reconstruction. 0.5 pounds of total phosphorus and

200 pounds of sediment are expected to be removed annually, although the primary

focus of this project is in provided some flood control, as it will add 0.27 acre-feet of

live storage volume. The total project cost is $229,000 and the applicant’s cost-

share request is $50,000.

President Preiner invited anyone who would like to offer comments about the projects. There

being no further testimony from the public, I close the public hearing and open the matter for

board discussion and action.

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.

ADDITIONAL ITEMS REQUIRING BOARD ACTION


Water Resource Specialist Axtell stated at its regular meeting on October 12, 2016 the RCWD
Board authorized staff to solicit proposals for the 2017 Urban Stormwater Remediation Cost-
Share Program. He noted there is $260,000 available to fund projects in 2017. He stated the
projects were reviewed by the Citizen’s Advisory Committee at their February 1, 2017 meeting.
They have taken input from the District Engineer.

Water Resource Specialist Axtell reviewed the proposed funding recommendations with the
District.

1. $50,000 to the City of Circle Pines – Golden Lake Iron-Enhanced Sand Filter
2. $60,000 to the City of Hugo – County Road 8 Stormwater Reuse Irrigation
3. $0 to the City of Fridley – Civic Complex Redevelopment
4. $50,000 to the City of Fridley – Moore Lake Biofiltration Basin Rehabilitation
5. $50,000 to the City of Mahtomedi – Edgcumbe Drive Storm Drainage Improvements
6. $0 to the City of Mahtomedi – Glendale Park BMP
7. $50,000 to the City of Roseville – Gluek Lane Underground Storage.

Manager Bradley wanted the record to reflect why they are giving $60,000 to the City of Hugo
and $50,000 for others. Water Resource Specialist Axtell stated because this is a water reuse
irrigation project, those projects are eligible for up to $10,000 per irrigated acre provided that
the supply and storage is adequate and in this location, there is plenty of water coming through Branch 3 of that ditch to supply this project.

Manager Bradley stated it was his understanding that they have had discussion with the City of Fridley with regard to possible alternate funding. Water Resource Specialist Axtell stated it has come up in the past. He has not directly talked to Fridley to this point and is pending the Board decision on these projects. If that project is ultimately not selected for funding by the Board the District can communicate to Fridley that there is a potential for continued discussion about that project. There is a lot of value in what they want to do.

District Administrator Belfiori stated in the 2017 Board approved budget the City of Fridley applied for a BWSR Clean Water Legacy Grant. It was not successful, however the Board did fund the match, approximately $70,000 in the 2017 approved budget so they already have that money available for the City Center project in Fridley should Fridley and/or the District plan to pursue a partnership.

Manager Waller thought the Fridley project has been around for a while and has previously been submitted for a grant. The District has pursued in recent years working with the cities on their projects. He looked forward when budgeting the next couple of years that they start to look at what the cities pay in individually and to see how their money goes back to them with their projects. He thought proper coordination would help out in situations like this. He felt this would fulfil the entire District.

Manager Bradley stated he was troubled that the Mahtomedi Glendale Park BMP project was not getting funded at all because they do not have enough money to do it all. The fact that they did tell them what the impact of their program was and if they were not happy with the very specific manner in which they told the District then they need to be told how to report their findings. He stated he was going to vote for this but thought they needed to reach out to their partners if they need different information.

Manager Wagamon stated he thought these projects are better projects and he would not be averse to adding more money to it in the future because he felt these are the kind of projects the District should be looking at.

President Preiner stated part of that has to be the price per pound of what they are removing for phosphorus. They need to start looking at these a little bit economically and flood control is important and if they are not providing much for phosphorus relief then the flood control has to be priority but they should be able to see the difference.

Manager Waller stated he supported these particular projects but also supports taking a look at how they provide those dollars that come from the communities back to those communities and their project areas.

*Motion by Manager Waller, seconded by Manager Wagamon, approving Resolution 2017-05, Ordering Of 2017 Urban Stormwater Remediation Cost-Share Projects, Pursuant To Minnesota Statutes §103B.251*
THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that pursuant to Minnesota Statutes §103B.251 and the WRMP, the Projects are ordered; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Board of Managers hereby authorizes the Board President to execute each of the respective cost-share agreements between the Rice Creek Watershed District and the Cities of Circle Pines, Hugo, Fridley, Mahtomedi and Roseville, with any final non-material changes and on advice of counsel.

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

Motion carried 4-0.

2. Consider Oasis Pond Iron-Enhanced Sand Filter (IESF) Board of Water and Soil Resources Grant Work Plan (Kyle Axtell).

Water Resource Specialist Axtell stated that the District had submitted an application to BWSR’s Clean Water Fund grant program, working in partnership with the City of Roseville, for the Oasis Pond Iron-Enhanced Sand Filter Project for the 2017 fiscal year. They were successful in that $280,000 grant application. Total project costs were estimated at $350,000. Since receiving notice in December 2016 they have been working through the process of getting the project underway. The first step in the process is the submittal of a work plan to BWSR for review and approval by March 3, 2017.

Water Resource Specialist Axtell stated the grant amount is $280,000 and working with the City of Roseville under a previous cooperative agreement for the application the City of Roseville was willing to commit $10,000 cash match to this project with the District making up the rest of the local match for the budget, which totals $60,000. Of that, they anticipate that staff time will likely account for $40,000 of the match and the District cash contribution will be around $20,000.

Water Resource Specialist Axtell stated the project will begin in April 2017. The grant window runs through the end of 2019, however, he expected the work to be complete by the end of 2018. He reviewed the Oasis Pond IESF Concept layout with the Board.

Manger Wagamon stated he did see where the City of Roseville was only putting in $10,000 and also read that they will have to take ownership of it and maintain it so wondered if that is how the $10,000 cost is coming into play. Water Resource Specialist Axtell stated they are able to utilize his time spent on the project as part of the grant match which will be the bulk of the District contribution to the project. He was glad the City was willing to kick in some money into the project and is willing to take on the bulk of that operation and maintenance risk for the next twenty-five years.
District Engineer Otterness noted that this project from a regulatory aspect is much less substantial than Hansen Park. There are no wetlands but the District will be pumping from Oasis Pond which is a public water so the District will have to obtain an appropriation permit from DNR.

Motion by Manager Bradley, seconded by Manager Wagamon, to approve the draft work plan and timeline as presented and directs staff to submit the materials to BWSR for review and approval. Motion carried 4-0.

3. Consider Pay Request #3 from the City of Saint Anthony for the Mirror Lake Project. (Kyle Axtell)
Water Resource Specialist Kyle Axtell gave a brief overview of the project to this point and informed the Board that construction is also a part of this pay request. The construction has been challenging due to the weather, it is similar to Hansen Park in that dredging may not be completed this year but they are making significant progress.

Motion by Manager Wagamon, seconded by Manager Bradley, moves to approve the City of Saint Anthony’s reimbursement request of $151,457.98 pursuant to the August 25, 2015 Cooperative Agreement. Motion carried 4-0.

4. Consider Pay Request #5 from Rachel Contracting, Inc. for the Hansen Park Project. (Kyle Axtell)
Water Resource Specialist Kyle stated that this is a much larger pay request than we have received in the past, as they’ve made a lot of headway on the operation. He will be having a discussion with the contractor this afternoon as to what to do for the summer. The project did not get completed as the weather got too warm the last couple weeks. The dredging is about 75% done, which given the weather, is phenomenal that they got that much work done. All of level 3 contaminated materials have been removed, and much of the level 2 is out. There’s hydrologic connectivity from the ditch all the way through the pond to the new dam and outlet structure. A lot of the critical features have been installed. The system can function for the summer, it’s just a matter of deciding what the protocol will be for maintaining the basin through the summer season and preparing it so we can continue in the fall.

President Preiner asked if there would be neighbors or children who would be playing in the basin.

Kyle said ideally not. Water level management is something we’re looking at, because we do have a lower water level now. There’s one large flat area in the northwest area of the basin that did not get excavated. We have some protocols in place, because we do have some level 2 materials out there. Talked with PCA proactively, and they don’t have specific guidelines or anything that’s in a statutory requirement. We’re going to keep west side of park closed, officially. There will be construction fence up through the year. The plan, right now, is to have a secondary line of construction fence around the proposed edge of the basin, and another line to keep people off the flats. It’s really soft material, and the level 2 is isolated, and he doesn’t believe anyone will make it out there anyway. There will be a second line of fence and signage up, and they’re seeding trying to get some vegetation on it for the summer.
Motion by Manager Waller, seconded by Manager Bradley, moves to approve Rachel Contracting, Inc.’s pay request as submitted and certified by the District Engineer, and directs staff to issue a payment in the amount of $606,173.10. Motion carried 4-0.

District Administrator Belfiori noted the last three items are critical regional water quality and flood control projects in the area of Ramsey Counties Ditches 2, 3, 5 and 4. These are significant project partnerships with three very large and critical cities and they also are all a result of the Board’s leadership and staff’s hard work in getting BWSR’s Clean Water Legacy grant. All of the grants are some of the highest ranked grants in the State that they utilized and would not be able to do these projects without that and the Boards leadership.

5. Consider Ramsey County Lake Monitoring Services Contract. (Matt Kocian)

Lake and Stream Specialist Kocian stated since the mid-1980’s Ramsey County Environmental Services (RCES) has monitored water quality on Ramsey County lakes. Most of RCWD’s Tier 1 and 2 lakes in Ramsey County, including White Bear, Bald Eagle, Turtle, Johanna, and Long, have been monitored by RCES. Monitoring data collected on these lakes have been vital in tracking long-term lake health, preparing diagnostic studies, and acquiring water quality improvement grants. RCES staff are proficient and efficient in collecting and analyzing water samples; they have their own equipment and maintain a laboratory that is certified by the MN Dept of Health. Beginning in 2016, RCES has sought to recoup monitoring costs from Watershed Districts. Capital Region, Ramsey-Washington, and RCWD currently contract with RCES for monitoring services. The scope of the 2017 monitoring services is consistent with past years, and represents a comprehensive summer monitoring program for RCWD Tier 1 and 2 lakes in Ramsey County. The total cost for this contract is $45,675.34. This cost was anticipated and is covered in the approved 2017 RCWD budget.

Manager Waller asked if this contract is with the County and not the Soil Conservation District. Lake and Stream Specialist Kocian indicated that was correct. Manager Waller what portion of the County is this contract with. Lake and Stream Specialist Kocian stated it is with the Public Works Department.

President Preiner asked if this will become the normal expense or is there anticipated fluctuations each year. Lake and Stream Specialist Kocian stated they work with Ramsey County to develop their work plan. Right now the work plan consists of the monitoring program they have implemented in the past up to this point. Now that the District will be paying for it they will have control over the services they get from them and District Administrator Belfiori and himself have discussed how they might modify that in the future to better serve the District needs and to lower costs. They have talked about in the future to somewhat scale back the scope yet somehow cover all of the lakes that they need to have covered in Ramsey County which would reduce costs somewhat. At this point they are anticipating this will be a long-term cost.

District Administrator Belfiori noted as part of the 2018 budget they will have some options for the Board to think about. They all involve generally similar level of costs if they want to keep the same outcomes and magnitude of their monitoring program. They would result in paying Ramsey County or more or less the same costs as the staff level at the District because of the need for additional staff resources. This assumes the Board does not want to expand their
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monitoring program. It is important they look at this comprehensively based on staffing and budgeting because there are different moving parts and if they want to expand one piece it might also affect another piece.

Manager Waller stated Ramsey County provides monitoring services currently but they also provided them in the past so this has been a part of their current monitoring program though the District has not funded it. Lake and Stream Specialist Kocian stated they have utilized the monitoring data frequently. Manager Waller stated he did not see this as an expansion of their current monitoring program. He thought this was an important help to the District. Lake and Stream Specialist Kocian stated that was correct and a significant portion of the overall costs of the monitoring program is laboratory analysis.

Motion by Manager Waller, seconded by Manager Bradley, moves to approve the 2017 Lake Monitoring Services contract between the Rice Creek Watershed District and Ramsey County, for an amount not to exceed $45,675.34, and authorizes the Administrator to execute the contract. Motion carried 4-0.

6. Consider Minnesota Association of Watershed Districts (MAWD) annual legislative reception materials

District Administrator Belfiori stated this year as in other years they have an upcoming legislative reception at the end of March. As part of that every year they send out some information, communication, to their legislatures.

He introduced Ms. Carreño who made a presentation to the Board on some new strategies and changes to the communication to the legislature this year.

President Preiner liked the idea of using Mail Chimp for the first communication and then follow up with direct mail.

Manager Bradley stated he was concerned at the link titled Rice Creek Watershed District Website because when he sees something like that he thinks he will end up on the front page of their website. Ms. Carreño indicated she can change the language of this. Manager Bradley stated he preferred the attachment be a part of the email. Ms. Carreño stated the problem with that is Mail Chimp will not allow attachments so she will make language changes.

Manager Bradley thought they needed to focus on what the District wants them to get done. He thought the “Who we are” part should be upfront. Ms. Carreño stated part of the reason they are communicating this is they have been told that MPCA is also showing this project in some of their legislative information.

Ms. Carreño asked if the Board wanted to take out the stormwater reuse piece as well. Manager Bradley indicated this should be taken out. District Administrator Belfiori stated the basic gist of what staff understands from the Board and what staff will follow through on is they will focus on the MAWD Resolution that they are asking for specific authors, which they are in the process of securing. They will be suggesting that it is the focus of this communicate and that they have one specific action which is to support this.
Ms. Carreño stated there is one other thing they are asking the Legislatures for action on, if the Manager’s wanted to support that. That is under the Other RCWD Priorities section which was the BWSR Local Road Wetland Replacement Status.

Manager Waller thought only two items needed to be in the email and hard mail, first was the wetland banking issue they have and the second is the fact that BWSR is providing enough wetland credits available for the counties, cities and their road projects. He thought this was something very important to the District and Counties.

District Administrator Belfiori recapped the changes to be made with the Board. He updated the Board on the Legislative meeting he was at.

7. Consideration of Treatment of Metro Shooting and Trost Settlements in District Financial Reports. (Phil Belfiori)

District Administrator Belfiori stated at the December 2015 workshop, the Board reached majority consensus that the contingent liability is remote and therefore not to be disclosed in the annual financial report. At the March 9, 2016 Board meeting the Board passed a motion to annually review the liability of the Metro Shooting/Trost contingent liability in February of every year and take a formal vote at the Board meeting as to the remoteness of the liability. This item was discussed at the February 6, 2017 Board workshop and upon further discussion the Board reached consensus to place this item on the February 22, 2017 Board meeting for consideration.

District Staff and the District Engineer have confirmed that there has been no change in the facts or circumstances relevant to this issue since the Board’s last consideration of this item approximately one year ago.

District Administrator Belfiori stated there are three possible motions to consider.

1. That the Board of Managers finds the triggering of the potential content future liability to be remote, and therefore not a matter to be disclosed in the 2016 financial report.

2. That the Board of Managers finds the triggering of the potential contingent future liability to be remote, but nevertheless concludes that it should be referenced in the 2016 financial report as follows, or as modified in the auditor’s judgement:

In settlement agreements approved in 2005, the District committed that when development occurs on two tracts then owned by the Metro Shooting Center and Trost, the application of the District’s wetland rules will not have the result of affording the owner for the Metro Shooting parcel fewer than 100 contiguous upland acres for development, and the owner of the Trost parcel no fewer than 45 such acres. If additional wetland replacement is required to allow for consolidation of the stated acreage, the District will bear the cost of that replacement. The District is unable either to determine at this time the likelihood of this potential future contingent liability, or to estimate the District expense if and when the liability should arise.
3. That the Board of Managers finds that it is reasonably possible that one or more events will occur so as to cause the District to incur what is now a potential contingent future liability, and therefore that this liability should be referenced in the 2016 financial report as follows, or as modified in the auditor’s judgement:

In settlement agreements approved in 2005, the District committed that when development occurs on two tracts then owned by the Metro Shooting Center and Trost, the application of the District’s wetland rules will not have the result of affording the owner for the Metro Shooting parcel fewer than 100 contiguous upland acres for development, and the owner of the Trost parcel no fewer than 45 such acres. If additional wetland replacement is required to allow for consolidation of the stated acreage, the District will bear the cost of that replacement. The District is unable at this time to estimate the District expense if and when the liability should arise.

Manager Bradley stated based on his professional experience, his law firm would have issued the second motion. He stated that is the one he was comfortable with and he would support the second option. Manager Wagamon stated his preference would be option one but he could defer to Manager Bradley’s expert knowledge.

Manager Waller stated he has always been interested in disclosing this and now they have the option to do it. He stated he would support either option two or three. He thought this was a housekeeping item and with that it provides them with transparency, accountability, objectivity and impartiality which are goals that are very important to him and he thought to the entire Board. He thought if they were to read the language in the resolution of 2013 that authorized this, they promised to prepare and furnish the financial conditions in affairs of the sponsor and he thought this did fulfil that commitment that was made in that resolution. Finally, he preferred option three but he would accept option two. The word remote means inconsiderable which means too unimportant to merit attention. He did not believe that definition fits this situation.

Manager Bradley stated he was not sure what line was added to option two to differentiate it from option three. He noted he had to really compare the two to find the difference but his point is he thought the one that reflects remote liability is more informative and is why he supported it.

Motion by Manager Bradley, seconded by Manager Waller, that the Board of Managers finds the triggering of the potential contingent future liability to be remote, but nevertheless concludes that it should be referenced in the 2016 financial report as follows, or as modified in the auditor’s judgement:

In settlement agreements approved in 2005, the District committed that when development occurs on two tracts then owned by the Metro Shooting Center and Trost, the application of the District’s wetland rules will not have the result of affording the owner for the Metro Shooting
parcel fewer than 100 contiguous upland acres for development, and the owner of the Trost parcel no fewer than 45 such acres. If additional wetland replacement is required to allow for consolidation of the stated acreage, the District will bear the cost of that replacement. The District is unable either to determine at this time the likelihood of this potential future contingent liability, or to estimate the District expense if and when the liability should arise.

District Attorney Holtman stated the addition in option two, the last sentence is to add the first clause, “The District is unable either to determine at this time the likelihood of this potential future contingent liability”, and the second clause, “or to estimate the District expense if and when the liability should arise” is the same in both options two and three.

District Attorney Holtman stated his understanding is to adopt option two without the clause after the comma, “or as modified in the auditor judgement.” The intent wasn’t for the auditor to determine the substance but to defer to any necessary adjustments in the placement of that statement and the arrangement of the report. Manager Bradley stated he was trying to give more flexibility to the auditor and is not proposing to delete that clause.

Motion carried 4-0.

8. Consider requesting Special Meeting on Revisions to MAWD Bylaws. (Phil Belfiori)
District Administrator Belfiori stated in the packet there is a proposed letter along with proposed MAWD by-laws. As heard at the annual MAWD meeting there is active work done by active subcommittee at the MAWD Board to go through working out the details of by-law change which will potentially affect dues structure and organizational structure and best way to proceed with transition of MAWD going forward given retirements that are pending at the end of this year. This is a request of the boards authorizing them to have a special meeting.

Motion by Manager Wagamon, seconded by Manager Bradley, to approve the RCWD letter dated February 22, 2017 regarding the proposed MAWD bylaws amendment and authorizes staff to send the letter to MAWD. Motion carried 4-0.

President Preiner stated she wanted to go back to the Legislator meeting and annual breakfast item again. She wondered if there was anyway there could be an agenda so Legislatures know when certain items are being presented. District Administrator Belfiori noted there is a specific timeline that is something they can look at doing. Another thing to think about is if they want to set up special meetings with certain legislatures and go to their office which would give them times that would work for them. He would recommend that option. Manager Waller thought that might be a good way to talk about the wetland banking issues. The Board then discussed that if any Manager wishes for staff to schedule a face to face meeting with a legislator that they would contact the administrator directly.

Motion by Manager Wagamon, seconded by Manager Haake, to approve check register dated 2/8/17, in the amount of $397,648.45, prepared by Redpath and Company. Motion carried 4-0.

ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION AND INFORMATION

1. Project Overview presentation – Anoka Conservation District 31/46 Repair Project.
District Engineer Garrett Monson provided a project overview of the ACD 31/46 Repair Project. He provided pictures of the before and after photos of the ditch systems. He showed a photo of an exposed pipeline that was crossing the ditch system where they worked with Magellan Pipeline to insure safety and the appropriate work. Mr. Monson stated they are working with Magellan to lower the pipe, but it will likely be 5 or more years before the work can be performed. Manager Waller stressed the importance to staff and the District Engineer to continue to work with the pipeline companies to have pipelines that are above or near the official profiles of the ditch systems lowered to elevations that ensure the maintainability and long term function of the ditch. Mr. Monson also provided an overview of lessons learned going forward of future ditch repair projects. He recognized project team: Veit & Company, District Public Drainage Inspector Schmidt, HEI staff Ian Olson-Holmy, and Jim Windingstad from the City of Columbus Public Works Dept. for their work on expediting the project. The Managers questioned if the project cost came in lower, what would happen with the remaining funds. District Engineers and staff replied it will be used for maintenance of the ditch. The ditches will be inspected each year for 5 years and then be on a 5-year maintenance schedule. The managers agreed with the need to provide on-going maintenance of ditch projects. President Preiner requested that staff and the District Engineer provide the presentation to the City of Columbus so they can upload it to their city website. She also requested that they contact the city and give this presentation to the Columbus City Council.

2. Staff Reports
There were no comments.

3. March Calendar.
There were no comments.

4. Manager’s Update
Manager Bradley informed the Board that he and Manager Waller will be attending the BEAA meeting and he will be giving a brief presentation.

ADJOURNMENT
Motion by President Preiner, seconded by Manager Wagamon, to adjourn the meeting at 12:33 p.m. Motion carried 4-0.