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, 1st Vice-Pres. Barbara Haake, 2nd Vice-Pres. John Waller, Secretary Michael J. Bradley, and Treasurer Steve Wagamon.

Absent: None


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

Visitors: Paul Heuer, St. Anthony Mayor Jerry Faust, St. Anthony City Engineer Todd Hubmer, St. Anthony Public Works Director Jay Hartman, Vince Driessen, Erik Miller.

SETTING OF THE AGENDA
District Administrator Belfiori added item 3c (Abiding Savior Church Cost Share Application) and item 5 (Authorize Houston Engineering to Develop Draft Cost Share Allocation Report for ACD 31-46).

Motion by Manager Haake, seconded by Manager Wagamon, to adopt the agenda as presented. Motion carried 5-0.

READING OF THE MINUTES AND THEIR APPROVAL
Minutes of the May 26, 2015, Board of Managers Special Workshop. Motion by Manager Wagamon, seconded by Manager Haake, to approve the minutes as presented. Motion carried 5-0.

Minutes of the May 27, 2015, Board of Managers Regular Meeting. Motion by Manager Wagamon, seconded by Manager Bradley, to approve the minutes as presented. Motion carried 5-0.
PUBLIC HEARING CONTINUATION AND BOARD ACTION: PETITION OF PULTE HOMES FOR
REALIGNMENT OF A PORTION OF ANoka COUNTY Ditch 53-62 AND PARTIALLY
ABANDONING THE DRAINAGE SYSTEM REMNANT AFTER REALIGNMENT.

President Preiner recessed the regular meeting and re-convened the public hearing as Drainage Authority

Statement of President Preiner:
This is the re-convening of the recessed public hearing on the petition of Pulte Homes for the realignment and partial abandonment of a portion of ACD 53-62. For this hearing, the Watershed District Board of Managers is seated as the Drainage Authority for Anoka County Ditch 53-62. Our decision on the petition is based on the following standard found in Minnesota Statutes Sections 103E.227 and 103E.806.

We may authorize the petitioned realignment and partial abandonment if we find, based on the engineer's reports and other evidence presented, that the proposed realignment will not impair the utility of the drainage system or deprive affected landowners of its benefit and, further, that the portion of the drainage system left remnant after the realignment will not serve a substantial useful purpose as part of the drainage system to any property remaining in the system and will not provide substantial public benefit and utility.

The initial hearing and public comment was held on April 23, 2015. At the close of public comment, the Board adopted a motion directing its staff to prepare a resolution consistent with the proceedings, including responses to all comments received through the public comment process; that the resolution be written to affect approval of the petitioned actions subject to a condition that the petitioner may not proceed to construct the drainage system modification until it acquires all required permits and all necessary rights-of-way and flowage easements from owners of land to be affected by it; and that the hearing be recessed to the Board's regular meeting on May 13, 2015, at 9:00 a.m., or by adjournment to an appropriate time on the Board's agenda, at which meeting the Board would consider a resolution approving the petitioned action.

During the public comment portion of the original public hearing, it was noted that the proposed realignment would impact a portion of state owned property adjacent to Pulte Homes' property and Pulte Homes requested that it be allowed to revise its plan for realignment to avoid impact to the adjacent property. Following recess of the public hearing, Pulte provided a revised plan which avoided impacts to the adjacent property.

Permit Coordinator/Wetland Specialist Tomczik stated in conjunction with their permit application for the Sanctuary Preserve residential plat, Pulte Homes submitted a petition for partial abandonment/realignment of the Main Trunk of Anoka County Ditch 53-62 (ACD 53-62) to the RCWD in February 2015. According to Minnesota Statue 103E.227, Subpart 3, after receiving the petition, bond and permit, if required, the drainage authority must appoint an engineer to investigate the effect of the proposed installation and file a report of findings.

Permit Coordinator/Wetland Specialist Tomczik explained Houston Engineering, Inc. (HEI) was appointed by Board of Managers on March 11, 2015 to review the effect of the proposed realignment of ACD 53-62 in accordance with Minnesota Statue 103E227, Subpart 3 and complete a report of findings. On April 2, 2015, HEI submitted a report of findings entitled ACD 53-62 Realignment Petition, Sanctuary Preserve (Revised) that determined that the petitioner has met the requirements of Minnesota Statute 103E.227, Subpart 3. Shortly thereafter, and based on RCWD permit review comments, the petitioner indicated to RCWD staff that they intended to modify the route of the realignment channel to avoid construction and easements outside of the property owned by the petitioner. They then submitted a revised plan set dated May 8, 2015. Based on the May 8, 2015 plan set, HEI prepared a reviewed set of findings.
Permit Coordinator/Wetland Specialist Tomczik indicated the petitioner has met the requirements of Minnesota Statue 103E227, subpart 3.

District Engineer Deutschman reviewed the Houston Engineering findings with the Board.

Manager Waller stated a culvert is a control device and in this case he wondered by changing the six foot bottom open channel with a five foot culvert if it will not impact the efficiency or capacity of this drainage system. Permit Coordinator/Wetland Specialist Tomczik indicated it does not increase the surface water elevation upstream of the culvert, which is the standard by which the criterion is reviewed. District Engineer Deutschman stated it will not decrease the utility of the drainage system. District Engineer Deutschman stated it is the obligation of the Engineer to, based on the available data, evaluate whether agricultural drainage quality is diminished by the action. Engineer Deutschman indicated there are three considerations evaluated when deciding if the utility of the drainage system is diminished for agricultural drainage. He indicated that from an agricultural drainage perspective, the hydrology associated with a 2-year precipitation event is used to assess drainage quality. However, the District Engineer also routinely evaluates potential changes in municipal drainage quality and the potential for flooding and flood damages from larger precipitation events. The hydrology associated with a 10-year precipitation event is used to assess municipal drainage function and a 100-year event, to assess flooding and flood damages. The change in the water levels upstream and downstream of the proposed re-route is one factor. If water levels remain similar to the current condition, tile outlets, side inlets, and open channels draining the adjacent land are not inundated, and the drainage function is not diminished. Specifically for agricultural drainage, the water levels for the 2-year precipitation event are most relevant. The proposal does not increase water levels. The peak discharge is the second factor evaluated. If the peak discharge remains largely unchanged and within the banks of the open channel upstream and downstream, drainage utility is not diminished. The peak discharge for the 2-year precipitation event remains essentially the same between existing conditions and with the realignment using the pipe. The third factor is the overall capacity of the drainage system. Capacity is defined as the amount of water carried by the existing and proposed drainage system, when flowing full in the open channel and / or pipe. The 100-year event provides some indication of the capacity, and remains larger the same after the alignment. These are the factors used by the District Engineer to determine that the utility of the drainage system is not diminished as a result of the abandonment and realignment.

District Engineer Deutschman stated for the larger floods, how the water moves through the drainage system is actually controlled by the downstream elevations at 135 and Pheasant Ridge where they have weirs in at elevation 891.46.

Manager Waller indicated his question has to do with the Statute that says they have to maintain the efficiency and capacity of that drain system and in the past when they have put culverts in, the bottom of the profile has been six feet and so the culvert has been six feet. Even though they might have the efficiency or increase because of the smoothness of the sidewalls they develop capacity issues. He felt this should be pointed out and has been the basis of several lawsuits in the past. He stated the capacity needs to be maintained for the upstream individuals.

Manager Bradley stated in each case the district engineer has reviewed the existing system and proposed system and determined that the proposed system has the same ability to convey the water efficiently. District engineer Deutschman stated the way he defines capacity as an engineer is the amount of water the channel and pipe can carry when it is full. When they get a two year precipitation event the pipe is not full and the two year precipitation event is what they have been using for drainage considerations and that is how he defines capacity. He noted the table is showing both future and current condition for a two year precipitation event and a ten year event, the maximum amount that can run through the system does not diminish and that is the reason why they rendered an opinion that they are maintaining utility of the drainage system and quality of drainage.
President Preiner stated Houston Engineering, LLC has reviewed the revised plan and concluded that the water surface
elevations and peak discharge on the main trunk upstream and downstream of the proposed realignment are not
impacted by the construction and should not impair the utility of the ditch or deprive affected land owners of its benefit.
The proposed realignment as a component of the Sanctuary Preserve Redevelopment Project will not result in an adverse
environmental impact due to the proposed mitigation features.

Motion by Manager Haake, seconded by Manager Bradley, to adopt Resolution 2015-20, Granting Petition of Pulte
Homes with the following actions:

1. The petition of Pulte Homes for the realignment of a portion of ACD 53-62 and to abandon the remnant
   portion of the drainage system after realignment as indicated in the petition and engineer’s reports is
   GRANTED.

2. The cost of proceedings be charged to the petitioner’s bond. Any deficiency in the bond to cover the cost of the
   proceedings shall be paid by the petitioner prior to release of this order.

3. Upon payment of costs, the drainage system record shall be amended to reflect the realignment and partial
   abandonment as petitioned.

4. The petitioner may proceed to make the drainage system modification as petitioned upon release of this order
   and provided that the petitioner has acquired or obtained all required permits and all necessary rights-of-
   way and flowage easements from owners of land to be affected by the drainage system modification.

5. The petitioner must proceed and finish with the drainage system modification as petitioned within three years
   of this order or it is null and void.

Manager Waller indicated he would be voting against this item because he felt the capacity of the drainage system
was being decreased.

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

Motion carried 4-1.

President Preiner closed the public hearing at 9:15 a.m.

PUBLIC HEARING AND BOARD ACTION: PETITION OF DRIESSEN GROUP, LLC FOR REALIGNMENT OF A PORTION
OF BRANCH 1 OF ANOKA COUNTY DITCH 53-62 AND PARTIALLY ABANDONING THE DRAINAGE SYSTEM
REMNANT AFTER REALIGNMENT.

President Preiner read the public hearing notice.

President Preiner recessed the regular meeting at 9:19 a.m. and convened the public hearing as Drainage Authority
Statement of President Preiner:
Welcome everyone to the public hearing on the petition of Driessen Group, LLC for the realignment and partial abandonment of a portion of Branch 1 ACD 53-62. For this hearing, the Watershed District Board of Managers is seated as the Drainage Authority for Anoka County Ditch 53-62. The purpose of this hearing is to receive comments from the public on the petition in order to inform the Board of the public’s concerns. Our decision on the petition is based on the following standards found in Minnesota Statutes Section 103E.227 and Section 103E.806:

For the proposed realignment, based on the engineer’s report and other evidence presented, will the action proposed: be of a public or private benefit; impair the utility of the drainage system; deprive affected land owners of the drainage system’s benefit; and for the partial abandonment, once the drainage system is realigned, will the portion of the drainage system left remnant by the realignment: serve a substantial useful purpose as part of the drainage system to any property remaining in the system; provide substantial public benefit and utility?

If the Board finds that the action will be of a public or private benefit and that the answers the remaining questions is “No”, then the Board will make an order modifying the drainage system as requested in the petition.

To facilitate comments at today’s hearing, notice of the time and location of the hearing was mailed to the petitioners, owners of property, and political subdivisions likely to be affected by the proposed action.

The Board received a petition and bond from Driessen Group, LLC for the realignment of a portion of Branch 1 of ACD 53-62 and for abandonment of the remnant portion of the drainage system if the realignment is granted.

The Board accepted the petition and bond under statutes sections 103E.227 and 103E.806 and appointed Houston Engineering to prepare a report assessing the impact of the proposed action.

Houston Engineering completed its work filed a report with the Board. The petition and engineer’s report were made available for review at the District’s offices in advance of this hearing and will be reviewed today.

Please note that our proceedings today are being recorded.

The order of business for this hearing will be as follows: The District’s Permit Coordinator will present information regarding the proposed action petitioned by the petitioner and the engineer’s review of the action.

After the initial presentation, I will open the hearing for public comment. The Board would like to hear your comments and concerns regarding the proposed action. Our decision must be based on the legal requirements related to the petitioned action as well as the engineer’s report and other evidence presented.

During the public hearing, managers may ask questions of staff or consultants making presentations and of commenters, in order to clarify any testimony.

In addition, if a member of the public asks a question and a manager believes that a response from the District staff or a District consultant can readily resolve the question or enrich the testimony, the manager may ask me to have the appropriate staff member or consultant speak to the question. I will exercise my judgment as to whether to allow such discussion.

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

President Preiner asked if any of the Board members wish to offer any further remarks. There were none.

Permit Coordinator/Wetland Specialist Tomczik stated in conjunction with their permit application for a Goodwill retail store in the City of Blaine, Driessen Group, LLC. submitted a petition for partial abandonment/realignment of the Branch 1 Lateral 1 of Anoka County Ditch 53-62 (ACD 53-62) to the RCWD on March 31, 2015 which was later amended on April 7, 2015. According to Minnesota Statue 103E227, Subpart 3, after receiving the petition, bond and permit, if required, the drainage authority must appoint an engineer to investigate the effect of the proposed installation and file a report of findings.

Permit Coordinator/Wetland Specialist Tomczik noted Houston Engineering, Inc. (HEI) was appointed by Board of Managers on April 22, 2015 to review the effect of the proposed realignment of ACD 53-62 Branch 1 Lateral 1 in accordance with Minnesota Statue 103E227, Subpart 3 and complete a report of findings.

Permit Coordinator/Wetland Specialist Tomczik stated Minnesota Statue 103E227, Subpart 3, requires the proposed project to provide public or private benefit and that it will not impair the utility of the ditch or deprive affected land owners of its benefit. The Statue also requires that the proposed realignment be feasible, the outlet be adequate and the public benefit is greater than the adverse environmental impact. The proposed realignment is designed to adequately convey multiple storm events that range from the 2-yr to the 100-yr event. The results of the modeling show that the water surface elevations and peak discharge on the Main Trunk upstream and downstream of the proposed realignment are not impacted by the construction and should not impair the utility of the ditch or deprive affected land owners of its benefit. The proposed realignment, as a component of the Driessen Group, LLC. development project, will not result in an adverse environmental impact due to the proposed mitigation features.

Permit Coordinator/Wetland Specialist Tomczik indicated the petitioner has met the requirements of Minnesota Statue 103E227, subpart 3.

Manager Waller asked how wide is the bottom of the profile at the point where they are going to put the concrete in. Permit Coordinator/Wetland Specialist Tomczik stated it is approximately six feet. Manager Waller indicated this is another reduction in the width of the ditch. Permit Coordinator/Wetland Specialist Tomczik indicated the open ditch would be replaced with a 60" concrete pipe. Manager Waller thought the capacity would be reduced. Permit Coordinator/Wetland Specialist Tomczik stated that the District engineer has concluded that it would not.

Manager Waller stated a culvert is a restricted measurement. Permit Coordinator/Wetland Specialist Tomczik stated this is not the case in the measurement of the water level in the system prior to and after the proposed action.

Manager Waller asked if it has been past practice of the District to replace culverts that are the same size as what the profile is that has been adopted by the District. Permit Coordinator/Wetland Specialist Tomczik indicated he could not answer that.

Manager Waller asked if it is a standard practice of the District to put in a culvert that is smaller than the bottom of the ditch. Permit Coordinator/Wetland Specialist Tomczik stated the District’s practice in regards to proposals on the public drainage system is to have the District Engineer review the proposal and determine any loss of capacity. He stated that if a culvert is replaced with a culvert of the same dimensions and materials, then capacity would be preserved but capacity
also can be preserved when the culvert shape or dimensions changes and he would defer to the Engineer in articulating the technical standard and analyzing the effect of the alteration.

Manager Haake asked if a box culvert would satisfy the needs proposed by Manager Waller. Permit Coordinator/Wetland Specialist Tomczik said he was uncertain what would satisfy Manager Waller. Manager Waller stated he would be satisfied if the culvert matched the width of the profile at the bottom and that the capacity would be maintained. He noted this was generally what they have done. Culvert sizes generally match what the profile size is of the ditch and in his opinion this does not conform to the State Statute to maintain the efficiency and capacity of the drainage system once the profile has been adopted.

Manager Bradley stated on page 45 of the materials, table one, he saw where the elevation height is unaffected by the change to a culvert but there is a reduction in the downstream peak discharge and he wondered why they are satisfied that this is adequate in light of the deep increase in downstream discharge.

District Engineer Deutschman stated the system can actually carry in excess of 10 CFS. His definition of capacity is the ability of the system when it is full of water to move water down the system. This is a much smaller event and there is still room in the pipe and ditch to take additional water so the capacity has not declined but in this particular rain event the flow rate is down a little bit. If there was more water coming through, the ditch still has more room available to carry it downstream. One of the considerations is to look at the water surface profile as well.

President Preiner invited the public to comment on this item. There was none.

Motion by Manager Haake, seconded by Manager Bradley, to adopt Resolution 2015-21, Granting Petition of Driessen Group, LLC with the following actions:

1. The petition of Driessen Group, LLC for the realignment of a portion of Branch 1 of ACD 53-62 and to abandon the remnant portion of the drainage system after realignment as indicated in the petition and engineer's reports is GRANTED.

2. The cost of proceedings be charged to the petitioner's bond. Any deficiency in the bond to cover the cost of the proceedings shall be paid by the petitioner prior to release of this order.

3. Upon payment of costs, the drainage system record shall be amended to reflect the realignment and partial abandonment as petitioned.

4. The petitioner may proceed to make the drainage system modification as petitioned upon release of this order and provided that the petitioner has acquired or obtained all required permits and all necessary rights-of-way and flowage easements from owners of land to be affected by the drainage system modification.

5. The petitioner must proceed and finish with the drainage system modification as petitioned within three years of this order or this order is null and void.

Manager Waller indicated he would be voting against this item because he did not feel that the drainage system was being maintained, though he did not have a problem with the realignment.
ROLL CALL:
Manager Haake – Aye
Manager Bradley – Aye
Manager Wagamon – Aye
Manager Waller – Nay
President Preiner - Aye

Motion carried 4-1

Manager Preiner closed the public hearing at 9:35 a.m.

PERMIT APPLICATIONS REQUIRING BOARD ACTION
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:

CONSENT AGENDA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Plan Type</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15-059</td>
<td>Anoka County Hwy Dept</td>
<td>Blaine</td>
<td>Bridge/Culvert Crossing</td>
<td>CAPROC 4 items</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Motion by Manager Wagamon, seconded by Manager Waller, to approve the consent agenda as outlined in the above Table of Contents in accordance with RCWD District Engineer’s Findings and Recommendations, dated June 6, 2015.  Motion carried 5-0.

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.

ADDITIONAL ITEMS REQUIRING BOARD ACTION

   Water Resource Specialist Axtell explained after extensive discussion at the May 11, 2015 and May 26, 2015 Board workshops, staff has compiled a draft letter to the City of Saint Anthony intended to serve as a response to its letters dated April 28, 2015 and May 24, 2015. The purpose of this letter is to outline a proposed partnership framework and basic terms of agreement between the District and City that will allow for the continued implementation of the Mirror Pond Restoration Project.

   Water Resource Specialist Axtell reviewed the information with the Board.

   Manager Waller stated of the $832,000 proposed cost of the District’s project alternative, how much is water quality and how much is flood control. Water Resource Specialist Axtell stated they are very inter-twined components. The water quality components are due to dredging of the phosphorus laden sediment within the pond. Dredging of that material and deepening of the pond allows the ability to get additional flood control storage from the basin.
District Engineer Deutschman stated he agreed and by deepening the pond and creating more dead storage they
are able to lower the normal water level on the pond and will get some flood control benefit because of the live
storage associated with it. There is roughly $80,000 in there that is attributable just to flood control, consisting of
the berm on the one side of the pond to increase the ability to store water and also the proposed outlet structure.
He believed there was an additional $60,000 associated with improving safety.

Manager Waller stated there is some separation of the cost factor, around $140,000 is being used for flood control
and so he wondered if the rest was being used for water quality. Water Resource Specialist Axtell thought the rest
of the cost associated with the dredging of the project fulfills both aspects of the project.

Manager Waller asked how much of the money the matching grant is. Water Resource Specialist Axtell stated the
amount of the grant allocated to this project was around $640,000 and the District has already expended some of
those funds on design and concept development to this stage so he believed they have roughly $575,000
remaining from the grant to go towards this project. Approximately $317,000 would be District ad valorem levy.

Mr. Jerry Faust, Mayor of Saint Anthony, 4033 Silver Lake Terrace, thanked the Board for the opportunity to speak
to them. He stated Saint Anthony is still committed to complete the project and not only meet the obligations of
the Board of Water and Soil Resources grant agreement, however, they also need to meet their flood prevention
needs in the City to the residents per the petition to the RCWD. He stated if they only meet water quality, his
City is not interested in it. He indicated they need some flood control. He thought they needed a little more staff
interaction rather than a formal meeting. He stated his duty is to the residents and would like more discussion.

Mayor Faust stated they look at the collaboration of this and want to continue with it. Unfortunately it has
gotten to the point where they are not collaborating as much as they should be and he would suggest the City of
Saint Anthony and the City Council is willing to meet the District half way on doing this right.

Mayor Faust thought by going from two feet down to four feet adds thirty five acre feet of water. He stated
because they are at the top part of the flow they would be adding some capacity and clarity in that process as it
would settle. They want to be partners and responsible individuals and want to do this right the first time. He
suggested that there is no sense of urgency and have the two staff works together efficiently. They are willing to
commit money if it eliminates flooding.

Mr. Todd Hubmer, St. Anthony City Engineer, thought where they stood today is what the recommendations are.
The RCWD has an alternative that they feel is an acceptable flood proofing alternative and that alternative does
not align with what the City believes it to be. They have asked for additional information in regards to risk
assessment on the operation of that system which is highly dependent on forecasting and mechanical operability
and those risks have not been fully vetted yet as to what that protection would be. In their brief look at it, they
do have some concerns associated with the risk of a system like that. It is not a commonly designed or
recommended system. This is the first time that a weather activated valve has been proposed in the twenty-three
years he has worked on these systems. He was looking for some reassurance that this type of a system would
activate and improve that.

Manager Haake asked if the monies they are receiving for this from the Clean Water Fund through a BWSR grant
and was the requirement for receiving that was to deal with water quality. District Administrator Belfiori
indicated that was correct and that the grant was provided through the Clean Water Legacy and the purposes of
the grant is to meet water quality reductions. In this case they are using phosphorus as an indicator and BWSR
has identified that and agreed to that as the indicator in the grant agreement contract that they have with them
Manager Haake agreed there should be more staff discussion and their alternative two and Saint Anthony's alternative five will accomplish the same thing. Another thing at issue is the automatic lift of the logs. She explained what the District is planning on doing for the project. She believed the District staff has been communicating well and she wondered if Saint Anthony wanted this to be tabled for further staff discussion. Mayor Faust stated whatever it takes to get this done they will meet the District halfway. He thought the two sticking points were the difference between two and four feet of dredging and the automatic weather service information. They feel that this needs to be done right the first time and they should spend the money to do it right the first time.

Manager Haake asked what the City of Saint Anthony is willing to contribute. Mayor Faust stated the City is willing to contribute fifty/fifty to the additional cost between alternative 2 and 5. He stated they do not know what the cost is and thought if staff discussed this further they could come up with an amount.

Water Resource Specialist Axtell stated the goal of the letter is not to limit the project to alternative two, what they were proposing was the City would be able to build whatever project they wish.

President Preiner asked what the timeline is on this. Water Resource Specialist Axtell stated the grant runs through the end of December 2018 and with any project there are regulatory challenges. There could be some timeline issues involved in getting this approved with other agencies. He would hate to run out of time and lose the $640,000.

Manager Wagamon thought staff getting together will not get the job done, the issue is the money and getting the project approved and done before the grant expires.

Manager Haake would like to discuss this further but would like to have staff send the City of Saint Anthony the partnership framework letter to review.

\textit{Motion by Manager Haake, seconded by Manager Bradley, to authorize the Board President to sign the attached partnership framework letter and directs staff to deliver the letter to the Mayor of Saint Anthony Village.}

Manager Waller hoped the letter being sent will not close off discussion of this project. He hoped the engineers can sit down and work out a program acceptable to everyone.

\textit{ROLL CALL:}

Manager Haake – Aye
Manager Bradley – Aye
Manager Wagamon – Aye
Manager Waller – Nay
President Preiner – Aye

\textit{Motion carried 4-1}
District Engineer Deutschman stated they could give the City of Saint Anthony all the information Houston Engineering has to review which might help in making a decision.

Motion by Manager Haake, seconded by Manager Wagamon, to accept the Mirror Pond Conceptual Design Memorandum dated May 6, 2015. Motion carried 5-0.

2. Consider Blue Thumb program agreement

Education, Outreach and Communication Coordinator Bromelkamp made a presentation to the Board. She said that District staff, with the assistance of Manager Bradley, has reached agreement with Metro Blooms on a transfer agreement, and that the agreement has been approved by the Metro Blooms board. She noted that a meeting was held with partners to review the agreement. One question was raised concerning the ability of past and present partners to continue to use the Blue Thumb logo. She received an email from Pat Sillerud the Board Chair of Metro Blooms, concurring that the agreement could include a clause allowing this use of the logo through 2015.

District Administrator Belfiori reviewed the recommended motion with the Board.

Manager Preiner thanked everyone involved and was glad to see this agreement happen.

Manager Bradley stated they now have a Blue Thumb steering committee of nine people that will meet quarterly. Metro Blooms has agreed to provide the District with a written report twice a year.

Becky Rice, Metro Blooms was at the meeting and thanked the Board for facilitating the process and thought the ultimate outcome is the best and she was pleased with the end result.

Motion by Manager Bradley, seconded by Manager Waller, to authorize the Board President to execute the Blue Thumb — Planting for Clean Water® program transfer agreement with any further non-material changes and on advice of counsel.

The Board thanked Manager Bradley for helping facilitate the agreement.

Motion carried 5-0.

3. Water Quality BMP Cost-Share Application

a. RCWD 15-01 Jamieson rain garden

District Technician Kreibich stated this project proposes conversion of an 800 square foot City of Mounds View infiltration basin into a formal, planted raingarden. The raingarden is part of a City effort to reconstruct all of its streets and is required by a RCWD permit. District Technician Kreibich stated staff and the Citizen Advisory Committee have recommended approval of funding for this application.

District Technician Kreibich made a presentation to the Board.

Motion by Manager Haake, seconded by Manager Wagamon, to approve RCWD Quality BMP Cost-Share Contract RCWD15-01 for Kaitlin Jamieson raingarden project, up to $577, not to exceed 50% of eligible project expenses, in accordance with established program guidelines. Motion carried 5-0.

b. R 15-05 Detournay swale and rain garden

District Technician Kreibich stated this project proposes the installation of a planted drainage swale and 200 square foot rain garden, which will capture a 1.15-inch event. The submitted materials indicate a great deal of work including concrete removal, planting a drainage swale, and the installation of rain garden. The proposed
project does not drain into a priority water body or a District conveyance system, as it ultimately drains to a MNDOT pond off Interstate 35W at Cleveland Ave. In its current state, the project and neighborhood are served by an existing catch basin, so drainage and flooding are not a known concern in this area. District Technician Kreibich stated staff and the Citizen Advisory Committee have recommended denying funding of this application.

**Motion by Manager Wagamon, seconded by Manager Haake, to deny funding for the RCWD Water Quality BMP Cost-Share Contract R15-05 Detournay raingarden project. Motion carried 5-0.**

c. **Abiding Savior Church Cost Share Application**

District Technician Samantha Kreibich reviewed the project plans with the Board which proposes the removal of bituminous parking lot and the installation of 3 rain gardens at Abiding Savior Church in Mounds View. She stated this is high visibility project and the church is very excited to provide tours and outreach to people in the community. District Technician Kreibich was unable to bring things application to the CAC due to time constraints. The Ramsey Conservation District (RCD) Board last night approved funding of this project through their Clean Water Funds-Community Partners Grant up to $23,008.50. Staffs cost-share recommendation is $7,669.50 which is 25% of the project cost. The RCD requires applicants to obtain 25% of their project funds to come from local match.

Manager Waller replied the applicant will not be providing any funds. District Technician Kreibich replied the church will provide in-kind help by participating in the plantings. Manager Waller questioned if the District had funded a project is this way before.

Water Resource Specialist Axtell replied the District had provided similar funding of the Rice Lake Elementary project in 2009-10.

Mr. Joe Lochner, Ramsey Conservation District stated they require a local match of 25% and can come from any source, just as long as it is not a State source. Manager Waller stated he would not have a problem putting $5,000 into the project but felt the church needed to contribute some funds to the project as well.

**Motion by Manager Haake, seconded by Manager Wagamon, to approve RCWD Water Quality BMP Cost-Share Contract R15-06 for Abiding Savior Church raingarden project, up to $7,669.50, not to exceed 25% of eligible project expenses, in accordance with established program guidelines.**

**ROLL CALL:**

Manager Haake – Aye  
Manager Bradley – Aye  
Manager Wagamon – Aye  
Manager Waller – Nay  
President Preiner – Nay

President Preiner felt there needed to be a cap put on funding. Manager Waller stated another issue is when they have had private ownership they have put money into it and felt the Church needed to contribute.

**Motion carried 3-2.**
4. Consider Check Register dated 6/10/2015, in the amount of $42,164.64, prepared by Redpath and Company.

Motion by Manager Wagamon, seconded by Manager Haake, to approve check register dated 6/10/2015, in the amount of $42,164.64, prepared by Redpath and Company. Motion carried 5-0.

5. Authorize Houston Engineering to Develop Draft Cost Share Allocation Report for ACD 31-46

District Administrator Belfiori made a presentation regarding cost allocation alternatives to the Board.

Manager Haake asked which ditch repair cost allocation including the use of wetland credits for mitigation.

District Administrator Belfiori stated ACD 46 is the rough estimate, the rough impacts is 4.6 acres and according to the option discussed for ACD 31, there is no proposed wetland impact. If they were to choose a different alternative for ACD 31, there may be impacts.

Manager Haake stated she would like to have additional discussion about how they are going to allocate the wetland credits throughout the District.

Manager Waller thought the credits for ACD 46 should be removed and reallocated later once there is further discussion. District Engineer Deutschman stated the issue with that is it will change the ratio of ad valorem to water management district if it is taken off the top now. In the past they have left that cost in which forms the basis for the ratio. If that is taken off the top now, that will shift the ratio. District Engineer Deutschman recommended that they develop a spreadsheet which lists the District wetland credits and where they are and what has been used. He could bring this to the next workshop meeting and update the Board. Manager Waller stated he understood the ratio would change and would still like to see what the ratio would be without the credits in ACD 46 cost allocation.

District Administrator Belfiori suggested having both items on the workshop meeting to review them together.

Motion by Manager Bradley, seconded by Manager Haake, the following based on the presentation of cost allocation alternatives presented by the engineer:

That the engineer undertake a charge allocation analysis for the repairs of ACDs 31 and 46 that allocates the costs of easement avoidance and other ecological costs to ad valorem tax; allocates the cost of culvert and crossing repair and replacement as a charge to the applicable road authority under 103E.525; and allocates the remaining costs of restoring the hydrologic function of the drainage systems to water management district charges within the water management districts established for each drainage system. That, once complete, the engineer shall present the cost allocation analysis to the Board for further discussion or refinement. Motion carried 5-0.

ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION AND INFORMATION

1. Scheduling landowner information meeting for Anoka-Washington Judicial Ditch 3 historical review memo.

District Administrator Belfiori stated the meeting is set for July 14, 2015 at 6:30 p.m. at Hugo City Hall Council Chambers.


Water Resource Specialist Axtell made a presentation to the Board regarding the EAW. He informed the Board that comments are due by July 8, 2015. Staff and the District Engineer will respond to comments and provide a
memo and resolution to the Board at their July 22, 2015 for a Board decision on the need for a full Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

3. **Engineer's update and timeline**
   District Engineer Deutschman updated the Board on Houston Engineering budget and timeline.

4. **Manager's Update**
   Manager Haake stated she went to a meeting on Big Head and Silver Carp. She distributed a map that was handed out at the meeting. She also updated the Board on the research she had done on data centers and paper companies and how much water they use per day.

   Manager Waller stated he has been busy attending meetings. The CAC meeting was at the new Forest Lake City Center where the CAC toured the Clear Lake water quality treatment project.

   President Preiner stated she had an interesting conversation with Congressman Emmer which turned toward Army Corp of Engineers and he had his staff take information and they will contact the Board for their perspective on how it is working.

   Manager Bradley wanted to thank Education, Outreach and Communication Coordinator Bromelkamp for all her help with Blue Thumb.

   Manager Haake wanted to welcome Dr. Jennifer Sorenson who was in the audience and was the Districts new DNR representative who will be handling their area. Dr. Sorenson introduced herself to the Board and stated it was a pleasure to meet them.

**ADJOURNMENT**

*Motion by Manager Haake, seconded by Manager Wagamon, to adjourn the meeting at 11:34 a.m. Motion carried 5-0.*