ROLL CALL

Present: President Patricia Preiner, 1st Vice-Pres. Barbara Haake, and 2nd Vice-Pres. John Waller.

Absent: Secretary Harley Ogata and Treasurer Steve Wagamon (with prior notice)

Staff Present: Administrator Phil Belfiori, Permit Coordinator/Wetland Specialist Nick Tomczik, Water Resource Specialist Kyle Axtell, Office Manager Theresa Stasica, and Technical Specialist/Permit Reviewer Chris Buntjer.

Consultants: District Engineer Mark Deutschman and District Attorney Louis Smith from Smith Partners

Visitors: Bridget Osborn

CALL TO ORDER

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

MOTION FOR ACTING SECRETARY

Motion by Manager Waller to appoint Manager Barbara Haake as Acting Secretary.

Manager Haake accepted and indicated a motion was not needed. President Preiner concurred and moved to the next agenda item.

SETTING OF THE AGENDA

District Administrator Belfiori added agenda items for Discussion and Information: Item 1 Update on Status of RCWD Rule Revision; and Item 2 Discussion on Permit Application Site Maps for Consent Agenda Items.

Motion by Manager Haake, seconded by Manager Waller, to adopt the agenda as amended. Motion carried 3-0.

READING OF THE MINUTES AND THEIR APPROVAL

Minutes of the May 28, 2014, Board of Managers Meeting

Motion by Manager Waller, seconded by Manager Haake, to approve the minutes as presented.
Permit Coordinator Nick Tomczik requested a revision on page 5, line 85 at the very end: "He indicated in administration the District did not take a position as to when or where those credits could be utilized by the municipality. Under the District's stormwater rule, the credits may be used anywhere within the township."

Manager Waller accepted the friendly amendment and Manager Haake seconded to approve the minutes as amended. Motion carried 3-0.

Minutes of the May 28, 2014, Special Joint Workshop Meeting. Motion by Manager Waller, seconded by Manager Haake, to approve the minutes as presented. Motion carried 3-0.

**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>13-043</td>
<td>Century Farm N., Inc.</td>
<td>Lino Lakes</td>
<td>Land Development</td>
<td>Variance Request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CAPROC 11 items</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Permit Coordinator/Wetland Specialist Tomczik stated this was previously reviewed and approved by the Board on April 24, 2014. The applicant included some park property within their wetland buffer, which was previously dedicated and removed from the plan. Therefore, the buffer that went along the public ditch system for the public wetland management corridor has been changed to reflect the property that should not have been included in the project. The changes are noted on page 20 and 21 of the packet in italic text. Page 21, under the second block of text, indicates the changes in the area of the buffer. In essence, the type and need for the variance remains the same with the amounts changing with the elimination of a portion of the involved property and limited function and value of the wetlands to the north. For that reason, the applicant is looking for an amendment approval for the variance as well as the CAPROC.

Manager Haake stated this variance was already given to them. The width was 25 feet and is now 22 feet. She asked for a map showing the lots that have been adjusted. Permit Coordinator/Wetland Specialist Tomczik stated the requirement is for a minimum 25-foot buffer along the wetland boundary for the wetland management corridor.

Technical Specialist/Permit Reviewer Buntjer showed the map of the project area. Permit Coordinator/Wetland Specialist Tomczik stated the presentation is showing several phases of the development, Century Farms, and that this is on one of the final phases. In a previous phase, some of the parkland was dedicated so it is not the applicant’s property and in an arrangement with the City, they could utilize that property in the platting of the next phase. But the City curtailed the amount of the property that was to be involved and that is reflected in what is now being shown.

Manager Haake asked for clarification where the park designation is shown. Permit Coordinator/Wetland Specialist Tomczik used a map to point out where the proposed buffer was going to be. He stated by that being eliminated, there is a reduction in the buffer. Technical Specialist/Permit Reviewer Buntjer showed the highlighted area where the buffer was proposed to be removed.

Manager Haake asked if the buffer is going to be removed, will something still be required of the landowner so it does not encroach. She asked if this was just for surveying purposes. Permit Coordinator/Wetland Specialist Tomczik indicated that was for a plated subdivision. He stated this is not the applicant’s property so they negotiated with the owner of that property, in which they overstepped, so this is now consistent with what that landowner agreed to. Manager Haake asked if this variance was so they could get a couple more houses. Permit Coordinator/Wetland Specialist Tomczik indicated that was not necessarily true. The other property owner did not want their property encumbered by the wetland management corridor, which is reasonable because they are not the applicant and the use of their property is at their discretion.
Manager Haake stated this is wetland and she wondered whether the homes are going to be on pads. Technical Specialist/Permit Reviewer Buntjer believed that was the case. This permit was previously given CAPROC and so this change is only to alter these buffer areas. Manager Haake asked if they had anything that would hold them harmless. Permit Coordinator/Wetland Specialist Tomczik did not see, in this case, that there is any greater threat to the District in obtaining the easements.

Manager Waller noted as he read the report, there is no greater threat to the environment either. Manager Waller stated there is also no greater input of phosphorus and if they were to fill in something where wetlands were lost, they would not want to lose those hydrocarbon generators.

Manager Haake agreed and wondered if there was something in the requirements that tells them they cannot do anything to this particular buffer, even though they have given them, for survey purposes, the encroachment. Permit Coordinator/Wetland Specialist Tomczik stated that was correct. A requirement of obtaining the permit is to record the easement. The easement would reflect these shaded areas as seen on the proposed condition. Technical Specialist/Permit Reviewer Buntjer believed there is also a requirement for signage on the buffer areas. Permit Coordinator/Wetland Specialist Tomczik indicated that was correct.

Manager Waller asked if the other landowner is the City, a public authority. Permit Coordinator/Wetland Specialist Tomczik stated that was correct, that portion of the property was a previous negotiation with the developer for the dedication of parkland. Manager Waller asked if this was still in the public ownership and was not going to become part of a development for private use. Permit Coordinator/Wetland Specialist Tomczik stated that was his understanding.

**Motion by Manager Waller, seconded by Manager Preiner, to grant the amended variance and CAPROC for Permit Application 13-043 in accordance with RCWD District Engineer’s Findings and Recommendations dated June 4, 2014.**

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

Motion carried 2-1.

Manager Haake stated this is the second variance and if they are trying to squeeze in more homes, she is opposed to that. She believed they can follow the rules by not trying to optimize every single inch.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Plan Type</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14-019</td>
<td>City of Mahtomedi</td>
<td>Mahtomedi</td>
<td>Street &amp; Utility Plan</td>
<td>Variance Request</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Permit Coordinator/Wetland Specialist Tomczik stated Pete Willenbring of WSB, as the City Engineer and project applicant for the Phase 1 Historic District Improvements in Mahtomedi (hereafter "Street project"), has submitted a written request for a variance for from District Rule C.6(d)(3) which states that "Offsite and/or regional BMPs must be sited in a downstream location for the runoff volume leaving the project site prior to the Resource of Concern or secondly anywhere within the same Resource of Concern Drainage Area that results in no greater mass of Total Phosphorus. The Street Project is located within the White Bear Lake Resource of Concern (ROC) and the applicant is proposing to provide water quality treatment for the project within the Lost Lake (ROC). The District Engineer evaluated the variance request
Technical Specialist/Permit Reviewer Buntjer stated several streets are being reconstructed and proposing treatment to the south of the lake at Wedgewood Park. They are proposing a storm water reuse system so they will be pumping water out of the pond and into two 500-foot infiltration trenches that have perforated pipe. The variance is because Wedgewood Park is within the Lost Lake ROC drainage area and not within the White Bear Lake ROC drainage area. However, the Lost Lake resource of concern drainage area does drain into the White Bear Lake ROC.

Permit Coordinator/Wetland Specialist Tomczik stated for this project he would like to run through the criteria and response based on the applicants signed application for variance and Houston Engineering’s memo in response to that application.

(a) How substantial the variation is in relation to the RCWD Rule requirement(s):

Technical Specialist/Permit Reviewer Buntjer stated per practical difficulties criterion (a), the applicant has fully met the Water Quality requirements including the preference for infiltration, except for the siting requirements. The proposed project will result in no greater mass of Total Phosphorus reaching the White Bear Lake ROC than on-site BMPs.

(b) the effect the variance would have on government services:

Technical Specialist/Permit Reviewer Buntjer stated per criteria (b), issuance of a variance for the street project is not expected to increase flooding (see criteria (c)) or have any negative effect on government services. The variance will generally have a positive effect on governmental services in that the project will repair and maintain City streets. Additionally, the project will treat stormwater within Wedgewood Park via infiltration reducing the flow to the downstream storm sewer system and improving the water quality of Lost Lake and eventually White Bear Lake.

(c) whether the variance will affect a substantial change in the character of the watershed resources or will be a substantial detriment to neighboring properties:

Technical Specialist/Permit Reviewer Buntjer stated per criteria (c), which sets the criteria for consideration of whether the variance will affect a substantial change in the character of resources within the watershed, the District Engineer used three criteria to assess substantial change: 1) water quality, defined as the quantity of pollutants such as phosphorus and suspended sediment leaving the site and the potential for degrading water quality downstream; 2) the presence of and potential impact to special and impaired waterbodies as defined by various laws including the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency stormwater program, whether a water body is impaired and related designations including Wild and Scenic or Outstanding Natural Resource Value designations; and 3) flooding, the potential for flood damages or other adverse hydrologic impacts.

In assessing whether a substantial change in the character of the watershed resources may occur, we considered, not exclusively but as a measure of impact, the presence of and potential impact to the following:

- a 303(d) listed water body (i.e., an impaired water);
- a high quality or non-degraded wetland;
- a federally listed threatened or endangered species or state threatened, endangered or species of special concern and their critical habitat;
- a Scientific and Natural Area as defined by the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources;
resources protected from nondegradation as identified within 7050.0180 Nondegradation for Outstanding Resource Value Waters; and

- Other generally sensitive resources.

White Bear Lake, which receives project drainage, is listed on the Section 303(d) impaired water list for mercury, but not for nutrient impairment. Lost Lake, the ROC that receives flow from the proposed BMPs, is not listed on the Section 303(d) impaired water.

The construction of the project is not expected to cause an adverse impact to White Bear Lake, or to the one wetland, known as Neville Wetland, which is also within the project area. The project is not increasing impervious area and will maintain the existing drainage patterns. The applicant is proposing sump catch basins prior to discharge into White Bear Lake and Neville Wetland. Thus, while an opportunity is lost to improve water quality of the direct run-off to White Bear Lake, the water quality is not expected to decrease.

Additionally, while Lost Lake is a separate ROC, White Bear Lake is immediately downstream of Lost Lake. The District has completed a P8 model to estimate the level of water quality treatment occurring under existing conditions within Lost Lake prior to reaching White Bear Lake. The results indicate that Lost Lake reduces the annual total phosphorus mass moving through Lost Lake to White Bear Lake by 65%. Therefore, a BMP built within the Lost Lake ROC would need to provide approximately three times the level of treatment of a BMP within the White Bear Lake ROC or the amount of mass treated by BMPs located within the Lost Lake ROC needs to be three times more to provide equivalent phosphorus mass reduction to White Bear Lake. The proposed BMP within Wedgewood Park is sized to provide three times the water quality treatment as required for the project.

None of the other resources identified above are located immediately downstream of the site.

Per criteria (c) and whether issuing the variance has a negative effect to the neighboring properties, we applied the following criteria:

- Whether granting the variance causes or contributes to a change in the 100-year floodplain elevation immediately downstream of the project site;
- The potential occurrence of flood damages to adjacent properties;
- The anticipated increase in hardship downstream (e.g., caused by peak flow and flood duration); and
- Other similar related criteria.

Since the applicant is not increasing the impervious area, or substantially changing drainage patterns, the proposed variance will have minimal effect of flood elevations.

White Bear Lake (Tier 1) and Lost Lake (Tier 2) are the two resources of concern affected by this variance. Tier 1 lakes are primarily used for public recreation and are a high quality resource for fisheries and wildlife. Tier 2 lakes have the opportunities to provide passive public recreation opportunities including aesthetic enjoyment and wildlife habitat. The goal of the RCWD Surface Water Management Plan for Tier 1 lakes is to maintain or fully restore the quality of the lakes for their designed uses. The goal for Tier 2 lakes is to improve the quality of the lakes in order to better support aquatic life and enhance the passive recreation experience. Granting of this variance will improve the water quality of both ROCs in accordance with District goals and will not affect the beneficial use of these resources.

Permit Coordinator/Wetland Specialist Tomczik stated where the project is on the map, it drains to White Bear Lake. But the place where the applicant wants to place the treatment is in Wedgewood Park, which drains to Lost Lake. According
to their rule, the treatment is to be in the same ROC. But, Lost Lake then flows into White Bear Lake so their engineer has calculated what would be necessary to have the same equivalent of phosphorus for treatment. He explained that what happens in Wedgewood Park would be three times as aggressive in treatment providing the equivalent to White Bear Lake.

(d) whether the practical difficulty can be alleviated by a feasible method other than a variance (economic considerations play a role in the analysis under this factor);

Technical Specialist/Permit Reviewer Buntjer stated per criteria (d) an assessment of whether the practical difficulty can be alleviated by a feasible method other than a variance (economic considerations play a role in the analysis under this factor) is necessary. The variance was created by the occurrence of two conditions:

a) First condition is the need of the City to maintain the roads and infrastructure within the Historic District of Mahtomedi and the lack of opportunity to provide water quality treatment due to the physical conditions within the project.

b) Second condition is the revision of the District's stormwater requirements in 2013.

The physical conditions of the project include a fully developed project area, on a slope immediately adjacent to White Bear Lake, a narrow right-of-way in the project area limits and high water table. The City of Mahtomedi recognized these difficult conditions and completed a regional study in 2011 identifying water quality treatment options. The Wedgewood Park underground treatment system was identified as a feasible option to meet District water quality treatment requirements for projects within the Historic District of Mahtomedi. Stormwater from the project area flows directly to the White Bear Lake ROC. Stormwater from Wedgewood Park flows to the Lost Lake ROC and eventually White Bear Lake. In 2013, the District revised its stormwater rules to require water quality treatment for a project within the same ROC drainage area (Rule C. C. 6(d)(3)).

(e) how the practical difficulty occurred, including whether the landowner created the need for the variance; and

Technical Specialist/Permit Reviewer Buntjer stated per criteria (e), consideration of how the practical difficulty occurred, including whether the landowner created the need for the variance requires consideration. The District Engineer finds that the current landowner did not cause the situation that lead to the implied practical difficulty. The variance was created by the need for road and infrastructure maintenance and the revision to District stormwater requirements. The applicant could not maintain the roads and infrastructure within the Historic District, which would eliminate the need for the variance, however, this is not considered a prudent option.

(f) whether in light of all of the above factors, allowing the variance will serve the interests of justice.

Technical Specialist/Permit Reviewer Buntjer stated in consideration of criteria (f), some determination of whether in light of all of the above factors, allowing the variance will serve the interests of justice is necessary. This criterion lies largely in the Board's domain as it involves judgments of a non-technical nature. Our criterion for assessing this portion of the practical difficulties standard is the ability or inability of other permit applicants with similar site conditions to comply with the Rule C.6(d)(1), BMP siting requirements. Other applicants have had the ability to feasibly meet this requirement onsite because the site constraints presented here were not evident.

Manager Haake asked where the chambers along the roadway will be installed. Technical Specialist/Permit Reviewer Buntjer used a map to show the locations.
Manager Haake asked whether there had been an educational program with residents regarding what is being put on the lawns or if they had a community meeting or indicated they should be controlling fertilization of their land. Manager Waller thought the green color of the lake could be some other type of vegetation other than algae.

Motion by Manager Waller, seconded by Manager Haake, to grant the variance for Permit Application 14-019 Phase One for the Historic District Improvements of Mahtomedi. Motion carried 3-0.

Motion by Manager Waller, seconded by Haake, to CAPROC Permit #14-019 Phase One Historic District Improvements for Mahtomedi in accordance with RCWD District Engineer's Findings and Recommendations dated June 4, 2014.

Permit Coordinator/Wetland Specialist Tomczik thought it was important to note on page 25 of the packet, the second stipulation is that this project is intended for some of the future phases of the Historic District. The District rule does not have the volume banking that it used to. They took that out to align with the MS4 permit and the concept of resources of concern. The method put into the rule to do that was through a Comprehensive Stormwater Management Plan (CSMP) so while there may be excess credit that could exist in this location, and they are not denying its potential existence, the way for an applicant to have it formalized with the Board is through that Comprehensive Plan and approval and agreement of it. At this point, that does not exist. They can recognize it for this project but as the next phase comes in, they could potentially use this and have to prove to the district at that time or proceed as this stipulation indicates in the packet to get the CSMP in order.

Manager Haake asked if this should be included in the motion. Permit Coordinator/Wetland Specialist Tomczik stated it is in the report and he just wanted the Board to be aware of this. He did not think it needed to be in the motion.

Motion carried 3-0.

CONSENT AGENDA

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

Table of Contents

PERMIT APPLICATIONS REQUIRING BOARD ACTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Plan Type</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14-020</td>
<td>City of Circle Pines</td>
<td>Circle Pines</td>
<td>Street &amp; Utility Plan</td>
<td>CAPROC 5 items</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Technical Specialist/Permit Reviewer Buntjer stated this is a City of Circle Pines street improvement project. They are reconstructing several streets and the project is approximately four acres in size. They are also proposing a stormwater reuse project so they will be pumping water out of the ditch and into several perforated pipes in the park area.

Technical Specialist/Permit Reviewer Buntjer reviewed the plans with the Manager.

Permit Coordinator/Wetland Specialist Tomczik stated this has the potential to have excess credit and if the applicant wants that to be recognized by the Board, it is in need of a Comprehensive Stormwater Management Plan. That is one of the stipulations on page 35.
Approved
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Motion by Manager Waller, seconded by Manager Haake, to approve CAPROC approve Permit application 14-020, 2014 Street and Utility Improvement Project, Circle Pines. Motion carried 3-0.

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

There were no comments made at Open Mike.

ITEMS REQUIRING BOARD ACTION


Administrator Belfiori explained this is related to the acceptance of Amended Basic Water Management Project. He stated on August 28, 2013, the RCWD Board of Managers, through Resolution 2013-23, accepted a petition from the Cities of New Brighton and Saint Anthony for the establishment of a phased basic water management project in the Ramsey County Ditches 2, 3 & 5 drainage area to develop a comprehensive and integrated strategy for stormwater management, flood damage protection and water quality enhancement and initiated the New Brighton/Saint Anthony Basic Water Management Project (Project number 2013-01). Through the process, the City of Roseville has participated in the project meetings and has now chosen to join the petition and become officially involved as a partner in the project.

Administrator Belfiori stated the RCWD has recently been awarded a $3,000,000 Targeted Watershed Demonstration Grant from BWSR’s Clean Water Fund and some of the grant funds have been targeted for use to implement two major projects, Hansen Park and Mirror Lake, identified within Phase 1 of the Basic Water Management Project. This has created a need to expedite the implementation of the Hansen Park and Mirror Lake projects outside of the planned phasing in the original petition.

Administrator Belfiori stated the Mayors and City Council Members from New Brighton and Saint Anthony wanted him to pass along their congratulations on the Grant award and also the deep gratitude they have for the Board of Managers for their leadership to tackle this very important flood control and water quality issue that has been in place in their communities for several decades.

Administrator Belfiori noted this resolution allows the City of Roseville as a joint petitioner. It allows implementation of the Hansen Park project and the Mirror Lake project without delay. It acknowledges the local cost allocation for Hansen Park and Mirror Lake between the TWD grant and RCWD-derived funds and allows the RCWD to proceed to Phase 2 & 3 concurrently for other project components identified under the petition process. Staff recommends approval of Resolution 2014-20 which allocates costs for the Hansen Park and Mirror Lake projects, as identified in the petition process, between the BWSR Targeted Watershed Demonstration Grant and RCWD-derived funds (no local municipality cost allocation at this time) and accepts the amended joint Basic Water Management Petition from the Cities of New Brighton, Roseville, and Saint Anthony and directs further proceedings as outlined in the petition.
Motion by Manager Haake, seconded by Manager Waller, to approve Resolution 2014-20 accepting the Amended Basic Water Management Petition (Project 2013-11).

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

Motion carried 3-0.

2. Consider Approval of BWSR Targeted Watershed Demonstration Grant Agreement and Work Plan and Memorandum of Understanding with Ramsey County. (Phil Belfiori)

District Administrator Belfiori stated on May 14, 2014, staff provided the Board with a high-level summary of the work plan components for this project. Since that time, staff has completed work to build out a final draft work plan, timeline, and measurable goal statement as required by BWSR. On May 27, 2014, New Brighton’s City Council adopted a resolution directing its staff to work with the RCWD toward developing access for purposes of design and construction of projects within Hansen Park. Saint Anthony’s City Council will be following suit on June 10, 2014. The Ramsey County Board will be considering the memorandum of understanding on June 10, 2014. BWSR Clean Water Fund Grant Policy requires that the RCWD commit to 25 years of operation and maintenance of any projects constructed under this program. This is similar to requirements placed on the RCWD related to the Oneka Ridge Golf Course Stormwater Reuse Irrigation Project. This assurance will be obtained from our landowner project partners as part of the project design phases and will be provided to BWSR prior to project construction. Staff recommends approval of Resolution 2014-21, which approves the grant agreement, authorizing the Administrator to sign and submit to BWSR; approves the grant work plan and associated documents, authorizing staff to submit to BWSR; and, approves the MOU with Ramsey County, authorizing the Board President to sign.

Water Resource Specialist Axtell made a presentation to the Board on the grant budget plan. He stated the total cost estimate is $7.2 million. The grant aspects are only related to water quality and they are not talking about or reporting to BWSR on the flood control aspects of this project. The total cost related to the grant is estimated at $5.06 million. He stated the first overall goal on the BWSR Work Plan Project Goal summary is they are looking to accomplish 25%-40% of the TP load reduction goal to Pike Lake and South Basin on Long Lake. The overall second goal is to reduce annual sediment transport through Middle Rice Creek by 25%-35%. Specific pollutant reduction estimates are given for each BMP proposed in the BWSR work plan and these are estimates only and will change as project designs are finalized. Financial constraints, permitting issues and/or sediment contamination may present future challenges affecting project design and resulting pollutant removal efficiency. Benefits of the Carp Management activities are not included in these numbers. They do not know what to do yet with the carp. He reviewed the BWSR work plan estimated timeline with the Board.

Manager Haake stated these are going to end up being like sediment basins. They already have a couple they are responsible for and it costs quite a bit to maintain them. She wondered if they have discussed having New Brighton or the areas help, in the future, with some of the costs on this. She thought there had to be some education to the residents so they can minimize the sediment going into the water. Water Resource Specialist Axtell stated Houston Engineering has put together some rough numbers for O&M costs. The way he would look at this, is once they get a handle on what the cost will be for the projects, they can put together estimates on how
fast these will fill up. It was noted that BWSR is most interested in the first 25 years. He thought they will have to look at those costs and talk with their partners about those costs as BWSR will be looking at the RCWD to provide that maintenance as part of the work plan under consideration today.

District Engineer Deutschman stated maintenance is going to be an issue. They have done some initial estimates on what the maintenance costs might be and he felt the amounts will be worked out with communities in the funding arrangement. One thing that would seem to make sense is if Rice Creek is investing the money up front in terms of just getting the projects constructed that the cities take on the maintenance obligations into the future. There will be discussions about this and it will have to be worked out.

President Preiner thought if the cities want to have the work done, they will need to come forward.

District Administrator Belfiori stated this project, like many in more recent history, integrates education and outreach into every component of the project development. It is actually budgeted into the project component so all of the work plans have education, outreach, and communications components. District Engineer Deutschman stated they are in discussions with the City about establishing a Water Management District in this particular area.

Manage Waller stated they have used those extra small special taxing districts not just for the drainage issues, but occasionally for lakes for water quality issues so that is not anything new and is expected to be explored.

Motion by Manager Waller, seconded by Manager Haake, to approve Resolution 2014-21 Approving BWSR Targeted Watershed Demonstration Grant Agreement and Work Plan and Memorandum for Understanding with Ramsey County.

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

Motion carried 3-0.

3. Consider HAB Aquatics Solutions, Inc. Pay Request #1 for $417,648.14 Bald Eagle Lake Alum Treatment. (Phil Belfiori)
District Administrator Belfiori stated on February 4, 2014 the RCWD Board of Managers awarded a contract to HAB Aquatic Solutions, Inc. to implement the Bald Eagle Lake Alum Project (Resolution No. 2014.04). The total contract price was $878,991.26. Phase 1 of the project, consisting of approximately one-half of the total work, was completed on May 15, 2014. Phase 2 of the project will be completed in 2016. HAB has submitted an invoice for services rendered for approximately one-half of the total contract price totaling $439,495.63. The project engineer has reviewed the invoice, and recommended payment, less retainage, totaling $417,648.14. Staff is in the process of submitting the Clean Water Partnership (CWP) loan disbursement request documentation for the $200,000 in loan dollars that was authorized as part of the Board’s previous approval of the CWP loan agreement/work plan.
Motion by Manager Haake, seconded by Manager Waller, to approve Partial Pay Request #1 for payment to HAB Aquatic Solutions, Inc. for the Bald Eagle Lake Alum Project in the amount of $417,648.14. Motion carried 3-0.


Motion by Manager Haake, seconded by Manager Waller, to approve check register dated June 11, 2014, in the amount of $39,155.81, prepared by HLB Tautges Redpath. Motion carried 3-0.

ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION AND INFORMATION

1. Update on Status of RCWD Rule Revision

Permit Coordinator/Wetland Specialist Tomczik stated the District has continued work in the revision of the RCWD rules. As you may recall, under the last revision the rule language was not changed to recognize the updated precipitation events of Atlas 14. The inclusion of Atlas 14 is one of the primary items of the proposed rule revision as well as correction to the landscape scale Wetland Management Corridor (WMC) mapping and other housekeeping items.

Houston Engineering completed three memos, which study these issues. The first memo dated April 2, 2014 addresses the use of Atlas 14 in the district wide modeling program. The second memo dated April 21, 2014 reviews the landscape scale WMC corridor on two subject properties, which were included in the map based on proposed development. (The development of this memo was in response to concerns regarding map accuracy by the City of Lino Lakes in consideration of development on a particular parcel.) The third memo dated May 14, 2014 considers the implication of adopting Atlas 14 into the regulations. These memos provide a base for the major contemplated changes to the rule.

District Engineer Deutschman stated the majority of the proposed rule revisions are outlined in the summary. The proposed revisions also include some relative small changes in text with the intent of clarifying items for the reader.

Manager Haake asked for clarification on what Atlas 14 is. Permit Coordinator/Wetland Specialist Tomczik stated Atlas 14 is the history of the precipitation events for the last 50 years and brings it forward as information that engineers can use in their documents. He stated this is a factual presentation of what is actually happening. There has always been distinction or some subjectiveness for the FEMA mapping. This is the best information the District has.

Manager Haake asked how they are getting this information out to the communities. Permit Coordinator/Wetland Specialist Tomczik stated the District is going forward with the intent to adopt. They have proposed meetings with each of the counties and invited all engineers and administrators from the counties and municipalities and MnDOT to participate and hear what materials the District has to share with them as they consider the implications. They are hoping the introduction and noticing of the rule revision will help stimulate some good comments to the District.

Manager Waller asked whether the cities will change in their rules to match the District’s once they go through the process of a rule change. Permit Coordinator/Wetland Specialist Tomczik stated they will have to recognize the District regulations.

Permit Coordinator/Wetland Specialist Tomczik reviewed the changes with the Board:
Rule C Stormwater Management Plans

- Clarification of the regulatory threshold
- Conversion of text to Atlas 14
- Maximum untreated stormwater to leave public linear project untreated
- Effective treatment option of impervious disconnect for residential
- Updated table C5 soil type & infiltration rates
- Clarification of extended permit terms and regional facility use

Rule D Erosion & Sediment Control Plans

- Clarification that mill, reclamation and overlay are not regulated
- Addition to demonstrate that activity does not increase peak runoff and no adverse impact during critical flood event

Rule F Wetland Alteration

- Correction to Wetland Management Corridor (WMC) map
- Adjusted language for defining site specific WMC
- Addition of "marginally degraded" to replacement table
- Addition allowing for reduced buffers when there is compelling need and a supportive TEP recommendation
- Clarification that stormwater BMPs may be in the WMC buffer

Permit Coordinator/Wetland Specialist Tomczik stated the Board is also asked to consider adding a declaration of maintenance for ditch systems.

Manager Haake stated she would like to go with the 45-day notice. Manager Waller asked about the drainage ditches and how a maintenance agreement will work with the highway department. He stated they have a lot of major crossings with the road authorities. The city or county or State do repair their roads and occasionally, there has been a change in Legislation as to what the authority was. He remembered voting no against acceptance of this and asked staff to check on this for future discussion.

Manager Waller also agreed to the 45-day notice. District Engineer Deutschman stated he felt they are much more able to work with people and the Board has been very aggressive in directing them to develop As Constructed Conditions so they are in a much better position to engage and help establish the culvert elevation.

2. Discussion on Permit Application Site Maps for Consent Agenda Items

District Administrator Belfiori stated this is a carryover from the discussion at the workshop and staff is trying to get some initial brainstorming from the Board for discussion on the permit application site maps. He stated they could include project maps in the meeting packets for the Board's review prior to the meetings. District Administrator Belfiori asked for Board input on what could be added to the packets in order to make some of the items clearer and easier to discuss.

Manager Haake stated she would like the maps included because they would be very helpful. Manager Waller thought maps were helpful.
Technical Specialist/Permit Reviewer Buntjer pointed out some of the highlights that could be included in maps for clarity. He wondered if anything else could be helpful for the Board. Manager Haake thought the highlights should also be explained as well as pointed out on the maps.

3. District Engineer Update and Timeline
District Engineer Deutschman asked the Board if they had any questions regarding the report.

4. Manager’s Update
Manager Waller stated he was at the Advisory Committee meeting in June and presentations were made by staff and did not see any items of concern. They had a presentation of the Forest Lake project by the City and that went well. It seems like the City is going to improve water quality to Clear Lake with the new reuse of the parking lot on the north end.

Manager Haake stated the MAWD Summer Tour is going to be held in Stillwater, June 18 to June 20. It will be going over many different things about the history itself, the scenic river, and a river tour as well. At the end of the workshop, they were given a piece of paper about a possible workshop agenda items. She went over it thought the three items about policy could be combined. Another item is one-stop shopping and she did not know if they would be able to do this but thinks it should be discussed.

ADJOURNMENT
Motion by Manager Haake, seconded by Manager Waller, to adjourn the meeting at 10:41 a.m. Motion carried 3-0.