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 Bradley, and Treasurer Steve Wagamon.

Absent: None

Staff Present: Administrator Phil Belfiori, Permit Coordinator/Wetland Specialist Nick Tomczik, Water Resource Specialist Kyle Axtell, Lakes and Streams Specialist Matt Kocian, Office Manager Theresa Stasica.

Consultants: District Engineers Chris Otterness and Greg Bowles, Houston Engineering, Inc. (HEI); and, District Attorney Louis Smith from Smith Partners.

Visitors: None.

SETTING OF THE AGENDA
District Administrator Belfiori indicated there were no changes.

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

READING OF THE MINUTES AND THEIR APPROVAL
Minutes of the July 11, 2016, Board of Managers Workshop Meeting. Motion by Manager Wagamon, seconded by Manager Bradley, to approve the minutes as presented.

Manager Waller stated he noticed there was not any mention in the minutes of the discussion Manager Bradley brought up regarding the issue of spending money for the development of the credits and this would result in not being the remote situation that they develop. He thought that when Government issues are discussed extensively there needs to be some kind of mention about it in the minutes. He noted it was talked about under the discussion about mitigation opportunities in the memorandum.
Manager Bradley stated he remembered the discussion. He stated the point was that they ask for updates for Tables 1 and 2 and language pertaining to the settlements. He was mostly interested in changing, fixing the exhibits and he will not forget this issue when it comes up again and is happy with the minutes as they read.

Motion carried 5-0.

Minutes of the July 13, 2016, Board of Managers Meeting. Motion by Manager Wagamon, seconded by Manager Bradley, to approve the minutes as presented. Motion carried 5-0.

Minutes of the July 13, 2016, Board of Managers Workshop Meeting. Motion by Manager Wagamon, seconded by Manager Haake, to approve the minutes as presented.

Manager Waller stated they were talking about governance issues during Item: Update on the Technician Site Plan Permit Review Position. Manager Waller talked about the limit on administrative costs for $400,000 and the use of Chapter 103D as a way to provide a limit on the growth of staff. He thought that was an important thing to talk about. Washington County paid out approximately eight million dollars over the last ten years and project wise they have not really received that money back in projects put in there. He thought that was important because this is an issue of governance and how you grow. He thought there should be some note in the minutes about those particular issues.

President Preiner asked what information needed to be added because there was information already in the minutes. Manager Waller agreed there was information in the minutes but he would like to talk about this more extensively in the Managers Report later. He stated it seems that when governance issues come up for discussion there is not a defined enough record. He would like to have staff go back and take a look at that discussion because there was no record made about the statute limits in the minutes.

Manager Wagamon indicated he would also like to have what the others managers' response was to Manager Waller's statement.

President Preiner suggested Manager Waller's statement would be reflected in this meetings minutes regarding the workshop minutes.

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

Motion carried 4-1.
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>16-041</td>
<td>Boulder Contracting, LLC</td>
<td>Blaine</td>
<td>Final Site Drainage</td>
<td>CAPROC 8 items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-060</td>
<td>United Properties Investment, LLC</td>
<td>Lino Lakes</td>
<td>Final Site Drainage</td>
<td>CAPROC 11 items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-061</td>
<td>Land O’ Lakes, Inc.</td>
<td>Arden Hills</td>
<td>Final Site Drainage</td>
<td>CAPROC 7 items</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Permit Coordinator/Wetland Specialist Tomczik stated for Item 16-041 they would like to add Exhibit 10 - City of Blaine Email: Applicant Permission to Work in Right-of-Way and Treat Road Runoff”. Received on 7/25/16 to page 4 of the engineer’s report.

Manager Haake stated on item 16-060, she stated there is a lot of wetlands there and in regards to the drainage she wondered where they will be putting it all and where will the mitigation occur and are they going to use something they have in Columbus or where will this occur.

District Engineer Bowles showed on the map where the drainage and stormwater treatment and control will occur. He noted the project will create 24.4 acres of new impervious surface and will disturb about thirty acres and the applicant is proposing to treat the disturbance with two storm water ponds. He reviewed on the map where the ponds will be located. He stated the project will fill 1.67 acres of floodplain and they have proposed to mitigate 11.02 acres of floodplain as part of the project and will be mitigated within the ponding area. They will be filling approximately .36 acres of wetlands which they will provide a .5008-acre mitigation.

Permit Coordinator/Wetland Specialist Tomczik stated the wetlands straddle the Centerville and Lino Lakes boundary and are primarily for the road extension. Part of this is in the CWPMP, the Lino Lakes side, and the other half is in Centerville. There is a different replacement ratio. They are planning on replacing using the wetland bank credits and those credits are from Dan Hair Wetland Bank and within the contributing draining area of the CWPMP and acceptable.

Motion by Manager Haake, seconded by Manager Wagamon, to approve the consent agenda for permits 16-041, 16-060, and 16-061 including staff recommended edits to 16-041 engineer’s report, as outlined in the above Table of Contents with accordance with RCWD District Engineer’s Findings and Recommendations, dated July 20, 2016. Motion carried 5-0.

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>16-068</td>
<td>Lauri Kigner</td>
<td>White Bear Lake</td>
<td>Bridge/Culvert Crossing</td>
<td>CAPROC 2 items</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Permit Coordinator/Wetland Specialist Tomczik stated this application required a fee for Rule I public ditch alteration plan. The fee amount is $2,250.00. Staff found that to be in excess of the work that was required to review the application. He reviewed the background of Rule G and Rule I with the Board. Staff found review under both rules needed to be included in the plans. The fee amount of $2,250.00 was originally contemplated in regards to actual public drainage petitions to reroute the drainage system and such but those petitions require a separate and independent bond; statute sets up a specific criteria and necessity of that. Staff felt the fees are excessive and staff is recommending to waive that fee and go forward with the application approval. He noted under District Rule on page 40 in the Engineer's Report, it should also note Rule I.

Manager Haake asked if they should charge any type of fee. Permit Coordinator/Wetland Specialist Tomczik stated thought in this case no fee under Rule I is necessary.

Manager Bradley noted on page 41, Findings 1, third sentence states that the applicant submitted a $600 application fee. He wondered if this is a separate fee or did staff forget about this. Permit Coordinator/Wetland Specialist Tomczik stated this is a separate fee and represents erosion control and then the crossing fee. He indicated each of their regulations has its own fee based on the extent of the project.

Motion by Manager Haake, seconded by Manager Wagamon, to CAPROC permit 16-068 in accordance with RCWD District Engineer's Findings and Recommendations, dated July 19, 2016, with a waiver of the Rule I drainage fee.

Manager Waller stated recently they had a bridge crossing in Hugo and he was made aware that the District required a maintenance agreement and he wondered if there will be a maintenance agreement on this particular bridge. He stated there is a permit rule and that should define what it is. Permit Coordinator/Wetland Specialist Tomczik stated specific to the CAPROC Permit File 16-068, the ER notes, Item #1, CAPROC requires the crossing maintenance document to be recorded on the property. That originated when they did the rule revision for the purposes of bringing the responsibility of the crosser to the attention of the people in a more recent recording. He stated when the crossings come up the intent of the recording is to get it on the legal record that it is indeed the landowners responsibility to correct any impediments from their crossing.

Manager Waller asked if there is a maintenance agreement in this particular situation or will there be one. Permit Coordinator/Wetland Specialist Tomczik stated there will be and it is stated in Item #1 of the CAPROC.

Motion carried 5-0.

Motion by Manager Haake, seconded by Manager Wagamon, to direct staff to draft a revised fee schedule specific to Rule G and Rule I and provide the draft back to the Board for consideration. 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.
ITEMS REQUIRING BOARD ACTION

1. Consider resolution awarding the project and issuance of the Notice of Award for Hansen Park
   Comprehensive Water Management Project.

Water Resource Specialist Axtell stated on June 21, 2016, the RCWD Board of Managers accepted final
plans and specifications for the Hansen Park Comprehensive Water Management Project and authorized
staff and the District Engineer to solicit bids for construction of the project. The engineer and staff both
recommend accepting the low, responsible bid from Rachel Contracting, Inc. of $2,768,480.12 and
transmitting a Notice of Award to that effect.

Water Resource Specialist Axtell reviewed the project with the Board and updated them on the ACOE
permitting process.

President Preiner wondered what the ACOE monitoring conditions may be and if the District is developing
them. Water Resource Specialist Axtell stated what was proposed was boiler plate out of the Corps’
manual for wetland mitigation banks and wetland restoration projects and that there were some pieces
the District staff and engineer were concerned about and that they were engaging the Corps in discussions
about the conditions.

President Preiner stated she wanted to make sure that the monitoring that the Corps expects is what the
District is performing.

Water Resource Specialist Axtell noted the engineer recommends authorizing a 15% contingency
($415,270.00) for potential change orders. Staff recognizes the large size of this contingency in terms of
total dollars and would recommending a smaller 7.5% contingency ($207,635.00). Any potential change
orders for additional work beyond this amount would be brought back to the Board for consideration.

Manager Wagamon asked if it concerned staff or the engineers about some of the discrepancies in the
costs for various line items in the bid tabulation. District Engineer Otterness stated they did look at that
and they recognize that there can be large swings, in particular the mobilization number, because that is a
catch-all for contractors for different items. Regarding the control of water item, Rachel Contracting
actually provided the most detailed water control plan of any of the contractors and is another of the items
that is a risk management item for the contractors.

Manager Wagamon asked if staff and Houston Engineering was familiar with Rachel Contracting because
he did not know anything about them. Water Resource Specialist Axtell indicated the District has worked
with Rachel Contracting in the past on the Oneka Ridge Stormwater Reuse Irrigation Project and have had
no issues working with them.

Manager Haake stated the bid of $2,768 million, there was information regarding the contingency of 15%
versus 7.5% and she thought usually the bid contains the contingency fee. Water Resource Specialist Axtell
indicated it does not. He stated the contingency is simply a budgeting tool for the District and ideally not a
penny of that contingency will be used and the project will move forward smoothly.
Manager Bradley stated the budget for this project is assumed to be $3.3 million at this time which would have included the contingencies and if they would have gone with Houston Engineering recommendation of $415,000, they would be at $3.2 million and would have a hundred thousand savings. Obviously going with the $207,000 the budget will save another $200,000. Did staff intend to show a budget cost then of the bid plus the $200,000 and then if Houston Engineering is correct the difference would be taken out of reserves. District Administrator Belfiori indicated that was correct. They did not know this bid at the last budget discussion and do not know the bid results for ACD 31/46 either so they will have both of those pieces of information and set budgets for both and will come back for an additional discussion at the August 8th workshop.

Motion by Manager Haake, seconded by Manager Waller, to approve Resolution 2016-14, Resolution Awarding the Contract for the Hansen Park Project Component of Basic Water Management Project 2013-01

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the RCWD Board of Managers that:

1. The contract for the Hansen Park Component of Project 2013-01 is awarded to Rachel Contracting for the contract price of $2,768,480.12;

2. The District Administrator is authorized to sign and transmit the notice of award, sign the construction agreement, and issue the notice to proceed on advice of Houston Engineering, Inc. and counsel and when prerequisites for issuance have been met by the contractor;

3. The District Administrator is authorized to manage bid bonds in accordance with the terms of the bid documents;

4. The District Administrator is authorized to sign change orders increasing the contract price in an aggregate net amount not exceeding 7.5 percent of the contract price.

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

Motion carried 5-0.

2. Consider resolution authorizing the Peltier Lake Drawdown
Lakes and Streams Specialist Kocian stated the public hearing was done on July 7, 2016. His intent is to ask the Board to pass a resolution authorizing Peltier Lake Temporary Drawdown and the submittal of a DNR permit application.
Lakes and Streams Specialist Kocian presented a few slides that were shown from the public hearing showing what was being proposed along with minutes from the meeting. He indicated there was a good public showing at the meeting.

President Preiner wondered if there was anything they could do to get some type of evaluation of the impact of the drawdown from the northern part. Lakes and Streams Specialist Kocian stated what he has heard from Engineering is that there are hydrologic controls near the upstream edge of Peltier Lake that are not going to allow for a major water level drawdown in upper part of Rice Creek. In addition, this time of year is normally a dryer time of year anyway.

District Attorney Smith stated he saw that there was modeling of the downstream impact of the drawdown in a two-year storm event and he wondered if the hundred-year event was also looked at. Lakes and Streams Specialist Kocian stated that was looked at also. District Engineer Otterness stated they chose to look at the two-year scenario for this because that was a scenario most likely during a fall drawdown. It is highly unlikely that a hundred-year rainfall would occur that late in the year. This is something they look at occurring in addition to having a maximum water elevation occurring at the same time. They feel that it would be very unlikely that an occurrence that would be greater than a two-year event would be occurring along with the drawdown at the same time. There is still the ability if there is a larger infall does occur they would be able to replace the stop logs temporarily until that event occurs then the drawdown can proceed again.

President Preiner asked if there is a legal issue where they would need to have that in there. District Attorney Smith stated if there is a hundred-year event during the drawdown and roads were damaged and the determination was that the roads would not have been damaged if there was not a drawdown during the event then the courts would hold the District responsible for the difference in the impact based on their actions. He stated it sounds like the Engineers did consider that and also have the ability to respond and adaptively manage the drawdowns based on runoff conditions.

Lakes and Streams Specialist Kocian doubted the stop log structure has the capacity to convey the hundred-year flood event anyway so in the unlikely event that the hundred-year event occurred this small opening will not be able to move that amount of water and water will be coming over the top of the dam anyway. District Engineer Otterness indicated that was correct.

Lakes and Streams Specialist Kocian continued with his presentation on the next steps to be taken on the project.

Manager Waller indicated this is the not first time the lake has had a drawdown and at the public meeting there were residents who commented on the positive impact the previous drawdown had on the lake. Lakes and Streams Specialist Kocian indicated that was correct.

Manager Waller thought this needed to be a continuous maintenance project that should occur regularly. He stated one of the reasons why this lake does not qualify under the water quality standards is because it has a lot of organic material on the north end. He thought the best thing that could happen to the north end of the lake would be the removal of much of the organic material which constantly feeds the phosphorus throughout the lake. He wondered if they could start to think about long term cleaning and
removal of the organic materials and restoring the lake for recreational purposes and possibly increase the holding. Lakes and Streams Specialist Kocian stated dredging was considered in the TMDL study and quickly dismissed as being too expensive. It is possible but the costs would be very expensive.

Motion by Manager Haake, seconded by Manager Wagamon, to approve Resolution 2016-13, Resolution Authorizing Peltier Lake drawdown.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Managers directs the District Administrator to submit a permit application to the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources (MnDNR) to conduct a temporary water level drawdown on Peltier Lake; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that, upon receipt of the necessary MnDNR permit, the District Administrator is to proceed with the temporary water level drawdown on Peltier Lake, and for that purpose is authorized to enter into contracts and take such other steps as may be necessary to conduct the drawdown.

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

Motion carried 5-0.

3. Consider HAB Aquatics Solutions, Inc. final pay request for Bald Eagle Lake Alum Treatment
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 (Resol. 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. Payment for the 2014 application, totaling $417,648.14, was approved by the Board and rendered on June 11, 2014.

Phase 2 of the project was completed on May 6, 2016. Payment for the 2016 application, totaling $417,393.56, was approved by the Board and rendered on May 25, 2016.

The project engineer, Wenck Associates, recommended withholding 5% retainage until all project components were fully completed, including any necessary site restoration. Site restoration was completed on June 4, 2016. Subsequently, the project engineer has provided the Certificate of Project Completion, and recommends disbursement of retainage totaling $43,949.56.

Motion by Manager Haake, seconded by Manager Bradley, to approve final payment to HAB Aquatic Solutions, Inc. for the Bald Eagle Lake Alum Project in the amount of $43,949.56. Motion carried 5-0.
4. **Consider comment letter to BWSR on the BWSR Buffer Law Implementation Policies.**

District Administrator Belfiori reviewed staff draft comments with the Board. He noted these comments are optional, and that the Board will be free to decide in the future whether it wishes to exercise enforcement jurisdiction for the Buffer Law.

Manager Haake asked if they do opt into this enforcement role, how will they enforce it because she felt the District is not a policing body. District Administrator Belfiori stated if the Board wished to opt in it may need to develop some rules.

Manager Waller asked for the District Attorney's comments on this. District Attorney Smith stated he did have some comments and would like to hold them until the end of the Board's discussion, but in regard to the enforcement question, if the District chose to assume an enforcement role, and there is a conflicting view about the state of compliance between the SWCD and the Watershed District, it would be his opinion that the District would have the ultimate determination on compliance. In practice they would want to have a good working understanding with the SWCD.

District Administrator Belfiori continued reviewing the policies with the Board.

**Motion by Manager Waller, seconded to Bradley, to authorize the District Administrator to send the comment letter to BWSR on the BWSR Buffer Law Implementation Policies.**

District Attorney Smith stated in terms of overall impact of the law within their watershed's landscape, the definition of the buffer is any form of perennial vegetation. In most developed areas, this perennial vegetation already exists and may be unlikely to be disturbed. Agricultural tilling areas would most likely be the primary area of impact. This point may assist the Board in evaluating how much of an investment of resources is this worth if they want to get involved in the enforcement.

He stated in regards to the MS4 exemption, in general the League of Minnesota Cities was the active advocate for this exemption with the belief that existing stormwater management infrastructure and requirements that are in place due to the MS4 permit system are an adequate alternative to the buffers. That is why, broadly speaking, the exemption is there. What the statutory language says is “water resource riparian protection” and there was some consideration in deleting the word “riparian” in the last Legislative session. There were objections raised to that and it was not deleted. He thought that one way to deal with this issue, relating to MS4, would be to compare a narrow reading of what “riparian protection” means with a broader reading. The narrow reading would say that the MS4 permits need to include buffer ordinances as a part of those controls. Currently, to his knowledge, no MS4 permit includes such protections. The broader view would be that there is treatment that is done of the surface water before it enters the bodies of water of concern. If they look to the alternative practices, they get a very functional definition of other ways to capture stormwater and provide some kind of treatment before it reaches the body of concern. He indicated they that the Board may consider a comment to offer this broader definition could be considered by BWSR; it would be consistent with other provisions of the law concerning “alternative practices,” and that might be one way to deal with the more practical definition of the MS4 exemption.
District Attorney Smith stated the requirement also is that the MS4 exemption meets that protection that is consistent with the buffer law. The buffer protection they have now for the wetlands in this watershed or the ordinances that typically exist in cities that require some kind of buffers, are all based on a land disturbance trigger. The new buffer law does not involve a land disturbance trigger. The buffer law requires the buffer everywhere regardless of whether or not there is land disturbance. He thought that this is one of the most practical, significant legal issues that should be considered by BWSR more carefully.

Manager Waller asked if these points could be offered as additions to the memo. District Attorney Smith stated that the had language available for Mr. Belfiori to utilize. Manager Waller moved to amend the motion to add District Attorney Smith’s comments.

Manager Haake seconded the amendment.

Motion on the amendment carried 5-0.

Motion on the main motion as amended carried 5-0.

5. Consider stormwater Reuse Irrigation Assessment Grant Agreement Amendment Authorization
District Administrator Belfiori stated the Board of Water and Soil Resources (BWSR) expressed interest in adding a workshop training component to the Stormwater Reuse Irrigation Assessment grant agreement. The District (in coordination with HEI) would provide a workshop for potential users of the methodology to instruct them how to use the methodology. A grant Agreement Amendment has been received from BWSR incorporating an additional $5,000.00 into the grant to cover the cost of the workshop, bringing the total grant amount to $105,000.00. The Grant Agreement Amendment also extends the deadline for project completion from January 31, 2017 to June 30, 2017. The workshop would be conducted no later than March 31, 2017 within the RCWD, but would be advertised and open to a wide range of practitioners, potential end user irrigators, local government water management entities, etc. both within and outside of the groundwater management area.

Motion by Manager Haake, seconded by Manager Bradley, to authorize President Preiner to 1) sign the attached Grant Agreement Amendment, and 2) sign the attached HEI Task Order Revision once the Grant Agreement Amendment is executed by the BWSR. Motion carried 5-0.

Motion by Manager Wagamon, seconded by Manager Haake, to approve check register dated July 27, 2016, in the amount of $347,814.41, prepared by Redpath and Company. Motion carried 5-0.

ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION AND INFORMATION

1. Staff Reports.
   There were no comments.

2. August Calendar
   There were no comments.
3. **Manager’s Update**

Manager Bradley stated as one of the residents on Bald Eagle Lake they have had extraordinary warm weather and lake temperatures are way up and there are no algae blooms.

Manager Waller gave the Board background on a Washington County study done in the 1990s regarding water management governance. It identified changes to improve the structure of water governance rather than the management of the resources itself. There were many suggestions made and it was a long term program. Many things were considered during this study and there were people from all backgrounds that were involved in the study. Manager Waller reviewed the executive summary with the Board. He stated after seventeen years they have reached the point where the City stormwater plans are now including watershed rules. Manager Waller stated this study wants them to identify financing mechanisms that are fair and accurate and can meet the portions of the County needs. He stated that the study’s report talks about building structures or having duplicate structures when it comes to increasing the amount of staff and trying to get the cities to do these things more, he believed that is the focus of what the County wants. He discussed having more coordination with the local units of government and not a duplicate regulatory authority. He stated he followed this study in his duties as a watershed manager. Manager Waller stated he would like to see an acceleration of these kinds of integration situations that are on-going. He believed there needs to be a focus on sending money back to the communities that have spent the money in the past and not received anything in return.

Manager Haake stated they are a Watershed District and like any other taxation, it does not mean it is going to come right back to a particular community, it is looking at the whole. Manager Bradley stated the last time this discussion was had, Washington County is upstream and they are paying for everything that is going downstream.

Manager Waller thought Washington County, in his viewpoint, has been treated very badly over the years due to lawsuits and lack of drainage/water programs/projects in the county.

Manager Haake stated Ramsey County happens to be one of four counties and Ramsey County historically from the beginning had been paying 63% to 65% of the tax levy from the counties and are down to 52% to 53% of all of the monies contributed and Ramsey County is not getting back that exact amount of money either. She stated she is looking at what is good for the whole District and that is what the watershed is really here about.

Manager Bradley thought that whatever sins of the past they are trying to improve their behavior now and their focus should be that going forward.

**ADJOURNMENT**

*Motion by Manager Haake, seconded by Manager Wagamon, to adjourn the meeting at 10:36 a.m. Motion carried 5-0.*