REGULAR MEETING OF THE RCWD BOARD OF MANAGERS
Wednesday, September 12, 2018
Shoreview City Hall Council Chambers
4600 North Victoria Street, Shoreview, Minnesota

Approved Minutes

CALL TO ORDER
President Patricia 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 Steven Wagamon.

Absent: None

Staff Present: Administrator Phil Belfiori, Permit Coordinator/Wetland Specialist Nick Tomczik, Technician Samantha Berger, Inspector Terrence Chastan-Davis, Office Manager Theresa Stasica.

Consultants: District Engineer Chris Otterness from Houston Engineering, Inc. (HEI); and District Attorney Chuck Holtman from Smith Partners; Justin Townsend-Ramsey County Soil & Water Conservation District

Visitors: Larry Lanoux.

SETTING OF THE AGENDA
Administrator Belfiori requested the Board move Item Requiring Board Action #5 to #1 and then continue on with the agenda.

Motion by Manager Haake, seconded by Manager Waller to approve the agenda as amended. Motion carried 5-0.

READING OF THE MINUTES AND THEIR APPROVAL
Minutes of the August 21, 2018 Workshop. Motion by Manager Wagamon, seconded by Manager Bradley to approve the minutes as presented. Motion carried 5-0.

Minutes of the August 22, 2018 Board of Managers Meeting. Motion by Manager Wagamon, seconded by Manager Bradley to approve the minutes as presented. Motion carried 5-0.
CONSENT AGENDA

The following items will be acted upon without discussion in accordance with the staff recommendation and associated documentation unless a Manager or another interested person requests opportunity for discussion:

Table of Contents

Permit Applications Requiring Board Action

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Plan Type</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-085</td>
<td>JP Ecommerce Inc., Columbus</td>
<td>Final Site Drainage Plan</td>
<td>CAPROC 7 items</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dale Furrer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Permit Coordinator/Wetland Specialist Nick Tomczik referred to page 23 of the agenda packet, Findings #1 and noted that this is a phased development plan that has a 10-year duration under Rule C.13 rather than the typical 1.5-year permit term. He stated that staff would like to add an additional stipulation to the permit: “Permittee must contact and provide to the District plans for continuation of the phased development plan, prior to executing the second phase of the project.”

Manager Waller expressed concern about finding a way to track this permit for such a great length of time, since it is a 10-year term. He stated that there have been times in the past where permits had been lost in the process and he does not want that to happen in this situation.

Permit Coordinator/Wetland Specialist Tomczik stated that the District has a very extensive system in place to keep track of permits. He stated that staff is pretty confident in the systems that are in place. He also noted that this site is in a very visible location, so work on the site is unlikely to go unnoticed. He stated that Section 13, Rule C, was intended to address the ebbs and flows of the economy, so this provides greater certainty to the permittee and allows for phasing this type of project with an extended term.

Manager Waller stated that he was not against a 10-year term, but was concerned about the internal checks systems in place so the staff can keep up with it.

Permit Coordinator/Wetland Specialist Tomczik stated that he will discuss these concerns with staff and ways to highlight this project in addition to the systems already in place. He referenced page 24 of the agenda packet, the third paragraph, the date November 2, 2107, should be changed to November 2, 2017. That same paragraph, he noted, refers to a known area of drainage concern and states that the findings of the referenced memo are still relevant. He stated that “and stand” should be added to the last sentence of the paragraph to read, “Although the assessment within the memorandum did not specifically address changes in drainage area, the net effect of the proposed project (increase in runoff volume) was evaluated, and the conclusions remain relevant to the proposed project, and stand.”
President Preiner stated that there are studies in progress right now for regional drainage. She asked if this solidifies the applicant’s project no matter what may happen around it.

Permit Coordinator/Wetland Specialist Tomczik stated that provided the project does not change, it would.

Manager Haake asked how much wetland is in this area because there will be almost 10 acres of new impervious surface.

Permit Coordinator/Wetland Specialist Tomczik stated that the wetland impact is less than one acre.

District Attorney Holtman suggested that with respect to Mr. Tomczik’s proposed stipulation that the applicant notify the District before commencing subsequent phases, the Board authorize the District Administrator to determine the appropriate text. He said that it is important not just that the District be notified, but that it reserve the right of approval to ensure that any future phase conforms to the terms of the present plans with respect to stormwater matters. Manager Bradley concurred.

*It was moved by Manager Waller, seconded by Manager Bradley to approve the Consent Agenda item for permit 18-085 as outlined in the above Table of Contents in accordance with RCWD District Engineer’s Findings and Recommendations dated September 5, 2018, and including the three adjustments Permit Coordinator/Wetland Specialist Tomczik outlined above, as further refined by District Attorney Holtman. 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.

Larry Lanoux stated that although he serves as a City Council member for the City of Grant, he is here representing himself and his personal concerns. He thanked the Board for allowing him to speak today and expressed appreciation for Manager Waller who recently spoke during a public comment portion of a Grant City Council meeting. He stated that the Grant City Council reviewed the Environmental Assessment Worksheet (EAW) for Mahtomedi Ice Arena Project and found it did not trigger an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). He stated that the Council also now has decidede that only residents of the City of Grant may provide public comment at Council meetings in the future.

Mr. Lanoux reviewed with the Board the areas of the EAW that he believes should trigger an EIS and asked that the RCWD Board request that an EIS be done for this project.
The Board asked Administrator Belfiori to follow up with Ginny at the MN Dept. of Health regarding the water quality testing in Lake Washington and Lost Lake.

Manager Haake asked District Attorney Holtman if the District is prohibited from asking for an EIS or an EAW after something may indicate that the supporting documents that were submitted were perhaps not answered completely truthfully.

District Attorney Holtman stated that any public body that has responsibility to formally approve a project has jurisdiction to receive a petition for environmental review and the Environmental Quality Board may reallocate responsibility for that review. He stated that he is not familiar with all the information that Mr. Lanoux referred to, but if an environmental review process was already conducted through an EAW, typically the next step would be to appeal the decision not to require an EIS as opposed to initiating a new petition with a different body.

Manager Haake asked District Attorney Holtman about the legal liability of the District in this situation.

District Attorney Holtman stated that public bodies that sit in a regulatory or review capacity are exercising their judgment and are protected from liability on the decisions they make. Typically, the liability would go with the landowner, the public body that is developing the property, or the proponents of the project.

Manager Bradley stated that he feels the District’s role is to review it if a permit comes before the Board within the scope of the District’s authority and determine whether or not the Board has the information needed to determine the water quality and runoff characteristics of the particular site. He stated that the issues brought up by Mr. Lanoux are absolutely in the authority and jurisdiction of the City of Grant.

Mr. Lanoux presented his documents to the Board to be entered into public record. He stated that in his opinion the documents appear to show that there is more concern about Blanding turtles than there are about the children.

Administrator Belfiori confirmed that he will follow up with Ginny at the MN Dept of Health today via e-mail.

**ADDITIONAL ITEMS REQUIRING BOARD ACTION**

1. **Consideration of scheduling a Compliance Hearing for Permit 17-105.**
   Administrator Belfiori introduced Justin Townsend from the Ramsey County Soil & Water Conservation District who went out to the site after the workshop on 9/10/2018.

   Justin Townsend, Ramsey County Soil & Water Conservation District, reviewed the findings from the site and presented pictures. He noted that the applicant has stated it is
working with an erosion control contractor to get the silt fence in place. He stated that
the imminent threat has been significantly reduced, and believes that Derek Brown and
Doug Johnson, representatives of the contractor Building Concepts and Designs,
understand the gravity of the situation and are working as quickly as they can to resolve
the issue.

Administrator Belfiori referenced the action taken by the Board at the 9/10/18 workshop
to direct that the District attorney seek a temporary restraining order (TRO) to address
soil stockpiles, lack of perimeter control and related imminent threats to the adjacent
lake. He noted that after the site inspection conducted on 9/10/2018, by Terrence and
Justin, he consulted with legal counsel and President Preiner, and considered the
discussion at the workshop. He decided to put work on the TRO on hold at this time, since
the threat has been significantly removed. He stated that he made a judgment call, but
realizes that work still needs to be completed. The first item that still needs to be
completed is to install the perimeter control. This is important, since the soil at that
location remains unstabilized, even if the ground has been leveled by removal of the soil
stockpile. The contractor’s representative verbally stated that he has hired an erosion
control contractor who is supposed to have this in place by the end of the day today. He
noted that the representative has also verbally stated, on two separate occasions to two
separate staff members, that he intends to do land disturbance and landscaping work in
the remaining vegetative buffer adjacent to the shoreline. He stated that the
representative then contradicted that statement during a third conversation with
Terrence. He stated that staff is unsure if this will be done because it has not been
included in any plans that have been submitted. Staff is recommending having an
Administrative Compliance Order (ACO) to address the perimeter control issue and
include language that states if the permittee plans to do work in the vegetated strip, the
contractor must submit and obtain approval of an amended erosion control plan before
any work is done. He noted that staff is also recommending moving forward with
scheduling the Compliance Hearing on September 26, 2018, pending resolution of
compliance matters.

Manager Haake stated that the ACO gives them 15 days to complete the work, but
confirmed that the District actually is asking the erosion control fencing to be put in place
immediately.

Permit Coordinator/Wetland Specialist Tomczik stated that his understanding is that
Administrator Belfiori is taking an action with the ACO that it should be considered by the
Board within 15 days. He suggests that the ACO state that any changes to the submitted
plan need review and approval.

Manager Haake noted that after the workshop she contacted the DNR representative.
She expressed her appreciation to the DNR for contacting Dellwood officials and
responding to this concern so quickly.
Manager Bradley stated that the language recommended by Permit Coordinator/Wetland Specialist Tomczik is too general and needs to be more specific about what the District is requiring, such as erosion control silt fence locations.

District Attorney Holtman gave an overview of the framework for the ACO including the requirement for the perimeter fencing to be in place by the end of the day that the ACO is delivered or the work will stop. He stated that the second item the ACO would contain is with regard to the shoreline vegetation and would state the current plans do not include disturbance of that vegetation and before that occurs, the permittee is required to come in with a new erosion control plan. He stated that he is also recommending that the Board schedule the compliance hearing in order to keep it on the docket.

Manager Bradley asked whether the District would get enough surety out of this permittee in light of the compliance problems the District has had.

District Attorney Holtman stated that the surety schedule provided for $1,000.00 financial assurance. He added that in internal discussion of this matter, the question was noted of whether this amount is sufficient for certain smaller developments that, due to their circumstances, still can pose a more substantial risk and implicate greater cost to address noncompliance.

Manager Bradley stated that he would like to see the Board require an adequate surety for the next component of the project.

Permit Coordinator/Wetland Specialist Tomczik stated that according to the surety schedule, his understanding is that any changes to the plans would not require any surety beyond what has already been collected. He stated that the District may have discretion to vary from the surety schedule but he is not sure that latitude is provided within the schedule. He commented that potential surety in these situations where the project is adjacent to wetlands, lakes or streams, there could be an increased surety such as a $5,000 surety fee.

Manager Waller stated that he is an advocate of the “velvet hammer” approach which sounds like what the staff is also recommending and that they have been in contact with Dellwood staff to ensure cooperation. He stated that he took a look at the site on his way to today’s meeting and noted that most of the stockpile had been moved around the perimeter of the concrete areas but the silt fence had not been installed. He stated that this area may be a good candidate for some of the shoreland stabilization grants that are available. He expressed his thanks to the staff for pursuing this in a prudent manner.
Motion by Manager Waller, seconded by Manager Haake, to set Compliance Hearing for permit 17-105 for September 26, 2018 Board meeting at 9 a.m. City of Shoreview Counsel Chambers. Motion carried 5-0.

Administrator Belfiori thanked Justin, Terrence, and District Attorney Holtman for working after hours on this situation.

2. Consider 2019 Preliminary Budget & Levy Certification- There will be a public meeting on the District’s budget and levy adopted today on December 12, 2018 in conformance with MN Stat 275.065.

Administrator Belfiori noted that the Board met on August 22, 2018 identifying the 2019 Preliminary Budget and Levy in an amount of $7,345,030 which is a 2.8% decrease from 2018. He noted that the total revenues for the 2019 preliminary budget are $5,221,249, with $4,710,392 coming from a general property tax and the remainder from fees and charges. He stated that the budget includes implementation of high priority projects and programs, including expediting large-scale public drainage projects.

Motion by Manager Haake, seconded by Manager Bradley, to adopt Resolution 2018-25: Adopt 2019 Budget and Adopt 2019 Tax Levies.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Rice Creek Watershed District Board of Managers adopts a 2019 general fund and plan implementation budget totaling $7,345,030;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that a levy of 0.048 percent of taxable market value, not to exceed $250,000.00, be certified to the Counties of Anoka, Ramsey, Hennepin and Washington and levied upon all taxable property in the Rice Creek Watershed District for the year 2019, for the purpose of paying the General Fund expenses of the District as provided by Minnesota Statutes Section 103D.905 Subdivision 3;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that a levy of $4,460,392 be certified to the Counties of Anoka, Ramsey, Hennepin and Washington and levied upon all taxable property in the Rice Creek Watershed District for the year 2019, as authorized by the Metropolitan Surface Water Management Act, Minnesota Statutes Section 103B.241, for the purpose of paying the costs of preparing and implementing a watershed management plan;

Manager Waller’s read the following statement into the record

In government service I strive not for perfection but to make things better. I support accountability through transparency, objectivity, and impartiality.
What is the budget narrative? Home market values have increased. At the current tax rate the increased home values could yield 8.85% more revenue. The mechanism to collect more revenue is to increase the budget. Simply increasing the budget will return 8.85% more tax collection without an increase to the tax rate.

In Washington County, 2018 total tax levy of $846,565 will rise to $928,805 in 2019 which is an increase of $82,240 (8.85%). The total estimated market value for taxes payable in 2018 for the Rice Creek Watershed District was $4,230,169,200. The total estimated market value for taxes payable in 2009 for the Rice Creek Watershed District was $4,104,547,200. The total estimated market value of the Washington County portion of Rice Creek Watershed District for taxes payable from 2009 to 2018 grew $125,622,000 or an increase to value on existing property of 3.6%. The total market value includes $471,462,500 of new improvements constructed in the Washington County Rice Creek Watershed District portion during the last ten years. The proposed 8.85% tax increase is more than twice the 3.6% total market value increase during the last ten years.

Does the proposed 8.85% tax increase serve justice? During the last ten years the Washington County Rice Creek Watershed District portion has experienced new construction. New construction regulation requires the best surface water quantity and quality management practices. These best management practices are improvements in the property and an increase value paid by the property buyer. This increased value results in the property owner paying greater tax revenue than owners of property without the value best management practices improvements. New construction buyers pay for the cost of water quantity and quality benefits through the price of the property. These regulations increase new construction value, and buyers pay a higher tax.

Does the budget increase serve justice? My colleagues advocate those who benefit should pay the cost of the benefit. I agree. I support annual tax collection from Washington County be spent in Washington County.

During the last twelve years the Rice Creek Watershed District has collect over $8 million dollars from Washington County portion of the district. Yet the watershed district has not spent $840,000 thousand dollars annually collected from Washington County in Washington County and Washington County has not received benefit. The watershed district budget has not provided for orderly management of all the water of the Washington County basin.
The district failed to provide to local government units necessary support to harmonize future land development. In the 1990's, the City of Hugo had to take court action against the district to repair Washington County Judicial Ditch Number 2. The district had not prevented the recurring damage to property which resulted from uncontrolled flooding and runoff. Out of frustration from the district's adversarial position to drainage, municipal officials invoked local government unit authority for the wetland conservation act and contracted with the district to perform the maintenance of JD2 for the sum of $40,000 annually. Although the contract has been renewed every five years, the district has refused the to budget any increase in the sum. In addition, the city performs the regulatory duties of the district. While not providing support to the city for performing regulatory inspections, the district annually budgets $50,000 to Ramsey County Conservation District to do regulatory inspections in Washington County.

The first generation watershed district July, 1974 comprehensive plan recommended ground water allocation - White Bear Lake Area project. Adequate long-term protection of recharging the Jordan aquifer (White Bear Lake) the most important groundwater supply source in the area is essential to water resource management. The budget does not fund development of a model to maintain the present size and quality of White Bear Lake for future generations.

There is greater need to coordinate district resources with other units of government; providing assistance to municipalities to ensure the design and operation of storm water and ditch systems; and determination of the volume and source and flowage of ground water supplies of the Washington County basin.

Some budget items, in my opinion, are not high priorities. For example, last years budget provided $50,000 for wetland bank site feasibility investigations. A technical memo dated April 4, 2018 identified fourteen potential sites list. Thirteen of these sites are in Anoka County and twelve of the sites are privately owned. These sites were reviewed and screened to credit estimates and development cost estimates. The sites were scored and ranked. The four highest ranked sites were all privately owned, located in Anoka County, three were located in the City of Columbus, and families of watershed district managers owned two of them.

This budget contains $100,000 to continue development of the four sites. I do not recognize an immediate need for this expenditure. Unnecessary budget items like fund 60-27 expand the budget to collect more revenue. A second
example of an unnecessary item is the salary increase for the administrator. Last year the budget provided a $10,000 increase for the salary of the administrator. This year salary survey of watershed administrators indicated the $109,000 was in the low or high end of the survey. I did not vote the $21,000 salary increase.

I support permanent budget rules which clearly state all tax collected in a county be spent in the county in which the tax was collected. Using the budget increase mechanism to increase tax collection from Washington County to $928,805 does not provide $928,805 spent in Washington County.

I do not support the resolution.

Manager Haake stated that Ramsey County is paying 52.08%, which she thinks is similar to last year. She asked if staff could send her the past progression of their portion.

Manager Bradley stated that because he did not have Manager Waller’s comments ahead of time, he isn’t fully prepared to discuss all of the points. He stated that there are a few that he would like to discuss. He stated that he does not believe that the District is seeking an 8.8% increase based on home values. He stated the RCWD may not have been doing its job in the 1990s, but he feels it has been doing its job for the last decade or more. He stated that he feels past grievances should be set aside and let the District continue to do the great work that it has been doing. He stated that it is impossible to isolate and spend, for example, 52.08% in Ramsey County and 19.7% in Washington County, when so much of the work benefits the entire District. He stated that to address the wetland issue, his recollection is that the District decided to use property owned by the watershed. He stated that to address Manager Waller’s point about how much the staff is paid, the District hires outside experts to give the Board the appropriate range of salaries and he believes this is being managed properly.

Manager Haake asked Manager Waller to get copies of his statement to the Board.

Manager Waller stated that he intends to call the question so there isn’t a long debate.

Manager Wagamon stated that he agrees with everything that Manager Bradley stated. He asked Manager Waller if he felt any of Manager Wagamon’s own family members should be precluded from doing the same as any other resident of that County and apply for a land bank.

Manager Waller stated that he has called the question so it cannot be discussed.

District Attorney Holtman clarified that per Robert’s Rules of Order, to call a question would need a motion, with a second, and 2/3 vote.
Motion by Manager Waller, seconded by Manager Haake, to call the question.

Manager Waller stated that he felt this was something better discussed in a workshop setting.

Manager Wagamon disagreed because Manager Waller had made his statement in this forum.

Manager Haake made a point of order that she had seconded the motion, which should stop the debate. District Attorney Holtman affirmed that with Manager Haake’s second, the motion is on the floor and non-debatable.

ROLL CALL vote to call the question:
Manager Waller – Aye
Manager Haake – Aye
Manager Bradley – Aye
Manager Wagamon – Aye
President Preiner – Aye
Motion carried 5-0.

ROLL CALL vote on the main motion resolution 2018-25:
Manager Waller – Nay
Manager Haake – Aye
Manager Bradley – Aye
Manager Wagamon – Aye
President Preiner – Aye
Motion carried 4-1.

3. Consider Bald Eagle Lake Water Management District - Certification of charges to counties -Decision/Resolution (Phil Belfiori).

Administrator Belfiori stated that the estimated cost will be $65,000 for certification charges for Bard Eagle Lake Water Management District. He noted that included in the packet is a table that shows the landowners in Washington, Ramsey and Anoka Counties that will be charged.

Motion by Manager Haake, seconded by Manager Bradley, to adopt Resolution 2018-26: Certification of Charges Bald Eagle Lake Water Management District.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Board as follows:
1. Table 1 attached hereto and made a part hereof by reference identifies parcels of real property lying within the charge area of the Bald Eagle WMD and the charge to each parcel for the 2019 implementation program.

2. The Board authorizes and directs the District Administrator, before the certifications are submitted, to confirm that the charges are consistent with the most recent parcel records available, to make any necessary adjustments on the basis of those records pursuant to established charge criteria, and after certification to report to the Board on any adjustments made.

3. The Board hereby certifies said list, as it may be adjusted by the Administrator, and requests that the Anoka County Auditor, Ramsey County Auditor, and Washington County Auditor include in the real estate taxes/assessments due the amounts set forth in Table 1 with taxes/assessments due and payable.

4. The District Administrator is directed to tender a certified copy of this Resolution to the Anoka, Ramsey, and Washington County Departments of Property Records and Revenue along with the identified parcels in a form as prescribed by each County, and to take such further steps as are required to effect the collection of charges provided herein.

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

*Motion carried 5-0.*

Manager Wagamon questioned whether the official resolution language needs to be read aloud into the record.

District Attorney Holtman stated that he would like to consult the Bylaws, but that even if the Bylaws do specify the reading, when a resolution is not read, unanimous consent to waive the reading can be presumed. He stated that the Board can establish how it would like it done, including whether the Board would like the resolutions reproduced in the minutes.

Manager Waller, in order to clarify it for the record, read aloud the descriptions of Resolution 2018-25 and Resolution 2018-26.
District Attorney Holtman stated that as a matter of statutory language the Board President is asked to explicitly state that at the December 12, 2018 meeting there will be an agenda item that will allow the public to comment on the budget and levy.

Manager Waller confirmed that the Board can lower the budget between now and the December 12, 2018 meeting, but cannot raise it.

President Preiner stated that there will be a public meeting on the District’s budget and the levy adopted today on December 12, 2018 in conformance with Minnesota State Statute 275.065.

4. **Consider Proposal for conducting Salary Survey.**

Administrator Belfiori stated that the Board discussed this item at the August 6, 2018 and August 22, 2018 workshops, and at the August 8, 2018 Board meeting when the request for qualifications (RFQ) was approved. He stated that the District is partnering with the South Washington Watershed District and Capital Region Watershed District on the approved RFQ for human resources consulting services for salary administration and job classification. He stated that the watershed districts held a joint meeting to review the firms that responded to the RFQ and made a recommendation to contract with Gallagher Human Resources and Compensation Consulting Practice. Staff is recommending that the Board approve Gallagher Human Resources and Compensation Consulting Practice to complete the Phase One objectives identified in the RFQ. He noted that the Phase Two activities will be considered after the completion of Phase One and will require a separate action. He noted that this is included in the 2018-2019 budget and is capped at $6,000.

President Preiner stated that she thinks this a great idea for the watershed districts to work together since they all need the same information.

**Motion by Manager Wagamon, seconded by Manager Bradley, to approve hiring Gallagher Human Resources and Compensation Consulting Practice to complete Phase 1 of the Board approved RFQ and authorize theAdministrator to approve a more detailed workplan that generally aligns with the attached proposal dated September 4, 2018. Motion carried 5-0.**

Manager Haake stated that when consultants compare salaries for a watershed district, they take into consideration anybody within any governmental department. She stated that she does not feel the administrator has as many duties as a city manager or a county manager and wouldn’t be comparing apples to apples. She stated that she doesn’t like taking into consideration those salaries and trying to equalize it for a watershed district administrator. She stated that she would like the comparison to be made among the 46 watershed districts that exist in the State.
Manager Wagamon stated that he believes it should be up to the consulting firm to know which salaries should be considered.

5. Consider Partial Payment #5 in the amount of $542.28 to North Pine Aggregate, Inc. for work completed under this pay request related to the Anoka County Ditch 53-62 Branch 2 Repair Project.

Administrator Belfiori stated that staff recommends approval.

Motion by Manager Haake, seconded by Manager Waller, to approve Partial Payment #5 in the amount of $542.28 to North Pine Aggregate, Inc. for work completed under this pay request related to the Anoka County Ditch 53-62 Branch 2 Repair Project. Motion carried 5-0.

District Engineer Otterness stated that they are waiting for the final close out items from the contractor before the project can be considered fully complete.

6. Consider Check Register dated September 12, 2018, in the amount of $49,149.98 prepared by Redpath and Company.

Motion by Manager Wagamon, seconded by Manager Bradley, to approve check register dated September 12, 2018, in the amount of $49,149.98, prepared by Redpath and Company. Motion carried 5-0.

ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION AND INFORMATION

1. District Engineer Update and Timeline.

   District Engineer Otterness stated that one of the projects that is ongoing is the Oasis Pond Iron Enhanced Sand Filter. He stated the contractor was delayed getting the necessary equipment on the site to finish, but they are now back on site. He noted that it is nearing completion and should have a trial run of the pumps soon.

2. Managers Update.

   Manager Waller stated he attended the Legislative Water Commission meeting on August 22, 2018 and August 29, 2018. MAWD Director Emily Javens was in attendance and discussed representation on the Drainage Work Group from the urban areas. He also attended the Forest Lake Stormwater workshop and tour which had a good attendance.

   Manager Bradley also attended the Forest Lake Stormwater workshop and tour.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion by Manager Haake, seconded by Manager Waller, to adjourn the meeting at 10:32 a.m. Motion carried 5-0.