**REGULAR MEETING OF THE RCWD BOARD OF MANAGERS**

Wednesday, September 13, 2017

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, Treasurer Steven Wagammon, and Secretary Michael Bradley.

Absent: None.

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

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

Visitors: None.

**SETTING OF THE AGENDA**

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 August 23, 2017 Board of Managers Meeting. Motion by Manager Wagammon, seconded by Manager Waller to approve the minutes as presented with the following correction to the sentence on line 489: “...no one owned up to any responsibility on for it.”

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>16-096</td>
<td>Chris Manning</td>
<td>Lino Lakes</td>
<td>Final Site Drainage</td>
<td>CAPROC 7 items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wetland Alteration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-076</td>
<td>Ramsey County</td>
<td>Arden Hills</td>
<td>After the fact, Bridge/</td>
<td>CAPROC 1 item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Works</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Culvert Crossing,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Floodplain Alteration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CAPROC= Conditional Approval Pending Receipt of Changes

Permit Coordinator/Wetland Specialist Tomczik requested an adjustment to permit 16-096 on page 24 of the agenda packet. On the third line down from the top, he requested the word “subdivision” be replaced with “impervious surface.”

It was moved by Manager Haake and seconded by Manager Bradley to approve the consent agenda as outlined in the above Table of Contents in accordance with RCWD District Engineer’s Findings and Recommendations for permits 16-096 and 17-076, dated September 6, 2017 with staff recommended change to permit 16-096. 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.

No comments.

ADDITIONAL ITEMS REQUIRING BOARD ACTION
1. Consider 2018 Preliminary Budget & Levy Certification- There will be a public meeting on the District’s budget and levy adopted today on December 13, 2017 in conformance with MN Stat 275.065.

District Administrator Belfiori referred to Resolution 2017-22 provided on page 32 of the meeting packet. He reported the total proposed expenditures for 2018 is $7,555,051, compared to $9,289,099 in 2017. Total revenues for 2018 are projected to be $4,943,120, of which $4,383,000 is from the watershed general property tax levy. This represents a zero percent increase to the property tax levy from 2017. The remaining revenue is from RCWD fees, grants, and investment income.
Motion by Manager Haake, seconded by Manager Wagamon, to offer Resolution 2017-22: To Adopt 2018 Budget And Adopt 2018 Tax Levies, and waive reading.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Rice Creek Watershed District Board of Managers adopts a 2018 general fund and plan implementation budget totaling $7,555,051;

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 2018, 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 $4,133,000 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 2018, 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;

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

Motion carried 5-0.

Manager Haake inquired what type of interest the District is getting on investment money.

Administrator Belfiori responded the investments are at Anchor Bank and interest is minimal due to the lower rates since the economic downturn.

2. Consider Bald Eagle Lake Water Management District - Certification of charges to counties -Decision/Resolution.
Administrator Belfiori referred to Resolution 2017-24 provided on page 48 of the meeting packet. He reported the estimated cost is around $58,000, and they are anticipating collecting the same amount. The majority of the revenue would be used to repay the loan for the 2014 and 2016 alum project.

Manager Waller inquired how many years were left on the levy.
Administrator Belfiori responded the levy will expire in 2021 and it will be discussed as part of the ten-year watershed plan revision. He identified that staff have begun initial conversations with Bald Eagle Lake Area Association Board members letting them know it will need to be updated. Staff conversations to date have been that at a minimum the Bald Eagle WMD should be extended to cover the duration of the 10 year MPCA loan payback period related to the alum project. He identified that the loan payment amount is approximately $45,000 a year.

Manager Bradley stated the people on Bald Eagle Lake are hoping to continue the curly leaf portion of the program.

**Motion by Manager Haake, seconded by Manager Bradley, to offer Resolution 2017-24: Certification Of Charges, Bald Eagle Lake Water Management District, and waive reading.**

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 2018 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.**
3. **Consider General Revisions of RCWD Bylaws.**

Administrator Belfiori referred to Resolution 2017-25 provided on page 65 of the meeting packet. He reported in February 2018, The Board decided to revise the By-Laws. Actions following that decision included approving creation a work group, discussion at three public workshop meetings, and authorizing sending out a 30-day notice at the August 9 Board meeting.

*Motion by Manager Bradley, seconded by Manager Wagamon, to adopt the general revision of By-Laws contained in the meeting packet.*

Manager Waller distributed a set of written amendments to the proposed Bylaws. He stated that the proposed revised By-Laws would not effect a substantive revision of the present administrative system. The Notice of Proposed General By-Law Revision fails to reestablish system checks and balances to administration of RCWD Board of Managers. The following revisions offer comparative advantages as compared with continuing the status quo through the Proposed By-Law Revision. The comparative advantages are: (1) Tighter fiscal controls to equalize spending by earmarking general taxes to the county from which the taxes were collected; (2) The creation of outside oversight of the administration of the Rice Creek Watershed District; (3) The return to the RCWD Board of Managers from the President and Administrator presently delegated powers such as to spend up to $30,000 dollars without notice or vote of the Board of Managers; (4) Mandated rotation of officers to utilize the diversity and talents of managers to meet future opportunities and challenges the watershed district faces; (5) Eliminate the problematic situation of bookkeepers (authorizing expenditure without documentation) and auditors (failure to report expenditure without documentation) caused by employing one consultant for both tasks.

**REVISIONS TO PROPOSED GENERAL BY-LAW REVISIONS**

Article III RCWD OFFICE AND WATERSHED DISTRICT'S BOUNDARIES Add new section:

Section 3: The district shall be divided into three special taxing districts: Hennepin/Ramsey, Anoka, and Washington counties. General tax money collected in each special taxing district shall be spent in that district. If the money is not spent in a fiscal year it shall roll over into the next year.

Article IV BOARDS OF MANAGERS

Section 2: Add sentence: A county shall appoint only one manager from any city or township.

Article V OFFICERS AND BOARD

Section 1: Election of Officers: Strike 1st Vice President and 2nd Vice President positions
Section 2: Officer Vacancies: Add: A county shall have only one manager serving in an officer position. No manager shall serve in the same officer position consecutively. The officer positions shall be annually rotated and each county have a manager in an officer position.

Section 4: Duties of Officers
Section 4b: First Vice President: Strike entire section.
Section 4c: Second Vice President: Strike entire section.
Section 5: Principals for Decision Making: Add: G) The Board of Managers shall alternate consultants hired to make surveys of salary structure.
Section 6: Authorized signatures by Managers: Add: The Board of Managers, at regular board meeting, must authorize any expenditure exceeding one thousand dollars before dispersal of funds.

Article VI CODE OF ETHICS
Section 8: Investigation and Reports: Strike entire section and replace: (a) Managers shall perform their duties with objectivity, impartiality, accountability, and transparency. (b) Complaint: A complaint concerning improper conduct maybe made orally or in writing to the Anoka, Hennepin, Ramsey or Washington County Board of Commissioners. (c) Evaluation and Investigation: Upon receipt of the complaint, a County Board of Commissioners shall conduct an evaluation within 60 days. (d) Consideration of Results and Action: The County Boards of Commissioners shall promptly consider the results of the investigation. If after consideration of the investigation results, the County Board of Commissioners finds the complaint is substantiated, the Commissioners may take further action.

Article VII MEETINGS OF RCVD BOARD OF MANAGERS
Section 6: Chair of the Meetings: Strike second and third sentence and replace: In absence of the President, a temporary chairperson shall be appointed form that meeting by a vote of the quorum of managers.
Section 7: Meeting Format (g): Strike (g) from Section 7 and replace: (g) The Board of Managers shall appoint all committees.
Section 8: Strike entire section and replace: Section 8: Committees of the Board: (a) The Board of Manager may create such committees as necessary to meet the needs of the organization.
(b) Each county shall be represented on all committees.
(c) Staff does not have voting rights on committees.
(d) It shall be the duty of committees to act promptly and faithfully in all matters referred to them and make reports at a future set time/date established by the Board of Managers.

Article XII ANNUAL AUDIT
Add new last sentence: If a public accountant is employed, the accountant must not be for any other purpose.
Article XIV AMENDMENT TO BY-LAWS Section 1: Strike entire section and replace:
Section 1: RCWD BY-LAWS MAY BE AMENDED, repealed, or adopted by a majority of
the Board of Managers upon (30) days written notice of the proposed change in its
entirety during a meeting of the RCWD Board of Managers. Notice of such alteration
or amendment is to be contained in the notice of such meeting and sent to all
counties, cities and towns for comment. The alteration/s or amendment/d must be
passed by a 4/5th's vote of the RCWD Board of Managers.

President Preiner suggested they table this item so that the Board can review these
suggested changes for further discussion.

Manager Haake stated amendments have gone through a specific process and
required notice.

Motion by Manager Haake, seconded by Manager Wagamon, to table the proposed
revisions to a workshop to be determined by the Board president. Motion carried 5-0.

President Preiner stated they had a lot of time for discussion on the By-laws, and
inquired of Manager Waller why he did not come forward with these changes sooner.

Manager Waller explained the revised By-laws were given to them on August 14, 2017,
and are subject to amendment by ordinary process.

4. Consider Procom Pay Request #1 for Carp Management Project.
Administrator Belfiori referred to the memo on page 81 of the meeting packet. He
reported this item was discussed with Lakes and Stream Specialist Kocian at the
September 11 workshop, and staff is recommending the total payment of $88,400 for
invoices 1 and 2 submitted by ProCom for services and equipment rendered. The work
included the fabrication, installation, and testing of two barriers at Rice Creek for the
Carp Management Program.

Motion by Manager Wagamon, seconded by Manager Waller, to approve partial
payment to ProCom System S.A. (pay request #1) for the installation and testing of
two portable, low-voltage fish guidance and barrier systems on Rice Creek, in the
amount of $88,400.00. Motion carried 5-0.

5. Consider Final Payment to Veit & Company, Inc. for the Anoka County Ditch 31 & 46
Repair Project.
Administrator Belfiori referred to the memo on page 103 of the meeting packet. He
reported work was completed to receive an early completion incentive of five percent.
Staff recommends authorization of the final payment in the amount of $22,700.82 to
Vei & Company, Inc.
Motion by Manager Haake, seconded by Manager Waller, to approve Veit & Company, Inc’s final pay request as submitted and certified by the District Engineer and directs staff to issue a payment in the amount of $22,700.82.

President Preiner inquired if the job could have been accomplished without the incentive option.

Administrator Belfiori responded the contractor was very aware of the incentive deadline and was working hard to meet it.

District Engineer Otterness stated they provided an incentive because of difficult site conditions and the engineer feels the cost for the incentive was a good value. The District got an extra year out of the project because the final completion date without the incentive was nine to twelve months later.

Manager Waller inquired if they would recommend a similar incentive again with future projects.

District Engineer Otterness responded it would depend on the circumstances, but would be useful with a similar project and site conditions. Administrator Belfiori agreed.

Motion carried 5-0.

6. Consider Resolution Related to Delegating Permitting Authority to Administrator.

Permit Coordinator/Wetland Specialist Nick Tomczik referred to Resolution 2017-23 provided on page 107 of the meeting packet. He reported this proposed Resolution supersedes Resolution 2009-09 that was previously adopted by the Board. A revised resolution has been distributed that includes a revision to the draft that was provided at the September 11, 2017 workshop meeting. The revisions include a new No. 4, and renumber from that point. It is specific to Rule G for subsurface crossings under a public drainage system when the ACSIC has been established, and under a creek or major watercourse.

Manager Haake inquired if they could refer to the Resolution as 2017-23b so that the changes are noted since the revisions were not included in the packet.

Permit Coordinator/Wetland Specialist Nick Tomczik commented it is not necessary since the complete document would be voted on and signed, at which point it would be the document endorsed by the Board.
Administrative Belfiori stated once the document is voted on and signed, it will also be incorporated into the District’s policy manual and that is what will be referenced by staff in the future.

Manager Waller commented the meeting packet on the website shows the original Resolution, not the revised Resolution. He inquired if it was possible to include the revised motion in the meeting packet on the website.

Permit Coordinator/Wetland Specialist Tomczik agreed there could be some confusion. However, the purpose of putting out the agenda is to identify items that will be discussed. If someone is interested in this topic, they will see the approved document in the Board minutes.

District Attorney Holtman commented that it is not unusual that a document in the packet is revised for approval, whether by distribution of a revised document or by an amendment in the motion to approve. An interested party can’t rely on the packet document but must review the minutes or the official signed document. The Secretary signs the document to confirm it is the action that the full Board approved.

**Motion by Manager Haake, seconded by Manager Preiner, to offer Resolution 2017-23: Delegating Permitting Authority to the Administrator (Superseding Resolution 2009-09).**

**THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED** that the District Board of Managers hereby delegates to the District Administrator the authority to make permit decisions on behalf of the Board under the following circumstances:

1. **Rule C:** An application for construction of a single-family detached dwelling, in any case where a permit or approval is required; or single-family residential subdivision meeting the criteria of Rule C.2(g). This delegation includes the authority to administer Rule F requirements as imposed by Rule C.10(d).

2. **Rule D:** All applications for an erosion and sediment control permit.

3. **Rule E:** All applications for a floodplain alteration permit.

4. **Rule G:** All applications for subsurface crossing of: (a) a public drainage system when the District has established an as-constructed and subsequently improved condition (ACSIC) elevation at that location, or (b) a creek or major watercourse.

5. **Rule I:** Applications for a permit for work affecting an existing public or artificial private drainage system (open and tiled elements) that does not alter design hydraulic capacity; risk significant wetland or water quality impact; or require an
individual permit from the DNR or the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, or wetland replacement under the Wetland Conservation Act.

6. Application for a previously approved but expired CAPROC or permit, if project scope and applicable rules have not changed substantially (as defined in item 8).

7. Application to assign a CAPROC, or assign or renew a permit.

8. Amendment of an outstanding CAPROC or permit that does not exceed any of the following (these items define “no substantial change”):
   - Changes in the on-site drainage patterns or stormwater network (private) on site, provided there is no change in what is treated by the BMPs and no change in what leaves the site.
   - Changes to proposed buildings (locations, layouts, alignments, dimensions and footprint) provided drainage patterns are not affected and stormwater treatment is not diminished (i.e. do not diminish volume control or water quality treatment and do not increase peak runoff rates).
   - Changes to proposed BMPs (locations, layouts, alignments, dimensions and footprint) provided stormwater treatment is not diminished (i.e. do not diminish volume control or water quality treatment and do not increase peak runoff rates).
   - Changes to proposed BMP pretreatments (locations, layouts, alignments, dimensions and footprint) provided stormwater pre-treatment is not diminished.
   - Changes to proposed BMP proprietary brand provided that stormwater treatment is not diminished.
   - Changes to erosion control plan components (e.g. type, location, dimension, etc) provided that overall function is not diminished.
   - Changes to proposed project feature locations, alignments and dimensions provided there is no net increase in floodplain fill and no increase in water surface elevations.
   - Amendments to Board-approved wetland replacement plans adjusting wetland replacement design (layouts, alignments, dimensions and footprint) provided replacement requirements are met.
   - Amendments to Board-approved wetland replacement plans reflecting changes to wetland impact (layouts, alignments, dimensions and footprint) provided that there is no increase in wetland impact or change to type of wetland impacted.

THEREFORE BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that permitting delegations 1 through 6, above, will be subject to the following procedures:

1. The delegation does not apply if a variance is required.
2. Staff should provide public notice for staff-issued permits to the same extent as for Board-issued permits.

3. On determining that an application is complete and subject to a delegated Administrator decision, staff will provide email notice (applicant’s name, project location, and general proposed project) to the Board. A Board member will have 48 hours in which to comment on the application. The Administrator will make no decision on the application until the expiration of the 48-hour time frame.

4. On timely written request of an interested party, a permit application otherwise suitable for staff determination will be brought before the Board. In advance of Board consideration, staff will make reasonable attempts to determine and address the concerns of the requesting party.

5. On request of a Board member, or on the Administrator’s determination that an application raises a technical, policy or legal question that should be considered by the Board, a permit application otherwise subject to the Administrator’s delegated authority will be brought before the Board.

6. On written request of an interested party addressed to District staff and received by staff within seven days after the date of a final staff determination on a permit application, the determination shall be brought before the Board for reconsideration, unless the timing of the next regular Board meeting would not allow Board reconsideration within the deadline established by Minnesota Statutes §15.99.

7. The Administrator quarterly shall present to the Board a report on District permitting activity describing permit applications submitted, disposition of applications, types of permits issued, locations of permitted activities, significant policy and programmatic issues arising under the permit program and constituent satisfaction with staff-issued permit procedures.

8. In implementing staff permitting authority, the Administrator will identify policy issues that arise and periodically bring those issues to the Board for consideration.

**THEREFORE BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED** that the Administrator is delegated the following additional authorities to implement the District regulatory program on behalf of the Board:

1. Authority to sign maintenance agreements, maintenance declarations, easements, escrow agreements and amendments to these.
2. Issuance of compliance orders (including stop work orders) with a duration of up to 15 calendar days or the next scheduled regular RCWD Board meeting, whichever greater. The delegation is limited to cases where:
   a. Substantial harm to the environment, public safety or property is occurring or threatened;
   b. The harm is or will result from the violation of a District statute, rule, permit, order or stipulation; and
   c. If the harm is threatened, it is likely to occur before the Board can meet to deliberate and issue an order.

The Administrator may subdelegate this authority to staff but is responsible to the Board to ensure it is used in accordance with the delegation.

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

*Motion carried 5-0.*

7. Consider Check Register dated September 13, 2017, in the amount of $97,159.96 prepared by Redpath and Company.

*Motion by Manager Wagamon, seconded by Manager Bradley, to approve check register dated September 13, 2017, in the amount of $97,159.96, prepared by Redpath and Company. Motion carried 5-0.*

**ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION AND INFORMATION**

1. **District Engineers Update and Timeline.**

   District Engineer Otterness provided an update on Halls Marsh. He reported they are a little over half way done with the project and have encountered many challenges along the way. The conditions are different than what was anticipated, but they have been able to stay on schedule so far. They still hope to have it completed by Thursday and have paid for the residents to be gone through Friday.

   Administrator Belfiori provided an update on the 25/25 open houses. Beth Carreño and Manager Bradley attended a meeting in Anoka County two weeks ago and he attended a meeting in Roseville with Ms. Carreño last night. There is another meeting with VLAWMO and the Cities of White Bear and Mahtomedi in a couple of weeks in White Bear and there is an open house in Stillwater next month.
2. **Managers Update.**

Manager Waller stated he read the letter sent to the Minnesota Commercial Railway (MCR). It clarified the District’s position, but did not expand well on the District’s affirmative position. He agrees that the District can legally spend public funds only for water resource purposes, but does think there are some water resource purposes involved in the situation, such as cleaning out the channel below the bridge. He referred to page 16 of the August 23, 2017 meeting minutes, line 508, and pointed out he requested they discuss with the MCR what the water quality aspects are and how the proposed replacement would improve navigation. The District grants funds for improvements on private property and there is room to work out a policy to provide for areas that are not altered natural watercourses.

Manager Waller stated he attended the Washington County Consortium and was pleased to learn that Rice Creek was not included as having problem areas. He has also visited with cities about getting their plans completed.

Manager Waller stated he visited Halls Marsh and learned there was six inches of asphalt on the driveway, the material dredged from the swamp was nice material, and it seemed the project was going well.

Manager Bradley stated he attended the meeting in Anoka. He believes the purpose of some of the meetings is to generate public interest in water quality, but does not think anything will actually come directly from them.

Manager Bradley stated a note was sent to One Bald Eagle in violation of requirements to have a permit. He advised the man building in this area has been cited for other permit violations and District staff should monitor compliance.

Manager Bradley advised he will address the railroad topic when there is a specific issue before him.

Manager Waller agreed the railroad will be a longer process and looks forward to working with Manager Bradley on it.

Manager Haake requested clarification on the Minnesota Commercial Railway.

Administrator Belfiori explained at the last meeting the Board specifically directed that a letter be prepared consistent with the Board’s direction, and reviewed by President Preiner before being sent. This was done and it identified that the RCWD is available and has spent a lot of time to assist in the technical review related to the potential regulatory permits for either short term proposals or long term permanent solutions. Staff has talked with MCR and offered modeling that provides hydraulic design
information to MCR engineers in order to understand the flows. This will help MCR to
design an efficient short term and permanent solution. The letter also stated that
District staff will continue to meet with MCR, and provide technical assistance in
relationship to the District’s role as a regulatory entity, but that the Board does not have
another role in it.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion by Manager Haake, seconded by Manager Wagamon, to adjourn the meeting at 9:38
a.m. Motion carried 5-0.