The Board convened workshop at 1:04 p.m.

Attendance: Board members, Patricia Preiner, John Waller, Barbara Haake, Harley Ogata and Steve Wagamon.

Absent:

Others: Administrator Phil Belfiori; Water Resource Specialist Kyle Axtell; Education, Outreach and Communication Coordinator Jessica Bromelkamp; District Engineer Mark Deutschman- Houston Engineering, Drainage Attorney John Kolb, Kevin Bendixen-Trend Enterprises Inc., City of New Brighton representative Grant Wyffels, City of St. Anthony representatives Jay Hartman, Mark Casey, and Todd Hubner, City of Roseville representatives: Ryan Johnson and Kristine Giga

Discussion: New Brighton/St. Anthony Basic Water Management Project and Targeted Watershed Demonstration Project Grant

Administrator Belfiori stated that Hansen Park and Mirror Pond are multi-purpose water quality and flood control projects. These represent the low hanging fruit in terms of identified projects to achieve both goals.

District Engineer Deutschman discussed the technical aspects including live and dead storage. He stated the flood control aspects of these projects have not been funded yet. He stated there are four projects: Middle Rice Creek, carp management, Hansen Park, Mirror Pond but today we will focus on Hansen Park and Mirror Pond.

District Engineer Deutschman then stated Hansen Park is located on Ramsey County Ditch (RCD) and is part of the trunk system. When constructed in 1969, it was authorized by the drainage authority (Ramsey County board at the time). The drainage area includes over 5,000 acres. The work outlined in this grant would create additional acre feet of new dead storage and live storage. District Engineer Deutschman stated Mirror Pond has a 234 acre drainage area. The work outlined in this grant would remove sediment as well as adapt the structure to create live storage. These are concepts right now so the numbers may change. a little bit. The water quality and flood control benefits were apportioned using a dead to live storage ratio in the BMPs as a surrogate. No treatment value has been accredited to live storage yet. Reduction in the total permanent phosphorous load has been seen as a regional project in the past by the Board.

Drainage Attorney Kolb defined regional: What does it cost to restore the basic drainage function of the system versus going above and beyond? Regional projects provide something beyond local benefits. For example, they may provide economic benefits by creating a more efficient system that reduces the cost of maintenance, etc. Anytime we get beyond the local benefit, it may be a regional benefit, which may impact who pays.
Manager Waller believes that Anoka-Washington Judicial Ditch 2 (AWJD2) provides a District-wide benefit. When we repaired Washington County Ditch 7 (WCD7), there was not a benefit assessment. This is because it was part of the ad valorem discussion on AWJD2. If we build storage in Hansen Park, taking some of the peak volume out of Long Lake, it is regional benefit.

Drainage Attorney Kolb replied that the historical memorandum for RCD 2, 3, and 5 repairs may not cost that much to address the core conveyance needs, most would be above and beyond. If we create live storage, especially in Hansen Park, to reduce the flood peak in Long Lake, then it is a regional project. If we divide the live storage and allow cities to use it, we will diminish the value downstream and increase the value locally.

District Engineer Deutschman replied the District has not looked at a combination of storage plus changes to the conveyance systems to solve the Long Lake flooding problem.

Administrator Belfiori replied that a discussion with the two cities about how to deal with the spoil for dewatering needs to occur at some point. We still don’t know about the cost because we are waiting for additional engineering results.

It was discussed that the rough estimate of range for the flood control benefit is $1-2.3M. The presentation identified the following possible options the Board could discuss further:

- Option A: Adjust project features during design
- Option B: RCWD pays for all of the flood control benefit using ad valorem funds
- Option C: RCWD pays for a portion of the flood control benefit having “regional or district-wide benefits”

Drainage Attorney Kolb replied that the petition was created because no one entity could solve this issue alone. The District was asked by the Cities to help coordinate these efforts to reduce Long Lake flooding. We are doing things out of sequence because of the grant. The grant identifies two of highest priority projects as identified in both the District and City plans. We are here to figure out how to finance this work. Roseville plans to join the petition.

Drainage Attorney Kolb drafted resolutions to amend the petition by adding Roseville to the petition and allowing implementation of these first two projects out of sequence. Within the resolutions, Alternatives A and B have been included in the draft resolutions of intent (below) to layout possible paths toward developing the share of local cost, if any, that is allocated to the Cities.

(Alternative A) WHEREAS, based on the Watershed District’s analysis, the allocation of costs for regional benefit to the Watershed District will be approximately ____________, and the allocation of costs for local benefit to the City will be approximately ____________, but not to exceed ____________; and

(Alternative B) WHEREAS, notwithstanding the intent of the Council expressed herein, not later than September 30, 2014, the City shall, in coordination with the Cities of
New Brighton and Roseville, commit to an acceptable allocation of local cost of the Mirror Lake and Hansen Park project components of the petitioned Basic Water Management Project; and

Todd Hubmer representative for the city of St. Anthony replied that the cities of St. Anthony and New Brighton are supportive of the projects and wants to be partners. It’s one of the reasons they participated in the interview process for the Targeted watershed grant. They don’t want to lose sight of the flooding issues because it is the Cities top priority. They cannot solve this problem on their own despite spending time and money. The same is true in the City of New Brighton. They cannot fix the problem independent of others. He stated that they favor Alternative B in the draft resolutions of intent documents passed out today at this workshop. He also stated that they are seeking other project partners to help fund this work. There is a concern that if they commit to a number, they won’t be able to include other funding project partners. These Cities have been contributing taxes for many years and contributing via other projects so they are dedicated to helping, but think some of the taxes collected should come back to their area. They are on board with these projects, but it is difficult for them to put a number together right now. More is time needed.

City of New Brighton representative Grant Wyffels replied that they are on board and excited about these projects in the grant, but are still trying to get an understanding of the cost. The projects are very conceptual in nature. They need to communicate details about the projects internally, with their council, and the public at large. They cannot commit to a dollar amount without more information about the projects. They favor Alternative B in the draft resolution of intent because more time is needed. They want to work with the District to understand all of the options on the table.

City of Roseville representative Kristine Giga replied that they are on board with this regional project because Roseville is already having flooding issues near RCD 5. They are not opposed to spending money outside of their city, but their council needs to clearly understand the project benefits and how they impact Roseville. They have been spending money since the 80s on flooding issues. Flooding is Roseville’s number 1 priority right now. They are working on a flood mitigation project right now in the area.

Manager Preiner stated if we choose Alternative B in draft resolution of intent, when will we have more information?

Administrator Belfiori stated that the District could minimize the amount of money spent on the grant until we reach that point of clarity with the City (if the District Board prefers Option C in the presentation which is to have the Cities pay for a part of the regional flood control benefit). If things don’t go well, we could adapt project elements as needed to more focus on water quality design elements.
Manager Ogata questioned can we begin work on aspects that only relate to this grant now with the idea that the flood control work would be postponed if we cannot come to an understanding within this timeline?

District Engineer Deutschman replied the water quality part of these projects enables the flood control parts of the projects.

Manager Waller stated there were several places where flooding occurred. He thinks something needs to be done south of Long Lake too. There are benefits in some of RCWD's most concentrated taxing areas. This work fits the trunk system and ad valorem taxes.

Water Resource Specialist Axtell stated that the District can make amendments to the BWSR workplan if things change.

Drainage Attorney Kolb stated Phases II and III in the petition project sequence will include looking at additional regional projects within RCD 2/3/5 conveyance system. If the District pays in full, they call the shots, if the Cities contribute, they have more say in how the benefits are used.

Manager Waller regrets that we haven't included Fridley in these conversations.

Manager Haake replied it is difficult to get money from BWSR and we don't want to lose this funding.

Drainage Attorney Kolb replied the District can use the time between now and September to determine the answers to these questions. You have money budgeted so you wouldn't be spending grant dollars.

City of St. Anthony representative Todd Hubmer replied these two projects (Mirror and Hansen) were included in the City approved petition so the risk to the District is limited.

Administrator Belfiori replied the Board has a workshop in one week which the Board could use to further discuss this issue. The Board has also noticed a 5/22 special Board meeting to further discuss the draft plan. Given the extension recently granted by BWSR (until June 15) the Board could continue to use all upcoming meetings to discuss next steps. Approval will need to happen at the 6/11 meeting at the latest.

Manager Ogata replied that the Board should discuss it at their workshop on Monday and see if they can come to a conclusion.

The workshop was adjourned at 2:45 p.m.