The Board convened workshop at 1:00 p.m.

Attendance: –Board members, Patricia Preiner, John Waller, Steve Wagamon, Mike Bradley, and Barbara Haake.

Absent: None.

Others: Administrator Phil Belfiori; Permit Coordinator/Wetland Specialist Nick Tomczik (portion of meeting); Office Manager Theresa Stasica; District Engineer Chris Otterness (portion of meeting) Houston Engineering (HEI); District Attorney Chuck Holtman-Smith Partners (portion of meeting); Drainage Attorney John Kolb-Rinke Noonan (portion of meeting); Nicholas Olson-MnDOT (portion of meeting); Beth Neuendorf-MnDOT (portion of meeting); Jerome Adams-MnDOT (portion of meeting); Bryan Bear (portion of meeting); and Jim Hafner (portion of meeting).

Administrator Belfiori requested the removal of 3:00 Susan Moore update item due to the absence of Public Drainage Inspector Tom Schmidt. Ms. Moore and her consultant were contact this morning. The Board agreed by consensus to the removal.

Administrator Belfiori introduced the District two new employees Lauren Sampedro, District Technician and Ashlee Ricci, District Technical Assistant to the Board.

Discussion on I-35 W design/build project.

Jerome Adams-MnDOT, presented information to the Board regarding their two upcoming proposed design-build projects located in the RCWD. The projects are the I35 split to Forest Lake project and I35W MnPASS project. MnDOT will be submitting permit information for the I35 split in roughly November 2016 with construction scheduled fall 2017-2019. Mr. Adams explained the reason MnDOT was using the design build instead of design-bid-build process is that design build transfers the final design risk to the contractor. MnDOT provides preliminary design with a layout and drainage overlay. The contractor provides the final design and
construction which allows new and innovative ideas from contractors. And MnDOT has
experienced in the past when using this process MnDOT receives the best value and better
contractors. President Preiner questioned MnDOT on how they were going to address the
drainage problem located in front of Freeway Storage where the untreated runoff from I35
creates flooding in front of the property. This has been occurring since the creation of I35 and
she has contacted MnDOT many times asking them to address this problem. MnDOT replied
this project will rebuild two bridges and the rest will be mill and overlay. RCWD permit
requirements do not require water quality/rate control measures since it is a mill and overlay
project. Board members questioned if the area near where AWJD4 crosses I35 be effected.
 Permit Coordinator Tomczik replied the District provided a letter to MnDOT with ACSIC and
culverts sizes for the I35W MnPASS project and currently Houston Engineering is in the process
of developing that information for the I35 split project. Mr. Adams reviewed the MnDOT
document dated 9/8/16 provided to the Board which addressed specific questions District staff
had for MnDOT regarding District permitting process with MnDOT’s design-build method. Mr.
Adams also discussed MnDOT’s cost estimates for RCWD reviewing for both projects which was
provided in their document.

The Board, Staff and MnDOT discussed what the permit process could look like. First the
drainage overview map must be agreed upon with a Board approved/CAPROC then MnDOT
would release for construction (RFC). If there was a substantial change to the preliminary plans
it would come back to the Board for review/amended CAPROC/approval. District Attorney
Holtman noted that in approving a permit for the proposed work, the Board of Managers would
need to delegate to the Administrator the authority to approve the subsequent RFCs as permit
amendments. He added that there is a current resolution delegating certain permit approval
authority to the Administrator that is similar to the delegation needed here and likely will cover
a lot of the necessary ground. It was discussed there would need to be at least a 2 week time
period for review along with a 48 hour notice to the Board. Administrator Belfiori reiterated
the importance of MnDOT incorporating a detailed “pre-screening” cover memo with each RFC
submittal that included a description of what RCWD rule related drainage /water resources
factors were being proposed to be changed by the contractor in the attached revised plan set
and which only includes those revised plan sheets that specific relate to those RCWD rule
related drainage /water resource factors. Staff identified that this could assist for prompter
review by the District. MnDot replied that the RFC would not be released to the contractor
until approved/CAPROC’d by the District. MnDOT informed the District that they will have a
project manager who will be the District main contact for compliance/questions. The
contractor will also provide an inspector. The District will need to decide what level of
inspection will be needed. District Attorney Holtman informed the Board the District will have
to amend their resolution regarding Completeness of Permit application for Board
Consideration to consider MnDOTs design-build process. The District informed MnDOT that the
Board only meets once in November and December so they take that into consideration with
their November submittal.
**Initial discussion on draft MOA with City of Hugo regarding maintenance of Anoka-Washington Judicial Ditch 2.**

Administrator Belfiori reviewed the draft MOA with the Board which is coming due in January. The main changes from the current agreement are for the City to provide to the District an annual work plan and budget. The intent of this is so RCWD drainage staff and City staff can agree to sit down before the next years maintenance work moves forward for a given year and reach agreement on what sections need maintenance. He informed the Board that Public Drainage Inspector Schmidt was in agreement with this approach. Hugo City Administrator Bryan Bear provided a map to the Board showing maintenance done and specific areas the City would like to address. He informed the Board that the system is challenging to work in because it is really wet and work may have to occur in a small window of time. He didn’t want the plan to make the process cumbersome and time consuming. The City has always worked well with District staff. He also discussed with the Board if they wanted to accomplish a larger part of the system maintain, they could discuss with the Council increase funding this year or next. The Board discussed potential funding options if they agreed to additional maintenance in future years and Attorney Kolb identified that the proposed language as currently drafted does provide the Board that flexibility if needed.

**Discussion on City of Blaine request to investigate possible repair/maintenance at Anoka County Ditch 53-62 Branch 1 Lateral 1.**

Administrator Belfiori informed the Board that the City of Blaine has requested an investigation of ACD 53-62 Br 1 Lat 1 in the Ball Road area. Jim Hafner from the City of Blaine outlined the city’s and citizen’s concerns regarding this area. Staff, Board and the City discussed the need to conduct an engineer investigation on the situation described to determine options moving forward and to determine what if any regulatory challenges may exist for those options. The Board by consensus directed staff to provide a task order to investigate.

**Update on proposed RCWD rule revision process.**

Permit Coordinator Tomczik and District Engineer Otterness reviewed the previously discussed proposed rule revisions (public linear reconstruction, BMP locational siting, and water reuse design standards) and the proposed additional rule changes that were not discussed. The Board had questions regarding the additional proposed changes for exemption for single family residential with no roadways. The Board would like to see the final explanation before consideration. The Board by consensus directed staff to draft the final proposed rule revision for their review at their September 28 Board meeting and for their authorization for release for the required public review.

**Requested discussion on audio taping of workshop meetings.**

The Board discussed the need for audio-taping workshop meetings. The District’s approved record retention schedule states audio tapes will be reused or discarded after 1 year and they
are not a permanent record. The Board did not have concerns about audio taping workshop meetings with a records retention schedule of 1 year and agreed that if someone wants to review a tape they are responsible for doing it on their own time and Manager Haake suggested if a manager wanted something included in the minutes that they should inform the minute taker.

**Initial discussion on Buffer Law.**
Administrator Belfiori updated the Board on recent conversations with the Washington Conservation District (WCD). The WCD did an initial analysis of buffer requirements and found around 24 potential sites that needed further field review. Staff identified that this type of information about the potential overall “scale” of the Law would be important for future District discussions. Upon further discussion the Board by consensus requested that Houston Engineering provide a similar analysis that WCD did within the District portion of Anoka County to see what potential buffer areas may need further field review in that area. The Board also requested that staff first contact Anoka Conservation District to see if they have done a similar analysis already.

**Discussion 2016 MAWD annual meeting resolutions.**
Administrator Belfiori informed the Board staff had no recommendations for MAWD resolutions at this time. The Board had no recommendations.

The workshop was adjourned at 4:28 p.m.