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

Attendance: Board members, Patricia Preiner, John Waller, Mike Bradley, Steve Wagamon, and Barbara Haake (arrived 1:10 p.m.).

Absent: None.

Others: Administrator Phil Belfiori; Public Drainage Inspector Tom Schmidt (portion of meeting); Water Resource Specialist Kyle Axtell (portion of meeting); Permit Coordinator/Wetland Specialist Nick Tomczik (portion of meeting); Office Manager Theresa Stasica; Technician Samantha Kreibich (portion of meeting); Technician/Inspector Catherine Nester (portion of meeting); District Engineers Mark Deutschman and Chris Otterness and Garrett Monson (portion of meeting) – Houston Engineering (HEI); Drainage Attorney John Kolb-Rinke Noonan (portion of meeting); District Attorney Chuck Holtman-Smith Partners via telephone (portion of meeting); Katie Thompson-WSB and Associates (portion of meeting); Floreen Meyer (portion of meeting); and City of St. Anthony: Mayor Jerome Faust, Engineer Todd Hubmer, Manager Mark Casey (all City members portion of meeting).

Discussion on preliminary 2016 budget.

Administrator Belfiori reviewed the proposed schedule for budget planning. He reviewed the budget and fund balance worksheets with the Board, which showed encumbered/designated funds for future district projects.

The Board discussed the importance of informing the public that instead of bonding or raising the levy, the Board has chosen to increase the fund balance to cover approved future projects. An idea was to provide a footnote showing the reserve/fund balance. Administrator Belfiori reported back to the Board on his findings of what the budget numbers would look like if there was an increase to the total levy amount while keeping the levy rate and levy impact the same as last year per the consensus of the Board at the June workshop meeting. In doing this research, he needed to contact each county to find out the estimated market value/tax capacity for this year. The counties did not have this information at this time so the preliminary information he gave to the Board was a very rough estimate. The next round of rough predictions from the Counties may be available in time for noticing the public hearing for the 2016 preliminary budget. The Board also discussed the idea of a budget line item for maintenance of the District’s trunk system similar to the district’s annual maintenance fund for Washington County Judicial 2. The Board also reached consensus that the next preliminary 2016 budget should include the increase to the tax levy based on rough predictions from the Counties available at that time, a specific ditch maintenance fund for each system, and that their August 10th workshop will begin at 1 p.m. to discuss the budget.
Discussion on Houston Engineering, Inc. (HEI) technical memo on inspection of private ditch near Rice Lake.

District Engineer Garrett Monson provided a brief presentation/overview of their inspection findings to the Board. The engineer’s conclusion is that the Meyer property flooding is not due to the Rice Lake outlet but by a blockage on a private ditch downstream of the Meyer property and upstream of the outlet. He reminded the Board that this ditch is a private ditch and past practice is that the District has provided this type of data to the private landowners and or the City. Manager Waller provide history of development and drainage in the area. The Board also had some additional questions about the state of the public drainage ditch and conservation easements in the area. They also discussed the need to look at the District rules to help prevent situations like this in the future.

Discussion on City of St. Anthony response letter regarding the proposed Mirror Pond project.

District Administrator Belfiori narrated the past activities with the City of St. Anthony regarding this project. A letter was sent by RCWD to the City on June 10, 2015 which included 12 points that identified basic terms of an agreement to go forward with the project. The District and City Staff met and discussed these items. On July 7, 2015 the City of St. Anthony replied with a counter offer. The City agreed to 11 of the 12 points, the exception being that they didn't agree with the financial funding of the project.

City of St. Anthony Mayor Jerome Faust thanked the Board for working with the city on this important project. After the recent District and City staff meeting, it was agreed that a value engineering alternative exists to reduce the project cost to $1.4 million. The City proposes that the District contributes $892,000 of grant funds to the project, and the City and District split 50/50 of the remaining project cost, with the District share not to exceed $250,000. The City will be responsible for any overages.

The District discussed the funding alternatives and the importance of the project with staff. The Board’s majority consensus is to move the project forward and bring an action item for Board consideration to the July 22nd meeting accepting the City of St. Anthony’s 7/7/2015 counterproposal and direct staff to work on an agreement.

Discussion on the draft HEI technical memo related to the proposed Comprehensive Stormwater Management Plan (CSMP) for the Northeast Area of Lino Lakes and discussion on Minnesota Statutes 103E management considerations.

Permit Coordinator/Wetland Specialist Nick Tomczik updated the Board on the City of Lino Lakes’ intent for development in the ACD 55 & ACD 72 area; noting the current agricultural use, potential adverse impacts of development, and Lino Lakes’ interest in an alternative method for a city or road authority to meet the standards of the stormwater rule. The rule revisions also include a shift to focus on the Resource of Concern (ROC) of the watershed; in some alignment with MS4 requirements. Lino Lakes’ project is all within the Peltier ROC. The city has provided modeling for its proposed project geographic area. Design details with the city still need to be resolved. The project, involving construction of an outlet for a subwatershed to Peltier Lake that currently drains through highly constrained tiles, would require a Rule I permit. Rule I allows the outlet only if there is no “adverse impact” upstream or downstream. The modeling demonstrates that adverse impact will occur and the proposed elements of the CSMP are the city’s means of alleviating the adverse impact. The project will also need to address the division of two public drainage systems, WCA, Erosion control, other
District rules and all MN Statutes 103E provisions. District Engineer Deutschman informed the board that HEI drafted a technical memo to the city. The memo concludes that certain mitigation is required to avoid adverse impact, and this mitigation would be a condition of any permit. The memo is requesting design details that need to be resolved, information about the regional storage proposed and how mitigation will be provided and the design of the proposed facility and how the gates will work. There are still many details to work out, including how the concept will be built on the ground. District Attorney Holtman also noted that a part of the subwatershed lies in the City of Hugo; the modeling assumes a limit on the peak flow entering the system from the City of Hugo and this limit will need to be one that can be maintained through Hugo’s local plan commitment or otherwise. He noted the importance of Lino Lakes coordinating with Hugo on this. Drainage Attorney Kolb briefed the Board on MN Statutes 103E drainage management procedures the city would need to follow to modify or possibly abandon parts of ACD 72 and 55. Permit Coordinator/Wetland Specialist Nick Tomczik stated the tech memo was sent to Lino Lakes & consultants, offered a meeting and identified the need for permits.

**Update/discussion on the proposed City of Hugo local water plan.**

District Technician Samantha Kreibich updated the Board on the review of the plan. The City was requesting taking over the maintenance of Anoka-Washington JD3, as it does for Washington JD2. However, the City was not clear on the funding mechanism for the maintenance. Ms. Kreibich noted that transferring maintenance responsibility to the City does not relieve the District of its responsibility as drainage authority or deprive it of its authority to regulate work in the drainage system under its rules. Also, there is currently no approved profile for this ditch system. District Administrator Belfiori stated the City also has requested the authority to approve its own Comprehensive Stormwater Management Plans (CSMP) under Rule C.5(f). Attorney Holtman explained that CSMP authority encompasses two different things. The first is when a city wishes to construct regional stormwater facilities for development that is anticipated within a certain area, and documenting the intent to use those for regional compliance. The second involves creating a rule overlay for a defined area that will apply in place of the specific terms of District Rule C. Attorney Holtman advised that the first of these would be a permissible authority to vest in Hugo. He advised that the second of these, however, is actually a rulemaking activity that he would advise against transferring to Hugo and that the District actually may not have the legal authority to transfer. The Board by consensus discussion said they initially agreed with the attorney’s recommendation.

**Discussion on administration under resolution 09-05.**

Permit Coordinator/Wetland Specialist Nick Tomczik summarized to the Board the contents of the District Resolution 2009-05 which states in part if there is not a resolution of the problem within the 10-day notice period the District will issue a compliance order. He informed the Board, in the various situations, waiting past the 10-day period can be beneficial. If there is communication with the applicant and an effort and a potential change for resolution then staff will extend that time period. The Board agreed with the implementation staff has been using.

**Follow-up discussion on HEI memo on Anoka County Ditch 31/46 cost allocation.**

District Engineer Otterness reviewed the cost allocation charts with the Board. After a lengthy discussion the Board by majority consensus agreed that Houston Engineering should re-evaluate the land use to see if a deferred future development charge could be utilized. This item will be on the August 10th workshop for further discussion.
Discussion on proposed MAWD interim office location.
Manager Haake updated the Board on a future need for an interim office location for MAWD due to the executive director retiring, and if they would be interested in making an arrangement. After discussion, the Board believed at this time there was not enough information to consider and that they would revisit this item when a plan was in place.

Discussion on proposed stormwater reuse for irrigation assessment project.
Administrator Belfiori and Technician/Inspector Catherine Nester updated the Board on recent discussion with the Board of Water and Soil Resources (BWSR) for the development of a watershed-scale assessment for stormwater reuse projects. The primary goal of the project would be the reduction of groundwater use for irrigation. After further discussion, the Board by consensus agreed to move forward with a scope of work and proposed grant agreement with BWSR.

The workshop was adjourned at 5:35 p.m.