The Board convened workshop at 2:00 p.m.

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

Absent: None.

Others: Administrator Phil Belfiori; Public Drainage Inspector Tom Schmidt (portion of meeting); Office Manager Theresa Stasica (portion of meeting); Inspector Elizabeth Hosch (portion of meeting); Permit Coordinator/Wetland Specialist Nick Tomczik (portion of meeting); Technical Specialist/Permit Reviewer Chris Buntjer (portion of meeting); District Engineer Mark Deutschman— Houston Engineering (HEI); District Attorney Chuck Holtman-Smith Partners (portion of meeting); District Attorney Kale Van Bruggen - Rinke Noonan (portion of meeting).

Discuss Rinke Noonan US EPA rule comments.

District Attorney Kale Van Bruggen reviewed Rinke Noonan’s written comments on behalf of RCWD, several other watershed districts, counties and cities. He asked the Board if they had any additions or would like to send the letter on their own letterhead. Manager Haake recommended the Board send under RCWD letterhead the concern that the EPA has still not responded to their conductivity report as outline in the Rinke Noonan letter on pages 3-5. The Board by consensus agreed that Rinke Noonan could send the letter to EPA as drafted and endorsed the comments made in the letter. The Board also agreed by consensus to send an individual letter to the EPA regarding the concern that the conductivity report has not been finalized. They also reached consensus to direct the administrator to contact MAWD to see if they are providing comments or if they would or other watershed districts would like to consider signing on to the letter. If so each could provide funding for the letter.

Discuss status of Anoka County Road/CSAH 21 improvements permit application.

Permit Coordinator/Wetland Specialist Nick Tomczik explained to the Board that they were working with the County to help them provide outstanding information on their incomplete engineer’s report. Staff requested that if the outstanding information was received and the district could review the information, was it acceptable to bring the permit to the September 10th meeting for Board consideration. The Board by consensus agreed that the permit could be brought to the 9/10/14 meeting for consideration if the applicant has provided the necessary information and the District Engineer has reviewed it and deemed the engineer’s report complete. Technical Specialist/Permit Reviewer Chris Buntjer provided the incomplete engineer’s report to the Board.
Follow-up discussion on items from future workshop agenda topics list including additional discussion on RCWD’s regulatory authority and the role of its Local Governmental Units (LGU’s), and discussion on election of officers and subcommittees.

Administrator Belfiori distributed a Smith Partners memo that was provided to the Board at their 6/9/14 workshop regarding RCWD regulatory authority and role of its LGUs. President Preiner responded since their last discussion of this item the Board members were asked to check with their city to see if they would be interested in handling their own permitting. She had checked with the City of Columbus and they were not interested in doing this because they did not have the available staff or expertise. Manager Waller replied that the city of Hugo were very happy with doing their own permitting and the city council would be very happy if some funds were rebated back to them, he felt it was duplicative and a local tax should be spent by the local government. The Board discussed whether it was their responsibility to contact each city or if the city was interested they could contact the District because the District already has an approved process in place in the District’s Watershed Plan. Some managers discussed that one important difference between District and City permitting was that the watershed district provided flood control & drainage over the whole district not just a local interest. District Engineer Deutschman informed the Board that in the District’s WMP there is a part 5b that the city must acknowledge and identify those locations where flows leave the City and are transferred downstream, with an assessment of how the rules applied by the City under current full build out conditions reduce flows if necessary. The Board by majority consensus believed the discussion was completed at this time but if new information were to be brought forward it could be discussed again at a future workshop.

Discussion on election of officers and subcommittees. The Board discussed the current election of officers. Manager Haake spoke to the rotation of officers with a 3-year term limit. Manager Waller recommended yearly rotation of officers which he thought would educate Board members and provide additional experience. Manager Ogata disagreed and wanted the right to elect whichever Board member he thought would represent the District. Manager Wagamon agreed. Managers Ogata, Wagamon, Preiner agreed with the status quo. Manager Haake stated the election of officers is a part of their bylaws and there was a 30-day notice period. The Board by consensus agreed to put the proposed process to revise the bylaws on the Wednesday Board meeting agenda for consideration.

Administrator Belfiori asked about the items 3 & 4 on the list. The managers agreed that item 3 regarding permit “walk-ups” had been discussed under the previous CSAH 21 item and could be removed. Item #4 per diem policy would be discussed at the next workshop. Administrator Belfiori asked about item #5 expanded monitoring program which Manager Waller had requested. The Board discussed the current monitoring plan. District Engineer Deutschman informed the Board that the District’s WMP is generally written and has flexibility and that Lake & Stream Specialist Kocian has a detail monitoring report that is the supplement to the WMP. He told the Board that there are usually 3 purposes why a monitoring station is added: investigative (1-2 samples), specific to a project, and long term trends where most sites are monitored for 10 years. Manager Haake replied this workshop item would be designated to Lake & Stream Specialist Kocian.

Update on Comprehensive Stormwater Plan process in City of Lino Lakes.

District Engineer Deutschman updated the Board on their recent pre-permit meeting with the city’s stormwater engineer at WSB & Associates regarding the City’s proposed Comprehensive stormwater plan process and the City’s proposed outlet for the ACD 55 /72 area. He informed the Board that HEI would be providing to WSB, per their request, the RCWD modeling for the ACD 72 & ACD 55 system.
Update on HEI updated project procedures manual.
Administrator Belfiori informed the Board that HEI has provided an update to their original manual. District Engineer Deutschman replied some of the updates include a detailed project close-out procedure and a detailed permit process.

Follow-up on Bald Eagle Lake Dam 8/11/14 workshop discussion.
Administrator Belfiori stated he had met with Bryan Bear, Jay Kennedy, Jason Boyle, Kent Lokkesmoe and Mark Deutschman. The DNR had not reached an interpretation of the MN Statute 103G.551 provided to them, but on quick analysis the DNR stated that they were not prepared to agree with the District’s interpretation and it would be sometime until they could analyze the situation and provide a definite answer. The DNR verbally agreed there could be a potential partnership as related to development of a grant agreement with the DNR where they could pay 50% eligible project cost. Manager Waller informed the Board that the City of Hugo had written a letter to the St. Paul Regional Water Services requesting them to participate in equal share of that part of the cost of the replacement of the level control structure not covered by DNR dam safety funds or relinquish all rights to surface water appropriations from Bald Eagle Lake. The Board by majority consensus directed District Attorney Holtman to begin a process to draft an agreement between the District and the City of Hugo once the DNR has provided further refinement on the cost of the project and the DNR grant share. Attorney Holtman also noted that it is important to have clarity on the maintenance commitment within the grant agreement, if any, from the DNR.

Follow-up on comments from August 27, 2015 budget public hearing.
Administrator Belfiori directed the Board to the handout in the packet which is the Board approved drainage system management policy memo which outlines the use of WMD funding and is the basis of the funding for the District’s drainage system projects.

Beromo, Inc. purchase agreement.
Administrator Belfiori informed the Board that the Beromo purchase agreement has been extended once and will expire on October 1, 2014. This easement is part of the ACD 53-62 Branch 1 repair. The Board by consensus agreed to the issuing of the check to Beromo for the purchase of the easement.

 Personnel Committee.
The Board discussed the administrator’s performance and agreed by majority consensus to a 4% increase to his salary.

The workshop was adjourned at 4:20 p.m.