



REGULAR MEETING OF THE RCWD BOARD OF MANAGERS

Wednesday, July 8, 2026

Mounds View City Hall Council Chambers
2401 County Road 10, Mounds View, Minnesota
and

Meeting also conducted by alternative means
(teleconference or video-teleconference) from remote locations

Minutes

CALL TO ORDER

President Michael Bradley called the meeting to order, a quorum being present, at 9:00 a.m.

ROLL CALL

Present: President Michael Bradley, 1st Vice-Pres. John Waller, 2nd Vice-Pres. Jess Robertson, Treasurer Marcie Weinandt, Secretary Janet Hegland

Absent: None

Staff Present: Administrator Nick Tomczik, Regulatory Manager Patrick Hughes, Lake & Stream Manager Matt Kocian, Program Technician Emmet Hurley (video conference), Office Manager Theresa Stasica

Consultants: District Engineer Chris Otterness from Houston Engineering, Inc. (HEI) & District Attorney John Kolb-Rinke Noonan

Visitors: Emma Macki & Pete Szurek-City of Mounds View

Visitors monitoring via Zoom: Michael Miller

OPEN MIC/PUBLIC COMMENT

No public comments were made.

SETTING OF THE AGENDA

Motion by Manager Robertson, seconded by Manager Weinandt, to approve the agenda as presented. Motion carried 5-0.

4325 Pheasant Ridge Drive NE #611 | Blaine, MN 55449 | T: 763-398-3070 | F: 763-398-3088 | www.ricecreek.org

**BOARD OF
MANAGERS**

Janet Hegland
Anoka County

Jess Robertson
Anoka County

Michael J. Bradley
Ramsey County

Marcie Weinandt
Ramsey County

John J. Waller
Washington County

READING OF THE MINUTES AND THEIR APPROVAL

Minutes of June 22, 2026, Workshop.

Motion by Manager Hegland, seconded by Manager Bradley, to approve the June 22, 2026, workshop minutes with the following edit: Line 17 “(post 202008)”. Motion carried 5-0.

Minutes of June 24, 2026, Board of Managers Regular Meeting.

Motion by Manager Hegland, seconded by Manager Bradley, to approve the June 24, 2026, regular meeting minutes with the following edits:

- Line 26 under Open Mic/Public Comment, add: “No public comments were made.”
- Lines 141-142: “...under the description for CAPROC Permit No. 26-001, the additional language that acknowledges the concerns that ~~the developer and the neighboring landowner that they will work this out, and~~ have been expressed by the landowners and the representations that have been made by the developer today, and to approve Permit No. 26-001, as outlined in the...”
- Line 175: “He noted that the District was working towards the District’s website being ADA-compliant.”

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 an opportunity for discussion:

Table of Contents-Permit Applications Requiring Board Action

No.	Applicant	Location	Plan Type	Recommendation
25-056	City of Lino Lakes	Lino Lakes	Street & Utility Plan Wetland Alteration Floodplain Alteration	CAPROC 8 items
26-051	HRM Apartment	Roseville	Final Site Drainage Plan	CAPROC 7 items

It was moved by Manager Hegland and seconded by Manager Weinandt, to approve the consent agenda permits 25-056 and 26-051 as outlined in the above Table of Contents in accordance with RCWD District Engineer’s Findings and Recommendations, dated June 29, 2026. Motion carried 5-0.

ITEMS REQUIRING BOARD ACTION

1. Anoka Ramsey Judicial Ditch #1 Repair Report - Scope of Services

Emma Macki, Stormwater Technician, City of Mounds View, and Pete Szurek, Public Works Superintendent, City of Mounds View, introduced themselves. Mr. Szurek explained that they were here representing the City of Mounds View and would be available to answer any questions the Board may have. Mr. Szurek stated that the City of Mounds View was in favor of getting the work done on Judicial Ditch #1. Ms. Macki

69 explained that they had received about \$150,000 from the DNR Relief Grant, and \$5,000
70 of that was specifically for this project to help support education and outreach with their
71 residents.

72
73 Manager Waller asked Mr. Szurek and Ms. Macki if they felt the work would work for
74 them.

75
76 Mr. Szurek stated that they have looked at the preliminary plans and reiterated that they
77 were in favor of getting this work done.

78
79 Manager Waller explained that he understood they were in favor of it, but wondered if
80 they felt it would work for them or if it needed something more.

81
82 Mr. Szurek stated that he believed it would work for them and referenced an area near
83 Greenfield Park, which he felt would be drastically improved with this project.

84
85 District Administrator Tomczik stated that he spoke to Mr. Zikmund, Administrator from
86 the City of Mounds View before the meeting, who also supported the District moving
87 forward with the repair of this system as the City has expended much effort in stormwater
88 management. He explained that for this item, the Board was being asked to approve a
89 change in the scope of services for Houston Engineering for the Anoka-Ramsey Judicial
90 Ditch #1 (ARJD#1) Repair Report. He gave a brief overview of the expected change in
91 scope related to the likelihood that there are Threatened and Endangered species (T&E)
92 within one mile of the proposed work area. Staff recommends approval.

93
94 Manager Weinandt referenced the map on page 39 of the packet and asked if Branch 2
95 goes under the building.

96
97 District Engineer Otterness clarified that Branch 2 Lateral 1 goes underneath the building
98 owned and operated by T-Force Freight. He noted that the cost provided by Critical
99 Connections is a not-to-exceed cost and would help the District get all the rare species
100 information needed to be ready for construction. He stated they held a meeting with the
101 City of Mounds View last month and have been reviewing the plans with them to ensure
102 that everything the District plans will work within the city as well.

103
104 Manager Weinandt asked if the survey was for the entire ditch system or just a specific
105 area.

106
107 District Engineer Otterness answered that it was for the entire ditch system and briefly
108 reviewed how this survey would be completed.

109
110 Manager Weinandt asked if this was the last, or close to the last, ditch that the District
111 had focused on for the last 10-15 years.

District Engineer Otterness stated that they had one more system after this with Ramsey-Washington Judicial Ditch #1.

Manager Weinandt stated that she was very familiar with this system and asked how they planned to deal with the low wetland area by Greenfield Park.

District Engineer Otterness stated the area she was referencing was not public waters, but they did need to consider the Wetland Conservation Act requirements.

Motion by Manager Robertson, seconded by Manager Weinandt, to approve the change in scope of services for the ARJD #1 Repair Report Task Order, not to exceed \$30,000, and further authorizes the administrator to sign the change in scope of services.

President Bradley asked if the District would need wetland credits.

District Engineer Otterness explained that they were not anticipating that wetland mitigation credits would be needed for this project.

Manager Hegland stated that the work order was approved in September, and now they have determined that they need to do the T&E survey. She stated that it sounded like this determination came to light through a database review and asked why that hadn't happened with the original work order.

District Engineer Otterness stated that this was completed as part of the original work order, and they could have done that earlier in their process of developing the repair report, but it wasn't something they would have known about until they began working on the requested work order.

Manager Waller asked for clarification on why they were looking outside of the right-of-way.

District Engineer Otterness stated that there are some circumstances where work may need to be completed outside of the right-of-way, and further that exemptions may not exist within the entire right of way.

Manager Waller asked about the differentiation between the footprint of the ditch and the right-of-way. He asked if District Engineer Otterness was saying that if they were in the actual ditch, they were exempt, but if they were in the spoils pile, they were not.

District Attorney Kolb explained that the District was relying on the DNR interpretation of Statute 85.0895, which does not give a degree of specificity to be able to answer Manager Waller's questions. He noted that the administrative rules that were adopted to implement the statute also do not give that level of clarity. He noted that it basically

157 says that plants on a ditch are exempt. He stated that the District looks at that and
158 thought that clearly those in the ditch, adjacent to the ditch in the original work area, but
159 if they extend out of that, that may not meet how the DNR interprets 'on a ditch'. He
160 noted that right now they were telling the District to proceed with caution.

161
162 District Engineer Otterness stated that within the task order, they have identified a not-
163 to-exceed amount and stated that they would try to narrow the scope as much as
164 possible, to help avoid some of the costs.

165
166 District Attorney Kolb stated that the last few times they have done this, the District has
167 been very careful to document the pre- and post-conditions. He stated that their
168 avoidance plans have worked and they have not damaged the habitat for these plants, so
169 they are able to demonstrate that they can successfully avoid or harm their habitats.

170
171 Manager Waller asked if the chain link fence mentioned by District Engineer Otterness
172 went across the entire ditch.

173
174 District Engineer Otterness stated that there are no fences that cross the ditch, but there
175 are several areas where they are parallel, including the MnDOT right-of-way, which
176 follows the freeway. He briefly highlighted some of the strategies they have developed
177 for dealing with those situations.

178
179 Manager Waller stated that the fences sound like they were within the right-of-way and
180 asked if it was possible to get them set back, so the next time the District comes here,
181 they won't have to do things twice.

182
183 District Engineer Otterness explained that it would depend on the location and noted that
184 he felt there was very little chance that would happen with the MnDOT right-of-way
185 fencing. He stated that for the private property situations, they can have conversations
186 with the landowners to see what may be able to be done.

187
188 Manager Robertson asked if Critical Connections was the only entity that does this scope
189 of work for T&E species.

190
191 District Engineer Otterness stated that the DNR maintains a list of individuals qualified for
192 this type of work. He noted that the list is very small, and of those individuals, there
193 were only a few who had experience with the Anoka Sand Plain, and Critical Connections
194 was one of them. He stated that they had not explored relationships with others
195 because they had had a very strong working relationship with Jason at Critical
196 Connections.

197
198 Manager Robertson stated that she would be interested in seeing what an RFP for these
199 services would look like and whether or not there would be extreme cost differentials.
200

201 ***Motion carried 5-0.***

203 **2. Stream Health Evaluation Program (SHEP) Agreement**

204 Lake and Stream Manager Kocian stated that he was asking for Board support for financial
205 support for the Stream Health Evaluation Program (SHEP), which is managed by The
206 Friends of the Mississippi River. He explained that the SHEP program was a volunteer
207 program that collects macroinvertebrate data on the streams' occupants. He stated
208 that the data SHEP collects complements the other data being gathered by the District
209 and noted that one of the values of this was due to the longevity of the data set, which
210 began in 2006. He stated that this proposed cost was included in the District's approved
211 2026 budget.

212
213 Manager Hegland asked how the District uses this information to make decisions. She
214 stated that it was clear to her that this was interesting and informative information, but
215 would like to have a better idea of how District staff uses it to make decisions about action
216 items or whether or not they have met an objective.

217
218 Lake and Stream Manager Kocian referenced the location near Irondale High School and
219 explained that the chemical and physical monitoring data that they collect can tell the
220 District about a snapshot in time of what is happening with things like phosphorus or
221 sediment. He stated that this can give the District a sense of what may be happening
222 with pollutant loading to a downstream waterbody. He reiterated that the biological
223 monitoring data gives the District a sense of the overall stream health, which
224 complements the District's monitoring program. He explained that this helps them
225 prioritize where they may want to do restoration projects within the stream reaches.

226
227 Manager Hegland asked if the District had always supported the SHEP program.

228
229 Lake and Stream Manager Kocian stated that the SHEP program predated his time with
230 the District, but he was fairly certain that the District had been a financial supporter since
231 its inception.

232
233 Manager Hegland asked if there were other financial supporters of the SHEP program.

234
235 Lake and Stream Manager Kocian stated that his understanding was that the two financial
236 contributors were The Friends of the Mississippi River and the District.

237
238 Manager Hegland asked what the District had contributed in the past and what the
239 proposed increase would be.

240
241 Lake and Stream Manager Kocian stated that last year the contribution was \$24,000 and
242 reviewed the costs over the years. He noted that just looking at 2025 to 2026, that

equated to about a 12% increase, but if you look at the last 17 years, it is also a 12% increase, which meant that on an annual basis it was less than a 1% increase.

Motion by Manager Robertson, seconded by Manager Waller, to authorize the Administrator to enter into an agreement with Friends of the Mississippi River for the Stream Health Evaluation Program, for an amount not to exceed \$27,000.00.

Manager Waller stated that he was a supporter of this and noted that they were looking at the trunk systems. He stated that this was required when the District started the JD 2 project, when they discovered that it was naturally polluted for lack of oxygen because they didn't have these little critters in there. He asked how many stations they had and if they were located near any of the inlets or outlets for the branches that empty into the trunk systems and streams.

Lake and Stream Manager Kocian answered that there were a total of 9 stations and stated that many of the locations were fixed to help preserve their longevity. He noted that there is one located just downstream of ARJD#1 and also one on Hardwood Creek right as it transitions from JD #2 to the creek.

Motion carried 5-0.

3. Check Register Dated July 8, 2026, in the Amount of \$220,571.72 Prepared by Redpath and Company

Motion by Manager Weinandt, seconded by Manager Bradley, to approve the check register dated July 8, 2026, in the Amount of \$220,571.72 prepared by Redpath and Company. Motion carried 5-0.

ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION AND INFORMATION

1. District Engineer Updates and Timeline

2. Administrator Updates

District Administrator Tomczik stated that placed on the dais were the petitions for Project 13-01, the Ramsey County Ditch 2,3,5 Basic Water Management Project per Manager Waller's request. He noted that included were the initial petition and the second petition that brought the City of Roseville into the petition. Jones Lake and ACD 10-22-32 Projects were discussed at the workshop and staff looked forward to the Board's direction. He stated that the Board had discussed holding a special workshop meeting to follow up on the Jones Lake project, and staff would be looking for possible dates for everyone. He stated that at the recent workshop meeting, there was an inquiry about the budget schedule and explained that he had modified the schedule to illustrate the past workshop review and reminded the Board that they had adjusted the schedule

because of the Labor Day meeting. He explained that the Board would see the draft budget at the August 10, 2026, workshop, hold the public hearing on August 24, 2026, and plan to adopt the 2027 budget at the September 9, 2026, meeting and the Truth in Taxation meeting in December.

3. Manager Updates

President Bradley stated per the recently approved workshop minutes, the Board identified the need to bring ACD 10-22-32 to a meeting to consider how to proceed before their meeting with municipalities and the county. He suggested the first meeting in August, while the information is fresh in the Board's minds and all managers are present.

District Administrator Tomczik explained that staff would look at what would work the best and noted that he felt a special meeting may make the most sense since they already had the budget slated for discussion at their August meetings.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion by Manager Waller, seconded by Manager Robertson, to adjourn the meeting at 9:50 a.m. Motion carried 5-0.