



| AUGUST |    |    |    |    |    |    |
|--------|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| S      | M  | T  | W  | T  | F  | S  |
| 2      | 3  | 4  | 5  | 6  | 7  | 8  |
| 9      | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 |
| 16     | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 |
| 23     | 24 | 25 | 26 | 27 | 28 | 29 |
| 30     | 31 |    |    |    |    |    |

| SEPTEMBER |    |    |    |    |    |    |
|-----------|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| S         | M  | T  | W  | T  | F  | S  |
|           |    | 1  | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5  |
| 6         | 7  | 8  | 9  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| 13        | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 |
| 20        | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 25 | 26 |
| 27        | 28 | 29 | 30 |    |    |    |

## RCWD BOARD OF MANAGERS WORKSHOP

Monday, August 3, 2026, 9:00 a.m.

Rice Creek Watershed District Conference Room  
4325 Pheasant Ridge Drive NE, Suite 611, Blaine, Minnesota  
Virtual Monitoring via Zoom Webinar

Join Zoom Webinar:

<https://us06web.zoom.us/j/87920604749?pwd=SP1Z2Z1rReGz0eDg7SjNg7M9ztFz6aY.1>

Passcode: 364390

+1 312 626 6799 US (Chicago)

Webinar ID: 879 2060 4749

Passcode: 364390

## Agenda

### ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION

- Jones Lake Project as Part of the BWP Project #2013-01 as Petitioned by the Cities of New Brighton, Saint Anthony, and Roseville
- Solicitation of Interest Notice for Professional Services

Administrator Updates (If Any)

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

**Jones Lake Project as Part of the BWP Project #2013-01  
as Petitioned by the Cities of New Brighton, Saint  
Anthony, and Roseville**

# MEMORANDUM

## Rice Creek Watershed District



**Date:** July 28, 2026  
**To:** RCWD Board of Managers  
**From:** Jen Oknich, Project Manager  
**Subject:** Jones Lake Restoration Project

---

### **Introduction**

This packet provides information for a discussion on the Jones Lake Restoration Project, a component of the New Brighton, St. Anthony Village, and Roseville Basic Water Management Project (2013-01) for flood control and water quality petition described below.

### **Background**

The 2011 superstorm prompted the city councils of New Brighton, St. Anthony, and Roseville to petition the District “for the establishment of a phased basic water management project to develop a comprehensive and integrated strategy for stormwater management, flood damage reduction, and water quality enhancement within the Cities that implements a series of project components...”

In response to the petition, RCWD crafted the Jones Lake Restoration Project to align with the Watershed Management Plan. The project meets our directives to seek opportunities to decrease the risk of flooding (F-1, F-2); and improve water quality by restoring ecosystems (WQ-4).

The project has been active for several years, due to the petitioned phases, funding, collaboration with external partners, permitting and nature of the Basic Water Management Project (2013-01).

Currently, staff are looking for Board direction on funding, and approach to addressing the DNR information request. The upcoming August 3 workshop will include a presentation by HEI; complimenting information provided in this packet.

### **Staff Recommendation**

This packet provides information for the Board’s consideration while deliberating the advancement of the Jones Lake Restoration Project. Staff recommend moving forward.

### **Attachment**

Jones Lake Restoration Project Funding Analysis

# JONES LAKE RESTORATION PROJECT

## PROJECT FUNDING ANALYSIS

7/28/2026

**Estimated Project Cost** **\$ 8,050,000**

**Dedicated Project Revenues** **\$ 2,130,000**

|                                       |    |           |
|---------------------------------------|----|-----------|
| MPCA Resiliency Grant                 | \$ | 1,170,000 |
| Ad Valorem Match for MPCA Grant       | \$ | 120,000   |
| Legislative Appropriation (DNR Grant) | \$ | 840,000   |

**Required Remaining Funding (Non-Allocated)** **\$ 5,920,000**

|                             |    |           |
|-----------------------------|----|-----------|
| Match for DNR Grant         | \$ | 840,000   |
| Other non-allocated funding | \$ | 5,080,000 |

### WMD Geography

|                               |  |       |
|-------------------------------|--|-------|
| Approximate Acreage           |  | 5,800 |
| Approximate Number of Parcels |  | 9,000 |

### WMD Charge Scenarios

|                                            | WMD Allocation | WMD Cost/ac | Residential<br>Lot Charge | 3 ac. Commercial Lot<br>Total Charge | 3 ac. Commercial Lot<br>Annual Charge |
|--------------------------------------------|----------------|-------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| 1. Nominal WMD Allocation                  | \$ 1,000,000   | \$172       | \$46                      | \$647                                | \$216                                 |
| 2. 60% WMD Allocation to Remaining Funding | \$ 3,552,000   | \$612       | \$163                     | \$2,297                              | \$766                                 |
| 3. 100% WMD Allocation to DNR Match        | \$ 840,000     | \$145       | \$39                      | \$543                                | \$181                                 |
| 4. 60% WMD Allocation to DNR Match         | \$ 504,000     | \$87        | \$25                      | \$326                                | \$109                                 |

## **Rationale for Charge Scenarios**

1. Nominal WMD Allocation: This is intended to provide quick calculation of landowner burdens for other allocations scenarios considered by the Board. It is not intended to replicate historic cost allocations or a logical allocation of project component costs.

2. 60% WMD Allocation to Remaining Funding: This is intended to replicate local funding distribution for recent water management district charges, specifically, public drainage system repair funding. The 60% allocation has been applied to all non-allocated funding shortfalls, including the required match for the legislative appropriation via DNR flood damage reduction grants.

3. 100% WMD Allocation to DNR Match: This is intended to describe an interim funding allocation to meet DNR grant requirements, using 100% local (WMD) share of costs

4. 60% WMD Allocation to DNR Match: This is intended to describe an interim funding allocation to meet DNR grant requirements, using 60% local (WMD) share of costs, replicating prior WMD allocations.

## **Notes**

1. All parcel cost burdens provided herein are approximate and are based on apportionment ratios for individual lot costs calculated for the RCD 4 WMD.

2. RCWD WMD charges most typically have had a 1-year payback period for parcel charges less than \$300, and 3-year payback for charges greater than \$300. Annualized charge estimates in the table follow this protocol.

3. Annualized charges assume no interest applied. To date, RCWD has not applied interest to any WMD parcel charges.

## **Solicitation of Interest Notice for Professional Services**