RICE CREEK WATERSHED DISTRICT

REGULAR MEETING OF THE RCWD BOARD OF MANAGERS

Wednesday, August 12, 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, Outreach & Grant Technician Molly Nelson, Project Manager Jen Oknich, Program Support Technician Emmet Hurley (video conference), Communications & Outreach Manager Kendra Sommerfeld, Office Manager Theresa Stasica

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

Visitors: William Bergeron

Visitors monitoring via Zoom: Jack Davis, Michael Miller, Pauline

OPEN MIC/PUBLIC COMMENT

No public comments were made.

SETTING OF THE AGENDA

Manager Waller explained that he would like to remove item #1 under Items Requiring Board Action because he felt this was premature and he still had questions about the outlet structure and size of the culverts.

Motion by Manager Waller, seconded by Manager Robertson, to amend the agenda by removing item #1 under Items Requiring Board Action.

President Bradley stated that the District knew that this needed to be done this year and stated that this would set the project back by a year, which is why he would vote against this amendment of the agenda.

Manager Robertson referenced the Special Workshop meeting related to this project, and noted that it was her understanding, which was shared by staff, and reiterated by the team at the City of New Brighton, that any costs associated with Critical Connections, the City of New Brighton had offered to cover those costs. She asked if that was referenced in the packet materials. She noted that following the workshop, she had asked Office Manager Stasica to send her audio of the meeting since she had to leave early that day. She stated that she had indicated that she wanted to receive feedback from the DNR on the two alternatives that seemed to have been proposed during the context of the meeting. She explained that she was confused as to why this was placed on the agenda when the District s had not received answers to their questions yet.

President Bradley stated that the costs can be separated and recovered through the WMD, so they would not be charged to the ad valorem, which was option 1. He explained that option 2 was the volunteer statement that the City of New Brighton and/or Roseville would pay for and address it, and had also indicated that after the project, they would do vegetation management in the future.

Manager Weinandt stated that she felt Manager Robertson was indicating that she wanted the answers to the two options presented prior to approving this subcontract. She noted that her understanding was that without the subcontract, a permit cannot be given by the DNR from which the District can get their responses to the two options.

District Engineer Otterness stated that his understanding was that the DNR would require the District to provide additional documentation on the restoration aspect of the project.

Manager Robertson explained that she wasn’t trying to hit pause on the project. She stated that she would like some additional context, whether this item stays on the agenda or not, by having an agreement with the City of New Brighton that memorializes their intent to cover these costs, because that was not indicated in the packet materials.

President Bradley agreed that the District should get an agreement from the City of New Brighton to document what they have offered the District orally, so it is on the record. He stated that he felt the Board should still proceed in getting authorization, so they can work on the little details without stopping the project for another year.

Administrator Tomczik stated that the future requirements are unknown as to what would be required of the District or its partners for the future conditions. He stated that he would be reluctant to take that step to agreement, but acknowledged that an offer had been made.

Manager Waller stated that until there is a determination on the size of the culverts, or if there will be culverts, he felt there wasn't a need to start figuring out what to do with the DNR's lake. He stated that the DNR has not made a formal request, which is why he felt this action was premature and that the District should wait until the DNR, for example, says it wants to see a plant study. He asked why they wouldn't just put in the outlet structure.

Manager Hegland clarified that the motion on the table was to remove the Jones Lake item from the agenda and briefly reviewed the points that were made by the Board and District staff. She stated that if she was understanding this correctly, she felt those issues could be discussed during the agenda item and would support leaving it on the agenda.

Motion failed 2-3 (Weinandt, Bradley, and Hegland opposed).

<u>READING OF THE MINUTES AND THEIR APPROVAL</u>

Minutes of July 22, 2026, Board of Managers Regular Meeting and August 3, 2026, Workshop.
Motion by Manager Hegland, seconded by Manager Weinandt, to approve the July 22, 2026 meeting minutes and August 3, 2026, workshop minutes. 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
26-033	Blaine Ventures, LLC	Blaine	Final Site Drainage Plan Public/Private Drainage System Wetland Alteration Floodplain Alteration	CAPROC 13 items
26-060	Rendova Partnership LLC	Blaine	Final Site Drainage Plan	CAPROC 7 items

Manager Hegland asked about the jellyfish device and if it was included in the draft declaration of stormwater management facilities.

Regulatory Manager Hughes confirmed that this would be included as part of the declaration. He noted that sometimes they have included language related to manufacturer's recommendations for what should be done for maintenance of the filters.

Manager Hegland asked that this information be included now and in the future, so this understanding is clear to all parties.

It was moved by Manager Hegland and seconded by Manager Robertson, to approve the consent agenda Permit 26-033 and Permit 26-060, as outlined in the above Table of Contents in accordance with RCWD District Engineer's Findings and Recommendations, dated August 4, 2026. Motion carried 5-0.

Water Quality Grant Program Cost Share Application

No.	Applicant	Location	Project Type	Eligible Total Project Cost	Pollutant Reduction	Funding Recommendation
R26-07	Chase	White Bear Township	Shoreline Stabilization & Restoration	$29,616.13	Volume: 4,176 cu-ft/yr TSS: 1,685 lbs./yr TP: 1.145 lbs./yr	$10,000.00 not to exceed 50% of eligible project costs or up to $10,000.00.
R26-08	Meier	New Brighton	Raingardens & Native Planting	$12,974.42	Volume: 7,656 cu-ft/yr TSS: 116.58 lbs./yr TP: 0.51 lbs./yr	$6,487.21 not to exceed 50% of eligible project costs or up to $10,000.00.
R26-09	Kippels	White Bear Township	Raingarden	$9,019.50	Volume: 2,558 cu-ft/yr TSS: 33.6 lbs./yr TP: 0.125 lbs./yr	$4,509.75 not to exceed 50% of eligible project costs or up to $10,000.00.
W26-02	Dowdal	Mahtomedi	Green Roof	$21,700.00	Volume: 0.0205 acre-ft/yr TSS: 6.5 lbs./yr TP: <0.01 lbs./yr	$10,000.00 not to exceed 50% of eligible project costs or up to $10,000.00.

Manager Hegland explained that she was intrigued by the green roof project and noted that she believed this was the first one.

Outreach & Grant Technician Nelson stated it was the first one and explained that this had been passed in 2024 as part of the annual program review. She noted that the applicant was also looking to do a shoreland restoration project in the future, which would turn this into a treatment train situation.

Manager Hegland asked if there would be a formal evaluation provided and noted that this kind of seemed like it was a pilot project.

Outreach & Grant Technician Nelson stated that was correct and confirmed that the District would be keeping close tabs on the project. She stated that she could work with the

Washington Conservation District to get a report written up after everything was done and work with the contractor so they are able to see where there were successes or challenges.

Manager Waller stated that he had seen green roofs in Argentina, generally above a restaurant or hotel, but noted that they typically have some type of animal present to trim the grass.

It was moved by Manager Robertson, and seconded by Manager Weinandt, to approve the consent agenda as outlined in the above Table of Contents in accordance with RCWD Outreach and Grants Technician's Recommendations, dated August 3, 2026. Motion carried 5-0.

<u>ITEMS REQUIRING BOARD ACTION</u>

1. Jones Lake Restoration Project - Subconsultant

Project Manager Oknich stated that this item was a portion of the District addressing a petition from New Brighton, St. Anthony Village, and Roseville. She noted that this was a portion of moving the project forward because they need a robust assessment of the current biological conditions there. She stated that this will help the District determine its permitting path and provide the District with something to measure against once the project is complete.

Motion by Manager Weinandt, seconded by Manager Bradley, to accept Houston Engineering's proposed amendment to Task Order 2025-012, revised scope of work for the Jones Lake Final Design and Permitting (Jones Lake Restoration Project) and authorize engagement of Critical Connections Ecological Services as a subconsultant under the terms outlined in the revised scope of work.

Manager Waller stated that he would like to see this contract be put out for bid, so it would be competitive. He explained that Critical Connections Ecological Services was the choice of Houston Engineering, and he didn't have much confidence in their choice.

President Bradley noted that the District had used Critical Connections Ecological Services for something at the last meeting and there weren't any concerns raised about them at the time. He stated that he has offered to sequester all of these costs and recover them through the WMD so there would be no cost to White Bear, Hugo, or Blaine residents. He stated that there was no reason to make the cost a concern for this project, because it was a local cost that had local benefit. He noted that going forward, the cities have stated that they will not abandon the project once it is completed and didn't feel having an MOA would be a problem. He begged the Board to approve this motion so this project can be kept on track and get done. He stated that he felt there would be an appropriate time to nail down how the costs would be recovered.

Manager Waller stated that the District has had problems with the contractor in the past. He stated that he and former Manager Haake had to go down to Environmental Services at the DNR over the $100,000 that it had become. He stated that going to another firm for outside bidding was not an uncommon practice for various projects. He noted that he would like to see a change in the District so they start looking at other contractors that do this type of work.

Manager Weinandt stated that there has been a lot of discussion about this issue and didn't think it was a good use of their time to rehash it again. She stated that Manager Waller was making a statement that would impact all the work the District does and wants a bigger pool of businesses who can provide information to the District. She explained that she would urge the Board to pass this motion so they can continue moving forward on Jones Lake and noted that all the other issues can be dealt with at subsequent times.

Manager Waller called the question.

Motion failed 3-2 (Waller, Robertson, and Hegland opposed.)

Manager Hegland explained that she had intended to offer a friendly amendment to the motion, before it was rushed through a vote, that would have addressed her concern. She stated that her proposed motion was that it would be contingent upon obtaining a written agreement with the City of New Brighton to fund the initial and ongoing requirements for this work.

Managers Weinandt and Bradley stated that they would accept that friendly amendment to their original motion.

Motion by Manager Weinandt, seconded by Manager Bradley, to allow a friendly amendment to the motion to include language that this was contingent upon obtaining a written agreement with the City of New Brighton to fund the initial and ongoing requirements for this work. Motion carried 5-0.

Administrator Tomczik noted that the petition came from three municipalities that benefit from the work and suggested that instead of singling out New Brighton, they change it to partners or something similar.

Manager Hegland stated that she thought New Brighton was the one who had offered to cover these costs, but would support the proposed change to 'partners.'

Manager Robertson asked if Manager Hegland was suggesting that, based on the conversations in the Special Workshop meeting with the City of New Brighton, final approval was contingent on an MOA by New Brighton or the partner cities to cover the upfront and ongoing costs in perpetuity related to restoration.

Manager Hegland stated that was correct and would alleviate her concern.

Manager Weinandt asked if this would hold up the contract until the District received the written MOA.

District Attorney Kolb indicated that, per the motion, it would.

Manager Weinandt stated that meant that the various City Councils would need to approve this action.

Manager Robertson stated that it would depend on the latitude the various City Administrators may have. She noted that she felt this was a fair compromise because it has been a key component of the holdup, and that she would support the proposed amendment.

President Bradley stated that he had already proposed that they recover the costs through the WMD, which meant they wouldn't need the cities to do this. He explained that he felt that approach was better than a contract in perpetuity.

Manager Hegland asked District Attorney Kolb to weigh in on this because her understanding from their discussion was that this wasn't a straightforward pathway and she didn't know how that would work on an ongoing basis.

District Attorney Kolb stated that the cities have to agree, so if they don't agree, then this whole thing will go away. He noted that if they agree to it, they will spread those costs over their entire municipality, and the difference between that and what President Bradley was describing was that if the District takes the cost and spreads it across the WMD charge, then not everyone in those cities will end up paying for it, just the portion of those in the cities that would be benefitted by this project. He stated that he did not think they were there yet, nor could they have a true MOA because they don't know what the obligations are yet. He noted that he had also heard a representative of the city state that they would be willing to take on the costs, which he felt was sincere. He stated that he was okay with the original language for a written agreement because he thinks they will be able to get a commitment from the cities pretty quickly. He stated that Houston Engineering cannot add a subconsultant without Board consent and noted that the costs of the subconsultant were being internalized within the current task order, so there should be no additional cost to the District for this additional work. He explained that he understood the concerns that have been raised by the Board, but they don't even know if there will be subsequent costs, because the project hasn't been established yet. He clarified that there will still be a lot of ground to cover related to Jones Lake, and this proposal will get them to the point where they can have meaningful conversations with the DNR because they have made it clear that this project cannot be done without clear evidence that it was a restoration project. He stated that Houston Engineering has essentially told the District that out of all the available consultants for this work, Critical Connections Ecological Services was the one that had the most sway and credibility with the DNR for what the District was proposing to do. He reiterated that he thinks they will be able to get a written agreement with the cities that memorializes their commitment to actively participate financially, but did not feel that they were at the point where they could have a true MOA.

Motion by Manager Weinandt, seconded by Manager Bradley, to accept Houston Engineering's proposed amendment to Task Order 2025-012, revised scope of work for the Jones Lake Final Design and Permitting (Jones Lake Restoration Project) and authorize engagement of Critical Connections Ecological Services as a subconsultant under the terms outlined in the revised scope of work, contingent upon obtaining a written agreement with the City of New Brighton to fund the initial and ongoing requirements for this work. Motion carried 4-1 (Waller opposed).

2. Anoka County Ditch 46 – Petition for the Partial Abandonment of Branch #5

Drainage & Facilities Manager Schmidt explained that the District had received a petition to partially abandon ACD-46, Branch #5 in Columbus.

Motion by Manager Waller, seconded by Manager Robertson, to adopt Resolution 2026-09 Findings and Order Accepting Petition and Directing Appointment of an Engineer.

Therefore, the Board makes the following:

ORDER

A. The Board of Managers accepts the Petition and appoints Chris Otterness, P.E., and Houston Engineering, Inc. to investigate the effect of the proposed action under the standards found in sections 103E.806 and 103E.227 and file a report of findings.

B. The Engineer is directed to include in its investigation an assessment of effects from the proposed action to private property which may require Petitioners to acquire flowage or other easements related to the diversion of drainage system waters and an assessment of the impact of the proposed action on the function and integrity of the remainder of the ACD 46 system.

C. This order is not an approval of the proposed action, nor does it modify the drainage system or abandon any portion thereof. Subsequent proceedings on the Petition will occur consistent with the requirements of Minnesota Statutes, sections 103E.806 and 103E.227.

Manager Waller stated that this would be called the Potomac Wetland Bank project and asked who owned it.

Regulatory Manager Hughes stated that it was currently owned by Lake Drive Properties.

Manager Waller asked if they were a development company.

Regulatory Manager Hughes stated that he presumed they were a development company.

Manager Hegland stated that she knew a bit about this property because it was located in Columbus. She noted that there had been a lot of speculation about what they plan to do with this property and noted that she believed that Lake Drive Properties was an affiliate of North Pine Aggregate. She stated that she had questions about the legal petitioning process for the District. She noted that Columbus has an ordinance that prohibits turning high land into wetlands and asked if this applicant had presented this concept to the City of Columbus to see if it would be legal within the City. She noted that she understood that wasn't the District's business, but she would hate to engage the District Engineer and pay for an evaluation of something that may be stopped dead in the water by the city. She explained that she would feel better about moving forward knowing that they had at least presented this concept to Columbus and they were open to the idea.

District Attorney Kolb explained that the District requires the petitioner to pay the costs for the engineering review and gave a brief overview of the typical petitioning process that the District follows.

Regulatory Manager Hughes stated that the applicant had submitted a wetland bank application for review. During the prospectus stage, it was noted that the City of Columbus may have concerns. He explained that when the District sends out the formal notice of application for comment, they include the city, but no comments have been received from the city at this point.

Manager Hegland explained that she hadn't been through this process before and wanted to ensure that they were not spending District resources to look into this work.

District Engineer Otterness noted that the petitioner had already submitted a bond to pay for this work.

Manager Waller referenced page 123 of the packet that outlines the area they were discussing and wanted to clarify that the abandonment is all on one ownership, but on two parcels.

District Engineer Otterness stated that the alignment crosses three different parcels but had the same owner. He noted that it would be the entire portion of ACD-46, Branch 5, that is south of 153^{rd}.

Manager Waller asked if there was anyone upstream that would lose their benefit from this action.

District Engineer Otterness explained that was what he needed to determine during the review and study.

ROLL CALL:
Manager Bradley – Aye
Manager Hegland - Aye
Manager Robertson – Aye
Manager Waller – Aye
Manager Weinandt – Aye
Motion carried 5-0.

3. Jones Lake Restoration Project – MPCA and USACE Permit

Project Manager Oknich stated that this item proposes that the Board accept the conditions of the MPCA and USACE Permit and authorize Administrator Tomczik to sign the permit. She noted that this action would be a step in acting on the petition from the cities of New Brighton, St. Anthony Village, and Roseville, not legally obligate the District to construct the project or to keep it static, which meant that they could request permit modifications in the future if the project changes.

Motion by Manager Weinandt, seconded by Manager Bradley, upon review of the Corps' Clean Water Act permit for the Jones Lake Restoration Project and its conditions, to authorize the Administrator to sign the permit and direct further engagement with the Corps' project manager as status and design of the project become clear.

Manager Robertson stated that she understood Project Manager Oknich's statement that this, for the most part, was boilerplate language. She stated that similar to item #1 on the agenda, the District had not locked in a final program plan for what these repairs will look like. She stated that they have two alternatives that they had asked staff to bring to the DNR and asked if this impeded any additional dialogue that may lead to a change in the scope of the project. She stated that she understood that the permitting process for regulatory agencies was complex, but it felt a bit weird for the Board to be asked to approve a permit when they really don't know what the project will actually look like.

Project Manager Oknich stated that she understood that concern, but clarified that there was no obligation to sign it; it was pretty commonplace for modifications to be requested. She gave the example of this particular document being written that it would be finished by the end of 2029, which means they have a lot of space before that time to figure out if they will stick with the permit as applied or if it would be modified.

District Attorney Kolb stated that the Corps had determined that anything they do to move material within the boundary of Jones Lake requires a Corps' permit, which included the two alternatives referenced by Manager Robertson. He stated that the only thing that would change this Corps' permit is if the District was going to create a new impact to waters of the United States that was not anticipated in the original application. He clarified that there will be ongoing dialogue, which is why there was language in the motion directing engagement with the Corps' project manager as the status and design of the project becomes clear.

Manager Waller referenced the map on page 147 of the packet and found it interesting that the excavation above the runout to the cattail fringe is 154,000 cubic feet and 16.25 acres. He noted that this was the maximum amount they were proposing to dig out, but acknowledged that it could be less than that.

Motion carried 5-0.

4. 2026 Minnesota Watersheds Resolutions: Appoint Delegates and Alternates

Motion by Manager Weinandt, seconded by Manager Bradley, to designate Manager Weinandt and Manager Hegland as the delegates for the 2026 Annual Meeting on Resolutions and Petitions, with Manager Bradley as the alternate, and instruct the delegates to vote in accordance with the stated RCWD positions.

Manager Weinandt asked if what was put on the dais was intended to replace what had been included in the packet.

Administrator Tomczik clarified that a single sheet was left at the dais for the Board that included the update from the Workshop discussion. He noted that he had discussed 2026-07, the Hazard Mitigation Fund, with Outreach & Communications Manager Sommerfeld. He stated that the District had noted its concern with the Flood Hazard Mitigation Fund and its lack of funding here; and the resolution it appears to coincide with the emergency management positions of the counties. He stated that they were miles away from final language and wasn't sure if this would establish a more robust bar for the District to receive funds, but felt support of this was important.

Manager Weinandt stated that during the Workshop, they noted that Matt was going to provide some additional information on the recommendation because he felt that the wake boat resolution was poorly written, so there may be some edits to what they were looking at today.

Administrator Tomczik stated that staff can follow up with Matt and communicate his thoughts on the way it was currently written to the Board. He noted that for Resolution 2026-08, there had been some updates, so a revised version was placed on the dais.

Manager Waller stated that he had read through the changes in Resolution 2026-08 and supported them.

Manager Weinandt asked if they wanted to suggest alternate language related to the wake boat, if they should also send it out to the delegates before the meeting, or present it at the meeting.

President Bradley noted that it would behoove the District to get any proposed language changes into their hands before the meeting.

Administrator Tomczik explained the process for sharing information with Minnesota Watersheds on the proposed resolutions.

Motion carried 5-0.

Manager Weinandt expressed appreciation to Outreach & Communications Manager Sommerfeld for her work in helping to organize the large Mounds View rain garden. She noted that there were monarch butterflies flying all over, so the pollinator patch was working.

5. Jones Lake Sediment Forebay and Public Drainage Maintenance Corridor Construction – Bid Authorization

Project Manager Oknich stated that this item was for solicitation of bids to construct the Jones Lake sediment forebay, realign the public ditch, and create a maintenance corridor access path and reminded the Board that this was part of the petition from the cities of New Brighton, St. Anthony Village, and Roseville.

Motion by Manager Waller, seconded by Manager Bradley, to acknowledge receipt of the Jones Lake sediment forebay and public drainage maintenance corridor access path construction plans, dated August of 2026, and authorize District staff and HEI to advertise a solicitation of bids for this project.

Manager Waller stated that he supported this portion of the project but would also like to see the outlet portion come forward.

District Engineer Otterness stated that the DNR would require the District to get a permit to do anything to the outlet. He stated that they will be proposing doing something different for the outlet than the current situation and would significantly change storage and water levels upstream. He noted that staff was still working on addressing all the questions from the DNR on those items.

Manager Robertson asked if this part of the project was part of the uses for the grant dollars that the District had been awarded.

District Engineer Otterness confirmed that this was all part of the larger project and the District was getting flood reduction out of this pond. He explained that one of the reasons that they wanted to move this part of the project forward was in order to meet the June 30, 2027 deadline for the MPCA grant.

Motion carried 5-0.

6. Check Register Dated August 12, 2026, in the Amount of $270,104.05 Prepared by Redpath and Company

Motion by Manager Weinandt, seconded by **Manager Bradley,** ***to approve check register dated August 12, 2026, in the Amount of $270,104.05 prepared by Redpath and Company.***

Manager Hegland asked for an explanation of the void and reissue from the check register.

Office Manager Stasica explained that they were uncashed surety return checks. Affidavit for lost checks were completed by each applicant, the checks were stopped, and replacement checks are being issued.

Motion carried 5-0.

<u>ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION AND INFORMATION</u>

1. District Engineer Updates and Timeline

District Engineer Otterness noted that the work for ACD 53-62, Branches #5 and 6 has been completed. He stated that the as-built records for ACD 10-22-32, Branch #4, and a few segments of JD-4 were also completed.

Manager Weinandt asked about the upcoming public information on Anoka Ramsey JD-1 and who would be there from staff.

Administrator Tomczik stated that it was a public information meeting and stated that he, Drainage & Facilities Manager Schmidt, District Engineer Otterness, and one other engineer will be there.

Manager Weinandt asked if staff had gotten any calls on this project.

Drainage & Facilities Manager Schmidt stated that he had not received any phone calls. He noted that Abel and Connor would also be at the meeting.

2. Administrator Updates

Administrator Tomczik stated there were citizen concerns regarding a proposed development in Arden Hills near County Road I and Fairview Avenue. He noted that he had adjusted the proposed 2027 budget utilizing fund balance so it would be consistent with the 2026 levy amount. He stated that there have been funding comments about the basic Water Management Project for RCD 2,3, and 5, but the project hasn't been ordered yet. He explained that the budget may be adjusted at a later date and make note of the WMD use in the later collection of the dollars. He stated that he was assembling materials for the fund balance accumulation questions that were raised and would email this to the Board when it was compiled. He reminded the Board that for ACD 10-22-32, alternative #4 will be on the agenda for their August 24, 2026 meeting for Board action. He gave a brief update for the Circle Pines outfall on ACD 53-62 and noted that they have asked HEI to weigh in with an engineering position. He explained that he would bring this to their September workshop meeting for further discussion.

3. Manager Updates

Manager Waller gave an overview of what took place at the recent CAC meeting where they toured the Hansen Park project. He reiterated that, as he mentioned at the workshop, when it comes to consultant services, he would like to see a robust competition.

Manager Weinandt noted that she would not be physically present for the August 24, 2026, meeting, but would be attending via Zoom.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion by Manager Robertson, seconded by Manager Waller, to adjourn the meeting at 10:19 a.m. Motion carried 5-0.