



REGULAR MEETING OF THE RCWD BOARD OF MANAGERS

Wednesday, September 23, 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, Drainage & Facilities Manager Tom Schmidt, Project Manager Jen Oknich, Program Support Technician Emmet Hurley (video conference), Operations & Maintenance Inspector Abel Green, Office Manager Theresa Stasica

Consultants: District Engineers Chris Otterness and Belle Reeve from Houston Engineering, Inc. (HEI) & District Attorney John Kolb-Rinke Noonan (video conference)

Visitors: Don Peterson, Michelle Utter, Collette Adkins, Gary Meehlhauso, Grace Thomas, Jonathan Thomas, Barb Anderson, Harold Anderson, Jim Christofersen, Kevin Teslaa, Steve Ramstert, Judy McGovern, Mike Read, Lois Kromrey, Jerry Kromrey, Casey Wright, Bill Bergelot, Rick Price, Sharon Kirscher, Rebecca Scholl, Nyle Zikmund, City Administrator for the City of Mounds View

Visitors monitoring via Zoom: Leah Tungseth, Lisa Partyka, Michell Miller, MH, Christopher Partyka, Heather

OPEN MIC/PUBLIC COMMENT

No public comments were made.

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

31 **SETTING OF THE AGENDA**

32 President Bradley explained that District Administrator Tomczik had requested a new Item #2
33 under Items Requiring Board Action for Ramsey County Ditch # 5 Maintenance Work Order.

34
35 Manager Robertson stated that she would like to remove agenda item 1 under Items Requiring
36 Board Action and move it to a future meeting.

37
38 ***Motion by Manager Robertson, seconded by Manager Bradley, to amend the agenda and***
39 ***remove item 1, Circle Pines Outfall, from Items Requiring Board Action and reschedule it for the***
40 ***next Board meeting.***

41
42 President Bradley noted that he had seconded the motion for the purpose of discussion. He
43 stated that the Board was in a position where they could move forward without the information
44 from Circle Pines because they had already received a comprehensive report from the District
45 Engineer and had also received legal advice from counsel. He explained that Circle Pines' costs
46 related to maintenance of their stormwater system are irrelevant to the District's responsibilities
47 with regard to the ditch.

48
49 ***Motion carried 5-0.***

50
51 **READING OF THE MINUTES AND THEIR APPROVAL**

52 **Minutes of September 1, 2026 Workshop and September 9, 2026, Board of Managers Regular**
53 **Meeting.**

54 ***Motion by Manager Hegland, seconded by Manager Weinandt, to approve the September 1,***
55 ***2026 Workshop meeting minutes, as presented. Motion carried 5-0.***

56
57 ***Motion by Manager Hegland, seconded by Manager Bradley, to approve the September 9, 2026***
58 ***meeting minutes, with the proposed minor edits, as discussed. Motion carried 5-0.***

59
60 **CONSENT AGENDA**

61 The following items will be acted upon without discussion in accordance with the staff recommendation
62 and associated documentation unless a Manager or another interested person requests an opportunity
63 for discussion:

64 **Table of Contents-Permit Applications Requiring Board Action**

No.	Applicant	Location	Plan Type	Recommendation
26-057	Anoka County	Columbus	Street & Utility Plan	CAPROC 8 items
26-077	City of Fridley	Fridley	Final Site Drainage Plan	CAPROC 4 items

68
69 ***It was moved by Manager Bradley and seconded by Manager Weinandt to approve the consent***
70 ***agenda permits 26-057 & 26-077 as outlined in the above Table of Contents in accordance with***
71 ***RCWD District Engineer's Findings and Recommendations, dated September 15, 2026.***

73 Manager Hegland asked for an explanation of the permit in the City of Columbus and how
74 vacating the ditch will not affect the rest of the system.

75
76 Regulatory Manager Hughes clarified that this was not a public drainage system in the project
77 area.

78
79 Manager Hegland acknowledged that her question was for a different agenda item later in the
80 meeting.

81
82 ***Motion carried 5-0.***

83
84 **PUBLIC HEARING: ANOKA-RAMSEY JUDICIAL DITCH 1, REPAIR REPORT & WATER**
85 **MANAGEMENT DISTRICT (WMD)**

86
87 President Bradley recessed the regular meeting and opened the public hearing. He read aloud
88 a statement outlining the purpose of the hearing, which was to receive comments and testimony
89 from all parties interested in the repair of Anoka-Ramsey Judicial Ditch 1 and the adoption of
90 Water Management District Charges to pay a portion of the costs for the proposed work.

91
92 Administrator Tomczik explained that proper notice of the hearing was published.

93
94 District Attorney Kolb stated today's proceedings are being conducted under Minnesota Statutes,
95 sections 103E.715 (drainage system repair) and 103D.729 (water management district charges)
96 regarding the repair of Anoka-Ramsey JD1. He reviewed the background and history of
97 considerations for Anoka-Ramsey JD1 and outlined the decision standards for the Board to
98 consider, including the repair project and its funding mechanism. He explained that the District
99 had looked at the right-of-way of the drainage system and had held an informational Open House
100 for residents to help them understand how this project may affect their property.

101
102 District Engineer Otterness shared a presentation that covered the findings of the repair report
103 for Anoka-Ramsey JD1, including: facts about the District, location of the ditch, definition of a
104 'public drainage system', reasons why this project would be important for people in the District,
105 definition of 'predictable drainage and stormwater management', standards for a Board decision,
106 facts about Anoka-Ramsey JD1 and the system in the area, reviewed recent events, observations
107 that were identified during the survey process, and outlined components of the recommended
108 repair. He gave an overview of some of the applicable regulations that needed to be considered
109 related to the repair. He discussed threatened and endangered species (T&E) and explained
110 that there have been 16 known species that are near the project area. He explained that this
111 was something that the District needed to consider and noted that they have procured a scientist
112 to complete a plant survey to be able to understand the potential impacts along the system and
113 potential mitigation requirements. He reviewed information regarding how the District
114 intended to handle tree removal along the drainage ditch. He displayed photographs of what
115 the project may look like before, during, and after construction. He reviewed the

116 recommendation to remove the existing weir wall, modifications to the trail and bridge crossings,
117 and Branch 2, Lateral 1 realignment. He noted that the plans are preliminary and that
118 construction details such as the side of the ditch tree clearing will occur along may change in the
119 final plans. He shared the preliminary opinion related to the probable construction costs of
120 approximately \$1.5 million, the project funding, and provided examples of the cost allocation per
121 acre for residents and commercial/industrial properties. He explained that the
122 recommendation is to allocate any parcel charge more than \$300 to be spread out over 3 years.
123 He reviewed the proposed timeline for the project but emphasized that the dates were just
124 approximations and were subject to change. He explained that if anyone has questions about
125 the project, they could contact District Drainage Inspector Abel Green or himself.

126
127 Manager Weinandt asked if notices had been sent out to everyone within the Water
128 Management District (WMD) or just everyone along the ditch.

129
130 District Engineer Otterness clarified that everyone within the WMD was sent a notice for the
131 public hearing.

132
133 President Bradley asked if there was anyone who wanted to speak at the public hearing.

134
135 Collette Adkins, 8640 Coral Sea Street NE, Blaine, stated that the proposed ditch repair will affect
136 many properties in the (Coral Sea) neighborhood. She stated that there is a trail near the back
137 of their properties that is owned by the City of Blaine that runs parallel to the ditch. She
138 submitted a document signed by more than a dozen residents in the neighborhood about their
139 concern that the proposed plan included creation of an access corridor and doing the work from
140 the property owners' side of the ditch. She explained that this approach did not make sense to
141 them because the trail is located on the other side of the ditch that already had open areas. She
142 noted that the neighbors rely on the large trees on their property to provide privacy from the
143 public trail as well as providing wildlife habitats. She asked that the District conduct the repair
144 from the trail side of the ditch and not on the property owners' side and to meet individually with
145 the property owners so they can discuss the prized features of their property and how they can
146 be preserved.

147
148 Manager Weinandt asked for more information on where her neighborhood is located.

149
150 Ms. Adkins pointed out the approximate location of the neighborhood on the map displayed on
151 the screen.

152
153 Drainage and Facilities Manager Schmidt noted that Ms. Adkins had sent him the information she
154 had just shared with the Board and asked if she would support him dispensing with reading it
155 into the record, since she had already addressed the Board.

156
157 Ms. Adkins stated that was acceptable.

Michelle Utter, 2831 85th Court, Blaine, stated that she also lived in Ms. Adkins' neighborhood (Coral Sea) and noted that her property extends beyond the ditch onto the other side of the walking trail. She noted some of the work she and her husband had undertaken on their property in the 20 years they have lived there. She explained that the neighbors in the area see the ditch as more than just a vital function of the District and also as habitat for a wide variety of wildlife. She stated that they are able to enjoy the privacy that comes with having this kind of nature while living in the middle of the city. She explained that they appreciated the work the District will do to keep their properties safe from flooding and understand the necessity of the project. She stated that the clearing of the ditch that took place to the north of the neighborhood left much of the brush and debris still in the ditch, which may need to be addressed so there aren't other blockages upstream within the system. She stated that her main concern with the project was related to preserving mature trees and landscaping on their side of the ditch and mature non-invasive trees on the walking path side. She reiterated that they understand the need for repairs and some clearing; they have greatly appreciated the natural fencing provided by plants and trees they have put in on their property and hope that the District will respect and preserve them. She explained that her request was that the work be completed from the north and west side of the ditch and for plants and trees on their home's side of the ditch to be left untouched, and appreciated the willingness of District Drainage Inspector Green to meet with her.

Mike Reed, 2208 Lois Drive, Mounds View, expressed appreciation to the District for taking on this project and explained that he had been in touch with the City of Mounds View for a few years asking them to clean out the ditch near his home. He stated that he believed the City was finally able to get the start of the ditch after the culvert was fixed so it wouldn't wash out anymore. He noted that he had also been asking them to cut more of the trees down because they weren't good trees and many of them seemed to be dropping into the ditch. He stated that this project may be about 20 years overdue, and appreciated that the District was getting to it.

Manager Weinandt noted that the location of Mr. Reed's property could be seen on page 76 of the packet materials.

District Engineer Otterness clarified that it was on page 61 of the packet and not page 76.

Casey Wright, 2841 85th Court NE, Blaine, stated that he lived near Ms. Adkins and Ms. Utter. He explained that it didn't really make sense to him for the District to approach the project from the nearby property owners and not the other side. He stated that he would like District staff to hold more individual meetings with the property owners in the area to talk about the trees because many of them bought their properties because of the existence of the trees to have woods and privacy from the public walking path.

Rebecca Scholl, 2467 Hill View, noted that she also owns property at 2310 Sherwood. She noted that the Sherwood property backs up to the trail and is adjacent to the bridge that will be replaced and turned into a culvert. She explained that she was in favor of taking care of the ditch and, while searching for a missing animal over the last few weeks, has been able to see the

condition of the ditch and the bridge. She stated that she had been concerned about the costs, but if she understood District Engineer Otterness correctly, she believes that her estimated costs would be less than \$200, which would not be a burden for her.

President Bradley noted that there was information within the packet that outlines the specific costs expected for each property, which could be reviewed with her following the meeting. He explained that most of the residential properties' costs would be around \$80.

Ms. Scholl thanked the District for looking at the bridge because she had been asking the City of Mounds View about it because it was marked as not safe. She explained that she would like to speak to people involved in the project because it appears that there will be extensive work adjacent to her property, and she wanted to preserve some of the buffer between the house, walkway, and the park.

Kevin Tesla, 9169 Harpers Court NE, Blaine, stated that the trail is located at the back of their lot and there is an 18-inch culvert in that area that goes under the trail into the ditch. He asked if those would also be cleaned out as part of this project. He explained that sediment has backed up into the culverts, which ends up holding water on the property.

District Engineer Otterness stated that any of the culverts along the main part of the drainage system that are in line with the drainage system were intended to be left in place. He noted that culverts are generally the responsibility of whoever owns them, but they do look to ensure they are large enough in capacity to handle the flow. He stated that they will try to clean up the sediment in front of the culvert as much as possible. He explained that if they see that the culvert is partially plugged, they can work with the owner of the culvert to try to get it cleaned out. He suggested that Mr. Tesla take time to talk with him following the meeting, and they can look at specific drawings of what is in the area to talk through his concerns.

Manager Weinandt asked if the bridges located in the project area were being replaced by culverts.

District Engineer Otterness stated that there are several bridges along the system and the plans were only to replace one of them. He noted that they were working with the City of Mounds View because they had already been hoping that this bridge could be removed and replaced, so it made sense to do it when they would already be working in the area. He noted that oftentimes landowners put in non-engineered structures to go across the system and try to work around them as best as they can, but sometimes they need to be moved, and they cannot guarantee that they will go back in still being in one piece.

Manager Weinandt confirmed with District Engineer Otterness that the reference to 'bridges' was talking about foot bridges and not ones for vehicle crossing.

District Attorney Kolb stated that the culvert mentioned by Mr. Tesla would have to be investigated to see who was responsible for the lateral culvert that drains his property under the

public trail. He stated that once that is determined, the District can assist Mr. Tesla in contacting them to get the culvert cleaned out.

Niles Zikmund, City Administrator, City of Mounds View, thanked the Board for their work on this project and noted that the Mounds View City Council had unanimously adopted the resolution for this project.

Administrator Tomczik noted that a written comment had been submitted that should be read into the record before the public comment is closed.

President Bradley read aloud a statement from Lois and Gerald Kromrey, Mounds View, explaining that they were against the bond proposed for the community center and various Mounds View parks in 2032 and did not want their property taxes to keep increasing.

Administrator Tomczik handed President Bradley an additional public comment to be read into the record that Drainage & Facilities Manager Schmidt had received via email.

President Bradley read aloud a statement from Merga Hunde, 2827 85th Court NE, expressing concerns about the plans for the creek clean-up. She outlined her concerns about how the project will harm her garden and that the District's equipment may damage her yard and sprinkler system.

President Bradley reiterated that District staff would be happy to discuss specific details about the project with anyone interested.

There being no additional comments, President Bradley recessed the public hearing and reconvened the regular Board meeting.

Motion by Manager Bradley, seconded by Manager Waller, to move that the drainage authority order the repair of Anoka-Ramsey Judicial Ditch 1 as detailed in the engineer's report and adopt Water Management District Charges as recommended; that based on the reports, the engineer's recommendation and the evidence presented, the drainage authority find that the engineer's recommended repair is necessary for the best interests of the affected property owners and best supports considerations of public utility, benefit and welfare; that based on the evidence presented, the Water Management District Charges, as recommended; are appropriate; and to allow for the preparation of detailed findings and an order, we recess this hearing to October 14, 2026, at 9:00 a.m., or by adjournment to an appropriate time on the drainage authority's agenda, at which meeting we will consider findings and an order for the repair in a manner consistent with the proceedings.

Manager Robertson stated that she wanted to acknowledge some of the comments made by residents of Blaine and explained that she also served on the Blaine City Council. She clarified that she did not represent their ward, but understood that part of the character and draw to the community was the natural elements. She assured the residents that she did not doubt that

the District staff would do exactly as they have said they would and meet with them individually and talk through their concerns. She suggested that Mr. Tesla reach out to the Public Works Department or the city engineer for the City of Blaine. She offered to share her email address with him so he could ask staff to take a look at the culvert he referenced in his statement. She noted that she was also willing to participate in meetings with the residents along that corridor if that would be helpful and stated that she wanted to ensure that if there were things that the City of Blaine needed to be aware of, they were informed.

District Attorney Kolb explained that he wanted to make sure that everyone in the room understood that the Board had not just rubber-stamped what the District Engineer had recommended. He stated that they will spend time developing findings and in the final order, they will provide instructions to staff and the District Engineer about the individual meetings with landowners and the need to balance the concerns expressed with the needs of the repair. He stated that this final order is what staff will be working on between now and the October 14, 2026 meeting.

President Bradley reiterated that language included in the motion under consideration and explained that it incorporated the concept that the District was not done working on this yet.

Manager Waller stated that based on the public comments, he would recommend that the District Engineer provide clarity on the location of the rights-of-way and where they end and begin.

Motion carried 5-0.

President Bradley recessed the meeting at 10:24 a.m. and reconvened at 10:33 a.m.

ITEMS REQUIRING BOARD ACTION

1. ~~City of Circle Pines Outfall~~ (removed from the agenda)

1. Ramsey County Ditch #5 Maintenance Work Order

Drainage & Facilities Manager Schmidt gave an explanation of the proposed addendum to the RCD-5 maintenance work order. He stated that as they began the tree work in the Jones Lake area, they noticed there was a discrepancy in the areas that the tree contractor had estimated for the work. He explained that there was a misunderstanding, so additional tree clearing was needed to complete the ditch realignment and the forebay. He noted that the additional costs pushed the costs beyond the contingency funds that were included in the original motion, so additional funds were needed.

Motion by Manager Weinandt, seconded by Manager Bradley, to approve the additional spending for Hugo Tree Service, in the amount not to exceed \$4,200; resulting in a new project total of \$103,100. Motion carried 5-0.

334
335 **2. Anoka Washington Judicial Ditch 3 Branch 2 Petition**

336 Drainage & Facilities Manager Schmidt reminded the Board that they had accepted a
337 petition in August for partial abandonment and a reroute of segments of Anoka
338 Washington JD3 (AWJD-3). He noted that the District engineer had completed the
339 report, so the next step in the process would be to accept the report and set a public
340 hearing for the petitioned action.

341
342 ***Motion by Manager Robertson, seconded by Manager Weinandt, to Accept the***
343 ***Engineer's Report and Set a Hearing Date on the Petitioned Action for October 28, 2026.***
344 ***Motion carried 5-0.***

345
346 **3. Anoka County Ditch 46 Branch 5 Petition**

347 Drainage & Facilities Manager Schmidt reminded the Board that they had accepted a
348 petition for the partial abandonment and rerouting of segments of the Anoka County
349 Ditch 46 (ACD-46), Branch 5 system. He stated that, like the last agenda item, the
350 District Engineer had completed the report and the next step in the process would be to
351 accept the report and set a date for the public hearing.

352
353 ***Motion by Manager Robertson, seconded by Manager Waller, to Accept the Engineer's***
354 ***Report and Set a Hearing Date on the Petitioned Action for October 28, 2026.***

355
356 Manager Hegland explained that this had been the question she had mistakenly asked
357 during the Consent Agenda portion of the meeting. She stated that she was familiar
358 with the area, but wanted someone to walk her through this project and noted that there
359 were things in the report that she didn't understand. She referenced page 226 of the
360 packet information and read aloud a portion of the report that stated, 'Land within the
361 drainage area that is outside of the petitioner's property does not currently derive direct
362 benefit from the drainage system though land use/improvements have placed an
363 additional burden on the drainage system.'" She noted that those statements seemed
364 contradictory to her and asked for a deeper explanation.

365
366 District Engineer Otterness shared background information about determination of
367 benefits on drainage systems and explained that most of the benefits historically were
368 assigned to just the properties located right along the drainage system. He stated that
369 now, in a more modern context, benefits are assigned to properties that go well beyond
370 the drainage system. He explained that the benefit assigned is related to the burden
371 that they place on the drainage system by the fact that they have improved their property
372 and send a higher volume of water downstream into the ditch. He stated that was
373 analogous here and noted that the real benefit of the ditch in this particular location is
374 solely to the property that is owned by Lake Drive Properties along the drainage system.
375 He noted that other landowners send water into the ditch from improvements made to
376 their properties, but they don't derive a real benefit from the ditch because they don't
377 have direct access to the ditch and rely on water getting across the neighbor's property

before it can get to the ditch. He explained that was why he said in his report that the effect of impounding the ditch and abandoning it really doesn't affect any of the landowners that drain to the system.

President Bradley asked if they would drain to the southeast, which would be into the wetland instead of the ditch.

District Engineer Otterness stated that was correct and in some cases would drain onto the neighboring property, which is farm fields.

Manager Hegland referenced additional information on page 226 about potential impacts on properties upstream. She read aloud the statement, 'A new ditch block will be constructed approximately 1150 feet south of 153rd Avenue, to an elevation of 902.0.' She asked if a 'ditch block' was like a dam.

District Engineer Otterness answered that a ditch blocky would basically be taking the spoil that is along the ditch right now and shoving it into the ditch and blocking it. He stated that he would not call it a constructed dam because it would not be holding a large volume of water back or be engineered and would be just filling in the ditch.

Manager Hegland stated that she assumed that the water would be flowing north to south in the ditch when it flows.

District Engineer Otterness clarified that it actually flows south to north.

Manager Waller asked if they do the ditch block, whether that would increase the amount of water that is in the blue area on the map that looks like a nice lake. He stated that the soils are muck soils and asked how far back that may impact others. He stated that, in his experience, something like this can have a tremendous impact and change the tax status of the property from something usable to wasteland. He noted that the petitioners were talking about making a wetland bank, which is highly profitable, but there may be an impact on the upstream folks with water saturation on the muck soils and their properties, which means they wouldn't have the benefit.

District Engineer Otterness stated that when they reviewed the drainage system, they reviewed it solely based on the effect of surface water flow from the ditch standpoint and did not look at the overall effect of the wetland banking project, which will include features that go beyond the ditch. He stated that the wetland feature components could have an effect on subsurface drainage of water, but reiterated that was not part of his purview in looking at this. He clarified that he only looked at the ditch abandonment and impoundment and how that may affect things. He noted that based on his review and the information provided by the petitioner, it did not appear there would be any impacts to properties other than those owned by the petitioner, from a surface water standpoint.

422
423 President Bradley asked where the wetland would reside.

424
425 District Engineer Otterness stated that the petitioner had construction plans that show
426 individual wetland banking pocket areas and did not intend to have it be the entire
427 property. He noted that they were intended for a portion of the property to remain as
428 agricultural so the wetland areas would be localized on the lower areas of the property.

429
430 Manager Waller stated that wetlands, depending on their type, can provide value for
431 agricultural land, and by limiting the surface water flowage, it may change the type of
432 wetland, which could also change the value of the property because they wouldn't have
433 the surface water drainage.

434
435 President Bradley asked if notice had been sent to people who owned the properties
436 being discussed.

437
438 District Engineer Otterness clarified that they would be noticed for the public hearing, but
439 that hasn't happened yet.

440
441 Manager Robertson asked if the District used the statutory minimums when engaging the
442 public for public hearings. She stated that for this project, the impact goes beyond the
443 adjoining properties and asked how they select who is notified for the public hearing
444 process.

445
446 District Attorney Kolb stated that the statute requires notice to be given to all owners
447 affected by the drainage system on a partial abandonment, so they would send notice to
448 everyone in the drainage system or within the Water Management District area of this
449 ditch, which would be different than a zoning application. He stated that he also wanted
450 to comment on Manager Waller's comments, which he felt were valid, because the
451 standard is to determine whether or not this serves any beneficial public purpose, and
452 whether a partial abandonment will deprive or prejudice anyone who needs it for a
453 drainage outlet. He noted that if this was an issue that the Board felt was important to
454 address, under the Statutory standard of not depriving anyone of the benefit of the ditch,
455 the Board could require the applicant, based on soil types and land elevations, to do some
456 type of transmissivity study. He stated that something missing from the packet that
457 would be beneficial would be the exact wetland restoration map of where they intend to
458 try to pond the water or supersaturate the soil so they can get their credits.

459
460 Manager Waller asked when the District could ask the petitioner for that kind of data.

461
462 District Attorney Kolb answered that if the Board was planning to give direction to hold
463 the public hearing, he would include direction in their motion for staff to coordinate
464 access to this data with the applicant if this was something the Board felt would be
465 important before moving forward with the public hearing.

466
467 Manager Robertson asked if the Board needed to work that into the existing motion on
468 the table.

469
470 District Attorney Kolb clarified that if getting this additional data and information was
471 important to the Board, he would include language in the motion alongside setting the
472 public hearing date. He noted that the Board could direct that the applicant would
473 provide specific analysis that shows the extent to which they believe the saturation may
474 or may not eventually leave the property.

475
476 ***Motion amended by Manager Robertson to include requests for additional hydrological***
477 ***data from the applicant, as discussed and outlined by District Attorney Kolb.***

478
479 President Bradley stated that the Board wants to know where they are planning to have
480 the actual wetland bank, its boundaries, and the impact of the wetland bank on
481 surrounding properties not owned by Lake Drive Properties.

482
483 District Administrator Tomczik suggested that the Board may also want the District
484 Engineer to review this and provide an addendum to his report.

485
486 President Bradley asked about the timeline of this and if it could be rolled over to the next
487 Board meeting or if they could just ‘sandpaper’ it as they went.

488
489 ***Manager Waller seconded the amended motion.***

490
491 District Administrator Tomczik stated that the recommendation for the public hearing
492 was October 28, 2026, which is a fair amount of time in the future. He explained that
493 this meant that providing the requested materials in a timely fashion would allow time
494 for the District Engineer to review the materials and be able to move ahead with the
495 public hearing on October 28, 2026, but it places the onus on the petitioner to provide
496 the materials.

497
498 Regulatory Manager Hughes stated that the wetland bank application was submitted
499 months ago and the District had provided comments on it along with the Army Corps of
500 Engineers and BWSR. He stated that they were still waiting for an updated wetland
501 banking application to be submitted from the applicant. He stated that he is meeting
502 with the applicant later today on other issues and does have a map that could be provided
503 to the Board, and felt that much of the other data the Board was interested in gathering
504 should be able to be provided soon.

505
506 Manager Waller stated that he was looking for information that wasn’t just the outline of
507 where they were talking about, but the soils and how the surface water would saturate
508 the soils.

Manager Robertson asked District Attorney Kolb if there was a limit on what documentation the Board can request and whether that can be cleaned up outside the current motion on the floor.

District Attorney Kolb stated that it can be cleaned up outside of the motion and explained that this was a situation where the petitioner bears the burden to demonstrate that they meet the Statutory criteria, so the Board can ask for whatever information that will help the Board make their decision.

Motion carried 5-0.

4. Ramsey County Ditch 5 Alignment & Forebay Project Construction Award

Project Manager Oknich gave a brief overview of the proposed realignment and forebay project for Ramsey County Ditch 5 (RCD-5) and noted that they received 11 bids for the project. She stated that staff was recommending that the Board award the contract for the project to Rachel Contracting, LLC. She explained that they had included a proposed motion in the meeting packet, but upon advice of counsel, would like to modify the motion and include the name Rachel Contracting, LLC.

Motion by Manager Bradley, seconded by Manager Weinandt, to award and further authorize the Administrator to sign, on advice of counsel, the contract and notice to proceed to Rachel Contracting, LLC for RCD-5 realignment, public drainage maintenance corridor construction, and sediment forebay construction for an amount not to exceed \$777,817. The Administrator is further authorized to approve contract amendments for an amount not to exceed 10% of the contract price (\$77,781.70).

District Engineer Otterness noted that one statement included in their memo was incorrect, where they said that the bid process included placing advertisements in the Pioneer Press. He clarified that their advertisement was solely through Quest CDN for this project. He stated that they were very happy with the number of bids this project received and felt they were very competitive. He noted that the estimated costs came in towards the middle, and the bid from Rachel Contracting was the lowest, but it wasn't way out of line in comparison with the other bids.

President Bradley stated that the only portion of the bid that seemed out of line to him from Rachel Contracting was the common excavation forebay at 38,638 cubic yards for 95 cents, when everyone else was not in that range.

District Engineer Otterness commended President Bradley for that observation but explained that every company bids differently and throws their overall costs into different components of the project. He stated that this results in a fair amount of variation within the individual unit pricing even though the overall costs may not be very different. He noted that something that protects the District on this is that it is a planned quantity,

which means that it would not be paid on a truck yard, so they would not get more or less than this amount.

Manager Weinandt asked if this satisfied the MPCA grant and if the District would be able to use all the money received.

District Engineer Otterness stated that he believed it would satisfy the grant and would be able to use all of the money that was received.

Manager Weinandt asked where the bonding money was located and if it would go to any of this project.

District Administrator Tomczik stated that it would not be going into this project.

Manager Waller stated that if he includes the bid, the contingency, and the cost for trees, it brings the cost up to around \$957,000, which doesn't include the engineering work. He stated that brings it fairly close to the \$1.17 million that the District received and reminded the Board that the District had to match that with \$120,000.

Motion carried 5-0.

District Administrator Tomczik stated that the District planned to continue noticing projects through Quest CDN. He explained that the Statutory language talks about newspaper noticing, which is somewhat antiquated. He stated that staff has spoken with District Attorney Kolb about this, and using Quest CDN is very efficient for this day and age, which they plan to continue.

Manager Weinandt noted that Minnesota Watersheds has a resolution that speaks to that same point and includes notice to more than just newspapers.

5. Ramsey County Ditch 5 Alignment & Forebay Project Construction Management

Project Manager Oknich explained that staff was recommending the Board approve an HEI Task Order for management of the contract the Board had just awarded to Rachel Contracting for the RCD-5 project.

Motion by Manager Weinandt, seconded by Manager Bradley, to approve and authorize the Administrator to sign HEI Task Order 2026-013 in an amount not to exceed \$75,500.

Manager Waller asked if, for \$75,000, the plan was for Houston Engineering to have someone standing on the site watching what is happening.

District Engineer Otterness explained that they were estimating that there would be around 75% observation on site, but 100% at the start of the project.

Manager Waller asked if that meant they wouldn't just be there in the morning for the construction meeting, but would be on site when the dirt was actually being moved.

District Engineer Otterness stated that was correct and would be there much of the time while it was being constructed.

Motion carried 5-0.

6. **Check Register Dated September 23, 2026, in the Amount of \$267,139.39 and September Interim Financial Statements Prepared by Redpath and Company**
Motion by Manager Weinandt, seconded by Manager Bradley, to approve the check register dated September 23, 2026, in the Amount of \$267,139.39 and September Interim Financial Statements prepared by Redpath and Company.

Manager Weinandt noted the 9 surety returns that were included in the check register and commended the work staff has been doing to monitor and close out those that have been completed.

Manager Waller noted that two of the surety closeouts were from 2000 and 2003 and was glad they were being cleared off the books after 26 and 23 years.

Motion carried 5-0.

ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION AND INFORMATION

1. Staff Reports

2. October Calendar

3. Administrator Updates

Administrator Tomczik stated that staff is working toward finding a meeting location for ACD 10-22-32 for November 19, 2026, from 3:00 to 5:00 p.m. He reminded the Board to bring their budget thoughts to the October workshop meeting with plans for further discussion at the November workshop meeting. He stated that the Minnesota Water Resource Conference was coming up and staff would be presenting on Iron Enhanced Sand Filters and the GIS Dashboards.

Manager Weinandt noted that presenting at the Minnesota Water Resource Conference was a competitive process and for the District staff to have been awarded two spots was impressive.

Administrator Tomczik stated that Regulatory Manager Hughes has been working on a landowner concern on West Bald Eagle Lake Boulevard.

Regulatory Manager Hughes explained that there was a permitted home demo and rebuild project, and one of the neighbors was concerned about sediment that has entered the street and their property. He stated that staff was doing regular inspections of the permit and coordinating with the city and County to investigate the problem.

Administrator Tomczik noted that the We Are Water traveling exhibit will be in Anoka County at the Northtown Library October 8 through November 30, 2026. He reminded the Board that he would be out of the office for during the coming week.

4. Manager Updates

Manager Waller stated that he attended the public meeting held in Centerville, which was well attended, and gave an overview of some of the questions and concerns that were raised.

Manager Weinandt noted that she would attend the Board workshop meeting on October 12, 2026 via electronic means.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion by Manager Robertson, seconded by Manager Waller, to adjourn the meeting at 11:18 a.m. Motion carried 5-0.