



REGULAR MEETING OF THE RCWD BOARD OF MANAGERS
Wednesday, September 25, 2024

Shoreview City Hall Council Chambers
4600 North Victoria Street, Shoreview, Minnesota
and

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

Minutes

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
31

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. Steve Wagamon, Treasurer Marcie Weinandt, and Secretary Jess Robertson

Absent: None

Staff Present: Regulatory Manager Patrick Hughes, Watershed Technician/Inspector Will Roach, Program Support Technician Emmet Hurley (video-conference), Project Manager David Petry (video-conference), Office Manager Theresa Stasica

Consultants: District Engineer Chris Otterness from Houston Engineering, Inc. (HEI); District Attorney Chuck Holtman from Smith Partners

Visitors: Chris Stowe, Roshaan Grieme (video-conference)

SETTING OF THE AGENDA

District Administrator Tomcik requested that an item be added to the agenda under Items for Discussion and Information as a new #1, Precipitation Events and the Rice Creek Watershed District Landscape.

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

READING OF THE MINUTES AND THEIR APPROVAL

Minutes of the September 9, 2024, Workshop and September 11, 2024, Board of Managers Regular Meeting. Motion by Manager Robertson, seconded by Manager Weinandt, to approve the minutes as presented. Motion carried 5-0.

32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41

42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63

64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73

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 opportunity for discussion:

Table of Contents-Permit Applications Requiring Board Action

No.	Applicant	Location	Plan Type	Recommendation
24-058	Walters MRF LLC	Blaine	Final Site Drainage Plan	CAPROC 3 items

It was moved by Manager Weinandt and seconded by Manager Wagamon, to approve the consent agenda as outlined in the above Table of Contents in accordance with RCWD District Engineer’s Findings and Recommendations, dated September 17, 2024. Motion carried 5-0.

OPEN MIC/PUBLIC COMMENT

Chris Stowe, 426 Pine Street, stated that he had attended the City meeting at Lino Lakes earlier in the week and he was confused. He explained that he had been told that the culverts on West Pine Street were lowered and that the District controls them, but at the last RCWD Board meeting, he was told that the next one down that crosses Andall Street was controlled by Lino Lakes and that the elevations were at the correct heights. He noted that he felt they were at the old correct heights and not the new ones because the pipes have been lowered. He asked who controlled the pipes because he was told by the City of Columbus and the City of Lino Lakes that they control the ditches, but the culverts were controlled by the District. He stated that the District had lowered the culvert north of him but now south of him was the City of Lino Lake’s problem. He stated that he felt it needed to be both lowered and increased in size. He showed the Board some photos on his phone from the last rain event that occurred during the summer. He expressed concern about development and also the desire by Lino Lakes to bring in city sewer and water near this location which is land that is currently zoned agricultural. He stated that he did not believe that they should be doing any of the work that they were already doing until they all get the ACD 10-22-32 issues figured out because it was essentially a disaster. He stated that he was unsure if the District controlled the pipes that were downstream from him, and reiterated that he has been told that the elevations are correct, but noted that they were off of the old drawings, and they ended up lowering the culverts at both West Pine Street and Pine Street which floods him out even more. He noted that he had been talking with an individual who had purchased land in Columbus who told him that part of his property used to drain to Coon Creek but now that they have developed stuff in Blaine, his property was also getting flooded out. He stated that it appears that the water is being forced over from Coon Creek into the Rice Creek system which means it is flooding even worse.

District Engineer Otterness stated that regarding the ownership of the culverts under the roadway, the District, as the Drainage Authority, is responsible for the drainage system, however, any of the culverts that are along the system that are under a roadway are the responsibility of the road authority. He stated that the District identifies when those roadway culverts have been undersized or too high, thus constituting an obstruction to the system. He explained that the District has collaborated with the cities in order to get those culverts lowered or properly sized when they have identified as a potential obstruction. He stated that with regard to the floodplain, the District has a rule that requires any property that places more than 100 cubic yards of fill within a floodplain to mitigate that fill, meaning they would have to excavate somewhere on their property in order to compensate for the amount of floodplain volume that would otherwise be lost in the system. He stated that if fill was brought in on a development, then the property

74 owner would need to determine where they can excavate to make up for the difference in volume. He
75 noted that there are some that they have anticipated and have identified floodplain mapping in the area
76 Mr. Stowe was referring to and explained that the District has recognized that there is a substantial portion
77 of the potentially developable area draining to the ACD 10-22-32 that is within the floodplain.

78 Mr. Stowe stated that he agreed with that but explained that the problem he was having right now is with
79 both the culverts that cross into Lino Lakes. He stated that Lino Lakes was not officially notified about
80 those culverts so he thinks someone messed up, if the pipes are theirs once it crosses that line, because the
81 lowered the pipes north of him but had not downstream of him, nor did they increase any of the sizes. He
82 stated that they now have storm surges going on which is why the sod farms were getting flooded out even
83 worse and when they are underwater, he is underwater, because the whole system cannot take it, so it was
84 spilling over the banks of ACD 10-22-32. He stated that the District seems to be saying that the culverts
85 are now the city's responsibility and asked why the District had lowered the pipes on Pine Street. He
86 explained that he felt this should have been a joint venture between the District, the City of Columbus, and
87 the City of Lino Lakes and that he should have been notified immediately and noted that he felt that there
88 were liabilities issues going on.

89 District Administrator Tomczik stated that the District, including its inspection staff, have been hard at work
90 on ACD 10-22-32 and have done a records affirmation and confirmed all the work on the system. He asked
91 District Engineer Otterness if, within all the survey work, the culverts were consistent with the ACSIC.

92 District Engineer Otterness stated that for the work that has been completed by the District, those
93 elevations were consistent with the ACSIC. He stated that they have done a repair report in the past to
94 identify the capacity of the culverts and identified that the capacity was sufficient based on those metrics.
95 He noted that there would be a forthcoming report for the Board that will talk about the culverts on Pine
96 Street and the relation to the two others downstream.

97 District Administrator Tomczik reminded the Board that Mr. Stowe had appeared before the Board
98 previously about this issue and a determination had been made to put this item on their October Workshop
99 meeting which was the report that District Engineer Otterness was referring to. He assured the Board that
100 the work that the District does includes communications with the cities. He explained that they do work
101 and collaborate with those entities and notification is consistent with the existing Statutes. He stated that
102 the capacity of the system is the capacity of the system, and things that go beyond that and proposals like,
103 lowering a culvert or increase the size of this culvert would be legally designated as improvements to the
104 system which is a whole different matter beyond the maintenance that is undertaken.

105 Mr. Stowe stated that the District did an improvement of the system upstream of him.

106 District Administrator Tomczik clarified that the District had not constructed what would be legally
107 designated as an improvement on the system under the drainage code.

108 Mr. Stowe suggested that the Board come out to Pine Street and take a look at the ditch, look at the 1890
109 surveys, the grade of the road, and how the water in the ditch now flows the opposite of the grade of the
110 road. He stated that by combining all the ditches and creating ACD 10-22-32, they were now sending the
111 water uphill toward his place. He noted that they had to lower the ditch because they ran out of elevation

112 which is why the power poles are leaning towards the street. He stated that he questioned the District
113 saying that the numbers were all good and reiterated his suggestion for them to look at the 1890 surveys.

114 Manager Waller stated that the whole ACD 10-22-32 complex is not just a question of what the capacity of
115 the drainage system is because there are so many places where there are muck soils. He stated that the
116 District, as the stormwater conveyance authority, isn't limited just to the 103E portion, which is the
117 capacity, and explained that, in his opinion, they haven't adequately taken into consideration what the
118 roads do to those areas that are adjacent the ditches that have the muck soils. He stated that the flowage
119 of water through the muck soils that no longer takes place and now has to go through a straw, is a problem.
120 He stated that the District has the authority to take a look at ground water that is just below the surface
121 and how the water does and doesn't flow there. He noted that the District also had authority to work with
122 the cities to do planning for stormwater conveyance systems under chapter 103B. He stated that this is a
123 situation that has happened many times in the past because of the piecemeal approach to things, but in
124 this case, it was active. He stated that he felt it was important for the District to not just consider the
125 elevation of the culvert and the capacity of the actual drainage ditch, but also what the road situation was
126 in 1890, the impact of building a road through a wetland with muck soil versus permeable soils, and how it
127 would impact the area. He stated that he can remember seeing pictures of the same type of thing while
128 serving on the Board a number of years ago on ditch 55 where all the homes were being put in on the west
129 side. He stated that he felt that when the Board holds their workshop, they need to look at more than just
130 chapter 103E but also what they can do about working with the cities for the other part.

131 Manager Robertson stated that she wanted to once again suggest that this item be brought to a workshop.
132 She stated that she feels that sometimes Open Forum turns into an agenda item which should really just be
133 an opportunity for the Board to hear the concerns of the residents and then for staff to take direct to place
134 it on the workshop agenda. She stated that she felt it wasn't appropriate to dialogue this matter during
135 the Open Forum portion of their meeting and suggested that the Board move on to the next agenda item.

136 President Bradley stated that the Board had already directed staff to bring this item back to the workshop
137 meeting in October. He noted that they have also had discussions with the City of Columbus about the need
138 for systemic planning because this is something that the District alone cannot fix.

139 **ITEMS REQUIRING BOARD ACTION**

140 **1. 2025 Stormwater Management Grant Release**

141 Watershed Technician/Inspector Roach presented the program documents for the 2025 Stormwater
142 Management Program. He noted that they had been presented to the CAC at their September 4,
143 2024 meeting and based on their feedback, the documents have had a few revisions. He gave a brief
144 overview of the recommended changes and updates from the CAC for the program documents and
145 the grant agreement. He explained that the RFP had also been revised to note that applicants
146 should review the program documents and stated that staff was recommending authorization of
147 the program, solicitation of applications through the RFP process, and approval of HEI Task Order
148 2024-008 for engineering review of the applications.

149
150 Manager Wagamon referenced page 34 of the packet in the bottom paragraph where it states, 'will
151 not consider projects from entities that owe funds to the District'. He asked if that meant funds in

152 arrears or if it meant that if they had another project going that they were paying on if they would
153 not be eligible.

154
155 President Bradley stated that he felt that the intent was if someone owed the District money
156 because they hadn't paid.

157
158 Manager Wagamon referenced page 45 of the packet on the grant agreement, Section I. A (2), where
159 it says, 'the District for the Administrator's written approval, not to be unreasonably withheld.' He
160 stated that he felt the use of the word 'unreasonably' was pretty subjective and asked what it
161 actually meant.

162
163 District Attorney Holtman explained that the wording was part of the existing boilerplate language
164 and noted that it was a standard formulation where it is giving the other party the opportunity to
165 present something different than what the agreement provides. He noted that the District would
166 retain the discretion to decide whether the proposal would be consistent with program purposes or
167 not, but also wanted to give some assurance that it would make that decision in good faith and not
168 in a random manner.

169
170 Manager Wagamon thanked him for the explanation and asked if the District had any idea about
171 the cost differences and if they were causing a lot of extra costs for people just applying for the
172 program and explained that he did not want this to be so expensive that people do not even apply.

173
174 President Bradley noted that it has not been a problem so far.

175
176 Manager Wagamon agreed that it hadn't been a problem, but now they were adding additional
177 items and was just curious about the overall costs and if the things that the District was asking for
178 were expensive.

179
180 District Administrator Tomczik stated that he did not believe that these requests were expensive
181 because they were all fairly routine items. He stated that he believed the work that Watershed
182 Technician/Inspector Roach and the CAC have done was to get it more in the forefront discussion
183 so everyone was thinking about it ahead of time.

184
185 Manager Robertson noticed that the majority of the red language highlighted was related to
186 reporting and the aftermath. She asked if the requirement for reporting was based on previous
187 grants that have been awarded where the standards were not met. She stated that she
188 understands the desire for 'before' and 'after' to ensure that the work was done. She stated that
189 some of the language included such as, requiring people for up to 10 years to report to the District,
190 seemed a bit excessive to her. She suggested that the reporting period could perhaps be done
191 when the District can ensure that the project was completed to the appropriate standards. She
192 asked if there was going to be a template available for the applicant to use for the reporting
193 requirement. She did not want the requirement to be burdensome to the applicant.

194
195 Manager Weinandt stated that these grants were requested by cities and organizations, not
196 individuals. She explained that it was standard practice for any State grant that if you get a chunk

197 of public money they were required to operate and maintain it for 10 years, which is what this
198 portion of the document outlines. She noted that she served on the CAC for a few year when they
199 would review the applications and some of them came in not completely thought out, so she felt
200 what has been happening year after year is that the application was becoming more and more clear.
201 She stated that she felt that having the applicants speak to people at the District prior to applying
202 can save a lot of time. She stated that she felt that the CAC had really played an important role in
203 talking about what the application looks like and also seriously reviewing the applications.

204
205 President Bradley shared examples of things like iron-enhanced sand filters or SAFL Baffles which
206 require maintenance. He explained that he believed all this was doing was saying that the District
207 knows that they will have to do maintenance on this and would like to know how they were going
208 to do it.

209
210 Manager Weinandt asked how long the District had been awarding these grants and whether any
211 of the projects had met the 10-year mark.

212
213 President Bradley stated that they have easily met the 10-year mark. He explained that he had been
214 on the Board for 10 years and they have done this every year he has been involved.

215
216 Manager Waller stated that he did not know exactly how long they have been awarding the grants,
217 but noted that they have been doing stormwater grants for a long time. He stated that they have
218 required them to continue operating and maintaining these things, but was not sure that there had
219 actually been a continuous annual report on them from each city. He stated that he would agree
220 that requiring 10 years of reports was excessive.

221
222 Manager Robertson stated that the language in the packet identifies potential applicants as being
223 cities, counties, school districts, libraries, and other public and private entities. She asked if private
224 entities also meant that residents within the District would be allowed to apply for this grant.

225
226 District Administrator Tomczik stated that within the general frame of the District's stormwater
227 management grant program, he would say private entity would be something like a corporate entity
228 or a university, those landowners at would have a large campus. He noted that the public, or mom
229 and pop landowners, would be more aligned with the water quality grant because the size of their
230 property was typically significantly smaller and the capacity of a BMP would be significantly
231 different. He stated that they 'could' apply, but felt it went back more to the element of what
232 Watershed Technician/Inspector Roach has brought before the Board with early and good
233 communication about what was intended and what would be involved and aligning that opportunity
234 with the District's framework and experience in order for them to be successful.

235
236 Manager Robertson stated that she appreciated the language about a pre-application sit-down with
237 staff because she felt that was very important within the planning process. She reiterated that she
238 just did not want to make the aftermath of the grant process anymore difficult than it needed to be.

239
240 Watershed Technician/Inspector Roach stated that the 10-year requirement on page 43 of the
241 packet would be asking the applicant to provide a maintenance plan of what activities would be

242 taking place within the first 10 years of the project. He noted that the actual reporting aspect
243 would only be an annual report for each year the grant was active.

244
245 Manager Waller asked what the word 'active' meant.

246
247 Watershed Technician/Inspector Roach explained that staff's intent, when using the term 'active',
248 would be reporting for the lifespan of the agreement itself.

249
250 Manager Waller stated that description would make quite a bit of difference relating to that lifespan
251 of the agreement itself versus the 10 years that had been mentioned.

252
253 District Engineer Otterness stated that he had just noticed one thing that may have the potential to
254 be misinterpreted. He referenced page 38, 'Project proposing the maintenance or repair of
255 existing stormwater management infrastructure are ineligible for Stormwater Management Grant
256 funding.' He explained that specific wording, to him, would imply that any project that would have
257 some component of it being repair or maintenance would make the whole project ineligible. He
258 stated that he felt that the intent was to make ineligible those project components that were related
259 to maintenance. He suggested that they amend the language to 'Project components which are
260 intended solely for the maintenance or repair of existing stormwater management infrastructure
261 are ineligible for the Stormwater Management Grant funding.'

262
263 Manager Waller thanked him for that comment, because he had written a note to himself on this
264 page that he would not vote in favor of this for that reason. He stated that he felt the language was
265 just too broad and goes against some of the things that the District wanted to do, for example,
266 encourage cleaning of stormwater ponds. He referenced the next sentence at the top of page 38
267 'Additionally, projects that are proposed by entities that owe funds to the District will not be
268 considered.' He stated that he did not remember too many of the instances in his 18 years on the
269 Board where someone owed money to the District. He stated that in his notes, he had this whole
270 new section underlined, and would say 'no' to the whole section. He explained that he did not
271 think the language should be amended and instead, it should be struck.

272
273 Manager Weinandt asked what would happen when the 10 years was met but repairs were needed.
274 She asked if the city or the other entity would be stuck with keeping it up. She stated that the
275 other clarifying question she had was that this was the Stormwater Management Grant but there is
276 also the \$500 mini grant as well as a grant in between the two, but she could not remember what it
277 was called.

278
279 District Administrator Tomczik explained that she was referring to the Water Quality Grant which
280 the District had periodically collaborated with the municipalities when they have a road project and
281 leverage this with the community for multiple rain gardens on private property within the right-of-
282 way.

283
284 Manager Weinandt stated that the Water Quality Grant was the one that private entities with cost-
285 shares can do some of the water quality work.

286

287 District Administrator Tomczik explained that his recollection from the CAC meeting and the
288 language on the top of page 38 regarding owing funds was that it came from a member of the CAC
289 that had business experience and had a situation arise where people were asking for more money
290 when there were already outstanding fees owed.
291

292 President Bradley stated that he did not remember the details but knows that there was a time
293 during his tenure where there were about 4 cities that had made a promise, as a result of prior
294 grants, to provide credits or something to the District. He stated that the District had given them
295 the option of either paying the money or to comply with the agreements. He stated that he felt
296 this proposed language would give them the opportunity to make it clear that the District expected
297 them to honor their other obligations to the District before they considered giving them more
298 money.
299

300 Manager Robertson stated that she assumed that this was reviewed every year and stated that she
301 had no problem with what was being proposed. She suggested that for discussion next year that
302 they want to work the longevity of the project into their ranking criteria along with what additional
303 maintenance costs may be.
304

305 **Motion by Manager Robertson, seconded by Manager Bradley, to authorize staff to initiate the**
306 **2025 Stormwater Management Grant program and to notify potential applicants of funding**
307 **availability by publishing the attached Request for Proposals, including correction of the**
308 **typographical errors as indicated by staff, and the amendment to the language on page 38, 3 (1)**
309 **to include language that reads, ‘Project components which are intended solely for the**
310 **maintenance or repair of existing stormwater management infrastructure are ineligible for the**
311 **Stormwater Management Grant funding.’**
312

313 Manager Waller explained that he would be voting against this item based on the language included
314 on page 38 because, in his opinion, it was unreasonable and unnecessary. He stated that in his
315 time with the District, it has not been a big enough problem to warrant including that kind of
316 language.
317

318 **Motion carried 4-1 (Manager Waller opposed).**
319

320 **Motion by Manager Robertson, seconded by Manager Weinandt, to approve the HEI Task Order**
321 **2024 – 008 for Engineering review of the 2025 Stormwater Management Grant program**
322 **applications. Motion carried 5-0.**
323

324 **2. Check Register Dated September 25, 2024, in the Amount of \$259,132.30 and September Interim**
325 **Financial Statements Prepared by Redpath and Company**
326

327 **Motion by Manager Weinandt, seconded by Manager Robertson, to approve check register dated**
328 **September 25, 2024, in the Amount of \$259,132.30 and September Interim Financial Statements**
329 **prepared by Redpath and Company. Motion carried 5-0.**
330

331 **ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION AND INFORMATION**

332 **1. Precipitation Events and the Rice Creek Watershed District Landscape**

333 District Administrator Tomcik noted that for the last few meetings, he has been holding up the DNR
334 maps which show their analysis of water levels in the watersheds throughout the State. He noted
335 that it was particularly wet April through August, and had finished August at 140% of normal
336 precipitation. He stated that the message received was that it was the wettest April-June that is on
337 record; things have dried out a bit in September; they were still well above the normal precipitation
338 for the year; but needed rain because things were drying out. He stated that in his mind this
339 appears to be conflicting information and wanted to look into it more closely. He stated that he
340 spoke extensively with Program Manager Kocian about the situation and would like to offer some
341 context. The hydrologic region in the State that includes RCWD is roughly 25% storage with lakes
342 and wetlands. He noted that RCWD has 30% storage, so they were well above the region and Coon
343 Creek has 24%. He stated that the slope as in the drop in the landscape across the region was at
344 7.76 feet per mile and RCWD has 2.23 feet per mile, so they are very flat which creates a bathtub
345 that holds the water with limited ability to drain. He stated that if they only look upstream of Long
346 Lake for the District, storage is at 33% and the slope is 1.9 feet per mile. He said he felt this offered
347 context that this is one element that the Board and staff should be aware of in considering issues.
348 He reviewed the current conditions and noted that Clear Lake has had high water levels all year that
349 were consistently above OHWL and they are slowly dropping. He noted that White Bear Lake's
350 water level is up and stated that this has been an area of great concern following 2 years of drought,
351 but they are nearing the long-term average. He noted that White Bear Lake was not yet out-letting
352 but had filled up a lot. He explained that Rice Creek had a current flow of 80 cubic feet/second and
353 noted that the average for this time of year was 55 cubic feet/second, which means they were well
354 above average. He stated that the message he would like the Board to take home with them about
355 this is that the watershed has a lot of storage, a lot of wetlands on the landscape and a lot of lakes,
356 yet very flat and so slow to drain.

357
358 Manager Robertson asked District Administrator Tomczik to send a summary of the information he
359 shared to the Board, including the DNR map information he had referenced.

360
361 Manager Waller stated that he felt District Administrator Tomczik's report demonstrated the
362 importance of noting the impact on the roads that are built through the permeable soils and creating
363 impermeable structures which limits the drainage, because that can make things even slower and
364 wetter.

365
366 Manager Wagamon stated that they also actually have ditches running backward.

367
368 Manager Waller stated that it also shows the need for the District to have a bigger picture look at
369 things when they are working with the cities.

370
371 **2. Staff Reports**

372 Manager Weinandt stated that she appreciated the staff reports and noted that it looks like they
373 were close to getting a full team put together again.

374
375

376 **3. October Calendar**
377 District Administrator Tomczik noted that the October calendar did not include the Bald Eagle Lake
378 de-listing celebration which will be held on October 17, 2024, at 7:00 p.m. and noted that it possibly
379 has an incorrect address.

380
381 The Board discussed the location for the event along with parking accommodations.

382
383 District Administrator Tomczik stated that staff would confirm the address and communicate if there
384 was any change.

385
386 Manger Robertson stated that she will be in attendance at the CAC meeting on October 2, 2024, but
387 may be a bit late.

388
389 **4. Administrator Updates**
390 District Administrator Tomczik stated that he was continuing work on the Blue Thumb logo transfer
391 to Metro Blooms. He stated that related to public drainage system, RCD-4 that the survey of the
392 banks has been completed and staff was currently working through the quantities and the estimates
393 for bank stabilization. He stated that for drainage and other issues on ACD 10-22-32 they are
394 awaiting the DNR position on the rare and endangered species from which to bring the Pine Street
395 permit back for Board consideration. He explained that there was some discussion about the
396 completeness of the record and discussion on the Coon Creek minutes and noted that both Coon
397 Creek and the City of Columbus were subject to a data practices act request. The material has
398 been reviewed by the District Engineers as it pertains to ACD 10-22-32 and noted that Manager
399 Wagamon had asked to look at those materials.

400
401 Manager Wagamon stated that he had received the materials earlier this morning.

402
403 District Administrator Tomczik stated he had additional copies available if anyone else on the Board
404 would like to see this material. He noted that he had engaged with Jack Davis, City Administrator
405 in the City of Columbus, about the flooding concerns. He had extended the cost-share study of the
406 area to him and noted that he believed the value in that would come from their land use plans and
407 that the representative engineers would best consider the parameters that might be included in any
408 such study to see if it would be viable and supportive of both entities. He stated that District
409 permits consider and work to mitigate the impacts of development on the landscape and how
410 development will affect landowners downstream. He explained that the rules work towards
411 having it contained within the properties and also have studies and projects with municipalities.
412 He noted that there would be several updates related to administrative housekeeping matters in
413 the employee handbook on the horizon and explained that he planned to bring them to future Board
414 meeting.

415
416 **5. Managers Update**
417 Manager Waller stated that a resident who lives in Forest Lake near the 180th Street area by the
418 pipeline that crosses JD-2 had informed him that he had signed an easement with the Northern Gas
419 Company to put in a third pipeline which means it was no longer rumor and asked staff to make sure
420 that this does not just go by the wayside.

421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436

District Administrator Tomczik stated that he believes that Regulatory Manager Hughes has been in contact with the company regarding their proposed work.

Regulatory Manager Hughes clarified that he had just had a conversation with Manager Waller about this situation just prior to the meeting, so he was aware of it.

President Bradley stated that he had attended the recent CAC meeting and was impressed with how they came forward with ideas and suggestions based on their annual reviews and frustrations with the grant process.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion by Manager Robertson, seconded by Manager Wagamon, to adjourn the meeting at 10:08 a.m.

Motion carried 5-0.