

Approved



**REGULAR MEETING OF THE RCWD BOARD OF MANAGERS**

Wednesday, September 23, 2015

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

**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  
32  
33  
34

**CALL TO ORDER**

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

**ROLL CALL**

Present: President Patricia Preiner, 1<sup>st</sup> Vice-Pres. Barbara Haake, 2<sup>nd</sup> Vice-Pres. John Waller, Secretary Mike Bradley, and Treasurer Steve Wagamon.

Absent: None.

Staff Present: Administrator Phil Belfiori, Permit Coordinator/Wetland Specialist Nick Tomczik, Lakes and Streams Specialist Matt Kocian, Office Manager Theresa Stasica.

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

Visitors: Katie Thompson-WSB Engineering; Kevin Behn-EOR.

**SETTING OF THE AGENDA**

District Administrator Belfiori requested additional Items Requiring Board Action: number 1, Consider Park Plaza Permit Application 15-066, new number 7, Consider resolution related to initiating repair of Branch 2 of ACD 53-62, new number 8, Consider resolution related to initiating repair of Branch 1 of Washington County Judicial Ditch 2 and new Items for Discussion and Information: number 2, Discussion on possible MAWD Annual Meeting Resolution.

*Motion by Manager Haake, seconded by Manager Wagamon, to adopt the agenda as amended. Motion carried 5-0.*

**READING OF THE MINUTES AND THEIR APPROVAL**

Manager Waller indicated he was marked as absent on the roll call vote for the September 14, 2015 Special Meeting but he recused himself from the meeting and abstained on vote.

**Minutes of the September 9, 2015, Board of Managers Meeting Workshop Meeting. Minutes of the September 9, 2015, Special Board of Managers Meeting and Workshop Meeting. Minutes of the September 14, 2015, Special Board Meeting Minutes and Minutes of the September 14, 2015 Workshop Meeting Minutes.**

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

<b>BOARD OF MANAGERS</b>	<b>Michael J. Bradley</b> Ramsey County	<b>Barbara A. Haake</b> Ramsey County	<b>Patricia L. Preiner</b> Anoka County	<b>Steven P. Wagamon</b> Anoka County	<b>John J. Waller</b> Washington County
--------------------------	--	--	--	--	--

35 **Motion by Manager Wagamon, seconded by Manager Haake, to approve the minutes as presented for 9/9/15, 9/9/15**  
36 **workshop, 9/14/15 workshop, and approve the 9/14/15 special meeting minutes with Manager Waller's revision.**  
37 **Motion carried 5-0.**

38  
39 **PERMIT APPLICATIONS REQUIRING BOARD ACTION**

40 The following applications have been reviewed by the District Engineer and Staff and will be acted upon without  
41 discussion in accordance with the Engineer's Recommendation unless a Manager or the Applicant or another interested  
42 person requests opportunity for discussion:  
43

44 **CONSENT AGENDA**

No.	Applicant	Location	Plan Type	Recommendation
46	15-071 Ramsey County	Arden Hills	Bridge/Culvert	CAPROC 7 items
47			Crossing/Floodplain	
48			Public/Private Drainage	
49			System Wetland Alterations	

50  
51 **Motion by Manager Wagamon, seconded by Manager Bradley, to conditional approve the consent agenda as outlined**  
52 **in the above Table of Contents in accordance with RCWD District Engineer's Findings and Recommendation, dated**  
53 **September 16, 2015.**

54  
55 **OPEN MIKE – LIMIT 12 MINUTES.** Any RCWD resident may address the Board in his or her individual capacity, for up to  
56 three minutes, on any matter not on the agenda. Speakers are requested to come to the podium, state their name and address for the  
57 record. Additional comments may be solicited and accepted in writing. Generally, the Board of Managers will not take official action on  
58 items discussed at this time, but may refer the matter to staff for a future report or direct that the matter be scheduled on an upcoming  
59 agenda.

60 There were no comments made at Open Mike.

61  
62 **ADDITIONAL ITEMS REQUIRING BOARD ACTION**

63 **1. Park Plaza Permit Application 15-066**  
64 Permit Coordinator/Wetland Specialist Tomczik stated on 9/14/2015 there was a workshop meeting regarding  
65 this application which revolved around wellhead protection and potential for infiltration on the site. The District  
66 was waiting for the City of Fridley's position as wellhead administrator in order to move forward with the  
67 potential for infiltration. The District did get the letter on 9/17/2015 from the City of Fridley finding that  
68 infiltration is acceptable and Fridley had some conditions that they were going to hold the landowner to. Those  
69 conditions will be under Fridley's own permit. The District did move forward with the applicant to look for  
70 infiltration on the site.

71  
72 Manager Haake asked what kind of decision or concession did Fridley make. Permit Coordinator/Wetland  
73 Specialist Tomczik stated the City of Fridley asked the landowner to monitor a number of things onsite such as  
74 handling of hazardous materials, pet waste, and similar items. The landowner would communicate to residents of  
75 the facility and also participate in the monitoring of the wellhead, infiltration area, as a condition.

76  
77 Manager Haake wondered who would be monitoring this, she understood this was a cooperative. Permit  
78 Coordinator/Wetland Specialist Tomczik stated the property is owned by a cooperative of the current residents  
79 and they have adopted the conditions and will have meetings and continue to manage the site.  
80

81 **Motion by Manager Waller, seconded by Manager Haake, to CAPROC Permit Application 15-066 in**  
82 **accordance with RCWD District Engineer's Findings and Recommendation, dated September 22, 2015. Motion**  
83 **carried 5-0.**  
84

85 **2. Consider Ramsey County's Rice Creek Commons Comprehensive Stormwater Management Plan.**

86 Permit Coordinator/Wetland Specialist Tomczik explained the District's Rule C 5(f) states: "A municipality or  
87 public road authority may prepare a comprehensive stormwater management plan setting forth an alternative  
88 means of meeting the standards of sections 6 and 7 within a defined sub watershed." In this case, while the rule  
89 provides for the proposal of alternatives standards to sections 6 (water quality treatment) and section 7 (peak  
90 stormwater runoff control) no alternatives are proposed here but rather the applicant is seeking approval of the  
91 proposed stormwater management plan framework under which future development will be required to  
92 conform.  
93

94 Rice Creek Commons Comprehensive Stormwater Management Plan (CSMP) is for the land area of the former  
95 Twin Cities Army Ammunition Plant (TCAAP). The applicant is Ramsey County and the City of Arden Hills  
96 working together under a Joint Powers Agreement (JPA), setting forth the establishment of a Joint Development  
97 Authority (JDA) for the area. Again, the applicant has proposed the Rice Creek Commons CSMP to define the  
98 framework under which future development will be required to conform.  
99

100 HEI has reviewed the plan and concluded the detail of the technical memo as follows:  
101

102 "The CSMP has established the storm water framework for development within the site, by sequencing the site  
103 for infiltration, providing regional ponds in areas where infiltration is not feasible, and establishing drainage  
104 patterns and demonstrating rate control for the developed site. Based on a review of the information supplied by  
105 the applicant, the CSMP has established a regional storm water plan for future development of the site, showing  
106 compliance with the Rule C.6 Water Quality Treatment requirements and the Rule C.7 Peak Stormwater Runoff  
107 Control requirements."  
108

109 A resolution has been drafted to approve the proposed Rice Creek Commons CSMP conditional on a single final  
110 document. At this time the resolution is ready for Board consideration.  
111

112 Manager Haake asked if soil borings have been taken and is there are not any soil contamination. Permit  
113 Coordinator/Wetland Specialist Tomczik stated the site has had a history of contamination. This is two-fold,  
114 there is the investigation on whether infiltration is feasible based on the soil permeability and separation to the  
115 ground water table and secondarily, the work of the Federal Government, as the previous owner, in conjunction  
116 with the EPA, MPCA and the current owner for their remediation of those contaminated areas of the site. There  
117 are certain areas where infiltration would probably aggravate or potential increase the plume of contamination  
118 and those areas are not proposed for infiltration.  
119

120 Manager Waller asked if the area with the hashmarks would be the areas with the wet ponds. Permit  
121 Coordinator/Wetland Specialist Tomczik stated that was correct. Manager Waller asked if the wet ponds will be  
122 lined so the water will not infiltrate the ground. Permit Coordinator/Wetland Specialist Tomczik stated that is  
123 likely however the proposal today is not approving work on the ground. The detail of how that pond would be  
124 created is not set at this time but lining the pond is a typical action to prevent the infiltration of the ground  
125 water.  
126

127 Manager Waller asked where the verification guarantee was for this. Permit Coordinator/Wetland Specialist  
128 Tomczik stated under the District permitting program. Earthwork and creation of impervious surface requires  
129 the creation of stormwater treatment areas and in this case there will be wet ponds and when it is advisable that  
130 infiltration not take place, those ponds are lined typically with heavy earth material, typically clay or lined with  
131 some kind of synthetic liner.  
132

133 Manager Bradley stated he recently took a tour with some of the staff and he thought they typically had staff that  
134 went on site on a regular basis to ensure compliance with their requirements. Permit Coordinator/Wetland  
135 Specialist Tomczik indicated that was correct. Once the permits are approved there are stipulations, the  
136 stipulations are referenced in the permit. The District has a number of different inspectors that go out onto the  
137 sites and look at the work on the site to make sure it is consistent with the approved plan.  
138

139 Permit Coordinator/Wetland Specialist Tomczik stated for the record the County and their representative are  
140 present if there are questions.  
141

142 ***Motion by Manager Waller, seconded by Manager Bradley, to approve Resolution 2015-30, Authorizing***  
143 ***Approval of the Rice Creek Commons Comprehensive Stormwater Management Plan.***  
144

145 **THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED** that the District administrator, with the advice of the District engineer and on  
146 such final revision as he may require, is authorized to approve the Rice Creek Commons CSMP.  
147

148 **ROLL CALL:**

149 ***Manager Waller – Aye***

150 ***Manager Haake – Aye***

151 ***Manager Bradley – Aye***

152 ***Manager Wagamon – Aye***

153 ***President Preiner – Aye***  
154

155 ***Motion carried 5-0.***  
156

157 **3. Consider Resolution Related to the City of Lino Lakes Formal Request for Affirmation of Northeast Area**  
158 **Outlet Project.**

159 Permit Coordinator/Wetland Specialist Tomczik stated the District held a workshop on September 9, 2015 with  
160 the City of Lino Lakes and landowners to discuss progress on Lino Lakes proposed outlet to increase stormwater  
161 drainage for the northeast area. In the meeting the City identified their need for affirmation, some assurance,  
162 from the District in order to move forward. The meeting concluded in the next step of the City sending a  
163 communication defining the action that the city was seeking from the RCWD Board.  
164

165 The City has communicated their interest for RCWD Board action by email dated 9-11-2015 from Michael  
166 Grochalla.  
167

168 Manager Haake thought an excellent job was done on this item. She would like to come to some sort of  
169 conclusion or compromise on this and it seems that they recognize some of the limitations and the fact that the  
170 RCWD rate control along with preventing flooding and increase the water quality.  
171

172 Manager Bradley indicated they did this specifically at the request of Lino Lakes. They sent the District an email  
173 and it did not meet the District standards on what they could officially do and the District responded back with

174 their points, which is the Resolution before them, and he wanted to make sure they give the City of Lino Lakes the  
175 opportunity to comment on this.

176  
177 Ms. Katie Thompson, WSB Engineering, on behalf of the City of Lino Lakes stated they had an opportunity to  
178 review what Permit Coordinator/Wetland Specialist Tomczik sent over and they believe that it meets what they  
179 are looking for in order for the City to move forward with the details of the project.

180  
181 **Motion by Manager Haake, seconded by Manager Bradley, to approve Resolution 2015-31, Resolution**  
182 **Regarding City of Lino Lakes Proposed Peltier Lake Outlet.**

183 **THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED** that the Board of Managers:

- 184 • Recognizes that the existing regional stormwater conveyance system for the described 1,430-acre area is not  
185 sufficient for the level of development that the City foresees and wishes to accommodate within this area;
- 186 • In its roles as regulatory agency and drainage authority, will approve a modification of regional stormwater  
187 conveyance by the City on finding that the City's plan meets the terms of District rules and the Minnesota  
188 drainage law;
- 189 • Affirms that the July 9, 2015 memorandum of the District engineer accurately states the criteria for approval  
190 under District Rule I, including the requirement of no adverse impact, and the status of the City engineer's  
191 analysis and submittals to the District with respect to those criteria;
- 192 • Affirms that as a part of its Rule I application, the City may submit a comprehensive stormwater management  
193 plan for District review and approval under District Rule C.5(f) as the means to commit to certain measures  
194 required by the Rule I permit to demonstrate that the project will have no adverse impact on upstream or  
195 downstream water quality or quantity;
- 196 • Recognizes that one such measure proposed by the City is its adoption of a restrictive stormwater flow rate  
197 standard to apply on a site basis within the project area, which the District would adopt in parallel and apply  
198 in its own review and permitting of future developments;
- 199 • Affirms that it is the obligation of the City to make formal application for a District permit and for approvals  
200 under applicable requirements of the Minnesota drainage law; and to submit adequate design, modeling and  
201 related materials to allow for the District to make the findings required for approval; and advises that it is  
202 preferable that the proposed means to operate and maintain the modified conveyance system be as reliable  
203 and simple to administer as reasonably possible so as to allow the Board to find that they will function as  
204 intended.

205 Manager Waller stated there are some important items in the Resolution, one being that the District is waiting for  
206 the memorialization of the stricter standard by the City and by the District and to make sure that does happen.  
207 During the workshop there was discussion about a technical memorandum, but the District is still awaiting the  
208 City's technical memorandum, which will indicate a number of gates and ponds with electronic controls. He did  
209 not like the electronic controls when they were proposed for St. Anthony and he was not anymore enthusiastic  
210 about them because rain is something they are working hard on to predict but micro-bursts and such are difficult.  
211 He stated while the technology is a good idea, he did not believe they were at the point of complete control. He  
212 wondered how they will handle those kinds of things in the future if they find they do not work. Permit  
213 Coordinator/Wetland Specialist Tomczik stated at this point, this is only an affirmation of where they are at  
214 today. To Manager Wallers' point, when the applicant comes forth and provides the rule-I application, setting up  
215 the application of the first phase or perhaps the entire project for the pipe to be laid, when there is a proposal for

216 those controls, it will be under the review of the District Engineer. There will be some assessment of whether the  
217 controls are deemed reliable or not.  
218

219 Manager Waller reviewed some projects where the controls put into place did not work as planned so he  
220 indicated he was concerned with using electronic controls and how they will work.  
221

222 Ms. Thompson stated the intent of the City is to move into the preliminary design phase where they will work  
223 through some of these issues and determine what specific types of controls that will be proposed for the ponds.  
224

225 District Attorney Holtman directed the Managers to the last sentence of the last bullet in the Resolution which  
226 advises that it is preferable that the proposed means to operate or maintain the modified conveyance system be  
227 as reliable and simple to administer as reasonably possible so as to allow the Board to find that they will function  
228 as intended, which is hopefully clear to encourage the City not to get too complicated in their design. The other  
229 comment is that when District staff and Houston Engineering reviews what the City is proposing, there are two  
230 parts to it. One is what is the means to retain and manage the water in appropriate places and the second is, on  
231 top of that, what is the technology or method that will be used to manage and operate that system. He did not  
232 think it will be just a matter of the City proposing a set of electronic controls, it will be a matter of making sure  
233 the standards are in place to hold the water, concur in the use of what is proposed as the means of managing that  
234 but if it were still not functioning, it would be an obligation to manage those gates some other way. The question  
235 is what would be the alternative way and could they make sure that the plan accommodates that if the  
236 electronics do not function properly.  
237

238 Manager Waller stated one last issue is this particular development is in the center of 72 and 55 so there are  
239 landowners above and below it that have a drainage capacity ownership. He has not heard how they will be  
240 protected yet and would this document ensure their protection, up and down stream, as they move forward.  
241

242 District Engineer Otterness stated nothing with this resolution is going to take away from the Boards authority  
243 and abilities as a drainage authority to manage the systems so as the City moves forward with any further plans  
244 they are going to have to take care of any of those concerns and issues to make sure that the benefiting  
245 landowners still have drainage by whatever means the City moves forward with to work within the confines. The  
246 Board will still maintain control until such a date in which the District would transfer any of that authority to the  
247 City.  
248

249 **ROLL CALL:**

250 ***Manager Waller – Aye***

251 ***Manager Haake – Aye***

252 ***Manager Bradley – Aye***

253 ***Manager Wagamon – Aye***

254 ***President Preiner - Aye***

255  
256 ***Motion carried 5-0.***  
257

258 **4. Consider Middle Rice Creek Restoration Project Receipt of Project Plans and Specifications and Authorize**  
259 **Staff to Solicit Bids for the Construction.**

260 District Administrator Belfiori stated the purpose of this memorandum is to request Board consideration of a  
261 motion to acknowledge receipt of project plans and specifications from Emmons and Oliver Resources, Inc. (EOR),

262 and authorize staff, with assistance from EOR, to solicit bids for the construction of the Middle Rice Creek  
263 Restoration Project.

264  
265 Lakes and Streams Specialist Kocian made a presentation to the Board. He indicated final plans and specifications  
266 have been received from the project engineer, the project is on schedule with Phase 1 construction taking place in  
267 winter of 2015/2016. The soil testing is complete and no contamination has been found. Key permits are in-  
268 hand, other permits are pending and the project engineer and RCWD staff continue to work closely with Ramsey  
269 County to coordinate access.

270  
271 **Motion by Manager Haake, seconded by Manager Bradley, to acknowledge receipt of final project plans and**  
272 **specification from Emmons and Olivier Resources, Inc. and authorizes staff, with assistance from EOR, to**  
273 **solicit bids for construction of the Middle Rice Creek Restoration Project, and authorizes the administrator to**  
274 **approve minor revisions to project plans and specifications provided that the revisions do not significantly**  
275 **affect projects costs or scope. Motion carried 5-0.**

276  
277 5. **Consider Findings and Order Correcting Drainage System Record for Anoka/Washington Judicial Ditch 3.**  
278 District Administrator Belfiori summarized the findings contacted in resolution 2015 -32 related to the order  
279 correcting the drainage system record for Anoka /Washington Judicial Ditch 3. He also stated that by Adopting  
280 the proposed functional alignment and grade of AWJD 3, as described in the engineer's Historical Review  
281 Memorandum and Final Addendum, the Board is now reconciling the historical record of the drainage system  
282 with the functional alignment, dimension and grade of the system as it has historically provided public benefit.

283  
284 **Motion by Manager Haake, seconded by Manager Waller, to approve Resolution 2015-32, Findings and Order**  
285 **Correcting Drainage System Record for Anoka/Washington Judicial Ditch 3.**

286  
287 Therefore, the RCWD Board of Managers makes the following:

288 ORDER

- 289 A. The Board of Managers hereby corrects the drainage system record of AWJD 3 to reflect the functional  
290 alignment, dimension and grade of the combined system as detailed in the engineer's Historical Review  
291 Memorandum dated March 27, 2015, attached as Exhibit A.
- 292 B. The alignment of the drainage system, as corrected, shall include the drainage system right of way as  
293 indicated by the engineer, which includes the area affected by the original construction of the drainage  
294 system for which damages were paid. The right of way includes the area physically occupied by the drainage  
295 system and an area of reasonable setback adjacent to the drainage system, necessary to protect the drainage  
296 system and to allow the drainage authority to perform its statutory obligations of inspection and  
297 maintenance.
- 298 C. The Board of Managers hereby vacates and abandons any remnant portions of AWJD 3 not included in the  
299 functional alignment detailed in the Historical Review Memorandum.

300  
301 Manager Waller stated he had a question in regards to order C. He noted it states "The Board of Managers hereby  
302 vacates and abandons any remnant portions of AWJD 3 not included in the functional alignment detailed in the  
303 Historical Review Memorandum", and what this section talked about. District Engineer Otterness believed that  
304 was a clause that Attorney Kolb has included with any of these resolutions regarding establishment of the historic  
305 profile and condition of the system, just in case that there are any other remnants from documentation that the  
306 Board does not have in its possession that could come up at some future date that would indicate that there was  
307 a piece of the ditch that was created that the District does not know about at this time. That said, there are a

308 couple of items that he was not sure were officially taken care of, particularly Branch 5, the branch that was taken  
309 over by Anoka County Ditch 55. He did not know if that was formally abandoned when Anoka County Ditch 55  
310 was created. That would be one of those housekeeping items to take care of.

311  
312 Manager Waller stated his concern was if a housekeeping error would result in the loss of the fifteen or twenty  
313 feet, which is actually the connector between the two systems where the tile ends on 55 and where the spillway  
314 begins to go into Ditch 3. District Engineer Otterness stated there is only one drainage system coming into JD 3,  
315 which is 55, and that system the order was done establishing where that outlet ended and that one does outlet  
316 into the main channel of AWJD 3, so there is not any gap there.

317  
318 Manager Waller stated years ago there was a lot of discussion from different parties as to what the profile would  
319 be and in the case of JD 2, it was resolved through a process called 103E.701 subdivision 2 and that involved the  
320 DNR, Soil Water Conservation District, the City of Hugo and in that process engineers went to establish what the  
321 profile would be. A couple of things happened during that process. One, the entire depth of JD 2 came up one  
322 foot from the plans because it needed to match the Hwy 62 culvert put in ten years after construction of the  
323 ditch but upstream on JD 2, Branch 1 and Branch 2, the compromise was reached that shortened those branches  
324 and the Hugo report indicated the profile showed they were to go beyond where they actually ended up. Part of  
325 the compromise was for those to be discontinued at that point and the same is true with JD 2, Branch 2, which  
326 they will probably deal with later. When they abandon these things he wondered if the City has commented on  
327 this because after they have participated in the program they are now coming back, fifteen years later with their  
328 records so he was concerned with having more confusions and mix ups in the future.

329  
330 District Engineer Otterness indicated the cities were noticed of their Public Hearing and the process that was  
331 going on and to his knowledge they received no comment from the cities regarding the profile and alignment of  
332 the system.

333  
334 Manager Bradley stated it occurred to him that in the Resolution, Item C decides something that does not need  
335 to be decided. It abandons things and they do not know what they are and he would much rather have someone  
336 come before them indicating the District has not fixed something rather than the District abandoning something  
337 they do not know about. He would be open to removing Item C from the Resolution. District Attorney Holtman  
338 stated this proceeding follows a statutory process that was put into place a couple of years ago specifically for the  
339 purpose of taking on certain drainage records and reestablishing formally what is part of the drainage system and  
340 what is not. He thought when they go through the process and get to the end of it the District is saying these  
341 elements are now the system and what is not described is no longer a part of the system in which case the  
342 drainage authority is vacated. He thought the effect of that is clear. What perhaps isn't as clear is what is vacated  
343 and what is not vacated because they do not have the memorandum in front of them and is simply addressed by  
344 reference in the Resolution. If it is clear in the documents what has been vacated then he did not think there was  
345 an issue.

346  
347 District Administrator Belfiori stated the memorandum is referenced in the resolution and has been attached in  
348 the packet. He reminded the Board that an important purpose of this process is to specify exactly on the earth  
349 where the District "manages" as drainage authority and where they do not manage as drainage authority. It is  
350 critical for staff as they move forward with repairs to know exactly where the Board has approved they have  
351 jurisdiction and more importantly, where they do not have jurisdiction. They do have before them a historic  
352 memorandum that does go through the years of what has happened here. Manager Bradley stated based on  
353 District Administrator Belfiori's explanation his concern is satisfied.

354  
355

356  
357  
358  
359  
360  
361  
362  
363  
364  
365  
366  
367  
368  
369  
370  
371  
372  
373  
374  
375  
376  
377  
378  
379  
380  
381  
382  
383  
384  
385  
386  
387  
388  
389  
390  
391  
392  
393  
394  
395  
396  
397  
398  
399  
400

**ROLL CALL:**

- Manager Waller – Aye**
- Manager Haake – Aye**
- Manager Bradley – Aye**
- Manager Wagamon – Aye**
- President Preiner - Aye**

**Motion carried 5-0.**

**6. Consider Houston Engineering, Inc. Task Order 2015-30 Related to Development of Repair Memo for Anoka County Ditch 53-62 Branch 2.**

District Administrator Belfiori stated the purpose of this project is to complete a repair memorandum for Branch 2 of the Anoka County Ditch (ACD) 53-62 public drainage system. The Rice Creek Watershed District (RCWD) has recently received complaints regarding the condition and function of ACD 53-62 Branch 2. To be able to address these concerns, the RCWD must understand the current condition of the public drainage system, the cost of completing repairs to the system, and associated permitting requirements.

**Motion by Manager Haake, seconded by Manager Bradley, to budget the amount of \$36,400 for engineering services described within this task order. HEI shall not exceed this amount for the completion of this work without prior authorization from the Rice Creek Watershed District and the work would be completed no later than June 30, 2016. Motion carried 5-0.**

**7. Resolution related to Initiating Repair of Branch 2 Anoka County Ditch 53-62.**

District Administrator Belfiori stated the Board is asked to give consideration of Resolution related to initiating repair of Branch 2 of Anoka County Ditch 53-62.

**Motion by Manager Waller, seconded by Manager Bradley, to approve Resolution 2015-33, Initiating Repair of Branch 2 of Anoka County Ditch 53-62.**

**THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** by the Board of Managers:

1. The Board hereby initiates repair proceedings to restore Branch 2 of ACD 53-62 to its ACSIC or as closely thereto as is practical.
2. The engineer is authorized to prepare a task order for the preparation of a repair report for the work.
3. The Administrator is directed to initiate discussions with the DNR and Corps of Engineers, including providing notice to the DNR pursuant to statutes section 103E.701, subd. 2, of the proposed repair to the extent that the proposed repair might impact public waters or waters of the US, or might implicate other permitting or permission requirements of the agencies.

**ROLL CALL:**

- Manager Waller – Aye**
- Manager Haake – Aye**
- Manager Bradley – Aye**
- Manager Wagamon – Aye**
- President Preiner - Aye**

**Motion carried 5-0.**

401  
402  
403  
404  
405  
406  
407  
408  
409  
410  
411  
412  
413  
414  
415  
416  
417  
418  
419  
420  
421  
422  
423  
424  
425  
426  
427  
428  
429  
430  
431  
432  
433  
434  
435  
436  
437  
438  
439  
440  
441  
442  
443  
444  
445

- 8. Consideration of Resolution Initiating Repair of Branch 1 of Washington County Judicial Ditch 2 (JD2).**  
 District Administrator Belfiori stated this item is to consider initiating repair of Branch One of Washington County Judicial Ditch 2. He stated on July 28, 2015 the District received a letter from the City of Hugo informing the District of high water conditions in the local private drainage ditches which outlet to Branch One of Washington Judicial Ditch 2. Following Board policy, staff investigated whether the function of Branch One of Judicial Ditch 2 may be a contributing factor to the problem. A detailed inspection was provided to the Board at the September 14, 2015 workshop meeting. At the Workshop, the Board reached consensus that the Board would like to bring this forward and initiate the repair proceeding and consensus was also reached that staff should work with the engineer to authorize the preparation of a task order for preparation of a repair report for the work that needs to be conducted.

***Motion by Manager Waller, seconded by Manager Wagamon, to approve Resolution 2015-33, Initiating Repair of Branch 1 of Washington County Judicial Ditch 2 (JD2).***

**THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** by the Board of Managers:

1. The Board hereby initiates repair proceedings to restore Branch 1 of JD 2 to its ACSIC or as closely thereto as is practical.
2. The engineer is authorized to prepare a task order for the preparation of a repair report for the work.
3. The Administrator is directed to initiate discussions with the DNR and Corps of Engineers, including providing notice to the DNR pursuant to statutes section 103E.701, subd. 2, of the proposed repair and the authorized ACSIC profile, as previously approved by the DNR.
4. Pursuant to the Board's Watershed Management Plan, the cost of repair shall be paid from funds allocated by the RCWD for repair of the trunk drainage system.

**ROLL CALL:**

- Manager Waller – Aye***
- Manager Haake – Aye***
- Manager Bradley – Aye***
- Manager Wagamon – Aye***
- President Preiner - Aye***

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

- 6. Consider Check Register dated 9/23/2015, in the amount of \$207,646.07, prepared by Redpath and Company.**  
***Motion by Manager Wagamon, seconded by Manager Bradley, to approve check register dated 9/23/2015, in the amount of \$207,646.07, prepared by Redpath and Company. Motion carried 5-0.***

**ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION AND INFORMATION**

- 1. Discussion on Scheduling a Public Information Meeting for Anoka County Ditches 31/46 Repair Report and Cost Allocation.**  
 District Administrator Belfiori stated this item is in regards to discussing the scheduling for a public landowner informational meeting on Anoka County Ditches 31 and 46 repair report and cost allocation. They are currently looking at the possibilities of October 12<sup>th</sup> at 5:30 and 7:30, which would be right after their regularly scheduled October workshop meeting.

446  
447 President Preiner asked if it would be possible to have a drone view at the meeting for the landowners so the  
448 public could see what the ditch looks like. District Engineer Otterness stated it would be approximately \$400 to  
449 do the one stretch on JD 2 Branch 1. He thought they could do a couple of smaller stretches for under \$1,000 but  
450 would not be able to fly the entire ditch for that cost.

451  
452 Manager Waller asked what the per-mile cost would be because there are some exceptional problems on this  
453 ditch system. President Preiner thought the audience would like to see what they are talking about. Manager  
454 Waller did not disagree and thought there was a use for it within a public right-of-way, as long as they are not on  
455 private property. District Engineer Otterness stated it was less than a half a mile they went last time for the \$400  
456 cost they incurred. The quote they received was \$700 to do a drone over two miles of the ditch. A lot of the cost  
457 is to get the person mobilized out there and he would have to talk to the subcontractor to see what kind of costs  
458 it would be to do a few portions of the ditch system. He was not certain it would be useful or time to actually go  
459 out and do this before the meeting.

460  
461 Manager Haake thought October 12<sup>th</sup> would be a good meeting time and the cost allocations could be emailed to  
462 the managers.

463  
464 ***Motion by Manager Waller, seconded by Manager Wagamon, to Schedule a Public Information Meeting for***  
465 ***Anoka County Ditches 31/46 Repair Report and Cost Allocation on October 12<sup>th</sup> at 5:30 p.m. for Ditch 46 and***  
466 ***7:30 p.m. for Ditch 31 at Columbus City Hall. Motion carried 5-0.***

467  
468 Consensus of the Board was to go ahead with the drone flight with funding cap of \$1,000.

469  
470 **2. Discuss possible MAWD Annual Meeting Resolution**  
471 District Administrator Belfiori stated this item is in regards to an email sent out to the Board a few months ago  
472 and staff has not heard back from the Board if there was any interest to pursue any resolutions but in talking to  
473 President Preiner staff added this to the discussion to inquire if there was any interest in development of any  
474 resolution for the 2015 MAWD resolution process.

475  
476 **3. Staff Reports**  
477 There were no comments.

478  
479 **4. October Calendar**  
480 There were no comments.

481  
482 **5. Manager's Update**  
483 Manager Waller stated the Board of Manager's has made the decision to implement the maintenance of JD 2 from  
484 the Weir Structure into Rice Lake and today they are going to have some cleaning and repair of Branch One of JD  
485 2 which is also upstream of the structure and there is also a Branch 2 and the main channel to that system and he  
486 thought as long as they are going in there and fixing one part, they should fix and clean all of them at the same  
487 time. He suggested having a drone look at JD Branch Two and the main channel which is between the two  
488 branches. He felt they were in as much repair as Branch One.

489  
490 President Preiner asked if the Board wanted to move forward with that. Manager Haake stated she would like to  
491 hear what staff has to say about this.  
492

493 District Administrator Belfiori stated Branch 1 of JD 2 was spurred by a letter from the City of Hugo. He reviewed  
494 the process taken with the Board. He indicated the Board can decide to have the other branch cleaned at this  
495 time or have staff look further into it. He did not think they have conducted an initial investigation on Branch 2  
496 similar to what the Board recently authorized and completed for Branch 1 per the Boards policy. President  
497 Preiner wondered if discussion with the City of Hugo would be helpful on that issue first. The Board asked staff to  
498 do a little bit of further research on this item before a decision is made.  
499

500 **ADJOURNMENT**

501 *Motion by Manager Haake, seconded by Manager Bradley, to adjourn the meeting at 10:25 a.m. Motion carried 5-0.*