



REGULAR MEETING OF THE RCWD BOARD OF MANAGERS
Wednesday, August 14, 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: District Administrator Nick Tomczik, Regulatory Manager Patrick Hughes, Program Support Technician Emmet Hurley (video-conference), Outreach and Grant Technician Molly Nelson, Project Manager David Petry, and Office Manager Theresa Stasica

Consultants: District Engineer Chris Otterness from Houston Engineering, Inc. (HEI); District Attorney Louis Smith (video-conference) from Smith Partners; and Nick Neylon-Ramsey County Soil & Water Division

Visitors: Janelle Calhoun, Eric Swenson (video-conference)

SETTING OF THE AGENDA

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

READING OF THE MINUTES AND THEIR APPROVAL

Minutes of the July 24, 2024, Board of Managers Regular Meeting. Motion by Manager Robertson, seconded by Manager Weinandt, to approve the minutes as presented.

President Bradley pointed out a typographical error on page 8, line 112. ...and not attached to a habitable ~~habituated~~ structure'.

32 **Motion by Manager Robertson, seconded by Manager Weinandt, to approve the minutes as amended.**

33

34 **Motion carried 5-0.**

35

36 **CONSENT AGENDA**

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

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

40 No.	Applicant	Location	Plan Type	Recommendation
41 24-045	Elmcrest Vistas, LLC	Forest Lake	Final Site Drainage Plan Land Development Wetland Alteration	CAPROC 8 items

44 **It was moved by Manager Wagamon and seconded by Manager Waller, to approve the consent agenda**
45 **as outlined in the above Table of Contents in accordance with RCWD District Engineer's Findings and**
46 **Recommendations, dated August 6, 2024. Motion carried 5-0.**

47 **WATER QUALITY GRANT PROGRAM COST SHARE APPLICATION (MOLLY NELSON)**

No.	Applicant	Location	Project Type	Eligible Cost	Pollutant Reduction	Funding Recommendation
R24-08	Chip Ahn & Travis Visser	White Bear Lake	Concurrent Shoreline Stabilization & Restoration	Ahn: \$10,254.00 Visser: \$8,711.00	Volume: 28.2% TSS: 99.8% TP: 86%	Ahn: 50% cost share of \$5,127 not to exceed 50%; or \$7,500 whichever cost is lower Visser: 50% cost share of \$4,355.50 not to exceed 50%; or \$7,500 whichever cost is lower
R24-09	Timber Hills Beach Association	White Bear Lake	Rain garden	\$1,633.75	Volume: 46% TSS: 46% TP: 46%	50% cost share of \$816.88 not to exceed 50%; or \$7,500 whichever cost is lower
R24-10	Silverthorn Estates	Shoreview	Wetland Edge Stabilization	\$1,882.15	Volume: 98% TSS: 98% TP: 98%	50% cost share of \$941.08 not to exceed 50%; or \$7,500 whichever cost is lower
W24-01	Christel Johnson	Forest Lake	Prairie Restoration	\$7,385.77	Volume: 81.8%	50% cost share of \$3,692.88 not to

					TSS: 81.77% TP: 81.8%	exceed 50%; or \$7,500 whichever cost is lower
W24-02	Forest Lake Area High School/ Minnesota Water Stewards	Forest Lake	Infiltration Basin Restoration and Prairie Conversion	\$27,585.59	Volume: 5 in/yr reduction TSS: 81 lbs/yr reduction TP: 0.5 lbs/yr	75% cost share of \$7,500 not to exceed 75%; or \$7,500 whichever cost is lower

48

49 President Bradley stated that sometimes when there has been a significant project that does multiple
50 things, the District has given more than 25% and asked if there was anything available in the budget so they
51 could go up to 50% for the Forest Lake project.

52 Outreach and Grant Technician Molly Nelson noted that this grant was \$7,500 which was 75% through the
53 Water Quality Grant and noted that she does have reserved funds within that budget for water steward
54 collaboration work of about \$15,000. She explained that some of that money would go towards technical
55 services for designing and coordinating the project and if there are any extra costs related to the project,
56 they could consider them. She stated that this will be considered a capstone project for the Water
57 Steward Program so there were also some funds available through Communications and Outreach.

58 President Bradley stated that it sounds like the District is giving them more money than what has been
59 identified through this grant.

60 Outreach and Grant Technician Nelson stated that was correct and clarified that there would be \$6,000 for
61 the Water Steward capstone project component.

62 Manager Weinandt stated that she believed that in the budget information they saw at the workshop there
63 was a line item referencing Forest Lake High School.

64 District Administrator Tomczik confirmed that was correct for 2025.

65 Manager Weinandt asked about the Johnson Cost Share application and noted that it referenced the RCWD
66 Rural Groundwater and Surface Water SWA and asked if the District was now looking at groundwater.

67 Outreach and Grant Technician Nelson explained that SWA = Sub-Watershed Assessment. This
68 assessment was completed by Washington Conservation District. This project was listed as a potential
69 project within the assessment.

70 Manager Wagamon asked if there were fees on the other grants that were not shown and noted that he
71 was not aware that there were other expenditures above and beyond what the Board had been seeing.

72 Outreach and Grant Technician Nelson stated that what was mentioned earlier was specific to the Forest
73 Lake project since it is a collaboration with the Water Steward Program.

74 Manager Waller stated that he was an Advisory Committee Board member and at the meeting, regarding
75 the prairie restoration in Forest Lake, one of the members of the committee commented about the
76 installation of fiber optic cable which was familiar to him because he saw such work in Hugo. He noted
77 that he did not remember seeing a permit from them and was bringing it up was because when they put
78 fiber optic cable through the drainage ditch on 61, it turned out to be high conflicting with the ditch and
79 also when they put it down 190th Street, they broke all the tiles for ditches 5 and 7. He stated that there
80 was some discussion about how the project at the high school was scored and felt that the scoring card
81 wasn't complete enough because this is such a public location and very visible, it should be given credit for
82 that. He stated that this is a project that is part of many projects and suggested that if, in the future, they
83 were going to have a lot of projects that are bundled together that they try to see what it will look like and
84 see if there is grant money available for the bundle of projects. He stated that a question was raised about
85 where the water, after it was treated, would go and he assumed it would go north under 97 and out and
86 around. He noted that all of these applications had passed unanimously, but there was one member who
87 had abstained from voting on the Forest Lake High School project.

88 Manager Robertson stated that for the Forest Lake High School project, the total cost is \$27,585 and asked
89 what the total amount of contribution the District would be making to that total cost outside of the grant
90 funds. She asked Manager Wagamon if that was the information that he was trying to ask about.

91 Manager Wagamon clarified that he was wondering if that was the case with all the applications.

92 Outreach and Grant Technician Nelson stated that the District's total contribution would be the \$7,500
93 grant along with \$6,000 through the Minnesota Water Stewards Capstone Fund which will be found in the
94 Communications and Outreach budget.

95 President Bradley asked if those would be covering costs that were included in the \$27,585 amount.

96 Outreach and Grant Technician Nelson stated that was correct and noted that is the maximum amount of
97 the project. She explained that there were certain components that Washington Conservation District
98 outlined that if the school cannot afford the entire project, things like the demonstration garden could be
99 decreased to be a smaller size. She noted that the overall contribution from the District will be \$13,500
100 from the two budgets.

101 ***It was moved by Manager Waller and seconded by Manager Weinandt, to approve the Water Quality***
102 ***Grant Program Cost Share Applications as outlined in the above Table of Contents in accordance with***
103 ***RCWD Outreach and Grants Technician's Recommendations dated August 7, 2024. Motion carried 5-0.***
104

105 District Administrator Tomczik noted that the Water Quality Grant guidelines come back before the Board
106 annually each fall for Board consideration. He stated that they can expect to see this later in the year and
107 noted that some of the matters that were raised by Managers can be discussed at that time.

108

109 **PUBLIC HEARING: PROPOSED 2025 BUDGET & LEVY, AND WATER MANAGEMENT DISTRICT**
110 **(WMD) CHARGES**

111 President Bradley recessed the regular meeting for the public hearing.

112

113 President Bradley opened the public hearing on the 2025 Budget and Levy including the watershed wide
114 property tax levy and a special levy for the Ramsey County Ditch 4 (RCD4) WMD.

115
116 District Administrator Tomczik recognized the District's proper notice of the public hearing and presented
117 the 2025 budget highlights. He explained that the total budget supports the implementation of the
118 District WMP and provides for resource management. He noted that the column titled 'Component of
119 Funds' identifies the relationship of that fund item or its sub-fund to the District's fund balance. He
120 reviewed funds and plans for 2025 within: General Administration; Communications and Outreach;
121 Information Management; Restoration Projects; Regulatory; Ditch and Creek Maintenance; Lake and
122 Stream Management; District Facilities; and Project Anticipation.

123
124 District Administrator Tomczik stated that the total proposed expenditures are \$9,332,614 for 2025 and
125 included nearly \$900,000 in committed spending, which generally means the District previously levied for
126 the work so those would come out of fund balances. In total, there is roughly \$2.5 million in fund balance
127 spending which is evidence of the District's success in securing grants and its approach to saving in advance
128 for projects and programs along with changes on the urban fringe regarding taxable market value. He
129 explained that the Board considers the levy implications each year on its property owners and noted that
130 the implications of the levy are indicated to be flat or declining. He said the budget levy impact on
131 property owners is challenging as it is being allocated across 4 different counties with various rates,
132 meaning there may be increases and decreases for individual property owners. He noted that the impact
133 will likely be relatively flat from the 2024 property tax impact and stated that the noticed 2025 budget is a
134 change of .67% over the previous year. The estimated tax impact on a property value of \$200,000 is
135 estimated at around \$32/year which is down from estimates in previous years He gave an overview of the
136 2025 Water Management District for Ramsey County Ditch 4 (RCD 4) WMD and explained that it would
137 result in a total collection of \$94,538 which is comprised of \$85,038 in levied charges and another \$9,500
138 in right-of-way direct billing to the road authority.

139
140 President Bradley asked if the Board had any questions about the budget for staff.

141
142 Manager Waller noted that he felt it would be very difficult to find a property in the District actually valued
143 at \$200,000. He stated that has seen that dollar figure used for many years and suggested that it be
144 updated to more accurately show that the average price for most would be around \$60 per year.

145
146 President Bradley noted that he had been following other budget communications in the paper and they
147 all appear to be doing the same thing, but felt that Manager Waller's point was well noted.

148
149 Manager Waller stated that he just felt it needed to be a bit clearer because he felt using \$200,000 was
150 unintentionally misleading people and reiterated that they should re-evaluate the use of the \$200,000
151 dollar figure.

152
153 President Bradley suggested that in advance of the budget next year they take the time to look at that
154 question and clarified that the District was not trying to hide anything.

155
156 Manager Waller clarified that he was not asking for this to be changed immediately.

157

158 District Administrator Tomczik stated that Manager Waller’s point was well taken and would agree that the
159 \$200,000 was simply following through with an amount the District continuously used in the past for the
160 purpose of comparison. He stated that if they simply double the property value to \$400,000 that would
161 result in about \$64/year.
162

163 Manager Robertson stated that since this is the Preliminary Budget the District could put in some kind of
164 amended total when they approve the Final Budget later in the year. She stated that she felt that the
165 point Manager Waller had raised was fair and noted that at her City they were using \$350,000 as the
166 average. She stated that given the housing market and the property values she agreed that it would be
167 fair to use a higher number and noted that she would rather put out a number that is higher than reality
168 than assume they are actually dealing with \$200,000 parcels. She stated that she understands that this
169 is how it has always been done but reiterated that she felt it would be fairly easy by the Final Budget to
170 include other numbers.
171

172 President Bradley suggested that the District actually do both things and acknowledge that historically they
173 have used \$200,000, but then also provide a reasonable estimate of the higher value as well.
174

175 District Administrator Tomczik stated that the Board adopts its final budget in September and at that time
176 he would bring the suggested number forward and asked if the Board felt a property valuation of \$400,000
177 would be reasonable.
178

179 Manager Weinandt asked if the \$200,000 reflected property value, and, if so, if someone had a \$600,000
180 home, if they could simply multiply that projected tax to the District by 3.
181

182 President Bradley stated that he did not think it was actually linear.
183

184 District Administrator Tomczik stated that he believed that it was linear.
185

186 Manager Robertson stated that she was not saying that the District had to do what the City of Blaine was
187 doing, but overall she did not think there was a single property in the District that had a property value of
188 \$200,000. She suggested that they could also just use the median home value for the State as their
189 baseline.
190

191 District Administrator Tomczik stated that he would come back with an alternative and noted that the
192 Board was indicating that the valuation to residential properties was their primary interest.

193 President Bradley explained that the purpose of the public hearing was to receive comments from
194 interested parties and asked if there was anyone that would like to speak during the public hearing.
195

196 Janelle Calhoun, 6729 West Shadow Lake Drive, explained that she was a Candidate for District 36A House
197 of Representatives. She stated that she was in attendance today for educational purposes in order to get
198 a better understanding of the District and its activities, including its interaction with cities and counties and
199 thanked the Board for the work that she has seen happening.
200

201 President Bradley stated that the District has proposed legislation in the House and noted that if Ms.
202 Calhoun was elected the District would be touching base with her about it.

203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246

District Administrator Tomczik noted that he did not see anyone else from the public who had indicated an interest in speaking but noted that staff did have comments to put in the record. He stated that for Communications and Outreach budget there was a discussion of a potential increase in Fund 30-04. He explained that he was approached by Jay Riggs of Washington Conservation District who was interested in an increase for the East Metro Water Resource Education Program (EMWREP) which has a goal of educating community residents, businesses, staff and decision makers about issues affecting their surface water resources and engage people in projects and programs. District Administrator Tomczik noted that in the past, the District has entered in contract with them to support those efforts and the funding was \$3,183/year and stated that the other watersheds that are within the East Metro Water Resource Education Program area contributions are between \$13,477 up to \$26,530. He noted that he felt that it would be reasonable for the District to support an increase and explained that it best for all their citizens to be receiving unified messaging and promoting the same across the areas watershed boundaries and this is one program that does that in addition to the District’s own programming.

Manager Waller noted that he had recently attended the Washington County Consortium meeting and he had also spoke with Mr. Riggs about this issue. He stated that Mr. Riggs has asked for the District to increase their contribution to \$6,000 on an annual basis based on property valuations. He stated that he has been able to experience this program over the years and felt that it was a very well run program. He stated that he does not have any objections to Mr. Riggs request, but would not advocate increasing contributions any more than that amount. He noted that most of this program has to do with the St. Croix and the Lower Mississippi.

District Administrator Tomczik stated that he had a discussion with Mr. Riggs and anticipates a meeting in the future related to program deliverables and explained that they would look at what products the Districts citizens receive or are exposed to from this program. He stated that if the Board felt the request was reasonable, they could put that into the budget and suggested that they should levy for the change in budget amount. He explained that this is for budgeting purposes and in the future the District would enter into a contract.

President Bradley stated that he would suggest that the Board not vote on this yet.

District Administrator Tomczik explained that at this point, the Board is taking public comment, input, on the proposed budget and he was communicating for the record the request from Mr. Riggs regarding EMWREP. He stated that he believed for budgetary purposes he had received the Board’s position and would adjust the budget for final adoption in September.

Manager Wagamon asked if they would have seen the deliverables by that time as well.

Manager Waller noted that just because they put it in the budget did not mean that it would happen.

District Administrator Tomczik confirmed that the District would need to consider and enter into a contract and noted that contracts typically include details of the deliverables.

247 President Bradley stated that he fully concurred with the recommendation to increase the contribution to
248 \$6,000 and asked that to be included in the Final Budget.

249
250 District Administrator Tomczik stated that the other issue he wanted to mention to the Board was the Clear
251 Lake Water Management Project, Fund 60-29. He stated that he currently has \$10,000 slated and
252 explained an increase to a total of \$85,000. The reconstruction project of Eureka Avenue in Forest Lake,
253 the District would like to see the restoration of the Clear Lake shoreline. He stated that the City of Forest
254 Lake was moving forward with their plans and noted that the construction's ground surcharge and
255 restoration may happen prior to the roadwork portion of the project. He noted that these additional
256 funds would come from the fund balance.

257
258 Manager Waller stated that this project has been on the books for a long time and has had delays due to
259 the different agencies that are involved. He stated that he believes that they had a marker in place for
260 this around \$50,000 and didn't feel that the suggestion of \$85,000 was too far off from the placeholder.

261
262 District Administrator Tomczik stated that the budget schedule included the potential for a special
263 workshop meeting on August 19, 2024, however, he did not believe it would be necessary.

264
265 ***There was a consensus of the Board that a special workshop meeting to discuss the budget was not***
266 ***necessary.***

267
268 District Administrator Tomczik stated that fund transfers are possible at any time and transfers common
269 with adoption of the budget. He stated that the discussion at their workshop had included the possible
270 removal of Fund 95-01 and Fund 95-02 and the guidance from Redpath, is that the District should zero
271 those accounts out which will require a fund transfer. He stated that the associated facilities still exist in
272 their Watershed Management Plan and noted that none of the other facilities have specific line items and
273 just have the inspection, maintenance, and repair fund to manage them.

274
275 Manager Waller stated that the reason that these two funds exist for those two facilities was that they are
276 expensive to maintain and the concept used essentially put funds away in a savings account. He stated
277 that theoretically, every 5 years, they would have to go in there and do something about them. He
278 explained that was why he wanted them removed from the plan so that there is no expectation that
279 because it is in the plan they have to do something, haven't been saving the money, and were now
280 desperately trying to find the cash needed.

281
282 President Bradley explained that his concern was the opposite of Manager Waller's and the Board may find
283 themselves in the position where they need to do something and they have no money.

284
285 Manager Waller stated that he agreed with President Bradley and explained that was why he wanted it
286 removed from the plan so there was not the 'need' to do something.

287
288 District Administrator Tomczik stated that he felt this was a good discussion and noted that they have
289 periodically updated their Watershed Management Plan to remove or add things. He stated if, in the
290 future, the Board determines that it is appropriate to answer to those two facility items, the Board has the
291 project anticipation fund which will have some funds available to them and there are also opportunities for

292 other funding sources, such as grants. He noted that the second fold of a fund transfer would be to move
293 the fund balance into the project anticipation fund (Fund 99) while adhering to the Fund Balance Policy
294 which is 40% across the different programs as well as their committed and restricted funds.

295
296 President Bradley explained that his concern has always been a political concern about, in particular related
297 to Locke Lake, where they built a whole subdivision around it and it is no longer going to be a lake and will
298 end up as a swamp and explained that part of the solution to that is for the City of Fridley to remove its
299 dam. He asked if the Board should begin the processes of amending their plan to remove these two
300 projects so they can give the public notice and start getting input from them about the reality going
301 forward.

302
303 District Administrator Tomczik stated that he agreed and noted that they have had some dialogue with the
304 City of Fridley regarding its dam and they do not have a definitive direction. He noted that dam ownership
305 can be challenging, but the District is here to support the resource. He explained that it is common
306 practice with dam removal to replace with a rock rifle.

307
308 President Bradley stated that if the District was, in fact, declaring that they have no intentions, he felt that
309 they ought to start telling people.

310
311 Manager Waller stated that he did not believe the District was walking away from the sediment issue
312 because they have already spent \$1 million studying this and will spend more to put reinforcement on the
313 meanders so the velocity of water does not wash the sediment down into the basin.

314
315 President Bradley noted that they just had this discussion a few days ago with a proposed project where
316 they are looking for funds to help them do that, but also wanted to quote Manager Waller who said, 'every
317 creek has sediment'.

318
319 Manager Waller agreed that every creek has sediment, but clarified that he wanted to make sure that it
320 didn't sound like the District was walking away from it.

321
322 There being no additional comments, President Bradley closed the public hearing.

323 **OPEN MIC/PUBLIC COMMENT**

324 None

325 **ITEMS REQUIRING BOARD ACTION**

326 **1. Check Register Dated August 14, 2024, in the Amount of \$169,163.09 Prepared by Redpath and**
327 **Company**

328
329 ***Motion by Manager Weinandt, seconded by Manager Wagamon, to approve check register dated***
330 ***August 14, 2024, in the Amount of \$169,163.09 prepared by Redpath and Company. Motion***
331 ***carried 5-0.***

332

333 **ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION AND INFORMATION**

334 **1. District Engineer Update and Timeline**

335 District Engineer Otterness noted that RCD-4 repairs will be getting underway soon and stated that
336 they held a pre-construction meeting earlier in the week. He explained that they have begun staking
337 things out so it shouldn't be much longer before tree removal should begin from that corridor. He
338 stated that the Drainage Work Group held a meeting last week. He was unable to attend but knew
339 that they had some discussion related to adequacy of outlet and notification, but the discussion
340 was more informational in nature. He stated that he served on a committee for the Minnesota
341 Watersheds annual drainage seminar in association with their annual meeting and they have
342 come up with ideas for seminar that he believed would be very informational and entertaining. He
343 encouraged the Board to consider attending.

344
345 Manager Weinandt noted that RCD-4 was another ditch system that was getting repaired. She
346 acknowledged the challenges of doing a ditch clean out in a highly residential area and asked about
347 feedback that staff may have been getting. She asked if the residents were being informed or were
348 participating at all and if there was anything that the Board should be aware of related to positive
349 or negative feedback.

350
351 District Engineer Otterness stated that they have multiple avenues in which they have engaged the
352 public, including individual meetings with landowners, including public information meetings and
353 individual on-site meeting. They had also invited Northwestern University and the City of Roseville
354 to their pre-construction meeting. He stated that with any project there will be a mixture of people
355 that are very pleased with what they are seeing going on and others that are unhappy, particularly
356 with the interim conditions. He noted that they always encourage people to be patient and that
357 what they were seeing is, in fact, an interim condition and would take a while for it is re-establish
358 the vegetation. He noted the District's continual refinement of their techniques and was very
359 confident that this effort will be successful in getting vegetation restored along the banks.

360
361 Manager Weinandt noted that the District has had an excellent relationship with the City of Roseville
362 on this entire project and explained that she was also keeping the County Commission and the
363 Senator in that area informed.

364
365 **2. August Calendar**

366
367 **3. Administrator Updates**

368 District Administrator Tomczik referenced the Centerville and the Federal Emergency Management
369 Agency letter of map revision and noted that he felt it was great news. He stated that it took 511
370 days for issuance.

371
372 President Bradley clarified that what this means is that residents who were previously in a flood
373 plain were no longer in a flood plain and would not need to purchase flood plain insurance.

374
375 District Administrator Tomczik stated that the best information that is available regarding the
376 flooding conditions in the area were now reflected in the Federal map. He stated that he has an

377 appointment set up to meet with City Administrator Statz at the City of Centerville regarding JD-3
378 and Clearwater Creek. He stated that at the workshop the New Brighton flood plain and FEMA had
379 also come up and noted that FEMA had asked the District for additional information which they
380 have provided. He noted that he gets monthly reports from the Minnesota DNR regarding the
381 conditions stream flow report and notably, Rice Creek and the surrounding areas are in flood flows.
382 He stated that the Board had reviewed communication from Perry Wagamon at their workshop and
383 he intended to issue a communication to him and also invite Mr. Wagamon to the Alternative #4
384 discussion when it is held. He stated that the celebration of the delisting of Golden Lake will be
385 August 15, 2024 from 5:00-7:00 p.m. at Golden Lake Park. He noted that related to the DNR and
386 the threatened and endangered presence, there are continuing discussions about the interpretation
387 of statute and application of its jurisdiction on District project ACD 10-22-32. He explained that
388 they are working with the DNR to resolve this and explained that the District had refuted the DNR's
389 position, to some degree, based on the statute but awaited the outcome. He stated that there is an
390 internal protocol that was developed with the District's attorneys.

391
392 Manager Weinandt referenced the map District Administrator Tomczik had shown and asked if Rice
393 Creek was the only one that was in high flow.

394
395 District Administrator Tomczik stated that Rice Creek was not the only one that was in high flow.
396 He displayed the map and explained that the dark blue depicted flood flows and aqua depicted high
397 flows.

398
399 Manager Weinandt clarified that this was essentially just telling them that there was a lot of water
400 in the system.

401
402 **4. Managers Update**

403 Manager Waller stated that he had attended the Washington County Consortium tour. He noted
404 that Washington County and the DNR had developed a 3,000 acre open space hunting/wildlife
405 management area/public park which begins on the south end of Big Marine Lake and extends
406 southward along County Road 15. He noted that he had also attended the CAC meeting where
407 they toured the Blaine wetland area which has a wonderful boardwalk. He stated that he would
408 also like to make some comments regarding the Centerville project that they had reviewed earlier
409 in the week and explained that the complaint appears to be related to the delta and felt that perhaps
410 it needed to be removed. He noted that in their past experience when they have had sediment
411 fall into ponds they have generally found it comes from the meanders that are upstream and
412 explained that he was interested in having the existing meanders reinforced upstream. He noted
413 that he was not sure that extending the meanders was a good idea and also did not see anything in
414 the project that would help out the cemetery that gets flooded. He explained that he was also not
415 certain that the two-stage ditch system that was being proposed upstream of this project was
416 necessary. He noted that overall, he felt that the project was fairly expensive but did not focus on
417 the primary issues and clarified that he was not against the project but felt that its format could be
418 adjusted. He stated that he had been reading through the rules and could not find Rule M which
419 had been referred to in Mr. Holtman's letter about the gun club settlement last year. He stated
420 that Office Manager Stasica was able to send him a copy of Rule M and would like to make sure that
421 the full Board received a copy of it.

422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442

Manager Weinandt stated that she had attended the CAC tour of the Blaine wetland and found it a very interesting walk.

Manager Wagamon stated that he also had many of the same concerns that were just raised by Manager Waller related to the same project in Centerville.

Manager Robertson stated that she assumed he was referring to the Clear Water Creek project, and explained that her understanding from the workshop was that once District Engineer Otterness' report was final it would come back before the Board. She stated that the Board has made no decisions and had given input on the presentation and felt that it was just the entry to a very broad conversation as there are several objectives that the project needed to address.

President Bradley noted that he would be out of town for the Golden Lake celebration event and encouraged the other Board members to attend.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion by Manager Robertson, seconded by Manager Wagamon, to adjourn the meeting at 10:25 a.m.

Motion carried 5-0.