



OCTOBER						
S	M	T	W	T	F	S
		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		

NOVEMBER						
S	M	T	W	T	F	S
					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

RCWD BOARD OF MANAGERS WORKSHOP

Monday, October 7, 2024, 9:00 a.m.

Rice Creek Watershed District Conference Room
4325 Pheasant Ridge Drive NE, Suite 611, Blaine, Minnesota

or via Zoom Meeting:

<https://us06web.zoom.us/j/87271585742?pwd=xmPNz8x9dwwhpMGqax6pxGgJDEvVd.1>

Meeting ID: 872 7158 5742

Passcode: 641800

+1 312 626 6799 US (Chicago)

Meeting ID: 872 7158 5742

Passcode: 641800

Agenda

ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION (times are estimates only)

- 9:00 Browns Preserve Wetland Bank Credit Accounting/Forecasting
- 9:15 Anoka County Ditch 10-22-32 Board-Requested Memo
- 9:45 HWY 61 Ponds Request For Proposals
- 10:30 Side by Side/Utility Task Vehicle Purchase
- 10:45 Professional Service Proposals

Administrator Updates (If Any)

9:00

Browns Preserve Wetland Bank Credit Accounting/Forecasting

MEMORANDUM
Rice Creek Watershed District



Date: October 1, 2024
To: RCWD Board of Managers
From: Nick Tomczik, Administrator
Subject: Browns Preserve Wetland Bank Credit Accounting/Forecasting

Introduction

Rice Creek Watershed District owns a wetland credit bank, and the credit balance an important factor in planning and prioritizing projects.

Background

The District established Brown’s Preserve a wetland credit bank under the State’s Wetland Conservation Act and the Federal 404 wetland regulations. The wetland credits are utilized to mitigate for regulated wetland impacts resulting from District-led projects and public drainage system repairs. There are currently several forecasted activities that potentially utilize the District’s wetland bank credits. The definitive number of credits necessary for each activity remains uncertain, yet the accounting forecast is useful for purposes of planning along with the Board’s consideration in balancing cost and value and prioritizing activities.

Staff is providing the spreadsheet as an informational item as the Board contemplates activities that are forecasted to potential use these credits.

Attachment

Browns Preserve Wetland Bank Credit Accounting/Forecasting Spreadsheet

Browns Preserve Wetland Bank Credit Accounting/Forecasting

9/26/2024

Note: Forecast estimates are for long range planning purposes only and are subject to change

Action	Status	Date	Credits	Debits	Rolling credit in bank	Note	Notes
Deposit	Completed	3/14/2013	10.4000		10.4000		15% Deposit
Withdrawal	Completed	10/31/2013		-0.7500	9.6500		10/22/32 Repair Mitigation
Deposit	Completed	11/5/2014	10.2900		19.9400		2013 Deposit
Withdrawal	Completed	10/6/2014		-0.2800	19.6600		ACD 53/62 Branch 1
Withdrawal	Completed	9/6/2016		-1.9400	17.7200		Hansen Park Mitigation
Deposit	Completed	9/12/2016	2.2181		19.9381		2014 Deposit
Deposit	Completed	10/3/2016	12.6477		32.5858		2015 Deposit
Withdrawal	Completed	9/6/2016		-0.7388	31.8470		ACD 46 Mitigation
Withdrawal	Completed	12/31/2017		-14.6400	17.2070		Mitigation for JD-4 Reroute (Browns Preserve)
Deposit	Completed	12/31/2017	15.1332		32.3402		2016 Deposit
Deposit	Completed	9/27/2018	8.9071		41.2473		2017 Deposit
Deposit	Completed	1/3/2021	1.1495		42.3968		2018 Deposit - FINAL (deposit end of December 2020, finalized deposit in Jan 2021)
Withdrawal	Completed	5/18/2022		-2.0970	40.2998		ACD 10-22-32 mitigation for removal of obstruction on Branch 4
Withdrawal	Pending	Late 2024		-2.0360	<u>38.2638</u>	(1)	ACD 10-22-32 mitigation for lowering Pine St. Culvert
Withdrawal	Forecasted	2025		-4.0000	<u>34.2638</u>	(2)	ACD 53-62 Branch 5/6 repairs
Withdrawal	Forecasted	2025		-14.6000	<u>19.6638</u>	(3)	ACD 10-22-32 Jodrell & 137th Ave. Culvert Lowering
Withdrawal	Forecasted	2026		-3.0000	<u>16.6638</u>	(4)	Jones Lake Mitigation
Withdrawal	Forecasted	2026		-3.0000	<u>13.6638</u>	(4)	JD 3 / Clearwater Creek
Withdrawal	Forecasted	2027		-2.0000	<u>11.6638</u>	(4)	ARJD 1 Branch 2 repairs
Withdrawal	Forecasted	2028		-2.0000	<u>9.6638</u>	(4)	RWJD 1 repairs
Withdrawal	Forecasted	TBD		-16.0000	<u>-6.3362</u>	(5)	Metro Gun Club Settlement
Total Deposit			60.7456				
Total Withdrawal To Date				-20.4458			
Forecasted Future							
Withdrawal				-46.6360			

Notes on Source of Estimates:

1. RCWD Joint Application dated 5/17/2024
2. Rough estimate based on preliminary repair report findings
3. DNR determined impact acreage @ 2:1 replacement ratio
4. Rough estimates based on prior project / repair requirements
5. Mitigation estimate is from 1/2/2013 HEI memorandum *Rule Revision and the Blaine EDA and Gun Club wetland impact and replacement obligations*.

Total impact estimate of 20.89 acres to achieve 100 acres upland, requiring 22.7 acres of mitigation

Debit # assumes City of Blaine will provide 6.7 acres of mitigation credits.

9:15

Anoka County Ditch 10-22-32 Board-Requested Memo

Technical Memorandum

To: Nick Tomczik, Administrator
Rice Creek Watershed District

Cc: Tom Schmidt

From: Chris Otterness, PE

Subject: ACD 10-22-32 Branch 4
Review of Landowner Concerns

Date: September 18, 2024

Project #: R005555-0080

Introduction

At the Rice Creek Watershed District (RCWD) Board meetings on August 28, 2024 and September 11, 2024, a landowner along Anoka County Ditch (ACD) 10-22-32 Branch 4 (Chris Stowe, 426 Pine Street, Lino Lakes) voiced concerns regarding performance of the drainage system and its potential effect on drainage from his property. Specifically, Mr. Stowe identified the following concerns:

- Size and elevation of the Andall St. culvert conveying Branch 4
- Effect of the lowering of the upstream culvert at Pine St. on downstream function
- Berming of spoils along the ditch at his property
- Overall drainage from his property

The purpose of this memorandum is to consider and address each of these concerns.

Size and Elevation of System Culverts

Sizing and elevation of each of the culverts along each branch of the ACD 10-22-32 public drainage system was reviewed in 2010 via the ACD 10-22-32 Repair Report. The repair report determined that the sizing and elevation of the Andall St. culvert was sufficient. Each of the other culverts along Branch 4 were determined at that time to meet the sizing criteria.

The invert elevation of the Andall St. culvert is consistent with the Functional Profile adopted by the RCWD Board via Resolution 2010-09 and with the culverts upstream and downstream of this location. The culvert size is sufficient to meet overtopping criteria (non-exceedance for 25-year, 24-hour rainfall event) and results in less than 2-inches of head (water surface loss) across the culvert for the 10-year rainfall event. A larger culvert at this location would not result in a significant change

in performance. For these reasons, the size and elevation of the Andall St. crossing is sufficient for the as-designed and constructed function of the public drainage system.

RCWD staff recently became aware of a sinkhole that formed at one of the catch basins that serve as an intake for curb and gutter along Andall Street. This sinkhole has blown sediment into the Andall St. culvert. RCWD staff had been in coordination with Lino Lakes Public Works staff to evaluate and correct the failure, including replacement of the catch basin and clean-out of the culvert.

Effect of Lowering Pine Street Culvert

In 2008, the RCWD replaced a culvert on Branch 4 under Pine Street (sometimes referred to as the “east culvert”) that had long since been obliterated. As the system was in disrepair and no as-constructed and subsequently improved condition (ACSIC) had been identified for the system, staff installed the culvert slightly lower than the prevalent sediment level. Subsequently, the RCWD completed efforts to determine the ACSIC grade and found it to be substantially lower than the installed culvert. To facilitate repairs to Branch 4 upstream of Pine Street and provide an outlet for City repairs to the Pine St. road ditch, RCWD lowered the Pine St. culvert on Branch 4 to the ACSIC (historic) grade.

Lowering this culvert did not introduce new runoff volume to the system nor did it significantly increase peak flows downstream. This is typical of most crossings where a culvert is lowered, and particularly so for locations where a substantial floodplain exists upstream of the structure (such as the Pine St. crossing). Andall St. and Mr. Stowe’s property south of Pine Street were unaffected by this repair to the drainage system.

Berming of Spoils Along Ditch

From 2013 through 2015, the RCWD completed repairs to ACD 10-22-32 Branch 4 from Pine Street down to its confluence with the Main Trunk. The plans for these repairs specified placement of spoils from the ditch excavation on the east side of the ditch (Mr. Stowe’s property is on the west side of the ditch). Observations during construction (including photographs) indicate that this protocol was followed. It is possible that berming indicated by Mr. Stowe is residual spoil material from the original construction of the drainage system and/or repairs/modifications that occurred sometime prior to the 2013 repair.

If Mr. Stowe continues to have concerns regarding a historic spoil pile preventing efficient drainage from his property, he can contact RCWD staff to schedule a site meeting to review the condition. Where warranted, RCWD has installed side inlets (either overland or culvert) to accommodate drainage into the system. Please note that a permit from the RCWD is required for any work completed on the public drainage system.

Overall Drainage from Stowe Property

As the Drainage Authority for ACD 10-22-32, the RCWD is responsible for the inspection and maintenance of the drainage system. RCWD staff is aware of vegetation growth in portions of Branch 4 that may be reducing the efficiency of the ditch. RCWD is planning to address this issue with a clean-out of the open channel as weather conditions permit (likely in the winter as frozen ground conditions will be more supportive for construction equipment).

The RCWD is not tasked with, nor does it have the ability to complete in a widespread fashion, facilitation of drainage of private property into the public drainage systems, and therefore this is the domain of the individual landowner. Landowners are responsible for obtaining required permits and meeting appropriate local, state, and federal laws (including RCWD Rules, Wetland Conservation Act (WCA), and Clean Water Act). RCWD can provide guidance to the landowner on which permits may need to be obtained and how RCWD Rule and WCA requirements affect proposed actions.

It is important to note that even with a well-maintained public ditch and well-tended private drainage infrastructure, persistent wet weather patterns can result in undesired ponding and stagnant water, particularly on land with shallow gradient and a high water table. Land use practices need to account for these varied weather patterns and how they affect land drainage on individual properties.

9:45

HWY 61 Ponds Request For Proposals

MEMORANDUM

Rice Creek Watershed District



Date: September 30, 2024
To: RCWD Board of Managers
From: Matt Kocian, Lake and Stream Manager
David Petry, Project Manager
Subject: Hwy 61 Ponds Project – Engineer Selection

Introduction

This memo will provide background on the District’s Hwy 61 Ponds Project, and our *Request for Proposals* for engineering services.

Background

The Hwy 61 Ponds (“Hwy 61 / JD No. 1 Treatment Basin” in the RCWD WMP) are a District Facility. The ponds are located near the terminus of Ramsey Washington Judicial Ditch 1 in White Bear Township, just upstream of Bald Eagle Lake. The purpose of the ponds was to provide water quality treatment for Bald Eagle Lake, as well as enhance wetland habitat in the area. The ponds were constructed in 2003/2004. Maintenance has not been conducted on the ponds since construction.

In 2022, the District received a *Watershed-Based Implementation Fund* grant from BWSR to conduct a feasibility study for enhancing the performance of the ponds. The scope of the study includes pond surveying, water quality modeling, concept design, and a feasibility report. The grant amount is \$40,000, with a required match from the District of at least \$7,000. Additionally, the District’s 60-06 (Bald Eagle Lake Water Mgmt. Project) budget has available funds to expand the study, up to a total budget of around \$60,000.

The District’s monitoring program has an established water monitoring station just downstream of the Hwy 61 Ponds. Data indicate an increase in dissolved phosphorus leaving the ponds in recent years, corresponding to a seasonal decline in dissolved oxygen. Increasing the performance of ponds to capture dissolved phosphorus is a difficult technical task. The Board’s *Outside Services Policy* identifies circumstances in which hiring an outside firm may be beneficial, including “utilizing specialized expertise” and “spurring creativity”. Due to the difficult technical task of this project, along with the desire to use creative ideas and new research¹, the District opted to consider outside engineering services for this project. District staff produced a *Request for Proposal (RFP)* for the Hwy 61 Ponds project (attached). The RFP was sent to 8 firms, each of whom had self-identified as having expertise in stormwater management and limnology.

District staff reviewed all proposals and evaluated them based on several factors. First, staff used a checklist to ensure that all necessary project components were identified in the proposal. Next, we checked for similar project experience – not just on pond cleanout, but also pollutant modeling and dissolved phosphorus mitigation. Lastly, and perhaps most importantly, we looked for creative ideas,

¹ The U of MN and Saint Anothony Falls Laboratory have been researching new technology for dissolved phosphorus management in recent years, including iron-enhanced sand and pond sediment analysis



MEMORANDUM

Rice Creek Watershed District

specific technical expertise related to dissolved phosphorus management and sediment chemistry, and links to recent U of MN research. All proposed fees fit within the District budget.

Proposals were transmitted to the Board separately, as they contain non-public information. Proposals will be reviewed at the October 7, 2024 Board Workshop, with staff seeking a Board consensus for engineer selection.

Attachment

- Request for Proposals, Hwy 61 Ponds Project



July XX, 2024

Engineer name and address

XXX

XXX

XXX

RE: Request for Proposal and Qualifications for the Highway 61 Ponds Project

You are invited to submit a proposal to provide engineering services to the Rice Creek Watershed District (RCWD) for the Hwy 61 Ponds Project. This letter will provide background information on the project, an anticipated scope of work, and deliverables. If you wish to submit a proposal, the **submittal deadline is Friday, September 20, 2024**. This RFP is being sent to 8 engineering firms.

Project Name:

Highway 61 Ponds Project

Location:

The project area is located near the intersection of U.S. Hwy 61 and Meehan Drive in White Bear Township, MN. *See Attachment A: Project Location Map.* Google map for general location: <https://maps.app.goo.gl/sKfnCkDD9HduDEcY8> See Figure A below for more detail.

Purpose:

The purpose of this project is to assess the functionality of existing stormwater ponds and propose 2-3 options for restoration and/or retrofitting, focusing on phosphorus load reduction to Bald Eagle Lake.

Project Background:

The Rice Creek Watershed District (RCWD) owns two connected stormwater ponds, just upstream of Bald Eagle Lake. These ponds are deemed a 'District facility'. The ponds were constructed by the RCWD in 2003 for the purpose of capturing phosphorus and sediment before outflow to Bald Eagle Lake (62-0002). The ponds are in-line with Ramsy Washington Judicial Ditch 1 (JD1), but not affecting the capacity of the ditch. The ponds encompass several parcels, including federal right-of-way, municipal right-of-way, White Bear Township land, and two private properties. The upstream watershed includes approximately 8,000 acres of wetlands, low-density (suburban) residential, rural residential, parts of two golf courses, and several lakes. One very large wetland system – Shuneman Marsh – is located upstream, also in-line with JD1. Many parts of the upper watershed are very likely non-contributing (landlocked) during most years. See Figure B below for more detail.

4325 Pheasant Ridge Drive NE #611 | Blaine, MN 55449 | T: 763-398-3070 | F: 763-398-3088 | www.ricestream.org

BOARD OF
MANAGERS

Jess Robertson
Anoka County

Steven P. Wagamon
Anoka County

Michael J. Bradley
Ramsey County

Marcie Weinandt
Ramsey County

John J. Waller
Washington County

Bald Eagle Lake, located just downstream of the Hwy 61 ponds, has fair to good water quality. After being on the *impaired waters* list for ~25 years for excess nutrients, the lake was recently *delisted*. This is attributed to several projects completed by the RCWD and partners, including the Oneka Ridge Golf Course Water Reuse Project (located upstream of the Hwy 61 ponds), several municipal stormwater retrofits, dozens of raingardens and filtration basins, and a large alum treatment. With this project, the RCWD intends to build on the progress made in Bald Eagle Lake by targeting additional phosphorus and sediment capture in the Hwy 61 ponds.

Survey or maintenance of the Hwy 61 ponds has not occurred since construction; current bathymetry and dead storage volumes are unknown.

The RCWD has operated a monitoring station (station name "JD1.1") just downstream of the Hwy 61 ponds since 2008. A recent analysis of these data yielded the following findings:

- The long-term annual TP and ortho-P means are 128 ug/L and 70 ug/L, respectively (n=140). Summer (Jun-Aug) means are higher, typically 175 ug/L and 100 ug/L, respectively.
- There is no apparent trend, from 2008 to present, in TP or ortho-P.
- There is an increasing trend in the ortho-P/TP percentage. Around 2009, approximately 30% of the TP was ortho-P; by 2020, the percentage of TP that is ortho-P was approximately 60%.
- Dissolved oxygen is very low in summer months, typically 1-3 mg/L. The dip in dissolved oxygen in summer months corresponds to an increase in TP and ortho-P.
- Total and volatile suspended solids are low, typically 2.5-7.5 mg/L.

In summary, the monitoring data suggest that, while TP concentrations leaving the Hwy 61 ponds are moderate and not changing, the percentage of ortho-P is increasing. Most of the phosphorus leaving the system is ortho-P (dissolved).

Funding for this project is primarily from a Clean Water Fund / Watershed-Based Implementation Funding grant from BWSR. The grant deadline (and thus, the project deadline) is December 31, 2025.

The anticipated budget for this project is approximately \$35,000 – 60,000.

Project Components:

The project engineer will conduct a feasibility study for maintenance and retrofit of the Hwy 61 ponds, for the purpose of maximizing phosphorus removal. The feasibility study will consider the original design and function of the ponds and develop at least 3 maintenance/retrofit alternatives, with a focus on capturing dissolved phosphorus. Alternatives should not decrease conveyance in the public ditch system. Creative ideas are encouraged, utilizing new research and technology to maximize capture of sediment and phosphorus.

The proposed alternatives should consider:

- General feasibility (e.g. access, elevation/grade, area)
- Technical feasibility – identifying the right tool(s) to maximize phosphorus removal

- Modeled phosphorus reductions of each alternative
- Cost - primarily in terms of efficiency (\$/lb P), but also overall
- Future project access, maintenance, and cost
- Permit considerations
- Implications for the Public Ditch System (Ramsey Washington Judicial Ditch 1)

Alternatives could include:

- Typical sediment cleanout, restoring dead storage
- Aeration, either typical or with nano-bubbles
- Chemical sequestration of P – e.g. alum, lanthanum-modified bentonite, iron
- Physical mixing
- Iron-enhanced sand filtration
- An outlet skimmer

Scope of Work:

1. Familiarize self with project area
 - a. Conduct initial meeting with RCWD staff
 - b. Review original pond construction and easement documents
 - c. Review available monitoring data
2. Survey the pond
 - a. Conduct a bathymetric survey of the pond (real elevation, not depth)
 - b. Compare current bathymetry to original, quantifying any loss of dead storage
 - c. Collect and analyze sediment samples for toxicological analysis (following *Managing Stormwater Sediment Best Management Practices Guidance, MPCA, 2017*, or other industry standard guidance)
 - i. To inform potential sediment disposal costs
3. Develop alternatives
 - a. Develop at least 3 alternatives for maintenance and retrofit of the pond
 - b. Alternatives should include:
 - i. Engineer’s Opinion of Probable Cost
 - ii. Phosphorus and sediment export reduction estimates, modelled (e.g. P8 or similar)
4. Feasibility Study
 - a. Prepare draft feasibility study
 - i. Present to RCWD and city partner staff
 - ii. Present to RCWD Board (Workshop)
 - iii. Assume 1-2 rounds of edits
 - b. Prepare final feasibility study
 - i. Present to RCWD Board (Meeting)
5. Project Closeout
 - a. Transmit all project materials to RCWD

Scope of Work Assumptions:

- Permitting: The project engineer will handle all necessary permitting (none anticipated?)
- Site access: The RCWD will facilitate site access via agreements with White Bear Township
- RCWD will provide all currently available data, models, and reports to the project engineer. *However, all data, models, and reports are provided “as is”, and without warranty.*
- *Currently available data, models, and reports will be provided upon request for the RFP*
- If currently available data, models, or reports are used in the design process, the engineer should verify that information and update as necessary
- The engineer will organize and lead meetings.

Anticipated Timeline (subject to change):

- Award contract for engineering services –Sept / Oct 2024
- Kick-off meeting – Oct 2024
- Field Assessment – Oct / Nov 2024 [Could push to Spring 2025 -see below]
- Synthesis of Information – Dec / Jan 2024-25
- Present Draft Alternatives – Feb 2025
- Draft Report – Apr 2025
- Final Report – May / Jun 2025

The timeline is subject to change, based on feedback from the project engineer, with concurrence from the RCWD. However, the Project must be fully completed by December 2025.

Deliverables:

All data, models, GIS layers, photos, and files developed as part of the project will be the property of RCWD. All products will be developed using official RCWD specifications and standards and will be delivered to the RCWD at project close out. ***RCWD has existing documentation standards and templates for models and construction plans/specifications.*** The engineer will retain ownership of instruments of services created and owned prior to entering into the contract.

Proposal Components:

- Include proposed cost for engineering services
- Demonstrate your firm’s expertise in the field of stormwater management and limnology, including specific examples of similar projects successfully implemented by your firm in Minnesota (references are encouraged)
- Hourly billing rates and number of hours allocated
- Names and qualifications of personnel
 - Identify project components that specific personnel will be assigned to, including the project manager

Evaluation of Proposals:

Proposals will be reviewed by the RCWD Board and staff. Proposals will be evaluated based upon, but not limited to, demonstrated success on similar projects in Minnesota, qualifications/expertise of staff assigned to the project, budget detail, overall cost, and references.

An example of the *Services Agreement* between the RCWD and the project engineer is below (Attachment C). Your proposal should not include legal contract terms inconsistent with the attached agreement form. The District does not expect to negotiate substantial terms of the agreement. However, if you find any terms of the agreement form materially problematic, you should identify those terms in your proposal and state your proposed alternative. The District will consider such submittals but may insist on the agreement language as a condition of contract award.

Proposal Submittal:

An electronic copy (PDF) of the proposal should be submitted to Matt Kocian (mkocian@ricecreek.org) by 4:30pm on September 20, 2024.

Questions and Point of Contact:

Questions should be directed to Matt Kocian at RCWD. mkocian@ricecreek.org or 763-398-3075

Attached:

- A. Project Location Map
- B. Upstream Watershed Map
- C. Contract Template (subject to change)

A. Project Location Map:



B. Hwy 61 Ponds – Upstream Watershed



10:30 Side by Side/Utility Task Vehicle Purchase

MEMORANDUM
Rice Creek Watershed District



Date: September 3, 2024
To: RCWD Board of Managers
From: Tom Schmidt, Public Drainage & Facilities Manager
Subject: Side-by-Side/UTV Purchase

Introduction

Staff is seeking Board approval to purchase a District Utility Task Vehicle (UTV).

Background

The District’s staff has extensive fieldwork to complete to address the needs of its programs, notably public drainage, facilities, and monitoring. The need continues to exist for multiple team members to access the same location together for safety reasons, and there is a need to bring needed tools and other equipment to remote areas of the District. This includes fieldwork, inspections, maintenance, and monitoring resource conditions. While the District currently has an All Terrain Vehicle (ATV) with tracks, it is designed for a single rider and has limited cargo-carrying and towing ability. The current machine will be kept primarily for use by the Public Drainage and District Facilities program for inspections as the smaller size is conducive to maneuvering on ditch banks through trees and the wettest areas. The UTV, again, allows for transporting multiple staff members and the necessary equipment for work. The District currently owns a trailer suitable for UTV transport. The UTV cost is reflected in the attached estimate. It is proposed to be allocated across the District funds of Restoration, Regulatory, Ditch & Creek, Lake & Stream, and District Facilities, respectively, funds 60, 70, 80, 90, and 95. There is no foreseeable maintenance or other vehicle that needs to be allocated to those funds.

Staff Recommendation

Staff seek concurrence from the Board of Managers and recommend authorizing the purchase of a new tracked UTV. When the Board concurs, the action may be placed on the next meeting to authorize the District administrator to enter into a purchase agreement for a UTV in an amount not to exceed \$30,000.00.

Attachment

Estimate from: Northway Sports.

NORTHWAY SPORTS

21429 ULYSSES ST NE
EAST BETHEL MN 55011

763-413-8988

Date 09/24/2024

Deal No.

Salesperson CHAD HOPPKE

Lienholder No Lien Holder

Buyer's Order

Blaine MN 55449

H 6125975031 C 612-597-5031 Email agreen@ricecreek.org

I hereby agree to purchase the following unit(s) from you under the terms and conditions specified. Delivery is to be made as soon as possible. It is agreed, however, that neither you nor the manufacturer will be liable for failure to make delivery.

Unit Information

New/U	Year	Make	Model	Serial No.	MSRP(ea)	Dealer Sale Price(ea)
New	2025	POLARIS	R25TAE99A1		\$15,999.00	\$15,999.00

Options:

Price:

MSRP (combined)	\$15,999.00
Discount/Rebate	\$0.00
Dealer Sale Price (combined)	\$15,999.00
Freight (combined)	\$1,095.00
Dealer Prep	\$0.00
Factory Options	\$0.00
Total Units Sale Price	\$17,094.00
Added Accessories	\$11,584.42

RGR-1K PREMIUM K-ACCY,HEATER,HRC \$1,169.99
 K-MNT,TRACK,STD,RGR,FS**MY21+ STANDARD A-ARMS** \$512.99
 LABOR \$1,837.50
 K-ACCY,WNDSHLD,PLY GP,ZS \$431.99
 K-ACCY,TRACKS,FS,18/17 \$5,246.99
 K-WINCH,45 HD,NF&H,RGZ**SYNTHETIC ROPE**DASH SWITC \$647.99
 RGR-K-ACCY ROOF POLY,SPORT,ZS-NEW 18'(ships as 2) \$404.99
 RGR-18-K-AACY,DOOR,CNVS,ZS \$971.99
 RGR-K-ACCY,PANEL,RR POLY,ZS \$359.99

Registration Fee \$68.50

Notes:

Subtotal	\$28,746.92
Trade Allowance	\$0.00
Payoff	\$0.00
Net Trade	\$0.00
Net Sale (Cash Price - Net Trade)	\$28,746.92
Sales Tax	\$0.00
Document Fee	\$125.00

Trade Information

Total (Net Sale + Other Charges)	\$28,871.92
Down Payment	\$0.00

Amount to Pay/Finance \$28,871.92

AVG. Monthly Payment of \$0.00 For 0 Months at 0.00% Interest

NOTICE TO BUYER: (1) Do not sign this agreement before you read it or if it contains any blank spaces to be filled in. (2) You are entitled to a completely filled in copy of this agreement. (3) If you default in the performance of your obligations under this agreement, the vehicle may be repossessed and you may be subject to suit and liability for the unpaid indebtedness evidenced by this agreement.(4) All deposits are non-refundable.

TRADE-IN NOTICE: Customer represents that all trade in units described above are free of all liens and encumbrances except as noted.

*With Approved Credit. Interest rates and monthly payment are approximate and may vary from those determined by the lender.

Buyer Signature _____ Dealer Signature _____

Co Buyer _____

Thank You for Your Business!

10:45 Professional Service Proposals

MEMORANDUM
Rice Creek Watershed District



Date: October 1, 2024
To: RCWD Board of Managers
From: Nick Tomczik, Administrator
Subject: Professional Service Proposals for District 2025-26

Introduction

The District every two years is to solicit interest proposals for legal, professional, or technical consultant services.

Background

The Board at its July 24, 2024, meeting authorized notice for solicitation of professional services for the District. The notice instructed interested entities to submit its proposal which was to include background and profile information on the firm, along with the specific information as to expertise in watershed district matters, hourly billing rates for the future 2025-2026 timeframe, and the names and qualifications of personnel. The deadline for submittal closed on September 13, 2024, the District receiving submittals for Board consideration to address the solicited areas of District professional service needs. *(The proposals are “non-public data” under Data Practices Act.)*

The publicized notice results in proposals from six engineer firms, two legal firms, one accountant firm, two information technology firms, and one human resource firm. Data Practices Act classifies the proposals as non-public data, prohibiting placement of the proposals in the packet. Therefore, staff will timely mail the non-public data proposals under separate cover for managers to handle with due care. The following are the service categories and firms (alphabetical) submitting a proposal.

Engineer

- Bolten & Menk
- Geosyntec Consultants, Inc.
- Houston Engineering, Inc.
- Merjent, Inc.
- Stanley Consultants, Inc.
- Stonebrooke Engineering

Accountant

- Redpath and Company

Information Technology

- RYMARK
- WebVolta

Legal

- Rinke Noonan
- Smith Partners

Human Resource

- Pitch HR LLC

Managers should independently consider the proposals for a firm’s background, profile, personnel as to expertise in watershed district matters and its fee schedule.

MEMORANDUM
Rice Creek Watershed District



Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends review of each firm as noted above and come to consensus on what, if any, additional information is necessary and how the information would be used in the decision-making process.

Request for Board Consensus

The Board of Managers need to discuss the above-mentioned proposals and reach consensus. (If the Board consensus is to conduct candidate interviews, then staff can facilitate that process.) Again, the Board should develop consensus on awarding services so that contracts may be developed and considered by the Board prior to the close of 2024.