

# LOWER RUM RIVER WATERSHED MANAGEMENT ORGANIZATION

SEPTEMBER 12, 2018

---

## CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Todd Haas called the meeting to order at 8:30 a.m. in the Work Session Room of Anoka City Hall.

## ROLL CALL

Voting members present were: Elizabeth Barnett, Anoka; and, Todd Haas, Andover.

Voting members absent were: Mark Kuzma, Ramsey.

Also present were: Ramsey Civil Engineer IV Leonard Linton, Ramsey City Engineer Bruce Westby, Anoka Engineering Technician Ben Nelson, Jamie Schurbon of Anoka Conservation District, David Berkowitz, Andover Director of Public Works/City Engineer, and Dan Fabian, BWSR.

## APPROVE AGENDA

**Motion was made by Barnett, seconded by Haas, to approve the September 12, 2018 agenda as presented. Vote: 2 ayes, 0 nays. Motion carried.**

## RESIDENT'S FORUM

None.

## FOURTH GENERATION PLAN

### Watershed Planning Scoping

Schurbon stated that the intent of today is to create a request for proposals (RFP) for consultants to assist with update of the LRRWMO Watershed Management Plan. He reviewed some of the topics that he would like Board direction on which will help to further refine the scope and direction. He stated that the last time they spoke they believed that the completion date was to be December 2020, but after speaking with Fabian the official expiration date of the current LRRWMO plan is December 2021. He noted that the Board could make the choice to delay the RFP process or could utilize an extended planning process. He noted that the One Watershed One Plan process begins in the next few months and a consultant could be chosen to attend those meetings on behalf of the LRRWMO. He explained that One Watershed One Plan will focus on regional issues, while the WMO would include local items as well.

Fabian stated that the WMO could adopt the One Watershed One Plan (1W1P), but there would need to be an additional section that addresses the more localized issues. He stated that the purpose of the 1W1P can include local issues, but more emphasis will be placed on regional issues.

Schurbon stated that 1W1P could be a good place to gather some of the information needed for the WMO plan.

Linton stated that he attended most of the WRAPP meetings and his perception is that it would be very difficult for the WMO to insert something given the dominant rural character of the people that were in the WRAPP sessions. He stated that their biggest concern was failed septic systems, not 40-acre commercial developments that come in at 90 percent impervious. He explained that it would be an apples and oranges comparison of what the cities of the WMO are facing as challenges.

Haas agreed.

Schurbon stated that watershed issues drive where those regional plans go and agreed that most of the other communities are rural.

Linton stated that the 1W1P will not get to the level of detail that the WMO will need for the municipal areas and therefore it would be better for the LRRWMO to just create its own plan.

Haas asked if the 8410 rules apply to 1W1P.

Fabian stated that it is a different program and legislation. He stated that the 8410 plans are equivalent to 1W1P, although he prefers 8410. He explained that 1W1P are perhaps in their second generation while the WMO has gone through several generations of their plan to further refine. He stated that the 8410 plans meet or exceed the requirements of the 1W1P.

Haas confirmed the consensus of the Board to develop its own plan.

Berkowitz agreed with Linton's comments that the WMO should focus on the municipalities and their challenges rather than joining the rural communities of 1W1P. He stated that Andover is also governed by Coon Creek Watershed District and Andover would like to see consistency between the two watershed organizations. He stated that Coon Creek Watershed District will have their plan completed by 2022, and Andover would like to see the LRRWMO plan adopted as close to that time as possible.

Fabian stated that in regard to the 1W1P process, it would be beneficial to have the LRRWMO participate as some of the rural communities are beginning to urbanize and therefore the knowledge of the LRRWMO would be helpful.

Berkowitz agreed that the LRRWMO could participate and perhaps some of the general information could be referenced in the LRRWMO plan.

Schurbon stated that the 1W1P will want to have kickoff meetings in the north and down here and therefore it could be helpful to combine the kickoff meeting between the LRRWMO and the 1W1P group upstream.

Fabian provided additional details on the orientation meeting in Mille Lacs that will take place on October 23<sup>rd</sup>.

Schurbon stated that there are multiple options for how the LRRWMO will participate in the 1W1P meetings. He noted that it could occur similar to the WRAPP meetings where one or two representatives from this group attend or a consultant could be appointed to attend on behalf of the LRRWMO. He provided additional details on the two levels of committees that will be a part of the process.

Berkowitz suggested that a Board member attend both Committees and the consultant be a part of the Advisory Committee.

Fabian stated that the Advisory Committee is mainly staff while the Policy Committee would be composed of Board member representatives. He stated that Advisory Committee makes recommendations to the Policy Committee.

Schurbon stated that the decision would be whether the consultant would attend the Advisory Committee or whether a member of city staff would represent the Board.

Linton stated that he would prefer that a member of city staff attend the Advisory Committee. He stated that a consultant would most likely be out of the south metro and therefore a lot of driving time would be paid for that consultant to attend meetings in Mille Lacs.

Haas stated that he would recommend Linton to attend the Advisory Committee meetings and he would attend the Policy Committee meetings.

Schurbon stated that if the staff member is chosen to do specific work for 1W1P, the State 1W1P planning grant would not pay for his time and mileage.

Fabian stated that it is a decision that the LRRWMO would want to make on whether to pay for the expenses for the staff member and Board member to attend the 1W1P meetings.

Haas stated that the funds could be provided from the funds set aside for the planning process.

Fabian asked what was done for the WRAPP meetings.

Linton stated that staff just took a city vehicle and it was just part of the regular daily duties. He stated that he would be okay with that but if the meetings become monthly, then perhaps compensation would need to be discussed. He believed that paying a consultant to attend the 1W1P meetings would be a significant hit to the LRRWMO budget.

Haas commented that Linton would have more background information on the LRRWMO than a consultant and therefore would be able to provide more accurate opinions.

Fabian noted that the LRRWMO could have representatives from each of the municipalities attending the meetings to alternate the responsibilities of the Advisory Committee.

Berkowitz stated that Andover could send Jason Law to attend the Advisory Committee meetings as an alternate or in addition to Linton.

Barnett asked if there would be additional responsibility for the staff members that attend the 1W1P Advisory Committee meetings.

Fabian stated that the only responsibility would be to attend the meeting and read the materials prior to ensure that they are prepared for the meeting. He noted that if the person chose to volunteer for additional duties, that would be their decision.

Nelson left the meeting at 9:03 a.m.

Berkowitz asked and received confirmation that the LRRWMO could be a part of the 1W1P process but still have its own plan.

Fabian used the example of another entity that is participating in the 1W1P process but will simply incorporate applicable elements into their own plan.

Schurbon reviewed the task descriptions included in the original RFP, including elements that are required and elements that are optional.

Berkowitz suggested making presentations to the member City Councils in a similar format to how the joint LRRWMO meetings were done in the past, with dinner offered, as that seems to gain attendance.

Haas asked how the development of goals would interact with water-based funding.

Fabian stated that when projects are done, it should be known as to how much that project is going to help the LRRWMO achieve that goal.

Haas stated that he has gotten the impression that either the LRRWMO or the cities have to come up with the measurable goals.

Schurbon stated that the LRRWMO, with the help of the consultant, would develop the measurable goals to include in the plan.

Fabian stated that if there is an item in a city's CIP, that should be included in the Watershed Plan as well.

Berkowitz stated that the Coon Creek Watershed District states that the District will identify improvements that will maximize the measurable goal and each municipality will participate in the cost-share, regardless of whether the improvement is located within the city's boundaries as the resource will still be improved by the project.

Fabian stated that this WMO operates with the city's implementing those projects.

Berkowitz stated that the WMO could identify the best projects that could maximize the impact to the water resource. He agreed that the member city where the project lies could develop the plans and construct the project, but then all member cities would participate in a cost-share. He believed that the LRRWMO should identify the projects in the Watershed Plan and then the member cities could include the project in their CIP in order to budget.

Westby agreed.

Haas stated that he got the impression that the water-based funding is going to continue, whether its annually or every other year.

Fabian noted that having projects defined in the plan makes the LRRWMO more competitive for funding and grant funding.

Schurbon stated that the approval process takes quite a while as BWSR has a 60 to 90-day review period.

Fabian stated that it typically is less than 90 days and provided additional information on the timeline.

Schurbon did a destructive planning exercise with the group to help identify the key stakeholders, existing documents and plans that should be reviewed, what is desired from the consultant, and the optimal number of meetings. He asked for input on community events.

Haas stated that perhaps the dinner meeting is done with a presentation that showcases projects for staff and Council.

Schurbon reviewed other options that could include a tour or keynote speaker event for the general public.

Fabian stated that perhaps a tour is done with a keynote speaker workshop that is done at the conclusion.

Schurbon stated that perhaps a less formal setting is chosen, like a park on the river or the golf course.

Berkowitz stated that he is not sure how well attended a tour would be and believed that a meeting with boards showing projects would be the best option.

Haas suggested using Anoka City Hall as the location as you can see the Rum River from the window. He stated that Anoka could give a little presentation on how the water level is controlled by the dam and the history of the dam.

Barnett stated that each city could utilize its Facebook account with an eye-catching photo to help increase participation in the event.

It was the consensus of the group that two reviews should be done of the plan.

Schurbon stated that the Board will be putting out an RFP but since the consultant will not be involved in the IWIP process, there is not a direct need to have the consultant on board right away and asked for input from the Board.

Haas believed that it would be beneficial to have the consultant begin earlier in the process because of the time it takes to get things going and confirmed the consensus of the group.

Schurbon asked for input on how to get the RFP out to consultants.

Haas noted that there is a method that TimeSaver has used in the past that consultants review.

Berkowitz and Westby confirmed that the cities typically have lists of consultants.

Berkowitz stated that he would not want the LRRWMO to receive 30 proposals to review.

Linton stated that the qualifications should be very specific to ensure that the consultant has done a certain number of plans within the past five years.

Berkowitz stated that staff could review the lists the municipalities have and bring that back to the Board.

Linton stated that this is a large amount of money for the LRRWMO and therefore the Board wants to ensure that the right consultant is chosen that can address all elements of the plan.

Barnett stated that perhaps other WMO's and Watershed Districts have gone through this process and the Board could ask for references from those entities.

Schurbon agreed that in the submittal process references could be required of the consultants.

Haas stated that perhaps a not to exceed amount should be specified within the RFP.

Linton suggested listing the not to exceed amount as 80 percent of the available funds the Board has.

Berkowitz suggested that the consultants provide a not to exceed amount rather than the Board listing that amount. That way the consultant is providing the amount rather than the Board giving that information.

Schurbon asked for input on the timeline, noting that consultants would need at least one month to prepare their submission.

Berkowitz stated that it would most likely be better to have the submittal date in early or mid-December with interviews to occur in January.

Haas suggested making the submittal deadline as December 7<sup>th</sup>, which would allow the Board to include that information in the packet for review with interviews in January.

Schurbon noted that a special meeting would then be set for the Board in January to conduct the interviews.

Westby asked who would review the proposals, in the case that 25 proposals are received.

Haas stated that perhaps each member city review the proposals to make a recommendation to the Board, with the Board ultimately making the final recommendation of the interview candidates.

Linton suggested making the submittal date three weeks prior to the Board meeting to allow city staff enough time to review the proposals and get their choices to TimeSaver in time to be included with the agenda.

Haas stated that staff could just bring their choices to the Board meeting.

Schurbon stated that the RFP could be approved by the Board at the next meeting and that could be sent out immediately to allow additional time on the front end.

Haas suggested making the submittal date as November 30<sup>th</sup> at 4:30 p.m. to the City of Anoka. It was the consensus of the Board for the city staff members to bring their recommendations of the top consultants to be interviewed at the December meeting. Interviews would be conducted in January.

Fabian stated that once the submittals are received, staff could go back through some of the references and review those plans to determine the quality of the plan that was prepared.

Schurbon stated that he will provide the RFP by email to the Board and staff via email prior to the Board meeting to allow everyone to review the information prior to the meeting to determine if additional elements should be incorporated. He stated that if the Board is not comfortable with the draft RFP at the September meeting, the approval could be delayed to the October meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made by Barnett, seconded by Haas, to adjourn the meeting. Vote: 2 ayes, 0 nays. Motion carried.

Time of adjournment: 10:13 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Amanda Staple  
Administrative Secretary