

LOWER RUM RIVER WATERSHED MANAGEMENT ORGANIZATION

JANUARY 17, 2019

CALL TO ORDER

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

ROLL CALL

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

Voting members absent were: None.

Also present were: Deputy Treasurer Brenda Smith, Ramsey Civil Engineer IV Leonard Linton, Ramsey City Engineer Bruce Westby, Anoka Engineering Technician Ben Nelson, Bob Obermeyer of Barr Engineering, Greg Williams of Barr Engineering, Steve Leighton, of Anoka Conservation District, and Jamie Schurbon of Anoka Conservation District.

APPROVE AGENDA

Motion was made by Barnett, seconded by Musgrove, to approve the January 17, 2019 agenda as presented. Vote: 3 ayes, 0 nays. Motion carried.

RESIDENT'S FORUM

None.

APPROVE MINUTES

December 20, 2018 Regular Meeting

Motion was made by Barnett, seconded by Haas, to approve the December 20, 2018 Regular Meeting minutes as presented. Vote: 2 ayes, 0 nays, 1 abstain (Musgrove). Motion carried.

FINANCE MATTERS

Treasurer's Report

Smith presented the Treasurer's Report for the period ending December 31, 2018. Account balances for the period were: Checking, \$251,896.51; less permit account balance of

(\$59,443.84); less 2018 4th Generation Plan Reserve (\$109,400), for a total balance of \$83,052.67.

Barnett referenced the League of Minnesota Cities and asked for additional information. She noted that there are funds received from the group and the Board also pays towards an insurance trust.

Smith stated that each year the Board pays for the insurance costs. She stated that an insurance dividend is received each year as well.

Barnett asked what is received in return for the cost.

Haas stated that the group provides insurance for the organization.

Musgrove referenced the permits shown on page four, noting that there is a difference in the alignment/spacing for the Station at Ramsey and asked for additional details.

Smith stated that she would follow up to ensure that information is not missing.

Westby stated that there is another permit shown on page six with a similar alignment.

Motion was made by Barnett, seconded by Musgrove, to accept the Treasurer's Report for the period ending December 31, 2018. Vote: 3 ayes, 0 nays. Motion carried.

Linton referenced Permit #2013-16 and asked if there has been any movement on that item. Schurbon stated that because it is wetland related, the ACD may be using the Wetland Conservation Act funds for reimbursement. He stated that he would look further into the matter to provide additional information.

Smith stated that she spoke with Lennar in regard to another outstanding balance and the developer stated that they would be sending payment.

Payment of Bills

Smith presented the payment of bills for Barr Engineering in the amount of \$2,588.90 (services rendered 11/3/18 – 11/30/18), TimeSaver in the amount of \$986.43 (services rendered in December of 2018), Minnesota Association of Watershed Districts in the amount of \$500 (2019 membership dues), and League of Minnesota Cities Insurance Trust in the amount of \$2,418 (2019 premium dues).

Motion was made by Barnett, seconded by Musgrove, to authorize payment as presented and indicated above. Vote: 3 ayes, 0 nays. Motion carried.

Resolution No. 2020-21 Budget Adoption

Smith stated that at the last meeting an allocation was agreed upon and is shown as proposed to be broken up between the different cities.

Motion was made by Barnett, seconded by Musgrove, to approve Resolution #2020-21 Budget Adoption. Vote: 3 ayes, 0 nays. Motion carried.

NEW BUSINESS

LRRWMO Permit #2018-15 ~ Kwik Trip ~ Anoka

Haas reviewed the January 10, 2019 memo from Barr Engineering in which Barr Engineering recommends that the LRRWMO approve of the permit for this project subject to seven conditions detailed in the memorandum.

Nelson stated that there was a condition that the City of Anoka will provide the infiltration required for the site, noting that additional information on that will be provided on an item later on today's agenda.

Obermeyer stated that this would be similar to what Ramsey has done for projects within The COR which are within the drinking water supply management area and therefore cannot provide infiltration onsite. He explained that the City of Ramsey is undertaking a large infiltration project to provide the infiltration for those projects. He stated that Anoka is completing a similar process, using accumulated credits to provide the infiltration for this project.

Motion was made by Barnett, seconded by Musgrove, to approve Permit #2018-15, Kwik Trip, Anoka, subject to seven (7) conditions as detailed in the Barr Engineering memorandum dated January 10, 2019. Vote: 3 ayes, 0 nays. Motion carried.

LRRWMO Permit #2018-17 ~ 1565 167th Avenue NW ~ Andover

Haas reviewed the January 11, 2019 memo from Barr Engineering in which Barr Engineering stated that on January 9, 2019 the applicant's agent Wayne Jacobson requested that another 60-day extension be issued to allow for additional time to resolve wetland issues.

Motion was made by Barnett, seconded by Musgrove, to grant another 60-day extension for Permit #2018-17, 1565 167th Avenue NW, Andover, as detailed in the Barr Engineering memorandum dated January 11, 2019. Vote: 3 ayes, 0 nays. Motion carried.

LRRWMO Permit #2018-21 ~ Sonstebly Properties ~ Andover

Haas reviewed the January 11, 2019 memo from Barr Engineering in which Barr Engineering recommends that the LRRWMO find the application incomplete Barr Engineering receives the aerial imagery review. Barr Engineering will submit a Minnesota Wetland Conservation Act

Notice of Application and provide the required 15 business day comment period after receiving the complete application. A recommendation to the Board will then be provided at the end of the comment period.

Motion was made by Barnett, seconded by Musgrove, to consider Permit #2018-21, Sonstebly Properties, Andover, incomplete as detailed in the Barr Engineering memorandum dated January 11, 2019. Vote: 3 ayes, 0 nays. Motion carried.

LRRWMO Permit #2018-22 ~ Anoka Infiltration Credits ~ Anoka

Haas reviewed the January 10, 2019 memo from Barr Engineering in which Barr Engineering stated 3,795 cubic feet of excess volume retention would be available to banking per the information submitted by Anoka on December 21st. If acceptable to the LRRWMO, and prior to establishment of the credits, it is recommended that as-builts for the areas, including documentation showing the basins are functioning as approved are provided to the LRRWMO.

Obermeyer provided a revised copy of his memorandum dated January 16, 2018 and reviewed the details. He explained that the City of Anoka completed road projects which did not require a LRRWMO, however onsite basins for stormwater management were constructed. He recommended that a total of 10,933 cubic feet of excess volume retention be available for banking.

Nelson noted that there would be roughly 2,000 cubic feet of credits remaining after the Kwik Trip credits are used.

Obermeyer explained the process that Anoka would follow to document the use of the credits for Kwik Trip.

Motion was made by Musgrove, seconded by Barnett, to authorize the creation of 10,933 cubic feet of excess volume retention credits for Permit #2018-22, Anoka Infiltration Credits, Anoka, as detailed in the Barr Engineering memorandum dated January 16, 2019. Vote: 3 ayes, 0 nays. Motion carried.

LRRWMO Permit #2018-23 ~ Riverdale Drive Trunk Utility Improvement ~ Ramsey

Haas reviewed the January 10, 2019 memo from Barr Engineering in which Barr Engineering recommends that the LRRWMO approve of the permit for this project subject to five conditions detailed in the memorandum.

Westby explained that this project would extend municipal utilities 2,600 feet along Riverdale Drive to LazyDays RV.

Motion was made by Barnett, seconded by Musgrove, to approve Permit #2018-23, Riverdale Drive Trunk Utility Improvement, Ramsey, subject to five (5) conditions as detailed in the Barr Engineering memorandum dated January 10, 2019. Vote: 3 ayes, 0 nays. Motion carried.

URRWMO 60-Day Plan Review Comments

Haas reviewed the January 16, 2019 memo from Barr Engineering in which Barr Engineering provided draft comments and responses.

Haas noted that he and Schurbon are part of the TAC for the URRWMO.

Schurbon stated that 30 years ago the URRWMO and LRRWMO were created separately based on municipal boundaries rather than watershed boundaries. He stated that the URRWMO has been relatively inactive in the past years and it has taken a longer amount of time for the group to develop their plan.

Obermeyer stated that the LRRWMO commented one year ago on the draft plan submitted for review by the URRWMO and provided a summary of the comments at that time. He stated that the new version of the plan did not seem to be addressed by the new draft of the plan and therefore those comments were reiterated in addition to the comments from the cities. He stated that the plan lacks guidance to the communities in terms of management of water resources.

Haas stated that the plan was vague on the wetland buffer requirements as well. He stated that the first comment letter from the LRRWMO simply asked the URRWMO to be more consistent with the LRRWMO requirements.

Schurbon stated that the new plan does include the wetland and stormwater requirements in the appendix, rather than including that language in the text. He stated that the plan for the URRWMO is to update those stormwater and wetland standards further in the future.

Obermeyer stated that if approved by the Board, Barr Engineering would draft the comments included in the memorandum into letter format to submit to the URRWMO as formal comments from the LRRWMO.

Haas stated that it would also be important for the URRWMO to ensure that projects are being designed to the Atlas 14 standards.

Barnett stated that reading through the plan it seems very generic and there were no plans for funding, which would make it difficult to execute any of the tasks that may be necessary.

Musgrove asked if there are specific development concerns the LRRWMO would have from the URRWMO.

Schurbon explained that the LRRWMO would want to ensure that the rate and water quality levels remain the same pre and post construction for development projects completed within the URRWMO to ensure that there are not negative impacts being passed downstream to the LRRWMO.

Motion was made by Musgrove, seconded by Barnett, to direct Barr Engineering to finalize the comments as discussed and authorize Haas to execute the letter and submit to the LRRWMO. Vote: 3 ayes, 0 nays. Motion carried.

Approve One Watershed One Plan (1W1P) MOA ~ Schurbon

Schurbon stated that there is a draft Memorandum of Agreement, noting that attorneys from multiple counties are still reviewing the draft but did not believe there would be substantial changes. He stated that once the agreement is executed the funds would be made available for the planning process. He stated that for the Watershed Based Funding that was previously allocated on a county by county basis, may be changed in the future to be allocated strictly on watershed basis. He explained that is why it is important to ensure that the priorities from the LRRWMO are included in this planning process. He confirmed that although there are not direct costs to the LRRWMO, the indirect costs would be the participation of a Board member and/or staff members from the member cities in the planning process. He reviewed the different entities that will be involved in this process.

Barnett asked if this process would add additional regulation to the LRRWMO.

Schurbon stated that the LRRWMO would want to include its potential projects within the planning process to ensure eligibility for 1W1P funding.

Musgrove stated that she would like to read additional information. She stated that if the desired outcome is to make additional funding available, she would support that. She stated that if this would develop additional regulatory requirements, she would be hesitant.

Haas stated that he did not believe that there would be any more restrictive regulations than the LRRWMO currently has.

Schurbon explained that this area goes farther up the watershed into Mille Lacs. He noted that those groups are hesitant to have more metro communities involved because of the more stringent requirements of the metro communities. He stated that this would not include additional regulations for the LRRWMO but would include a menu of projects that would be available for funding.

Haas stated that he and Linton will represent the LRRWMO on different Committees throughout this process. He stated that he is very comfortable with the MOA and will continue to keep the Board updated on the process.

Williams noted that Barr Engineering is a part of the 1W1P process for other organizations and explained that the MOA is the least restrictive option.

Motion was made by Barnett, seconded by Musgrove, to approve the One Watershed One Plan MOA, pending review of the final draft. Vote: 3 ayes, 0 nays. Motion carried.

Designate Board Member and Alternate to 1W1P Policy Committee ~ Haas

Schurbon stated that the Policy Committee is the decision-making group for this process. He noted that the range of meetings proposed for the next 18 months which states 18 to 24 meetings is on the high end and noted that it would more likely be about 12 to 15 meetings during that time period. He stated that meeting dates and times would be based on the availability of the members involved.

Haas noted that Linton is a part of the Advisory Committee. He stated that the Policy Committee must have a Board member from the LRRWMO. He noted that both the Board Member and alternate should attend the first orientation meeting. He confirmed that he would be comfortable representing the Board as the primary position.

Barnett stated that she would be comfortable being the alternate.

Motion was made by Barnett, seconded by Musgrove, to designate Haas as a Board Member and Barnett as the Alternate for the 1W1P Policy Committee. Motion carried.

CONSIDER COMMUNICATIONS ~ None

REPORT OF OFFICERS & WAC ADMINISTRATION REIMBURSEMENT

Musgrove left the meeting.

Linton presented the Year 2018 Fourth Quarter Report for the City of Ramsey.

Motion was made by Barnett, seconded by Haas, to approve the Year 2018 Fourth Quarter Report for the City of Ramsey, as presented. Vote: 2 ayes, 0 nays. Motion carried.

Nelson presented the Year 2018 Fourth Quarter Report for the City of Anoka.

Motion was made by Barnett, seconded by Haas to approve the Year 2018 Fourth Quarter Report for the City of Anoka, as presented, and to authorize release of unused escrow for Permit #2017-32. Vote: 2 ayes, 0 nays. Motion carried.

Haas presented the Year 2018 Fourth Quarter Report for the City of Andover.

Motion was made by Barnett, seconded by Haas, to approve the Year 2018 Fourth Quarter Report for the City of Andover, as presented. Vote: 2 ayes, 0 nays. Motion carried.

ACD QUARTERLY REPORT

2018 Fourth Quarter Report

Schurbon stated that most of the work from 2018 is 90 to 95 percent completed, with a small amount of reporting to be finalized. He noted that he will provide a summary at the next meeting.

OLD BUSINESS ~ None

OUTSTANDING ITEMS/TASK CHECKLIST

Haas reviewed the outstanding items and task checklist.

OTHER BUSINESS

Discuss Fourth Generation Plan ~ Barr Engineering

- a. Approve Contract with Barr Engineering

Haas stated that the contract from Barr Engineering was reviewed by the LRRWMO Attorney for review and the comments suggested have been incorporated.

Motion was made by Barnett, seconded by Haas, to approve the Fourth Generation Plan contract with Barr Engineering. Vote: 2 ayes, 0 nays. Motion carried.

- b. Meet with Barr Engineering

Williams stated that he is looking forward to working with the group to further characterize the great relationship the member cities have with the organization and to develop an implementation plan. He stated that there are some additional issues that have increased in focus since the development of the Third Generation Plan, which he will discuss with the Board during the next year. He stated that there is sufficient time to develop this plan and therefore schedules should not be an issue. He stated that the first few tasks will be to develop a Citizens Advisory Committee and Technical Advisory Committee and to gather information from a stakeholder group.

Haas stated that it has been a challenge to create a Citizens Advisory Committee and gain participation.

Williams stated that it can be difficult because you are relying on committed volunteers. He stated that perhaps ACD can identify individuals that may be interested in participating.

Schurbon agreed that it is a struggle because there are not a lot of organized groups in this area. He stated that it would be helpful to have at least one meeting with the Citizen Advisory Committee.

Williams stated that there are two points in the process in which input from that group would be helpful, in the beginning for the initial prioritization and identification and then again later in the process for input on the education and outreach element.

Haas stated that perhaps an article could be included in the member city newsletters asking for people that may be interested.

Barnett suggested that communication be sent directly to property owners along the river.

Nelson stated that he can include information in the email blast he sends out about lowering and raising the dam, as that includes most of the river property owners and other people that have interest in that topic.

Linton stated that Ramsey has an Environmental Policy Board and those members could be invited to participate.

Williams stated that the initial public meeting could include an option for members of the public to stay involved as members of the Citizens Advisory Committee.

Haas suggested that a potential date be discussed for a public meeting.

Williams stated that he would first want response from the public agencies on the initial notice that was sent out, which has a 60-day comment period. He noted that tentatively he would have the public meeting scheduled for June, but that could be moved up depending on the responses received.

Update on Informational Brochure ~ Schurbon

Schurbon stated that the new outreach person for the ACD will assist in creating a layout for the brochure and provided a pencil type sketch of a potential brochure layout. He also provided a full color example used by another organization. He stated that the sketch would include photographs and general information, with the intention that the brochure would be available for distribution at public events. He noted that the example from the other organization includes more technical data and asked for input from the Board.

Barnett agreed that the brochure would be available for distribution at public events and buildings. She stated that she would want the information to be relevant to the audience and quick and easy to understand.

Haas agreed that pictures help to get people's attention.

Barnett agreed that the more scientific data should be avoided, as that most likely will not gain interest from the general public.

Linton stated that the information showing how water quality has changed over time could be helpful information to include if the data is available.

Barnett stated that she would prefer an eye-catching photograph on the front of the brochure rather than the LRRWMO “logo”.

Schurbon stated that ACD staff will email a rough draft once completed.

Discuss Meeting Start Time

Westby noted that Musgrove had to leave the meeting early to go to work. He noted that although meetings typically do not run longer than an hour, Musgrove will need to leave by 9:30 a.m. and therefore perhaps it would be helpful to begin a little earlier.

Nelson noted that the group typically does not exceed a one-hour meeting and therefore an 8:00 a.m. start time should be sufficient.

Motion was made by Barnett, seconded by Haas, to change the meeting start time from 8:30 a.m. to 8:00 a.m., effective beginning at the regular February meeting of the Board. Vote: 2 ayes, 0 nays. Motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT

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

Time of adjournment: 10:03 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Amanda Staple
Administrative Secretary