

LOWER RUM RIVER WATERSHED MANAGEMENT ORGANIZATION

APRIL 15, 2021

CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Todd Haas called the meeting to order at 8:00 a.m. in the Committee Room of Anoka City Hall.

ROLL CALL

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

Voting members absent were: None.

Also present were: Deputy Treasurer Brenda Springer, Ramsey Civil Engineer IV Leonard Linton, Anoka Engineering Technician Ben Nelson, Bob Obermeyer of Barr Engineering, Andover Natural Resources Technician Kameron Kytonen, Greg Williams of Barr Engineering, and Chris Larson of Anoka Conservation District.

APPROVE AGENDA

Musgrove commented that she thought the February minutes were approved with the pending changes at the March meeting. She asked if it was a formality to have the fully completed set as a matter of the record rather than something that requires action.

Haas confirmed that the changes were approved at the last meeting and that the updated February minutes were included as a matter of the record and do not require action.

Motion was made by Musgrove, seconded by Weaver, to approve the April 15, 2021 agenda as presented. Vote: 3 ayes, 0 nays. Motion carried.

RESIDENT'S FORUM

None.

APPROVE MINUTES

February 18, 2021 Regular Meeting

Noted.

March 18, 2021 Regular Meeting

Motion was made by Musgrove, seconded by Weaver, to approve the March 18, 2021 Regular Meeting minutes as presented. Vote: 3 ayes, 0 nays. Motion carried.

FINANCE MATTERS

Treasurer's Report

Springer presented the Treasurer's Report for the period ending March 31, 2021. Account balances for the period were: Checking, \$233,420.94; less permit account balance of (\$42,422.54); less 2018 4th Generation Plan Reserve balance of (\$65,792.50), for a total balance of \$125,205.90.

Motion was made by Weaver, seconded by Musgrove, to accept the Treasurer's Report for the period ending March 31, 2021. Vote: 3 ayes, 0 nays. Motion carried.

Payment of Bills

Springer presented the payment of bills for TimeSaver in the amount of \$781.74 (March professional services) and Barr Engineering in the amount of \$5,845 (engineering services).

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

NEW BUSINESS

LRRWMO Permit #2021-02 ~ Northfork Meadows ~ Ramsey

Haas reviewed the April 12, 2021 memo from Barr Engineering in which Barr Engineering recommends that the LRRWMO table this item until a revised submittal is provided for review.

Obermeyer commented that he continues to work with the applicant's agent in order for them to submit a plan that complies with the volume requirement. He stated that the City would also need to agree with the proposal from the applicant.

Motion was made by Musgrove, seconded by Weaver, to table Permit #2021-02, Northfork Meadows, Ramsey, as detailed in the Barr Engineering memorandum dated April 12, 2021. Vote: 3 ayes, 0 nays. Motion carried.

LRRWMO Permit #2021-03 ~ Andover Village ~ Andover

Haas reviewed the April 6, 2021 memo from Barr Engineering in which Barr Engineering recommends that the LRRWMO approve of the permit for this project subject to six conditions detailed in the memorandum.

Obermeyer stated the request is straightforward in meeting the requirements and noted that additional review was done in terms of the low floor elevation. He stated that there is a comment

related to staking of the wetland boundaries and to ensure no fill is placed within the wetland boundaries.

Haas commented that Andover staff is aware of the project requirements.

Musgrove stated there are seven stormwater basins proposed and asked if that would mean smaller size basins that would have more potential to fill with sediment and overflow over time if maintenance is not provided. Obermeyer stated the basins will provide for infiltration and are not intended to hold standing water for more than 48 hours. He confirmed that maintenance would be needed over time and it would be the responsibility of the City to maintain that element to ensure the basins function and remain in place over time.

Kytonen asked if these would be considered more of a modified rain garden. Obermeyer confirmed that to be true and noted that plantings could be added in a similar fashion.

Motion was made by Musgrove, seconded by Weaver, to approve Permit #2021-03, Andover Village, Andover, subject to six (6) conditions as detailed in the Barr Engineering memorandum dated April 6, 2021. Vote: 3 ayes, 0 nays. Motion carried.

LRRWMO Permit #2021-04 ~ Greenhaven Parkway Phase II ~ City of Anoka

Haas reviewed the April 6, 2021 memo from Barr Engineering in which Barr Engineering recommends that the LRRWMO approve of the permit for this project subject to four conditions detailed in the memorandum.

Obermeyer commented that this is a straightforward road project with ponding basins provided for stormwater management.

Motion was made by Musgrove, seconded by Weaver, to approve Permit #2021-04, Greenhaven Parkway Phase II, City of Anoka, subject to four (4) conditions as detailed in the Barr Engineering memorandum dated April 6, 2021. Vote: 3 ayes, 0 nays. Motion carried.

LRRWMO Permit #2021-05 ~ GiGi's Salon ~ Ramsey

Haas reviewed the April 6, 2021 memo from Barr Engineering in which Barr Engineering recommends that the LRRWMO approve of the permit for this project subject to six conditions detailed in the memorandum.

Obermeyer commented that this is within The COR in Ramsey and therefore the project will utilize the City's regional COR infiltration basin as previously planned by the City of Ramsey and approved by the LRRWMO.

Musgrove noted that the applicant's address is missing from the form. Linton confirmed that he would follow up with Springer to add that information.

Motion was made by Musgrove, seconded by Weaver, to approve Permit #2021-05, GiGi's Salon, Ramsey, subject to six (6) conditions as detailed in the Barr Engineering memorandum dated April 6, 2021. Vote: 3 ayes, 0 nays. Motion carried.

CONSIDER COMMUNICATIONS ~ None

REPORT OF OFFICERS & WAC ADMINISTRATION REIMBURSEMENT

Kytonen presented the Year 2021 First Quarter Report for the City of Andover.

Motion was made by Weaver, seconded by Musgrove, to approve the Year 2021 First Quarter Report for the City of Andover, as presented. Vote: 3 ayes, 0 nays. Motion carried.

Nelson presented the Year 2021 First Quarter Report for the City of Anoka.

Motion was made by Musgrove, seconded by Weaver, to approve the Year 2021 First Quarter Report for the City of Anoka, as presented. Vote: 3 ayes, 0 nays. Motion carried.

Linton presented the Year 2021 First Quarter Report for the City of Ramsey.

Musgrove referenced Permit #19-08, Delta ModTech, and asked for an update on the status. Linton commented that building is complete, and the report was simply not fully updated.

Musgrove referenced Permit #19-27, Ramsey Villa, which states townhomes, but she believed that development is single-family homes. Linton explained the original developer could not move forward and sold to another developer that will come forward for construction. He stated the road was installed ten years ago, and building would occur behind the curb. He commented that this would be small lot single-family homes, similar to a detached townhome product.

Motion was made by Musgrove, seconded by Weaver, to approve the Year 2021 First Quarter Report for the City of Ramsey, as presented. Vote: 3 ayes, 0 nays. Motion carried.

ACD QUARTERLY REPORT

First Quarter 2021 Report

Haas stated now that winter has passed, there will be more activity with monitoring.

Larson identified the water quality monitoring that would be completed, provided a summary of the upcoming activities that are planned, and the work that has occurred as planned.

2020 Work Results

Larson stated that the draft was included in the packet and any changes from the Board are welcome and can be incorporated before the report is finalized. He briefly reviewed the details of

the report including lake level monitoring, wetland hydrology, Rum River bank erosion grants, and rain garden installation partnership with City of Anoka.

Musgrove commented that overall, it is great to have this type of report as a resident resource. She stated she received positive feedback on the educational letters, noting that some of the letters were provided in example, but not all of them.

Larson commented that he could review and include all of the educational letters before posting.

OLD BUSINESS

Watershed Based Implementation Funding Update

Musgrove had nothing to report. She did not believe the group would meet again until additional funding is allotted.

OUTSTANDING ITEMS/TASK CHECKLIST

Haas reviewed the outstanding items and task checklist.

OTHER BUSINESS

Update on Fourth Generation Plan

Williams commented that at the last meeting, the Board directed him to send this to Fabian at BWSR to provide an informal review prior to the formal review. He stated that Fabian was very thorough in his informal review and provided about 70 comments of varying levels of significance. He summarized the comments and proposed responses within the table included in the packet, noting that many of these are relatively minor. He reviewed the comments from Fabian that he categorized as level three, along with his suggested response in order to receive input from the Board prior to making the changes and submitting the Plan for the formal 60-day review. He asked if ACD would have specific wetland areas within the LRRWMO that they would want identified as priority.

Larson commented he would not have that knowledge but another ACD staff member could share that input. Williams noted that he would follow up with ACD staff to determine if there are priority wetlands that should be identified as priority.

Musgrove stated that Ramsey recently completed a wetland inventory and asked if that list would provide indication to areas that could be noted within the plan. Linton commented that the City spent a lot of money completing the wetland inventory, but the sitting Council rejected that and did not make it actionable. He stated the information would still be available if Williams is interested, but that has not been acted on nor been a priority for the past nine or ten years.

Williams commented that information would be helpful for him to review and could perhaps be used by the LRRWMO to provide value, especially if the City is not going to take action on it. He continued to review the comments and draft responses.

Musgrove noted there are specific organizations for the Mississippi River and asked if those groups have projects identified for funding. She stated if including the Mississippi River, it would be broadening the mission of this organization when other organizations should be focusing on that resource.

Williams stated that if the Board chooses, it could make a statement that by directing focus on the Rum River it would improve the contributions towards the Mississippi River.

Weaver stated that the LRRWMO received grants for linear bank stabilization projects and asked if it would be conflicting to have the statement that the Mississippi River is not a priority. Williams agreed that it would be harder to receive those types of funding to address bank issues if the Rum River is made a priority and the Mississippi River is not.

Musgrove noted there are other organizations that have the Mississippi River as their main resource and priority. She asked if the Critical Corridor designation comes with its own funding opportunities. She understands that some runoff from the Rum River can impact the Mississippi River, but believes the focus of the LRRWMO should remain the lower section of the Rum River and allow other organizations to address the Mississippi River.

Williams commented that with watershed based implementation funding, that is allocated on a geographic basis. He stated while it is true that the Mississippi River is a larger resource and within many organizations, it makes it easier for that resource to fall through the cracks as each organization could take the stance that they only impact a small section of the River and do not matter. He stated that each organization is only a small portion of the Mississippi River drainage area and therefore he is unsure there is another entity that would consider it their primary responsibility. He stated the Mississippi WMO has the River running through as its primary resource, but they can only address the section that runs through their geographic boundary. He explained that identifying the resource does not commit the LRRWMO to action, but simply opens the door for funding opportunities that may come forward. He did not believe other sections of the Plan would need to be changed in response to including the Mississippi River.

Nelson commented that Anoka received grants from the LRRWMO and the Clean Water Fund for riverbank projects along the Mississippi River. He asked if the City would have been eligible to receive those funds if the River were not included as a priority for the WMO.

Williams agreed that if the Mississippi River and its tributary areas are not identified within the Plan, it would be more difficult to obtain those types of funds.

Nelson commented that Anoka would find it important to include the Mississippi River for those reasons.

Linton agreed that the Mississippi River should be kept in as a priority. He stated that he has doubts on adding Trott Brook, which is impaired because of low dissolved oxygen but that is due to wetlands and wetlands are the head of Trott Brook. He commented that there is not enough mitigation that could be done to override the inherent nature of that water body. Williams stated it would seem to make sense to include these bodies as a secondary priority level, which would not require action but would make them eligible for funding sources.

Linton stated that sometimes level one is higher priority while other times level two is considering higher priority. Williams commented that the different levels could be identified within the Plan. He noted that Fabian mentioned these could be listed as a lower-level priority.

Musgrove stated she would support having the Mississippi River as level two and Trott Brook as level three, with additional explanation of the natural character of Trott Brook and what could or could not be done to change that. She asked if it would need to be specified that the Mississippi River would be a priority for only the section within the LRRWMO boundary. Williams commented that would be implied.

Weaver stated that the Mississippi River is the prized jewel of these communities, a resource that is known by the world, and should be at the top of the list. He stated that Anoka has invested a lot in infrastructure to clean up the Mississippi River and the cities are fortunate to have it as a resource. He stated that he is an advocate of protecting that river.

Haas agreed with the comments of Weaver. He stated that any project done along the Mississippi River within the LRRWMO boundaries requires a permit and it should remain as a higher level. He also agreed that it is a jewel of the communities and while the LRRWMO is named after the Rum River, it also holds permitting over projects that impact the Mississippi.

Musgrove asked if the LRRWMO monitors the Mississippi River. Haas commented that the LRRWMO has completed boat tours along its section of the Mississippi River for violations similar to the Rum River.

Musgrove asked if monitoring is completed. Haas commented that someone else monitors that river.

Williams commented that the State and Corps of Engineers completes that monitoring. He stated that designating the river as a level one priority does not commit the WMO to action but simply makes it easier to obtain funding should it choose to complete a project.

Musgrove asked if that would give the wrong impression to the public in that the River is a priority, but nothing is being done to monitor it. Haas commented that the LRRWMO is doing what it can do to ensure people receive the necessary permits and protect waters.

Musgrove asked why the River was not included in the plan before. Haas commented it was known that the River was in there, but he could not remember applying for grants.

Williams commented that the LRRWMO is doing things to improve the Mississippi River in that the entire WMO drains to the river. He stated that the focus on prioritization is a new focus from BWSR that came forward from the 1W1P framework and therefore the previous Plan was not required to prioritize resources.

Musgrove confirmed the consensus of the Board to have the Mississippi River added as a level one priority and Trott Brook as a level two priority.

Williams continued to review the comments and draft responses.

Linton commented that the LRRWMO does not have staff and the means to enact things, therefore education and engagement are done on the city levels. He stated that the guide could include high level guidance, but the implementation is the responsibility of the cities.

Kytonen agreed that the education and activity programs of the cities are well underway and represent the LRRWMO. He stated that the Water Resource Coordinator also completes work on behalf of the cities and LRRWMO.

William clarified his intent was to more specifically describe how those educational activities are executed by the cities and ACD.

Kytonen agreed that Williams responded well to the comment and clarified that the comments from himself and Linton were directed to the comment from Fabian.

Williams continued to review the comments and suggested responses. He asked for input on the stormwater impact fund and whether it still exists.

Linton commented that early on in the third generation Plan, there was talk of a watershed-based fund but it never gained traction. He noted that Ramsey undertook an infiltration basin for projects within a specific area within The COR. He stated there is no general fund to offset infiltration requirements in the overall LRRWMO. He stated the impact fund would be city by city.

Williams commented that he hoped that some of these comments would now not be received during the formal review because they were able to address them through this process and will include the table. He stated he anticipates that he would incorporate all the changes as proposed prior to the next Board meeting. He stated that if the Board is comfortable, they could authorize him to submit the Plan on behalf of the LRRWMO for the 60-day review. He stated that if preferred, the Board could review the entire draft at the next meeting as well.

Haas commented that when the Plan is submitted for the 60-day review, each of the reviewing entities will provide comments that the Board will again review. He stated that he would support submitting the Plan.

Motion was made by Weaver, seconded by Musgrove, to authorize Barr Engineering to submit the Plan on behalf of the LRRWMO for the 60-day review with the changes as discussed. Vote: 3 ayes, 0 nays. Motion carried.

Update on Rum River 1W1P JPA

Haas stated that the comments from Andover and Anoka were sent to Schurbon and those were forwarded to the group attorney. He stated that the group hopes to meet again prior to the Policy Committee meeting at the end of April.

Linton stated that he also forwarded the Ramsey comments to Schurbon and those were included with the others to send to the attorney.

Other ~ Rum River Wake Zones

Musgrove commented that a resident reached out related to wake zones for the Rum River and therefore information will be included in educational information for residents. Haas commented that the resident first reached out to him and he suggested the resident reach out to Ramsey as they are a Ramsey resident.

Musgrove noted that there has been limited internal discussion at Ramsey. She will speak with Schurbon to determine if there could be inclusion of that in the spring letter to residents.

Haas commented that there were a lot of comments related to no wake zones during the citizen input meetings for the Plan.

Weaver asked for input on what the interest would be related to the no wake zones. Haas stated that the desire would be to extend the no wake zones farther.

Musgrove commented that she would like to gather additional information on the topic with Schurbon for the group to discuss.

Nelson noted that Anoka sends out emails to residents that have signed up for updates related to the dam and there are residents from other communities on that list.

Haas stated there used to be letters sent but they no longer do that because Anoka has the email list.

Musgrove stated that perhaps the resident was referring the old letters sent by the LRRWMO.

Haas commented that it would be up to the cities to send out that information as enforcement is done by the cities and Sheriff's Department.

Weaver stated if there are common waters with other municipalities, a JPA would be needed to extend a no wake zone.

Musgrove commented that she does not want to extend the zone, but simply wants to reply to the resident and remind residents of the existing no wake zones through education.

Kytonen explained that part of the concern from that resident was related to enforcement, which would fall to the Sheriff's Department.

Bookmark Electronic Packets

Weaver asked if it would be possible to have TimeSaver make the online agenda items bookmarked the same as the paper agenda.

Haas stated that he could follow up with TimeSaver.

ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made by Musgrove, seconded by Weaver, to adjourn the meeting. Vote: 3 ayes, 0 nays. Motion carried.

Time of adjournment: 9:30 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Amanda Staple
Administrative Secretary