

LOWER RUM RIVER WATERSHED MANAGEMENT ORGANIZATION

FEbruary 17, 2022

CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Debra Musgrove 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; and Jeff Weaver, Anoka.

Voting member absent was: Valerie Holthus, Andover.

Also present were: Deputy Treasurer Brenda Springer, Ramsey Civil Engineer IV Leonard Linton, Anoka Engineering Technician Ben Nelson, Andover Natural Resources Technician Kameron Kytönen, Jamie Schurbon, of Anoka Conservation District, Becky Wozney of Anoka Conservation District, Colleen Werdien of Anoka Conservation District, and Carla Wirth of TimeSaver.

APPROVE AGENDA

Motion was made by Weaver, seconded by Musgrove, to approve the February 17, 2022 agenda as presented. Vote: 2 ayes, 0 nays. Motion carried.

RESIDENT'S FORUM

None.

APPROVE MINUTES

January 20, 2022 Regular Meeting

Wozney referenced the discussion related to lake level monitoring. She noted that the minutes reflected that ACD completes the lake level monitoring, but it is actually volunteers that complete that action. She clarified that ACD staff completes the water quality monitoring.

Musgrove noted that under the Treasurer's Report she had asked a question about funding, which was clarified as reimbursement from the League of Minnesota Cities.

Motion was made by Weaver, seconded by Musgrove, to approve the January 20, 2022 Regular Meeting minutes with the noted changes. Vote: 2 ayes, 0 nays. Motion carried.

FINANCE MATTERS

Treasurer's Report

Springer presented the Treasurer's Report for the period ending January 31, 2022. Account balances for the period were: Checking, \$201,532.03; less permit account balance of (\$57,876.59); less 2018 4th Generation Plan Reserve (\$40,235.33), for a total balance of \$103,420.11.

Musgrove asked for clarification on the yellow highlights. Springer confirmed that identifies a balance owing. Musgrove noted a highlighted item on page nine, item 19, Hampton Townhomes and asked if that project previously had a different name. Linton stated that the project may have begun with a different name and provided additional details. Musgrove asked if the cities track developments that have balances owing. Linton confirmed that he reports that information back to the city's finance department. Musgrove asked if interest is charged. Springer stated that 18 percent interest is charged on the invoice.

Motion was made by Weaver, seconded by Musgrove, to accept the Treasurer's Report for the period ending January 31, 2022. Vote: 2 ayes, 0 nays. Motion carried.

Payment of Bills

Springer presented the payment of bills for TimeSaver in the amount of \$895.56 (professional services), Barr Engineering in the amount of \$10,788.10 (engineering), and LMCIT (property/casualty coverage premium) in the amount of \$2,601.

Motion was made by Weaver, seconded by Musgrove, to authorize payment as presented and indicated above. Vote: 2 ayes, 0 nays. Motion carried.

Update on Fiscal Agenda Consultant

Springer stated that a proposal was included in the packet as submitted by Yager. She noted that billing would occur quarterly and would be based on the time spent on needed tasks.

Musgrove asked if the WMO attorney should review the document. Springer noted that currently everything is tracked on a spreadsheet and Yager would like to convert that to QuickBooks.

It was confirmed that the contract would be submitted to legal counsel for review and should come back to the next meeting for the Board to consider action.

ACD 2022 Contract

Schurbon stated that the proposed 2022 contract is based upon the approved budget of the WMO. He stated that the content of the agreement remains the same as previous years. He referenced the table, shown on page 48 of the packet, number five, and provided a correction to show the fee which then impacts the total shown at the bottom of the table as well. He noted that total would then exceed the budgeted amount from the WMO. He highlighted additional items within the proposed contract and specific line items.

Musgrove asked if the \$150,000 would be allocated each year. Schurbon noted that grants are awarded every two years. He noted that additional funds could be allocated in the next year in order for the WMO to better position itself for available matching funds. He stated that if the WMO wanted to reduce the total, it could be done by removing items from the last line item (matching grant funds). Musgrove asked if the CAC line item could be reduced. Schurbon clarified the intent of the CAC this year. He believed that to be an accurate estimate of the staff time but stated that it could be reduced to \$750 if desired. Musgrove stated that she would prefer to reduce to \$750. Weaver stated that he supports the additional funds allocated for matching grant

funds in order to make the WMO eligible for more funding. He stated that he could also support the change to \$750 on the CAC line item.

Motion was made by Weaver, seconded by Musgrove, to approve the 2022 ACD contract with the noted changes, moving \$250 from the CAC line item to the last line item for matching grant funds. Vote: 2 ayes, 0 nays. Motion carried.

NEW BUSINESS

LRRWMO Permit #2021-19 ~ Trott Brook Crossing ~ Ramsey

Linton reviewed the February 11, 2022 memo from Barr Engineering stated that a decision cannot be made until there is more clarification on the project's potential for indirect wetland impacts. According to MN Rule 8420.0515 subpart 3, the wetland replacement plan cannot be approved if the proposed activities will permanently adversely affect the rare natural communities of wetland 5.

Motion was made by Weaver, seconded by Musgrove, to table Permit #2021-19, Trott Brook Crossing, Ramsey, as detailed in the Barr Engineering memorandum dated February 11, 2022. Vote: 2 ayes, 0 nays. Motion carried.

LRRWMO Permit #2021-29 ~ Riverstone South ~ Ramsey

Linton reviewed the February 8, 2022 memo from Barr Engineering in which Barr Engineering recommends that the LRRWMO approve of the permit for this project subject to nine conditions detailed in the memorandum.

Motion was made by Weaver, seconded by Musgrove, to approve Permit #2021-19, Riverstone South, Ramsey, subject to nine (9) conditions as detailed in the Barr Engineering memorandum dated February 8, 2022. Vote: 2 ayes, 0 nays. Motion carried.

LRRWMO Permit #2021-30 ~ Andover Crossing Multi-Family Apts. ~ Andover

Kytonen reviewed the February 10, 2022 memo from Barr Engineering in which Barr Engineering recommends that the LRRWMO approve of the permit for this project subject to eight conditions detailed in the memorandum.

Motion was made by Weaver, seconded by Musgrove, to approve Permit #2021-30, Andover Crossing Multi-Family Apts., Andover, subject to eight (8) conditions as detailed in the Barr Engineering memorandum dated February 10, 2022. Vote: 2 ayes, 0 nays. Motion carried.

LRRWMO Permit #2021-31 ~ Andover Crossing Commercial Sites ~ Andover

Kytonen reviewed the February 10, 2022 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.

Motion was made by Weaver, seconded by Musgrove, to approve Permit #2021-31, Andover Crossing Commercial Sites, Andover, subject to six (6) conditions as detailed in the Barr Engineering memorandum dated February 10, 2022. Vote: 2 ayes, 0 nays. Motion carried.

LRRWMO Permit #2021-32 ~ Andover Crossing Senior Housing ~ Andover

Kytonen reviewed the February 10, 2022 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.

Motion was made by Weaver, seconded by Musgrove, to approve Permit #2021-32, Andover Crossing Senior Housing, Andover, subject to seven (7) conditions as detailed in the Barr Engineering memorandum dated February 10, 2022. Vote: 2 ayes, 0 nays. Motion carried.

CONSIDER COMMUNICATIONS ~ None

REPORT OF OFFICERS & WAC ADMINISTRATION REIMBURSEMENT ~ None

ACD QUARTERLY REPORT

2021 Work Results Report

Schurbon provided a summary of the 2021 work results report including recommendations, lake level monitoring, lake water quality, stream bio monitoring, wetland hydrology monitoring, water quality grant fund, and outreach collaborative.

Musgrove commented that it appeared the key information for the table/graph is found in a paragraph rather than a specific key for that table/graph. She noted that it might be helpful for a reader to clarify that information. Schurbon stated that there is an introduction chapter that provides clarification but confirmed that another section could be added that would clarify those values as well. Weaver provided additional comments on things that might be interesting for readers.

OLD BUSINESS ~ None

OUTSTANDING ITEMS/TASK CHECKLIST

Wozney reviewed the outstanding items and task checklist.

OTHER BUSINESS

Update on Fourth Generation Plan

Wozney stated that it may be possible to remove this item from future agendas but noted that she would verify with Barr Engineering.

Update on Rum River 1W1P JPA

Wozney stated that a motion is needed to allow Musgrove to act on behalf of the LRRWMO related to the plan.

Schurbon stated that because of the way the planning is setup, normally each entity would approve submission of the plan to BWSR so instead they are asking the representative from each entity to act on their behalf.

Musgrove stated that there are two pots of money between 1W1P and WBIF. She asked if the upcoming vote would be to submit to BWSR and whether the plan would still come back to the entities for additional review. Schurbon noted that this plan is following the same process as the WMO's 4th Generation Plan, with BWSR reviewing and approving the plan and the local entities then having the choice of whether to adopt the plan.

Weaver commented that this action would provide someone the authority to vote on behalf of the WMO without seeing the final draft. He stated that there are huge concerns with the language related to the Anoka Dam and therefore he would have a hard time supporting this without seeing that language.

Musgrove commented that she also has concerns with the totality of it. She stated that they also do not see the whole plan that is being submitted. She asked if the WMO would have opportunity to provide changes if there is something they do not agree with in the future. Schurbon stated that what is voted on moves forward. He stated that there will be discussion at the meeting the following week and therefore Musgrove and Werdien, who is representing the ACD, may need to make their vote based on the discussion at that meeting. He stated that the full plan is available, at more than 200 pages, and therefore only snip-its have been sent to the Board for review.

Weaver appreciated the input from Schurbon but stated that he wants to see firm language about the Anoka Dam so that there is not room for interpretation. He stated that the dam is a resource that means very little to those upstream, but it means a lot to the City of Anoka. Schurbon stated that he would send out the comments and responses along with a link to the whole plan with bookmarks that reference, or did reference, the Anoka Dam. Weaver commented that should have been a part of the packet if action was to be taken today. Schurbon noted there were multiple rounds of revisions in responding to the comments from the WMO. He stated that there is language in the plan related to fish passage and blocking of invasive species. He stated the Anoka Dam is listed as an exception to fish passages. Weaver stated he is not comfortable approving this today.

Musgrove noted that the proposed action does not specify if the representative should vote in favor of or against and asked if that should be specified. She stated that she does not intend to vote based on her own perspective and wants to represent the intent of the WMO. Schurbon stated that it is the decision of the Board as to whether to dictate the way in which Musgrove should vote. He noted that other entities have authorized their representative to vote and have placed their trust in their representative to make the decision. Musgrove stated that she would not want to vote individually and would like direction from the Board.

Weaver commented that he could not support this at this time as he has not seen the actual text to review. He stated that if the language is reviewed by Anoka City staff and found suitable, he could then support the action. He suggested holding a special meeting the following week before the 1W1P meeting in order to take action on the item after staff and the Board have time to review. Wozney confirmed that a special meeting could be scheduled.

It was the consensus of the Board to hold a special meeting on Tuesday, February 22, 2022 at 9:00 a.m.

Update on Watershed Based Implementation Funding (WBIF) Grants

Schurbon confirmed Musgrove's earlier statement that there are two pots of money for funding. He stated that he sent out a scheduling tool for all the participants in regard to the metro pot of money and provided additional details on the meeting that will be held. He stated that the process for the whole pot of money will start in one to two months and will apply to those parties that have adopted a 1W1P.

Discussion on Digital Plan Requirement/Permit Form Update

Wirth stated that this item was related to the tight storage capability and whether the Board should request the plans to be submitted digitally. She stated that currently the WMO is receiving paper copies of the plans.

Linton asked if there would need to be an update to the 4th Generation Plan to allow that type of submission.

Weaver asked if City staff is receiving its plans electronically or on paper. Nelson confirmed that staff can easily review digital plans and noted that Barr Engineering should be consulted on their preference.

It was confirmed that this item should remain on the agenda for the next meeting to determine the action that would be necessary to allow/require digital plan submission. Wozney confirmed that she would complete the necessary research.

Update on File Scanning and Reimbursement to Anoka

Springer noted that the City of Anoka was reimbursed for the scanning that had been completed.

Wirth stated that she spoke with Obermeyer who stated that rather than digitizing these large scale plans, an option would be to look into offsite storage. She noted that Barr Engineering uses Iron Mountain and there is a similar storage company Champlin. She stated that if desired, she could reach out to the document storage facility to investigate the cost.

Weaver believed that Anoka has the equipment to scan the files. Nelson confirmed that Anoka has the equipment but does not have staff to allocate.

Wozney commented that it would be good to find out the cost for document storage, but requiring digital submission may resolve the need for additional storage space. She stated that the only obligation an LGU has is to store the WCA information for ten years. She noted that other files would be kept on file at the member cities in terms of plans, therefore, there may be duplication.

Nelson commented that the benefit of having the original plans is for comparison of what was constructed and/or revisions requested in the future. He stated that when he receives a revision, he keeps that on file and disposes of the original.

Kytonen stated that Andover follows the same path as Anoka.

Linton confirmed that Ramsey also follows that path. He commented that Ramsey has moved to almost fully digital in its plan retention and submission.

Musgrove commented that she would prefer to pay Anoka for storage rather than paying another entity for document storage, especially if it will no longer be needed in the future if digital plan submission is required.

It was confirmed that the Board would follow up on the possibility of digital plan submission and hold off on obtaining a quote for additional document storage.

City of Ramsey Comprehensive Plan Amendment

Linton provided details on the City of Ramsey Comprehensive Plan amendment which was sent to all required entities for review. He noted that typically the WMO does not provide input on land use changes. He believed the appropriate response would be to acknowledge receipt of the amendment, noting that all future developments would need to submit appropriate applications.

Motion was made by Weaver, seconded by Musgrove, to acknowledge the City of Ramsey Comprehensive Plan amendment noting that all future developments would need to apply for the appropriate WMO permits. Vote: 2 ayes, 0 nays. Motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT

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

Time of adjournment: 9:44 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Amanda Staple
Administrative Secretary