



**Ramsey-Washington Metro Watershed District
Minutes of Regular Board Meeting
June 2, 2021**

The Regular Meeting of June 2, 2021, was held via Zoom web conferencing. A video recording of the meeting can be found at <https://youtu.be/JNBO47wr8z8>. Video time stamps included after each agenda item in minutes.

PRESENT:

Larry Swope, President
Cliff Aichinger, Vice President
Dianne Ward, Treasurer
Dr. Pam Skinner, Secretary
Val Eisele, Manager

ABSENT:

ALSO PRESENT:

Tina Carstens, District Administrator
Laurann Kirschner, Attorney for District
Nicole Soderholm, Permit Inspector
Dave Vlasin, Project Coordinator
Paige Ahlborg, Project Manager
David Filipak, SRF Consulting
Laura Eder, Lake Owasso resident

Bill Bartodziej, Natural Resource Specialist
Brad Lindaman, Barr Engineering
Andy Walz, Lake Owasso resident
Joe Bester, President Lake Owasso Association
Mark Riegel, Washington County
Laurann Kirschner, Attorney for the District
Edward Roberts, Lake Owasso resident

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by President Swope at 6:30 p.m.

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA (2:30)

Motion: Manager Aichinger moved, Manager Ward seconded, to approve the agenda as presented.

A roll call vote was performed:

Manager Eisele	aye
Manager Aichinger	aye
Manager Skinner	aye
Manager Ward	aye
President Swope	aye

Motion carried unanimously.

3. CONSENT AGENDA (2:44)

- A. Approval of Minutes from May 5, 2021
- B. Treasurer's Report and Bill List
- C. Permit Program
 - i. 21-14 – Kwik Trip, North Saint Paul
- D. Stewardship Grant Program

- i. 21-28 CS – Grandview Townhomes, Native habitat restoration
- ii. 21-19 CS – O'Neill, Rain garden
- iii. 21-20 CS – Kohlman Chain LVMP Phase 3, Harvesting
- E. North St. Paul Target Store Retrofit – Change Order No. 1
- F. CIP Maintenance and Repair 2021 – Change Order No. 2

Motion: Manager Ward moved, Manager Aichinger seconded, to approve the consent agenda as presented.

A roll call vote was performed:

Manager Eisele	aye
Manager Aichinger	aye
Manager Skinner	aye
Manager Ward	aye
President Swope	aye

Motion carried unanimously.

4. VISITOR COMMENTS (3:22)

Andy Walz stated that there is a development proposed at the south end of Lake Owasso along a federally recognized wetland area. He stated that the area is heavily vegetated and is a special place for wildlife. He stated that the development plan would construct five luxury homes with lots that curve toward the lakeshore and converge in the thickest part of the wetlands. He stated that the increased activity on the water would devastate that natural area. He stated that he is concerned with the impacts to the lake and watershed as a whole. He stated that there are already flooding concerns and additional tree removal would not help that problem. He stated that the DNR recently released comments against platting the project but recognized that the DNR is just a commenting agency while the District would have permitting authority. He asked if the District would be able to express an opinion in support of the DNR comments against the project. He stated that residents have signed a petition requesting an EAW that will go before the City Council and perhaps the District could support that action as well. He stated that the Planning Commission approved the preliminary plat based on the comments by the developer that the District supports the project, but Walz did not believe a permit had been granted as of yet.

Joe Bester commented that the language within the letter from the DNR was fairly strong but there is a feeling that the comments will be blown off. He stated that the group of residents that have mobilized has happened organically in attempt to respond to the sensitivity of the wetland and protect it. He stated that it is important to think about livability outside of revenue generation. He stated that it would be nice to see a visionary approach to development, using the example of Central Park in New York and the benefit that provides. He hoped that something could be done to protect this area on Lake Owasso. He stated that without an area for nesting, the loon population could leave. He hoped that the District could support their concerns.

President Swope noted that the Board will discuss this item later on the agenda.

5. PERMIT PROGRAM (11:35)

A. Applications

Woodbury Edgewood Culvert Replacement, Woodbury

Nicole Soderholm stated that this project would replace failing infrastructure. She stated that an existing culvert and retaining wall are failing and the City would propose to replace those elements which would require fill within the 100-year floodplain. She stated that a variance has been submitted for compensatory storage and supporting documentation was provided explaining why the fill would not impact existing habitable structures.

Motion: Manager Aichinger moved, Manager Ward seconded, to approve the permit with the special provisions and variance request.

Further discussion: Manager Aichinger stated that he can verify that this problem has been developing for the past few decades and definitely needs to be addressed.

President Swope agreed that the pictures are dramatic, and this seems to be a more natural solution.

Manager Eisele stated that the permits both impact the Battle Creek watershed and both permits have special provisions. He asked the District responsibility to look at how this request interacts with the other larger permit. He stated that perhaps there is an interaction that is not noticed as the permits are reviewing individually.

Nicole Soderholm stated that staff updates the models based on the permits issued but the applicant is also required to submit an existing conditions model that takes into account upstream and downstream areas. She stated that the existing and proposed condition models were submitted for comparison purposes.

Brad Lindaman commented that in this situation staff has reviewed these together. He stated that the variance request for the next permit state that the 100-year rates are not increased but the lower rates that would be within the local system rather than the overall system. He stated that in this permit is the position of the culvert that requires fill and there is not more water or flow being added into the overall system. He explained that the rules are setup to ensure that small incremental projects do not add up over time.

Manager Eisele stated that it was unique to see two permits within the same watershed requesting variances.

Nicole Soderholm stated that when there is a valley like this in a creek, sometimes compensatory storage would be further damage to the creek in response to the small benefit that would be provided.

A roll call vote was performed:

Manager Eisele	aye
Manager Aichinger	aye
Manager Skinner	aye
Manager Ward	aye
President Swope	aye

Motion carried unanimously.

Metro Transit Gold Line Bus Rapid Transit (BRT), Various Cities

Motion: Manager Aichinger moved, Manager Ward seconded, to approve the permit, special provisions, and variance request.

Further discussion: Nicole Soderholm stated that this is years in the making as staff has been involved in planning meetings for years and the design team has been working for even longer. She stated that she attempted to provide a summary of the project within the packet because of the length of the submittal for the project. She stated that the gold line would provide service from Saint Paul to a future park and ride in Woodbury off 494. She stated that part of the project would be a dedicated bus guideway and part would be an additional mixed traffic lane. She stated that this project goes through multiple municipalities, counties, and two Watershed Districts. She stated that the project would exceed the stormwater quality treatment requirements of the District. She stated that the project includes two variance requests related to wetland buffer impacts and for rate control as there are slight increases for the two- and ten-year events in two subwatersheds. She stated that the rate control requirements are met with the overall project but is also reviewed on the subwatershed level for a project of this

size. She explained that the District requires assurance from the local infrastructure owner (city or county) that there is additional capacity in their system to accommodate that increase.

Manager Eisele asked if the 100-year rate control would be met. Nicole Soderholm confirmed that the rate control would be met for the 100-year event in both subwatersheds.

Manager Ward commented that the Board received a very extensive presentation on the project that includes many maps that she found helpful. She noted that perhaps that information would also be helpful to Manager Eisele.

Manager Eisele agreed that his questions arose because he did not have the history on the project.

Nicole Soderholm stated that there will be additional work to review the additional BMPs, the credits that will be ~~earned~~ banked, and who will own those credits for future roadway projects.

Tina Carstens commented that this project set the bar very high as to what can be accomplished with a linear road project. She stated that they took the District rules seriously and worked to incorporate those elements.

David Filipiak, SRF, on behalf of the applicant agreed that it is very unusual to end up with extra credit on this type of project. He stated that he has worked on a lot of large projects, both linear and not, and to achieve the water quality goals for a linear project is unique. He stated that there are a lot of elements that will require ongoing maintenance and therefore that comes with a discussion as to who will take ownership. He noted that they have attempted to work with municipalities to design different elements in the way that municipality prefers in order for that to fit into their ongoing maintenance plans.

President Swope stated that he recalls the original presentation and appreciates all the work that has gone into this.

A roll call vote was performed:

Manager Eisele	aye
Manager Aichinger	aye
Manager Skinner	aye
Manager Ward	aye
President Swope	aye

Motion carried unanimously.

B. Victoria Shores Permit Update

Nicole Soderholm stated that staff has been contacted by a number of residents related to this project and therefore an update was requested. She stated that the permit is not on the agenda tonight as the City of Roseville has not yet made its decision on the EAW petition.

Tina Carstens stated that residents submitted a petition to the Environmental Quality Board that forwarded that to the City of Roseville and the city will need to determine whether it will pursue requiring an EAW. She stated that the EAW is not required because of size and type of project and therefore would be discretionary. She commented that if the EAW is required, the process would be at least 60 days and the District would act in a supporting role. She reviewed the purpose of an EAW and the process which would then follow to determine whether an EIS would be required. She stated that the DNR letter was related to the City's shoreland ordinance regulations and recommendations on how the City could move forward. She stated that staff has met with City staff over the past few weeks and the discussions have focused on whether there would be a recommendation to require the EAW,

whether the lot sizes and widths would be adjusted, how the buffer area could be incorporated into the maintenance agreement, and to ensure that the agreement includes regulations on the wetland buffer requirements. She stated that there is an attempt to ensure there is strong language as to what can and cannot be done in a wetland, wetland buffer and shoreland. She stated that staff continues to provide input and comments related to the submittals that have been received.

President Swope referenced the issue of timing, as typically it would seem that a city has already permitted a project prior to the watershed receiving a request. He stated that it appears that the District received the permit request prior to the city approval being gained in this case. Tina Carstens replied that often the applicant works concurrently through both entities and typically things are straightforward which allows for both processes to move forward at the same time.

Nicole Soderholm agreed that often the applicant is working concurrently to gain both approvals. She stated that the District staff works together with city staff to ensure open lines of communication. She stated that in this case it is good that everyone is working together but additional elements need to be flushed out on the city side before the District continues to provide its own review.

President Swope asked how the District role of WCA administrator plays into this review. Nicole Soderholm agreed that the District is the LGU tasked with administered WCA. She stated that the applicant submitted a delineation which the District accepted and approved. She reviewed the definition of wetland impact and stated that this proposal does not propose a definable jurisdictional impact. She stated that while a dock may have a different impact, that is not considered an impact under WCA. She stated that the District would regulate and enforce any potential impacts by landowners in the future.

President Swope referenced the mockup of what five or six docks close together and commented that would impact the wetlands. He asked if the Board would have any regulation over that. Nicole Soderholm stated that docks do not fall under the rules of the District.

Tina Carstens explained the different types of regulation related to wetland, wetland buffer, and the lake itself along with the different entities that would have control over those regulations. She stated that the District would regulate over fill in the wetland, which is not proposed, and would regulate the buffer.

Manager Aichinger commented that he would believe there would be some alteration to the buffer in order to have access to a dock. He asked if the dock clearly bridges the wetland into the lake or whether there would be some level of fill in the wetland to access the start of the dock. Nicole Soderholm stated that fill would not be proposed. She stated that for physical access there would most likely be removal of understory. She stated that the District is still having conversation that grading and fill would not be allowed in the wetland buffer, but trees or buckthorn could be removed to physically get to that area.

Manager Aichinger commented that it would seem that if these are luxury homes, a dirt path would not be acceptable for access to the dock. He stated that if it is made clear that landscaping or an improved walkway would not be an option in the buffer area, perhaps this would not be as appealing. Tina Carstens agreed and stated that is why the District is working with legal counsel to draft clear language as to what is not allowed in the buffer area.

Manager Aichinger commented that his concern is that those impacts happen very quickly, outside of the view of people from the street or lake as it is within the woods. He stated that this is a sensitive issue and is unsure how to deal with it from a regulatory standpoint. He agreed that the recorded agreement would be the correct path but was unsure how well those will be reviewed by buyers. Nicole Soderholm recognized that most times the District finds out about things after the fact, but the agreement would provide enforcement ability.

Manager Aichinger commented that he does not believe six docks would be acceptable into that wetland area as the marshland would eventually dissipate over time from the treatment and activity. He believed a consolidated docking facility would be a more viable option but recognized that probably is not as appealing to the developer.

Manager Ward asked if the District has to provide an access agreement. Nicole Soderholm stated that the District has never done that before. Manager Ward asked why the District is doing that now. Nicole Soderholm stated that it would be an added protection in terms of enforcement that would be recorded with the properties when the permit is closed.

Tina Carstens stated that the agreements do not provide access to the homeowners but would provide access ability for the District to ensure the rules are being followed. She stated that the agreement would also contain a number of provisions related to the wetland, buffer, and the lake.

Manager Ward asked if the Board has seen the DNR letter and asked if the work that staff is doing with the city is consistent with the DNR comments. Tina Carstens replied that staff and President Swope have seen the DNR letter and stated that the general staff comments are consistent with the DNR comments. She stated that the city has indicated that some of the statements from the DNR related to the enforcement of the shoreland ordinance were incorrect and therefore city staff are working with the DNR in attempt to clarify the statements. She stated that as this moves forward, more information would be available.

Manager Skinner stated that the District and Board are limited in what they can do to prevent the development of such pristine lots. She stated that in the past the District began to pool money for land it would want to purchase and protect. She acknowledged that this land would most likely be expensive but hoped that the District could look for properties to protect. Tina Carstens clarified that there is not currently a fund of that nature to purchase properties for preservation. She stated that there are funds to implement projects for water quality or flood mitigation.

Manager Aichinger stated that the District has the ability to purchase property for capital improvement projects but has not pursued purchased for preservation and believed that would fall to a different type of entity.

Manager Eisele stated that it sounds that staff is doing their best to support some of the DNR comments and asked if the Board would have power to further support some of those recommendations. Tina Carstens commented that is not something the Board has done in the past, providing comments to a City Council about a proposed project. She stated that typically the work occurs between District staff and city staff. She stated that the city is a partner in the extra agreement the District is working on and would be named in the agreement as well.

Manager Eisele stated that he likes the idea of the additional agreement but asked how much power that would introduce. He commented that he does not believe a real estate agent is required to disclose that information during closing. Tina Carstens commented that because the agreement is tied to the property, it would be part of the closing documents but acknowledged that there would be a lot of paperwork signed at closing. She stated that the District could also make contact with the property owners once they move in to ensure they are aware of the agreement and provide additional education.

Manager Eisele asked if staff has evaluated the option to install a fence or put up a sign that states that it is a protected wetland. Nicole Soderholm stated that the applicant has shown that there would be wetland signage at each lot, as required. She stated that the buffer agreement would be in addition.

Laurann Kirschner commented that it has been helpful to hear the discussion from the Board, as that will help to inform the agreement language. She stated that there are two pieces of this, one of which would be notice to the eventual landowners. She stated that once the agreement is filed with the County, that serves as legal notice. She noted that the question then would be whether the District should be doing more to provide actual notice to the

landowners in terms of signage and/or reaching out directly. She stated that once the agreement is signed by the developer, the agreement is signed and recorded with the land and would remain in perpetuity. She stated that the other question would be related to enforcement. She stated that the agreement would require restoration, if there is impact, at the expense of the homeowner.

Manager Aichinger asked if it is clear that the amount of restoration is to be established by District staff. Nicole Soderholm stated that she met with the city of Roseville to ensure that is clear.

Manager Aichinger stated that he would want to ensure that it is clear that the District establishes the restoration that would be necessary, and that the homeowner would be responsible for the cost.

Manager Ward asked if it would help for the Board to support the request for an EAW. Tina Carstens commented that could be a discussion of the Board but was unsure that anything found from an EAW would support the agreement the District is working on.

Manager Aichinger commented that personally his opinion is that EAW's seldom provide very valuable information. He stated that in this case it could identify the nature of the habitat and the city could state that they are aware of that and an EAW is not required. He stated that an EAW provides opinions based on available information. He stated that perhaps it would be helpful if endangered animals or plants are identified. He stated that normal development impacts are acceptable. He noted that the biggest issue is the eventual impact on the wetland and lake and if the developer maintains that there will not be impacts or that the impacts would be minimal, it would come down to whether that is believable.

Manager Ward asked if additional requirements would come about if endangered species were identified.

Manager Aichinger stated that if endangered species were identified and it were stated that the habitat would be destroyed by this development, the project could most likely not move forward but did not believe that would be the case. He stated that he believes the District would be overstepping its bounds by going to Roseville and requesting an EAW.

Manager Eisele stated that there was concern from the resident comments related to boat traffic and asked if that is being considered in the agreement and how that would factor into environmental impacts. Tina Carstens stated that there are things that are hard to regulate based on a potential. She stated that the developer is not building the docks, therefore the extent of what is reviewed for the permit is different than assumptions for what could happen in the future.

Manager Eisele asked if a joint dock would be installed by the developer or come about between the property owners. Nicole Soderholm stated that there are houses proposed on the other side of Victoria that are not on the lakeside and therefore the developer is proposing community access for those properties on the south side of the development which would total six docks.

President Swope stated that the other docks on the lake are quite spaced out while these docks would be very close together. Tina Carstens stated that the city requirement for lot width is met at the homes but not the lake side. She stated that staff has brought that comment forward to the city and that could be a significant change to the plan if pursued by the city.

Nicole Soderholm stated that staff has communicated that less is more but noted that staff is attempting to work within the boundaries of the District rules and authority.

President Swope asked if the Board is interested in supporting the staff in their efforts to possibly mitigate the effects of this development, or any development on the wetlands.

Manager Ward stated that she would also want Roseville to know that an EAW would be supported.

Manager Skinner commented that staff does that all of the time and does not believe a motion would be needed.

Manager Ward noted that it would not be a message to staff but to the outside community.

President Swope agreed that his intent is to make that message clear to Roseville that the Board supports the comments from staff.

Motion: Manager Skinner moved, Manager Eisele seconded, to communicate the message to Roseville staff and City Council that the Board supports the work of District staff to mitigate any impacts to the wetland from this proposed development.

Further discussion: Tina Carstens asked if the Board could provide bulleted information on the statements, it would like included in the letter. She stated that she would also want direction on whether the letter would be sent to the City Council or to city staff and copied to the Council.

Manager Aichinger stated that he believes it would be most clear to have the letter from Tina Carstens to the City Administrator.

President Swope asked if the Roseville staff would then communicate that information to its City Council.

Manager Aichinger stated that the letter/email could be send to the City Administrator and then copied to the staff and City Council.

Manager Eisele agreed with that method.

Manager Skinner stated that she would believe a statement that the Board fully supports staff doing everything in their ability to mitigate any impacts that could occur from the development would communicate the desired intent.

Manager Aichinger stated that he would suggest bullet pointing certain elements under that statement.

The Board suggested the following bulleted statements:

- Number of access points to the lake
- Concern with ultimate impact to the wetland and vegetation adjacent to the development
- 100-foot lot width at the lakeshore
- Difficulty in enforcement without frequent inspections
- Concern with having to complete inspections and administer restoration efforts and reimbursement for that cost
- Ability to effectively communicate the regulations to potential homeowners

Tina Carstens clarified and confirmed the consensus of the Board that the motion to direct staff to send the letter would be sufficient and a resolution would not be required. She stated that she will use the information provided by the Board to draft the letter and send via email the following day.

A roll call vote was performed:

Manager Eisele	aye
Manager Aichinger	aye
Manager Skinner	aye
Manager Ward	aye
President Swope	aye

Motion carried unanimously.

Manager Aichinger referenced a resident comment that the Board also mention support for the concerns expressed within the DNR letter. Tina Carstens confirmed that she would bullet out the concerns as discussed rather than specifically calling out that letter.

C. Monthly Enforcement Report

During May, 13 notices were sent to address: install/maintain inlet protection (1), install/maintain perimeter control (3), install/maintain construction entrance (1), sweep streets (2), stabilize exposed soils (3), contain liquid/solid waste (2), and install/maintain energy dissipation (1).

6. STEWARDSHIP GRANT PROGRAM (1:23:55)

A. Applications – See Consent Agenda

B. Budget Status Update

President Swope asked why the maintenance costs are increasing. Paige Ahlborg explained that the budget is increasing because that is being offered to projects from the previous year and are staff approved.

7. PRESENTATIONS AND/OR ACTION ITEMS (1:24:35)

A. Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan Annual Report

President Swope asked if there were members of the public present that would like to make comments on this item.

No comments were made.

President Swope concluded the public comment period.

Motion: Manager Aichinger moved, Manager Eisele seconded, to accept the 2020 MS4 Annual Report and authorize District Administrator to submit the report to the MPCA.

Further discussion: President Swope asked if the issue of zero public comments has been resolved. Tina Carstens confirmed that box would be unchecked as there were no public comments.

President Swope stated that the report mentions a training video for staff and asked if the Board could view that. Tina Carstens confirmed that could be shared with the Board.

President Swope referenced the map of the culverts and asked if that is available on the website. Tina Carstens stated that the MS4 facilities and culverts are included on the website within the interactive map feature.

A roll call vote was performed:

Manager Eisele	aye
Manager Aichinger	aye

Manager Skinner aye
Manager Ward aye
President Swope aye

Motion carried unanimously.

The Board took a five-minute break.

8. BOARD ISSUES, POLICIES, AND OPERATION (1:35:42)

A. Follow Up on Maintenance Strategies, Processes, and Policies

President Swope noted that many of the items from the discussion the previous month have been allocated to staff. He stated that he wanted to follow up on the presentation that was provided related to maintenance strategies, processes, and policies. He asked if any members of the Board have ideas, they would like staff to look into. He asked if parts of the presentation could be regrouped into a shorter presentation that could be posted on the website to help educate the public. Tina Carstens confirmed that she can follow up on that.

Manager Ward asked if staff has given thought to making a more accessible method for people to report issues and commented that there should also be a policy related to the length of time in which the response would be provided. Tina Carstens stated that there is a report a problem section on the Contact Us page of the website which is used by residents. She stated that internally the policy is to respond in one business day to at least get more information and then follow up with field inspections the following business day.

Manager Eisele stated that perhaps those comments could be made public as that could help prevent multiple comments on the same topic. Tina Carstens commented that the District does not typically receive multiple contacts on the same issue. She stated that if that were an issue, that could be something they look at more specifically, but it has not been an issue to date.

Manager Ward asked if there could be a more frequent inspection schedule when CIP projects have been completed because of the disruption that can occur. Tina Carstens confirmed that is already done. She stated that the District completes heavy restoration efforts for all of its projects. Brad Lindaman noted that once a project and the restoration is complete it is not uncommon for District staff to visit the site multiple times in the year to review the condition. He noted that many of the projects also have warranties and therefore are inspected to ensure there are no issues that need to be addressed.

Manager Aichinger stated that all the District staff are aware of the capital projects and therefore they view the sites when they are out in the field doing other work. He stated that perhaps when the procedures booklet is developed a set number of inspections is mentioned for that first year.

President Swope asked if there is documented feedback that staff is checking these projects. Tina Carstens reviewed the typical inspection process and documentation that is done if an issue is observed.

Bill Bartodziej stated that staff is always in communication with each other and if an issue is noticed, staff communicates to ensure proper follow up.

Manager Eisele stated that he liked the visual graph and asked if there is something that could be shared with the public to educate them on ongoing inspections. He stated that after the meeting Dave Vlasin invited him to come along on a creek inspection and thanked him for that invitation.

President Swope thanked Dave Vlasin for his reporting of the trail conditions to Ramsey County, as that was quickly addressed and repaired.

Tina Carstens commented that she can speak with staff but was unsure that a list of ongoing maintenance would be a huge draw to the website. She stated that staff has attempted to increase the District social media presence by showing how the District is out in the community and maintenance has been highlighted in that effort.

President Swope commented that there are multiple audiences for the website and perhaps it could be separated between the general public and more technical information. He asked the thought process towards having a contractor that could complete items that are identified by staff, rather than having the Board approve that action as it would provide a timelier response. Tina Carstens commented that is not how the District functionally operates during the year. She stated that when something cannot wait, they do get that done.

Brad Lindaman noted that typically a contractor is engaged by the 1st of the year and is on board through some point in July, therefore there is an opportunity to add projects as change orders if something comes up. He stated that if there is an urgent issue, that is addressed, otherwise it is more efficient to create a list and continue to handle them in this method.

Manager Aichinger commented that if the District responded to issues individually the cost would increase exponentially because of the mobilization costs. He stated that there is a cost savings in packaging the items together that are not time sensitive. Tina Carstens stated that if there are time sensitive issues, there are contractors the District can engage for a timelier response.

President Swope referenced the success the District has had in working with cities to clean up municipal ponds and asked if that relationship could be expanded to other entities and cover things such as culverts. Tina Carstens stated that the role of the District is to coordinate with the cities and not to take over the flow path responsibility. She noted that the pond cleanout would typically require a contractor to be hired, whereas a culvert cleanout could be done by city staff.

President Swope commented that he would suggest leveraging that approach to the extent possible. Tina Carstens noted that the District has stepped in when asked by other entities.

Brad Lindaman noted that there is increased interest in the program each year for the pond cleanouts.

President Swope asked if there are metrics that support the inspection schedule and whether there is a need for more resources to check the systems. Tina Carstens noted that the two-year cycle only applies to the creek system and creeks are not added, therefore that system remains the same. She stated that other projects are inspected on a more, or less, frequent schedule as appropriate.

9. ADMINISTRATOR'S REPORT (2:07:00)

A. Meetings Attended

No comments.

B. Upcoming Meetings and Dates

Manager Ward commented that she will not be in town in July and asked if there would be a hybrid option. Tina Carstens confirmed that July was planned to attempt a hybrid method unless people would not be available in person for July.

President Swope asked for the guidance provided to reestablish normal meeting functions.

Manager Skinner stated that she would prefer a hybrid option.

Tina Carstens commented that after this past year there have been efficiencies identified in offering a Zoom meeting format. She noted that it would also allow for members to attend when out of town. She stated that it is her understanding that once the emergency powers of the Governor end, a quorum would need to attend in person and while a member could attend virtually, their location would need to be made public. She anticipated that the regulation would be reviewed and possibly updated at some time in the future by the legislature. She noted that the hybrid format has been discussed as having the Managers present with staff and members of the public attending virtually. She stated that if the full Board would not be present, the meeting could be held on Zoom for July.

President Swope stated that he believes that it is most efficient to have the meeting on Zoom while still allowed.

Manager Aichinger agreed that as long as allowed the Zoom meetings should continue but once required, the hybrid format could begin with the Board attending in person and staff and the public attending virtually.

She commented that there are new technologies which increase availability and participation in an efficient manner. She hoped that the laws would catch up with technology.

Manager Ward stated that in the past when a Manager is not available, the date of a meeting has been changed and noted that she would prefer a hybrid option over changing a meeting date. She stated that she would prefer to stay with Zoom while allowed.

Laurann Kirschner stated that there is an amendment to the legislation that is in process that would not require the virtual member to disclose their location but at this time it only applies to state agencies.

Tina Carstens confirmed the consensus of the Board to hold the July meeting via Zoom.

Laurann Kirschner commented that would be fine as long as the emergency order remains in place at that time.

Tina Carstens provided an update related to the meeting that was held with the Twin Lakes residents.

Manager Eisele provided input on the feedback that he received from other Twin Lakes residents.

Paige Ahlborg provided an update on the daylight meeting for Phalen Creek.

Tina Carstens stated that there was not much work that occurred in May related to the Ramsey County permitting issues but anticipated additional work this coming month.

Manager Ward expressed concern with the length of time this process is taking and asked if it would be appropriate to bring it forward to the County Administrator. Tina Carstens stated that this was not high priority on her list for the past month. She noted that she has sufficient time to have the process in place prior to the time this comes forward again for the next season and therefore has placed it appropriately in her list of priorities.

C. Ongoing Updates

Tina Carstens reviewed the other updates included in the packet.

D. Update: COVID-19 Back to the Office Plans (Staff and Board Meetings)

No additional comments.

E. Equity, Inclusion and Belonging Training

Tina Carstens stated that she has begun the first step and would be sending a meeting request to the Board for the meeting that will be held in June.

F. Board Workshop Planning

Tina Carstens stated that she asked the Managers to provide input on the workshop topics they would find most valuable, noting that the top three were prioritized and the bottom three could be addressed in a regular meeting presentation. She stated that if the wetland workshop were the top priority for August, she would bring forward a proposed outline for the workshop with potential outcomes to receive additional feedback to ensure staff can adequately prepare. She asked for input on the timing of workshops and whether it would be appropriate to designate the third Wednesday of the month for workshops.

The Board confirmed consensus to hold the wetlands workshop in August and plan to schedule workshops for the third Wednesday of the month.

President Swope referenced the topic of District rules and permitting and commented that he would still find it helpful to have a presentation on that topic. Tina Carstens confirmed that could be done at a regular Board meeting.

G. District Budget Overview and Process

Tina Carstens reviewed the budget basic information she included in the Board packet to provide additional background on the budget, levy, general fund, and capital improvement fund. She also reviewed historical data on the levy and budget noting that while those have remained steady, the capital improvement fund has increased. She reviewed the budget process noting that there is a lot of opportunity for input from staff, consultants, and the Board. She also reviewed the budget categories within the general fund and capital improvement fund. She also provided background information on the progression of different types of projects. She also reviewed some of the feedback that she received from the Managers related to the budget categories and items to consider for 2021.

President Swope thanked staff for the presentation and believed a larger discussion could occur at the July meeting. He asked about tours. Tina Carstens asked that the Managers provide a list of things they would like to see.

10. ATTORNEY REPORT (2:58:50)

Laurann Kirschner stated that her office continues to work on the wetland maintenance agreement as earlier discussed. She stated that there has also been discussion related to the audit and disclosing outstanding liabilities. She provided an update on the previously potential liabilities from vehicle damage at the Target store location but that has since been dismissed as a potential liability due to unresponsiveness of the claimants.

11. PROJECT AND PROGRAM STATUS REPORTS (3:01:00)

A. Ongoing Project and Program Updates

- i. Interim Emergency Response Planning
- ii. FEMA Flood Mapping Updates
- iii. Kohlman Creek Flood Risk Reduction Feasibility Study
- iv. Ames Lake Area Flood Risk Reduction Feasibility Study
- v. Special Project BMP Monitoring
- vi. Shallow Lake Aeration Study
- vii. Phalen Chain of Lakes Changes in Water Quality
- viii. 2021 Tanners Lake Alum Facility Monitoring
- ix. Automated Lake Monitoring Systems

Manager Ward asked for an update on the automated lake monitoring systems. Tina Carstens provided an update and stated that water quality staff will be visiting the site weekly to ensure the equipment is working correctly. She noted that staff will also be working to clean up the

data that was recorded because of equipment malfunction due to winter conditions. She stated that there is also a schedule identified for each station that has a repair or need.

- x. Target Store Stormwater Retrofit Projects
- xi. Targeted Retrofit Projects
- xii. Keller Channel Weir and Phalen Outlet Resiliency Modifications
- xiii. Ryan Drive and Keller Parkway Conveyance Project
- xiv. Beltline/Battle Creek Tunnel Five Year Inspection
- xv. CIP Maintenance and Repair Project 2021
- xvi. Natural Resources Program Update
- xvii. Education Program Update
- xviii. Communications Program Update
- xix. WaterFest Update

Tina Carstens provided a brief update on the WaterFest planning.

Manager Eisele encouraged staff to reach out to lake associations to participate in a focus group related to the website improvements.

12. MANAGER COMMENTS AND NEXT MONTH'S MEETING (3:08:17)

President Swope stated that Manager Aichinger mentioned that he had a slideshow about the Battle Creek changes. Manager Aichinger stated that he could attempt to find that once the office is open.

Manager Skinner referenced a recent article she read related to aluminum and noted that she would pass that onto the Board and staff.

Tina Carstens welcomed input from the Board prior to the next meeting related to tour suggestions and reviewed the other actions she would be completing following the meeting tonight as discussed. She noted that the next agenda would also feature the potential workshop frame and budget discussion.

13. ADJOURN

Motion: Manager Aichinger moved, Manager Eisele seconded, to adjourn the meeting at 9:43 p.m. Motion carried unanimously.