



**Ramsey-Washington Metro Watershed District
Minutes of Regular Board Meeting
April 5, 2023**

The Regular Meeting of April 5, 2023, was held at the District Office Board Room, 2665 Noel Drive, Little Canada, Minnesota, and via Zoom web conferencing, at 6:30 p.m. A video recording of the meeting can be found at <https://youtu.be/d1NSrscrpXY>. Video time stamps included after each agenda item in minutes.

PRESENT:

Val Eisele, President
Matt Kramer, Treasurer
Ben Karp, Secretary
Mark Gernes, Manager

ABSENT:

Dr. Pam Skinner, Vice President

ALSO PRESENT:

Tina Carstens, District Administrator
Brandon Barnes, Barr Engineering
Nicole Soderholm, Permit Inspector
Kyle Kubitza, Water Quality Technician
Bill Bartodziej, Natural Resource Specialist
Laurann Kirschner, Attorney for District
Dustin deFelice, Bolton and Menk
Monte Hileman, Saint Paul Port Authority

Paige Ahlborg, Project Manager
Mary Fitzgerald, District Inspector
Dave Vlasin, Project Coordinator
Eric Seaburg, Bolton and Menk
Bob Barth, WSB
Greg Williams, Barr Engineering

1. CALL TO ORDER

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

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA (0:10)

Motion: Manager Kramer moved, Manager Karp seconded, to approve the agenda as presented.

A roll call vote was performed:

Manager Karp	aye
Manager Gernes	aye
Manager Kramer	aye
President Eisele	aye

Motion carried unanimously.

3. CONSENT AGENDA (1:33)

- A. Approval of Minutes from March 1, 2023
- B. Treasurer's Report and Bill List
- C. Permit Program
 - i. 23-09, Woodbury 2023 Street Improvements
 - ii. 23-11, Reuter Walton Apartments II, Little Canada

- iii. 23-12, Jordan Seeds Property Grading, Woodbury
- D. Stewardship Grant Program
 - i. 23-08 CS, Jakel, Rain Garden

Motion: Manager Gernes moved, Manager Kramer seconded, to approve the consent agenda as presented.

A roll call vote was performed:

Manager Karp	aye
Manager Gernes	aye
Manager Kramer	aye
President Eisele	aye

Motion carried unanimously.

4. VISITOR COMMENTS (2:04)

No comments.

5. PERMIT PROGRAM (2:32)

A. Applications

Permit #23-08: Little Canada 2023 Street Improvements

Nicole Soderholm noted that she provided an introduction to this request at the last meeting relating to the proposed wetland impact. She hoped that the amendment wetland replacement plan answered the questions from the previous month. She provided a general overview of the proposed road project between the two cities.

Commissioner Gernes noted that he raised questions the previous month related to the evaluation of providing restoration within the District and stated that his questions were answered by the materials provided by staff and the applicant. He noted that this would be a small impact that he is comfortable with.

Commissioner Karp noted that his questions have also been addressed by the revised materials.

President Eisele stated that he had questions on water treatment and appreciated the additional details. He asked if the minimum wetland buffer of 37.5 would be maintained around the area of construction. Nicole Soderholm replied that the minimum wetland buffer of 37.5 feet is shown in yellow on the map and noted that the existing roadway is within that area therefore the minimum buffer is not met under existing conditions. She stated that the road is being narrowed but there would still be impacts from the trail. She stated that there is a related variance request proposing an average wetland buffer of 41 feet. She explained the desire to balance the existing corridor and the importance of stormwater treatment. Staff recommends approval. President Eisele commented that if staff recommends the treatment plans proposed that would also make sense to him.

Motion: Manager Karp moved, Manager Gernes seconded, to approve Permit #23-08 with special provisions, wetland replacement plan, and variance request.

A roll call vote was performed:

Manager Karp	aye
Manager Gernes	aye
Manager Kramer	aye
President Eisele	aye

Motion carried unanimously.

Permit #23-10: Oakdale Senior Living

Nicole Soderholm stated that this is a proposed senior living development which proposes to develop the southern portion of the large parcel. There are no impacts to the wetland proposed but there would be temporary wetland buffer impacts for grading. She stated that the buffer would be revegetated with a native seed mix. She noted that the average buffer would be exceeded.

Manager Gernes commented that the drawings were not clear as to the drainage plans and the direction water would flow. Nicole Soderholm provided additional details on the path drainage would follow for different areas of the site.

Brandon Barnes stated that the applicant is improving the drainage on the southeast side of the parcel to respond to offsite runoff.

Manager Gernes referenced the managed C wetland to the northwest of the parcel and asked if that would be the primary discharge location. Brandon Barnes replied that the discharge would be to the managed B wetland after treated by one of the two stormwater management areas.

Manager Gernes noted that it was mentioned that there would not be any wetland impacts proposed, only the temporary buffer impact. He commented that it seems that the new pond is very near the managed B wetland. Nicole Soderholm explained that the diagonal hatching is the delineated buffer, not the wetland.

Motion: Manager Gernes moved, Manager Kramer seconded, to approve Permit #23-10 with special provisions and variance request.

A roll call vote was performed:

Manager Karp	aye
Manager Gernes	aye
Manager Kramer	aye
President Eisele	aye

Motion carried unanimously.

B. Monthly Enforcement Report

During March, two notices were sent to address: install/repair construction entrance (1) and install/repair inlet protection (1).

President Eisele referenced the apartments in Oakdale mentioned in the report and asked if the water management was not established, causing the pooling water, and whether that was typical to occur. Nicole Soderholm stated that the site is temporarily graded and temporary containment of water. Mary Fitzgerald replied that this was an existing pond that was converted to the temporary basin. She stated that they were not anticipating the water level to bounce to the level it did.

Manager Karp stated that his question was also in regard to that site. He asked if District staff is present to conduct an inspection during the dewatering to ensure the water is not silty. Mary Fitzgerald replied that she attempts to be onsite for at least part of the dewatering and then photos are required of the water discharged showing the date and times. Nicole Soderholm stated that the MPCA is looking to add more specific dewatering requirements and staff is attempting to get contractors used to that practice of active monitoring.

C. Hillcrest Golf Course Redevelopment – Wetland Replacement Plan Information

Nicole Soderholm stated that Saint Paul Port Authority is the developer for this site and a general presentation was provided to the Board in December 2020 for their mixed-use development. She recognized that many managers were not part of the Board at that time and provided background information on the closed golf course and development intentions. She stated that this is a unique site because of the mercury contamination and remediation that would be necessary. She reported that a grading permit has been submitted to the District and staff is reviewing that. The City of Saint Paul is the LGU for administering WCA and therefore is reviewing the wetland replacement plan which has been noticed for comments. She stated that close to one acre of temporary impact is proposed for contamination removal, and three acres of permanent impact as a result of contamination removal. She stated that one-to-one mitigation would be provided onsite. She stated that a number of agencies have provided input on the wetland replacement plan, and she would also plan to provide written comments.

President Eisele asked the total project area. Nicole Soderholm replied that the site is 112 acres. President Eisele asked what would prevent full replacement of the wetland acreage that would be lost. Tina Carstens replied that one to one replacement would be provided onsite and the additional wetland credits would be required as a two to one rate of replacement is required for permanent impacts.

Manager Karp asked if there is reasoning why the full two to one replacement is not proposed on site with such a large site. Monte Hileman, applicant from the Port Authority, stated that the Port Authority purchased the site for the purpose of redevelopment and realized that would need to be done through mixed use. He provided general background on the process and parameters that were placed on the purchase of the site by the City of Saint Paul. He stated that agreement required 1,000 jobs to be created onsite, 1,000 housing units, 20 acres of parkland and open space; noting that the City only wanted to own and maintain five acres and the Port Authority agreed to own and maintain in perpetuity as publicly available park and open space area. He also noted the trails and stormwater that would be necessary. He provided details on the progress they have made in their design development. He noted that each parcel has been programmed with hypothetical buildings in order to meet all the parameters placed on the site. He stated that part of their mission is to advance sustainable development and they have done their best to incorporate that into all the public sector goals for the property. He commented that every turn lane, setback, easement has been strongly considered and they have tried to strike the best balance. He stated that this is not a conservation project but a restoration project because of the mercury that was used on the golf course. He stated that there are practicalities of what is feasible and practical for all aspects of the site. He commented that they have tried to accommodate all the goals within the site. He explained that they are a public entity, and their end goal is public benefit rather than maximization of profits. He noted that there will likely be a variance request in the future related to wetland buffers that will be pinched. He believed that the wetlands and stormwater system will be an amenity that will be an opportunity for education and would love to speak with the District about that when they get to that point.

President Eisele asked the type of wetlands and proposed changes that would come. Tina Carstens noted that would be included in the next review.

Manager Gernes stated that he lives in that area and is curious about the soil remediation. He asked where that material would be going. Monte Hileman commented that would be part of the bid with the contractor but confirmed it would be hauled offsite. Bob Barth provided additional details on the amount of material that is anticipated to be removed from the site and the steps that would be followed to monitor that activity. Monte Hileman noted that there would be two state agencies monitoring that process.

Manager Gernes commented that the majority of the wetlands lie on the east side of the property with a fair amount of topography which could create challenges for drainage. He commented that wetlands to the east of the site have been stressed. Monte Hileman commented that they would be improving the status of this site which would positively impact adjacent properties.

Nicole Soderholm provided details on the wetlands that would be impacted and the remediation that would be proposed onsite. She stated that the purpose of this discussion was to bring this to the Board to review the mitigation that would be proposed both onsite and offsite.

President Eisele asked for details on the process. Tina Carstens commented that the stormwater review is under review. Nicole Soderholm stated that the WCA process is different and will be wrapped up before they go into more detail on the other elements. President Eisele commented that he likes the onsite mitigation. Monte Hileman credited District staff for the onsite mitigation as they were alerted early on that is very important to the Board and the District. He commented that they will hopefully award a contract in March and the contractor would mobilize in June.

President Eisele thanked Monte Hileman and his team for providing this information tonight.

6. STEWARDSHIP GRANT PROGRAM (41:00)

A. Applications

Permit #22-08 CS: Battle Creek Middle School – Request for additional funds

Paige Ahlborg provided details on the additional fund request for this project to fund the construction of a filtration basin and native planting to assist with drainage problems. She commented that the project was delayed and has incorporated additional elements requested by staff. She noted that an additional \$30,000 is being requested towards the project. She stated that revised plans were submitted the previous day along with MIDS calculations and staff will follow up with some questions. She stated that if the Board recommends approval it should be contingent upon the applicant working with staff to ensure the project meets the guidelines of the grant program.

President Eisele referenced the increase amount noting that it goes above the maximum limit. He asked how much of that is due to the ask of the District for changes, versus other things. Paige Ahlborg estimated about \$15,000 was for the plants and the remainder was for soil work and overall construction cost increases. President Eisele stated that this would be a 30 percent increase over the maximum limit and asked the sense on the return of investment for the project. Paige Ahlborg replied that she would review the cost benefit. She stated that school projects have been funded through this program at higher amounts. She commented that there are a lot of eyes reviewing this as other grant funds are involved. She stated that the total project cost was about \$260,000 which included outdoor classroom areas, noting that changes were made to that to reduce to around \$230,000.

Manager Gernes commented that he was curious as to whether this would set precedent on exceeding the \$100,000 mark for this program. Paige Ahlborg commented that while this is a significant request, the Board has approved additional funds for projects for similar reasons. She stated that she felt this was suitable because a large portion of the increase was a result of the District request for changes to the planting plan. She stated that there have been residential, commercial, and school projects that have gone above the maximum threshold.

Manager Gernes asked how long those maximums have been in place and whether it should be adjusted due to the status of the economy. Paige Ahlborg replied that they review the program each year and have had the same maximums for the past three years. She stated that the additional fund requests are not often received or encouraged, unless staff deem it appropriate. She confirmed that they would review those numbers again this year.

Manager Karp asked if staff has reviewed the planting plans closely and determined where there could be more cost-effective choices to lessen the increase. Paige Ahlborg replied that the plan is reviewed with Ramsey Soil and Water and advised that part of the plantings are being funded through BWSR/DNR grants and those agencies will also be reviewing the plans. She stated that they balance costs with ongoing maintenance and proper establishment.

President Eisele asked what would happen if the additional funds were not approved. Paige Ahlborg did not believe the project would move forward as the school has limited funds and the other grants from other agencies are already maximized. Tina Carstens noted that the grants are reimbursed and therefore it would be possible that the applicant would not reach the maximum approved.

Manager Karp asked if there are other potential projects known that would help determine if these funds would be available in the budget. Paige Ahlborg stated that there is sufficient funding available. She noted that there are some large projects in the early planning stages but did not feel that allocating these additional funds would prevent another project from moving forward.

Manager Gernes asked the size of the site being restored. He commented that it seemed that this site is in an underserved area and asked if this would be a priority area. It was confirmed that this is located in a priority area for the District. Paige Ahlborg stated that the actual project size is about one-half acre.

President Eisele felt that the Board should be transparent in why it allowed additional funding to ensure this would not set precedent in going over the maximum threshold. He acknowledged that this is a priority area and a school. Tina Carstens commented that the cost-share program does state that additional funds can be requested and would be considered at the discretion of the Board. She stated that staff has provided input on the planting, using the example of plugs providing a more successful outcome for the plantings.

Manager Gernes commented that the switch from seeding to containerized is a large cost that was a request of the District to increase the likelihood of success.

President Eisele stated that he would feel more comfortable with a more specific cost breakdown of the funding request. He asked if delaying this by one month would have an impact on the project timeline. Paige Ahlborg replied that the work would be started once school is out. Tina Carstens stated that the school would also need to let the project for bid prior to that time.

President Eisele asked the justification and/or liability if the Board were to approve this request but deny a future request from another applicant that wanted to go over the maximum threshold. Laurann Kirschner commented that if the Board is going to vary from the standard table, the Board would follow this exact process in having this discussion that is reflected in the minutes along with the decision. She stated that the basis for the decision should be noted and if a similar scenario arises in the future, it would likely be good to follow a similar decision. She stated that she is not concerned with liability as the District has discretion in whether or not it awards the grant as well as whether or not additional funds are allocated.

President Eisele summarized the discussion regarding the pros and cons of approval. The pros being:

1. reviewed the benefits of approving the additional funds noting that this Pproject site is within a priority area for the District.
2. Project is within an equity area for the District.
3. Project is located at a school so there would be benefit to children and education. ~~and is~~
4. Project increased costs are largely due to a request from the District staff.

President Eisel continued with the cons of approval of this request including:

1. Setting precedent for future grant project overages and requests for additional funds.
- ~~1.2. He reviewed negative impacts to consider related to budget impacts and that t~~1.2. The request is significantly over the maximum threshold.

Manager Gernes asked how frequently the District has experienced other overages within the program. He recognized that these are estimates and the funds are reimbursed. He asked how likely it would be that the end

cost would come in higher. Tina Carstens stated that typically this type of project would go through the targeted retrofit program where there would not be this type of cap.

President Eisele asked if this could be recategorized into the targeted retrofit program. Tina Carstens explained that in a targeted retrofit project the District would bid and construct the project, which is not occurring in this project.

President Eisele asked if the Board is comfortable moving forward with the request.

Manager Kramer commented that he is comfortable moving forward.

Manager Gernes asked how often projects go over the estimated amounts awarded. Paige Ahlborg stated that at times a project will go over but that is not typical as contractors stay within their bids. She commented that this contractor has been involved in the process. She noted that this is a not to exceed award from the District.

Manager Karp commented that he is comfortable moving forward because this is a priority area and equity area for the District. He noted that there are also other grant funds that have been awarded towards the project and was comfortable with the increased allocation.

Manager Gernes asked if this is phase two of a three phase project. Paige Ahlborg commented that the entire project will be completed this year.

President Eisele stated that he is comfortable moving forward for the reasons discussed.

Manager Gernes stated that although he has some pause, he would be comfortable with the conditional motion.

Motion: Manager Gernes moved, Manager Karp seconded, to approve an additional \$30,000 for application #22-08CS contingent upon the applicant working with staff to ensure the project meets the guidelines of the grant program.

Further discussion: President Eisele asked if the Board be alerted to any major changes. He also asked that a summary of the revisions to the planting plan be provided to the Board for review once available.

A roll call vote was performed:

Manager Karp	aye
Manager Gernes	aye
Manager Kramer	aye
President Eisele	aye

Motion carried unanimously.

B. Budget Status Update

No comments.

7. ACTION ITEMS (1:09:31)

A. Owasso Shoreline Restoration Phase 2 Advertise for Bid

Paige Ahlborg noted that this is phase two of the Owasso shoreline restoration which includes six residential properties. She stated that pending approval tonight the project would go out to bid Friday and staff would bring back the recommendation for the contractor at the May meeting.

President Eisele asked if there was a sense as to why more homeowners did not want to participate. Paige Ahlborg was unsure, noting that they did a large outreach effort with mailers, social media posts, and shared information with the lake association. She noted that if more homeowners are interested in the future, that could be done through the stewardship grant program.

Motion: Manager Kramer moved, Manager Karp seconded, to approve the preliminary design, estimated costs, and proposed project schedule and direct staff to finalize the design and bidding documents and advertise the project for bid. Motion carried unanimously.

B. Arbogast Underground Stormwater Filter Advertise for Bid

Paige Ahlborg stated that this is for the construction of an underground filtration project near Lake Emily in Shoreview. She explained that the project was identified through the feasibility study, and this will go through the targeted retrofit program to be constructed this summer. She stated that BWSR clean water grant funds have been allocated for this project as well. She noted that pending approval this would go out to bid and also come back to the Board for contractor selection in May.

Manager Karp stated that he was interested in the difference between the iron enhanced sand and CC17, noticing that staff chose to select the CC17. He asked if this type of project would ever be feasible using iron enhanced sand as a secondary treatment option. Brandon Barnes replied that the 30 percent design did include iron enhanced sand as part of the design, but the filter media was switched because of the longer prolonged flows. He stated that the CC17 can stay inundated for a longer time. He stated that it would not be cost-effective to add a secondary treatment in this location.

Manager Gernes asked how long the CC17 would be effective. Brandon Barnes replied that the lifespan would be dependent on the phosphorus concentration. He commented that this would not be something that would need to be replaced annually. Manager Gernes asked if a dryer season would advance the age of the material. Brandon Barnes stated that the maximum capacity is driven by loading. He stated that whether it is a wet or dry season, the phosphorus would continue to be removed. Manager Gernes asked for details on maintenance costs. Brandon Barnes replied that CC17 is used in the Kohlman Weir, although this would be a slightly different application. He stated that there would be less maintenance costs because it is an aggregate material. He noted that they would conduct inspections but there would be less maintenance with CC17 than iron enhanced sand. He explained that the stop logs will assist with flow adjustment through the system and provided additional details on how the system is designed.

Tina Carstens stated that maintenance is factored into the cost benefit. She confirmed that the District would inspect the project. Brandon Barnes stated that the District would complete maintenance for the first two years and then the City would take over maintenance.

Motion: Manager Karp moved, Manager Kramer seconded, to approve the preliminary design, estimated costs, and proposed project schedule and direct staff to finalize the design and bidding documents and solicit bid proposals.

A roll call vote was performed:

Manager Karp	aye
Manager Gernes	aye
Manager Kramer	aye
President Eisele	aye

Motion carried unanimously.

C. 2023-2025 BMP Maintenance Program Selection of Contractors

Paige Ahlborg stated that this is the BMP maintenance program which would cover 2023 through 2025. She stated that staff has chosen the three contractors specified in the report and provided details on the experience of each, noting that two of the contractors have been involved in the maintenance program before.

Manager Gernes asked if the selection was based more on cost, experience or other factors. Paige Ahlborg confirmed that all of those things were factored in, noting that two contractors were ruled out because their prices were very high. She stated that the office locations were also factored to ensure quick response could be given, along with experience. Manager Gernes asked if input was solicited from the partners involved in the projects. Tina Carstens noted that these are all District projects that are being maintained.

Paige Ahlborg provided details on the shoreline restoration projects that are having maintenance completed by the contractors for those projects, while Snail Lake has now transitioned to this program.

Motion: Manager Kramer moved, Manager Karp seconded, to award the 2023-2025 BMP Maintenance contract to Rock Leaf Water Environmental, Davey Resource Group, and Sandstrom Land Management for the projects specified and direct staff to prepare the necessary documents and work with the selected contractor.

A roll call vote was performed:

Manager Karp	aye
Manager Gernes	aye
Manager Kramer	aye
President Eisele	aye

Motion carried unanimously.

8. ATTORNEY REPORT (1:27:27)

Laurann Kirschner welcomed the new Board members as this is her first meeting back. She did not have a specific report.

President Eisele commented that currently a roll call vote is completed and asked if the Board could transition back to voice votes. Laurann Kirschner commented that if the Board is all present in the room, a voice vote would be sufficient. She stated that if there was an opposing vote, a roll call vote could follow. She stated that if a member is attending virtually, a roll call vote would be needed. President Eisele confirmed consensus of the Board to return to voice votes at future meetings.

9. BOARD ISSUES, POLICIES, AND OPERATION (FOR DISCUSSION AT MEETING) (1:30:10)

A. Spring Flood Risk Assessment

President Eisele stated that he has been asked by residents about the plan for potential flooding and information was provided in response within the project summary report. Brandon Barnes commented that flooding is a big concern of residents and can be disruptive. He stated that the models are updated and rerun several times as the season progresses.

Tina Carstens confirmed that staff would be available to respond to resident concerns. Brandon Barnes noted that the information learned from the models will be shared with the member cities. He provided additional details on when modeling would be updated.

Manager Gernes asked if there would be value in having presence on the website related to flooding to share more broadly with the public. Tina Carstens stated that the lake level stations are posted on the website. She stated

that the more specific flooding information would be a lot to digest for the average website user and therefore it is easier to respond one on one when residents call with questions or concerns.

President Eisele stated that the intention in placing this item on the agenda is partially to make this information accessible to the general public.

Manager Karp acknowledged that this is not a simple subject to disclose. He noted that perhaps some basic information could be provided. Tina Carstens stated that staff could develop a newsletter article that talks more about the process. The Board agreed.

B. Adopt-A-Culvert

President Eisele asked that this item be postponed to the next meeting.

C. Agenda Changes

President Eisele highlighted a few changes that have or will be made to the agenda.

10. NEW REPORTS AND/OR PRESENTATIONS (1:42:22)

Manager Kramer left the meeting.

A. District Wetland Management Strategies

Greg Williams stated that there was a request for more information on the District involvement with wetland management, how that aligns with other entities in the metro area, and whether adjustments should be made to those strategies. He provided background information on wetlands as well as details related to the wetlands inventory and classification, the current RWMWD wetland management roles, and wetland management roles of other WMOs and WDs. He reviewed possible revisions to the RMMWD roles and bounce and inundation standards.

Tina Carstens asked how that type of requirement could impact developers. Brandon Barnes commented that it would depend and reviewed some of the factors that would be considered. He stated that in some cases developers have integrated into their design process, while in others it can be a lot of effort if attempting to address it at the end.

President Eisele used Hillcrest as an example and asked how this regulation would impact that development as proposed. Brandon Barnes noted that Hillcrest is unique because of the size and mass grading and wetland mitigation, therefore this type of regulation may not be applicable to that development.

President Eisele stated that he would be curious as to maintenance. Tina Carstens explained that this would only apply to development or redevelopment through the rules program.

Manager Gernes asked if some responsibilities would be pushed onto the cities in those instances mentioned. Tina Carstens explained the difference between a WMO and WD. Greg Williams noted that even in the case of a WMO, the regulation would only be triggered through development or redevelopment.

Manager Karp commented that it is a lot to digest, especially with the downstream effects.

President Eisele used a flood event when the bounce and inundation standard cannot be met and asked what would happen. Tina Carstens replied that nothing would happen as it is meant to be a design standard and a flood event cannot be controlled. Manager Gernes noted that rate control would seem to better address flood events.

Greg Williams provided additional input on the experience of organizations that have implemented bounce and inundation regulations.

Manager Gernes recognized that the five- and ten-year events would tend to be more frequent, which would make sense as to why the regulations apply to those events rather than the larger events.

Greg Williams provided potential revisions to consider related to buffer standards, noting that the District rules are already quite strong.

Laurann Kirschner stated that landowners tend to not like easement agreements, and usually those need to be paid for because it remains on the land in perpetuity. She commented that sometimes more informal agreements tend to go over better. Nicole Soderholm stated that the signage requirements for buffers tend to provide the necessary education when properties change hands.

Greg Williams reviewed potential revisions related to wetland monitoring that could be considered. Tina Carstens stated that the District has over 1,000 wetlands. She noted that an updated MNRAM assessment could be done on a representation of those many wetlands to gauge the level of change.

President Eisele agreed that it would be cost prohibitive to do monitoring every year on every wetland but perhaps some type of rotation schedule could be developed.

Nicole Soderholm noted that BWSR may be moving away from MNRAM assessment and therefore perhaps a full assessment would not make sense.

President Eisele agreed that it would not make sense to monitor too often and perhaps there is a trigger for inspection.

Nicole Soderholm stated that there is a process an applicant can follow if they believe the MNRAM assessment is incorrect.

Greg Williams reviewed potential revisions related to wetland restoration.

President Eisele stated that in a previous workshop they discussed the role banking plays and asked how this would relate to capital projects. Tina Carstens replied that this would be related to projects that the District would pursue. President Eisele asked if the District could require payment into a fund that would be used by the District to restore wetlands. Tina Carstens replied that the applicant would follow the WCA process, and the District would not want to be in the middle, creating credits that could be used for applicants. She noted that there were no sites identified that would create a wetland bank within the District boundaries.

Manager Karp stated that he likes the idea of water quality and asked how much thought has been put into underground filters at inflow/outflow areas or how water quality could be improved in other areas that previously provided treatment. Tina Carstens stated that the capital improvement funds are used for water quality projects, providing examples of those different programs. She commented that while wetland restoration would enhance that it would not be the primary tool for achieving water quality goals and would fall more under ecological restoration. Manager Karp asked how that would rate versus a targeted retrofit project. Tina Carstens commented that funds have been allocated in the budget for wetland restoration, but if the Board wants to be stronger in that area that should be identified as a higher priority in the next generation plan, or the current plan could be amended. She explained how the prioritization tool is used to rank different projects and concepts.

Manager Gernes noted past wetland restoration projects the District has been involved in. Tina Carstens confirmed and explained that those projects have gone through other programs of the District.

Greg Williams stated that the intention for tonight was to provide this information to the Board and gain any input on the potential revisions mentioned within the presentation. He also provided information on project review and documentation. He stated that based on the discussion thus far it seems that the buffer standards are sufficient and confirmed consensus of the Board.

President Eisele stated that he would love to see the best cost benefit relating to bounce and inundation standards.

Manager Karp agreed, noting that he would like to see more information as well as implications on development. Tina Carstens confirmed that staff could bring back something for the Board to consider and if it was determined that should move forward, a larger rule revision would be needed.

Manager Gernes confirmed that he would also want to see more information on the bounce standards and could see value in restoration. He stated that he would also be interested in information on wetland monitoring.

The Board agreed that it would like more information on bounce and inundation, wetland restoration and wetland monitoring. It was noted that monitoring should be intentional, and action driven rather than over burdensome.

Bill Bartodziej noted that maintenance is a large element of wetland restoration that should be considered as that would be a long-term responsibility.

B. Owasso Basin Area & North Star Estates Flood-Risk Reduction Scope Summary

No comments.

C. Targeted Retrofits – Roosevelt Homes, St. Paul Scope Summary

No comments.

11. ADMINISTRATOR'S REPORT (2:49:30)

A. Meetings Attended

No comments.

B. Upcoming Meetings and Dates

No comments.

C. Board Action Log and Updates

No comments.

D. Minnesota Watersheds Updates

No comments.

E. Staff Changes and Organizational Chart

Tina Carstens noted that the retirement of Bill Bartodziej is fast approaching, and staff will alert the Board once a recognition event is planned. She noted that she will not be present at the next meeting and Paige Ahlborg will be present in her place to assist with leading the meeting.

12. PROJECT AND PROGRAM STATUS REPORTS (2:15:23)

A. Barr's Approach to Assessing the Risk of Spring Flooding

Project Feasibility Studies

B. Interim Emergency Response Planning

C. Kohlman Creek Flood Risk Feasibility Study

D. Kohlman Creek/Wakefield Lake Diversion Feasibility Study

E. County Ditch 17 Improvements Feasibility Study

- F. Phalen Village Feasibility Study
- G. Ames Lake Area Flood Risk Reduction Planning Study
- H. Owasso Basin/North Star Estates Improvements
- I. Carver Ponds Improvement Study
- J. South Metro Mississippi River TSS TMDL
- K. Resiliency Study for Non-Beltline Tributary Areas
- L. Street Sweeping Study

Research Projects

- M. Kohlman Lake Aquatic Plans and Nutrients Study

Capital Improvements

- N. Woodbury Target Store Stormwater Retrofit Projects
- O. Targeted Retrofit Projects
- P. Stewardship Grant Program Support
- Q. Arbogast Stormwater Filtration BMP
- R. Pioneer Park Stormwater Reuse
- S. Double Driveway Pond and Fish Creek Tributary Improvements

CIP Project Repair and Maintenance

- T. 2023 CIP Maintenance and Repair Project
- U. 2023-2025 BMP Maintenance Program

Program Updates

- V. Natural Resources Program
- W. Public Involvement and Education Program

13. MANAGER COMMENTS AND NEXT MONTH'S MEETING (2:52:12)

No comments.

14. ADJOURN

Motion: Manager Gernes moved, Manager Karp seconded, to adjourn the meeting at 9:22 p.m. Motion carried unanimously.