



**Ramsey-Washington Metro Watershed District
Minutes of Regular Board Meeting
October 6, 2021**

The Regular Meeting of October 6, 2021, was held via Zoom web conferencing. A video recording of the meeting can be found at <https://youtu.be/wUryRSBIPgY>. 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
Brandon Barnes, Barr Engineering
Brad Lindaman, Barr Engineering
Andy Walz, Lake Owasso Resident

Paige Ahlborg, Project Manager
Tracey Galowitz, Attorney for District
Nicole Soderholm, Permit Inspector
Brian Frank, Representing Lower Afton Apartments

1. CALL TO ORDER

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

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA (01:30)

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

A roll call vote was performed:

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

Motion carried unanimously.

3. CONSENT AGENDA (02:00)

- A. Approval of Minutes from September 1, 2021
- B. Treasurer's Report and Bill List
- C. Permit Program
 - i. 21-29: Lower Afton Apartments, Maplewood
- D. Stewardship Grant Program
 - i. 21-33 CS: Loewen, Shoreline Restoration
 - ii. 21-34: Adrian, Permeable Driveway
- E. North St. Paul Target Store Retrofit – Change Order No. 3

F. Keller Channel Weir and Phalen Outlet Project – Change Order No. 6

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

A roll call vote was performed:

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

Motion carried unanimously.

4. VISITOR COMMENTS (02:41)

Andy Walz thanked the Board for the shoreline grant program on Lake Owasso. He stated that the lake association appreciates the project and will do what it can to spread the work and increase participation. He stated that in the past there was a good discussion related to the Victoria Shores development on Lake Owasso. He thanked the Board for submission of the letter to the City, noting that the environmental assessment worksheet has been submitted and deemed complete. He stated that the letter was published and is open for public and agency comment through November 4th. He understood the District staff will be providing comments and encouraged others to submit comments as well. He did not believe the EAW was complete, and some issues were not included. He stated that the watershed is mentioned directly, stating that the stormwater BMPs would comply with the standards but he did not believe that they did. He believed that an EIS would provide additional benefit.

5. PERMIT PROGRAM (06:36)

A. Applications – See Consent Agenda

B. Monthly Enforcement Report

During September, 16 notices were sent to address: install/maintain inlet protection (4), install/maintain perimeter control (5), install/maintain construction entrance(s) (2), stabilize exposed soils (1), contain liquid/solid waste materials (2), remove discharged sediment (1), and maintain permanent BMPs (1).

6. STEWARDSHIP GRANT PROGRAM (06:53)

A. Applications – See Consent Agenda

B. Budget Status Update

Paige Ahlberg stated that they are still working to finalize design on some projects. She stated that the Twin Lake projects have had site prep and a controlled berm with plugs to be installed this fall.

7. ACTION ITEMS (07:53)

A. Watershed Excellence Awards Approval

Tina Carstens stated that the award recommendations were provided to the Board and welcomed any input.

Manager Ward commented that she is always impressed with the depth of the projects and commitments of those within the district. She stated that she supports the slate of award recipients as proposed.

Managers Aichinger and Skinner echoed those comments.

President Swope agreed and stated that it is always nice to see people devoted to the environment.

Motion: Manager Aichinger moved, Manager Eisele seconded, to recommend and approve the proposed Watershed Excellence Award winners.

A roll call vote was performed:

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

Motion carried unanimously.

President Swope asked if the event would be held in person.

Tina Carstens replied that is still being discussed but it would most likely be held virtually.

B. District Art Policy

Tina Carstens stated that there have been a few projects that have come before the Board and have been approved but the Board desired guidelines for the review of public art projects. She noted that goals, a mission, and process was developed. She noted that they would want to ensure that the public art projects are tied to the stewardship grant program and assist with outreach and/or education.

Manager Aichinger referenced the artist that provided input in the past and asked if that was reviewed.

Tina Carstens confirmed that she did, noting that artist is still working with Capital Regional Watershed. She noted that some of the goals came from that work.

Manager Eisele asked for details on the amount chosen. Paige Ahlborg stated that the most that has been spent in the past has been \$8,000 or \$9,000 and therefore believed that the amount selected would be more than adequate. She stated that if a larger request were to come in that seemed appropriate, staff could bring that to the Board.

Manager Aichinger commented that the mural at the Maplewood Mall project was in the area of \$50,000 but noted that was a multimillion-dollar project. He noted that there may be instances in which the Board may deviate from the policy, but that could be brought to the Board.

Paige Ahlborg commented that she believed that type of project would be brought forward separately, noting that additional work at Aldrich Arena would most likely be brought forward separately.

Tina Carstens noted that it would also make a difference if it were a District project or someone else's project.

Manager Skinner stated that in the past there was a lot of discussion about public art, and she agrees with the policy that was developed at that time. She believed there is enormous public benefit to public art. She stated that she is fully supportive and believes that this is valuable and should continue to be supported.

Manager Ward asked that requested be outlined in the same manner as other requests, showing the goal that a request would accomplish.

President Swope asked if there is a goal to incorporate public art into future projects.

Tina Carstens stated that for District projects there is always signage but noted that additional incorporation of public art would depend upon the project. She agreed that signage is different than public art for a District project but noted that if someone else was requesting signage for their project it would most likely be processed under public art.

Paige Ahlborg confirmed that previous signage requests have been processed under public art in the past. She stated that for outside projects, applicants typically alert the District in the beginning if they would like to incorporate public art.

Manager Eisele commented that signage could be considered as outreach, whereas specific art work would be considered public art. He stated that if signage were split out from public art, that budget could then be reserved for more meaningful work.

Tracey Galowitz stated that she likes the way the policy was done, tying the request for public art to the project and an educational component.

Tina Carstens stated that staff will use the input to draft the final policy to bring to the Board at the next meeting.

8. ATTORNEY REPORT (21:43)

Tracey Galowitz stated that this month the main focus was working with an applicant that needed to provide funds to the storm impact fund. She stated that they worked with staff to ensure that all steps were followed.

Nicole Soderholm provided background information on a permit approved in 2018 for an apartment building in Maplewood. She noted that the filtration basin is holding water because of a groundwater issue that was not anticipated. She explained that because the site is built out there was not space for another BMP and therefore the other option was for the applicant to pay into the storm impact fund for the amount that the applicant is short from the basin.

Manager Aichinger stated that he would believe the escrow fund could be used to offset part of that cost.

Nicole Soderholm stated that the funds would be used within the subwatershed to construct another project. She noted that while the basin is not working as designed, it does provide flood control and the stormwater reuse was setup.

Tina Carstens noted that this is a great example of the benefit of the storm impact fund as well, as there was not another option for the applicant.

Manager Ward commented that she was glad there were alternatives set up. She stated that at the last meeting they received an update on open meeting laws and asked for input on how other clients are handling meetings during this time.

Tracey Galowitz commented that attendance continues to be varied depending on the meeting, but more clients are returning to virtual meetings.

President Swope stated that he has noticed that other government entities in this area have also pulled back to virtual attendance and therefore he would feel comfortable continuing in this manner for the time being.

9. BOARD ISSUES, POLICIES AND OPERATION (FOR DISCUSSION AT MEETING) (28:40)

A. West Vadnais Lake Strategy and Status

Tina Carstens stated that she met with the administrator the previous day and he offered to attend a Board meeting if the Board desires. She stated that group has been doing a lot over the past year, partnering with the District on carp management and the carp barrier. She stated that Board also approved a budget increase for rough fish management in 2022. She stated that a full fish survey of West Vadnais is also planned for 2022. She stated that group is also at the final stages of completing a sustainable lake management report (SLMR) for West Vadnais Lake, which is a predecessor to a TMDL, noting that the TMDL is scheduled for 2024. She stated that internal loading has been identified as the main problem in the lake. She stated that District staff will also be reviewed the SLMR to ensure the actions fall in line with what the District would anticipate for that system.

Manager Ward stated that she always wondered why this lake is not included in the District system. She stated that she is glad this work is being done but would like additional information on why the lake is not part of the District and whether it should stay that way.

Tina Carstens stated that historically, at one time, East and West Vadnais were one lake. She stated that the Grass Lake area was not part of the District until more recent years.

Cliff Aichinger stated that when the District boundaries were first established, East Vadnais was part of the Saint Paul Regional Water Supply System while West Vadnais was landlocked. He stated that after the low flow system was established, there would have been some reason to incorporate but because it was low flow, it was not felt important to incorporate that water body. He stated that it appeared more important once the Grass Lake area was incorporated into the District. He stated that while it would make sense to incorporate, it is being managed and therefore it is not necessary. He stated that as long as the two watersheds work together to resolve problems, it could continue to work as is.

Manager Eisele asked what steps would be taken or what would it take to change minds to include West Vadnais in the District boundaries. He asked if time to action would be shorter if the water body were in the District.

Manager Aichinger stated that if a major capital improvement was needed, that could be a catalyst to make the change because the District has a larger tax base. He stated that if VLAWMO sees the lake as a large expense, they could make the request, but he did not see a reason to push the issue at this time.

President Swope commented on the long process needed in order to lower the outlet in the past.

Tina Carstens commented that was the EAW process, not the process of VLAWMO.

President Swope commented that the infrequent meeting schedule of VLAWMO can cause project delays.

Manager Aichinger stated if there was a need, and VLAWMO agreed, the process could be completed in three to four months.

Manager Skinner stated that she agrees with the comments of Manager Aichinger. She noted that in the past they really discussed the option of taking on West Vadnais. She commented that this is a complicated system as East Vadnais is used for drinking water and West Vadnais is very dirty. She stated that if the Board took this on it would be complicated with a lot of problems.

President Swope asked if the steps are known that would need to be taken to move the lake to the District boundaries.

Tina Carstens stated that the District has gone through boundary changes in the past. She noted that the controls for West Vadnais are within the District boundaries, therefore the District has control of that flow. She noted that

VLAWMO has taken steps with the District to address the water quality. She noted that before the Board would consider a boundary change, the VLAWMO administrator would like to have a conversation with the Board.

President Swope suggested inviting the VLAWMO administrator to a future Board meeting.

Manager Eisele stated that as a constituent, he recalls from a community perspective that it was difficult to determine who would be best suited to help in this situation. He stated that as long as the time to decision and time to action can be as short as possible.

Manager Ward commented that she appreciates the outline of the history and noted that things have changed. She believed that technically it is beneficial for West Vadnais to be in the District boundary and the question is just related to timing. She believed that more information should be gathered to determine if that decision should be made proactively or reactively.

Manager Aichinger stated that discussion could be had with the VLAWMO administrator when he attends.

Manager Skinner commented that would be taking on West Vadnais would be a huge expensive thing to fix and having the District residents pay for that expense is something that should be considered. She stated that there should be partners to that project if that is something that is going to be taken on.

Manager Ward asked if the study of the connectiveness between East and West Vadnais could be shared prior to the meeting. She also asked if a list could be provided of the work the District has done on West Vadnais in recent years. She stated that her concern is the water quality and its impact on the water downstream; specifically, whether they can move fast enough and whether they could move faster if they were in control.

Manager Eisele asked if there is a process that shows the steps that would be taken and time that would be necessary if there were a conveyance issue.

Tina Carstens confirmed that she could provide examples of previous projects. She noted that even if West Vadnais were within the District boundaries, it may not rise to the top of the priorities for water quality, especially because the problem is internal load management. She stated that if VLAWMO still maintains West Vadnais and the District comes forward with a proposal, there would be an option for a cost share and the District to be a partner rather than the sole entity responsible.

10. PRESENTATIONS (55:36)

A. Grass Lake Berm Wetland Mitigation Overview

Brad Lindaman provided background information on the raising of the berm on the west side of Grass Lake. He noted that the wetlands in that area were impacted by the raising of the berm. He provided additional details on the wetland impact and mitigation, noting that wetland replacement credits were purchased, and onsite wetland creation was planned and approved in 2018 to meet the no net loss policy. He displayed an aerial photograph of the site and identified the wetland boundaries, pedestrian trail, and planned wetland replacement area. He provided additional details on the three planned wetland creation areas and the District responsibility related to the WCA requirements. He reviewed the initial work and conditions and the technical evaluation panel findings from the site review conducted on August 10, 2021. He provided details on wetland monitoring, the initial monitoring results, and the existing conditions. He noted that they are approximately 1,000 square feet short due to the lack of wetland establishment in one of the areas. He reviewed the initial recommendations.

Manager Skinner stated that this area has fluctuating conditions and asked if seeds have been considered for that area that would work in that fluctuation.

Brad Lindaman confirmed that is considered as they continue to gather data. He noted that they will continue to oversee and look for those opportunities. He reviewed the options for the 1,000 square feet that are short and stated that it may be best to purchase credits to fulfil that requirement.

Nicole Soderholm stated that it is awkward because the District is permitting itself. She stated that perhaps the upland buffer could be reviewed to meet the requirement for WCA. She stated that the District has to meet WCA requirements, but also the District no net loss policy which is more stringent. She stated that perhaps this is a topic for the wetland workshop. She commented that wetland establishment is hard and complicated.

Manager Skinner stated that she is concerned when wetland credits are purchased outside of the District as opportunities disappear to create wetland within the boundaries. She believes that purchase of credits outside of the District would be a disservice over time and encouraged staff to continue to look for opportunities to create wetland credits within the District boundaries.

Tina Carstens commented that it is hard to create wetlands in areas that have never been wetlands but there could be opportunity to restore wetlands. She noted that while those may not satisfy BWSR requirements for credit, that could satisfy the need to meet the District no net loss policy.

Nicole Soderholm stated that the easiest path would be to focus on meeting the WCA requirements at this time if an exception would be granted to the District no net loss policy.

Tina Carstens noted that purchasing credits would be the last option and believed that additional work should be done onsite in attempt to meet the requirement. She stated that if they reach the point where additional work would not be beneficial to the wetland, credits could be used as the last option.

Nicole Soderholm stated that this is also unique in that the District does not own the property.

Manager Aichinger stated that if this were an applicant, the District would want the wetland established and believed more effort should be made in that attempt. He believed that additional grading would be needed in the swale area to ensure surface hydrology and then replant that area.

President Swope commented that it was his understanding that when the berm was raised, it was raised to the designed height to protect Grass Lake. He asked if the lower rain levels have also impacted the level of Grass Lake. He asked if that area is still considered a wetland.

Tina Carstens explained what defines a wetland and noted that the impacts from the berm would not have impacted the wetland designation, as the wetlands have been in existence far before the wet period from Grass Lake as there is hydrology not just from overflow but from underground as well. She stated that the lack of wetland establishment is more about hydrology.

Manager Ward asked if there is a map of all the wetland areas of Grass Lake and whether that could be shared on the website.

Tina Carstens confirmed that the wetlands are mapped and on the interactive portion of the website. She noted that map is based on aerial photos and not delineation.

Manager Ward stated that she also wants to avoid purchasing additional credits and believed that staff should further explore the other options.

Brad Lindaman provided details on the monitoring wells that were installed.

Nicole Soderholm stated that they could determine if it would be helpful to have a monitoring well at the overflow swale to determine if there is hydrology in that area.

Brad Lindaman noted that he is unsure that would be needed because it is so close to the central location.

President Swope commented that this is a lot more complicated than he anticipated when he asked the question and believed this was helpful discussion prior to the wetland workshop.

B. Keller Weir and Phalen Outlet Operations Plan

Brandon Barnes commented that this is a good time for the discussion as this project is transitioning from the construction phase into the operations and management phase. He stated that a draft form of the operations plan was included in the packet for the Board to review. He stated that this project was originally identified through the Beltline Resiliency Study and provided background information on how the project came forward through that process. He provided photographs showing the Keller weir and Phalen outlet pre-project conditions, during construction, and current conditions. He explained how the gates can be operated for the Keller channel and the Phalen outlets. He stated that the operation plan was based on the District stormwater model and was submitted to and discussed with the DNR prior to the project beginning. He reviewed the items which are considered within the plan and provided some hypothetical situations, explaining how the operations plan would dictate the gates be operated. He reviewed the next steps which include finalizing the operations plan, implementation of the operations plan, and continue to look for additional project opportunities flood risk reduction system modifications upstream.

Manager Eisele asked if the video could be shared on the District website.

Tina Carstens confirmed that could be done.

President Swope stated that three-inch rainfall was selected and asked if there is any information on the accuracy of those forecasts. He stated that in the past two inches was used and asked why the move was made to three inches.

Brandon Barnes stated that they chose a depth at which they would mitigate flood risk for homes on the Phalen Chain and also limit the number of times District staff would need to make adjustments to the outlets. He stated that the higher rainfall depth reduces the number of times staff would need to adjust the outlets. He explained that two inches was used during the resiliency study, but the configuration for the modification changed from the resiliency study to the final design. He stated that the changes made between the resiliency study and final design allowed the change from two inches to three inches without changing the benefit.

President Swope asked the length of time it takes for changes at the weir to impact downstream.

Brandon Barnes stated that live storage is created once the gates are lowered or opened. He stated that the operation plan targets a drawdown to the normal water level within a 24-hour period. He stated that if only one gate is opened, it would take longer to create that live storage compared to opening four gates.

Manager Eisele asked if rate was taken into account and whether the rate of rainfall would trigger response.

Brandon Barnes stated that the rate does not necessarily determine a change in the weir as the system is volume driven.

Manager Eisele stated that it is not just rainfall that changes the water level. He stated that perhaps the rainfall equates to a higher change in the water level because of those other factors, such as ground water and saturation.

Brandon Barnes stated that the model was using typical conditions. He stated that the uncertainty pointed out by Manager Eisele can be accounted for in the upper limit.

President Swope asked if the operation of the weirs would be part of the review for at risk homes.

Tina Carstens clarified that part of the project and program status report refers to the homes mentioned within the Ames Lake and Kohlman Creek studies.

Brandon Barnes stated that those are feasibility studies that are next in the sequence. He noted that those studies would look at flood risk mitigation in areas not immediately adjacent to the chain, but changes to the system in those areas are done with the assumption that the outlets are in place and accounting for the operations plan for those structures.

Manager Aichinger stated that he likes the operation plan but noted that there will most likely be extenuating circumstances down the road where there are wet conditions with a rain event that occurs. He stated that if the lake does not respond as quickly, he would assume the system would allow the gate to remain open or open another gate to return the lake to the normal level.

Brandon Barnes noted that is something they would continue to look at as they begin to operate this. He stated that this plan is based on the drawdown that they are seeing with the model and once they start operations, they will have new data points that will inform the number of gates that should be opened, if the advance notification is set correctly, and any other adjustments that may be necessary.

Manager Eisele confirmed that his question also supported that ability for staff to make adjustments to the operations plan if needed per the circumstances.

Brandon Barnes stated that perhaps an overriding statement is added to the end of the draft plan that the gates could be opened in consult with the Administrator and District Engineer.

Manager Ward stated that she was interested in the evaluation and amendment process for the plan. She asked if the operation plan would be reviewed upon each use of the gates or upon a certain length of time as data continues to be collected. She commented that formal evaluation will be needed to ensure a nimble operation plan moving forward.

Brandon Barnes agreed.

Manager Aichinger referenced the predicted rain levels and asked if there is a site that would be used for that prediction. He noted that sometimes predictions are different than actual rainfall levels and asked if staff would be authorized to respond to the actual rainfall when less rainfall was predicted.

Brandon Barnes believed that could be done within the context of the plan. He stated that the upper elevation trigger would allow for that authorization by staff. He stated that the other side of that would be where the prediction is made for three inches, but only one inch is received. He noted that in that example the gates could be opened based on the prediction and the level falls below the outlet and the gates are then closed to allow the flow to return.

President Swope congratulated everyone for getting this done.

Tina Carstens commented that this is a unique system for a watershed to operate and they are looking forward to this process.

11. ADMINISTRATOR'S REPORT (2:07:38)

A. Meetings Attended

Manager Aichinger asked for an update on the Metro I-Net meeting.

Tina Carstens provided an update noting that at the meeting they provided authorization to officially hire an Executive Director under the JPA. She stated that the Executive Director would then evaluate staffing and where officing would occur. She stated that they anticipated holding the 2022 budget where it had been, and the Executive Director will make an evaluation for the 2023 budget.

B. Upcoming Meetings and Dates

Tina Carstens confirmed that the MAWD meeting will be held virtually once again and noted that more information will come forward over the next month. She confirmed that the December Board meeting would be held one week later than normal in order to avoid a conflict with the MAWD meeting.

C. Ongoing Project/Program Updates

Tina Carstens provided an update on discussions with Ramsey County related to District projects on County property, lake level monitoring stations, alum use, and the Victoria Shores development EAW comment period.

President Swope confirmed that he would agree staff should follow the typical process to submit the letter with the District comments and simply provide a copy of that letter in the next Board packet for review.

D. Wetlands Workshop

Tina Carstens noted that staff will send materials prior to the workshop for the Board members to review. It was confirmed that the meeting would be held virtually.

Manager Skinner commented that she does not believe she will be able to attend on the scheduled date.

12. PROJECT AND PROGRAM STATUS REPORTS (2:18:28)

A. Ongoing Project and Program Updates

- i. Interim Emergency Response Planning
- ii. Kohlman Creek Flood Risk Reduction Feasibility Study
- iii. Ames Lake Area Flood Risk Reduction Feasibility Study
- iv. Special Project BMP Monitoring
- v. Kohlman Permeable Weir Test System
- vi. Shallow Lake Aeration Study
- vii. Keller Channel and Phalen Outlet Operations Plans
- viii. Target Store Stormwater Retrofit Projects
- ix. Targeted Retrofit Projects
- x. Keller Channel Weir and Phalen Outlet Resiliency Modifications
- xi. Ryan Drive and Keller Parkway Conveyance Project
- xii. Twin Lake Outlet
- xiii. District Inspection Standardization
- xiv. Beltline/Battle Creek Tunnel Five-Year Inspection
- xv. County Road D Ravine
- xvi. CIP Maintenance and Repair Project 2021
- xvii. New Technology Review: LG Sonic Monitoring Buoy and MPC-Buoy
- xviii. Natural Resources Program Update
- xix. Education Program Update
- xx. Communications Program and Website Update
- xxi. Citizen Advisory Committee Update

President Swope referenced the inspections standardization, specifically the feedback requested related to the miscellaneous category and rating system. He stated that he is fine with the miscellaneous category as long as it is well documented. He stated that he would support the 1-5 scale.

Manager Eisele also agreed that miscellaneous would make sense and agreed that he likes the 1-5 rating. He stated that typically he prefers not to have a middle point in a rating system and it pushed more of a decision.

The Board confirmed consensus on the miscellaneous category and rating system of 1-5.

Brad Lindaman appreciated the input. He stated that they will continue to provide more up to date information to the Board in order to have these types of discussions.

Manager Eisele stated that he likes this approach and tends to prefer something that begins simple and then becomes more complex.

Manager Ward stated that it would also be nice to review this after some time and see how certain projects were rated. She stated that this has an impact to the budget and staff time and believes that this will assist in prioritization.

Manager Aichinger referenced the Roseville Willow Pond CMAC system, noting that it seems that has taken a long time to be finished and operating. He asked for an update on the delay in the project.

Brad Lindaman stated that a variety of things happened and provided additional details on the project.

President Swope referenced the communications program and asked if staff could continue to provide updates on the communications with other government entities.

Manager Eisele referenced the new technology section and asked if lake levels impact the functionality of the technology.

Brad Lindaman provided additional details on the reports that are provided on those items. He stated that the report was less about the lake level and more about the items that could be in the way.

President Swope asked if there had been any discussion with the cities that experience problems with algae problems and whether they would be interested in this.

Tina Carstens stated that they have not reached out yet but would share this information to determine if there would be interest in testing.

13. MANAGER COMMENTS AND NEXT MONTH'S MEETING (2:29:23)

Manager Aichinger stated that staff is still completing work like pre-COVID and he is impressed in how staff and the consultants continue to complete the same amount of work.

Tina Carstens reviewed the items that would be included in the next packet and/or on the next agenda.

14. ADJOURN

Motion: Manager Aichinger moved, Manager Skinner seconded, to adjourn the meeting at 9:01 p.m.

A roll call vote was performed:

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

Motion carried unanimously.