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1. Call to Order: The Red River Watershed Management Board (RRWMB) met on Tuesday, March 20, 2018 at the Marriott Hotel in Moorhead, Minnesota. Mr. Finney called the meeting to order. Managers present were: Greg Holmvik, LeRoy Ose, Jason Braaten, Roger Mischel, Jerome Deal, Dan Money, and Daniel Wilkens.

Others present included:

Robert L. Sip, Executive Director
Nikki Swenson, Executive Assistant
LeRoy Carriere, Manager, Roseau River Watershed District (RRWD)
Jay Leitch, Chair, Buffalo Red River Watershed District (BRRWD)
Tara Jensen, Bookkeeper, Wild Rice Watershed District (WRWD)
Terry Sorenson, Manager, Red Lake Watershed District (RLWD)
Dan Veshledal, Manager, Sand Hill River Watershed District (SHRWD)
Peter Fjestad, Vice Chair, BRRWD
Nathan Kestner, NW Regional Manager, EWR, MN Department of Natural Resources (DNR)
Joel Praska, Administrator, Middle Snake Tamarac Rivers Watershed District (MSTRWD)
Morrie Lanning, Private Consultant
April Swenby, Staff, SHRWD
Roger Hansen, RRWMB Designated Manager and SHRWD Manager
Jim Ziegler, Regional Director, Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA)
Tracy Halstensgard, Administrator, RRWD
Curt Johannsen, Chair, Red River Basin Commission (RRBC)
Myron Jesme, Administrator, RLWD
Tracy Bergstrom, Administrative Assistant, RRWD
Keith Weston, Executive Director, Red River Retention Authority (RRRA)
Ted Priester, Executive Director, RRBC
Chuck Fritz, Executive Director, International Water Institute (IWI)
Henry Van Offelen, Board of Water and Soil Resources (BWSR)
Kevin Ruud, Administrator, WRWD
Debra Walchuk, Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS)
2. **Meeting Additions and Adoption of Agenda: Motion** to approve the Agenda was made by Mr. Holmvik, **Seconded** by Mr. Ose, **Carried**.

   Executive Director Sip stated that Item 6 on the agenda, the Benefit Cost Analysis (BCA) presentation would not be heard today as one of the co-presenters Jerry Bents of Houston Engineering could not attend today’s meeting. Sip indicated that the presentation would be given in the near future.

3. **Approval of Meeting Minutes: Motion** by Mr. Deal to dispense with the reading of the minutes, **Seconded** by Mr. Braaten, **Carried**.

   Sip stated that the meeting minutes that were submitted in the packet to the RRWMB Managers had some grammar errors and said there were copies available for the audience. He indicated that the changes were minor and resulted in some adjusted language regarding Jim Ziegler’s report from last month. The version for today was dated March 18, 2018 and is the correct version that should be reviewed.

   Mr. Wilkens provided the Managers with a document indicating some changes that he would like made in the February 20, 2018 RRWMB meeting minutes. He discussed several proposed changes and stated that his meeting minutes would have to be overlaid with RRWMB staff meeting minutes to obtain the correct minutes.

   Tracy Halstensgard stated that for the meeting minutes to be accurate, alternates on the RRWMB should be labeled as alternates in the meeting minutes and managers in the audience should be labeled as such, even though the delegated managers are not sitting at the Board table. Manager Braaten reiterated what Halstensgard stated to the Managers. She stated that it was her understanding that the alternates are not the delegates. Mr. Wilkens asked about this and Halstensgard discussed the future and that the younger generation would need to know this since we are discussing the accuracy of the meeting minutes. Mr. Deal indicated that this could be done.

   Sip acknowledged that there were errors in the meeting minutes and discussed how this occurred. He stated that during the review process, the wrong set of minutes were inadvertently used to make copies, which were sent out to the Managers and email distribution list. Sip stated that the meeting minutes were developed using the audio recording and notes from both he and Executive Assistant Nikki Swenson. Additional discussion was held and Mr. Holmvik stated that he would like Sip to review the audio recording from the February 20, 2018 meeting and that is what should be used to reflect the meeting minutes.
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**Motion** to approve the Meeting Minutes incorporating changes as discussed and with the review of the audio recording was made by Mr. Deal, **Seconded** by Mr. Ose. **Carried.**

4. **Office Location – Public Hearing:** Mr. Finney opened the public hearing on the office location at 9:45 am and read the following statement:

“Good morning. I would like to open the public hearing to receive comments on the proposed change of principal place of business of the Red River Watershed Management Board. On February 20, 2018, the Board of Managers proposed the change of the Red River Watershed Management Board’s principal place of business to Ada, MN. To be clear, our Board rotates the location of its meetings each month to a different member watershed district, and we will continue to follow that practice. The proposed change of our principal place of business is only about the location of our RRWMB office and where we conduct business.

For years and until the end of 2017, the RRWMB had its office at the home of its previous administrator in Detroit Lakes and prior to that the Executive Director in Ada. As of February 1, 2018 the RRWMB has had a temporary office at the Arvig building, 9 East Fourth Avenue, in Ada. Since our last meeting, Mr. Sip has held discussions as authorized by the RRWMB Managers, and with the Wild Rice Watershed District, about a potential office for the Red Board in their facilities at 11 Fifth Avenue East in Ada.

The purpose of the hearing today is to allow interested members of the public to present comments to the Board directly on this change to the office location, and we welcome comments on either the Arvig or Wild Rice addresses in Ada.

The Red River Watershed Management Board is not legally required to hold this hearing to change our office location, or principal place of business, but this is the procedure required for watershed districts, so it seems reasonable and appropriate for our Board to follow the same process as our member watershed districts. In February, our Board adopted a resolution stating the proposed change of location to Ada, setting a time and location for this hearing on the change of the principal place of business, and directing published notice of the hearing.

After the hearing today, the managers may order the change in the Red River Watershed Management Board’s principal place of business. I will now ask Executive Director Robert Sip to offer further background on this proposed change of the Red River Watershed Management Board’s principal place of business. When he has finished his remarks, the floor will be open for public comment.

At that time, if you wish to comment, please come forward and state your name and address for the record. We ask that you limit your comments to five (5) minutes. If you have a written copy of your statement, or any other documents that you would like to submit, please give them to Mr. Sip.
During public comment, Managers are welcome to ask questions of commenters to clarify their remarks. I also may ask Mr. Sip to respond to any questions raised. I would ask however that if a Manager then wishes to speak to the merits of the change of the principal place of business, this be reserved for a later time when the Board will have the opportunity for discussion.”

Mr. Finney offered the floor to Executive Director Sip to make additional comments. Sip discussed the public notice process that was used and indicated that all counties in the MN portion of the Red River Basin were notified and an ad was placed in the Fargo Forum as advised by legal counsel. Sip stated that no comments were received via telephone, email, in a written format, or in person. He also mentioned that the RRWMB has been discussing office space since 1978 and after 30 years we are at a point that we need to establish an office to show transparency and professionalism. He stated that the RRWMB needs a public place to do business and that this entity should not be in a home. Since we are a government agency, it is appropriate that the office be in a public setting.

Mr. Finney asked for comments from the audience. Leroy Carriere stated that the Ada location is good since it is centrally located and is better for handicap access. Tracy Halstensgard stated that at one point the RRWD was not sure that there should be an established office but now as the process has moved forward, an office is beneficial, and that Executive Director Sip stated reasons why there should be an office. The RRWD agrees with an established office. Myron Jesme stated that the message from the RRWMB was clear that the Executive Director would make the decision on the office location and he felt that the procedure and protocol was followed to establish the office. He felt that there were timely opportunities to give input into the process.

Mr. Finney closed the public hearing and stated that the Board of Managers will carefully consider all of the comments that have been offered today and any comments received in writing. Mr. Wilkens stated that he was asked by his Board of Managers to read a statement and was as follows:

“The Sand Hill River Watershed District opposes a permanent location change to 11 5Th Avenue East due to financial uncertainties. The Sand Hill River Watershed District recommends that the RRWMB continue to maintain a temporary office location at 219 North Mill Street in Fertile as formally approved in December 2018.

This will ensure adequate checks and balances between the Treasurer and the Executive Assistant, allowing the Treasurer to provide much needed assistance for the financial transition of the RRWMB financial records in a time of record instability. The Sand Hill River Watershed District feels that the RRWMB decision to permanently relocate the Wild Rice Watershed District office is not in the best interest of the tax payers and instead is a decision made to only provide convenience to staff.
Attendees at the February 20, 2018 meeting report that the RRWMB had zero discussion on matters of finance for office location or which location would be more fiscally responsible. Attendees reported that the decision to choose a location that will ultimately cost the RRWMB more money annually and stands without a firm quote, was based off a recommendation from the Executive Director. The minutes of the February 20, 2018 meeting compliment the reports by a statement from the acting Chairman, who is also the WRWD Chairman, encouraging a more costly option to accommodate staff. The minutes read as follows: “Manager Holmvik said that the decision was made by staff and it would be unfair to make them move. Manager Braaten agreed with Managers Holmvik and Ose about leaving the decision up to staff on the office location. According to multiple sets of RRWMB minutes, the staff knew prior to their employment that the office location could be in one of three locations.

The Sand Hill River Watershed District does not feel that committing to a ten-year lease, for $1,150 per month, with the estimated price subject to change based on actual costs, is what is best for the RRWMB, when the Sand Hill River Watershed District offered the same amenities with a more centralized location for $700 per month. We are all accountable for our tax payer dollars and the Sand Hill River Watershed District is devoted to being good stewards of those dollars.”

Mr. Finney inquired about the cost from the WRWD and Kevin Ruud indicated that all costs are firm and that it includes utilities. Mr. Finney stated that it appears that it would be more costly to have the office in Ada versus Fertile. Kevin Ruud indicated that the monthly price in Ada includes all utilities except telephones. Sip said the WRWD proposal was made available again at today’s meeting. Mr. Ose asked about the length of time for the leases and Mr. Finney stated that both proposals included a 10-year option. Mr. Ose asked why it was for such a long period and Ruud indicated that the length of time would make funds available for the remodel project of the WRWD.

Mr. Deal stated there was much discussion in the previous months during the hiring process and the RRWMB wanted this to be flexible. Mr. Deal said we completed the process and that the hiring committee fulfilled their responsibilities. Mr. Money echoed the discussion and indicated that a process was followed, was enacted months ago, that the office was narrowed to 3 sites, there were board meetings where permissions were given, adequate time was given for discussion, and that he was comfortable with the process.

Mr. Braaten stated that he was comfortable with the process and the Managers have discussed the issue many times. Mr. Finney called for the question on the resolution in front of the Managers. Motion by Mr. Deal to accept the resolution, Seconded by Mr. Braaten. Mr. Wilkens was opposed to the resolution. Carried.
5. Financial Reporting: Mr. Wilkens said he and Sip had an arrangement to review the draft Treasurer’s Report(s). Mr. Wilkens stated that he had not seen the Treasurers Reports and wanted to table the Treasurers Reports until the Budget and Finance Committee could meet to discuss. Mr. Finney stated that the Committee could develop a proper procedure for developing and reviewing the Treasurer’s Reports each month and that the process could be brought to the full board. Mr. Deal stated that a Committee meeting had been previously scheduled but was cancelled due to the weather. Motion to table the Treasurers Reports by Mr. Holmvik, Seconded by Mr. Ose, Carried.

Regarding bills to be paid, Mr. Wilkens asked which version of bills to be paid should be reviewed. Sip stated that the version was dated March 19, 2018. Mr. Wilkens stated that the Arvig bill seemed high but could be explained later. The bills presented for approval as of March 20, 2018, were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE:</th>
<th>NAME:</th>
<th>MEMO:</th>
<th>AMOUNT:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2/21/18</td>
<td>Arvig</td>
<td>Office Rent, Phone and Internet</td>
<td>1,226.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/1/18</td>
<td>Brandner Printing</td>
<td>Conference Flyer Printing</td>
<td>92.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/16/18</td>
<td>Buffalo-Red River Watershed District</td>
<td>50 % Project Team Expenses</td>
<td>5,087.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/12/18</td>
<td>Constant Contact</td>
<td>Monthly Bill</td>
<td>56.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/14/18</td>
<td>Dot.Com Connection</td>
<td>February 2018 Website Services</td>
<td>90.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/9/18</td>
<td>Forum Communications Company</td>
<td>Public Hearing Ad</td>
<td>116.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/21/18</td>
<td>HDR Engineering, Inc.</td>
<td>Invoice No. 1200101904</td>
<td>2,272.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/7/18</td>
<td>HDR Engineering, Inc.</td>
<td>February 4 – March 3, 2018 Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/12/18</td>
<td>International Water Institute</td>
<td>Benefit Cost Analysis Project</td>
<td>21,955.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/6/18</td>
<td>Jon Schauer/Consulting Unlimited</td>
<td>Final Payment for Accounting Services</td>
<td>187.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/2/18</td>
<td>Marco Technologies LLC</td>
<td>Overage for Copies on Previous Contract</td>
<td>308.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/14/18</td>
<td>Minkota Technologies</td>
<td>Computer Labor and Parts</td>
<td>274.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/9/18</td>
<td>MN PEIP</td>
<td>Coverage for April 1, 2018 to April 30, 2018</td>
<td>1,479.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/21/18</td>
<td>Office Supplies Plus</td>
<td>Office Supplies and Computer Monitor</td>
<td>715.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/21/18</td>
<td>Ralph's Food Pride</td>
<td>Meeting Supplies</td>
<td>32.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/13/18</td>
<td>Red River Basin Commission</td>
<td>Funding Match Request for 2018</td>
<td>75,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/28/18</td>
<td>Smith Partners PLLP</td>
<td>February 2018 Legal Services</td>
<td>1,953.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/1/18</td>
<td>Verizon Credit</td>
<td>January 29 to February 2018 Overpayment</td>
<td>-94.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL: 140,405.16
**Motion** to approve and pay bills along with Manager vouchers presented by Mr. Money, **Seconded** by Mr. Braaten. **Carried.** For further reference, copies of the bills approved are attached hereto in the Treasurer’s Report.

Regarding Auto Pay Vendors, Executive Director Sip mentioned that some bills are due right before or after board meetings and that staff are looking to streamline the process of paying monthly bills. Mr. Finney asked for further explanation of the auto pay vendors and was curious about the costs to use the auto pay vendor system. Executive Assistant Swenson said it was $1.75 per check and that it gets deposited automatically. Mr. Wilkens asked about the Arvig bill and Sip said the monthly payment was $625 monthly plus the regular monthly phone bill. Swenson added that the bill was higher because there was a month and a half for a phone bill and the rent.

Mr. Deal said we should not risk late payments. Mr. Finney inquired more about Quickbooks payroll service and Sip stated that the RRWMB had to upgrade the software and when using the service each month, it is $1.75 per check. Mr. Money asked about the fees and Sip stated that the fee is $1.75 per check. Mr. Deal asked about bank charges and Sip mentioned that bank fees are a couple hundred dollars a month. As an example. Mr. Money said that his watershed district has about 15 to 20 transactions per month, and if they used Quickbooks, his watershed district would pay $1.75 per transaction to process the payments. **Motion** to approve the Auto Pay Vendor List by Mr. Deal, **Seconded** by Mr. Mischel, **Carried.**

6. **Strategic Plan** – Sip said at the February RRWMB meeting, there was discussion about how to move forward and recapped what will be done at the March Conference to obtain input. He stated that it will be an excellent opportunity to gather thoughts from many people and stakeholders that will be in attendance. A facilitated discussion will be held during the conference with small groups. There will be numerous presentations and input will be brought back to the RRWMB Managers and the Flood Damage Reduction Work Group. He also stated that it would be helpful to potentially use an on-line survey but it will take some time and effort to implement it.

The BCA discussion would also be helpful to further inform the process of developing the plan. Sip recommended a strategic planning meeting to help guide and develop the process, timelines, and the need for a planning committee or possibly outside facilitators or consultants. He stated that some of the agencies have resources that could be utilized to reduce costs and to be more efficient with the finances. Sip recommended a committee with sideboards and clear direction to proceed. Sip is looking for a motion to move forward with this process.

Mr. Finney stated that any committee would need to be kept to 4 managers and a couple of administrators to ensure that there is no quorum. Myron Jesme asked if alternates on the board can wear two hats. Mr. Money stated that whoever the board thinks are the best participants, then they should be on the board to participate. Mr. Wilkens stated that this is the next most important thing we need to do, and we need to keep moving forward with all the new people.
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He said the problems in the past are connected to not having a plan in place. He said that this is critical and that we need to do the plan for all the new people in the future so that we all end up in the same place. Mr. Finney asked Sip about his thoughts and Sip stated that 3 Managers and 3 Administrators would work. Mr. Money asked if there was an existing committee and Mr. Finney inquired with Morrie Lanning if there was a committee from previous strategic planning processes that could be used. Lanning indicated that things were done as a committee of the whole in the past. Mr. Money said this might be a better way to do it.

Mr. Finney indicated that the process would move forward as a Committee of the Whole and that Myron Jesme and Tracy Halstensgard would be the administrators that would participate. A strategic planning session will be held the afternoon of the next regular RRWMB meeting on April 17, 2018 at Thief River Falls after the RRWMB meeting. Mr. Ose asked about Morrie Lanning and Jay Leitch assisting and Mr. Finney stated that the RRWMB could do it. He also mentioned that results from the conference should be available for discussion at the planning session meeting next month.

7. Legislative Report: Legislative Liaison Lisa Frenette was not available via conference call and Sip presented her report:
   a. The Minnesota Association of Watershed Districts (MAWD) legislative conference was recently held and there were several individual and group discussions during the event with legislators.
   b. In-lieu Fee Program – Sip stated that Frenette has been working with Representative Fabian and there is draft legislation, which is included in the meeting packet. Sip stated that this also relates to Northeast (NE) Minnesota mitigation of wetlands due to mining projects and that there are not many places left in NE Minnesota to do mitigation. The Red River Basin is a good place to consider wetland banks and to use the in-lieu fee program due to the opportunities that exist. Mr. Finney asked Morrie Lanning about the NE Minnesota wetland mitigation plan, but Lanning did not offer additional information.

   Mr. Money discussed wetland credits and that Representative Fabian is looking at Flood Damage Reduction (FDR) projects to provide wetlands for banking, which can help pay for projects, but we need to pay attention to the details. Mr. Deal said it is a large amount of money if you can get the program to work. Mr. Money said projects may need to be more multipurpose in the future.

   Mr. Deal talked about the wetland bounce issue and that there is a need to obtain exclusions to get projects to work. Programs may need to change for RRWMB situations. Myron Jesme said that Black River Impoundment can be used for wetland banking and there might be some possibilities to farm some of it in the future. He stated that lump sums of money for in-lieu fee is appealing but rent over so many years may result in more funding. However, perpetual easements may come into play depending on other programs that may be used.
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There was discussion about the agencies and what they are looking at for wetlands in the upper reaches. It was stated that a more long-term approach should be taken to this issue and that some projects may be a good fit, but that the RRWMB should be cautious. It was mentioned that the RRWMB should meet with Representative Fabian to discuss more details. Mr. Ose briefly talked about a recent RLWD citizens advisory committee where they have had discussion on wet/dry impoundments.

c. Watershed Statute Changes – Sip discussed proposed changes as being pursued by the MN Center for Environmental Advocacy (MCEA) and the Minnesota Environmental Partnership (MEP). There have been a couple of contentious meetings recently between agencies and MCEA and MEP, who want more transparency, more outcomes, fewer random acts of conservation, and more done on the landscape. Many plans already exist at local, state and federal levels and we have the newly released US Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE) plan for the Red River Basin. Sip stated that there is plan fatigue at all planning levels and that there may be additional upcoming meetings for this issue.

d. Drainage Work Group (DWG) – The drainage runoff-based option was discussed, and it was mentioned that it did not make it into draft legislation. Sip stated that there was a great amount of time spent on this by the full DWG and committees. MCEA did not consent to this voluntary option in the draft language at the last full DWG meeting. The DWG operates on full consensus and this issue will have to wait until 2019 unless there is some movement this session. This discussion has been a three to four-year process.

Mr. Wilkens was at a recent meeting of the Minnesota Drainage Inspectors in Willmar and an old court decision was referenced that frequently is mentioned at DWG meetings. The key issue is that MCEA does not want conservation lands taxed and Mr. Deal indicated that conservation lands still have runoff. Mr. Wilkens talked about the RRBC and their past difficulties in gaining consensus. As a result, the RRBC had to change their by-laws and the DWG may need to do something similar in the future. Sip also talked about the recently finalized BWSR report on accelerating buffer strip acquisitions.

e. Wetland Conservation Act – Sip state that there has been no movement on this issue at the present time.

f. Soil Loss Rules – Sip discussed a recent meeting of a stakeholder group that is working with BWSR on this issue and that Frenette included a presentation from the meeting in her report. Sip indicated that the timelines included in the presentation would be important to continue to track. Mr. Wilkens stated that a few counties have soil loss rules already in place.
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Mr. Deal mentioned that BWSR may be able to enforce, that BWSR has worked on an Administrative Penalty Order (APO) plan, and that there are concerns over state enforcement. There were comments and concerns about the type of soil loss and erosion that can be complained about, who can offer up complaints, and that complaints could be anonymous. It was mentioned that Frenette and Sip are involved with this process. Mr. Money inquired if MAWD or Minnesota Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts is involved with this issue. Sip stated that a committee membership list could be obtained.

g. 404 Assumption – Nothing new to report.

h. Environmental Quality Board (EQB) Alternative Environmental Review – Recently Sip, Frenette, and Ron Harnack were at a meeting with EQB, MPCA, MDA, MCEA and BWSR to work on this issue. The meeting resulted in the DNR and the RRWMB committing to work together on this issue.

Nathan Kestner stated that the points of concurrence would be a good starting point. It was mentioned that the MCEA supports this process.

8. Legal Services Agreement – Sip stated that the board had agreed to sign a legal services agreement with Smith Partners the previous month as long as the fees had not significantly increased. Sip stated that the hourly fee for 2017 was $211 per hour and for 2018 it was $218 an hour, upon further clarification with Smith Partners. Sip also indicated that the legal fees had recently gone down noticeably. It was mentioned that it could only take one issue for the monthly bill to increase again. Motion by Mr. Deal to approve the contract, Seconded by Mr. Braaten, with Mr. Wilkens voting against the motion, Carried.

There was discussion about a previous version of the contract and the original contract was $218 for all attorneys and Louis Smith’s hourly rate was $249. Sip had asked Smith about this and after discussion, the fees are as laid out in the agreement for legal services.

9. Disability Insurance – Sip brought forward a request for disability insurance according to his employment agreement, which states that disability would be through the MN Public Employee Insurance Program or equivalent. Since this program does not provide disability insurance, Sip obtained quotes from other providers. Sip indicated that long-term disability could be obtained for $195 a month. Motion by Mr. Holmvik to approve this amount, Seconded by Mr. Deal, with Mr. Wilkens voting against the motion, Carried.

Additional discussion was held and Mr. Finney stated that Sip does not get nearly what the previous staff received for benefits. Mr. Finney stated that he is working on reviewing the RRWMB personnel manual. Mr. Money stated that he would like to review the employment agreement made with Sip in the future.
Mr. Wilkens and Mr. Money asked about employment agreements and the RRWMB personnel manual. Mr. Finney stated that the manual is outdated and needs updating. Mr. Money would like to see an annual review and Mr. Holmvik stated that it is in the employment agreement. Myron Jesme stated that Sip’s agreement should be followed and talked about transparency given the past. Mr. Finney stated that positions to Sip’s typically have disability insurance. Chuck Fritz talked about his board and the rationale that is used for offering disability insurance when available sick leave is limited for staff.

Mr. Money talked about his concerns about the previous negotiations held by strategic plan consultants. Mr. Wilkens stated that what one employee gets, they should all receive the same benefit. Sip stated that he asked Smith Partners to review the issue and disability insurance is part of the employment agreement. Mr. Money indicated that he was fine with this as long as it is within the budget. Sip stated that if Managers have not received his employment agreement, that he could send it out. He was not aware of who had or had not received it since it was signed and agreed to while he was still employed by the MN Department of Agriculture.

10. Step Project Funding Requests – None were received. A funding proposal was brought forward for an educational project by Joel Praska of the MSTRWD. The request was for some kiosks to be placed at FDR project sites. The project is a joint effort between the MSTRWD and the RLWD. Several panels that are part of the kiosks have been built and are ready for installation. Praska went into detail about the project and where kiosks would be placed and that the panels and kiosks are well received.

Myron Jesme also added that his board supports education efforts such as this and that they are comfortable with moving forward. Mr. Finney inquired with Keith Weston to see if there would be potential for the RRRA to fund the project. Weston indicated that the RRRA would be meeting soon and could discuss it then. The RRRA does not have an official application process and it would be up to the RRRA members to discuss. The funds being requested are $7,000 to finish up the project.

Mr. Finney, Mr. Money, and Sip discussed how the RRWMB could fund this request. The RRWMB Governing Documents lays out a process to fund projects like this and Money stated that Praska should apply to the RRWMB for funding. This request can be accepted as an oral application today and Praska will make a request to the RRRA as well.  

**Motion** by Mr. Money to accept this proposal orally, with Praska being asked to attend the RRRA meeting to request funding, with a written funding request coming back to the RRWMB depending on the outcome of the RRRA meeting, **Seconded** by Mr. Ose, **Carried.**
11. Reports:

A. Red River Coordinator – Rodger Hemphill of the DNR gave a report that included updates on conference planning, current FDR quarterly reimbursements, the ring dike reimbursement grant, and environmental review status of FDR projects. Mr. Money asked about remaining funds and Kevin Ruud stated that it was his understanding that there was limited funding left at this point. Swenson stated there are still reimbursements to process and Sip stated that he, Swenson, and Hemphill could determine the correct funding levels that remain. Mr. Finney asked if the list of 21 projects was complete and Myron Jesme indicated that a project involving Thief River Falls will become forward soon as a Step I.

Mr. Money had a correction to the list brought forward by Hemphill and stated that the Klondike Project should be listed as a PL566 project. There was discussion about what projects should be included in the environmental review list.

B. Internal RRWMB Committees: Sip stated that an updated committee list was included in the board packet.

C. Executive Director Report: Sip discussed the following items:
   i. MDA Agricultural Water Quality Certification Program Update – a factsheet was included in the board packet.
   ii. An updated map illustrating fall restrictions for the application of nitrogen fertilizer was shared.
   iii. We are Water Display – This free-standing display unit was at the Capitol during the MAWD legislative event and will be in Crookston in the coming months.
   iv. Public Information Committee – Sip proposed a meeting in the near future with Mr. Deal indicating that the Committee had not met in some time.

D. Agency and Partner Reports:
   i. WRWD – A written report was included in the board packet.
   ii. RRRA – Keith Weston provided a written report and discussed some of the highlights in his report. Weston recently met with Debra Walchuk and will be scheduling a meeting to review the planning status of the RCPP to discuss how to move projects forward. He also provided additional detail about several items in the written report.
   iii. NRCS – Deb Walchuk gave an update on reimbursement requests and discussed several issues regarding workload, her background, and status of projects.
   iv. MDA – Jeppe Kjaersgaard provided an update on the Nitrogen Fertilizer Rule that is currently being worked on by MDA.
   v. IWI – Chuck Fritz gave an update on recent International Water institute activities and a written report was included in the document.
vi. BWSR – Henry Van Offelen gave an update on drainage related BWSR grants in addition to 1W1P activities. He also discussed upcoming BWSR grant opportunities and mentioned that more information can be shared about the soil loss rules.

vii. RRBC – Ted Priester gave an update on some of their activities at the legislature as well as grant projects. The RRBC is actively working on the RRB feasibility study and RRBC has asked ACOE to not close the study and to continue their work on flood mapping. He also indicated that there is $350,000 in in-kind work that has been done.

Mr. Finney and Mr. Money inquired about the status of this project and mentioned that the feasibility study group has not met recently and that any requests and discussion should be held at the committee level since the RRWMB is a signer of the project. DNR staff stated that some workshops were being considered to present final models, data, and studies. Mr. Money stated that the committee should meet soon and that ACOE staff should be contacted to organize a meeting.

E. Advisory Comments: There were no advisory comments presented.

12. Upcoming Meetings: Executive Director Sip shared information about the week’s events:

- RRWMB Budget and Finance Committee Meeting – March 20, 2018.
- Pre-conference technical seminar – March 20, 2018.
- SWCD/BWSR Meeting – March 21, 2018.
- EQB tour and meeting – March 21, 2018.
- RRRA Meeting – March 22, 2018.

Sip also thank the conference planning committee for all their hard work in planning the conference.

Adjournment: The next meeting of the RRWMB will be on Tuesday, April 17, 2018 at 9:30 a.m. at the Red Lake Watershed District Office in Thief River Falls, MN. There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 12:15 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,

____________________________  ________________
Jerome Deal         Nikki Swenson
Secretary         Executive Assistant