



# Sunrise River Watershed Management Organization

Regular Meeting for **Thursday, January 6, 2022 6:30 pm**

in the Booster West Room of East Bethel City Hall at 2241 221<sup>st</sup> Ave NE Cedar, MN 55011

## AGENDA

*Agenda to be finalized at meeting*

1. Call to Order
2. Roll Call
3. Approval of Agenda
4. Approval of Minutes for November 4, 2021
5. Financial Reports
  - a. Treasurer's report
  - b. Current grants financial report from Anoka Conservation District (ACD)
6. Unfinished Business
  - a. Review of communities' ordinances for compliance with SRWMO minimums
  - b. JPA amendment recommendations update
  - c. Carp management update
  - d. Internal loading studies grant opportunity for Martin and Typo Lakes - update
7. New Business
  - a. 2019 WBIF grant closeout
  - b. 2022 request for proposals for professional services
  - c. Recording secretary agreement extension
  - d. 2023 budgeting
  - e. West Branch Sunrise River removed from Impaired Waters List
8. Mail
9. Other
10. Invoice(s) approval
  - a. Recording Secretary services for Nov 2021 meeting (\$200)
  - b. Anoka Conservation District for AIS mgmt. at Typo Lake (\$3,000)
11. Adjourn

Upcoming Meeting Dates: February 3, 2022.



# Sunrise River WMO

2241 – 221<sup>st</sup> Ave  
Cedar, MN 55011

## Final Minutes

Sunrise River Water Management Organization Meeting

Thursday January 6, 2022

Meeting was held in person at the East Bethel City Hall

1. Call to Order

Ms. Hegland called the meeting to order at 6:33 pm.

2. Roll Call

Present: Leon Mager, Tim Harrington, Tim Melchior, Candice Kantor, Janet Hegland, Tim Peterson.

Audience: Jamie Schurbon, Anoka Conservation District (ACD)

Cameron Blake, Recording Secretary (attending remotely via Zoom)

3. Approval of Agenda

Mr. Schurbon proposed one addition to the agenda: Matt Downing's and Dan Babineau's resignations as item 7f.

**Ms. Kantor moved to approve the agenda with the one addition and Mr. Melchoir seconded this motion. The motion carried on a roll call vote with all in favor.**

4. Approval of Minutes for November 4, 2021

Mr. Mager had some corrections for the discussion about curlyleaf pondweed in Coon Lake. Ms. Hegland and Ms. Kantor also had some edits for the minutes.

**Ms. Kantor moved to approve the minutes with those corrections and Mr. Harrington seconded this motion. The motion carried on a roll call vote with all in favor.**

5. Financial Reports

A. Treasurer's report

Mr. Schurbon displayed the most recent bank statement and reported a beginning balance of \$37,491.35 for the most recent month of December 2021 with a debit of \$11,402.34 to the ACD and a deposit of \$3,000.00 from the county AIS grant. This results in an end of year balance of \$29,089.01.

**Mr. Harrington moved to accept the treasurer's report and Mr. Melchoir seconded this motion. The motion carried on a roll call vote with all in favor.**

B. Current grants financial report from Anoka Conservation District (ACD)

Mr. Schurbon presented the current grants financial report. The 2019 WBF grant from BWSR is about to be closed out with \$1,596 remaining and already-incurred staff time to consume that amount. The BWSR Carp Management grant has about \$100,000 remaining out of the \$148,000 grant. The board asked if the grant needs to be spent by the end of 2022 and Mr. Schurbon confirmed this. He explained they are technically behind on accomplishment by the number of carp harvested. They may underspend the grant.

6. Unfinished Business

A. Review of communities' ordinances for compliance with SRWMO minimums

Mr. Schurbon explained that this was a recurring agenda item with no new information. Ms. Hegland said she left a message for her city's staff and will reach out again. Mr. Harrington said he would reach out again as well.

B. JPA amendment recommendations update

Ms. Hegland is looking for input on next steps to take in this process. Linwood, Columbus, and East Bethel agreed with the recommended JPA changes. One exception is that East Bethel wishes to maintain the requirement that SRWMO budgets be unanimously ratified by all four communities. Ms. Hegland explained her concern is that currently one community could prevent the SRWMO budget from being approved; at the moment she was unsure how the SRWMO could address this if this occurs. Columbus wanted to discuss the funding mechanism further. Ms. Hegland thought one option would be to proceed with the other changes and wait on the controversial items.

The City of Ham Lake has expressed concerns with the JPA amendment. Ham Lake city council did not provide an opinion on the recommended JPA edits, but did express a strong desire to revise the funding method in the JPA. Ham Lake wishes to pay 3.8% of all expenses. They currently pay 3.8% of non-operating expenses based on the formula in the JPA, and an equal share of operating expenses. Ham Lake does not want to contribute funds for attorney and staff time to update the JPA, as the other three communities are willing to do.

Ms. Hegland reported that Columbus is also interested in discussing the funding formulas for the SRWMO. She described that her city has explored other options. She feels discussion is warranted.

Ms. Hegland explained that she wants to coordinate a meeting that invites the four communities to discuss these items but would need a neutral facilitator. Ms. Hegland will see if the League of MN Cities could provide a facilitator but she is unsure as to cost. She recommends that decision makers such as mayors or council members be present at that

meeting. Ms. Hegland also suggested that it may be helpful to separate the non-controversial housekeeping JPA changes that can proceed quickly and the funding formula discussions.

The board recalled that Ham Lake's financial concerns were also voiced in a recent year and were believed to be resolved. Mr. Schurbon explained that the concern was voiced during budget discussion two years ago and it was addressed by moving some budget line items from operating expenses to non-operating expenses. At that time meetings with all the communities found general agreement that moving those line items was appropriate and consistent with the JPA.

Ms. Hegland mentioned that another option for Ham Lake is to withdraw from the SRWMO and take on the administration and management of the current watershed activities on their own. This would allow the SRWMO to continue its work in the other participating communities. She believes that Hugo or Centerville in the RCWD chose this option and follow the watershed rules and administer the required activities on their own. Mr. Mager expressed concern that any community opting out results in a WMO that does not cover the whole watershed. Mr. Schurbon noted that the Ham Lake city boundary runs through Coon Lake and having one lake in multiple watershed management jurisdictions is problematic. Mr. Melchoir and Mr. Mager expressed concern about effective watershed management if a community were to leave the SRWMO, and questioned whether that was legally an option.

The board noted that the City of Ham Lake currently does not have a representative on the SRWMO due to recent resignations, but is seeking replacements. The group discussed if anyone knew someone in Ham Lake who could be engaged in these discussions. Ensuring the Ham Lake city officials are well informed and engaged is important. This engagement is important both to resolve JPA concerns as well as ensuring regular business can occur, such as approving annual budgets (which requires ratification by all member communities).

Ms. Hegland wanted some guidance from the MN Board of Water and Soil Resources (BWSR) on what could occur if one of the four current communities chose to block SRWMO regular business such as budget ratification or paying budgeted amounts to the SRWMO. She discussed an option of using help from one of their attorneys to draft a letter asking the community to participate and pay their share of the budget or to decide to do these activities on their own. Mr. Schurbon explained the last time the SRWMO faced this issue two years ago BWSR essentially told them to figure it out internally. There is a new BWSR Board Conservationist.

Ms. Hegland said she would feel more comfortable moving forward in discussions with Ham Lake with some clarifying information from BWSR about what options exist and what different possible outcomes would mean for the SRWMO. This might be accomplished through a phone call with Mr. Schurbon, Ms. Hegland, and their BWSR representative. Mr. Schurbon will coordinate this phone call with BWSR. Ms. Hegland will reach out to the

League of MN Cities about the question of a facilitator for a meeting of all the communities' leaders.

The board discussed whether communities really understood the value of work they get from their participation in the SRWMO, and how most of them would not have the capacity to take on the activities the SRWMO does. Communicating this value to Ham Lake would be important and BWSR may help with this. Mr. Melchoir commented that none of the Ham Lake elected officials participated in the SRWMO tour this fall, so they are likely less familiar with the SRWMO's work.. Mr. Harrington noted that the other communities have a council liaison to the SRWMO, but Ham Lake does not. Mr. Schurbon noted that Ham Lake has relatively small area in the SRWMO and URRWMO.

#### C. Carp management update

Mr. Schurbon updated the board on the carp management efforts. He explained that they will likely not catch the number of carp they believed they were going to in every lake but that the improvement to water quality still reflects success of the grant. This is the last year of the grant and he is developing the 2022 work plan with discussion with ACD staff, consultants, BWSR grant staff, and colleagues in other watersheds.

Generally, approaches may be:

- Martin Lake – PIT tagging, spring spawning migration netting, and box netting. As a bonus, PIT tags can provide an updated population estimate. There is little chance of catching our goal of carp at this lake.
- Linwood Lake – Winter seine, spring spawning migration netting, and/or box netting. Our goal is to remove 600+ carp, which is possible.
- Typo Lake – The latest population estimates find we have met goals at this lake. Therefore, little work is planned.

Mr. Mager talked with one of the contractors doing the work. One strategy discussed was putting a trap on the Martin Lake side of county road 85 and funneling the carp into it. They could tag many of carp in early spring and see when they are moving via antennas. The carp can't move between lakes with the carp barriers but they still try.

Ms. Hegland asked for more explanation for Martin Lake and why they may not reach the goals there. Mr. Schurbon explained there has been decreasing returns with box netting. A commercial seine captured few carp. Ms. Hegland asked about other strategies. Mr. Schurbon replied electrofishing isn't a good option because it does not produce large numbers. There is no currently accepted form of chemical sterilization or biocontrol. There is a carp specific virus but that is not approved yet. The board discussed a carp bounty and fishing contests, but these are generally not cost effective. There are treatments to kill all fish in the system but it is a major reset that would produce a lot of dead biomass. Mr. Schurbon invited members of the board to participate in the process of developing 2022 work plans.

#### D. Internal loading studies grant opportunity for Martin and Typo Lakes

Mr. Schurbon submitted a request for funding internal loading studies at Martin and Typo Lakes. The funding would be through the Lower St. Croix 1W1P group, and its WBIF grants.

We should hear an answer by the February SRWMO meeting. The consultant quote Mr. Schurbon obtained for the studies at these two lakes was \$39,000 and he requested the grant pay 100%. Mr. Schurbon explained that it seems likely that the request may not be funded this round, but be positioned for funding in 2023. In 2022, it is more likely that Forest Lake be funded because they are asking for the grant to pay <100% and have funding immediately for any alum treatment that is recommended. This may be just fine, as the SRWMO would realistically need until 2023 to have match for any alum treatment grant. Moreover, it is not until perhaps 2023 or later that WBIF grant funds might be available for such a treatment. The group discussed the potential cost for alum treatment and the length of time the feasibility study would be viable for in the case of needing to budget for match for an alum treatment. Mr. Schurbon reminded the group that in the case of an alum treatment there could be funding assistance from other organizations. He reminded the group that the potential cost of the treatment is still unknown and could be less than they are predicting which is what the study will show. At the moment the SRWMO had budgeted \$11,000 just for the feasibility study, and if the study is grant funded then these dollars could be repurposed for implementation.

7. New Business

A. 2019 WBIF grant closeout

The 2019 WBIF grant financial report needs an authorized signature for grant closeout. BWSR reporting is due February 1<sup>st</sup>. Typically the chair signs the reports. The acting chair is Ms. Hegland. Ms. Kantor asked if they planned on overspending grant funds for stormwater retrofits and underspending funds for shoreline stabilizations. Mr. Schurbon explained this was planned and allowed.

**Ms. Kantor moved to authorize Ms. Hegland to sign the financial report and other grant closeout documents for the 2019 WBIF Metro grant to the SRWMO and Mr. Melchoir seconded this motion. The motion carried on a roll call vote with all in favor.**

B. 2022 request for proposals for professional services

The SRWMO is required to seek bids for professional services every two years. This needs to be done now for services to be provided in 2022. Because the Anoka Conservation District plans to submit a proposal, it is best for the board to take a lead role in soliciting proposals.

Draft RFPs for water monitoring and management, and recording secretarial services were reviewed. Ms. Hegland asked if the recording secretarial services RFP had to be sent out as the SRWMO recently went through that process. The board discussed requesting that Mr. Blake provide a proposal for that service and he indicated his willingness. Ms. Hegland asked if the RFP for water monitoring and management needed to comply with open bidding law, and discussion was that it did not but did need to comply with rules for WMOs to solicit proposals. The board discussed sending that RFP to the consulting engineering firm for each member community. Ms. Hegland agreed to distribute the RFPs and receive responses.

C. Recording secretary agreement extension

Mr. Schurbon explained the SRWMO needs a motion to extend the current Recording Secretary agreement through the February board meeting. At that time new proposals will be considered.

**Ms. Kantor motioned to extend the current recording secretary contract with Cameron Blake through the February 2022 SRWMO board meeting and Mr. Melchoir seconded this motion. The motion carried with all in favor.**

#### D. 2023 budgeting

Mr. Schurbon presented this agenda item. A draft 2023 SRWMO budget is attached. The timeline for budget consideration is generally:

- January SRWMO Board reviews first draft budget
- February SRWMO reviews second draft, approve for submission to communities
- April Communities consider ratification.
- May SRWMO Board adopts budget

The draft budget attached follows the SRWMO Watershed Management Plan. Items are categorized as Operating or Non-Operating as was agreed during discussions with Ham Lake in 2019-2020, and consistent with the 2021 budget. The SRWMO Watershed Management Plan calls for the SRWMO to maintain a flat \$50,000 budget until 2026. During 2021 & 2022 budgeting the SRWMO elected to spend down reserve funds in order to request less funds from the communities than planned. The amount spent down was \$8,724.72 for 2022 and \$7,013.76 for 2021. Mr. Schurbon does not recommend further spend down of reserve funds during 2023 budgeting. The SRWMO Plan sets a reserve target of approximately \$5,800 to \$11,500 (15-30% of an average annual budget). After 2021 and 2022 are complete, Mr. Schurbon estimates that reserves will be below \$8,500 and in the mid-range of the SRWMO target. Mr. Schurbon noted there was \$5,500 set aside in 2022 and again in 2023 for alum treatment budgeting.

One item to discuss was Line 15 which was the carp feasibility studies. By 2023 the current carp management grant will be expended. The SRWMO Plan includes a line item to keep track of carp populations and determine any “maintenance work.” At Typo Lake, a population assessment is unlikely to be needed because one was done in 2021. Martin Lake may or may not have one done in 2022. That leaves Linwood and Coon Lake. Linwood will not have had a recent population estimate. Coon Lake was included in the SRWMO plan, but may deserve discussion again given there are no clear carp or water quality problems. As a final consideration, the SRWMO should consider what is would do if carp populations were not within target levels – without another grant only modest funding is available for “maintenance work.” Mr. Mager acknowledged the SRWMO will not likely do carp management work in Coon Lake due to high water quality there. There was discussion to maintain this budget line item and in 2023 decide whether to use the funds for a Coon Lake carp management feasibility study or maintenance harvests on other lakes.

The board discussed the water monitoring schedule and strategy and when Coon Lake would be monitored. It will be monitored next in 2022. This strategy will be revisited next year and Mr. Mager will continue to advocate for a return to the previous cycle of monitoring each lake at least every other year to address data accuracy to better inform management decisions and responses. There would be an increased cost to this monitoring frequency.

Ms. Hegland brought up the cost in the budget for the 1W1P organization despite initial promises that there would not be another ongoing cost for another watershed organization. There is a lot of time involved on Mr. Schurbon's and Ms. Hegland's part. Ms. Kantor said she considers it a small investment relative to possible kickback of funding opportunities. Mr. Peterson asked about the lake grades for Martin and Typo and if there was improvement in those. Mr. Schurbon explained there was improvement. Mr. Peterson asked about the Sunrise River and there was testing done in the river for pH levels by another organization. The board discussed the budget timeline. The board will revisit this budget next month before sending to the communities to ratify.

The board discussed any potential changes to the budget before the next meeting. Mr. Mager wants to keep the carp management funds and use wording in the budget to give some flexibility in how the SRWMO chooses to use it. The board discussed strategy to promote better monitoring of SSTS systems. They can do more education and outreach with articles through lake associations. This could be backed more with ACD funding.

The group discussed the lack of SSTS ordinances in communities, attempts to fit SSTS inspections at point of sale, and BWSR's decisions around this. There are triggers for SSTS inspections at the point of sale.

Mr. Schurbon will re-present the budget at the February board meeting.

#### E. West Branch Sunrise River removed from Impaired Waters List

Mr. Schurbon updated the board in the exciting news that the West Branch Sunrise River was removed from the impaired waters list for pH. pH is higher with higher amounts of algal growth and had been dropping over the last 10 years in this part of the river. He sent this update to communities and newsletters.

#### F. Matt Downing and Dan Babineau Resignations

The board accepted Matt Downing's and Dan Babineau's resignations and the need to select a new treasurer and secretary. Officer elections will take place at the next meeting in February, which happens to be the annual meeting.

**Mr. Harrington motioned to accept Matt Downing and Dan Babineau's resignations Ms. Kantor seconded this motion. The motion carried with all in favor.**

#### 8. Mail

There was one item of mail which was an insurance certificate from the stormwater BMP contractor work this fall.

#### 9. Other

#### 10. Invoice(s) approval

A. Recording Secretary services for Nov 2021 meeting (\$200)

**Mr. Melchoir moved to and Mr. Hegland seconded to pay the invoice #11421, payment for \$200. The motion carried on a roll call vote with all in favor.**

B. Anoka Conservation District for AIS mgmt. at Typo Lake (\$3,000)



**Mr. Peterson moved to and Mr. Melchoir seconded to pay the invoice #2021292, payment for \$3,000. The motion carried on a roll call vote with all in favor.**

11. Adjourn

**Mr. Mager motioned to adjourn the meeting and Mr. Melchoir seconded this. The motion carried and Ms. Hegland adjourned the meeting at 7:56PM.**

Mr. Schurbon checked on if there would be a quorum for the February meeting with Mr. Mager's trip out of town. Mr. Harrington will be present so the quorum will be met.

The board discussed the need for two authorized signers for the SRWMO checks. The board also needs to remove Mr. Downing and Mr. Babineau from the list of authorized signers.

**Mr. Peterson motioned to re-open the board meeting and Mr. Mager seconded this. The motion carried and the meeting was reopened.**

**Ms. Hegland motioned to remove Mr. Downing and Mr. Babineau from the list of authorized signers for the SRWMO. Mr. Harrington seconded this and the motion carried with all in favor.**

**Ms. Hegland motioned to add Mr. Harrington as an authorized signer at the bank for the SRWMO. Mr. Peterson seconded this motion and it carried with all in favor.**

Mr. Harrington noted that his term on the SRWMO expires every year and he won't know he was reappointed until January 10<sup>th</sup>, but anticipates he will be. Mr. Mager advised Mr. Harrington to take a copy of the minutes to the bank as they would need to see those to add him as an authorized signer. The board suggested Mr. Harrington be made the treasurer at the February election of officers. Mr. Schurbon asked the recording secretary to send these minutes to Mr. Harrington.

**Mr. Peterson motioned to re-adjourn the meeting and Mr. Melchoir seconded this. The motion carried with all in favor.**

Upcoming Meeting Dates: February 3, 2022.

Submitted by:  
Cameron Blake



# Sunrise River Watershed Management Organization

Regular Meeting for **Thursday, February 3, 2022 6:30 pm**

in the Booster West Room of East Bethel City Hall at 2241 221<sup>st</sup> Ave NE Cedar, MN 55011

## AGENDA

*Agenda to be finalized at meeting*

1. Call to Order
2. Roll Call
3. Approval of Agenda
4. Approval of Minutes for January 6, 2022
5. Annual meeting items
  - a. Election of officers
  - b. Designate newspaper of record
  - c. Set regular meeting dates through February 2023
  - d. Hear any recommendations on amendments to the JPA and watershed management plan
6. Financial Reports
  - a. Treasurer's report
  - b. Current grants financial report from Anoka Conservation District (ACD)
7. Unfinished Business
  - a. Review of communities' ordinances for compliance with SRWMO minimums
  - b. JPA amendment recommendations update
  - c. Carp management update
  - d. Internal loading studies grant for Martin and Typo Lakes – update
  - e. 2023 budgeting
8. New Business
  - a. 2021 ACD work results report
  - b. Responses to 2022 request for proposals for professional services
  - c. Award 2022-23 contract for recording secretary services
  - d. Award 2022 contract for water monitoring and management services
  - e. Select representative to 2022 Watershed Based Implementation Funding process
  - f. Development reviews in Linwood – Sunrise Pines, Cliff's Boettcher Estates, & Dellwood Country Estates
9. Mail
10. Other
11. Invoice(s) approval
  - a. Recording Secretary services for Jan 2022 meeting (\$200)
12. Adjourn

Upcoming Meeting Dates: TBD



# Sunrise River WMO

2241 – 221<sup>st</sup> Ave  
Cedar, MN 55011

## APPROVED MINUTES

Sunrise River Water Management Organization Meeting  
Thursday February 3, 2022  
Meeting was held in person at the East Bethel City Hall

1. Call to Order  
Ms. Hegland called the meeting to order at 6:30 pm.
  
2. Roll Call  
Present: Tim Melchior, Janet Hegland, Tim Harrington, Candice Kantor, Ashley Millerbernd, Tim Peterson  
  
Audience: Jamie Schurbon, Anoka Conservation District (ACD)  
Cameron Blake, Recording Secretary (attending remotely via Zoom)
  
3. Approval of Agenda  
Mr. Schurbon had two additional items for the agenda; item 8g boundary update and 8f 1W1P.  
**Ms. Kantor moved to approve the agenda with those two additions and Mr. Melchoir seconded this motion. The motion carried with all in favor.**
  
4. Approval of Minutes for January 6, 2022  
Ms. Kantor has some edits for the January minutes and will send those to Cameron Blake.  
**Mr. Harrington moved to approve the minutes with those edits and Mr. Melchior seconded this motion. The motion carried with all in favor.**
  
5. Annual Meeting Items
  - A. Election of officers  
The board needs to elect a chair, vice chair, treasurer, and can choose to elect a secretary whose role is to run the meetings if the chair and vice are not available. Ms. Kantor said she would be willing to be the chair.  
**Ms. Hegland nominated Ms. Kantor for the position of Chair and Mr. Melchior seconded this motion. The motion passed with all in favor.**  
Ms. Kantor began to run the meeting. Ms. Hegland said she would be willing to stay in her role as Vice Chair.

**Mr. Harrington nominated Ms. Hegland for the position of Vice Chair and Mr. Melchior seconded this motion. The motion passed with all in favor.**

Mr. Harrington volunteered to be the Treasurer.

**Ms. Hegland nominated Mr. Harrington for the position of Treasurer and Mr. Melchior seconded this motion. The motion passed with all in favor.**

The board briefly discussed the secretary position.

**Ms. Hegland nominated Mr. Melchior for the position of Secretary and Ms. Millerbernd seconded this motion. The motion passed with all in favor.**

B. Designate newspaper of record

The board recalled spending time discussing this item at the last annual meeting. One newspaper does not cover the whole watershed but the Forest Lake Times covered a significant portion. In addition the SRWMO may choose to post in multiple newspapers for issues that warrant it, and posts on its website as well.

**Mr. Harrington moved to designate the Forest Lake Times as the SRWMO's newspaper of record. Ms. Hegland seconded this and the motion passed with all in favor.**

C. Set regular meeting dates through February 2023

Mr. Schurbon provided a proposed list of meeting dates, noting that they are all the first Thursdays of the month at 6:30pm and happen to not fall on any holidays this year. They are proposed for the same months as in the past, skipping the summer months.

**Ms. Hegland moved to approve the list of regular meeting dates through February 2023. Ms. Millerbernd seconded this and the motion passed on a roll call vote with all in favor.**

D. Hear any recommendations on amendments to the JPA and watershed management plan

Board recommendations developed in 2021 to update the JPA were noted. No other recommendations were heard.

6. Financial Reports

A. Treasurer's report

Mr. Harrington reported a January 2022 beginning balance of \$29,089.01 with four checks deposited and three debits. This resulted in a balance of \$52,664.69.

The board noted that all communities had paid their first half of 2022 contribution. At the last meeting the board had removed and added authorized check signers. At present the SRWMO has Mr. Harrington and Mr. Mager authorized. The board wishes to have three authorized signers, and recommended that Ms. Kantor, as Chair, be added. Ms. Kantor will bring the minutes from this meeting to the bank to be added.

**Ms. Hegland motioned to add Ms. Kantor as a signatory to the SRWMO bank account.**

**Mr. Harrington seconded this and the motion passed on a roll call vote with four in favor and one abstaining (Ms. Kantor).**

**Ms. Hegland moved to accept the treasurer's report and Mr. Melchoir seconded this motion. The motion carried with all in favor.**

B. Current grants financial report from Anoka Conservation District (ACD)

Mr. Schurbon introduced this agenda item to Ms. Millerbernd. He explained the current grants and their background and explained that either SRWMO or the ACD has held these grants and that he gives this one page report with an update on activities at each meeting.

The 2019 BWSR grant is being closed out.

The Carp Management grant has about \$97,000 left from state grant funds. There has not been many changes from the last board meeting, just some end of year staff time expenses.

The last table on the financial report is a running tally of SRWMO contributions as match for these grants.

Ms. Hegland asked if the 2020 contributions to the SRWMO cost share grant fund were actually 2021. Mr. Schurbon said he didn't believe so but will double check that there were no contributions needed in 2021. The contributions are normally made through the ACD annual work contract. The board will be selecting that annual contract later in the agenda.

Ms. Hegland asked about the values in the lower table and if the \$28,500 SRWMO contributions to carp management were also included in the table for the carp management grant. Mr. Schurbon confirmed it was.

Ms. Kantor asked if the state carp management grant is underspent if the match funds would also be underspent. Mr. Schurbon explained that it is likely that all match funds will be expended. He noted that several more grants (from the county) than originally planned have been secured to support the project.

7. Unfinished Business

A. Review of communities' ordinances for compliance with SRWMO minimums

Ms. Hegland gave an update on her community's progress with this item. They have two items left to complete. They are comparing the rules of all watershed organizations in their city. In efforts for simplicity and consistency, rules applied in the SRWMO area may be more protective than the SRWMO minimum standards. She expects Columbus will reach 100% compliance with SRWMO minimums when the process is complete.

Mr. Harrington will check on his community.

Mr. Schurbon explained that Ham Lake is complete and Linwood is still in progress as part of a large ordinance update and is struggling with some short staffing.

B. JPA amendment recommendations update

Mr. Schurbon and Ms. Hegland updated the board on what has taken place since the last board meeting. They reminded others that the City of Ham Lake has concerns about the WMO's funding formula and wishes to pay less. The board discussed the challenge of being one city in multiple watersheds.

Ms. Hegland and Mr. Schurbon participated in a conference call with their new BWSR representative, Michelle Jordan. While BWSR is still discussing this internally, it seems like BWSR would not be supportive of Ham Lake leaving the SRWMO because it would result in the watershed boundary inside of Coon Lake. BWSR was clear that every community must be part of a watershed organization.

Ms. Hegland explained that she wants to reach out to Ham Lake to start a conversation that is solutions and compromise oriented. Ms. Hegland asked who at Ham Lake might be best to approach. It was discussed that it would be appropriate to go through the city administrator first and then they may elect to engage one or two council members. Ms. Hegland hopes this will be the best approach to understand what can be done to address Ham Lake's concerns. Mr. Peterson asked if Ham Lake could legally leave the WMO and Ms. Hegland explained that Hugo had apparently done this in the RCWD. They still have to implement the RCWD rules and they do all the work the RCWD would do. She noted Hugo is well staffed and have the technical expertise to do this work. The RCWD also then audits them to make sure the work is being completed and the rules are being followed. This would not be a good situation for the SRWMO as a WMO rather than a WD who already does permitting. The board discussed again the relatively low cost of participating in the SRWMO in order to meet these standards.

Ms. Hegland noted that SRWMO communities may apply the SRWMO levy differently. For example, Columbus residents are charged on their tax bill only for the watershed organization or watershed district where they reside. The board noted that a Ham Lake resident had in the past expressed concern that Ham Lake residents in the CCWD have a tax line for that watershed district but then are also paying for the SRWMO in their city levy.

Overall the board agreed to the approach Ms. Hegland identified – for Ms. Hegland to have a small group meeting with City of Ham Lake staff and/or council members to discuss. The board asked whether Ham Lake, which currently has no representatives on the SRWMO board, is seeking representatives. Mr. Schurbon stated that he has seen the city's advertisement seeking interested parties.

#### C. Carp management update

Mr. Schurbon wanted to follow up on this agenda item from the last meeting; 2022 plan for carp management to finish out the grant. SRWMO comments on 2022 work plans were invited. Mr. Schurbon summarized recommendations at each lake including:

Martin Lake – PIT tagging, watching the north inlet with PIT tag antennas during spawning migrations and using a block net to remove those carp if they show up.

Linwood Lake- the goal listed in the grant was to catch 600 more carp. The first part of the plan would include commercial seining which could start as early as next week. The area where carp had been seen to aggregate had been cleared of debris last year after nets were snagged. The fisherman could be paid up to \$9,000 if the numbers are high and \$4-5,000 if not. The second part of the plan would include putting cameras at the outlet of the lake to see if carp are moving there, and using a fence to contain carp. The culvert could then be blocked off and electrofished out. This would be easy and straightforward with minimal cost.

Typo Lake - Most of the stated grant goal has been met so BWSR is encouraging the SRWMO to not focus too much time or funding here. The work being proposed is at the outlet. They can use already PIT tagged carp and an antenna to detect carp aggregating at the outlet during spring spawning. If carp are detected, a block net would contain them for removal. Box netting at this lake is an option too.

The board then discussed bow fishing that board members have seen before and whether the SRWMO could encourage this activity. Mr. Schurbon would not be opposed to this but promoting it has not been cost effective for other entities. The board discussed that if Linwood Township allowed bowfishing from the carp barriers that may be a small and low cost benefit.

Mr. Schurbon said he will finalize these pans with the consultants soon.

D. Internal loading studies grant opportunity for Martin and Typo Lakes- update  
The Lower St. Croix Partnership's subcommittee and steering committee discussed requests for internal loading study funding. \$50,000 is available and \$122,235 in requests were received. The group selected Forest Lake (\$16,500 for a \$36,330 study). A final decision has not been made on the other lakes, but it is likely that all will be denied including the \$39,000 request for Martin and Typo Lakes. Substantial discussion occurred about the amount of external loading that should be addressed before an internal loading study is pursued. Forest Lake was selected because >80% of internal loading has been addressed and the local watershed district has funding to implement an alum treatment soon after the study is completed. All of the other lakes requesting funding have <10% of the internal loading addressed. In the case of Typo and Martin Lakes, arguments were made that the TMDL estimate of internal loading is incorrect (there was agreement on this), that the majority of identified projects have been installed, and lake water quality has improved as if a substantial portion of external loading was addressed. As a result of discussion, these lakes scored third amongst all proposals. Still, the group would like to see more external loading reductions. The board asked if it would make sense to just apply for Martin Lake? Mr. Schurbon pointed out that because Typo Lake flows to Martin Lake, treatment of Martin Lake alone may have shorter lasting benefits. The board asked about what projects remained to be completed for Typo Lake and Mr. Schurbon explained there are concepts for several wetland restorations that would benefit water quality, but landowners are not willing at this time. Outreach to them will continue. The board asked what happens to the 1W1P funding allocated to internal loading studies if it is not all distributed and Mr. Schurbon explained the funding would likely be repurposed to other activities.

E. 2023 budgeting

Mr. Schurbon presented the current draft 2023 budget. It is presently \$50,000, the same as the total in the SRWMO Watershed Management Plan. Two line items were highlighted for discussion:

- Line 15 – A carp management feasibility study. A study at Coon Lake had been suggested by Mr. Mager at the last meeting. Mr. Schurbon noted the likely cost would be greater than the amount currently budgeted. He also noted reasons the board may not choose to do study at Coon Lake but may wish to do maintenance carp removals at other lakes which would also likely cost more than the budgeted amount.

- Line 16 – The draft budgeted amount was intended for grant match. We now know that an alum feasibility study grant is unlikely to be awarded by the Lower St. Croix Partnership. The board may re-evaluate whether to pursue this item.

It was noted that the SRWMO planned budget each year is capped at \$50,000. Ms. Hegland stated she felt cities are sensitive to the amounts budgeted and proposed reducing costs wherever possible. She proposed removing items from the total budget that are not the highest priorities and documenting this process to build good will from the communities.

Ms. Kantor said if activities were removed and the budget to below \$50,000, then the WMO could get into a position of needing to ask for more funds later in order to do the activities in the plan, and that this may be disagreeable. She expressed concern that cutting budget line items meant cutting activities that are in the approved watershed plan. She noted that the board worked to include only priorities in the watershed plan.

Ms. Hegland asked about budget rollover and if this was included in the budgeting process as cities don't look favorably on having unspent money while asking for more money.

Mr. Schurbon said the purpose of the rollover line item is to maintain a \$50,000 budget across years that have actual expenses both above and below \$50,000. Ms. Hegland said she felt this is what the reserve is for. Mr. Schurbon said it depends on what the purpose of the reserve is viewed as; is it a cash flow or reserved for if something emergent occurs.

Ms. Hegland explained that for her community, the SRWMO coming to them with a \$45,000 budget request after having a plan for \$50,000 was viewed favorably and builds good will. Ms. Kantor said an individual community won't see much savings if line items are removed and Ms. Hegland said it was more about the principle. Ms. Millerbernd asked about the SRWMO's recent budget history in relation to Ham Lake and the board explained that two years ago Ham Lake expressed concern with the budget and wanted a funding formula review; that was after a budget decrease.

Ms. Hegland said her perspective was if there was not a project they want to do or an upcoming grant that she didn't want the SRWMO to put aside money just for the sake of having it. Ms. Kantor explained that she was concerned about the SRWMO needing matching funds to get grant funding and that it may be difficult to accumulate those funds on short notice. Ms. Hegland referred specifically to the Line 16 funds that were being allocated to saving for an alum feasibility study. Those funds would be to match for a grant award that is now unlikely. Mr. Melchior expressed concern about missing windows of opportunity to get grant funds if they don't have funds available for match, and then needing to pay for the full amount of the planned activity in the future.

Mr. Schurbon explained the 1WIP funds for internal loading studies will be available for a while until they are repurposed, but there would be new cycles of funding and so it will likely still be an option in the future. Mr. Melchior said he understood why the SRWMO would put away funds every year for this activity so that they have the funding to do the activity on their own when the time comes. Ms. Hegland said she feels like the likelihood of this activity is too low and she would prefer to give the funds back to the communities or allocate it to something the SRWMO can do.

Mr. Schurbon said there is no identified project in the plan for the alum treatment funding, but the watershed plan does include the alum treatment feasibility study. If study results are



favorable, discussion would be needed on funding the treatment. Ms. Kantor suggested that if an alum study won't be funded because too little lake external load has been addressed, then the SRWMO should consider more funding of watershed practices.

Ms. Hegland asked if Mr. Harrington received similar feedback (that budget reductions are wanted) in his community and he said he doesn't.

Ms. Hegland said her community feels like there is not a lot of activity done within the City of Columbus limits. Mr. Melchior asked if things could be done about the drainage issues in his area of Columbus and if SRWMO funding could be allocated to identifying solutions. Mr. Schurbon said there could be work done but rectifying large scale drainage issues can be expensive. Ms. Hegland and Mr. Melchior discussed different issues with stormwater management in their community including ponds that need maintenance without clear ideas of ownership, ditch maintenance, etc. Ms. Hegland said the city has already taken ownership of the drainage issues and it's their responsibility to figure them out. She doesn't feel it's something the SRWMO should be involved in. Mr. Melchior said part of the reason he joined the SRWMO board was to promote the interests of his community.

Mr. Schurbon asked the board's wishes for budget line 16- alum feasibility study \$5,500. Mr. Schurbon recommended zeroing out Line 16 because it is meant to be grant match and the likelihood of a grant is now low. He asked if the board wanted to increase Line 15 since any carp study at Coon Lake or carp maintenance harvests at other lakes is likely to be several fold-greater cost than the \$2,000 budgeted. He suggested a minimum \$6,000 would allow for those activities to take place, but noted that carp maintenance harvests can be scaled to the dollar amount available.

After further discussion, the board supported eroining out Line 16.

The board asked about Line 15. Ms. Hegland said she wanted to leave the budget for that item as is and expand the title to include management for carp maintenance activities. Ms. Kantor expressed concern that \$2,000 would not cover the planned activities. Ms. Hegland said she disliked carp funding compared to stormwater BMPs because there is not as clear of a way to measure return on investment. Stormwater BMPs have a clear cost:benefit calculation. After more discussion, the board supported leaving Line 15 at \$2,000 and they can scale the work to the available funds. Ms. Hegland said she supports that decision.

Ms. Kantor asked about the raingarden on East Front Blvd that was designed but has no installation funding. Mr. Schurbon said it wasn't in a priority areas as designated by the 1W1P, and therefore wasn't eligible for those funds. It remains as a worthy project for consideration because there are no other options to treat stormwater in that area that currently drains to the lake without treatment, but the cost:benefit is not as favorable as most past projects.

Ms. Hegland asked Mr. Schurbon to write a memo summarizing the process the SRWMO took to reduce the budget. The memo should accompany the budget to the cities.

**Mr. Melchior motioned to zero Line 16 and rename Line 15 to carp management or feasibility studies and to send the 2023 budget totaling \$44,500.000 to communities to ratify it along with the memo Mr. Schurbon will prepare. Ms. Hegland seconded this and the motion passed with all in favor.**

8. New Business

A. 2021 ACD work results report

Mr. Schurbon presented the 2021 ACD work results draft report. He explained there was time to incorporate any comments from the board. Mr. Schurbon read some of the recommendations at the start of the report including hiring a new outreach coordinator for targeted outreach. Other items in the report that were discussed include: SSTS grants, lake levels, lake water quality, three wetlands that were monitored, cost share projects and funds held for other projects, carp removal activities, and communications to the communities. The board said the report was nice and the pictures made it more impactful than reading the SRWMO management plan.

B. Responses to 2022 request for proposals for professional services

The ACD was the only response and has proposed fees that overall are equal to or less than amounts budgeted. In addition to the RFP work, ACD proposes to do lake monitoring that was planned for 2021 but mistakenly not done.

Mr. Peterson left the meeting at this time and has some questions he will follow up with Mr. Schurbon. Ms. Millerbernd commented on inflationary budget cuts and price increases she has observed elsewhere.

**Mr. Melchior motioned to approve the 2022 SRWMO Water Monitoring and Management contract with ACD totaling \$53,925.80. Ms. Hegland seconded this motion and it passed on a roll call vote with all in favor.**

C. Award 2022-23 contract for recording secretary services

Mr. Blake was the only applicant and did not make any changes from his previous agreement with the SRWMO. He proposed the following:

Task	Description	Fee
Meeting minutes for meetings up to 2.5 hours  Meeting time is from the call to order to adjournment.	Review the agenda in advance of the meeting and attend the meeting. Take minutes. Provide draft minutes within one week of the meeting to the WMO administrator for review and comment. Perform any edits as directed. Fee includes travel to/from meeting.	\$_200_/meeting
Meeting time beyond 2.5 hours	Additional fee for in-meeting time beyond 2.5 hours. Amount due will be calculated per tenth of an hour.	\$_70_/hour
Meetings cancelled due to lack of a quorum	In the event that the Recording Secretary and board members arrive at a meeting, but that meeting is cancelled due to lack of a quorum, the Recording Secretary is paid at an hourly rate for travel to the	N/A if remote participation is continued

	meeting, time spent at the meeting location, and travel time from the meeting.	
Clerical	Minor clerical tasks as directed including but not limited to invoicing member communities, reporting, or others.	\$_50_/hour
Invoicing	Provide an invoice for the previous meeting's service and any other completed clerical work no less than 8 days prior to the next meeting.	No charge
Equipment: I will provide a computer with the following software: MS Word, MS Excel, email.		

This pricing shall be effective from March 1, 2022 to February 28, 2024.

**Ms. Kantor motioned to approve Mr. Blake's 2022-2023 RFQ for the SRWMO recording secretary contract and Mr. Harrington seconded this motion. The motion carried with all in favor.**

D. Award 2022 contract for water monitoring and management services  
This was included with item 8B.

E. Select representative to 2022 Watershed Based Implementation Funding process  
The process to determine how Lower St. Croix metro Watershed Based Implementation funding will be used is likely to start in mid-2022. The last time this was done, Ms. Hegland was the SRWMO's representative and the group elected to pool the metro funds with the larger Lower St. Croix WBIF. A representative for this funding round is needed.  
Ms. Hegland volunteered to represent the SRWMO again.

**Ms. Kantor moved to select Ms. Hegland as the SRWMO representative at the 2022 metro WBIF convene process and Mr. Melchior seconded. The motion passed with all in favor.**

F. Development reviews in Linwood – Sunrise Pines, Cliff's Boettcher Estates, & Dellwood Country Estates

Mr. Schurbon presented the plans for three developments and summarized draft comments.  
Sunrise Pines: there are 11 family lots and they are required to treat the first inch of stormwater runoff. The developer is anticipating that this treatment will happen naturally as it runs into the woods from the development. The engineers water modeling is showing there will be some increased runoff that will need to be treated. A swale is one suggestion but there is a question as to who will be responsible to maintain it. Treating runoff, likely along Ryan Lake Dr, before it reaches the Sunrise River is a priority.

Cliff's Boettcher Estates: There are not many comments because there is not much impact to water resources.

Dellwood Country Estates: There will be some stormwater treatment needed and required wetland buffers but not many other comments. The Township is going to be discussing road

alignment and emergency service access. There was discussion about snow plowing and the DNR.

G. Boundary update

Mr. Schurbon updated the board that the RCWD's petition for a boundary adjustment has been approved by BWSR.

H. 1W1P

Mr. Schurbon wanted to let the board know that discussion has started regarding the model of organization for the Lower St. Croix Partnership formed during the 1W1P process. They started as a joint powers collaboration and the Policy Committee is largely in favor of moving towards becoming a joint powers entity. This will likely be discussed at the next partnership meeting in April. The reason for this move involve efficiency, engaging the Policy Committee in more decisions, and cost. He believes there may be a higher cost.

9. Mail

There was no mail.

10. Other

There was no discussion.

11. Invoice(s) approval

A. Recording Secretary services for Jan 2022 meeting (\$200)

**Ms. Hegland moved to and Mr. Harrington seconded to pay the invoice #10622, payment for \$200. The motion carried with all in favor.**

12. Adjourn

The board noted that Mr. Mager should be back in six weeks.

**Mr. Harrington moved to adjourn the meeting and Mr. Melchoir seconded this. The motion carried and Ms. Kantor adjourned the meeting at 8:58PM.**

Upcoming Meeting Dates: April 7, May 5, September 1, November 3

Submitted by:

Cameron Blake



# Sunrise River Watershed Management Organization

Regular Meeting for **Thursday, May 5, 2022 6:30 pm**

in the Booster West Room of East Bethel City Hall at 2241 221<sup>st</sup> Ave NE Cedar, MN 55011

## AGENDA

*Agenda to be finalized at meeting*

1. Call to Order
2. Roll Call
3. Approval of Agenda
4. Approval of Minutes for February 3, 2022
5. Financial Reports
  - a. Treasurer's report
  - b. Current grants financial report from Anoka Conservation District (ACD)
6. Unfinished Business
  - a. Review of communities' ordinances for compliance with SRWMO minimums
  - b. JPA amendment recommendations update
  - c. 2023 budget approval
7. New Business
  - a. Lower St Croix Partnership riverboat workshop – Minimum Impact Development Standards (Barbara Heitkamp)
  - b. Lakeshore stewardship outreach (Barbara Heitkamp)
  - c. Lower St. Croix Partnership governance structure and liability
  - d. Lower St. Croix Partnership annual work plan approval
  - e. Invitation to join MN Association of Watershed Districts
8. Mail
9. Other
10. Invoice(s) approval
  - a. Recording Secretary services for Feb 2022 meeting (\$200)
  - b. Anoka Conservation District 2022 services invoice 1 of 3 (\$17,975.27)
11. Adjourn

Upcoming Meeting Dates: September 1, November 3



# Sunrise River WMO

2241 – 221<sup>st</sup> Ave  
Cedar, MN 55011

## Approved Minutes

Sunrise River Water Management Organization Meeting

Thursday May 5, 2022

Meeting was held in person at the East Bethel City Hall

1. Call to Order  
Ms. Kantor called the meeting to order at 6:36 pm.
  
2. Roll Call  
Present: Janet Hegland, Tim Harrington, Candice Kantor, Tim Peterson, Troy Wolens, Jeff Entsminger, Leon Mager  
  
Audience: Jared Wagner, Anoka Conservation District (ACD)  
Barbara Heitcamp, East Metro Water Resource Education Program (EMWREP)  
Cameron Blake, Recording Secretary (attending remotely via Zoom)
  
3. Approval of Agenda  
**Ms. Hegland moved to approve the agenda as presented and Mr. Harrington seconded this motion. The motion carried with all in favor.**
  
4. Approval of Minutes for February 2, 2022  
There were edits received from Ms. Kantor and Ms. Hegland that will be incorporated into the minutes.  
**Ms. Hegland moved to approve the minutes with those edits and Mr. Harrington seconded this motion. The motion carried with all in favor.**
  
5. Financial Reports
  - A. Treasurer's report  
Mr. Harrington reported a beginning balance of \$36,289.42 with one upcoming debit. This will result in a balance of \$34,289.42.  
**Mr. Mager moved to accept the treasurer's report and Ms. Hegland seconded this motion. The motion carried with all in favor.**
  
  - B. Current grants financial report from Anoka Conservation District (ACD)

Mr. Wagener presented the current grants financial report. Due to a Quickbooks error there is more funding than realized for cost share projects. The report was also updated with expenses related to carp management. A new contract item (cost share funds through Lake Associations) was added which will be discussed later in the agenda.

Ms. Hegland asked about the remaining funds for carp management which need to be used this calendar year. The board discussed this topic from previous meetings. Mr. Schurbon may ask BWSR for an extension, otherwise the funds will be returned. SRWMO will not be penalized for underspending the grant because the target goals of the grant were met. Ms. Hegland asked for clarification on how this would affect remaining SRWMO match dollars. Other sources of match were used as well; approximately \$17,500 from the county at this point so there may be \$7,500 SRWMO match funds remaining. This question will be brought back to Mr. Schurbon.

## 6. Unfinished Business

### A. Review of communities' ordinances for compliance with SRWMO minimums

Mr. Schurbon will forward a request for help for East Bethel to Mr. Harrington. The status of this recurring agenda item is otherwise very similar to the last update. Linwood is challenged by a lack of staffing capacity and may not be able to finish this ordinance update. They were including this process in a larger internal update. Ms. Hegland asked what the next step for the SRWMO is based on this information. The board asked if there was a timeline for completion or if there was an alternative way for the community to be in compliance with SRWMO minimums than the current ordinance update. This question will be brought back to Mr. Schurbon.

### B. JPA amendment recommendations update

Mr. Schurbon's memo updated the board on the progress made with Ham Lake. After their meeting Ham Lake approved the 2023 budget and approved their contribution of \$2,000 for the JPA amendment process.

Ms. Hegland updated the board that the SRWMO identified a facilitator for this process. The individual works for the state and has a background working as a mediator for different government agencies like the MPCA. She did not receive his resume in time to distribute to the SRWMO board. He understands the budget for the process and will work within it.

Ms. Hegland explained that the SRWMO JPA needs to handle the contract for this process. The ACD often handles contracting for work for the SRWMO but this is a different scenario. The individual cities also wouldn't have the authority to enter into a contract for the JPA. Mr. Schurbon recommended the board authorize the SRWMO to enter into this agreement but the JPA is between the cities. Ms. Hegland will have more information from her inquiry with the legal staff at the City of Columbus. The board agreed that the SRWMO has done its role for this JPA amendment, and that it is now up to the cities to decide on the changes the SRWMO has recommended. The SRWMO will continue to work on setting up the meeting. Ms. Hegland explained that although this is a self-imposed timeline she wants the progress to continue to avoid potential issues, such as the current ability for a single community to hold

up the SRWMO budget from passing. It will not be an issue this year but could in the future as it has in the past.

C. 2023 budget approval

The 2023 SRWMO budget has been ratified by each community.

**Ms. Hegland moved to approve the SRWMO 2023 budget and Mr. Wolens seconded this motion. The motion carried with all in favor.**

7. New Business

A. Lower St Croix Partnership riverboat workshop – Minimum Impact Development Standards (Barbara Heitkamp)

Barbara Heitkamp introduced herself as the new educator for the SRWMO along with other communities in the LSCWD. As part of the 1W1P process, the participating organizations structured the workplan to include outreach to member communities regarding their current ordinances. The goal is for the entire LSC watershed to adopt the MIDS stormwater standard in their local ordinances to address water resource issues caused by development. Part of this outreach includes a planned riverboat workshop for public officials. This is an interactive event in which feedback is sought from the communities. The event will likely occur in late August with the boat located in Taylor's Falls. It has capacity for 140 people, and invitees include county commissioners, city council members, planners, zoning administrators, etc.

B. Lakeshore stewardship outreach (Barbara Heitkamp)

The SRWMO's 2022 contract with ACD has two expenditures related to promoting lakeshore stewardship. Mr. Schurbon is seeking board direction on what activities to pursue.

The SRWMO 2022 contract and budget includes \$2,250 for Lakeshore Restoration Guidance Materials which would include preparing or consolidating existing materials and promoting them to lakeshore homeowners. The SRWMO 2022 budget includes \$7,570 for Cost Share Grants through Lake Associations with the idea that residents may feel more comfortable working with neighbors than a government agency. These funds are in addition to the SRWMO "for anyone" cost share fund that currently has a \$4,524 balance.

Options for lake stewardship outreach include: the Lake Steward Program, ACD staff outreach (including a new outreach resource, the Decks, Docks, and Flip Flop's flier), and other options through Barbara Heitkamp. There are also options for how to use the cost share funding. One option is for Mr. Schurbon to pursue grant funding and use the current funds as match so there is a much larger fund available for cost share. This could involve a Clean Water Fund application in August. The other options are to make funds available to landowners through the ACD a usual or make funds available to the lake associations to manage. Mr. Schurbon's memo noted there are three site visits waiting that could turn into potential shoreline projects.

Ms. Heitkamp explained the goal of outreach is to change landowner perceptions to promote healthy shorelines with native vegetation buffers, which will benefit the lake quality for everyone. She researched existing programs that promote this kind of community engagement. The Lake Steward Program (through the MN Lakes and Rivers Advocates organization) involves identifying one volunteer landowner to take the lead in communicating with shoreline residents. The volunteer would receive training. Landowner's can join the



organization and take a quiz to receive a score for their current shoreline and actions that can improve it. The challenge with this is identifying someone to be the lead volunteer.

Other resources Ms. Heitcamp identified included native planting resources through the Blue Thumb organization. They are also creating a webinar for shoreline residents. Another resource is a lakeshore workshop through EMWREP for realtors. The Adopt-A-Drain program encourages storm drain cleaning which reduces pollutant loading to water resources. Anoka County is already a member of this program. Mr. Wagner discussed some of the current and previous strategies for outreach such as targeted mailings after lakeshore surveying.

The board discussed the different options for outreach and cost share funding. The managers agreed they felt it would be difficult to identify a volunteer for the Lake Steward program, and that they didn't think Lake Associations wanted to manage the cost share funds. They did feel the Lake Associations would help promote the cost share funds and shoreline projects. The managers requested the materials funds be used to print the Flip Flop flier customized with the ACD logo and distribute them to landowners at upcoming LA meetings and city halls in the SRWMO.

Mr. Wagner discussed the different strategies of distributing funds. Analyses can identify locations in which projects will have greater impact, but the landowner is not always willing to engage at these locations. Implementing projects with willing landowners has the benefit of exposure and normalizing native shorelines which can bring in more interested landowners for projects. The managers discussed the topic of state property taxes, reimbursement, and cost share funds.

There was additional discussion on permits required for lakeshore activities. Mr. Wagner explained the ACD as a general permit with a streamlined process they use to go through the DNR rather than individual landowners applying directly with the DNR.

The managers asked the SRWMO to promote the Adopt a Drain program in Anoka County. Mr. Mager said Lake Associations may be useful in promoting this program especially when members know the drain adoption helps their lake specifically. There was discussion on sources of excess nutrients, the impact on lakes, and the benefit of native vegetation on lakeshores for water quality.

The board discussed and agreed that they felt it was a better use of the cost share funds to distribute to willing landowners now rather than keep them for a potential grant application, especially if there are not identified projects for that larger grant funding if received. There was discussion on the larger cost of any lakeshore project that involves grading versus native plantings. Ms. Kantor asked how much notice Mr. Schurbon would need to apply for a Clean Water Fund grant, in case no funds were distributed prior to the CWF application deadline, and Mr. Wagner estimated to weeks. They discussed making funds available for one or two projects and retaining some funds for a CWF application.

The managers discussed the possibility of the cost share funds being out towards highly visible demonstration projects such as a park. They discussed potential locations including a road and boat launch by the Carlos Avery WMA.

Mr. Wager said he felt he had received sufficient direction from the board on this topic to bring back to Mr. Schurbon.

### C. Lower St. Croix Partnership governance structure and liability

Ms. Hegland updated the SRWMO board about recent discussion and a need for a decision in the LSC partnership. The current organizational structure is a Joint Powers Collaboration. There is discussion about whether the group wishes to become a Joint Power's Entity. Discussion in the LSC Policy Committee has included topics such as liability and efficiency of decision making. Ms. Hegland explained that previously the group seemed to favor switching to a JPE after their start as a JPC. However the opinion of the group seems to have shifted. Ms. Hegland has specific questions about liability she wants Mr. Schurbon to investigate. As a JPE the LSC would have their defense and damages covered if a lawsuit was ever raised due to issues around funding allocation or zoning and projects, etc. As a JPC, each partner is liable instead and would need to find a way to pay for any potential legal costs. Ms. Hegland feels that the question of liability is crucial and may be enough for her to recommend leaving the LSC partnership if it is not addressed sufficiently.

D. Lower St. Croix Partnership annual work plan approval

The board briefly discussed the workplan and what activities are involved initially with some contribution from Ms. Heitcamp on some of the planned activities.

**Ms. Hegland moved to approve the LSC annual workplan and Mr. Wolens seconded this motion. The motion carried with all in favor.**

E. Invitation to join MN Association of Watershed Districts

Mr. Wagner explained the context of this request. MAWD opened their organization up to include Watershed Management Organizations a couple year ago. At the time the SRWMO declined this invitation. MAWD is asking again and Mr. Schurbon's recommendation is to decline mostly due to the fee structure and unlikelihood that the SRWMO would benefit enough from membership to justify the cost. The board noted some benefits to membership included lobbying to the state which would occur with or without the SRWMO's membership. Another benefit could be access to a facilitator such as the SRWMO sought out for their JPA amendment process.

**Ms. Hegland moved for the SRWMO to decline MAWD's membership invitation and Mr. Wolens seconded. The motion passed with all in favor.**

8. Mail

There was no mail.

9. Other

There was no discussion.

11. Invoice(s) approval

A. Recording Secretary services for Feb 2022 meeting (\$200)

**Ms. Hegland moved to and Mr. Mager seconded to pay the invoice #20322, payment for \$200. The motion carried with all in favor.**

B. Anoka Conservation District 2022 services invoice 1 of 3 (\$17,975.27)

**Mr. Harrington moved to and Ms. Hegland seconded to pay the invoice #2022038, payment for \$17,975.27. The motion carried with all in favor.**

12. Adjourn

**Mr. Harrington moved to adjourn the meeting and Mr. Mager seconded this. The motion carried and Ms. Kantor adjourned the meeting at 8:14PM.**

Ms. Kantor noted that if the need arises the board may meet before September to approve any time sensitive decisions.

Upcoming Meeting Dates: September 1, November 3

Submitted by:  
Cameron Blake



# Sunrise River Watershed Management Organization

Special Meeting for **Tuesday, June 28, 2022 5:30 pm**

in the Booster West Room of East Bethel City Hall at 2241 221<sup>st</sup> Ave NE Cedar, MN 55011

## AGENDA

*Agenda to be finalized at meeting*

1. Call to Order
2. Roll Call
3. Approval of Agenda
4. Approval of Minutes for May 5, 2022
5. Financial Reports
  - a. Treasurer's report
6. Unfinished Business
  - a. Facilitation services for joint powers agreement update
  - b. Legal services for joint powers agreement update
  - c. Coordination services for joint powers agreement update
  - d. Determine member community invoicing timing and structure for joint powers agreement updates
  - e. JPA member communities meeting logistics
7. New Business
8. Mail
9. Other
10. Invoice(s) approval
  - a. Recording Secretary services for May 2022 meeting (\$200)
11. Adjourn

Upcoming Events: September 10 at 10am-4pm (need volunteers to staff the SRWMO booth)

Upcoming Meeting Dates: September 1, November 3



# Sunrise River WMO

2241 – 221<sup>st</sup> Ave  
Cedar, MN 55011

## FINAL MINUTES

Sunrise River Water Management Organization Meeting

Tuesday June 28, 2022

Special Meeting was held in person at the East Bethel City Hall

1. Call to Order  
Ms. Kantor called the meeting to order at 5:35 pm.
  
2. Roll Call  
Present: Janet Hegland, Tim Harrington, Candice Kantor, Tim Peterson, Troy Wolens, Jeff Entsminger, Leon Mager  
  
Audience: Jamie Schurbon, Anoka Conservation District (ACD)  
Kerry Goldstrand, Linwood Lake Association  
Cameron Blake, Recording Secretary (attending remotely via Zoom)
  
3. Approval of Agenda  
**Mr. Peterson moved to approve the agenda as presented and Ms. Hegland seconded this motion. The motion carried with all in favor.**
  
4. Approval of Minutes for May 5, 2022  
There were edits received from Ms. Kantor and Ms. Hegland that will be incorporated into the minutes.  
**Ms. Hegland moved to approve the minutes with those edits and Mr. Peterson seconded this motion. The motion carried with all in favor.**
  
5. Financial Reports
  - A. Treasurer's report  
Mr. Harrington reported a beginning balance of \$34,289.42. He noted that all member community contributions have been received for 2022. Mr. Schurbon said he projects the bank balance by the end of the year to be close to \$14,000 which the board has been reaching by spending down the reserves.  
**Mr. Harrington moved to accept the treasurer's report and Mr. Wolens seconded this motion. The motion carried with all in favor.**

6. Unfinished Business

A. Facilitation services for joint powers agreement update

Ms. Hegland presented the resume of the proposed facilitator for the JPA amendment process. The meeting attendees will be the administrator and one elected official from each SRWMO member community. The facilitator provided a typical agreement and Ms. Hegland’s city attorney adjusted it for the SRWMO. The delegation of authority is currently undefined in the JPA. The SRWMO board needs to authorize the Chair or Ms. Hegland to execute the agreement if it wishes to proceed, as it is the SRWMO who is entering into the agreement on behalf of the cities.

Ms. Hegland noted that one new edit to the SRWMO JPA that may be warranted is to specify who acts on the SRWMO’s behalf for administrative matters.

The group agreed that the SRWMO funding model will likely take the most discussion during the facilitated meeting of cities, and whether the SRWMO budget process will require a majority vote or all in favor. The group is optimistic that the amendment process could be completed in one meeting, however two facilitated meetings will initially be scheduled.

**Mr. Mager moved to authorize Chair Kantor or Vice Chair Hegland to execute a contract for services with Milt Thomas for facilitation of the member community meeting(s) to discuss SRWMO JPA amendments in an amount up to \$1,500. Mr. Peterson seconded this and the motion carried with all in favor except Ms. Hegland who abstained from the vote.**

B. Legal services for joint powers agreement update

The SRWMO had previously selected Troy Gilchrist of Kennedy and Graven as its legal counsel, with work to be billed hourly. Mr. Schurbon suggested the board re-affirm they wish Mr. Gilchrist to provide legal services for the update of the joint powers agreement. His hourly rate is currently \$193 and not expected to exceed \$205 during the term of this work. Provided there is not a lot of back-and-forth, he expects his work to consume <20 hrs.

**Ms. Hegland moved to authorize hourly services of Mr. Troy Gilchrist of Kennedy and Graven as the SRWMO joint powers agreement update attorney not to exceed \$4,100. Mr. Harrington seconded this and the motion carried with all in favor.**

C. Coordination services for joint powers agreement update

The board discussed an amendment to its 2022 Water Monitoring and Management contract with the Anoka Conservation District to additionally provide coordination of the JPA amendment process. This work would include coordinating meetings and meeting packets, attending meetings, drafting recommended JPA changes for attorney refinement, coordinate the legal process of the JPA update including member community signatures, and others as needed to complete the JPA amendment process.

The board noted that the fees listed in the meeting packet would put the budget for the JPA amendment over by \$250 compared to the \$2,000 each member community has committed. Mr. Schurbon stated the ACD “up to” amount can be revised downward by \$250. so the motion was adjusted. The group asked how the ACD contract amendment would occur and Mr. Schurbon explained this motion and Ms. Kantor’s signature would suffice.

**Ms. Hegland moved to authorize hourly services of ACD for SRWMO joint powers agreement update coordination at a rate of \$88/hour not to exceed \$2,400. Mr. Entsminger seconded this and the motion carried with all in favor.**

D. Determine member community invoicing timing and structure for joint powers agreement updates

Each SRWMO community has committed up to \$2,000 toward the JPA updates process expenses. The SRWMO is contracting the services (facilitation, legal, coordination) and will invoice the communities accordingly. The group discussed different invoicing options (up front, partial up front, or only at the conclusion of work). There was consensus to invoice the member communities for equal shares of actual expenses at the end of the process. Similarly, the parties doing contracted work will be paid at the conclusion of the process.

**Mr. Wolens moved to authorize invoicing of SRWMO member community’s equal shares of the balance of actual expenses at year end and the completion of work. Mr. Peterson seconded this and the motion carried with all in favor.**

E. JPA member communities meeting logistics

Mr. Schurbon explained the question of whether the SRWMO could include the Upper Rum WMO in the JPA amendment process. The URRWMO has similar issues regarding its JPA. The group was concerned this could lead to discussion getting off track and taking longer than the time they currently have for the SRWMO JPA amendment. They also expressed concern about the communities outside of the JPA not having contributed financially to the process, and the frustration that could result because of this. Additionally, the SRWMO has had lengthy discussion about the JPA and proposed amendment so the additional communities wouldn’t be coming in with the same level of understanding and background. There also may have been some recent turnover in communities that could lead to a lack of background knowledge of this topic. The board agreed they do not wish to include the Upper Rum WMO cities in the SRWMO JPA amendment process, however could share with the URRWMO the options considered and choices made so that it can guide a separate URRWMO process. Mr. Schurbon will send out a poll to identify a meeting time, and will first get some options of times from the facilitator. The SRWMO board would like administrators and a council member from each community to participate. It was agreed that a hybrid meeting is likely not the best option for this meeting which will be intensely discussion-based. Mr. Schurbon will proceed with meeting coordination based on this input.

7. New Business  
None

8. Mail  
MN Counties Intergovernmental Trust (MCIT) bulletin newsletter from May/June 2022

9. Other

Mr. Schurbon updated the board that Clean Water Fund applications are now open. He received the board's direction to use existing cost share funds as a match to try and receive a larger grant for projects. They should find out in December if they were successful.

Mr. Schurbon updated the board that the brochures discussed at the last meeting are done. They have been brought to the Martin Lake Association and he will bring to Linwood's meeting as well.

Mr. Schurbon asked for volunteers for the Linwood Family Fun Day and Booster Days. He is looking for a display for the SRWMO as well. Ms. Kantor and Mr. Mager volunteered for partial shifts as did Mr. Peterson. Mr. Schurbon will send out a reminder. Mr. Mager stressed the importance of asking, during the event, for contact information from residents who are interested in help from the SRWMO. Then, staff can respond. Providing SRWMO contact information is much less effective.

Ms. Hegland asked what options the SRWMO has to address local ordinance's compliance with the SRWMO Management Plan/Standards. The issue has not been resolved in a timely way at some cities. Ms. Hegland suggested that there needs to be clear direction on what is needed and consequences of inaction. Mr. Schurbon explained that the SRWMO has the option of not approving a community's Local Surface Water Management Plan without the ordinances being consistent with SRWMO standards. The worst case scenario is that BWSR can say the SRWMO is not implementing its own management plan and withhold funding. Ms. Hegland requested a letter on behalf of the SRWMO board with a deadline and response the SRWMO can take. Mr. Schurbon said he would draft a letter and bring it to the board at the September meeting. He will also ask communities for an update on their ordinance compliance process.

11. Invoice(s) approval

A. Recording Secretary services for May 2022 meeting (\$200)

**Mr. Harrington moved to and Ms. Hegland seconded to pay the invoice #50522, payment for \$200. The motion carried with all in favor.**

12. Adjourn

**Ms. Hegland moved to adjourn the meeting and Mr. Harrington seconded this. The motion carried and Ms. Kantor adjourned the meeting at 6:19PM.**

Upcoming Events: September 10 at 10am-4pm (need volunteers to staff the SRWMO booth)

Upcoming Meeting Dates: September 1, November 3

Submitted by:

Cameron Blake





# Sunrise River Watershed Management Organization

Special Meeting for **Thursday, September 1, 2022 6:30 pm**

in the Booster West Room of East Bethel City Hall at 2241 221<sup>st</sup> Ave NE Cedar, MN 55011

## AGENDA

*Agenda to be finalized at meeting*

1. Call to Order
2. Roll Call
3. Approval of Agenda
4. Approval of Minutes for June 28, 2022
5. Financial Reports
  - a. Treasurer's report
6. Unfinished Business
  - a. Review of communities' ordinances for compliance with SRWMO minimums
  - b. SRWMO JPA amendment process update
  - c. Linwood Family Fun Day booth coordination
7. New Business
  - a. Lower St. Croix Partnership work plan amendment approval
  - b. Lower St. Croix Partnership operations
  - c. Anoka County aerial photo funding request
  - d. Request to assume Coon Lake channel maintenance responsibilities
8. Mail
9. Other
10. Invoice(s) approval
  - a. Recording Secretary services for June 2022 meeting (\$200)
  - b. Anoka Conservation District Water Monitoring and Mgmt invoice 2 of 3 (\$17,975.27)
11. Adjourn

Upcoming Events: September 10 at 10am-4pm Linwood Family Fun Day booth

Upcoming Meeting Dates: 2022 - November 3      2023 - January 5, February 2



# Sunrise River WMO

2241 – 221<sup>st</sup> Ave  
Cedar, MN 55011

## APPROVED MINUTES

Sunrise River Water Management Organization Meeting

Thursday September 1, 2022

Board Meeting was held in person at the East Bethel City Hall

1. Call to Order  
Ms. Kantor called the meeting to order at 6:35 pm.
  
2. Roll Call  
Present: Janet Hegland, Tim Harrington, Candice Kantor, Tim Peterson, Tim Melchior, Leon Mager  
  
Audience: Jamie Schurbon, Anoka Conservation District (ACD)  
Cameron Blake, Recording Secretary (attending remotely via Zoom)
  
3. Approval of Agenda  
Ms. Hegland proposed agenda items 7a and 7b be switched in the agenda and the group agreed.  
**Ms. Hegland moved to approve the agenda as amended and Mr. Peterson seconded this motion. The motion carried with all in favor.**
  
4. Approval of Minutes for June 28, 2022  
There were edits received from Ms. Kantor that will be incorporated into the minutes. Ms. Hegland requested a sentence added under item 6a to clarify that delegation of authority is currently undefined in the SRWMO JPA. The group discussed whether the SRWMO or the cities are entering into the JPA facilitator agreement. Mr. Schurbon clarified that the SRWMO is entering into the agreement. This language will be added to the minutes.  
**Ms. Hegland moved to approve the minutes with those edits and Mr. Harrington seconded this motion. The motion carried with all in favor.**
  
5. Financial Reports
  - A. Treasurer's report  
Mr. Harrington reported a beginning balance of \$49,742.75 with an ending balance of \$31,576.48 if all invoices are approved at the end of the meeting.

**Mr. Peterson moved to accept the treasurer's report and Mr. Harrington seconded this motion. The motion carried with all in favor.**

6. Unfinished Business

A. Review of communities' ordinances for compliance with SRWMO minimums

Mr. Schurbon explained that most of the communities are close to completing this with Linwood still in progress and having farther to go. As requested by the board, Mr. Schurbon drafted a letter to the communities with a deadline of October 24, 2022 to submit a plan of work to be done and timeline to completed. The memo also listed a completion deadline of June 30<sup>th</sup>, 2023. Ms. Hegland proposed the deadline be the end of 2022. Mr. Schurbon explained this may not be feasible for Linwood. Ms. Hegland requested that the memo list a December 31, 2022 deadline for completion because the task is already overdue and the cities can explain why they need more time if that is the case.

The group discussed the SRWMO requirement that wetland buffers be within a drainage/utility easement. Two communities may need this in this ordinances. Mr. Schurbon clarified that these buffers and setbacks do not exist for all properties, only for new developments that contain at least three lots or new development >1 acre. Ms. Hegland will go back to Columbus and look at this section and explained the city is trying to have consistency for this ordinance across the three watersheds it contains.

The board directed Mr. Schurbon to send the memo to communities.

B. SRWMO JPA amendment process update

Mr. Schurbon presented a timeline. Ms. Helgand and Mr. Schurbon met with the facilitator to assess a strategy for how the meeting can be as efficient as possible, including sending materials in advance to the cities. The meetings are set for October 4 and December 6. The board thanked Ms. Hegland for doing this work.

C. Linwood Family Fun Day booth coordination

Most of the booth components have been prepared. Mr. Mager and Ms. Kantor are the two volunteers for the first and second shift. However, the setup and takedown will take more than one person. Mr. Melchior volunteered to help set up and Mr. Harrington will check his availability.

7. New Business

A. Lower St. Croix Partnership operations

Ms. Hegland referred to the meeting packet memo with background of this group and the implications of the organizational structure. The Lower St. Croix (LSC) Partnership initially chose to be a joint powers collaboration (JPC) instead of joint powers entity (JPE). This topic was revisited at the beginning of 2022 to see if the group wanted to shift to a JPE. Legal opinions about the organizational structure options were sought, which consistently favored the JPE structure for liability reasons. While the Policy Committee leaned toward changing to a JPE at their first meeting in 2022 discussing the topic, at the next meeting they decided to

remain a JPC. Ms. Hegland is concerned about the liability implications under this structure, as well as a number of operational processes.

Ms. Hegland described some recent project funding approvals that concerned her. Those approvals required that the Partnership dramatically shift funding amongst grant pots of money and commit future grant dollars to a specific project. Ms. Hegland expressed discomfort with how the process went and what is being proposed. She feels if the group were to switch to a JPE there would be more due process around project selection and funding allocation. The board agreed with her concern around reshuffling the Partnership's grant work plan, taking money from future grants, and the potential for this kind of activity to continue to occur under the current organizational structure.

Ms. Hegland identified options the SRWMO could take: pulling out of the LSC partnership, doing nothing, or expressing concerns to the LSC Partnership Policy Committee and waiting to see if their concerns are addressed. The board discussed the benefits to being in the LSC partnership and potential for funding in the future, as well how the SRWMO is included in the LSC plan. The board also agreed that they may not see funding if bigger projects elsewhere in the watershed continue to receive disproportionate funding. The board discussed current liability of the SRWMO as part of this organization. The board continued to discuss current and potential future benefits to being a part of the LSC Partnership and what activities would continue to take place regardless of the SRWMO's participation. Mr. Schurbon clarified that there will still be competitive grant funding available to apply for outside of the funds being allocated in the LSC Partnership.

Mr. Scuhrbon explained that the Chisago SWCD is acting as the fiscal agent for the group and is receiving recommendations from the JPC Policy Committee. The Chisago SWCD has this as an agenda item at an upcoming meeting and will be bringing a recommendation to the next Policy Committee meeting to create new processes and policies to address concerns, however this is unlikely to include changing to a JPE.

Ms. Hegland explained that she recommends the SRWMO pull out of the group if it does not transition to a JPE organizational structure, but that it is up to the SRWMO Board to decide this. She doesn't feel like this action will have much impact on its own but it may encourage other organizations to speak up about concerns with the LSC Partnership.

The board requested Ms. Hegland draft a letter to the Chisago SWCD and LSC Policy Committee expressing concerns and requesting the organization switch to a JPE with improved practices and policies. Then, at upcoming meetings the SRWMO Board can review any steps taken by the LSC Partnership in response, and decide whether to remain part of the LSC Partnership.

**Mr. Melchior moved to submit this letter to the LSC Policy Committee with the request they make substantive changes towards becoming a JPE or the SRWMO may leave the Partnership. Ms. Hegland seconded this motion. The motion carried with all in favor.**

The next Policy Committee meeting is September 22<sup>nd</sup> so the deadline for Ms. Hegland to prepare the letter will be a week prior for inclusion in the meeting packet. The SRWMO Board discussed an end of year deadline for the LSC Partnership to take some action or

direction towards becoming an JPE. Ms. Hegland noted that the JPE would be able to create the due process that is lacking and to ensure funding is used judiciously.

B. Lower St. Croix Partnership work plan amendment approval

Mr. Schurbon and Ms. Hegland reviewed the Lower St. Croix grant work plan amendment. The amendment is needed to fund two large projects. It includes shifting funding amongst grant pots of money and committing future grant dollars to a specific project. Ms. Hegland & Mr. Schurbon provided a joint recommendation to not approve this work plan amendment. The projects are good but they do not feel the SRWMO can agree to this process.

**Mr. Melchior moved to vote “no” the LSC Partnership work plan amendment and Ms. Hegland seconded this motion. The motion carried with all in favor.**

C. Anoka County aerial photo funding request

The group discussed the value of these images. Ms. Hegland said the city has to pay for image requests from the county so she doesn't understand why they would contribute to this cost in addition.

The group asked Mr. Schurbon to share a concern with the county that asking for funding from both the cities and WMOs is essentially a double-ask of the cities (which fund the WMOs).

The consensus of the SRWMO board was not to provide 2023 funding to Anoka County for aerial photos because it is not in the already-finalized 2023 SRWMO budget.

D. Request to assume Coon Lake channel maintenance responsibilities

The group discussed the City of Ham Lake's request that the SRWMO take over maintenance dredging of the channel between Coon and South Coon Lake. It was noted that the city council proposed that they would drop SRWMO funding formula concerns if the SRWMO takes on this activity. Mr. Schurbon provided a summary memo which had been reviewed by the Ham Lake City Administrator for accuracy.

The board noted that the SRWMO has a long standing approach and policy to not take on long term maintenance projects, including for SRWMO's own projects. It was noted this is formalized in both the SRWMO joint powers agreement and SRWMO Watershed Management Plan. In order for the SRWMO to consider this request those documents would need to be amended to include this kind of responsibility. Ham Lake could request this amendment to the other communities and see if there is agreement.

The SRWMO board discussed the history of this area, features on the landscape, and challenges that would require resolution before work could begin. The board noted:

- **Access** – The City's attorney indicated there is no legal access for the maintenance work from land, and adjacent landowners are unwilling to allow it. Either cooperation of the adjacent landowners would need to be obtained or an easement would need to be established.
- **Adjacent structures** – Adjacent private retaining walls, driveways, homes, and other structures are exceedingly close to the channel and an engineering study will likely be needed to ensure they are not destabilized.

- **Achieving a boat-able depth** – A boat-able depth appears to be a resident priority. The current DNR permit allows excavation only 6 inches below the Interlachen Drive culvert invert which is not adequate for boat passage.
- **Permitting** - The City's 2005 DNR permit cannot be transferred to another party. A new permit approval from the MN DNR is needed, which would require development of design plans for the project for DNR consideration. Discussion at the June 2022 city council meeting indicated the DNR may not be in favor of disturbing the sediment.
- **Cost** – A cost estimate and estimate of the recurrence frequency of the work is needed after access and stabilization of the adjacent structures is resolved.
- **Funding** –The SRWMO has found this work would not be eligible for any grants that we have researched because it is considered maintenance. That would leave the funding of the project falling on the four JPA communities.

**Mr. Melchior moved to respond to the City of Ham Lake that the SRWMO could not take maintenance dredging responsibility for the Coon Lake to South Coon Lake channel because it is not a purpose of the SRWMO in its joint powers agreement, would be contrary to the SRWMO Watershed Management Plan policies, and is not a priority task in the SRMWO Watershed Management Plan. This position is to be communicated to the City of Ham Lake by memo. Mr. Harrington seconded this motion. The motion carried with all in favor.**

8. Mail

Mail included:

- Advertisement letter from a website domain network.
- Pamphlet from MN Counties Intergovernmental Trust (MCIT) about insurance rate setting. There was a 2022 dividend update from MCIT. The SRWMO will not be receiving one this year.
- MCIT estimated 2023 contribution for insurance in the amount of \$1,774. The invoice for next year usually arrives in December with payment due in January. Due to meeting timing the board usually pre-authorizes an amount at the November meeting so that the invoice can be paid on time.

9. Other

11. Invoice(s) approval

A. Recording Secretary services for June 2022 meeting (\$200)

**Ms. Hegland moved to and Mr. Harrington seconded to pay the invoice #62822, payment for \$200. The motion carried with all in favor.**

B. Anoka Conservation District 2022 services invoice 2 of 3 (\$17,975.27)

**Mr. Melchior moved to and Mr. Harrington seconded to pay the invoice #2022038, payment for \$17,975.27. The motion carried with all in favor.**

12. Adjourn

**Mr. Mager moved to adjourn the meeting and Ms. Hegland seconded this. The motion carried and Ms. Kantor adjourned the meeting at 8:05PM.**

Upcoming Events: September 10 at 10am-4pm Linwood Family Fun Day booth  
Upcoming Meeting Dates: 2022 - November 3 2023 - January 5, February 2

Submitted by:  
Cameron Blake



# Sunrise River Watershed Management Organization

**Thursday, November 3, 2022 6:30 pm**

in the Booster West Room of East Bethel City Hall at 2241 221<sup>st</sup> Ave NE Cedar, MN 55011

## AGENDA

*Agenda to be finalized at meeting*

1. Call to Order
2. Roll Call
3. Approval of Agenda
4. Approval of Minutes for September 1, 2022
5. Financial Reports
  - a. Treasurer's report
6. Unfinished Business
  - a. Review of communities' ordinances for compliance with SRWMO minimums
  - b. SRWMO JPA amendment process update
  - c. Sunrise Chain of Lakes carp management grant update
7. New Business
  - a. Lower St. Croix Partnership operations
  - b. Linwood Township 22529 Martin Lake Dr stormwater pipe issue
8. Mail
9. Other
10. Invoice(s) approval
  - a. Recording Secretary services for June 2022 meeting (\$200)
  - b. Anoka Conservation District Water Monitoring and Mgmt invoice 3 of 3 (\$17,975.26)
11. Adjourn

Upcoming Meeting Dates:            2023 - January 5, February 2





# Sunrise River WMO

2241 – 221<sup>st</sup> Ave  
Cedar, MN 55011

## APPROVED MINUTES

Sunrise River Water Management Organization Meeting

Thursday November 3, 2022

Meeting was held in person at the East Bethel City Hall

1. Call to Order  
Ms. Kantor called the meeting to order at 6:30 pm.
  
2. Roll Call  
Present: Janet Hegland (arrived 6:39PM), Tim Harrington, Candice Kantor, Tim Peterson, Tim Melchior, Leon Mager, Troy Wolens  
  
Audience: Jamie Schurbon, Anoka Conservation District (ACD)  
Cameron Blake, Recording Secretary (attending remotely via Zoom)
  
3. Approval of Agenda  
The group discussed adding an agenda item as 10c; preapproving a not to exceed payment amount for 2023 MCIT insurance invoice to ensure this is paid in time before the January board meeting.  
**Mr. Peterson moved to approve the agenda as amended and Mr. Wolens seconded this motion. The motion carried with all in favor.**
  
4. Approval of Minutes for September 1, 2022  
There were edits received from Ms. Kantor that will be incorporated into the minutes.  
**Mr. Harrington moved to approve the minutes with those edits and Mr. Mager seconded this motion. The motion carried with all in favor.**
  
5. Financial Reports  
A. Treasurer's report  
After discussion about an error in the treasurer's report, Mr. Harrington reported a beginning balance of \$31,567.48 with an ending balance of \$13,392.22 if all invoices are approved at the end of the meeting.  
**Mr. Peterson moved to accept the treasurer's report and Mr. Wolens seconded this motion. The motion carried with all in favor.**

## 6. Unfinished Business

## A. Review of communities' ordinances for compliance with SRWMO minimums

Mr. Schurbon said Ham Lake and East Bethel are currently in compliance, Linwood's process should be complete by December 1st, and Columbus should be in compliance by the end of December. Mr. Schurbon will bring one last update to the board at the January meeting.

## B. SRWMO JPA amendment process update

The administrators and council representatives from SRWMO communities have met twice recently to discuss JPA amendments. The meetings were October 4 in person and Oct 19 on Zoom. Progress has been made on many administrative/housekeeping edits. The funding formula remains under discussion. A goal is to have agreement on all issues by the conclusion of a scheduled December 6 meeting. Thereafter, each community would have time to approve the revised JPA in December-January.

There is tentative agreement on budgeting process changes, but it will be revisited after the funding formula is determined. Points of tentative agreement include:

- A period of 60 days should be allowed for community's initial review of a draft SRWMO budget. Failure to respond within this time period constitutes ratification.
- If there are objections to the budget the SRWMO may amend the budget and send it back to the communities for review. That second review is 30 days. Failure to respond within this time period constitutes ratification.
- Objections to ratifying the budget must include a reason which must be about the budget, not about the JPA terms.
- Unanimous budget ratification by all four communities is required.

The board discussed the timeline of the SRWMO budget process compared to the budget timeline for the communities. The goal is to get the funding formula determined and sent to the communities in January. Ms. Hegland noted the SRWMO budget is laid out in the SRWMO 10-year management plan which communities have agreed to. One concern is the lack of councilmember liaison from Ham Lake, and this concern has been expressed to the city administrator.

Because the meetings of the member communities have been going well the board agreed the next meeting could occur without the facilitator to save money.

## C. Sunrise Chain of Lakes carp management grant update

The Sunrise Chain of Lakes Carp Management grant expires at the end of the year. Project goals included carp biomass reduction below 89 lb/acre in Typo, Martin, and Linwood Lakes and reductions in phosphorus levels towards the state standard. The biomass goal has been met for Typo Lake, and new population estimates are coming soon for Martin and Typo Lakes. Martin Lake is almost reaching state water quality standards and a 27% phosphorus reduction was reached in Typo Lake. Linwood Lake efforts were less successful during the course of the grant although initial population estimates were too high. Not all of the grant

funding was spent. Once project costs have been finalized some funds will be returned to the state. If not all matching funds from the SRWMO District and Linwood Lake Association are required, they may be returned as well.

Ms. Hegland asked if any of the remaining grant funds could be used for the feasibility study but this is not possible as it was not part of the original work plan. Ms. Hegland asked if the SRWMO could apply for a grant extension and Mr. Schurbon explained the SRWMO is unlikely to see more progress. As the number of carp diminishes the cost/lb removal increases. Many removal methods were attempted: open water, under ice, sport fishing, intercepting migrating carp, etc. Other methods are likely not cost effective or infeasible. The group discussed lake aerators and lake health.

Next steps include maintenance harvests which are recommended to begin in 2024. The SRWMO could rent or lease box nets from Carp Solutions and do the work with a well-trained volunteer group.

Other steps for water quality improvements for these lakes include the Adopt-a-Drain program, enhanced street sweeping, and stormwater projects, among other options outlined in the board memo. Linwood Township is considering applying for an enhanced street sweeping study through the LSC Partnership this winter.

## 7. New Business

### A. Lower St. Croix Partnership operations

Ms. Hegland referred to the meeting packet memo with an update on this topic. She felt that the concerns she brought to the Lower St. Croix (LSC) Partnership Policy Committee were ignored and the discussion on the topic was insufficient. Ms. Hegland noted that the attorney for Washington County also recommended a JPE organizational structure but the group did not act on that either.

Ultimately the Policy Committee decided to continue to stay a Joint Powers Collaborative and to annually re-visit whether to transition to a Joint Powers Entity. There was discussion about lack of policies and procedures. All were directed back to staff to further develop. Ms. Hegland noted she felt the staff involved were doing excellent work and were focused on the projects; but the Policy Committee should be responsible for addressing these policy concerns and she doesn't feel they are. She feels the Policy Committee will continue to operate with inadequate policies and procedures and this currently opens participants up to too much risk and liability. For example, policy members should abstain from voting on funding projects within their own organizations because doing so creates a conflict of interest. There was no interest in drafting a Conflict of Interest Policy. She believes there is bias in the decisions being made, unequal treatment in the project decision process, and poor practices and procedural issues that will continue without policies in place to prevent them. The group discussed the current voting structure and makeup of the Policy Committee and political influences that have been observed.

Mr. Schurbon explained the options he sees the SRWMO as having: exiting the LSC, continuing to participate for short time to see how what policy changes are adopted, or continuing to participate while seeing if the LSC will transition to a JPE arrangement in the more distant future. He noted if the SRWMO exits the LSC they will be ineligible for grant

funds through them. There are identified opportunities the SRWMO has to apply for LSC grant funding which they would be unable to use however there are other funding options the SRWMO can use. He also explained the group should specify if they will continue to adopt the LSC Management Plan as their guidance document which can be used as a requirement for state funds for future grant applications.

Ms. Kantor asked how other watershed groups are structuring their organizations and Mr. Schurbon explained it was variable. He said there is no required action from the board tonight but they can make a decision if they wanted. Mr. Schurbon has drafted a resolution for the board to use if they so choose.

**Ms. Hegland moved to adopt the draft resolution for the SRWMO to exit the LSC Partnership. Mr. Mager seconded this motion. The motion carried with all in favor.**

B. Linwood Township 22529 Martin Lake Dr stormwater pipe issue

A letter dated September 16, 2022 to the Anoka Conservation District and the Sunrise River WMO, care of Mr. Schurbon, was received from Linwood Township's attorney. The letter was also addressed to Anoka County Environmental Services. This letter and its enclosures were provided to the SRWMO board members on September 27, 2022. The letter concerns a stormwater pipe at 22529 Martin Lake Drive. The letter states the pipe appears to be under the home and has deteriorated. There are questions about solutions and responsibilities. The letter does not ask anything of the Sunrise River WMO. It does request certain information from the ACD and Anoka County about the aforementioned property, stormwater conveyances, and a rain garden. The Anoka County Attorney office has replied to this request for information.

The group asked Mr. Schurbon to send these documents to their attorney so that he is aware of the issue and can provide any advice to the SRWMO that he deems appropriate.

8. Mail

Mail included:

- Brochure from MN Counties Intergovernmental Trust (MCIT) about insurance.

9. Other

10. Invoice(s) approval

A. Recording Secretary services for September 2022 meeting (\$200)

**Mr. Wolens moved to and Ms. Hegland seconded to pay the invoice #90122, payment for \$200. The motion carried with all in favor.**

B. Anoka Conservation District 2022 services invoice 3 of 3 (\$17,975.26)

**Ms. Hegland moved to and Mr. Peterson seconded to pay the invoice #2022038, payment for \$17,975.26. The motion carried with all in favor.**

C. MN Counties Intergovernmental Trust (MCIT) 2023 Insurance

The MCIT insurance rate estimate for 2023 was \$1,774.

**Ms. Hegland moved to and Mr. Wolens seconded to preapprove up to \$2,000 for payment of the 2023 MCIT insurance invoice when received. The motion carried with all in favor.**

11. Adjourn

**Mr. Mager moved to adjourn the meeting and Ms. Hegland seconded this. The motion carried and Ms. Kantor adjourned the meeting at 8:05PM.**

**At 8:05PM Chair Kantor reconvened the meeting.** She described that there are upcoming payments for the SRWMO joint powers amendment process that will need timely payment. **Hegland moved and Harrington seconded to authorize payments not to exceed \$8,000 for the JPA amendment process to Milt Thomas for facilitation, Kennedy and Graven for legal, and Anoka Conservation District for coordination. Motion passed with all in favor.**

**Mager moved and Hegland seconded to adjourn. Motion passed with all in favor.**

Upcoming Meeting Dates: 2023 - January 5, February 2

Submitted by:  
Cameron Blake