



# 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 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