Middle Fork Crow River Watershed District  
Board of Managers Meeting  
September 12th, 2012  
174 Lake Avenue North  
Spicer MN 56288  


A Public Hearing was held prior to the Board of Managers meeting for the purpose of the 2013 Budget Hearing. The hearing was called to order by Chairman R. Hodapp at 6:45 pm. The budget was reviewed and discussed by the Board. No public comment was offered. A motion was made by J. Flanders and seconded by G. Behm to approve the 2013 budget; the motion passed 5-0. The Public Hearing closed at 6:59 pm.  

1. The meeting was called to order by R. Hodapp at 7:00 pm.  
2 The District Mission Statement “We exist for the protection and preservation of water quality in the Middle Fork Crow River Watershed” was read by R. Hodapp.  
3. A motion was made by J. Flanders and seconded by B. Wing to approve the agenda. The motion passed 5-0.  

CONSENT AGENDA  
4. Approve the August 7th meeting minutes.  
5. Treasurer’s report  
6. September bills to pay.  
7. Permit 12-16 Baghani  

A motion was made by G. Behm and seconded by J. Flanders to approve the Consent Agenda. The motion passed 5-0  

REGULAR AGENDA  
8. Building financing: David Drown presented the revised plan for the financing of the new building. See document. Dorsey & Whitney are the bond attorneys involved in this project. Construction will begin this spring and the financing process will proceed as stated in the document.  
  8.a. Resolution #12-09: Bond Resolution for office construction- A motion was made by B. Wing and seconded by G. Behm to approve Resolution #12-09; the motion passed 5-0.  
9. Nest Lake Aquatic Plant Management 2013 Budget-C. Anderson presented the process used to develop the 2013 budget (see document) and this was reviewed with the Board. A motion was made by J. Flanders and seconded by B. Wing to approve the 2013 Nest Lake Aquatic Plant Management Budget. The motion passed 5-0.  
10. Administrator’s Report:  
  10.b. Review of Project Status  
  10.b.1. Rain Barrel Program-results/update-107 people signed up for a cost share agreement and 20 are on a waiting list for a rain barrel. 101 barrels were sold on a cost share with the property owners paying $25 each for a regularly priced $200 barrel.  
  10.b.2. BWSR Green Lake Stormwater Project-The retrofitting project received $252,000 grant funds. Local contributions must cover 25% of the total overall grant. C. Anderson met with Irving
Township Board members about a possible curb cut raingarden on township land. Township Board members expressed their unofficial support for the project concept, making clear 3 points:

1. The township has limited funds.
2. The township does not have the means to provide maintenance
3. The township requests that the access to the lake not be limited.

C. Anderson was asked to attend the township meeting on Sep 18 to provide more information and determine if the Board is officially interested in the project.

10.b.3. MWRPP Public Meeting—see previous notes.

10.c. Administrative Matters

10.c.1. Check issued for Rain Barrel Program: A check was issued for $4950. The rain barrel company required 50% down payment prior to shipping.

10.c.2. CROW River Cleanup—donation request—A motion was made by B. Wing and seconded by G. Behm to approve up to $300 for the Clean up the Crow River Project. The motion passed 5-0.

10.c.3. USGS Gaging Station Cost Share—C. Anderson will check with the DNR to seek assistance for future cost share agreements. A motion was made by G. Behm and seconded by J. Flanders to approve up to $8,100 for the USGS gaging station for new contract. The motion passed 5-0.

10.c.4. Workers Compensation Insurance Renewal—A motion was made by J. Flanders and seconded by B. Wing to renew the Workers Compensation plan for $939. The motion passed 5-0.

10.c.5. K-1-12: City of Spicer Update and Voucher—Installation of a grit chamber on Kevin Drive which was for $26,584. The WD contribution will be $19,038 (319 funds and BWSR Green Lake Stormwater funds). A motion to approve contract K-1-12 City of Spicer was made by J. Flanders and seconded by B. Wing; the motion passed 5-0.

10.c.6. K-5-12: Lykken Shoreline Update and Voucher—V. Glieden-Henjum presented the shoreline restoration project which cost $7850 with WD contribution of $5889 (BWSR Shoreline funds). The property owners paid $2000. A motion was made by B. Wing and seconded by G. Behm to approve contract K-5-12; the motion passed 5-0. See photos.

10.c.7. K-6-12: Meier Raingarden Update and Voucher—Cost of the project was $9,050 with the WD contribution of $5237 (319 funds). The WD partnered with SWCD on this project—SWCD provided $1550 and provided technical assistance. A motion was made by J. Flanders and seconded by G. Behm to approve contract K-6-12; the motion passed 5-0.

10.c.8. K-7-12: Dybvik Shoreline improvements—A motion to approve contract K-7-12 for the amount of $2268.56 was made by J. Flanders and seconded by B. Wing; the motion passed 5-0.

10.c.9. K-8-12: Brekke Shoreline improvements—A motion was made by J. Flanders and seconded by B. Wing to approve contract K-8-12; the motion passed 5-0.

10.d. Follow-up on August administrative matters

10.d.1. Request for Program Funds: Calhoun Lake Association County Ditch 26 project is still in need of further meetings with representatives from the Lake Association, NRCS and SWCD to determine which organization can and will take the financial lead.

10.d.2. New building update—C. Anderson and G. Behm met with the City of Spicer to determine the status of the utilities to the property. Status is still pending.

10.d.3. K-1-08 Michaelis Shoreline update—J. Kolb presented the legal process of follow up of the breach of contract K-1-08. See document. The Board chose the next WD Board meeting of October 2nd at 7:15 pm for the Michaelis’ to appear before the Board in a Show-Cause Hearing.

10.d.4. K-6-09 Cassmann Shoreline update—V. Glieden-Henjum presented an overview of recent conversations. At our last meeting the Cassman’s were present and stated they would restore the project as the contract stated and pursue a maintenance agreement with a local company. The project site is “physically too difficult for us to maintain”. More recent conversations noted no
agreement is in place and the owners have declined all estimates presented to them. Financial options were reviewed and the Board asked V. Glieden-Henjum to contact the property owners again and explain the cost of proceeding with restoration and maintenance costs vs. the cost of repayment to the WD if the project is not restored.


12. Public Access Forum-C. Burmeister stated that this was his first WD meeting and “I am impressed with all that you’re doing, thank you”

13. A motion to adjourn was made by J. Flanders and seconded by B. Wing. The motion passed 5-0 and the meeting adjourned at 8:52 pm.

Submitted by,
Ruth Schaefer
Secretary