

MIDDLE FORK CROW RIVER WATERSHED DISTRICT

April 20, 2006

Regular Meeting 7:00 pm

Bell Tower Plaza

118 Lake Ave. N.

Spicer, MN 56288

PRESENT: Robert Zenner, Robert Hodapp, Gordy Behm, Joseph Flanders and Ruth Schaefer of the Board; Tom Fischer-BWSR, Kurt Deter-Attorney, Maggie Leach-MPCA, Julie Klocker-Administrator of Sauk River Watershed District, Dennis Peterson-Kandiyohi County Commissioner, Tom Bonde-Technical Advisor, Ann Latham-Administrative Assistant, Matthew Johnson-Mid MN Development Commission and Blair Hagen and Rod Hughes of Spicer.

The regular meeting was called to order by Chairman, Robert Hodapp at 7:00 pm.

Old Business:

1. A motion was made by R. Zenner and seconded by G. Behm to revise the agenda by adding - # 9 Environmental Services Report for Stearns County-R. Zenner. The motion passed.
2. A motion was made by G. Behm and seconded by R. Zenner to amend the minutes of the 3-16-06 meeting by deleting T. Fischer's name from the attendance roster. The motion passed.
- 3. Treasurers Report-Gordy Behm-see attached report**
A motion was made by J. Flanders and seconded by R. Schaefer to approve the treasurer's report subject to audit. The motion passed.
4. A motion was made by G. Behm and seconded by R. Zenner to approve payment of the April bills. The motion passed.

NEW BUSINESS:

5. M. Johnson-MMDC -Comprehensive Plan update:

5.1 Technical Committee update- The Water Plan Technical Committee listing was revised to add Todd Kolander, Regional Environmental Director of the DNR and Wayne Cymbalek of Stearns County Environmental Services.

5.2 April 6, 2006 Technical Committee meeting summary was reviewed and discussed :(see attached form).

TC#2-"Write a 10 year plan with a 5 year implementation focus" was discussed. T. Fischer stated that BWSR will approve a 10 year plan with implementation of a 5 year update. The 5 year update would be a separate chapter within your overall plan. R. Zenner asked, if it was less expensive to write a 10 year plan vs a 5 year plan. M.

Johnson stated that most of the Plan doesn't change. You do have the flexibility to change your priorities based on funds available or project needs. A. Latham asked, what is required to change a Plan or update the Plan. M. Johnson stated that public meetings would need to be held and your document would need to list the changes made. R. Schaefer asked J. Klockner, how often SRWD changes your Plan. J. Klockner stated that, SRWD doesn't change their Plan very often. A motion was made by R. Zenner and seconded by G. Behm to adopt a 10 year plan with a 5 year implementation focus. The motion passed.

TC #3 TMDL-The standards is still being formulated and the WD will need to follow the TMDL standards at some point in time. M. Leach stated that MPCA will be updating the 303 d list every 2 years on even years. In 2007 the next assessment will be developed for 2008.

TC #4 Stormwater Management

4. a. Permitting- The issue of permitting will be an important one for the WD. R. Zenner asked if all counties are permitting their residents. T. Fischer stated that Buffalo Creek WD is regulating/permitting tile intakes as requests for maintenance come before their Board. Their WD is not allowing open inlets anymore and they are moving towards French drains. R. Hughes asked if farmers would be helped more by education rather than creating another set of rules?

4. D Stormwater Management-It was decided after much discussion of the complexities of Stormwater management that a subcommittee will be formed to address specific issues. K. Deter requested that "information updates are made available prior to the meetings so that everyone can learn the issues and terms ahead of time. M. Johnson agreed that the terminology is difficult and an in-service maybe beneficial.

K. Deter suggested that M. Johnson create a draft of this information that the Board can review and edit as needed. M. Johnson agreed that documentation would be made available. R. Schaefer requested that M. Johnson set up in-services prior to the Technical Committee meetings or incorporate an in-service into the Technical meetings.

R. Zenner asked J. Klockner if SRWD has impaired lakes. J. Klockner explained that, SRWD does have many impaired lakes; she is hopeful that one lake may be working its way off of the impaired list for its specific pollutant.

TC #7. Identification of Critical areas will need to be done first. Dividing the WD into sub-watershed areas may allow for funding to be more specific to a project.

TC #8. - Work with the Conservation Reserve Program (CRP) if other agencies are addressing this topic sufficiently then the WD can focus on other areas. J. Klockner stated that the SRWD provides money to all "new enrollees" for the buffer strip program. This is an example of not duplicating an existing program but providing greater incentive for that program.

TC# 9. USFWS-This agency has money to do a wetlands restoration project that the WD could become a partner. S. Erickson of USFWS is interested in partnering with the WD.

TC# 10 Certified Erosion Control Staff will need to be hired by either the WD or local counties.

5.3 PRIORITY GOAL AREAS -See attached form. The summary sheet of possible priorities was reviewed:

5.3.1. Reduce Priority Pollutants-A. Latham asked what the difference between a priority and a goal. M. Johnson stated that was listed on an earlier handout. R. Schaefer asked if "sewer district expansion" is part of the WD responsibilities.

5.3.2. Watershed Accountability- the WD will be responsible for these resources. J. Klocker stated that "Administrative and financial accountability is important within her WD". This was discussed amongst the board and agreement was reached that this is an important issue and will be added to the list.

Further review of this list was tabled till the next meeting. The priority goals will need to be discussed further. R. Schaefer asked M. Johnson, when the next meeting was scheduled as she would like to attend. T. Bonde asked "if it is necessary for Board members to attend the Technical Committee meetings?" K. Deter suggested the M. Johnson summarize the meetings and provide minutes to the Board members so that if they disagree with any part of the discussion/priorities they can intervene at that point. The next meeting was scheduled for May 4th at 1:30 at Bell Tower Plaza. M Johnson will send out a notice to all Technical Committee members and a notice will be posted at the WD office. A. Latham will fax all county commissioners.

6. J. Klocker-Sauk River Watershed District Administrator.

A presentation was provided of the SRWD which is 1000 square miles and is divided into 10 sub-watershed management districts. The Board consists of 9 members and the other staff includes: an administrator, 3 year around staff (handle field operations, organizes BMP & street sweepers, feedlot inspections meetings monitoring and assessments) and 2 summer interns (monitor 26 river sites and 22 lakes).

J. Klocker stated that the initial outline being proposed by MFCRWD is good, sometimes being less specific is better, then you can actually check off what is done. It is good idea to review your plan on a regular basis, but on a minimum every 5 years.

The plan needs to allow for accomplishments with other agencies; by partnering you can work with more people while using less WD resources. A. Latham asked, "How do you write partnering into your plan?" J. Klocker stated, "Writing is the easy part. I ask different agencies what grant money is available to their agency and then explore ways in which our WD can partner into that project. There is grant money is available and when we find it we use it!" It is important for the WD reach out to all areas; all residents pay into the District and all residents should receive benefit.

SRWD is well documented with pictures taken by staff that can be used later for educational purposes. Lynn Nelson provides the lake analysis for the SRWD. Sauk Lake has been cutting weeds for 16 years with little or no improvement. G. Behm stated that Diamond Lake does feel that their weed cutting program has been helpful.

It is important to establish a volunteer group to assist in any way possible it will allow for greater involvement and stretch your resources. Another idea is to establish "greenway plans" by setting up a map of protected areas. This will protect areas of land for future generations.

Another financial option is the Survey and Data Acquisition Fund. A WD can levy once every 5 years for money (.284 of market value) to be used in the acquisition of

data. Some WD uses the funds for monitoring or gauge stations. For example, an anchor monitoring stations is a permanent station, which measures each sub-watershed district area. This allows the SRWD to calculate the amount of flow throughout their entire WD. In the SRWD, \$100,000-\$125,000 is spent on monitoring alone. J. Klocker and L. Nelson wrote 5 grants, each grant included a plan for monitoring and BMP's along with education.

J. Klocker is also the Certified Erosion Control person. Unfortunately she is in the office most of the time and not in the field. It is important that your staff actually can do their jobs as written.

J. Klocker suggested that MFCRWD use the term "impaired water" rather than TMDL's as stated on our outline. By using the TMDL you will limit your actions available to you. By using the term "impaired water" you then can act on the specific problem creating the impairment (ex. phosphorus or mercury). M. Leach stated the 2005 data report from S. Wright and B. Wilson will help because the TMDL information is listed within the document.

The SRWD created a cheat sheet that lists "fiscal authority, managing authority, inspection authority, technical advisor" for all possible situations. This guides the WD through various tasks to keep everyone functioning in their own of jurisdiction. T. Fischer asked if the SRWD does "Annual Plan List"; J. Klocker stated that they do not, they use benchmark areas and try to follow them throughout the year."

7. Water Monitoring update-R. Schaefer

7.1 Josh Reed-NFCRWD has started monitoring our District. The Board discussed the need to expand monitoring sites in the Diamond Lake area. T. Bonde suggested the "Wheeler inlet and another site". As Diamond Lake is listed as an impaired lake a motion was made by R. Schaefer and seconded by R. Zenner, for "The WD to add 2 sites on Diamond Lake to our list of monitoring sites for 2006". The motion passed. R. Schaefer and T. Bonde will discuss this further with J. Reed.

7.2 T. Bonde reported on the USGS email stating the costs of reactivating the CR #2 flow gauge. See attached email. R. Zenner asked why it is important for the WD to know this data. T. Bonde stated that the WD needs to know the flow of water going through the WD area in order to estimate the amount of phosphorus. The two main things to know are: 1) amount of water in your District, and 2) chemical analysis of the water. The Board decided that more information is needed before a decision can be made and this issue will need to be tabled to the next meeting. If a decision needs to be made sooner then a special meeting would need to be called.

8. Office update- A. Latham

8.1 No action needed.

8.2 MN Waters membership is expiring soon. The majority of the Board felt that the newsletter is informational and would like it continued. Unread newsletters could be given to the Citizens Advisory Committee. A motion was made by R. Zenner and seconded by R. Schaefer to renew the membership to MN Waters allowing all managers to receive a copy of the newsletter. The motion passed.

8.3 Grant County did a great job of partnering with all area agencies.

8.4 In the office filing cabinet, each manager will find their specific information on renewal of their term. Managers should keep in mind the time frame for their home county to post their position and vote on renewal.

8.5 The Board discussed the offer made by Harley Miller of Shell Rock WD to speak with the Board. The Board decided to revisit this offer at a later date.

8.6 No action needed.

8.7 A. Latham would like to create a letter of commendation for the City of New London in their approval of a DNR grant for landscaping of the Mill Pond Park. A. Latham asked if any Board members would assist in the planting process. R. Schaefer volunteered to attend. A. Latham will find out further information.

8.8 Citizens Advisory Committees will be convened after the Board is further along with the Plan.

8.9 No action needed.

9. Environmental Services Report- R. Zenner attended the Stearns County Environmental Services meeting and provided a packet of information for the Board to review. Stearns County does have grant money available. R. Schaefer has the packet now and the matter will be discussed further at the May meeting.

As no further information was presented a motion to adjourn was given by J. Flanders and seconded by G. Behm. The motion passed and the meeting ended at 10:00 pm.

Submitted by,

Ruth Schaefer
Secretary