

Middle Fork Crow River Watershed District  
Board of Managers Meeting  
June 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2009  
174 Lake Ave  
Spicer, MN 56288

Present: G. Behm, J. Flanders, R. Zenner, R. Hodapp, and R. Schaefer of the Board; C. Anderson-Administrator; V. Glieden Henjum and S. Jacobson-Staff; A. Ripple-Attorney; T. Bonde-Technical Advisor; J. Michels - EOR, B. Wing – future Board member, J. Kent and C. Kent – Brooten, J. Ruter and J. Peterson - Nest Lake, D. Peterson – Kandiyohi Commissioner, D. Hansen – Kandiyohi SWCD.

1. The meeting was called to order at 7:00 pm by Chairman R. Hodapp.
2. A motion was made by J. Flanders and seconded by R. Zenner to approve the agenda. The motion passed.
3. A motion was made by R. Zenner and seconded by J. Flanders to approve the minutes of the May 5<sup>th</sup> meeting. The motion passed.
4. Treasurers Report was presented by C. Anderson and reviewed by the Board. Income received was noted (general income, permit application fees, Calhoun Lake Association monitoring) as was expenditures (project pay outs, Houston Engineering-TMDL study and RMB Labs). A motion was made by J. Flanders and seconded by R. Schaefer to approve the Treasurers' Report subject to audit. The motion passed.
5. The June Bills to Pay list was reviewed by the Board and presented by C. Anderson. The Cardmember Services bill is larger than usual due to the purchase of monitoring rods and cable equipment (\$4,000), which the WD will apply as cash contribution toward the Clean Water Partnership grant. The Diamond Lake modeling project and April services were paid to Houston Engineering. A motion was made by J. Flanders and seconded by R. Schaefer to approve the June Bills to Pay list. The motion passed.
6. Eagle Scout C. Kent presented his final report on his project in Belgrade. The Board had previously approved staff time and supplies for stormwater drain markers. C. Kent organized 10 other volunteers to mark and map out all 80 stormwater drains within the city limits of Belgrade. GPS was used to locate all stormwater drains. The expected outcome of this project will reduce the amount of sediment and contaminants, which enter the Middle Fork Crow River via stormwater drains. Pictures were presented and the Board thanked and congratulated Chris on his accomplishment.
7. Stormwater management options for the WD area were discussed as a general topic. C. Anderson asked the Board "How do you want to proceed with stormwater management issues on a Watershed District wide basis?" The latest example is of County Road #10; how does the WD proceed when it is not legally able to contribute money to a private property owner for a project that does not have WD wide benefit.

J. Michels-EOR did a walk through of New London and Spicer with C. Anderson and S. Jacobson, noting the number stormwater projects that “could be implemented or better maintained”, were obvious. The lack of street sweeping was evident in the amount of debris in the stormwater drain grids. Currently New London and Spicer sweep their streets two times a year. Cities are lacking sufficient funds to continue street sweeping on a consistent schedule and General WD funds can not be used for maintenance costs.

MN Statute 103D law allows a WD to set up a Stormwater District (SWD) as a separate taxing authority. The City of New London may be interested in the development of a SWD. Some cities use their SWD for their maintenance and management of all stormwater related duties. Creation of a SWD would create another fee to the property owners. A SWD can go beyond city limits and affected Cities would then petition the WD requesting entrance into the SWD. SWD General Funds can be used for maintenance costs and projects costs are assessed to those who benefit.

A. Ripple explained that the process would start with a petition submitted to the WD for the creation of a SWD and signatures would be obtained. J. Michels stated that Project Nemo is developing information on how to access 319 Grant funds for SWD. G. Behm asked, “What are the responsibilities of a SWD”? A. Ripple stated they are similar to a WD, such as BMP projects but the main difference is that “...the SWD funds can be used for maintenance costs”. R. Schaefer stated that seems like a duplication of the WD goals and expressed concern over adding another tax. J. Michels stated, “Currently money is not being spent efficiently with a lack of coordination of services such as street sweeping (coordination of County, Cities of New London and Spicer)”. C. Anderson stated that a hypothetical SWD would include New London, Spicer and all of Green Lake. T. Bonde stated that he was “...Utilities Director of Spicer for years and many stormwater basins do not have catch basins and the correction of these would increase taxes significantly...” He went on note that the majority of water entering Green Lake comes from Nest Lake and not the stormwater culverts. No further action was taken.

## 8. Administrator’s Report

8.a. Review of Calendar-C. Anderson stated he will be on vacation June 11-16<sup>th</sup>.

8.b. Review of Project Status

8.b.1. Nest Lake Petition-Engineer’s Report discussion. The Nest Lake Association has reviewed the Petition process and officially requests that the Petition be tabled for now. J. Ruter stated that the DNR will conduct an Invasive Species Study. The Nest Lake Association will pursue grant possibilities. A motion was made by R. Schaefer and seconded by R. Zenner to table the Nest Lake Petition to the July meeting. The motion passed. One option to keep the project moving for Nest Lake is an offer of a feasibility study. J. Michels-EOR offered this study to review what has been done and determine treatment options of the Curly Leaf Pondweed problem for an estimated cost of \$3000-4000. A. Ripple stated a RFP could be issued if the treatment options were agreed upon by the Lake Association, as it would be a Lake Association project. The WD could be petitioned at a later point in time by the Nest Lake Association.

8.b.2. 319 Stormwater grant update-No samples have been collected recently due to minimal rain events.

8.b.3. Diamond Lake TMDL update- Two streams are dry and equipment problems have been corrected.

8.b.4. New BMP projects-

-Neer Park (City of New London)Shoreland restoration (K-7-09). J. Bergman-NL City Council, T. Guptill City Administrator and WD staff met with J. Michels to inform

Mr. Bergman and Ms. Guptill of the plans to decrease erosion in front of the ski team's grandstand. Possibilities include the use of pea gravel filled socks to stabilize the shoreline and increase vegetation. The polypropylene socks last many years when kept from direct sunlight. J. Bergman and T. Guptill approved of the ideas. Estimated costs are \$22,000-\$25,000, and the City of New London hopes to share the cost between Kandiyohi County, Little Crow Ski Team and others. New London City Council's next meeting is 6-3-09. Over 600 feet of shoreline would need treatment. MPCA funds are one option for funding. A motion was made by R. Zenner and seconded by G. Behm to approve up to 75% of approved costs of K-7-09 pending approval by the New London City Council. The motion passed.

-T. Wermerskichen project K-11-09 for \$9,500 on Monongalia Lake was reviewed. A motion was made by R. Schaefer and seconded by J. Flanders to approve up to 75% of approved cost of the project. The motion passed.

-T. & J. Johnson of Nest Lake project K-12-09 was reviewed. The project cost was estimated at \$15,000. A motion was made by J. Flanders and seconded by R. Schaefer to approve up to 75% of the approved cost. The motion passed. When completed three continuous properties will have shoreline restorations Cassmann, High Point Condos, and Johnson.

-8.b.4.c. Morrison raingarden project in Atwater was presented by C. Anderson. Anderson requested a discussion with the Board regarding the homeowner's desire to implement the rain gardens less than 10 feet away from the house. Ten feet of separation is recommended to avoid the potential for structural problems in a heavy rain event or issues with freezing – the discussion among the Board members revealed reticence to fund a project of this type, and the Board unanimously agreed that no further action would be taken.

-8.b.5. BMP updates/changes

-8.b.5.a. Benston project K-8-09 see photos of project on Nest Lake. V. Glieden Henjum stated that she ran an infiltration test on the garden and it met the criteria of infiltration.

-8.b.5.b. R. Anderson project K-2-09 exclusion fencing and river crossing project. An additional \$900 was needed to complete the project. The project included an extra load of Class 3 riparian aggregate for the bridge work. A motion was made by R. Zenner and seconded by G. Behm to approve the additional expenditure of 75% of the \$900 for K-2-09 project. The motion passed.

-8.b.5.c. J. Smith M-1-09 stream stabilization project. The voucher shows a zero balance due for the property owner because the 25% financial obligation portion was assessed back to all affected property owners by Meeker County.

-8.b.6. SRF loan agreements for BMP implementation of 9 loan agreements:

-K-2-09 R. Anderson (livestock exclusion)

-K-5-09 M. Hodapp-raingarden

-K-6-09 D. & L. Cassman-shoreline restoration

-K-8-09 Benston-raingarden

-K-9-09 S. Wright-shoreline restoration

-K-10-09 High Point Condominiums-shoreline restoration

-K-12-09 J. Johnson shoreline restoration

A motion was made by R. Zenner and seconded by J. Flanders to approve all 9 SRF loan agreements. The motion passed.

8. c. Administrative matters:

8.c.1. CWP Continuation Grant- the State of MN has offered the Watershed District the opportunity to continue the Clean Water Partnership activities another three years. The deadline for the proposal is June 15, 2009. A motion was made by R. Schaefer and seconded by G. Behm to designate C.

Anderson as the Project Representative and to pursue the CWP Continuation grant as stated in pending guidelines. The motion passed. This extension will allow for more SRF to flow through the CWP grant.

8.c.2. Intensive Watershed Monitoring-a new program by the MPCA has divide the State into 81 different watersheds, water bodies within each watershed will be assessed on a 10 year cycle. The program started in 2008, and will provide more specific biological information for each watershed. MPCA asked each watershed area to provide two different projects specific to their area in need of treatment. Several ideas were discussed (Alvig Slough, Green Lake Inlet project, or County Road 10 project). Project costs were to be less than \$500,000. The three projects discussed could cost up to an estimated \$900,000. C. Anderson will update the Board upon further review of MPCA.

8. c.3. WD Property Insurance was renewed.

8. c.4. Permit request approved by C. Anderson was Permit #09-06.

8. c.5. WD vehicle was involved in a minor accident resulting in a tailgate dent. The Board decided to not correct the dent. Ways in which the incident can be avoided were discussed.

8. d. Follow up on the May meeting:

8. d.1. Office space- R. Schaefer contacted area realty business to inquire about larger space options. She will provide further information at the next meeting.

8. d. 2. Additional June payments:

K-2-08 \$14,785.10 City of New London

K-8-09 \$993.73 Bentson

K-2-09 \$3100.77 Anderson

K-3-09 \$448.63 Ambourn

K-5-09 \$1157.75 Hodapp

K-6-09 \$3750.00 Cassmann

K-9-09 \$1556.75 Wright

K-10-09 \$4500.00 High Point Condominium

8. d. 3 Volunteer Monitoring Grant-A motion was made by J. Flanders and seconded by R. Zenner to approve up to \$1500 to pay for Volunteer Monitoring costs prior to the expiration of the grant. The motion passed.

9. Legal Counsel-A. Ripple stated that the WD Board could schedule a closed meeting for the intent of discussing private purchase offering if it chose to buy office space.

As no other business was presented, a motion was made by J. Flanders and seconded by R. Zenner to adjourn the meeting. The motion passed and the meeting was closed at 9:10 pm.

Submitted by,

Ruth Schaefer  
Secretary  
6-30-09