

**MIDDLE FORK CROW RIVER WATERSHED DISTRICT
BOARD OF MANAGERS MEETING
Monday, February 5, 2018, 6:30 p.m.
MFCRWD Office, 189 County Road NE, Spicer, MN**

Present: B. Wing, J. Hedtke, R. Schaefer-Board; M. Johnson, J. Morales, D. Erickson-Staff; J. Kolb-legal, R. Imdieke, B. Larson-County Commissioners. Absent: G. Behm, R. Hodapp.

1. V. President B. Wing called the meeting to order at 6:30 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 V. President B. Wing.
3. Motion to approve the Agenda was made by J. Hedtke, second by R. Schaefer. Motion passed 3-0.

CONSENT AGENDA

(The consent agenda is considered as one item of business. It consists of routine administrative items or items not requiring discussion. Items can be removed from the consent agenda at the request of a Board member).

4. Approve the minutes of the January 2, 2018
5. Treasurer's Report
6. Margaret Johnson – Performance Review

Motion to approve the Consent Agenda made by R. Schaefer, second by J. Hedtke. Motion passed 3-0.

REGULAR AGENDA

7. Administrator's Report:
 - a. Review Calendar -No calendar
 - b. Review of Project Status
 1. Diamond Lake TMDL Implementation, Hubbard, Schultz, and Wheeler
Implementation Activity CIP #13-02 A Technical meeting was held at the WD last week to discuss the next steps. Starting tomorrow, channeling will be implemented to increase the length of the channel and increase the flow. J. Hedtke stated he visited the site and the flow has slowed down. The culvert has been cleaned out and the flow did increase. Time lapse video is occurring and will be available to the Board next month. Safety signs were placed in the open water areas, as suggested last month by J. Hedtke.
 2. North Fork One Watershed One Plan -
 - a. Formal Review and Public Hearing, Public Comment -M. Johnson collaborated with Kandiyohi County and the SWCD to coordinate a Public meeting. The public meeting must be 14 days after the formal review process. Comments made will be addressed at the meeting. Potential meeting date could be late April. This will be a formal Public Meeting held in Litchfield, Meeker County. The informal meeting will be first, then the Public Meeting. Dates will be determined at the Policy meeting.
 - b. January 17, 2018 – Special Meeting Minutes-Release the Plan- The WD Special meeting was reviewed. The designated MFCRWD representative was declared. See minutes. Agreement on the Joint Hearing Plan was discussed. A motion to approve the minutes made by J. Hedtke, second by R. Schaefer. Motion passed 3-0.
 3. Elkhorn Lake Association Establishment- J. Morales, reported on a September DNR vegetation survey of Elkhorn lake. This survey, identified Eurasian Watermilfoil, which prompted the Kandiyohi County AIS Task Force to place

identification door hangers on all property owner's doors. Residents: G. Chetrit, M. & M. Williamson met with J. Morales to discuss lake management options. The potential establishment of a lake association with bylaws will be discussed at a February 22nd, meeting. The Eurasian Watermilfoil is isolated to the bay area and not wide spread at this time.

4. George Lake Board – Lake Management Plans-Will meet on April 28th meet at the Decisions Hill Prairie Restoration will present information on Shoreline Management options.

8. Administrative matters

- a. Manager Appointment Expiration April 2018: J. Hedtke-technically is finishing J. Flanders last year of a three-year term. M. Johnson will send a letter to Meeker County and J. Kolb suggested that the letter state the Boards desire for J. Hedtke to continue to represent Meeker County, if that is his desire. J. Hedtke, stated he was interested in another term. The final decision is made by the Meeker County Commissioners.

- b. Clean Water Fund Project Implementation Funding -The BWSR Board met and approved their projects to be funded; the CD 47 Meeker County Project was not approved. If this project is deemed important by this Board and consistent with their Comprehensive Plan, then funding would be the next step. J. Kolb presented four options for funding such a project:

-Benefits Land Assessment-This is a challenging because it is difficult to determine a property value benefit for a water quality project of this type. Further, this option will require the involvement of appraisers (at added expense) and involve the county auditors and assessors preparing and maintaining assessment rolls.

-Water Management District Charge-This charge would be assessed for run off, erosion control and pollutant loading. It is a charge to properties contributing to the need for the project (usually based on a subwatershed). Establishment of Water Management Districts requires a plan amendment with specific language related to the purpose, amount and duration of the charges, along with a justification of the basis of the charges. The process adds administrative expenses related to the plan amendment and engineering expenses related to the basis of the charges and determining the extent of the management district. The WD would determine an amount and those charges would be collected. This would also involve the county auditors and assessors.

-Allocation from the general fund (ad valorem tax)- this would involve allocating a portion of the general fund levy over time to a project fund. The overall project could be broken down to smaller projects, which could be implemented over time as funds are available. The allocated funds could be combined with other funds that might become available for the project, including county contributions.

-State Revolving Fund (CWP Loan) (repaid with additional ad valorem tax)- Here you could use the current CWP loan at 0% with a 15 year payback to fund the entire project immediately or over time. With your additional ad valorem authority under 103D.905, subd. 9 to repay CWP loans, you could, annually until paid off, increase your ad valorem levy to repay the loan. Again, the project could be done all at once or could be broken down to smaller projects, which could be implemented over time. The Board asked M. Johnson to obtain more information on this type of funding.

1. CD 47 See above discussion. If the Counties were to be asked for funding, this would need to occur soon as Meeker and Kandiyohi County do their budgets in June. Neither County Commissioner thought on going contributions would be feasible.

2. City of New London -The City of New London is also discussing grant options for their street repair and possible implementation of water quality projects. A portion of such projects could be paid under the same mechanisms described above.

c. Stream site MFC4 – equipment needs. J. Morales reported that the current equipment has been in use since 2005. The monitoring of this gauge involves a physical on-site reading, adding to staff time and travel. Troubleshooting the equipment is problematic. Some of the costs of an upgrade would be: \$3500-the bubbler; \$3500-the Sutron satellite link; \$600-the antenna; \$300 rain gauge and \$1500 for the enclosure. See form for complete list which totals \$16, 225. The start-up costs for data work up would be \$2700, installation cost \$3,625. If approved, then equipment would be purchased and be ready for use this spring. Results would be incorporated on the cooperative stream gauging site which is sponsored by MPCA and DNR. No annual cost for this WD. Motion was made by R. Schaefer to approve \$16,225 for the monitoring system, second by J. Hedtke. Motion passed 3-0. R. Schaefer asked that data gained be shared with the public, for educational purposes and a resource.

See the following website for more information. www.dnr.state.mn.us/waters/csg/index.html

J. Morales reported on a discussion of water trails, which included B. Fischer-Willmar Convention Center. DNR- J. Losinski has offered river access down by Goat Ridge in New London. The river paddle could be educational on water quality issues. A real time read out could be used by staff for monitoring tasks and by water trails visitors. K. Johnson owns the covered bridge and is willing to discuss an easement. R. Imdieke asked about an easy way to determine safe water levels for a river paddle. The Board discussed the need to adhere to the mission statement of the WD as it relates to water quality and not purely recreation. The WD can partner with local organization/LGU's who could provide the recreational component.

- d. Board Quarterly workshops -The first workshop is rescheduled to March 6th, 5:45- 6:30 pm. Hydrologist Ethan Jenzen, will be the speaker. The second workshop will be May 1st.
- e. Earth Day Donation to PWELC April 21st. Motion to approve a \$400 donation for Earth Day was made by J. Hedtke, seconded by R. Schaefer. Motion passed 3-0.
- f. Legislative Days – March 7th & 8th -Board members in attendance are B. Wing and R. Schaefer; J. Hedtke is undecided.

- 1. MAWD Legislative Priorities-The Board discussed the open meeting law and funding issues.
- 2. Electronic Meeting Attendance Survey was conducted by MAWD and the results were reviewed by the Board. See survey results.

g. Follow up on December administrative matters- Park Lane Project-J. Kolb reported that the City of Spicer holds the easement. The easement area was 14 feet at its narrowest and 22 feet at the widest point. WD provided funding for the BMP and via a Memorandum of Understanding, the WD agreed to manual maintenance of the project. Major/mechanical maintenance is the City of Spicer's responsibility. He also stated that he has not seen the 319 Agreement, more specific information is needed. The Board discusses the WD role/obligation in this project. J. Kolb reported that "If the easement is being encroached upon, then the City would need to proceed". The WD does not hold the easement, therefore cannot enforce the easement. The WD may not be able to hold up their portion of the agreement if the City is not able to uphold their portion of the agreement. It was recommended to the Board that the City of Spicer should either, enforce the easement or release the WD from their responsibilities. M. Johnson and J. Kolb will create a letter to the City.

9. Legal Counsel Report-None.

10. Public Access Forum-No comments.

11. A motion was by J. Hedtke to adjourn the meeting, seconded by R. Schaefer. The motion passed 3-0 and the meeting ended at 8:18 pm.

Submitted by,

Ruth Schaefer
Secretary