

Sunrise River Water Management Organization Meeting  
Thursday March 7, 2019  
6:30 pm at East Bethel City Hall

Present: Chair Babineau, Paul Enestvedt, Leon Mager, Matt Downing, Tim Harrington  
Janet Hegland, Shelly Logren  
Absent: Sandy Flaherty  
Audience: Jamie Schurbon, Anoka Conservation District (ACD)

3. Approval of Agenda **Mr. Mager moved and Ms. Hegland seconded to approve the agenda as presented. Motion carried.**

4. Approval of Minutes **Mr. Downing moved and Mr. Harrington seconded to table the February 21, 2019 minutes until reference to Ms. Logren's discussion on budget and spending is included. Motion carried.**

5. Financial Reports  
A. Treasurer's Report  
Mr. Downing reported the following:  
February beginning balance \$57,008.35  
2 Debits totaling \$19,164.04 (ACD \$18,989.04, Recording Secretary \$175)  
February ending balance: \$37,844.31

Mr. Downing also presented a Budget vs. Actual 2019 year-to-date report.

**Mr. Harrington moved and Mr. Enestvedt seconded to approve the Treasurer's Report as presented. Motion carried.**

B. Current grants financial report from Anoka Conservation District  
Mr. Schurbon reviewed the SRWMO Current Grants Financial Report and noted the SRWMO "Upcoming Projects" line items:

- Watershed Based Funding projects \$8,000.00 for budget year 2018
- Watershed Based Funding projects \$6,589.00 for budget year 2019
- Martin/Typo Carp Harvest \$3,411.00 for budget year 2019
- Martin/Typo Carp Harvest \$1,309.49 for budget year 2016

The "Upcoming Projects" line items did not include the \$3,000 of funds approved for 2019 Martin and Typo Lake carp harvests at the previous meeting. Mr. Schurbon will add this to the report.

6. Unfinished Business  
A. Linwood Lake Carp Management Feasibility Study  
Mr. Mager noted that the preliminary study results show that carp are near the threshold at which lake health is affected. He asked why carp harvests are being pursued when the targeted goal has been reached. Mr. Schurbon responded that the study purpose was to determine carp abundance so an informed decision can be made about whether to pursue carp management. No carp harvests are currently planned. Schurbon noted that Carp Solutions, LLC will attend the next SRWMO meeting, at which time additional discussion can occur.

7. New  
Business

A. Consider joining MN Association of Watershed Districts (MAWD)

At this time MAWD is not a good fit for the SRWMO as there are no employees to attend training provided and the WMO will receive some benefits from MAWD anyway.

B. SRWMO and Rice Creek Watershed District boundary issues

The issue:

- A 2015 the Rice Creek Watershed District (RCWD) initiated a boundary change with the SRWMO. The change focused on only areas draining to Anoka Co Ditches 31 and 46 for the purpose of charging properties for a ditch project. We didn't catch it at the time, but this change created a geographically disconnected area of the Sunrise River WMO - 8 parcels.
- Of the 8 parcels, at least 2 hydrologically drain to the RCWD. Others may drain to the Comfort Lake Forest Lake Watershed District (CLFLWD) or RCWD. None appear to drain to the SRWMO, the organization which they are now within.
- The CLFLWD boundary is the county boundary, and Mr. Schurbon's understanding is that changes that cause the CLFLWD to be in another county or city would not be favored, especially for just a few parcels.
- An examination of these properties might also lead to discovering other boundary edits, particularly between the CLFLWD and RCWD.

What's needed:

A boundary change is warranted. It's inconsistent with watershed management principles to have a geographically discontinuous watershed organization. The boundary amendment process includes:

- Hydrologic study, primarily by GIS and some field visits, to determine appropriate watershed boundaries.
- Petition to BWSR to change the boundary.
- Seek written concurrence from the neighboring watershed organizations.

Who should lead the boundary change?

Any of the three affected watershed organizations could lead the process. Mr. Schurbon asked the RCWD and CLFLWD for their opinions but have not yet received responses. At this point he would consider RCWD to be the central player and likely candidate to lead the process. This is because:

- Some, and maybe all, of the parcels would shift from the SRWMO to RCWD.
- CLFLWD has expressed they do not want to expand into Anoka County for administrative simplicity.
- This process may identify other RCWD boundary changes that are warranted.
- The RCWD has other boundary inconsistencies around Anoka County that might be cleaned up during this process.

Costs:

Preliminarily, Mr. Schurbon estimates that the boundary amendment process could take 20 hours. Costs are likely \$1,500-\$2,200.

When is a boundary update needed?

The update is not needed immediately. Mr. Schurbon believes the SRWMO should prepare its new watershed plan based on the *current* boundaries. A boundary adjustment will take too much time to include in the new SRWMO plan. Updating the boundaries within a few years will probably be enough.

Consequences for residents:

Preliminarily, it looks like at least two of the eight parcels in question would be moved from the SRWMO to the RCWD. They would almost certainly experience a higher tax bill. If they have drainage concerns, they would likely benefit from being in the RCWD because that organization actively manages drainage ways. It's unclear what, if any, water management issues these landowners have.

It was recommended to not act on this matter now and to let discussions with RCWD and CLFLWD continue and to recognize the need for the boundary adjustment in the new SRWMO Plan, including any funding needed (which may not be known for a few months).

Mr. Downing suggested sending a mailing to the property owners to attend a meeting to provide input. When should the letter be sent? Mr. Schurbon will revisit this suggestion at a future meeting when a recommended path forward is known. Ms. Hegland, who is the Columbus city council liaison to Rice Creek, offered to address this item with Rice Creek and report back at the next meeting.

8.  
Watershed  
Management  
Plan  
Update  
Work  
Session

A. Consider approaches to septic systems

Mr. Schurbon presented a spreadsheet showing member communities implementation. Ham Lake and Linwood Township currently do not require point of sale septic system inspections. Mr. Schurbon reached out to those community's staff and received the following feedback:

- Ham Lake staff expressed support. Building Dept. says it does not do it because it has never done it before.
- Linwood Township is in favor of and is trying to get grant money to help with costs.
- East Bethel does not send reminders to homeowners every three years to maintain/pump their septic system. Mr. Schurbon reached out to city staff for feedback. Staff and Mr. Harrington will be discussing the topic.

Discussion followed regarding how to address owners who are not pumping their septic systems. Mr. Schurbon noted that Ham Lake and Columbus send multiple notices and if the owner still fails to maintain their septic system the city can perform the maintenance and bill the expense back to the owner. However, staff from those cities indicated that the situation is almost always addressed through notices alone. Mr. Mager and Chair Babineau expressed concern. Discussion ensued regarding the need for communities to have a way to enforce compliance with septic system pumping requirements in order to avoid public health or environmental health threats. The board directed Schurbon to email draft SRWMO septic system standards to the

member communities' staff again and bring special attention to this provision. Additional comment from communities' staff will be requested.

Ms. Logren asked if unpumped septic systems are contributing to the poor letter grades on lakes. Mr. Schurbon said it can be a contributing factor, and its contribution is estimated in impaired waters TMDL studies. Failing systems also need to be fixed to protect ground water due to leakage.

If SRWMO standards for septic system point of sale inspections, pumping reminders and addressing unpumped systems are in the SRWMO Plan, cities will be responsible for writing it into the city code or ordinance to cover these actions.

#### B. Consider SRWMO development review

Member communities were asked for their opinion on a new process by which the SRWMO would review development sketch plans. SRWMO comments would be non-binding on the community permitting system. All communities had no problem with this. ACD would do the sketch plan reviews on behalf of the SRWMO. Mr. Downing clarified that each member community would bear the cost for its community and that this would not be a shared cost. ACD would bill the respective city for the plan review with no review cost to exceed \$500.

#### C. Implementation plan

- SRWMO Tasks - Tasks were reviewed by category
  - Mr. Downing asked if there should be an attorney present at meetings and if a line item for legal fees should be added. Consensus of the Board was there is no need to have an attorney in attendance at meetings. Mr. Schurbon will ask member communities what legal services the SRWMO should have.
    - Line Item #32 Participate in 1W1P – The One Watershed One Plan could be adopted as the SRWMO's Plan in the future.
    - Line Item #41 Model projects' pollutant reductions - can be rolled into a project so that costs can be covered by grants.
    - Line Item #45 Carp management feasibility and effectiveness studies - needs the wording changed to reflect that a vegetation study is being done on Coon Lake.
- Schedule and costs associated with the tasks were reviewed.
- Estimated carryover funds balance year-by-year through 2029 was reviewed.
- 10-year planned expenditures portrayed in a pie chart were reviewed.
  - Goal is to have 50% of all projects be grant driven
- Sub-table of water monitoring schedule was reviewed.
- Breakout for public outreach was reviewed.
- Member community tasks
  - Board members were asked to review and send comments to Mr. Schurbon
- Estimated community contribution to the SRWMO by year was reviewed.
  - Board members were asked to review with their city/township and send comments to Mr. Schurbon.
- Anoka County Outreach Coordinator support was discussed. Currently the draft

indicates the SRWMO may provide \$2,000-\$5,089 of support per year. Greater funding may be needed. Mr. Schurbon suggested increasing this amount in the draft plan if offsetting cost reductions occur elsewhere that keep overall budgets within goals. There were no objections.

- **Water Monitoring Schedule**

The effectiveness of volunteer monitoring of lake water quality was discussed and whether it would be better to go with a more professional monitoring system. CAMP is a program where the SRWMO sponsors citizens to do monitoring. The cost difference for this type of monitoring is approximately \$500 per lake with CAMP versus having professional monitoring. Also, someone will need to manage the who, what, when, where. Mr. Downing provided pros and cons of citizen and professional monitoring. The board favored professional monitoring of lake water quality. Schurbon will revise the draft Implementation Plan to reflect this. Consensus was to eliminate Island Lake from the water monitoring schedule.

9. Mail           None

10. Other       None

11. Invoice Approval   A. ACD invoice for groundwater video for \$250.00  
**Mr. Downing moved and Mr. Harrington seconded to approve the ACD Invoice for groundwater video for \$250.00. Motion carried.**

B. ACD invoice for Martin and Typo Lakes carp management in 2019 for \$3,000  
**Mr. Downing moved and Mr. Mager seconded to approve the ACD invoice for Martin and Typo Lakes carp management in 2019 for \$3,000.00. Motion carried.**

C. Recording secretary March invoice for \$175.  
**Mr. Downing moved and Mr. Harrington seconded to approve the recording secretary March invoice for \$175.00. Motion carried.**

12. Adjourn       **Mr. Mager moved and Ms. Logren seconded to adjourn at 8:35 pm. Motion carried.**

Gail Gessner, Recording Secretary  
 Submitted via email on 3/21/19