

Sunrise River Water Management Organization Meeting
Thursday April 4, 2019
6:30 pm at East Bethel City Hall

Present: Chair Dan Babineau, Paul Enestvedt, Leon Mager, Matt Downing, Sandy Flaherty, Tim Harrington, Shelly Logren
Absent: Janet Hegland
Audience: Jamie Schurbon, Anoka Conservation District (ACD)
Jordan Wein, Carp Solutions LLC
Suzanne Erkel, East Bethel City Council member
Randy Plaisance, East Bethel City Council member
Bob Nygaard, Linwood Lake Association member
Jim Smith, East Bethel resident
John Genser, [East Bethel resident](#)

3. Approval of Agenda **Mr. Harrington moved and Mr. Downing seconded to approve the agenda with the addition of the approval of the February 21, 2019 minutes under item #4. Motion carried.**

4. Approval of Minutes **Mr. Downing moved and Mr. Harrington seconded to approve the February 21, March 7, 2019 minutes as amended. Motion carried.**

Mr. Harrington moved and Mr. Enestvedt seconded to approve the March 7, 2019 minutes as written. Motion carried.

6. Carp Solutions LLC presentation – results of work at SRWMO lakes Item #6 was moved up in the agenda order.

Mr. Wein of Carp Solutions, LLC gave a presentation on what the company is working to provide to the Sunrise Watershed.

There are four (4) objectives the company is working on at Linwood Lake:

1. Carp bio-mass/population estimate
2. Determination of carp age to learn how often carp are recruiting
3. Assessment of potential nurseries and identify where carp are moving into and having young
4. Implantation of radio trackers to see where carp are traveling

Electro fishing survey showed the average size carp is 24" and 7 lbs. Based on median age 1/3 are 14-29 years old and 2/3 (65%) are from the last decade and are less than 10 years old. This type of information helps when requesting habitat grants.

Right now the carp population is sitting just above the desired management threshold. Because of the young carp population and recent carp spawning success, the carp may be positioned for significant carp increases soon. Carp removals may be warranted to prevent additional carp population increases. It can be difficult to reduce carp to desirable levels when populations become very high. Moreover, by the time clarity and phosphorus changes are noticed the carp population has already increased to a level that significant measures are needed for their control.

The company hopes to check Linwood Lake soon for radio tagged carp to see where they are located. When the carp were checked via telemetry in mid-February most were found in two areas..

Mr. Wein stated that pound per pound, carp management is the cheapest way to remove/limit carp from the lake. While predatory fish can help control carp, a robust panfish population is most helpful as those fish eat carp eggs. Once carp reach a modest size, they do not have any meaningful predators.

It was asked whether bow fishing affects carp numbers. Mr. Wein responded that the impact is insignificant.

The population of carp in Boot Lake was discussed. The number of carp in Boot Lake is unknown. Any radio tagged carp that move from Linwood Lake to Boot Lake will be noted. Rice Lake, upstream of Boot Lake, could be a possible carp nursery.

It was asked whether the impact of carp on lake water quality and vegetation is being monitored. Mr. Schurbon responded that lake water quality is regularly monitored. Mr. Wein responded that the DNR does aquatic plant surveying/vegetation mapping on occasion, but Carp Solutions, LLC does not.

It was asked if there is any history of a lake with carp control being moved out of the impaired designation. Discussion included that it has contributed to removing lakes from the impaired waters list.

Next steps at Linwood Lake include:

- Continued radio tracking carp.
- Test baiting carp in 2019 to see if baited box nets are a viable carp removal option.
- Final report in fall 2019.

Discussion shifted to Martin and Typo Lakes. The plan is to continue carp management in Martin and Typo Lakes through 2019.

5. Financial Reports

A. Treasurer's Report

Mr. Downing reported the following:

April beginning balance	\$38,019.31
Deposits totaling	+ \$25,407.51
Payments made	- <u>\$ 3,600.00</u>
February ending balance:	\$59,826.82

Mr. Downing noted that the only change on the Budget vs. Actual 2019 year-to-date report was the recording secretary fee.

Mr. Mager 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 following change from last month's report: Added \$3,000 for carp harvests to the bottom line of the report, consistent with the February 2019 SRWMO Board action.

7. Unfinished Business**A. Update on SRWMO and Rice Creek Watershed District boundary**

At the last SRWMO meeting it was discussed that a 2015 Rice Creek Watershed District (RCWD) boundary change inadvertently created a geographically disconnected area of the Sunrise River WMO of 8 parcels. Since that time RCWD's consultant had contacted Mr. Schurbon. RCWD's consultant has been charged with comparing hydrologic and jurisdictional boundaries between the SRWMO and RCWD. These actions may lead to a formal boundary change between the organizations. The SRWMO would have a chance to review and concur with any such change.

B. 2020 budget

Linwood and Columbus both have approved the 2020 budget, East Bethel has tabled this item to its next meeting, and Ham Lake's status is unknown.

Suzanne Erkel, East Bethel City Council member, asked if any work done by the SRWMO is paid for by grants and donations? The answer was yes, both.

Ms. Erkel questioned why taxpayers should be paying for the website and outreach items including a booth display, newsletters and elected officials tour of projects? Various members in attendance contributed to the discussion, noting that these items are not eligible for most grants, are required by the State, or are part of efforts to inform the public. Because resident actions affect water resources, outreach and education is part of SRWMO activities. It was further discussed that the SRWMO's budget is lean compared to other watershed organizations, and the SRWMO has a track record of cutting and minimizing costs.

Ms. Erkel asked who is being paid to do the website? The SRWMO has no staff, and the Anoka Conservation District (ACD) is contracted to host and operate the website, as well as perform day-to-day management of other SRWMO programs. Ms. Erkel noted that the ACD is a government entity and wondered why the SRWMO would pay another government entity. Mr. Downing noted that ACD is a government agency but does not have taxing authority. ACD charges fees for certain services provided to others.

Ms. Erkel further asked for more information on the need for a booth display, newsletter, and tour. It was explained that the booth display is used at many events and meetings to provide more information about the SRWMO, the newsletter is used as an educational tool to reach residents, and the tour is to let member communities and lake associations know what is being done and how the SRWMO can help and educate the public.

Ms. Erkel questioned the cost of a tour of projects. Board members responded that the bulk of the tour money goes toward bussing (there is not much room for multiple vehicle parking at many of the places visited), coordination of the tours and mailings. It was noted that many of the speakers at the last tour were volunteers from lake associations. Tours are not an annual event.

8. New
Business

There was no new business.

9. Watershed
Management
Plan Update
Work Session

A. Septic system standards – review communities staff comments

At the last SRWMO meeting some board members expressed reservations about having a requirement that cities pump septic systems where the owner has failed to do so after three notices. As directed, Mr. Schurbon got additional feedback from community staff. Staff from East Bethel and Ham Lake communicated that they thought the intention of the requirement was good but would be difficult to implement for legal and other reasons. Mr. Schurbon recommended that based on this feedback the SRWMO should delete the provision in question from its draft standards.

Mr. Mager moved and Mr. Harrington seconded to remove action taken after a third notice is sent to property owners in the Septic System Standards. Motion carried.

B. Attorney services - review communities staff comments

At the last SRWMO meeting it was discussed whether the SRWMO should consider including attorney services in its 10-year plan. Mr. Schurbon was asked to get feedback from the member communities. Two differing opinions were received and are printed below.

Jack Davis, East Bethel City Administrator

Do you think the SRWMO should, in their new 10-year plan, budget for attorney services? If so, to what extent?

(a) an attorney at every meeting..... No

(b) attorney review of minutes/actions This would be after the fact and may not have any benefit.

(c) attorney on call for when questions arise.....This would work if it's known that there would be a legal matter on the agenda and a specific time could be set with the attorney for a conference call during the meeting. My only fear with this approach is that I'm old school and get more out of face to face communication especially involving discussion of legal issues.

(d) rely on member communities' attorneys (if so, which one and who pays?)... This is probably too cumbersome and a variety of attorneys might have a variety of opinions.

(e) do nothing. Hire an attorney only in the unlikely event one is ever

needed.....Should there be legal questions, the matter could be referred to one of the City Attorneys who could bill the City and that City could be reimbursed by the SRWMO from either the undesignated reserve fund or a legal fund created within the budget. This option would be my recommendation at this time.

Elizabeth Mursko, Columbus City Administrator

Referencing the list, I think (a) would be very costly, (d) and (e) would be hard as most city attorneys are not familiar with "water law". I do think that (b) and (c) are a good idea and would use one of the attorneys that RCWD or Coon Creek use as they would be very familiar with the types of questions and projects that the WMO would be doing.

Linwood Township provided input that they support the SRWMO seeking attorney services only when questions arise.

Mr. Schurbon reported he reached out to two possible attorneys who provide services to other nearby watershed organizations. One had not yet responded. The other Troy Gilcrist of Kennedy and Graven responded. He provides hourly services to many watershed organizations.

After discussion, the board decided not to add a line item for legal expenses to the new watershed plan.

It was asked if the SRWMO insurance carrier, Minnesota Cities Insurance Trust (MCIT) would provide risk or liability reduction training/guidance. Mr. Schurbon was directed to check with MCIT.

C. Coloring contests concept for youth outreach

Chair Babineau suggested a coloring contest as an outreach an education effort to be included in the new watershed plan. Chair Babineau will put together a proposal to give to Emily Johnson and encourage her to do this type of contest on a larger scale throughout the county. Mr. Schurbon will include the concept in the new watershed plan without any corresponding cost. No objections were heard.

D. New Watershed Plan (Plan) content (drafts provided)

Mr. Schurbon reviewed the new draft chapters of the Plan. They are mostly required, factual text. The new text includes:

- Table of Contents – to see how the plan will be laid out.
- Executive summary
- Introduction – basic information about the SRWMO and this Plan.
- Resource Inventory and Assessment - A required documentation of soils, land use, water bodies, water trends, and reports available.
- Assessment of Regulatory Framework – A summary of discussions from months ago by the SRWMO board and the technical advisory committee that set the tone for SRWMO standards which have been fine-tuned.
- Evaluation and Reporting – A short section describing how the SRWMO will evaluate its implantation of the new plan and report to the State. It follows required rules.
- Amendments to the Plan – A required short section that simply says the SRWMO follow State rules if/when it ever amends this plan.

- Local Water Plans – A short required section that reiterates State rules regarding communities’ local water plans.
- Maps

Comments

Pg. 8 – Notes three impaired lakes, however, on page 20 Table #4 lists four lakes.

Pg. 19 – Fawn Lake is a natural environment lake, but not a recreational lake.

Currently it is listed with other larger lakes that have many homes and public access. Consider removing it from the list with other recreational lakes.

Pg. 81 – Mr. Schurbon will add updated language under Septic System Ordinance.

Mr. Schurbon will re-review the Plan for consistency and bring an entire assembled SRWMO Watershed Plan to the May meeting to consider sending out for the first formal review/comment period.

10. Mail None
11. Other Mr. Schurbon was thanked by East Bethel and Ham Lake representatives for the excellent newsletter provided.
12. Invoice Approval A. Recording secretary April invoice for \$175.
Mr. Mager moved and Mr. Downing seconded to approve the recording secretary April invoice for \$175.00. Motion carried.
13. Adjourn **Mr. Enestvedt moved and Mr. Mager seconded to adjourn at 8:44 pm. Motion carried.**

Gail Gessner, Recording Secretary
Submitted via email on 4/25/19