



MINUTES OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS
 August 23, 2017

Attendance		Present	Absent
Dan Jones, Chair	City of White Bear Lake	X	
Jim Lindner, Vice Chair	City of Gem Lake	X	
Rob Rafferty, Secretary-Treasurer	City of Lino Lakes	X	
Ed Prudhon	White Bear Township	X	
Marty Long	City of North Oaks	X	
Terry Nyblom	City of Vadnais Heights	X	
Stephanie McNamara	Administrator	X	
Kristine Jenson	Program Mgr.	X	
Brian Corcoran	Water Resources Mgr.	X	
Nick Voss	Education & Outreach Cord.	X	
Tyler Thompson	Water Resource Tech.	X	

Others in attendance: Margaret Behrens (Ramsey Conservation District), Mark Graham (City of Vadnais Heights Engineer & TEC Chair); Paul Duxbury (White Bear Township TEC representative), Keith Boulais, Premier Materials.

I. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 pm by Chair Jones. A quorum is present for the meeting.

II. Approval of Agenda

A motion was made by Lindner and seconded by Rafferty to approve the agenda as presented. Vote: all aye. Motion passed.

III. Approval of Minutes from July 12, 2017

A motion was made by Prudhon and seconded by Lindner to approve the minutes from the July 12, 2017 Board of Directors Meeting. Vote: all aye. Motion passed.

IV. Visitors and Presentations

Keith Boulais – Premier Materials – briefly presented information on the EcoSoar Kria Ionizer, a machine infuses negatively charged oxygen or super oxide into water. It is used in Japan. It is used in the medical industry but it isn't used in many places because it is hard to develop it. They worked with the Army Corps. It raises the dissolved oxygen levels. It is called a "pesticide device". The super oxide is put back in the water and with that, the DO levels are raised and cleans the water column and sediment of algae bacteria (organic pollutant). Laboratory testing indicates it will work on getting rid of zebra mussels. They have done studies to show this works. They are now looking for a 3rd party test done in open water. They want us to identify the lake and to verify lab tests that were proven to work. The machine reaches ½ mile. They want to partner with someone and have explored a Clean Water Legacy grant to help with costs. They have been talking to the City of North Oaks to pursue testing this in one of the lakes that are infested with zebra mussels. Rafferty asked what it would cost VLAWMO? Boulais said at the moment that it is manpower from VLAWMO but he isn't sure what the costs would be to VLAWMO.

They are looking for a watershed to partner with for a Conservation Partners Grant through the DNR which is due Sept 12. He thinks it will cost about \$500,000. The grant requires a 10% match and he says the company would pay the match. Kristine commented on the Conservation Partners Grant – stating that it has a \$400,000 grant limit and that it is focused on habitat restoration for wetlands and prairies and therefore may not be a good fit for this sort of project. But that there could be some exploration into other grant options. Consensus from the Board that there is not enough time to

pursue the Conservation Partners grant. The Board says they are open to learning more about the product and possibly pursuing a project next year.

Board directed staff to talk more with Mr. Boulais to determine if it would be a good fit for VLAWMO to partner with on and invited Mr. Boulais to come to a VLAWMO TEC meeting and start talking with potential partners.

V. New Business

A. Goose Lake Shoreline Priorities Meeting

While chemical treatments such as alum and spent lime are being evaluated, there remains active erosion on the western shore of West Goose and in the eastern Polar dealership channel. Restoration designs have been made and as yet remain unimplemented. It has been suggested that a meeting of key parties interested in Goose Lake could be useful. On the agenda would be identifying common goals, the roadblocks to progress and possible common priorities for moving forward. There are several stakeholders in this discussion and there are questions to be resolved. The meeting could be held this fall if the Board wishes. **Staff is seeking Board direction on if VLAWMO should facilitate such a meeting and what are VLAWMO's priorities for the shoreline.**

Questions for VLAWMO Board consideration:

- Are some areas of the Goose Lake shoreline in need of stabilization?
- Which areas are in need of stabilization?
- Are there priority areas?
- What have been the hurdles in the past to shoreline stabilization?
- Who owns the priority areas?
- Would some stabilization areas count toward Waste Load Allocations for Stormwater Permits?
- Is there a consensus vision to move forward with?
- What does the VLAWMO Water Plan say?

Local groups and agencies interested in Goose Lake are invited to participate in a discussion focused on the Goose Lake shoreline. This meeting will be facilitated as a circle style discussion.

Stakeholders include: City of White Bear Lake, Ski Otters, DNR, Ramsey County Public Works, Mn Dot, VLAWMO.

Format:

Reframing:

- Definition of common goals for the lake.
- Any complex situation or conflict has aspects that are “stuck” and aspects that are “flexible”. A clear outline of these will support lasting progress for the lake, and can help improve communication habits for future projects and focuses.

Current situation:

- Applying the reframing to the current circumstances.
- Definition of common goals for the shoreline.
- Gathering questions from stakeholders
- What answers do we have? What information is still needed?

Recap & next steps:

- Definition of short term action items. Long range aspirations.
- Outline partner responsibilities. Recap shared vision.

Stephanie showed photos of issues along the shoreline on West Goose and at the channel along Polar Chev into East Goose.

Discussion:

Jones stated that if we are going to consider that Goose Lake is our number 1 priority, why would we do some of the internal projects without addressing these shoreline/channel concerns. Jones stated

that if we tell the Ski Otters to stop what they are doing, it will cause uproar. Rafferty asked if there is a viable issue that is a contained financial investment that could at least be a start. Rafferty felt the West Goose “beach” has a lot of limitations and not much opportunity to do something. Rafferty favors doing something that is favorable for the residents but admits that he doesn’t fully understand the process of how the lakes work. Nyblom stated that he has other priorities and responsibilities rather than this. Jones noted the eroding channel by the car dealership may offer an opportunity while the expansion and reconstruction are going on. Long stated that there is probably more of an issue from Highway 61.

Jones stated the staff is looking for direction for whether we should pursue a meeting to talk about these issues. He recognizes that Mr. Nyblom may have other priorities and it could be up to the Board to adjust its priorities. Jones stated that the sand dumping on the west side needs to stop.

Stephanie stated that we do have a design for stabilizing the beach area that the Ski Otters were part of but it didn’t come to fruition. Nyblom stated that he feels placing rock along the shore would be the best way to protect the shoreline. Jones thinks it would be useful to have all the parties together to talk with everyone and create dialogue. The Board directed staff to pursue this meeting.

VI. Old Business

A. Goose Lake Treatment Design

1. Alum treatment dosing proposal

At the last meeting of the VLAWMO Board there was direction to proceed with securing proposals for alum dosing analysis and design for Goose Lake. There are two proposed agreements before the Board, one to hire Barr Engineering to do the analysis and design for an alum treatment and another with the St. Paul Regional Water Service to accept their contribution of \$5000 to help pay for this work.

1st Agreement: with Barr Engineering

Staff contacted Greg Wilson of Barr Engineering for a proposal to do the follow-up alum treatment design. This proposed agreement is included in your packet. The scope of the work would include sediment cores of both East and West Goose, development of alum dosage and an application plan and a Technical memorandum. Preparation of supporting information for a State grant application is included. That work would be done for \$10,000. After discussion with the City of White Bear Lake engineering staff and Barr, one additional testing site was added as an option for Board and partner consideration. Oak Knoll pond is south of Goose Lake and part of its drainage area. Adding sediment monitoring of this pond as a potential spent lime pilot project to this proposal would allow VLAWMO and its partners to evaluate the spent lime pilot in as a treatment option. The additional sediment coring and analysis would cost \$2000. Having this information positions VLAWMO to do a robust spent lime pilot study if the Board chooses to do so.

Recommendation: staff recommends approval of the Barr Engineering Agreement for Sediment Phosphorus Monitoring of Goose Lake and Oak Knoll Pond’ with the Oak Knoll option for a total cost of \$12,000. There are carry over funds from 2016 to address impaired waters and Lambert Creek that can fund the \$7000 cost to VLAWMO.

Nyblom called Greg Wilson to discuss his concerns about treating West Goose Lake when it is so heavily used by the Ski Otters. He said that Wilson agreed that there would need to be an agreement relating to the use on the lake if we were going to treat it.

2nd Agreement: with St. Paul Regional Water Service for a Goose Lake Sediment Analysis and Alum Dosing Study

The St. Paul Regional Water Service (SPRWS) has been a part of the technical team studying the possibility of alum or spent lime treatment of Goose Lake. They have been an active partner with VLAWMO since the beginning of the watershed. When the feasibility study for

Goose and Wilkinson was completed and it became apparent that additional work was needed to bring a treatment plan to a final design, VLAWMO discussed work and how it would be funded with its partners. SPRWS stepped forward offering to pay \$5000 toward the above study.

Recommendation: staff recommends approval of the Agreement between the Vadnais Lake Area Water Management Organization and the Board of Water Commissioners of the City of Saint Paul for Goose Lake Sediment Analysis and Alum Dosing Study.

Discussion:

The Board was pleased with the fact that there is partnership with this project.

Jones said that even if we don't pursue an alum or spent lime treatment, the results of the sediment studies will be helpful and valuable. Jones stated that he feels that even if we cleaned up Goose, people wouldn't be flocking to the lake but it is a public water and it is on the Impaired List and we have deemed it a priority. Rafferty stated that on Peltier Lake, they limited boat traffic to deal with water quality and they ended up finding out that it was something else affecting the water quality.

It was moved by Long & Rafferty to approve both the contract with Barr to complete the alum dosing study for \$12,000 and the agreement with SPRWS to accept \$5000 towards the work. Vote: All aye. Motion passed.

2. Spent Lime Pilot Funding

Staff understood there to be direction to pursue what would be involved in a pilot spent lime study as an alternative to alum treatments for phosphorus reduction. An additional \$10,000 was added to the 2018 budget help fund spent lime pilot project development. Two issues were apparent: one was funding amount and timing and the other was potentially completing necessary summer monitoring that could be used in a winter analysis and pilot development. To deal with the second issue – was there information that needed to be collected in the summer if a pilot project plan was developed in the winter? Sediment coring in Oak Knoll pond would be needed as well as intensive late summer water quality monitoring. Using Oak Knoll pond as a control basin could help clarify whether or not the spent lime is effective when some of the unique variables on West Goose (higher wind stirring and intensive use by water skiers) are removed. The sediment coring could be done if the Board approves the option on the Barr Agreement to do the Oak Knoll sediment work (\$2000). VLAWMO staff has discussed the water sample collection and this could be added to the existing monitoring. Lab analysis of those samples would be about \$1200.

The original very rough estimate from Barr to develop this pilot project which would now involve treating West Goose Lake and Oak Knoll pond as a control basin was \$15,000 - \$35,000. We don't have a defined proposal from Barr with a solid cost at this time. Work on this portion of the possible treatment design could be delayed until 2018 when the \$20,000 would be available. This funding may not be enough. But we could go to our partners again or redirect additional VLAWMO funds.

For Board Consideration: Does the Board wish to reallocate the remaining \$20,000 in the 2017 LL2 grant program to the Goose Lake subwatershed to assist with funding for this work?

Discussion:

It was moved by Jones & Lindner that VLAWMO put \$2000 toward the spent lime preliminary analysis. Vote: All aye. Motion passed. Jones also stated that we can ask the City of White Bear Lake for the \$1200 for the additional testing and if they approve it, we can do the additional testing this year.

B. Storm Sewer Utility Rate Establishment – Resolution 02-2017

The annual SSU rates are based on the budget approved by the Board at its last meeting for the following year. The Storm Sewer Utility is based on the amount of impervious surface generally associated with different land use types and provides the major financial support for watershed activities.

As discussed at the July Board meeting when the 2018 Budget was passed, the SSU rates will go up. And increase of 14.98% is less than the 15.49% total budget increase due to a large division in North Oaks. This year we anticipate the SSU will provide a sustaining level of income for the anticipated projects and programs identified in the new Water Plan. In other words, we are not drawing down our reserves to cover operating expenses. Grants have helped defray some of the costs and allowed VLAWMO to do more than is reflected in annual budget. But they are an unreliable source of income.

The proposed 2018 SSU annual rate is \$42.63/unit or \$61.44/acre. This is an increase of 14.98% from last year. Single family residential units will increase by \$5.79/year or about \$0.48/month. On nonresidential property the rate increased \$8.04/acre or \$0.67/month. The additional parcels from the boundary change helped absorb some of the increase.

Again, our budget is no longer being subsidized by drawing down reserves. The SSU is at a sustainable level. This budget begins to address priorities in the 2017-26 Water Plan and the watershed ditch authority responsibilities. The budgets anticipated in 2017-2026 Water Plan anticipate a fairly modest annual operating increase. More substantial increases are seen in the capital part of the budget. This rate includes a 0.9% buffer to account for subsequent parcel changes, manual overrides and delinquent payments.

Recommendation: Approval of Resolution 02-2017 setting the Storm Sewer Utility Rates for 2018.

Discussion:

Jones reiterated that the recent increases in SSU were due to providing competitive salaries and benefits for employees and for stepping up our programs and projects which was necessary. Long stated that we need to be responsible with our budget and take care of our staff but that he thinks we will have some of the team leaders leaving in the next few years and we need to keep that in mind as we think about how we move forward.

Rafferty reiterated that addressing health insurance costs is a priority for him. He feels employees need to have insurance and is concerned about rising costs. Stephanie stated that we will be receiving information for next year’s health insurance. Rafferty stated that he feels we need to take care of our employees and wants to work with staff at addressing better health insurance options.

RESOLUTION NO. 02-2017

A RESOLUTION APPROVING THE STORMSEWER UTILITY RATES FOR 2018.

WHEREAS, the 2018 Budget of the Vadnais Lake Area Water Management Organization (VLAWMO) has been approved by the VLAWMO Board of Directors and

WHEREAS, Storm Sewer Utility (SSU) Rule of the Vadnais Lake Area Water Management Organization, has been applied to the properties within the boundary,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE BOARD OF THE VADNAIS LAKE AREA WATER MANAGEMENT ORGANIZATION, The SSU Rates for 2018 will be as follows:

Classification	Total Amount	R.E.F.	Rate
Residential 1- 3 units	\$436,350.36	1.00	\$42.63 / Unit
Residential 4 or more	\$28,218.41	2.72	\$61.44 / Acre
Commercial	\$137,795.53	4.23	\$61.44 / Acre
Industrial	\$71,073.54	3.30	\$61.44 / Acre

Institutional	\$61,462.22	3.30	\$61.44 / Acre
Golf courses	\$10,105.91	0.74	\$61.44 / Acre
Agricultural	\$7,303.07	0.25	\$61.44 / Acre
Vacant/Road/RR/Water	\$0	Exempt	\$0.00

A motion was made by Lindner and seconded by Prudhon to approve Resolution 02-2017 to set the 2018 Storm Sewer Utility Rates. Vote: all aye. Motion passed

C. Lambert Creek Maintenance

Corcoran reported on information he has gathered since the previous Board meeting. Moving forward on the Lambert Creek drainage maintenance and VLAWMO’s responsibility as ditch authority, staff contacted the DNR for their requirements when doing maintenance within public waters. Below is the DNR process and alternatives that could help improve flow through the system

When a ditch authority undertakes a public drainage ditch repair or project in or near public waters, DNR has a statutory obligation under MN Statute Chapters 103G and/or 103E to exercise oversight over the project. This is because public ditch repairs and projects have the potential to affect public waters because excavation is involved

To meet this definition (103E.701), the ditch authority would need to either have original design plans/as-built surveys for the public ditch or do soil borings and other analysis to determine the original dimensions of the ditch prior to excavation. The ditch repair has to be maintenance of an existing channel to original dimensions, not an improvement. So the ditch authority has to have documentation of the original channel dimensions. Also, prior to a ditch repair project through a public water wetland, DNR would need to survey the OHW and the outlet elevation of the public water (there hasn’t been an OHW survey done yet for this PW-wetland).

There are alternatives that the DNR provided that could help improve flow through the public water wetland and that would avoid the need to meet ditch law requirements:

1. Apply for a DNR aquatic plant management permit. This would allow spraying herbicide to kill vegetation in the wetland to help open up an area to facilitate flow. This approach does not require a public waters permit.
2. If needed, apply for a public waters permit to excavate at inlets/outlets to the wetland, to help facilitate flow. This process is pretty straightforward. The excavation is limited to that required to improve flow at the inlets/outlets, with excavation being done from land (no equipment enters enter the wetland). This could be done in conjunction with herbicide treatment.
3. If needed, remove the root mass of a portion of cattails in the wetland to help facilitate flow. This would require a public waters permit. Excavation depth would be limited to the depth of the cattail root mass and would not create an excavated channel. Detailed project plans would be required as part of the permit, specifically depth of excavation, documentation showing that there wouldn’t be negative impacts to downstream flows, and a description of how equipment would access the wetland. This has the most impact of the options listed here. A permit would also be required from the Army CORPS for any work done in this system, WCA rules would not apply for work below the OHW of a public water in the system.

Discussion:

Nyblom passed out a photo of a culvert at County Road F where the land has covered the culvert. He thinks the ditch bottom would be at the bottom of the culvert. He doesn’t understand why the 1987 survey wouldn’t be applicable for the DNR to prove the ditch elevations. Corcoran stated that we only had the 1987 elevations from when they dredged it at that time and we

couldn't find any paperwork regarding permits. The DNR is stating we need to provide them with the information proving the original size of the ditch.

Nyblom asked if we had gotten any costs for debris removal on County Ditch 14. He stated that the July meeting minutes state that the Board directed staff to get bids for debris removal and bids for survey. We hadn't done that and Nyblom asked why we hadn't yet. Stephanie said we could get costs for the next meeting. Jones and Lindner stated that staff pursued background information that are causing obstacles that we have to still work through.

Graham stated that he is trying to find bids and quotes for Branch 5 but it isn't an easy thing to do and there aren't many people who do it. He noted the ditch has trees and debris.

Long asked if we could call Barr Engineering to get an estimate for costs for a survey because we can't get bids until we have an RFP and we don't know exactly what we are asking for.

Nyblom stated that if we have to wait until there is damage to properties or if the homeowners are doing the removal work, then maybe we don't tax them. Jones asked if it can be proven that the trees are causing property damage. Nyblom responded no, it is based on observation and opinion. Lindner stated that he would support us pursuing this more. Long stated the City of North Oaks pays for all their ditch maintenance.

Graham stated that the struggle is determining who should pay for maintenance work on the ditch. If it is VLAWMO, there is no budget for that. So is it the City? His goal was to have the City pay for the removal but a member of the City Council felt that the City shouldn't pay for the County Ditch 14 so he asks the Board to determine how this is figured out.

Corcoran asked for clarification of the Board direction. The Board requested costs for debris removal in County Ditch 14 and costs for surveys on Ditch 14.

Jones stated we budgeted an extra \$30,000 to address this and it won't cover much but hopefully it will cover the cost of the survey.

D. Consideration of Ditch Authority – Legal Opinion

Clarifying authority and responsibility as a ditch authority continues to be an ongoing discussion. We have some legal guidance from Troy Gilchrist, the VLAWMO attorney which provides further background and legal argument for how we should manage the ditch and its branches. The following is McNamara's summary of his opinion.

- Through State Statute and the VLAWMO JPA, VLAWMO should manage the ditch under section 103B which basically means VLAWMO will manage the ditch as is identified in the our Water Plan.
- A petition by individuals or groups would not be accepted because we are not managing it under ditch law (103E) we are using watershed plan law (103B). VLAWMO could always be sued of course. The watershed could be found liable if it "fails to maintain the ditches and that failure allegedly results in damage to properties."
- The VLAWMO responsibility to the ditch is much like municipal responsibility to maintain roadways in a safe condition that does not cause damage to others property.
- VLAWMO may want to consider hiring an engineer to inspect all or portions of the ditch for maintenance issues. VLAWMO staff and municipal partners have been checking for erosion or obstructions. The inspection that might be done by engineers would also include hydraulic capacity and rate. Hydrologic and hydraulic modeling (H & H) would also help us understand the plumbing of this system.
- How we manage the ditch should be defined in our water plan. The VLAWMO Plan can be found at the following link: [VLAWMO Water Plan](#). There are references under Priority Issue 6 (pg. 31)

Localized flooding; Under Subwatershed Activities for Lambert Creek (pf.47) and of course the budget where we pay for work (pg. 57) identifies stream restoration projects being funded periodically. The Water Plan may be updated and the ditch management plan further clarified. VLAWMO would go through a plan amendment process with BWSR and our stakeholders to do that.

The following are the questions posed to our attorney and the answers provided. The email includes more historical precedent for some of the opinions. The assessment question was postponed for the time being but can certainly be a follow-up review.

1. As ditch authority, what is VLAWMO required to do?

With the authority provided under Section VI, Subd. 5 to repair, improve, and maintain the drainage system under the MWO's in Chapter 103B comes a general duty to keep the system reasonably maintained as there are no specific duties related to drainage system in the WMO's authority under Chapter 103B. This is similar to the general duty a city has to keep its streets open and maintained (i.e., there is not a list of statutory tasks a city must perform on its streets (there are strings attached to state funding, but that is a different matter)).

What work is to be done on the ditch system to satisfy this general duty is up to the commission to decide. If the condition of one of the ditches is such that it is creating problems for the adjacent property owners, the commission would reasonably want to take action to correct the situation. Though any such work must be carried out in conformance with the watershed plan.

Given the fact that the commission is to manage the drainage system that was transferred to it in accordance with its authority under Chapter 103B and must conform to its watershed plan, I recommend the commission provide for any work it proposes to perform on the ditches as a capital improvement project under its plan. I do not get involved with developing the details of the capital improvement program, but if there are on-going maintenance duties the commission wants to provide for I do not see why that could not be identified and incorporated into the plan.

2. Could VLAWMO be petitioned or sued to do work on the ditch by individuals or perhaps municipalities?

Because the commission is managing the ditches under Chapter 103B, not Chapter 103E, in my view the petition procedure set out in Chapter 103E does not apply. The answer to second part of your question, can we be sued, is always yes. We cannot control what people may choose to sue over, but I am not concerned that the commission would be successfully challenged for not carrying out some specific duty with respect to the ditches under Chapter 103E since it is not operating under that authority. If, however, the commission fails to maintain the ditches and that failure allegedly results in damage to properties, then there could be liability. This goes back to the general duty I mentioned – a failure to maintain that results in damage to others can constitute a breach of that duty for which liability can result.

3. What process should we be following if we identify a need along the ditch to assess the options and then implement a possible best management process?

My thought is that commission would have its engineer review the ditches, determine if any work/project is needed to keep them properly maintained, and then schedule it as a capital project under the plan. In other words, the commission would take this on as its own project that it would fund, contract for, and perform/construct. This is, of course, different from its typical role of assisting in funding projects constructed by others. I suggest the commission program in the review by the engineer on some regular basis as recommended by the engineer and seek input from the engineer as to whether there are other issues the commission should be considering as part of its general duty to keep the ditches maintained. I suspect finding the funds to pay for the inspections and any needed work will be of particular importance to the commission. I didn't research that issue, but my initial impression is that since this work is part of the authority given to the commission, there should be no (legal) issue with it using its funds for that purpose.

Discussion:

Jones stated that we need to keep moving ahead on this and press to find the answer. Long asked if BWSR could help in find the answers regarding the difference between ditch authority and financial responsibility.

Stephanie stated that an option for paying for projects would be an assessment over a drainage area and the municipalities would collect that money and could do it like they do for road projects or pay for it through City SSU fees.

Prudhon asked if it would be helpful for the attorney was present at the next meeting. Jones stated that this type of policy discussion isn't really a fit for a Board meeting. It is dragging out these meetings very long and while he dislikes having extra meetings, we may need to have a meeting that addresses this particular issue. Board will send Stephanie their questions for the attorney to answer and she can bring the responses to the next meeting.

VII. Operations and Administration - Reports

A. Education & Outreach

1. Community Outreach Update

- We currently have 6 drains adopted in the adopt-a-drain program.
- During our bothing season, we gave away 5 rain barrels and grew our email list by 75 new email subscriptions to our seasonal newsletter.
- A partnership with an Eagle Scout (Erik Barsness) provided valuable service hours at the VLAWMO booth, 16 labeled stormdrains in Vadnais Heights, and 35 lbs. of debris (sand, leaves, grass) removed from these stormdrains. Such information is gathered with each stormdrain labeling project and will compile a total at the end of each year.
- Water Bugs at Sucker Channel has had 6 events with 77 participants. To accompany workshops, informational VLAWMO brochures are provided to students to take home to parents/guardians.
- VLAWMO staff is holding a 'tour the watershed' presentation on August 30th at 6-7:30 pm at the VH Fire Department. We'll cover watershed history, lakes and Lambert Creek, future projects and goals, and take Q&A. The presentation will be recorded for local cable channel 16.
- VLAWMO is partnering with Rice Creek, WBL, Mahtomedi, and Conservation Minnesota to host a community water meeting in conjunction with the State-wide "25 by 25" initiative. The goal, from Governor Dayton, is to improve MN water quality 25% by 2025. The goal of the meeting is to collect comment how to improve water quality at the local level. VLAWMO will be present with a table, will provide a brief presentation introducing what watersheds do for water resources, and will be available for questions. We see this as an opportunity to keep VLAWMO connected with neighboring organizations and be present where relevant. The meeting will take place on September 21 at 6:30-8:30pm, at WBL City Hall.

2. Comprehensive Plan Assistance

VLAWMO is in contact with each City and Township regarding the updating of their comprehensive plans. With all cities yet to complete a complete draft, VLAWMO has provided an initial summary of our watershed comprehensive plan to maintain familiarity throughout the plan process.

We are now forming detailed assistance to help specify city-specific standards, nutrient loading, and goals, based on the 2013 TMDL, VLAWMO water policy, and VLAWMO

comprehensive plan. Initial results will be ready this fall, and will be ongoing with the planning process as needed.

B. TEC Report to the Board

Mark Graham presented the TEC Report to the Board and summarized items the TEC has been involved with on behalf of VLAWMO.

Jones stated that while we like having Graham here but he doesn't have to be. Graham stated he doesn't mind coming and will continue to do so.

C. Finance

August finds our expenses and income right about where it was anticipated. 59% of the operations budget and 42% of the Capital budget have been expended as reflected in the Treasurers Report summary. Expenses are coming in under the Whitaker treatment wetland project. And the first three reimbursement payments have been received as well.

D. Project Updates

1. Sucker Channel Restoration Project

This project went out for bid. Urban Companies was the lowest responsible bidder.

2. Birch Lake

Jenson submitted an application for a Clean Water Fund Grant for this project. We will not hear any decisions until December. The City of WBL passed a resolution supporting this project and pledging \$15,000 towards the match requirements. The high end cost estimate is \$121,000. Kristine's request was for \$97,000 which would require a nearly \$30,000 match.

3. Whitaker Treatment Wetlands

The contractor is moving forward with coordinating construction, which is set to begin October 2nd. It is expected to last 4-6 weeks. Reimbursement requests to the LCCMR for the grant we were awarded have been submitted and accepted.

E. Planning – Charley Lake Sustainable Lake Management Plan (SLMP)

Staff have been working on the latest SLMP, focusing on Charley Lake. As discussed in the 10 Year Watershed Management Plan, VLAWMO is committed to producing these reports on an annual basis. A chart with the schedule for these reports is shown below:

Lake	Year Completed	Year Updated
Charley	2017	
Deep	2018	
Amelia	2019	
Pleasant	2020	
East Vadnais	2021	
Sucker	2022	
West Vadnais	2023	
Birch	2008	2016/2026
Tamarack	2009	2019
Gilfillan	2010	2020
Wilkinson	2011	2021
Goose	2013	2023
Gem	2015	2024
Black	2015	2025

As part of our SLMP preparation, we have been working with the Ramsey Conservation District to conduct bathymetry and vegetation surveys. The bathymetry gives us a picture of what the lake bottom looks like and the general make-up of the sediment (hard vs. soft soils). By understanding the shape and structure of the lake bottom, we get a better idea as to whether

certain fish or other water creatures can thrive there as well as where we would likely find vegetation. The vegetation study gives us a picture of what plants live in the lake as well as along the shoreline. It helps us identify if there are any invasive plants and determine the spread of those plants.

The goal is to have the SLMP complete by the end of this year. Kristine has been working with Tyler on the production of maps as well as the writing of the report. Previous SLMPs are available for other lakes on our website. These reports are useful tools in helping VLAWMO determine the current health of the lake as well as what projects we should be planning for in the future.

VIII. Discussion

A. Capstone Project

Stephanie stated that the City of North Oaks is pursuing a study with the University of MN Capstone Project to analyze the chain of lakes. The North Oaks Homeowners Association contacted Barr Engineering and a staff member who is also an adjunct professor there has been talking with them about what could be pursued.

B. Agenda

Jones discussed how he has been shifting the agenda – case in point, the Visitors and Presentation item which we had tonight. He wants to limit the time for this to be 5-10 minutes. He is still trying to tighten and tweak things.

IX. Administration Communication

Project site tour in the fall or spring – would the Board be interested in doing an informal tour on September 27 to see some of the projects we talk about at meetings? Jones said to just set it up and post it so that if there is quorum, they obey open meeting laws.

X. Public Comment

XI. Adjourn

A motion was made by Lindner and seconded by Rafferty to adjourn at 9:23pm. Vote: all aye. Motion passed.

Minutes compiled and submitted by Kristine Jenson.