

**MINUTES OF THE WATERSHED MANAGEMENT PLAN WORKSHOP  
OF THE  
COMFORT LAKE -FOREST LAKE WATERSHED DISTRICT**

**Tuesday, January 11, 2011  
5:00 pm**

1) **Call to Order**

The President called the January 11, 2011 CLFLWD Watershed Management Plan (Plan) Board of Managers Workshop to order at 5:00 p.m. at the Forest Lake City Offices, 220 North Lake Street, Forest Lake, Minnesota

Present: President Richard Damchik, Treasurer John Lynch, Secretary Wayne Moe, Manager Jon Spence.

Absent: Vice President Jackie Anderson

Staff: Doug Thomas, Lisa Tilman (EOR)

Others: Mark Lobermeier (new City of Wyoming Representative)

2) **Meeting Purpose**

Doug went over the purpose of the meeting which was to provide an overview of comments from the January 6, 2011 TAC/CAC meeting, and to continue to discuss and get comments from the Managers on the draft Plan, with tonight's focus being on local water plan contents, progress measurements, and financing sections of the Plan along with the Land and Water Resource Inventory (Volume 2).

3) **January 6<sup>th</sup> TAC/CAC Meeting Overview**

Engineer Tilman and Administrator Thomas gave an overview of the discussion from the meeting. The areas of the Plan that the TAC/CAC was asked to review and provide comment on included the sections on local plan content, progress measurements, and financing along with the land and water inventory and assessment. Lisa noted that there was not a lot of discussion on any of the items and that she would bring up specific TAC/CAC comments during the review and discussion of each of the respective sections with the Managers tonight. Doug pointed out that it was his opinion that there were really no substantive comments from the group and that they seemed to be agreeable with the documents as they have been drafted.

4) **Measuring Progress**

Lisa T. went through each of the progress evaluation metrics as follows:

- Permitting (page 25) – noted discussion by TAC/CAC to tie this metric more closely back to whether the inspection schedule called out for in the rule is being adhered to

rather than the arbitrary number of three inspections in the current language. Consensus was that this would be modified based on the discussion.

- Monitoring (page 28) – noted discussion that this metric should be changed to more closely tie back into the data analysis goals. Consensus was that this made sense since we are more concerned if the data is being used to assess conditions and modify our efforts rather than how and if it is being collected.
- Non-point Source Pollution Abatement Program (page 31) – noted discussion on the use of number of projects and that most felt it was somewhat arbitrary and could be influenced more by funding decisions than on anything else. Consensus was that this metric should be modified. Doug T. also noted a suggested change on page 30 in the Municipal/Urban Stormwater Remediation Program description to take out the word retro-fit. The person commenting felt that it may inadvertently cause some projects, such as a project done on parkland, to be excluded. The consensus was to modify the text to make sure that it does not accidentally exclude municipal projects to only areas that are already developed.
- Education (page 33) – noted TAC/CAC discussion on making this more measureable and comments along the lines of measuring behavior change that came up in the discussion. Managers discussed this and it was noted that education and outreach are pretty hard to measure and that care has to be taken to not get too carried away with measuring for the sake of measuring. Consensus was to leave it as is.
- Technical Resource Sharing (page 35) – noted TAC/CAC discussion that the activities are all so different that the draft metric is not very useful. Consensus was to modify this metric in a way that it addresses the individual programs/activities in this section.

Lisa pointed out that there were no other comments from the TAC/CAC on the evaluation metrics and asked the Board if they wanted to go through the remaining metrics. The consensus of the Board was that they were comfortable with what is in the Plan and did not feel it was necessary to go through them one by one.

## 5) **Local Plan Requirements**

Lisa went through the section and explained the rationale of the two tiers which separate those communities which will continue to have the District continue to exercise its rules through District permitting versus a community that may choose to be the sole permitting authority. The provisions included in the section also allow a township such as Franconia, which only has a very small part of its territory in the District, to adopt the CLFLWD Plan by reference and then provide in a memo form the additional items that are required for a tier 1 local water plan. She also noted two items that were specifically covered with the TAC/CAC which were the recommended local plan completion dates and the requirement for the submittal of a process by which the local unit of government would submit variance requests to the District for review and comment. The only discussion from the TAC/CAC on these two issues was in regards to the recommended dates for completion of a local water plan. The City of Scandia requested that their date be changed to November of 2013 as they will not be budgeting for an update of their current local plan until 2013. Wyoming notes that they will be starting on a local plan this year and will be ahead of the date listed. Forest Lake commented that the date did not appear to be a problem with them. It was noted to the Board that these are recommended dates and that there is no real statutory consequence if a community did not meet the two year requirement to update. The consensus of the Board was

that they were OK with changing the City of Scandia's recommended local plan submittal date to November of 2013.

6) **Financing**

Lisa went through the financing section and commented specifically on the following items:

- The type of financing/revenue generating authorities the District has.
- How each of the authorities can be used and for what type of projects and/or programs.
- That the section signals the current philosophy of the Board on the method of financing it is likely to use.
- Capital improvement projects
- Other funding sources.
- Water management district authority and general concept developed earlier by the Board.

Doug T. elaborated on the significance and importance of the capital improvement program and with its approval how it sets up the various financing options.

7) **Resource Inventory and Assessment (Volume 2)**

Lisa T. asked if there were any comments on this section. No comments were offered.

8) **Next Steps**

Doug T. commented that from his perspective the Plan, with the changes noted this evening along with the lack of any substantive comments from the final TAC/CAC meeting on January 6<sup>th</sup> is 99% complete and ready to be accepted by the Board and to begin the formal review process which starts with a local 60 day review and comment period. He briefly described the overall formal Plan review process and the steps that we will go through in the next 5 months. The next step will be for the Board to act on staff's recommendation on January 20<sup>th</sup> to start the formal review process including setting the date for the public hearing. He noted that this is not the last time that there will be opportunities for changes between now and when the Plan is submitted for the final state review, which is expected to be in June.

9) **Adjournment**

Following discussion on the presented, the Board, by consensus, adjourned the Manager's Watershed Management Plan workshop at 6:20 pm...

---

Wayne S. Moe, Secretary