

This packet of information is being sent to each watershed district office. *Please distribute appropriate copies to your managers*. If you have any questions, please contact Ray Bohn at 651-452-8506. Electronic versions of this notice will also be sent out to all watershed district offices.

This packet includes:

- \* Legal notice of the Annual Meeting
- \* Preliminary Meeting Agenda with proposed resolution with from the MAWD Resolutions Committee Recommendations and proposed bylaws amendment with recommendations from the MAWD Bylaws Committee
- \* Certificate of Membership; Voting Delegates
- \* Minutes of the 2016 Annual Meeting and June 21, 2017 Special Meeting

<u>Please complete all necessary forms and return them to the Minnesota Association of Watershed</u> <u>Districts, 540 Diffley Road, St. Paul, MN 55123 by November 21, 2017.</u>

Thank you!

·



# Minnesota Association of Watershed Districts

651-452-8506

651-686-8679

Land and Water Shall be Preserved

540 Diffley Road St. Paul, MN 55123

Oct 30, 2017

## Minnesota Association of Watershed Districts, Inc. Notice of Annual Meeting of Members

Phone:

Fax:

Nov. 30 - Dec 2, 2017

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the 2017 Annual Meeting of the Minnesota Association of Watershed Districts, Inc. will be held at the Arrowwood Conference Center, Alexandria, MN, beginning at 9:00 a.m. on Friday, December 1, 2017 for the following purposes:

- 1. To receive and accept the reports of the President, Secretary, and Treasurer regarding the business of the Association of the past year;
- 2. To receive the report of the auditor;
- 3. To elect three directors from each region for terms ending in 2020, and one director from Region I with term ending in 2018, and one director from Region III with term ending in 2019.
- 4. To consider and act upon proposed resolutions.
- 5. To consider and act upon proposed bylaws.
- 6. To take action upon any other business that may properly come before the meeting.

The business meeting of the Association will begin at 9:00 a.m., Friday, December 1, 2017. A preliminary agenda for the meeting is enclosed.

Sincerely,

wa Haake

Barb Haake Secretary

www.mnwate E-mail: rayb

www.mnwatershed.org E-mail: raybohnmga@aol.com

# Minnesota Association of Watershed Districts, Inc.

## 2017 Certificate of Membership & Delegate Appointment Form

	Watershed District hereby certifies that it a watershed district
duly established and in good standing p	oursuant to Minnesota Statutes 103D, and that it is a regular
member of the Minnesota Association	of Watershed Districts, Inc. for the year 2017.
	Watershed District herby further certifies that the names of
its two official delegates to the Associa	tion are
and	, and the name of the alternate delegate is
	_, all of whom are managers in good standing of the
	Watershed District.
Dated:	_

Watershed District

Ву: \_\_\_\_\_

### 2016 Annual Meeting Minnesota Association of Watershed Districts Minutes (Draft) Arrowwood Conference Center, Alexandria, MN December 1<sup>st</sup>-3<sup>rd</sup> 2016

The 2016 MAWD Business meeting convened at 9:02 a.m. The meeting was presided over by Lee Coe, President.

The agenda was reviewed and approved.

Lee Coe gave the President's Report. Coe welcomed everyone to the 45th Annual Meeting. Coe thanked and introduced the 2016 Board of Directors. Coe also thanked Ray and Peg Bohn for all their hard work. Coe announced he is resigning and thanked everyone for all the wonderful years. Coe asked for a moment of silence in memory of Larry Kuseske, MAWD Board Director and manager of the Sauk River WD who passed away in a car accident in October.

Barb Haake, MAWD Secretary, gave the Secretary's Report. Mary Texter, Capitol Region Watershed District moved to adopt the minutes. Mike Thienes, Capitol Region Watershed District, seconded the motion. The motion passed on a voice vote.

Craig Leiser, MAWD Treasurer, presented the 2016 Treasurer's Report. Craig Leiser, Browns Creek, Watershed District moved to approve the 2016 Treasurer's Report. Duane Willenbring, Sauk River Watershed District seconded the motion. The motion passed on a voice vote.

Craig Leiser gave the Strategic Plan Committee Report. Craig Leiser, Brown's Creek Watershed District moved to table until the December 3<sup>rd</sup> meeting. Mary Texter, Capitol Region Watershed District seconded the motion. The motion passed on a voice vote.

A proposal to change the By-Laws was reviewed. Craig Leiser, Brown's Creek Watershed District moved to table until the December 3<sup>rd</sup> meeting. Perry Forster, Riley Purgatory Watershed District seconded it. The motion passed on a voice vote.

Craig Leiser, MAWD Treasurer, reviewed the proposed 2017 budget and Craig Leiser, Browns Creek Watershed District tabled until the December 3<sup>rd</sup> meeting. Mary Texter, Capitol Region Watershed District seconded the motion. The motion passed on a voice vote.

John Jaske gave the BWSR Report. Jaske thanked Lee Coe for his many years of service. Jaske reported on the new buffer guidance policy and mapping, completion of the Section 404 feasibility study in mid-January, successful pilot project of the one watershed one plan and the new updated Drainage Manual that will help with redetermination of benefits to all drainage systems. The Clean Water Funds have been awarded for 2016.

Leslie Yetka from the Fresh Water Society reported on their new pilot project in Training and Education Stewards to address water issues. Each person completes 50 hours of education and then completes their project. 79 stewards have completed the course and 64 are in training. Yetka looks forward to working with Watershed Districts.

President Lee Coe recessed the regular meeting until 10:30 am.

President Lee Coe reconvened the regular meeting at 10:37 a.m.

**Resolution Committee Report:** President Lee Coe turned the podium over to the Resolutions Committee to preside over the resolution portion of the business meeting. Barb Haake, in her capacity as Resolutions Committee Chair, introduced Resolution # 1.

**Resolution# 1:** <u>Yellow Medicine River Watershed District: Making Human Resources Expertise</u> <u>Available to Districts through MAWD</u> was presented by the Chairman of the Resolution Committee, Barb Haake. Tim Dritz, Yellow Medicine Watershed District made a motion to adopt Resolution #1, Jackie Anderson Comfort Lake Watershed District, seconded the motion. The motion passed on a voice vote.

**Resolution # 2** <u>Establishments of Watershed Districts in MN River Basin</u> was presented by the Chairman of the Resolution Committee, Barb Haake. Craig Leiser, Browns Creek Watershed District made a motion to table Resolution #2. Mike Thienes, Capitol Region Watershed District, seconded the motion. The motion passed on a voice vote.

**Resolution #3:** <u>Two Rivers Watershed District: Increase in Managers Per Diem</u> was presented by the Chairman of the Resolution Committee, Barb Haake. Barb Haake, Rice Creek Watershed District made a motion to table Resolution 3 because it is already MAWD policy. Perry Forster, Riley Purgatory Watershed District, seconded the motion. The motion passed on a voice vote.

Resolution # 4: <u>Rice Creek Watershed District: Correcting Watershed Based Wetland</u> <u>Conservation Act Implementation</u> was presented by the Chairman of the Resolution Committee, Barb Haake. Barb Haake, Rice Creek Watershed District made a motion to adopt Resolution 4. Ruth Schaeffer, Middle Fork River Watershed District, seconded the motion. The motion passed on a voice vote.

**Resolution # 5:** <u>Minnehaha Creek Watershed District: Tax Treatment of Conservation</u> <u>Easements</u> was presented by the Chairman of the Resolution Committee, Barb Haake. Craig Leiser Brown's Creek Watershed District made a motion to table Resolution 5. Mary Texter, Capital Region Watershed District, seconded the motion. The motion passed on a voice vote.

Resolution # 6: <u>Middle Fork Crow River Watershed District: Support Legislation to lift Middle</u> Fork Crow River Watershed District general fund levy Resolution 6 was withdrawn.

**Resolution # 9:** <u>MAWD Board of Directors: Support increasing general fund levy cap to</u> <u>\$500,000 by Legislation Action</u> was presented by the Chairman of the Resolution Committee, Barb Haake. Craig Leiser, Browns Creek Watershed District made a motion to table Resolution 9. Perry Forster, Riley Purgatory Watershed District, seconded the motion. The motion passed on a voice vote.

**Resolution # 7:** <u>Middle Fork Crow River Watershed District: Watershed District Funds</u> <u>Statutory Correction to Impose a Project Tax</u>. was presented by the Chairman of the Resolution Committee, Barb Haake. Jackie Anderson, Comfort Lake Watershed District made a motion to adopt the Resolution 7. Mike Thienes, Capital Region Watershed District, seconded the motion. The motion passed on a voice vote.

**Resolution # 8:** <u>Middle Fork Crow River Watershed District: Amend MN Open Meeting Law to</u> <u>allow WD Manager meeting participation via electronic means outside the territorial limits of</u> <u>the WD or State</u> was presented by the Chairman of the Resolution Committee, Barb Haake. Perry Foster, Riley Purgatory Watershed District made a motion to adopt Resolution 8. Linda Vavra, Boise de Sioux Watershed District, seconded the motion. The motion passed on a voice vote. The regular meeting was recessed until Saturday, December 3rd.

#### Saturday, December 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2015

The business meeting reconvened at 10:15 a.m. on Saturday, December, 3<sup>rd</sup>. At that time, President Lee Coe welcomed everyone.

#### Barb Haake reconvened the Resolution portion of the meeting.

**Resolution # 5:** <u>Minnehaha Creek Watershed District: Tax Treatment of Conservation</u> <u>Easements</u> was presented by the Chairman of the Resolution Committee, Barb Haake. Perry Forster made a motion to remove from the table. Craig Leiser, Browns Creek Watershed District seconded the motion. The motion passed on a voice vote. After discussion, Pam Blixt, Minnehaha Creek Watershed District made a motion to adopt Resolution 5. Kathy Jonsrud, Clearwater River Watershed District, seconded the motion. The motion passed on a voice vote.

**Resolution # 9:** <u>MAWD Board of Directors: Support increasing general fund levy cap to</u> <u>\$500,000 by Legislation Action</u> was presented by the Chairman of the Resolution Committee, Barb Haake., Perry Forester, Riley Purgatory Watershed District made a motion to remove from the table. Craig Leiser, Brown's Creek Watershed District seconded the motion. The motion passed on a voice vote. After discussion, Ruth Schaefer, Middle Fork Watershed District made a motion to adopt Resolution 9 as amended Barb Haake, Rice Creek Watershed District, seconded the motion. The motion passed on a voice vote.

**Ray Bohn gave the MAWD Administrative Report.** Bohn thanked the Annual Committee for a well-organized conference. Ron Harnark and Ray Bohn worked hard on clarifying the language in the Buffer Law before it was passed. The 2016 Summer Tour was held in Winona area where they toured an organic farm and a 1500 cow dairy farm, Lock & Dam No. 5 and the flood damage repair from 2007. The 2017 Summer Tour will be held on Leach Lake. The Round Table Committee is working hard on the One Watershed/One Plan. We were saddened in the loss of Larry Kuseske and he will be greatly missed. Thirty Lakes Watershed District was terminated. Bohn gave a big thank you to Peg and Maddie Bohn, and their granddaughter. Also to the Annual Committee, Awards Committee, Resolution Committee, and the MAWD board for all their help.

Lee Coe thanked Bohn for all his hard work.

Perry Forster, Riley Purgatory made a motion to remove the Strategic Plan from the table. Mary Texter Capital Region Watershed District seconded it. The motion passed on a voice vote. Lee Coe, Red Lake Watershed District moved to adopt the Strategic Plan as amended. Perry Forster, Riley Purgatory seconded it. The motion passed on a voice vote.

Craig Leiser, Brown's Creek made a motion to remove the By Laws from the table. Barb Haake, Rice Creek seconded it. The motion passed on a voice vote. A proposal to change the By-Laws was reviewed. Craig Leiser, Brown's Creek Watershed District to drop and assign to the by law committee. John Waller, Rice Creek Watershed District seconded it. The motion passed on a voice vote.

**2016 Budget:** Craig Leiser, Brown's Watershed District, moved to remove the 2017 budget from the floor. Barb Haake, Rice Creek Washington Watershed District, seconded the motion. The motion passed on a voice vote. Craig Leiser, Brown's Watershed District, moved to adopt the 2017 budget.

Barb Haake, Rice Creek Washington Watershed District, seconded the motion. The motion passed on a voice vote.

#### **Region Reports:**

Region I Report was given by Ginney Inholte. Lee Coe was selected as Caucus Chair and Ginney Inholte as Caucus Reporter. The new Region 1 MAWD Directors are Peter Fjestad of Buffalo-Red and Ben Kleinwachter of Middle Snake, Jerome Deal of Bois De Sioux will continue thru 2017. The future Strategic Plan was discussed with Dennis Kral, Committee member explaining the back ground and development of the proposed plan and possible costs and due structure. The region discussed how the plan was developed in response to member surveys, allowing for future growth and an adequate timeline to implement. Jerome Deal will be chairing the Strategic Plan Committee with Linda Vavra continuing with two additional committee members. The MAWD budget was accepted by consensus with the hope that Treasurer Craig Leiser continues throughout this transition. Each attending WD highlighted current project progress including flood protection, river channel restorations, drainage impoundments, dam repairs, water quality and zoning enforcements. This highlighted the diversity of Region I WD goals, Watch for these completed projects as future project of the Year. Ron Harnark of the Red River Basin Board requested the managers discuss MAWD priorities contained in the proposed MAWD Resolution considering the differences in levy capacity between 103 B & 103 D. A special thanks to Lee Coe of the Red Board for years of service. Good luck fishing.

Region 2 Report was given by Ruth Schaeffer, Middle Fork Watershed District. Duane Willenbring was elected to take over the term of Larry Kuseske. They had a lengthy discussion on the Lower Minnesota Resolution, Barb Haake was re-elected to the MAWD Board.

Region 3 Report was given by Sherry Wright, Minnehaha Creek WD. The group reviewed the Strategic Plan. Craig Leiser re-elected to the MAWD board, they discussed proposed term limits and a resolution on how to improve the resolution process. No ADA report was given.

#### Attendance Report:

618 people attended the MAWD Annual Meeting and Trade Show and Pre-Conference Workshops.

**Audit Report:** Treasurer Craig Leiser reviewed the Audit Report. Craig Leiser, Browns' Watershed District moved to approve the Audit Report. Barb Haake, Rice Creek Watershed District, seconded the motion. The motion passed on a voice vote

The Legislative Breakfast is March 29 - 30.

The 2017 Summer Tour will be held on June 22-23.

**2017 Annual Meeting Location:** Perry Forster, Riley Purgatory Bluff Creek Watershed District moved to allow the board to make that decision. Mary Texter, Capital Region Watershed District seconded the motion. The motion passed on a voice vote.

Ray Bohn thanked Lee Coe for all his years of experience.

Adjourn: Craig Leiser Brown's Watershed District moved to adjourn the meeting. Barb Haake, Rice Creek Watershed District seconded the motion. The motion passed on a voice vote.

Respectfully Submitted,

Barb Haake Secretary

#### Minnesota Association of Watershed District, Inc.

#### Special Membership Meeting Minutes, June 21, 2017

#### Country Inns & Suites, Bemidji, MN

President Ruth Schaefer called the special meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. based upon more than 50% of watershed district members requested the meeting in writing.

Bemidji mayor welcomed MAWD and gave a brief presentation on the area.

Kevin Bigalke presented an update on the final Buffer Law.

· · · · ·

Ruth Schaefer went through an explanation of the meeting rules. This primarily concerned how the votes would be taken.

Mary Texer moved to accept the rules, Cathy Jonsrud seconded. Motion passed.

Ray Bohn spoke in favor of the transition and the need for a full time executive director.

Jerome Deal talked about the Transition Committee plans:

Office Interviews in August Approve at the September Board Meeting

This was dependent on the upcoming votes to be taken.

Barb Haake gave the By-laws Committee report. A motion was made to approve the by-laws as presented by the Board by Jack Levold and seconded by Duane Wellenbring. The motion passed.

Craig Leiser gave a presentation on Manual of Policy & Procedures (MOPP). There were some housekeeping amendments. A motion to approve MOPP amendments as proposed by the Board was made by Anne Mueller. Seconded by Lincoln Fletcher. The motion passed. The main motion to approve the MOPP as amended was moved by Duane Wellenbring and seconded by Mary Texer. It also passed.

Craig Leiser explained the proposed 2018 Budget. There were some questions about the dues structure. There was discussion about a tiered dues structure. Cathy Jonsrud moved to accept the proposed 2018 Budget as submitted by the Board, seconded by Mary Texer and passed.

Page 2, MAWD Special Meeting Minutes, Jun 21, 2017

There being no further business, President Ruth Schaefer adjourned the meeting at 7:45 PM.

×,

Respectfully submitted,

Perry Forster Secretary

#### Minnesota Association of Watershed Districts Proposed budget for year ending September 30, 2018

s a a

> Proposed Actual Actual Actual Budged 11/01/16 11/1/2015 11/1/2014 Year End to to to REVENUE 9/30/2017 10/31/2016 10/31/2015 9/30/2018 121,412 103,834 Dues 225,000 117,590 Interest 100 111 241 39 Annual Meeting 55,000 52,068 49,390 51,861 Summer Tour 17,500 21,469 14,390 15,530 Drainage Seminar 5,000 5,595 9,010 5,015 Trade Show Fees 13,000 22,250 11,495 16,285 8,325 7,450 Legislative Breakfast 9,000 10,083 ADA Training 600 775 600 535 Managers Training/Basic Water Mgmt Fees 2,500 4,250 2,950 2,250 Communication/Public Education 2,500 2,720 3,000 Staff Development Other 2,815 Associate Membership Income 2,500 32,315 TOTAL REVENUE 233,854 221,239 332,700 240,562 EXPENDITURES 90,000 74,566 General Administration & Lobbying Fees 62,311 81,345 Communications & Conferences 25,000 Lobbying, Contracted Service 35,000 Education Program Operating Expenses 23,000 33,750 10.000 Office space rental, location not confirmed 3,000 Benefits for salaried employees 30,000 Office equipment & telecommunications 5,000 **Executive Director Hiring** 1,609 AIS Symposium Co-hosting 1,000 Round Table Participation 2,500 1,896 316 1,000 Lobbyist Expenses 3,647 1.754 4,282 Supplies & Equipment 1,000 679 3,124 42 Dues, Other Organizations 500 185 Telephone, Conference Calls 220 900 509 439 Committee Meeting/Work Per Diem/Expense 30,000 19,512 25,297 18,594 **Directors Meeting Expenses** 1,500 1,440 1,471 1,600 Payroll Taxes 1,500 1,377 684 787 Legal Fees 2,000 1,308 Accounting and Audit Fees 5,000 4,100 3,550 4,100 Watershed District Handbook 1,361 1.700 1.551 Liability Insurance 1.645 1,552 Leadership & Development, Surveys 7,250 WD Messaging/PR Website/Social Media/Internet Expense 300 1,460 650 1,815 Credit Card & Bank Charges 3,500 3,323 2,791 3,434 ADA Seminar Expenses 500 339 367 Trade Show Expenses 9,000 6,322 9,569 4,932 37,079 Annual Meeting Expenses 40,000 39.208 37,161 Summer Tour Expenses 20,000 16,000 14,402 18,367 Legislative Breakfast Expenses 7,500 7,045 7,177 7,233 Communication/Public Education 2,271 2,500 Aquatic Invasive Species Conference 153 33,606 Drainage Seminar Expenses 2,000 1,817 2,993 1,258 2,500 Managers Training Expenses 2,288 580 559 Memorials 250 Salary Survey 1,500 7,110 TOTAL EXPENDITURES 348,150 212,815 214,766 222,579 **REVENUES OVER EXPENDITURES** (15,450) 21,039 6,473 17,983 BEGINNING NET ASSETS 125,888 119,415 101,432 Change in net assets 21,039 6,473 17,983 ENDING NET ASSETS \$146,927 \$ 125,888 \$ 119,415 ASSETS, CASH AND EQUIVALENTS 154,113 140,033 122,093 Deposits received, 2017 annual meeting (11,385) (4,799) (2,005) Liabilities, accounts payable, taxes payable (4,359) (4,008)(2,500)Deferred costs paid, liability insurance 2017 919 Deferred costs paid, annual meeting 1,972 1,827 329 ENDING NET ASSETS 146,927 125,888 119,415



# Minnesota Association of Watershed Districts

Phone: 651-452-8506 Fax: 651-686-8679 www.mnwatershed.org E-mail: raybohnmga@aol.com

Land and Water Shall be Preserved

540 Diffley Road St. Paul, MN 55123

Oct. 30, 2017

**TO: Watershed Districts** 

FROM: Barb Haake, Co-Chair, MAWD Bylaws Committee

MAWD Bylaws amendments as proposed by Prior Lakes Spring Lake Watershed District and the Lower Minnesota River Watershed District for membership action at the 2017 MAWD Annual Meeting & Trade Show as listed below

In addition, the two districts also proposed an amendment to the MAWD Manual of Policy & Procedures (MOPP). Because any amendments to the MOPP must be considered by the Board of Directors, that proposed amendment, entitled "MAWD's Dues Structure" was forwarded to the MAWD Board for their consideration.

These proposed bylaw amendments have been reviewed by the MAWD Bylaws Committee and provided recommendations on the proposed bylaw amendment to the MAWD Board and membership as outlined in this document. The MAWD Board will review these proposed bylaw amendments and Bylaws Committee recommendations at the Board meeting on Thursday, Nov 30<sup>th</sup> at its regularly scheduled meeting and may or may not make further Board recommendations as well.

#### 1. Bylaws change: MAWD Board Composition Based Upon Dues

#### **Article IV. Board of Directors**

4.2) <u>Directors to be Elected by Regions</u>. For the purpose of the Board of Directors, the State of Minnesota is divided into three regions; three the number of Directors-shall be elected from each region with staggered three-year terms, and the numbers of Directors elected shall be based upon the proportion of dues the Region pays to MAWD.-Members from each region shall elect one director for a three-year term at the Annual Meeting of the Association. No Watershed District shall have more than one Manager elected to be a Director on the Board of Directors of the Corporation. Regional caucuses shall elect a chairman and Recording Secretary from its delegates for the purpose of its election procedure and report the election results to the Convention at a designated time.

<u>Committee Recommendation</u>: All watershed districts and regions should be treated equally regardless of the total amount of their dues to MAWD. It is imperative that all watershed districts have had an equal and fair hearing in the development of statewide water management policy. If they do not, it will quickly lead to the

#### Page 2

disintegration of MAWD as a statewide organization. Committee recommends this bylaw be discussed by full membership and further recommends that the proposed amendment not be accepted by our members for the reasons stated above.

#### 2. Bylaws change: Term Limits for MAWD Board Members

#### **Article IV. Board of Directors**

4.4) <u>Number, Qualification and Term of Office.</u> The number of directors constituting the board shall be nine. Each director elected at the annual meeting shall be elected for a three-year term, <u>and may, upon</u> <u>re-election, succeed himself/herself for two successive terms.</u> Directors shall be on the board of a watershed member in good standing of this corporation.

**Committee Recommendation:** Regardless of the number of years served on the MAWD BOD, board members are "limited" by their region's vote at MAWD's Annual Meeting. Regional members can already limit MAWD board member's term when the term is up for election at the Annual Meeting. MAWD has experienced some difficulty filling the Region I & II director positions over the years. Committee recommends forwarding to the full membership for discussion and action at 2017 MAWD Annual Meeting.

#### 3. Bylaws change: MAWD Board Composition to Include Administrators

#### **Article IV. Board of Directors**

4.4) <u>Number, Qualification and Term of Office.</u> The number of directors constituting the board shall be nine. Each director elected at the annual meeting shall be elected for a three-year term.

Directors shall be <u>District Administrators or</u> on the board of a watershed member in good standing of this corporation. (Note: MAWD's Articles of Incorporation <u>may</u> need to be changed to support this bylaw amendment).

**Committee Recommendation:** Administrators are "employees" of their respective watershed districts. We believe employees should not serve on the MAWD Board. Only the policy decision makers, appointed watershed district managers should serve and vote on policy that the MAWD Board deals with on an ongoing basis. Administrators through their ADA/MAWA president has been invited to attend and participate in the board meetings for over a decade on an ad hoc basis. They have regularly reported on activities administrators were involved in and any other concerns in their report to the board, and have been allowed to express any opinion they may have about any subject during the course of the meetings. The MAWD Board has always welcomed their input. Administrators have their own organization (ADA/MAWA) and we see no need to change the present structure. Committee recommends that this proposed bylaw be discuss by the full membership and further recommends that the proposed amendment not be accepted by our members for the reasons stated above.

#### **2017 MAWD Bylaws Changes Background Information**

Proposing District: Prior Lake-Spring Lake Watershed District & Lower MN River WD.

Contact Name: Diane Lynch

Phone Number: (day) 952-440-0067

, X

Email Address: dlynch@plslwd.org

Resolution Title: MAWD Board Composition Based Upon Dues

Factual points which provide background to, or a basis for, the issue addressed by Resolution:

1. MAWD's Bylaws, Article IV, 4.2 Directors to be Elected by Regions, states:

For the purpose of election of the Board of Directors, the State of Minnesota is divided into three regions; three Directors shall be elected from each region, with staggered three-year terms. Members from each region shall elect one director for a three-year term at the Annual Meeting of the Association.

No Watershed District shall have more than one Manager elected to be a director on the Board of Directors of the Corporation. Regional caucuses shall elect a Chairman and Recording Secretary from its delegates for the purpose of its election procedure and report the election results to the Convention at a designated time.

**2.** According to MAWD's spreadsheet detailing the dues for 2018, Region III will pay approximately 46% of the dues; Region II will pay approximately 31% of the dues and Region I will pay 23% of the dues; however, given the current Bylaws, no matter what the financial contribution is, each Region has the same number of members on the Board of Directors.

**Based upon the above facts, what is the proposed solution to the problem discussed above:** The number of Board directors should be based upon the Region's financial contribution to MAWD's dues, so if a Region pays approximately 50% if the dues, that Region should be able to appoint ½ of the number of Board Members. Given the current composition of 9 members, that would mean 4-5 members would represent that Region.

#### Likely Reaction by the Public or Other Governmental Units?

We would expect some regions to support it, while others would oppose it.

Manager \_\_\_\_\_\_ introduced the following resolution and moved its adoption:

#### **RESOLUTION 17-06**

#### RESOLUTION SUPPORTING MINNESOTA ASSOCIATION OF WATERSHED DISTRICTS (MAWD) BOARD COMPOSITION BASED UPON DUES

**WHEREAS**, the Lower Minnesota River Watershed District (LMRWD) is a special purpose unit of government, established in accordance with Minnesota Statute 1013D; and

WHEREAS, the LMRWD is a member of MAWD; and

**WHEREAS**, the current MAWD bylaws indicate that the Board should be comprised of up to three (3) directors from each of the three (3) regions; and

**WHEREAS**, according to MAWD's 2018 spreadsheet, the Metro Region (Region 3) will pay nearly Fifty Percent (50%) of the MAWD dues.

**NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED,** that the LMRWD Board of Managers supports a change in the MAWD Board for representation based upon the percentage of dues calculates annually: Region I (23%) would have 2 representatives; Region II (31%) would have 2-3 representatives and Region III (46%) would have 4-5 representatives..

Adopted by the Board of Managers of the LMRWD this 20th day of September, 2017

Yvonne Shirk, President

ATTEST:

Jesse Hartmann, Vice President



# WATERSHED DISTRICT

#### MAWD Board Composition Based Upon Dues Resolution 17-319

WHEREAS, the Prior Lake-Spring Lake Watershed District (PLSLWD) is a watershed management organization and political subdivision of the State of Minnesota and is a member of MAWD and

WHEREAS, the current MAWD bylaws indicate that the Board should be comprised up three directors from each region and

WHEREAS, according to MAWD's 2018 spreadsheet, the Metro Region III will pay nearly 50% of the dues

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the PLSLWD Board of Managers supports a change in the MAWD Board for representation based upon the percentage of dues calculated annually: Region I (23%) would have 2 representatives; Region II (31%) would have 2-3 representatives and Region III (46%) would have 4-5 representatives.

The question was on the adoption of the Resolution and there were  $\underline{L}$  yeas and  $\underline{L}$  nays as follows:

Absent BREITBACH CORRIGAN **HENNES** SPITZMUELLER HOWLEY

Upon vote, the chair declared the resolution adopted.

Dated: \_\_\_\_\_\_, 2017

Charlie Howley, Secretary

#### Bylaw Amendment #2

#### **2017 MAWD Bylaws Changes Background Information**

**Proposing District**: Prior Lake-Spring Lake Watershed District & Lower MN River WD.

Contact Name: Diane Lynch

**Phone Number**: (day) 952-440-0067

Email Address: dlynch@plslwd.org

Resolution Title: Term Limits for MAWD Board Members

Factual points which provide background to, or a basis for, the issue addressed by Resolution:

1. MAWD's Bylaws, Article IV, 4.4, Number, Qualification and Term of Office, states:

The number of directors constituting the board shall be nine. Each director elected at the annual meeting shall be elected for a three-year term. Directors shall be on the board of a watershed member in good standing of this corporation.

This language is silent on term limits.

**Based upon the above facts, what is the proposed solution to the problem discussed above:** Board Officers have term limits, but Board Members do not. We suggest staggered terms for Board members and retirement from the Board on a date certain (3, 3-year terms).

**Likely Reaction by the Public or Other Governmental Units?** We would expect some regions to support it, while others would oppose it.

# PRIOR LAKE - SPRING LAKE WATERSHED DISTRICT

#### MAWD Board Term Limits Resolution 17-320

WHEREAS, the Prior Lake-Spring Lake Watershed District (PLSLWD) is a watershed management organization and political subdivision of the State of Minnesota and is a member of MAWD and

WHEREAS, the current MAWD bylaws indicate that the Board should be comprised up three directors from each region and

WHEREAS, according to MAWD's bylaws, members of the Board of Directors do not have term limits and

WHERAS, according to MAWD's bylaws, Board Officers have term limits

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the PLSLWD Board of Managers supports a change in the MAWD Board that establishes a limit of three consecutive terms for members on the MAWD Board of Directors to ensure there will be new perspectives and fresh ideas to move the organization forward.

The question was on the adoption of the Resolution and there were  $\frac{5}{2}$  yeas and 2 nays as follows:

BREITBACH CORRIGAN HENNES SPITZMUELLER HOWLEY <u>Nay Absent</u>

Upon vote, the chair declared the resolution adopted.

Dated: <u>9-12</u>, 2017

Charlie Howley, Secrétary

Manager \_\_\_\_\_\_ introduced the following resolution and moved its adoption:

#### **RESOLUTION 17-07**

#### RESOLUTION SUPPORTING MINNESOTA ASSOCIATION OF WATERSHED DISTRICTS (MAWD) BOARD TERM LIMITS

**WHEREAS**, the Lower Minnesota River Watershed District (LMRWD) is a special purpose unit of government, established in accordance with Minnesota Statute 1013D; and

WHEREAS, the LMRWD is a member of MAWD; and

**WHEREAS**, the current MAWD bylaws indicate that the Board should be comprised of up to three (3) directors from each of the three (3) regions; and

**WHEREAS,** according to MAWD's bylaws, members of the Board of Directors do not have terms limits.

**NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED,** that the LMRWD Board of Managers supports a change in the MAWD bylaws that establishes a limit of three consecutive terms for members on the MAWD Board of Directors to ensure there will be a new perspectives and fresh ideas to move the organization forward.

Adopted by the Board of Managers of the LMRWD this 20th day of September, 2017

Yvonne Shirk, President

ATTEST:

Jesse Hartmann, Vice President

### **2017 MAWD Bylaws Changes Background Information**

Proposing District: Prior Lake-Spring Lake Watershed District & Lower MN River WD.

Contact Name: Diane Lynch

Phone Number: (day) 952-440-0067

5 , 1 , 5 T

Email Address: dlynch@plslwd.org

Resolution Title: MAWD Board Composition to Include Administrators

Factual points which provide background to, or a basis for, the issue addressed by Resolution:

#### 1. MAWD's Bylaws, Article IV, 4.4, Number, Qualification and Term of Office, states:

The number of directors constituting the board shall be nine. Each director elected at the annual meeting shall be elected for a three-year term. Directors shall be on the board of a watershed member in good standing of this corporation.

The Board does not include District Administrators.

#### Based upon the above facts, what is the proposed solution to the problem discussed above:

District Administrators and Board Managers should both be on the MAWD Board to accurately reflect the joint decision-making that occurs in the daily operations of a watershed district. The Administrators and Board Managers could be selected by each Region at the MAWD Annual Regional Meetings. It would be up to each Region to select up to 1 Administrator and 2 Board Managers or 3 Board Managers.

Likely Reaction by the Public or Other Governmental Units? We would expect some regions to support it, while others would oppose it.

# PRIOR LAKE - SPRING LAKE

# WATERSHED DISTRICT

#### MAWD Bylaws Change to Include Administrators on the Board Resolution 17-322

WHEREAS, the Prior Lake-Spring Lake Watershed District (PLSLWD) is a watershed management organization and political subdivision of the State of Minnesota and is a member of MAWD and

WHEREAS, the current MAWD bylaws only allow managers to be on the MAWD Board and

WHEREAS, District Administrators are experienced in all aspects of watershed administration and can provide insight on what they need from MAWD

WHEREAS, the PLSLWD Board of Managers supports a change in the MAWD Board to accurately reflect the joint decision-making that occurs in the daily operations of a watershed district

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the PLSLWD Board of Managers recommends a change in the bylaws that allows up to 1 Administrator and 2 Board Managers to be selected by each region and the MAWD Annual Regional Meetings.

The question was on the adoption of the Resolution and there were  $\underline{c}$  yeas and  $\underline{c}$  have as follows:

BREITBACH CORRIGAN HENNES SPITZMUELLER HOWLEY <u>Nay</u> <u>Absent</u>

Upon vote, the chair declared the resolution adopted.

Dated: (1)2-, 2017

Charlie Howley, Secretary

Manager \_\_\_\_\_\_ introduced the following resolution and moved its adoption:

#### **RESOLUTION 17-09**

#### RESOLUTION SUPPORTING MAWD BYLAWS CHANGES TO INCLUDE WATERSHED DISTRICT ADMINISTRATORS ON THE MINNESOTA ASSOCIATION OF WATERSHED DISTRICTS (MAWD) BOARD OF DIRECTORS

**WHEREAS**, the Lower Minnesota River Watershed District (LMRWD) is a special purpose unit of government, established in accordance with Minnesota Statute 1013D; and

WHEREAS, the LMRWD is a member of MAWD; and

**WHEREAS**, the current MAWD bylaws only allows managers to be on the MAWD Board of Directors; and

WHEREAS, Watershed District Administrators are experienced in all aspects of watershed administration and can provide valuable knowledge and a different perspective to the MAWD Board of Directors; and

WHEREAS, having watershed district administrators on the MAWD Board of Directors would more accurately reflect the joint decision making that occurs in the daily operation of a watershed district.

**NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED,** that the LMRWD Board of Managers supports a change in the MAWD bylaws that allows up to 1 watershed district administrator elected from each region to the MAWD Board of Directors.

Adopted by the Board of Managers of the LMRWD this 20th day of September, 2017

Yvonne Shirk, President

ATTEST:

n 16 2 y 16 2

Jesse Hartmann, Vice President



# Minnesota Association of Watershed Districts

651-452-8506

651-686-8679

www.mnwatershed.org B-mail: raybohnmga@aol.com

Received

BV.

Land and Water Shall be Preserved

540 Diffley Road St. Paul, MN 55123

Oct. 30, 2017

**TO: Watershed Districts** 

FROM: Barb Haake, MAWD Resolutions/Policy Committee Chair

#### **Re: 2017 Proposed Resolutions Recommendations**

Below are the recommendations of the MAWD Resolutions/Policy Committee to MAWD membership for the 2017 MAWD Annual Meeting. The committee will meet again at our Annual Meeting on Friday, December 1st at 7:30 am to entertain any questions regarding their recommendations from the proposing watershed district or other member districts and review any Board of Director's Resolutions. Please watch for the location of this meeting on the Annual Meeting program.

Phone:

Fax:

<b>Resolution#</b>	Sponsoring WD	Title
#1;	Capitol Region WD	State Water Program Coordination &
,	· -	Integration with Local Water Implementations

Recommendation: The Committee recommends that MAWD work with the agencies involved through the Local Government Water Roundtable in attempts to solve this issue administratively instead of taking legislation to the capitol.

#2; Comfort Lake-Forest Lake WD Temporary Quarantine Authority to Control Spread of Aquatic Invasive Species

Recommendation: The Committee recommends that the Watershed District and MAWD work with DNR in a collaborative manner to explore these and other options to deal with AIS in local lakes before WD's ask for this authority.

#3; Confort Lake-Forest Lake WD Support for CRP in Federal Farm Bill

Recommendation: MAWD support the resolution as written. Further suggest that MAWD work with the other local governments through the Local Government Water Roundtable to pursue this resolution's objectives.

#4; Nine Mile Creek WD

Support Legislation to provide limited liability protection for commercial salt applicators who

are certified by the voluntary state certification program

Page 2

Recommendation: The Committee recommends this resolution be presented to the membership for discussion and action without recommendation.

#5; Middle Fork Crow River WD Watershed District Funds: Statutory Correction

Recommendation: The Committee recommends this resolution be tabled because it is present policy. Legislation has been introduced in the House (HF2456) and it has a Senate author but not yet introduced.

#6; Middle Fork Crow River WD Allow WD managers Participation in Electronic Meeting Outside of Territorial Limits of the WD or state.

Recommendation: Committee recommends the tabling of this legislation. It is already a MAWD Policy position and legislation is drafted ready for introduction for the 2018 session.

#7; Middle Fork Crow River WD	Lift MFCRWD's General Fund Levy Limit
-------------------------------	---------------------------------------

Recommendation: The Committee recommends this resolution be presented to the membership for discussion and action without recommendation.

#8; Rice Creek WD

Aliening Commercial Carp fishing Regulations with clean water goals; and promoting markets for invasive carp

Recommendation: Committee recommends the tabling of this legislation. It is already a MAWD Policy position.

#9; Two Rivers WD Stable Funding for Flood Damage Reduction

Recommendation: Committee recommends that MAWD work with the Red River Watershed Management Board on this issue. Open to discussion and action at the membership meeting.

## 2017 MAWD Resolution Background Information

Proposing District: Capitol Region Watershed District

Contact Name: Mark Doneux

**Resolution #1** 

Phone Number: 651.644.8888

Email Address: mark@capitolregionwd.org

# <u>Resolution Title (brief subject statement)</u>: State Watershed Program Coordination and Integration with Local Watershed Implementation

Current implementation of the both the One Watershed, One Plan and the WRAPS programs should better integrate into local watershed implementation efforts.

State Clean Water Funds should not be expended on state efforts that duplicate or do not advance local watershed implementation.

#### Factual points which provide background to, or a basis for, the issue addressed by Resolution:

One Watershed, One Plan was developed by the Local Government Water Roundtable (Association of Minnesota Counties, and the Minnesota Associations of Watershed Districts and Soil and Water Conservation Districts) which recommended that local governments charged with water management responsibilities should organize and develop focused implementation plans on a watershed scale.

The vision of One Watershed, One Plan is to align local water planning on major watershed boundaries with local strategies towards prioritized, targeted and measurable implementation plans.

#### Based upon the above facts, what is the proposed solution to the problem discussed above:

The Minnesota Association of Watershed Districts pursue legislation requiring state Clean Water Land and Legacy Funds for One Watershed, One Plan and the WRAPS programs to provide a direct linkage and alignment with each other as well as local watershed plan implementation.

Clean Water Land and Legacy funds for One Watershed, One Plan and the WRAPS programs must not duplicate local efforts and are focused towards local watershed implementation.

#### Likely Reaction by the Public or Other Governmental Units?

Favorable

This issue is of importance (Check one):

To just our District:

To just our Region:

To the entire State: X

## Resolution

## State Watershed Program Coordination and Integration with Local Watershed Implementation

Whereas, Minnesota has a long history of water management by local government units; and

Whereas, the Minnesota Legislature authorized the creation of watershed districts in 1955, through the Watershed Act, with the idea that water management policies should be developed on a watershed basis, because water does not follow political boundaries; and

Whereas, the statutory purposes of watershed districts are to conserve the natural resources of the state by land use planning, flood control, and other conservation projects by using sound scientific principles for the protection of public health and welfare and the provident use of natural resources; and

Whereas, the specific duties of Watershed Districts vary across the state -- some focus mainly on flood damage reduction, while others have a broad range of programs and services to protect and improve water quality; and

Whereas, One Watershed, One Plan was developed by the Local Government Water Roundtable (Association of Minnesota Counties, and the Minnesota Associations of Watershed Districts and Soil and Water Conservation Districts) which recommended that local governments charged with water management responsibilities should organize and develop focused implementation plans on a watershed scale; and

Whereas, the vision of One Watershed, One Plan is to align local water planning on major watershed boundaries with local strategies towards prioritized, targeted and measurable implementation plans; and

Whereas, BWSR's vision for One Watershed, One Plan is that plans developed through this approach will address the need for focused watershed-based implementation plans that will be prioritized, targeted, and measurable; and

Whereas, the MPCA is charged with the State adopted "watershed approach" to address the state's 81 "major" watersheds to develop Watershed Restoration and Protection Strategies (WRAPS); and

Whereas, current implementation of the both the One Watershed, One Plan and the WRAPS program needs to be better integrated into local watershed implementation efforts; and

Whereas, Clean Water Funds should not be expended on state efforts that duplicate or do not advance local watershed implementation;

Therefore, be it resolved that the Minnesota Association of Watershed Districts pursue legislation requiring state Clean Water Land and Legacy Funds for One Watershed, One Plan and the WRAPS programs to provide a direct linkage and alignment with each other as well as local watershed plan implementation; and

Be It Further Resolved that Clean Water Land and Legacy funds for One Watershed, One Plan and the WRAPS programs do not duplicate local efforts and are focused towards local watershed implementation.

## **2017 MAWD Resolutions Background Information**

Proposing District: Comfort Lake-Forest Lake Watershed District

Contact Name: Mike Kinney, District Administrator

Phone Number: (Day/Cell/Evening) 651-395-5855

Email Address: Michael.kinney@clflwd.org

ų.

**Resolution Title (brief subject statement):** Temporary Quarantine Authority to Control Spread of Aquatic Invasive Species

#### Factual points that provide background to, or a basis for, the issue addressed by the resolution:

Aquatic Invasive Species (plant, fish, invertebrate, and pathogen) continue to spread to more lakes. According to the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources (DNR), 48 new infestations have been listed in 2017. The spread of AIS may be assisted by boat transfer that occurs before measures to limit spread can be determined or implemented.

#### Based upon the above facts, what is the proposed solution to the problem discussed above:

Among other tools, and analogous to a land use moratorium, public agencies engaged in AIS control should have the authority to close public boat access points for a period of time appropriate to assess and institute active measures to prevent a threatened movement of an AIS species into or from the quarantined lake. After a public hearing and with adequate technical findings, a watershed district, with or without DNR oversight, should have the authority to impose a public access quarantine for motorized and non-motorized craft for an appropriate time, e.g., up to 24 months, while AIS response is being determined and implemented. The quarantine would not affect private access to the waterbody by riparian owners or through private marina entry.

#### Likely Reaction by the Public or Other Governmental Units?

We believe that at least several lakes in Minnesota have been temporarily quarantined, with DNR cooperation, in conjunction with AIS management actions without negative reaction. This would formalize and structure, but also expand, the ability to quarantine.

Riparian owners may be supportive. The DNR may express reservations about the potential to limit public lake access, as may recreational lake users and businesses that serve them. An open public process to make quarantine decisions is critical.

Counties and cities regulate water surface use under Chapter 86B and may view this as an incursion on that authority. However exercising authority over lake access is different from regulating boat size, speed, areas of use and similar surface use matters.

#### This issue is of importance (Check one):

To just our District: \_\_\_\_\_ To just our Region: \_\_\_\_\_ To the entire State: X

#### **RESOLUTION to Authorize Temporary Lake Quarantine** to Control the Spread of Aquatic Invasive Species

WHEREAS Aquatic Invasive Species (AIS), including invasive plants, fish and invertebrates, continue to spread throughout Minnesota lakes, with the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources (DNR) reporting many new infestations in 2017;

WHEREAS the movement of a newly identified AIS infestation into or out of a lake may be assisted by boat transfer that occurs before measures to limit that movement can be decided or implemented;

WHEREAS a temporary quarantine can prevent the movement of newly identified AIS species into or out of a lake while measures to respond to the infestation can be decided and implemented;

WHEREAS while in several instances temporary public access quarantines have been applied in conjunction with AIS treatment measures, the authority for quarantines is not explicit in state statute;

WHEREAS all parties affected by a potential quarantine would benefit from a more formal and structured process of deciding on and instituting the quarantine;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Minnesota Association of Watershed Districts supports legislation granting to watershed districts, independently or under DNR oversight, the authority, after public hearing and technical findings, to impose a public access quarantine, for a defined period of time in conjunction with determining and instituting an AIS management response to an infestation.

## **2017 MAWD Resolutions Background Information**

Proposing District: Comfort Lake-Forest Lake Watershed District

Contact Name: Mike Kinney, District Administrator

Phone Number: (Day) 651-395-5855

8

1

Email Address: Michael.kinney@clflwd.org

Resolution Title (brief subject statement): Support for CRP in Federal Farm Bill

#### Factual points that provide background to, or a basis for, the issue addressed by the resolution:

Congress presently is developing the 2018 federal Farm Bill. The Farm Bill will contain a conservation title with appropriations for federal conservation programs for agricultural lands including the Conservation Reserve Program (CRP). The State of Minnesota has been a leader in developing and implementing approaches that maintain agricultural productivity while integrating conservation practices for water quality and habitat benefit. The State has shown its commitment through its constitutional mandate for conservation spending and other state and local appropriations for water quality and habitat purposes. CRP is a principal element of the array of federal/state conservation programs for agricultural lands but enrollments are presently at the federal acreage cap.

#### Based upon the above facts, what is the proposed solution to the problem discussed above:

MAWD should advocate for a strong CRP element in the Farm Bill conservation title including CRP reauthorization with an increased acreage cap, maintenance of continuous signup for high value environmental practices such as buffers and wetland restoration, maintenance or expansion of the grasslands program, and removal of restrictions on incorporation of drainage water quality management practices. Acreage increase and other elements with spending implications should not be at the expense of other successful conservation practices such as the Environmental Quality Incentives Program or the Conservation Stewardship Program. MAWD should coordinate with the Minnesota Board of Water and Soil Resources, Minnesota Department of Agriculture and others to advocate to and work with the State's Congressional delegation and other federal representatives.

#### Likely Reaction by the Public or Other Governmental Units?

We believe there is general support for a strong conservation title among the agricultural, conservation and hunting/fishing communities generally and continuing support for CRP.

#### This issue is of importance (Check one):

To just our District: \_\_\_\_\_ To just our Region: \_\_\_\_\_ To the entire State: X

#### **RESOLUTION to Support CRP in the 2018 Federal Farm Bill**

WHEREAS Congress presently is preparing the 2018 federal Farm Bill, which will contain a conservation title with appropriations for federal conservation programs for agricultural lands including the Conservation Reserve Program (CRP);

WHEREAS the State of Minnesota has been a leader in developing and implementing approaches that maintain agricultural productivity while integrating conservation practices for water quality and habitat benefit, and has shown its commitment through its constitutional mandate for conservation spending and other state and local appropriations for water quality and habitat purposes;

WHEREAS the CRP is a principal federal/state conservation program for agricultural lands but enrollments are presently at the federal acreage cap;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Minnesota Association of Watershed Districts supports a strong CRP element in the Farm Bill conservation title, including but not limited to CRP reauthorization with an increased acreage cap, maintenance of continuous signup for high value environmental practices such as buffers and wetland restoration, maintenance or expansion of the grasslands program, and removal of restrictions on incorporation of drainage water quality management practices, while maintaining other successful federal conservation programs for agricultural lands such as EQIP and CSP;

THEREFORE BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that MAWD will coordinate with the Minnesota Board of Water and Soil Resources, Minnesota Department of Agriculture and others to advocate to and work with the State's Congressional delegation and other federal representatives to achieve this policy goal.
# 2017 MAWD Resolutions Background Information

Proposing District:	Nine Mile Creek Watershed District		
Contact Name:	Randy Anhorn, Administrator		
Phone Number:	(day) 952.835.2078	(cell) 651.472.4061	(evening)
Email Address:	ranhorn@ninemilecreek.org		

## **Resolution Title (brief subject Statement):**

Watershed district support for amendment to state law providing limited liability protection to commercial salt applicators who are certified through an established voluntary salt applicator certification program.

## Factual points which provide background to, or basis for, the issue addressed by Resolution:

Monitoring of our lakes, wetlands, streams and groundwater shows high chloride levels in urban areas across the state.

As of 2016, 39 waterbodies in the Twin Cities metro area had been listed by the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency as impaired for chloride. Total Maximum Daily Load studies have been completed for two waterbodies: Shingle Creek and Nine Mile Creek. This, while only about 10% of metro area surface waterbodies have been assessed for chlorides. The MPCA is developing TMDL studies for the remaining 37 impaired waterbodies through a metro-wide TMDL study.

A recent MPCA study found that 30% of monitoring wells tested in shallow sand and gravel aquifers in the Twin Cities metro area exceeded the state chronic standard for surface waters of 230 mg/L for chloride (MPCA 2013).

Once in the water, chloride becomes a permanent pollutant and continues to accumulate, with no feasible way to remove it. Excessive chloride in streams can harm aquatic life, including fish, invertebrates and aquatic plants and in drinking water is a human health concern.

The Nine Mile Creek TMDL study indicated that largest chloride source to our lakes and streams is through the application of chloride compounds on roads, parking lots, sidewalks and other hard surfaces for winter maintenance practices.

Municipal and county public works departments and the Minnesota Department of Transportation have long trained maintenance staff on proper use of salt. Many have adopted and implemented chloride-management policies and best practices. (As a general matter, public road authorities are already statutorily protected from liability for snow and ice conditions on roads and sidewalks.)

Generally, property owners over-apply salt out of concern over liability for property damage and injuries resulting from accidents caused by snow and ice on sidewalks and other impervious surfaces. Many commercial property-maintenance contractors and property owners are reluctant to implement salt-reduction practices for fear of increased liability.

A bill introduced in 2016 (attached) would provide limited liability protection to commercial applicators (maintenance companies) who complete training and become certified, as well as to property owners who hire certified salt applicators to maintain their properties. The legislation requires maintenance in keeping with best practices and recordkeeping.

In short, providing limited liability to certified salt-applicators and property owners who use certified applicators would minimize the application of chloride compounds on roads, parking lots, sidewalks and other hard surfaces for winter maintenance practices and reduce chloride loading to water resources.

The Minnesota Pollution Control Agency currently oversees a Smart Salting Certification Program that provides training to public and commercial salt applicators, private property owners and managers and others on how to maintain safe surfaces using salt efficiently, because excess salt increases costs and pollutes water resources.

# Based upon above facts, what is the proposed solution to the problem discussed above:

Pass legislation and enact a state law that would provide limited liability to commercial salt applicators that are certified through an established voluntary salt applicator certification program and follow best management practices through the certified training .

# Likely Reaction by the Public or other Governmental Units:

While it is not clear that the public is generally aware of the damage caused to waterbodies by chloride, our conversations with those that more closely follow environmental issues, such as Master Water Stewards and the City of Edina water quality working group, indicate that they are well aware of the impact that the application of chloride compounds on roads, parking lots, sidewalks and other hard surfaces for winter maintenance practices has on our water resources and are very supportive of the limit liability legislation.

Governmental entities in Minnesota have adopted salt-use best practices, and may well support expansion of the practices to private properties. In limited conversations we have had with city, county and state public works and transportation representatives, they feel like they are doing their part and now the private sector needs to step up. Attorneys, on the other

hand, who represent persons with snow- and ice-related claims may oppose the liability exemption.

# This issue is of importance (Check one):

To just our District: \_\_\_\_\_

To just our Region: \_\_\_\_\_

To the entire State: X

\* \*

## RESOLUTION

# Watershed District support for state law that provides limited liability to commercial salt applicators that are certified through an established voluntary salt applicator certification program.

- WHEREAS chloride contamination of water resources has been found in urban areas around the state;
- WHEREAS the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency has listed 39 waterbodies in the Twin Cities metro area as impaired for chloride and has completed Total Maximum Daily Load studies on Nine Mile Creek and Shingle Creek and is currently developing TMDLs for the remaining impaired waterbodies through a metro-wide TMDL study; and
- WHEREAS the TMDL studies have indicated that the largest chloride source to our lakes and streams is through the application of chloride compounds on roads, parking lots, sidewalks and other hard surfaces for winter maintenance practices; and
- WHEREAS liability for property damage or personal injury as a result of snow or ice is one of the main reasons over-salting occurs and many private commercial contractors and property owners are reluctant to implement salt-reduction practices for fear of increased liability; and
- WHEREAS the MPCA currently oversees a voluntary Smart Salting Certification Program that provides training to public and commercial salt applicators, private property owners and managers and others on how to maintain safe surfaces using salt efficiently;
- NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, the Minnesota Association of Watershed Districts supports passage and enactment of state law that provides a limited liability exemption to commercial salt applicators and property owners using salt applicators who are certified through the established salt applicator certification program who follow best management practices.

01	/1	n/	16
<b>W</b>	11	21	I O

This Document can be made available in alternative formats upon request

: 4

REVISOR

16-5301

2594

State of Minnesota

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES H. F. No.

## EIGHTY-NINTH SESSION

03/08/2016 Authored by Kahn and Erhardt

The bill was read for the first time and referred to the Committee on Environment and Natural Resources Policy and Finance

1.1	A bill for an act
1.2	relating to environment; establishing certified salt applicator program; limiting
1.3	liability; authorizing rulemaking; proposing coding for new law in Minnesota
1.4	Statutes, chapter 116.
1.5	BE IT ENACTED BY THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF MINNESOTA:
1.6	Section 1. [116.2025] VOLUNTARY SALT APPLICATOR CERTIFICATION
1.7	PROGRAM.
1.8	Subdivision 1. Definitions. For the purpose of this section, the following terms
1.9	have the meanings given:
1.10	(1) "commercial applicator" means an individual who applies or supervises others
1.11	who apply salt for hire, but does not include a municipal, state, or other government
1.12	employee; and
1.13	(2) "salt" means sodium chloride, calcium chloride, magnesium chloride, or any
1.14	other substance containing chloride.
1.15	Subd. 2. Voluntary certification program; best management practices. The
1.16	commissioner of the Pollution Control Agency shall establish a program to allow
1.17	commercial applicators of salt to obtain certification as a water-friendly applicator. The
1.18	commissioner shall develop a training program that promotes best management practices
1.19	that use the least amount of salt while ensuring safe conditions on surfaces traveled by
1.20	pedestrians and vehicles. The commissioner shall certify a commercial applicator that has
1.21	completed the program as a water-friendly applicator for a period of time to be determined
1.22	by the commissioner. The commissioner shall develop additional training or requirements
1.23	for renewing the certification. Notwithstanding section 16A.1283, the commissioner
1.24	may charge a fee to commercial applicators to recover the costs of developing and

1

	01/12/16	REVISOR	CKM/AA	16-5301
2.1	administering this section. The commis	ssioner shall post the	best management pra	ictices
2.2	developed under this section on the age	ency's Web site.		
2.3	Subd. 3. Liability. (a) A comme	ercial applicator certif	ied under this sectior	<u>ı or</u>
2.4	the owner, occupant, or lessee of land n	maintained by a comr	nercial applicator cer	tified
2.5	under this section is not liable for dam	ages arising from ins	ufficiencies or hazard	ls
2.6	on any premises owned, occupied, mai	ntained, or operated l	by the applicator, own	ner,
2.7	occupant, or lessee, even with actual no	otice thereof, when th	e hazards are caused	solely
2.8	by snow or ice, and the commercial app	olicator's, owner's, oc	cupant's, or lessee's f	ailure
2.9	or delay in removing or mitigating the	hazards is the result o	of implementation, at	osent
2.10	gross negligence or reckless disregard of	of the hazard, of the b	best management prac	otices
2.11	developed by the commissioner under t	his section. Commerc	cial applicators certifi	ed under
2.12	this section and owners, occupants, or le	essees of land maintai	ned by a certified cor	nmercial
2.13	applicator who adopt the best managem	ent practices are pres	umed to be acting pu	rsuant to
2.14	the best management practices in the ab	osence of proof to the	contrary.	
2.15	(b) To receive the liability protect	tion provided in parag	graph (a), the comme	rcial
2.16	applicator or the owner, occupant, or le	ssee of land must kee	p a written record de	scribing
2.17	the road, parking lot, and property main	itenance practices use	ed. The written record	<u>d must</u>
2.18	include the type and rate of application	of de-icing materials	used, the dates of tre	atment,
2.19	and the weather conditions for each eve	ent requiring de-icing	. The records must be	e kept
2.20	for three years.			
2.21	Subd. 4. Penalty. The commissio	ner may revoke or de	cline to renew the cert	tification
2.22	of a commercial applicator who violates	s this section or rules	adopted under this se	ection.
2.23	Subd. 5. Rulemaking. The comm	nissioner may adopt r	ules necessary to imp	olement
2.24	this section.			

2

# **Resolution #5**

#### 2016 MAWD Resolutions Background Information

Proposing District: Middle Fork Crow Watershed District

Contact Name: Margaret Johnson

Phone Number: 320-796-0888

4

*.*,

**Resolution Title (brief subject statement):** Watershed District Funds; Statutory Correction (Resolution Renewal)

#### Factual points providing background and basis of the issue:

Minnesota Statutes section 103D.905, subd. 9, allows Watershed Districts to impose a Project Tax Levy, in addition to other tax levies provided in law, to pay the costs of projects undertaken by the Watershed District which are to be funded, in whole or in part, with the proceeds of grants or construction or implementation loans under the state's Clean Water Partnership program (sections 103F.701 to 103F.755), including that costs of bonds and notes issued by the watershed district under the program or construction or implementation loans under the program.

Section 103D.905, subd. 9, was included in statute at a time when the Clean Water Partnership program was the only program offering grant, cost share and low interest loan dollars for water quality and environmental enhancement projects. The rationale for the statutory amendment was to provide a mechanism to ensure watershed district possessed tax authority to re-pay state loans under the Clean Water Partnership program. However, the statutory language was broad enough to allow the imposition of a project levy to pay shortfalls in the cost of projects funded in whole or part by the program. The rationale for allowing an additional ad valorem tax was that the projects or actions had already been reviewed and vetted by state government, and by virtue of receiving funding, were found to be of broad public or state-wide benefit.

Now, Watershed Districts routinely compete for Clean Water Fund, Outdoor Heritage, Legacy and other funds which are all reviewed and vetted by state government or the Legislative and Citizens Committee on Minnesota Resources, and by virtue of receiving funding, are found to be a broad public or state-wide benefit. Funds received under these "new" programs should be given the same consideration as Clean Water Partnership funds as Watershed District seek to find local funding and matching dollars for projects. A Watershed District should have the same special revenue generating authority regardless of whether funding derives from the Clean Water Partnership program, Clean Water Fund, Outdoor Heritage, Legacy or other funding source. This aspect of the additional funding authority is especially important as organizations begin to implement One Watershed Plans.

Based upon the above facts, what is the proposed solution to the problem discussed above:

In order to correct the omission that has occurred with the creation of new funds, we recommend that MAWD ask BWSR sponsor an amendment to section 103D.905, subd. 9, to include all current and future, state-wide grant, cost share or low interest loan programs.

#### This issue is of importance (Check one):

To just our District: To just our Region: To the entire State: X

# **RESOLUTION # 16-01**

# **RESOLUTION OF THE MIDDLE FORK CROW WATERSHED DISTRICT BOARD OF MANAGERS**

# Recommending Renewal of a Resolution to the MAWD Board Regarding Watershed District Project Levy Authority

WHEREAS, Minnesota Statutes section 103D.905, subd. 9, allows Watershed Districts to impose a Project Tax Levy, in addition to other tax levies provided in law, to pay the costs of projects undertaken by the Watershed District which are to be funded, in whole or in part, with the proceeds of grants or construction or implementation loans under the state's Clean Water Partnership program (sections 103F.701 to 103F.755), including the costs of bonds and notes issued by the watershed district under the program or construction or implementation loans under the program; and

WHEREAS, section 103D.905, subd. 9, was included in statute at a time when the Clean Water Partnership program was the only program offering grant, cost share and low interest loan dollars for water quality and environmental enhancement projects; and

WHEREAS, the rationale for allowing an additional ad valorem tax was that the projects or actions had already been reviewed and vetted by state government, and by virtue of receiving funding, were found to be of broad public or state-wide benefit; and

WHEREAS, now, the Middle Fork Crow Watershed District routinely competes for Clean Water Fund, Outdoor Heritage, Legacy and other funds which are all reviewed and vetted by state government or the Legislative and Citizens Committee on Minnesota Resources, and by virtue of receiving funding, are found to be a broad public or state-wide benefit; and

WHEREAS, funds received under these "new" programs should be given the same consideration as Clean Water Partnership funds as Watershed District seek to find local funding and matching dollars for projects; and

WHEREAS, the Middle Fork Crow Watershed District should have the same special revenue generating authority regardless of whether funding derives from the Clean Water Partnership program, Clean Water Fund, Outdoor Heritage, Legacy or other funding sources.

**THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED,** that the Middle Fork Crow Watershed District approves submitting the attached resolution to MAWD and directing it to work with BWSR to amend section 103D.905, subd. 9, to include all current and future, state-wide grant, cost share or low interest loan programs.

[04154-0002/2463286/1]

# Minnesota State Legislature

# Minnesota House of Representatives

 $\frown HF$  2456  $\,$  as introduced - 90th Legislature (2017 - 2018) Posted on 03/31/2017 07:18pm

KEY: stricken = removed, old language. <u>underscored</u> = added, new language. <u>Version List</u> <u>Authors and Status</u>

#### Jump to page/line # eg. 2.1

1.1	A bill for an act
1.1	relating to taxation; modifying levy authority of watershed districts; amending
1.3	Minnesota Statutes 2016, section 103D.905, subdivision 9.
1.4	BE IT ENACTED BY THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF MINNESOTA:
1.5	Section 1. Minnesota Statutes 2016, section 103D.905, subdivision 9, is amended to read:
1.6	Subd. 9. Project tax levy. In addition to other tax levies provided in this section or in
1.7	any other law, a watershed district may levy a tax:
1,8	(1) to pay the costs of projects undertaken by the watershed district which that are to be
1.9	funded, in whole or in part, with the proceeds of money appropriated by law for grants or
1.10	construction or implementation loans under sections 103F.701 to 103F.755 to the district;
1.11	(2) to pay the principal of, or premium or administrative surcharge, if any, and interest
1.12	on, the bonds and notes issued by the watershed district pursuant to section 103F.725; or
1.13	(3) to repay the construction or implementation loans under sections <u>103F.701</u> to
1.14	<u>103F.755</u> .
1.15	Taxes levied with respect to payment of bonds and notes shall comply with section
1.16	<u>475.61</u> .

https://www.revisor.mn.gov/bills/text.php?number=HF2456&version=0&session=ls90&session\_year=2017&session\_number=0

**Resolution #6** 

# **RESOLUTION # 16-02**

## **RESOLUTION OF THE MIDDLE FORK CROW WATERSHED DISTRICT BOARD OF MANAGERS**

# Recommending Amendment to the Minnesota Open Meeting Law (MOML)(Statutes Chapter 13D) to Allow Watershed District Manager Participation in Meeting via Electronic Means Outside of the Territorial Limits of the Watershed District or State

WHEREAS, Minnesota statutes section 13D.02 allows any public body to meet by interactive television so long as:

(1) all members of the body participating in the meeting, wherever their physical location, can hear and see one another and can hear and see all discussion and testimony presented at any location at which at least one member is present;

(2) members of the public present at the regular meeting location of the body can hear and see all discussion and testimony and all votes of members of the body;

(3) at least one member of the body is physically present at the regular meeting location; and

(4) each location at which a member of the body is present is open and accessible to the public; and

WHEREAS, Minnesota Department of Administration (MDA) Advisory Opinion 13-009, issued on March 19, 2013, states that plain language of the statute does not forbid a member of a public body from "attending" a public meeting at a location "open and accessible to the public" outside of the entity's geographic area; and

WHEREAS, MDA Advisory Opinion 13-009 is in direct conflict with the Minnesota Supreme Court decision in Quast v. Knutson, 150 N.W.2d 199 (Minn. 1967), in which the Court ruled that the phrase "open to the public" as used in the MOML means "within the territorial confines" of the public body; and

WHEREAS, several counties face challenges finding watershed district managers who are willing and able to attend all meetings at all times during the year. For this reason, some very well qualified individuals decline service on watershed boards. Some watershed districts are unable to assemble a quorum during winter months when several managers may be temporarily relocated to warmer climates; and

WHEREAS, allowing meetings by interactive television will allow for efficient continuity of watershed district governance at times when one or more managers is vacationing or temporarily relocated. It will also broaden the pool of individuals willing to serve as watershed district managers; and

WHEREAS, Minnesota statutes section 13D.02 allows any public body to meet by interactive television so long as:

(1) all members of the body participating in the meeting, wherever their physical location, can hear and see one another and can hear and see all discussion and testimony presented at any location at which at least one member is present;

(2) members of the public present at the regular meeting location of the body can hear and see all discussion and testimony and all votes of members of the body;

(3) at least one member of the body is physically present at the regular meeting location; and

(4) each location at which a member of the body is present is open and accessible to the public; and

WHEREAS, Minnesota Department of Administration (MDA) Advisory Opinion 13-009, issued on March 19, 2013, states that plain language of the statute does not forbid a member of a public body from "attending" a public meeting at a location "open and accessible to the public" outside of the entity's geographic area; and

WHEREAS, MDA Advisory Opinion 13-009 is in direct conflict with the Minnesota Supreme Court decision in Quast v. Knutson, 150 N.W.2d 199 (Minn. 1967), in which the Court ruled that the phrase "open to the public" as used in the MOML means "within the territorial confines" of the public body; and

WHEREAS, several counties face challenges finding watershed district managers who are willing and able to attend all meetings at all times during the year. For this reason, some very well qualified individuals decline service on watershed boards. Some watershed districts are unable to assemble a quorum during winter months when several managers may be temporarily relocated to warmer climates; and

WHEREAS, allowing meetings by interactive television will allow for efficient continuity of watershed district governance at times when one or more managers is vacationing or temporarily relocated. It will also broaden the pool of individuals willing to serve as watershed district managers; and

WHEREAS, at its annual meeting in 2013, MAWD adopted a resolution supporting watershed district manager participation in meetings via conference call or other electronic means; and

WHEREAS, to date no action has been taken in furtherance of the resolution.

**THEREFORE,** the Minnesota Association of Watershed Districts directs its staff to work with MDA to sponsor an amendment to section 13D.02 to clarify that the term "open and accessible to the public" can include a location or locations outside of the geographical jurisdiction of the entity, including out of state.

WHEREAS, at its annual meeting in 2013, MAWD adopted a resolution supporting watershed district manager participation in meetings via conference call or other electronic means; and

WHEREAS, to date no action has been taken in furtherance of the resolution.

**THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED,** that the Middle Fork Crow Watershed District approves submitting the attached resolution to MAWD and directing it to work with MDA to sponsor an amendment to section 13D.02 to clarify that the term "open and accessible to the public" can include a location or locations outside of the geographical jurisdiction of the entity, including out of state.

#### 2016 MAWD Resolutions Background Information

## **Resolution #7**

Proposing District: Middle Fork Crow Watershed District

Contact Name: Margaret Johnson

Phone Number: 320-796-0888

. .

**Resolution Title (brief subject statement):** Support of Legislation to lift Middle Fork Crow River Watershed District's general fund levy cap.

#### Factual points providing background and basis of the issue:

Minnesota statutes section 103D.905, subd. 3, provides that a watershed district's general fund: may not exceed 0.048 percent of estimated market value, or \$250,000, whichever is less.

Absent additional levy authority, a non-metro watershed district's ability to fund projects and programs is limited to water management district charges; benefitted property assessment; ad valorem tax funds allocated from the general fund.

The general fund must also pay the general expenses of the watershed district, including staff pay and benefits, manager per diem, facilities expense, etc.

State grant funding is limited and seldom pays the full cost of meritorious projects proposed by watershed districts pursuant to their watershed management plans and in support of TMDLs or other, state-wide water quality or quantity management objectives.

Absent additional levy authority it is practically impossible for non-metro watershed districts to implement plans and projects by any means other than benefitted property assessment or water management district charge – each of which are difficult to justify in the case of water quality projects.

Middle Fork Crow River Watershed District is completing its participation in the North Fork Crow River Watershed One Watershed One Plan planning process. The outcome of this process will be a One Watershed Plan that will require local participants to commit to funding projects identified within the plan within their jurisdictional boundaries. Such funding is practically impossible for the Middle Fork Crow River Watershed District under the current, general fund levy limit.

Removing the \$250,000 levy cap and allowing the levy to be limited by the 0.048 percent of estimated market value cap, will give Middle Fork Crow River Watershed District the flexibility to meet is basic operating budget while also giving it means to allocate general fund dollars to complete projects identified in its current watershed management plan and those identified in the draft One Watershed Plan within the Middle Fork Crow River Watershed planning area.

#### Based upon the above facts, what is the proposed solution to the problem:

Middle Fork Crow River Watershed District intends to work with its constituent counties and its legislative delegation to draft special legislation affecting a change in its general fund levy cap. The District requests MAWD support this effort.

#### This issue is of importance (Check one):

To just our District: X To just our Region: To the entire State: WHEREAS, Minnesota statutes section 103D.905, subd. 3, provides that a watershed district's general fund: may not exceed 0.048 percent of estimated market value, or \$250,000, whichever is less; and

. ....

WHEREAS, Middle Fork Crow River Watershed District is completing its participation in the North Fork Crow River Watershed One Watershed One Plan planning process. The outcome of this process will be a One Watershed Plan that will require local participants to commit to funding projects identified within the plan within their jurisdictional boundaries. Such funding is practically impossible for the Middle Fork Crow River Watershed District under the current, general fund levy limit; and

WHEREAS, Removing the \$250,000 levy cap and allowing the levy to be limited by the 0.048 percent of estimated market value cap, will give Middle Fork Crow River Watershed District the flexibility to meet is basic operating budget while also giving it means to allocate general fund dollars to complete projects identified in its current watershed management plan and those identified in the draft One Watershed Plan within the Middle Fork Crow River Watershed planning area.

**THEREFORE,** the Minnesota Association of Watershed Districts support the efforts of Middle Fork Crow River Watershed District to draft and advance special legislation affecting a change in its general fund levy cap.

# **RESOLUTION # 16-03**

# **RESOLUTION OF THE MIDDLE FORK CROW WATERSHED DISTRICT BOARD OF MANAGERS**

# Seeking Support of Legislation to lift Middle Fork Crow River Watershed District's General Fund Levy Cap

WHEREAS, Minnesota statutes section 103D.905, subd. 3, provides that a watershed district's general fund: may not exceed 0.048 percent of estimated market value, or \$250,000, whichever is less; and

WHEREAS, Middle Fork Crow River Watershed District is completing its participation in the North Fork Crow River Watershed One Watershed One Plan planning process. The outcome of this process will be a One Watershed Plan that will require local participants to commit to funding projects identified within the plan within their jurisdictional boundaries. Such funding is practically impossible for the Middle Fork Crow River Watershed District under the current, general fund levy limit; and

WHEREAS, Removing the \$250,000 levy cap and allowing the levy to be limited by the 0.048 percent of estimated market value cap, will give Middle Fork Crow River Watershed District the flexibility to meet is basic operating budget while also giving it means to allocate general fund dollars to complete projects identified in its current watershed management plan and those identified in the draft One Watershed Plan within the Middle Fork Crow River Watershed planning area.

**THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED,** that the Middle Fork Crow Watershed District approves submitting the attached resolution to MAWD seeking support for the efforts of Middle Fork Crow River Watershed District to draft and advance special legislation affecting a change in its general fund levy cap.

. .

**Resolution #8** 

# 2017 MAWD Resolutions

# **Background Information**

Proposing District: Rice Creek Watershed District

Contact Name: Phil Belfiori

Phone (office): 763-398-3071

Email: pbelfiori@ricecreek.org

**Resolution Title:** Aligning commercial carp fishing regulations with clean water goals, and promoting markets for invasive carp

#### Factual points which provide background to, or a basis for, the issue addressed by Resolution:

Commercial carp fisherman and watershed districts share a common desire to remove carp from Minnesota waters. Commercial fisherman work to remove and sell carp as a business. Watershed districts remove carp to restore water clarity in lakes and rivers. Commercial carp fishing in Minnesota is regulated by State Statues (97C.800), and rules developed by the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources (DNR). While the regulations recognize the positive impact to natural resources of removing carp, they also create financial and logistical burdens to watershed districts and commercial operators. Combined with poor commercial market conditions for carp products, these burdens have made commercial carp fishing financially challenging.

#### Based on the above facts, what is the proposed solution to the problem:

Watershed districts will be in a better position to work with commercial fisherman to remove carp and improve water clarity by better aligning commercial carp fishing regulations with clean water goals, and by encouraging market growth for commercial carp products. This may be accomplished by creating streamlined regulatory conditions for commercial carp fisherman that are actively working with watershed districts (or other clean water LGU's, e.g. counties), and using scientifically accepted methods for managing carp populations. Further, the State of Minnesota could offer, or prioritize within existing programs, small-business development grants or loans to businesses that provide or use commercial carp products.

#### Likely reaction by the public or other governmental units?

The resolution would likely have broad public support. DNR may have concerns. However, the intent of the Resolution is to encourage dialogue and cooperation between the DNR and watershed districts, and not force one-sided policy. The resolution may face resistance from special sportsman's groups (e.g. Bowfishing Associations).

#### This issue is of importance:

To just our District \_\_\_\_\_

To just our Region \_\_\_\_\_

To the entire state <u>x</u>

## Resolution

## Aligning Commercial Carp Fishing Regulations with Clean Water Goals, and Promoting Markets for Invasive Carp

Whereas, commercial fishing for carp in Minnesota waters is governed by State Statues (97C.800) and Minnesota Department of Natural Resources (MN DNR) Rules; and

Whereas, carp are known to degrade water quality and damage aquatic ecosystems; and

Whereas, watershed districts and other local units of government desire to restore water quality in lakes and rivers; and

Whereas, managing carp is a proven method for restoring water quality; and

¢ 1.,,

Whereas, cooperation between commercial carp fisherman and watershed districts on removing carp is beneficial to both parties;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Minnesota Association of Watershed Districts call on legislators and the MN DNR to:

- 1. Better align commercial carp fishing laws and rules with clean water goals, and
- 2. Offer, or prioritize through existing programs, small-business development loans and/or grants to businesses that provide or use commercial carp products

# **2017 MAWD Resolution Background Information**

Proposing District: Contact Name: Phone Number:	Two Rivers Watershed District Dan Money, District Administrator 218-843-3333	Resolution #9
Resolution Title:	Stable Funding for Flood Damage Reduction	

Factual Points which provide background to, or a basis for, the issue addressed by Resolution:

- 1. Each time flooding occurs within the State of Minnesota, millions of dollars in damages occur to public infrastructure, cropland, business, and private property.
- 2. In the past two legislative sessions (2016 & 2017), a total of only \$11 million of bonding money has been appropriated to the DNR Flood Damage Reduction grant program.
- 3. FEMA and MN HSEM have incurred significant expense to repair and rebuild public infrastructure.
- 4. Counties, Cities, Watershed Districts, Townships, and others many times do not have the resources to construct projects to reduce the effects of severe and repeated funding, nor do they have the resources to continually repair infrastructure following a devastating flood.

Based upon the above facts, what is the proposed solution to the problem discussed above:

The proposed solution to this problem is to incorporate a mechanism to provide stable funding to the Flood Damage Reduction program to cost share on flood prevention and flood reduction projects. A suggested amount is \$20 million to \$25 million per year for a period of at least 10 years.

Likely reaction by the Public or other governmental units:

It is unknown what the reaction to this proposal will be. Given the lack of funding in recent years but the high demand for funding to construct projects, it is assumed that it would be favorable.

This issue is of importance: \_\_\_\_\_ To just our District

\_\_\_\_\_ To just our Region

<u>x</u> To the entire State





Board of Managers: President-Darrel Johnson, V.P.-Jim Kukowski, Secretary-Daryl Klegstad, Treasurer-Paul Olsonawski Manager-Roger Anderson, Manager-Allen Brazier, Manager-Gary Johnson Staff: Dan Money, District Administrator; Matt Thompson, Head Technician

410 5treet S., Suite 112, Hallock, MN 56728 - Phone (218) 843-3333 - Email: <u>daniel.money@mn.nacdnet.net</u> World Wide Web: www.TwoRiversWD.com

## Resolution

WHEREAS, Severe flooding is known to occur repeatedly within the Red River Valley and within the State of Minnesota, and

WHEREAS, Each flood event costs the public millions of dollars to repair and replace infrastructure that is damaged by flooding, and

**WHEREAS**, FEMA and MN HSEM provide resources to repair infrastructure following a flood, however very limited resources are available for prevention of flooding, and

WHEREAS, The DNR Flood Damage Reduction grant program has been a successful tool for local governments to utilize to design and build projects to reduce and prevent flooding, and

WHEREAS, The DNR FDR program is severely underfunded.

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** that the Minnesota Association of Watershed Districts pass a resolution asking the MN Legislature to provide stable funding for the DNR FDR program. A suggested sustainable level of funding is \$25 million per year for the next 10 years.

# Minnesota Association of Watershed Districts, Inc.

# 2017 Certificate of Membership & Delegate Appointment Form

MINNGHAHA	CREEK	Watershed District hereby certifies that it a watershed district
duly established and	l in good standin	g pursuant to Minnesota Statute's 103D, and that it is a regular
member of the Mini	nesota Associatic	on of Watershed Districts, Inc. for the year 2017.

MNUEHAHA	CREEK	_Watershed District	herby further certifies	that the names of
its two official delegate	es to the Association	n are BLC	OLSON	
and SURGORY	WHITE	, and the na	me of the alternate del	egate is
	, č	all of whom are man	agers in good standing	of the
MINNEDAHA	CREEK V	Vatershed District.		

Dated: NOV. 9. 2017

MINNEHAMA CREEK Watershed District ress By: SECRETIN