

FINAL

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF
THE MINNEHAHA CREEK WATERSHED DISTRICT
CITIZEN ADVISORY COMMITTEE
SEPTEMBER 24, 2014**

1. Call to Order

The regular meeting of the Minnehaha Creek Watershed District Citizens Advisory Committee was called to order at 6:40 p.m. in the Big Island Room at the Minnehaha Creek Watershed District offices.

2. CAC MEMBERS PRESENT

Tom Baltutis, Bill Bushnell, Sliv Carlson, Jerry Ciardelli, Chris Dovolis, Nina Holiday-Lynch, Lee Keeley, Mark Kjolhaug, Joe Lofgren, Steve Mohn, Dave Oltmans, Peter Rechelbacher, Marc Rosenberg, Michael Osterholm, and Susan Diaz Rydstrand

MANAGERS PRESENT

Sherry White, Bill Olson

OTHERS PRESENT

Brett Eidem, Darren Lochner

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

***Keeley moved, seconded by Holiday-Lynch to approve the agenda as amended:
Add under New Business:***

7.8 November/December meeting dates

7.9 MAWD annual meeting

Under Old Business:

8.1 Report back regarding motions made on past meeting,

Motion carried, none opposed.

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

4.1 August 27, 2014

Rechelbacher moved, Lofgren seconded to table this item to the October meeting. Motion carried, none opposed.

5. REPORT FROM STAFF

Lochner reported today was the deadline for the Cynthia Krieg grant proposals. A sub-committee will be formed after the October meeting. He noted there were about fifteen proposals.

6. REPORT FROM CAC MEMBERS

Osterholm asked if there could be some information provided on the cost of flooding and supporting services. Lochner stated staff is continuously working on sites throughout the area. Osterholm stated it would be helpful to learn from it. White noted Wenck Associates has been hired to gather the financial information.

Kjolhaug asked if there could be an update on Christmas Lake and the zebra mussel issue.

7. NEW BUSINESS

7.1 E-Grade Monitoring Program – Joe Bischoff, Wenck Associates

Amy Christianson and Kelly Duve from the MCWD were present along with Joe Bischoff from Wenck Associates to introduce the E-grade Monitoring Program.

Bischoff gave an introduction to the program and its purpose and goals. He also gave an introduction to Ecosystem Services and Metrics. He discussed planning context, an integrated resource management.

He explained how areas would be assessed on a graded scale and identified for improvement through a five-step process. The first step would be to identify watershed features. He defined ecosystem services which are the benefits people obtain from ecosystems such as food and water, flood and disease control, cultural services.

He discussed the EEP primary ecosystems services (flood control, nutrient cycling, biodiversity, habitat diversity, recreation, and drinking water supply). He stated there will be plenty of opportunities to provide feedback. He showed an example of a flowchart which would be used to work through the process. The process will help to identify stressors and the steps which should be taken.

Bischoff reviewed the second step to identify the ecosystem services and identify functions and potential indicators and metrics. The second step will also build on other programs already in place through the MPCA, DNR and other governmental agencies. Data will then be collected and analyzed beginning with deep and shallow lakes, wetland and streams in three sub watershed areas.

Bischoff reviewed the relationship of EEP to current MCWD programs (e.g., monitoring programs, education, and communications).

Bischoff stated this would be a 3-4 year process. He reviewed a calendar of how the program will begin. The process should be completed by 2017.

Ciardelli asked if there is enough staff to handle this program. Bischoff stated there should be enough staff.

Baltutis asked how it would be used with new developments. Bischoff explained how it will help as a framework for evaluation.

Osterholm asked how the three sub watershed areas were selected. Bischoff stated there are data sets available.

Osterholm asked what information the new data would provide. Bischoff stated this is a way to identify those areas that are not functioning correctly. It will also build off the newer sciences available and look at it from a different perspective.

Duve explained how this would expand the current grading system and provide more information to the public.

Ciardelli asked if this is a new concept. Bischoff stated it is a young concept that hasn't been applied.

- 7.2 **Cost Share Sub-Committee Discussion**
- 7.3 **Cost Share – Susan Rappaport, Deephaven**
- 7.4 **Cost Share – Craig Piepkorn, Mound**
- 7.5 **Cost Share – Ray Lorimor, Mound**
- 7.6 **Cost Share – Union Congregation Church, Minneapolis**
- 7.7 **Cost Share - Patricia Paul, St. Louis Park**

Eidem stated four projects were discussed this evening and three of the four were recommended for approval. He stated one project is \$5,000. Project one and three and four were recommended.

Eidem stated the Rappaport project has progressed from a Cynthia Krieg grant last year. He stated a manual has been prepared as part of this project. There is also art and sculpture including a shoreline buffer strip incorporating sculptures and landscape beds. It is along 125' of shoreline. The cap for this cost share is \$5,000.

The Piepkorn project involves a retrofit redirecting a downspout to drain tile and a rain barrel in the front yard. The second rain barrel will be the educational piece which will be at a workshop they host. The rain barrel will be raffled off at the workshop. The cost share for this project is \$705.50.

The third project is directing downspouts to the middle of the yard where two rain gardens will be located. The cost share is \$324.

Baltutis moved, Kjolhaug seconded to approve the cost share items as recommended. Motion carried, none opposed.

In response to a question from Kjolhaug, Eidem discussed the budget for the cost share program. He discussed opportunities in the future for bigger projects.

7.8 November and December meetings

Bushnell noted the November meeting takes place during Thanksgiving and the December meeting falls during the Christmas holiday.

Osterholm believed we should accommodate all major holidays. Bushnell stated we could look at the entire calendar at the beginning of the year.

Bushnell suggested the second Wednesday of the month in November and December.

Mohn moved, Lofgren seconded to move the November and December meetings to the second Wednesdays of the month. Motion carried, none opposed.

7.9 MAWB Annual Meeting

Bushnell asked if there is a deadline to sign up to attend this meeting. White noted it is December 4-6. Lofgren stated he would check to see what funds are available for representatives to attend. Keeley and Diaz Rydstrand indicated interest as did Bushnell. Bushnell stated there is still time to check again at the October meeting.

8. OLD BUSINESS

8.1 Review Bylaws

Bushnell stated there is a need for a committee to review our bylaws and asked for volunteers to help Keeley. Rechelbacher and Mohn volunteered to help.

Osterholm stated a lot is covered in Robert's Rules of Order which we should also review. He stated conflicts of interest should also be covered.

Bushnell stated he would also serve on the committee. Ciardelli and Osterholm also offered to serve. Lochner stated he would serve as staff liaison. An e-mail will be sent out to set a date to begin discussions.

Baltutis stated this should be completed before reappointments in January. Lochner stated terms and membership should be set as well.

Rechelbacher suggested there be a rough draft available in October or at least November for review.

Bushnell suggested all committee members provide dates they would be available to meet.

8.2 Spartz Memo for Board of Managers Meeting

White reviewed the Board of Managers' response to the CAC motions.

Bushnell asked for further comment on the CAC members' attendance at Board meetings and be allowed to speak. White explained when attendees are allowed to speak at Board meetings.

Osterholm stated the CAC is saying when there is an information issue relating to action taken by the CAC, they should be allowed to provide additional information when the topic is being discussed at the Board level. He cited an example of when this was not allowed. He stated he understood the need for order but it was discretionary.

Baltutis discussed the importance of having current minutes publicized.

Osterholm suggested that the Chair have the discretion to call on a CAC member in attendance. He discussed the importance of the two groups getting along.

Keeley was concerned that we don't have a copy of the Spartz memo. She stated we should put the memo on the next month's agenda. Lochner stated he would send an e-mail of the memo out. It was noted it is on the website.

Osterholm discussed good governance and the areas associated with it.

Mohn questioned the purpose of the CAC. Bushnell stated we are still working on what the purpose is of the CAC.

Baltutis stated we do represent the citizens. Our vote of no confidence in the Board should be a concern.

Diaz Rydstrand read the copy of the Spartz memo from the MCWD website.

Meeting televising was discussed. Bushnell noted the current Board meeting is outside of the LMCC jurisdiction. He stated there are many issues involved.

Keeley moved, Manser seconded to table this item to the October meeting. Keeley stated she has overheard that some CAC members do not wish to continue discussion of this item. Motion carried, none opposed.

9. **SPECIAL ITEM TO ADDRESS BY CAC/STAFF BEFORE NEXT MEETING**

10. **ADJOURNMENT**

Keeley moved, Baltutis seconded to adjourn the meeting at 8:12 p.m. Motion carried, none opposed.