

“Draft”  
MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING  
OF THE  
COMFORT LAKE - FOREST LAKE  
WATERSHED DISTRICT

Thursday, April 26, 2012

**1. Call to Order**

The President called the April 26, 2012 regular Board meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. at the Forest Lake City Offices, 220 North Lake Street, Forest Lake, Minnesota

Present: President Richard Damchik, Vice President Jackie Anderson, Secretary Wayne Moe, Treasurer Tom Lynch and Manager Jon Spence

Absent: None

Others: Doug Thomas (CLFLWD), Jason Naber (EOR), Mark Lobermier (Wyoming), Rennie Smith (CAC), Phil Elkin (Stantec), Erik Anderson (WCD), Ben Montzka (Chisago Co. Comm.), Archie Ducharme (landowner).

**2. Setting of Agenda**

The President called for the reading and approval of the April 26, 2012 regular Board meeting agenda. President asked if there were any changes or additions. Manager Moe asked that the issue of upcoming engineering costs be discussed. Manager Spence asked that an item be added under new business to discuss idea of public access signage relating to invasive species. Motion to approve the agenda, as amended was made by Manager Moe and seconded by Manager Lynch. Discussion. Upon vote, the motion passed.

**3. Reading and Approval of Minutes**

The President called for the reading and approval of the minutes of the March 22, 2012 regular Board Meeting. Administrator Thomas read two changes to the minutes that were provided by Attorney Holtman which were to add “as a condition of receiving grant funds” in two places on page 3 & 4 of the draft minutes. Motion to approve the March 22, 2012 regular Board meeting minutes, as amended, was made by Manager Spence and seconded by Manager Moe. Discussion. Upon vote the motion passed.

**4. Public Open Forum**

Manager Damchik opened the floor to anyone in attendance wishing to comment on items that are not already scheduled to be discussed as part of the meeting agenda.

Chisago County Commissioner Ben Montzka introduced himself and noted a recent meeting with a constituent who had expressed concern about the Sunrise River Project and that it would back water up on his land. He commented that he had spoken with both Manager Spence and District staff and had positive discussions with them regarding the project. He offered his continued support and involvement in the District’s work to get a project built in this area and commented on the County’s support in the past along with the transfer of tax forfeited land to the District for this purpose.

Mr. Archie Ducharme, a landowner on the former JJD 1 system, commented that he was here tonight to get answers to his problem. He commented that he has been waiting 14 years to get water off of his land. When the watershed took over he was told the problem would be resolved in one year. President Damchik asked who told him that. Mr. Ducharme responded that it was first the Ditch Board and then the Watershed District. He further commented that he won his lawsuit with the Ditch Board. He also commented that Commissioner Hegberg will say that he was paid and that abandonment of the ditch took away any rights he had to drainage. He disagrees with that and that the easement that the County has is no good.

President Damchik asked Mr. Ducharme what he was looking for this evening. Mr. Ducharme stated that he has been deprived the use of his land and that we should just buy him out. He commented on how he first started work with Anhorn now Thomas says that the project will isolate water only from the NW but nothing proposed to deal with the water coming out of Forest Lake itself. Manager Moe commented that he understands that the Shallow Pond project will keep the wetlands wetter but did not call for flooding of areas. Mr. Ducharme asked the Engineer what will it do. Jason Naber, sitting in for Engineer Tilman gave a brief explanation of the three possible projects that were evaluated and their effect on Mr. Ducharme's property. All of the projects are designed to get ditch water out into the adjacent wetland areas that function to increase flow residence time and uptake of water. He noted that the project on the tax forfeit land will divert water from the Heims Lake drainage which would take some burden off of the ditch on the north side of the project. The second component would divert some of the flow coming out of the City of Forest Lake through the former ditch. This would impact the Ducharme property along Highway 61 making it wetter. The third possible project evaluated was a partial restoration of Shallow Pond. He noted that this project will raise the water in the ditch approximately two feet and which will impact the property. He concluded by noting that in the Engineers Report it contemplates that project's that have an impact on private property would require agreements with those landowners. Mr. Ducharme commented that if the District wants the land to absorb more why not just buy him out and quit all of the fighting.

Administrator Thomas commented that for the Board's information when he met previously with Mr. Ducharme about the potential projects he did discuss that they would only be built if we had landowner cooperation and that he had mentioned that there would be some form of compensation and that it could range from purchase, to easement to trading of land. Mr. Ducharme commented that the District only wanted to take part of his land and that there was no mention of buying him out and he knows the whole farm will be impacted. Administrator Thomas commented that purchase of the whole property was on the table but in the end it will be the Board that decides.

Manager Anderson commented that it was good to hear the Administrators' comments as she wondered how did this discussion get so far off track. She went on to describe that this issue has taken a long time to get addressed, and unfortunately it has been far longer than she could have imagined. And even today after all of the engineering there is still no absolute answer. She briefly explained the history of this issue starting with the Township, then the Ditch Board and now the Watershed District. There was always recognition that there was damage to property but the decision had been made to look at the bigger picture including the areas upstream including the developed part of Forest Lake. Studies have confirmed what folks thought and reinforced suspected impacts. Manager Anderson recalled Mr. Ducharme's agreement to work with the District that was followed by meetings with him and former Administrator Anhorn. Along with that, Chisago County agreed to petition the District to speed up the process and that we now have an Engineer's Report that will be used to move forward. One of the biggest issues all along was what do we do with the biggest portion of JD1 water coming out of the developed areas of Forest Lake. During that early time Randy had started discussing potential concepts with Mr. Ducharme. Manager Anderson stated that she was excited to see Mr. Ducharme at tonight's meeting and that he is interested and willing to discuss using his property. Now we are at a point where we have developed ideas and that Mr. Ducharme's property has always been seen as an integral part of the project and was not necessarily seen as only about

partial involvement. Hopefully with tonight's discussion this gives Mr. Ducharme some comfort that he needs to and will be part of that discussion and that she, Manager Anderson, is excited about the prospects. She sees that Mr. Ducharme needs to be at the table, and cited her vision of this project as being a benefit to the whole community and how water quality, wildlife, and recreation can be included in that larger vision. Commissioner Montzka commented that maybe County Parks can be part of the solution. Manager Anderson noted that it is important that both counties' are involved. Commissioner Montzka cited need for parkland in the SW portion of the county, and that this has been a very difficult issue and that it has taken a long time to get to this point.

Mr. Ducharme asked the Board to the best of their knowledge how long is it going to take before he knows what is going on. He went on to say that he was not interested in trading for land in Washington County. Commissioner Montzka noted the need now for further meetings with staff as he had some specific questions. Manager Anderson thanked Mr. Ducharme for being willing to be part of the process and it is good to know where he stands. Mr. Ducharme commented that he appreciated Manager Anderson's comments and that he has been afraid to think about possible improvements not knowing what is going to happen. Administrator Thomas noted the next steps that will take place, including the Board accepting the Engineer's Report tonight which will kick off a 60 day state advisory comment period, followed by a public meeting and ordering the project which will play into the 2013 budget process for any work that might occur in 2013. He further commented that when he had met previously with Mr. Ducharme that he explained that the Board could begin with a land appraisal within a couple of months. Mr. Ducharme commented that if the District buys him out he would need a year to move.

Commissioner Montzka thanked the Board for working on this and that it is good to see plans and that they can work. He also likes the concept of the park element. Manager Anderson commented that she is reminded that with study after study it has proved that Mr. Ducharme was right and it is unfortunate that this effort has taken so long but in the end it can result in a project with many positive benefits.

## **5. New Business**

### **a) 2011 Stream Monitoring Report**

Erik Anderson presented the 2011 Water Monitoring Report to the Managers and then gave an overview of the Report including:

- The location of 2011 monitoring stations.
- The method that was used to collect data on quality and quantity.
- Summarized the 2011 results from each site.
- Discussed the addition of the Heims Lake drainage site in 2012 and the effectiveness monitoring that will take place in 2012 with the completion of the Broadway Ave. bio-filtration basin.
- Went through the conclusions and recommendations in the report.

Manager Anderson asked what the source of e-coli was that was monitored such as human, livestock, or wildlife. Erik responded that all of them could be sources but he felt that the most likely source is from animals. Manager Anderson asked what is the next phase to determining the source of the e-coli and suggested that this might be the next step. Erik Anderson commented that there is a technology referred to as finger printing that can give information on the possible source.

Manager Anderson moved to investigate the cost of finger printing and have that information available for the Board's consideration when putting together the 2013 work plan and budget. Motion was seconded by Manager Spence. Discussion. Upon vote the motion passed.

Manager Spence asked what is a macro invertebrate survey and how is it a measure of quality. Erik Anderson responded that the survey is designed to collect and measure the number and type of invertebrates, the small bugs and critters, in the stream and then calculate a stream health score which can be used to provide an assessment of stream health. This type of survey is sometimes used as the invertebrates often respond to small changes in water quality and can give you a quicker assessment than waiting a number of years to have enough water quality data to make the same assessment of is the stream getting better, staying the same, or getting worse.

Manager Moe moved to investigate the cost of adding macro invertebrate survey to the District monitoring program for the Board's consideration when putting together the 2013 work plan and budget. Motion was seconded by Manager Anderson. Discussion. Upon vote the motion passed.

Manager Anderson commented on the value and importance of this report and that it is one of the most important things we do on an on-going basis. She further commented on how it can be used to direct efforts and the need to build on it with the things we have just been discussing. She then referred to the map on page 50 of the report and how it shows high load areas and what it means in relationship to defining hotspots and what else can we do to further identify and address the high loads in these areas. She further commented on what do we really know about what is going on in these areas and what can we do about it. Erik Anderson commented on when the loads come and their association with high flows which is predictable. Manager Anderson wants to discuss is there something else we should be looking at beyond what we discussed before we launch into these big regional projects and wants the scientists to look into this as we move into our budget process. Need to use data to help design where we need to implement additional BMP's to reduce phosphorous. Is there a way to model these areas where we can look at all of these known factors and determine if we are able to determine their effectiveness without waiting five years after the fact to conclude that we did not meet an objective. Trying to use technology to help us do this and maybe by spending some additional effort in advance. Jason Naber responded that modeling was used to evaluate the projects in the Sunrise River Engineer's Report against the estimated required load reductions to meet water quality standards. He noted that the models are good at estimating reductions for total suspended solids but do not do as good a job with dissolved phosphorous. He pointed out, for example, the wetting and drying of wetlands as being a significant potential cause of high phosphorous concentrations during peak runoff events and this may be the type of thing where we need additional monitoring. Manager Anderson commented on the side ditches in the project area and do we understand their role. If not maybe this should be looked at before undertaking the project. What do we need to do to look at this hot zone in its entirety and what do we need to look at in the way of incorporating these factors as part of the report and do some more in this area. She would like to see more information on this as part of developing the budget. Can we do an inventory of all of these factors within these hot zones and make sure we are addressing them all.

Motion by Manager Anderson to direct technical staff to look at the hot zone areas for phosphorus load and to develop a cost to do an inventory and analysis of all of the factors that could be contributing to the overall phosphorus loading. Motion was seconded by Manager Moe. Discussion. Upon vote the motion passed.

#### b) TH61 Aesthetics & Water Quality Improvement Planning Study

Administrator Thomas introduced Phil Elkin from Stantec who was the project manager for the TH61 Aesthetics & Water Quality Improvement Planning Study. He also noted that the study was done through a three way partnership with the City of Forest Lake, CLFLWD, and RCWD.

Phil Elkin went through an overview of the draft study report including:

- An overview of the history of the project and how it came about.

- Described the project area which is the Highway 61 corridor between Highways 97 & 8.
- Discussed the importance of the Mn Department of Transportation in the process and any future work as they own the ROW which is substantial at approximately 280 feet.
- Some of MnDOT concerns are over maintenance, stormwater credits, and future transportation uses/needs.
- Went through the issue identification and analysis for the three areas that the study broke out.
- Described the types of storm water management BMP's that were identified.
- Showed some examples of what the corridor improvement might look like.
- Described in more detail the North Gateway portion of the report which is the area of the corridor that is within the CLFLWD.

c) 2011 Annual Report

Administrator Thomas noted his memo in the Board packet and gave a brief overview of the 2011 Annual Report.

Manager Moe made the motion to accept the attached 2011 Comfort Lake Forest Lake Watershed District Annual Report and 2012 Work plan and authorizes staff to submit it to the State Agencies pursuant to MS 10B and 103D. Motion was seconded by Manager Spence. Discussion. Upon vote the motion passed.

c) 2011 Audit

Administrator Thomas noted his memo in the Board packet. He explained that in this year's audit there was one deficiency relating to internal controls which dealt with the way up front grant funds are tracked at the end of the year and that any unspent funds at the end of the year should be listed as deferred revenue. This results from us using a cash basis for accounting during the year and then having to convert that to an accrual method at the end of the year. The report also identified one exception which was related to collateral deposits and a deficiency of \$10,050 in the end of the year and which was corrected in January of 2012. He also noted the District's management responses to the two items noted.

Manager Spence made the motion to accept and authorize filing of the Comfort Lake Forest Lake Watershed District 2011 Financial Report and Audit. Motion was seconded by Manager Moe. Discussion. Upon vote the motion passed.

d) Invasive Species Boat Launch Signage

Manager Spence commented about recent discussions of the Comfort Lake Association which identified the idea/need for invasive species signage at the public landings of area lakes that showed all of the lakes in the area and their status as to what invasives are found in the various lakes and might be being brought to another lake. The idea would be to help boaters understand what they may be transporting from lake to lake if they do not clean off their boats properly. Manager Damchik commented that doesn't the DNR do this. Manager Moe commented that at least with Bone Lake there is a sign that informs boaters that the lake has milfoil. Manager Anderson commented that this is not a bad idea but probably needs a little more work and the need to go back to the agencies to see if there is any assistance available for something like this. Administrator Thomas commented that he would follow-up with the Chisago County Water Resource Manager and the DNR to look into this suggestion.

**6. Old Business**

a) Sunrise River Project – Accept Engineer's Report & WMP Amendment

Administrator Thomas noted his memo in the Board packet on this item. He provided a brief chronology of the steps that the District has undertake to get to this point in time where the Board needs to accept the Engineer's Report and submit it to the DNR & BWSR for advisory comments as well as initiating the proposed amendment to the District's Watershed Management Plan that will incorporate the Engineer's Report into the Plan and as such allows the District to implement projects identified in the Engineer's Report over a period of time using the its 103B authorities. He also pointed out the addition of a project cost summary as requested by Manager Moe at the April meeting. Staff recommended that Board accept the Engineer's Report and instruct the submittal of it to the BWSR and DNR for their advisory comments and to instruct staff to initiate the Plan amendment procedure as outline if MS103B and the District's watershed management plan.

Manager Moe commented that he had a number of questions dealing with the next phases of the projects. He noted the Board minutes from the May 26, 2011 meeting where the motion was to accept the initial evaluation and recommendation memo and move ahead with preparation of the final engineers report for \$210,374 without prior Board approval. What he understood to be part of the work was to be at 90% of final design on the projects. He added that he had raised the question about the cost of the final 10% and if that meant that we would have to pay another \$200,000 or if it meant that it would represent the remaining 10% and that Engineer Tilman said it would be in the range of 10% of the original cost. As he adds up the engineering for the final design in the cost summary sheet that was sent out with the board packet he noted that the engineering cost without the Carp work is roughly \$250,000 which is a lot more than 10%. Jason Naber asked Manager Moe if he was referring to just the design portion. Manager Moe responded yes, and he wondered what the other Managers feel about this. He noted that he is willing to accept the report but we are being told now that it is going to cost significantly more than the 10% to get to final designs and he has concerns about this.

Administrator Thomas commented that if you look at the projects, not including the retrofits it is about \$70,000 for final designs. He noted that the Forest Lake retrofits were presented in a separate engineering memo and it was acknowledged in that memo the 60 to 70 sites that were identified were not going to go to final plans or 90% plans. He commented that he had understood that the comments related to the last 10% was related to the projects such as Bixby Park and the Wyoming Wetland Enhancement. Manager Moe commented that in the April 16, 2012 memo it identified location of urban retrofits. Manager Spence commented that EOR did identify potential sites.

Manager Moe commented that we did sign on for 90% final design as one of the deliverables and that for him that meant the \$201,000 was to get us up to 90% designs. Now we are being told that final design is going to cost us another \$245,000. Manager Spence noted that the \$245,000 includes the retrofit final design number of \$165,000 but to him it should not. Manager Lynch asked if there was a difference between the copies of the cost summary that he received with the packet. Administrator Thomas noted that they were all the same.

Manager Spence questioned whether Shallow Pond was part of the work order. Manager Moe disagreed and noted a memo that identified the evaluation of the enhancement of the interaction between the floodplain and upstream of comfort Lake and that means Shallow Pond. He also noted a 1/12/2011 memo that identified on page 4 of 7 that another option was installing a weir will be considered. He also commented that in March of 2011 he brought up and mentioned Shallow Pond specifically and we have always had discussions if Shallow Pond was a sink or source from the beginning.

Jason Naber commented that regarding the work order for the retrofits it said to identify sites and feels that EOR has delivered on that point. Relating to Shallow Pond that the reference to floodplain areas was meant to be those areas upstream of Greenway Ave and included the areas around the tax forfeit land and

Bixby Park. Regarding Shallow Pond as they began to do more evaluation the modeling component became very complicated as EOR looked at impacts from restoring Shallow Pond which resulted in increased engineering outside the original scope. Manager Moe commented that he certainly expected some numbers on bidding and construction but did not expect the other number to be so high. He noted that he had no problem with paying the portion just done but does have a problem with Shallow Pond as he felt it was in the original scope. He stated that he is OK with the other stuff such as the McCullough site and the storyboard.

Administrator Thomas commented that if Manager Moe is comfortable with accepting the Engineering Report and moving ahead with the process and with the next agenda item which is to address the final engineering invoice because the work order stated that the cost was not to exceed the original amount without board approval he suggested that the Board move on the Engineer's Report and Plan amendment and then take this discussion up again in the next agenda item.

Manager Moe moved resolution 12-04-01 for its adoption. Manager Lynch seconded the motion. Discussion. Manager Spence noted a correction that needs to be made regarding elevations on pg. 51. Upon vote the motion passed. President Damchik called for a roll call vote on Resolution 12-04-01. Anderson yes, Damchik yes, Lynch yes, Moe yes, Spence yes. Upon a vote of 5 yes's and 0 no's the President declared the resolution adopted.

b) Sunrise River Project – Approval of Final Engineers Invoice

Administrator Thomas noted his memo in the Board packet. He pointed out that he considers the EOR memo as a final invoice and it is being presented for the Board consideration. The memo identifies four areas where cost exceeded the original work order including 1) a \$3,387 overrun, 2) costs associated with the addition of Shallow Pond and the McCullough site, 3) creation of a project story board, and 4) presentation of the project at a St. Croix River Basin meeting. His recommendation is to pay for the additional project designs and the story board. He felt that the other items are either a cost of doing business or can be thought of as marketing opportunity for EOR with a group of potential future clients.

Manager Spence asked Manager Moe if he was OK with the McCullough design and the story board. Manager Moe responded that yes he was Ok with those items. Manager Spence commented that he was puzzled as to what would have left Shallow Pond out of the equation with the original work. He stated that he was not sure what he wants to do and sees Manager Moe's point. Manager Moe commented that Shallow Pond has always been there and in his opinion was one of the possible projects from the beginning. Manager Spence commented that he recalls that this wet dry cycle is the part that we have talked about. He stated that he needs to have more information/detail in order to determine if the work was in fact outside of the scope.

Manager Anderson suggested that Shallow Pond could be set aside and that we can have more discussion on it when Engineer Tilman is back. She commented that good points have been raised and that for her the with the information that has been presented it is unclear if the additional work was outside the scope. Jason Naber commented that the work order defined the scope of work and as the project manager he felt that that is what EOR focused their efforts on and that developing project designs for Shallow Pond was not part of that. Manager Moe commented that Shallow Pond has always been part of the discussion. Jason Naber explained that the final work order was based on the initial evaluation and recommendations report that was done and that the final work order does not identify Shallow Pond to move ahead for project design. He did note that further modeling did show a potential for a partial restoration of Shallow Pond and the decision was made to pursue developing a preliminary design. He noted that after the feasibility study the intention was to leave Shallow Pond as is. Manager Spence clarified that the memo Jason was referring to was the feasibility and recommendation memo. Manager Moe commented on the

1/12/2011 memo. Jason Naber clarified that the final work order that they were working off of was the one dated 5/26/2011. Manager Anderson requested to have both of these memos provided to the Board and that the Shallow Pond pay request be put on the May Board meeting agenda for further discussion.

Manager Anderson moved to approve payment to EOR per Administrator Thomas's recommendation minus the Shallow Pond component. Motion was seconded by Manager Moe. Discussion. Upon vote the motion passed.

c) Sunrise River Project – County/City Meetings

Administrator Thomas noted his memo in the Board packet. He gave an update on his contact with Chisago and Washington Counties to set up meetings to present and discuss the Engineer's Report and how the counties might become involved in the bigger aspects of the project area such as recreation, trails and open space. He noted that he has heard back from the lead water staff from both counties and has a list of people from each county which are recommended to attend. At this point he explained that he is looking for some direction from the Managers on their attendance before he moves forward with setting up meetings. Managers commented that they are interested and it is important for the Managers to attend their respective county meeting. Consensus was for Administrator Thomas to move ahead with setting up the meetings.

d) Revised Administrator Performance Review Form

Manager Spence updated the Board on the new Administrator Performance Review Form that was sent out with the Board packet. He pointed out that after last year's review there was discussion that the review form could be improved upon and that at that time he and Manager Anderson were appointed to serve on an ad-hoc work group to come up with a revised form. Original thought was to merge the existing CLFLWD form with one that the Rice Creek WD was using. After looking at other forms and processes, and a draft merged form that Administrator Thomas had taken a shot at it, he and Manager Anderson concurred the Rice Creek form was really pretty good and that what it needed was some minor modifications to reflect the discussion that the Board had last fall. Manager Anderson commented that the revised form incorporates new headings for the rankings and with a few other small changes that it will work well and meet the Board's expectations. Consensus was for Managers to complete the form and bring it back to the next meeting or get it to Manager Spence before the next meeting.

e) NBL12/Foshay – Request to Authorize Minor Repairs

Administrator Thomas noted his memo in the Board packet. He explained that after a very dry fall and after this spring's rain inspection of the Foshay Project revealed some areas needing minor repair including some re-seeding, soil correction of a wet area, and shaping of the rock filter. He noted that he had discussed this with the Chisago SWCD and that they have provided the District with instructions for completing the repairs and that he has contacted D. George Construction and has received a quote of \$950.00 to complete the work.

Managers asked if this will be the last costs for this project. Administrator Thomas commented that it would be and that future maintenance will be the responsibility of the landowner which is laid out in the grant agreement that the District has with the landowner.

Manager Anderson made the motion to authorize District staff to contract with D. George Construction in the amount of \$950.00 to complete minor repairs as directed by the Chisago SWCD for the NBL12/Foshay water quality improvement project. Motion was seconded by Manager Spence. Discussion. Upon vote the motion passed.

f) Comfort Lake Outlet – Beaver Dam Update

Administrator Thomas gave an update to the Board on the beaver dam removal on the Sunrise River upstream of the rock weir at County Road 22. He noted that he has met with a licensed animal control contractor and it has been confirmed that beaver are active in this area which was not un-expected. He then provided the Board with the cost that was quoted by Animal Eviction services for beaver removal. The quote was broken down into two options including \$395 plus taxes for one week of time or a per beaver charge plus a trip fee and taxes. Administrator Thomas recommended the use of Animal Eviction Services in this situation as they are licensed and bonded.

Motion was made by Manager Moe to contract with Animal Eviction Services for the removal of beaver at on the Sunrise River and for using the one week rate and then a per animal basis after that. Motion was seconded by Manager Spence. Discussion. Upon vote the motion passed.

g) CLFLWD/City of Wyoming – Coordination Agreement

Administrator Thomas noted his memo in the Board packet. He explained that the draft cooperation agreement was developed as a result of the Board discussions and direction back in November of 2011 after the Mastell violation occurred on Comfort Lake. The direction that was provided by the Board was to have staff develop a draft cooperative agreement that could be used with the City to develop a more formal process for coordinating activities in shoreland and floodplain areas with the goal of reducing the chance for violations to occur as well as continue to improve on our already good working relationship with the City. Administrator Thomas noted that he was not looking for any decision or discussion at the meeting but will be putting this back on the May agenda for discussion and to determine if it fulfills what the Managers were looking for back in 2011.

**7. Report of Staff**

Administrator Thomas noted his written report in the Board packet. He also pointed out a couple of information pieces on an upcoming horse workshop and the MAWD summer tour.

Emmons and Olivier Resources (EOR) – Nothing new to report

**8. Report of Treasurer**

Approval of Bills

Treasurer Lynch presented the Treasurer's Report (A copy of which is annexed and incorporated by reference) and bills and payroll totaling \$46,852.67.

Motion was made by Manager Anderson to approve the April 26, 2012 Treasurer's Report and pay the bills and payroll as presented. Manager Moe seconded the motion. Discussion. Upon vote, the motion passed.

**9. Reports of Officers and Managers**

Manager Damchik – Recognized the excellent job Manager Anderson did in responding to Mr. Ducharme's during the public forum.

Manager Lynch – Left early

Manager Spence – Nothing new to report

Manager Anderson – Nothing new to report

Manager Moe – Nothing new to report

**10. Adjournment**

Motion to adjourn the CLFLWD regular Board meeting at 9:15 pm was made by Manager Spence and seconded by Manager Moe. Upon vote, the motion passed.

---

Wayne S. Moe, Secretary