

**LAKE MINNETONKA CONSERVATION DISTRICT  
BOARD OF DIRECTORS**

7:00 PM, Wednesday, December 10, 2008  
Wayzata City Hall

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

Whalen called the meeting to order at 7:01 p.m.

**2. ROLL CALL**

**Members present:** Lisa Whalen, Minnetrista; Tom Tanner, Wayzata; Andrew McDermott, Orono; Tom Scanlon, Spring Park; Chris Jewett, Minnetonka; Steve Johnson, Mound; Keith Kask, Deephaven; Dennis Klohs, Minnetonka Beach; Bill Olson, Victoria; Kelsey Page, Greenwood; Richard Siakel, Shorewood; Herb Suerth, Woodland. Also present: Charles LeFevere, LMCD Counsel; Greg Nybeck, Executive Director; Judd Harper, Administrative Technician; and Emily Herman, Administrative Assistant.

**Members absent:** Doug Babcock, Tonka Bay. The City of Excelsior has no appointed member.

**3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

**MOTION:** McDermott moved, Tanner seconded to approve the agenda as presented.

**VOTE:** Motion carried unanimously.

**4. CHAIR ANNOUNCEMENTS**, Chair Whalen

Whalen made three Chair announcements. First, she reminded the Board that the December 24<sup>th</sup> meeting had been previously cancelled and she wished all a Happy Holiday. Second, the LMCD held their Open House on December 3<sup>rd</sup> and she thanked all that attended. Third, the LMCD Personnel Committee was scheduled to meet on December 15<sup>th</sup> to discuss the performance of the Executive Director. She requested that Board members forward their comments to her by December 12<sup>th</sup> so that they can be included in the performance review.

Page arrived at 7:04 p.m.

**5. APPROVAL OF MINUTES-** None

**6. APPROVAL OF CONSENT AGENDA**

Tanner requested that agenda item 6F be removed from the consent agenda.

McDermott moved, Olson seconded to approve the consent agenda as amended, removing agenda item 6F. Motion carried unanimously. Items so approved included **6A**, Audit of vouchers 11/16/08-11/30/08 and 12/1/08-12/15/08; **6B**, October financial summary and balance sheet; **6C**, 10/30/08 EWM/Exotics Task Force Meeting Minutes; **6D, Harborage HOA**, draft Findings of Fact and Order approving new multiple dock (minor change) license and variance applications to reconfigure nine Boat Storage Units (BSUs) on 705' of continuous shoreline on Smithtown Bay; and **6E, City of Deephaven**, draft findings of Fact and Order

approving new multiple dock license, special density license, and variance applications for 225 BSUs on 3,829' of non-continuous shoreline.

**7. ITEMS REMOVED FROM THE CONSENT AGENDA**

**6F. Minnesota Department of Revenue**, staff recommends Board approval to authorize payment and signature for the processing of the Consent to Change Sales and Use Tax form as a result of the 2005-2007 Sales and Use Tax Audit.

Whalen asked Tanner to clarify why he had item 6F removed from the consent agenda.

Tanner asked Nybeck why the LMCD was penalized for items purchased in 2005 and 2006.

Nybeck stated that the MN Department of Revenue performed a Sales and Use Tax audit for the period of 2005-2007. During the 2006 audit that was performed by Abdo Eick & Meyers, reference was made that the LMCD made payment for a few invoices for purchases made from out of state vendors that did not reference the payment of sales tax. Staff worked with the accountant to resolve that matter from 2007 to present; however, there were a few invoices from 2005 and 2006 that sales and use tax was not paid. This was identified by the Minnesota Department of Revenue and payment needed to be made.

McDermott asked if the LMCD pays out of state sales tax for purchases made.

Nybeck believed the LMCD pays out of state sales tax; however, that would need to be clarified. He stated he wanted the Board to be aware of the audit and provide approval to proceed with the signing of the required forms and approval of payment. Overall, he was pleased with the outcome of the audit and the minimal findings that were documented.

**MOTION:** Tanner moved, Siakel seconded to authorize payment and signature for the processing of the Consent to Change Sales and Use Tax form as a result of the 2005-2007 Sales and Use Tax Audit.

**VOTE:** Motion carried unanimously.

**8. PUBLIC COMMENTS-** Persons in attendance, subjects not on the agenda (limited to 5 minutes)

There were no comments from the public on subjects not on the agenda.

**9. PUBLIC HEARINGS**

There were no public hearings scheduled.

**10. OTHER BUSINESS**

**A. Heidi Wolf**, 2008 MN DNR Public Access Inspection Program.

Whalen welcomed Heidi Wolf on behalf of the Board and asked her to provide an overview of the 2008 project.

Ms. Heidi Wolf, MN DNR Watercraft Inspection Program Coordinator, stated that she was in attendance to review the 2008 project and she provided an overview via a PowerPoint presentation. She highlighted the following information:

- Expectations- The LMCD received a MN DNR prevention grant for 542 hours of inspections, with an equal amount of inspection time to be matched by the MN DNR. The LMCD also chose to cooperatively hire with the MN DNR for an additional 1,846 hours. She stated this was the first year the prevention grant was available and that it will continue again in 2009. The LMCD requested that the 2008 inspections be performed at four high use public accesses (Grays Bay, Spring Park, Maxwell and North Arm) and four less popular public accesses (Wayzata, Mound, Carsons, Halsteads) on a rotating basis.
- Results- 3,364 hours of inspections were completed for all Lake Minnetonka public accesses; which resulted in 13,573 inspections. 2,092 hours were completed at the eight public accesses on Fridays, Saturdays, Sundays and Holiday, as well as 1,700 hours completed for six of the eight public accesses.
- Inspections and Hours During "Peak" Times- She reviewed, on a public access basis, inspections conducted (entering and exiting), hours of operation, and inspections per hour. The Grays Bay public access had the highest activity (9.34 inspections per hour), with Wayzata Bay public access having the lowest activity (1.09 inspections per hour). A recommendation was made to decrease inspections at the Wayzata Bay public access, due to lesser traffic, and increase inspections hours at the Carsons Bay public access.
- Zebra Mussels- Based on a series of questions, approximately 258 boats had come from another body of water infested with zebra mussels; compared to 473 in 2007. There were no zebra mussels found on any watercraft entering or exiting Lake Minnetonka. There were 172 (approximately 1.5%) watercraft entering Lake Minnetonka that came with attached vegetation; providing for the highest statistic in the last four years. There were 415 watercraft exiting Lake Minnetonka that had attached vegetation before inspection.
- Decal System- An overview of the decal system utilized by MN DNR inspectors was provided, including related statistics.
- Boater Knowledge- 97% of watercraft users were familiar with Eurasian watermilfoil, including their impacts, and 95.8% were familiar with zebra mussels.
- Future Recommendations- 1) continue to define "peak" hours as 6 a.m. to 2 p.m. at all public accesses other than Grays Bay (6:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m.), 2) decrease or eliminate hours at Wayzata Bay and increase hours at Carson's Bay, and 3) increase the percentage of peak hours accomplished.
- She entertained questions and comments from the Board.

Whalen asked if the inspectors could identify how many of the 172 incoming watercraft with attached vegetation included Eurasian watermilfoil and if the higher rate of attached vegetation in 2008 was due to an increase in inspection hours.

Wolf stated that the inspectors did not have the ability to identify whether attached vegetation was Eurasian watermilfoil. Therefore, the owners of these watercraft were asked to remove their vegetation away from the launch ramp so that it does not wash back into the Lake. She could not document why there was an increase of attached vegetation and agreed that the increase in inspection hours could have affected the results.

Tanner asked Wolf if there was a standard inspection procedure utilized and why she recommended increasing inspections at the Carsons Bay public access.

Wolf stated the MN DNR has a specialized inspection procedure that was created for use at Lake Minnetonka, which included discussion of zebra mussels first rather than later as utilized on other bodies of Minnesota waters. She also stated there is a separate inspector crew trained specifically for Lake Minnetonka. The inspection itself takes about five minutes per boat. She recommended increasing hours on Carsons Bay public access due to having more public contacts per hour.

Whalen asked what type of watercraft operator feedback was received.

Wolf stated that 2008 provided for no altercations being reported and that watercraft operators were generally very nice. Due to the heavy presence on Lake Minnetonka, the inspectors do deal with public frustration when congestion of boats for launching and parking are provided. Altercation training is provided to the inspectors; however, they are not peace officers and must rely on such officers at times.

Nybeck asked Wolf to comment on the use of the MN DNR Conservation Officer during the 2008 boating season.

Wolf stated that the MN DNR provided for herself and four Conservation Officers (known as Water Resources Officers) to make a strong presence at the Grays and Maxwell Bay public accesses for the purpose of access checks and educational discussions with the public. As the MN DNR cannot do roadside checks, the officers can perform such inspections and write citations or warnings. The officers are new this year, have specialized training in the prevention of invasive species, and can dedicate 50% of their time to such. She would welcome their presence on an increased basis. One citation and multiple warnings were issued.

Nybeck stated that one of the criticisms that LMCD had received in previous years was the lack of a MN DNR Conservation Officer, or other licensed peace officer, to issue citations or warnings relating to invasive species at public accesses on Lake Minnetonka. He believed that this was a positive step and the program should be expanded in 2009 and beyond.

Suerth concurred on the need to increase the presence of license peace officers, in particular MN DNR Conservation Officers. He asked that Wolf initiate contact for such action in 2009 and beyond.

Olson stated that a boat was stopped in 2008 from being launched at a commercial marina on Lake Minnetonka due to the presence of zebra mussels. He asked if the MN DNR received a report on such issue.

Wolf stated the MN DNR does not receive a report unless they are called for verification or questions during the process. She reviewed a typical procedure that is in place should they be called in for assistance.

Tanner asked if the MN DNR works with training marina staff.

Wolf stated that the MN DNR was always willing to train anyone working around the prevention of invasive species.

Whalen thanked Wolf for her presentation on behalf of the Board.

**B. Ordinance Amendment**, first reading of an ordinance establishing Quiet Waters in the channel north of Cedar Point East on Wayzata Bay.

Whalen provided a brief background of this agenda item, directing the Board to the draft ordinance in their packet. She asked Nybeck to expound on this agenda item.

Nybeck stated that a public hearing was conducted by the LMCD on this matter at the October 8<sup>th</sup> Board meeting. At this meeting, the Board directed staff to prepare a draft ordinance amendment to establish a Quiet Water are in the channel north of Cedar Point East on Wayzata Bay. He provided the Board with a buoy placement layout, prepared by Tony Brough from Hennepin County Environmental Services, after consultation with Lt. Kip Carver of the Sheriff Water Patrol.

The Board discussed the proposed buoy layout, including the number of red and green navigational buoys provided and the distance between their placement. There was discussion of the navigational buoy system on Lake Minnetonka and how Hennepin County Environmental Services provides buoys for the Sheriff's Water Patrol for navigational and public safety purposes. The Board asked Nybeck to communicate to Brough the Board's interest in placing the red and green navigational buoys at Cedar Point East as wide apart as possible.

Whalen recommended that the Board consider adoption of the draft ordinance amendment, subject to staff working with Hennepin County on the placement of the buoys. She asked the Board if they would like to adopt such ordinance and whether they would be willing to waive the second and third readings.

McDermott questioned the wording of Subd. 17, which noted, "... through the shallow water area...." He felt the wording should state, "... through the deep water area..."

LeFevere stated the intent was to document the marked channel through the shallow water area. If that is confusing, the ordinance could read, "... the channel north of Cedar Point..." Ordinarily, a channel is between two parts of land.

**MOTION:** Siakle moved, Jewett seconded to approve first reading of the draft ordinance amendment as submitted, to waive the second and third readings, and to adopt the ordinance amendment.

**VOTE:** Motion carried unanimously.

**C. Seahorse Condominium Association**, 2008 reconfiguration of non-conforming multiple dock license application.

Whalen asked for comments from Mr. James Gilbert, legal counsel for Seahorse, prior to getting further background from LMCD staff. She welcomed Gilbert on behalf of the Board.

Gilbert made the following comments:

- He was in attendance to discuss a proposed resolution through a settlement agreement, which was further outlined in a letter he submitted, dated 12/10/08. Seahorse has agreed to accept the Board's direction from last May (26,800 square feet for the 67 overnight Boat Storage Units (BSUs) and 2,400 square feet for the 10 transient BSUs). He believed that the proposed settlement agreement complies with all provision of LMCD Code, including Section 2.015.
- The proposed site plan is for 25,300 square feet for the 67 overnight BSUs, with a reduction in transient BSUs to nine.
- This is a full settlement of any or all claims for larger square footages for his clients. If agreed to by the Board, his clients have agreed to waive their rights to expand the facility in the future, unless LMCD Code changed and would allow such expansion.
- This settlement would put to rest incomplete and inconsistent records over the past years. However, Seahorse maintains that they are entitled to over 30,000 square feet for the overnight BSUs.
- He requested that the docks be accepted as they currently are. At this time, his clients do not have intentions to make changes, which is problematic with Nybeck's recommendation that the current dock would need to be changed for 2009. The current installation has some discrepancies throughout, a few inches here and there for width, and Seahorse would prefer not to update the site plan at this time. They believe that this would be more appropriate when they make a future application for the remaining 1,470 square feet for the overnight BSUs.
- He believed that the age of the facility should be taken into consideration and he encouraged the Board to agree to this settlement agreement.
- He entertained questions and comments from the Board. Seahorse President Steve Carlson was in attendance if the Board needed further clarification from him.

Whalen asked for further background from Nybeck.

Nybeck provided an overview of his staff memo, dated 12/4/08, via a PowerPoint presentation. Some of the discussion points that he highlighted included: 1) features of the site, 2) Board discussions the past 15 months, and 3) the four Options discussed at the October 22<sup>nd</sup> Board meeting. LeFevere was directed to prepare Findings of Fact and Order when the applicant was only willing to consider the 30,760 square foot Option. These draft Findings were delayed when Gilbert attended the November 12<sup>th</sup> Board meeting and communicated that his clients were willing to consider the 26,800 square feet Option. He reviewed the Seahorse proposed site plan on whether it complied with the five requirements that need to be complied with in Code Section 2.015, pointing out that it does not comply with the second requirement that does not allow for an increase in the total square footage of the overnight BSUs. He recommended that the Board should focus its attention on what the total square feet is for the 67 overnight BSUs. If the Board deems that adequate evidence has been provided to approve the application, he recommended that six conditions be included in the draft Findings. These included: 1) recommendations on baseline square feet for the overnight and transient BSUs, 2) the need for docking and boat storage to be constructed in strict conformance with the approved site plan, 3) the need for watercraft to be stored within authorized BSUs, 4) the submittal of an as-built survey within 60 days after the new docks are constructed, 5) a four foot overhang restriction as defined by LMCD Code, and 6) the payment of \$232.50 for underpayment on their 2008 application, as well as

possibly billing Seahorse for fees underpaid from 1988 through 2007 or for fees incurred to process the 2008 application. He entertained questions and comments from the Board.

Whalen stated that there has been a lot of discussion on this application for a number of months. She hoped to put it to rest and asked for feedback from the Board on the proposed settlement, including the request to not have to reconstruct the docks prior to next summer.

LeFevere stated that Code Section 2.015 would establish the number and cumulative square feet for BSUs at this facility. The Code does not prohibit from constructing something less than what they are approved for. The Board in its analysis should determine what was approved in 1978, not what was constructed. He believed that both parties have agreed that a dock consisting of 26,800 square feet has not been constructed for the 67 overnight BSUs. If the applicants want the Board to consider this as a reconfiguration, he believed that the Board had the ability to approve the proposed site plan because it is less than 26,800 square feet. However, he questioned how Seahorse could take the position that this facility was in existence in 1978 and has grandfathered rights, other than to avoid the four-foot overhang rule, which the Board has the ability to provide relief from.

Page stated that the Gilbert letter received is generally done when there is already pending litigation. He did not believe that there was a need to agree to the terms because there was not a pending lawsuit, although this has been implied by Seahorse.

**MOTION:** Page moved, McDermott seconded to direct LeFevere to prepare draft Findings of Fact and Order approving the 2008 Seahorse HOA reconfiguration multiple dock license application, subject to: 1) establishing the proposed site plan of 25,300 square feet for the 67 overnight BSUs and 2,364 for the nine transient BSUs as in existence at this time, 2) to allow expansion of the overnight BSU square feet to occur up to 26,800 (provided necessary application and site plan are submitted and approved by the LMCD Board in advance of the expansion), 3) the reconfiguration shall be subject to the four-foot overhang expansion as defined by LMCD Code, and 4) there shall be no collection of additional application fees from Seahorse for 2008 or before.

LeFevere stated that the proposed motion would differ slightly from the Seahorse proposed settlement because of the four-foot overhang restriction. He believed that it would be appropriate for the Board to ask Seahorse whether they were willing to continue to agree to not litigate or make a claim against the LMCD for a higher number because the motion was agreeable to them.

The meeting was recessed at 8:28 p.m. and re-convened at 8:37 p.m. to allow Gilbert to discuss the question raised by LeFevere.

Gilbert stated that Seahorse appreciated the intent of the motion made. However, there are some longer boats at the facility that cannot comply with the four-foot overhang restriction. He did not believe that this could be quantified at this time and would have to be looked into further by Seahorse.

LeFevere stated that staff had brought to his attention that the dock installed, based on inspections, was not identical to what has been represented as an as-built survey. To address this, Seahorse either needs to: 1) make the necessary adjustments next spring for the proposed site plan, or 2) amend the

proposed site plan to what has been installed. This has been brought to Gilbert's attention when the meeting was recessed.

**VOTE:** Motion carried unanimously.

**D.** LMCD's 42<sup>nd</sup> Anniversary "Save the Lake" Recognition Banquet Dinner

Whalen requested the Board's consideration on the following two matters: 1) the need to establish a date and 2) approval of a special deputy to be recognized at the Banquet Dinner. First, she recommended two optional dates; February 5<sup>th</sup> or February 19<sup>th</sup>. Second a recommendation has been made by Lt. Kip Carver to recognize Special Deputy Jayson Johnson as the LMCD's 2009 Special Deputy.

The consensus of the Board was to hold the Banquet Dinner at Bayview Event Center on February 5<sup>th</sup>.

**MOTION:** Siakel moved, Johnson seconded to recognize Jayson Johnson as the LMCD's special deputy honoree to be recognized at the 42<sup>nd</sup> Anniversary "Save the Lake" Recognition Banquet Dinner.

**VOTE** Motion carried unanimously.

**E.** Chair update on 12/5/08 EWM/Exotics Task Force Meeting.

Whalen asked Suerth to provide an update on this agenda item.

Suerth stated that the Task Force met on December 5<sup>th</sup>. Based on the discussion at this meeting, he believed that there were two matters pending Board consideration. These included: 1) the management of the 2009 Herbicide Treatment Program, and 2) the type of Request for Proposals (RFP) to be submitted to the commercial applicators. He asked Nybeck to expound.

Nybeck stated there were two options in the style of RFP to be submitted. The first option includes establishing a protocol for treatment by the technical team for submittal to the commercial applicators, with a review and comment period, at which time a decision could be made on whether changes should be made to the protocol through an addendum. The second option includes a design and build process, with well defined goals, objectives and desired outcomes established by the technical team. This option would allow the commercial applicators to design a program to accomplish these goals, objectives, and desired outcomes. He stated that the Task Force recommended the second option; however, he preferred the first option due to too many uncertainties with this option that could cause the LMCD some legal issues. He believed that the question for the Board at this meeting was what organization(s) would assume project management responsibilities in 2009. He recommended that the LMA should assume this role in 2009, similar to 2008.

McDermott asked what the Task Force's recommendation was for project management.

Nybeck stated the Task Force did not have a recommendation for project management. His recommendation for the LMA to manage the project in 2009 was based off of the LMCD's current

workload and the gray areas associated with the design and construct RFP option. Once proposals are received by the LMA for the 2009 project, the LMA has agreed to review them with the technical team at a EWM/Exotics Task Force meeting.

Whalen asked if there was any discussion in terms of costs for the LMA to manage the 2009 project, referring to approximated \$20,000 of administrative costs incurred in 2008.

Osgood stated that he believed there was no cost to the public in 2008 in terms of administrative costs. The administrative costs that Chair Whalen referred to were an estimated \$27,000. This was categorized by the LMA differently than administrative costs (10% or less on true project administration, with the remainder on fundraising, project management, etc.). The 2008 contract with the LMCD contained no money exchange, except for reimbursement for partial treatments. The cost of the 2009 LMA project management contract would maintain the same elements of the program (fundraising, chair committees, meeting attendance, etc.).

Whalen asked Osgood to clarify who pays for management, administrative, and fundraising fees.

Osgood stated the LMA pays for those fees through their LMA budget, fundraising, and current project funds.

Whalen asked Osgood to clarify whether the funds collected from the residential property owners, the MN DNR, the individual municipalities, and the LMCD are pooled together for the payment of project management, administrative, and fundraising expenses.

Osgood stated that Whalen's assessment was correct. He anticipated that project management costs for the 2009 project would be approximately 15%, plus additional costs.

Suerth asked Osgood to expound on the residential property owners that were skilled in fundraising efforts who are volunteering their time for the 2009 project.

Osgood stated that he established a working relationship with individuals skilled in marketing and fundraising business from the individual bays being treated in 2008. He stated that his role will be to support them, provide information and materials, and attend numerous meetings. Should the LMCD provide for the management of the project, he would still bill for his work in the project to accomplish the same goal; charging the LMA those same dollars. He acknowledged the actual administration of the RFP and working with the applicators is a small portion of those charges.

Suerth expressed an interest in seeing LMA funds contributed towards the 2009 project, rather than relying only on those collected from the local property owners.

Osgood respectfully disagreed because he believed that 70% of the costs for the 2008 project came from the LMA. The LMA chose not to take funds from the general budget because the funds raised within the three bay treatment areas was adequate to pay for the project costs.

Jewett stated the LMA is asking the LMCD to utilize Save the Lake funds from individual donations made from other individuals not within the three bay treatment areas. He suggested that any future use of Save the Lake funds be designated for treatment costs only, not project management.

Osgood stated the LMA would be agreeable to receiving funds with such designation. He attested that the residential property owners were well informed on the use of their donated funds in 2008 and that they did not have a concern with the how the funds were spent.

LeFevere believed it would be helpful for the Board to better define various terminologies currently being discussed. The Board has been discussing two types of RFP's for consideration. An RFP is considered a contract and the process utilized in the hiring of the applicator. The standard contract, utilized 99% of the time, defines the specification and performance (as outlined in the first option noted above). With the design and build RFP, (the second option noted above and one Nybeck was not recommending), it is a self-contracting RFP in which the Board, via the Task Force, is defining the results and the company curtails the specifications to match the defined goals and objectives. If that is the Board's choice, then the Board would have to decide who is going to do the contracting. If the LMCD were to manage the project in 2009, then it is the LMCD's project and certain laws apply. If the Board contracts with the LMA to award the contract for the 2009 project, then the Board needs to retain the LMA on a grant basis. It would then be the LMA's project and the LMCD Board is giving them money to perform the project. If the LMCD is not interested in dealing with performance bonds, then the LMCD cannot manage the project because public agencies require performance bonds and the project needs to be awarded to the lowest, responsible bidder. He reviewed the difficulties in the LMCD managing the project with the design and build option; opening the LMCD up for bidding and litigation possibilities.

Whalen restated that any funds being distributed need to have clear documentation on what the money is going to be directed to and what those costs are covering. As a governmental agency, it is important that the funds utilized are getting the best bang for their donated buck; providing for the importance of competitive bids. She believed that this would also be true for municipal funds provided for the 2009 project.

Osgood stated that the LMA would be agreeable to sharing whatever wisdom the LMCD chooses to have its funds directed towards. The LMA takes the responsibility of operating on donated funds very seriously and that the organization is upfront with its donors on the use of their operating budget. He had planned to go back to the individual cities to solicit funds for the 2009 project; noting the City of Mound recently approved a 2009 payment of \$12,000 for Phelps Bay.

Jewett stated that he supported the 2009 project, provided there is a more thorough evaluation by the LMA of where funds collected are being spent, as well as project management expenses incurred by the LMA.

Osgood stated that if the LMA coordinates the RFP process, the LMA will perform such within their best business practice as they did last year. He requested Board direction at this meeting as to the LMCD's involvement in the RFP process and on initiating the contract.

**MOTION:** Siakle moved, Suerth seconded to approve the LMA's management of the 2009

project subject to: 1) an undetermined amount of Save the Lake grant funding to be decided at a later date, and 2) the EWM/Exotics Task Force to serve as a consultant during the RFP process.

**VOTE:** Motion carried unanimously.

Whalen stated that the Board would discuss funding of the 2009 project at the January 14<sup>th</sup> Board meeting after the Save the Lake Committee has reviewed Proposals received, including recommendations.

McDermott asked which organization would be applying for the MN DNR grant.

Whalen stated that would be the LMA's responsibility.

Osgood stated that based on the discussion at this meeting: 1) he understood that the LMA can proceed with seeking proposals through an RFP process once the LMA has the Task Force's input on the specific protocol, and 2) that the LMA does not need to wait until the next EWM/Exotics Task Force meeting as the LMA could finalize the RFP with Task Force members via email.

Nybeck stated that there might be a need to schedule an Exotics Task Force in the near future for the comments made by Osgood.

## 11. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR REPORT

Nybeck stated the most recent LMCD newsletter was recently mailed out, with copies being forwarded to the LMCD member cities.

## 12. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 9:30 p.m.

Lisa Whalen, Chair

Andrew McDermott, III, Secretary