

**LAKE MINNETONKA CONSERVATION DISTRICT  
BOARD OF DIRECTORS**

7:00 P.M., Wednesday, October 24, 2012  
Wayzata City Hall

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

Babcock called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

**2. ROLL CALL**

**Members present:** Doug Babcock, Tonka Bay; Dan Baasen, Wayzata; Andrew McDermott, Orono; Kelsey Page, Greenwood; Gary Hughes, Spring Park; Fred Meyer, Woodland; Jeff Morris, Excelsior; Bill Olson, Victoria; and Sue Shuff, Minnetonka. Also present: Charlie LeFevere, LMCD Counsel; Greg Nybeck, Executive Director; Judd Harper, Administrative Technician; and Emily Herman, Administrative Assistant.

**Members absent:** David Gross, Deephaven; Anne Hunt, Minnetrista; Steve Johnson, Mound; Dennis Klohs, Minnetonka Beach; and Mark Sylvester, Shorewood.

**3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

Babcock stated there was a need to amend the agenda (adding agenda item 9C) to consider LMCD Resolution #132, "Approving Master Subscriber Agreement for Minnesota Court Data Services and Authorizing Execution Thereof."

**MOTION:** Hughes moved, McDermott seconded to approve the agenda as amended, adding agenda item 9C as noted above.

**VOTE:** Motion carried unanimously.

**4. CHAIR ANNOUNCEMENTS**, Chair Babcock

Babcock stated that he had no Chair announcements.

Nybeck solicited the Board's availability in scheduling the annual meeting with the Hennepin County Sheriff's Office. He offered the dates of Monday, November 19<sup>th</sup>; Thursday, November 29<sup>th</sup>; and Wednesday, December 12<sup>th</sup> at 7:30 a.m. at the Water Patrol office.

It was the consensus of the Board to schedule the meeting around Board member Steve Johnson's availability on November 29<sup>th</sup> and December 12<sup>th</sup>; with the November 29<sup>th</sup> being the first choice.

**5. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – 10/10/12 LMCD Regular Board Meeting**

**MOTION:** Shuff moved, Hughes seconded to approve the minutes from the 10/10/12 Regular Board Meeting as submitted.

**VOTE:** Ayes (7), Abstained (2; McDermott and Morris); motion carried.

## 6. APPROVAL OF CONSENT AGENDA

Nybeck directed the Board to an amended Audit of vouchers (agenda item 6A) within their handout folder; adding check #19537 in the amount of \$1,285 to Action Mailing Services (for the postage costs associated with mailing of the fall-winter newsletter).

Baasen moved, McDermott seconded to approve the consent agenda as amended, including the amended agenda item 6A as noted by Nybeck above. Motion carried unanimously. Items so approved included: **6A**, Audit of vouchers (10/16/12 – 10/31/12); **6B**, September financial summary and balance sheet; and **6C, Personnel Committee**, approval of updates to Executive Director, Administrative Technician, Administrative Assistant/Code Enforcement, and Administrative Clerk position descriptions.

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

Babcock stated that there will not be any public comments taken during the presentation of the draft Comprehensive Eurasian Watermilfoil and Curly-Leaf Pondweed Plan (Plan) for Lake Minnetonka (agenda item 9A). This is the Board's first review of the Plan that will be presented by a representative of the LMCD's AIS Task Force and Sub-Committee. He asked all present in the audience that had immediate comments on this agenda item to address them directly with the Sub-Committee. Additionally, he urged the audience to stay and listen to the presentation; acknowledging that there may be an opportunity for public comments at future Board meetings in the further consideration of the Plan. With that said, he asked if there was anyone in attendance that wanted to make public comments on a subject not on this meeting's agenda, in which there were none.

## 8. PUBLIC HEARINGS

There were no public hearings.

## 9. OTHER BUSINESS

**A. AIS Task Force**, draft Comprehensive Eurasian Watermilfoil and Curly-Leaf Pondweed Plan for Lake Minnetonka.

Babcock asked Page to provide an introduction to this agenda item.

Page stated that the draft Plan was prepared by the AIS Sub-Committee, which is comprised of members of the AIS Task Force. The Plan was reviewed by the AIS Task Force on October 12<sup>th</sup>, in which they considered input from the Lake Minnetonka Association (LMA) bay captains (one of which was proposed public funding for the Plan), made a few minor changes, and recommended it be forwarded to the Board for consideration. He thanked committee members, in which he named, expounding on the hours of participation required to accomplish this task (as well as the input from the LMA bay captains). When the draft Plan moved forward to the AIS Task Force, a range of funding levels by the LMCD was provided. At the direction of the Task Force, a funding amount was established and documented within the Plan. He asked Mr. Nybeck and John Barten, members of the committee, to present the Plan. After this presentation, he stated that he would provide comments on the areas that warranted further discussion.

Olson arrived at 7:13 p.m.

Mr. John Barten, Director of Natural Resources and Management for the Three Rivers Park District, stated that he was in attendance representing both the AIS Task Force and Sub-Committee. He provided a highly detailed overview of the draft Plan, via a PowerPoint presentation, with Nybeck offering the overview on mechanical harvesting during the "Implementation" aspect of the presentation. Their comments were as follows:

- Background:
  - The positive aspects of native aquatic plants, as well as negative aspects of invasive species such as Eurasian Watermilfoil (EWM) and Curly-Leaf Pondweed (CLP).
  - The discovery of EWM in 1987, the process of establishing best management practices (mechanical harvesting), and the establishment of the LMCD's EWM Task Force and the Scientific Management Team to provide professional guidance.
  - The 5-year, three bay coordinated herbicide treatment demonstration project on Carmans, Grays, and Phelps Bays, which included the preparation of a Lake Vegetation Management Plan in the winter of 2007 and 2008. The two primary goals for this project were: 1) to evaluate managing EWM and CLP on a whole bay with lower dosage rates and 2) to evaluate whether these treatments damage native species. The AIS Task Force (formerly known as the EWM Task Force) served as the LVMP advisory committee.
- An acknowledgement that there are more aquatic invasive species (AIS) of concern to Lake Minnetonka in addition to EWM and CLP. However, the AIS Sub-Committee addressed only EWM and CLP in an effort to provide a comprehensive Plan in a timely manner, as well as one that can be well analyzed. With that said, a detailed overview was provided of the draft Plan by subdividing it into the following: 1) Purpose, 2) Plan components, 3) AIS Sub-Committee, and 4) Goals and Objectives.
- An overview of the Implementation section of the EWM Harvesting Program was provided. The Plan's sub-paragraphs of Project Management; Funding; and Monitoring, Evaluation, and Reporting were reviewed, in which the following comments were offered:
  - Acknowledgement that the LMCD has been the project manager for this management tool and that it should remain as such.
  - Harvesting should continue to remain as the primary management tool in public areas.
  - Contact or systemic herbicides could be used as a complement to the harvesting program.
  - An overview of the program itself.
- An overview of the Implementation section of the Whole Bay or Large Scale Herbicide Treatments was provided. The Plan's sub-paragraphs of Funding; Monitoring, Evaluation, and Reporting; and Project Management were reviewed, in which the following comments were offered:
  - Eight bays have been identified as suitable for a whole bay or large scale herbicide treatment as a complement to the harvesting program. This review included the current financial, technical, and regulatory constraints; how the bays were ranked (Appendix E); and their key information (Appendix F).
  - The LMCD's financial contribution to the treatment of these eight bays should be limited to public areas (\$75,000 in the annual operating LMCD budget).
  - Monitoring, evaluation, and reporting of the herbicide treatments (efficacy, sampling styles,

- and collection of data), as well as the documented need criteria (percentage frequency of occurrence, measurements, timeline, and the reason).
- Project manager to provide summary report to the Board, in which the reported areas were reviewed. To date, the AIS Task Force could not reach a consensus on the ownership of the project manager (public or non-public sector organization).
- An overview of the roles and responsibilities of the LMCD, Minnesota Department of Natural Resources (MN DNR), LMA, and other governmental agencies was provided.
- Barten entertained any questions and comments from the Board.

Page thanked Barten for his comprehensive review. He provided an overview of the following two areas of the draft Plan that warranted further discussion; both of which are under Section II, "Whole Bay or Large Scale Herbicide Treatments:"

- Page 9, Subparagraph C, "Project Management."
  - He reiterated that the Task Force could not reach a consensus on the ownership of project management for the whole bay or large scale herbicide treatments. At the October AIS Task Force Meeting, all but the LMA agreed that the LMCD should serve as project manager; with the LMA expressing their belief that they should.
  - He expounded on the LMA's previous position in the LMCD serving as project manager and funding future herbicide treatment projects due to their belief that the five year demonstration project on Carmans, Grays, and Phelps Bays was a proven success. It was his understanding that (due to the fact that the LMCD proposed to not fully fund the large scale or whole bay treatments in the Plan), the LMA has changed this position and their current position is that they should now serve as project manager, which they believe could be done more economically.
  - Herbicide treatment projects on Lake Minnetonka will always be a combination of private and public funding; naming the LMCD, potentially the Minnehaha Creek Watershed District (MCWD), and the LMA and/or Lake residents as possible funding sources.
  - He also understood that if the LMCD is determined to serve as project manager and control future herbicide treatment projects, the LMA would not contribute nor participate in the program. Instead, the LMA will separate from the LMCD and obtain their own treatment permits from the MN DNR. He was unsure if this position currently remained.
- Page 8, Subparagraph A, "Funding."
  - Discussion of funding was a subject of debate at the October AIS Task Force Meeting.
  - He reviewed the paragraph, within the Plan, which included the LMCD's recommended portion of annually funding \$75,000 for herbicide treatments through its operating budget. The Sub-Committee presented the Task Force a range of \$62,000 to \$75,000 for consideration. However, the Task Force recommended a flat budget; acknowledging the constituents deserved a firm figure for the following reasons: 1) to show the LMCD is serious about the herbicide treatments and 2) to provide a firm figure so that other public agencies/organizations providing funding would know what the LMCD would be contributing.
  - He acknowledged that the LMCD would not have the ability to fund whole bay treatments in the eight bays outlined within the Plan; nor have the ability to levy such as it exceeds the allowable limit. He confirmed that the recommended amount would raise the member cities levy, which would vary amongst the cities and be a difficult matter to address.

- The recommended amount would eliminate the need for future Save the Lake funding.
- Questions pending included: 1) will unspent funds carry over or disappear, 2) will grants be applied for and, if approved, will that funding be a portion of the \$75,000 or up and above, and 3) will the use of other approved herbicides, such as 2, 4-D, reduce the cost of treatment projects (providing for more areas to be covered under the funded amount).
- He asked Nybeck to provide any follow-up comments.

Nybeck stated that the draft Plan also makes the recommendation that the LMCD annually budget at least \$35,000 from its operating budget for depreciated mechanical harvesting equipment. This is important for the Board to keep in mind because the draft Plan recommends that mechanical harvesting continue to be the primary management tool to manage EWM and CLP on Lake Minnetonka.

A summary of the Board discussion, which included the following comments and questions, was as follows:

- Page confirmed (for Baasen) that the draft Plan recognizes the public/private partnership, both within and outside of a sites dock use area (DUA).
- Babcock recommended that a third management goal be added to draft Plan that the LMCD would support management activities that will leverage the broadest funds available. This additional goal should allow the LMCD to encourage other agencies/organizations to participate in the future, but also provides for specific parties contributing for a specific area to have their funds remain within that area's treatment. Additionally, it challenges the LMCD to annually solicit the broadest based funding for this effort (harvesting or herbicide treatments) and allows us to recognize those that participate.

Page believed that more agencies/organizations would participate knowing that the LMCD has provided a firm financial commitment to the program.

- McDermott asked the following questions:
  - Is there a way to more evenly distribute the levy so that the Cities of Orono and Minnetonka do not get hit with such a large levy?  
LeFevere stated that the current levy distribution to the member cities is established by state law. In order to change this, it would require a change to the LMCD's enabling legislation.

Babcock concurred with LeFevere that the distribution of the LMCD's levy to the member cities is well defined by state law. He stated that the maximum levy the LMCD may forward is based on a percentage of the cumulative taxable market value of the 14 member cities. The distribution of the approved levy is based on each cities percentage of total net tax capacity, with no member city paying greater than 20 percent of the total levy. Any change to this funding formula would require legislative efforts.

- Can the LMCD distribute public tax dollars (for the management of herbicide treatments) to the LMA without any competition?

LeFevere stated that public funds cannot be given away. Due to the fact that the public funds were distributed as a grant for previous herbicide treatment projects, in which there was a quid pro quo agreement, a sealed bid process was not warranted. However, if the LMCD contracted out the management services, a sealed bid process would be required (or could be required if so chosen via the grant process). In regards to the transferring of \$75,000, as noted above, for the management of herbicide treatments, a sealed bid process would be conducted under a contract basis.

- What is the time frame in determining whether a bay is eligible for treatments and when would the treatments be provided (i.e., early spring)?

Page directed the Board to Section II, "Monitoring, Evaluation, and Reporting," subparagraph B-3 on page 9. He reviewed the criteria used to determine treatment needs for a bay (specifically bullet point 3), in which all required information would need to be provided to the LMCD and LMA by October 15<sup>th</sup> of the year preceding a proposed treatment. He expounded on variables that would come into play with this criterion, i.e. prognosticating future needs and being flexible when the bay warrants a different treatment at the time of release. He believed that criterion was added as an expected annual treatment control factor.

Babcock expressed an interest in adding the flexibility to exempt a bay from treatment or the completion of the criteria findings if patterns warrant such.

- Babcock believed the LMCD's five-year pilot herbicide treatment program provided for advanced information in the treatment of whole bays. He questioned if there is a need to, going forward, do more studies around partial bay treatments. He cited the east side of West Point as an example of an area routinely infested with EWM and wondered if a two-year pilot program looking at littoral areas that are associated with a large body of water (Echo Bay in this example) should be considered.

Page concurred that such a program would be beneficial; however, the draft Plan currently does not call for such. In his opinion, he believed that what has been determined is that complete bay treatments every other year would have the most efficacies.

Barten stated that if there were 10 or 15 acres in a larger bay with matted EWM, a treatment could be successfully done (taking into consideration the topographical area). However, that type of treatment would be considered a "spot treatment" vs. a "large-scale" treatment (as defined by 40 plus acres).

Babcock questioned if over time the Plan should consider implementing small scale treatments and whether that would be a balanced spend of public funds, in which he believed it could be (taking into consideration Barten's comments above).

Page directed the Board to the last sentence of subparagraph B, "Funding," on page 7, in which he read the following, "The LMCD may decide, on an as-needed basis, to use contact or systemic herbicides, as a complement to mechanical harvesting." This sentence does address, but not

specifically address, spot treatments. Additionally, he directed the Board to the colored "Whole Bay or Large Scale Herbicide Treatment Matrix" within the Plan; pointing out that findings presented at this time may change on a regular basis (calling it a "moving target").

- Baasen reiterated the need to remain consistent as possible and not pull funding from different areas should a bay's need change from criteria presented by the October 15<sup>th</sup> deadline, as noted above, to the next spring findings.
- Shuff asked the following questions:
  - Is harvesting and herbicide treatments mutually, exclusive to one another; expounding on the documentation that treatments are a compliment to harvesting?  
Page stated the management tools are not mutually exclusive; providing for the example that if a herbicide treatment was done in Gray's Bay (within Shuff's represented City of Minnetonka), ideally it would not be harvested for two years in hopes of receiving a proper efficacy rate. However, he believed treatments previously applied in St. Alban's Bay (within Page's represented City of Greenwood), did not provide a two-year efficacy rate and that harvesting was warranted but not completed the second year. Additionally, he stated that spot treatments in conjunction with harvesting are also considered at times.

Babcock stated that during the five year herbicide treatment program, spot treatments and harvesting in littoral areas were not allowed for the purpose of obtaining good measurements of finding. This Plan provides for more leniencies in that the findings are still important, but more options are available.

Nybeck clarified that the lack of spot treatments were encouraged; however, were not prohibited.

Barten stated that generally when a bay is receiving a whole bay treatment, the MN DNR will limit the amount of area that each individual property owner is allowed to treat.

- What is the LMA's argument in wanting to manage the herbicide treatments; over and above all other Task Force members wanting the LMCD to manage the treatments?  
Page stated that the LMA has communicated that they would be providing the bulk of the funding in a particular bay; providing for a more affectively and nimbly service. Other than the funding factor, he believed that they would be in a more efficient position to move forward.

Babcock stated that he believed the control of funding and obtaining the permits are two different aspects of the Plan. He believed the LMCD should manage all large scale herbicide treatment permits for Lake Minnetonka as the permit manager; providing for a more efficient process in working with the MN DNR. However, the funding aspect could be handled under the designated project manager.

- Babcock provided the following comments for consideration relative to the verbiage of the Plan:
  - Page 5, II, "Plan Components," first bullet point: He believed that sentence, "The Plan needs

- to be balanced, cost effective, and environmentally sound,” was very broad; specially, “environmentally sound.” He recommended adding language that management efforts should not cause detrimental ecological impacts.
- Page 6, Subparagraph C-2, under “Management Areas:” He recommended adding language to the second management area that would include other public access points.
  - Page 9, Subparagraph C, “Project Management:” He directed the Board to the second sentence, “Project management for future whole bay or large scale herbicide treatments could be done by the public agency, most likely the LMCD, or a non-public sector organization.” He recommended adding language that this could also be done by a private company.
  - Page 9, III, “Roles and Responsibilities,” Subparagraph 1: He expressed concern about the use of the word “possibly” as written within the sentence, “Serve as the project manager for the mechanical harvesting program and possibly the herbicide treatment project(s).” He understood that consensus has not been reached as to who would be the project manager, but he believed the LMCD could express their willingness to do so.
  - Page 10, “Other Governmental Agencies (Hennepin County, MCWD, TRPD, and U.S. Army Corps of Engineers):” He recommended adding language to recognize “in-kind” services.
- Page recommended adding the word “herbicide” to the first full sentence at the top of page 7. The sentence would read, “The sub-committee recommends that mechanical harvesting continue....: however, there are certain bays where whole bay or large scale herbicide treatments might be appropriate.”
  - McDermott requested clarification as to why the Plan documents the recommendation of seven bays for herbicide treatments; however, the PowerPoint presentation noted eight. Nybeck stated that Carsons and St. Louis Bays were combined as one in the draft Plan.
  - Babcock recommended the draft Plan refer to the 42 management areas, not bays.
  - Discussion was held on the use of the colored Whole Bay or Large Scale Treatment Matrix, in which the following was offered:
    - It should not be over structured so that there is no flexibility in the specific needs of the management areas
    - Barten acknowledged the AIS Sub-Committee had significant discussion specific to the flexibility of the Matrix, in which he expounded on the documented “technical constraint” and wording within the Plan to address changes in such.
    - A recommendation to document that the Matrix was created in 2012.
  - Baasen recommended the Board address their municipality with the idea that the LMCD’s combined interest in funding for both the harvesting program and herbicide treatments will assist in managing the Lake vs. just addressing all the funds going to herbicide treatments.

Page expounded on the fact that if the member cities’ bays are not going to get a herbicide treatment, they will most likely receive more thorough harvesting (based on the 2012 treatments freeing up the ability for the harvesting to be performed twice in non-treated areas).

- Babcock recommended logistics be provided for the yacht clubs, as an example, to ban together and sponsor mid to late-August harvesting of a specific area (i.e., Diamond Reef).

Nybeck commented on the LMCD working with the Minnetonka Yacht Club (MYC) a few years ago when they sponsored an inland regatta. Prior to the event, the MYC contacted the LMCD for harvesting; however, staff communicated that Diamond Reef most likely could not effectively be harvested based on past experiences. In response to this, the MYC secured a permit from the MN DNR for the inland regatta. Additionally, the LMCD worked with the City of Orono to harvest Veteran's Bay in 2012 when the MCWD's weevil project was postponed. To this end, he believed Babcock's comments, noted above, are being addressed even though they are not outlined within the Plan. Additionally, he stated that when the Board considers the project manager for the herbicide treatments, the LMCD would not be performing the fundraising portion for the abutting property owners as that would most likely be performed by the LMA. He expounded on the difference between the LMCD being project manager, which was done for the three bays in 2006, and why the LMA took it over for the five year demonstration project.

Page solicited the Board's input as to the next step. He confirmed that the draft Plan, once adopted, would be initiated in 2014 since the LMCD has already adopted its operating budget. Therefore, the consideration of funding for such will be in 2013 for the 2014 LMCD Budget. For this reason, he recommended action on this matter, sooner rather than later, as the proposed \$75,000 in funding will be considered in 2013.

Nybeck recommended the matter be addressed at the next two meetings via the following process: 1) the Board to consider a revised Plan (taking into consideration comments noted at this meeting) at the November 14<sup>th</sup> Board meeting and 2) the Board could direct staff (at the 11/14/12 meeting) to schedule a public hearing on the draft Plan at the December 12<sup>th</sup> Board meeting.

The Board concurred with Nybeck's recommendation and scheduled a second review of the draft Plan at the November 14<sup>th</sup> Board meeting.

#### **B. 2012 EWM Harvesting Program, staff update on post-season activities**

Babcock asked Harper for an update on this agenda item.

Harper directed the Board to his staff memo, dated 10/16/12, in which he provided the following comments:

- He highlighted post-season activity conducted to date.
- As previously communicated to the Board, the harvester purchased in 2005 was down at the end of the season due to significant wear to both of the harvester's hydraulic pumps (requiring replacement or rebuilding). In working with Aquarius Systems and Kirvida Fire, he outlined two options for consideration of either replacing or rebuilding the pumps. Staff determined that Option 1

(modifying the harvester to a new, single pump) was recommended at the quoted amount of \$7,012.53 (including the flushing and replacement of the environmentally safe hydraulic vegetable oil fluid) vs. the rebuilding of the two pumps at \$7,527.05. He stated that the parts may be purchased this year, with the mechanical work to be performed in the spring (providing for the pricing of the quoted parts to be maintained for 60 days).

Nybeck reminded the Board that there was a previous recommendation to purchase stands to store the harvesters on land during the off-season (estimated at \$4,000). Funds will be available to replace the hydraulic pump on the harvester, as well as to purchase the new stands, based on budgeted funds not spent in 2012 on the EWM Harvesting Program.

Babcock stated a motion for the expenditure of the above funds was not in order unless objections were noted, in which there were none.

- Harper documented that the LMCD's 1994 Mako runabout (donated to the LMCD in 2005) came with a 1994 Spartan double axel trailer. Due to the trailer: 1) needing work (wheel bearings, breaks, and lights) to make it road worthy, 2) not being needed for winter storage or launching in the spring, and 3) that the LMCD pay's for its storage, staff recommended it be sold. He stated that Tonka Bay Marina documented its worth to be \$750 and assisted in locating a potential buyer for such. Therefore, staff recommended the sale of the trailer in the amount of \$750.

The Board had a brief discussion as to what the LMCD currently pays for storage and how staff utilizes the boat; clarifying that the sale of the trailer will not restrict its use.

**MOTION:** Olson moved, Morris seconded to sell the 1994 Spartan trailer for the amount of \$750.

**VOTE:** Ayes (7), Nays (2, Baasen and Page); motion carried.

**C. LMCD Resolution #132**, a resolution approving Master Subscriber Agreement for Minnesota Court Data Services and authorizing execution thereof.

Babcock directed the Board to Resolution #132 within their handout folder and asked LeFevere to provide background on this matter.

LeFevere stated the Board previously approved similar agreements with the State of Minnesota Bureau of Criminal Apprehension for the LMCD's prosecuting attorney to have electronic access to their database. The agreements before the Board this evening provide for the prosecuting attorney's access to the State of Minnesota Court Data Services. He stated the documents were reviewed without concerns noted.

**MOTION:** McDermott moved, Shuff seconded to approve Resolution #132, approving Master Subscriber Agreement for Minnesota Court Data Services and authorizing execution thereof.

**VOTE:** Motion carried unanimously.

#### **10. Update from standing LMCD Committees**

Babcock asked for an update from the Chair, or designated representative, of each committee (Save the Lake, AIS Task Force, Finance, Personnel, Public Safety, and Ordinance Review). He stated that some of the Personnel Committee matters were addressed under agenda item 6C earlier in the meeting.

Nybeck stated that staff is in the process of clearly defining the Board's direction in addressing the proposed bow fishing ordinance prior to sending it back to the Public Safety Committee for discussion.

Olson stated that a Save the Lake Committee meeting was scheduled for tomorrow, October 25<sup>th</sup> (8:30 a.m. in the LMCD office).

Page stated that there was no additional AIS Task Force update.

#### **11. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR REPORT**

Nybeck directed the Board to his Executive Director Report, dated 10/23/12, within their handout folder. He made the following comments: First, the lake level reading as of October 22<sup>nd</sup> was 927.70', with the dam closed. This is approximately four inches lower than last year at this time. Second, he attended the MCWD's Hero's Banquet with Babcock and Olson last Thursday, October 18<sup>th</sup>, at the Bayview Event Center. Former Board member Herb Suerth was recognized. Third, he will be attending the annual Hennepin County Sheriff's Volunteer Appreciation Banquet on October 26<sup>th</sup>.

#### **12. ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 8:59 p.m.

---

Doug Babcock, Chair

---

Andrew McDermott, Secretary