

**LAKE MINNETONKA CONSERVATION DISTRICT  
BOARD OF DIRECTORS**

7:00 P.M., Wednesday, July 10, 2013  
Wayzata City Hall

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

Babcock called the meeting to order at 7:03 p.m.-

**2. ROLL CALL**

**Members present:** Doug Babcock, Tonka Bay; Dan Baasen, Wayzata; Gary Hughes, Spring Park; Jay Green, Mound; David Gross, Deephaven; Ann Hoelscher, Victoria; Dennis Klohs, Minnetonka Beach; Fred Meyer, Woodland; Jeff Morris, Excelsior; 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:** Anne Hunt, Minnetrista; Andrew McDermott, Orono; Rob Roy, Greenwood; and Mark Sylvester, Shorewood.

**3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

Babcock proposed moving agenda item 9D ahead of 9A; providing for the remaining agenda items to follow as scheduled.

**MOTION:** Baasen moved, Shuff seconded to approve the agenda as amended, accepting Babcock's proposed change.

**VOTE:** Motion carried unanimously.

**4. CHAIR ANNOUNCEMENTS**, Chair Babcock

Babcock expressed his appreciation to Board members Baasen and McDermott for chairing the June Board meetings in his absence.

Nybeck reminded the Board that the regular meeting of July 24<sup>th</sup> had been cancelled due to the closing of the City of Wayzata meeting room for technical upgrades. In place of this meeting, the Board previously scheduled a Lake tour, in which staff will be working with the Chair and communicating the logistics of.

**5. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – 6/12/13 LMCD Regular Board Meeting  
6/12/13 LMCD Board Workshop/Planning Session**

Green directed the Board to the middle of page five of the 6/12/13 LMCD Regular Board Meeting minutes; specifically, the sentence that read, "Green believed the LMCD should support this project." He expounded on this comment by documenting his interest in the LMCD not only supporting projects, in general, but also being actively involved (referencing an article in the *Minnetonka Patch* that noted the LCMD's lack of involvement in the Zequanox Trials project).

**MOTION:** Shuff moved, Hughes seconded to approve the minutes from the 6/12/13 Regular Board Meeting as amended, making the change noted by Green above.

**VOTE:** Ayes (9), Abstained (1, Babcock); motion carried.

**MOTION:** Baasen moved, Morris seconded to approve the minutes from the 6/12/13 Board Workshop/Planning Session as submitted.

**VOTE:** Ayes (9), Abstained (1, Babcock); motion carried.

## 6. APPROVAL OF CONSENT AGENDA

Gross moved, Shuff seconded to approve the consent agenda as submitted. Items so approved included: **6A**, Audit of vouchers (6/16/13 – 6/30/13) and (7/1/13 – 7/15/13) and **6B**, May financial summary and balance sheet.

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

There were no public comments.

## 8. PUBLIC HEARING

- **Michael and Holli Johander**, dock length variance application at 245 West Point Road in Echo Bay.

Babcock asked Harper to provide background on this agenda item.

Harper reviewed his staff memo, dated 6/28/13, which summarized a request for a dock length variance with the hardship of shallow water. The site has approximately 80' of continuous shoreline and is located on the west side of Echo Bay. The applicants proposed, as outlined on a site plan, to: 1) extend their dock out to 146 feet from the 929.4' shoreline (estimated 4.7 feet of water depth), 2) install a boat lift on the south side of the dock that would meet the conforming 20 foot side setback, and 3) install a dock that would maintain a 13 foot setback from the northerly side site line extension. The applicants have documented ownership of the property to the north and would remove part of the platform to meet the 20 foot conforming side setback upon sale of such property. He believed that condition could be documented in the variance order. He provided an overview of the following relevant LMCD Code Sections: 1) Code Section 2.01, subd. 1 – defining of authorized DUA; 2) Code Section 1.07 – outlines the variance process; and 3) Code Section 2.02 outlining watercraft density restrictions. He recommended the Board direct LeFevere to prepare Findings of Fact and Order approving the dock length variance, subject to their consideration of three questions outlined within his staff report. He entertained questions and comments from the Board, in which he confirmed the dock currently installed was depicted on the aerial photograph offered.

Babcock invited the applicants to address the Board.

Mr. Michael Johander, owner of 245 West Point Road in Tonka Bay (residing in Shorewood), expressed an interest in having a dock use area variance approved, rather than one documented by a specific site plan, so

that he maintained the flexibility in the configuration of his dock. He confirmed an estimated 80' of shoreline; providing for a 146' dock length variance (referencing similar dimensions to a recently approved dock length variance for Vice Chair Baasen's site). He believed his request to extend out to 4.7 feet of water depth (rather than the five feet approved for Baasen's variance) was a compromise in requesting the smaller side setback to the north (13 feet). Additionally, the request provided for continued standard aesthetics in the surrounding area; providing for this dock to not be the longest. He entertained questions and comments from the Board.

Babcock confirmed that if the property to the north changed ownership, the dock, in some manner, would have to be adjusted to comply with the 20 foot setback. Additionally, a watercraft could not be moored in that area as well.

Johander stated that, upon sale of the property, they would remove a portion of the platform to comply with the setback requirement. Additionally, he questioned if it could remain with neighboring consent.

Babcock opened the public hearing at 7:10 p.m. Seeing no comments, he closed the public hearing at 7:11 p.m. He solicited LeFevere comments relative to whether the applicant had the ability to obtain neighboring consent to maintain the 13 foot side setback should the property to the north be sold.

LeFevere stated that apart from the ownership situation, the Board has historically been reluctant to allow consent to be used for an approved variance. For that to occur, he stated that different variables would have to be considered (i.e., a combined dock to be shared by both sites, individual dock use areas for the possible rental of one property, etc.). The question of whether the Board would like to allow such is presented for their consideration.

Babcock stated that generally if a site had common ownership, he concurred with the ability to obtain consent to waive side setbacks. However, if common ownership is not provided, it becomes a burden on the other property owner in responding to that question [acknowledging the applicant's nod of agreement within the audience]. He provided further detail of how this would be written into the variance (responding to a question from Gross as to the status of the variance once the property to the north was sold).

**MOTION:** Gross moved, Morris seconded to direct LeFevere to prepare Findings of Fact and Order for the approval of a dock length variance, with the conditions noted above.

**VOTE:** Motion carried unanimously.

## 9. OTHER BUSINESS

### D. Wayzata Lake Effect Project, update on LMCD's participation in project.

Babcock invited Wayzata City Planner/Assistant City Administrator Bryan Gadow to provide an update on this agenda item.

Mr. Bryan Gadow provided the following update on the project via a PowerPoint presentation:

- It is the City of Wayzata's (city) intention to strategically maximize the use of the waterfront area based on amenities and community involvement. They are focusing on this project (16 month long consultant aided approach) from the "bottom up" to engage the residents in its design and use.
- A review of a number of assets (in which he named) along the Lakefront that could be better utilized.
- He reviewed challenges and opportunities presented with this project (i.e., protecting and enhancing Lake Minnetonka as the community's most significant asset, etc.).
- An overview of the community engagement process; providing for the hiring of the Saint Paul Riverfront Corporation to serve as Process Manger Consultant, as well as assist in the designing and executing the 16 month engagement process.
- Multiple "high-touch" avenues are being used to engage all in this development (i.e., booths, mailings, social media, etc.).
- A detailed overview of the various phases in its development: Phase 1, "Value Proposition"; Phase 2, "Framework;" and Phase 3, "Implementation."
- A review of comments received to date (no silver bullet; "Lighter, Faster, Cheaper;" interest in a Lakefront boardwalk with additional trail connections and boat docks; meeting environmental needs, etc.). Additionally, the community would like this project to be both local and regional, in which the city will be partnering with the LMCD, Three Rivers Park District, Metropolitan Council, and the Minnehaha Creek Watershed District.
- He provided contact information relative to the project and entertained questions and comments from the Board.

The Board asked a few questions, in which Gadow provided the following responses:

- The interest in more docks would be for transient use.
- They will be presenting a ten year plan (providing for multiple phases) during the community's James Jay Hill Day this September.
- A review of the Lakefront boardwalk's construction elements currently being considered (i.e., softer, more natural, possibly a stone edge, etc.).
- Confirmation that there will be more restaurants and retail (possibly entailing the LMCD's consideration of some ordinance amendments).
- This project will encompass not only summer but all seasonal activities, as well (skating rinks, fire pits, etc.).
- Options will be provided for the community to weigh in on; with the city council adopting the final plan.
- The belief that the Lakeshore is owned by the city with an easement for the railroad's use. Additionally, further safety aspects, within their control, are being considered.

Babcock thanked Gadow for his presentation.

**A. MCWD, presentation of 2012 Water Quality Sampling Project**

Babcock welcomed Kelly Dooley and Yvette Christianson from the Minnehaha Creek Watershed District

(MCWD).

Kelly Dooley and Yvette Christianson introduced themselves as the Water Quality Technicians for the MCWD. They were in attendance to present the 2012 Streams and Lake Water Quality Monitoring Report, in which the following was highlighted via a PowerPoint presentation:

- A review of the MCWD's partnerships, which included the LMCD and many of the local government units (LGU).
- Precipitation was measured and monitored at seven locations, as well as additional locations via the Citizen Precipitation Monitoring program (reported monthly). Data from both resources were utilized in the Report. She reported that the 2012 annual precipitation was 29.59", which is 0.6% higher than the long term average of 29.41."
- An overview of storm water and water level monitoring was provided (including the use of telemetry equipment). This overview provided for the monitoring locations, as well as information on the 2012 Grays Bay Lake level as it compared to the dam's discharge rate during ice out conditions.
- Stream flow monitoring and water quality sampling were completed on a weekly basis at 10 locations on the Minnehaha Creek and 32 locations in the Upper Watershed. Manual stream monitoring was obtained by use of a SonTek Flow Tracker, as well as the use of a YSI multi probe meter to measure water temperature, dissolved oxygen (DO), Phosphorous (pH), and conductivity. Additionally, water quality samples were obtained for total phosphorous (TP), soluble reactive phosphorous (SRP), total suspended solids (TSS), and total nitrogen (TN); weekly, weekly, bi-weekly, and monthly, respectively. Chloride monitoring is collected monthly in the open water season and when salt/sand is present on the roads during the winter season.
- E. Coli was tested weekly (April through August). Typically this test is performed through October; however, drought conditions prevented testing past August.
- Lake water quality was measured for the same physical and chemical parameters noted above, as well as Chlorophyll-a, secchi disk depth, and Chloride. Additionally, Phytoplankton and Zooplankton samples were obtained from 11 bays on Lake Minnetonka. Weekly water depth levels were also monitored for 21 lakes.
- The process in reporting water quality data was reviewed, in which the formula is provided by the Metropolitan Council. A chart documenting the water quality grade for all 27 bays was provided (as well as those in the upper watershed and limited access lakes). In general, water quality on Lake Minnetonka has had minimal changes since 2010 (more particular to the east side of the Lake).
- A review of new projects that were performed in 2012, which included the incorporation of more biological and habitat parameters in the grading of the overall health of the lakes and streams in each of the 11 watershed district's subwatersheds; lake grades, vegetation and macroinvertebrate surveys, and aquatic invasive species (AIS). This project will be a ten-year approach; switching subwatersheds every three years (providing for Lake Minnetonka to have a more in-depth water quality testing process during the years 2020 to 2022).
- Dooley and Christianson entertained questions and comments from the Board.

The Board had a few questions, in which the following responses were provided:

- The MCWD does not test for heavy metals based on the State of Minnesota not listing such as impaired. With that said, the MCWD would consider heavy metal testing if support from other partnering agencies warranted it. Additionally, they believed the Pollution Control Agency performs that type of testing.
- Confirmation that the MCWD does sample for Phytoplankton and Zooplankton, in which the results will be placed in the Zebra Mussel's three year study due to the timing of the results and how the Zebra Mussels are affected by such (which was reviewed in detail).
- The MCWD's Planning Department would be able to respond to the question as to how the declared impairment of Lake Pepin had changed the focus of the MCWD's upstream projects.

Babcock thanked Dooley and Christianson for their presentation.

**B. MN DNR, update on use of tablets and new application for collecting survey information in 2013**

Babcock invited Adam Doll from the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources (MN DNR) to present an update on this agenda item.

Mr. Adam Doll introduced himself as the MN DNR's Region 3 Watercraft Inspection Supervisor. He provided the following update based on being halfway through the project for this boating season, as well as how the inspection surveying application could be of benefit to the LMCD:

- Historically, the MN DNR inspectors and grant eligible local government units (LGU) were issued Personal Data Assistants (PDA) to document the survey results obtained from the watercraft operators (specifically working with the LMCD to provide a sufficient amount of units as possible). This process became obsolete due to the operating system offered.
- The number of MN DNR inspectors have increased 30%. Additionally, the number of LGUs have increased (25 in 2013); providing for the need to establish new technology.
- 2013 provided for the use of a mobile device platform, which was used in place of the PDA's. This up-to-date, multi-devised platform (iSURVEY's software) is housed out of New Zealand that provides secured servers in Illinois. Additionally, it provided the MN DNR with the ability to create their own survey application; maintaining an unlimited use contract via paying for each survey obtained (est. 160,000 surveys in 2013).
- He provided a detailed overview of the application offered (including pros and cons), as well as the designed surveyed questions, secured access, and usable respective devices. A sample of the MN DNR tablet (one type of usable device) was present for the Board's review.
- Real-time data (locally or state wide) can be pulled from the application, in which he provided an overview of 77,000 surveys completed the date of this meeting (offering how many had the drain plug in or out upon arrival).
- He entertained questions and comments from the Board.

The Board had a few questions and comments, in which the following was offered:

- Confirmation that all data collected is public record (with the exception of enforcement cell phone numbers).

- The MN DNR recognizes the importance of expediting the inspection process for watercraft operators that only recreate on Lake Minnetonka. However, he acknowledged the difficulties in doing so based on the need to confirm compliance with the state's laws (providing for no exceptions for those individuals). Babcock asked if the MN DNR collected documentation that would build a profile for such an exception, in which Doll referred him to the last two questions of the survey that would do so.
- For operators who have AIS attached to their watercraft but a decontamination unit was not present, the inspectors issue them an authorization form that accompanies the operator in transporting their watercraft with attached AIS (allowing them to legally transport their watercraft to an area where they can safely remove the AIS). This process is also utilized for fall pull-out and spring launches (offering another profile for one to utilize in consideration of changing how the legislation is written). Additionally, this process could potentially be used in consideration of language changes to future surveying applications (i.e., transporting to storage units).
- Confirmation that the application is only provided to LGUs and not private associations or commercial Lake stakeholders. Additionally, the inspectors are trained to document whether the operator is a service provider or not (which a profile could also be obtained). Babcock expressed interest in obtaining this data for service providers such as marina operators that launch and pull watercraft that are currently not being documented.
- Confirmation that each device has a LGU name and number; providing for the surveying results to be identified by region.
- Confirmation that license plate numbers are public information, in which each survey has a discrete listing (i.e., no owner information is offered).
- The spraying of mud off of anchors, etc., is a preventative measure.
- Confirmation that the MN DNR does not provide (to date) matching funds for the purchase of the devices to run the application.
- Approval was recently provided to add three wireless hotspots for the decontamination trucks.
- Doll could not confirm how many inspectors were utilizing smart phones as the device choice is up to the individual LGU.

Babcock thanked Doll for his presentation.

**C. John Sullivan**, permanent (non-multiple) dock license application at 2765 Maplewood Circle in Woolsey Pond

Babcock asked Nybeck for an overview of this agenda item..

Nybeck directed the Board to his staff memo, dated 7/2/13, in which he highlighted as follows:

- Mr. John Sullivan has submitted a request for a permanent (non-multiple) dock license at his residential property on Woolsey Pond.
- The site has an estimated 280' of continuous shoreline (a combination of the channel and a lagoon-like turn-around area) with a currently installed dock that is estimated at 82 feet in length. An overview of this area was provided via aerial photographs.

- The applicant has proposed to install an 82 foot long permanent dock located further to the south of the site (maintaining a proposed side setback of 48 feet from the south extended side site line).
- The proposed dock conforms to dock use area (DUA) requirements (well below the 100 foot maximum dock length allowance and the minimum side setback requirement to the south extended side site line of either 15 or 20 feet (depending on whether a canopy is installed).
- This type of application is typically approved at staff level (LMCD Code Section 2.06). However, he recommended it be reviewed and approved at Board level based on three questions outlined within his staff memo.
- The City of Woodland and the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources (MN DNR) were provided an opportunity to review and comment on this request, in which the LMCD received comments from the City of Woodland (provided in their handout folder).
- He confirmed this is agenda item is not a public hearing (nor is it required) and that it does not require notification to abutting neighbors. However, he stated he proceeded in notifying six neighbors on the south end of Woolsey Pond based on the proposed changes to the dock (including its permanent construction). Various letters from the neighbors have been provided for Board review. Additionally, the applicant is in attendance to address the Board and questioned if the Board would like to obtain testimony from neighbors that are in attendance, as well.
- Based on the Board's comfort level, he recommended the Board either approve the proposed application (which they had the ability to do so) or clarify concerns for possible non-approval so that the applicant can consider the necessary adjustments.
- He entertained questions and comments from the Board, in which there were none.

Babcock reminded the Board that this request is not a variance; therefore, requirements of such do not apply. Additionally, the request conforms to all LMCD ordinances. He explained that had the applicant chosen to install a seasonal dock as proposed, he could do so without Board approval.

LeFevere followed-up by confirming a permanent, non-multiple dock license is approved (subject to complying with LMCD Code) at staff level; with the Executive Director's right to forward the request to the Board for consideration and approval. Should the Board conclude the request does comply with the Code, then, in all respect, the request would be approved. However, he reviewed one Code provision in which the request may not comply (Code Section 2.12, Subd. 10, "Miscellaneous Provisions," outlining "Structures not to Obstruct"), in which he read. If the Board concludes the proposed application complies with this section, then approval of the request is warranted.

The Board discussed this request by making the following comments:

- Nybeck could not confirm if the neighboring dock to the south complied with a 20' setback. Additionally, that neighbor was not in attendance to confirm such. Babcock believed, via his informal, on-site review, that a crowding concern was not present with the neighboring dock to the south once the proposed dock would be installed.
- Klohs questioned whether a future variance application would be needed for both the applicant and the neighbor to the south once the proposed permanent dock would be installed. Babcock pointed out that such applications are not before the Board for consideration, in which Klohs

continued to express concern that all facts are not before the Board should the south dock currently be placed over the applicant's side site lines.

- Nybeck could not provide exact placement of the proposed dock, but confirmed (via discussion held with the proposed dock installer) that the dock would be moved further to the south to prevent impeding public navigation, as well as extending the dock out an additional 35 feet. This decision ultimately provided for his decision to bring the application to the Board for consideration.
- Hoelscher inquired as to when a permanent dock is authorized as opposed to non-permanent dock, in which Babcock stated the Code provides for a permit to place a permanent dock, "any dock which is not a seasonal dock." Additionally, it was confirmed that the Code does not allow the issuance of de-icing permits for non-commercial, permanent dock structures (such as this dock).
- Nybeck stated that the LMCD does not receive many non-commercial, permanent dock applications based on the fact that they are not able to obtain a de-icing permit (although one can de-ice after March 15<sup>th</sup> without such). He reiterated the following areas of concerns relative to why this application was before the Board: 1) the site is in a channel, as well as a pond/lagoon turnaround area, 2) typical permits are issued for sites that are parallel to each other (alleviating the question as to whether the application is impairing navigation to neighboring docks), and 3) proactively addressing neighboring concerns up front rather than after approval at staff level. Babcock supported staff's decision in bringing the matter before the Board.
- Meyers (who lives in the area and utilizes Woolsey Pond's surface waters on a regular basis) made the following comments: 1) the Woodland City Council unanimously agreed that the proposed dock is not consistent with the aesthetics of Woolsey Pond, 2) he expressed concern that the water levels may not support the applicant's watercraft during low water depth periods (documenting a watercraft in the area that had to remain in place through the winter due to the same concern), and 3) he requested the applicant to consider meeting with the neighboring property owners affected by his proposed request (with the goal to work something out that would not be so intrusive).
- Babcock supported the application and believed that more problems exist with smaller site owners that purchase larger boats.
- The Board confirmed that the applicant is acting at his own risk relative to de-icing; reiterating that they can do so after March 15<sup>th</sup> without a permit.
- Gross agreed with the above discussion, as well as not having a reason to deny the request. However, he urged the applicant to consider if his request is truly necessary (considering a win, win situation).
- LeFevere stated that the granting of any permanent dock license does not provide vested rights to continue should future neighboring applications be granted that would affect the placement of the dock (i.e., a variance). Should such an application be approved, the proposed dock might have to be moved (providing for installation of a permanent dock at the applicant's own risk).
- Babcock confirmed that the Code provides for the Executive Director's ability to forward permanent, non-multiple dock license applications, when warranted, to the Board for consideration (confirming that the Board is not setting a precedent in providing for this process).

**MOVED:** Morris moved, Green seconded to approve John Sullivan permanent, non-multiple dock license application at 2765 Maplewood Circle in Woolsey Pond as submitted.

**VOTE:** Ayes, (9); Nays, (1, Meyer); motion carried.

**E. Staff update on 2013 EWM Harvesting Program**

Babcock asked Harper for an update on this agenda item.

Harper provided a detailed overview of the program's time table of accomplishments, as well as the completion and upcoming harvesting schedule based on the South Upper Lake Option (with diversion due to growth). He entertained questions and comments from the Board, in which he confirmed the equipment was holding up well and that residents seem pleased with the work performed (with the exception of one day providing for high winds and interfering fragments).

**F. Staff update on current Lake Minnetonka water levels**

Babcock asked Nybeck for an update on this agenda item.

Nybeck directed the Board to his staff memo, dated 7/10/13, in which he made the following comments:

- The 2013 season has provided for fluctuating water levels (initially considering a Low Water Declaration and then moved to a possible High Water Declaration).
- He directed the Board an attachment within his memo that provided for a list of water level readings from June 10, 2013 to July 8, 2013.
- Based on the readings offered within the noted list above, he provided a detailed overview of specific dates and their respective water level readings as it related to the consideration of a High Water Declaration (outlining five of those dates within his staff memo). Additionally, he reviewed the Code as it relates to declaring High Water and why on one of the days that the water level could have triggered a declaration, it was not made (extended dry weather outlook).
- He recognized the assistance of Tiffany Forner from the Minnehaha Creek Watershed District who worked closely with staff in reporting the water level readings on a regular basis. Additionally, he stated he worked closely with the Hennepin County Sheriff's Office in preparation of a possible press conference.
- Although the water level reading dropped below the High Water Declaration trigger point, he stated staff would continue to monitor the water levels.
- He entertained questions and comments from the Board, in which there were none.

Babcock stated that staff was proactive in submitting an educational press release over the Fourth of July holiday acknowledging the importance of the public managing their wakes (even though a declaration was not made). Additionally, the Sheriff's Office placed electronic signage to this affect on the Arcola Bridge, in which Baasen believed watercraft operators did not adhere to.

**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).

Morris stated there is an AIS Task Force meeting on July 12<sup>th</sup> at 8:30 a.m. in the LMCD office. Additionally, he stated that the Minnehaha Creek Watershed District Weevil experiment on Big Island had been cancelled for the 2013 season.

Green stated that the Minnesota AIS Advisory Committee is having a Lake Minnetonka field trip on July 11<sup>th</sup>. They will be starting the day at Tonka Bay Marina learning to inspect and wash different watercraft (providing for discussion on what can and cannot be done in this regard). Additionally, the committee will be going to the North Arm public access (working with Tony Brough from the Hennepin County Environmental Services), as well as taking a Lake tour of the various AIS issues offered.

Babcock stated that the Ordinance Review Committee meeting for June 19<sup>th</sup> was cancelled due to legal communication representing the marina owners relative to the amenities of the special density license. It was not his intent to expend legal fees on this matter.

Hughes stated the Public Safety Committee met on June 24<sup>th</sup>, in which they discussed the Quiet Water Area request in Lower Lake North by Marcel and Jodi Schwendimann. In follow-up to that request, Tony Brough from the Hennepin County Environmental Services was going to recheck the placement location of the respective buoys that are currently installed. He stated that staff is following-up in scheduling their on-site visits, as previously directed by the Board, in which he has asked to be included in that process. Based on his personal observations, he believed a safety aspect existed.

Klohs stated that Brough had confirmed that the number of point buoys in this area were reduced from three to two; with the slow wake buoys remaining the same over time. He believed a perceptual situation existed, in which watercraft operators are cutting the corner early with the removal of the third point buoy.

Babcock recommended consideration be given to moving the slow wake area closer to the bridge.

Nybeck stated prior direction from the Board was not only to consider the petition but also assess and evaluate the buoy placement for the entire area. He welcomed other Board member ideas and/or participation that could be considered by the committee.

Baasen stated the Save the Lake Sub-Committee is scheduled to meet on July 15<sup>th</sup> to discuss the proposed Boater Safety Education Program. Additionally, the Save the Lake Committee has a standing scheduled meeting the last Monday of each month. He asked Hughes to comment on the June 24<sup>th</sup> Save the Lake Committee meeting.

Hughes stated he has started putting together a rough story board for the presentation of the Boater Safety Education Program (including communication with Lt. Saunders from the Hennepin County Sheriff's Office Water Patrol on specific concerns relative to the use of personal watercraft). Review of this process is ongoing and he confirmed that the Water Patrol had sufficient technical capabilities to power the computers.

There were no Finance or Personnel Committee meeting reports.

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

Nybeck stated staff has a number of projects moving forward at this time. He entertained questions and comments from the Board.

Green asked if the Watercraft Inspection Program surveys were being collected.

Nybeck confirmed the surveys were being collected (acknowledging the third year in doing so). He stated the MN DNR is requiring more detailed data entry of the surveys; therefore, this process will require more involvement than anticipated. Had he known the data entry would be that involved, he would have provided a stronger recommendation to obtain the tablets.

#### **12. ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 9:24 p.m.

---

Doug Babcock, Chair

---

Gary Hughes, Treasurer