

**LAKE MINNETONKA CONSERVATION DISTRICT  
BOARD OF DIRECTORS**

7:00 P.M., Wednesday, January 13, 2016  
Wayzata City Hall

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

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

**2. ROLL CALL**

**Members present:** Dan Baasen, Wayzata; Gregg Thomas, Tonka Bay; Gary Hughes, Spring Park; Jennifer Caron, Excelsior; James Doak, Woodland; Jay Green, Mound; Ann Hoelscher, Victoria; Gabriel Jabbour, Orono; Bret Niccum, Minnetrista; Rob Roy, Greenwood; Sue Shuff, Minnetonka; and Deborah Zorn, Shorewood. Also present: Greg Nybeck, Executive Director; Emily Herman, Administrative Assistant; and Troy Gilchrist, LMCD Legal Counsel.

**Members absent:** Chris Jewett, Deephaven; Dennis Klohs, Minnetonka Beach

**3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

**MOTION:** Thomas moved, Roy seconded to approve the agenda as submitted.

**VOTE:** Motion carried unanimously.

**4. CHAIR ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Baasen made the following Chair announcements:

- The City of Woodland has re-appointed James Doak to the LMCD Board. He welcomed Doak on behalf of the Board and asked Gilchrist to administer the oath of office.
- He reminded the Board that the January 27<sup>th</sup> meeting will be held at 6:00 p.m. in light of the newly adopted meeting schedule.
- He publically wished former LMCD Legal Counsel Charlie LeFevere well in dealing with some health concerns.

**5. APPROVAL OF MINUTES-** 12/9/15 LMCD Regular Board Meeting

Green requested the following amendments relative to Jabbour's comments: 1) the removal of the words "commercial" and "events" from the seventh bulleted point paragraph on page 13 and 2) to correct the spelling of the word "transit" to "transient."

Baasen requested the word "recommended" be changed to "recommending" in the second to last sentence of Jabbour's first paragraph on page 18.

**MOTION:** Green moved, Hughes seconded to approve the 12/9/15 LMCD Regular Board Meeting minutes as amended, making the changes noted above.

**VOTE:** Ayes (11), Abstained (1, Thomas); motion carried.

## 6. APPROVAL OF CONSENT AGENDA

Thomas moved, Baasen seconded to approve the consent agenda as submitted. Motion carried unanimously. Items so approved included: **6A)** Audit of vouchers (12/16/15 – 12/31/15) and (1/1/16 – 1/15/16) and **6B)** November 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 HEARINGS

There were no public hearings scheduled.

## 9. OTHER BUSINESS

**A) Ordinance Amendment(s)**, first reading of two ordinance amendment options to the LMCD Code relative to deicing.

Gilchrist stated that at the December 9<sup>th</sup> meeting, he and Nybeck were directed to draft ordinance amendments that would take into consideration the ability to deice around boat houses. He directed the Board to three ordinance amendments for their consideration. He provided an overview of the documents as follows:

- This process was originally approached by offering the following two options for the Board's consideration: 1) move the March 15<sup>th</sup> date in which one can deice without a deicing license (with conditions) to March 1<sup>st</sup> or 2) expand the eligible facilities that could be issued a deicing license to "Lawfully existing boat houses."
- In further defining the word lawfully, he stated that boat houses are considered a historic structure via regulations within the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources Shoreland Management Program. Therefore, the use of the word reflects that most are lawful, non-conforming structures.
- The Sheriff's Office had an opportunity to review the two options. A concern was raised for Option #1 (moving date forward) relative to public safety and the existence of activities that remained on the Lake at that time. To this end, additional language was added and presented as Option #1B within their handout folders. That option is summarized by requiring those that deice between March 1<sup>st</sup> and March 15<sup>th</sup> to entirely enclose the area to be deiced with a snow fence and reflectorized signage vs. the currently approved ordinance that states March 15<sup>th</sup> with signage only.

Nybeck confirmed the Sheriff's Office had an opportunity to review Option 1B in which they concurred with the additional revisions.

- Gilchrist stated that if the Board was inclined to consider the options offered, he would recommend either Option 1B or Option 2 for approval. He entertained questions and comments from the Board in which the following was offered: 1) concurrence with Option 1B based on those that deice close to a fire lane or public access and 2) confirmation that the proposed language offered for deicing between March 1<sup>st</sup> and 15<sup>th</sup> only required fencing and signage and that the Board would not have the ability to address specific conditions, i.e., deicing curtains, etc.

Baasen stated that this matter was originally addressed based on the request of a Mr. Peter Pflaum (in attendance at the December 9<sup>th</sup> meeting) who owns a boat house that was in need of deicing by the end of February. Baasen stated Pflaum could not be present this evening; therefore, he asked a representative to come in his place. Baasen invited that representative to address the Board if he so inclined.

Attorney David Newman, 4918 Birch Lake Circle in White Bear Lake, stated that he is Mr. Pflaum's partner who had requested that he be present on his behalf. He believed that Pflaum did a nice job articulating his concerns on December 9<sup>th</sup> and that either one of the two options would suffice for his needs.

**MOTION:** Jabbour moved, Niccum seconded to approve the first reading, waive the second and third readings, and adopt draft ordinance amendment Option 1B relative to deicing.

**VOTE:** Motion carried unanimously.

**B) Lynn and Associates**, update on 2015 performance review results for LMCD Executive Director

Baasen stated the Human Resources Task Force (HRTF) will be meeting in the near future to review the 2015 performance review results of the Executive Director. He spoke with Dr. Lynn and confirmed that all 14 Board members had responded to his request; however, he wanted an opportunity to provide the results to the HRTF prior to the full Board (scheduled for January 27<sup>th</sup>).

Zorn questioned why the HRTF would not consider meeting just prior to the January 27<sup>th</sup> Board meeting to remain consistent with the meeting schedule established for the other committees. With that said, it was her belief that the presentation should have been scheduled for this evening.

**C) Ordinance Amendment**, first reading of an ordinance amendment to the LMCD Code relative to watercraft safety rules (including equipment)

Nybeck stated that he and a number of other representatives met on December 2<sup>nd</sup> to discuss possible ordinance amendments relative to public safety. Some of the representatives in attendance included Gilchrist, Jabbour, Klohs, Hughes, Green, LMCD Prosecuting Attorney Steve Tallen, Lt. Vnuk, and an attorney from Hennepin County. The main topic of discussion was ordinances within Chapter 3 of the LMCD Code, "Regulation of Watercraft and Other Craft and Vehicles." It was the consensus of those in attendance to consider amendments that should be considered on a fast track, at this meeting, with the opportunity to bring other possible amendments to the Board for their initial review at the January 27<sup>th</sup> meeting. He recommended Gilchrist provide an overview of the draft ordinance amendments.

Gilchrist stated that those in attendance recommended streamlining the ordinances by simply referencing the respective state statute. This process is further outlined in the first proposed amendment; Adoption by Reference. Other proposed amendments included the following sections: Noise, Watercraft Safety Rules, Watercraft Equipment, Incorporation of Amendments, and Effective Date. In closing, he stated that the representatives of this group expressed an interest in presenting the proposed amendments to the Board in hopes of having them adopted by the beginning of the boating season. He inquired as to whether Nybeck heard back from the Sheriff's Office on the proposed amendments in which Nybeck confirmed he had not. To this end, Gilchrist entertained questions and comments from the Board.

The Board had a lengthy discussion on this matter as summarized below:

- Two notes of reference: 1) that the fine revenue would go to whichever agency's statute is cited, i.e., the state or LMCD and 2) some of the currently adopted LMCD ordinances, such as the enforcement of noise levels, are not always being enforced based on how it is currently written and the high probability that, if challenged, would not stand up in court.
- This process is a positive step for the LMCD.
- Confirmation that the LMCD may have ordinances that are more restrictive than the state; however, there is a fine line in an ordinance being preempted, conflicting, or just more restrictive. In talking with the representatives, it was stressed that it is better to have more uniformed rules for the subject matters listed; offering there are other areas in which the LMCD does maintain more restrictive rules at an appropriate level.
- The positive in offering less restrictive regulations (providing more testing options for the enforcement of noise levels) is that it does not tie the hands of the officers.
- The proposed amendment relative to noise relates to the operation of a watercraft. Gilchrist confirmed that he is currently drafting an amendment relative to the LMCD's public nuisance laws that would address noise levels offered through electronic devices which would be drafted as a policy of the LMCD and not reference to state statute.
- The interest in updating the LMCD ordinances to be pertinent, accurate, and fair.
- Gilchrist read the current state statute relative to different types of decibel levels; recognizing they are slightly higher than the currently approved 80 decibels offered within the LMCD code but more uniform to how they are utilized elsewhere.

**MOTION:** Green moved, Shuff seconded to approve the first reading, waive second and third readings, and adopt draft ordinance amendments relative to watercraft safety rules.

**VOTE:** Motion carried unanimously.

Nybeck stated that the group referenced above utilized a spread sheet that outlined the various code provisions of Chapter 3. This document, as well as other coded provisions that Gilchrist was working on, will be presented to the Board at their January 27<sup>th</sup> meeting.

**D) Staff update on 2015 LMCD Proactive Code Enforcement Program**

Herman directed the Board to her staff memo, dated 1/12/16, within their handout folders. A summary of her update, via a PowerPoint presentation, was as follows: 1) the program was initiated in 2006 for the purpose of enforcing watercraft storage ordinances at residential sites on Lake Minnetonka, 2) the primary enforcement efforts included: identifying and/or re-inspecting sites storing five or more restricted watercraft that do not have a multiple dock license and sites storing three or four larger restricted watercraft that do not comply with the 1:50' General Rule, 3) a detailed overview of the established documentation and communication process, 4) a general overview of the 2015 findings and how prosecution matters are typically settled, 5) an update on eight Complaints filed for the 2014 boating season, as well as an overview of the seven that are scheduled from the 2015 season, 6) an overview of staff time and equipment utilized in performing the program, and 7) concluding comments which included the recommendation to schedule a future meeting to consider possible code amendments and the overview of a statistical enforcement chart from 2006 to 2015 (in anticipation of Board discussion as to the future of this program). She entertained questions and comments from the Board as summarized below:

- The request to provide a total number of sites inspected based on the amount of violations offered [2015 provided for a total of 142 inspections of which 44 were out of compliance].
- The statistics were compared to an estimated 3,500 sites and an estimated 10,000 boats (LMCD Boat Storage Count) stored on the Lake during a typical year.
- Whether the program was effective based on the funds and staff time spent in comparison to the statistics offered.
- Recognition that the statistics document a decrease in violations and a recommendation that the program's existence should be scheduled for discussion at a workshop session.
- The belief that the program was originally initiated based on the request of a couple marina owners and that the program itself generated animosity towards the LMCD.
- The question of how many violations maintained jet skis and would it warrant the consideration of documenting them as less than one restricted watercraft (acknowledging that many maintain more than one). A recommendation was offered by staff to consider enacting an ordinance that would provide for the visibility of the registration number should the change in density count for a jet ski be considered.

Baasen summarized the discussion by offering the need to consider frequency, size of boats, and the storage of jet skis. He recommended tabling the discussion for consideration at an upcoming workshop.

#### E) Update from LMCD Strategic Plan Initiatives Sub-Committee

Baasen recommended the Board consider agenda items 10-13 and then move to a workshop to consider this agenda item. Seeing no concerns, he moved to agenda item 10.

### 10. UPDATE FROM STANDING LMCD COMMITTEES

Green provided the following update on the December 11<sup>th</sup> Aquatic Invasive Species (AIS) Task Force meeting.

- Tony Brough from Hennepin County Environment and Energy gave a presentation on alternative

pathways for AIS. This included a tour of commercial garden vendors and landscapers, by Fortin Consulting, to see who was selling items that should not have been. The results offered were positive (previously distributed to the Board).

- The members received the 2015 Minnesota Department of Natural Resources (MN DNR) Watercraft Inspection Report. Green stated he will be analyzing the statistics against the LMCD's.
- The next meeting is scheduled for February 12<sup>th</sup>. At that time, the members will initiate plans for the 2016 Harvesting and Watercraft Inspection Programs. After that date, they will meet quarterly as needed.
- He and Jabbour, representing the State AIS Committee, are meeting with the MN DNR Commissioner January 14<sup>th</sup> to talk about future AIS plans, as well as attending the MN DNR AIS Roundtable that will be held Friday, January 15<sup>th</sup>.

Baasen stated the Save the Lake Committee met this date at which time they confirmed that they would be meeting the second Wednesday of every other month and that they reviewed nine funding proposals that will be forwarded to the Board in the near future.

Caron stated that the Nominating Committee met last Wednesday. As a result an email was submitted to the Board soliciting interest in those that would like to serve as an officer in 2016. The deadline for responding to that request was Friday, January 15<sup>th</sup>. The committee will meet on January 21<sup>st</sup> at which time they will discuss the responses.

## **11. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR REPORT**

Nybeck provided the Board the following updates: First, he annually attends the MN DNR Roundtable and will again this Friday. Second, he thanked Green for assisting him in the installation of the winter signs which included the placement of the rules pamphlet in the drop boxes. Third, the LMCD is in receipt of a certiorari appeal relative to Browns Bay Marina, Site 2. He anticipated a closed session in the near future so that LMCD's attorney from Hoff, Barry, & Kozar could provide the Board an update on this matter. Fourth, staff has finalized the draft work plan for the proposed updated strategic plan as well as a list of the LMCD's core programs and activities that the Board will be considering this evening. Fifth, he thanked the LMCD staff for their additional efforts while the office maintains a vacant position.

Jabbour stated he was disappointed that he found out from someone else that a representative from the LMCD was sitting on a Lake Effect Committee for the City of Wayzata (city) in which the Board members that he spoke to were not aware of this appointment nor had received reports on such.

Baasen stated that Jabbour may have a point; however, he personally serves on the city's Parks and Trails Board, as well as for their representative to the LMCD. He was asked to serve by a selection committee for what he called the Signature Project and that it was his understanding he was doing so as a representative of Wayzata and not the LMCD. Additionally, Nybeck is serving on a technical committee so that he can interpret the LMCD's Code for them. He stated that any confusion relative to this was not intentional.

Jabbour believed that he was speaking on behalf of the city in that if it was their intention to keep the Board

apprised of the progress, they had failed miserably.

Baasen reiterated that he believed the intention of his service was for him to serve as a citizen of the city and not as a representative of Parks and Trails or the LMCD.

Nybeck stated that he was confused with Jabbour's concerns. He offered that there are several organizations that request staff's assistance in providing technical support, which is what they were looking for. If it is the Board's pleasure that staff would need to obtain approval to provide that technical support, it would create a very cumbersome process. He has expended an estimated six hours on this project in which that has not been taken from the work day but for him to make up his work after hours. Lastly, he stated that the LMCD is one of the biggest permitting agencies that warrants providing technical support up front as a great deal of that project includes the placement of docks; providing for a proactive approach prior to bringing an application to the Board for consideration.

Jabbour rejected Nybeck's comments as he believed it would be extremely helpful to the Board members when they are discussing matters at the state level.

Nybeck directed the Board to the fifth bullet point in paragraph one of his Executive Director Report; documenting his attendance to the Wayzata Lake Effect Technical Committee meeting. He offered that this attendance has been documented in prior reports.

Baasen asked if the Board members that report LMCD business to their represented city should provide a report to the Board; offering the question of how that is different.

Jabbour believed it was Nybeck's job to keep the Board apprised of all projects; offering this particular project is profound to Lake Minnetonka. Furthermore, he believed that Nybeck is wasting his time attending the MN DNR Roundtable. He stated that he felt short changed when his Mayor asked him how this project was going as there is a member of the LMCD serving on that committee.

Zorn was at the last Strategic Planning Sub-Committee in which they received confirmation that Nybeck was serving on this technical committee; offering that all committee members present were not aware of such. With that said, she believed that she was not aware that the meeting was documented on the Executive Director Report but that if so, it would warrant an update on the progress and documentation of time spent.

Shuff stated that it was not unanimous that all sub-committee members did not know of Nybeck serving on the committee.

Baasen reiterated that Nybeck's time in this matter was to provide technical assistance. He further believed that it was inappropriate for a Board member(s) to retroactively document that a staff member did something wrong.

Green stated that Nybeck's involvement in an advisory committee made sense to him as the LMCD should be a resource to questions asked; acknowledging the lack of Board information on this matter. His main concern

was that the LMCD's name is connected to this activity; providing for his belief that an assumption is being made that the LMCD has a buy-in on the matter.

Jabbour believed that the city should want something different and that their interest would be better served if more diversified members served on that Board from around the Lake. Lastly, he believed his communication standard (inclusive) is different from others (exclusive).

Baasen did not believe it was fair for Jabbour to assume one's communication standards as that would be based on his interpretation only. He stated this project is owned by the city that has not, to date, provided a definitive plan that will affect the Lake. Furthermore, he believed it was unfair to the city to state that they should not have local representation but diversified from around the Lake.

Thomas suggested that, in light of this conversation, Baasen and Nybeck could provide a brief update at one of the upcoming Board meetings.

Nybeck stated that the lead representative(s) of the project will be proposing a recommended plan to their city council within the next 60 to 90 days. He recommended that after such would be the appropriate time to provide the Board an update as currently there is nothing concrete to offer.

Baasen stated that his participation in his represented city's endeavors in not meant to be exclusive to the Board and if it is the Board's pleasure for them to receive an update, he would be happy to provide it (offering a brief overview of three proposals currently being considered). Additionally, he and Nybeck would have been happy to provide individual updates simply by asking for such.

## 12. OLD BUSINESS

There was no Old Business

## 13. NEW BUSINESS

There was no New Business

**MOTION:** Thomas moved, Caron seconded for the Board to continue the meeting in a workshop setting to consider agenda item 9E and adjourn thereafter.

**VOTE:** Motion carried unanimously.

The meeting was recessed at 8:37 p.m. and reconvened at 8:45 p.m.

**9E)** Update from LMCD Strategic Plan Initiatives Sub-Committee (Note the Board may decide to continue this agenda item in a workshop)

Nybeck directed the Board to his staff memo, dated 1/8/16, in which he provided a detailed overview of

the process to date relative to the LMCD's action in updating the approved strategic plan. In reviewing the January 6<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Strategic Planning Sub-Committee [approved by the Board in August of 2015 to assist staff in creating the proposed initiatives to the Board's established priorities], he stated it was the consensus of the committee to delay further review of the proposed 2016 strategic initiatives until the entire Board provided direction on the proposed 2016 core activities and programs. To this end, he directed the Board to a spreadsheet outlining the main activities and programs and recommended the Board answer the following two questions: 1) whether the documented activities and programs should continue in 2016 and, if so, 2) should the activities and programs be completed in-house or contracted out.

A summary of the Board's comments are as follows:

Eurasian Watermilfoil (EWM) Harvesting Program

- The sub-committee recommended the LMCD contract out for the project manager duties; allocating up to \$4,000 from the 2016 budget. This option was tried by the LMCD prior to the hiring of former Administrative Technician Judd Harper.
- In recent years, the Minneapolis Parks Board investigated contracting out all aspects of their harvesting (with a conclusion that it is more cost effective to keep it in-house).
- A recommendation that the LMCD should advertise for the services to answer the question as to whether it would be worthwhile to consider. With that said, a greater concern as to what the LMCD can expend in 2016 and how much harvesting could be completed existed.
- Contracting out is going to provide for a markup in the services offered vs. the LMCD currently paying for minimum compensation. Therefore, a recommendation was made to place more administrative responsibility on the person running the program; providing for compensation of such.
- Nybeck stated that there would continue to be a need to have a full-time staff member acting as liaison to the site supervisor, but that the time could be reduced. He believed it would take a while for staff to put together a bid process that fully outlines all the harvesting needs for 2016. He concurred that the process might be a good exercise for the LMCD to go through.
- Baasen asked Green, based on his experience in working with the delegation of programs with outside companies, if he would take the lead in formulating alternatives that the Board could consider; working with Nybeck. Green agreed to this request.

Watercraft Inspection Program: Green recommended the LMCD continue to work with the Three Rivers Park District in contracting for these services; recognizing the high level of performance in 2015.

Communications: The spreadsheet outlined multiple communication avenues that the LMCD is currently offering (staff education through public inquiries, newsletter, website updates, and press releases). The Board had a lengthy discussion on the newsletter. Although direction was not provided on this matter, many comments were offered that the communication process, particularly the way in which the LMCD's overall information is disseminated to the public, needed to be reconsidered.

Financial, Inspections, Licensing-Permitting-Special Approvals, and Meeting Liaison: Zorn believed there was not a need to discuss the above listed programs as they would continue regardless of this exercise. Therefore, she recommended the Board turn their attention to the Proactive Code Enforcement and Watercraft Safety Education Programs.

Proactive Code Enforcement Program: Zorn provided an overview of staff's percentage of time in performing this program (estimated 20-30%) and asked the Board if they would like to continue dedicating this time to the program. A summary of the Board's discussion is offered below:

- A recommendation was made to suspend the program for 2016 with a follow-up workshop to further discuss the future of this program and, if warranted, any changes. A follow-up recommendation was to direct staff to complete any pending actions, including the settlement of Complaints that remain unresolved. This action provides for code enforcement of watercraft storage to be handled on a formal complaint basis only.
- Staff provided an overview of the time in which compliance is achieved.
- Nybeck recommended the Board adopt a policy that defined who could file a formal complaint to avoid someone running around the Lake and submitting multiple complaints; providing for unforeseeable staff time involved.

A question was raised as to whether the LMCD could legally require such; offering that staff does not have to immediately respond to formal complaints.

Nybeck stated a similar policy is in place for addressing side setback complaints. He expressed concern that the Board is going to operate on a reduced staff levels in 2016, including the removal of the seasonal employee that was hired for this program, add additional initiatives, and then leave an open ended option for staff's time to be consumed by multiple formal complaints. To this end, he encouraged a policy that only allowed the abutting neighbors to file the complaint.

Herman documented, in follow-up to a question, that the formal complaints have been reduced since the Proactive Code Enforcement Program was initiated; offering those that inquire chose to have staff follow through via this program vs. the submittal of a formal process.

For the record, Jabbour stated that he did not have a problem with those that violate this ordinance to continue to do so based on the percentage of violations documented.

Baasen asked the Board if there was a consensus to suspend the 2016 program and provide code enforcement for such via formal complaints only. No Board members expressed a concern.

Solar Lights: Green recommended not only the Solar Lights Program but other outside maintenance projects (such as the installation and removal of signs) should be contracted out on a case by case basis. In regards to the Solar Lights Program, the Board did not express any concerns in continuing that program with one recommendation to consider sending a letter to Hennepin County Environment and Energy for their consideration in taking over the program as they currently place the buoys on which the lights are affixed. Lastly, he stated that the placement/removal of the lights are performed by volunteers.

Boater Safety Education Program: Baasen understood that the main concern with the program is the amount of staff time involved in putting on the three 2015 sessions. He stated that most of the activity was offered through the Board and Save the Lake Committee members. He confirmed that the 2016 sessions are being reduced to two. A summary of the Board's comments on this matter is offered below:

- The recommendation that Save the Lake should operate independent from the LMCD. This recommendation was not offered to delete any programming but to maintain such in a self-sufficient state; utilizing contributions and volunteers to run the programs.
- Save the Lake is directly linked to the LMCD and contributions to such are given with the notion that the LMCD is running the activities on the Lake that are supported by their contributions.
- A portion of the member city levies are being utilized for the administrative costs, i.e., staff time, etc., for Save the Lake with contributions being fully directed to programming.
- The belief that Save the Lake is a part of an LMCD mission creep with a recommendation to research the ability to partner with other agencies in some of the programs offered.
- The belief that there is a link between the LMCD and the need to assure boater safety; recognizing staff reduction could be considered and/or reimbursed at the very least.

Baasen provided an overview of the Save the Lake budget and what was spent in 2015 for the boater safety program. He recommended documenting the expenditure of all for the year 2016 to provide for a base of what is needed to be self-sufficient.

Nybeck stated the 2016 Save the Lake Budget has not been approved to date. Once considered, it will allocate contributions towards the Board's approved funding proposals which the committee has recently initiated that review.

Jabbour offered to assist in the restructuring of the Save the Lake Fund; incorporating outside agencies for professional expertise.

**MOTION:** Roy moved, Shuff seconded to suspend this workshop session to the Board's January 27<sup>th</sup> meeting.

**VOTE:** Motion carried unanimously.

#### 14. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 9:10 p.m.

---

Dan Baasen Chair

---

Gregg Thomas, Vice Chair/Secretary