

**LAKE MINNETONKA CONSERVATION DISTRICT
BOARD OF DIRECTORS**

6:00 P.M., July 8, 2020
Virtual Meeting

Due to COVID-19 Guidelines, pursuant to a statement issued by the presiding officer (Board Chair) under Minnesota Statutes, section 13D.021, the meeting was conducted remotely through electronic means using Zoom. The LMCD's usual meeting room was not open or available to the public or the Directors.

WORK SESSION

6:00 p.m.

Members Present:

Gregg Thomas, Tonka Bay; Rich Anderson, Orono; Ann Hoelscher, Victoria; Bill Cook, Greenwood; Dan Baasen, Wayzata; Ben Brandt, Mound; Gary Hughes, Spring Park; Michael Kirkwood, Minnetrista; Dennis Klohs, Minnetonka Beach; Mark Kroll, Excelsior; Denny Newell, Woodland; Nicole Stone, Minnetonka; Jake Walesch, Deephaven; and, Deborah Zorn, Shorewood. Also present: Troy Gilchrist, LMCD Legal Counsel; Vickie Schleuning, Executive Director; and Matt Cook, Environmental Administrative Technician.

Members Absent:

None

Persons in Audience:

Eric Evenson, Gabriel Jabbour, and Jason Naber.

1. AIS Management Workshop

B. Cook reviewed details on the AIS Master Plan including the AIS 2021 budget breakdown. He reviewed the three questions the Board could focus its' discussion on: should the LMCD be involved in the prevention and management of AIS, should the LMCD hire a Lake Specialist to assist in the LMCD's expanded role, and should the LMCD fund additional grant programs.

Chair Thomas commented that the LMCD has a number of other activities it conducts related to management of the lake and suggested the Board start with whether the LMCD should be involved in AIS management.

Hughes asked what LID stands for.

Chair Thomas replied that LID stands for Lake Improvement District.

Hughes stated that the LMCD should be involved in AIS management but was unsure that the LMCD should be in charge. He stated that the LMCD should be a stakeholder.

Baasen stated that if it is not the LMCD, what group would it be?

Hoelscher stated that she agrees with Baasen, as there is not a coordinated effort out there in regard to AIS management for Lake Minnetonka. She believed that the LMCD has an obligation to be involved and help coordinate and review the best options.

Brandt stated that AIS management is an important topic for lake health and the LMCD should be involved. He stated that the resounding question from the DNR was who was in charge. He stated that LMA and other stakeholders take initiatives to support projects and treatments. He stated that the LMCD should be involved to some degree and the LMCD should continue to support the other entities on the lake that have taken initiative.

Anderson commented that the LMCD is too slow to react to things, noting that the LMA and other stakeholder groups have taken initiative because of the time it takes the LMCD to respond to requests. He stated that if the LMCD stays in AIS management, he is afraid that this situation would continue with the organization too slow to react and stop anything. He did not believe the LMCD should be involved in AIS prevention and management.

Kirkwood echoed the concern of Anderson, stated that it seems historically there has been a lot of effort without much action. He stated that he would say the LMCD has a role in leadership and enabling others to take action. He stated that perhaps the group has accomplished its role in awareness.

Stone stated that she agrees that this is a complicated question and she struggles with the fact that there are a lot of stakeholders and groups of people doing good things. She was unsure that the LMCD is equipped to coordinate all of it. She stated that in her own bay there are so many different people giving information and therefore it appears there is a problem with communicating information to the public. She did not think the LMCD should be the lead for AIS management. She stated that there are a lot of "cooks in the kitchen" doing their own thing and therefore it is hard to say who would take the lead. She stated that the LMCD could be involved in helping to spread information to the public to ensure that correct information is being communicated.

Kroll commented that he believes the LMCD should be involved. He stated that the LMA does a great job of herbicide treatment and he supports privatization of services. He stated that the LMCD has tax dollars and should be willing to subcontract out the work.

Newell stated that he likes the comments of Kroll but does not believe that with \$80,000 per year the LMCD would have enough funding to be masterful. He stated that he likes the ideas of mapping and providing information to bay captains and LIDs so that those groups can see whether their treatments are effective. He stated that perhaps the LMCD could provide matching grants to help those groups with their efforts, but the LMCD does not have the financial wherewithal to make an impact and therefore he sees the group in a guidance role.

Zorn stated that she is appreciative that the Board is having the discussion. She stated that the mandate of the LMCD can be translated in many different ways, but does not believe the levy could fund the efforts needed for the LMCD to be the primary leader in implementation and instead sees the LMCD as a coordinator between the stakeholder groups. She stated that the LMCD cannot take this on without stakeholder agreement.

Walesch thanked Cook for the presentation. He stated that his impression is that historically, the LMCD has not had the technical expertise, staff time or budget to take the lead role in AIS management. He stated that it has never been the LMCD to take the lead and it has always been others taking the lead in AIS management, aside from harvesting. He stated that groups have been critical of the LMCD spending funds on studies and not implementing the recommendations from those studies. He stated that there have been varying opinions on using funds to complete studies rather than putting those funds into the lake. He listed different organizations and stakeholders that have taken an active role in AIS management. He stated that when he looks at the idea of a Lake Specialist, he would like to see the details of the RFP and job description. He stated that he would require buy in from the other governmental entities to support spending the funds on a Lake Specialist. He stated that the LMCD needs to start aligning with other entities rather than going ahead and doing what it thinks other people want and then be criticized. He stated that he would not support more than 20 percent of the budget for a Lake Specialist. He stated that in order to continue spending money on studies and things like that, the LMCD should have support in writing from the other entities. He stated that he continues to hear feedback that the LMCD continues to spend money on studies and does not put that money into the lake. He stated that he would suggest partnering with AIS management experts who are currently doing AIS management on the lake (LMA, LIDs) and the majority of funds should be spent partnering with those entities. He stated that the administration activity should be 20 percent of the AIS budget, harvesting should be 15 percent of the budget, and the remainder should be used to partner with entities for projects on the lake. He stated that he would like to see the LMCD make funds available for use by entities completing projects that benefit the lake. He stated that he would love to see the LMCD sell the harvesting equipment and any future harvesting could be completed through contracting with third parties. He stated that he would like to increase positive interactions with other entities and have better working relationships. He stated that he would like to keep options open to pivot to a more management role in AIS management but that will take time to build relationships.

Klohs stated that the LMCD has made a lot of progress. He stated that all the agencies were represented at the last TAG meeting. He stated that if there is an overall coordination effort to make the individual effort more effective, the LMCD would be the only group to do that. He stated that the LMCD does not have the staff or funding to do anything specifically. He stated that the best the LMCD could do, is potentially make the efforts of others more efficient. He stated that if this were easy, another organization would have done this and the LMCD could follow that model. He stated that the LMCD is the only hope to make the activities more efficient. He stated that the LMCD will either need to drop this now or make an attempt to hire a coordinator that would attempt to make the current processes being completed by other stakeholders more efficient. He noted that this would not be starting from scratch. He agreed that the probability of failure is high but the LMCD is the only hope to try to attack this and he believed it is too early to throw the towel in. He suggested one to three years of a part-time or full-time coordinator in attempt to get the other stakeholders to be more efficient.

Chair Thomas stated that it appears the majority of the Board believes that the LMCD should continue to be involved, although there are differences of opinion on how that should be done.

B. Cook stated that he believes the LMCD is role is to support, not to lead or manage. He stated that with all the stakeholders coordinating their own activities, he would suggest the LMCD assist in facilitating

rather than using the term coordinate. He suggested that the discussion move to the second question related to the Lake Specialist.

Chair Thomas agreed that there are many groups around the lake doing good things to control AIS.

Klohs stated that he agrees with the term facilitate rather than coordinate.

Walesch asked how the LMCD would facilitate in a practical sense. He used the example of current projects related to flowering rush. He asked if the LMCD feels it could bring anything to the table for those types of projects outside of funding.

B. Cook stated that it would be presumptuous for the LMCD to believe it could do anything to the current flowering rush program that others are involved in. He stated that the LMCD could review the results of projects like that, on an ongoing basis, to suggest whether others could try that treatment in other parts of the lake. He stated that for a program that far along, the LMCD could help to share the results to the rest of the lake.

Walesch stated that perhaps a new program is developed. He noted that other groups have their own experts and asked how the LMCD would help and whether the LMCD believes other groups would use the LMCD consultant rather than its own.

B. Cook commented that the groups mentioned have access to experts that are nationally recognized and therefore it would be incredibly presumptuous for the LMCD to believe it could provide assistance. He stated that he would think that the LMCD could assist with other groups that need support in getting their projects started, whether that is administrative or technical support.

Walesch asked if the Lake Specialist would assist on a case by case basis based on the specific project that is brought forward to provide technical assistance to help implement the project.

B. Cook confirmed that statement and noted that the LMCD could also help to share the results of the project with others that may be interested in doing similar projects.

Anderson stated that there were plenty of people that said they would like to continue to be involved in AIS and stated that perhaps those Board members could provide input on what they would think the LMCD would be involved in, rather than placing all the burden on B. Cook.

Chair Thomas referenced the second question related to whether a Lake Specialist should be hired.

Anderson stated that he would still like input from the other Board members on what they believe the LMCD could be involved in related to AIS management.

Chair Thomas stated that Schleuning and her staff have been doing a good job and have some experience but one of the recommendations was to retain someone to assist with expertise in lake management.

Hughes stated that on a high level he would support looking at how the lake is used or misused and believed the LMCD needs to look at how the use of the lake has changed. He stated that could be one of the activities that a Lake Specialist could look at, along with coordinating with Water Patrol.

Baasen reminded the Board that two years ago October, the LMCD attended a meeting where other groups asked the LMCD to review its harvesting program. He stated that the decision was that made sense and the LMCD should determine whether that could be done better. He recognized that the Master Plan development costs money but believes that plan puts expertise into the area of AIS. He stated that he is very supportive of having a Lake Specialist. He stated that the LMCD only assesses the communities served and there is a reason to increase the levy if there is a reason to do so. He stated that if there is a good plan, the levy could be increased, which would provide additional AIS funding.

Hoelscher stated that it is important to have someone with technical expertise to evaluate what is going on with the lake and help the LMCD decide what would be important efforts. She stated that she would also hope that having someone on staff would help to secure grant money from the state which would add value. She stated that she would support hiring a Lake Specialist.

Brandt stated that if the LMCD is going to be involved in AIS management, then a Lake Specialist would be needed to facilitate that effort. He stated that his biggest question would be what the budget looks like and believes the scope needs to be very clear for the role.

Anderson stated that the 2021 budget breakdown identifies \$40,000 for a Lake Specialist, which he agreed with prior comments would most likely not get much for that type of position. He stated that the LMCD could work with the LMA and the AIS specialist could be Erik Evenson. He commented that for \$40,000, the LMCD is not going to get a high caliber specialist. He stated that there are already specialists on the lake the LMCD could work with, therefore he is against spending funds on a Lake Specialist.

Kirkwood stated that he believes the LMCD should be an observer rather than a manager in terms of AIS management. He stated that he is curious about the LIDs, their role and how effective those groups have been. He stated that perhaps LIDs would be more useful with the LMCD providing guidance and connections. He stated that the other groups could implement with the LMCD ensuring that harm is not done to the lake.

Chair Thomas stated that perhaps a presentation on LIDs should be done at a future Board workshop.

Kirkwood stated that the Lake Specialist is a role that needs further development. He stated that it feels like a solution for a problem that is not agreed upon as to how to solve.

Stone stated that the LMCD should first decide whether it is going to be involved in AIS. She stated that there is confusion in the community since harvesting stopped. She stated that if the LMCD is going to be involved in AIS, then she would support hiring someone to help coordinate the other stakeholders on the lake.

Newell commented that he wants the LMCD to bring value to anything it does and was unsure that adding

another administrative level to the cost structure would bring that value. He believed that additional discussion is needed to determine whether the LMCD is capable of doing that or whether the LMCD should collect the data to share with others on the lake and stay to that level.

Zorn stated that she would not support adding an additional full-time position at this time. She stated that if additional staff is needed, that should be vetted. She stated that she did not believe that the desired skill set would be found for a part-time position. She believed that additional work would need to be done, and if the Board cannot agree as to what the job would be, that would not set that person up for success.

Walesch stated that it was his understanding that this would be a consultant role and would not take up additional time from existing staff. He asked whether this would be an LMCD employee or a consultant.

Klohs stated that this does not need to be an employee but would be more efficient to have a consultant that works as needed. He stated that all of the questions could hopefully be answered by the consultant over the next few years.

Chair Thomas stated that there was not time for the third question and therefore recommended that the discussion be carried over to the next meeting with the caveat that decisions need to be made. He stated that there were a number of questions related to the job description and whether the position would be an employee or consultant. He suggested that those details be flushed out further prior to the next workshop.

Cook stated that the group will put together something to generate conversation with the Board.

Anderson suggested that the Board continue the workshop discussion after the regular Board meeting.

Chair Thomas asked the consensus of the Board as to whether it would like to continue the discussion following the regular meeting or continue the discussion at the next workshop.

It was the consensus of the Board to continue the discussion at the next workshop.

There being no further business, the work session was adjourned at 6:58 p.m.

FORMAL MEETING

7:00 p.m.

1. CALL TO ORDER

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

2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

3. ROLL CALL

Members present: Gregg Thomas, Tonka Bay; Rich Anderson, Orono; Ann Hoelscher, Victoria; Bill Cook, Greenwood; Dan Baasen, Wayzata; Ben Brandt, Mound; Gary Hughes, Spring Park; Michael Kirkwood,

Minnetrista; Dennis Klohs, Minnetonka Beach; Mark Kroll, Excelsior; Denny Newell, Woodland; Nicole Stone, Minnetonka; Jake Walesch, Deephaven; and, Deborah Zorn, Shorewood. Also present: Troy Gilchrist, LMCD Legal Counsel; Vickie Schleuning, Executive Director; and Matt Cook, Environmental Administrative Technician.

Members absent: None.

Persons in Audience:

Steve Bedell, Harry Hurley, Gabriel Jabbour, Josh Leddy, John Lundquist, Lt. Shane Magnuson, and Russ Schumer.

4. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

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

A roll call vote was performed:

Anderson	aye
Baasen	aye
Brandt	aye
Cook	aye
Hoelscher	aye
Hughes	aye
Kirkwood	aye
Klohs	aye
Kroll	aye
Newell	aye
Stone	aye
Thomas	aye
Walesch	aye
Zorn	aye

Motion carried unanimously.

5. CHAIR ANNOUNCEMENTS

Chair Thomas commented that the Officers met to discuss the LMCD workgroups and committees that provide updates at the end of each meeting. He stated that there was discussion of perhaps having four standing committees that handle issues that arise at meetings, with the four groups being: operations, finance, communications and save the lake. He stated that the Officers will work on a charge for those workgroups to be considered by the Board. He noted that the Deicing workgroup would continue and then sunset. He welcomed any comments from the Board on that idea through email.

6. APPROVAL OF MINUTES- 06/24/2020 LMCD Regular Board Meetings

MOTION: Kroll moved, Kirkwood seconded to approve the 6/24/2020 LMCD Regular Board Meetings minutes as submitted.

A roll call vote was performed:

Anderson	aye
Baasen	aye
Brandt	aye
Cook	aye
Hoelscher	aye
Hughes	aye
Kirkwood	aye
Klohs	aye
Kroll	aye
Newell	aye
Stone	aye
Thomas	aye
Walesch	aye
Zorn	aye

Motion carried unanimously.

7. APPROVAL OF CONSENT AGENDA

MOTION: Baasen moved, Kroll seconded to approve the consent agenda as presented. Items so approved included: **7A)** Audit of Vouchers (07/01/2020 – 07/15/2020) and **7B)** Recodification Clarification Amendments.

A roll call vote was performed:

Anderson	aye
Baasen	aye
Brandt	aye
Cook	aye
Hoelscher	aye
Hughes	aye
Kirkwood	aye
Klohs	aye
Kroll	aye
Newell	aye
Stone	aye
Thomas	aye
Walesch	aye
Zorn	aye

Motion carried unanimously.

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

Gabriel Jabbour, 985 Tonkawa Road, stated that there has been controversy about wakeboard and wake boats and the comments of Kroll. He stated that he is trying to get the boat manufacturers and those responsible for the wakeboards to be more of the mind of being good neighbors, combined with those against the boats understanding that the lake should be enjoyed by all parties. He stated that the boat manufacturers have a Bill in the Senate that would allow any activity as long as you are 200 feet from shore. He stated that he does not support that Bill and eliminate local control. He stated that the other group is trying to say the wake is destroying the natural resources and would want the depth to be 12 to 15 feet for that type of activity. He stated that he has always believed that the emotional part of the dialogue should be removed, and facts should be used. He stated that he, Minnesota Lakes and Rivers, and the MN COLA are initiating a fundraiser to complete step one of the initiative to find the science behind the issue. He stated that his job has been enormously hard to bring everyone to the middle. He urged the LMCD to wait until the facts are there before it reacts. He stated that he will make it difficult for others to take away the ability for others to enjoy the lake. He stated that he has continued to hear comments that "rich white men are attempting to take away the rights of others to enjoy the lake." He stated that there were seven BWI over the Fourth of July weekend. He stated that seven or eight Officers had to leave the lake to chase someone that was arrested and fled on foot. He stated that the Water Patrol budget is the budget that the LMCD should be looking at.

Russ Schumer, 955 Tonkawa Road, stated that he has never seen the lake like this. He recognized that people want to use the lake and noted that he enjoys watching people enjoy the lake. He commented that on the weekends he has counted ten to 12 wakeboarders and when it is that populated, they tend to come closer to shore, within 50 feet, which causes problems to the shoreline. He stated that he has problems with his boat being pushed into his dock. He stated that perhaps there could be extra patrols on the weekends to keep people away from the shore.

9. PUBLIC HEARING

A) 5th Street Ventures, LLC (Back Channel Brewery) New Multiple Dock License Application to Add Another Transient BSU and Variance for Setbacks at the Qualified Commercial Marina, Located within Seton Lake at 4681 Shoreline Drive in Spring Park

M. Cook presented a request for a New Multiple Dock License, noting that this request would add one transient slip. He stated that the variance request would adjust the setback from the channel to the west to accommodate the new BSU. He displayed the proposed site plan, highlighting the space where the applicant would like to add one watercraft. He stated that the total number of BSUs for the site would increase from 29 to 30. He stated that the requested variance would reduce the setback to the channel from 40 feet to 33.8 feet. He stated that an EAW was completed in 2016/2017 for a previous expansion of the marina. He noted that this request would not trigger a mandatory EAW. He stated that one comment was received expressing concern with the proximity to the channel.

Anderson stated that Kroll made a statement at the last meeting that Anderson would have a conflict of interest because he is a marina owner. He asked for an opinion from legal counsel.

Gilchrist stated that he did mention that the group should have a conversation about conflicts of interest, noting that he believes that should occur at a workshop. He stated that the concern that he has expressed in the past is that if someone is involved in a competitive business, they could be seen as trying to rally against another business. He stated that it would be fine for that person to ask questions and make comments, but issues start to arise when an advocacy role is taken.

Chair Thomas stated that at the last meeting he made the decision that Anderson could vote on these issues and that remains his stance. He stated that Anderson is not the first marina owner to be a Board member and have the opportunity to discuss issues involving other marinas.

Gilchrist confirmed those statements. He noted that he would still like to have a workshop discussion related to conflicts of interest in general.

Walesch asked if a motion to approve were made, would the type of transient boat using the slip be regulated; or whether the Board could specify that any boat using that slip would need to fit within that slip.

M. Cook stated that the proposal is for a slip with definite dimensions. He stated that if the Board approved the application, the size would be locked in. He stated that the Board could also call that item out specifically.

Hoelscher stated that when the original plan was approved, a transient slip was not approved in that location and asked if anyone on the Board remembers why that transient slip was not allowed.

Schleuning replied that slip did not meet the code requirements.

Chair Thomas stated that there was a great deal of discussion about the bog and the traffic in the channel and therefore the current configuration was agreed to related to the number of allowed BSUs. He stated that he did not recall a discussion related to this slip.

Schleuning reaffirmed.

Walesch asked if the slip was included in the original application and the Board did not approve that slip, or whether that slip was not included in the original request.

Chair Thomas stated that the owner and applicant were easy to work with and this configuration was agreed upon.

Walesch asked if slip 30 was included in the proposal when it came to the Board previously.

Schleuning stated that the original request included additional slips that were not approved by the Board.

Baasen asked why the slip would be approved at this time, if the Board chose not to approve that slip in the past, as the conditions have not changed. He stated that the brewery is busy and there are people lined up in the channel to get in.

Walesch stated that he did not believe that this slip was in the original proposal.

Brandt asked if any structural changes would be needed.

M. Cook confirmed that there would not be any structural changes, the only change would be the space taken up by the BSU.

Brandt asked if there has been any enforcement when boats have been parked in that location in the past.

Schleuning commented that there have been a few occasions when a boat has been stored in that location and between a walkway. She noted that a compliance letter was sent, and staff met with the marina operators to discuss the issue. She stated that there were other complaints that staff followed up on last summer for other sites as well.

Chair Thomas stated that he also met with the applicant related to boats docking in that location. He stated that he got the impression that it was not the intention of the applicant to use that slip, but rather the issue of a boat docking there.

Hughes stated that during the original review of the license, there was a lot of discussion related to traffic waiting for slips to open up. He stated that it was agreed that this slip would not be allowed, and he believed that if this slip is added it would simply add to the traffic waiting to use the slip.

Thomas invited the applicant to address the Board.

Josh Leddy, applicant, stated that Back Channel did not have any part in the creation of this layout. He stated that Back Channel came into the process as the docks were being created. He stated that the transient slips have been in operation for two full seasons. He stated that they understand how the channel operates and the flow of traffic through the channel. He stated that there have been incidents where boaters pull into the slip when the dock attendant is occupied. He stated that a large issue has been trying to prevent people from using the slip because they think it is a slip. He commented that use of this slip would not create an issue with safety and would not impede traffic in the channel. He did not believe that use of this slip would create problems for the area. He believed that this would only provide a benefit.

Chair Thomas stated that there was previously a great deal of discussion related to a flag system for queuing and asked the applicant for details.

Mr. Leddy stated that because this is an area where boaters are coming through the channel, they wanted to make something visible. He stated that green flags identify open slips. He stated that boaters can see the flag from a distance and know that if there is a green flag, the slip can be used.

Walesch asked how the business would control the length of the boat using that slip.

Mr. Leddy stated that all of the slips are allowed a four-foot overhang. He stated that any boat longer than 34 feet tends to be wider than 12 feet and therefore knows they cannot use these slips. He stated that the Black Lake bridge is short and therefore extremely large boats cannot come into this part of the lake. He stated that

dock attendants would need to police the issue. He commented that the dock slips are always manned by an attendant.

Walesch asked and received confirmation that a swim platform counts in the total length of the boat; if the swim platform exceeds the allowed length, the boat could not use the slip.

Anderson stated that he supports the four-foot overhang. He asked why the 40-foot setback is required. He stated that he would support the use of the transient slip. He stated that the business has a low density and therefore does not see why the slip could not be used. He asked if a pylon would be added. He stated that he would not recommend installing a pylon.

Mr. Leddy stated that he deems this slip the most safe and accessible slip because boats can easily slip in and therefore, they would prefer to not add a pylon and instead manage the size by use of the attendant.

Anderson commented that if that transient slip were used for delivery it would make that process quick and easy.

Kirkwood stated that he has visited the business and finds the flag system helpful.

Thomas opened the public hearing at 8:57 p.m.

Chair Thomas read aloud a statement received from a property owner across the channel that commented that Back Channel has been a great neighbor.

Harry Hurley, 4764 West Arm Road, commented that all the dealings that they have had with Back Channel have been positive and the residents in this area like the business. He stated that having another location where boaters can stop would be excellent.

No additional comments were offered, and the public hearing was closed at 7:59 p.m.

Kirkwood stated that an added pylon would be hard to see at night and therefore would follow the comments of Anderson that a pylon should not be required.

M. Cook stated that if the four-foot overhang is allowed, the dimensions of the setback would slightly change as well.

MOTION: Walesch moved, Kroll seconded to direct staff and LMCD legal counsel to draft Findings of Fact and Order approving the 5th Street Ventures, LLC 2020 Multiple Dock License and Variance applications for the properties located at 4681, 4665, and 4695 Shoreline Drive in the City of Spring Park with the additional clarification that the boat size would be 12 feet by 34 feet and any changes to the setback should be taken into consideration, for consideration at the July 22, 2020 Board meeting.

A roll call vote was performed:

Anderson	aye
Baasen	aye
Brandt	aye
Cook	aye
Hoelscher	aye
Hughes	aye
Kirkwood	aye
Klohs	aye
Kroll	aye
Newell	aye
Stone	aye
Thomas	aye
Walesch	aye
Zorn	aye

Motion carried unanimously.

10. OTHER BUSINESS

There was no other business.

11. OLD BUSINESS

There was no old business.

12. NEW BUSINESS

There was no new business.

13. TREASURER REPORT

No report.

14. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR UPDATE

Schleuning provided the following information:

- Fourth of July Statistics: 211 stopped contacts over the holiday weekend, 51 citations were issued, six BUIs, 198 verbal warnings, three written warnings and seven medical calls. Thanks to Hennepin County Water Patrol, DNR, and other agencies that assisted with safety on the lake and medical calls. Staff received inquiries about photos that were circulating on social media, noting that at least one photo was from a previous year and not from this year.

Lieutenant Magnuson provided details on an incident that happened over the holiday weekend with a person that attempted to flee. He recognized the other Fire Departments and paramedics that assisted

over the holiday weekend. He stated that while the statistics seem comparable, the overall attitude on the lake was polite and pleasant.

- Own Your Wake: Information was distributed over the holiday weekend. A video was created along with a logo. She commented that she has noticed that some people are starting to pay more attention to their wakes and move further from shore.
- Report Vegetation: This will continue to be promoted.
- Information will be placed on social media related to an upcoming University of Minnesota study related to wakes.

Anderson commended Lieutenant Magnuson and his work on the Own Your Wake Campaign. He stated that he sent this information out to all his customers and believes that education will be the key component in changing behavior.

15. STANDING LMCD COMMITTEE/WORKGROUP

Aquatic Invasive Species Taskforce: No report.

Budget Workgroup: No report.

Communications and Legislative Relations: No report.

Deicing and Permanent Dock Workgroup: Anderson provided an update on recent activity of the group.

Schleuning stated that input will be gained from the public as well, confirming that information would be sent to the current license holders.

Gilchrist commented that there was a very productive meeting which helped him to gain clarity on the intent of the members of the group and confirmed that the desired outcome would be to bring forward an ordinance for the Board to review in the future.

Save the Lake Committee: Baasen reported that the group will be meeting the following week and reviewed the topics on the agenda.

Strategic Plan Subcommittee: Zorn reported that the committee met this week and is working to update the dashboard. She stated that the goal is to share the updated dashboard with the Board at a workshop in August.

16. ADJOURNMENT

MOTION: Kröll moved, Cook seconded to adjourn the meeting at 8:23 p.m.

A roll call vote was performed:

Anderson	aye
Baasen	aye

Brandt	aye
Cook	aye
Hoelscher	aye
Hughes	aye
Kirkwood	aye
Klohs	aye
Kroll	aye
Newell	aye
Stone	aye
Thomas	aye
Walesch	aye
Zorn	aye

Motion carried unanimously.

Gregg Thomas, Chair

Dan Baasen, Secretary