

**LAKE MINNETONKA CONSERVATION DISTRICT
BOARD OF DIRECTORS
AGENDA**

7:00 PM, Wednesday, April 27, 2005
Wayzata City Hall

CALL TO ORDER

Skramstad called the meeting to order at 7:06 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Members present: Tom Skramstad, Shorewood; Katy Van Hercke, Minnetonka; Paul Knudsen, Minnetrista; Jose Valdesuso, Excelsior; John Berns, Wayzata; David Gross, Deephaven; Steve Johnson, Mound; Pete Nelson, Victoria; Tom Scanlon, Spring Park; Tom Seuntjens, Minnetonka Beach; Cree Zischke, Greenwood. Also present: Charles LeFevere, LMCD Counsel; Greg Nybeck, Executive Director; Judd Harper, Administrative Technician; Emily Herman, Administrative Secretary.

Members absent: Doug Babcock, Tonka Bay; Herb Suerth, Woodland; the City of Orono has no appointed member.

CHAIR ANNOUNCEMENTS, Chair Skramstad

Skramstad announced that the public was welcomed to attend and share thoughts at an upcoming LMCD public meeting on Wednesday, May 11, 2005 from 7 p.m. to 10:00 p.m relating to boat density on Lake Minnetonka.

READING OF MINUTES- 4/13/05 LMCD Regular Board Meeting

MOTION: Seuntjens moved, Gross seconded to approve the minutes from the April 13, 2005 LMCD Regular Board Meeting as submitted.

Berns requested amending the minutes on page 4 to reflect that he left the Board meeting because he served on the Wayzata fire department and a call came in during the meeting. Seuntjens and Gross agreed to this friendly amendment.

VOTE: Ayes (10), Abstained (1, Nelson); motion carried.

PUBLIC COMMENTS - Persons in attendance, subjects not on agenda (5 min.)

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

CONSENT AGENDA- Consent agenda items identified with a (*) will be approved in one motion unless a Board member requests discussion of any item, in which case the item will be removed from the consent agenda.

Nybeck requested that agenda items 1D and 3A be removed from the consent agenda.

Knudsen moved, Van Hercke seconded to approved the consent agenda as amended, removing agenda items 1D and 3A. Motion carried unanimously. Items so approved include **2B, 2005 Multiple Dock Licenses**, staff recommends Board approval of 2005 renewal, without change, multiple dock license applications for Cedarhurst

Association, Foxhill Home Owners Association, Minnetonka Portable Dredging, and Sailors World; **3B**, January, February, and March Financial Summary and Balance Sheets; and **4A**, Minutes from the 4/8/05 EWM/Exotics Task Meeting.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

- **Al and Alma's Supper Club**, new on-sale intoxicating liquor license application for the charter boats, Avant Garde, Avanti, Avenir, and Aventure.

Skramstad opened the public hearing at 7:10 p.m. and asked Harper for the background.

Harper reviewed the staff memo, dated 4/5/05, which summarized Al & Alma's Supper Club's request for new intoxicating liquor licenses, with Sunday option, for the charter boats, Avant Garde, Avanti, Avenir, and Aventure. He recommended that the Board approve: 1) the new intoxicating liquor license applications, with the Sunday option, for the 2005 charter boat season for the charter boats Avant Garde, Avanti, Avenir, and Aventure, and 2) a full refund of the \$3,000 for the preliminary investigation deposit. He entertained questions or comments from the Board.

Skramstad invited the applicant or the general public to provide additional background or comments on the application. There being no comments, Skramstad closed the public hearing at 7:12 p.m. He invited Board discussion or a motion on the applications.

Berns questioned whether there had been any enforcement issues with this applicant?

Harper stated that there had not been any enforcement issues with the applicant.

MOTION: Seuntjens moved, Scanlon seconded to: 1) approve the new on-sale intoxicating liquor license applications for Al & Alma's Supper Club, with Sunday option for the 2005 charter boat season, for the charter boats Avant Garde, Avanti, Avenir, and Aventure, and 2) approve a full refund of the \$3,000 deposit for preliminary investigation.

VOTE: Motion carried unanimously.

- **Custom Charters**, new on-sale intoxicating liquor license application for the charter boat, Driftaway,

Skramstad opened the public hearing at 7:13 p.m. and asked Harper for the background.

Harper reviewed the staff memo, dated 4/5/05, which summarized Custom Charters request for a new intoxicating liquor license, with Sunday option, for the charter boat Driftaway. He recommended that the Board approve: 1) the new intoxicating liquor license applications, with the Sunday option, for the 2005 charter boat season, and 2) a full refund of the \$3,000 for the preliminary investigation deposit. He entertained questions or comments from the Board.

Skramstad invited the applicant or the general public to provide additional background or comments on the application. There being no comments, Skramstad closed the public hearing at 7:15 p.m. He invited Board discussion or a motion on the application.

Berns asked if there has been any enforcement issues with this applicant?

Harper stated that there had not been any enforcement issues with the applicant.

MOTION: Seuntjens moved, Johnson seconded to: 1) approve the new on-sale intoxicating liquor license application for Custom Charters, with Sunday option, for the 2005 charter boat season, and 2) approve a full refund of the \$3,000 deposit for preliminary investigation.

VOTE: Motion carried unanimously.

1. LAKE USE AND RECREATION

A. Minnehaha Creek Watershed District (MCWD), presentation by Senior Technician Jim Hafner, of project to deploy five SolarBee circulation units on Stubbs Bay.

Skramstad welcomed Mr. Hafner on behalf of the Board and asked for an overview of the project.

Hafner stated that the MCWD has had some concerns about the declining water quality in Stubbs Bay for a number of years. This resulted in a feasibility study, which was completed a year ago. Study results and recommendations to address the concerns were presented, via a PowerPoint presentation, with the following information:

- Two tributaries enter Stubbs Bay, Classen Creek, and Stubbs Bay Creek. Stubbs Bay consists of predominately residential and undeveloped land. The bay has 199 acres of lake surface area and a maximum depth of 37 feet, with a total watershed area of 1,749 acres.
- Some of the contributing factors to declining water quality include: 1) high levels of phosphorous, 2) high levels of Chlorophyll-a, 3) low secchi disk readings, and 4) a high frequency of algae blooms. The swimming classification for Stubbs Bay is either "partially impaired" or "impaired."
- It is estimated that there will be an increase of residential land use on Stubbs Bay of 80 percent by 2020. This increase in residential land use will continue to further decline water quality in Stubbs Bay.
- Two improvements have been discussed by the MCWD to improve water quality in Stubbs Bay. These include the creation of water quality ponds and the use of SolarBee units. Hafner focused his discussion on the use of SolarBee units.
- The SolarBee units to be installed are powered by solar source. The units maintain a power blade that moves the water up from the bottom through a tube, which is placed at whatever depth level is needed for project results. This water is then spread upon the surface of the lake providing for more oxygen and circulation. The manufacturer notes that the water could be spread up to 50 acres of the water surface; creating vertical and horizontal mixing. The tube is 36" in diameter and would be placed at a thermocline (temperature change) depth. The end result of circulating this water would slow down the production of algae.
- He entertained questions or comments from the Board.

The Board asked Hafner a number of questions. Some of these questions included:

- How would the MCWD locate the anoxic level and what would happen if water was drawn from this level?
- What are the physical features of these units, including how they are secured in the lake, what safety features do they have, and the overall size of them?
- Whether the placement of the units was a pilot program, including the costs for these units and the likelihood of these units continuing past 2005?
- How long these units have been used historically?

- Why Stubbs Bay was chosen for this project, including whether the residents on the bay and the City of Orono were aware of the project?
- What are the exact locations where these units would be placed, including whether all five were necessary?

Hafner responded to the questions outlined above. A summary of his responses are detailed below:

- The MCWD would locate the anoxic level by measuring the depth of bay and thermocline temperature, and making adjustments when necessary. It is not recommended to disturb the anoxic level, which is at the bottom of the bay, because if would redistribute phosphorous back into the water that has settled into the sediments.
- The units would be anchored to the base of the bay utilizing cement anchors and chains. The units are approximately 17' across. The public is safe because the blade is fully contained and suction of water is not at a risk level. He stated that both the Sheriff's Water Patrol and the MN DNR reviewed the safety features of these units, pointing out that both agencies have issued a permit for 2005. There will be a sign leading into Stubbs Bay to educate the public on the use of these units this summer. There will also be marking on the units to inform the public of any dangers.
- The placement of these units in 2005 is a pilot program that might be expanded past 2005, depending on their success. The MCWD will be leasing them for 2005; however, they could be purchased in the future. He estimated the costs to purchase all five of these units to be between \$150,000 and \$160,000.
- These units have been used at other locations for around 15 to 20 years. They have historically been used at wastewater plants and the use of them in fresh water is fairly new.
- Stubbs Bay was chosen for this project because it is a contained bay with a small drainage area. He stated that the City of Orono, in which residents of Stubbs Bay were invited, held public meetings. Press releases and public information meetings will be continued as the project progresses.
- He estimated that the five units would be approximately 150' from shore. He stated that he believed that all five units are necessary on Stubbs Bay because each unit covers approximately 40 acres of water.

Nybeck stated that he scheduled this agenda item for two reasons. First, he stated that he wanted to bring this project to the Boards attention. Second, Code Section 3.09 requires the issuance of a special event permit for this project.

MOTION: Seuntjens moved, Johnson seconded to approve the MCWD special event application for the 2005 season to install five SolarBee units on Stubbs Bay.

Gross proposed two friendly amendments. These included: 1) to make it illegal to interfere with the SolarBee units and 2) to establish Stubbs Bay as "Quiet Waters" while the units are present. Seuntjens and Johnson did not agree to this.

VOTE: Ayes (10), Nays (1, Gross); motion carried.

B. ThomTech Design, presentation by Greg Thompson of 2004 Lake Minnetonka Boat Use Study.

Skramstad welcomed Greg Thompson from ThomTech Design on behalf of the Board. He asked Nybeck for a brief summary.

Nybeck stated that this project is completed every four years as outlined in the 1991 Management Plan. The contract for this project was awarded in 2004 to Greg Thompson from ThomTech Design. He stated that Tim Kelly, a Research Analysis from the DNR, was present and would be utilizing Mr. Thompson's information to prepare a Report outlining boating trends on Lake Minnetonka.

Thompson addressed the Board and presented an overview of the 2004 project. The project was conducted from mid May to Labor Day, utilizing both aerial boat counts and boater interviews. The primary goals for the project were to: 1) to determine the level and type of boating activity on Lake Minnetonka, and 2) to measure boater characteristics and attitudes concerning the boating experiences. The objectives were to: 1) measure total use by source of boater, and 2) measure boater experiences, perceptions, and characteristics by source of boater. The source of boater information was collected via aerial boat counts to determine the contribution to boating from five sources: public accesses, marina slips, marina accesses, municipal docks, and homeowners' association docks. The boater experiences were sampled by using a mail out survey for the residents and handout surveys for the boaters using public accesses. The heaviest boat density was on the weekends and 4th of July. He entertained questions or comments from the Board.

Valdesuso questioned if weather made a difference in the results.

Thompson stated that he believed weather made a difference in the results on some days, pointing out that surveying was not taken at public accesses during bad weather.

Nelson questioned if it is fair to say that most people have communicated that they had a favorable experience in the use of the lake in 2004.

Thompson stated that he believed that most people had a good experience on Lake Minnetonka in 2004 based on the survey results.

Seuntjens and Gross expressed concern that the Report did not include an analysis of the data and statistics received in 2004.

Nybeck stated that information received from this Report would be further analyzed later this year by the MN DNR and included in a Report that analyzes historical trends on Lake Minnetonka

Kelly addressed the Board on this trend analysis Report. He stated that the MN DNR has historically completed a trend analysis Report that follows up on the project conducted by ThomTech. This Report will summarize all the information that was collected, with a draft copy likely to be presented to the Board sometime next fall.

The Board briefly discussed how the current information could be utilized. The Board concluded it would be beneficial to wait for the trend analysis Report to be finalized by the MN DNR.

Skramstad thanked Thompson and Kelly for their fine work on this project.

- C. **City of Mound**, consideration of request to place six buoys in the Lost Lake Channel to denote a "No Wake Area."

Skramstad asked Nybeck for background on this agenda item.

Nybeck stated that this request tied into the Mound Downtown Lost Lake project. Mound Parks Superintendent Jim Fackler has recently contacted the LMCD office with a procedural question on the approval of placing the subject buoys in the Lost Lake Channel. Nybeck stated that he and LeFevere reviewed the "Quiet Waters" section of the Code and this area has already been designated as "Quiet Waters". He stated that Fackler was in attendance to review the proposed plan to place "No Wake Area" buoys along the Lost Lake channel.

Fackler stated that he was in attendance to provide an overview of the plan to place "No Wake Area" buoys based on concerns raised by Mound citizens and the City of Mound. The City of Mound was first approached about the concept of installing buoys in 2004, pointing out that funds were included in the 2005 budget to accomplish this. He stated that Mound was seeking Board approval to place six "No Wake Area" buoys at 300' intervals along the channel. In addition to purchasing to these buoys, Mound would install and remove them annually. He entertained questions from the Board.

Scanlon questioned whether all six buoys were needed.

Fackler stated that the decision for the placement of the buoys was driven by the budget and he was open to planning ideas. He added that Hennepin County would be involved in the placement of the buoys at the entrance of the channel on Cooks Bay.

Nybeck stated that Hennepin County has traditionally installed the "No Wake Area" buoys on Lake Minnetonka. He suggested that it might be prudent for Mound to work with Hennepin County in the installation of these buoys on a one-time time basis. Another means to communicate the "Quiet Waters" restriction on Lost Lake Channel could include a sign at the entrance point to the channel at the bridge.

Seuntjens stated he could supported the proposed layout, provided there were fewer buoys and the inclusion of signage at the entrance of the channel. He also suggested that it might make sense to have Hennepin County supervise the installation and removal of these buoys annually. He questioned whether there were other buoys on the lake that were not maintained by Hennepin County.

Fackler updated the Board on conversations that he has had with Tony Brough from Hennepin County regarding the signage on the bridge and the installation and removal of these buoys. Hennepin County has communicated that the signage on the bridge, and the installation and removal of these buoys would be the responsibility of Mound.

MOTION: Zischke moved, Nelson seconded to approve the request made by the City of Mound for the placement of six "No Wake Area" buoys in the Lost Lake Channel to denote a "Quiet Waters" for a one-year period, subject to monitoring their use in 2005.

A number of Board members expressed concern about the number and locations of the buoys proposed by the City of Mound.

VOTE: Ayes (6), Nays (5; Johnson, Knudsen, Scanlon, Seuntjens, and Van Hercke); motion

carried.

- D. Al & Alma's Supper Club**, approval of 2005 renewal Wine and Non-Intoxicating Malt Liquor License applications for the charter boats, Allante and Avalon.

Skramstad asked Nybeck for background on why he requested this agenda item be removed from the consent agenda.

Nybeck stated that the Hennepin County Sheriff's Department had recently concluded an investigation for Holiday Fair, Inc. since the packet was sent out for this meeting. A favorable investigation was report for Holiday Fair, Inc. and he recommended the Board include approval of a wine and non-intoxicating malt liquor license for the 2005 season for the charter boat, Holiday Fair, in addition to the charter boats Allante and Avalon.

MOTION: Gross moved, Johnson seconded to approve 2005 wine and non-intoxicating malt liquor license for the charter boats Allante, Avalon, and Holiday Fair.

VOTE: Motion carried unanimously.

- E. Upper Minnetonka Yacht Club (UMYC)**, consideration of buoy request.

Skramstad asked Nybeck to provide background on this agenda item.

Nybeck stated that he and Skramstad had been in contact recently with a representative from the UMYC, Scott Colesworthy, regarding a request for the placement of six red and green navigational buoys in the area in front of the applicant's dock for the marking of a channel. In order to have the buoys installed for the 2005 boating season, the Code requires approval from the Board. He stated that Mr. Colesworthy was not in attendance to represent the UMYC; however, Noel Neuman was in attendance to represent UMYC. Feedback from Lt. Storms and Tony Brough on this request was included in the handout folders for informational purposes. When reviewing the request made by UMYC, he recommended the Board take into consideration what future precedent approving the request might set.

Skramstad stated that he had discussed this request with Mr. Colesworthy. This facility is in the City of Shorewood in a secluded area of Enchanted Island. Traditionally, it has had heavy milfoil infestation and he was inclined to support the request made by UMYC.

The Board discussed other alternatives to address the UMYC concerns, including added harvesting mechanical and land markers.

Harper stated that in 2005, the South Upper Lake Option for harvesting would be implemented by the LMCD and that area in the vicinity near UMYC would be harvested early in the season.

Neuman provided the Board a historical overview of the efforts made by UMYC to control milfoil in the area. These efforts include both chemical treatments and private mechanical harvesting. He provided a map that described the location of UMYC on Enchanted Island, including danger and point buoys in the near vicinity. He stated that there were a limited number of neighbors in the immediate area and he believed that they support the request made by UMYC.

Van Hercke stated that she was sensitive to the milfoil issues in this area. However, she expressed concern about the use of red and green navigational buoys as proposed by UMYC.

Nybeck stated that he had spoke with Lt. Storms from the Sheriff's Water Patrol regarding this request. Lt. Storms has questioned whether the UMYC request qualifies as a temporary structure and he did not believe that the request was an appropriate use of red and green navigational buoys. Nybeck reported that Lt. Storms had similar concerns that he had regarding setting an undesirable precedent if the Board was inclined to approve the UMYC request.

MOTION: Valdesuso moved, Nelson seconded to approve the installation of six channel markers for UMYC, which are not red and green navigational buoys, to be privately maintained.

Nybeck expressed concern about the motion because he believed that the exact type of buoy should be finalized prior to approving the UMYC request. He suggested that he and Lt. Storms could meet with a UMYC representative to fine-tune and bring it back for consideration by the Board in the near future.

The Board discussed the recommendation made by Nybeck. The consensus of the Board was to follow the recommendation made by Nybeck. Valdesuso and Nelson withdrew their motion.

F. Additional Business

Van Hercke asked Nybeck to provide the Board an update on the plans for the Boat Density Public Meeting scheduled for 5/11/05.

Nybeck stated that the mailing of the Meeting Notice and Boat Density Committee Considerations were being sent out in three phases, with Phases 1 and 2 completed. Phase 1 included the mailing of documents to the newspapers, LMA, and representative cities on 4/21/05 to meet publication requirements. Phase 2 included mailing to multiple dock licensees on 4/26/05. Phase 3 will include the remaining stakeholders that have been identified. A Meeting Notice and Boat Density Committee Considerations should sent out to these stakeholders by 4/29/05.

Van Hercke thanked efforts of staff for their assistance on this project.

2. WATER STRUCTURES

A. Discussion of LMCD Code relating to bridges on Lake Minnetonka.

Skramstad asked LeFevere for background on this agenda item.

LeFevere stated LMCD Code currently does not have separate regulations for bridges. Historically, the LMCD has approved bridge requests utilizing dock regulations for water structures. With two requests made in the past couple of years for bridges, there has been some concerns expresses about the handling of these requests. He reminded the Board of a recent bridge development involving the City of Minnetonka that would tie into their trail system by the dam, whereby the City of Minnetonka contested jurisdiction of the LMCD. The LMCD granted a permit to Minnetonka; however, other issues will arise as renewal applications are brought forward. From that recent incident with the City of Minnetonka, a question was raised whether it is appropriate to apply LMCD dock regulations to bridges. Thence, the Board directed staff to further discuss possible Code amendments relating to bridges. LeFevere reported that he met with staff, reviewed applicable code provisions. Based on this meeting, memorandum was

prepared, dated 4/20/05, that outlined a list of considerations for regulation of bridges for the Board to consider.

In reviewing the memorandum, a numbers of considerations were discussed by the Board. These included:

- The 100' length restriction limitation to reach both points of land.
- Whether to exempt state, county, or municipal pedestrian bridges that are not used to dock or store watercraft.
- Whether to require a permit to be issued on a one-time basis, provided no changes are made to the bridge.
- The need for the LMCD to ensure that bridges are not impeding navigation, including how this is determined on a case by case basis.
- Whether the LMCD has jurisdiction to regulate bridges on Lake Minnetonka.

MOTION: Seuntjens moved, Zischke seconded to direct LeFevere to prepare a draft Code amendment relating to bridges that reflects the considerations outlined in the 4/20/05 memo that he prepared and the Board discussion.

VOTE: Motion carried unanimously.

C. Discussion of LMCD Code and State of Minnesota rules relating to dock construction standards on Lake Minnetonka.

Skramstad stated that he had recently met with Nybeck, a representative from the MN DNR, and a number of local dock installers to discuss LMCD Code and the State of Minnesota regulations relating to dock construction standards. He asked Nybeck to provide an overview of this meeting.

Nybeck stated based on the meeting with the dock installers, it further clarified what is taking place on the construction of docks compared to what is allowed by current Code. For example, LMCD Code prohibits a dock from exceeding six feet in both length and width. The State of Minnesota has a similar regulation; however, a dock cannot exceed eight in both length and width. Nybeck stated that Dale Homuth from the MN DNR attended this meeting and a number of dock construction violations on Lake Minnetonka were discussed. Two questions that he believed the Board should address include, 1) Does the Board want to make changes to LMCD Code so that it is consistent with State law?, and 2) How does the Board want to deal with docks installed that exceed LMCD Code for dock construction standards?

The Board discussed in length on whether to change dock construction standards in LMCD Code so that they are consistent with the State of Minnesota rules. The consensus of the Board was LMCD Code should be consistent with state law.

Nybeck questioned whether the LMCD could prosecute dock installers for knowingly installing illegal docks that do not comply with LMCD Code.

LeFevere stated that LMCD currently does not license installers and he would not recommend prosecuting them. However, this would preclude the LMCD from putting dock installers on notice, via a certified letter, of LMCD docking regulations. He believed that the LMCD could continue to enforce violations on a complaint basis or inspect the entire lake of possible violations.

Nybeck stated that Homuth thought the assistance of a MN DNR conservation officer could be provided on Lake Minnetonka if this becomes a priority of the Board.

MOTION: Gross moved, Seuntjens seconded to direct LeFevere to prepare a draft Code amendment to amend LMCD Code so that dock construction standards are consistent with the State of Minnesota.

VOTE: Motion carried unanimously.

D. Additional Business

There was no additional business.

3. FINANCIAL

A. Audit of Vouchers (4/16/05-4/30/05).

Knudsen reviewed the audit of vouchers as submitted. He asked Nybeck for clarification why he had this removed from the consent agenda.

Nybeck stated that check number 15371, in the amount of \$294.17 to Hartland Auto Glass, should be added to the audit of vouchers originally submitted. He recommended the Board approve the audit of vouchers with this additional check.

MOTION: Nelson moved, Seuntjens seconded, to approve the Audit of Vouchers for the period of 4/16/05 - 4/30/05, adding check number 15371 to Heartland Auto Glass, in the amount of \$294.17.

VOTE: Motion carried unanimously.

C. Review of timetable to consider draft 2006 LMCD Budget

Skramstad asked Nybeck for background on this agenda item.

Nybeck stated that the 2006 LMCD Budget process was beginning and the first formal review is scheduled for the 5/25/05 Board meeting, with subsequent review at the 6/8/05 and 6/22/05 Board meeting. The Board has typically scheduled a working session prior to the first formal review of the draft budget and he recommended that this be done the week of 5/16/05 through 5/20/05. There will be an opportunity for interested city officials to review and comment on the draft 2006 LMCD Budget in the office at 12 NOON on Friday, June 3, 2005. The adopted 2006 LMCD Budget will be forwarded to the 14 member cities by the July 1 deadline established by the state enabling legislation for the LMCD.

Skramstad entertained questions from the Board.

Gross expressed concern that the timetable does not provide sufficient time for Board members to present the budget to their representative cities. He added that the City of Deephaven had expressed concern as to the timing of the procedural process in past years.

Nybeck confirmed that although the meeting with the 14 member cities is scheduled to be held on 6/3/05, the 14 member cities will have the opportunity comment on the draft 2006 LMCD Budget up to the 6/22/05 Board meeting.

LeFevere reminded the Board that the LMCD is required to adopt a budget and forward it to the 14 member cities by July 1st. From that point forward, the cities can request a public hearing on the adopted budget if they object to it.

The Board briefly discussed the concerns raised by Gross and directed Nybeck to proceed with the 2006 LMCD Budget process as proposed.

D. Additional Business

There was no additional business.

4. EWM/EXOTICS TASK FORCE

B. Report from the 4/8/05 EWM/Exotics Task Force Meeting

There was no Report provided due to Chair Suerth's absence.

C. 2005 EWM Harvesting Season, Staff overview of project.

Skramstad asked Nybeck for background on this agenda item.

Nybeck stated that he believed the staff overview was relatively self-explanatory. The total 2005 EWM/Exotics Budget is \$145,300, which further breaks down to \$109,000 for the EWM Harvesting Program and \$36,300 for the Zebra Mussel Program. Project revenues for 2005 will be slightly less than \$145,300; however, these revenues will be made of "Save the Lake" and pre-paid expenses, both for the 2005 Zebra Mussel Program. He recommended the Board approve the hiring rates outlined in the staff memo.

MOTION: Seuntjens moved, Johnson seconded to accept the 2005 EWM/Exotics Budget as proposed and authorize the hiring of EWM employees as outlined in the staff memo.

VOTE: Motion carried unanimously.

D. Evaluation of Truck Hauling Bids for the 2005 EWM/Harvesting Season

Skramstad asked Nybeck for background on this agenda item.

Nybeck reviewed the staff memo, dated 4/22/05, which summarized the timeline and sealed bids Received for the 2005 EWM truck hauling contract. He recommended that the Board award the trucking contract for the 2005 EWM Harvesting Program to Curfman's Trucking and Repair, Inc. after all documents required have been received.

MOTION: Suentjens moved, Knudsen seconded award the 2005 EWM trucking contract to Curfman's Trucking and Repair, Inc. at an hourly rate of \$58.00 for one truck service and \$112.00 for two truck service.

VOTE: Motion carried unanimously.

E. Additional Business

There was no additional business.

5. ADMINISTRATION

A. Discussion on how to improve communications with LMCD member cities.

Skramstad stated that he updated the Shorewood city council quarterly on LMCD related issues. This includes a written report that is a modification of the quarterly Executive Director Newsletter. He applauded a PowerPoint presentation that Gross recently prepared to present to the Deephaven city council. He questioned other Board members how frequently they update their respective city councils and if additional techniques, such as a PowerPoint presentation, would be beneficial.

The Board briefly discussed how frequently they update their respective city council on LMCD issues. Formally, this ranged from an as-needed basis, to annually, to quarterly, to monthly. Informally, a number of Board members stated that they had more frequent conversations with their respective mayor and/or city council members. The Board briefly discussed how they could improve what is currently being done to communicate with their respective cities. There was no consensus of the Board on this.

Skramstad stated that he would like to continue to discuss this agenda item quarterly, if the Board did not object, at a Board meeting to improve communications with the 14 LMCD member cities. The Board did not object to this request. He asked Gross to forward the PowerPoint presentation that he prepared for the City of Deephaven if he did not object. Gross stated that he would forward it to the LMCD office.

B. Discussion on draft RFP for improved summer and winter public access signage.

Skramstad asked Nybeck for background on this agenda item.

Nybeck reported that he obtained quotes on signage similar to an exotic species sign located at Minnewashta Regional Park in follow-up to the Boards request at the 4/13/05 Board meeting. He recommended holding off on these quotes so this signage could be included in the overall project to improve summer and winter public access signage.

The Board agreed with recommendation made by Nybeck.

C. Additional Business.

There was no additional business.

6. SAVE THE LAKE

There was no discussion.

7. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR REPORT

Nybeck stated that the lake level reading as of 4/25/05 was 929.39', with a discharge of 80cfs. He requested the Board to authorize the purchase of a new laptop computer because two computers are needed. The new laptop computer would be used to coordinate visual aids at the meeting and Herman would use existing laptop computer for minute taking purposes.

The Board briefly discussed the purchase of a second laptop computer. The consensus of the Board was to authorize the purchase, provided it is within budget allowances for 2005.

8. OLD BUSINESS

Six Mile Marsh

Skramstad asked Knudsen if there was an update from Minnetrista regarding the Six Mile Marsh.

Knudsen stated that the City of Minnetrista had not heard back from the MN DNR to date.

Bayview HOA

Skramstad asked Nybeck for an update on Bayview HOA.

Nybeck stated that he not been recently contacted by any representatives from Bayview HOA.

Orono Representative Update

Skramstad asked Nybeck for an update on a LMCD representative from the City of Orono.

Nybeck stated that he believed Orono was getting closer to appointing a representative to the LMCD Board.

Howard's Point Marina

Gross asked Nybeck if Howard's Point Marina signed the consent form to the 60-day rule consistent with the Board motion for their 2005 renewal, without change, multiple dock license application.

Nybeck stated that a signed consent form has been received from Howards Point Marina. However, Howards Point Marina has not had further communications with LMCD staff regarding their pending 2005 application.

Gross asked LeFevere if Howards Point marina was currently licensed.

LeFevere explained that technically, Howards Point Marina does not have a 2005 multiple dock license to operate. However, the Board has not historically prosecuted applicants for operating a multiple dock facility that are in the process of resolving issues.

9. NEW BUSINESS

There was no new business.

10. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 10:15 p.m.

Tom Skramstad, Chair

Jose Valdesuso, Secretary