

**LAKE MINNETONKA CONSERVATION DISTRICT
BOARD OF DIRECTORS**

7:00 PM, Wednesday, May 23, 2007
Wayzata City Hall

CALL TO ORDER

Skramstad called the meeting to order at 7:01 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Members present: Tom Skramstad, Shorewood; Tom Seuntjens, Minnetonka Beach; Gene Altstatt, Greenwood; Mary Bader, Wayzata; David Gross, Deephaven; Steve Johnson, Mound; Andrew McDermott, Orono; Pete Nelson, Victoria; Herb Suerth, Woodland; Lisa Whalen, Minnetrista. Also present: Charles LeFevere, LMCD Counsel; Greg Nybeck, Executive Director; Judd Harper, Administrative Technician; Emily Herman, Administrative Assistant.

Members absent: Doug Babcock, Tonka Bay; Leigh Harrod, Excelsior; Tom Scanlon, Spring Park; Katy Van Hercke, Minnetonka

CHAIR ANNOUNCEMENTS, Chair Skramstad

Skramstad made three Chair announcements. First, a meeting has been scheduled in the LMCD office on May 24th at 12 NOON to review the draft 2007 LMCD Budget. He encouraged Board members to attend this meeting if they were interested. Second, he stated that the MCWD would be hosting a 2007 State of the Waters Summit on May 24th from 3:00 to 4:30 p.m. at the City of Minnetonka Community Center. He encouraged Board members to attend and participate in this meeting if they were interested. Third, he reminded the Board that the annual Lake Inspection Tour was scheduled for June 6th. He asked Nybeck for further details.

Nybeck stated that arrangements were being made with Al & Alma's because the inspection tour was planned for the Upper Lake. In the past, the inspection tour was coordinated from 6:30 to 9:30 p.m. Al and Alma's had suggested an alternative time from 7:00 to 10:00 p.m. and he asked for Board feedback on this. Additionally, he asked for Board feedback on whether they preferred a sit down meal or appetizers if the cost of the inspection tour would be reduced by having appetizers.

The consensus of the Board was to: 1) maintain the inspection tour times from 6:30 to 9:30 p.m., and 2) to coordinate appetizers rather than a sit down meal if it would reduce the costs of the inspection tour.

READING OF MINUTES- 5/9/07 LMCD Regular Board Meeting

Whalen recommended amending the minutes in the summary paragraph on page eight when the Board discussed the draft 2008 LMCD Budget. She believed that language should be added that "the Board directed staff to evaluate existing LMCD fee schedules and to provide recommendations back to the Board on possible amendments".

MOTION: Nelson moved, Whalen seconded to approve the 5/9/07 minutes as amended, adding the language recommended by Whalen on page eight.

VOTE: Ayes (8), Abstained (2, McDermott and Skramstad); 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 item 3A be removed from the consent agenda.

Whalen moved, McDermott seconded to approve the consent agenda as amended, removing agenda item 3A. Motion carried unanimously. Item so approved included: **1B**, Hennepin County Sheriff's Water Patrol Significant Activity Report and **3B**, April financial summary and balance sheet.

PUBLIC HEARING

- **Mark and Kati Lovaas**, dock length and side setback variance application from LMCD Code at 17840 Breezy Point Road on Wayzata Bay.

Skramstad asked Nybeck for background on this agenda item.

Nybeck reviewed the staff memo, dated 5/17/07, which summarized a request from Mark and Kati Lovaas for variance from LMCD Code for dock length and possibly side setbacks requirements. The applicants have proposed: 1) a 72' long dock to store two watercraft (an 18' inboard/outboard motor boat and a smaller boat with a nine horsepower motor, and 2) special consideration for a longer dock for swimming by the family and friends at the site. He highlighted three LMCD Code Sections to evaluate the variance application. These included: 1) Code Section 2.01, subd. 1- outlines authorized dock use area requirements, 2) Code Section 1.07- outlines the variance process from LMCD Code, and 3) Code Section 2.02- outlines the number of restricted watercraft that may be stored at a site. He believed that there were three fundamental issues for the Board to address when considering the variance application. First, he believed that the applicants had documented that shallow water existed at this site to direct LeFevere to prepare Findings of Fact and Order for a dock length variance between 48' and 56'. The applicants have requested special consideration for a 72' long dock for swimming purposes and he questioned the hardship and potential undesirable precedent. Second, a question remains on whether this site still qualified for the five foot grandfathered side setback. If the Board concluded that it did not qualify, he believed that there was a hardship that justifies a reduction of the required 10' and 15' setback requirements and this would need to be determined by the Board. Third, the Board needs to decide what the appropriate number of restricted number of watercraft was for this site. He entertained questions and comments from the Board.

Gross stated that it appeared that this docking arrangement had existed for at least 12 years. He questioned why this application had been submitted.

Nybeck stated that an inquiry had been made by one of the neighbors in recent years. A number of

subsequent discussions took place with the applicants, educating them on LMCD Code requirements, where non-compliance appeared to exist, and providing them options on how they might resolve these issues of non-compliance.

Gross questioned if it would be fair to state that the docking situation existed over the years because of mutual consent arrangements.

Nybeck concurred with that characterization, pointing out that mutual consent did not currently exist from either of the abutting property owners.

Skramstad asked for additional comments and background from the applicants.

Mr. Mark Lovaas, 17840 Breezy Point Road, stated that he believed this problem was created when his mother and father-in-law were looking for a place to live and he built them a guest house. During that process, the situation became difficult and he was served legal papers for having some dirt put on the abutting neighbor's property. This was separate issue and he reported that it had been resolved. During the construction process for the guest house, it was determined that the narrow access to the shoreline for this site was on the property of the neighbors on the other side of the property. This was also a separate legal issue and he reported that it had been resolved. All three properties had some non-compliance issues with LMCD Code in the past and he hoped to make his site compliant through the variance process. He stated his father-in-law had Parkinson's disease and a bad back. He loves to swim, which helps the pain in his back. A special ladder has been constructed 56' into the lake and allowing the additional 16' out to 72' allows him to swim and enjoy the lake with his grandchildren. He believed that the 72' length would not pose problems for either the neighbors or the public navigating in the area. He hoped to put the docking issues in this area to bed and he requested Board approval of the variance application as submitted. He entertained questions and comments from the Board.

Skramstad asked Mr. Lovaas to clarify the length of the smaller boat with a nine horsepower motor.

Mark Lovaas stated that the boat was an older 12' long Lund alumacraft.

Ms. Christina Lovaas, 17840 Breezy Point Road, stated that she enjoyed Lake Minnetonka a lot and this area was used both in the summer and winter months.

Skramstad opened the public hearing at 7:26 p.m. and invited other members of the public to comment on the variance application.

Mr. Bert Foster stated that he represented the abutting property owner to the west, Peter Hajas. He made the following comments:

- Owners of both properties that abut the applicants' have withdrawn past mutual consent arrangements because of a number of land issues. Both of the abutting properties have around 140' to 150' of lakeshore frontage, with the applicants having approximately 33' of lakeshore frontage.
- His client believes that the applicants could comply with LMCD Code requirements. Nobody was suggesting that this site should not be allowed to have a dock and boat storage, or allow for swimming arrangements for the applicants father-in-law.
- He provided the LMCD a deed of sale document from 1987 that resulted in three feet of

shoreline being added to the applicants' site. Because of this, he did not believe that this site should continue to qualify for the grandfathered five foot side setback requirement. He questioned whether this setback would even be appropriate because he believed the applicants could accomplish what they want with a 10' side setback.

- He proposed an alternative dock design for the Board to consider. This included: 1) a 10' side setback from the westerly extended side site line, 2) a dock use area width of 13' to allow for straight dock on the west side with watercraft to be stored on the east side of the dock, and 3) a 10' side setback from the easterly extended side site line. He believed that it would be appropriate to allow for one restricted and one unrestricted watercraft at this site, which the applicants currently had.
- He concurred with the applicants' documentation that four feet of water depth exists at around 50'. The current dock installation has seven, eight-foot section, with the first three or four feet of the first dock section on shore. His client did not want the LMCD to allow an "L" shaped dock section at the end of the dock.
- To assist in the initial and subsequent dock installation at the applicants' property, he believed that it would be appropriate to require a pair of range or witness markers by a surveyor in conjunction with the normal as-built survey requirement for approved variances. He believed that this was a reasonable request and would prevent further problems in the future.
- He entertained questions and comments from the Board.

Suerth asked for clarification of whether the applicants had any control over the land transaction in 1987, which added three feet of shoreline to their site.

Mr. Peter Hajas, 17950 Breezy Point Road, stated that the three feet of added shoreline was a legitimate transaction rather than a re-plat by the City of Woodland. The transaction involved a three foot wide by approximately 500' long strip of land by the prior owners of the Lovaas property.

Altstatt stated that he had a philosophy of what a person could do and what a person should do. He questioned Foster why his client was so concerned about the minute spacing details between his dock and the applicants' dock.

Foster stated that his client believed that there was a lot of egregious behavior that had taken place in recent years. Based on this, Mr. Hajas had removed mutual consent that he had agreed to in the past and requested that the applicants comply with LMCD Code.

Ms. Kati Lovaas, 17840 Breezy Point Road, stated that she did not have problems with the neighbors and that she liked them. She believed that the neighbors could get along and that her kids go to school with the Hajas kids. The lawsuits that took place were initiated by the abutting neighbors and she did not believe that egregious behavior had taken place. She hoped to put an end to the issues and to allow the kids to be friends.

Mr. James Sundberg, 17870 Breezy Point Road, stated he owned the abutting property to the east of the applicants' site. He and his wife had lived at this site since 1972 and had a similar dock configuration over the past 35 years. He requested that the Board not approve any variance from LMCD Code for two reasons. First, an additional home was constructed in 2005 on the Lovaas site, which resulted in additional traffic on the applicants' property because it served two families rather than

one. He believed that there would always be two families at the applicants' site. Second, the current dock installation of 72' was 20' further out than his dock, which is kind of a sore site when looking out their window. He believed that approval of the variance application would result in a small threat of navigation and decreased value of his house. This all started in 2005 when Nybeck was out in the area inspecting all docks. Nybeck informed him that his dock had been out of compliance for the past 33 years because of side setbacks. In 2006, the dock installer was installing the dock where it had been placed historically. At that time, the Lovass' stated that they wanted his dock to be in compliance with LMCD Code and he made the necessary adjustments. He believed that there was adequate space to install a dock and store watercraft as previously recommended by Foster. He entertained questions and comments from the Board.

The father-in-law for the applicants stated that he had children that were nice enough to build him and his wife a guest home. He moved to this country in 1951 and had never had any trouble with neighbors. He expressed concern about the neighborhood issues and he hoped that the variance request would resolve some of the issues.

Hajas stated that he concurred with the comments from Kati Lovaas that also had no problems with the neighbors. He further expanded on the problems that occurred during the construction process of the guest home, which resulted in the courts resolving this.

Seuntjens asked Hajas to clarify his docking arrangements at his site.

Hajas stated he always had four restricted watercraft at his site. Currently, he had two full size boats and two personal watercraft at his dock. He recognized that a third personal watercraft was at the dock being fixed and would need to be moved.

Seuntjens stated that it was important that all neighbors comply with LMCD Code requirements in this area, not only the applicants.

Hajas concurred with the comments made by Seuntjens.

There being no further comments, Skramstad closed the public hearing at 7:59 p.m.

Whalen asked LeFevere to clarify LMCD side setback requirements and whether the land transaction that took place nullified the five foot grandfathered side setback.

LeFevere stated that the applicants were currently requesting one restricted and one unrestricted watercraft. If it were accurate that this site has been changed, it would lose its grandfather entitlement to have two restricted watercraft because of the replat or subdivision. In the early 1970's when the Board adopted its first setback ordinances, it was recognized that there were a number of smaller platted lots that were too narrow to meet new LMCD Code requirements for setbacks. Because of this, sites that were legally in existence when the ordinance was adopted in 1970 were provided a reduced side setback, five feet. When a site is altered, including expansions, there is a question of whether a grandfathered side setback should continue. Assuming that the grandfathered entitlement was lost, that would mean the site would be subject to conforming side setback requirements. He did not believe that there was a dispute that a land transaction had taken place. Thus, a side setback variance would need to be approved for this site if the Board were inclined to approve the variance application as

submitted.

Seuntjens stated he believed it was important that the Board continue to use four feet of water depth as the standard for dock length variances. For this site, this was between 48' and 56' from the 929.4' shoreline. He supported: 1) a 56' long dock for this site, 2) the storage of one restricted and one unrestricted watercraft at the dock, 3) maintaining a 10' side setback from both extended side site lines, and 4) a side setback variance to allow for a 10' side setback for the last six feet of dock use area.

LeFevere stated that current LMCD Code might make it difficult to store any restricted watercraft at the site because of the replat or subdivision that took place in 1987. The general rule, one restricted watercraft for each 50' of continuous shoreline, was adopted in May 1978. However, it does not allow for rounding up of restricted watercraft until a site has at least 100' of continuous shoreline. In this case, the site has only 33' of shoreline.

Whalen asked when this site was originally platted.

Sundberg stated he believed the site was platted in 1965.

Suerth encouraged the Board to review the application without taking into consideration the three feet of shoreline added in 1987. He did not believe that it appreciably changed the site configuration and was a technicality.

Whalen concurred with Suerth and did not believe that the adding of three feet of shoreline should negate the five foot setback entitlement. She believed that this was not consistent with the spirit and intent of the ordinance when it was adopted.

Seuntjens asked for further clarification on the number of restricted watercraft that may be allowed at the applicants site.

LeFevere stated that LMCD allows for four restricted watercraft at a site if there were only one single family residential structure on the site. Based on the testimony, it appears that there were two houses on the site and it would preclude them from this exception.

Whalen believed that the site was not subdivided for a second single family home. Instead, a guest cottage was added and the LMCD might want to look at the city's ordinances to better understand the definition of a guest cottage.

LeFevere stated that the ordinance he was interpreting was the LMCD's, not the City of Woodland's. The ordinance was the Board's and the interpretation of single family residence was subject to interpretation by the Board. There have been other situations where two residential structures exist and the Board has not allowed the four boat rule to apply to these sites.

Mark Lovaas stated that he might have misspoken when he called the house for his parents a guest house. The house was an addition to the existing house and was physically connected, including the water and sewer. It was essentially a wing of the existing house that could not be rented as an apartment.

Sundberg stated there were two houses that were separated by about 20' in space.

Nelson stated that there appeared to be a lot of conflicting issues. He was inclined to think that the courts have always maintained that riparian properties have some riparian rights, which the Board was not going to take away. He believed that the issues for the Board to address were how long the dock should be and what the side setback requirements should be. He questioned what the hardship beyond four feet of water depth would be for swimming purposes.

MOTION: Nelson moved, Johnson seconded moved to direct LMCD legal counsel to prepare Findings of Fact and Order to deny the Lovaas variance application as submitted, with a recommendation to the applicants to resubmit a variance application for dock length to four feet of water depth and maintaining 10' side setback requirements.

Seuntjens questioned whether the motion would amend the applicants' proposed variance application or deny the application.

Nelson questioned whether it would be appropriate to grant a variance request other than what was applied for by the applicants.

LeFevere stated that it sometimes made sense to deny the variance application rather than the Board getting into the business of redesigning it. That might not be the case here because there was discussion of defining a dock use area rather redesigning a new dock plan. The Board could deny the dock length variance request for 72' and approve an alternative dock length variance, with whatever setbacks the Board deems appropriate. The advantage of this was that the applicants would not need to go through the entire variance process again.

Nelson proposed a friendly amendment to clarify that his motion was to: 1) deny the dock length variance of 72' and approve a 56' long dock use area, 2) to require 10' side setbacks and approve a side setback variance for the last six feet of the dock use area, and 3) to allow for the storage of one restricted watercraft and one unrestricted watercraft within the dock use area. Johnson agreed to this.

VOTE: Motion carried unanimously.

Seuntjens request that staff conduct an inspection during 2007 boating season to ensure that docking and boat storage at all three sites complied with LMCD Code.

1. LAKE USE & RECREATION

A. Staff update on 2008 Lake Minnetonka Boat Density and User Attitude Surveys (joint project of the MN DNR and the LMCD);

Skramstad asked Nybeck to provide background on this agenda item.

Nybeck stated that there was discussion at the May 9th Board meeting relating to whether the Lake Minnetonka Boat Density and User Attitude Surveys project should take in 2008. This discussion took place during the review of the draft LMCD Budget. Per the Board's direction, an invitation was extended to Tim Kelly from the MN DNR provide the Board further feedback on this project and to address questions and comments from the Board. Kelly turned down the request because the driving force for the project in the early 1990's was the LMCD in response to the recently adopted

management plan at that time. Kelly wanted the Board to make the decision on whether to postpone or discontinue this project without the MN DNR's influence. He did not believe that the Board needed to make a decision until the June 13th meeting when continued review of the draft 2008 LMCD Budget would take place.

The Board discussed this project and the idea of possibly postponing or abandoning this project. The consensus of the Board was to continue discussion until the June 13th Board meeting.

E. Additional Business

There was no additional business.

2. WATER STRUCTURES

A. **Three Rivers Park District**, consideration of draft Findings of Fact and Order approving bridge and variance applications in conjunction with the Dakota Regional Trail System.

Skramstad requested Nybeck to provide background on this item.

Nybeck stated LeFevere had prepared draft Findings to approve the bridge and variance applications as discussed at the May 9th Board meeting.

Seuntjens stated that there was discussion at the May 9th Board meeting that the Three Rivers Park District would communicate to LMCD staff what preservatives would be used on the bridges prior to using them. He believed that this should be added as a fourth condition to the draft Order.

LeFevere stated that language could be added to the draft Findings that "The applicant shall provide LMCD staff with a list of any preservative chemicals proposed to be used on the bridge timbers, for staff approval, prior to construction".

MOTION: Gross moved, McDermott seconded to approve Three Rivers Park District Findings of Fact and Order as amended, adding a fourth point with the language recommended by LeFevere for the treated bridge timbers.

VOTE: Motion carried unanimously.

B. **William Hite, Jr. and Lisa Smith**, consideration of draft Findings of Fact and Order approving a side setback variance application at 2217 Huntington Point Road East.

Skramstad requested Nybeck to provide background on this item.

Nybeck stated LeFevere had prepared draft Findings to approve the side setback variance application as discussed at the May 9th Board meeting. He entertained questions and comments from the Board.

MOTION: Nelson moved, Seuntjens seconded to approve the draft Findings of Fact and Order approving the William Hite, Jr. and Lisa Smith side setback variance application as submitted.

VOTE: Motion carried unanimously.

C. Additional Business

There was no additional business.

3. FINANCIAL

A. Audit of vouchers (5/16/07 – 5/31/07).

Skramstad asked Nybeck why he requested removing this agenda item from the consent agenda.

Nybeck stated that check number 16379, in the amount of \$7,521.04 to R and R Marine should be added to the list of vouchers. This additional check was for the new pontoon motor, which was scheduled to delivered on May 25th. Funding for this new purchase was proposed from Equipment Replacement Funds.

MOTION: Suerth moved, McDermott seconded to approve audit of vouchers amended, adding check number 16379 in the amount of \$7,521.04 to R and R Marine.

VOTE: Motion carried unanimously.

C. Additional Business

There was no additional business.

4. EWM/EXOTICS TASK FORCE

A. Staff update on 2007 I-LIDS project.

Skramstad requested Nybeck to provide background on this agenda item.

Nybeck stated that there was a spreadsheet in the handout folders that provided an overview of the status of the 2007 project. A summary of his comments included:

- The duration of the contract was five months, from May 12th through October 11th. The contractor needed to secure all necessary approval and permits, and demonstrate to the LMCD's satisfaction prior to the billing period that each unit was operating in compliance with the specifications. At the Grays Bay public access, the unit was operating and functioning by the May 12th date. However, there were concerns that the unit was not functioning 24 hours a day as required by the contract because its use was being limited by a timer. At the Maxwell Bay public access, the unit was also operating and functioning by the May 12th date. However, the unit had stopped working because of a lack of battery power. Neither of the units were operating and functioning at the North Arm and Spring Park public accesses. He suggested that the Board should discuss how to handle this non-compliance with contract specifications and he suggested prorating the seasonal costs, which he believed the contractor was agreeable to.
- The contract requires the contractor to review 100% of the video sequences captured during non MN DNR inspection hours. 50% of the license numbers and or

watercraft registration numbers must be visible when the watercraft and vehicle is within the field of view. Additionally, the contractor was required to provide weekly updates on a variety of information outlined in the contract. The contractor would have to provide this information by the end of the day on May 24th for May 12th through 19th at Grays Bay and Maxwell Bay public accesses.

- The contract requires contractor to provide each unit a 24" x 36" educational sign. The old 2006 signs had been installed at the Grays Bay and Maxwell Bay public accesses by May 12th. The status of the signage at the North and Spring park public accesses was unknown.
- The contract requires the contractor to provide the LMCD insurance prior to May 12th date that meets a number of insurance specifications. Although there were some deficiencies at this time, the contractor had submitted a new insurance premium prior to the meeting that would need to be further reviewed by LMCD staff in the near future
- He stated that Eric Lindberg was in attendance to provide further details and to address questions and comments from the Board.

Mr. Eric Lindberg, CEO of Environmental Protection, LLC, stated that he was working with Tony Brough from Hennepin County Environmental Services on optimal placement of signs at the North Arm and Spring Park public accesses. He provided the Board a brief overview of video sequences taken to date at the Grays Bay and Maxwell Bay public accesses. The main reason why the units at the North Arm and Spring Park public accesses are not operational was a delay in updating the circuit board. He believed that this should be resolved in the next week. One thing that was not included in the report prepared by Nybeck was the wireless access points at Maxwell Bay, North Arm, and Spring Park public accesses.

Skramstad asked Lindberg to comment on the reduction of seasonal costs on a prorated basis at the North Arm and Spring Park public accesses as recommended by Nybeck.

Lindberg stated that there fixed and seasonal costs for this contract. He agreed with the recommendation made by Nybeck on prorating the seasonal costs at the two accesses where the units were not operating and functioning in compliance with the contract specifications.

Nybeck stated that Lindberg was required by the contract to provide the LMCD a verbal, mid-season report. This most likely would be scheduled for the June 27th Board meeting.

The Board discussed payment options to Lindberg for fixed and seasonal costs incurred. The consensus of the Board was to reimburse the fixed and seasonal costs for work performed by Lindberg at the Grays Bay and Maxwell Bay public accesses. At the North Arm and Spring park public accesses, the Board agreed to pay the fixed costs when the units were operating in accordance with the contract specifications and to prorate the seasonal costs for the days that the units were not operating.

B. Additional Business

Suerth stated that there had recently been a successful training session of Minnetonka Power Squadron members to initiate the volunteer inspection program. He directed the Board to their handout folders and suggested that each Board member contact the representatives of each homeowners association within their community to participate in the volunteer inspection program.

He stated that he would like to offer each Board member the opportunity to be trained by the MN DNR Watercraft Inspection Program. He recommended conducting this before the June 13th LMCD Board meeting.

The Board agreed with Suerth's recommendation and the consensus was to coordinate a training session at 5:30 p.m. with the MN DNR on June 13th.

Gross stated that he had recently talked to the Deephaven Police Chief relating to enforcement of aquatic invasive species laws. In 2006, the Deephaven police department wrote 26 citations or warnings for violation of aquatic invasive species laws.

5. ADMINISTRATION

- A. Consideration of staff recommendation for compensation adjustment for Administrative Technician, Judd Harper.

Skramstad asked Nybeck to provide background on this agenda item.

Nybeck recommended tabling action on this agenda item to the June 13th Board meeting to allow the Personnel Committee to participate in the performance and compensation review process.

- B. 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 as of May 21st was 929.38', with a discharge of 90 c.f.s.

8. OLD BUSINESS

Update on Pending AIS Legislation

Skramstad updated the Board on the pending aquatic invasive species (AIS) legislation introduced by Representative John Berns and Senator Gen Olson. The legislation was included in an omnibus bill and did not reach the floor for a vote in this legislation session. He anticipated that this would be taken up in the 2008 legislation session, which would commence next February.

Suerth stated that Representative John Berns had recently conducted a survey of, with 1,500 residents responding. Of those that responded, 70 percent of them expressed a willingness to pay for additional AIS management and prevention.

Update on 2006 LMCD Code Enforcement Letters

McDermott asked for an update from staff on the letters to be sent out.

Nybeck stated that the letters for the sites with five or more restricted watercraft were recently sent out,

with each Board member getting a copy of the database for the letters sent out in their municipality. He anticipated that letters would be sent out in the near future for sites storing three or four larger restricted watercraft. He reported that the Shelley Miller, the 2007 Code Enforcement and Permitting intern, would start on May 30th.

9. NEW BUSINESS

The Board discussed the idea of conducting a new LMCD Board member orientation for those that were interested after this meeting was adjourned. The consensus of the Board was to conduct this session during a Board Planning/Workshop Session in the near future in place of a regularly scheduled Board meeting.

10. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 9:15 p.m.

Tom Skramstad, Chair

Tom Scanlon, Secretary