

AIS Advisory Committee  
Wednesday October 4th 1:00pm  
Wright county Courthouse  
10 2<sup>nd</sup> St NW Buffalo, MN 55313 Rm 111

## MINUTES

In attendance: Luke Johnson, Alicia O'Hare: Wright SWCD; Greg Kryzer: County Attorney's Office; Chris Hector: WCRIP President, Jim Gray: WRIP Lake Association Governance Council; Todd Hoffman: Wright County Sheriff's Department; Jefferson Bishop: Anchor Dock and Lift; Heidi Wolf (phone): MN DNR; Christine Husom: County Commissioner

Not Present: Darek Vetch: County Commissioner; Jeff Herr: City of Annandale Police Department; Chris Wall: Transient Boater

### I. Initiative Foundation Grant Update

Chris Hector reported that the Initiative Foundation Grant had been extended until June of 2020. That allows IF matching funds to be used for July-October of 2019.

Hoffman asked about the structure of the grant and if the County Commissioners should be informed and monitoring.

Hector reported that the GLSA was the fiscal party for the grant. There are 3 objectives: 3 Lake Pilot, Expanded Pilot (adding additional lakes) and Float Your Boat. Financial reports are sent to the Initiative Foundation and can be shared with this group. The next report covers 2018 3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter and is being prepared. He also reported that a new corporation (Wright County Regional Inspection Corporation – WCRIC) has been formed and has just received 501(c)(3) status from the IRS. WCRIC will assume all responsibilities currently held by the GLSA starting January 1, 2019.

Hoffman asked about Float Your Boat (FYB) and is the County monitoring this.

Wolf stated that unless FYB was incorporated into the decontamination protocols for the DNR any use of it would be voluntary.

Kryzer asserted that Wright County would not make use of FYB mandatory for liability reasons.

O'Hare stated that FYB was a research project, that investigation was ongoing – but WCSWCD had not received a proposal nor had they evaluated it. Further discussion was tabled.

## II. Enforcement Recap

The minutes from the previous meeting were reviewed and accepted. Next steps on enforcement would be to draft a contract with the County for the Sheriff's department based on existing templates used for cities. Kryzer and Hoffman would work on that outside of the meeting and it would likely be signed in 2019. Hoffman recommended that it be drafted as a Not To Exceed agreement.

Kryzer expressed concern about writing a process describing when violations would be written. Hector clarified that the document was recommended by Hoffman and covered when citations would be requested by rovers.

## III. Additional Lakes Recap

Johnson reviewed the enforcement discussion from the previous meeting. Johnson said that up to 12 would meet the proximity requirement. Hector reported that 5 lakes had approved the addition, and that conversations would be ongoing with others. He also followed up a previous query that the number of properties and % of properties represented by lake associations would be included in future proposals – but currently they range from 60 – 80%.

Wolf was asked about timing and recommended that a proposal for 2019 be submitted as soon as possible. It could be submitted along with the 2018 final report. She also stated that the ordinance need not be in place for the plan to be submitted. Further, she stated that an ordinance was not required since statutory language was already in place.

Hoffman asked whether DNR enforcement would be available if there were no ordinance. Wolf offered to add DNR enforcement to a call if needed to explore further.

Kryzer requested a single ordinance for 2019 rather than a series of updates as lakes were added. He also said that he would not draft anything until specifically requested by Commissioners.

Husom was asked about timing of the next meeting with the Commissioners. O'Hare was requested to get it on the agenda for a committee of the whole meeting on December 11 or 12. O'Hare requested that the DNR be represented at that meeting.

## IV. Recommendations for Improvements in 2019 Plan

General discussion, all items discussed require further review for feasibility.

Can LSP's be exempt from regulations. (Bishop, Wolf) LSP's are the most knowledgeable about lake equipment but are also high risk. Wolf asserted that there are no higher penalties for LSP's, but violations could result in loss of their permit to operate.

Can LSP's be trained for self-inspection. O'Hare – SWCD is the delegated authority and there are issues in extending that authority to employees of another organization.

Should seals have a time limit of 8 days. O'Hare – this would address re-use of seals/proof-of-inspection and use of seals after visiting an outside lake. Wolf – is the 8 day interval based on observed data? O'Hare – most seals are used within 1 day. Hector – reuse of seals could also be addressed by an application that had immediate access to survey data and was used by rovers in place of paper logs. Hector agreed to draft a proposal to the group. Wolf agreed to see if the DNR had any issues with WCRIP paying for their own data iSurvey instance or using the existing API to have immediate access to the data.

Can shrink wrapped boats be inspected during the offseason – reducing the demand in the spring? Hector – 21 days is the required out of water time for docks and lifts, so don't we just need to certify that? Bishop – there is a difference between inspections defined by 84d and the ordinance requirement which is defined by the County. Wolf – the requirement for not transporting invasives cannot be met without a full inspection. Hector – what about the Minnetonka project allowing invasives to be transported for LSP's. Wolf – only in pilot stages now and record keeping is not very good.

Allowing LSP's to re-use a trailer if making multiple trips to the same water. Hector – could be monitored using GPS tracking unit.

## V. Exit Inspections

Tabled

## VI. Next Meeting

There was agreement that the next meeting should be in 2 weeks. O'Hare will send an email to schedule.