

Standley Lake Boating Taskforce  
MEETING NOTES  
Tuesday, May 21, 2019, 6pm – 8pm  
Location: City Hall Multipurpose Room

NOTE: Audio recordings of each meeting are posted online as soon as possible after each meeting.

TF Attendees: Wayne East, Gary Johnson, Megan Ihotsky, Tammie Wyns, Steve Garrod

Resource Staff: Jason Genck, Holly Walters, Sarah Borgers, Kelly Cline, Max Kirschbaum, Joe Reale (note taker)

**1. Welcome and Roll Call**

- a. Everyone in attendance

**2. Approval of Agenda**

- a. Added Elizabeth Brown, Colorado Parks and Wildlife Invasive Species Coordinator, as guest speaker
- b. Approved as amended

**3. Approval amended Minutes from May 2 Meeting**

- a. Approved as corrected; Correction submitted by Wayne East and updated by PRL Staff

**4. Old Business: Update on Action Items:**

- a. Update from Tagging Subcommittee:
  - Kevin Work (KW) spoke on behalf of committee
    - Demos handed out to TF
    - Given added layers from previous version
    - The subcommittee's focus is not to create an "unhackable" system but to create a 100% detectable system (if system is bypassed ranger should be able to tell)
    - Current proposal, made up of 3 systems
      - State that all 3 systems must be bypassed to release boat
      - Through the hull attachment (previously approved)
      - "Nut-Swedge-Nut" configuration as attachment; per subcommittee "no matter what you do you still have to drill out Nut"; cutting wire "100% of time does not pass the pull test" easy test
      - Security Tape and/or Epoxy on "nut"
      - Swedge can be stamped with interchangeable (random?) patterns

- Subcommittee believes this system cannot be bypassed w/o detection. 100% detectable, if ranger follows flow sheet for evaluating tag
- Flow Chart tests for “every possible” way of cheating the system
- Subcommittee further believes that added time to bypass system (ordering materials), additional penalties and heightened awareness of community would further de-incentivize any “cheating”

Board Questions (BQ): Staff opinion of system?

Holly Walters: Staff needs time to evaluate, just received this system today; needs thorough vetting

BQ: Are you proposing both glue (epoxy) and security tape?

KW: Proposing using both; City doesn't like tape, but disagree on effectiveness, still testing.

CJ: Likes the change in focus from unhackable to detectable

BQ: Is the wire being used in proposal the same as previous Standley Lake wire?

HW: No, it is not the same, it does match the wire used by the state, the use of swages requires this change in wire and that would need to be assessed

JG: What would it take for a patron to purchase all the components to mimic system in order to cheat?

KW: Extremely difficult, “nuts” difficult to obtain, match serial number, match swage stamp, all within the 35 day quarantine period. Can provide city with tool for “cracking open nuts” if that option is chosen.

Electronic locks may be available, lots of interesting options just not available to test right now, could be viable down the road.

Additional samples will be given to Holly.

**b. Update from Jason Genck/Holly Walters 1 Boat, 1 Lake Option (1b1l)**

- Quick turnaround, so not a complete assessment
- Appears to be a viable solution for future (2020?) could be worked on could be prepared and reviewable with modifications to concept and facilities;
  1. Time
  2. Funding
  3. Security (gate, fencing)

- Infrastructure and procedures not in place to handle 1b11 this year
- Will limit number of boats
- Recommendation of 1b11 continues to be sound and should be evaluated further
- Don't believe it can be executed in 2019

BQ: Any ability to open additional parking space/storage?

JG: anything is theoretically possible. Marginal at best. Opens up additional issues, but likely would not go over well with IGA partners. Host of issues that would need resolution.

JG: Staff is working very hard evaluating issues, looking for solutions 7 days a week. Email tracking shows continued effort. Know we are not there yet, need time to vet, value working with subcommittee.

Being clear, solutions and follow through from staff has been "out of this world"

We have 300,000 people relying on us to make wise decision. When they hear that a solution is not 100% reliable or 100% viable that comes back to staff. Need to make sure whatever we decide moving forward meets that criteria and allows recreation to continue. I feel like we are going to get there, I don't know when.

CJ: Agree, proposal is 100x better than previous, I want to move forward

WE: Are we (taskforce) ready to move forward with recommending looking into 1b11?

CJ: recommend forming a subcommittee for evaluating 1b11;

TW: Yes, for longer term solution, still need tagging option for leaving lake. Desire for a solution for this year.

Not sure about subcommittee; have heard boating concerns, have read reports, heard complaints that it was a knee-jerk reaction; don't believe this is true, the city had 300k best interests in mind when making decision. Decision was made for a reason. Have heard City state they are leaning to 1b11.

We have heard we don't want to hurry the issue, need to get it right, but we have also heard we want to get boats on the lake this year. For me that is confusing and stressful, can only imagine stress on staff. I am getting interest from non-boaters to assure protection. Our charter says to protect water and get boats (no set number) on lake.

WE: Comfortable recommending to staff to look into 1b1l, staff knows the details needed to determine; fencing, security, cost. Etc. gives 9-10 months to look into for next year.

Still look into tagging system, knowing it will still be needed for exiting lake (maintenance etc.)

GJ: need to separate short term (tag) and long term 1b1l

MI: 1b1l might be a super-viable best decision, but it is not a 2019 solution. Would like to fully vet all solutions (has a phone conference with fleet tracking tomorrow and will update board at next meeting) multiple options need to be brought to the table.

Wants to see the details of 1b1l.

SG: wants to see 1b1l vetted. Likes tag process. Need 2019 solution. Only 250 permits. Appreciates comments and work of City. Don't believe there has been a predetermined solution

#### **RECOMMENDATION FOR FOLLOW-UP:**

##### ***Staff to look into 1b1l solution for the future (2020 and beyond)***

JG: Call to question: Charter of SLBT - "restoring trailered boating to Standley Lake without compromise to water quality" based on what you are seeing tonight (with tagging 2.0) and information you currently have, are you ready to green-light this to be the tagging program on Standley Lake for boating this season?

WE: No. Not tomorrow.

TW: No. Want time to test.

SG: No, Feel we will get there, but not ready

MI: No tomorrow, but feel we are much closer; credit to work done. Need to look at fully vet

GJ: Based on previous approved tag, this is way better, this "much layered system" is worlds better. Tomorrow No, next week absolutely. This is good enough for me. I know many people can't beat this. Good enough for the honest person. On the honor system.

JG: I agree this is an improved detection system: Need to outline that when the program is restored, the process the rangers will use if there is any reason to suspect tampering there will be a new 35 day quarantine, we will err on the

side of caution. Need to make sure from a customer service stand point that incidental events can't jeopardize ability to boat and cause new quarantine. Need to feel confidence to say "the city has done the very best it can to restore this without jeopardizing water quality. Has heard request to restore boating quickly (tomorrow) but can't at this point. Do not want to be back here again, need a long term viable solution.

## **5. New Business:**

- a. Elizabeth Brown, Colorado Parks and Wildlife Invasive Species Coordinator invited to provide any updates from the state  
No prepared statement, was interested in listening appreciates the cooperative effort being undertaken, State understands the need to balance the needs for resource protection with recreational access. Watching this process to see if there are recommendations for improving their program.

735 state-wide inspectors, 72 locations including Standley  
8 Boats with ZQM detected already this year  
Majority of intercepts from Lake Powell, then Great Lakes  
Record number of intercepts last year 51  
Double previous years  
Greatest pressure from Lake Powell  
People use Lake Powell for a weekend and return  
Mussels exploding in low water there  
Different at Lake Powell, low water and ideal habitat, extensive exposure. Mussels found in engines, strainers after a couple of days.  
Found all over boat  
No detections at Green Mountain, no detection this year (spring)  
Not because of winter or cold water. Don't know if detected veligers were alive at time of detection.  
ZQM can survive Colorado Winters

Q: About Ballast Tanks, master filters

Designed as fine mesh strainer to filter veligers, can send study details; sea strainer, do hold water, challenges with installation, Committee is working on recommendations for boat builders specifically looking at ballast tanks. Hoping for industry innovation. However significant legacy fleet 30-40 years for turnover in fleet  
Ballast tanks are the biggest challenge for keeping out AIS  
Website with information [westernais.org](http://westernais.org)

Q: Book states “cleaned, drained, dry and no ANS will survive” do you stand behind that?

Yes, if it is cleaned drained and dry. A ballast tank cannot be dried, an inboard/outboard engine cannot be dried, some wells cannot be drained and therefore they have to be decontaminated.

Q: what are your thoughts about quarantine process at Westminster as compared to the state?

The state fully supports the City’s decision to manage their water body to the greatest protection that they see fit. The state has the ability to quarantine and we do so when necessary on a case by case basis. Layered approach that has been effective. Is based on 27-29 day reported in literature.

Q: any discussion at recent meeting about tags or other items of interest?

Western 9 states have discussed, are interested and curious. Open to doing this different. Much of their conversation doesn’t revolve around tags as it does around boater education and compliance. Without Boater compliance program is challenging. States can’t police everyone everywhere. Some of the infested waterbodies outside CO are significant. A lot comes down to working with boaters and industry to create value of resource. At bigger scale we need to create buy-in.

State echoes a lot of the recommendations. Likes the “detectable” concept, altered training to focus on teaching people how to detect, and working on enforcement.

Q: Is state going to change location of tagging as TF has recommended? (Bow-ring)

Again, Boaters need to comply. Can’t answer at this time. Looking at options. Altering Boats concerns state, more difficult for state to mandate this. Easier for a single lake under permit system.

Looking at more tools more cost. Easier for single lake, what happens at Standley may influence the direction of others.

Q: Anything we should be looking at? Missing?

No. It comes down to acceptable risk. The TF, and 300k consumers need to determine that. It may be different than somewhere else. Multistate database will be helpful. Know Holly has been working on that. Enforcement has been discussed at CPW assuring consequences. Appreciate the conversation being had here. Think you are talking about all the key things.

**b. Jason Genck update on tracking at Golf Course**

Tracking system is a possibility (geofencing), want to explore. Locks into GPS which has some limitations.

Identified a second possibility “Noke” locking mechanism that may work. Staff is working hard to find answers. Continuing to explore options and talking with vendor.

GJ: asked to hear thoughts from the City

JG: Without question the City is committed to restoring trailered boats to Standley Lake and we need to get through this process. We do not and can't have a timeframe. Staff is fully on board and is working very hard. We do need the time to review. We are very appreciative of the effort of the TF and subcommittee. I believe the future is bright but I do not know if that is 2019 or 2020. Simply because we start counting days we don't know that we have the time this season to restore. We are all in this together to find a long term solution. We need time, the TF has done given so much time and effort and we are appreciative.

Would ask the TF if there is any new reports, information or recommendations that would warrant follow-up meetings? Otherwise staff needs time to go through this, hesitate to commit to update. Ask that staff let TF know when they are ready to respond.

TW: What is staff opinion about ballast filters as mandated part of layered system?

Elizabeth Brown indicated that studying of Ballast filters is currently on-going and will provide any updates to TF as they are available

GJ: For City, What is the acceptable risk?

*The City will consider this question and provide an update*

## **6. Future Meeting/Next Steps**

**a. Demos that need vetting**

- b.** 1 Boat 1 Lake to be explored by City, come back to TF
- c.** Recap from MI on call with US Fleet Tracking, logistics, costs etc.
- d.** Staff to evaluate requiring ballast filters on all ballast boats as part of layered system and provide opinion to TF (will defer to state as applicable)
- e.** What is acceptable risk for the city?
- f.** Request for information on the known violators; any information that can be released, residency? Lake they were on?
- g.** City provide feedback, and notify the committee when staff has information to share

Next meeting to be determined

Meeting Adjourned at 8:30p

---

Signature

Date