

# Mountain Island Lake Marine Commission



**East Lincoln High School  
6471 Highway 73 (Library)  
Lincolnton, NC**

**April 5, 2006 Minutes**

**Commissioners Present:** Chairman Jerry Campbell (Gaston County), Vice Chairman Dan DuVall (Mecklenburg County), Secretary/Treasurer Alice Battle (Mecklenburg County), Commissioner Pam Beck (Gaston County), Commissioner Ann Danzi (Gaston County), Commissioner Greg Shelton (Mecklenburg County), Commissioner Chris Watson (Lincoln County)

**MILMC Staff Present:** Mike McLaurin, Executive Director, Chris Clark, Legal Counsel, Annette Lawing, Clerk

<b>Topic</b>	<b>Discussion Summary</b>	<b>Action</b>
<b>Welcome &amp; Introductions</b>	Chairman Jerry Campbell called the meeting to order at 6:33 pm. Commissioners and staff introduced themselves.	
<b>Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag</b>	Chairman Campbell asked everyone present to join in to Pledge Allegiance to the Flag	
<b>Approval of the April 5, 2006 Agenda</b>	The agenda for the April 5, 2006 was approved	A motion was made by Commissioner Beck to approve the April 5, 2006 agenda. Seconded by Commissioner Danzi. The motion was approved.

<b>Topic</b>	<b>Discussion Summary</b>	<b>Action</b>
<b>Statement of Purpose</b>	Legal Counsel, Chris Clark read the Statement of Purpose into the record.	
<b>Public Comments</b>	Mr. Ray Drury, a Nance Cove homeowner spoke regarding the proposed 150' No Wake Zone on Mountain Island Lake. He and his family have been a Nance Cove resident for three (3) years and enjoy water sports on the lake. He feels strongly that the proposed 150' No Wake Zone will not only affect water sport activities but also the value of his property. He is not in favor with the proposed No Wake Zone.	
<b>Approval of the March 1, 2006 Meeting Minutes</b>	<p>The minutes from the February 27, 2006 meeting were approved with the following revisions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Base Operating Plan, pg. 4 – Breath Analyzer of Law Enforcement – Needs to be tabled on Attachment C, not deleted from Attachment C.</li> <li>2. Commissioner's Comments, pg. 6 – Correct spelling of Commission to Commissioner Watson.</li> </ol>	A motion was made by Commissioner Danzi to approve March 1, 2006 meeting minutes with revisions. Seconded by Commissioner Watson. The motion was approved.
<b>Consent Agenda</b>	None	
<b>Public Safety Reports</b>	<p><b>Charlotte – Mecklenburg Police Department</b>  Officer Turner reported</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ No activity on the lake</li> <li>▪ Working with Gaston County Police to crack down on trespassers on the Big Island</li> </ul> <p><b>Gaston County Police Department</b>  Sgt. McCants reported</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Patrol boat is now fully functional in addition, will be utilizing two (2) jet skis for the Lake Unit.</li> <li>▪ Introduced Sgt. Hamrick as the new patrol officer.</li> </ul> <p><b>Lincoln County Sheriff's Office</b>  Deputy Warlick reported</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ No activity on the lake</li> <li>▪ Patrol boat is now on the lake</li> <li>▪ Can be reached at jwarlick@lincolnsheriff.org</li> </ul> <p><b>N.C. Wildlife Resources Commission</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ No report</li> </ul>	

Topic	Discussion Summary	Action
	<p><b>Mecklenburg County Parks and Recreation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ No report</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Environmental Reports</b></p>	<p><b>Mecklenburg County Land Use and Environmental Services</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ No report</li> </ul> <p><b>Charlotte Engineering and Property Management</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ No report</li> </ul> <p><b>Lakekeepers Report</b> Pam Beck reported</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Not a lot of activity on the lake at this time</li> <li>▪ Metal No Trespassing signs are now installed on the Big Island. Hopefully, by installing the signs with metal screws and up high will lessen vandalism. Pam thanked the Catawba RiverKeeper Foundation for donating the use of their boat and gas to install these signs.</li> <li>▪ Commissioner Danzi asked if fires on the Big Island are allowed? Pam responded by saying that the new signs do not indicate any regulation against building fires. However, it is against the law to build fires in Mecklenburg County but not in Gaston County where the island is located.</li> </ul> <p><b>Duke Power</b> Kelvin Reagan reported</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Six (6) pier approvals, one (1) stabilization</li> <li>▪ Lake level at 96.1</li> <li>▪ Chairman Campbell asked Kelvin Reagan and Mark Oakley with Duke Energy if there are any concerns regarding the recent drought and how it is affecting the lake levels? Mark stated that the drought problem is statewide. Duke Energy along with the Drought Management Advisory Committee is looking at testing the low inflow and drought response procedures, which kicked in earlier than they expected.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Special Reports – FERC</b></p>	<p><b>FERC Update and Recommendations for Signing of the AIP</b> Secretary/Treasurer Battle began her report by putting the AIP document in perspective. Duke Power chose to include stakeholders from the Catawba River basin in the relicensing of their hydro dams to shorten the time from the submission of the application to the time the license would be granted. There is one relicensing project that has been dragging on for thirty years. FERC has not granted a new license to this project, so the project is still operating on the old license. Duke didn't want this to happen. Delays could occur if the application is challenged.</p>	

Topic	Discussion Summary	Action
<b>FERC Report (Continued)</b>	<p>Duke convened the stakeholders group knowing that everyone could not be completely happy with the results. The goal was consensus – a license application that everyone could live with. The idea was to eliminate or minimize challenges to the application by listening to the stakeholders and making accommodations where possible.</p> <p>There has been another benefit. Before the relicensing project, communication and interaction amount the different groups along the Catawba was fragmented. Development is occurring so rapidly in the Catawba Basin yet there was no forum for dialogue among the different interest groups. The relicensing process has brought together not-for profit groups, city and county governments and private businesses, even private citizens with an interest in the river.</p> <p>Several sections in the AIP of interest are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Section 16 – Miscellaneous Agreements – This section basically deals with signatories’ responsibilities and obligations related to the FERC licensing process and those for developing the 401 Water Quality Certifications. The AIP requires the signatories’ act as a unit. The 401 Water Quality Certification will not be completed by the time the final agreement is signed. The Resource Committee dealing with water quality is still meeting monthly to help Duke meet the water quality standards. Members of the committee have informed Alice that Duke has been very responsive to their suggestions, and they feel confident that Duke will meet the standards. Mountain Island Marine Commission Counsel, Chris Clark has reviewed Section 16 and has found no conflict with the mission and responsibilities of the Marine Commission. One organization, S.C. Department of Health and Environmental Control (DHEC) has told Duke they will not sign. Since they have been exempted from the obligations and responsibilities in both the FERC process and the 401 certification, the only reason Alice can find that they won’t sign is that Duke has not given them a copy of the final agreement that they had requested. Duke has published the date for distribution of the final agreement and it sticking to that date.</li> <li>▪ Section 16.7.2 addresses the formation of the Final Agreement Committee chosen by the signatories. They will meet once a year for five years after the signing of the Final Agreement. Beyond that they must agree to continue meeting.</li> <li>▪ Section 8 – Lists the marine commission as an agency to be contacted by Duke with emergency information.</li> </ul>	

Topic	Discussion Summary	Action
<b>FERC Report (Continued)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Section 10 – The Recreation Management Plan includes procedures for temporary closure of access areas in case of high or low water events. There are two access areas on Mountain Island Lake. The Plan also focuses on non-boating recreation on the river. When the contract with Wildlife for management of the access areas expires in 2008, the islands may be included in the new management contract with Wildlife. Big Island will then be in the FERC boundaries, as well as the four other islands on the lake. The islands are not included under the present license.</li> <li>▪ Section 10.11 – Mountain Island Development – The Highway 73 access area for law enforcement will be finished before the license is renewed. The Lucia Bend access will become a reality only if the Educational State Forest obtains an Access Area Improvement Initiative lease. They will be responsible for maintenance.</li> <li>▪ Section 10.11.4 – Alice spoke with David Kraus, City Manager of Mount Holly, about section 10.11.4 the Riverbend Access Area. Mr. Kraus said Mt. Holly is satisfied with the agreement, but will happily accept more financial aid. Duke Energy will pay for the installations of restrooms. They will also provide consultation as to other recreational uses for the 50 acres near the Riverbend access, as well as the Gastonia property and the Mt. Holly property along the tailrace.</li> <li>▪ Section 4.1.5.1 lists Mountain Island Bypass Reach for mitigation money. Section 14.4 lists 4 million dollars plus mitigation money for Land Conservation Support. Section 14.4.3 tells of ways this money might be lost. Many of the lands identified for conservation easements will be managed by Wildlife. The option-purchase schedule is pretty tight and in some cases, Wildlife will have to come up with purchase funds.</li> </ul> <p>Signing of the AIP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ There are five levels for signing <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Endorsement – member likes the AIP</li> <li>2. Endorsement with Minor Point of Contention</li> <li>3. Agreement with Minor Reservations</li> <li>4. Stand aside with Major Reservations (member can live with it) <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Do not have sufficient information to agree with this proposal/provision</li> <li>b. Formal disagreement, but will not block the proposal/provision</li> </ol> </li> <li>5. Block – Member will not support proposal or provision. Member does not agree to</li> </ol> </li> </ul>	

Topic	Discussion Summary	Action
<b>FERC Report (Continued)</b>	<p>continue working within the stakeholder process. Member has decided to leave the team and may choose to use methods outside of those provided in the team’s charter to meet his/her interest.</p> <p>Commissioner Battle recommends signing the AIP at a 3 or a 4. Several sections of concern are;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Section 14.4.3B – Mitigation of water going over Mountain Island Dam – Commissioner Battle would have liked to see those funds mitigated to Mountain Island Lake.</li> <li>2. So much of conservation land is in the upper portion of the basin and not a lot down toward Mountain Island.</li> <li>3. Land on Johnson Creek – Secretary/Treasurer Battle and Commissioner Beck wants this land to be preserved. The river has run red several times from Highway 16 construction and ran red for months. Commissioner Battle was told that there were not enough powerful agencies advocating for this land.</li> </ol> <p>Secretary/Treasurer Battle also explained why the commission should not sign at a 5. In Section 16.71, this section lists all the resource committees that can be reopened after the final agreement is signed to reexamine the different sections. For example, the Recreation Section is only good for 20 years. During this time, they will reconvene the stakeholders group to reexamine the AIP. If you sign as a 5, you will not have the opportunity to be on the Stakeholder’s Group anymore.</p> <p>Mark Oakley with Duke Energy of the Carolinas added some thoughts and information to Alice’s report.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Mark thanked Secretary/Treasurer Battle and Commissioner Beck for their hard work throughout this process</li> <li>▪ Section 14 – Duke had to approach this Section as a “total package” and they feel it is something they can support. For any changes in the AIP, this section can be rebalanced. Section 17 will address how this rebalancing can take place if need be in the future.</li> <li>▪ One thing this document does is goes to mitigation before anything else is done. The Stakeholder’s Group will discuss any problems and address them. A group decision is made by consensus. This should eliminate any bad talk and dislikes.</li> </ul> <p>Commissioner Battle added that there are a lot of good things in the AIP. Low Inflow</p>	

Topic	Discussion Summary	Action
<p><b>FERC Report (Continued)</b></p>	<p>Protocol, Maintenance and Emergency Protocol, and Public Information Systems all are necessary for persons living on or near the lake.</p> <p>Commissioner Beck had several questions and comments regarding the AIP;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Section 8.2.3 – Define normal and abnormal situations. Mark with Duke Energy will get back with Commissioner Beck with the definitions.</li> <li>▪ Section 10.1.2.2 – This section refers to two (2) entities, Duke Energy and Duke Power. Which is the licensee? Mark with Duke Energy stated that Duke Power has merged and will now be Duke Energy of the Carolinas. The reason you will see both listed in the AIP is because any item that relates to transfer or discounted sales of land are not Duke Powers assets. The land belongs to Crescent Resources. Duke Energy, by that name has to be part of the agreement to capture that commitment. If the final agreement is signed, the final licensee will be Duke Energy of the Carolinas.</li> <li>▪ Commissioner Beck is very disappointed in the State agency’s procedure for determining items such as Johnson’s Creek. It’s a “one size fits all” approach to handling issues on Mountain Island Lake. This approach does not work because Mountain Island Lake is very different in many ways from the other lakes on the Catawba. Commissioner Beck feels that the State’s system isn’t looking out for what is best for the lake but for looking out for the system.</li> </ul> <p>Commissioner Danzi posed a question regarding the Recreational Section:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ What will happen if the local government is unable to build what they have forecasted on the allotted 50 acres of land? Mark with Duke Energy replied that he does think the AIP gives a time frame on completing the construction. He also added that this is fairly workable and forgiving in order to make things happen. Commissioner Battle added that this is in the second 5-year period of the AIP therefore, will not come about until after the year 2013. This was a request by the City of Mount Holly because of other important priorities in the near future.</li> </ul> <p>Commissioner Beck would like to see the commission sign as a 4A due to lack of information given. Section 17 and Appendix N (Water Quality) are both incomplete.</p>	

<b>Topic</b>	<b>Discussion Summary</b>	<b>Action</b>
<b>FERC Report (Continued)</b>	<p>Mark with Duke Energy of the Carolinas added that there would be a lot of opportunities to revisit shoreline management, recreation needs, etc. on a regular basis. Duke has put a lot of things in place to help react to future needs. They also have tried to look into the future to a 50-year water supply projection. Duke is very proud of what has been done so far and appreciates the commission's input.</p> <p>Executive Director, Mike McLaurin wanted to note to the commission that the AIP is not the final document and it is a non-binding document. If the commission signs the AIP, there will be a couple of months in which they will be able to review the information before the final document is signed. By August 31, 2006, Duke will send the application to Washington, D.C.</p> <p>Commissioner Beck and Commissioner Danzi are still unsure of signing at a 3 since all of the information has not been given. Section 17 needs to be complete and given to the commission for review.</p> <p>Mike McLaurin suggests that Commissioners Shelton, Beck, Battle, as well as Legal Counsel Clark and Executive Director, Mike McLaurin compile a 500-word statement outlining the issues of concern with the AIP. Deadline to submit statement to Duke is April 24, 2006.</p> <p>Mark with Duke Energy of the Carolinas defined Section 17 and it's role in the AIP as a checklist of items that need to be written into the final agreement.</p> <p>Commissioner DuVall asked if all of the Stakeholders that are currently involved with this process come back to review this agreement in the future or is a committee going to be formed? Commissioner Battle replied that there would be a committee that will be formed as of September 1, 2006. There are six (6) Stakeholder Groups, totally about 160 stakeholders. Each group will choose representatives who will the annual meetings. They will meet every year for five (5) years. The Stakeholders should be able to stay informed of what is transpiring at these meetings by visiting the Duke Energy website.</p>	<p>A motion was made by Commissioner Shelton that the MILMC sign the Agreement in Principle (AIP) at a rate of 3. Seconded by Commissioner Battle.</p> <p>Commissioner Shelton amended his previous motion to include signing the Agreement in Principle (AIP) at a rate of 3 with stipulation that a 500 word or less statement to Duke Power be compiled by Commissioners Beck, Battle, Shelton, Executive Director Mike McLaurin, and Legal Counsel, Chris Clark outlining the issues of concern with the AIP.</p> <p>The motion was approved by Commissioners</p>

Topic	Discussion Summary	Action
<b>FERC Report (Continued)</b>		Campbell, DuVall, Battle, Danzi, Shelton, and Watson. Commissioner Beck opposed the motion.
<b>Discussion of a 150' No Wake Zone</b>	<p><b>Discussion of a 150' No Wake Zone</b> Secretary/Treasurer Battle and Executive Director Mike McLaurin reported</p> <p>Mike began the discussion by recapping information that was generated at the March 17<sup>th</sup> No Wake Zone Committee meeting on how to address the issues of the proposed 150' No Wake Zone. Four items addressed are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Public Response</li> <li>2. Description of the proposal</li> <li>3. Facts</li> <li>4. Identify process to follow from here</li> </ol> <p>Commissioner Battle outlined the process of preparing the proposed 150' No Wake Zone proposal. After speaking in length and also receiving a letter from Joan Troy of North Carolina Wildlife concerning the same issue of having a 150' No Wake Zone, Alice began composing this proposal. Three weeks before the February MILMC business meeting, Commissioner Battle submitted the proposal to Executive Director Mike McLaurin for comments. He suggested that the proposal needed a map of the whole lake for reference. This map will be printed and inserted into each of the commissioner's packet along with the proposal. By this point, Commissioner Battle had put in a great deal of time and money into printing maps, research, and writing the proposal. The suggestions that were generated from the No Wake Zone Committee meeting are also very labor intensive and Commissioner Battle feels that some do not relate to the issue. Issues that relate to the problem at hand are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. No Wake Zone Committee suggested using the Recreation Studies done by Duke Power. These studies are boat density studies. Some of the most dangerous accidents occur when the lake is NOT crowded. Usually in open water!</li> <li>2. Docks and piers contribute to the problem along the shoreline of the lake. It's called development of the shoreline. The docks and piers narrow the open water.</li> <li>3. Increase of people who are not trained to handle boats. They also do not know the features of the lake, such as shallow water.</li> </ol>	

Topic	Discussion Summary	Action
<p><b>Discussion of a 150' No Wake Zone (Continued)</b></p>	<p>Commissioner Battle concluded by saying she is willing to count all of the docks in Nance Cove but has no more time to work on this proposal.</p> <p>Commissioner Shelton believes that Nance Cove is a separate issue and feels that it is burdensome to propose the entire length of Nance Cove be a No Wake Zone. Another concern is channeling everyone to the center of the lake is a safety issue in itself.</p> <p>Commissioner Shelton concluded by stating that a more tailored approach for Nance Cove would be addressing with warnings and then leave the remainder of the lake as is.</p> <p>Executive Director, Mike McLaurin reviewed the April 2005 MILMC business meeting minutes highlighting the motion to “table” the request for a No Wake Zone in Nance Cove. Legal Counsel, Chris Clark added that the status of the No Wake Zone in Nance is no longer on the table and would have to be reinstated.</p> <p>Commissioner DuVall believes that vast majority of the regulations on any lake that are successful are because of “self-enforcement”. The more regulations that are put on this lake without educating people about the existing regulations, the more confusion we cause.</p> <p>Commissioner Beck added two points to the discussion. First, there is already a 100' No Wake Buffer for personal watercraft from docks, piers and access areas. Again, self-enforcement plays a huge role in the success of this buffer. Secondly, Nance Cove is littered with buoys that homeowners set out near their docks. Duke does have authority to remove these buoys at any time if they are not permit approved. Most homeowners do not know this fact.</p> <p>Since the said motion failed, Chairman Campbell would like a committee be formed to educate homeowners and boaters about current lake regulations. Commissioners Beck volunteered to serve on this committee.</p>	<p>A motion was made by Commissioner Shelton to receive the information given by the No Wake Zone Committee and take no further action with the 150' No Wake Zone proposal. Seconded by Commissioner DuVall.</p> <p>Commissioner Shelton amended his previous motion to state postponing indefinitely the discussion of the 150' No Wake Zone proposal. Seconded by Commissioner DuVall. Motion failed. Commissioners Campbell, DuVall, and Shelton approved motion. Commissioners Danzi, Battle, and Beck opposed motion.</p>

Topic	Discussion Summary	Action
<p><b>Base Operating Plan (BOP)</b></p>	<p><b>Base Operating Plan Update</b>  Commissioner Danzi reviewed BOP with the assistance of various commissioners</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Project 1 – Blue Fin Award (Beck) – have not received any nominations for the Blue Fin Award.</li> <li>▪ Project 5 – Builder/Developer Workshop (Campbell) – Scheduled for September 2006.</li> <li>▪ Project 6 – Law Enforcement Workshop (Danzi) – Talked with Officer Howard of the CMPD and Mecklenburg County holds their own workshop in late May or early June. Gaston and Lincoln Counties are invited to this workshop. MILMC will become involved in this in lieu of holding separate workshop.</li> <li>▪ Project 7 – Bi Annual Boating Classes (Danzi) – Scheduled for June 22<sup>nd</sup> at Mt Island Harbor. This will be advertised with local homeowners associations when the date is closer.</li> <li>▪ Project 9 – Post Boating Safety Rules – a tabled item. Motion was approved to return this item as an active project. Commission Battle volunteered to be in charge of project.</li> <li>▪ Project 16 – Neck Road Access Road Transfer (McLaurin) – Needs to be marked completed on Attachment C.</li> <li>▪ Project 19 – Inter Basin Transfer (Campbell) – See Chairman’s report</li> <li>▪ Project 24 – Memorandum of Understanding (Campbell) – Complete for 2 years. Motion was approved to move this project to Exhibit D.</li> <li>▪ Project 28 – Clean Lake Management (Battle) – A neighborhood meeting was held on March 27 with Mecklenburg County Parks and Recreation’s Director of Open Space, Michael Kirschman. Mr. Kirschman stated that they have resurveyed the 115’ acre Haymarket Street property. He gave the neighborhood three (3) options to vote on as to what to do with the property: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Completely No Trespassing – no one is allowed on the property at any time.</li> <li>2. Would allow hiking and picnicking but no drinking or swimming.</li> <li>3. Install a 5-car gravel parking lot and use the existing trails for nature walks.</li> </ol> The neighborhood voted and decided to make the property No Trespassing. Signs are to be installed and hopefully will be vandal proof.</li> </ul>	<p>A motion was made by Commissioner DuVall to return Project #9 – Post Boating Safety Rules as an active project on Attachment C. Seconded by Commissioner Shelton. Motion was approved.</p> <p>A motion was made by Commissioner Shelton to move Project 24 (MOU) to Exhibit D. Seconded by Commissioner DuVall. The motion was approved.</p>

<b>Topic</b>	<b>Discussion Summary</b>	<b>Action</b>
<p><b>Chairman's Report – Update on Inter Basin Transfer</b></p>	<p><b>Update on Inter Basin Transfer</b></p> <p>Chairman Campbell reported that he and Catawba Riverkeeper Donna Lisenby have had some recent discussion regarding Mecklenburg County and their non-responsiveness towards the concerns of the proposed IBT.</p> <p>With the consent of the commission, Chairman Campbell would like to meet with Mecklenburg County Commissioner Jennifer Roberts to discuss these issues.</p>	<p>A motion was made by Commissioner Shelton that the commission authorize Chairman Campbell to contact Mecklenburg County Commissioner Jennifer Roberts on behalf of MILMC to discuss issues regarding the IBT. Seconded by Commissioner Beck. The motion was approved.</p>
<p><b>Executive Director's Report</b></p>	<p><b>Executive Director's Report</b></p> <p><b>Finance and Activity Report</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Mike distributed the Finance Report in budget format and cash flow format</li> </ul> <p><b>FY 2006-2007 Budget</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Each commissioner received the proposed FY 2006-2007 Budget information.</li> <li>▪ A public hearing needs to be scheduled for the next MILMC business meeting (May 3, 2006) to review proposed budget and then put in a Budget Ordinance Format.</li> <li>▪ Approval of the budget needs to be completed by July 1<sup>st</sup>.</li> </ul> <p><b>Request to Transfer Funds to the NC Capital Management Trust</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The NC Capital Management Trust Fund was created by the local governments for the local governments</li> <li>▪ Request that the existing MILMC funds that are presently in a savings account be transferred into a money market account that presently yields 4.75% interest</li> </ul>	<p>A motion was made by Commissioner Shelton for Executive Director, Mike McLaurin to hold a public hearing at the May 3<sup>rd</sup> business meeting on the FY 06-07 Budget Ordinance. Seconded by Commissioner Danzi. The motion was approved.</p> <p>A motion was made by Commissioner Battle to authorize Executive Director Mike McLaurin to</p>

<b>Executive Director's Report (Continued)</b>		transfer existing funds in savings account to the NC Capital Management Trust Fund. Seconded by Commissioner Danzi. The motion was approved.
<b>Commission Counsel Report</b>	No Report	
<b>Commissioner Comments</b>	<p><b>Commissioner Comments</b></p> <p>Commissioner Danzi – would like to request the commission reimburse Commissioner Battle for some of the expenses she has encountered in printing and generating information related to the proposed 150' No Wake Zone. Commissioner Battle to provide receipts of expenditures.</p>	A motion was made by Commissioner Danzi to have MILMC reimburse up to \$200 to Commissioner Battle for the expenses relating to the proposed 150' No Wake Zone. Seconded by Commissioner Beck. The motion was Approved.
<b>Adjournment</b>	The meeting was adjourned at 9:16 p.m.	A motion was made by Commissioner Danzi to adjourn meeting. Seconded by Commissioner Beck. The motion was approved.
<b>Next Business Meeting Date and Location</b>	The next MILMC business meeting will be held on May 3, 2006 at 6:30 pm at Charlotte – Meck Utilities Building, 5100 Brookshire Blvd., Charlotte, NC	

Annette Lawing, Marine Commission Clerk