

CITY OF DELAFIELD PLAN B DREDGING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

CALL MEETING TO ORDER

Al Zietlow called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

ROLL CALL

Present

Absent

- Al Zietlow, District 6
- Mike Hausman, District 1
- Caroline O'Brien, District 2
- Bob Aulik, District 3
- Mark Millot, District 4
- Raffi Shirikian, District 5
- Beth Leonard, Alderperson District 2
- Tim Aicher, Alderperson District 7

A. Zietlow explained there was not yet a replacement for Don Blomstrom to represent the District 7 area of the City. A new representative should be available after consideration by the Common Council.

1. APPROVE MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 17, 2010 DREDGING PLAN B COMMITTEE MEETING

M. HAUSMAN MOVED TO APPROVE THE FEBRUARY 17, 2010 DREDGING PLAN B COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES AS AMENDED ON PAGE 5, PARAGRAPH 2, SENTENCE 2, CHANGE "1975" TO "1970". T. AICHER SECONDED THE MOTION. A. ZIETLOW QUESTIONED R. SHIRIKIAN WHETHER HE HAD COMPLETED RESEARCH ON A FUNDING MECHANISM IN EXISTENCE WITHIN THE CITY CODE CHAPTER 26. R. SHIRIKIAN STATED HE WAS STILL RESEARCHING THE MATTER. THERE WAS NO FURTHER DISCUSSION. ALL WERE IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIED.

2. CITIZEN'S COMMENTS PERTAINING TO ITEMS ON THE AGENDA

Erv Sadowski, President of the Common Council, thanked all for participation and diligence on this Committee. He briefly reviewed the history of dredging activity in the City, as well as present and future City financial obligations. The amount of money spent on dredging since 2002 was approximately \$500,000. At that time, dredging was pursued through a Chapter 30 dredging permit for people that wanted and needed dredging. The Army Corp of Engineers had been contacted and various permits applied for to provide relief to people that needed it and were willing to pay for it. That was the original intent of the dredging project. In 2008, City Staff was directed to cut the budget for 2009 by 3%. Most departments had reached or exceeded that amount, thus, allowing the City continue to provide valuable City services without a reduction in Staff or services. He commended the City Administrator and Staff for completing this task.

CITY OF DELAFIELD PLAN B DREDGING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

Due to the construction of the new buildings, residents would experience an increase in the mil rate associated with city taxation that would last for five to six years. He briefly summarized portions of the budget for the group and explained that the City did not have capital reserves and borrowed for its needs. With regard to the future, he addressed the group as a resident rather than Council member. He stated it was his opinion that the Chapter 30 permit should be extended to the extent possible as it would be beneficial to the City and the dredging needed to be done. In addition, his priority if he were on this Committee would be to provide the dredging to people that needed it. He did not anticipate another referendum on this topic, and he encouraged the Committee to be creative in solving the dredging issue and to work toward getting the dredging to the people that need it.

3. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

a. DISCUSSION OF THE FOLLOWING COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS:

i. REFERENDUM RESULTS SURVEY

A. Zietlow compiled the referendum survey results discussed at the last meeting and shared the trends reflected in the survey answers. People in support of the referendum thought the dredging would improve lake ecology, thought lake maintenance was needed, saw a necessity for holding property values, believed in responsibility for city shared maintenance of the lake, supported a shared cost model, and thought there was a need that future lake use required more than six inches of water at the shoreline. People against the referendum thought there was a significant cost factor, dredging was not needed as water and accessibility were fine, large assessments were not able to be afforded by residents, these were tough economic times, there was not enough benefit to offset the cost, not enough education or detailed information had been provided, lake residents should have to pay for the dredging and some people felt forced into the dredging plan.

ii. CITY SUPPORT OF LAKE RESTORATION AND MAINTENANCE

M. Hausman distributed a handout regarding this matter. He met with various members of the Council and City Staff related to the City's support for lake restoration and maintenance. General questions were asked of these individuals. Feedback indicated support from the City was there for the work of this Committee provided recommendations regarding the dredging were reasonable, equitable and comprehensive. Sensitivity to the tax burden of city residents was also desired. It was the work of the Dredging Committee to provide options to move the project forward at this point. A financial analysis of the impact of lake properties on the City tax base should also be provided to residents for educational purposes.

CITY OF DELAFIELD PLAN B DREDGING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

M. Hausman had drafted a one page document of Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ's) regarding the Chapter 30 dredging permit. In review of this material, he noted several discrepancies regarding information provided by the DNR. K. Attwell explained errors were noted and addressed via email to DNR Staff providing the information. A. Zietlow stated he would include these items in a list for discussion and clarification at a later date with DNR Staff.

A. Zietlow reported the information reviewed thus far in the summary of materials presented to Committee members indicated that for the 441 riparian owners on Nagawicka Lake, the assessed value was \$350,000,000 and represented 35.5% of all residential assessments in the City.

R. Shirikian stated he would continue to review information related to this topic and report any pertinent information at a later meeting of the Committee.

iii. **FINAL DRAFT REPORT ON POLLUTION SOURCES**

M. Millot reported no new information had been presented in the report on pollution sources, but the references noted on the last page were of importance for monitoring efforts. M. Hausman questioned the status of the monitoring sites on the lake and whether new data was being tabulated as time went on. K. Attwell explained the monitoring sites on the lake were operational and were part of an ongoing process. Data was live on the City website. A grant for the monitoring had been received at one time and monies were in the City budget for this cost sharing grant. In addition, there was a citizen's group that was responsible for lake monitoring and data collection. A. Zietlow was a member of this monitoring group. He thought this monitoring was a valuable tool and the information collected could be useful to this group for future planning purposes.

iv. **CRITERIA USED TO SELECT RIPARIAN PROPERTY OWNERS THAT WERE PROPOSED TO RECEIVE SPECIAL ASSESSMENTS**

B. Aulik and D. Blomstrom were working on this matter together. Once a replacement had been found for D. Blomstrom, more work would continue on the research of the criteria used to select riparian property owners that were proposed to receive special assessments.

CITY OF DELAFIELD PLAN B DREDGING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

M. Millot clarified the cost burden for various property owners. A. Zietlow noted the cost per foot in one area was different from costs per foot in other areas. More information would need to be analyzed to determine the equity of the cost burden going forward. A. Zietlow explained the cost models for 1970 and 1998 were on a per foot basis. There were some flat fees involved also that were divided equally in the "common areas" at that time. C. O'Brien explained that in the area of Zastrow's Bay that was dredged in the past, the dredging costs were equally divided by parties involved.

v. **WHAT IS A LAKE MANAGEMENT DISTRICT AND WOULD IT BE APPLICABLE FOR NAGAWICKA LAKE**

C. O'Brien and R. Shirikian worked on this matter. R. Shirikian noted this included two parts- what is a lake management district and would it be applicable for Nagawicka Lake. He provided a summary outline for a lake district's powers and activities. There was a difference between a lake district and a lake association. Responsibilities were different legally as were the operational duties for the two entities. A lake district was a taxing entity. A lake association did not have taxing authority to residents. Various benefits and risks of each needed to be considered prior to formation. With regard to the question of whether it was applicable for Nagawicka Lake, R. Shirikian explained there was additional information needed regarding the support needed for formation. He noted 85% of the lakeshore was owned by the City of Delafield. The rest was owned by other municipalities. Consideration would need to be given to working with the Village of Nashotah on formation of a district or association if desired. Pewaukee Lake was noted as a nearby lake with current operation of a lake district comprised of representatives from varying municipalities that governed its shoreline.

A. Zietlow stated he would invite Jeff Thornton of the Southeastern Regional Plan Commission (SEWRPC) to attend a future meeting of this Committee regarding formation of a lake district or association.

vi. **DEVELOPING A LONG RANGE LAKE MAINTENANCE PLAN**

This item was not discussed at this time.

vii. **DREDGING ADVANTAGES**

A. Zietlow noted he and Mark Millot worked on this item. A report would be submitted to all once finalized.

CITY OF DELAFIELD PLAN B DREDGING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

M. Millot noted advantages to all residents citywide would include overall improvement to the ecology, improved fish habitat due to greater water depths, well overspill into other waterways would be reduced, increased boat navigation, property values stabilized, and non lake properties would appreciate accordingly. The city wide boat launch was available to all to allow access and usage for all city residents. This was unique and beneficial to all residents. Thus, the maintenance of a body of water that would benefit all would be benefited by all in this case. He noted the financial impact to maintaining the lake with the dredging. The 441 property owners impacted by the dredging would equate to 35% of total property values for residential valuations that supported the city tax base. To decrease the amount of property values for these individuals would result in a substantial increase in the tax burden throughout the entire City. More education of residents was required related to this issue. Devaluing of properties would occur if the dredging would not take place.

Advantages to 441 riparian owners would include the above listed as well as water depths at frontages would increase, improve and in some cases would create navigability. Boat maneuverability would improve in certain areas. Accessibility to the lake and piers would improve. Property values would increase which had the effect of lowering the tax base for all. Riparian owners would be able to enhance and maintain shoreline erosion. Runoff and sediment loading would improve. Weed cutting would be enhanced as shallow areas were removed.

M. Millot noted the issues of riparian and non-riparian viewpoints. Legally, he understood there was a rationale related to various parts of dredging process, the City of Delafield was one community in this matter and enough benefits would result from the dredging that some percentage of assessment could be made citywide. Everyone would benefit in some way and could be assessed. A. Zietlow stated Council had set a precedent in this matter previously when noting that a certain amount of the project should be born by all.

T. Aicher noted that the property taxes were not likely to go down in the future. Exact numbers should be utilized in education for all residents of the project impacts. This would allow people to compare how much the individual property taxes would go up as a result of the dredging or as a result of lack of dredging. This information needed to be simply shared with all to develop understanding of the entire financial impacts to all city residents.

CITY OF DELAFIELD PLAN B DREDGING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

viii. YAGGY COLBY APRIL 2009 COST ALLOCATION MODELS

A. Zietlow referenced Item 15a in the Committee's summary materials for this agenda item as it was the most updated version of this information. Through Lake Welfare Committee efforts with Yaggy Colby, funding differentiations were realized. The number of property involved impacted the project. Also, the distribution of all city properties from the assessor's records also impacted the outcome of the project as it related to the amount of equalized value the City had. There were several alternative allocations presented by the Lake Welfare Committee in the past. Over 75% of the City tax base is paid by City residents. Thus, the residential property owners carried the weight of the tax base for the City. A. Zietlow briefly reviewed each of these alternate allocations. Numbers presented as fact within the community required review as there were many different ways to examine the project. Work on this assignment would be ongoing.

ix. LAKE WELFARE COMMITTEE GRANT EFFORTS

A. Zietlow noted information had been received from City Staff regarding the timeline for application of the Waterways Commission Grant available to the City. The Committee indicated consensus for recommending the application for the Waterways Commission Grant be submitted. A. Zietlow will communicate this support to City Staff. M. Millott noted there were currently no grants being sought out or applied for as a result of the proposed dredging project. K. Attwell confirmed this although several smaller grant opportunities existed that application could be made for once the process was further along. At this point in time, his opinion was that the money had been spent to apply for the Waterways Grant and there was no reason not to send it.

4. NEW BUSINESS

a. DISCUSSION AND ACTION ON COMMUNICATOR NEWSLETTER ARTICLES

A. Zietlow shared a draft newsletter article for review by the Committee. The topic of the newsletter was to provide information to residents on the purpose of the Plan B Dredging Committee regarding restoration and maintenance of the lake with community support as well as the process being utilized to do so.

B. LEONARD MOVED TO APPROVE THE ARTICLE AUTHORED BY A. ZIETLOW AS PRESENTED FOR INCLUSION WITHIN THE CITY NEWSLETTER. M. MILLOT SECONDED THE MOTION. THERE WAS NO FURTHER DISCUSSION. ALL WERE IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIED.

CITY OF DELAFIELD PLAN B DREDGING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

b. DISCUSSION ON DNR MEETING QUESTIONS

A. Zietlow will meet with DNR Staff on Tuesday, March 09, 2010 to discuss the dredging permit. Various questions would be asked regarding the Chapter 30 permit including possible extensions for the permit, alternates to the scope of the project, potential phasing, and validity and use of data currently procured for the Chapter 30 permit and individual dredging permit use. M. Hausman suggested attempting to partner with the DNR to further DNR efforts or initiatives through the dredging project. M. Millot thought it important to understand the agenda of all parties present at that meeting. B. Leonard suggested the methodology of spoils disposal also be discussed as well as previously dredged areas of the lake. T. Aicher thought it was important to request a synopsis or example that could be followed for future planning. Open ended questions should be utilized rather than specifics to move the project forward.

c. DISCUSSION ON NEW COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS

The following study groups were formed and study topics noted.

Mark Millot and Tim Aicher	Should the City Council as part of the Smart Growth plan designate/purchase a site to place the dredging spoils for present and future lake restoration and maintenance needs? Where in that plan can this fit?
----------------------------	---

Bob Aulik and Mike Hausman	What is the rationale for dredging the basin at the mouth of the Bark River? How long is it going to last? What is the potential it is going to have? Is it going to have any payback for the whole City?
----------------------------	---

Beth Leonard and Caroline O'Brien	Where are the specific plant restoration areas located? What does the plant restoration entail? When natural plants colonize what controls can be put on the species, such as Eurasian milfoil? What does the "No weed cutting" statement in the grant really mean?
-----------------------------------	---

d. COMMITTEE REQUESTS OF FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

A. Zietlow will include items discussed this evening for future agendas. Any additional items should be directed to him via email in the near future.

M. Hausman requested Item 3avi be placed on the next meeting agenda as it was overlooked on the agenda for this evening.

CITY OF DELAFIELD PLAN B DREDGING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

5. CORRESPONDENCE

A. Zietlow noted correspondence received was regarding the DNR meeting on Tuesday, March 09, 2010.

6. NEXT MEETING DATE MARCH 24, 2010--7:00 P.M.

The next meeting of the Dredging Plan B Committee was tentatively scheduled to take place on March 24, 2010 at 7:00 p.m. There would not be a meeting on April 1, 2010 as a result.

7. ADJOURN

R. SHIRIKIAN MOVED TO ADJOURN THE MARCH 4, 2010, DREDGING PLAN B COMMITTEE MEETING AT 9:40 P.M. T. AICHER SECONDED THE MOTION. ALL WERE IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIED.

Minutes prepared by:

Accurate Business Communications, Inc.