

CITY OF DELAFIELD PLAN B DREDGING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

CALL TO ORDER

A. Zietlow called the meeting to order at 7:04 p.m.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

ROLL CALL

Present

Al Zietlow, District 6  
Mike Hausman, District 1  
Bob Aulik, District 3  
Mark Millot, District 4  
Beth Leonard, Alderperson District 2

Absent

Raffi Shirikian, District 5  
Tim Aicher, Alderperson District 7

No information has been received regarding a representative from District 7.

1. APPROVE MINUTES OF MARCH 4, 2010 DREDGING PLAN B MEETING.

**M. HAUSMAN MOVED TO APPROVE THE MARCH 4, 2010 DREDGING PLAN B COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES AS PRESENTED. B. LEONARD SECONDED THE MOTION. THERE WAS NO FURTHER DISCUSSION. ALL WERE IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIED.**

2. CITY OF DELAFIELD CITIZEN'S COMMENTS FOR ITEMS ON THE AGENDA.

Mike Roehl, 3329 Lake Drive thanked the committee members for their time and effort as dredging is vital to the community and lake. He gave his full support to move forward on dredging and felt that many residents on Lake Drive felt the same.

3. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

- a. DISCUSSION AND UPDATES ON ASSIGNMENTS PREVIOUSLY RECORDED IN MINUTES.

- i. DRAFT OF CITY SUPPORT OF LAKE RESTORATION AND MAINTENANCE

M. Hausman reported on the draft of city support and lake restoration and maintenance. Alderperson L. Morrison agreed, along with the majority of the Common Council, with the package of statements from this Committee and indicated that they were in favor of them and these statements should be put forth.

CITY OF DELAFIELD PLAN B DREDGING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

ii. CRITERIA USED TO SELECT RIPARIAN PROPERTY OWNERS THAT WERE INCLUDED PROPOSAL TO HAVE SPECIAL ASSESSMENTS FOR DREDGING.

B. Aulik had continued the task of polling individuals regarding whether they felt dredging was necessary and how much they would pay for it. Of the 15 properties visited on West Shore Drive, seven contacts were made. Of these seven people, six indicated dredging was not needed. One did require dredging and would pay \$5,000 to do so. Information gathered from the retention area near the Bark River indicated a majority that thought dredging was not needed in their area with one exception. Concerns were heard from contacts regarding the perception that residents were not able to "opt out" of the plan. The issue was considered emotionally charged and resulted in many "no" votes. Educational efforts were also needed to provide information on the concept of a sediment trap.

In the Woodland Park area, 28 properties were polled. Two voted yes and would be willing to spend \$5,000; eight voted no. Some residents noted the Woodland Park area was trying to "opt out" of the dredging but this never occurred. Residents in this area also thought the issue seemed as though it was being forced and in many cases they did not need dredging. Questions remained regarding the possibility of forming a lake district. In addition, costs did not justify the means. Again, it was reported to be a very emotional issue and most did not feel it was necessary for them with little hope of being able to "opt out" of the project.

A. Zietlow noted data gathering efforts should be ongoing and residents will be provided with more information on the retention area in the future.

iii. DRAFT OF PRO-CON PROPOSAL TO CONSIDER LAKE MANAGEMENT DISTRICT FOR NAGAWICKA LAKE

R. Shirikian was not present this evening, thus, information will be shared on this topic at a future meeting of the Committee.

iv. DREDGING ADVANTAGES FOR ALL CITY RESIDENTS.

M. Millot stated there was nothing new to add on this matter at this time.  
A. Zietlow stated there was a need to communicate this information related to dredging advantages to city residents in the future.

b. DISCUSS AND REVIEW THE FOLLOWING ASSIGNMENTS:

i. DEVELOPMENT OF A LONG RANGE PLAN OF RESTORATION AND MAINTENANCE FOR NAGAWICKA LAKE

CITY OF DELAFIELD PLAN B DREDGING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

M. Hausman distributed information related to the development of a long range plan of restoration and maintenance for Nagawicka Lake. He had met with City Administrator Tim Schuenke on this matter. Philosophically, the City was in support of a long range plan; however, more information would be needed to determine potential funding and budgeting processes. Long term efforts should be geared toward lake restoration and should be limited strictly to dredging. Ultimately, the project outcome would be the result of working with the Department of Natural Resources (DNR) on this matter. Education was believed to be important for all regarding the project. More information would continue to be gathered and shared with the Committee at a later date.

- ii. SHOULD THE CITY AS A PART OF THE SMART GROWTH PLAN CONSIDER DESIGNATION/PURCHASE OF A SITE TO STORE DREDGING SPOIL FOR PRESENT-FUTURE LAKE MAINTENANCE PROJECTS?

M. Millot reported he worked with T. Aicher on this assignment. Additional time was needed for completion to allow meeting with City Staff. This information would be provided at the next Committee meeting.

- iii. WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR DREDGING THE BASIN AT THE MOUTH OF THE BARK RIVER AND LONG TERM VALUE?

M. Hausman distributed information to the Committee related to the rationale for dredging the basin at the mouth of the Bark River and the long term value of doing so. Salient points were noted for the Committee. With regard to the sediment trap, it was noted approximately 75%-80% of the incoming lake sediment was from the Bark River and without control of the land upriver, the dredging process could be considered questionable. The sediment trap was the only dredging solution that addressed the sediment from the Bark River. The DNR had approved all aspects of the sediment trap. Gerald Burg of Foth supported the sediment trap and noted the logic and science behind it was considered sound throughout the project design. This logic and science had been documented in the Chapter 30 permit, and the Southeastern Regional Plan Commission (SEWRPC) had confirmed the source of the sediment as coming from the Bark River. One more confirmation from SEWRPC was also needed related to this matter. He noted the research into this matter had yielded a conclusion thus far that the science and logic of the sediment trap was sound and was the only significant effort of the entire dredging project that could be classified as common good.

In response to a question of delineation of the dredging areas relating to the sediment trap, M. Hausman would examine the issue further. With regard to the concern related to the shallow depth being an issue that would result in filling in of the dredged areas, M. Hausman stated his research had indicated there were many that thought the logic was

CITY OF DELAFIELD PLAN B DREDGING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

sound, and without removal of the “hard pan” in that area from the original estimates, had yielded information that indicated ten years might be appropriate. B. Leonard questioned whether the area on the east side of Delafield in part of the lake’s watershed that provided runoff into the lake at the south end of Zastrow’s Bay shown in a 2004 Stormwater Management plan had been considered for a basin. A. Zietlow stated this issue had been brought to the attention of the DNR Staff in the past, but details were not available as to the outcome. B. Leonard also questioned whether information had been gleaned from a 2004 Hayes Associates report. M. Hausman had not seen this report as of this date.

iv. WHERE ARE THE SPECIFIC AREAS IN THE LAKE THAT WILL REQUIRE PLANT RESTORATION? WHAT REGULATIONS WOULD BE IN EFFECT?

B. Leonard provided a handout to the Committee regarding regulations and plant restoration for the lake. Information provided demonstrated research yielded the current restoration plan included a call for establishing “founder (plant) colonies” in protected sites related to the dredging areas. Various limitations of lake use were noted. The goal of the restoration was to help prevent colonization of Eurasian milfoil (EWM), improve fishery habitats, and to help stabilize sediment by limiting its slide into newly dredged areas. EWM monitoring and eradication programs would be required. The DNR would permit use of herbicides in sensitive areas only where vegetation was comprised of 50% or greater EWM. Various factors related to the timing of this restoration as well as impacts to the success of the restoration efforts were also noted. Areas of Zastrow’s Bay shown as part of the supporting documentation for this information were known to receive a great deal of wave and wind action as well as significant shoreline erosion.

A. Zietlow explained the typical treatment for EWM as well as the grant opportunities from the DNR as part of a rapid response to weed growth. More information should be gathered on this matter. Discussion ensued regarding the impacts from EWM rapid growth and restoration work. Chemical treatments were typically considered part of aquatic plant management for lakes. The aquatic management plan for the lake would need renewal in 2012.

v. REVIEW AND DISCUSS PROPOSED GRANT APPLICATION TO THE WATERWAYS COMMISSION TO FUND OUR PROJECT AFTER MEETING WITH CITY ADMINISTRATOR

A. Zietlow reported the Waterways Commission grant had been submitted for funding of the dredging project. This action had Committee and Common Council support. The grant application was currently being reviewed. Additional information would be available on this matter at a later date.

CITY OF DELAFIELD PLAN B DREDGING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

vi. REVIEW AND DISCUSSION OF QUESTIONS USED WITH DNR OFFICIALS DURING MARCH 9 MEETING

A. Zietlow distributed and reviewed a summary of the questions asked in the meeting with DNR officials on March 9, 2010. He explained he met with Geri Rademacher and Andrew Hudak regarding the Chapter 30 dredging permit application approved for use in the City's original proposed dredging project. He provided background on the meeting tools used as discussion points, including the article submitted for publication in the upcoming City newsletter, The Communicator. It was noted there was a difference between a two year and three year permit related to the statute number or administrative code that permits cannot be longer than a five year block for DNR purposes, and then the process must be restarted. It was not known why the City initially requested a two year permit.

M. Millot questioned what was meant by the formal proposal referenced in the questions. A. Zietlow explained it was his understanding that different methodologies were being discussed. Because of the dollar amounts associated with various portions of the project, if smaller areas could be done at a time, there may be smaller dredging firms interested and moving some dredged materials might be easier. With regard to different disposal methods and sites, A. Zietlow noted arsenic was found in all areas tested. K. Attwell stated all areas of the lake had some level of arsenic. Only the levels found in the northwest channels were over the allowable limit and required special disposal areas and handling.

With regard to Item F, examples such as narrow channel areas were noted. Comments from DNR Staff included the concept that perhaps the City could average the five foot depth by working more on the bog side than on the riparian side of the channel.

With regard to Item G, K. Attwell stated that contractor input was influential in determining items such as the ten foot rule to stay away from piers and other objects.

A. Zietlow explained clarifications had been received and he would provide these to the City Administrator for assistance in writing a letter for appropriate extensions. The City might also want to consider a phasing model as a result of this discussion with DNR Staff. Attempts were being made to meet with DNR Staff in early April. Anyone wishing to provide input for this meeting should contact A. Zietlow as soon as possible.

M. Millot clarified that the permit, data, and studies completed for the Chapter 30 permit and any part of the project done in phases would be acceptable as long as they were completed by 2013.

## CITY OF DELAFIELD PLAN B DREDGING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

A. Zietlow stated the area of the Northwest Channel that included the highest level of arsenic might be able to be segmented out from the project as this part was not located within the City's jurisdiction. He suggested research be undertaken to determine where the test areas were and to gather specific information related to median locations and high/low tides. He had also found that in 1992 and 1998 there were many sediment tests conducted that were on file. The majority of the lake did not change from what was shown in 1998 and this might be in the City's favor in working with the permit activities.

With regard to the extension of the permit, A. Zietlow explained that if a revision was acceptable and stayed within parameters; the two year extension could come forth. He would like to get it in writing as soon as possible and will meet with the City Administrator regarding writing a letter in order to get a formal response that would include a caveat about the extra year. This information would help with the timing of the project process.

### 4. NEW BUSINESS

- a. DISCUSS THE PROCESS OF DEVELOPMENT OF A FACTOID CHART THAT WOULD SUMMARIZE ALL DATA REVIEWED BY THE COMMITTEE IN SIMPLE BULLET POINTS, SUPPORTED BY THE DETAILS OF THE COMMITTEE'S RESEARCH IN WRITTEN FORMAT.

A. Zietlow introduced the concept of a Factoid Chart to the Committee. The purpose of the chart would be to summarize all data reviewed by the Committee in a simple straightforward manner that would be easy for residents to understand and would also convey main topics of information gathered. This information could be used to provide communication to all residents regarding why the need to maintain the lake was so important for all. Examples had been provided on the sheet distributed to the Committee. Committee members should continue to review the information to determine if there was a pattern of information that should be communicated to residents in the future that would provide additional educational information not yet utilized.

- b. DISCUSSION OF NEW COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS

A. Zietlow explained the entire Committee had been given a long term assignment regarding funding sources available for the restoration of the lake. This list would need prioritization in an upcoming meeting and rationales developed that could be used to support a recommendation to the Common Council on the dredging.

Suggestions for future meetings included having a chemist attend a Committee meeting to provide information on test results and inviting dredging contractors to learn of their process and rationale for project outcomes.

CITY OF DELAFIELD PLAN B DREDGING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

5. CORRESPONDENCE

It was noted Caroline O'Brien resigned from the Committee. On behalf of the Committee, A. Zietlow thanked her for her participation on the Committee and wished her all the best in the future.

6. COMMITTEE SUGGESTION ITEMS FOR NEXT MEETING.

Potential items suggested by the Committee for discussion at upcoming meetings included:

- Discussion on a Lake Management District
- Updates on agenda items outstanding
- Questions or subjects for future DNR discussion
- Potential schedule for DNR Staff person to speak to the Committee

7. NEXT MEETING DATE WEDNESDAY, APRIL 21, 2010.

The next meeting of the Plan B Dredging Committee was slated for April 21, 2010. Committee members should review personal schedules to determine if additional meetings in April and May were feasible.

M. Roehl questioned whether a sediment project that would cost less than a million dollars had been considered by the Committee. A. Zietlow explained if phasing of the project were allowed, it might be possible. He also noted the possibility existed if a change in the disposal method, scope of work, etc., might make it more affordable. He thought if there was a good rationale for a smaller sediment project, he thought the Council would listen.

8. ADJOURNMENT

**B. LEONARD MOVED TO ADJOURN THE MARCH 24, 2010, PLAN B DREDGING COMMITTEE AT 8:41 P.M. M. HAUSMAN SECONDED THE MOTION. ALL WERE IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIED.**

Minutes prepared by:

Accurate Business Communications, Inc.