

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
- Bob Aulik, District 3
- Mark Millot, District 4
- Raffi Shirikian, District 5
- Beth Leonard, Alderperson District 2
- Tim Aicher, Alderperson District 7

1. APPROVE MINUTES OF MARCH 24, 2010 DREDGING PLAN B COMMITTEE MEETING

B. LEONARD MOVED TO APPROVE THE MARCH 24, 2010 DREDGING PLAN B COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES AS PRESENTED. M. HAUSMAN SECONDED THE MOTION. A. ZIETLOW STATED HE WOULD LIKE TO HAVE THE COMMITTEE HEAR A VOICE MAIL REPLY FROM DNR STAFF JIM RICHEY AT THIS TIME. HE WENT ON TO EXPLAIN THAT IT WAS HIS IMPRESSION THAT K. ATTWELL HAD INFORMED THE PLAN B DREDGING COMMITTEE THAT DNR WOULD HAVE LITTLE ROLE IN THE WATERWAYS COMMISSION GRANT; HOWEVER, IT WAS APPARENT FROM THE VOICEMAIL THAT THE DNR WOULD CLEARLY BE INVOLVED. HE THEN PLAYED THE VOICEMAIL FOR THE LISTENING AUDIENCE. CERTAIN CHANNELS WOULD BE REMOVED AND OTHERS WOULD NEED FURTHER DISCUSSION. THERE WAS A NEED TO PROVIDE INFORMATION ON PUBLIC BOATING RECREATION BENEFITS. J. RICHEY WOULD PROVIDE A FOLLOW-UP LETTER ON THIS MESSAGE LATER IN THE WEEK. DISCUSSION ENSUED REGARDING THE INFORMATION PRESENTED IN THE VOICEMAIL AND MORE CLARIFICATION WAS NEEDED BY THE COMMITTEE REGARDING PUBLIC BOATING RECREATION BENEFITS. FIVE WERE IN FAVOR. T. AICHER ABSTAINED. MOTION CARRIED.

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

There was no one present wishing to speak at this time.

CITY OF DELAFIELD PLAN B DREDGING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

3. PRESENTATION BY GUEST SPEAKER, DR JEFF THORNTON, SEWRPC. "LAKE MANAGEMENT DISTRICTS", COULD THIS BE A PLAN FOR NAGAWICKA LAKE MAINTENANCE?"

A. Zietlow explained this item would be placed on the next Committee meeting agenda as Dr. Jeff Thornton of the Southeastern Regional Plan Commission (SEWRPC) was not able to be present this evening.

4. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

- A. DISCUSSION OF ASSIGNMENTS UPDATES

Committee members provided updates related to Committee assignments from the last meeting.

M. Hausman distributed a synopsis of information learned since the last meeting related to the rationale of dredging the basin at the mouth of the Bark River as recommended by consultants and DNR staff. He explained that upon further review of the information related to the portion of the dredging, there were five additional salient points. These items were related to areas of the Bark River inlet, Appendix L in the Chapter 30 "re-application" including detailed substantiation of the science supporting the sediment trap design, the total cubic yardage associated with various areas of the dredging, the sediment trap percentage related to total project, and the storage life of the sediment trap. In addition, he had learned of new information related to the sediment trap design that included an updated set of specifications allowing a depth of 6.5 feet sited in the December 2008 DNR approval letter. M. Hausman stated he would provide a factoid sheet on his findings for future use.

R. Shirikian provided updated information related to an assignment regarding pros and cons of a lake district. Pro factors were that a Lake District would be self-sufficient, would bypass municipal approval process, create its own governing body, take ownership of lake related projects, and could acquire property. Con factors were that a Lake District would add taxing authority in addition to a local governmental body, would take on new duties currently provided by local municipality, such as weed harvesting, patrol, etc., would have limited general tax revenue, and also could be sued or be sued. He explained he had also utilized learned information to provide an alternate funding idea.

A. Zietlow then noted there were five areas that had been realized for funding possibilities for the dredging project to date. These five areas were riparian owners only, riparian owners and the City, the whole City, grants, and a Lake Management District.

R. Shirikian then distributed information for an alternative payment plan for dredging of Nagawicka Lake. He noted the plan to be straightforward and simple in methodology. The formula was based on the number of parcels to be dredged in each of the specified areas, and was also based on assessment. He then reviewed the possible plan for all, noting this plan would provide funding for the

CITY OF DELAFIELD PLAN B DREDGING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

dredging over 10 years time and would also provide use of long term goals for the project. M. Hausman explained this was simply one alternative for funding the project and could be modified or discarded as desired.

A. Zietlow noted there were residents heard that did not want to be part of the dredging project that would have been included in this formula. He questioned the impacts to the formula if approximately half the residents were removed.

In response to a question, B. Aulik noted the people in various areas of the lake did not think they needed dredging in front of their house as some of them has recently completed dredging as a private project and others did not believe the water depth in front of their property to be an issue.

Discussion ensued regarding the impacts realized from the dredged and non-dredged areas of the lake. More information would be gathered for the next Committee meeting regarding the reasons why residents did not believe dredging was needed in certain areas and why the DNR would support dredging in those same areas. With certain parcels removed, the amount of dredged spoils yardage would be impacted in the alternative funding plan and would result in different costs to residents than those presented this evening.

T. Aicher complimented R. Shirikian for providing a model with exact numbers that could be discussed. B. Leonard agreed, noting that education would be necessary in many avenues related to the dredging for the Common Council and area residents. Consideration would need to be given to how this project compared and contrasted with other projects funded by the City for the common good for all.

R. Shirikian shared information related to formation of a Lake District and its roles and responsibilities as a taxing authority. Pro and con factors were noted with regard to formation of a Lake District in this matter. He also noted the petition and process of formation for a lake district. J. Thornton would speak to this issue at the next Committee meeting.

D. Tills, member of the Lake Welfare Committee, explained that it was true that most survey work related to formation of the Lake District was done when the process for dredging was far along; however, in ten years time dredging was the primary issue of concern raised by residents at the Annual Lake Awareness Meeting held by the Lake Welfare Committee. The originally proposed dredging project came together as a result of hearing this concern from area residents that were trying to work together privately with the DNR without success. The DNR provided criteria in the middle of the process that said that if a resident had three feet of water at the end of their pier than they would not be dredged. There were very few people in that project that had over three feet of water at the end of the pier. In the original dredging proposal, the northwest channels, west channels and the northeast shoreline, the "kettle" area and St. John's Bay were proposed as part of the dredging project. The DNR removed certain areas as part of the approval for the proposed project. Some formal survey work of residents was completed in the past. Over 50% said they wanted to move forward with the

CITY OF DELAFIELD PLAN B DREDGING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

project at that time; however, once the costs became apparent and criteria established by the DNR the interest levels in the project dropped off.

B. Leonard questioned whether the sediment seen flowing into the lake as a result of flooding impacted the decision to dredge at that time. D. Tills stated he did not get the impression that one event affected people's decision to move forward. It might have at that time, but it would be difficult to determine how many changed their mind as a result of one event, such as flooding or sediment.

T. Aicher and B. Aulik offered to attempt to determine how many people in the northwest channels would be willing to be part of a dredging project moving forward in order to begin to assemble estimates correctly.

Discussion ensued regarding how dredging would impact the overall value to property. M. Hausman stated he thought it important to get more information on the various areas of the lake. Further discussion ensued regarding the impact any grant money received would have on the project cost model presented. A. Zietlow thanked all for this discussion, noting more information would be discussed on these issues at the next meeting.

B. DISCUSSION AND REVIEW OF THE FOLLOWING ITEMS:

I. LAKE MAINTENANCE ROLE IN THE CITY'S SMART GROWTH PLAN

M. Hausman and T. Aicher had reviewed the issue of a lake maintenance role in the City's Smart Growth Plan. M. Hausman explained there was nothing amended or needing to be added to the Smart Growth Plan regarding the welfare of the lake and surrounding property. Information had been clearly stated and scientific information provided through extensive studies on spoils and logical dredging sites for the spoils for dewatering purposes. Several sites had been investigated throughout the City for dredging spoils and the Oakwood Park site determined to be the best one. T. Aicher noted this matter would not be done after one dredging; it was going to require a commitment to long term maintenance planning as it would need to be done again. While the City owned the Oakwood park site, it now had the potential to conflict with park plans for the future due to the potential timing of the dredging. Additional costs to the project would be realized to truck the material offsite. Discussion ensued regarding why the spoils had to be dewatered in the specific manner outlined in the Chapter 30 permit. Other suggestions for the dredging spoils were heard.

II. DISCUSSION ON PREVIOUS REPORT RATIONALE FOR DREDGING THE MOUTH OF THE BARK RIVER

There was nothing further to report on at this time. This item had been discussed as part of Item 4a.

CITY OF DELAFIELD PLAN B DREDGING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

III. DISCUSSION AND SUGGESTIONS AS TO WHAT THE CONTENT OF THE PROPOSED EDUCATIONAL FACTOID SHEETS SHOULD BE

A. Zietlow reviewed the list of possible educational factoid sheets. Potential ideas for factoid sheets included general lake information, sedimentation sources, chemical status, restoration, a Lake District, grant attempts, and possible benefits. No other ideas were added at this time.

5. NEW BUSINESS

A. DISCUSSION AND SELECTION OF POSSIBLE METHODS OF FUNDING THAT THE COMMITTEE SHOULD DEVELOP AND DISCUSSION OF DETAILED INFORMATION FOR MODELS THAT NEED TO BE PRESENTED TO PUBLIC FOR THEIR INPUT IN FUTURE MEETINGS

A. Zietlow reviewed the list of possible funding sources. B. Leonard questioned whether assessed valuation could be utilized to generate a cost model. She suggested the use of land assessments only so that costs could be better equitably split between all interested property owners. R. Shirikian explained he had attempted to construct a cost model based on assessed value, but rapidly found it to be challenging at this point in Committee discussions. R. Shirikian stated he would work toward further development of such a model.

B. UPDATE AND DISCUSSION ON PRIVATE RIPARIAN OWNERS APPLYING FOR SMALL AREA DREDGING PERMITS

This item had been discussed as part of discussion in Item 4a. Various options would need to be discussed by the Council regarding possibilities for phasing parts of the dredging project, funding of the project, and assessment matters after a recommendation was forthcoming from the Dredging Plan B Committee on the dredging. Property values would most likely change in assessment based on the economy. This would have a noticeable effect on any cost model associated with assessments.

C. CONTENT OF FUTURE MEETINGS WITH DNR IN APRIL

A. Zietlow stated he was trying to continue to work with DNR Staff and was hopeful that DNR regulations, controls, and confirmations on project specifications could be written by the next meeting. An update would be provided on this matter at the May 6, 2010 Committee meeting.

6. CORRESPONDENCE

None.

CITY OF DELAFIELD PLAN B DREDGING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

7. COMMITTEE SUGGESTIONS FOR NEXT MEETING--MAY 6, 2010

The following items were slated for the May 6, 2010 Dredging Plan B Committee meeting. Dr. Jeff Thornton would also provide the presentation referenced in Item 3 for this agenda at that meeting.

- A. REVIEW CHEMICAL ANALYSIS OF SEDIMENT SAMPLES FOR PROBLEM AREAS AND POSSIBLE SOLUTIONS
- B. REVIEW DNR CHAPTER 30 PERMIT REGULATIONS
- C. REVIEW CONSULTANT REGULATIONS BUILT INTO DNR CHAPTER 30 PERMIT
- D. DREDGING PROJECT FUNDING MODELS

8. NEXT MEETING DATE MAY 6, 2010 7pm

A. Zietlow noted the next meeting date of the Committee to be held on May 6, 2010 at 7:00p.m. at the Public Safety Building.

9. ADJOURNMENT

T. AICHER MOVED TO ADJOURN THE APRIL 21, 2010, DREDGING PLAN B COMMITTEE MEETING AT 9:22 P.M. B. LEONARD SECONDED THE MOTION. ALL WERE IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIED.

Minutes prepared by:

Accurate Business Communications, Inc.