

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
Beth Leonard, Alderperson District 2 (arrived at 7:15 p.m.)
Bob Aulik, District 3
Mark Millot, District 4
Raffi Shirikian, District 5 (arrived at 7:24 p.m.)
Tim Aicher, Alderperson District 7

1. Approve Minutes of August 19, 2010 Dredging Plan B Committee Meeting

M. HAUSMAN MOVED TO APPROVE THE AUGUST 19, 2010 DREDGING PLAN B COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES AS PRESENTED. T. AICHER SECONDED THE MOTION. THERE WAS NO FURTHER DISCUSSION. ALL WERE IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIED.

2. City of Delafield Citizen's comments for item on the agenda

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

3. Unfinished Business

- a. Discussion Raffi model Chapter 26 application—assessment

A. Zietlow stated he would return to this item once R. Shirikian was present.

R. Shirikian was present and distributed information regarding the storm water management district. He noted certain parcels were on the river within the City boundaries but would not be impacted by dredging. The request from the Common Council to calculate impacts of dredging related to impervious surface would be difficult to determine because of special parcels such as this kind. The Committee needed to figure out the impervious surface square footage for properties in the watershed and once that was formulated it would provide a reasonable expectation for payment for the dredging process. A. Zietlow stated City Staff had been contacted regarding the need for calculations of square footage for impervious surfaces. There was certain engineering equipment needed that was not owned by the City and would require a subcontracting effort to determine the data necessary. He noted difficulties in calculating that formula without this equipment. Without the data, it would be difficult to return to Council

CITY OF DELAFIELD PLAN B DREDGING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

to explain the formulaic calculations for residents. T. Aicher questioned whether the proposal was limited to riparian owners or to all. He thought the Council wanted to know the general principle behind the new taxation method. R. Shirikian stated he thought it should be the watershed within the City boundaries. This would predominantly include the riparian, but would also include vacant lands, commercial lands, and other lands. T. Aicher stated he had received feedback regarding spreading out the responsibility upstream to the residents. R. Shirikian stated the City had limited authority to only tax within its boundaries. T. Aicher questioned how people that were within watershed boundaries but not within City boundaries would fund the project and how benefits for city residents that are in the watershed, but have no runoff to the lake would be determined. R. Shirikian stated people would be impacted financially based on the water being released downstream into the watershed.

Concerns were expressed regarding people that were being taxed based upon where they lived that had little to no storm water management based on the year that the housing was constructed. R. Shirikian stated there were still storm water management impacts that came from the housing regardless of age. These impacts would require study and a study would require money. The Council had indicated that no money was to be expended at this time, so there was a challenge in how to gather the information necessary to proceed. T. Aicher stated that while he understood the principle being discussed, he did not necessarily agree with the funding for the sediment basin. He thought it would be helpful to push for budget money to induce people to deal with storm water issues as identified. He was hearing inequities in distributing cost to city residents and was concerned. He thought it more important to work on the Bark River and work with Department of Public Works to remedy the storm water issues currently understood. B. Leonard stated agricultural properties contributed a great deal of runoff and silt and would have little impervious surface. A. Zietlow noted County right of way areas also provided runoff into the lake as well and he questioned how that would impact the formula.

A discussion of impervious and pervious surfaces was had at this time.

M. Hausman questioned K. Attwell regarding what could be done in terms of dewatering alternatives and related expenses for doing so as well as the obstacles noted during attempting to obtain estimates from contractors. K. Attwell stated the Chapter 30 permit required the project to be dewatered in the liners in the manner noted. To do something different, a refilling of Chapter 30 would be required. With regard to securing estimates, contractors thought the entire project proposed to them was confusing and difficult to estimate. A concern for lack of specific funding was also noted at that time.

A. Zietlow questioned whether the basin spoils could be dewatered differently. K. Attwell stated the sediment basin was free of arsenic; however, a new Chapter 30 permit would be required. The sediment basin could be phase one of the project and a contractor could bid on that portion of the project only without having to re-file the permit. The Chapter 30 permit allowed the City to all work asked for in the permit. The riparians had filed for a permit based on much of the

CITY OF DELAFIELD PLAN B DREDGING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

City's information. M. Millott questioned why the City could not do the same thing for the basin. K. Attwell explained that the Chapter 30 permit would have been modified if it could deal with less expensive dewatering. He did not think it would be too difficult for City Staff to separate out the costs for a phased or different dewatering project. If there was no arsenic in the water, passive dewatering was allowed.

Without objection, A. Zietlow moved to Item 3c.

b. Discussion of proposed recommendations to city officials

A. Zietlow stated some proposed recommendations had been presented to the Committee for future consideration by City officials. He then reviewed certain recommendations presented regarding storm water, riparian dredging efforts, and potential phasing of the dredging project for restoration of Nagawicka Lake with responsibility for funding of this project being undertaken by the whole city.

B. Aulik questioned whether an actual cost could be given for the dredging as there were various figures discussed throughout time. A. Zietlow stated he would be able to secure an estimate from the private riparians approved for dredging to take place in upcoming weeks despite a decrease in the amount of spoils to be removed as part of that project.

Discussion ensued regarding the amount of spoils, arsenic levels, and process for removal of the spoils in other areas of the state. M. Millott stated it might be prudent to consider modeling the phased dredging project upon the private riparian project to be able to move forward.

A. Zietlow questioned whether all the recommendations on the sheet presented should be kept or removed. T. Aicher stated he thought it reasonable to determine some recommendations where suggestions could be presented for budget consideration that would begin to plan for dredging to take place at some point in the future. He thought it reasonable to suggest that the Committee desired some City funding be appropriated to begin explore funding options in the amount of \$10,000-\$20,000 to establish support to be able to speak to contractors for project ideas, such as the sediment basin at the mouth of the Bark River. He wanted to balance the needs of all and thought a modest amount of money would be appropriate.

M. Hausman agreed. B. Leonard stated that she thought the money might be available to request a rough estimate from contractors present currently on the lake and those estimates should be pursued. She thought this could be informally requested rather than going through an RFP process. Discussion ensued regarding how to handle the dewatering process in an estimate. Additional discussion ensued regarding the possibility of utilizing City Staff to determine the total number of square feet involved in the project to assist in an estimate for the dredging project. T. Aicher questioned the cost of the sediment trap for the original referendum that could be applied to the 2011 budget cycle for a rough estimate. A. Zietlow stated he would speak to the private riparian

CITY OF DELAFIELD PLAN B DREDGING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

owners regarding gathering an estimate from area contractors. M .Millott questioned how citywide financing of the sediment trap would be handled as a recommendation from the Committee. B. Leonard stated an estimate would be helpful to determine required efforts. Discussion ensued regarding the process that should be followed at this time and if the Committee wanted to recommend that citywide financing of the sediment trap as a first phase of the dredging project be explored. A. Zietlow stated he thought this was a bit premature as he thought several additional discussions should be held prior to doing so to determine if accurate rough cost estimates could be gathered. The Committee concurred.

Without objection from the Committee, A. Zietlow moved to Item 3a.

- c. Discussion of model to assist riparian owner dredging cost

This item would be discussed in the future if needed.

- d. Additional items from previous assignments

M. Hausman provided information to the Committee regarding science behind the sediment trap. There was a great deal of information to be found in Appendix L in the Chapter 30 permit. More information would be shared at a later date as needed. He thought the logic and science behind the sediment trap was sound. He wanted to include this material in the educational information to be shared with residents at a future date.

R. Shirikian questioned whether the science supported the monetary value needed to move forward with the dredging project. M. Hausman stated he thought the cost benefit would be supported with this information. He noted that the sediment basin was the only solution brought forward at this time that would work to slow the problem of siltation coming down the river. A. Zietlow stated the problem would not be solved if the shoreline dredging took place first or second, as nature would continue in its way and dredging would continue to be needed in the future. T. Aicher questioned several factors that would impact the dredging and the order that the dredging should take place and what would the related impacts be in this case. K. Attwell stated the sediment trap would improve the overall health of the lake and no matter where one lived benefits would be gained.

- e. Private dredging application update

This item was discussed as part of Item 3b. A. Zietlow outlined the process of approval that would be required for the private riparian dredging project.

CITY OF DELAFIELD PLAN B DREDGING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

4. New Business

a. LWC request for information

A. Zietlow explained that the information requested was to have R. Shirikian attend the next Lake Welfare Committee meeting with A. Zietlow to discuss the funding formula information prior to going before the City Council.

b. Impervious surface information from City Engineer

This item had been previously discussed as part of Item 3a.

c. Priority in dredging areas

This item had been previously discussed as part of Item 3a.

d. Opt out criteria discussion

This item would be discussed at a future meeting of the Dredging Plan B Committee.

5. Correspondence

None.

6. Next meeting date

A. Zietlow noted the next meeting of the Committee would be held on Thursday, September 15, 2010 at 7:00 p.m. at the City of Delafield Public Safety Building.

7. Adjournment

B. LEONARD MOVED TO ADJOURN THE SEPTEMBER 2, 2010, DREDGING PLAN B COMMITTEE MEETING AT 8:40 P.M. M. HAUSMAN SECONDED THE MOTION. ALL WERE IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIED.

Minutes prepared by:

Accurate Business Communications, Inc.