

CITY OF DELAFIELD PLAN B DREDGING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

Call Meeting to Order

Al Zietlow called the meeting to order at 7:05 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  
Bob Aulik, District 3  
Mark Millot, District 4  
Raffi Shirikian, District 5  
Tim Aicher, Alderperson District 7

1. Approve Minutes of October 7, 2010 and October 20, 2010 Dredging Plan B Committee Meeting

A. Zietlow noted the October 7, 2010 Dredging Plan B Committee meeting minutes had already been approved at the October 20, 2010 meeting.

**T. AICHER MOVED TO APPROVE THE OCTOBER 20, 2010 DREDGING PLAN B COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES AS PRESENTED. M. HAUSMAN 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

Charles Hall, 3019 Sylvester Drive, stated he had lived and paddled a canoe in the Bark River for 37 years. There is a great deal of deep muck in the river. He stated a Department of Natural Resources (DNR) permit is a terrible thing to waste and he encouraged the City to make use of it. He thanked all on the Committee for their effort in moving the dredging project forward. He thought dredging the sediment basin at the beginning of the Bark River would benefit all.

Dennis Sobczak, 3141 Sylvester Drive stated he too appreciated all the time and energy spent by the Committee moving this matter forward. He remained concerned about the upcoming spring election and the fact that it seemed no action was taken by the Committee in time to make use of the election with a referendum question. He had listened to recent City budget discussions and while he appreciated B. Leonard's support, he was taken aback by T. Aicher's support for removal of the project from the City budget for next year. He sent an email to the Mayor requesting the money be left in the budget and he further encouraged the Committee to focus on the greater good of the sediment trap and to move forward with some action on the dredging.

**CITY OF DELAFIELD PLAN B DREDGING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES**

A. Zietlow stated he was not able to be present at the City budget meeting for family reasons; however, he thanked the public for supporting the dredging by attending that meeting.

Mike Roehl, 3329 Lake Drive, thanked the Committee members for their efforts, noting the work of the Committee remained vitally important to the health of the lake. He stated he could see sediment flowing across the top of the river, and he thought it important to push forward with the dredging project.

Larry Chapman, 2112 Baypoint Lane, stated he frequently used a paddle board near the Bark River area, and he referred to the area where it spewed into the lake as the "Bark River delta" due to all the siltation flowing into the lake. That area required dredging as he thought there would soon be no ingress or egress out of the river. He hoped that all on the Committee could agree on what should be done and move forward. If the sediment trap area was to be dredged, he thought it would allow the sediment to settle out quickly.

3. Special Presentation-report by Tom Hafner, Director of Public Works and Foth Engineering Representative on dredging areas and costs

A. Zietlow explained the history of the request for engineering information related to dredging the sediment trap near the Bark River and the City's Chapter 30 permit. Tom Hafner, Director of Public Works, and Brian Hinrichs, of Foth, was present to discuss findings. A copy of the map showing the area to be dredged as discussed in the proposals submitted to dredging contractors was distributed to the Committee.

T. Hafner thanked the Committee for the opportunity to speak, noting information regarding the dredging contractors had been distributed to the Committee as well. He explained there were eight contractors that had received plans detailing the dredging project. Of the eight contractors contacted, cost estimates had been received from three of them. There were two additional contractors that were not able to respond prior to the meeting; however, those responses were anticipated in the next week or so. He then reviewed the various estimates in detail, noting there were cost savings associated with the project if passive dewatering were allowed instead of the use of geo-textile tubing.. Project costs ranged from approximately \$1.3 million to \$1.7 million with contingencies included. T. Hafner noted the comparison of project data was provided to the Committee in terms of cost per cubic yard and included dredging only with no plant restoration or soft costs for the project. Private dredging project estimates were also included for comparative purposes.

When the City bid the project in 2007 and then revised the cost estimate in 2009, Foth had estimated the total cost of the dredging project to be approximately \$3.3 million; however, they used different unit prices for different parts of the lake. The basin had specific estimates of \$23-\$26 areas per cubic yard at that time. With those estimates from Foth in mind, the City had then bid the project. The resulting information at that time indicated a bid of \$3.6 million; however, it was not what the City had requested in the scope of the project. Based on that information and subsequent discussions with dredging contractors, Foth developed concerns that the cost estimates originally associated with the project were too low. The City no longer had funds remaining for

**CITY OF DELAFIELD PLAN B DREDGING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES**

addition services supplied by Foth, and thus, in 2009, T. Hafner and Lake Welfare Committee representatives had revised cost estimates resulting in a project cost of \$3.4 million and a cost per cubic yard of \$39.50. More recently, the private dredging project included a cost of \$120,000 for 4,200 cubic yards or \$29 per cubic yard. T. Hafner then reviewed the cost estimates for the Committee on a per cubic yard estimate basis. In response to a question, T. Hafner explained the reasons that the two remaining contractors had not yet supplied cost estimates. One contractor was still completing private dredging work in the area and the second would return from vacation near the end of the week and only worked with geo-textile tubing so the estimates might be higher.

B. Leonard complimented T. Hafner on the data supplied and the format utilized. T. Hafner clarified the project location on the map supplied to the Committee. He further explained that the sediment trap should be dredged in conjunction with the property owners shown on the map. If the City attempted to complete the project without shoreline dredging, the sediment would slough off into the area dredged by the City and little would be gained.

B. Leonard questioned the use of passive dewatering as a cost savings measure as indicated by the supplied dredging estimates. T. Hafner explained there were several issues with passive dewatering. First the City did not have a permit for it. Also, while the samples taken from the lake indicated no contamination in this area, passive dewatering methods included pumping the spoils into a pond that would be adjacent to homes in the area. The pond water would then be allowed to infiltrate the ground. While there was a low risk, some risk must still be assumed with that infiltration. With the use of geo-textile tubing, adjacent home owners would be at ease and the tubes would also help to keep dust and odor down. Aesthetically, the site would be cleaner and he also noted there would be quicker land use reclamation with the tubes instead of the passive dewatering method. The geo-tubes were anticipated to be present for approximately three to five months; however the passive dewatering would need approximately two to three years to get to the necessary solid concentration so that they could be spread. Furthermore, the park land was an asset to the City and as such would eventually be developed as a park and that future activity should be considered as a factor in determining how to utilize the park land prior to being able to reclaim the land for its intended purpose. While this information could be considered a recommendation not to pursue the passive dewatering, T. Hafner stated he knew that the chairperson of the Lake Welfare Committee differed in opinion.

B. Leonard questioned the process for testing samples of the dredge spoils. T. Hafner explained in the private dredging, the contractor took samples and the homeowner provided those samples to a private lab for testing of total suspended solids that would return to the lake. Conversely, the City would have a great deal more involvement and additional information on the testing samples would be required. All information regarding dredging had to be reported to the DNR.

T. Hafner also explained that conversations with the dredging contractors regarding the cost estimates provided all included a desire to have a closer dewatering site as that was a significant cost factor for the project. He did not think that the DNR would be willing to agree to passive dewatering in this case.

**CITY OF DELAFIELD PLAN B DREDGING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES**

M. Millot questioned whether T. Hafner thought all possibilities had been exhausted for public or private dewatering sites that would decrease the cost of the project while maintaining use of geo-textile tubing for dewatering. T. Hafner explained there could be a few potential dewatering sites; however, the tubes would need to remain on site for more than one full season of the year in someone's yard. In addition, the bags would need to be stacked three high on the site.

A. Zietlow questioned the life expectancy of the basin and its related function. T. Hafner stated that originally the dredging project was designed as a result of requests from property owners that were not able to utilize the lake as desired and thus the primary purpose was to get depth at the shoreline. With the sediment trap being presented as a primary objective and the shoreline dredging being secondary, he had concerns that the original intent of the dredging project was not being accomplished. The sediment trap was an "extended warranty" for the shoreline dredging in that if people were going to make an investment in dredging the shoreline areas near their property, the sediment trap would allow the dredging efforts to last longer. He had always been concerned about the sediment trap as Foth representatives had expected the trap to capture approximately 50% of what was coming down the river. He thought this was could have been overstated. The material that it would capture was already settling out in the Bark River "delta" area and he was not sure it would fall out at that point only. Conversely, there would be benefits to dredging that area as it would provide deeper water for recreational use. Also, he noted that if the sediment trap were to be dredged, it was important to consider the implications if it did all that it was expected to do. If it filled at the rate described, it would require redredging in approximately 14 years at the cost of at least \$1 million that would continue into the future.

T. Hafner introduced Brian Hinrichs to the Committee at this time.

B. Leonard questioned the historical data related to the basin and whether activities had changed in the past 25 years regarding runoff. T. Hafner stated he was not familiar with any historical analysis of the area; however, various erosion control measures and management practices had changed in recent history that he thought would impact the runoff. R. Shirikian questioned whether there was any data available on the sediment trap's performance that might indicate efficiency of use. B. Hinrichs stated he was unaware of any at this time but could research the matter. With regard to the efficiency of the trap, he noted in static times more efficiency would be noted and less in heavy scouring events. Scouring did not release the particulates back into the current in a re-suspended form so there was some efficiency noted there as well. In heavy events, heavier larger grain material sediment would be brought into the lake and would be spread across the lake. The whole issue was related to energy and reduction in energy was the desired outcome. In addition, he noted other lakes, such as Delavan Lake, had found that inland sediment traps decreased the invasive species found in the lake.

R. Shirikian questioned whether the sediment trap was the right size for this lake. B. Hinrichs stated that based on lake geometry and the current delta area, he thought it was appropriate. If a bigger trap was desired, he thought it would be more practical to dredge the whole lake.

**CITY OF DELAFIELD PLAN B DREDGING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES**

Discussion ensued regarding benefits to dredging the sediment trap and shoreline dredging. T. Hafner stated he wanted to note that if the dredging project proceeded, this action would not stop sediment from reaching the lake. It would fill faster and require additional dredging in the future. The sediment trap should not be done as a single project, but in conjunction with the shoreline dredging. The DNR would allow the City to skip the shoreline dredging and dredge less than approved.

Discussion ensued regarding whether placement of an additional sediment basin or a different location for a basin would be helpful. T. Hafner stated while there were locations available, past studies indicated regional basins on the west side did not make sense to do. At this time, he did not think there were any alternative locations. Discussion further ensued regarding the ownership of various properties and wetlands that might be suitable for inland holding ponds.

M. Millot questioned an estimated timeframe before the area was not navigable. B. Hinrichs stated that information would require further study; however, it could take multiple years or at minimum twelve months near the mouth of the Bark River due to the larger grain being deposited closer to the mouth of the Bark River.

A. Zietlow thanked T. Hafner and B. Hinrichs for appearing before the Committee. The Committee would need to determine a potential direction for the project and an appropriate timeline as the City held the permit and he wanted to utilize it.

Without objection, A. Zietlow moved to Item 4b on the agenda.

**4. Unfinished Business**

- a. Discussion and action on previously presented possible recommendations to Council by committee

M. Hausman stated he wanted to focus on what could be done and he would like to take the information presented by T. Hafner and utilize it to extrapolate into a formula. It seemed as though the research noted by the Committee indicated riparians would be willing to pay approximately \$1000 for dredging and he thought the balance could then go back to city wide funding as one possible alternative. He thought the new information presented this evening should be utilized for funding opportunities. M. Millott stated it was important to move forward with this matter in a timely manner and if a referendum was needed the Committee should have recommendations completed by mid-January.

**M. MILLOT MOVED TO COMPLETE THE DREDGING PLAN B COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS BY JANUARY 15, 2011. M. HAUSMAN SECONDED THE MOTION. THERE WAS NO FURTHER DISCUSSION. ALL WERE IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIED.**

A. Zietlow stated it was important to have a long term plan to dredge the sediment basin and fund that repeated dredging need and also to address other runoff issues that contributed to the need for dredging in the future.

**CITY OF DELAFIELD PLAN B DREDGING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES**

b. Additional information from previous assignments

A. Zietlow distributed information regarding short and long term funding needs associated with the dredging project to be distributed to the Common Council if desired by the Committee. R. Shirikian explained the rationale behind the information presented, noting there were various options presented depending on the areas to be dredged. Discussion ensued regarding which areas of the lake were considered in the direct riparian dredging costs within the formulas presented.

T. Aicher expressed concern for the formulas presented. There was some non-riparian support in the last referendum on the matter and in the formula presented, the cost of the non-riparian portion was significantly higher than in the referendum that had a negative outcome. He was concerned that the Committee would be expecting a favorable result with non-riparians now having higher overall dredging costs than in the original referendum. B. Leonard agreed, noting it seemed as though private dredging efforts would be less costly than the City's funded dredging project if property owners worked cooperatively to dredge the lake.

Concern was expressed for having a referendum with the same cost redistributed to different allocations rather than another option for the project.

M. Hausman questioned the potential turnout for spring elections. Discussion ensued. B. Leonard stated it was imperative that people that wanted dredging should have some assistance from the City in some way in moving forward. M. Millot stated if the sediment basin were to be dredged, a referendum was required as that portion of the overall dredging project would not be allowed with private funding. T. Aicher noted that the City was not allowed to act as a bonding agent without having to provide the project management aspects of the dredging in this matter. Discussion ensued regarding any options for payment options or deferral of assessment for the project.

A. Zietlow recessed the meeting at 9:10 p.m. and reconvened 9:22 p.m. moving to Item 5c on the agenda.

c. Discussion and action on dredging basin vs. riparian properties

This item was not discussed.

d. Discussion and action on impervious surface/Chapter 26 storm-water proposal

This item was not discussed.

5. New Business

a. Discussion and action on item presented by Tom Hafner, DPW Director

This item was discussed as part of Item 4a.

**CITY OF DELAFIELD PLAN B DREDGING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES**

- b. Timetable for recommendations

This item was discussed as part of Item 4a.

- c. Discussion on City of Delafield 2011 Capital Improvement Budget

A. Zietlow explained the Common Council met recently to discuss the City's 2011 Capital Improvement Budget. T. Aicher stated in the past years he had learned the budget process and found the purpose of "place holders" in the budget. Because the referendum had failed for the dredging project, there would be no impact for the 2011 Capital Improvement budget whether the money was left in the budget for the project or not. He thought it was important to provide distance from the failed referendum, and a good way to do that was to inject new numbers into the budget and that required a referendum. A. Zietlow stated the Common Council could spend money at any time for a referendum by simple resolution. He thought all people would interpret the actions of the Common Council members in their own way. B. Leonard stated she thought numbers in the budget could be symbolic based on her experience and she thought sometimes an action to remove monies from the Capital Budget did drive actions. She thought to remove the monies from the budget would send a poor message to the community and Committee and thus she advocated to leave the money in that budget. T. Aicher stated his point was that no matter what happened in the future with the dredging project, the Common Council would have to vote on it whether the money was left in the budget or not.

- 6. Correspondence

None.

- 7. Next meeting date

A. Zietlow noted the next meeting of the Committee would be held on December 14, 2010 at 8:00 p.m. at the City of Delafield City Hall Council Chambers.

- 8. Adjournment

**M. HAUSMAN MOVED TO ADJOURN THE NOVEMBER 30, 2010, DREDGING PLAN B COMMITTEE MEETING AT 10:00 P.M. B. LEONARD SECONDED THE MOTION. ALL WERE IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIED.**

Minutes prepared by:

Accurate Business Communications, Inc.