

CITY OF DELAFIELD LAKE WELFARE MINUTES

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

CALL MEETING TO ORDER

K. Attwell called the meeting to order at 6:05 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Present

Kent Attwell
Jerry Bills (exited at approximately 7 p.m.)
Bonnie Fieber
Gayle Gaborsky
Rick Lartz
Lynn Morrison
Gary Pratt
Don Tills
Ken Wiedmeyer

Absent

Jerry Dunnick
Mike Wiggins
Jerry Burg

1. APPROVE MINUTES OF JULY 25, 2007

This item will be discussed at the next Lake Welfare Committee (LWC) meeting.

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

No citizens wished to speak.

3. OLD BUSINESS

a. BOAT HOUSE CODE – DON TILLS

B. Fieber reviewed the proposed draft ordinance incorporating changes requested by the Plan Commission. Items in black were the original existing code. D. Tills stated that it would be ideal to get one copy showing the current ordinance comparing it to this one. Specific language in the draft document was discussed. The draft will be reworked and brought back to the next meeting.

4. NEW BUSINESS

a. TIM MENTKOWSKI UPPER NEMAHBIN LAKE MNGT DISTRICT CHAIR –
GAYLE GABORSKY

CITY OF DELAFIELD LAKE WELFARE MINUTES

1) DISCUSS WAYS TO WORK TOGETHER

G. Gaborsky introduced T. Mentkowski to the LWC. T. Mentkowski is the Chairperson for the Upper Nemahbin Lake Management District. The Upper Nemahbin Lake Management District would like to work together with the City in regards to water issues and lake levels. T. Mentkowski briefly reviewed his background. He stated that many people along the Bark River experience flooding in the spring time.

B. Fieber suggested that T. Mentkowski set up a meeting with T. Hafner now so a plan could be prepared for spring time events. K. Attwell stated that a member of LWC would also attend a meeting such as this.

T. Mentkowski will work with G. Gaborsky and T. Hafner.

b. PEWAUKEE LAKE PROPOSED 2.4-D TREATMENT PUBLIC MEETING – KENT ATTWELL

The DNR hosted a meeting regarding the proposed 2.4-D treatment of Pewaukee Lake. K. Attwell attended and stated that it was a good example of how once the DNR is on your side, they will argue on your behalf. There were a number of people in attendance who were very uninformed on the subject.

c. LAKESHORE RESTORATION PROJECT

1) STATUS OF DREDGING APPLICATION – KENT ATTWELL

Jerry Burg of Foth & Van Dyke was present via speaker phone and gave an update on the status of the project. They have put together an estimate and proposal to address the entire list of DNR comments. Foth & Van Dyke met with T. Hafner to show examples of other Chapter 30 applications that they have completed for the state that have been approved by the DNR and have moved forward. T. Hafner was going to take this information back to the City and DNR. Foth & Van Dyke did not think that the Chapter 30 permit required the level of information that the DNR has requested in their 15 page letter. Foth & Van Dyke is hopeful that the DNR will be open to items proposed to be reduced. Foth & Van Dyke needs an approval to proceed – once this is received, it needs to determine what steps to take next. Foth & Van Dyke is waiting to hear from T. Hafner. Detailed cross sections of all channels, more information on biological impacts, and final design on the disposal facility are being requested by the DNR for the Chapter 30 permit.

CITY OF DELAFIELD LAKE WELFARE MINUTES

The LWC needs to keep in contact with the City officials who are doing the negotiating to let them know that the LWC is very anxious to keep this moving. If anything is needed from the LWC, the LWC will help. K. Attwell stated that a few weeks ago Mayor Schuman went out on the lake with DNR officials.

d. WORKGROUPS REPORTS

1) COMMUNICATIONS AND EDUCATION- BONNIE FIEBER

L. Reas emailed with a request to set another date. B. Fieber has asked someone to make contact at Kettle Moraine High School's Science Department.

2) RESTORATION REFERENDUM AND FUNDING - KENT ATTWELL/DON TILLS

This will be discussed at the next Common Council meeting. K. Attwell stated that the LWC was recommending a plan with two categories: the riparians that would be dredged and restored would pay 100% of their costs for removing the effluent by volume and their administrative costs; and those areas that have been deemed "common good" would be to spread over all of the taxpayers in the City of Delafield. All of the monies spent thus far have been approved within the budget by the City Council.

Alderperson G. Mac Dougall was present and asked why taxpayers should pay to maintain the lake property values. B. Fieber stated that they would be maintaining the tax base. K. Attwell stated that there was not one question for which there was not supporting documentation. After the financial information is received by the Council members, K. Attwell would like to meet with each of the Council member to explain the data so they can make an accurate and informed decision. He stated that there is a plan to introduce this to the public.

G. Pratt explained his email dated August 6, 2007 regarding the administrative portion of the funding formula. His position was that the residents of the City should acknowledge that they benefit somewhat from the lake and should contribute \$8.89. It was stated that the contractor would charge by volume plus the fixed administrative cost.

K. Attwell stated that the recommendation to the City Council was to spread the administrative cost by volume to all riparians being dredged. Those administrative costs associated with the common good areas would be paid by everyone.

CITY OF DELAFIELD LAKE WELFARE MINUTES

B. Fieber wanted more clarification on the charges. K. Attwell explained that the administrative costs would be those costs charged by the consultant and those costs that T. Hafner incurs to implement the construction management costs in addition to the permit. Administrative costs are not paying for the USGS monitoring station; this would be paid for by a grant.

B. Fieber agreed with G. Pratt's point on permitting – everyone should pay the same amount. K. Attwell preferred to stay with the proposal that was voted upon at the last meeting. B. Fieber would rather not give the City Council and the media information that would make it appear as if the LWC had not thought everything through. She would rather give the Council a well thought out plan that was agreed upon by the majority of the group. She did not think that the group had the data needed to vote at the last meeting. The numbers need to be analyzed. She did not feel comfortable giving the previous information to the Council and felt the LWC needed to wait.

B. FIEBER MOTIONED TO BRING THE FUNDING RECOMMENDATION, RE-DO THE SPREADSHEET TO INCLUDE A DIFFERENT MECHANISM FOR PAYING THE ADMINISTRATIVE FEES – SEPARATING THE PERMIT AND THE OTHER ASPECTS OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE FEES, TAKE ANOTHER VOTE, AND TAKE THE UNITED/MAJORITY PACKAGE TO THE COUNCIL. ADDITIONALLY, A POWERPOINT PRESENTATION SHOULD BE MADE. K. WIEDMEYER SECONDED THE MOTION. K. Attwell stated if G. Pratt's methodology was used for the administrative costs it could be presented as part of the proposal as "Option B" along with its rationale. B. Fieber did not think that she had accurate information when the first vote was taken and would like to review all of the information. She would like to know the options; how much it would cost per riparian being dredged for all of the riparians on the lake. D. Tills stated that the riparians who were not going to have dredging done in front of their property would have been charged like the other City residents. K. Attwell stated that to his best understanding, the administrative costs are costs paid to the consultants (Vierbacher, Foth & Van Dyke) and the costs that T. Hafner incurs in hiring someone to oversee the dredging project. Testing is included in part of Foth & Van Dyke's costs. G. Mac Dougall stated that his biggest concern was that this be done in a fiscally responsible manner. The last vote was 7-1 indicated that the fairest way to charge would be by dredge volume. **B. FIEBER WITHDREW HER MOTION.**

CITY OF DELAFIELD LAKE WELFARE MINUTES

B. FIEBER MOTIONED TO CHANGE THE RECOMMENDATION AS IT RELATES TO ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS AND RECOMMEND THAT THE CITY CHARGE RIPARIANS BEING DREDGED FOR ADMINISTRATIVE FEES UP TO THE START OF THE ACTUAL DREDGING EQUALLY AND THAT THE COMMON GOOD AREA WOULD BE DIVIDED EVENLY BY VOLUME. G. PRATT SECONDED THE MOTION. DISCUSSION TOOK PLACE ON THE IMPACT THIS MOTION WOULD HAVE ON VARIOUS AREAS OF THE LAKE. SEVEN WERE IN FAVOR. R. LARTZ OPPOSED. MOTION CARRIED.

5. CORRESPONDENCE

NR15 Comparison Chart – this will be sent to the committee members in their next packet. NR15 only affects unincorporated municipalities. This does not apply to the City of Delafield.

6. ADJOURN

B. FIEBER MOTIONED TO ADJOURN FROM THE MEETING. G. GABORSKY SECONDED THE MOTION. THERE WAS NO FURTHER DISCUSSION. ALL WERE IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIED. THE MEETING ADJOURNED AT 9:25 P.M.

Minutes Prepared By:

Accurate Business Communications, Inc.