Lake Ripley Management District Meeting Minutes July 17, 2010

I. Call to Order and Roll Call

The Lake Ripley Management District Board met at the Oakland Town Hall on July 17, 2010. Chairman Molinaro called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. Board members present: Gene Kapsner, Dennis McCarthy, Walt Christensen, Georgia Gomez-Ibanez, John Molinaro, Jane Jacobsen-Brown and Mike Sabella. Also present: Paul Dearlove (District Lake Manager), Dave DeGidio, Kent Brown, Rick Kutz, Debbie Kutz, Shirley Teske, Mia Myklebust, Joe Dorava (Vierbicher consultant) and Cambridge Cable TV 98.

II. Public Comment

There were no public comments concerning issues not already on the agenda.

III. Approve Minutes of Last Meeting

Draft minutes from the 06-19-10 meeting were previously distributed for Board review. *McCarthy moved to approve the minutes without additions or corrections. Motion seconded by Gomez-Ibanez. Motion carried 7-0.*

IV. Treasurer's Report

Sabella distributed and reviewed the financial statements for the six-month period ending June 30, 2010. Handouts included a Statement of Assets, Liabilities and Equity (Balance Sheet), Statement of Revenues and Expenses, Actual-to-Budget/Budget-Remaining Report, General Ledger, and Transaction Listing. The Balance Sheet showed total current assets of \$141,752.59. Current liabilities of \$1,637.93 consisted entirely of federal and state payroll taxes. For the second quarter ending June 30th, there were \$1,635.32 in total revenues, \$19,925.64 in operating expenses, and \$2,549.96 in other expenses, resulting in revenue under expenses of \$24,253.43. For the six-month period ending June 30th, revenue exceeded expenses by \$27,555.67. *McCarthy moved to accept the treasurer's report and enter it into the record. Motion seconded by Gomez-Ibanez. Motion carried 7-0.*

V. Lake Manager's Report

Dearlove distributed his lake manager summary report, phone logs and a detailed cost-share project review. He reported on the following activities that occurred since the last meeting:

Landowner Cost Sharing

- *Hoard-Curtis Scout Camp*: \$62,682 DNR Lake Protection Grant award approved based on estimated cost of \$83,576; contractor bids are being solicited to bring to the August meeting for cost-share consideration
- Thompson shore restoration: Planting was completed and final cost-share reimbursement issued
- Fischer/Schabowski shore restoration: Aquatic plantings were installed and final reimbursement requested
- Prepared riprap construction plan and permit application for the Hilleshiem shoreline
- Pat Long of Long Sod Farms interested in enrolling previously cost shared property into the Wetland Reserve Program; cost-share release requested to allow for transfer of easement to USDA-NRCS

James Daly Internship Report

- Over 11 weekend hours spent performing boater-education surveys and inspecting watercraft for aquatic invasive species at the public landing
- Public outreach activities have included co-authoring newsletter/newspaper articles
- Geese-monitoring program initiated to evaluate whether nuisance situation exists

Weed Harvesting

- 19 loads of weeds already harvested by mid-July (5/27-7/15)
- Harvester pulled from lake for repairs to cutter bar; tires replaced on trailer
- Preliminary partnership agreement with Jefferson County LWCD to complete 2011 aquatic plant survey

Lake District Preserve

• Fire breaks mowed in preparation of 2011 prescribed burn

- Trail mapping and cost estimating for budgeting consideration
- Plans confirmed with USFWS and DNR to seed 26 acres of remaining cropland to prairie after the fall harvest

Public Outreach

- Summer edition of Ripples is currently in production
- Articles to be published in Lake Ripley Edition of the Cambridge News
- Welcome Wagon mailers to new residents
- Lake Ripley E-Bulletin announcing boater education program and aquatic invasive species prevention measures

VI. Old Business

No discussion items were brought up under Old Business.

VII. New Business

A. Presentation by Ripley Waters Association concerning the group's proposal to dredge the inlet channel of Lake Ripley

Joe Dorava, a consultant for Vierbicher, presented a proposal to dredge the lake's inlet channel on behalf of the several property owners representing Ripley Waters Association. As described by Mr. Dorava, the purpose of the project was to return the channel to its post-dredging depth to improve boat navigation. While a permit from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers had been granted, a DNR permit was still pending but expected. A DNR stormwater permit and county shoreland zoning permit for the disposal site were also being pursued. It was explained that one reason for the DNR permit delay was due to concerns about impacts to Blanding's turtle habitat. The Blanding's turtle is a threatened species in Wisconsin. Total project costs were estimated at \$221,000. This would involve mechanically removing 20,000 cubic yards of stream bed during the winter, and land spreading the spoil material in an agricultural field near U.S. Highway 18 and County Rd. A. The plan was to deepen the channel by five feet, and dredge out three "sediment holding ponds" to a depth of 10-12 feet. Because the project was found not to be grant eligible, a request was made that it be brought to the Lake District's Annual Meeting as a budget item. Dorava noted that Ripley Waters Association members had already spent about \$15,000-20,000 of their own money to date in engineering consulting fees. A question-and-answer period followed the presentation, with each member of the Board posing questions and concerns (summarized below).

As treasurer, Sabella questioned the affordability of the project, noting the estimated price tag was essentially double the District's entire annual operating budget. He also pointed out that no more than \$10,000 is typically budgeted each year for cost sharing. Debbie Kutz added that other landowners receiving cost-share awards, like her homeowner's group, have always been required to come up with a 50% match. Sabella received confirmation from Dorava that the Ripley Waters group was asking that all costs be shared proportionally by the District tax payers, and with the expectation that the District could use bonding or take out a bank loan to be repaid over multiple years.

Gomez-Ibanez pointed out that "rehabilitating the channel" would actually mean restoring it to a shallow creek meandering through wetlands. She said the project seemed more of a way to facilitate navigational convenience for a few property owners as opposed to providing some larger benefit. Concern was also expressed about the significant risk to the lake in terms of destruction to habitat and hibernating aquatic life within the project area.

Jacobsen-Brown posed questions about the net impact of such a project to the lake as a whole, suggesting there was probably a reason why it was not grant eligible. She said it was her experience that sediment-containment measures often fail to perform as intended. She felt it was necessary to get more input from the membership, especially since most people she's spoken with seem to oppose the project.

Kent Brown received confirmation from Dorava that the District, by financing the work, would assume liability and oversight responsibility for the project. He was concerned that the dredging would have to be repeated due to infilling, and that we would be back in the same situation just as soon as any loan was paid off.

Christensen received confirmation that it would be up to the contractor to determine whether the ground was sufficiently frozen to minimize wetland impacts. It was also confirmed that less disruptive methods, such as hydraulic dredging, had been deemed too expensive and involved to be feasible. He questioned whether project proponents had a clear understanding of all the costs and risks associated with such a massive undertaking.

McCarthy felt the magnitude of the project warranted more time for community consideration. He questioned whether the anticipated benefits would outweigh the costs and other impacts, and expressed concern about the life and effectiveness of the sediment-holding ponds.

Molinaro said he was shocked by the cost and the expectation that the District foot the bill, especially since it was not clear how this was such a great project. He said he would not put the issue on the annual meeting agenda since there was not enough time to properly inform and engage the membership on this latest proposal. He added that he did not get the impression from talking to people that there was much support for the project. If it was something the Lake District felt to be necessary, he pointed out that it would have been targeted as a management priority.

Kapsner felt that such a sizable tax impact would be a tough sell, and preferred not to include the item on the annual meeting agenda. The Board generally agreed that the group needed to spend more time explaining and justifying the project to the Lake District community, particularly if it hoped to secure support for such a large investment of tax dollars. No final decision was made as to how project-related information should be disseminated and by whom. Discussion ended with no action or formal Board position being taken.

B. Discussion and possible action concerning Lake Ripley carp-control measures

Molinaro said he recently heard some complaints about the carp, and wondered if any action was appropriate to try to reduce the population. Dearlove noted that management-planning recommendations relating to carp control were included in the Board's meeting packets. Recommendations included exploring the feasibility of a carp barrier at the outlet, and hosting community carp-harvesting events. Dearlove explained that a barrier would require a Ch. 30 permit from DNR, and that its effectiveness would be severely limited during high-water periods. This prompted some limited discussion involving possible control strategies. Consensus was reached that the idea of a carp barrier near the outlet should continue to be explored. There was also interest in finding out if it was cost effective to contract with a commercial harvester. Molinaro asked that Dearlove prepare a report on possible options that the Board could review later this year.

C. Review and discussion of proposed 2011 budget

Molinaro explained that he, Sabella and Dearlove met for over three hours yesterday to develop a proposed budget. The budget meeting had been noticed and was open to the public. A very general overview was provided. Since the committee needed more time to prepare the resulting budget presentation, Molinaro indicated that the details would be distributed for consideration prior to the August 21st meeting. The Board would then have a chance at that time to ask questions and suggest any changes. A closed session will be included to discuss employee compensation.

VIII. Correspondence

- 6/23/10 e-mail from Jane Jacobsen-Brown confirming her intentions to run for board re-election
- 6/28/10 e-mail from the Lake District to Al Byla (DNR) providing comments related to Ripley Waters Association's inlet-dredging permit application (6/28)
- 6/28/10 Lake Ripley E-Bulletin on AIS-prevention strategies and upcoming boater-education activities
- 7/1/10 e-mail from Susan Graham (DNR) announcing our \$62,682 Lake Protection Grant award for the Hoard-Curtis Scout Camp restoration
- 7/12/10 e-mail from Mike Sabella confirming his intentions to run for board re-election
- 7/14/10 letter from Larry Aschbrenner stating he does not plan to comply with the contract he signed to maintain the grass waterway. Molinaro commented that an attorney will be contacted prior to the next meeting to discuss legal options for enforcing the terms of the contract.

McCarthy moved for adjournment at 10:35 a.m.	Motion seconded by Jacobsen-Brown.	Motion carried 7-0
Next meeting: August 21, 2010 at 9:00 a.m. at th	e Oakland Town Hall.	

Respectfully Submitted,		
Jane Jacobsen-Brown, Secretary	Date	

Recorder: PDD