

Big Roche-A-Cri Lake District
November 19, 2007, Adams Community Center

Commissioners Present: Susan Lydon, Jim Speichinger, Ray Heins, Gary Chapman, Joyce Kirslenlohr, John Pavelec, Jim Miller. **Others Present:** Candy Chapman, Mike Lydon, Dave Miller, Dick Heitman, Nathan Niles, Levi Olson, Linda Mohns.

Minutes of Previous Meeting: Correction to minutes of 10/20/07. In paragraph 2 of the Treasurer's Report, strike the word "Magorski" and replace it with "Mogalski". No other comments or changes from the floor.

Motion to approve the minutes of 10/20/07, as corrected, made by Ray Heins and seconded by Jim Speichinger. Yes Votes: 6; No Votes: 0. Motion passed unanimously, as corrected.

Treasurer's Report:

Income:	\$1,921.46	Total income for 2007:	\$110,085.03
Expenses to date	\$1,768.40.		
		Balance from last month:	<u>\$ 4,063.32</u>
			<u>\$114,148.35</u>
		Less Expenses	<u>\$101,426.99</u>
		Balance in checking account	<u>\$ 12,721.36</u>

Ray reported that expenses to date were \$1,768.40. Two major items are Wisconsin River Coop for \$584.77 and removing the barge from the lake at a cost of \$250.00. The income of \$1,921.46 was from the DNR educational grant that the Lake Advisory Group received for rules, the signs and the calendars. An observation was made that the Lake District looked as if it was in pretty good shape for the end of the year. Ray explained that next month the Lake District will receive the workers' comp bill and the building insurance premium and those two bills alone may be close to \$5,000. Ray also mentioned that \$1,700 would be coming out of the budget for calendars as well. When asked if the money the Lake District was setting aside for spraying was coming out, Ray explained it was coming out in next year's budget and we were still working with the 2007 budget money.

Motion to approve the treasurer's report as filed was made by John Pavelec and seconded by Joyce Kirslenlohr. Yes Votes: 6; No Votes: 0. Motion passed unanimously.

Committee Reports:

Adams County: Adams County Board budget hearing is scheduled to approve the budget at its next meeting.

Joyce said there was an open meetings law requirement meeting and was informed at that meeting that a door can be closed if a sign is posted outside of the door stating that it is an open meeting.

Town of Preston: Preston Township is getting ready for winter.

Harvesting: There previously was a request for information regarding the report that Jim M. annually sends to the DNR, and other information relating to the number of weeds taken out of the different areas of the

Lake. Jim M. passed out his report and explained that one section is the report that he sends to the DNR every year. Jim M. spoke to Deb Konkel approximately a week ago because there seemed to be some confusion about a report that had to be turned in, or was late being turned in. Deb Konkel assured Jim M. there was no additional report and the report was not late. Prior to the permit process Jim M. reported on the number of loads. When the permit process started the DNR requested it in tons, not in loads. Later the DNR wanted it broken down into three time periods which Deb Konkel referred to as early cutting, which would be when the Lake District started cutting, which in this case was May 11, 2007 to May 30, 2007, then May 31, 2007 to September 3, 2007 would be regular cutting, and then after Labor Day it would be considered late cutting, which ran until September 13, 2007. That is the breakdown of what Jim M. sends Deb Konkel. Jim M. did a breakdown on tons and loads between 2006 and 2007 that showed the harvesters were getting more weeds out of Area 4 compared from 2006 to 2007 than in other areas. It is somewhat confusing showing the report in loads because the 10' harvester takes out heavier loads than the 5' harvester. It does not accurately reflect the amount of loads.

With regard to the drawdown, Jim M. said that Deb Konkel told him that the DNR would not rely so much on Jim M. 's report as much as the DNR would rely on its findings after they did the weed count on our Lake. At that time they will determine whether a drawdown is essential at this particular time and if they do not see enough of whatever they want to see, then they will not approve a drawdown and the Lake District can apply the next year, and the next year, until it gets the drawdown. Candy told Jim M. that she felt the report was more for her benefit because she needs to see how many more loads were taken. Candy also mentioned that Deb Konkel sent her an email saying that next year she is going to want us to report (or Jim M. to report) on targeted areas. Jim M. Said that Deb Konkel never mentioned that to hiM. Candy also mentioned that Deb Konkel is going half time and she is trying to get her files in order to turn them over. Jim M. said that the east end would not be a problem because it is a confined area, but the problem is going to be if the DNR wants to know how many loads are going to be taken out of one little section that the DNR has identified. The harvesting crew jumps around to where the weeds are. Candy mentioned that she believes Deb Konkel is talking about the late harvesting period, after Labor Day, targeting specific plants. Jim M. feels that the DNR wants to get more specific so the DNR has better data to make decisions on whether things are working or not working. It is hard to look at some of this data and have a clear understanding to make decisions on whether to do a drawdown or not. Jim M. feels it is best if they come and take a look. Seeing is believing.

With regard to tracking hours and maintenance, Jim M. Showed the Commissioners the time sheets that were currently being used. Sue said that she just wanted to see what we were using to see if it could be improved upon.

Sue passed around a daily report that used to go out with the annual meeting newsletter. She stated that because we are working differently she would like to modify the report so it could be used, or something similar could be used to track what is going on. Sue felt it would not be difficult to use if a template was made so the workers could write in how many loads, or whatever. Because it is old, Sue felt it should not be thrown away but perhaps modified and updated. Jim M. said he would look at it and see if it is something that can be used. Gary asked if it was something that the driver would fill out. Sue said it would depend on what type of information would be put in the report. Jim M. felt it was just a different form than the one that is currently being used. Sue feels we need to give information back to the people instead of talking about it at the meetings. Jim M. said he felt that it may have become a money issue putting it in the newsletter, because it was becoming too costly. So some of the information that was typically in the newsletter is now discussed at the Spring and Annual meetings. Ray mentioned that when it was stopped people were informed that the information would be posted at the Country Deli bulletin board. There was much discussion on what reports were posted on the bulletin board. Linda Mohns mentioned that she would be happy to help create a

spreadsheet and assist Jim M. with imputing data regarding man-hours, section harvesting, number of loads, and other reports that can be posted on the bulletin board. People will have to accept the data, when posted, as valid.

It was mentioned that the harvesters need to be painted orange to keep them high profile. Jim M. said he was not looking for the harvesters to be high profile. Jim M. said the people that are looking out at the harvesters every day from their windows, are the people that requested they be painted a different color than orange, something more toned down. It was mentioned that it is a safety issue and they need to be painted back to a higher profile color.

A motion was made to keep the color of the harvesters orange. There was a vote taken with one abstention. Ray felt the vote was invalid because of the lack of discussion. He felt the Commissioners needed to explain to the people why the color will be changed. There was discussion on whether the Commissioners were overstepping their bounds by going ahead and making the decision without informing the public as to the reason. It was pointed out that a newsletter was coming out and perhaps it should be mentioned in the newsletter. Ray said he had no objection to the color being orange but he feels that the people that previously complained about the color deserve to know why it is being changed back to orange.

Gary Chapman made a motion to return the harvesters to the original color of orange for safety reasons, and notify all residents by newsletter that the harvesters will be returned to that color. The motion was seconded. Yes Votes: 5; No Votes:1. Motion passed.

John asked if there were any big problems with any of the harvesters right now. Jim M. informed the Commissioners that there were no big problems right now.

Jim M. discussed potential changing of the plans for insulating of the building after reviewing the figures. Jim M. reported he spoke with a company that could do the job for between \$3,000 and \$5,000 but after re-evaluating the job, the company said it would cost approximately \$21,000. Marlin suggested using the box from the Penske truck and insulating that and using that as a modified workshop instead of insulating the building. Jim M. feels it would take away from excess storage and take away from the use at the rummage sale, which money is counted on over the years, to purchase tools that may be needed. It came to Jim M. hat perhaps the Lake District should purchase a step-van to solve some to the problems by at least putting off putting up a building for a few years. Since most of the maintenance work on the machines is done in the water and they are not taken out of the water, perhaps we should purchase a step-van to carry necessary tools back and forth to the machines instead of constantly going back and forth to the building to get the appropriate tool. If the Lake District had a truck with a big enough box on it, it could be insulated and used during the months of October, November, March and April, with a small shop inside. Jim M. feels it could be used year around but would have to be have a 15-foot box on the back.

Candy reported that Fred S. And Dave M. are looking into the cost of insulating the existing building but had not yet made a recommendation to the Commissioners. There had also been talk about volunteers insulating the bay but nothing had been decided. Candy said she would need to defer to Dave Miller because he was working on the project and had looked into costs. It was pointed out that the whole scope of what was being looked into by the Advisory Group would now have to be rethought. It was mentioned that this was an issue to be brought up at an Advisory Group meeting and not the Commissioners meeting. Joyce mentioned that an issue she saw was there was nothing in the budget for this and the Lake District would end up borrowing money. Sue said that if it would cost \$2,000 the Commissioners could authorize a purchase like that if the money was remaining at the end of the year. John said he could look into federal surplus equipment since

sometimes that was available at a good price. The Commissioners felt that the Advisory Group should look into a step-van and report back to the Commissioners. It was recommended that John look into federal surplus equipment and Jim M. look into the Lake District purchasing a step-van and report at the March meeting. Candy suggested that Dave should be kept apprised of what was found out since he in was in charge of looking into the insulation project for the Advisory Group. Jim M. And John would report back.

Advisory Group Report: The resolution for the drawdown is finalized and Candy presented it to the Commissioners. She revised the previous Resolution that was used in the first drawdown. It gives Candy, on behalf of the Advisory Group, the authority to begin the paperwork process. One of the main items to be attached do the paperwork is the scope of the project which is what she is presently working on. Candy asked that the Commissioners read the Resolution and if it okay, that the Commissioners vote on the Resolution today. Joyce pointed out that the Resolution stated that the Lake District would meet the financial obligations under the grant. Candy explained there was a \$500 permit fee but it was a 50-50 grant so the Lake District would have to pay 50% of the overall cost in addition to the \$500 permit fee. She pointed out that we do not know the exact cost because we do not yet know the formula paid to the dam operator. She pointed out this Resolution was exactly the same as the last Resolution except the dates were changed. Candy stated that the drawdown would still have to be approved by the landowners at the Spring meeting, she was merely asking for approval to go to the Town of Preston, the County and the State for letters of support.

There was discussion as to how far the Lake would be drawn down. It was mentioned last time it was drawn down 30" and it was asked whether we could go deeper. The Advisory Group will look into that. It was reported there was a new DNR person coming in and Candy had no contact with that DNR person or Scot Ironsides at this point. It was requested that the Advisory Group look into going as deep as possible. Scott Provost, early on, suggested that the Lake be drawn down until mid-June. However, Scott was told by other DNR people that could not be done.

Candy also reported that the Advisory Group would have to give a presentation at the Spring meeting regarding dredging so it could be voted on at the Annual meeting. The Advisory Group was looking into the area that needed the most dredging which they felt was as far down on the east end as possible, going up the channel to the bridge. A letter was being written to Ayers & Associates and Josh asking them to put in a proposal for the dredging so it could be presented at the Spring meeting. A sediment basin will need to be discussed and located at the Advisory Group meeting, following the Commissioner meeting. There is a company called Manke that also does dredging, and they will also be contacted.

A motion was made by Ray to allow the Advisory Group to go ahead and take a look into, and create the steps necessary to fulfill the obligations of a drawdown inclusive of Resolution No.1-2007. Said motion was seconded by Gary. Yes Votes: 6; No Votes: 0. Motion passed unanimously.

It was reported that the calendar was ready to go to the printer next week and will be back by the end of November for distribution. The Advisory Group asked when the newsletter was coming out and was informed it should be out soon. An order form would be placed in the newsletter.

Jim M. had an observation that as the complexion of the Advisory Group had changed, two people that were previously not Commissioners before are Commissioners now, and it almost seemed there are more Commissioners actively on the Group than residents on the Advisory Group. Jim M. felt it is similar to a double Commissioners meeting. Candy stated that one of the Commissioners attended the meeting on behalf of the Commissioners. Candy feels that the people that attend the Advisory Group meetings are the

individuals that care enough about the Lake to show up and they will always be welcome. It has been mentioned at the Spring and Annual meetings that volunteers are needed and these are the people that have come forth. It takes a commitment to be involved with the Lake. The original members are still considered members but several of them are not attending the meetings. It was mentioned that the Advisory Group is a discussion group and it is not a government entity. In addition the Advisory Group does not take many votes but it does research, discusses and recommends to the Lake District.

Old Business:

Gypsy Moth Report: Linda Mohns reported that she attended the Town of Preston meeting, whereby the Town of Preston voted to take money out of regular tax dollars, not in a special assessments, to \$25,000 they have set aside for invasive species treatment through the DNR. So as far as the Lake is concerned, we do not have to spend the \$10,000. At the end of the meeting, some individuals from the Town of Adams wanted to come on to our application. They wanted to collect their own money and turn it over to us. Linda told them she did not believe it was a good idea to umbrella them under the Town of Preston because of the liability issue and if they didn't pay it would create a problem. So they will do their own application. There were 11 people that returned the card saying they were opposed to the spraying. Linda asked, because it was voted on at the annual meeting to have the Lake sprayed, is that grand-fathered in or, because now it is being done through the DNR, there may be some people on the Lake that will not be sprayed. Linda was informed that because some individuals were opposed to the spraying, there may be areas that were blocked out. Of the people opposed to the spraying, only 4 of those were right on the Lake. The cost going through the DNR is close to \$40.00 per acre, but the cost is being covered by the Town of Preston and it will not be a special assessment. It does not pay to spray an area that is devoid of caterpillars because the spray kills the caterpillars themselves. The egg count is going to be done this week and by Friday the master plan has to be sent to the DNR. The Lake District previously agreed that it would pick up the cost and spray in areas which would not be sprayed by the DNR. Linda pointed out in order for the Lake District to do that, a press release would need to go out, a legal notice would need to be published and posted, and a special meeting held. Putting something in the newsletter is another option. Linda said that the people opposed were not so much opposed to the spraying as they were to the Lake management. The gypsy moth people would like a committee of two people to go to the properties that stated they had heavy infestation and do the block. They will know by Thursday whether the entire Lake will be done or if only a portion of the Lake will be done. Linda will be contacting the people opposed by Sunday night. The DNR will be using a plane to spray so there may be some over-spraying, but it was decided to go with the DNR because of the liability issues and protection of the wildlife. The DNR will make sure everything is done correctly. If there are properties on the Lake that do not want to be sprayed, that block will be taken out of the spray area, which could mean that people with heavy infestation may not get sprayed because a neighbor is opposed. The DNR, because they are handling everything, is responsible for sending out notices. They have until February 22, 2008 to remove property from the spray. Objections must be dealt with by March 7, 2008. According to the DNR this is a 5-6 year cycle and we are coming up to the tip of the cycle, so next year (2008), the DNR predicts infestation will be worse and then infestation will begin to go down, so we will probably want to spray in 2009 and then infestation will go down for a few years. The Town knows it may be a 2-year proposition. Linda was commended for the work she has done on this project.

Newsletter. Sue received an email from Mary Ellen recapping what the Commissioners needed to give to Mary Ellen for the newsletter. The calendar information, information on ads, time and place of future Commissioners meetings were listed. Sue has sent Mary Ellen the information on dates for meetings and will contact her about input and volunteers for the Lake Advisory Group, as well as an item about the harvesting information being posted at the bulletin board.

Next Meeting: Saturday, March 8, 2008 at the Adams Community Center

Adjournment: Motion to adjourn was made and seconded. Unanimously approved.

Respectfully submitted by Gary Chapman