



## BALSAM LAKE PROTECTION & REHABILITATION DISTRICT

Citizen's Committee - East Balsam Water Quality Meeting Minutes May 18, 2019, 10:00 AM

Polk Business Center Meeting Room

### 1) CALL TO ORDER:

- Tom Kelly called the meeting to order at 10:00 AM

### 2) COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:

- Tom Kelly, Steve Rediske, Andy Wilhoit, Bill Mork, Rod Preble (teleconference), Dave Mariani (teleconference)

### 3) COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

- Paul Duxbury
- Ray Sloss
- Mike Kampmeier
- Laura Sloss
- Josh (teleconference)
- Brad (teleconference)
- John Davis (teleconference)
- Paul Gydesen
- Jerry Shaunessy
- David Kerr (teleconference)

### 4) OTHERS PRESENT:

- Cheryl Clemens, Harmony Environmental
- Patty Kabus (recorder, teleconference)

### 10:00 AM WELCOME AND OVERVIEW:

- Cheryl introduced the agenda. Focus is communicating and how to communicate to the community
- Information on costs
- Information/feedback on the content for the public meeting

**5) 10:10 AM REVIEW OF DOCKSIDE ARTICLE:**

- Dick Miller drafted the dockside article with input from Ray Sloss and Milt Stanze. Input from committee:
  - Paul G thought it would be good to include a chart with the numbers so it's more understandable
  - Paul D noted the article doesn't have the total cost. People noted there is a total cost in the article
  - Paul D also noted that there is a comment that there is no scientific proof that alum will benefit the entire lake. Cheryl explained there is a scientific modeling result and then there is a common sense opinion.
  - Ray Sloss noted that Barr's report showed that phosphorous is higher closer to East Balsam where it flows out but then gets lower as you get farther away from East Balsam. This is more impactful in higher-water years and tends to support the philosophy that alum would benefit where it flows out of the basin. Tom and Bill to go look at the Barr report to see if the evidence can be supportive
  - Paul D noted with increased water clarity, there will be increased plant growth. This should be stated and also note that the lake district is prepared to manage the plant growth
  - Mike noted the tone of the article seems a bit desperate in stating several times that 'we are all in this together'. Maybe this should be a bit more scientific
  - Paul has an article dealing with price per foot study that provides evidence that values increase as clarity increases. Tom stated we should put that article in the website
  - Tom did a very good job explaining how the water clarity is averaged over the entire lake, so improving water clarity in East Balsam will benefit the overall lake clarity numbers, which is directly related to property values
- Q & A regarding the proposed plan to improve water quality in East Balsam Lake
  - Tom provided information about how shoreline values on the lake as a whole benefit from by the average lake clarity
  - Bill noted the lake enjoyment as a whole is benefited by the treatment
- Does the article address your concerns and anticipated concerns from property owners? See meeting #1 notes
  - Paul asked if there will be a table in the article showing cost

**6) 10:20 AM COST AND FINANCING FOR THE ALUM TREATMENT:**

- Tom reviewed the costs
  - Grant will be submitted by February, response by April
- Total application costs \$1,439,700

- Grants over 4 years is projected to be 800,000 (grant covers up to 75% of the cost up to a maximum of \$200,000 per project)
- Each year is considered a separate project and the grants are paid per project
  - Summary – average cost per year per 100,000 in assessed value - \$218.43 total, \$24.27 per year over 9 years
- Discussion around costs and how it will be paid
  - Ray noted this has been discussed and studied for almost 10 years now, with the support of Bill James (UW Stout) and Alex Smith (DNR) so this is not a new concept
  - Cheryl noted there is a planning process, including an amendment to the long range plan. This gets reviewed and approved by the DNR before they approve the project. Grants are also competitive.
  - Cheryl also noted there is up to another \$75,000 in grants to help pay for monitoring costs (which are currently included in the total costs)
  - Loans will be applied for each project separately (to the BCPL).
  - Tom noted the preference is to get approval for the full 9 year project at once even though loans will be applied for per project, and that adaptive management is recommended so the applications can be changed if needed as a result of the monitoring
  - Tom also noted that the monitoring will inform how the project is working
  - Paul noted that all previous projects were aimed at prevention vs treatment
  - Paul noted the current project will benefit some owners more than others
  - Paul feels special assessments will be more likely to be approved, with more cost being assessed to East Balsam residents
  - Bill noted the project would likely not go forward without the grant money
  - Rod noted the Rice Creek purchase was paid by the entire lake even though it did not significantly benefit East Balsam
  - Cheryl noted the board creates and defines the plan to bring to the constituents
  - Tom believes this is a solid plan and it will either be voted for or against
  - Paul G agrees with Paul D that this is something we need to do but stated that we are missing the constituents who are adamantly opposed to the project
  - Tom noted the June 8<sup>th</sup> meeting is a wonderful opportunity for everyone to voice their opinions and also to learn about the project
  - Dave noted that his property is not on East Balsam but he sees the benefit to the lake as a whole
  - Paul feels special assessment will have a better chance of passing
  - Cheryl noted that one idea might be to take a straw poll at the June 8<sup>th</sup> meeting
  - Cheryl also noted that if the vote fails at the annual meeting, then a special meeting is possible. Cheryl suggested and asked the committee if this is a true statement: “it’s not really a matter of whether we should do it, but more about how do we structure it so it will pass.”
  - John noted that we are one body of water

**7) 10:45 AM COMMUNICATION STRATEGY:**

- Review and provide feedback for abbreviated presentation for June 8
  - Cheryl noted she cut the slides back but kept other slides at the back in case they are needed
  - Cheryl noted the annual meeting presentation will be even shorter than the June 8<sup>th</sup> meeting notes
  - Cheryl briefly went through the slides for the June 8<sup>th</sup> meeting, and got feedback on which slides are helpful and which should be removed/combined
- June 8 meeting format
  - Tom will welcome and introduce the presentation and will facilitate the question and answer session
  - Very favorable for Bill James to be at both meetings
  - Ray noted we should provide more information at the June 8<sup>th</sup> meeting and consider adding a second meeting and then keep the presentation shorter at the annual meeting itself
  - John noted it might be a good idea to make slides available on the website after the meeting. Tom noted they will also provide contact information if people have questions after the meeting
- Additional communication elements strategy and schedule
  - John asked where this topic will be in the annual meeting and suggested this item might be placed earlier in the meeting.
  - Tom noted the budget can't be reviewed until after the vote has been tallied since the budget is dependent on whether the vote passes or not
  - Mike noted we should have no more than 8-10 slides
  - Tom noted he has some structure around the public comment section of the meeting
  - John asked if Bill James will be at the meeting. Tom said he would prefer Bill be at both meetings [Post meeting note - Bill is not able to attend June 8 or July 29. He is available for a potential second public meeting June 22.]]
- Tom thanked everyone for coming and for being involved in the process and adjourned the meeting