

Minutes of Meeting of the Lake Committee held Wednesday, May 5, 2010

Present. Committee: Joe Donlin (Chairman), Bonnie Wilcox, Don Funseth, Dave Eustice, Jim Root, Ben O'Brien and April Little.

Madison Community Foundation (MCF) Discussion:

1. **Update on Lake Restoration Project** – Jeff Hruby of Montgomery Associates gave an overview of the plans and budget to date.
2. **Overview of Madison Community Foundation** – Bob Sorge was present. The MCF has already given \$68,000 to Belleville's library and food pantry and \$30,000 for the Lake Committee as a challenge fund. It is a non-profit institution to support community assets. The Village has created a pass-through fund for the lake and would like eventually to build an endowment for the lake. They can handle administration tasks of the fund, such as receipting, and can allow anonymity. They also build campaign expertise, and can process funds in a multitude of ways. The fund's first contribution was from Ben O'Brien's bowling fundraiser. Anyone can donate now via the MCF website. The fee is 1% of contributions.

The first task is to decide on the goal for the campaign. The community needs a target to shoot for. Second we need to celebrate the success that we already have had. One challenge is that people may be tired. We are already halfway to our goal. A campaign is always about momentum. From there we would build a gift pyramid; i.e. one gift at \$100,000; two at \$50,000 etc. The community must be involved in the conversation. What are key messages? They must be simple and consistent. It's also about the whole impact to the community such as economic development. Ask people to join you in this effort. Raise awareness, raise resources and distribution are the goals. The campaign must be realistic.

Goal – Laurine Lusk would like to see the expanded plan happen. There is much skepticism still out there. Word of mouth starts the change. People may also respond to factual knowledge. The first message: the project will happen and will be this done by 2011. Jim Root and Herb Blaser felt people need to see construction. Village Board needs to say it is committed. Becky Olson gave a donation. There is a risk. It was mentioned that other adjunct projects are out there - put the whole thing out?. Think globally but raise money incrementally. Sorge said that there must be celebration along the way.

Sorge: Need to change momentum; certainty is the first step. Must engage the community in the dialogue of what is possible. Must have clear goal, hard numbers, and a consistent message. Timing is a key issue. Might want to wait to set the goal before the campaign; build credibility first. Most earth work will be done by early spring.

Action items: think about personal gifts; how long to allow pledges; who is missing from the meeting and needs to be part of the conversation; what are you willing to do to help. Sorge felt bid numbers would give us credibility.

Regular Meeting Agenda:

Call to Order – All members still present. Ben O’Brien had to leave.

Approval of Minutes – Root made a motion to approve; seconded by Wilcox. Motion passed unanimously.

Old Business:

1. Permitting

- a. **WDNR** – Chapter 30 permit is in hand from DNR. Chapter 31 is being reviewed; expecting word next week. This is for dam and spillway work. Erosion control is 30 days before construction.
- b. **USACE** – Provisional permit was issued some time ago. However, are working with some revisions. Anthony Jernigan said that he anticipates that revisions will be incorporated within the next two weeks. No surprises are anticipated with any permits.
- c. **Local** – Expected mid to late May. Floodplain and erosion control have 30-day review time.

Hruby spoke with archeological reviewer; he does not anticipate major problems.

2. **Design Development** – Drawings are at 90 percent completion overall. Reviewing geo-tech data on the berm. They are proposing a system using a geo-grid of plastic mesh on the soft sediment with a 30-inch lift of fine sand over top. It provides a uniform base in the case of settling and better load distribution. It added a bit of cost but is better for long term maintenance. Might be easier for construction also, which might lower cost slightly. 10-foot path with 5-foot clear zones on either side. Native vegetation will help keep geese off the berm and promote stability.

Mill race area would be partly filled in and the road taken out. Benefits are increased park area and improved entrance and reduced long-term safety costs. Costs are approximately \$50-\$60,000 additional total. Includes: utility: \$15,000; concrete pipe install and backfill at \$22,500 (might be able to use infill); new asphalt drive is \$9000 and demolition of bridge and existing drive and portion of concrete is \$9000. There are costs tradeoffs. Options are bid as is and see what numbers are or do change order. The stop log structure currently leaks. Could also look at hybrid options.

Rob Montgomery: costs are not trivial but long term it is a better plan. Donlin said this cost should not be part of lake project budget. Cons of keeping the bridge are safety and long term maintenance. Pros are that it will cost less now. The bridge is not in bad shape. Could leave bridge in place and move structure to the south. Plans would need to be redone. Funseth was concerned with the cost as well. Width of road entrance would be the same. Is there any costs savings to leaving the bridge? There would be some design problems.

Whatever is done – Village prerogative to replace utility lines. The sanitary pipe must come up and over lake pipe and back into alignment. This requires grinder pump. The alternative is to keep fundamentally as is today, but may perpetuate other problems. Walls are not high enough south of the bridge. In current design, would bury the mill race structure. The bridge is in the way of the structure, which would be about the height of the bridge today. Several members would like to see the bridge stay. Wilcox felt the current situation was hazardous. Opinions were that cost and historical value were important. Could look at putting gates just south of the bridge.

Horseshoe pits may be relocated. The players may have some money to assist and will look for advice on location. The plan will include some counterfort repair on the dam. There will be two separate bids for restoration; long term restoration (years 1-3) will be bid separately.

Bid document will include an attachment for the expanded plan to allow for estimates. The bid will allow moving forward with the expanded plan. There is a time frame when the general contractor will be out there; there can only be costs certainty during mobilization. Other enhancements could happen 2-3 years from now as the mobilization costs are not great. Boat landing could be graded in on the lake side. Dam has not technically been inspected. It is unclear if more inspection work will be required.

- a. **Berm / Walkway Entrance** – Bollard may need to move because of utilities. Trees would be 2 ½ inch caliper.
3. **Funding Update** – Revised opinion of probable costs – base plan – is adjusted to \$2.143 million. Estimates were conservative. It includes estimating contingency and construction services. Cost increases were primarily because of mill race and separation berm. The difference is about a \$233,340 increase, primarily for the berm and construction services.
 - a. **Army Corp of Engineers** – They presented many conditions on getting involved with the project that would cause long delays. There are offering to meet with the Village. There could be some benefits. No interest in meeting with them was expressed.
 - b. **Other** – Deb Kazmar offered to do a cookbook project for a fund-raising
4. **Project Schedule** – Best case is May 17 Village Board appearance. May 24 begins bid period. June 21 would be bid results and award. August 9 - major construction begins (some minor can begin July 26). June 17 - Lake Committee would make bid recommendation if desired. Public Works Committee might wish also to make a recommendation to Village Board on the bidder. July 12 would be potential notice to proceed. Bid documents will require submission of similar projects for screening purposes. Prequalifying bidders is a long process and might miss a qualified candidate.
5. **New Business:**
 - a. **Consideration of Recommendation to Village Board on Proceeding with Bidding of Lake Restoration Construction** – Root made a motion to recommend that Village Board to proceed with the bidding of the lake project. Seconded by Eustice. Motion passed unanimously.

- b. **Shoreline Owner's Meeting / Open House with DNR** – There might be some grant money possibilities. Richard Wedepohl said we will work with DNR. Discussion of using fish stock from the Sugar River. Could be funded from a lake planning grant. Could also use volunteers.
- 6. **Set Next Meeting Agenda, Date and Time** – June 17 at 6 p.m. for Lake Committee and possibly earlier for the fundraising meeting with MCF.

Adjournment – Funseth made a motion to adjourn seconded by Wilcox. Motion passed unanimously.

- April Little, Executive Director