

Yahara Lakes Advisory Group 2 – Public Comments – 3/28/2012

1. Water Levels

1A Retain current water level orders until an observational network and modeling indicates a need for change in order to better balance public and private interests.

- Yes
- Reasonable
- Keep the same water levels
- Yes
- Ok. I would support this but orders for flood conditions need to be put in place
- Okay as long as there are good ideas about what do to for floods
- Order state to perform new bottom sonar study of entire chain to evaluate and prioritize dredging to bring lake floor back to original bottom elevation and water capacity
- Disagree I believe the lake levels especially Mendota should be lowered by 3” to accommodate the chronic high water levels
- Agree
- Summer min levels on Waubesa are too low
- No -need exists now to make changes so that natural systems can be maintained and reestablished - wetlands/marshes/extended shorelines
- Agree- don't do things until it is understood
- I live on Lake Waubesa, we are the forgotten lake. It seems to us that only Lake Mendota and Monona matter. We just get the scraps during low water and the excess dousing high.
- It is time to lower summer water levels average by 6” to protect habitat and provide flood absorption
- Current levels notwithstanding, I think the water orders are too high
- This is sound thinking unlike some of the other ideas
- Agree wholeheartedly!!
- Agree
- Save spawning habitat
- Save the northern pike
- This especially true until all YLAG 1 recommendations have been implemented especially as it relates to the R.R. Bridges
- Yes I agree

1B Clarify implementation of Lake Mendota level orders when summer maximum is exceeded during high flows. (DNR)

- Yes I agree
- This is reasonable thought and suggestion given lack clarity of 1979 order.
- Save the northern pike
- Save spawning habitat
- Yes
- Add - accommodate and promote shallow water wildlife habitat and more nonmotorized recreation habitat areas
- Manage the Yahara as a system not one lake parceled from another
- Keep levels lower so maximum are likely to lower- max leads to negative shorelines impact
- All lake levels not just Mendota
- Agree
- I'm not sure this is the best idea since leaves Dane Co. with less wiggle room. However coordination is necessary especially of all the dams
- Yes but 'clarification" does not mean much, we need dams for action
- May want to create agreed upon strategy and pilot it before made into an order that is hard to change

- Yes (though I live downstream and don't want to inundated)

1C

Coordinate lake levels in the Yahara River system and particularly Lake Mendota to remain high enough (summer minimum - 849.6) from March 15 to mid-May to allow fish to spawn, young fry to grow to sufficient size to survive once water levels are lowered as determined by Dane County and DNR Fisheries.

- They aren't going to be lowered below summer min until Nov. 1 anyway
- Yes
- Only if effects the fishery
- I have to admit that I am a fisherman so this is important to me but sometimes Mother Nature is not nice and like now. Easy as snow for winter but not good for water lake levels
- Ok agree
- Yes it's important for the healthy functioning of all the lakes for fish to spawn. This was new information for me and needs to be disseminated!
- What about the other lakes to support spawn and fry?
- Agree
- Fish spawn in the entire Yahara system not just Mendota. This should be in place for the entire system
- Agree
- I agree. The same should be policy for all the lakes
- Add - set permanent no wake zones for areas 3 feet or less deep on summer average with appropriate buoy markers, signage and education
- Yes but high only compared to other times of year. Overall lower levels would create larger shallow areas for spawning during this time
- This is a sound idea
- Agree; perhaps even allow a level slightly above the summer minimum during this time period. The fish in these lakes are the top economical influence to our chain of lakes, and we must allow them to flourish.
- Lake Mendota is one of the best northern pike fisheries in the entire state so allowing pike (and other fish) to spawn is a high priority. The economic impact of pike fishing cannot be underestimated.
- Agree
- If water levels (precipitation) allows for 1C. – I support the motion
- This is a critical finding of 1979. it is not negotiable
- Yes people are constantly talking about preserving resources, the fishing in the Mendota is a wonderful resource and should be protected
- Lake levels minimums need to be kept high enough especially during months of March-May on all lakes in order for spring fishing spawning to take place
- Agree
- I'm fine with management for fish spawn as long as not in conflict with wetland restoration.

1D

Strive to operate Lake Kegonsa's water level at the midpoint of the summer range from June 1 through September 1.

- Agree
- No opinion
- If Lake Kegonsa levels can be substained at midpoint summer range, I support
- yes
- agree
- add- proactively plan watershed and lake levels management for climate change predicted moisture and weather extremes by avoiding uses and expectations that cannot accommodate disruption
- ok
- no - not if it impairs functions upstream. Kegonsa is not a stand alone lake- it has to fit into

- system dynamics and could benefit from improved wetlands shorelines
- not only should begin Kegonsa be operated at mid-point but Mendota/Waubesa should also be operated at no less than the midpoint low levels pose hazards to safe navigation
- all lakes should be at or above their summer mid-point
- Agree
- Should water levels be reevaluated since it's been 33 years
- Strive to operate Lake Kegonsa's water level at least at midpoint of the summer range from June 1 through September 1
- N.A.
- Okay but where's the data simulation to support this?
- Don't have enough info on what this would do to system

1E Evaluate the winter minimum water levels orders on all the Yahara System to meet the public interests. – eg., fish and wildlife habitat.

- Ok, but change only if the management of the system can react fast enough (hold or release)
- Yes + flooding & shoreline damage too
- yes
- if minimum water levels are ordered to be reduced/lowered, the dredging needs shall be defined prior to that reduction and be assigned to responsible jurisdiction (county) and have allocated funds to do dredging before lowering occurs
- agree
- winter levels need to be held at a level that does not create fish kill by low levels
- add- adjust lake shore taxes to add publicly managed wider lakeshore buffer to allow better planning, public access, and more natural vegetation shoreline habitat.
- yes
- agree
- winter minimum need to be high enough to ensure that water levels will be sufficient in the spring for fish spawning
- yes
- yes, winter minimum should be ahead too
- no opinion
- yes - the water is way too low. The spring spawning is in jeopardy and this could affect fish populations for years
- Lack of water in our lakes greatly effect fish habitat of littoral zone
- Agree – it's too low now.

1F Centrally coordinate the operation of all permitted dams on the Yahara System to maximize efficiency in the system.

- Agree
- Agree
- Save the northern pike
- Common sense
- Agree
- Very important so all controls work together
- Don't we do this already?
- Add- include more environmental group representation in CARPC
- Dane county needs to modernize the dams to be able to regulate by the inch rather than 6-inches
- Agree its one system ==> don't operate in a silo
- Yes - this has not been consistently don't and will help with flows out of all lakes
- Yes
- Yes please, and get the politics out of it
- Agree

- This seems absolutely necessary for good outcomes
- Yes implement this
- Yes
- Sounds reasonable
- That this is not happening should be an embarrassment to all authorities involved

1G | Do not deliberately operate the lakes below current minimums as a means to provide flood storage.

- Not unless modeling (or human intelligence) would indicate the need
- Are there annual climatic weather pattern models that meteorologists use that study long range patterns - can predict that it is likely to be a really wet year only in this case might this have any merit
- Only if large rains coming pumps water before
- No
- I disagree, with increasing rain this maybe necessary
- This seems at odds with the data on rainfall increases and flood events. This may be a necessary step to deal with our 500-&100 years flood events
- Disagree: Impossible to achieve this level of fine tuning. Nature will generate wet years and dry years, Avoid minimum levels
- If we are talking about summer minimums then we should consider operating below summer minimums if water levels precipitation and other relevant variables warrant taking action
- Agree
- Agree -need to manage the water with the dams below- Waubesa
- Agree this hurt and silos individual lakes and interests
- Yes, do other mitigation such as better shallow area vegetation in Cherokee to absorb and release floods
- Disagree
- Why should Lake Mendota be used as a storage pool for water problems that have been increasingly more problematic due to bad infiltration
- Agree - not cater to the extreme minority of lake utilizers
- The lakes should not be managed below minimums for any reason, as this will impact navigation and fish habitat
- Totally agree
- Agree
- Moderately disagree
- Yes
- Minimums are set for specific reasons according to fish and wildlife. Purposely keeping levels low will have a negative impact in fish and wildlife
- Agree

1H | Develop operating orders to address operation of the Stoughton Dam in the event of a high water emergency based on modeling analysis.

- Agree
- Agree
- Agree
- Save spawning habitat
- Another good idea
- Yes
- Why is this dam from the stone ages? Where are property tax \$ going? The infrastructure stinks
- Yes definitely. Often do not open the dam until it is too late
- This dam needs to be responsive to upstream problems

- Develop systems for the entire system not just Stoughton
- Neutral/ No comment
- Good Idea
- Yes
- Yes need to dump water quicker
- That this is not already the case should be embarrassing (again) to all authorities involved

1I Explore water level orders that recognize that Lakes Monona and Waubesa act as one lake.

- Agree
- Yes
- With the RR Bridge in the middle it's not truly one lake
- They are one lake, no expectation is necessary since they are not separated by a dam, what happens to one, happens to the other
- Are they essentially not the same lake as it is?
- This concept is not reasonable as the two lakes have varying levels
- Monona and Wabesa are totally different lakes. Monona acts as a holding ponds for water coming out of Mendota. Waubesa is often lower than Monona in flooding. Need to continue to cut weeds in Yahara River and manage dams below Waubesa to manage Monona. Might as well group Mendota and Monona as one lake
- Yes modification of the RR tressle should happen and dredging the Yahara between the two lakes should happen to increase flow and a min navigation level should be implemented
- Agree
- Good Idea since there's only one dam that hold back the water in both of them
- Yes
- Yes
- Yes need to dump water quicker
- This has interesting challenges- would like to learn more
- Save spawning habitat

1J Retain the existing lake level orders for the Yahara System.

- Agree same as A1
- Agree
- Save spawning habitat
- Agree
- Excellent Idea
- No they are to high
- Agree until better/more community input is reviewed and technical analysis and study is completed
- NO
- Agree the automate the management of them
- Disagree- consider modest interim changes (lower lake levels) until additional data is available
- Given the incidence of flooding, it seems to be time to act on this, not wait... How about getting rid of the Stoughton pain and the train trestle on Mud Lake to improve flow
- Maybe but this needs to be studied
- Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes otherwise DNR will have to open up dock restriction again
- Until scientifically (analysis, study) proven to need change.

1K Manage Lake Mendota close to its summer minimum of 849.6 feet MSL instead of the near the summer maximum of 850.1 msl in order to provide more storage for major runoff events.

- No!
- Summer minimums are not acceptable for both navigation and fish well being
- NO
- Mendota is not a retention basin
- Agree
- Disagree
- Lake Mendota being managed near its summer minimum means that most shallow fish habitat is not usable, launches are shallow, and navigation is difficult
- Disagree- manage towards the higher end to aid in water recreation
- Yes
- A minimum of 6" lower on average is needed to permanently protect the wetlands that provide so many benefits
- I completely disagree! Properties were placed in the flood plain and this would mean we'd now be too shallow => incongruence
- Yes
- Disagree
- Agree but I can support an interim on 850.2" (3 inch lower) regime as well
- Okay, but does 6" really make that much difference?
- Maybe
- Only if modeling or human intelligence indicates the need
- Save spawning habitat

1L | Establish target "median" levels for the lakes.

- Agree
- Sure, as long as it's within the upper end of recommended levels
- Yes
- Yes makes sense to have a target level established
- Yes agree
- Yes but they should be lower than at present
- What for? Would this be where lakes would be managed to?
- Not realistic with changing system, is it?
- Agree
- Consider as part of a longer range study
- Seems no different from current averages plus or minus 3"
- Maybe
- A 6" range between max & min IS a median

1M | DNR should establish winter maximum lake levels.

- Ok
- The DNR needs to go further into anticipation of the moisture coming in the spring and correct the lake levels accordingly
- Yes, but only after it starts considering moisture collected in snow cover (or lack of) in the Mendota watershed
- Moderately agree- pike and fish habitat should not be compromised
- No, I do not agree with maximum winter levels as they may result in too low of levels in the spring
- Yes agree, the fishing in shallow areas in the last few winters has been abysmal due to the winters due to excessive winter drawdowns
- See 1G- Why should lake Mendota be used as a storage pool for water problems that have been
- increasingly more problematic due to bad floatation
- Winter minimum should be no more than a foot below summer average to avoid damaging wetlands that provide so many benefits

- Yes, the '08 floods were caused by coming out of winter @ summer max levels which were systemically high for the remainder of summer
- Yes would help in high water years
- And minimum
- Disagree
- Yes, especially for Lake Monona
- Yes for Monona
- Worth considering if there is a point for doing so

Other:

- No later than MAR 2013 lower the 1979 Lake Orders' summer targets by 6 inches. This may be accomplished by lowering the target levels by 3" in 2012 and, if not problems emerge, an additional 3" in 2013. (Capital Region Advocacy Network for Environmental Sustainability – CRANES)
- Annually adjust the winter minimum target to equal the previous summer minimum target or no less than 6 inches lower. (CRANES)
- By JAN 2014, complete all studies and public participation necessary to begin further lowering the summer targets 2" per year, starting in summer of 2014, until Lake Mendota's natural level is achieved ~58" total. See map below.(CRANES)
- Lake Mendota's Level: An Un-Natural History, 1848-2012
This PPT, developed by CRANES (Capital Region Advocacy Network for Environmental Sustainability) and other experts, includes historic lake level, dam, and wetlands information.

This "un-natural" history supports the CRANES recommendations to lower Lake Mendota by six inches (no later than March 2013), then by two inches per year to its natural level, 40-60 inches lower than its present day level, when managed for the Summer range of the WDNR 1979 Lake Orders.

The PPT includes assessments by various experts of the benefits of the CRANES recommendation.

To download the most recent draft of the PPT, go to [CRANESinc.org](http://www.cranesinc.org); use link at lower left corner of homepage.

For a PDF version: <http://www.cranesinc.org/presentations/CRANES-YLAG2-L%20Mendota%20Level%20Recs-small-v2012-03-28.pdf>).

2. Watershed Management	
2A	<p>Protect and restore, and in some cases, acquire wetlands in the Yahara System to improve hydrology, flood storage capacity, water quality, fish and wildlife habitat.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This should be a high priority. Public needs education to understand how this meets a wide variety of needs • Agree • Agree. Restore the wetlands on North side of Mendota host in floods • Agree • Do more this and stop developers • Yes • Yes but I wonder how cost effective this is? Are there any studies? • This may of the most important ways to turn this flooding situation arrows • Save the marshes and tributaries • Agree

2B	Convene a technical advisory group to determine if it is technically and economically feasible to increase the infiltration above the infiltration standard for new development and redevelopment.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I think if a high infiltration (>75%) standard is not economically feasible for a given project, then that project is not feasible • Agree • Ah small return on effort • Agree • Yes • Especially for drainage to Monona • Ok, not high priority • Run off is clearly a big part of the flooding problem since for every inch of rain, there are two inches of rain off. YES. Do this • Agree
2C	Support a study to determine where it is technically and economically feasible for infiltration opportunities for existing development.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Somewhere in the management system is a flood plain program. Why is this followed more closely? I sympathize with victims of flooding. But if their home or business was built on a flood plain- they should expect some kind of flooding at sometime • Agree • Small return on effort • Agree but lower priority compared to 2A and 2B • Yes • Yes • Ok not a high priority • Again do this if at all possible • Agree
2D	Support a study to determine where it is technically and economically feasible for infiltration standards for existing development.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good Idea • Small return on effort • Same as 2C • Yes • Yes • Not clear what this means • Increase the standards if possible • Agree • Disagree- existing homes would be unduly harmed financially
2E	Investigate opportunities to retrofit infiltration systems for outfalls discharging to the Yahara System.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good idea • Agree • Agree • Yes • Yes extend what is already being done • We live near Spring Harbor and every time it rains, there is an ugly brown plumb of storm sewer water that drains to the lake. This would really help I think • Agree

2F	<p>Inventory and evaluate the effectiveness of installed storm water practices including storm water outfalls, and promote to property owners and developers effective retrofit practices that help restore natural hydrology, such as enhanced infiltration, rain gardens, disconnecting impervious areas, and green roofs.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not sure if this covers fertilization of yards. This is something that should not be allowed. I understand the need to fertilize but the efforts on our water system is damaging • Good idea • Disagree. Private homeowners should not be subject to expense • Ok • Agree • Yes • Yes good • Yes • Agree
2G	<p>Establish countywide regulatory requirements to protect and enhance significant infiltration areas.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes • Good idea • Yes good idea high priority • Yes especially monstrous lake homes • Agree • Ok
2H	<p>Convene a technical advisory group to explore standards that would require the detention of the 100-year storm event in the Yahara Watershed.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Save spawning habitat • ? • This should be a feasible thing from the Yahara hydrological model system • Does this mean the capacity to hold 100 yr storm amounts or that you will aim to always have this much in the system • Wow that's a tall order! Perhaps something higher than the current std. 30-50 years? • Ok • Disagree
2I	<p>Further restrict development and redevelopment on lots where a portion of the lot is within the 100-year flood plain such that the lowest entrance openings must be 2 feet above the regional flood elevation.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disagree. Property values would be housed • No • Save spawning habitat • Good Idea • Yes ok • Nah let'em build and deal with flooding –serves 'em right. • Neutral • Yes money usually talks when developers really want to develop in these areas. They should not be allowed. They build and then leave the area to go elsewhere to build. Can some kind of a time table go along with the developers that they have to be responsible for "X" number of years
2J	<p>Review the requirements regarding infiltration associated with the development and drainage/pumping of enclosed depressions by a Technical Advisory Team (similar to that which generated the recharge requirements).</p>

- Agree
- Yes
- Ok
- Good Idea
- Save Spawning habitat
- Ok
- Agree

2K

Study new construction regulations for hydric soil areas to see if new rules are needed to guide and/or restrict construction in areas susceptible to basement flooding from shallow ground water that leads to basement dewatering needs and pumping which increases runoff to the lakes.

- There should be no basement built where basement dewatering is necessary
- Agree
- Ok
- Save Spawning Habitat
- Good Idea
- Ok
- Yes
- Agree- Lower Priority

Other:

- Look at redirecting and enhancing the flow between Waubesa and Kegonsa, by adding pipes
- Require that all future development in the Yahara River watershed recreate natural hydrological conditions. (Capital Region Advocacy Network for Environmental Sustainability – CRANES)
- Retrofit existing development insofar as possible toward achieving natural hydrological conditions, to assure that the Yahara lakes do not need to be utilized as a detention facility for unnatural storm water runoff. (CRANES)
- End closed basin ditching. (CRANES)

3. In-Lake Management

3A Continue aggressive aquatic plant harvesting in the Yahara River to maximize flow.

- Allow plant harvesting only where it is necessary for water flow. Harvesting should not be allowed back in the bays where it does nothing for flow
- Agree w/ this but the extremely aggressive weed cutting in the lakes themselves needs to stop. Incredibly irrelevant areas to harvest weeds (such as the docks of shallow bays) are at as it is. There us no benefit to the expensive cutting being preformed on all of the lakes
- Agree
- Save the pike
- Agree that anything that can be done to improve flow where that are restrictions is important to reduce potential flooding
- Yes and do more
- Maybe- harming aquatic habitats is not to our benefits. How will benefits & costs be evaluated?
- Reduce manure runoff. Increase the number of manure digesters-make it economically adventurous to residents to turn manure into methane and fuel. And keep it out of lakes.

3B Evaluate all permitted dams on the Yahara System to determine if necessary upgrades must be designed and implemented to allow for more effective and reliable operation.

- Agree
- Agree
- Agree
- Agree – more efficient and effective
- This is long overdue. A long range plan should be developed to upgrade these dams to serve the needed function
- Agree
- Yes upgrade them or remove

3C **Continue to investigate flow restrictions on the Yahara System using the observational networks and models with the goal of identifying and prioritizing the restrictions including cost benefit analysis and developing a comprehensive plan to mitigate the top 5 by 2020 if financially, technically, culturally and legally acceptable.**

- Agree
- Agree
- Mother Nature will have her way. You can try
- Good recommendation. This is absolutely necessary and I wondering why this elevation wasn't done long ago when flooding became more frequent
- Agree
- I don't see anything happening as a result of this. Our lakes need aggressive action which coalition of communities can't provide as they are mostly selfish - As am I

3D **Continue to respond to flooding situations by enacting emergency slow-no-wake orders for boating during times of extreme high water to protect property and the environment.**

- Slow no wake orders are ineffective to protect shorelines, wind has much greater impact. The only people who want slow no wake orders are the property owners who were dumb enough to build in the flood plains
- Agree to an extent
- Agree
- When reason/current method seems to work just fine
- We have police to stop boaters from making wakes, but no one to police the wind. People who live on the lake knew the pit falls and the best of the populace suffers
- Agree
- More no wake- Monona shoreline has been eroding for year! Because of high water levels and wakes

3E **Dredging should be considered to aid in navigation in lake areas with shoaling problems.**

- Yes, allow dredging to assist navigation
- Whole heartedly agree- we need water for boat navigation
- Agree
- Yes, channels leading into and around Yahara system are in desperate need of dredging
- Implement the "river Reroute modeled by the VW info's system: 2 72" pipes alongside the Waubesa Kegonsa channel that can be opened and regulated as needed. Federal money is available and any cost or impact to wetlands will be easily offset by the lack of flood damage to wetlands and other property
- Yes where absolutely necessary and as a last resort
- Yes between Monona and Mud Lake
- Depends on where the Shoaling problem is located. If it has a mud bank caused by excess deposition then yes
- I don't know what the risk is of loosening conunents in sediment- is risk to great- otherwise, dredging many fix past ireneased runoff. But won't it fill right back in? Seems risky to me

3F	The early Native American fish weir and the underwater corduroy log bridge (some refer to as the “Douglas Dam”) located on the bed of the Yahara River between Lower Mud Lake and Lake Kegonsa are important cultural artifacts to our region’s history and should not be altered or removed to enhance river flow or boat navigation.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disagree; remove this structure as it is a navigational hazard, nothing more! • This historical artifact is a navigation nemesis. I have seen several boat props sheared beyond repair and are nearly impossible in a normal water year even when utilizing prudent boating experience. There is no marker to even document the damage and the vast majority of people would not notice if it was different. As it is Lower Mud is essentially unusable to motor craft • Agree • Likely a non-issue to water flow. Stay as is • I do not understand why these obstacles would not be modified if it had a significant impact on solving the restricted flow problem • Disagree- Modern life can’t allow for maintaining outdated artifacts of the past. These structures served their purpose for their time; we need to manage the water system for our time and remove the old system as needed • Agree • Yes-the fish weir- which existed before they were here- how arrogant are we to suggest removing it? There’d be a pretty big protest if it were attempted, I’d guess too • Dredge the entire water system. Dams (historical or not) are the biggest environmental detriment to any river system. Remove them. Only through dredging can adequate water flow occur • The need for river flow far outweighs the historical impact! Totally disagree!
3G	Designate the upper Yahara River (from Highway 113 north), a no-motor craft water-body, to protect the public’s investment in native shoreline/land and marsh vegetation restoration efforts.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No this is a publically navigable waterway that should be open to all boats • Vehemently Disagree! It sees minimal boating pressure as is and is already no-wake!!!! There will be no ill effects from continuing to allow motor craft in the marsh. The birdwatchers that utilize it one day a year will have to deal with it, as they for a long time • Disagree. No-wake yes. • No that seems like a personal request not a public request • Agree - Some portions where wetland restoration is desired should have navigation restrictions to and restoration.... • Yes more no motor craft areas. Add east end of Lake Monona (shallow areas) to no wake zone too.

Other:

- Close the Yahara River north of HWY 113 to motorboats, to reduce shoreline erosion from wave generation (provide exemptions for boaters with disabilities).
- Implement the “river reroute” modeled by the UW INFOS System: Two 72” pipes alongside the Waubesa to Kegonsa channel that can be opened and regulated as needed. Federal money is available and any cost or impact to wetlands will be easily offset by the lack of flood damage to wetlands and other property.
- We need more wetland restoration projects.

4. Analyses

4A	Study the public and private interests of lowering the summer minimum and maximum of the Yahara Lakes.
----	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not sure how this could be done. Our lakes are enjoyed by many for a variety of reasons. But it would be interesting to see how many different types/kinds of interests are out there • Agree • I kinda thought this was your charge (ok, not just “lowering” but regulating managing controlling) • A good idea, but this needs to be done to be done in a fashion that weights the high taxes lake dwellers pay as opposed to the free use of the lakes by those who use them for recreation • The summer minimum levels on Waubesa and Monona are already too low and should be operated at high point • Study the public interests, and place less weight on private special interest groups • Save spawning habitat • Disagree
4B	<p>Support the continued development, implementation and maintenance of an observational network and models to optimize lake levels and river flows of the Yahara Lakes System.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes good recommendation. There should be a standard repeatable process to control the levels and flows and a model would help achieve this goal • Yes • This is an important part of getting the data needed for informed decision making • Save spawning habitat • As long as we can maintain sufficient lake levels for public use and protect habitat
4C	<p>Analyze sediment hydraulics and flow dynamics in the Upper Mendota and Cherokee Marsh area to determine if methods are available to restore and maintain a navigation channel, and an implementation plan for this work should be established.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No • Upper Mendota/Cherokee marsh has limited legal riparian access rights. Study/evaluate and order removal off all illegal piers/docks • Ok, if environmentally responsible • Yes • A navigable channel through upper Mendota to Cherokee Marsh is an important objective • Save spawning habitat • Yes increased flow and dredging is needed
4D	<p>Create a navigation draft/depth standard for specific areas on the chain of lakes system.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes • Only if the standard also takes the other interest (environment, property loss) into account • Important for boaters to know where it’s best to drive/sail/etc. • A “min” depth channel for the Yahara River between Monona and Waubesa including Squaw Bay should be established at 5! • Yes, as long as the draft standard is sufficient for most boats • Save spawning habitat

Other:

- Please educate stakeholders that min. lake level on Mendota is necessary for northern pike spawning

- Get rid of the Stoughton Dam and the train trestle on Mud Lake to improve water flow in the Yahara Chain
- Low lake levels are hazardous to safe boating on the lower Yahara chain. There are many shallow areas and rock hazards, which are exacerbated by low levels. Low levels also increase the matting of lake weeds
- Save the Northern Pike of the Madison lakes!!! Proven fact that water levels must be kept at Summer minimums during the spring Northern Pike spawn
- Before minimum can be set, moisture content of ground and precipitation levels need to be considered
- Fish habitat is what is most important to me.

5. Education and Outreach

5A Develop educational material and incentives for landowners to promote the flood proofing or removal of structures in low lying areas.

- Educate landowners on why building in a flood plain may come back to bite them when we get above average precipitation
- Yes
- Yes agree
- Agree especially if other improvements are not implemented to improve flow during periods of potential flooding
- Agree
- Yes
- Also for landowners in watershed to encourage infiltration/ runoff reduction
- I think there is a lot of info out there. For all of this. Maybe one central spot should be available. This could be part of a lake management position.
- Yes – remove structures in low lying areas with increased risk assessment – public should not assume risk. Climate is too erratic.
- Agree

5B Continue a public education effort on the system of controls and allow them to be track, on an advertised web site, those control efforts on a daily basis.

- Not even sure what this entails
- This is a great idea
- Maybe – what's the cost?
- Also put in the paper, tell people how lucky we are to have the Lakes, and should be taken care of!
- Yes
- Save spawning habitat, raise lake levels

5C Develop informational materials for riparian landowners describing the dilemma or balance between high and low lake levels and climatic variation that balance public interests of less flooding versus reduced access.

- Tell the lake front owners that they represent a small minority of lake users. The public usage and enjoyment of our waterways for overweighs the interests of a small group
- "Climatic variations" is the key phrase here. We have had 100 year floods several past times in the last decade. Historically, this is not likely to continue. While this obviously may be extremely undesirable for them, you can't restrict access to all lake users (via boat launch) because of these extreme events. This goes along with point 5A.
- This probably would provide some value, but would not solve the problem
- Agree
- In emergency, high water situations, especially when water is being released upstream use reverse 911 (or some type of emergency notification system) to notify property

	<p>owners on or near the lakes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tax poor riparian practices (lawn chemicals) and reward good riparian practices – restoration of native adaptive systems • Yes • Sound great but last year I was able to get my boat off my lift only three times on Lake Waubesa. For the taxes I pay – Not Good. • Agree
5D	Have a concise, accessible, easy to understand data center for past historical no-wake orders complete with thorough information as to when enacted and released, the corresponding water levels, and the type of restriction placed.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree • Agree • Is this even realistic • I think people would be interested in this • Agree • Yes • Yes. Can there be an intern program for this at the UW? • No wake orders seem politically motivated and don't solve much. Wind is far more bad. • Is this even realistic? • Agree

Others:

- Strongly support all environmental efforts

6. Other	
6A	Reconvene YLAG2 to update progress on recommendations in 2 years.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Great Idea • Yes need to continue to monitor progress in order to sustain improvements • Yes, it is important that results are made public. This problem is not going away in 2 years. This should be continuous • Or reconvene regularly by other time frame (3 yrs – 5 yrs) • Yes • Yes
6B	Establish a single, full-time Lake Management position within Dane County.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No. Maybe part time (.5) or seasonal... When all questions are put together- maybe there is a possibility of a full time position. There is a lot of info to co-ordinate in all of this • Yes • Yes, but what would s/he do? • Yes but what is their role?

Other Comments:



20120504112356760

.pdf

from Madison Audubon Society, Inc.