

**Yahara Lake Level Advisory Group 2 (YLAG2)
Minutes**

Thursday, February 9, 2012

2 - 5 pm with Public Comment beginning about 5:00 pm

**Location: Lyman F. Anderson Agriculture and Conservation Center
1 Fen Oak Court, Madison**

Participants in attendance:

Scott Reiersen	Jack Von Rutenberg	Mike Kakuska
Ken Potter	Rob Phillips	Anita Weier
Richard Gullickson	John Van Dinter	Ed Minihan
Tom McGinnis	Mike Amstadt	Bill Fitzpatrick
Jim Bowen	Susan Tesarik	Melissa Sargent
Kevin Connors	Sue Jones	Sue Josheff
Mindy Habecker	Phyllis Berg-Pigorsch	Chuck Rolfsmeyer
Robin Schmidt	Don Peterson	Chin-Hsien Wu
Richard Lathrop	Lloyd Eagan	Melissa Malott

Participants absent:

Kurt Welke Dan Stephany

- 1. Introductions** - all
- 2. Approval of Minutes** - none available for review and approval
- 3. Check-in**
- 4. Discuss criteria, discussion and decision process** – The group reviewed the communication guidelines and mission statement hanging on both sides of the room and the criteria for decision-making. We will continue to review and refine the draft recommendations. Some felt by the time we get to voting, that it could be done on-line.

Who do the recommendations go to and who is going to implement the recommendations? The recommendations will go to DNR, the participant groups and other groups or agencies that involved in water levels. After voting, volunteers from YLAG2 may want to meet to discuss who should implement and communicating with those parties.

5. Discussion draft recommendations –

Recommendation F. The subcommittee (Sue Jones (convener), Susan Tesarik, Robin Schmidt) suggested language for recommendations.

Recommendation F1. Convene a technical advisory group to determine if it is technically and economically feasible to increase the infiltration above the infiltrations standard for new development and redevelopment

F1b. Support a study to determine where it is technically and economically feasible for infiltration opportunities for existing development.

F1c. Support a study to determine where it is technically and economically feasible for infiltration standards for existing development.

Comment: Who is going to implement? Will be assigning responsibility after the recommendations are final – may be a small group of volunteers at the end. If there is a change in government – standard could be lowered. Opposition to regulating existing development. We know that it is feasible and economical – it's where. This is CARPC Support a study to determine where it is technically and economically feasible for infiltration opportunities for existing development.

F2. Investigate opportunities to retrofit infiltration systems for outfalls discharging to the Yahara System.

F3. Inventory and evaluate the effectiveness of installed stormwater practices including stormwater 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.

F4. Should establish countywide regulatory requirements to protect and enhance significant infiltration areas.

Comments - Focused recharge is most effective

F5. Explore funding sources and incentives such as a basin-wide stormwater utility and tax breaks that could be used to fund and incentivize practices that reduce runoff and infiltrate water.

Recommendation G – The subcommittee (Rob Phillips (convener), Sue Josheff, Kevin Connors, Anita Weier, Ken Potter) suggested language for 3 recommendation under this category. The group discussed and agreed to the following wording.

G1 - Development and redevelopment on lots where a portion of the lot is within the 100-year flood plain should be further restricted such that the lowest entrance openings must be 2 feet above the regional flood elevation.

Comments – The two-feet comes from Administrative Rule NR 116. Some questioned if this should apply to accessory buildings and farming.

G2 - The requirements regarding infiltration associated with the development and drainage/pumping of enclosed depressions should be reviewed by a Technical Advisory Team (similar to that which generated the recharge requirements).

G3 - All new development in the Yahara Watershed in areas with hydric soils be further studied to see if new requirements are in the best interest of the landowner and the watershed.

Comments: New construction in areas with hydric soils typically results in increased shallow groundwater pumping to protect foundations which increases water discharge to downstream waters. The requirements could include a provision that prohibits basements that require pumping, requires infiltration of all the water that is to be pumped from foundations, restricts

development entirely or other measures as appropriate. The issue should be studied by a County Technical Advisory Team (similar to that which generated the recharge requirements).

Recommendation H. Convene a technical advisory group to explore standards that would require the detention of the 100-year storm event in the Yahara Watershed.

Comments – Initially LU3 was substituted for Recommendation H but there were a number of technical issues that needed to be better defined so language was changed to parallel the technical advisory group in Recommendation G. Many believe that Recommendation H is incorporated in Recommendation F. In the final draft of recommendations, Recommendation H should follow Recommendation F.

Recommendation I. Establish a single, full-time Lake Management position within Dane County.

Comments: This position's primary responsibility is to address levels and flows.

Recommendation J. 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.

Comments: Minor changes to provide a time frame but to also recognize budgets, legal issues, etc.

Recommendation K. Develop educational materials and incentives for landowners to promote the floodproofing or removal of structures in low-lying areas. (NO change)

Recommendation L1. The existing lake level rules for the Yahara System do not need to be modified.

L2. 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.

Comments: Move MM11 under Recommendation L to under Recommendation A.

Lakes are operated at the high end of the range and don't have storage. We could operate on the low end but some of the group doesn't know enough about the impacts.

Need a discussion of winners and losses. This is a complex system – on the same lake – some feel water is too high and too low at the same time.

Recommendation M. Explore water level orders that recognize that Lakes Monona and Waubesa act as one lake.

Comments: There is not a dam on the outlet of Lake Monona. Lake levels on Lake Monona are determined by the flow discharged from Lake Mendota and the discharge for the Lake Waubesa Dam. Current water level orders set the levels for Lake Monona at 0.2 feet higher than Lake Waubesa. During lower flow, there may be no water level elevation change between the two lakes. During high flows there may be as much as 10-inches.

Recommendation N. Sediment hydraulics and flow dynamics in the Upper Mendota and Cherokee Marsh area should be analyzed to determine if methods are available to restore and maintain a navigation channel, and an implementation plan for this work should be established.

Comments: This is a navigation recommendation. Current research on Cherokee Marsh is more wholistic. Some are concerned that this recommendation does not address sediment movement, restoring Cherokee Marsh. Those issues are handled in later recommendations that are still to be discussed.

Recommendation O. Lower the summer minimum and maximum of Lake Mendota by 6" until such time as improvements can be made to the downstream system allowing discharge out of Monona and Waubesa can be improved allowing these lakes to be more responsive to operational changes.

Comments: This recommendation is to provide necessary flood storage and wetland protection.

Why 6-inches? Why not something less that wouldn't impact riparians as much? YLAG 1 discussed 1' but that wasn't acceptable. A 6" drawdown of Lake Mendota can contain a 3" storm event but Monona would be high for longer because the volume of Lake Mendota has to flow through Lake Monona.

Recommendation P. This recommendation was assigned to a subcommittee (Sue Josheff – convener, Sue Jones and Melissa Malott) to review and possible revision.

6. Discuss Public Forum – The public forum is scheduled for March 28 evening at the Alliant Center. Jeremy Balousek and Sue Josheff will provide an overview of the system and the draft recommendations will be discussed.

7. Future meeting dates, location and agenda items - Feb 29, 2 - 5pm at the same location – One Fen Oak Drive.

8. Public Comment – None