



Presenter/ Time	Agenda Item	Key Points	Outcomes, Next Steps, Assignments
1:00 PM	<b>1. Call to Order</b>	<p><b>Members Present:</b> Chair, Roger Walsh, Jan Allman, Bruce Neeb, and Korin Doering</p> <p><b>Others Present:</b> Bobbi Winebar, Sara deBruijn, Jessica Terrien, Cheryl Housley, Gina Keenan, Chris Halbur, Mary Rothenmaier, Annie Loechler, Faith Murray, Cathy Burrow, and members of the public.</p>	<p>Meeting called at 1:10 PM by Roger Walsh.</p> <p>Agenda Repair – Honoring soon to be retiree – Annie has worked for the DNR for 37+ years.</p>
	<b>2. Discussion of Policy Items</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>a. Funding of Sediment/Sand Traps</b></li> <li><b>b. Eco-Harvesters (Korin Doering)</b></li> <li><b>c. Stormwater Requirements</b></li> <li><b>d. ADA Compliance</b></li> <li><b>e. Alternate Plans NR 1.91(6) and NR 1.91(4) (Bruce Neeb)</b></li> <li><b>f. Engineer Stamped Plans (Bruce Neeb)</b></li> <li><b>g. Fiscal Responsibility (Spending Budget) (Jan Allman)</b></li> <li><b>h. Community Support (Jan Allman)</b></li> <li><b>i. Boating Safety 10% Cost Share Increase Requests</b></li> <li><b>j. Update Boat Wash Station Item on Policy Document:</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Funding of Sediment/Sand Traps: Draft Summary – Bobbi Winebar stated that a legal opinion was received. Analysis included that they would create an artificial depression that would be deeper than what a dredged channel should be which is inconsistent with code making them ineligible for grant funding. A horizontal trap may be eligible but would still need to stay within the parameters in s. NR 7.05(9), Wis. Adm. Code. Channel Dredging was not part of the program when s. 30.92 Wis. Stats. was created. It was added with the passage of the 1991 budget bill (Wisconsin Act 39).</li> </ul> <p>Question – if a channel dredging applicant wants to dredge a channel to a depth of 4 feet which would be sufficient to sustain the dredge for 10 years and is sufficient for the recreational boats using that channel, but they apply for dredging of 8 feet deep, is this eligible? Dredging a channel is different than dredging a depression for a sediment/sand trap. If they prove that a depth deeper than the 5 feet is needed, then it may be eligible</p>

			<p>dependent on sedimentation types and proper review and acceptable documentation. Sediment traps creates a deeper depression which doesn't fit the parameters of Administrative Code thus making them ineligible for RBF funding.</p> <p>Question - What is asked for in a normal dredging permit? All dredging requires a 404 review. The 404 review has to do with the dredge sustaining for 10 years. Sediment/sand trap will not be eligible under RBF.</p> <p>Once the policy is written it should come back to the commission.</p> <p>b. Eco-Harvesters (Korin Doering):  Eco-Harvesters – two options – one pulls plants, one chops. Cutting keeps the roots and sediment in place. The one that pulls could be creating open areas for invasive species. Korin reached out to biologist for opinion on eco-harvester. Biggest concern is disturbing sediment could require dredging permits. If this equipment is requested under grant funding this could cause additional permitting work and questioning if this equipment pulls us in a different direction than what this funding is meant for. Eco-Harvesters without a cutting bar have proven to create problems within the sediment. It is proposed that if we are to fund eco-harvesters it should be eco-harvesters with a cutting bar and that no pull eco-harvesters should be funded. The paddle wheels on the harvester also create sediment disturbance. Committee wants more in depth response or guidance from the lake biologist</p>
--	--	--	---

			<p>regarding whether these are good or bad. Permitting of eco-harvesting use is lake specific. **Propose eco-harvesters are not funded unless approved by lake association and lake biologist have approved. This would ensure proper permits would be required. Chris Halbur indicated that this proposal sounds consistent with codes. Question - How many of the eco-harvesters have we funded? Only a couple. Because the policy review is not finalized there are questions on if the eco-harvester is funded now what is to say a permit would be or not be available later. More discussion is needed on this topic. Lake biologists have not finalized the Eco-Harvester Guidance document.</p> <p> EcoHarvester Guidance Draft.pdf</p> <p>c. Storm Water Requirements – Presentation by Sarah Anderson, Storm Water Specialist, WDNR:</p> <p> Storm Water Construction Site Pern</p> <p>Sites that disturb 1 acre or more of land are required to obtain a construction site WPDES Permit prior to any land disturbing activity. Parking lots are considered land disturbance. Less than an acre you don't need a permit, but you still have to implement proper rules and regulations.</p>
--	--	--	--

			<p>Must apply for a storm water permit online at least 14 days prior to the start of construction.</p> <p>Question - Has a project ever been denied a Storm Water Control permit?  No, not recently. Chis Halbur asked Bobbi Winebar if we should come up with a checklist or a question on the application to assist with applicants in this process. Checkbox or checklist tends to work better than description boxes. This is only an issue for projects that will have under 1 acre of disturbance because the ones over an acre require the permit.</p> <p>d. ADA Compliance:  Don't need to have a boarding dock but if you do, then needs to meet ADA standards.  Nature doesn't always allow for appropriate slopes but must try your best to your greatest extent possible.  ADA parking doesn't need to be the closest spot near the launch, but it does need to be in the safest and most applicable spot.  Proper transitions between surface changes. Cannot be more than a half inch gap.  Don't need to have edging or rails but if you do have rails, they have to meet specific ADA standards.</p> <p>e. Alternate Plans NR 1.91(6) and NR 1.91(4) (Bruce Neeb):  Should we take in to account other access on the lake?  If we require in submitting an application that they identify other access points on the water body that would be developed and improve water body access to the</p>
--	--	--	--

			<p>lake. Could we consider that access on this application? Yes.</p> <p>It would be nice to know that the applicants are considering this when applying and not just checking a box. When you count public access points are you counting privately owned property that is open for public access – Chris Halbur stated that, yes, you would count that as public access.</p> <p><i>AMENDED at April 11, 2023 Meeting: Minutes be amended to reflect that the question discussed was whether alternative action plans should be required when min/max standards under NR 1.91(6) and NR 1.91(4) are not met. Minutes should also reflect department position at the time, which is that it is an issue the department should pursue.</i></p> <p>f. Engineer Stamped Plans (Bruce Neeb): In the past, we would have an engineer sign off on department plans. We would let the grantees verify that the engineering guidance is being met. Should these be signed off by an engineer in order to assure proper plans and specifications? There is difficulty in seeing the feasibility in these projects without engineering designs. Opposition is that rural small communities that apply for this funding cannot afford to have an engineer sign off on plans and specifications. Chris Halbur stated that 80-90% of the past 5 years of cost amendments for these projects are due to engineering agreements. The projects that would require an engineer signature would require a permit in some way from the DNR. Requiring</p>
--	--	--	---

			<p>applicants to have them pay for a professional engineer to review the plans seems like an undo hardship to the applicants.</p> <p>Annie Loechler stated that she doesn't think we can do this to the small towns and rural communities that cannot feasibly make this possible.</p> <p>g. Fiscal Responsibility (Spending Budget) (Jan Allman): Deferred to future meeting</p> <p>h. Community Support (Jan Allman): Jan recently participated in the Michigan Waterways Commission meeting. Letters of support from the community were important because they wanted to make sure the community is aware of the funding received for these projects. Should we ask the communities to publicize the receipt of funding? We will talk to communications department to see if they have some kind of template we could use and we could add this to the grant agreement asking the community to publicize a news release stating that the project was funded with grant funding.</p> <p>i. Boating Safety 10%: What do we need as proof that they are holding a boater safety program? Coordinate with DNR Recreational Wardens cause the program should be listed on Law Enforcement's website. To receiving the extra 10% cost share, the course must be a certification course. If a local law enforcement provides 10% enforcement on that water body, would they be eligible for the additional 10%?</p>
--	--	--	---

			<p>This will be reinstated for the 2023 applications. We will confirm before then who is eligible and what is needed to be submitted.</p> <p>j. Update Boat Wash Station Item on Policy Document: Is it only funded if part of a larger project? Is it funded on its own? There is a new boat wash station (CD3) that is solar operated, decontamination materials, and does not require water, uses air. Would this be fundable? Create policy broad enough to fund these new waterless wash stations. Proposing we ask a DNR AIS specialist if they are effective. Will check on this and revisit at a future meeting.</p>
	<b>3. Public Comments</b>		No Public Comments
	<b>4. Adjournment</b>		Motion by Jan Allman to adjourn a 4:17 PM, seconded by Bruce Neeb. Motion carried unanimously.