

WISCONSIN WATERWAYS COMMISSION AGENDA & RECORD

October 25, 2016

Town of Rib Mountain Town Hall, Rib Mountain, WI
Meeting Minutes Recorded: Bobbi Winebar

| Presenter/ Time | Agenda Item | Key Points | Outcomes, Next Steps, Assignments |
|----------------------------|---|--|---|
| 8:30 AM | 1. Call to Order | <p>Members Present: Chair, Jim Rooney, Roger Walsh, Dave Kedrowski, Maureen Kinney and Lee Van Zeeland.</p> <p>Others Present: Bobbi Winebar, Ed Slaminski, Ann Loechler, Chris Halbur, Sara deBruijn, Jim Ritchie, Patrick Kirsop, – DNR.</p> | Meeting called at 8:41 AM by the Chair. |
| | 2. Acceptance of Minutes of Previous Meeting | Minutes of August 16, 2016 | <p>Correction to the minutes by Roger Walsh on bottom of page 2: “Motion by Lee Van Zeeland to approve #14 should be #13 since there wasn’t a #14”</p> <p>Motion by Roger Walsh, second by Dave Kedrowski to approve the minutes of August 16, 2016. <u>Motion carried.</u></p> |
| | 3. Public Comments | | None |
| | 4. Commission Discussion/Decision Items | 1 Grant Application Cycles | <p>Jim Ritchie presented that the DNR staff would like to have a set schedule for the grant application so that sponsor’s will know when applications will be due each year on a consistent basis. This will help with sponsor’s Commissioners and DNR staff scheduling and work planning. Commission can meet up to 4 times a year. Meetings would be held on the 2nd Tuesday of the month, whenever possible:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1st quarter: funding meeting set for August 8th (but is dependent on budget) in Wausau with applications due June 1; • 2nd quarter policy meeting in Oct/Nov with the possibility of including a |

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| | | | <p>tour at that time; Date not set.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 3rd quarter funding meeting in January to be held in Madison/Fitchburg with applications due Nov. 1 (if money is still available); Meeting date set for January 10.• 4th quarter funding meeting in April if funds are available (early April due to having to have the funds encumbered by May 1) in Wausau with applications due Feb. 1. Meeting date set for April 11. <p>Motion by Lee Van Zeeland to accept these dates and locations. Second by Maureen Kinney. <u>Motion carried.</u></p> <p>Lee Van Zeeland asked what our role is with working with the sponsor regarding their perspective projects. Jim Ritchie provided the following: Staff discusses project to determine what is eligible, do a site visit if feasible, go over rating sheets, once package is ready to go then submit to Bobbi Winebar for final processing before sending packages to the commission. He also questioned about if the one month is sufficient for DNR work. DNR staff agreed that one month should be sufficient but there may be some delay. Lee asked about DNR staff providing information on grant applications and how it helps and can affect funding decision. Discussion about what Commissioners do for understanding projects prior to meeting and that it is their job to do work. Commissioners would like list of projects about 5-7 days after the application deadline so that if they happen to be in a project area, they can stop and do a</p> |
|--|--|--|--|

| | | | |
|--|--|-------------------------------|---|
| | | | <p>site visit.</p> <p>Pat Kirsop indicated that any changes to the program guidance would have to be put on website for 21 day comment period. Commissioners will review any comments received at Jan. meeting.</p> |
| | | <p>2 Canoe/Kayak Launches</p> | <p>Annie Loechler indicated that Sports Fisheries Restoration (SFR) funding can be used for paddle craft projects.</p> <p>Discussion on whether these launches need to be at sites where an RBF project had already been funded or would these have to be part of a bigger motorized launch project and not just a stand-alone project? Funding comes from stewardship so it is bonded money which means it gets paid back by the general funds. Kayakers/ canoeists (paddle crafts) contribute to these general funds.</p> <p>Jim Rooney presented that he feels canoes/ kayaks should be registered. Currently the paddle crafts are not required to be registered. Would have to check with customer service to see how many are actually registered. Some boat launches charge fees for paddle craft launching.</p> <p>Roger Walsh mentioned that in 30.92(4)(b)7., Stats., it mentions motor powered recreation but not non-motorized, so it leaves this in rather a gray area. It also mentions that projects qualifying for funding are listed along with the phrase “but are not limited to.”</p> <p>Annie Loechler brought up the subject if whether a hoist at a motorized launch is an</p> |

| | | | |
|--|--|-----------------------------|--|
| | | | <p>eligible project item. It is eligible but the municipality would have to take on the project and maintenance.</p> <p>Motion by Maureen Kinney to consider kayak/canoe launches as part of a bigger motorized area. Second by Dave Kedrowski. Roger Walsh made an amendment to the motion that the launch cannot be a stand-alone canoe/kayak project. Second by Dave Kedrowski. <u>Motion carried as amended.</u></p> |
| | | <p>3 Rating Cover Sheet</p> | <p>Bobbi Winebar presented the updated cover sheet that was worked on at the BOAT Team meeting on Oct. 24, 2016.</p> <p>Lee Van Zeeland asked for clarification on “state of readiness” and “distance” and “no existing public access on the waterbody.” State of readiness is scored on whether the project has final engineering plans and is ready to being construction after receiving the grant agreement. Distance is scored on how far away the next existing access site is from the project site. No existing public access on the waterbody means that this is the first public access site to be developed on this waterbody. Other scoring items were discussed because it seemed that some of the questions weren’t being used for anything. Statutes require that projects be scored. Commission agreed to continue use.</p> <p>Pat Kirsop mentioned concern for 16 county area that refers to forestry in ss. 25.29(7)(a). Found in Guidelines for Recreational Boating Facilities Program: http://dnr.wi.gov/files/PDF/pubs/CF/CA0004.pdf. This document is from 2010 so needs to</p> |

| | | | |
|--|--|---------------|---|
| | | | be revised in the near future. |
| | | 4 Launch Fees | <p>Roger Walsh presented that at the last funding meeting that 2% of the total project cost up to a max of \$5,000 was deducted if the project sponsor didn't charge a launch fee. The reason for wanting them to charge a launch fee is for maintenance of the launch.</p> <p>Ed Slaminski wanted to know why the launch fee amount collected isn't then deducted from the next project for that same municipality when they apply for another grant. Also discussed was the question on the application as to whether they have a maintenance fund or not to not have the 2% deducted for no launch fee. Ed said that he knows of counties that will not charge launch fees but have a maintenance fund. Ed also mentioned people have told him that they will not use lakes with launch fees.</p> <p>Sara deBruijn presented that Sanitary District's would not receive any of the money collected for a launch fee.</p> <p>Pat Kirsop presented that the "life of a project" should be 10 years for a project funded with bonding money. If a sponsor comes back within those 10 years then they shouldn't receive additional funding.</p> <p>Chris Halbur presented that a lot of small lakes are used by others outside of the community. Also if a municipality has worked hard to get their portion of the funding and gets frustrated that the commission docks them because they don't have money coming in from their own coffers.</p> |

| | | | |
|--|--|--|---|
| | | | <p>Annie Loechler mentioned that she also was trained to help applicants to find matching funding so they didn't have to have money coming out of their own coffers. She doesn't promote this as much anymore because of the commission docking funds if they don't have any of their own funds in this project.</p> <p>Donations/Voluntary boxes are acceptable and shouldn't be docked the 2%.</p> <p>Motion by Maureen McKinney to not require those sponsors that do not have the authority to adopt or charge a launch fee that the sponsor not be penalized for not having a launch fee. Second by Roger Walsh. <u>Motion carried.</u></p> |
| | | <p>5 Saxon Harbor Plan for Funding</p> | <p>Jim Rooney proposed that as a discussion point that \$250,000 should be made available for the Saxon Harbor storm damage areas for their preliminary work. An application would have to be received from the sponsor for a specific project.</p> <p>Dave Kedrowski stated that preliminary estimates at Saxon Harbor are at 9 million dollars to replace the whole marina. Have to wait to see how much money FEMA will put towards the project. The community would only have to provide 12% of the total replacement value agreed upon. RBF doesn't fund marinas but could fund the transient docking and the dredging. Project would take at least 4-5 years to complete.</p> <p>Jim Rooney suggested that Annie Loechler go back to the municipality to get them to start working on an application for this</p> |

| | | | |
|--|---------------------------------|---|--|
| | | | emergency funding for the Jan. meeting. Annie asked the commission if she could give the municipality leniency on the Nov. 1 deadline if needed due to the extenuating circumstances. The DNR can choose to accept an application after the deadline for extenuating circumstances due to acts of nature and FEMA funding issues. |
| | Public Comments | None | |
| | 6. Member Items | Weed Harvesters | <p>Lee van Zeeland raised issue of 35% funding of weed harvesters when the Guidelines effective July 1, 2015 stated that the guideline was to fund at 20%</p> <p>Roger Walsh brought up that originally decided on 20% and then it was changed to 35%. Lee indicated that he was not in agreement to this change and that this singles out one particular type of funding. Roger was in disagreement and that this topic shouldn't need to be discussed anymore. The 20% cost-share funding was presented as a guideline and the motion passed at the WWC 11/14/2014 Policy meeting. The decision of the WWC was made as a guideline that may change depending on funding available at the time.</p> <p>Chris Halbur presented a question to the commission regarding RBF funds for fuel docks. Are these fuel docks eligible for maintenance/rehab funding? According to the commission these are not eligible items.</p> |
| | 7. Next Meeting/Location | Discussion regarding 3 rd quarterly meeting. | Finalized in item #1 |
| | 8. Adjournment | | Motion by Maureen Kinney, second by Lee Van Zeeland to adjourn at 11:20 AM. <u>Motion carried.</u> |

