



**MINUTES  
DEVILS LAKE WATER IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT  
REGULAR MEETING**

**LINCOLN CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS**

**April 9, 2015**

**6:00 P.M.**

**PRESENT:** Brian Green, chairman  
David Skirvin  
Kip Ward  
Randy Weldon  
Kent Norris

**ABSENT:** None

**PUBLIC SPEAKERS:**

Richard Danielson	Pat Christie
Paul Katen	Les Davis
Dale Walker	Gary Fromm
Angie Wright	Mariellen Rich
Craig Selvidge	Mitchell Moore
Mike Roth	Roger Smith
Mark Christie	Jack Strayer
Bill Piggott	Mary Dooling
Tom Rice	Monique Tyler
Lauren Waltz	Pat Dooling
Ren Jacob	Larry Rich
Susie Henderson	Dean Klaus
Vicki Taft	Tina French
Allan Kramer	Michelle Highland
Miles Schlesinger	Mark Highland
Steve Logan	John Coburn
Bill Sexton	Melissa Bauer Lindsay
Mike Delk	Jim Hoover
William Henderson	

**STAFF:** Paul Robertson, Lake Manager

**(Video: 0:00)**

Chairman Brian Green convened the meeting at 6:06 p.m. He advised the public that since all seats in the meeting room were taken, other people could watch and listen to the meeting on a video screen in the courtroom.

## **I. ROLL CALL**

All directors are present.

## **II. CONSENT AGENDA**

**David Skirvin moved to approve the consent agenda, including the minutes and financial report of the March 2015 meeting. Green seconded. Unanimous vote in favor.**

## **III. RESOLUTION: Registered Office and Registered Agent**

**Green read into the record Resolution 2015-02, recognizing the physical and mailing address of the Devils Lake Water Improvement District and recognizing its Lake Manager, Paul Robertson, as registered agent. Unanimous vote in favor.**

## **IV. COMMENTS from CITIZENS on NON-AGENDA ITEMS**

Green outlined the public comment policy. Because of the large number of expected speakers, comments were limited to 3 minutes apiece.

**(Video: 4:20)**

**RICHARD DANIELSON, 1824 NW 26<sup>th</sup> Street, Lincoln City:** Recommended that the entire board of directors and lake manager resign in shame. Asked for clapping. Said lake has gone downhill since carp were introduced. There has been a decrease in bird species because there are no weeds and no bugs. Aeration is a joke. No company will want to guarantee that aeration will work on a large scale. The cost is prohibitive. Inspection of septic systems should be required. You'll need a water cannon to blast the channel open if the dam comes out. Jet skis and weeds never got along, and that's the main reason for the carp.

## **V. SPECIAL ORDER OF BUSINESS**

### **a. Public Hearing**

#### **i. Opening of the Public Hearing, Introduction & Hearing Procedures**

SEE STAFF REPORT

#### **ii. Staff Report & Presentation**

**(Video: 10:20)**

SEE STAFF REPORT for Lake Manager's review of the history, structure, and operation of dam; history of lake levels; problems connected to the dam; possible benefits of removing the dam; support letters from hydrologists commenting on removal; review of water rights; review of needed permits; possible options for replacement; managed use of water rights; discussion of algae; erosion, dock, septic system studies.

#### **iii. Questions & Comments from Board**

#### iv. Public Comment Period

(Video: 51:20)

**PAUL KATEN, 56630 Sitka Drive, Otis:** Does not own property on lake, but as an Oregon taxpayer, supports boards that manage lake and water quality; all Oregonians' opinions matter; lake belongs to all of us; he wants no pollution, safe swimming; stop artificially managing lake levels, favors removal of dam so sediment will flush.

**DALE WALKER, 3999 NE East Devils lake Road, Otis:** Not in favor of removing dam. Likes the 9.5' lake level; easier for old people to get in and out of boats; we're part of the environment, too. Don't mess with dam until you have all funding, designs, permits in hand so we don't lose water right.

**ANGIE WRIGHT, 4763 NE East Devils Lake Road, Otis:** Favors replacement of dam, not full removal; agrees that cement structure is plugging lake when it needs to be flushed; at higher ocean levels, waves come up lake, and sand gets stuck at cement bar when it should have flushed.

**CRAIG SELVIDGE, 925 NE East Devils Lake Road, Otis:** On lake since 1984, even though his taxes increase, lake sometimes unusable; against total removal of dam, but remove center or modify dam to allow quick flush of lake; should be engineered and controllable; could dredge on both sides and move a lot more water more quickly to let it flush.

**MIKE ROTH, 4619 NE Loop Drive, Otis:** House is for sale, no offers at \$200,000 less than assessed value, because of uncertainty about lake; last month, the board authorized money to explore aeration; that should be one variable; if no change, turn to next variable; discussing aeration and dam removal introduces another variable; following a hunch is no way to proceed; blocking the lake with sand bags would trap the same debris.

(Video: 1:01:30)

**MARK CHRISTIE, 3184 NE Loop Drive, Otis:** Opposed to change in dam, because you only referenced two opinions and no study; based on lake manager assumptions; need studies and data to support claims; talk to an agency that provides modeling to show it could accomplish objectives; uncertainty in language of supporting testimony; establish a sufficient D River slope; your engineering firm is saying removal of dam will not achieve desired outcomes; for aeration to be successful, you need to impound water.

**BILL PIGGOTT, 1323 NE Harbor Ridge, Lincoln City:** Keep water retention rights fully viable; don't give up control over lake levels; should increase flow rates during winter for sediment flushing; board should not relinquish water rights; concerned about partial exercise of rights; afraid we're on the verge of losing water right; allow lake to flush.

**TOM RICE, 3970 NE 40<sup>th</sup> Street, Neotsu:** Legacy to fulfill, father was Al Rice, who was critical to the lake; encouraged board to accept questions during the public comment period; prudent to consider, test, best alternative prior to removal of existing structure.

**LOREN WALTZ, 3343 NE 34<sup>th</sup> Loop, Neotsu:** Vacation home built in 1960; conclusions are being determined without adequate study; soil erosion study makes no sense; carp took care

of weeds when it looked like we would lose lake, might have gone overboard; support continued study, including fish migration; best use of lake was after dam impounded water to 9.5', from selfish point of view; appreciate that we're all trying to come up with a solution, but slow down.

(Video: 1:15:30)

**REN JACOB, 600 SE Oar, Lincoln City:** Supports taking out dam, which is detrimental to fish passage; natural hydrology better for flushing, fish passage; thanked volunteer board members; he's with watershed council, so involved with water monitoring; concrete dam causes a lot of issues.

**SUSIE HENDERSON, 3191 NE Loop Drive, Otis:** Presented a petition signed by 262 citizens asking to retain current dam policy of installing dam at 9.53' long enough to secure water right, then let water drop to 9.0'; don't make changes until clear and measurable goals established; then solicit plans to be properly assessed; read letter from Dorothy Graziano of Beaverton, who is concerned that the water rights will be forfeited and property values harmed if the lake level is not maintained.

**VICKI TAFT, 2885 NE Loop Drive, Otis:** Opposes removal of dam; doesn't think there is enough information to make good decision; read letter from Julie Cudahy of Tualatin, who is opposed to dam removal because removal would hurt recreation and property values; don't make this a wetlands.

**ALLAN KRAMER, 1116 NE Lakewood, Lincoln City:** When lake was at its meanest, white substance on lake flowed toward ocean; it was a rare super-high tide; the 8' concrete dam blocks the flow of water in the winter; supports dam removal.

**MILES SCHLESINGER, 212 SE Keel Avenue, Lincoln City:** Presented a year ago a written plan for aeration and for removal and replacement of the dam, which he thinks is the ultimate fix; dam should not be removed until all permits are in place; build a state-of-the-art structure to retain water rights during the summer; flush lake by opening gates during the winter.

**BILL SEXTON:** Lake contractor, surprised you would jeopardize water right; opposed to removal of dam without a public workshop; in 40 years of lake has seen no dam, lots of weeds; doesn't think dam is impeding sand flushing; if you take concrete dam down to 6 feet, sand will still fill in; sand is brought in by ocean; lake flow not strong enough to remove sand; once you get past the dam, no elevation difference, so sand won't flush; no gain for more expense on taxpayer; not looking forward to filling 500 sandbags.

(Video: 1:30:20)

**MIKE DELK, 2820 Lake Drive, Lincoln City:** Financial impact on lake; has put \$100,000 into his house in 7 years, but it's worth 15-20% less; can't even get family to come to lake because they get rashes from the water; proposed correlation between lake level and algae bloom; worst year was a couple of years ago when lake was lowered to 8.3' during summer; last year, better when lake was 9.5'; against lowering lake below 9.5' until September; against removing dam until new approach decided; against temporary structure; don't know effect on water rights, no commitment to putting it in every year; could accomplish same with permanent structure; should be a way help fish without limiting use of lake.

**WILLIAM HENDERSON, 3191 NE Loop Drive, Otis:** Against taking out the dam; favors maintaining water rights; read letter from neighbor Steven and Marci Lovejoy of 3132 NE Loop, Otis, objecting to removing dam and relinquishing water rights; present condition of lake is a disaster; algae disappeared when lake was at high levels, came back when lake dropped; claimed mismanagement by board and manager with one ill-advised decision after another; millions of dollars in property values at stake; theory of improved water flow with dam removal is nonsense; result will be permanently lower lake to unacceptable levels.

**PAT CHRISTIE, 3184 NE Loop Drive, Otis:** Supports keeping water rights and not removing dam; read letter from Greg Whitaker of Lake Drive, Lincoln City, who is concerned about dam removal and wants to retain water right; sounds like lake manager is considering giving up water rights; questioned uncertainty of language in letters supporting dam removal.

**LES DAVIS, 4005 NE 20<sup>th</sup>, Otis:** Very concerned about removing dam and consequences; concerned that we haven't retained water right; you need to listen to concerns of stakeholders; don't make a hasty decision; lake is a very valuable tourism asset.

**GARY FROMM, 2915 S. Hill Road, Otis:** One of the largest landowners, he and his neighbor hold 223 acres at south end of lake; Green Acres, one of the few businesses affected; has many acre-feet of water behind East Devils Lake Road; suggested dredging Rock Creek channel, which is being silted over; get water to flow into lake faster, might help solve lake problem; losing acreage every year; need it for horses; could help salmon.

**(Video: 1:46:20)**

**MARIELLEN RICH, 4590 NE Loop Drive, Otis:** Read letter from Deborah Flory of Loop Drive, Otis, who said recreation on lake is her priority; opposes return to natural hydrology; sees negative bias toward second-home owners.

**MITCHELL MOORE, 2929 NE Loop Drive, Otis:** Representing Devils Lake Neighborhood Association; concerned about health of Devils Lake; questioned whether notice or water rights discussion was presented at an earlier meeting; urged protection of water rights at 9.53'; supports redesign of water retention structure; suggested district define measurable goals and solicit plans for permanent and seasonal replacements.

**BILL SEXTON** read a letter from Julie Sexton, asking board to preserve water rights. When we impound water, we're not closing off the entire river system; we are letting about 9.7 acre-feet a day out of the lake.

**ROGER SMITH, 3480 NE 26<sup>th</sup> Street, Lincoln City:** We should take our time on a decision to remove dam; handshake agreement with ODFW inadequate; he hasn't been able to use boat in August or September for several years because lake is too low.

**JACK STRAYER 1550 NE Lake, Lincoln City:** Spoke to coho migration, which is threatened by ocean conditions and global warming; taking out dam doesn't create water so lake won't flush; county sanitarian should be checking for *E. coli*; paddleboarding and kayaking won't

be helped by lowering channel level; it won't get rid of seagulls; claimed weak substantiation not supported by facts; deserve more from lake manager and board.

(Video: 2:03:00)

**MARY DOOLING, 4799 NE East Devils Lake Road, Otis:** Lake needs water; this is the worst time of year to remove a dam; state bracing for fourth straight year of water scarcity; drought conditions affect our lake watershed; less water due to warmest winter on record; retain water for fish and for summer recreation.

**MONIQUE TYLER, 10770 SW Tonquin Loop, Sherwood:** Presented petition signed by 423 citizens asking board to retain water right by raising lake to 9.53'; other petitions this evening were obtained in less than 24 hours; all of Oregon watching; there is a drought and Devils Lake is at end of it; why is lake manager not in front receiving comments; all I've heard is his one-sided view.

**PAT DOOLING, 4799 NE East Devils Lake Road, Otis:** Lake was raised to increase recreation and safety; reducing lake level by 6" wrecks boat propellers; much lower level would cause more damage; many homes built in last 24 years with higher docks; many boat lifts unusable over last 3 summers; dam removal without a concrete replacement plan is unwise and probably illegal; dam removal would change culture of lake; please slow down.

**LARRY RICH, 4590 NE Loop Drive, Otis:** Always questioned why we can't ask questions at board meetings; didn't first shoreline erosion study say lake level had little or no impact on erosion? Isn't part of the problem with D River the logs that slow down the sand? Joe Barnes offered to remove logs for free; expect drought conditions; maintain higher lake level to prepare; don't remove dam until everything in line for replacement and retain water right.

**DEAN KLAUS, 3520 NE Yacht Street, Lincoln City:** Why would anyone give up water rights; seems like lake is unhealthy and proposed solution is to get rid of the lake.

**TINA FRENCH, 260 NE East Devils Lake Road, Otis:** Where is the scientific data backing up statements that removing dam will improve water quality; what is urgency to move ahead so quickly; removing dam doesn't increase water; removing dam will merely move sand to next blockage; what is elevation of bedrock under D River, so if we remove dam, won't we move sand to the next obstruction; sand bags are ugly, it will look like a construction zone every year; why aren't you putting all your time and money behind aeration; oppose hasty decision before new board in place; keep lake at 9.53' and retain water right.

(Video: 2:17:30)

**MICHELLE HIGHLAND, 2170 NE Lake Drive, Lincoln City:** Board moving too quickly to remove dam; will have unknown effects on beautiful lake; why do you want to eliminate water right? Felt that in the past public input has had little effect on board decision; place needs of public above ambitions of board.

**MARK HIGHLAND, 2170 NE Lake Drive, Lincoln City:** Mother died a week ago, should be home in Tigard, but came here because of her love for lake and community; opposed to dam removal.

**JOHN COBURN, 3110 NE Loop Drive, Otis:** Opposed to dismantling dam and possibly losing water right; most homeowners on lake don't get to vote for board because these are vacation homes, but they pay taxes and support the local economy; need to address algae; board appears ready to ignore its mission, the impact on economy; taxes will increase; businesses will close; fewer jobs; houses for sale; what about the science – simplest explanation almost always the most correct; worst algae when lake is lower.

**MELISSA BAUER LINDSAY, 3655 NE Johns Loop, Neotsu:** Since 2007, put \$200,000 into home, and lost 40% of value, due to algae and controversy at lake; favors keeping the water right and against complete removal of dam but favors center removal and flushout; manager's report lacks scientific background.

**JIM HOOVER, 3150 NE East Devils Lake Road, Otis:** Just because you can doesn't mean you should; Thompson Creek runs across his property; culvert at East Devils Lake Road collapsed and caused water to back up but lake manager said flooding was caused by lake level; manager misrepresented info; how many properties and docks are affected when lake levels low?

(Video: 2:33:20)

[RECESS]

(Video: 2:53:00)

#### **v. Close of the Public Hearing**

**Green moved to close public hearing. Weldon second. Unanimous vote in favor.**

#### **b. Board Deliberations**

GREEN: Reviewed water right options: maintain right at 9.53'; change right to 9.0'; relinquish right; do nothing. Board members have same interest in property values as everyone in the room. Information from Lake Manager is scientifically based. Worst algae blooms have occurred when water is highest.

NORRIS: Thanked everyone for coming; board appreciates participation and hearing different viewpoint; HABs have happened naturally forever, we won't get rid of them; can try to prevent intensity or number of HABs but can't eliminate.

GREEN: Important to focus on aeration project.

NORRIS: Spoke in favor of maintaining water right at 9.53', then setting water height according to board policy.

WELDON: We heard interesting ideas, such as reducing water in Rock Creek area. Heard a lot of misinformation. Drought and snowpack not an issue in Devils Lake watershed. Lake is still navigable at lower water levels. Some talked about being on lake for generations and how they learned to water ski years ago, but there was no dam until 1997 and that dam leaked. At times we have to pull dam apart in summer to show we're not impounding water. Inexperienced boaters will break propellers; you have to stay offshore. Lake board has never

as a district moved ahead with any project without getting permits. At 9.53', I see a lot of erosion in the summer. My job is to improve water quality. We represent 10,000 people, not just the 100 that come here. Supports letting lake go to natural state 9 months of the year. Hydrologists concur that removing dam is a positive step. In 1990, lake was not used because of weeds. In 1994, when lake cleared people started using lake and property values went up. Goal is less algae, clear water, more recreation.

WARD: Lake is 14,000 years old; fisheries were thriving, water was clear; so natural hydrology would not hurt the lake. Favors returning water rights, quicker the better.

**Ward made a motion to return water rights. [No second.]**

NORRIS: Need balance with human factor. We can retain water right by putting boards in next week. Not hurting anything by doing that. We're below normal in rainfall. If we allow natural hydrology, we don't know implications for lake. The dam provides an easy way to retain the water right. Has not seen evidence that removing the dam will be positive. Approached OSU engineering professor Hal Pritchett, who could meet with board or set up grad students to look at hydrology and effect on sand. No need to decide tonight. Would rather engage professionals.

SKIRVIN: Seems to be a lot of predisposition that board wants to tear dam out tomorrow. But that's not the intent. There's merit to removing dam. We're not out to damage the lake. We can deal with more than one solution at a time. 9.53' does cause erosion, inundates vegetation. At 9.0', plants can grow. Boat lifts can be adjusted. Algae blooms have been getting worse since long before the lake was lowered.

NORRIS: When people hear about change, natural to be fearful because they don't know what change will bring. People aren't necessarily against change: they're against rushing into change.

GREEN: We have looked at the water level issue for six or seven years, and we know that HABs not correlated with water level or temperature. It's residence time, sunlight, lower rainfall. From that perspective, level of 9.0' has more positives than higher level.

NORRIS: Even if 9.0' is preferred, we can still capture lake at 9.53' to preserve water right.

SKIRVIN: What's your personal thought on current board policy? Does it make the lake unusable? Does it cause algae blooms? If one or two docks are affected, does that justify flooding the wetlands or inundating septic fields?

NORRIS: We're now above 9.53'; here's our opportunity to capture that without harming the vegetation or the septic fields. We can do it in a day.

WELDON: Been on the lake at over 10', and it's extremely expensive to hit logs. When the water's high, you have to be careful because it picks up debris from the shoreline. At 9.0' or 9.53', there's no difference on recreation. You shouldn't be that close to the shore.



NORRIS: In some areas, lower lake level causes more erosion.

WELDON: May be true in some areas, but most areas will erode more with higher levels.

**Norris moved to instruct the lake contractor to place the boards in the dam so we can hold the lake level at 9.53' for a day so we can retain our water right. Skirvin seconded.**

SKIRVIN: We get a lot of rain in the spring and the lake tends to stay high. It doesn't flow out that fast in the spring. When it's high, the water destroys plant life. Would not vote today to raise level.

GREEN: Will not vote for 9.53'; prefers 9.0'.

NORRIS: A vote today would not affect future board decisions.

GREEN: How much benefit is there to 9.0' and not higher? There's a lot. It eliminates connection to drainfields, lets more plants grow. Healthy wetlands and shoreline plant growth do a lot to reduce nutrient loading from stormwater runoff and reduce erosion.

NORRIS: Overwhelming opinion of public that testified is to retain water right. Shoreline restoration can fight erosion. We should retain right because it's hard to get it back if we lose it.

WARD: Why is that? If the higher level is good for the lake, it should be easy to get the license back.

GREEN: Could be hard to get the water right back because of the damage that's been done by the higher level in the past.

SKIRVIN: Sounds like you want to make a decision based on public opinion. Shouldn't we find a balance between what people want and the health of the lake?

NORRIS: Retaining the water right doesn't limit our decisions in the future; but if we go to a different level, then we remove options.

WELDON: Has personally seen damage from 9.53': increased erosion, clumps of grass floating in lake. Soil entering lake is highly nutrient-loaded. Opposite of what we're supposed to do.

NORRIS: If that's the case, current level is 9.6', we should be seeing a lot of erosion. Asking now that we retain our water right. We don't have to keep it at the high level; it gives us options.

Call for vote.

**Norris voted aye. Green, Ward, Weldon, Skirvin voted no. Motion rejected 1-4.**

**Skirvin moved that we proceed with the exploration of modifying or removing the dam structure depending on what the science says on how we can improve that area. Norris seconded.**

WARD: Interested that we're not throwing out the idea of natural hydrology. Humans put sewage in lake, cut down forests, put in dairy farms.

Board discussion asked for clarity on the motion. Call for vote.

**Skirvin, Norris, Ward voted aye. Green, Weldon voted no. Motion passed 3-2.**

**Weldon moved that we start the dam replacement permitting process through the Army Corps of Engineers. Green seconded.**

**Green, Weldon, Ward voted aye. Skirvin, Norris voted no. Motion passed 3-2.**

**Green moved that we modify all of our existing water rights, certificates, and permits so that we are entitled to impound water to an elevation of 9.0' above mean sea level, which equates to approximately 998.5 acre-feet of storage, and impounding water no earlier than June 1 and then only if the lake level is below 9.0' above mean sea level on June 1; otherwise to begin impoundment only by June 15 and impounding water only through October 15 at the latest with a combination of water drawdown in August and September as required by the existing water rights. Weldon seconded.**

NORRIS: Read ORS 540.610(1) and part of (2), the statute referring to the forfeiture of water rights for non-use. "Whenever the owner of a perfected and developed water right ceases or fails to use all or part of the water appropriated for a period of five successive years, the failure to use shall establish a rebuttable presumption of forfeiture of all or part of the water right." If we fail to use part of the water right, the burden of proof is on us to continue the right.

SKIRVIN: Doesn't want to see water right lost for the sake of not exercising it.

NORRIS: We should not change our existing 9.53' right.

**Ward, Weldon, Green, Skirvin voted aye. Norris voted no. Motion passed 4-1.**

Green directed Lake Manager to file an affidavit with the Water Resources Board.

## **VI. UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

**(Video: 4:26:00)**

### **a. The Devils Lake Plan**

#### **i. Septic/Sewer**

SEE STAFF REPORT re: mandatory septic system ordinance; buildable lands inventory.

GREEN: City council continued its hearing on the Voyage LID. Opponents said they heard that costs had doubled, when it really went up 7%. City council sent out new polling cards.

**ii. Save our Shoreline (SOS)**

SEE STAFF REPORT: re: updates on three projects.

**iii. Vegetation Management**

SEE STAFF REPORT re: no update.

**b. Communications Report**

SEE STAFF REPORT re: strategies for public outreach (Internet, Channel 4, social media (YouTube, Facebook), AM radio 1610 broadcasts, radio interviews, Clearwater E-Newsletter, 100 Years on the Lake presentations, Know Your Lake column ad in News Guard).

New items include Community Days Banquet and Lake Steward award on April 25, 2015; Devils Lake Revival July 18; Devils Lake Paddle on April 18; Life Jacket Loaner Station ribbon-cutting was March 20; 178 participated in Fishing Frenzy over spring break.

**c. Safety Report**

SEE STAFF REPORT re: no incidents or updates.

**d. MidCoast TMDL**

SEE STAFF REPORT re: no update.

**e. East Devils Lake Road**

SEE STAFF REPORT re: no update. Lake Manager said county aiming for August to install culvert to try to control flooding.

WELDON: How will that affect flow from wetlands? Could Army Corps of Engineers investigate channeling water to help flow?

ROBERTSON: That area is owned by the state parks, so probably not. ODFW would probably oppose because channeling would drain the wetlands and impair fish and wildlife habitat.

**f. Harmful Algal Blooms**

SEE STAFF REPORT re: work proceeding on direct appointment of engineer for the aeration project.

**VII. NEW BUSINESS**

None.

**VIII. NON-AGENDA ITEMS**

None.

## **IX. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS from CITIZENS on NON-AGENDA ITEMS**

**(Video: 4:41:00)**

**MITCHELL MOOORE:** Expressed disappointment with water rights decision. The number 9.53' was used a lot, but not because people were advocating a change in current policy. They were calling for retention of the water rights. Please reconsider.

**TINA FRENCH:** Devils Lake Neighborhood Association has offered eight times to remove logs and sand from east of the dam. Why have you never acknowledged that?

**JIM HOOVER:** Why do you not call this dam what it really is, a fish retention structure? If we remove the dam and lose all the carp in the wintertime, the lake will turn green and be full of vegetation.

**SKIRVIN:** The requirement for fish retention was lifted in 1998.

**ANGIE WRIGHT:** Are the Rock Creek wetlands a district responsibility? Why is there a landfill right there? What is the history of that wetland?

**ROBERTSON:** Offered to meet to explain history.

**MARK HIGHLAND:** Disappointed in outcome of meeting. What happens if in looking at aeration, we need more water?

## **X. BOARD COMMENTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS**

**GREEN:** We have looked at the impact of lake level on aeration. There's no question that more water is better, but contractors have said 6" won't matter.

**WARD:** Thanked Paul, saying he had a rough night and no one should have to put up with that.

**GREEN:** Modifying dam or modifying water certificates were not Paul's idea. He got that direction from the board. He did not instigate those issues.

**WELDON:** Bumper crop of cattails this year, so will deliver some to anyone who wants. They do a phenomenal job of erosion control.

## **XI. ADJOURNMENT**

Green adjourned the meeting at 11:02 p.m.

The next regularly scheduled board meeting will be May 14, 2015, at 6:00 p.m.

| Respectfully submitted,  
Rick Mark