

## Paradise Lake Improvement Board Minutes – 3/16/11

1. All members present minus Arden Bawkey
2. Motion by Cathy to accept minutes from the PLIB meetings for 2/9/11 and 2/23/11 (special meeting). Support by Jim. Motion carried.
3. Public Comment
  - a. Rosemary Consoni – We appreciate the work that was done for the presentations. The FoPL would like to go on record for supporting the Laminar Aeration Flow system.
  - b. Marilyn Smith – The PLA encourages the board to investigate the possibility of utilizing the Laminar Aeration Flow system option.
4. Correspondence
  - a. As the board received a considerable amount of emails, all correspondence will be posted on the website.
5. Brief discussion on the LTBB application for a boat wash station. The board supports that notion and would like to secure more information on the possibility.
6. Old Business
  - a. The Board has secured insurance covering all members.
  - b. Discussion on candidates for lake treatment
    - i. ECT – Elaine commented that she liked their ability to use a lake scan in that it would allow for future problems to be identified before they become unmanageable however, their bid was too high. Cathy agreed. Paul did not consider them at all since their bid was late. Jim felt they gave a great presentation but also feels they were too expensive.
    - ii. Comment by Chairman – Jim felt that both ECT and Progressive had the best response to the RFP in that their proposals including steps that were mandated by law whereas Lakeshore and Savin/Enviroscience did not appear to address this necessary process.
    - iii. Comment by Rosemary Consani - Lakeshore would use their 2009 study as a foundation. Comment by Elaine – Not sure that using a 2 year old study is the best tact. Comment by Cathy – She understands using their study as a foundation to build from however, there are other considerations such as a SAD which must also be part of the study.
    - iv. Comment by Guy Savin – Our company understands Michigan Law in reference to SAD's.
    - v. Brief discussion instigated by Chairman Jim in regards to the steps of a feasibility study.
    - vi. Cathy suggests the possibility of using either Lakeshore Environmental or Progressive AE. Elaine – If we went with Progressive, they could assist us in finding aeration vendors.
    - vii. Rosemary Consani – Did the RFP state that bidders had to use our weed study to base their bids on? Cathy answered “no, it was only to be used as a reference”.
    - viii. Chairman Jim – Stated he wanted to make a long range plan and that means a feasibility study.

- ix. Elaine – I am intrigued by the possibility of aeration but I feel that the price Mr. Tucci came up with was astronomically high and was cost prohibitive. I would like to look into other vendors providing the same service and wonder if it wouldn't be possible to put out another RFP for aeration alone. Elaine feels that we have a good bargaining chip in that success on our lake using this method would put the concept of aeration "on the map" as we have such a large treatment scope therefore, we should be able to find someone willing to work with us more financially. Cathy said that we could indeed look into other vendors but doing another RFP would slow our process down too much.
- x. Elaine – The Board is interested in moving forward as quickly as possible however, we need to make sure we are complying with all the steps necessary. The decision is difficult because we have 2 vendors who want to start treatment immediately and forego the steps mandated by law and the other two want to perform a lengthy study. If we choose Progressive, can we stipulate that we would like them to move as quickly as possible so that some treatment will begin this year? Cathy stated that we could discuss the possibility of moving forward at a faster pace in order to accommodate that thought.
- xi. Cathy makes a motion to enter into a contract with Progressive if they can shorten the process of the study and if they will seriously look into the possibility of utilizing Laminar Flow Aeration as a part of treatment. Also discussed was the feasibility of starting with a test area for aeration rather than setting the system up throughout the lake initially.
- xii. Elaine mentioned that although it was not a part of their proposal, since they would essentially be working for us, they must accommodate the direction we wish to go. Additionally, Elaine mentioned that Progressive included an integrated approach (chemical and weevils) in their presentation and that she felt the Board should make it clear that at this point in time, we are only interested in pursuing Laminar Aeration and Biological means. Based on the information learned during the presentation, she feels that chemical treatment would be a short term and costly solution that would ultimately turn into a long term problem because of the muck it would create, especially without aeration.
- xiii. Paul stated that he did not feel that weevils have been given a fair chance in our lake and that he doesn't understand why some residents have been saying that they did not work. He went on to say that if you put a handful of weevils in a large weed bed, it would not be enough to do the trick. The PLA used what money they had for weevils through the years but they could never raise enough funds to seriously tackle the problem.
- xiv. Elaine supported Cathy's motion to go with Progressive AE
- xv. Chairman Jim – Stated that their engineers will be able to give us answers and costs for options to treat the lake. These options will give us results.
- xvi. Bob Roll – The engineer will tell us if aeration will work.
- xvii. Rosemary Consani – Progressive already said that aeration wouldn't work so why hire someone who isn't behind the idea? Answer: Progressive will have the same results as Lakeshore if aeration is used. It will either work or it won't.
- xviii. Chairman Jim – Stated he liked the idea of Progressive but was not so much on board with their time frame. He would like to see them speed up the process so treatment can commence this year.

- xix. Roll call vote to accept Progressive AE as the chosen treatment firm – Cathy – yes, Elaine – yes, Jim – yes, Paul – yes. Motion carried.
  - c. Chairman Jim stated that we need 2 board members to sit on a committee in order to set up a contract with Progressive. Paul and Cathy were approved by the Chairman. Jim then stated that we should hopefully have a contract by the next meeting. Also, Progressive should be at the next meeting as well.

7. Financial Report

- a. Everything paid to date

8. Comments concerning Hebron Township resident Michael Byers

- a. Cathy let it be known that the Board was contacted by ECT with news that they had in turn been contacted by LSSU. Apparently Mr. Byers had written a letter to the president of the university concerning the ECT/LSSU bid and questioned their qualifications. The Board felt this action to be inappropriate.
- b. Elaine stated that a concerned community resident had forwarded the Board two disturbing emails that Mr. Byers had forwarded to his alleged constituents. The emails contained several statements that were false including:
  - i. Members of the LIB were not reading all information [necessary to their duties]
  - ii. Some of the candidates [for lake treatment] related that the lake has been mismanaged.
  - iii. Mr. Byers insinuated that the Board was filtering the information it was passing to fellow board member Arden Bawkey.
  - iv. Mr. Byers stated that Lakeshore Environmental was the only bidder who planned for treatment this year.
  - v. He also stated that the board has made enough procedural missteps for a lawsuit [no examples given]
- c. Mr. Byers also threatened to make the condition of the lake and the Boards decisions thus far “very visible” and would use his experience as a marketer to publicize “how bad the problem is” in order to shift the momentum.
- d. Elaine feels that the attitude that Mr. Byers displayed is quite dangerous to the community and pointed out a letter written by a local realtor at the request of Rick Schweller in March of last year. The letter reads “I have seen a significant decrease in the interest in Paradise Lake based on not only the present real estate market conditions (this would be expected), however as buyers become aware of the milfoil issue in the lake, they often prefer to look at other inland lakes. I have experienced many folks who state they prefer to look at other lakes, rather than Paradise Lake because of the water conditions they actually see or have heard via the grapevine.
- e. Elaine went on to say that the operative word in the realtor report is “grapevine”. Due to the constant sought after attention the condition of our lake is garnishing from the Petoskey News Review and in other areas outside of our community, the term “weeds” is now synonymous with Carp Lake and taking a toll on our property values. Elaine believes that Mr. Byers and others within the community have in effect “marketed” our weeds utilizing local periodicals to vent their opinions have caused property value depreciation outside of the normal state of the economy.
- f. Elaine finally went on to question who it was that was funding Mr. Byers and went onto ask who exactly he represents and if he was being funded in the capacity of a marketer as that is Mr. Byers occupation.

9. Public Comment

- a. Deborah Irwin – In their public campaign, Mr. Byers and others have made it appear that Eurasian Water Milfoil is exclusive to our lake alone when it is a common problem that plagues many, many lakes. It is everywhere but perhaps a majority of people don't know that because other lakes don't publicize their weeds as much as ours has. We aren't trying to hide our problem but we don't want to make it appear that this problem is exclusive to us either. Bad news travels fast and wide and we need to be more responsible and work on bringing the community back together.
- b. Marilyn Smith – I would like to thank you again for all the effort put into the process. You have selected Progressive but what will happen if they are not on board with aeration? Answer: they work for us so they will follow our guidelines.
- c. Paul – I would like to say thanks to Elaine for all the work she has put into our website. We have a very professional looking and easy to navigate website.
- d. Marilyn Roll – Concerning correspondence, I make 2 copies of everything we get. All correspondence including emails. One copy goes into a file and the other goes to Arden so he does receive everything.

10. Meeting adjourned at 9:00 PM