

GENEVA LAKE ENVIRONMENTAL AGENCY  
WILLIAMS BAY, WISCONSIN  
**Virtual Ad-Hoc Committee meeting on Geneva Lake Environmental Agency's Future  
Minutes.**  
Wednesday, April 28, 2021

Members identified as being in-person present; M.J. Fesenmaier (LG). T. Peters, recording Sec.

Virtually present; J. Weiss (Linn Twn.), P. Kenny (VOF), Peg.

The meeting was called to order at 6:47 by Chair Kenny.

1. No comments from the public.
2. **There was no action on the March 31 and April 22 meeting's minutes.**
3. Section 1 of the Uniform agreement, Composition, was suggested as an area to consider changing if the GLEA is going to expand its make-up. Peters stated that D. Rasmussen, the GLEA attorney, felt that any change to the Uniform Agreement and By-Laws would require a re-signing of the document by all parties. M. J. Fesenmaier felt that could lead to problems and delays and that it would be best if we could work within the existing Agreement so as not to have the agreement go through another re-signing process. She felt that what changes we are anticipating could be done under existing language. If there are to be changes it should be a major change if we are going through agreement changes.

Under Section 2, Purpose, the agreement states to study and collect data. Not necessarily implementation. Which way are we going? GLEA does the studies and makes recommendation to the communities to implement. The question is who oversee the implementation? If we hire an engineer or consultant, they will oversee the operation under the direction of the GLEA.

Nowhere in Section 2 or in the Uniform Agreement does it say the GLEA should be responsible for implementation, enforcement, or execution of recommendations. There was discussion on expanding Section 2, to include implementation, execution, or enforcement. Discussion went on as to whether that should be by the community. Traditionally, when it comes to lake issues, the GLEA has been the leader in working together with the communities to implement recommendations.

There was discussion on possibly include an addendum to the agreement to address implementation. It is felt that all the other organizations are getting involved in lake management is because they feel the GLEA is not doing enough implementation. Perception is reality. Implementation is policy. The GLEA should not and has not developed policy. The question of whether we have the authority by the Agreement or by Wis. Statutes 66.03 to do any of three was raised. Historically it has been the GLEA identifies a problem, does the research, collects the data, develops recommendations, and presents them to the communities. Peters mentioned that in 1970's when the GLEA and the Agreement were developed, there was considerable discussion on whether the GLEA should have enforcement power. It was felt that the local communities have enforcement authority, and they should be the ones who enforce. It is difficult to get all the communities to see the same side of an issue, but the GLEA needs to be the leader in getting all of them to work together.

Discussion on GLEA, implement, execute, or enforce. Because SSW will be around for a long time and it looks as if the GLEA will be the lead on managing it, should we develop a special agreement to allow GLEA take the lead and implement management for SSW? Discussion moved to how did the GLEA ended up being responsible for implementing SSW management? Believed to be a result of SSW happening so fast and getting to be a significant issue that we moved on it. Better to try some management ASAP. GLEA present direction on SSW management is based upon the need to do something, even if we fail, rather than doing nothing and having it said we should have done something.

Should the GLEA develop a position paper on SSW management?

The Geneva Lake Environmental Agency, the Board, and the Agency are the same. The board is the GLEA.

The existing by-laws allow for the development of standing committees (section 4f), ad-hoc committees (section 4g), the hiring of professionals (section 7a ) and the formation of a Public Advisory Committee (section 7a(4)) to carry out its duties and function. The expanding of the GLEA to include other groups could be done under several of these including Section 9 that permits the formation of a Public Advisory Group “ to be consulted on matter concerning the Agency’s purposes which it may seek.” The question was raised, do we need to change or add any additional language on this matter? Discussion followed.

Peters pointed out item 3c regarding an annual report, it was felt that indirectly it is done with monthly reports, budget request, and budget approvals. Peters could composite the monthly reports with a year end financial statement and submit as meeting intent of Section 3c.

There was a consensus to not make any changes to the Agreement or By-Laws.

**A M.J. Fesenmaier/ J. Weiss motion directed Peters to develop a position paper that defines a GLEA’s SSW management strategy and collaborators, to be presented at the GLEA May 20, 2021 meeting. CU**

For discussion and consideration on the content of the position paper - gathering of data, data analysis, recommendation for remediation of SSW, implementation, after obtaining financial support from collaborators and communities. It should reflect that science realizes that complete eradication may never be possible. Refer to it as management of SSW.

It was felt that there was no longer a need for the ad-hoc committee or for it to meet again.

4. In view of the discussion at the preceding GLEA board meeting, Peters is to get a Director’s job description to the GLEA board by their May 20, 2021 meeting.
5. **Motion to adjourn by M.J Fesenmaier. CU at 7:45 pm.**

Dated May 4, 2021. Upon approval, posted at the GLEA office and website [www.genevalakemanagement.com/](http://www.genevalakemanagement.com/). These minutes were recorded and transcribed by Theodore W. Peters, Director GLEA.

Approved May 20, 2021