

**Commission members present:**

Al Sikora (Village of Waterford) (Chairman)  
Don Scott (Town of Vernon) (Vice-Chairman)  
Doug Koehler (City of Waukesha)  
Chad Sampson (Racine County)  
Alan Barrows (Waukesha County)  
Barb Holtz (Town of Mukwonago)  
Randy Craig (Town of Vernon)  
Robert Bartholomew (Town of Vernon)  
Dean Falkner (Village of Mukwonago)  
Mike Hahn standing in for Jeff Thornton (SEWRPC)  
Jim D'Antuono (Wisconsin DNR)  
Jim Pindel (Town of Waterford) (Secretary/Treasurer)

**Commission members absent:**

Randy Meier (Town of Waterford)  
Francis Stadler (Village of Big Bend)  
Ron Peterson (Village of Big Bend)  
Shelley Tessmer (Town of Waterford)  
Mary Pindel (Town of Waterford – Alternate)  
Any representative from the Town of Waukesha

**Also present:** Jim Ritchie, Eric Ebersberger and Nicki Clayton of the WDNR, Ron Barker of the Fox Waterway Agency of Illinois, John Bostrom of the WWMD, Brian Cushion of Racine County and Michael Schwar a resident of the Town of Vernon

At 1:02 PM, 3/15/2013, Chairman Al Sikora called the meeting to order.  
The Pledge of Allegiance was recited. Roll call was taken and a quorum was confirmed.

**Minutes** The minutes from the February 15, 2013 meeting were reviewed. Mike Hahn commented that on page 7 under the discussion concerning the diversion of water away from the Fox River by the City of Waukesha, Jim Pindel made an interpretation of a part of the SEWRPC's letter summarizing the SEWRPC's position on the diversion which did not agree with the intention of the letter. The statement by Jim was "The letter states in conditions of high flow in the receiving stream (Root River) and low flow conditions in the Fox River return flow management could divert treated wastewater to the Fox River". Ron said that the intent of the Water Management Plan was that under conditions of low flow in the Fox River, no matter what the conditions were in the receiving stream, water should be diverted back into the Fox River. Essentially water would be diverted into the Fox under low flow conditions and would also be diverted to the Fox under high flow conditions in the receiving stream causing some additional flow in the Fox, but not more than is presently experienced. It was motioned by Don Scott and seconded by Mike Hahn that the minutes be approved. The minutes were approved unanimously.

**Treasurer Reports** – The Treasurer's Report for February 2013 was reviewed. In summary we started with \$105,903.96 in our money market account and made \$16.25 in

interest resulting in a final amount of \$105,920.21. It was motioned by Randy Craig and seconded by Dean Falkner that the Treasurers Reports be approved. The report was approved unanimously.

**At this point we jumped ahead in the agenda to item d. of New Business:**

d. Possible diversion of City of Waukesha water treatment plant discharge away from the Fox River. Eric Ebersberger and Nicki Clayton of the WDNR were present to address this issue. Eric started by saying that he and Nicki were from the Water Use section in Madison which is responsible for implementing the Great Lakes Compact legislation which includes water diversion proposals like the request by the City of Waukesha. Eric provided a handout which summarized the following:

**The Problem-** Waukesha's application states that the city needs the new source of water to address current water quantity and quality concerns. Waukesha currently obtains its public water supply primarily from the deep aquifer. Groundwater pumped from the deep aquifer contains high levels of radium, a carcinogen. Water levels within the deep aquifer have dropped more than 500 feet and continue to decline at a rate of up to 9 feet per year.

**Proposed Water Source Solution** – Waukesha seeks to divert up to an annual average of 10.9 million gallons of water per day with a maximum day diversion of 18.5 million gallons per day. The water is proposed to serve an area that includes the City and some surrounding communities. Oak Creek has been identified as the water supplier.

**Proposed Wastewater Return** – The application identifies the Root River and Lake Michigan as possible locations to return its treated wastewater. The WDNR has requested that more information be provided for wastewater return options. The WDNR is still waiting for this information.

**WDNR's Waukesha Application Review Process:**

Step 1 – Public Hearing I, introduces the review process, receive comments on the Environmental Impact Study (EIS) scope and review process, allows for a 30 day public comment period. This is the only step completed to date.

Step 2 – WDNR Technical Review / EIS Draft – Review of the application and public comments, provide a draft of the technical review, EIS and a preliminary decision on the application. This step is still in process.

Step 3 – Public Hearing II – Receive comments on the draft technical review, EIS and Preliminary decision followed by a 45 day public comment period.

Step 4 – WDNR finalizes Review and EIS – Review public comments, finalizes EIS and determine if the application is approvable, followed by a 30 day comment period on the final EIS.

Step 5 – Regional Body & Compact Council Review – If application is approvable, WDNR forwards the application to the Regional Body and Compact Council.

Step 6 – WDNR Final Decision – If the compact Council approves the application. WDNR will make the final decision regarding approval of Waukesha's application.

The City's application must meet several strict criteria under the Compact. The Compact prohibits diversions of water out of the Great Lakes Basin except for straddling communities such as New Berlin which has obtained a diversion or if you are in a

straddling county, which is the case for the City of Waukesha. There are stricter criteria for communities who do not straddle a continental divide but exist in a county which does straddle a divide. The WDNR has received the application from the City and a major issue is that the City has to show that they have no reasonable water supply alternative in the Mississippi Basin. This is a very complicated issue. This City is also working on a Water Conservation and Efficiency Plan for which the Compact has strict rules. The language in the Compact is vague as to what standards have to be met in this regard. However the state has a Compact Implementing Statute which is what the WDNR will follow for Waukesha's application. The City is still working on defining their exact water demand and then the WDNR must rule on whether it is reasonable. It is still not clear how much of the Town of Waukesha will be in the water service area. The Great Lakes Compact requires that all the water taken from the Great Lakes be returned to the Great Lakes basin except for the amount for human consumptive use generally in the range of 10% - 12%. The WDNR is still waiting on all these final details and then it will require at least 90 days to complete Step 2 as defined above. If the WDNR believes that the application is approvable it will forward the application, draft technical review and draft EIS to the Regional Body. The Regional Body consists of other seven Great Lakes state and the provinces of Quebec and Ontario. The Regional Body prepares the declaration of findings which defines whether they felt that the application met the criteria for diversion. The Regional Body forwards their findings to the Compact Council which consists of just the eight US states. The states then vote on accepting the proposal and the vote has to be unanimous, that is every state has veto power. If the application is approved by the Council it is sent back to the WDNR where it would be responsible to provide any final permits or approvals. Eric said that he was not able to provide a timeline for this process, once they receive all the information they are waiting for it would probably be at least five months to complete the process. Eric pointed out that this is the first time the WDNR, the Regional Body and Compact Council have been through this process and so the timing may be affected accordingly.

At this time Eric asked if there were any question or comments. Jim Pindel asked if Eric had reviewed the section of our last month's meeting minutes which reported on the study done by Carroll University regarding the environmental effects on the Fox River that would be caused by this diversion. Eric reported that he and his staff had reviewed the study and this is an issue that has to be included in the environmental impact statement. However the impact on the Fox River is not one of the criteria for the diversion proposal itself. Eric said that in his discussions with the other states the main concern is that all the water taken from the Great Lakes gets returned to the Great Lakes except for the consumptive use on a continuous basis. There is not consideration for effects and consequences in other watersheds. Waukesha's initial proposal utilizing Underwood Creek allowed for the return water to be diverted to the Fox River under flood conditions and this was considered unacceptable since they required continuous return flow. There can be no disruption in the return flow; it is all the water all the time. As it stands now for all the water taken from the Great Lakes up to 18,500,000 gallons per day has to be returned continuously to the Great Lakes. When asked if the supply system was being sized for 10.9 million gallons per day or 18.5 million gallons per day, Eric said it would be sized to 18.5 gallons per day. One slight advantage for the Fox in

the case of Waukesha obtaining the diversion is that the City would no longer be drawing from the shallow aquifer which would then probably provide more water to the Fox. There is also a requirement that they minimize the amount of Mississippi basin water that is introduced to the Great Lakes. This will be handled by minimizing the amount of Infiltration and Inflow (I&I) to the sewer system. Minimizing the I&I only helps the Fox River.

Jim Pindel went on to say that our main concern is that if we have dry conditions like we experienced last summer when the people from Carroll University had to portage their kayaks in the northern section of our jurisdiction and people in the Waterford impoundment could not navigate in the shallow bays due to silt build up, the loss of an additional 2" of water depth would be intolerable. Eric said he understood our situation and that if the diversion does come about there will be some level decrease in the Fox River. These consequences will be part of the EIS but this is not a decision making document it is more of an advisory document. The decision making authority has to do with Great Lakes Compact. Don Scott asked if there were any properties with private wells that dumped into the Waukesha sewers. Eric said he was not aware of any and if there were a few it would be insignificant. Eric also pointed out that if the diversion were to occur all the residencies would be required to be hooked up to City water. Jim Pindel asked that since what we have been trying to do is to affect the EIS and if the EIS is not a decision making document, what should we be doing differently. Eric said we were doing the right thing by trying to work through the WDNR on getting our voice heard in the EIS. Dean Falkner said that he was concerned that Waukesha was working on expanding their water sources without paying enough attention to water conservation. There doesn't seem to be any emphasis on conservation. There is a large concern about the radium in the water but there must be other alternatives to Lake Michigan water for solving the radium problem. Eric said the water conservation and reduced consumption are considered in the review of Mississippi basin alternatives; this goes back to the phrase 'reasonable water supply alternatives'. This phrase is not defined in the Compact but is defined in Wisconsin's implementing statute. The WDNR has told the City that Wisconsin's definition is what is being used for approval of their application. The first factor in the statute is cost. A cost within 30% of the existing cost of water supply is considered reasonable. This definition works in Wisconsin but there is no guarantee that the other seven states will have the same concept of what is reasonable. Dean Falkner asked if water reuse has been considered for the Waukesha situation. Dean said he is aware of communities that reuse water for sprinkling and industrial use instead of drawing off fresh ground water or from some lake. He wondered if reuse coupled with conservation could not satisfy Waukesha's needs. Eric said that the WDNR has requested Waukesha to investigate water reuse, but admitted that we are not as sophisticated as California or Arizona in our laws regarding water reuse. So there are limitations in Wisconsin as to what water can be reused for. Dean then said that the rates charged by the Public Service Commission (PSC) should change from decreasing with higher volume usage to increasing to encourage water conservation. Eric said that the water rates in Waukesha already had an increasing block rate structure. Mike Hahn asked Eric to clarify that the maximum daily diversion rate was 18.5 million gallons per day from day one or would be daily maximum rate graduate up as time when on to this 18.5 million gallons per day rate. Eric said as it stands right now the rate is 18.5 gallons

per day from day one. Ron Barker asked if any other communities had received diversions of Lake Michigan water and Eric said that New Berlin as a staggered community had been granted additional diversion in May 2009. Eric pointed out that New Berlin was already getting Lake Michigan water for its eastern about 1/3 of the community and with the additional diversion was supplying another 1/3 of its community. Eric said that the Waukesha application was the first of its kind and that there were other communities waiting to see how it ends up before they make an application themselves. Ron said he was aware of seven communities in Illinois who were watching the Waukesha application so that they might apply for a diversion. Eric pointed out that Illinois has a unique situation in which they get their allocation of 3.2 Billion gallons per day of Great Lakes water and it is up to them to manage it. Barb Holtz asked if Waukesha had considered using some of its well water and augmenting it with some Lake Michigan water. Eric said that it was determined to be cost prohibited to maintain both water sources. Barb went on to ask that if Waukesha's deep aquifer water was connected to Lake Michigan did this have any bearing. Eric said this concept was discussed and that there was a credit point if your current water supply was linked to the Great Lakes but this was a minor point compared to the Compact itself. Dean Falkner asked if the cost of rehabilitating Waukesha's sewer system to minimize I&I added to the infrastructure cost of the supply system from Oak Creek would make the overall project unacceptably expensive. Eric said that the costs associated with the sewer rehabilitation would not be considered part of the cost comparison for supply options. Eric said that what we have done so far, communicating with the WDNR and making our position known is exactly what we should be doing. He said that our next major opportunity will be in the Step 3 Public Hearing II. He said we can make our position known personally in the hearing or in writing, it is not necessary to attend the hearing. Eric said that he would be sure that we were advised of the time and place of these hearings. Eric said that there is a website dedicated to the Waukesha application and you access it by going to the WDNR website and type in "water use", this will put you to the main water use page and there you have to select Waukesha and there you can access all the application materials.

### **Old Business**

- a) Mukwonago River Restoration within Rainbow Springs – Benjamin Heussner was not present to make a report. Jim Pindel reported that he had received documentation from Ben in the US mail and forwarded it to Jim Ritchie. The two Jims agreed that in keeping with our mode of operation we could provide this cash advance to Historical Society. Jim will email Benjamin to ask who to make the check payable to and where to send it.
- b) Fox River Partnership Summit – Tom Slawski was not present but he emailed a short report to Jim Pindel which he shared with the commission. The report stated the following:
  - a. The deadline for the summit has been extended right up to the morning of the conference, so please let everyone know that it is not

too late to register. Tom did ask that people contact him in advance if possible and no one with \$35 in hand will be turned away.

- b. We have just over 100 registered attendees for the summit as of yesterday morning. Letters are still coming into the PO Box.
- c. A small program change is the Ken Klick will be the speaker instead of Jim Anderson on behalf of the Lake County Forest Preserve.
- d. Susan Bence, investigative journalist, for UWM = National Radio has registered and will spend the entire day at the summit.

Al Sikora added that the sense of the email sent by Tom Slawski was that even though he has over 100 people signed up he is looking for as many more as he can get. So everyone should do whatever they can to encourage other attendees.

Later in the meeting Ron Barker stated that he and his group passed out about 500 brochures at the Lake County Boat Show, which followed just after the FWA meeting attended by Jeff Thornton and Tom Slawski.

- c) Ecosystem Restoration Project (ESR) -Sediment Sampling: –WWMD John Bostrom of the WWMD reported that they have received the results of the additional sediment sampling which had been conducted. There were 18 additional samples taken, 4 at two different locations looking for Arsenic and 10 samples in one other location looking for DDT. All 18 samples came back negative indicating that there are no pervasive contaminants in these areas. In the case of the DDT there were no indications of this chemical present and there was even some concern of the original sample being contaminated. These test results will be reviewed between the WDNR and Graef Engineering to modify any special handling that was expected due to the presents of these contaminants. It appears these were false alarms. Graef will now be able to generate the final sediment sampling report closing out this task in the dredging application process. This report will be available for public review. There has been a manager change within the WDNR for this project; Travis Holt has replaced Jennifer Jerich as the WDNR's lead person. At this point the emphasis of the group is to find sediment disposal sites and so they will be sitting down with landowners to discuss the results of the sediment sampling showing that it is all good soil and trying to find enough locations for all the sediment to be removed from the impoundment. The ESR group has had contact with the Army Corps of Engineers and the good news there is that they will only require a general permit from their standpoint. The sediment sampling project funded by grant funds by the SEWFRC will be completely finished in the second quarter or this year with the completion of the final sediment sampling report from Graef Engineering.

**New Business**

- a) Big Bend boat/canoe launch repair/restoration – Francis Stadler At the last meeting Francis asked that this project be tabled until next meeting, when he would make his presentation. Neither Francis or Ron Peterson from Big Bend was present so the project has been tabled again until next meeting.
  
- b) Consideration of expanding the Commission’s jurisdiction south to the Illinois border Al Sikora said that there was really nothing new to report. For those who were not present at the last meeting Al reported that Jeff Thornton, Jim Pindel and himself had met with the Town of Burlington and a representative of the City of Burlington namely Craig Workman the Director of Public Works. Both the Town and the City have draft copies of MoU’s provided by Jeff Thornton. The Town said that they needed some time to think about their participation and it is most likely that we will have to make a separate presentation to the City of Burlington in the future. Chad Sampson mentioned that he had a conversation with Diane Baumeister the Town Administrator initially on a different topic and that she had asked him some questions about the commission. Chad said he explained that it was a win-win situation working with the commission and he pushed for our expansion to the south.
  
- c) Possible request for grant funds for Mukwonago shoreline restoration: Dean Falkner said that he was trying to get people together and asked Alan Barrows if Mike Reese had talked to Alan’s person to review exactly what was being changed from the original design. Alan said that they had met with Mike Reese and the changes were not that significant. Alan said he had written down the points of the conversation and that most of it was in regard to woody vegetation for stabilizing the river banks considering that there are overhead power lines that eventually could be interfered with. Also there was some concern about the some species that were going to be left like Siberian Elm which they considered an invasive species. There were also some emails that went back and forth between Jim D’Antuono and Mike Reese in 2012 which Alan now has copies of. Alan visited the site last week Wednesday and took pictures of the site which he passed around to the commission members present. WE Energies doesn’t seem to be very concerned with the fact that the property is highly eroded and much of the problem at the site seems to be goose manure. The geese seem to eat the vegetation on the site exposing it to erosion plus adding their droppings. Dean Falkner added that there are similar problems on the Village side of the river and that they need to come up with a common solution to the goose problem. Alan said that WE Energies stated that they have biologists which they could donate to the project. Alan said that he has summarized all the information he has into a sequence that that could be used to take this project forward. Step one is to find someone to champion the project. Alan said that he felt that Mike at WE Energies would be a good choice and they would have to pay 10% of it. Dean said that he agreed and that the goose situation had to be address by both WE Energies and the village. Alan offered the fact that cutting back on the tall weed vegetation and

adding shrubbery was a good means of keeping geese out because it hides the food vegetation from the geese in the water. Dean also said that someone at WE Energies said their foundation could make a donation to a 501 c3 organization to help with this project, but a 501 c3 organization must be found. When asked by Jim Pindel for a new budget figure for this project the consensus was about half of the original figure or \$50,000.

- d) Possible diversion of City of Waukesha water treatment plant discharge away from the Fox River: This agenda item was discussed previously so that Eric Ebersberger could leave early for a meeting later in the afternoon in Madison. **Please refer to page 2 above.**
- e) Shoreline erosion mapping and stabilization planning study proposed by Graef Engineering: Jim Pindel stated that as he was working with Graef Engineering taking the additional sediment samples in the Waterford impoundment earlier reviewed by John Bostrom, he had discussed some of the work done by our commission. As a result of these discussions Jim received an unsolicited proposal from Graef which made a lot of sense. The study boils down to six tasks as summarized below:
1. A paper study including GIS and aerial review of our territory to evaluate land uses, property ownership and locate areas of potential erosion.
  2. Field reconnaissance to identify and GPS map areas of significant erosion.
  3. Create maps of eroded sections, potentially restorable sections and place a priority and feasibility value on each.
  4. Generate a report detailing all the findings from the work above.
  5. Conduct a study to identify potentially restorable riparian and floodplain wetlands to manage and mitigate sediment releases.
  6. Possible creation of a wetland mitigation bank.

Jim Ritchie offered the fact that he was aware of a similar study conducted by the City of Brookfield using a different engineering firm a couple years ago. Jim said he would try to find a copy of that report and especially the criteria they used to judge the severity of the erosion for a particular site. Jim Pindel said that this would be helpful especially in task 1 above and also in this regard he had asked Jeff Thornton if they took GPS readings of the erosion sites they photographed during their last river survey in 2010. Jeff said they took photos only not GPS locations. Barb Holtz added that as Graef was conducting it field reconnaissance it would be helpful if they identified and GPS located any invasive species they encounter along the Fox and its tributaries. This would give us a handle on attacking this problem which we are obliged to do as part of our implementation plan. Jim did mention that even though he could not locate the copy of the proposal he had with him, he had already forwarded the proposal and cover email to all the commissioners. Chad Sampson said he was aware of a study performed on a lake by a lake association (later Dan Treloar said the lake was in Waushara County) in which they photographed the entire shoreline and GPS mapped the location at the same time. The outcome was a document that recorded the exact location and erosion conditions existing around the entire lake. This gave the

association the ability to address the problem areas. Dan Treloar added that there is a link, he would try to provide, on the internet where you can see this panoramic view with GPS coordinates, where they prioritized the extent of the erosion.

- f) Review preliminary 2014 SEWFRC Budget Jim Pindel referred to the “2014 Budget for Counties Rough Draft 030113” spreadsheet he provided for all commissioners. In summary the balance forward into 2013 was \$29,635.48 after adding all real and estimated income and subtracting all real and estimated expenses, the net available from non-grant funds come to \$29,993.11. Looking at the grant funds taking the \$200,000 we received in ENUM-18 and subtracting the \$188,265 in actual and estimated grant funded projects, we have a total of \$11,735 available grant funds going into 2014. This figure is without any new state grant enumeration in the state’s 2013-2014 budget. We are hopeful of some new funding but at this time cannot count on it in our proposed budget. At this point we reviewed potential project for the remainder of 2013 and into 2014. Jim asked all present to identify projects in the next two weeks for inclusion in the proposed budget we need to approve at the next April meeting. One potential project that has somehow fallen off the radar is the Restoration of the Wetlands adjacent to the Fox River in Vernon Marsh, which had been proposed by Brian Glenzinski while he was still with the WDNR before he moved to Madison. Alan Barrows said that he knows the new wildlife manager for Vernon Marsh and he would look into what happened to this project. Alan also said that they are presently working on the project that we supported with \$50,000 for Ducks Unlimited in the Vernon Marsh.

### Reports and Updates

- a) Report on activities of Fox Waterway Agency (FWA) of Illinois – Ron Barker started by thanking Jeff Thornton and Tom Slawski for coming down and making a presentation about the SEWFRC to his board of directors. The presentation was well received. By coincidence the day after their presentation the Lake County Boat Show was held and Ron’s group was able to hand out about 500 brochures for the Fox River Summit which hopefully will increase the attendance. Ron spent a lot of time promoting the value of our partnership and the conference itself.
- b) SEWFRC Website – Al Sikora said that he had nothing to report at this time.

### Correspondence –

- a. 2/15/13 Email with proposal from Graef Engineering concerning shoreline erosion mapping and stabilization planning study
- b. 2/20/13 Email to Eric Ebersberger advising him of our next meeting date (today 3/15/13). Eric responded 2/21/13 that he would attend.
- c. 2/20/13 Email from Jim Pindel to all Commissioners and friends of the commission asking for new projects for 2014 budget

- d. 2/20/13 Forwarded email response from Kurt Peot about Mukwonago Shoreline restoration to Dean Falkner
- e. 2/21/13 Email from Jim Pindel to Jim Ritchie concerning partial payment request for Mukwonago River culvert removal project.
- f. 2/21/13 Email from Jim Pindel to Dan Treloar asking for names of the Senator(s) and Representative(s) along the Fox River in Kenosha County. Dan responded on 2/22/13 with names and email addresses.
- g. 2/22/13 Email from Jim Pindel to all commissioners with draft copies of letters to present and hopefully future state legislators concerning our proposed boundary expansion. Received responses from Dean Falkner, Jeff Thornton and Don Scott.
- h. 2/27/13 Emails to Sen. Lazich and Rep. Craig with update on SEWFRC activities
- i. 3/1/13 Emails to Samantha Kerkman, John Lehman, Neal Kedzie and Tyler August introducing the SEWFRC and advising our plan to extend down to the Illinois border.
- j. 3/14/13 Email from Tom Slawski with report on Fox River Summit
- k. 3/14/13 Marketing brochure received from Crispell-Snyder saying they merged with GAI Consultants
- l. 3/14/13 Jim Pindel sent an email to the clerk of the Town of Waukesha, Jamie Salentine, requesting that they assign someone to our commission.
- m. 3/14/13 Email from Rep David Craig stating that we had not been included in the Wisconsin State Budget, but that he would try to work with the WDNR to get us some funding.

### **Miscellaneous Issues** –

Chad Sampson mentioned that on his way to the meeting he notices a lot of work being done along Highway 164 and was concerned that this work would undo some of the projects we accomplished in the past along the highway. Don Scott advised that the road was going to be widened and sewer installed in Big Bend. Apparently there is a sign up stating that the highway will be closed starting March 26, 2013. Several of the commissioners asked John Bostrom present to represent the WWMD to make sure that the WWMD monitors the work done to not ruin their accomplishments.

Alan Barrows said that he had a three panel display available for the summit and asked anyone who had display pictures or information to provide it to him. Alan volunteered to print and assemble it. Alan said he had a jurisdiction map to put on the display as well as our logo. Al Sikora said that for any pictures on our website he could provide larger photos to Alan.

Barb Holtz let the commission know that Tom Slawski would be making a presentation tomorrow morning at 9:30 AM in the Mukwonago library to the Friends of the Mukwonago River, if anyone wanted to attend.

Regarding the date for our next meeting, Jim Pindel suggested 4/19/13 for our April meeting followed by 5/17/13 for our public hearing and May meeting. These dates were accepted by the commission.

Don Scott motioned to end the meeting and the motion was seconded by Chad Sampson the motion passed unanimously.

**Meeting Closed** at 3:00 PM

**THE NEXT OFFICIAL MEETING AND WILL BE Friday,  
April 19, 2013 at 1:00 PM. (Meeting Location: Big Bend-Vernon  
Fire Station #3, W233 S7475 Woodland Lane, Big Bend, WI  
53103.)**