

# Drainage District 88 Assessment Report Objections


It appears to us that the new Drainage District 88 assessment report dated Aug 18, 2012 has deviated drastically from the Montgomery/Setterston Water Quality Management Plan which was agreed upon by all parties and the courts.

## Examples of the deviation that we object to and comments:

1. Nothing was mentioned in the Montgomery/Setterston report about the water coming from the Woock property (land west of county I) into the drainage ditch. Hence, now we see that the drainage district wants to run the additional contaminated water from the Woock property into a 4 foot ditch along County B on the Meylink property and continue downstream. We are totally against this additional contaminated water coming down stream with no accountability for where this contaminated water will end up.
2. On the proposed map we see a **rock outlet stabilization** area at the end of the Meylink property but we see no detailed plan about how this is going to be constructed or how it is going to retain all additional contaminated water so it does not continue downstream and affect Springbrook Creek, the village of Burnett property owners, Horicon Marsh, Lake Sinissippi, or other areas downstream. At the hearing in front of Judge Bauer he made it very clear that the drainage district needed to come up with a detailed plan in regards to how the drainage district would deal with the water at the end of the district and Mr Giese needed to be involved in the plans that were being proposed.
3. We also object to the non-perforated sealed conveyance pipe running along the North side of County B. We believe that this will increase the flow of the contaminated water traveling downstream.
4. We have not agreed to the maintenance of a private drainage ditch on parcel no. 2042-001 on the south side of County B.
5. We would like an explanation on the drainage basin to the far west of the Woock property on the north side of County B and the west side of County I. How far will this grassed waterway extend? Will the waterway extend the length/width of the property and will it be 40 feet wide? We would like to know who will be benefiting from this water way?
6. On page 3 of the assessment report there is a reference to a grassed waterway on parcel 2042-001 of a suitable grade. There is not a grassed waterway on that parcel just merely a weed area that cannot be farmed as erosion has occurred. Also on the map you have listed a private drain how will that be constructed without disturbing the land?
7. We do not find anything in the assessment report as to a plan for adequate erosion protection at the culverts. What is that plan and should it not be included in the assessment?
8. In the beginning Mr Giese and his experts (attorney and engineers) made mention that there would be additional water coming downstream from this district formation but Mr Roche, Mr


Goetsch, and Dan Pranuske all assured us that there would not be any additional water coming downstream. We find it interesting that now in the new assessment report Mr Pranuske makes mention that there will be additional water coming down stream and erosion can be expected. If that is now the case as we have previously informed the dodge county drainage board we would like the previous question answered again as to why the residents in the village and further downstream were not made aware of the potential flooding of their properties as well as potential contaminated well water. It sure seems to us that someone is trying to pull the wool over the eyes of the people downstream and we are confident that the dodge county drainage board would not let this happen being aware of the concerns of Judge Bauer.

9. We realize that the Montgomery/Setterston report "did not contain grades, elevations, profiles and other data sufficient to construct the drains as recommended" but we do want to remind the drainage board that they hired this engineering firm and agreed to their recommendations. Looking at the Montgomery/Setterston report under Letter A; Number 1: "The Drainage Board and Petitioners hereby acknowledge and agree that laying out the District drains and associated facilities according to the Montgomery/Setterston Plan will best promote the public health and welfare and drain and protect lands of the interested parties with the least damage and greatest benefit to all of the affect(ed) lands". I believe that the Montgomery/Setterston report was signed by all the petitioners as well as the County Drainage Board.

  
Dennis Giese

10/25/12

Karen Tomko

 10/20/12