

Summary of Exhibits

- Exhibit 1- State Statute 33.25 explains the required contents of the Petition. 33.26 explains timeline and recourse. Please note the highlighted sections.
- Exhibit 2- This document was distributed to County Board supervisors in April by Robb Jensen. Our Dept. received a copy of this document the morning of County Board's April 20 meeting.
- Exhibit 3- Much of Mr. Jensen's document centered around the 2006 edition of *UWEX-People of the Lakes*. There is a 2018 edition, but both guides have this important statement: "the contents and interpretations presented in this publication represent opinions of the authors".
- Exhibit 4- This document was received April 19, and challenged signatures on six parcels. Also included in Exhibit 4 is Mike Romportl's review of challenged signatures. At the time packets were distributed on Monday, May 3, 2021, it was the intention that the CUW Committee would make determination on each challenged signature. After further discussion, Chairman Mott has requested a recommendation from staff. Staff recommendation: No disqualification of signatures. Number of acceptable signatures will remain at 192 (55.97%).
- Exhibit 5- Through research I came across two additional lake district petitions that used a 'one-page verification' sheet. Both of these lake districts have been approved by their respective counties. I have also included the Lake Nokomis one-page sheet.
- Exhibit 6- This is page 6 & 7 from the Crescent Lake petition submission. There were numerous questions pertaining to this document at the April 20 County Board meeting. Items #2 and #3 were heavily debated. Please see Exhibit 7 for my questions to Corp. Counsel and Mike Fugle's response.
- Exhibit 7- I reviewed the Zoom recording from the April 20 County Board meeting and posed two questions to Corp. Counsel. Answers in red.
- Exhibit 8- Three examples of 33.25(2)b statements (***the necessity for the proposed district***) and 33.25(2)c statements (***that the public health, comfort, convenience, necessity, or public welfare will be promoted by the establishment of the district and the lands to be included therein will be benefitted by such establishment***). All were approved by County Boards and are now lake districts in their respective counties.
- Exhibit 9- This memo from Dodge County Corp. Counsel was shared by Dan Butkus from his research into a local lake district (for him). This memo specifically addresses "necessary" and "benefit", however our Corp. Counsel states "*The Dodge County memo (and the Court opinions cited therein) explain "what" needs to be determined. But, there is no "how" regarding going about and making the determination.*" Chairman Mott wanted the memo to be shared with Committee.
- Exhibit 10- This was included to show how Dodge County Land Resources presented their findings and made a formal recommendation to their County Board. I have created a similar piece for discussion at our CUW meeting on May 10. Please see the attached document titled "County Board recommendation May 18".

