

## **INTRODUCTION**

In 2007, the Lakes and Watershed Board (LWB) of the Village of Whispering Pines (WP) initiated a planning effort for all its lakes. The purpose of this planning is, in part, to fulfill a component of the WP Land Development Plan. The specific purpose of each lake plan is to ascertain current status of each lake, perceptions of WP residents on lake uses, and identify and prioritize management needs for each lake. The integration of individual lake plans is anticipated to contribute to a Comprehensive Watershed Management Plan, which should form the basis for prioritization of management by the Village.

Spring Valley Lake (SVL) is the second largest lakes in Whispering Pines, and is highly used by those who live on the lake as well as residents throughout the Village. Village ordinances (Article II) (Section J) govern use of water for irrigation, operation of watercraft, codes of conduct and dress, piers and floats, vegetation control, access areas, regulations and safety rules (for watercraft and swimming), fishing, permits, penalties, and maintenance of aquatic ecology. Responsibility for management of the Village lakes rests with the Village Council, generally upon recommendation of the LWB, made in accordance with the individual lake plan and the comprehensive lakes management plan. SVL interests are brought to the LWB by the lake representative. The SVL representative has an advisory team (Core Group) to assist in recommendations to the LWB. Enforcement is via the Village Police Department and the Code Enforcement Officer.

### **I. —STATUS**

Spring Valley Lake is an 89 acre lake located within the southeastern portion of WP. It is bordered by Pine Ridge Drive, Oakview Place, Piney Point, Rays Bridge Road, and Memorial Causeway. It was impounded in 1964 by an earthen dam 41.5 ft in height with a crest length of approximately 1,550 ft. The deepest part of the lake is 34.6 feet and average depth is about 19 feet. It is the deepest of WP lakes, and is primarily spring fed but does receives inflow from farm ponds and streams as far out as State Highway 22. As told by an original construction worker who drove trucks during the initial construction, they found a gravel vein in the original stream and that gravel was removed and stored near the water department building and subsequently used for most of the road beds in Whispering Pines.

## Infrastructure

Water overflow from SVL goes through two 30 inch corrugated metal pipes installed in the northeast section of the dam then to a rip-rap spillway subsequently ending in an irrigation pond located on the west course of the County Club of North Carolina (CCWP) property. There is also an 8 inch outflow pipe with a shut off valve allowing for supplementation of irrigation when the water is too low to go through the normal pipes. The current overflow pipes are due to be replaced and a new spillway installed in the winter of 2009. During storm events water overflow is first discharged through the pipes in the dam, then via the emergency spillway. An August 2008 report, written by Eddy Engineering, describes the history of dam, including problems and maintenance since 1980. Copies of this report are available upon request at Village Hall.

SVL is surrounded by 127 lakeshore lots, of which 114 have residences; 96 are owner residents and 18 are absentee owners or rentals. Of these 127 lots, two are Village parks, six are un-buildable due to size or terrain and four are double lots. Approximately 92 of the 114 residential lakeshore properties have a bulkhead, mostly wood or a composite material. One hundred and seven lakeshore properties have docks in place, mainly constructed of wood or composite material. Construction of all docks and bulkheads require permits from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, the State of North Carolina, Moore County and the Village.

Residents have responsibility for maintaining their docks and retaining walls under a WP ordinance. In conversations with long time residents, they indicate that a drawdown of the lake's water level was done periodically until about 1997 to give residents the opportunity to conduct maintenance and repairs of docks and bulkheads. This practice ceased until it was reinitiated in 2006 when a winter drawdown of SVL was initiated by the Village. At that time many residents used this opportunity to repair/replace docks or bulkheads, and to clean up shoreline debris along their waterfront. Although some residents are voluntarily policing debris from SVL, because the Village owns the property impounded by the lakes, the responsibility for maintaining shorelines below bulkheads and removing associated debris is, at this time, unclear.

Residents are allowed to draw water from SVL for residential irrigation under permit from the Village. Approximately 89 residents have irrigation systems drawing from SVL. The majority of permitted irrigation pumps are owned by lakeside residents but there are some permitted irrigation systems installed on non-lakeside properties. In addition to residential irrigation withdrawals from

SVL, the CCWP has the right to withdraw water from SVL for irrigation purposes pursuant to language contained in the transfer deed executed when the Village accepted ownership of all Village lakes. However, it appears that there is no stipulation as to the amount of water the CCWP is allowed to pump from the Village lakes. Due to recent years of drought and significant drops in water levels of SVL and Pine Lake caused by CCWP irrigation practices, the Village has begun discussions with the Country Club regarding water withdrawals, especially under drought conditions.

Lake access for Village residents is provided via two parks on Pine Ridge Drive. Access for boats launched from trailers is provided by a paved (soon to be re-paved) ramp located at SVL # 68 Park, adjacent to the swimming area. This park is currently under renovation. SVL Core Group is currently involved in developing a modernization/revitalization program for the two parks. Phase I of the #68 Park renovation is complete and included construction of a pavilion, circular drive to make boat launching easier, a level parking area for approximately 15 cars and golf carts, and a handicap parking area. Phase II will include installation of an irrigation system, landscaping, sod, and creation of a sandy beach. Phase III will include repaving of the boat ramp and construction of a launch-and-load platform. The SVL #204 Park currently has a manual launch area only and a swimming area. Parking is on the right away. Both parks have boat storage racks which are at capacity. Additional boat racks will be installed in the near future. The SVL core group will be addressing the modernization of the # 204 Park once renovations to the #68 Park are complete and we acquire resident input on renovation priorities for #204.

WP ordinance allows one mooring buoy for SVL, and that has been established (SV#68 Mooring). The mooring was originally installed to assist some of our seniors and others who had difficulty in handling an anchor. It is also used regularly by a group of boaters who get together for a SVL "Snak N Yak", a weekly gathering of boat owners and other WP residents that was started for the purpose of getting to know our neighbors.

Use of WP lakes is generally restricted to property owners, occupants, and their guests. Beyond its ubiquitous esthetic value to lakeside residents of other users, SVL is utilized recreationally for boating (no gas-power)/canoeing/ kayaking, fishing, and swimming. Parks additionally are used for picnicking, exercise activities, walking dogs, etc.

### Water Quality

A 2001 Lakes Assessment Report (LAR) completed for WP by Buck Engineering indicated that "no evidence of accelerated sedimentation from human activity upstream was observed". Since then, siltation has occurred in 6 major areas of

SVL. Probably as the result of upstream dredging of a private pond in 2003, siltation has occurred in the cove between lots #164 and #168 and around the southern end of the lake from lots #158 to #168 on Pine Ridge Drive. In 2007, work began on the two new subdivisions in the southern section of the SVL watershed. During the development of the road infrastructure for the Arrowstone and Newbery subdivisions, soil erosion caused by several rain events occurred resulting in sediment deposition in the coves between lots #154 and #158 and between #128 and #132 on Pine Ridge Drive. On two occasions, sediment deposition into SVL was so significant that it transported a silt plume the full length of the southern cove up to the corner at #12 Piney Point.

In order to prevent further sedimentation into Village lakes, a draft ordinance regarding soil erosion and sedimentation control was drafted by the Lake and Watershed Board and submitted to Village Council for consideration. In addition, the Village has recently purchased a small mobile dredge to do maintenance dredging where needed. It is currently being tested in a cove on Thagard Lake. Dredging permits are being pursued for Village-wide use. It is anticipated that this equipment will be used to dredge silt from affected coves on SVL in the near future.

The water quality of SVL is generally indicated to be good. According to data provided in the Buck Engineering 2001 LAR, water samples taken in SVL during the month of July, indicated the following:

Trophic State:	Oligotrophic (low productivity)
Average Surface Conditions: (mg/l)	
Total N:	<0.05
NH3:	<0.05
NO2+NO3:	<0.05
Total KN:	0.64
TotalP:	<0.02
PO4:	<0.01
Total DS:	24
Total SS:	<5.0
pH:	7.21
Sp. Conductivity:	38 <i>umhos</i>
Chl. a:	1.98 <i>ug/l</i>
Alkalinity:	(taken, not reported)
Water Clarity:	10.3 ft
Stratification Depth:	13 ft

Water clarity has decreased since the 2001 report was completed, but has been improving over the past 2 years. Water quality data provided by Foster Lake and Pond Management (FLPM) taken in October, 2004, supplemented the above

parameters:

pH:	6.5
Clarity:	24 in (plankton bloom in progress)
Alkalinity:	24 mg/l
Hardness:	30 mg/l

During the summer months, testing is done for fecal coliform bacteria to ensure the water is for swimming and other uses. Testing for fecal coliform is done by an outside laboratory during May thru September. No adverse levels of bacteria have been detected in SVL.

A water quality monitoring program has been implemented on an informal basis as a part of a new comprehensive water sampling plan being implemented by the LWB. Some testing was done in August 2008 and we plan another test in September. Formal protocol will begin in April 2009.

### *Biotic Environment*

Aquatic vegetation in SVL consists primarily of floating heart and water-shield, two types of floating leaf plants which sometimes extend as far as 30 feet from shore (LAR, 2001), especially in one of the uplake coves. Bladderwort, chara, and spikerush, all submergent plants, are also found in SVL (FLPM, 2004). Some aggregations of water lilies occur in the coves which create a nuisance to boaters when props foul. Spring and summer algal blooms, a primary component of a healthy lake, have been more prominent since 2004.

Vegetation has not been a significant problem in the past 2 years due to a combination of chemical treatment and the stocking of grass carp. Grass carp have been introduced in 1994, 1995 and 1997, approx. 390 in total. The FLPM report confirmed that the grass carp are doing a good job for control of submergent plants. Chemical spot treatment of specific problem areas occurs on an as-needed basis using two chemicals, "Aqua Neat" and "Reward" that target either floating or submerged weeds. In 2006, no chemicals were used and only 1 spraying of "Reward" was done in 2008 in 1 cove. There have been no signs of "exotic" aquatic weed species.

The LWB has drafted a formal set of protocols for treating aquatic weeds which is in the approval stage at this time. These protocols include a residential irrigation notification procedure, a system of marking the sprayed area with buoys, and posting notifications at the boat launches indicating the locations and date of spraying. Once approved, a copy of these protocols will be appended this plan.

Fish species in SVL include largemouth bass, bluegill, green sunfish, redear

sunfish, black crappie, golden shiners, and grass carp as reported by the most recent electrofishing survey in 2004 (FPLM). In addition, anglers report the presence of blue catfish, American eel, and warmouth. Based on the results of a 2004 assessment, the fish community in SVL appears to be out of balance. Largemouth bass are somewhat undersized on average but not severely stunted due to deficiency in forage sized fish. The lack of small fish suitable for the bass to consume is most likely a result of reduced shoreline spawning habitat and aquatic vegetation. Other food sources include aquatic invertebrates and other insects. Fish management has consisted of stocking programs (the latest stocking done was in 2005 as recommended by FLPM), and winter water level drawdown intended to concentrate forage fish. Fish harvest is subject to NCWRC regulations. There is no known mercury advisory for fish consumption for SVL, although it is recommended that acidic lakes be tested periodically.

Since 1992, there have been 3 formal lake assessments completed for SVL, North Carolina Wildlife Resources Commission, Buck Engineering, and Foster Lake and Pond Management. Each study concluded that enhancing aquatic structure in SVL was a key component to managing the fisheries. With the exception of the abiotic and biotic water data that will be collected under the LWB program, no ongoing assessments are in place to monitor vegetation and status of the fishery in SVL.

SVL is utilized by both resident and migratory waterfowl. There are year round resident populations of both mallard ducks and Canada geese. A high resident Canada goose population had been a problem in the past but densities have declined over the past few years due to Village control measures.

### Public Outreach

A variety of mechanisms are in place for Public Outreach/Input. All lake representatives are identified in the Village website and contact information provided. SVL and other Village residents can provide input directly to the SVL representative at any time. Communication is enhanced via a 5 member Core Group which interacts individually and collectively with the SVL representative. The members are all Spring Valley residents. Some are not lakeside residents but all use the lakes and parks; 2 members have small children that mainly use the parks, 1 is and avid boater, 1 is and avid fisherman, 1 is a contractor. Along with the SVL representative, these individuals get together and discuss issues and concerns heard from residents and then try to develop solutions. As an example, the Core Group led the effort with the #68 Pine Ridge Drive Park modernization. Notification of residents is via reverse 911 and Village bulletin board, and specific to SVL, the getting together at "Snak N Yak" also is an informal notification system.

An annual meeting of SVL residents and other interested Village residents is held to report on progress in management implementation and identify citizen concerns. Information about the status of SVL will be disseminated by the LWB through a column in The Pitch and Village Topics, and using electronic media such as Channel 18, the local cable access cable channel, and the Village website.

## **II.—PERCEPTIONS**

Perceptions of the status of SVL and suggestions for matters of attention were accumulated from a series of sources. First, the SVL Lake Representative to the LWB responded to a draft list of topics for consideration in the planning effort (2/29/07). A second set of more specific responses was developed by the SVL Core Group, which serves as advisory to the Lake Representative. A forum for SVL residents and interested parties, held 8/04/07 and attended by 13 people provided further inputs.

The Village Lake Management Questionnaire administered Village-wide in 2007 resulted in responses from 71 residents who designated themselves as living on SVL. Responses to all questions by these residents, along with their written comments, formed the principal basis for the survey data. The Questionnaire was comprised of a set of general questions and a set of lake-specific questions, the lake of interest being chosen by the respondent. SVL was chosen as the lake of interest by 54 of 245 questionnaire respondents who indicated that they did not live on a lake.

Questionnaire response numbers for individual questions were somewhat variable, as some respondents did not answer every question. Consequently, percentages are expressed as proportion of those answering any individual question.

The lake is very important to SVL residents for water-based recreation. Of the respondents, 93% (63/68) use Village lakes for water-based recreation. Of those using the lake, all uses were high: Boating: 59%; Canoeing/Kayaking: 31%; Fishing: 49%; and Swimming: 59%. Not surprising, SVL residents do not use SVL parks very much. Of 70 respondents, only 21% (15/70) indicated that they use SVL parks.

SVL is an important resource for WP residents who do not live on the lake. Of the 245 off-lake residents who responded to the Questionnaire, 113 (46%) indicated that they use Village lakes for water-based recreation, and 64 of these (57%) include SVL among the lakes used. SVL was the highest-use lake among off-lake residents for water-based recreation, slightly exceeding Thagard Lake

(60/113). SVL parks are also important to off-lake residents. Of the 245 who responded to the Questionnaire, 105 (43%) indicated that they use Village Parks, and of those, 50 (48%) use SVL parks, somewhat less than use of Thagard parks. Integration of these numbers indicates that 26% (64 of 245) of off-lake residents use SVL for water-based recreation and 20% (50/245) use SVL parks.

Questionnaire responses to the lake-specific questions were very similar for lake residents and off-lake residents. Consequently, comments regarding lake-specific response data were generally pooled for the two groups.

Inputs on perceptions from various sources were consolidated and organized as follows:

II.1. Lake Infrastructure

- Dam/Spillway
- Access and Boat Launches
- Docks and Retaining Walls

II.2. Watershed Activities and Effects

- Disturbance
- Sedimentation
- Dredging
- Water Withdrawals

II.3. Water Quality

- Water Clarity
- Pollution Sources
- General Water Quality Monitoring

II.4. Aquatic Vegetation

II.5. Winter Water Level Drawdown

II.6. Boating

- Regulations
- Registration
- Mooring Buoys

II.7. Fisheries

II.8. Parks

- Parking/Boat Storage
- Swimming Areas
- Picnic Areas
- Pets
- Sanitation
- General

II.9 Swimming

- Maintenance of Swimming Areas
- Segregation of Activities
- Floats and Rafts

11.10. Enforcement

II.11. Communication

II.12. General Satisfaction with Management

**II.1.Lake Infrastructure**

WP residents consider the lake’s infrastructure to be extremely important. Respondents to the 2006 Citizen Survey of Land Development and Use overwhelmingly expressed that it is extremely important for the Village to maintain or improve dams. Respondents also expressed a strong expectation for maintaining and improving access to Village lakes.

II.1.1. Dam/Spillway

A safe and well-functioning dam and spillway is critical to the life of SVL and property values of lakefront lots. The dam has been neglected for years. A second pipe is needed. We should do whatever it takes to preserve this resource, regardless of cost. The village has a responsibility to preserve our property values and our resources. The current plan is to replace the spillway and provide adequate drain for emergency and draw down conditions in the fall of 2009.

II.1.2. Access

Other than via lakeside residences, access to SVL is via the boat launch and the parks. Access to the launch and parks is considered adequate (70% indicated no problem or little problem).

	No Problem→Big Problem					
(5.) Adequacy of parks and access areas	ON	<b>52</b>	<b>20</b>	19	6	3
	OFF	<b>32</b>	<b>36</b>	16	10	6

SVL residents consider access for boat launching to be adequate (72%). However, the boat launch on SVL should be improved and preferably moved to the far corner of the park, constructed of concrete, and equipped with a small dock. This would provide spatial segregation of boats and trailers from the swimming areas.

	Highly Unsatisfactory→Highly Satisfactory					
(17.) Access for boat launching.		3	6	29	<b>51</b>	<b>11</b>

*As a result of recent improvements (since the survey), access to the boat launch and park at #68 Pine Ridge has been improved by providing parking for 15 cars, 2 golf carts, 1 handicap space with easy access for boat trailers via circular drive, a new concrete launch ramp and a dock to facilitate "launch and load". Also, the park has been divided to separate swimming area from fishing and pets. Park at # 204 will be addressed at a later date.*

**II.1.3. Docks and Retaining Walls**

Docks and retaining walls are a typical amenity for lakefront residents. Lakefront residents were in neither high agreement nor high disagreement with the effectiveness of construction and maintenance management.

[Strongly Disagree](#)→[Strongly Agree](#)

(34.) Construction and maintenance of private docks and bulkheads are effectively monitored and controlled. 7 24 19 43 6

Some docks and bulkheads are in a state of disrepair, but overall are in better condition than at some times in the recent past due to maintenance or replacement during the 2007 drawdown. Some residents are looking forward to another drawdown to facilitate more maintenance. Some concern was expressed regarding lakefront appearance, over-size docks and fences in the water. The residents have a responsibility to maintain their docks and retaining walls. Some confusion exists for residents regarding what to repair or replace. and when a permit is required.. The village should make it easier for them to get permits. It should be a simple one stop procedure

**II.2. Watershed Activities and Effects**

SVL residents indicated that stormwater inflows (49% concerned) and sedimentation (61%) were of concern as factors affecting water quality of SVL. In selection of the factor of greatest concern in water quality, stormwater inflow (17%) and sedimentation (26%), when combined, exceeded any other single factor.

**II.2.1. Watershed Disturbance**

Residents feel strongly that watershed activities are affecting SVL, and watershed disturbances are not being adequately controlled (50% disagree/strongly disagree that new construction is being managed effectively; 50% agree/strongly agree that stormwater runoff is not effectively controlled).

[Strongly Disagree](#)→[Strongly Agree](#)

(44.) New construction in the watershed is being effectively supervised in terms of controlling silt and sediment runoff. 27 23 33 15 2

(52.) Storm water run off is not effectively controlled and is harming the lakes.

0 10 40 27 23

Watershed effects were noted as residential, commercial, upstream development of Blue Lake, and street runoff. Any construction should be closely monitored. City ordinances are in place to control off-site/downstream impacts and should be strictly enforced. Strict penalties should be invoked, and used to offset impacts. Contractors should put up a bond to remediate effects of runoff into the lakes.

Containment basins are needed at all inlets to SVL. All road runoff to the lakes should also go through a containment basin.

*Pertinent to these concerns, a draft proposal for an ordinance regarding soil erosion and sedimentation control dated August 26, 2008, was submitted to Village Council for consideration.*

II.2.2. Sedimentation

SVL residents consider siltation of lake coves to be a serious problem (57% indicated dissatisfaction with siltation). Sedimentation has reduced water depth and created unstable lake bottoms in the cove areas.

Highly Unsatisfactory→Highly Satisfactory

(15.) Siltation of cove areas.

28 29 26 16 0

All SVL inlets are badly silted, and current/future activities in the watershed will exacerbate the situation. The source of sediments must be found and stopped either by the village or the residents. Whereas runoff from construction areas and streets will occur to some extent, a containment basin should be installed on each inlet to intercept runoff and accumulate silt and debris.

The Village should require all contractors (residential, sub-division) to be responsible to clean any sedimentation in SVL resulting from their activity.

*There is an existing WP ordinance that addresses Erosion Control (K-III-52 section 9.2 paragraph d. and K-IV-10 section h, paragraph 1), putting the cleanup responsibility on the contractor. Adoption of the above proposed ordinance (August 2008) should help solve this problem. All ordinances need to be strictly enforced.*

II.2.3. Dredging

Siltation of coves has progressed to the point that dredging is needed to deepen the coves (68% of residents agreed/strongly agreed that the Village should dredge). This priority was affirmed by those in attendance at the SVL forum

(68% agree/strongly agree).

Strongly Disagree→Strongly Agree

(53.) The Village should dredge areas where siltation has occurred. 0 7 25 37 31

*The Village has recently purchased a small mobile dredge to do maintenance dredging where needed. It could serve the various WP lakes with sedimentation problems. Residents could serve as volunteers to assist dredging operations. After initial dredging, and with better watershed management, maintenance dredging should not be demanding. Purchase costs might be partially recovered by leasing the dredge to other municipalities.*

II.2.4. Water Withdrawals

Water withdrawals occur both for Golf Course irrigation and for residential use. Both user groups need to be conservative during periods of drought, and both subject to similar conservation measures.

Residential irrigation is not perceived as a problem (50% of residents agree; only 18% disagree).

Strongly Disagree→Strongly Agree

(51.) Residential irrigation systems drawing from the lakes are managed effectively by the Village. 6 12 31 40 10

Some concern exists regarding how far irrigation pipes and markers extend into the lake.

A mechanism should be established to switch pumps off during herbicide application to control aquatic weeds, thereby protecting lawns and shrubs.

*A work group has designed a procedure for notification of residents when herbicides are being used (notification by phone, e-mail, personal visit, signs at parks, and a system of buoys at spray sites).*

II.3. Water Quality

Most SVL residents are concerned about water quality (92%), reinforcing the results obtained Village-wide in the WP Land Development and Use Survey (93% felt that it was important for the Village to maintain water quality).

(10.) The WP Land Development and Use survey indicated high importance for maintaining water quality, which is affected by a variety of factors.

- ( ) I am concerned about lake water quality. 92
- ( ) I have no concerns about water quality in WP lakes. 8

Nevertheless, about 50% of respondents (on- and off-lake residents) considered

overall water quality to be of no or little problem.

		No Problem→Big Problem				
(1.) Overall water quality.	ON	21	24	29	14	12
	OFF	23	33	29	12	4

II.3.1. Water Clarity

Most residents considered water clarity to be satisfactory (57%), though few felt it was highly satisfactory. Water clarity is perceived to have declined over the past 10 years.

		Highly Unsatisfactory→Highly Satisfactory				
(18.) Water clarity.		10	16	9	57	9

Winter drawdown is perceived to have helped water clarity.

II.3.2. Pollution sources.

Pollution sources with which SVL residents indicated concern were septic tank leakage (52%), fecal coliform levels (50%), runoff of pesticides and herbicides from lawns (42%), and animal wastes (32%). Some concern was expressed for trash, grass clippings, and gas/oil from boats with outboard motors when brought to SVL. Nevertheless, the situation for trash and debris was generally perceived as satisfactory (89%).

(11.) If <u>concerned</u> , CHECK all that apply.	
<input type="checkbox"/> Septic tank leakage	52
<input type="checkbox"/> Lawn runoff [pesticides/herbicides]	42
<input type="checkbox"/> Fecal coliform levels	50
<input type="checkbox"/> Animal wastes	32

(12.) Then CIRCLE your <u>highest</u> concern:	
<input type="checkbox"/> Septic tank leakage	29
<input type="checkbox"/> Lawn runoff [pesticides/herbicides]	9
<input type="checkbox"/> Fecal coliform levels	11
<input type="checkbox"/> Animal wastes	8

Highly Unsatisfactory→Highly Satisfactory

(13.) Trash and debris in the lakes.	1	13	7	56	23
--------------------------------------	---	----	---	----	----

Although septic system leakage was considered the pollution source of greatest concern, only a small percentage of respondents (on- and off-lake) indicated that it was a problem (18-27%).

		No Problem→Big Problem				
(2.) Lake pollution due to faulty/substandard septic systems	ON	27	31	24	10	8
	OFF	25	23	25	17	10

Although a high percentage of residents are concerned with septic tank leakage,

there have been few reports of leakage, but at least the residents are aware that it could be a problem.

SVL residents were evenly divided on perceptions of adequacy of septic contamination monitoring by the Village.

Strongly Disagree→Strongly Agree

(40.) Monitoring for septic contamination in Village lakes is adequate. 14 24 32 19 12

Although runoff from lawns is considered of lesser concern than septic tank leakage, SVL residents feel strongly that use of lawn herbicides should be restricted (69%).

Strongly Disagree→Strongly Agree

(46.) Use of lawn herbicides near shorelines should be restricted. 6 4 21 48 21

Residents and their lawn care services should be asked to refrain from fertilizing close to the lake's edge. We should encourage a buffer zone.

People must be made aware of what chemicals do to the water quality when runoff from their property occurs. SVL residents feel strongly that they should be provided with better information on practices to minimize pollution, especially runoff from lawns.

Strongly Disagree→Strongly Agree

(54.) The Village should provide residents with technical information on watershed and lake management "best practices." 0 2 5 65 29

Concerns for the impact of herbicides, fertilizers, septic systems etc, should not be limited to those around the lake, but to include any watershed area that feeds SVL.

### II.3.3. General Water Quality Monitoring

SVL residents feel strongly that monitoring programs should be put into place to track water quality status and changes.

Strongly Disagree→Strongly Agree

(39.) Periodic monitoring of lake water quality should be conducted. 0 0 2 28 70

*To establish status and detect trends, the LWB is implementing a standardized sampling program for WP lakes. Each lake representative will have a monitoring kit with tests capable of being done by volunteers (established by the lake rep). Sampling should be done at fixed stations on a regular basis and the results maintained in a log. Following initial testing in 2008, a formal protocol should be in place for 2009. Some tests will have to be done in a lab. Attributes to be monitored need to be identified and frequency of sampling established.*

SVL residents (89%) feel strongly that they should be informed of the results of water quality monitoring.



Strongly Disagree→Strongly Agree

(49.) Water levels should be drawn down periodically.

9 4 7 54 25

Drawdown also provided residents and the Village the opportunity to inspect/repair bulkheads and docks, to clean up waterfront areas, and do any lake/dam maintenance while lake levels are low. The Village should be more involved with trash and debris cleanup during this time. During drawdown, the Village could also provide maintenance of swimming beaches.

At the time of the next drawdown, the letter to all lake front residents apprising them of the drawdown should include recommendations as what a home owner can accomplish while the water level is down.

The major drawback to the drawdown is that we cannot guarantee that Mother Nature will cooperate and restore the water level, although SVL with its springs has a good chance to return to normal in a reasonable time.

Drawdown should be started earlier (December 15th), and dropping the water level as fast as possible. More drainage pipes should be used.

**II.6. Boating**

Boating, along with swimming, is the highest recreational use of SVL by its residents (59%). Canoeing and kayaking activities also involve 31% of residents.

**II.6.1. Regulations**

Most residents (70%) agree with current boating regulations. Some (25%) feel that boating regulations are not adequately posted or understood.

Strongly Disagree→Strongly Agree

(29.) Boating regulations are appropriate as currently written.

0 10 21 49 21

(30.) Boating regulations are posted where required and are easily understandable.

5 20 36 30 9

Some support (65%) exists for modification of the Village ordinance restricting night-time boating.

Strongly Disagree→Strongly Agree

(33.) After-dark use of watercraft should be extended provided that proper safety lights are displayed.

10 13 12 41 24

Relative to hours of operation, revise the present ordinance to be a noise ordinance. Boats, kayaks, and canoes should be allowed after dark providing they display proper running lights and observe the noise ordinance. Inexpensive clip-on lights should suffice. The safe operation of any water craft is the responsibility of the operator. However, for safety reasons, proper lighting should

be strictly enforced.

II. 6. 2. Boat Registration

According to ordinance, the lakes of WP are intended for the sole use of residents and their guests. Under the ordinance, all boats are required to have a decal. The Village clerk must be prepared to ensure that the applicant for a decal is a resident of WP.

SVL residents strongly agree (73%) that registration costs are reasonable.

[Strongly Disagree](#)→[Strongly Agree](#)

(32.) Fees for boat decals are reasonable and should be collected. 5 8 15 **52 21**

A graduated fee should be considered, differentiating boats with motors from those without, using different decal colors.

Although most users of SVL (58-60%) considered un-permitted boats to be non-problematic, 25% of SVL residents did.

[No Problem](#)→[Big Problem](#)

9. Presence of boats without current lake sticker  
ON **27 33** 15 12 13  
OFF **28 30** 28 9 4

Residents feel strongly that registration requirements should be firmly enforced (79%).

[Strongly Disagree](#)→[Strongly Agree](#)

(31.) Current decals for all watercraft should be stringently enforced by the Village. 3 3 15 **48 31**

All boats in and out of water in WP should have a current decal. Violators of the registration requirements should be penalized by both a fine and confiscation of the boat until penalty is paid.

II.6.3. Mooring Buoy

The SVL mooring buoy is popular with residents. There is opportunity for greater use of the mooring buoy; lake users probably would benefit from orientation on how to use it.

II.7. Fisheries

Fishing is an important activity for SVL residents (49%). Although few indicated high satisfaction with fishing, most (53%) indicated satisfaction, and few were highly dissatisfied. Most (57%) were also satisfied with the shoreline fishing areas.

[Highly Unsatisfactory](#)→[Highly Satisfactory](#)

(16.) Fishing. 2 18 28 **45 8**  
(24.) Fishing areas (shoreline/parks) 3 8 32 **49 8**

However, concern exists for fishing in the proximity of swimming areas, especially the presence of rusty hooks and lines which pose safety hazards. Restriction of shoreline fishing to the boat launch area, away from swimming areas, should be considered. *(This has been implemented for the renovated park and is being discussed for the future park renovation.)*

Residents were in noticeable disagreement (33%) that fish monitoring is adequate. They firmly believe that monitoring results be publicized.

Strongly Disagree→Strongly Agree

- (42.) Status of fish populations is adequately monitored. 14 19 42 22 3
- (43.) The water quality and fishery testing program for our lakes should be formalized and results published. 0 0 12 49 40

SVL residents strongly support (84%) supplemental fish stocking as a management tool for SVL, but that all fisheries management should be tailored to individual lake needs (85%).

Strongly Disagree→Strongly Agree

- (48.) The Village should stock the lakes for fishing when needed. 0 0 14 68 18
- (50.) Fish management programs should be tailored to individual lakes. 0 0 15 59 26

Stocking, if done, should be done in conjunction with other management, e.g., habitat management and harvest strategies, allowing nature to take care of much of the need.

## **II.8. Parks**

Although SVL park use by SVL residents is low (22%), they, as well as off-lake users were quite satisfied with the adequacy of parks (about 70%).

No Problem→Big Problem

- (5.) Adequacy of parks and access areas
- |     |    |    |    |    |   |
|-----|----|----|----|----|---|
| ON  | 52 | 20 | 19 | 6  | 3 |
| OFF | 32 | 36 | 16 | 10 | 6 |

Regarding most park issues, SVL residents expressed satisfaction (51-67%).

Highly Unsatisfactory→Highly Satisfactory

- |                       |   |   |    |    |    |
|-----------------------|---|---|----|----|----|
| (19.) Size of parks   | 0 | 0 | 33 | 57 | 10 |
| (20.) Number of parks | 1 | 7 | 27 | 55 | 9  |
| (21.) Parking areas   | 3 | 7 | 39 | 42 | 10 |
| (22.) Swimming areas  | 0 | 5 | 29 | 58 | 9  |
| (23.) Picnic areas    | 0 | 5 | 34 | 55 | 6  |
| (24.) Fishing areas   | 3 | 8 | 32 | 49 | 8  |
| (27.) Safety          | 0 | 7 | 42 | 45 | 6  |

In addition, both off-lake and lake residents were generally satisfied (80%) with noise levels at parks. However, some residents in proximity to the parks expressed concern about noise from the parks.

No Problem→Big Problem

- (6.) Noise levels at parks and access areas
- |    |    |    |    |   |   |
|----|----|----|----|---|---|
| ON | 52 | 28 | 13 | 8 | 0 |
|----|----|----|----|---|---|

All parks should be closed 1 hour after sunset, except for boat ramp use or when used for special functions as approved and with a permit from village officials.

Both SVL residents (43%) and off-lake residents of WP (30%) indicated that non-resident use of parks and access areas was problematic.

		<a href="#">No Problem</a> → <a href="#">Big Problem</a>				
(7.) Non- resident use of parks and access areas	ON	30	15	12	15	28
	OFF	29	27	14	14	16

*The noise and non-resident use issues have mostly been resolved with the increase of police patrols and with police communicating with users.*

II.8.1. Parking/Boat Storage

Despite general satisfaction with parking, space for parking cars and storing boats will always be a problem. In the discussion of the park at 204 Pine Ridge Dr. it was noted that more off road parking was needed and the boat storage is inadequate. The problem is solvable only by taking away from the park area or obtaining the use of the right of way on the road for parking. Boat storage capacity could be increased, people could be given an assigned space, or possibly spaces could be rented.

*Boat storage as well as parking is on the agenda for the next Core Group discussion.*

II.8.2. Swimming Areas

See separate section on Swimming (II.9)

II.8.3. Picnic Areas

Some covered picnic areas are recommended to provide shade and cover.

II.8.4. Pets

Residents were equivocal regarding pet policies at the SVL parks.

		<a href="#">Highly Unsatisfactory</a> → <a href="#">Highly Satisfactory</a>				
(26.) Pet policies		8	18	44	26	5

Although the Village leash law pertains to the parks, concerns are regularly expressed about dogs running loose, especially in swim areas. Some residents would like to see pets prohibited from the parks.

II.8.5. Sanitation

Of the park issues, SVL residents were least satisfied (42%) with sanitary facilities at the parks.

Highly Unsatisfactory→Highly Satisfactory

(25.) Sanitary facilities

12 30 40 12 6

Permanent sanitary facilities (no Porto Johns), doggie litter bags, and trash cans were suggested as needed improvements. Permanent restroom facilities are not likely cost-wise due to need for septic system, lighting, maintenance, and cleaning supplies.

### II.8.6. Parks—General

Residents are looking forward to revitalization of the park at 68 Pine Ridge Dr. The plan includes construction of a pavilion, redirection of boat launching traffic, improvements to boat launch ramp, running electric and water lines to the dock and pavilion, more parking and sanitary facilities.

New signs are needed at both parks. Signage should be done when the new Section J ordinance is approved.

### II.9. Swimming

Like boating, swimming is the most common use of SVL by residents (59%). Swimming in SVL is an activity emanating from various locations—lakefront lots, parks, access areas, boats, and inflatable rafts. Issues related to swimming are largely those of safety. SVL residents were generally satisfied (67%) with the park swimming areas.

Highly Unsatisfactory→Highly Satisfactory

(22.) Swimming areas

0 5 29 58 9

#### II.9.1. Maintenance of Swimming Areas

Swimming areas should be cleaned on a regular basis by village employees. Volunteers should be utilized on an organized basis. The Village should provide major maintenance of swimming areas annually during drawdown with the use of their heavy equipment.

#### II.9.2. Segregation of Activities

Although the questionnaire item regarding segregation of park activities apparently was not well understood (answered by the fewest respondents, and most neutral—68%), comments were received expressing better segregation of swimming from fishing and boating activities.

Highly Unsatisfactory→Highly Satisfactory

(28.) Spatial segregation of park activities

2 7 68 22 7

Segregation of swimming and fishing should reduce the safety issues associated with lost/discarded fishing hooks and lines in beach areas. Currently, a sign is posted at # 68 park to have swimming and picnic only on 1 side and no pets or fishing in that area; the same is proposed for #204 park.

For the safety of open-water swimmers, including distance-swimmers, boaters must be aware that they will see swimmers in the lake and should be on the lookout for them. Swimmers should also take responsibility to make the boaters visually aware that they are there. Swimming should be limited to daylight hours only.

**II.9.3. Floats and Rafts**

Besides swimming issues associated with parks, the principal swimming issue is that of floats and rafts used in conjunction with swimming activities. New floats are now prohibited by ordinance J-II-4, Sec. 8, par b. If a resident would like a float (inflatable or other), it would be necessary to petition the Village Council for and ordinance change, as the ordinance reads that new floats are prohibited.

SVL residents and off-lake users do not consider the existing floats to be problematic (<50%).

		No Problem→Big Problem				
(8.) Presence of semi-permanent floats	ON	<b>39</b>	<b>21</b>	20	9	11
	OFF	<b>28</b>	<b>28</b>	13	4	4

Attitudes toward large, inflatable floats, anchored temporarily in open water, were less favorable. Over half (58%) of SVL residents disagree that such floats should be allowed, although 30 percent were in agreement. If allowed the floats should be restricted in size and distance offshore (74-81%)

		Strongly Disagree→Strongly Agree				
(35.) Offshore anchoring of large inflatable floats should be allowed.		<b>38</b>	<b>20</b>	12	28	2
(36.) If so, floats should be restricted in size.		4	4	19	<b>42</b>	<b>32</b>
(37.) If allowed, distance offshore should be restricted.		0	0	19	<b>41</b>	<b>40</b>

The floats should be removed or moved shoreward to the shoreline/dock at night.

**II.10. Enforcement**

Some SVL residents are concerned about inadequate enforcement of Village ordinances (27-32%), while off-lake users were quite satisfied (64%).

		No Problem→Big Problem				
(4.) Enforcement of current lake ordinances	ON	31	15	26	16	11
	OFF	37	27	25	6	4

		Strongly Disagree→Strongly Agree				
(57.) Village lakes are adequately patrolled and regulations enforced.		16	16	25	37	6

Enforcement issues of concern were principally those of lake and park use by non-residents. Greater pro-active enforcement by Village police is needed at parks, launch areas, and on the lake. Employment of a part-time enforcement officer during high use periods is an alternative to expecting greater police presence.

Better identification of residents/guests would be attained if decal requirements were expanded (from boats) to include decals for vehicles at parking areas and identification bracelets for lake and park users.

Ordinances should be enforced stringently on all users, including lake residents and those impacting the watershed through off-lake activities, especially construction/development.

A Lake Watch program should be implemented for SVL (and all lakes). SVL should have a responsible Lake Watch representative, and a set of volunteers individually responsible for looking at parks, boating, fishing, etc. These people could also act as a community watch and used as volunteers elsewhere in lake management as needed.

**II. 11. Communication**

Effective communication is essential at many levels for effective management of SVL. Residents felt that communication about lake matters was not very good. The need to know was particularly evident in responses to queries regarding water quality and management (89-94%)

Strongly Disagree→Strongly Agree

- |  |   |   |    |           |           |
|--|---|---|----|-----------|-----------|
| (43.) The water quality and fishery testing program for our lakes should be formalized and results published.            | 0 | 0 | 12 | <b>49</b> | <b>40</b> |
| (54.) The Village should provide residents with technical information on watershed and lake management "best practices." | 0 | 2 | 5  | <b>65</b> | <b>29</b> |

Every available means for communication should be used, such as The Pitch, The Village Topics, The Web Page, and Channel 18, with possible monthly topics.

The SVL Core Group, comprised of the Lake Representative, and individuals with interest/knowledge in specific aspects of lake aspects/activities, should be more active in communication (two-way) with residents, carrying their concerns to the LWB, and informing them of actions at the Board and Village levels. The Core Group could also serve as a Lake Watch team. An annual SVL forum should be held to enhance communication and address actions under the lake plan.

**II.12. General Satisfaction with Lake Management**

Most SVL residents and off-lake users judge the overall quality of the lake to have changed little over the past 5 years (52-79%) Respondents more often judged the overall quality to have declined than improved.

(10.) Over the past *five years*, would you say the overall quality of this lake is: (check one)  
 ON ( 15 )Getting better ( 52 )About the same ( 33 )Getting worse  
 OFF (9) (79) (13)

SVL residents feel strongly (99%) that effective management is important.

[Strongly Disagree](#)→[Strongly Agree](#)

(56.) Effective management of Village lakes is important to maintaining a high quality of life for Village residents. 0 2 0 **29** **70**

Residents were neither strongly satisfied nor strongly dissatisfied with current management (0%). Nevertheless, over half of the residents (55%) indicated that they felt that the overall quality is adequately maintained.

[Strongly Disagree](#)→[Strongly Agree](#)

(58.) Overall, I am satisfied with the current management of Village lakes. 0 16 16 **67** 0

(55.) The overall quality of the Village lakes is adequately maintained. 6 22 16 **52** 3

### III.—SVL ACTION PLAN

*Goal 1. Maintain and enhance the infrastructure, esthetic values and recreational opportunities of SVL (including its parks).*

#### **Objective 1.1: Complete dam repairs by July 2010.**

Action 1.1.1: Bring the dam and spillway up to specifications for safety and effective function.

[Priority \(High\)](#)

[Cost \(High\)](#)

[Timeline \(Long/scheduled for winter 2009\)](#)

[Responsibility: \(Village Manager/contractors\)](#)

#### **Objective 1.2: Complete planned improvements to lake parks by December 2009.**

Action 1.2.1: Apply concrete surface to existing boat ramp at #68 Park and add a dock to facilitate launch and loading of boats.

[Priority \(Med\)](#)

[Cost \(Low\)](#)

[Timeline \(Short\)](#)

[Responsibility \(Village Maintenance\)](#)

Action 1.2.2: Increase the number of parking spaces and add two boat

storage racks at both parks.

Priority (High)

Cost (Low)

Timeline (Short)

Responsibility: (Village Maintenance)

Action 1.2.3: Establish one permanent sanitary bathroom facility at each park.

Priority (Low)

Cost (High)

Timeline (Long)

Responsibility: (Village/contractors)

Action 1.2.4: Establish a Volunteer program to work with Village Maintenance Staff to maintain clean parks and swimming areas, including maintenance of beaches during water drawdown.

Priority (High)

Cost (Low)

Timeline (Short)

Responsibility: (SVL Core Group)

Action 1.2.5: Update signage at parks to reflect current rules and regulations.

Priority (High)

Cost (Med)

Timeline (Short)

Responsibility: (Village/contractors)

Action 1.2.6: Construct fences to segregate swimming areas from boat launch and fishing areas.

Priority (High)

Cost (Low)

Timeline (Short/being done at #68, planning on #204)

Responsibility: (Volunteers/Village Maintenance)

**Objective 1.3: Repair or replace all substandard bulkheads and docks by March 2009.**

Action 1.3.1: Establish a schedule for winter water drawdowns to repair public and private docks and bulkheads and to clean up shoreline debris.

Priority (High)

Cost (Low)

Timeline (Short)

Responsibility: (Core Group/Village Maintenance)

Action 1.3.1: Inventory all docks and bulkheads and notify residents if repairs are required and provide permitting guidance.

Priority (High)

Cost (Low)

Timeline (Short)

Responsibility: (SVL Representative/Village Manager)

**Objective 1.4: Reduce sediment deposition into SVL by 80% by January 2010.**

Action 1.4.1: Inventory and map all surface inflow drains and streams and assess sediment deposition at inflow sites.

Priority (High)

Cost (Low)

Timeline (Short)

Responsibility: (SVL Core Group/Volunteers)

Action 1.4.2: Install sediment catch basins at all primary lake inflow sites.

Priority (High)

Cost (Med)

Timeline (Short)

Responsibility: (Village Maintenance)

Action 1.4.3: Use portable dredge to remove excessive sedimentation from affected coves and other priority areas.

Priority (High)

Cost (Low)

Timeline (Short)

Responsibility: (Village Maintenance/Volunteers)

**Objective 1.5: Revise Chapter J Ordinance to enhance opportunities for approved boating access and other uses of the lake.**

Action 1.5.1: Establish a graduated fee for boat decals, differentiating boats with motors from those without, using different decal colors.

Priority (High)

Cost (Low)

Timeline (Short)

Responsibility: (LWB/Village Manager)

Action 1.5.2: Amend Village ordinance to allow night-time boating and

fishing up to 11 PM using vessels with proper lighting and enforce using existing noise ordinance.

Priority (High)

Cost (Low)

Timeline (Short)

Responsibility: (LWB/Village Manager)

Action 1.5.3: Amend Chapter J to allow temporary floats, with restriction on size, distance offshore and time of use.

Priority (High)

Cost (Low)

Timeline (Short)

Responsibility: (LWB/Village Manager)

**Objective 1.6: Secure necessary resources to enforce all ordinances that pertain to the protection and management of lakes by January 2009.**

Action 1.6.1: Hire an additional part-time enforcement officer to increase enforcement during high use periods (in conjunction with other WP lake enforcement programs).

Priority (High)

Cost (Med)

Timeline (Short)

Responsibility: (Village Council/Manager)

Note: The Village hired a part-time code enforcement officer in 2008.

Action 1.6.2: Establish a volunteer-based SVL Lake Watch Program.

Priority (High)

Cost (None)

Timeline (Short)

Responsibility: (SVL Representative)

*Goal 2. Using sound scientific principles ensure that the lake's aquatic environment, including water quality and quantity, vegetation and fish, is healthy and will provide high quality recreational uses for Village residents.*

**Objective 2.1: Develop a long-term water quality assessment program by March 2009.**

Action 2.1.1. Establish water sampling protocols, including identification of

sample locations, schedules and appropriate water chemistry parameters (e.g. nutrients, coliform bacteria, contaminants).

Priority: (High)

Cost: (Moderate)

Timeline: (Short)

Responsibility: (LWB/SVL Core Group)

Action 2.1.2: Collect water quality data each month and provide summary of results to Village residents

Priority: (High)

Cost: (Moderate)

Timeline: (Short)

Responsibility: (LWB/SVL Core Group)

Action 2.1.2. Work with the Village's Wastewater Committee to establish a monitoring program to assess septic system leakage into SVL.

Priority: (Medium)

Cost: (Moderate)

Timeline: (Long)

Responsibility: (LWB/Wastewater Committee)

Note: The Village Council is currently looking into a program for monitoring.

**Objective 2.2: Identify priority fisheries management strategies in accordance with specific expectations of Village residents by March 2009.**

Action 2.2.1: Fund periodic fishery assessments by professional consultant.

Priority: (Low)

Cost: (Medium)

Timeline: (Intermediate)

Responsibility: (LWB/Village Manager)

Action 2.2.2: Sample fish species to determine presence or absence of mercury contamination.

Priority: (High)

Cost: (Moderate)

Timeline: (Short)

Responsibility: (LWB)

Action 2.2.3: Identify locations for placement of artificial fish habitat structures and install a minimum of 10 structures.

Priority: (Medium)

Cost: (Moderate)

Timeline: (Short)

Responsibility: (SLV Core Group/Village Maintenance)

Action 2.2.4: Based on results of fishery assessments, conduct fish stockings to augment game and forage fish populations.

Priority: (Medium)

Cost: (Moderate)

Timeline: (Intermediate)

Responsibility: (SLV Core Group/Village Maintenance)

**Objective 2.3: Establish an aquatic weed management strategy by March 2009.**

Action 2.3.1: Annually survey lake for presence and distribution of noxious weed species to determine need for chemical treatment.

Priority: (High)

Cost: (Low)

Timeline: (Short)

Responsibility: (SVL representative/Village Maintenance)

Action 2.3.2: Conduct periodic winter drawdowns to control noxious aquatic vegetation.

Priority: (High)

Cost: (Low)

Timeline: (Short)

Responsibility: (SVL representative/Village Maintenance)

Action 2.3.3: Inventory the current population of grass carp in SVL to assess the need to add additional fish to maximize biological control of aquatic weeds.

Priority: (High)

Cost: (Low)

Timeline: (Short)

Responsibility: (SVL representative/consultant)

Action 2.3.4: Develop standard operating procedures for contacting residents prior to applying chemical treatment for aquatic weeds.

Priority: (High)  
Cost: (Low)  
Timeline: (Short)  
Responsibility: (LWB)

*Goal 3. Utilize existing and create new forums to promote effective communication between the SVL Representative, SVL Core Group and Village residents regarding the condition and ongoing management of SVL.*

**Objective 3.1: Create and distribute fact sheets and other educational material explaining the ecological value of SVL and how to protect and manage its natural resources and maintain public and private infrastructure by May 2009.**

Action 3.1.1: Create SVL web page on Village web site.

Priority: (High)  
Cost: (Low)  
Timeline: (Short)  
Responsibility: (SVL Representative/ Village Web Master)

Action 3.1.2: Develop a fact sheet describing Best Management Practices (BMPs) for lawn and shrub care that minimize fertilizer and pesticide runoff into SVL.

Priority: (High)  
Cost: (Low)  
Timeline: (Short)  
Responsibility: (LWB/SVL Core Group)

Action 3.1.3: Provide monthly results of water quality sampling to residents using Village web page and in hard copy at Village Hall.

Priority: (High)  
Cost: (Low)  
Timeline: (Short)  
Responsibility: (LWB/SVL Core Group)

Action 3.1.4: Develop fact sheet on maintenance of docks and retaining walls residents, including permitting information.

Priority: (High)  
Cost: (Low)  
Timeline: (Short)  
Responsibility: (LWB/Village Planner)

Action 3.1.5: Notify lakeside residents via letter and all residents via Web site and Channel 18 two months before scheduled drawdowns to facilitate permitting process.

Priority: (High)

Cost: (Low)

Timeline: (Short)

Responsibility: (LWB/Village Planner)

Action 3.1.6: Provide annual “state of the lake” report to residents and post on Web site, publish in Village newsletter and in the “Ptich” and provide hard copy for Village Hall.

Priority: (High)

Cost: (Low)

Timeline: (Intermediate)

Responsibility: (SVL representative/SVL Core Group)

Action 3.1.7: Hold semi-annual public meeting to discuss issues related to SVL.

Priority: (High)

Cost: (Low)

Timeline: (Short)

Responsibility: (SVL representative/SVL Core Group)

Action 3.1.7: Post lake assessment reports from NCWRC, Buck Engineering and FLMP to Web site.

Priority: (High)

Cost: (Low)

Timeline: (Short)

Responsibility: (SVL representative/SVL Core Group)

Action 3.1.8: Develop a fact sheet about uses and rules for SVL parks.

Priority: (High)

Cost: (Low)

Timeline: (Short)

Responsibility: (LWB/SVL Core Group)