

## **2005 PLIA Survey Summary (Comprehensive)**

- Ø On April 11, 2005, the Pewaukee Lake Improvement Association (PLIA) sent out 942 newsletters to a list of homeowners provided by a local real estate company.
- Ø The newsletter contained a 2-sided 8 ½ x 11 survey along with a number nine self-addressed envelope. Respondents were required to provide their own postage.
- Ø Unlike the PLIA survey of 2003 that went only to PLIA members and attendees at an education and informational meeting presented by Dr. Jeff Thornton on the SEWRPC lake plan, this survey went to riparians and households across the street from riparians.
- Ø The goal was to get one survey from each household to make a determination on citizen perceptions and priorities with regard to the management of Pewaukee Lake.
- Ø In the interest of objectivity, when multiple responses were received from one household (2 instances), one survey was selected; the selected survey contained additional comments. As the question responses in these two instances were found to be identical, the concept was that the people willing to comment would have stronger feelings on the issues, so their survey was used.
- Ø The number of respondents amounted to 8% over the period of April 11, 2005 through May 3, 2005 (postmark of May 2), with a total of 78 surveys returned.
- Ø We will assume that the respondents represent those most interested in lake issues.
- Ø If surveys contained conflicting answers (example: "chemical treatment should not be considered" and "chemical treatments should be considered for entire lake") only that question was excluded from the results for the respondent (2 instances).
- Ø On questions number 3 and 13 where respondents were to list a 1, 2, or 3 response for each item:

If respondents instead numbered 1 - 6, 1 and 2 were counted as a (1) response; 2 and 3 were counted as a (2) response, and 5 and 6 were counted as a (3) response.

If people just checked an item, it was considered a (1), since most items were left blank, and the checked items were considered as important to the respondent.

If respondents listed only a 1, 2 and 3, the responses were counted as a (1), (2) and (3) response respectively.

- Ø Percentages were rounded up or down to create whole numbers.
- Ø Eastern and Western Basin percentages are based upon respondents who indicated an answer to that question or provided an address.
- Ø When compiling the totals and percentages, there were a number of people who did not answer all of the questions on the survey. The percentages are based upon those respondents who indicated an answer.

The profile of respondents is as follows:

78 surveys were returned (8%)

42% of respondents are PLIA members  
58% of respondents are not PLIA members

96% of respondents own property on the lake  
4% of respondents do not

43% of respondents live on the western basin  
57% of respondents live on the eastern basin

13% live in the Village of Pewaukee  
45% live in the Town of Delafield  
42% live in the City of Pewaukee

(1 survey had no address, but lives in the Eastern basin)

**Question #3:**

|   | <u>Eastern Basin</u> | <u>Western Basin</u> |
|---|----------------------|----------------------|
| 78% of respondents consider weeds in open water a major concern or are somewhat concerned                 | 86%                  | 67%                  |
| § 48% feel it is a major concern  | 62%                  | 30%                  |
| § 30% are somewhat concerned  | 24%                  | 37%                  |
| 22% of respondents have minimal concern about weeds in open water   | 14%                  | 33%                  |
| <hr/>   |                      |                      |
| 92% of respondents consider weeds along the shoreline and piers a major concern or are somewhat concerned | 93%                  | 89%                  |
| § 62% feel it is a major concern  | 78%                  | 41%                  |
| § 30% are somewhat concerned  | 15%                  | 48%                  |
| 9% have minimal concern about weeds along the shoreline and piers   | 8%                   | 10%                  |
| <hr/>   |                      |                      |
| 93% of respondents are concerned about invasive weed species (i.e. Eurasian watermilfoil)                 | 92%                  | 93%                  |
| § 81% feel it is a major concern  | 87%                  | 72%                  |
| § 12% are somewhat concerned  | 5%                   | 21%                  |
| 7% have a minimal concern about invasive weed species   | 8%                   | 7%                   |
| <hr/>   |                      |                      |
| 94% of respondents are concerned about algae blooms   | 94%                  | 93%                  |
| § 72% feel it is a major concern  | 74%                  | 70%                  |
| § 22% are somewhat concerned  | 20%                  | 23%                  |
| 6% have minimal concern about algae blooms  | 6%                   | 7%                   |
| <hr/>   |                      |                      |

**Question #3 continued:**

|   | <u>Eastern Basin</u> | <u>Western Basin</u> |
|---|----------------------|----------------------|
| 83% of respondents have concerns about zebra mussels                    | 82%                  | 84%                  |
| § 51% feel it is a major concern  | 44%                  | 60%                  |
| § 32% are somewhat concerned  | 38%                  | 24%                  |
| 17% have minimal concern about zebra mussels in Pewaukee Lake           | 18%                  | 16%                  |
| <hr/>   |                      |                      |
| 64% of respondents have concerns about shoreland protection and buffers | 66%                  | 62%                  |
| § 21% feel it is a major concern  | 14%                  | 29%                  |
| § 43% are somewhat concerned  | 52%                  | 33%                  |
| 36% have a minimal concern about shoreland protection and buffers       | 34%                  | 38%                  |
| <hr/>   |                      |                      |
| 74% of respondents have concerns about boater safety                    | 68%                  | 82%                  |
| § 33% feel it is a major concern  | 13%                  | 56%                  |
| § 41% are somewhat concerned  | 55%                  | 26%                  |
| 26% of respondents have minimal concern about boater safety             | 32%                  | 19%                  |
| <hr/>   |                      |                      |
| 65% of respondents have concern about beach closings                    | 81%                  | 46%                  |
| § 33% feel it is a major concern  | 39%                  | 27%                  |
| § 32% are somewhat concerned  | 42%                  | 19%                  |
| 35% of respondents have minimal concern about beach closings            | 19%                  | 54%                  |
| <hr/>   |                      |                      |

**Question #3 continued:**

|  | <u>Eastern Basin</u> | <u>Western Basin</u> |
|--|----------------------|----------------------|
| 79% of respondents are concerned about development and land use planning | 75%                  | 82%                  |
| § 38% feel it is a major concern   | 29%                  | 46%                  |
| § 41% are somewhat concerned   | 46%                  | 36%                  |
| 21% have minimal concern about development and land use planning         | 25%                  | 18%                  |
| <hr/>  |                      |                      |
| 84% of respondents have concerns about wetland protection                | 87%                  | 82%                  |
| § 48% feel it is a major concern   | 37%                  | 61%                  |
| § 36% are somewhat concerned   | 50%                  | 21%                  |
| 16% of respondents have minimal concern about wetland protection         | 13%                  | 18%                  |
| <hr/>  |                      |                      |
| 79% of respondents have concerns about fishery protection                | 77%                  | 81%                  |
| § 46% feel it is a major concern   | 35%                  | 58%                  |
| § 33% are somewhat concerned   | 42%                  | 23%                  |
| 21% of respondents have minimal concerns about fishery protection        | 23%                  | 19%                  |
| <hr/>  |                      |                      |

**2005 Survey Results  
(Comprehensive)**

**Question #4:**

|  | <u>Eastern Basin</u> | <u>Western Basin</u> |
|--|----------------------|----------------------|
| 88% of the respondents feel it is important for the three municipalities on the lake to participate on the Pewaukee Lake Management Committee (PLMC) | 93%                  | 83%                  |
| § 70% feel it is very important  | 72%                  | 68%                  |
| § 18% feel it is important   | 21%                  | 15%                  |
| 11% feel it is not important or are opposed to such a committee  | 7%                   | 18%                  |
| § 5% feel it is not important  | 0%                   | 12%                  |
| § 6% are opposed to the committee  | 7%                   | 6%                   |

**Question #5:**

|   |     |     |
|---|-----|-----|
| 71% feel it is important for the other municipalities in the watershed to participate on the PLMC | 79% | 63% |
| § 32% feel it is very important   | 37% | 27% |
| § 39% feel it is important  | 42% | 36% |
| 28% feel it is not important or are opposed to their participation                                | 22% | 36% |
| § 16% feel it is not important  | 15% | 18% |
| § 12% are opposed   | 7%  | 18% |

**Question #6:**

|  |     |     |
|--|-----|-----|
| 75% of respondents agree with the City of Pewaukee Lake Plan to harvest Eurasian watermilfoil in up to 250 acres in the center of the eastern basin. | 79% | 71% |
| 25% do not agree   | 21% | 29% |

**Question #7:**

|  |     |     |
|--|-----|-----|
| 65% of the respondents feel that a Lake District should be created with authority to assume management of all aspects of Pewaukee Lake, its health, and its use. | 73% | 55% |
| 35% do not agree   | 27% | 45% |

**Question #8:**

|  | <u>Eastern Basin</u> | <u>Western Basin</u> |
|--|----------------------|----------------------|
| 68% of respondents would support their municipalities budgeting funds for studies of Pewaukee Lake | 75%                  | 61%                  |
| 32% do not support funding studies   | 25%                  | 39%                  |

**Question #9:**

|   |     |     |
|---|-----|-----|
| 62% of respondents feel mechanical harvesting has been effective in control of weeds within 200 feet of the shoreline | 57% | 69% |
| 38% do not feel it has been effective   | 43% | 31% |
| 42% feel mechanical harvesting has been effective between boat lifts and piers  | 37% | 50% |
| 58% do not feel it has been effective   | 63% | 50% |

**Question #10:**

|  |     |     |
|--|-----|-----|
| 70% of respondents feel that chemical treatment should be used on the entire lake or only on problem areas | 75% | 63% |
| § 38% feel chemicals should be used on the entire lake   | 40% | 36% |
| § 32% feel chemicals should be used only in problem areas  | 35% | 27% |
| 30% feel chemical treatment should not be considered under any circumstances                               | 25% | 36% |
| No respondents (0%) feel chemical treatment should be left to individual homeowners under DNR permits      | 0%  | 0%  |

**Question #11:**

|  |     |     |
|--|-----|-----|
| 53% of homeowners on the lake are satisfied with the removal of weeds and other debris from their shoreline. | 46% | 62% |
| 47% are not satisfied.   | 54% | 38% |

**2005 Survey Results  
(Comprehensive)**

**Question #12:**

|   | <u>Eastern Basin</u> | <u>Western Basin</u> |
|---|----------------------|----------------------|
| 46% of the respondents have a shoreline buffer to protect from erosion  | 53%                  | 38%                  |
| 54% do not have a shoreline buffer                                      | 48%                  | 63%                  |
| 64% of those without a shoreline buffer would consider establishing one | 47%                  | 79%                  |
| 36% would not consider establishing a shoreline buffer                  | 53%                  | 21%                  |

**Question #13:**

|  |     |     |
|--|-----|-----|
| 80% of the respondents feel it should be a short term priority for the PLIA to work with all communities in the watershed to implement the SEWRPC Lake Plan as amended by the Pewaukee Lake Management Committee | 83% | 78% |
| § 55% felt it should be a high priority  | 53% | 59% |
| § 25% feel it should be a medium priority  | 30% | 19% |
| 19% feel it should be a low priority   | 18% | 22% |
| <hr/>  |     |     |
| 64% of the respondents feel that more public education should be a short term priority for the PLIA  | 64% | 64% |
| § 25% feel it should be a high priority  | 32% | 16% |
| § 39% feel it should be a medium priority  | 32% | 48% |
| 36% feel public education should be a low priority   | 35% | 36% |
| <hr/>  |     |     |
| 88% of the respondents feel that, in the short term, the PLIA should put a priority on land use planning and zoning to reduce nutrients entering the lake  | 89% | 86% |
| § 61% felt it should be a high priority  | 51% | 73% |
| § 27% feel it should be a medium priority  | 38% | 13% |
| 12% feel this should be a low priority   | 11% | 13% |
| <hr/>  |     |     |

**Question #13 continued:**

|  | <u>Eastern Basin</u> | <u>Western Basin</u> |
|--|----------------------|----------------------|
| 94% of the respondents feel that 0% phosphorous in fertilizers should be a short term priority for the PLIA                | 89%                  | 100%                 |
| § 77% feel it should be a high priority  | 62%                  | 96%                  |
| § 17% feel it should be a medium priority  | 27%                  | 4%                   |
| 6% feel that in the short term 0% phosphorous in fertilizers is a low priority   | 11%                  | 0%                   |
| <hr/>  |                      |                      |
| 85% of the respondents feel that more aggressive weed management and controls should be a short term priority for the PLIA | 88%                  | 82%                  |
| § 69% feel it should be a high priority  | 75%                  | 61%                  |
| § 16% feel it should be a medium priority  | 13%                  | 21%                  |
| 15% of respondents do not feel that more aggressive weed management controls should be a short term priority for the PLIA  | 13%                  | 18%                  |
| <hr/>  |                      |                      |
| 79% of respondents feel that seeking grants to conduct studies and research should be a short term priority for the PLIA   | 73%                  | 86%                  |
| § 47% feel it should be a high priority  | 43%                  | 52%                  |
| § 32% feel it should be a medium priority  | 30%                  | 34%                  |
| 21% feel grants for research should be a low priority  | 27%                  | 14%                  |

**Question #3 comments:**

- #3: Clean up the lake so I can STOP being embarrassed
- #18: Use of fertilizers in lake basin area should be ban
- #28: The City of Pewaukee/PLIA s lack of cooperation with all of the other government entities who have adopted the SEWRPC study and lake management plan contained therein
- #35: Lake Protection it s about the lake, not me.
- #54: Low flying, loud, out of place motorized ultralight!!!
- #55: If we can t swim off our shore or get our boats out of Starke Bay, why would we pay anything for lake management? Close beach if the lake is considered toxic
- #59: Since we are in a special area, weed harvesting isn t done yet the special area ends at the county launch when the draft report included land on the other side of the county launch
- #77: The fact that changes can have a significant adverse effect on the market value of my property potentially amounting to tens of thousands of dollars. NR 115 & Waukesha County Ordinance changes. You people should pay our property taxes since you know what is best for us private property owners!

**Question #4 comments:**

- #78: We feel it is important for the municipalities to communicate and work together, but not necessarily under the recommendations of the PLIA.

**Question #5 comments:**

- #55: Easier said than done. But we have to continue on our own if it doesn t happen.

**Question #6 comments:**

- #12: Don t try to make a lake out of a marsh!
- #14: I desire to use all of the lake all basins
- #15: Will anything short of a full poisoning work?
- #18: You should know! Do you really think it s justified?
- #19: It is needed because the growth is out of control.
- #25: Has not been effective.
- #28: I believe the SEWRPC study was the most complete & objective study ever done of Pewaukee Lake. That lake management plan is the one that should be followed.
- #33: Chemical treatments should not be considered.
- #35: No herbicides however
- #40: We never endorse chemicals due to the effects of ecobalance to lake.
- #49: Along with herbicides
- #53: No spraying chemicals

**Question #6 comments (continued):**

- #55: Why cut a channel down mid-lake so weekend warriors can zoom from one end of lake to other? Also topping any plant life will make it grow thicker & denser.
- #66: The milfoil should be treated with an herbicide and quit wasting everyone's time doing everything else.
- #71: It's the City's responsibility to keep their equipment in their city limits.
- #78: We agree with more aggressive harvesting, but do not agree with use of chemicals in the lake.

**Question #7 comments:**

- #6: No more taxing authorities on Pewaukee Lake
- #28: The LPSD is already doing this on an ongoing basis.
- #33: Not enough info to comment on this
- #35: Not sure what this entails
- #48: PLMC preferred
- #49: Lake health should be primary topic vs. building watch dog
- #54: Depends who is on it
- #55: Too much government control
- #58: Not PLIA or PLMC
- #59: Extra layer of bureaucracy which would not represent exclusively the interests of riparian property owners
- #64: We feel Charles Shong and the Pewaukee L. Sanitary District is doing an excellent job of controlling weed growth and enhancing the lake environment. We strongly oppose any chemical treatment of our lake.
- #65: PLMC is better too much taxes already
- #69: But don't we already have the Pewaukee Lake Sanitary District?

**Question #8 comments:**

- #1: Not obstructionist however
- #4: The DNR should fund
- #6: This is the responsibility of the DNR. They have the authority to approve valid management plans. Studies are being conducted why more?
- #14: We have the answers
- #28: The LPSD is already doing this on an ongoing basis
- #55: Money, money, money for studies when we know we just have to stop development – subdivisions office parks more cement, more runoff
- #58: Not PLIA or PLMC
- #61: PLIA already knows what needs to be done
- #68: Sanitary Commission can do this and does
- #73: How many studies are needed? Just do it!

**Question #9 comments:**

- #6: Not wise to do. High risk of damaging equipment and piers. Who is liable? What about damage caused by paddle wheels in shallow waters?
- #12: Charlie has done an excellent job!
- #14: Never enough
- #19: It doesn't fix anything
- #28: But mechanical harvesting should not be done between boat lifts & Piers. The homeowner should use a weed rake and then pile weeds for pickup by shore crew.
- #49: Stirs up the bottom & muck
- #53: Could be done better
- #61: It reduces but does not control the Eurasian Milfoil
- #68: It has been a safe approach with long range benefits
- #74: No problem
- #76: Within 150 feet
- #78: Within its capacity

**Question #10 comments:**

- #14: I'd like to use all of the lake, not portions. I might as well go to a smaller lake.
- #15: Depends on effectiveness. Can we kill down and start over?
- #35: Stop fertilizing lawns on lake
- #77: Let the City of Pewaukee poison their part of the lake

**Question #11 comments:**

- #6: The LPSD
- #49: Ends too soon in the Village of Pewaukee
- #54: Except last year
- #65: Ends too soon [Village of Pewaukee]
- #75: Season too short [Village of Pewaukee]
- #77: LPSD

**Question #12 comments:**

- #10: No room
- #15: Have had no erosion for perhaps 70+ years. A concrete buffer now in need of repair.
- #38: Concrete wall
- #44: Concrete wall
- #49: Concrete wall
- #75: Concrete

**Question #13 comments:**

- #4: Anything to do with solving the algae problem. I am concerned with this issue.
- #6: Go away please hidden agendas that are for enhancement of property values are wrong
- #12: Grants come from taxes taxes are too high now
- #14: Make our lake the cleanest. I want to be proud not ashamed and make excuses for the algae. Use of chemicals on the entire lake.
- #23: Building rules and regulations made uniform more defined between municipalities
- #28: Disband, so the LPSD doesn't have to waste its time and resources fighting with you, so they can commit all efforts to maintaining the eco-system as they have been doing for over 60 years.
- #32: 0% Phosphorous already done
- #53: No lawn service for 1000 feet from lake (enforce fines)
- #58: Stop conducting themselves as political organization that is set up to benefit only its membership who own property on the former swamp (east end)
- #73: 0% Phosphorous this is a B.S. question
- #77: Leave us alone none of the residents around us pollute the lake. It's more from outsiders – we respect the lake

**Question #15 additional topics for future informational meetings:**

- #1: Educate people on learning to work together to solve problems
- #6: What makes you think that your group and its grand plan can overcome the power of Mother Nature (God)?
- #13: More public education
- #23: Future development plans, weed control; municipalities joining together
- #27: Weed control and water clear
- #29: If possible, speaker from other lake associations that have successfully used 2,4-D
- #40: The dangers of chemical additives to the lake and its watershed and how it can disturb the eco-balance of the lake and its cohabitants
- #42: Management of the fishery
- #48: DNR / State regulatory changes
- #49: The three cities to work together
- #52: Control of weed growth and lake water quality
- #58: Stop all meetings unless they are led by Charlie Shong or others who are not self-serving
- #69: How are we working together with others
- #73: Please stop being so political the questions of the survey are obviously directed to receive a certain result. The Lake Improvement Association is a good idea! Don't be so political.