

## **Top Line Riparian Owners Survey Results**

This can be a valuable data source for our future plans and priorities. It clarifies what people use our waterway for, what they value, what they worry about, what they expect going forward...both qualitatively and quantitatively along with their current level of support. The results also provide us with useful insights related to education and information sharing opportunities.

We can take comfort that the survey integrity was protected to the best of our ability by the processes and controls utilized such as the multi-stage registrant review process.

We had a 44.4% registration rate, with 85% of those that registered at least partially complete the survey.

Riparian owners were asked the \$64K support question. Overall riparian owners support the ESR project by an almost 2 to 1 margin. 175 people were supportive (highly and somewhat likely) and 95 were not supportive (highly and somewhat unlikely) and 15 were not sure at this point in time. By tier this breaks down as follows;

- T1 – 19 support, 31 do not support and 2 are unsure
- T2 – 70 support, 30 do not support and 6 are unsure
- T3 – 86 support, 34 do not support and 7 are unsure

The distribution of respondents by tier is;

- T1 – 18%
- T2 – 37%
- T3 – 45%

Respondents we also presented with two open ended questions with respect to additional information needed and what is most important for the WWMD to consider going forward. Responses were both general and very specific ranging from their individual circumstances to; cost calculations, results longevity, and value to the regional community, contributions by others not on the water and expressions of urgency with respect to “getting on with it”. UW-Whitewater continues to analyze the data and will provide deeper analytics at a later date.

Finally some responded that they had all the information they needed and thanked the WWMD sharing project specifics, costs, value and urgency, with the caveat “keep it coming”.

Topics that received much attention were as follows:

1. DNR / state support was a dominant theme.
2. There was concern about the readiness and sustainability of the project.
  - a. Need to explain management of runoff and other preparation
  - b. Need to explain the tapering of dredged paths and the post-dredging maintenance plans
3. What does the future without dredging look like?
4. Explain the riparian responsibility for assess from dock to dredged channel. Can personal dredging be coordinated with the main project (at a cost)?
5. Many wonder why there are no launching fees or other way to have non-riparian users pay their way.
6. Can the dredging timeline be clarified?
7. Why can't the silt be sold as is done in Illinois?
8. Why is Waterford Lake being dredged – the depth and condition is fine?
9. What is the relative timing and impact of dredging / drawdown / diversion? These topics need to be discussed together.
10. What is the targeted dredging depth?
  - a. Some want as deep as possible just to lengthen the life of the project.
  - b. Some are misled to believe that the main channel will be dredged to 100 feet deep.

And yes, some folks were kind enough to share some nice words about the WWMD and its communication efforts.