

Village would become an unpopular neighbor to Town residents on the other side of the property. The Village may have to subsidize the Blocks. There is no assurance that the next owner would cooperate with the Village as the Blocks have in the past.

Plan C: The Village Acquires Title to the Block Property. The Block property could be leased back to the Blocks or others. The DOT would provide a new ramp. For now, the Village would keep parking at the current level. The site would remain gravel. The Village would provide additional parking on Block property and back lots.

Advantages: The Village would have complete control. The Village can later negotiate with the State to enlarge and/or improve facility to meet standards. If necessary, the home could be moved or removed. The fisherman flavor would remain. The State standards can be met at current site at a later date. There would be close coordination with the DNR assuring the Village that the DNR would not propose another site on the Lake for a boat launch.

Disadvantages: The cost to the Village could be high. The Village would have burdens as a landlord. There could be high continuing costs to satisfy the DNR. We could become an unpopular neighbor with residents of the Town of Oconomowoc as we would be invading the back lots for parking.

Mr. Fischer commented that the problem with Plan B is that in time it would be unacceptable to the State in terms of the length of the distance one has to back up and the limited amount of parking that it might offer. Mr. Fischer feels we should acquire title to the Block property so that we have all the flexibility we need in the future to meet any parking or site demands that would be placed upon us.

In February 1987, Mr. Frank reported that the Plan Commission developed ramp plans in conjunction with Mr. John Jahnke, our engineer and planner, to prove that we could still put in a boat ramp that would work despite the fact that the State Highway Department was going to utilize some of the Village-owned land for the frontage road construction. Yes, indeed, we could sneak in a 200-ft. boat ramp from the westerly portion of the site down to the river and through the use of retaining walls would protect the house as it is currently situated. The other alternative is to use the land which is occupied by Block's house where you would get flexibility as far as maneuvering cars and trailers in a much shorter distance in backing up into the water.

The purpose of the acquisition of the Ray Block property would be to make certain that we have sufficient land in the event that for some reason it should become necessary to increase the parking requirements or redesign the ramp at some future date.

Mr. Meyer made a motion to make the following resolution, seconded by Mr. Clayton, with motion amended as follows by Mr. Fischer, seconded by Mrs. Bickler, and CARRIED:

In view of the strong public input on the question of ownership and control of our public boat access site on the Oconomowoc River, and in view of the desire of

the Village residents that the ownership and control of our public access shall remain with the Village of Oconomowoc Lake,

Resolved, that the Village of Oconomowoc Lake shall retain both the ownership and the control of its existing access to Oconomowoc Lake, and pursue acquisition of the Block property, independent of any control or rights of the Department of Transportation or the Department of Natural Resources, and

Further Resolved, that the Village of Oconomowoc Lake shall retain title to those lands presently owned or to be acquired by it in the vicinity of the boat launch site for the purpose of providing public boat access to Oconomowoc Lake.

OPEN TO THE FLOOR: Mr. Roberts read letters from George M. Chester of September 19th, Orville R. and Mary Jane Mertz of September 16th, and Benn S. DiPasquale of September 16th concerning their views in keeping the boat launch site at Ray Blocks. These letters are on file.

Mr. Verne Read, 4063 Petit Road, voiced his concern in protecting our interests, in keeping the ramp the way it is now, and in seeking additional representation for this matter.

Mr. DiPasquale spoke in favor in acquiring the Block property as well as those points mentioned in his letter.

Mr. Jim Mitchell, 4539 N. Sawyer Road, asked how much the Block property would cost the Village. At this time no one knows, and the ultimate acquisition may not be all in dollars, Mr. Fischer said. The objective is to acquire title to the Block property but that does not necessarily mean we pay for all of it. We do have compensation due us for the taking of our present land at the launch site. Part of our bargaining position with the State would be compensation adequate to pay for a major share of it.

In response to Mrs. Barbara Rogers' question, 4425 N. Sawyer Road, there has been some discussions with the Blocks. They were in favor of negotiating with the State and they would be in favor of working with the Village, Mr. Fischer said. Mrs. Bickler heard that they were not favorable to the State.

Mr. Chuck Reuben asked if the Blocks wanted to stay and run the facility or if they wanted to own it. The ultimate direction that the Board is tending towards, Mr. Roberts said, is absolute control of the launch site and whatever needs to be done to use it. Mr. Roberts commented that the Blocks have been running the launch site very successfully from the Village's standpoint for many years.

Mr. Greg Stein, the Block's son in-law, said the Blocks feel this whole situation has gotten out of hand with the changes to the plans and in putting parking in their backyard with additional parking in the immediate area; and the Blocks feel their home has been taken away from them. In view of all this, they are willing to sell; but they are also willing to negotiate other avenues, Mr. Stein commented, such as leasing the property. What is disturbing the Blocks most right now