

April 3, 2009

Dear Lake Santa Fe Residents:

Thank you all for answering the LSF Lake Management Survey. All but 6 have been returned so far, and one of those is the vacant Nichol's house. Even though, in retrospect, some of the questions were not as clear as they should have been, the majority of residents answered them. Some answers were left blank. For example, some did not answer *Would you approve a special assessment and/or dues increase for weed control?*, because it was not specific on which. And some people answered *Yes - hire a professional lake mgmt. co., and also a Yes - Conservation Committee should remain in charge*, which makes sense, too. On the subject of chemical or natural treatment, some also marked both. There were some very good comments that need to be read by all.

Here is a survey summary with people's comments following. The Board and Conservation Committee will take everyone's opinions into consideration. If a vote is needed, it will be taken at the annual homeowner's meeting in May. Thanks - Cindy Phillips

Should chemical treatments be increased?

12 yes 14 no

Should natural alternatives be used?

23 yes 4 no

Approve hiring a professional lake management company?

15 yes

Conservation Committee should remain in charge?

18 yes

Would you approve a special assessment and/or dues increase for weed control?

28 yes 4 no

Top dollar amount willing to be assessed?

9 @ \$100 1 @ \$150 10 @ \$200 0 @ \$300 1 @ \$400 7 @ \$500

* Thanks for all of your hard work to tackle this problem. We feel this has been handled very well and very fairly by the board.

The roads and the wells must take financial priority over the grounds and the lake. When we turn off of Santa Fe Trail, we must be able to get to our houses on the roads and we need water in our homes. These two things have more to do with the value of our homes than the lake does. We love the lake, but we could live without it if we had to.

We don't want a sterile lake but we do believe that there is way too much vegetation in the lake. The problem started about five years ago as the last batch of grass carp died off.

We would like to see the rooted vegetation taken care of with grass carp, as it has been successfully for the last 25 years. We would like the non-rooted vegetation taken care of with chemicals. For swimming and shore fishing, the beach and pavilion area should be treated with chemicals for rooted vegetation to get what the grass carp miss. This would be the most cost effective way to handle the problem.

We have heard people who object to grass carp say they poop the partially digested vegetation back into the lake and this causes a problem. Vegetation that is killed by chemicals also remains in the lake to

decompose and therefore causes the same problem. The grass carp are consistent and do their thing a little at a time while chemicals cause a big kill all at once which causes massive oxygen depletion in the lake. We have heard people who object to grass carp say they make the water a little cloudy. This is true. The option of adding dye to the water to obstruct the sun light from penetrating the water is an expensive option. It is a free benefit of the grass carp.

We feel the aeration option would be too expensive and demand costly maintenance, and therefore not a good option because of our financial priorities. We would rather not have chemicals and dyes used for rooted vegetation when the same results can be accomplished with the proper amount of grass carp for a much lower cost than any other option. Adding the proper amount of grass carp would not be experimental like other options, because we already know that grass carp work in our lake to control rooted vegetation.

* No more chemicals! Bare minimum. Only approve special assessment if Conservation Committee does it. I would not want an assessment to pay for a professional lake management company.

* Approve hiring professional as long as they are fully qualified, certified, and not related to anyone who lives here - no nepotism. Also, must use "green techniques". If this is an annual amount, which is not specified, I'd probably be willing to do \$100, but would like to know exactly what we're paying for first, to know how high I would be willing to go.

* We need outside help as we are currently not getting the job done. If we have to have an assessment, so be it.

* Regarding special assessment - This is not clear! It matters if this is one time or yearly.

* Lake is eutrophic - a natural process. Since we want to sort of freeze it's natural succession - we need to use unnatural means - as well as natural. Therefore, chemicals are alright with me as long as they are used in moderation, according to directions and with caution. The Conservation Committee plan slows down the eutrophication process to the point where we can maintain lake quality with minimal chemicals. Very important to maintain septic and replace old septic with newer, modern septic. Suggestion - if you do have a lake quality assessment on a yearly basis - why don't you waive it for a year for any property owner who has a new, modern septic installed in that year. My problem with company that wants to treat the lake on a contract basis - 1) I don't know what they want to do. Will they just "band-aid" the problem year by year - thus insuring their ongoing employment at higher and higher levels of cost? 2) The cost seems to be uncertain since they don't know what they will do. My last comment is: I don't want to have any more grass carp put in the lake! Thanks for asking our opinion.

* My concern is the septic systems that are not in compliance. Years ago, Jim Schmitt (lot 11) had his septic piped to the lake with the retaining wall showing the pipe. All septic systems should be checked for a marshy area 25 feet from the lake. Phosphates from laundry run directly to lake are also part of the problem. Also weed control and fertilizers in backyards. Our dogs drink the water and we swim in it. As few chemicals as possible is what we want. Are these methods effective? (natural alternatives) I use a leaf rake and rake out the algae in front of our lakeshore. It is easy, good exercise, and the algae is good mulch.

* If aeration is an option, keep in mind electrical power hookup cost and power consumption to run these could get very expensive. What happened to grass carp option?

* My number one complaint is concerning the algae. I prefer long term solutions instead of "quick-fix" band-aids. I will support the solution that meets the needs of the majority of the homeowners. Natural alternatives should include adding selective planting of water plants which will "tie-up" the nutrients and decrease the amount of algae formation. The Conservation Committee should follow through on their commitment to decrease the siltation/nutrient inflow. Whether approving a special assessment depends on what, by whom, how much, expected results, etc.

* Create a separate Lake Committee from the Conservation Committee. Chemical treatments by residents is illegal. Dredge the coffer dam to prevent silting! Approve hiring a professional lake

management company. \$200 times 40 lots = \$8,000, enough to hire a professional to treat the majority of the lake and leave the dam untreated for fishing.

* Natural alternatives should include carp. Approve \$500 assessment for Management Company only.

* I don't agree with how this is being handled. Job of CC is to research and execute. Job of Board is to inform and educate homeowners. Then homeowners can make informed decision. Concerned about fishing, but think too much money being spent to stock lake. Can't answer if chemical treatments should be increased if we don't know how much is currently being used. Job of Board to inform us! Dye is NOT natural. Dredging is NOT natural. Enzymes already in lake. Introduction of foreign bacterial which produce enzymes needs to be addressed per species and not used in generality.

* The continual use of chemical treatment is nothing more than a band-aid. Fix the root of the problem. To continue to out-source the work is not what the work hours plan is all about. We are capable of taking care of this type of work. The idea of spending \$5,000, \$10,000, or whatever it takes just for ASTHETIC beauty is a foolish waste of our money. There are a few more projects here that need attention first (ROAD, Grounds). How sad is it that the kids of the subdivision are trying to solicit labor so they can have a nice playground. The people complaining the most are the people using the lake the least. When everyone moved here they were aware that this is a lake. If they were looking for something clean and clear they should have considered a pool community. As far as property values - THIS IS NOT A HIGH END subdivision. People looking to spend \$1,000's in dues should consider Lake Arlan. Our priorities should be #1 - Water, #2 - Road, #3 - Lake, #4 - Grounds.

* Chemical treatments should be increased only as a last resort if all else fails. On amount willing to be assessed - it depends upon plan. Would go higher if plan necessitates.

* I'm in favor of hiring a professional lake management company - first. Special assessment - none or as little as possible is my preference, but up to \$500 is o.k.

* Keeping the population of geese to a minimum may keep certain smells **and algae** down.

* We would suggest enzymes, increase of chemicals, **aeration**. I would be **willing** to consider dredging again if it included **all areas** that should be dredged. **We** would also approve of hiring a professional so there is accountability. i.e, they fix if not correct. While I **applaud** CC's efforts, it has not proven to be successful. Approve special assessment for a solution that delivers **accountability** for entire lake.

* Chemicals only if all else fails. Roads must be top priority! Will our current funds cover that cost, or **will we need a special assessment?** Also believe lake should always **have enough money** held in reserve to cover the cost of replacing at least one well.

* Hire a professional lake management company to correct situation, get it on track and educate, then **turn** over to LSF Conservation Committee to maintain. Should **chemical treatments** be increased depends on how bad the **situation is**. Not a yes or no answer. Once assessed - **if this applies**, then go forward with this type of treatment. On approving a **special assessment** - Show a budget that justifies a **special assessment** ---**then we might consider**.

1. **Have the residents on the lake side had their septic tanks cleaned?**

2. **It disturbs us that resident(s) on lake side chose to rope off and apply chemicals to lake without approval. How do we know that did not hurt the environment of lake?**

* Increase budget - **Leave** under control of Conservation Committee. **Chemical** treatments as needed. Natural alternatives by the CC. If professional lake management company is hired - **I will see** that the CC is disbanded **if this happens**.