APPENDIX H

Comments & questions from public meeting regarding Tri-Lakes Management Plan

Water quality hasn't changed in 25 years why change management practices?

Arrowhead Lake has no drawdown yet water quality has decreased. Arrowhead Lake theoretically has ideal conditions to prevent nutrients but has worst water quality.

Camelot Lake serves as nutrient sink. Nutrients coming from upper watershed and settle on lake bottom. Nutrients flow through the groundwater of Camelot Lake to the other lakes. Higher the lake levels the more ground water flows. Primary path of groundwater is under the dams. Drawdowns reduce pressure which will reduce groundwater flow.
Need to determine the amount of nutrients coming from the dam.
Need to sample lakebed sediments.

Would like further studies on groundwater flows into the lakes so more detailed data can be obtained. It should take 189 years for Phosphorus to reach lake through the groundwater.

2000-2002 study did not state to eliminate drawdowns.

Let weeds utilize nutrients and then harvest weeds thus removing nutrients. This is supported by science. Compromise for harvesting weeds was not actually a compromise because science shows removing harvested plants is good.

Why the need to address a small source of nutrient loading? Let's concentrate on larger sources. Historically, the shoreline areas have practices installed to address nutrient loading-it is as good as it will get. Need to address watershed. 14 Mile Creek Watershed Study states streams are largest contributors of nutrients-specifically 14 mile creek.

Lake drawdowns provide cleansing effect.

Original drawdown designed for weed control along shoreline.

Dredging drainage ditches and eliminating drainage ditch dams (used to control peat fires) have increased nutrient loading in the lakes.

Impede the flow of water to the Tri-Lakes by building wing dams. Between 8th Ave and County highway D. Original area east of Camelot Lake designed as a sediment basin.

Has there been any lakes in the state where drawdowns have been reversed.

Need a cost analysis of winter drawdown?

Can drawdowns be taken away legally? Is adverse possession in effect?

Comments & questions from public meeting regarding Tri-Lakes Management Plan continued…

More information needed about surface runoff.

Planning process needs to be more democratic. Feel Tri-Lakes Mgmt District members should vote on the plan. Too much emphasis on Lake Advisory Group.

Who would be responsible if accidents occur due do to weed growth. Favor aquatic plant harvesting to increase recreational safety.

Residents need to consider wildlife and biodiversity. Should not sacrifice downstream water quality. Need to consider whole package.

Need benchmarking for data and practices implemented (i.e. if drawdown occurs, what will the decrease in nutrient loading be?)

Plan has too many quick fixes. Plan needs more long-term solutions.

$ 1 million worth of docks will be destroyed if drawdowns are eliminated.

Need to harvest channels like they have in the past.

Lake advisory group is a sham and DNR will dictate the outcome of the plan.

Need to listen to wishes of property owners and use common sense.

Plan would not allow use of lakes as stated in the Public Trust Doctrine.

Running harvesting machines too fast – not getting all the weeds.

A show of hands saw a majority of the people attending the meeting would like to keep a major drawdown on Camelot and Sherwood Lakes and be able harvest as they have in the past.

Nutrient loaded water is not polluted water.

Despite advisory group, DNR will regulate what is going to happen.
Perception is gov't is going to tell us what to do.
If local residents do not get a choice or vote, contact legislators and suggest budget cuts.