

**Red Lake Watershed District  
Pine Lake Area Project Work Team  
Meeting Notes  
August 19, 2016**

The meeting was convened by Myron Jesme, Administrator, Red Lake Watershed District (RLWD) at 9:30 a.m. The following Project Team members (or their alternates) were present:

Myron Jesme (RLWD)	Dan Sauve (Clearwater Co. Hwy.Dept.)
Nate Dalager (HDR)	Nick Phillips (Clearwater SWCD)
Cory Gieseke (HDR)	Keith Weston (NRCS)
Les Torgerson (RLWD)	Denise Oakes (MPCA)
Terry Sorenson (RLWD)	Chad Severts (BWSR)
Tammy Baden (MnDNR)	Stephanie Klamm (MnDNR)
Dave Rave (MnDNR)	Craig Jarnot (Corps) via telephone
Les Roos (Landowner)	Cari Roepke (NRCS)
Juane Johnson (Landowner)	
Dave Dalager (Landowner)	

Nate Dalager updated the group on the process of the project and discussed objectives for today's meeting. Dalager would like to come away from this meeting with a strong sense of the Purpose and Need Statement.

Dalager discussed the NRCS 11 step process for planning. The project is currently in Stages 1 and 2. The Project Team needs to resolve the Purpose and Need Statement. Keith Weston stated that the Purpose and Need Statement will also coordinate with the Corps Points of Concurrence. Once the Purpose and Need Statement is finished, it will get formally submitted to the NRCS.

Dalager updated the Project Team on the Open House that was held on July 12, 2016. Les Torgerson stated that he felt it was a good meeting, but unresolved issues with landowners still remains. Discussion was held on comments from various landowners. Les Roos stated that the landowners he has spoken to on Pine Lake would like to see the lake 6" higher than what it normally is at this time of year. Currently the stoplogs are pulled at the Pine Lake Dam due to recent rain events. It was noted that we are not adding flood storage to Pine Lake just because we change the outlet dam. Torgerson questioned downstream capacity if additional water is allowed to be released from a new outlet structure. Dalager stated that the downstream channel is within banks. The new structure would allow earlier releases without increasing the peak, without increasing lakes levels. Dave Rave questioned what would happen to septic systems and structures with additional water on the lake? Dalager stated that we would have the ability to stop the peak. Dalager further stated that 6" may be too high, he's thinking more like 4". Dan Sauve stated that the key is upstream storage. Torgerson stated that the dam can be adjusted if 4" is too much. Dave Dalager and Les Roos both stated that the outlet has closed off in the channel from the lake to the dam. Cattails have grown into the lake and in the channel to the dam. Dalager stated that if we change the structure, it would be logical part of the project to clean out the channel.

Discussion was held on Site F-Little Pine Lake WMA. Dalager stated that they have been working on a non-structural approach to make some changes to the current operating plan where an additional 260 ac.ft.

of additional storage could be attained by revising the Operating Agreement, contingent upon approval by the MnDNR. Dalager stated that this would be equivalent to 2" of water on Pine Lake. Changes to the structure could also be incorporated into the project.

Discussion was held on lake level consensus, which is very allusive in terms of solidifying an agreement. Dalager stated that they tried to identify broad categories as it relates to the lake, with an objective perspective. Dalager discussed how he ranked the items and what he would like to see accomplished, asking the group if there was anything missing or unclear. Myron Jesme stated that water quality is a very broad category. Denice Oakes stated that water quality and erosion should be split out. Roos recalled an earlier statement that some lakes are good for fish and some for waterfowl, but some not necessarily for both, and whether Dalager took this into consideration. Torgerson stated that the level Pine Lake is at now, is not the natural level due to the dam and will we be able to change that level. Jesme stated that if there is a project under MN Statute 103D we would be required to have a public hearing to make changes. Torgerson would like to recommend that the structure be flexible. Dalager stated that we will have a stoplog bay that would allow us to set a different levels. Rave discussed concerns with the graph that was created, stated that lake shore impacts would have erosion with higher lake levels. Dan Sauve stated that consistent water levels would lesson erosion. Cari Roekpke questioned if waterfowl habitat and DNR preference (waterfowl) are the same thing. Dalager responded that the DNR staff is stating their preference is waterfowl. Dalager stated that if we want to make this more specific we should do a lakeshore survey of erosion; observe what is going on elevation wise and what would change with erosion. We probably need to get out in a boat and observe.

Dalager asked as a Project Team Member take a look at this and identify what is missing and give us an idea, as the whole point is consensus of water levels is hard to obtain. Keith Weston asked if there are any pastures and impacts to live stock or fences close to the lake. Jesme responded that there is nothing close and that most of the pasture land is upstream of Pine Lake. The additional 6" would most probably affect wetland areas which probably should not be fenced anyway.

Currently the lake is at 1284, target is 1283.5 1282.5 is the drawdown target for fall. Chad Severts asked at what point do landowners have issues with their docks. 1282.5 is low, most cabins are docked for 1283.5. Terry Sorenson asked if the winter draw down would change if we raised the lake 4". Severts asked if it is feasible if we get upstream storage we would have a delayed release to keep the water level even. The operating plan upstream would have to be spelled out how the long the water will be on landowners property upstream.

Discussion was held on the Purpose and Need Statement. Dalager stated that this discussion is very illusive. It is required as part of the NRCS process. Dalager stated that this is the first cut, we had to have something on paper to have the public open house, but it is changing. Nothing is final until presented to the NRCS. Dalager reviewed the following draft Purpose and Need, "The purpose of the project is to allow adaptive water level management of Pine Lake throughout the year". Dalager asked Craig Jarnot and Weston is this is adequate. Jarnot indicated that we are focused on Pine Lake and when we start looking at upstream retention that could be an issue. He further stated that when we start focusing on the Red River our geographical area widens up, it gets us to a geographical location. Jarnot stated that we should try to build in some sort of benefit to Pine Lake when we start looking upstream and build into flood damage benefits. Dalager stated identify the problems at Pine Lake and also locally if we do that it can support the purpose with an additional benefit of FDR benefits. Weston stated that he likes the purpose. If we have opportunity of NRE or have supplemental structure to do the adaptive water management that could be incorporated there. We have to address hydrology, environmental and economics. We want to come up with alternatives that hopefully when we implement them we get

benefits back. Weston indicated that it appears that if we stay with a smaller watershed, the infrastructures (homes, businesses) will show good benefit cost ratio. Jesme stated that we could add in agricultural loss. Weston stated that you carry those damages and benefits downstream as far as you can take it.

Rave stated that when we talk about the project purpose it does not talk about big upstream structures. Are those structures all part of the project and do we need them for the project to be a project? Jesme stated that he feels they clearly have to be part of the project due to the flashiness of the lake. If we want to maintain the water levels we have to be able to store water and be able to slowly release flows that are stored upstream. Dalager noted that this is part of the Corps Concurrence Part 1, but part of the NRCS plan this is the tip of the iceberg. It does not call out all the alternatives but this is where all the other steps come into play. Jarnot stated that this if the first step, it drives your alternatives analysis. Sauve stated that we should remove the flashiness of the lake. Jarnot added that is something we could include in the Purpose and Need statement. Weston asked how long there have been homes and cabins on the lake and if it was before the last structure was installed and if it was flashy then. Sorenson stated for sure 1930 and 40's. Torgerson stated there are farms around the lake and there is new development and that area of the lake is very low and shallow. Sauve stated that area of the lake is eroding away, we are losing shoreline and we should look at if we are losing the lake because of the flashiness. Roos stated this in 1955 his current cabin was 75' from the shore line. They have lost about 25' of shoreline in 50 years. Sauve noted that it should be goal to keep the erosion from happening. DNR has the highest recorded water level in 1938. Sorenson stated that we talk about downstream, but we are not really changing flow volumes, are we releasing the same amount volume wise.

Dalager stated the appreciated the feedback and that he will continue to put together the problem statement. Dalager will work on gathering concerns and will send out to the project team. There should not be a need for a Project Team meeting for several months. Dalager will continue to work on the plan work. Overall goal is to get thru the 11 step process in the next year. Dalager asked the Project Team to respond to the draft project statement when it gets sent out.

Severts stated the focus and tomorrows goals and the 20% goals and the last one was Pine Lake water levels. Should these be swapped around and have Pine Lake First. Sauve stated that this could be a secondary goals. Jarnot stated that for other projects the 20% has come in at the end.

Torgerson asked what is standing between the decision of 2", 4", 6" or none? What is the next step? Severts asked if that needs to be a discussion. Weston noted that this could ahead of itself. Jesme stated that he assumes when the modeling is completed, a recommended elevation will be shared. Dalager stated that the plan should lead us in a certain direction and it will work out. Roepke asked why this can't be worked out in the operating plan. Does it need to be set in stone until we get to the planning part? Weston stated that we may have too much water, not enough water and once we finish up the Purpose and Need we will look at alternatives to have flexibility to have a certain range. Sauve stated that the upstream storage will determine how much extra water we can have in Pine Lake.

Dalager displayed feedback received from the MnDNR. Dalager stated that Theresa Olson, MnDNR will be helping to finish up the Purpose and Need statement.