

Proposed Questions for Round Lake Public Meeting July 6, 2007

This is not a complete list of questions but only an opinion of what some of the questions could be. www.roundthelake.com

Round Lake Water Level Questions:

The 1941 PSC order authorized flow rates of 150 c.f.s. in the outlet channel between Round & Osprey Lakes. This is a substantially higher flow rate than in the SEH Hydraulic report. Why are the proposed “new” flood levels not consistent with existing law? Why are these new apparently non compliant (with 1941 order) proposed flood levels being used as a reason not to build a truly better dam by eliminating the Carlson Dam constriction? Why shouldn’t the flood levels be redone to be compatible with existing law? Why hasn’t Sawyer County maintained the outlet channel to comply with the 1941 order. Why aren’t the beaver dams upstream of NN removed.

It is our opinion that SEH has contradicted their Hydraulic Controls Evaluation report from March of 2007. On page 11 last paragraph SEH states: “To maximize the amount of water leaving Round Lake and Little Round Lake during times of high lake levels, thus increasing the rate that available storage is returned to the system and minimizing the chance of flooding, the Little Round Lake Dam constriction should be eliminated.”

Now SEH is proposing keeping the Carlson Dam and putting a wider dam in front of it. It is our opinion that this would negate the benefits of a new dam and is illogical. The existing dam is adequate for low water control. The new dam as originally proposed improves high water control. By proposing putting a new dam in front of the existing dam this contradicts the written SEH report. The narrow existing dam is still present thus obviating better high water function for a wider dam in front of it. This appears to be based on flow rates much less than authorized in the 1941 PSC order.

Can SEH Engineering find any other engineering firm that would support putting a new weir or dam in front of the existing Carlson Dam and leave the existing structure? Doesn’t this eliminate the benefit of a wider dam increasing flows or adding more protection during high water times? Why did SEH change their report and make it less scientific? In the same report SEH claims that flows will be increased from 53 to 59cfs or just over 10% with a new wider dam REPLACING the existing dam. At higher elevations flows will be increased more. How does this alter the flood level in Osprey Lake? Be specific? Does this consider lowering the NN culverts? These low flow rates are much less than is authorized in the 1941 PSC order and consequently how could the flood level be changed?

1. Has the county considered or studied long range property tax collection implications if Round Lake is lowered by abandoning the Carlson Dam? Would property values go

down on shallow bays, Filter Bay, and the Flats area etc.? How would this affect recreation and existing private and public boat landings? If there is wider water level extremes on Round Lake because of dam abandonment how would this affect property tax revenue and public recreation access?

2. What needs to be done from an engineering standpoint to keep the Round Lake level at 1344.75 to 1345.5? If Carlson Dam is abandoned will Round Lake have more frequent low water and lower lows if the Carlson downstream channel stays open? Will there be higher highs on Round Lake if the Carlson channel downstream of the dam is blocked? Will navigation into some of the bays be adversely impacted?

3. What is the “controlling factor” when boards are in the existing dam set at 1345 feet or if a new dam had a sill level of 1345 feet?

4. If Carlson Dam is abandoned what will happen to the artificial navigable channel downstream of the Dam? Will it get plugged with debris and beaver activity? Will this mean that we will have high water say above 1346 feet like in the 1940’s before the Carlson Dam/channel was built to solve high water problems. Will anyone have legal authority to clean out debris from the channel? Will the County do this?

5. What function will the natural SE drainage channel from Little Round Lake have in the future (where the snowmobile trail is)? Will this be needed if the Dam is abandoned and its downstream channel becomes obstructed from debris and beaver activity and no one cleans this out?

6. Will a wider new dam set at 1345 feet with a V in the middle drain water faster from Round Lake than the existing dam? How would this affect the flood level in Osprey Lake? Is the increased flow about 10% or what is it? How could there be increased flow thru a new dam if it is placed in front of the old dam? Why keep the old dam constriction there if a new one is built?

7. Can the existing Carlson Dam be repaired or modified? What condition is the existing dam in and how long will it last?

8. How can there be any sustained/controlled minimum flow downstream of the Carlson Dam if all the boards are removed from the Carlson Dam thus eliminating all storage capacity assuming sufficient rain to fill the lake back up to the sill level of the existing dam?

9. Why does Sawyer County appear to have an adversarial relationship with Round Lake Property Owner’s Association? Why don’t the relevant county officials have any meaningful discussions with Round Lake Property Owner’s Association?

10. Why does SEH Engineering appear to be slanting its report to the Counties apparent abandonment predilection? Have they changed their presentation/report since March 2007? Why does SEH not say that if the homeowners desire a water level of 1345 feet or above that the beaver dams upstream of NN will not be the controlling factor? Why does SEH keep talking about the beaver dams at 1344.8 feet when they must know that the majority of Round Lake homeowners want a level of Round Lake to be at least 1345?

11. Has anyone from the county and specifically the Board of Supervisors & the Land & Water Conservation Committee read the SEH report?

Placid Diversion Canal Questions:

1. Who studied the “stream” history back several years ago when another application for abandonment was being considered?
2. What prior evidence is there that there was a stream where the Placid Diversion Canal is? How can this information be obtained? Are there records available showing what happened several years ago when another abandonment application for the Diversion Canal was made? Does Mr. Fred Zietlow (Board Supervisor) or anyone know about a picture (possibly aerial) pre construction of the Placid Diversion Canal that showed a preexisting stream at the diversion canal location?
3. The Placid Diversion Canal has had some drainage into Round Lake off and on for the last 60+ years including this year-is there any evidence whatsoever that “exotics” or for that matter any harmful effect on Round Lake has taken place secondary to this water from the Tiger Cat Placid Diversion Canal entering Round Lake?
4. Are there any reputable studies that show damage on Round Lake from the Placid Diversion Canal or the possibility of exotics that could enter Round Lake that are not here already?
5. What exotics are present in the Tiger Cat now that could enter into the Round Lake Water? Have there been any documented exotics in the past on Tiger Cat Chain?
6. What exotics are in Round Lake now?
7. How much water enters Round Lake from The Tiger Cat via the Diversion Canal? Should we not know this before it is abandoned?
8. Does Round Lake drainage join up with the Tiger Cat/Chief River drainage at the Chippewa River some miles south of the Chippewa Flowage dam?
9. Why should this Placid Diversion Canal be abandoned independent of an agreed upon comprehensive plan for Round Lake?
10. What is the minimum flow requirement downstream of the main Tiger Cat Dam? Is there a minimum flow requirement in the Placid Diversion Canal?
11. What is the elevation of the Tiger Cat Flowage compared to the elevation of the small culvert that supplies the Placid Diversion Canal? What is the authorized level of the Tiger Cat and what elevation is the culver at that supplies the Placid Diversion Canal?
12. Why is Sawyer County paying for SEH engineering work to facilitate abandonment of this structure when none of the above questions have been answered in an open and complete matter? Why is the County contracting with SEH when they know RLPOA opposes abandonment? Why does Dale Olson say that everyone agrees with Placid Diversion Canal Abandonment when he knows that RLPOA opposes that?

If anyone has more questions please let us know at: tk25@roundthelake.com

Sincerely,

Tom Kintzinger RLPOA; www.roundthelake.com