

**City of Lake Elmo
Environmental Committee Meeting
Minutes of October 14, 2016**

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT: Julie Fliflet, Jill Lundgren, Mary Florence Brink, Tedi Carlson, Brett Emmons, Wendy Griffin, Deb Krueger, Jeff Riegle, Barb Sahr

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT: Dave Bucheck, Sarah Hietpas, Jim Kelly, Ellen Neuenfeldt

STAFF PRESENT: City Administrator Kristina Handt

AGENDA:

- Approval of Minutes – September 9, 2016
- No Wake High Water Level for Lakes Olson, Demontreville, Jane and Elmo

Approval of Minutes- September 9, 2016

Minutes approved with minor changes as noted in updated minutes

No Wake High Water Level for Lakes Olson, Demontreville, Jane and Elmo

Issue Before Commission: Should the Environmental Committee recommend any changes to the no wake trigger level for Lakes Olson, Demontreville, Jane or Elmo?

Options:

- 1) Recommend the City Council change the no wake levels for some or all of the lakes
- 2) Identify additional information needed or next steps before making a decision
- 3) Recommend the City Council make no changes to the current ordinance

Administrator Handt Presentation:

History, Interaction with DNR, City Code 97.21 (Current No Wake Language), DNR requirements for reconsidering changes to High Water Mark.

Olson and Demontreville have different no-wake triggers vs. what the DNR sets as the Ordinary High Water Mark (OHWM). Lakes Jane and Elmo have the same no-wake trigger as the DNR OHWM.

Roger Johnson provided an overview of the weir functionality for Lake Demontreville (that is a part of the Lake Elmo Water Management Plan). The weir is an overflow mechanism to facilitate the movement of water from one lake to the next during high-water events. 929.35 is the highest setting for the Lake Demontreville weir (bounce lake). The weir setting is determined by the DNR and

can only be adjusted with a permit. Lakes Olson/Demontreville drain under Lake Elmo, into Eagle Point and eventually into the St. Croix River. Watershed Conservation District and City Staff work together to monitor water levels

Public Comments:

Brook Duerr, 4870 Jerome Ave. N., stated that he would recommend that the committee obtain a better understanding of the real cause of the erosion. Indicated it could be wind damage rather than damage from boating.

Darren Envall, 331 2nd Ave. S Mpls, MN, stated that he would recommend that any decision be based only on the facts of the situation.

Denise Boczek, 8110 DeMontreville Trail, spoke against lowering the no wake level and indicated that there are methods of controlling the erosion via the weir levels, managing shoreline vegetation and water runoff.

Jean Boyum, 8032 Hill Trail N., spoke against lowering the no wake level and indicated that they protect their shoreline and don't have a sand beach. Stated that it is not boat traffic causing the issues – wind is much more damaging to the shoreline.

Nadine Obernweller, 8696 42nd St. No., spoke against lowering the no wake level and recommended that the water weir be utilized to better manage the lake level so that residents can more fully utilize the lake.

Link Lavey, 8510 Hidden Bay Trail N., indicated that in addition to shoreline erosion, also need to consider sediment being washed into the lake. Offered information from Prior Lake that was used in determining their restrictions (WSUM Taskforce).

Pat Dean, 8028 Hill Trail, provided a presentation indicating that erosion is natural and that wind damage is a significant cause. Presented Lake Demontreville and Olson OHWL and No Wake Trigger historical summary and argued that dropping no-wake level to 929.3 would be taking property rights away from owners. Believes this would be highly restricting lake use with respect to other area lakes.

Dave Carlson, 8554 N Hidden Bay Trail, spoke against any changes to the no wake level and believes that the levels as set are working. Indicated that wind damage is also being experienced.

Roger Johnson, 8048 Hill Trail, stated that he believes that erosion damage is due to boat traffic (wakes). Referenced several studies presented to the committee. Presented LDO lake level summary (he'll send to committee).

Brenda Jo Carlson, 8554 N. Hidden Bay, spoke against any changes to the no wake level and recommended a more comprehensive review before making any changes.

Jim Arkell, 8131 Hidden Bay Trail N., indicated that he has in the past applied for a grant from the Valley Branch Watershed District to return his property to its more natural state, thus reducing the amount of erosion.

Next Steps:

1. Continue discussion at next meeting
2. Wendy Griffin requested that we also look at setting a slow no-wake threshold for Lake Elmo. Asked that representatives from DNR attend the next meeting to discuss terminology and help the committee understand the hydrology for the lakes in Lake Elmo. Also requested that John Hanson from the Valley Branch Watershed District also attend the next meeting to get their perspective.
3. Committee should look at lakeshore restoration opportunities that can be shared with the lakeshore associations.
4. Other materials for review: Saint Croix River study has valuable information on impacts of high-water and shoreline erosion. DNR Score Your Shore Article

Next Meeting – Wednesday November 9th, 8am

Meeting moved to accommodate Veterans Day on November 11

Submitted by,
Barb Sahr