

Medicine Lake Stakeholder Meeting Tuesday March 4, 2014 6:30 – 9:00 p.m. Plymouth City Hall

Results of Small Group Breakout Discussions

Questions posed to each of four small groups

(Each group included representatives from various stakeholder groups; given approximately 30 minutes to discuss)

- 1. Who will make the final decision regarding how Medicine Lake water levels are managed? What will help them make a fair, well-informed decision?
- 2. Who is responsible for improving or protecting the quality and values of Medicine Lake? What is needed to help them do that?
- 3. What are reasonable next steps?

Responses – Group A

- 1. People will help influence the decision. Property owners, local units of government, stakeholders, lake users (boaters, fisherman, swimmers), downstream users. Needed: all the required studies, scientific data and lake modeling.
- 2. Shoreline property owners, those who recreate, watershed residents, downstream, government entities (MPCA, EPA, BCWMC, cities). Needed: Money, public input, hydrologic and environmental studies.
- 3. Who leads the charge? Identify and secure majority of all property owners. (Who is majority?) Hydrologic studies who pays? Surveys, environmental assessments.

Responses – Group B

- If run-out elevation is changed, then DNR. If run-out elevation is not changed (with installation of variable weir), then still DNR. Needed: Hydrologic and hydraulic information to define effects of changes in outlet structure and/or effects on upstream and downstream areas; includes survey information to get elevation of potentially affected structures/properties; elevations and sensitivity of environmental elements of Medicine Lake (plants, shoreline, animals, etc.)
- 2. Everyone is responsible. Needed: Money; good technical information (internal loading rates and alum doses to control); aquatic plan management strategy; how much external load reduction is needed and how much has been achieved?; prevention measures to reduce risk of aquatic invasive species infestations; establish partnerships.
- 3. Comprehensive inspection of all inbound boats and water-borne structures. Updated aquatic plant management plan.

Responses – Group C

- 1. Not any one entity combination of stakeholders and DNR final say. Ultimately, BCWMC and Hennepin County need to check boxes DNR will defer to them. Needed: Data; answer to question: can you design a structure?
- 2. Everyone is responsible. Needed: education of all stakeholders, money, data, engagement
- 3. Water quality seems at right spot. For dam level: is it possible to retain water during dry times (engineering question)? What is owners' position on issue (Hennepin County) would they transfer ownership? Committee of interested persons.

Responses – Group D

- 1. DNR, cities, BCWMC (or watershed district if one is formed). Needed: Facts on how it will affect the lake and surrounding areas. Need to prioritize which issue is most important: health of lake, recreational use, flooding. Need to know who pays.
- 2. No response (due to time constraints)
- 3. Prioritize issue of improving the lake. Hydrologic study.