

July 27, 2009 Email Correspondence with Amy Loiselle, MN DNR

From: Dan Donovan, President – Pelican Lakeshore Owners Association
To: Amy Loiselle - DNR
CC: Mark Holsten – DNR; Bob Meier – DNR; Rep. Dave Dill; Mike Peloquin - DNR
Sent: 7/27/2009 8:20:09 P.M. Central Daylight Time
Subj: Pelican Lake Outlet Dam

Amy:

Thanks for your inquiry about our Association's meeting on Sunday, July 19, 2009. We had an excellent turnout, with approximately half of the 120+ members represented in person and by proxies. We had lots of good questions and interest about several topics, including the Dam. You can also look at the website we have put together for more information-www.pelicanlakeshoreowners.org.

While people were encouraged to know the hole in the Dam would be closed, there was disappointment expressed by our directors and the membership at large with the remaining details of the recent letter/press release regarding remedies for the Dam. Based upon our previous meetings, we had hoped that there would be more movement on the part of the DNR regarding our questions/requests. More specifically, we would appreciate you addressing the following issues:

1) What happened to the DNR's original alternatives A & B which were proposed at the August 2007 meeting and reiterated at our February 12, 2009 meeting? These alternatives/suggestions seemed reasonable and provided some relief, albeit temporary. Have they been dismissed? Why?

2) We repeatedly raised the issue of water leaking through and/or under the Dam at the February 12, 2009 meeting with you. What are the plans to address this issue? Perhaps there is a cost efficient, reasonable method to determine whether there is leakage under and through the structure.

3) What ever happened to the suggestion by Mike Peloquin to temporarily raise the Dam as an experiment at the August 2007 meeting in Orr? Our membership was highly interested in this avenue being pursued and that was reiterated at our Association's meeting on July 19.

4) How can we be certain that the old dam was at the authorized level, as suggested in the recent release? Based upon our members' experience and observations (which we acknowledge are not scientific in an "engineering" sense), it seems the dam was generally at a significantly higher runout level prior to reconstruction - not just for a few years, but for decades. Shouldn't that be factored into any of the analysis?

5) Following up on items 3 and 4, is there a regulatory or legislative mechanism to temporarily grant a "variance" - on an experimental basis in light of our members' experience and observations - to raise the runout level say 6" and then monitor conditions for a year or two? One of our members stated this has been done in recent years with at least one other dam. If the current proposed fix is going to utilize plates to achieve the corrective height, can those be made adjustable so that the County and/or DNR can easily make changes during an experimental period?

We feel these issues are reasonable; in fact, many of these points were made by the DNR. Given the near term nature of the construction remedies, we wanted to pass along our concerns quickly and would like a response from you as soon as possible.

Once again, thank you for your assistance and we look forward to your reply.

Sincerely,

Dan Donovan
President
Pelican Lakeshore Owners Association