ISSUES/PROBLEMS/ERRORS WITH EA

2. middle to end of 1st para:
"Since 2002 the NDDD has experienced increased flooding of the district drainage canals due to the lass of the winter drawdown in Wind Lake and the requirement that the Dam be opened if more than 2 inches are flowing over the dam. The Wind Lake Drainage Canal and its associated agricultural drainage ways now experience sudden changes in water level due to the narrow operating levels and abrupt opening and closing of the dam. These sudden changes in water level cause flooding."

There is no supporting data or documentation to support these claim. The improper operation of the Rochester dam would also cause the problems indicated by NDDD. The EA should be a statement of facts, data, and the environmental results, not simply reflect NDDD positions.

2. middle of 2nd para:
" *These is not documentation in either the 2000 or 2002 environmental assessments or the files that the NDDD was contacted directly prior to these meetings by either the Department of the Lake District*."

The required notices for both EA's and the resulting hearings were published in the Racine Journal Times, which is also the official notice location for NDDD. The issue was publicly-noticed for over a 4 year period, seeking input.

5. end of 4th para:
This scenario (lowering the lake in winter) will also lead to significant algae blooms as is presently the situation on Eagle Lake. This should be added to the EA.

5. 5th para:
"*Lowering the winter level to 93.15 PSC would allow some water storage within the wetlands even in years of low spring runoff and rainfall and provide some spawning habitat for northern pike at ice-out, but would still prevent ice damage to the shoreline*".

None of this sentence is true. A two foot drop in lake level would mean the adjacent wetlands will drain to the lake. A two foot drop will render most of the northern pike spawning habitat dry as the 3rd para in this section attests. Also, as the EA's in 2000 and 2002 attest, the low water levels in winter undercuts the shoreline and causes more damage. Since the water levels have remained constant, the amount of shoreline damage is significantly reduced.

6. 2nd line:
"The re-establishment of the winter drawdown will result in a lesser impact downstream."
There is no supporting data or documentation to support this claim. It is the position of WLMD that proper operation of the Rochester dam would reduce flooding in the channel system.

9. Attachments:
The attachments are not current. The depth map of Wind Lake was redone under a DNR grant in 1996 and is available from DNR. The 1988 Macrophyte information is also extremely outdated and more recent information is available from DNR.

11. 2nd para:
" Portions of the lake on the north, east and west sides are designated as Class I Wildlife Habitat."
This is an important, true statement. Since these types of habitat are becoming more scarce, it is contradictory for the DNR to agree to damage that very habitat.

11. Fish (6th para):
This paragraph was not read. This is a direct carryover from the 2000-2002 EA's and is NOT a correct statement since the lake is not lowered in winter.

15. 2nd para:
This is an important point.

16.b.
"Impacting the Northern Pike fishery and the benefits which accrued to other fish and wildlife by the elimination of the winter drawdown will be eliminated."
This is poorly written. We think this says that the fisheries and wildlife benefits that Wind Lake have experienced since going to no-drawdown, would be eliminated.