

Little McDonald, Kerbs and Paul Lakes Improvement District  
Special Membership Meeting Minutes  
November 1, 2014  
IOTW Museum, Perham MN

Board Members Present: Roger Neitzke, Joe Esser, Bill Putnam, Sue Meyhuber, Ardell Wiegandt, Glenn Schreier, Dan Gleason, Les Konley and Mark Plencner

160 LID Membership Present

Consultants Present: Jeff Volk and Mike Opat from Moore Engineering; John Shockley from Ohnstad Twichell

The meeting was called to order at 9:00 AM by Roger Neitzke

The handout distributed to all members and reviewed at the meeting is posted on the website under the Venting tab. [LMPK LID](#)

MEETING PURPOSE: The purpose of the meeting was to inform the Membership on project development since the Annual Meeting in July and to request approval to construct an outlet to the Otter Tail River.

#### VENTING PROGRESS

- As of today, we are 44½" above our OHW level as reported by Dave Wenzel of Little McDonald Lake. The goal is to lower our lakes to OHW level. We are going into winter the highest we have ever been.
- Reviewed what the LID Board has accomplished since the Annual meeting in July, 2014.
- The route presented in July is still the route the LID Board is proposing.

#### DEVILS LAKE

- The Devils Lake LID Board and the a committee of four from the LMKP LID Board met several times to look at possible options for the two LIDs to work together and come up with a possible venting solution.
- Houston Engineering did a study 15 years ago and the estimate to construct the outlet at that time was \$2 million. The Devils Lake LID Board hired them to re-evaluate the plan. Below are the options they provided estimates for:
  - East Route (Schuster Lake to Mud Lake to the Otter Tail River): \$7-8 million and this does not include the pipe from Little McDonald Lake to Devils Lake.
  - Modified East Route: \$10-11 million
  - Northeast Route: \$9-10 million
- The reason why these options are so expensive is because:
  - Water table is high and it would cost \$1 million for de-watering.
  - The depth the pipe would need to be buried.
- LMKP LID Board determined the best option was to continue to pursue the original North route proposed at the Annual meeting.

#### PROPOSED PROJECT

- Goal is to lower LMKP lakes to OHW which is approximately 4' based on current levels
- Water Transfer
  - This is the pipe that will take water up over the hill. The LID made decisions on sizing to ensure we can move the maximum amount of water possible.
- Water Collection & Filtration - this is required due to veliger's
  - Direct Intake with Mechanical Filters: This type of system has been approved by the DNR for other projects; however, is expensive.
  - Direct Intake with Sand Filter: This is an above ground filter system and may cause challenges if wanting to pump all year long.
  - Vertical Well Intake: This is not a viable solution as it may draw water from neighboring wells.

- Collector Wells Intake: Very efficient method but most expensive option.
  - Angle Wells Intake: Least risky solution of pulling from aquifer. This will not draw water from neighboring wells.
  - Drain Intake: Basically a drain tile solution installed 12-20' below existing water surface elevation.
- The LID Board recommends using either the Angle Wells Intake or the Drain Intake
- Paul Lake Connection
  - This would be a 24" pipe trenched between Paul Lake and Little McDonald and would be installed at the shortest distance between the two lakes.
  - The cost to construct this connection would be \$400,000 - \$500,000
- Soil Boring
  - We will use the isthmus on Johnston's property.
  - To ensure the system would work efficiency on the isthmus, we needed to conduct some soil borings.
- Potential Drawdown Scenarios & Costs
  - The graph in the handout illustrates the drawdowns and potential costs
  - The LID Board recommends using the 20 and 25 cfs with a 2:1 or 3:1 ratio for drawdown.
  - When looking at the costs, the LID Board is recommending either the Drain Tile or the Angle Wells.
    - Drain Tile: Not sure this is constructible and if drillers will bid on it due to challenges with de-watering.
    - Angle Wells: Assured this will work and this has been approved by the DNR for other projects.
- Operating Costs
  - Electricity will vary depending on many things and could range from \$0 - \$300,000/year. This is based on 25 cfs for 9-months of operation.
  - General Maintenance will vary on pump replacement and filter maintenance.
- Estimated Project Costs
  - The cost has increased because of:
    - Higher level of design
    - Construction costs
    - Unknown bidding markets in 2015
    - Filtration costs
  - The cost to construct the system would cost between \$6.4 million and \$8.3 million.
  - We will test Little Pine and Rush lakes next July for zebra mussels and if they are infested, we will pursue the possibility of venting without a filtration system; however, the DNR ultimately will make the final decision.
  - Keep in mind the slides in the handout are not using the final formula for assessment meeting. The formula in the handouts is based on:
    - 70% equal amount
    - 15% of lake frontage
    - 15% EMV
- Board Recommendation
  - Based on 20-25 cfs transfer system for all collection/filtration options.
  - Board will pursue the least expensive alternative.
  - The Board is looking for the Membership to give them permission to make the necessary decisions as we move through the process without having to come back for additional approvals which would result in a delay in the construction timeframe.
    - Both the EAW and DNR permitting process will dictate some of our options.

#### POSSIBLE FUNDING

- Angela Willenbring wrote a letter to the Governor in July. The Governor answered her letter and agreed to meet with her and others.
- Angela put together a story board with pictures and provided the cost of damages to-date is \$7 million.
- Angela and others have met with several different governing agencies: Land & Resource, Tax Commissioners, County & State Legislators, Soil Conservation, FEMA, etc.

- We were hoping for a special session; however, that didn't happen but positive this will come up again after the election next week.
- FEMA indicated we have a unique problem which they have never seen before i.e. the water never goes away like it does with flooding. The cost to apply for the grant is \$200,000 - \$250,000 and is a 2½ year process.
- We are cautiously optimistic we will get some money but cannot promise anything at this time.

#### CHAPTER 429 ASSESSMENT PROCESS

- There would be two public hearings where Membership will have the opportunity to voice their opinion.
  - Project Hearing: Estimated costs and assessments will be shared with the Membership
  - Assessment Hearing: Actual costs and assessments will be shared with the Membership

#### QUESTIONS / DISCUSSION

- Dave Pawlowski, Kerbs Lake
  - Q - How will water transfer between Little McDonald and Kerbs if the water falls below OHW?
  - A - No study has been done to-date. We believe the two lakes will continue to fall at the same level. This was confirmed by both Todd Peterson of Little McDonald and Scott Hokanson of Little McDonald.
- Alan Krueger, Little McDonald Lake
  - Q - Are the operating costs of \$300,000 separate from the constructions costs? If so, if we pump for 10 years we could be paying an additional \$3 million in operating costs.
  - A - Yes, they are separate. However, if we end up paying \$3 million in operating costs, we have either built the wrong system or we had very wet years.
- Mike Holper, Little McDonald Lake
  - Q - If we start the project, is there a possibility we could get less funding from our agencies?
  - A - No, we will continue to pursue possible funding options. The only funding agency with this type of stipulations is FEMA.
- Dennis Happel, Little McDonald Lake
  - Q - What have we already spent and what will we need to spend to get to construction?
  - A - If we receive approval to move forward with the project, we will be asking the Membership for approval to increase our Line of Credit \$500,000.
- Todd Peterson, Little McDonald Lake
  - Q - He supports the project but there is already a connection between Paul and Rusche and between Paul and Little McDonald, do we need to construct another one?
  - A - Yes, we looked at that possibility but studies show the system will work better with a direct connection.
- Dawn Edvall, Kerbs Lake
  - Q - Concerns that no study has been done with the isthmus between Little McDonald and Kerbs Lake and hearing a response that the two lakes should drawdown the same is not a satisfactory answer. Also you are asking us to approve a project without providing the cost estimate per property and the associated benefit. We need to know what each property owner could expect for a benefit with this project.
  - A - The isthmus between Little McDonald and Kerbs Lakes will be looked into. As for the costs, this will all become part of the assessment process and Members will have the opportunity to voice their opinions
- Jim Haider, Little McDonald Lake
  - Q - If we move forward with this project will we still get assessed for Ditch 25?
  - A - We will maintain the Ditch 25 alternative until we determine we will not use that route.
- Judy Lightowler, Little McDonald Lake
  - Q - The benefit of this project would exceed the border of our lakes and how are they going to be assessed?
  - A - Our By-laws state we can only assess those within our LID.
- Bob Meyhuber, Little McDonald Lake
  - Q - He supports the project; however, he has concerns with Devils Lake coming into the picture.

- Bob made a motion that if Devils Lake LID presents a plan to use part of our project, it would need approval from the entire Membership and not just the nine Board Members. Seconded by Dave Edvall, motion carried - 6 opposed.
- Ardell mentioned that at every meeting with Devils Lake they have stated they do not want to hold us up. Also, if possible they are willing to make a commitment financially to join us later.

#### LID MEMBERSHIP AUTHORIZATION

- Motion to have LMKP LID Board to proceed with constructing an outlet project that costs greater than \$5,000 by Ralph Logan, seconded by Jeff Jones, motion carried - 8 opposed.
- Motion to increase our Line of Credit to \$500,000 to get the project through pre-construction expense by Blair Anderson, seconded by Tim Neitzke, motion carried - 3 opposed.

Motion to adjourn the meeting at 11:16 by Ardell, seconded by Denny Davison

Sue Meyhuber, Secretary