

Comments on future drawdowns:

Absolutely not! Although, I likely won't be affected, because I plan to sell, in spite of the drastically lowered property values due to the drawdown.

I'm OK with it if it fulfills its purpose.

The wild rice beds didn't come back good and will need to be re-seeded. You really mess with the eco-system when you draw down the water.

Do we have a choice? 1. Grant money running out. 2. D.N.R. does not want eradication; need future study and jobs. 3. Upper reaches of lake only beneficiary. Only negative on lower end. If Lake Association wants to truly represent the whole lake they should look to projects that benefit all of us. Your idea on fish cribs is one. Sand Island (we all take our kids, grand kids there) is another. I talked to former members who dropped out because all our representation and resources were going to the north end. Last dues increase total to Milfoil and Douglas County refusal to assist final straws .

Drawdown appears to have gotten rid of a lot of the milfoil without any long term consequences. We highly support a winter drawdown as a way to control the milfoil

If there is a problem already with EWM then it appears that an almost year-long drawdown did not control the EWM well.

If they are affective. The only thing that is unknown is how much are we talking here; 3 feet, 5 feet, 8 feet etc. It is impossible to really give you a complete answer without this information.

On a year with a drawdown owners could leave their docks in place!

I ice fish during the winter and use the lake with ATV's. This depends on if it's every year or not. The Chippewa Flowage is lowered every year mainly for spring runoff, but they still have milfoil problems.

Now that we know how long it takes to fill the lake, we should really wait until the ice is out or almost gone before we fill it back up. The other option would be to have a plan to remove debris.

Would depend on the amount and frequency and if it did indeed control the EWM without further damaging the "good" lake weeds.

I would like to see more proof that drawdowns are an effective control measure. Did the last one result in reduced level of E.M? Are continued drawdowns harmful to fish populations over the long haul?

I have shore heaving problems from ice. This has caused me to loose several feet of shoreline through the 18 years we have owned the property. If there isn't a drawdown for milfoil control, I think it would help on shore line erosion to at least drop it 12 inches during the winter months. Thank you for your service for the lake.

I think is is a very good way to control milfoil

Are there any other ways to control this? Perhaps chemicals, then regular volunteers @ boat landings inspection boats? How will this affect fish population?

If fishing is not permitted during drawdowns I would be in favor.

If it helps

maybe not as much water let out

Comments on future drawdowns:

Winter drawdown would minimize tree dying issue (if more are in fact, impacted) and it most certainly impacted milfoil growth. My feeling is we are fortunate to be on a flowage where we can "regulate" milfoil growth. Sorry I'm late! I did notice the dragon flies hatched to dry land rather than under water the year of the drawdown and this likely had some sort of impact just as the increase in dragonflies resulted in much less of a mosquito issue but I imagine these sorts of changes take care of themselves. Also, we likely prevented damage/injury to boats and boaters by removing stumps that were clear hazards. It's a shame about the birches but that's water under the bridge and not likely to occur the next time around.

BUT the DNR must restock in coordination with these drawdowns. Thank you very much for taking a proactive approach for addressing the EWM issue in our lakes. Unfortunately, residents and guests need to be more responsible when using their watercrafts to reduce the spread of this enemy. They need to be made more aware of how EWM gets caught on their watercraft propellers when they travel through an area and then deposited elsewhere in the water when it come off.

Not sure of the cost vs benefit. Time of the year and duration of the draw down? Would draw down result in more floating stumps and loss of trees? Is the purpose only for EWM. I think closing the park might go just as far. Direct and indirect costs park users create may cost owners more than the county gains. With the high taxes, few services, no representation and "if you don't like it sell" attitude non residents are silenced. Thank you for the work the group is putting forward. We do appreciate it.

I said yes to this question but only on the assumption that it is effective in EWM control. Also, I would want to make sure the fish population does not suffer.

Only if there were a plan for additional debris removal from private property. This was an area that was not well planned for during the last draw down and has had a negative impact on our property.

Concerns about trees and shore foliage

No comment

A drawdown should be used every few years to control the Milfoil. It was the best way to kill it and costs the least.

This milfoil thing is out of control. I watched hundreds of dead fish float by my dock. The fishing has been terrible. All the good spots are gone. We have a \$2.00 Nazi at the boat launch. A winter drawdown would be catastrophic as it would probably eliminate ice fishing like on the Chippewa Flowage and make the lake inaccessible for snowmobiling. All Winter recreation would come to and end. If that was the case I would need to fire-sell my cabin and move to a different lake.

We proposed this solution since we discovered EWM in 2002. Too many were afraid to try it. It was very successful in getting rid of most of it for awhile as we all now know. EWM will return because there are seeds deep[in the sediment.. A winter draw down should not affect the trees because they are dormant. Wildlife will pool to deeper waters as the waters gradually recede and there will be low impact. Snowmobiling on ice obstructed by stumps will be a hazard. Cutting stumps in navigational areas should be done during a winter draw down and don't worry about the DNR fussing about lasck of fish habitat. Douglas County should have cut these trees before the flooding of the Flowage in 1938 like Washburn County did and the Army Corps of Engineers requested! It will be a considerable reduction in water hazards for boating season and will benefit the safety of many! I'm sure many would volunteer to help.

We need to control EWM. If a winter drawdown is an effective way to do that, when should pursue it. However, we wouldn't want to lose any more trees.

Depends on the details

Comments on future drawdowns:

I want to see the completion of various research projects before supporting any plan

Water has been very clear since the drawdown, especially this August.

Shorter drawdown period of time. Ensure the dam gates will close next time around.

the summer drawdown seemed to result in dead trees and loss of fish. Our opinion is that a winter drawdown would not result in this problem. We definitely feel that the EWM needs to be controlled. We would not be in favor of another summer drawdown. We would be in favor of a periodic winter drawdown.

BETTER OPTION THAN CHEMICAL TREATMENT OR PHYSICAL REMOVAL.

But do understand the benefit in controlling EWM.

Too much shoreline damage.

If draw down was done in October and refill done in April it would result in minimal disruption to the recreational use of the lake.

It does not matter what I think! DNR will do whatever it wants! Don't give me the bullshit about this survey meaning ANYTHING! It's like dam meetings that meant NOTHING!

Yes, if it controls EWM.

EVERY OTHER YEAR WOULD WORK.

I think winter drawdowns make much more sense financially than spending thousands of dollars every summer for only a temporary solution. I also worry that use of chemicals every summer may have an adverse effect on lake quality in the future that we may not be aware of at the present time.

What about ice fishing and safe ice. We were lucky that we didn't have a freeze out and that could happen if we have very cold winter. Also very worried about the lost of trees on the shore line a lot of trees were killed and are struggling to survive most of the white birch are dead along the lake already. We will be a good candidate for disease for the trees because stress they were under, just look at bass lake and the disease they have there.

If it is ascertained that winter drawdowns could be managed efficiently and effectively. I think they would be a great tool in controlling Eurasian Water Milfoil. My biggest concern would regard damage to "good" native aquatic plants. Legal liability for injuries caused by protruding stumps and debris are also of concern.

I think drawdowns have the fewest negative effects on the lake and seems to easily have had the most dramatic effect on the milfoil. The flats in front of our place have been completely milfoil free each of the last two years.

I thought the drawdown did not cause any issues. The lake in the last two years has been very clean. Similar to what it was in the pre-milfoil years.

If I can do shore line improvement during this time

It seems to be the best solution in terms of effectiveness and cost

ABSOLUTELY NOT!

I do not want to have to pay the energy company for lost power. If that is a by-product of a drawdown I am not in favor of it. I am also concerned about the fishing impact as stated in the above box.

If there is a cost to association or property owners due to loss of revenue for dam operators than we would not be in favor....taxes and assessment for dam repairs are enough!

Comments on future drawdowns:

Here are my thoughts on the possibility of future drawdowns: - **Cost of the drawdown:** I have heard talk that the electric company will charge us some calculated cost for drawing the water down and diminishing their revenue during the spring refill, but I will want to discuss this with them in detail. I know how the "potential" of the water's electrical generation is based on the water going through the turbines. It seems to me that if they open up the water and let most of it go through the generators then they will generate *more* electricity during the time the lake is being lowered. Conversely, in the spring, they will generate *less* electricity when the lake is being filled. The bottom line is that the extra generating should come close to cover the shortfall in the spring...thus, hopefully it won't cost much to do a drawdown in the fall (say late Oct. or early Nov.) and refill in the spring. The only catch is that I don't know how long or it would take to drawdown the lake through the generators. - **Wells:** If the lake is taken down 5 feet around Nov. 1st and raised with the spring melt, the impact on wells should be far less than the year-long drawdown we had...the question is, how much? Since we went down 6 feet last time and they are talking 5 feet, it will be less, plus being down 5 months versus 12 months should also affect the water table less. But we should also consider this: Since the effect on wells should be less than last time, everyone whose well might be borderline has likely *already* had to make theirs deeper, so it's entirely possible few if any would be affected next time. - **Debris:** We got clobbered last time, though we turned the debris into shoreline protection. Again, since a future drawdown would be for 5 months versus 12, and not during the summer when the old stumps and the formerly waterlogged logs really dried out, I would expect less woody debris in the spring. My guess is some percentage of the stumps (25%) got ripped out last time when the ice rose with them encased in it, and now many of those are now stuck against the shoreline somewhere (including 7 on our shoreline!) Again, there will be debris, but it has to be less than last time, perhaps way less. - **Dead trees:** Well, the ones that couldn't survive a summer with the water down have already died, right? Considering it's during the winter (when trees are supporting leaves), I doubt we'd see any more trees die. - **Conclusion:** Considering the "spend less" political climate in Wisconsin, I'd say we are *very* lucky to have drawdowns as an option going forward. We know it kills off much of the milfoil, which (so far) seems to take years to come back, and it also seems to help the wild rice and either help or at least not hurt the fishing. We should thank our lucky stars that it can be dealt with like this, costing little and hopefully affecting few (compared to last time.) If/when the milfoil gets to the point of needing to be attacked we'll then get to see

The last draw-down occurred during the winter. Did it result in killing EWM?

I would be in favor of future winter drawdowns if chemical treatment of EWM was also part of the control process.

We spend very little time there, so we won't comment

only if it is not detrimental to the flora and fauna and doesn't impact wells again.

Based on the above why would we drawdown.

Too risky - In many ways.

Only if the milfoil becomes bad along channels and decreases the "quality" of the lake. I believe a winter draw down would not have as much effect on the trees provided it was timed correctly. Our summer draw down really damaged trees but allows new growth going forward .

Hopefully, the drawdown would be as late as possible and the refill as early as possible. There were shrubs along my shoreline at the waterline that died out with the summer-long dam repair drawdown. There are a few early signs that the shrubs may recover if the root moisture is preserved.

If it is used to control EWM, absolutely.

Lake level would go down 5' - 7' - 9' !! Too much. Lake levels restored by May 1 at the latest.

We do snowmobile, I worry about drawdown creating unsafe water? Will the lake hard freeze?

If it helps EWM control, but water should not be restored until ice-out.

Comments on future drawdowns:

The amount of milfoil is far less than it used to be and doesn't warrant the harm it would do to the fishery by doing further draw downs.

1) Natural with no chemical herbicides. 2) Does not seem to effect fishing.

Limit total drawdown . Possible slow drawdown to insure less fish loss. If we have a shallow shore can we leave docks in?

I do not want the water level to change while ice is present. I leave my dock in the water which is fine as long as the water level is not changed. I had dock damage due to failed dam construction tests and subsequent unplanned drawdown. Also, I don't think we would need to draw down by more than 2.5 feet, since ice thickens to at least 2.5 feet and weeds only grow to 5 foot depth.

this brings me to a different point which is currently by biggest issue. I can no longer use the Cranberry Lake boat launch because the "improvements" made it so shallow I can't float my boat without swamping my vehicle. I have used Pogo's (a big hassle) and the DNR Smith Bridge (too shallow and lots of wood debris) and now use Totagatic Park. I have seen I drag a lot of milfoil back and forth between the water. I have no need to leave Cranberry Lake, and seldom do except to launch and trailer my boat. I don't think a drawdown is needed to fix our launch, but if it is, please use that opportunity to see that it is made usable for those of us without trucks.

Absolutely not!!!!

Other lakes control milfoil problems without draining the lake. Is this DNR answer to milfoil problem, because we have a dam to do it?

This summer there was less grass growth in the sand by our dock/shoreline. Otherwise i didn't notice anything else about the lake. I would not be open to paying for drawdowns annually.

The only thing that makes sense and is good for the environment.

It could make more trees die.

It causes way to many hazards. You can't use the lake in winter to fish and get to snowmobile trails. The lake is to unstable to be on at all. Summer floating logs is hazardous as well.

Not sure that it helps as the milfoil just changes locations. It is also obvious from the Cranberry Flowage area that having no water and frozen ground was not enough to eradicate it from those areas where is seemed to take off with a vengeance following the drawdown.

Too much damage to shoreline, loss of spawning grounds & fish kill and loss of water table causing pump problems.

Anything that can open up water for fishing.

If it doesn't hurt the fish population, or affect their survival.

From all research available, this does not seem to be effective. Nor does any effort that we have, as an association, paid for thus far. The focus on "Serenity Bay" is ridiculous and costly, without long term benefit to the lake. The drawdown not only killed trees, but also turtles, birds who rely on certain habitats, as well as other forms of wildlife. Very unhappy with the Association and its response to the drawdown and its costs. Would discontinue membership if we hadn't already paid in advance.

The drawdown was incredibly expensive in terms of the loss of shoreline trees, both on our property and on the entire opposite side of the lake and the islands which constitute our viewing area; the loss of habitat for native wildlife; and has provided relief from EWM in isolated areas and for only a short time. By this time next year, the EWM will be back in force and we will have suffered from this drawdown without any long-term benefit. I can assure you I will vigorously oppose any future drawdowns by organizing our lakefront community in opposition to such short-term, short-sighted and costly procedures.