

**Question 7: If you oppose improved navigation in question 5, what are the primary reason(s) for not improving the channel for navigation?**

**121 Responses as of 8:30 pm, Monday, August 19, 2013**

- Pollution, more boating traffic, higher taxes
- na
- Much like White Bear Lake, the underground aquifer is at an historically low level. Unless and until that level rises to its normal level, it would be a waste of time and money to dredge a navigable channel for boating. The small lake just to the east of the Cty Rd 20 bridge is knee-deep at best, with a heavy muck bottom and very weedy. The resources should be put to use elsewhere.
- Water Quality, Drop in Water Levels, Tax increase
- cost
- Low water in upper lakes
- It's a plus in all ways.
- We don't need a BOAT FREEWAY
- It would be nice to travel between the lakes but we are strongly opposed to any design that lowers the lake level of North Center lake
- N/A
- 1- increased boat traffic 2-pollution from North Center Lake
- center lakes water level will drop to match Chisago lake level which is usually much lower leaving many people with no usable lake frontage
- Too much traffic
- I do not want more government or taxes. This project will cost real money in the short, medium and long term. I do not care which level of government will be 'paying" for this. I will be paying for this.
- privacy, will cause to much boat traffic all over
- increase in pollution, noise and inevitable tax increase.
- there is no good reason not to.
- My bay is too shallow and I can't get there.
- keep low boat traffic, esp. speed boats & wave runners
- lake water levels will be lower
- If water drops 1' I oppose it. And I and many, many, many others will be contacted. I personally will go to every lake owner myself with a petition.
- Lake levels have been low and this could only make it worse
- We do not need more lake traffic. If there is money to be spent why not use it to really impact weed control, which we ae not close to today. One lake for the HO is enough, three makes no sense.
- na.
- lower water levels on the Center lakes
- spend the money on water quality instead
- I do not want to see the water levels in North & South Center go down by opening the channel to North Lindstrom Lake. North & South Lindstrom Lakes are three feet lower than North & South Center, we would lose roughly one and a half feet of water. What about getting water from

the Sunrise River? I also do not want any additional tax added to our property taxes. Our property value keeps going down while there is very little change in property taxes. We are senior citizens.

- the lakes are so low, money and it will benefit only a few.
- I am a Lindstrom resident. My taxes continue to climb yearly. Two years ago the city tore out the curb running along my front yard during a drainage repair project. They NEVER came back and repaved my curb. I feel a collection fund for any channel projects from users at the boat landings and/or residents ON the lakefront should carry any costs!
- Cost and increased boat traffic
- The level of North Center Lake would be lowered. Wildlife in the wetland would be disturbed.
- water is too low
- I do oppose it, See number 6
- Lower water levels in S. Center Lake and invasive species control
- But am concerned about lowering water levels
- I would like to see the project of improving 288th and Lakelawn Dr take priority over this proposed project.
- Who really cares? Water quality is larger issue.
- We are concerned that dredging the channel every year will continue to cause the lake level of South Center Lake to decline more and more. Also, we don't want another Lake Minnetonka!!
- How do you market a chain to prospective businesses, lake owners and tourists that you can't guarantee will be navigable? Either you connect them, or you don't.
- Because you should have done this when you were working on that bridge this spring! Now it will mean more money spent!
- n/a
- 1. Taxes 2. Not enough regular Water Patrol on any of the Chisago County lakes
- Let nature take its course - should not have lowered the lakes years ago.
- The lakes are low, do not mess with mother nature
- Traffic
- Taxpayer dollars in the market should go to education.
- Given all the projects that are competing for our tax dollars, this one has to have the LOWEST return on investment. You exhausted time and resources on evaluating if the project could be done but never answered the question WHY it should be done. Continually raising our taxes - versus cutting your expenses - for projects that most residents won't benefit a single ounce, it complete irresponsible fiscal behavior. There is no economical return from this project. Even the positioning the options for questions #8 makes me question your motives.
- none
- additional boat traffic & noise AND expense
- cost, water quality and heavier traffic in N. Lindstrom, water level in N.Center
- Potential environmental impacts
- worry about decreasing water level
- Waste of money
- Absolutely not one damn tax dollar should be used for something only a few will benefit from. If you use the rational that all the lakes were once connected, you can use the rational that this whole area was probably once a large lake after the glacial age. Why not hook up Green, Walmark, Lake Ellen, Kroon and Pioneer while you are at it. Maybe even Sunrise. I don't live on

the lake, yet I am charged every year with a Lake Improvement tax so the property owners with lake frontage can make sure they have nice lake frontage. Bunch of crap!! How about that fantastic ditch built back in the 80s when the lakes were high? Who paid for that and who really benefitted from it. The channel being discussed has nothing to do with roads or development changing it. It is nature's course. Some years there is water and some years there isn't. Absolutely ridiculous to make taxpayers pay for something that so few will benefit from. A helluva lot better things to do with taxpayer money. But, I am sure it doesn't matter what I say or any other opposers, as the government does what the hell it wants to anyhow.

- Long term water levels
- NA
- Not a good way to spend tax dollars
- Increased high speed traffic
- more boat traffic on Chisago lake and increased possibility contamination by invasive species
- I have traveled the route from S Lindstrom to N Center several years ago when water levels were high, the route was full of milfoil, opening it up will hasten the spread of invasive species. This whole crazy idea of connecting the lakes has been pushed by a few wacko history buffs , at the expense of tax dollars of citizens , as myself, while property taxes and taxes and expenses keep rising , we've taken a huge hit on property values. To think to spend tax dollars on a channel to appease an elite exclusive "club" would be absurd! Let them wait for Mother Nature to rain on down, raise the lake levels and portage over the existing bridges, instead of cruising their pontoon boat flotillas to and fro, what's next? Demand bascual bridges for sailboats!??
- We can spend our money on things like food for poor people rather than boat venues for rich people
- Each lake has its own access. Chisago lake access has 60 parking spaces for trailers and it is full most of the time. No need to make the lake more busy. People can select the lake they want. If the access is full no need to make the lake more busy Marinas also add more boat traffic. Without any water inlet there is no way to control the passage.
- depends on the cost of the project
- **WE DON'T NEED IT. TAXES ARE EXCESSIVE IN THIS COUNTY NOW. HOW CAN YOU EVEN CONSIDER SUCH AN EXPEDITURE?**
- why should tax payers pay for this it's really a business need for the dinner bell let them pay for it
- cost-rather see the lakes we already have navigational
- Costs
- Cost and it does Nothing for my property. I DO NOT want one penny of my tax dollars to go to this project !
- No
- This is not what the lid was formed for and we should not be spending any money on this at all. Clean the lakes would be a better item to spend lid resources on, this is a stupid self-serving idea and should not be entertained at all!!!!
- Don't mess with nature
- So many other infrastructures that need attention rather than channeling the lakes
- We do not want our lake level to go down.
- With water levels as they are dredging out a navigable channel wi further lower the water levels.

- lowering lake level, disrupt wildlife, damaging natural beauty,
- Disturbance to existing wildlife along proposed channel
- N/A
- lake level will be affected negatively
- Na.
- Concerns of water levels on Center Lakes. Cost of project and ongoing maintenance. Potential of increased criminal activity. Lakes can get crowded as it is. Should the project increase boat traffic we could see an increase in boating accidents.
- if it is possible and at a reasonable cost
- North Lindstrom is a very quiet lake with very little boat traffic and the channel would increase accessibility.
- Lake levels, water quality downstream, property value
- 1. the area to be improved is mostly a wet land which is a natural filter between lakes. 2. lake levels are very drastically different between north/south center compared to south/north lindstrom lakes. over 3 ft of elevation change which would cause drastic changes and effecting property values into the millions of dollars if shallow bays and areas would become swamp and unusable
- Concerned about what the impact would be on North Lindstrom Lake
- restoration of the lakes so all lakes can be used again
- from the review of the information provided on the web site, it would appear that improving the channel for navigation would lower the levels of water in North (and subsequently South) Center Lakes by 1-2 feet in low water years. that is unacceptable
- n/a
- 1. environmental issues, 2. higher taxes 3. weir maintenance 4. North Center water levels 5 high water levels are a rare occurrence. boats and pontoons cannot go through without dredging 5. cost to tax payers 6. No hard conclusive evidence that this will improve the socioeconomic climate of this area.
- May cause more degradation to the water quality of all the lakes
- 1. MANAGING WATER LEVELS, NO WATER WHERE CHANNEL IS SUPPOSED TO GO, NO SIGN OF WATER RETURNING ANYTIME SOON. 2. CONCERNED LANDOWNERS WHO BENEFIT (NORTH LINDSTROM) GREATLY WON'T PAY FOR IMPROVEMENTS. 3. NORTH AND SOUTH LINDSTROM LAKE LANDOWNERS RISK LOWER WATER LEVELS, ALREADY VERY LOW. LITTLE UPSIDE FOR NORTH/SOUTH CENTER AND SOUTH LINDSTROM. 4. FISH MANAGEMENT - WHAT IS THE PLAN, COST, IMPACT. 5. BAD IDEA MESSING WITH MOTHER NATURE
- With the lake lowering that tax payers paid for. It caused the lake levels to drop 4-5 ft. Until the lakes come back up, I think it would be to costly to dig the channels that deep.
- Your definition of "improving" must mean lowering average lake levels for N Center and increasing the phosphorus levels (pollutants) of N Lindstrom. What a joke!
- Loss of property values if water is drained, loss of use of the lake in shallow areas
- Draining North Center Lake into North Lindstrom would negatively impact the value of my lake shore. I would need to see a permanent reduction in my county tax assessment and a cash payment on the order of \$100,000.00 for a yes vote on the channel from me.
- lake level it could drop center lake by 3 feet.
- north center lake full of milfoil, impact on property owners

- impact on land owners, north center full of milfoil
- presently we are on a bay which has basically dried up. Additional dredging, etc. would dramatically reduce the lake level even more.
- increased noise, boat traffic, party people and degradation of water quality in N.Lindstrom, S,Lindstrom and Chisago Lakes.
- I am very concerned about lake levels rising on Chisago Lake and having even more pollution enter Chisago/Lindstrom Lake
- decreasing N Lindstrom lake water quality and lowering N center lake levels and cost.
- keep watercraft traffic down.
- only concern would be any difference in water levels
- The new bridge put in on HWY 8 and unable to get through the channel between N & S Lindstrom.
- don't want more traffic on north lindstrom. it is peaceful and can enjoy water sports more without boat traffic.
- the average water levels on N and S center lakes will be lower. Maybe restricting access between those lakes
- There are bigger fish to fry. More attention should be put on understanding why the lakes are at the level they are, and how that can be mitigated or resolved.
- would increase boat traffic in No Lindstrom L and decrease water quality
- I am concerned about water levels. Q. Would a channel change any water levels?
- Cost. Our government does not have the money, we are taxed enough.
- Introducing pollution into Lindstrom lakes. Introducing more boat traffic.
- The negative impact to NLL,SLL &CL
- spread of invasive species, boat traffic
- boating traffic might increase and we don't need traffic
- The problem isn't the channel it is the lake level. Improve the lake level and the problem of the channel is solved.
- North Lindstrom Lake is small and the water quality is better than the other lakes.
- I don't want more boat traffic on North Lindstrom. Concerned with the pollution in North Center. This year North Lindstrom is so clear and weed free. Any improvements done should wait until the pollution has been addressed. The channel between north and south Lindstrom should be taken care of first. There's been enough disturbance in our city for a while let's concentrate on what we have to complete to make the city look like it really cares?
- Poor quality lake water in north center, too much pollution. The pollution concerns should be addressed first before any lake connections.
- cost of bridges, channel maintenance, invasive species, increased boat traffic
- None
- Costs/TAXES associated with this project - TAXES!
- None
- None
- The water is too low, so project is a waste of my tax dollars. Navigation will improve over time as water rises again as it has in the past. I do support improving the County 20 Bridge, especially if a sidewalk/trail is incorporated along 20 to connect the developments north of town to downtown. But, I see no benefit in spending money to excavate a channel that will simply fill back in with sediment (as channels in water do) prior to it providing any beneficial use. The

channel will also (if it works the way proponents envision, which I highly doubt) will bring boat traffic and flow in from poor water quality lake to better water quality lake. North Lindstrom is small lake that can't support much more boat traffic.