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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Lake Metigoshe is the most popular of the lakes located in the Turtle Mountains. The lake and the land surrounding it provides an important source of recreation.

Much concern has been raised over the fluctuating level of the lake. Because of this concern an alternative source of water was investigated.

Lake Metigoshe has a total drainage area of 59 square miles. Because of the hilly terrain however, a portion of this area does not contribute runoff to Lake Metigoshe. Instead, the runoff ponds in several small lakes. This is the situation for a 3.8 square mile area located east of Lake Metigoshe. As proposed, channels would connect these upstream lakes, allowing them to drain into Rost-School Section Lake. A dam would be constructed below School Section Lake to store the runoff. In years when Lake Metigoshe falls below its control elevation, water would be discharged from Rost-School Section Lake into Lake Metigoshe. While attempting to stabilize the level of Lake Metigoshe, Rost-School Section Lake would be allowed to be drained completely.

Two alternatives were looked at. Alternative 1, estimated to cost $390,000, would have channels constructed so that all the upstream lakes would be controlled at the elevation shown on the 1956 quadrangle map. Alternative 2, with an estimated cost of $825,000, consists of excavating a channel to such a depth that all the upstream lakes would be drained.

Starting in 1956, actual precipitation and evaporation records were used to determine the effect that this system would have on the elevation of Lake Metigoshe, if it had been in place. For Alternative 1, it
was found that the upstream lakes provided very little runoff. In fact, nearly the same results would be obtained if the upstream channels were not constructed. Only Rost-School Section Lake Dam and the short channels connecting Rost Lake, School Section Lake, Lake McDonald, and Lake Metigoshe would need to be constructed. Neither alternative would be able to stabilize Lake Metigoshe at its control elevation during the second of two consecutive dry years. Almost all the storage of Rost-School Section Lake would be discharged into Lake Metigoshe during the first dry year. No supplemental water would be available during the second dry year. Historically, these are the only years that the level of Lake Metigoshe has dropped much distance below its control elevation. This is the period that supplemental water is needed the most. None would be available.

Also, from tests taken in May 1982, the water quality of these lakes is poor. Phosphate and nitrogen levels are actually higher than found in Lake Metigoshe. Conditions would be expected to improve after the initial discharge. The water quality of this area, however, would still not be better than the quality of Lake Metigoshe.

If the Oak Creek Water Resource Board decides that the main goal of this project is to improve conditions when the normal elevation of Lake Metigoshe is much more than 0.5 foot below its control elevation then neither alternative is recommended.

If it is decided that a serious problem exists when the normal elevation of Lake Metigoshe is within 0.5 foot of its control elevation, only constructing School Section Lake Dam and only the short channels connecting Rost Lake, School Section Lake, Lake McDonald, and Lake Metigoshe would provide the most benefit compared to the costs. This
construction is estimated to cost $100,000, $95,000 for School Section Lake Dam and $5,000 for the channels.

Only limited benefits could be expected by this construction. Rost-School Section would be severely drawn down during many years. Also, environmental problems and Canadian concerns should be taken into account.
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ROST LAKE REPORT

I. INTRODUCTION

PURPOSE

Lake Metigoshe is located on the U.S.-Canadian Border in Bottineau County, which is located in north-central North Dakota. Figure 1 shows its location within the state. It is one of many lakes that exist in the Turtle Mountains. Being one of the largest and deepest, it is the most popular. Many people enjoy the recreational opportunities the lake provides.

Over the years, there have been numerous times when the level of Lake Metigoshe was below its control elevation of 2138 msl. This decrease in water level is caused by evaporation. Due to the relatively small area contributing runoff to the lake, in many years there isn't enough runoff to maintain the lake's level. This causes the lake level to fluctuate. A very dry year can lower the water level. The reduction can be so great that a normal spring runoff will not fill the lake. This problem was realized as far back as 1931.

Lake Metigoshe and the land surrounding it is a popular recreation area. At present, there are over 1,000 cabins along its shoreline. There are also two Bible Camps, a Boy Scout Camp, and a State Park located there. The lake provides summertime opportunities for water-related activities including boating, sailing, water skiing, fishing, and swimming. Also, the forested area surrounding the lake is good for hunting, hiking, and camping. During the winter the lake provides opportunities for cross country skiing, snowmobiling, and ice fishing.
Because of these activities, the popularity of Lake Metigoshe is increasing.

The fact that there are over 1,000 cabins, three camps, and a State Park shows that there is a considerable investment in the lake. It is understandable that the cabin owners are concerned about fluctuating lake levels. They would like to see the lake level stabilized. This would improve recreational activities which in turn maintains or increases the value of their investment.

Cabin owners are also very concerned about the quality of the water in Lake Metigoshe. They believe that providing a supplemental water supply for the lake will enable fresh water to enter the lake when it is needed. It is felt that this would help maintain good water quality.

A hydrological investigation of the area east of Lake Metigoshe was performed. There are numerous small lakes that could be tapped to provide supplemental water for Lake Metigoshe (Figure 2). This supply of water, if available, could be used to help stabilize the lake levels during dry years and help improve water quality.

SCOPE

This report attempts to identify possible areas that could contribute water to Lake Metigoshe. Information was gathered from USGS 7½ minute quadrangle maps. A number of surveys have been done in the area. The most recent and comprehensive survey was done in 1962 and is the one used for this preliminary report. Using this information, a hydrologic study was done of the area. This amounted to estimating flows into the various lakes, flood routing the lakes, and determining the flows from the lakes for channel design. These channels would carry
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excess water from these lakes into a reservoir at School Section and Rost Lakes.

A water balance study was also done. The study looked at the amount of runoff that could be collected by a system of channels. Runoff was compared to expected evaporation from the proposed reservoir, which includes School Section and Rost Lake. This was done to see whether the increased level of School Section and Rost Lakes could be maintained.

Two alternatives were looked at for the design of the system of drainage channels. The intent of Alternative 1 was to allow excess water flowing into the numerous upstream lakes to be drained away. This means that the lakes would not be entirely drained. In order for the lakes to drain naturally, they would have to be raised by a considerable amount. The drainage channels would allow water to drain when the lakes get above their normal level.

All the lakes within this upstream area would be completely drained with Alternative 2. Channels would be constructed with the bottom elevation as low as the lowest point of each lake. Therefore, all runoff would drain directly into Rost and School Section Lake.

Preliminary design for the channels, lake control structures, and the dam at the outlet to School Section Lake were done. Included in this report are cost estimates for the preliminary design of both alternatives. Also included is a summary and recommendations of what can be done.
II. STATEMENT OF PROBLEM

BACKGROUND

The problem of fluctuating lake levels and insufficient runoff into Lake Metigoshe was realized in 1931. In that year, the State Engineer, Robert Kennedy, wrote a report on the lake.

Kennedy began his report by describing the natural beauty that abounds in the area around Lake Metigoshe. He also stated that the popularity of the area was increasing. This was based on statistics showing increased sales of fishing licenses in the area as well as the fact that 408 cabin sites were platted along the lake. At the time of his report there were already 70 cabins along the lake. Much of the lake's increase in popularity was attributed to the construction of a new road into the area.

He also mentioned that the number of fish in the lake changed with changes in the water level. Fishing was the main activity on Lake Metigoshe. If it was bad, the popularity of the lake decreased. This hurt businesses near the lake and in the surrounding towns. Therefore, Kennedy related an economic loss to reduced water levels in Lake Metigoshe.

Lake Metigoshe's problem, according to Kennedy, was its limited watershed. Being only about 59 square miles, it did not have the potential for a lot of runoff. The watershed also consists of numerous small lakes. Kennedy noted that in order for many of these lakes to contribute water downstream, their levels would have to rise considerably. Therefore, there is a lot of dead storage in the watershed. The State Engineer wanted to make this dead storage in the tributary lakes available to Lake Metigoshe.
In order to tap some of this dead storage, Kennedy proposed two projects. The first was a drainage canal between Rost Lake and Lake Metigoshe. According to Kennedy's report, Rost Lake would have to rise 3 feet before it would start running downstream. This amounts to a dead storage of 1,228 acre-feet. If this were available to Lake Metigoshe, it would raise the lake 9 inches. The second project involved building a dam across the channel draining Rost Lake. It was to be located at the outlet to School Section Lake. This reservoir would occupy 800 acres and store 7,390 acre-feet.

In April of 1949, a petition was presented to the State Water Commission by area citizens. It requested the Water Commission to aid in stabilizing the banks on some roads and to investigate the stabilization of the lake levels. This was to be accomplished by a system of dams, canals, gates and general channel maintenance. During the summer of 1949, surveys were made to investigate the possibility of constructing a dam in the channel between Rost Lake and Lake Metigoshe. It was intended that excess flows be impounded behind the dam and released when water was needed in Lake Metigoshe to compensate for evaporation losses.

Water was seeping out of the Lake Metigoshe spillway structure in July of 1950. At that time it was discovered that the structure was in a state of disrepair. It evidently was seeping at a rate large enough to affect the lake level. Therefore, in November of 1950, the original 40-foot weir was lengthened to 70 feet. This was accomplished by placing 15-foot extensions on each end of the existing weir. These extensions were gravity sections constructed out of rubble concrete and having the same shape as the original weir. Seepage was also coming through the center 10-foot length of the original weir. This section of the weir
had a notch 8 feet long and 1 foot deep. To correct this seepage, a wall of sheet piling, 6 feet deep, was driven across the upstream side of the structure in this problem area. Also, this part of the weir was replaced by a gravity section of rubble concrete and the notch was eliminated. A June, 1949 survey, indicated that the weir was at elevation 2138.04 msl. The notch in the weir was at elevation 2137.0 msl.

In April of 1953, inquiries were again presented to the State Water Commission regarding a retention dam. Evidently, at this time the investigation started in 1949 was looked into further. The project ran into some problems in securing easements from landowners. There were also problems in getting approval from State and Federal concerns. Since Rost Lake is on the U.S.-Canada border and the proposed reservoir would raise Rost Lake, there were problems with the Dominion of Canada. Costs for the two projects proposed by Robert Kennedy were estimated in December of 1954. At that time, the drainage canal between Rost Lake and Lake Metigoshe via Hanson's Meadow was estimated to cost $9,040. Construction of the dam between the two lakes was estimated to cost $29,665. This dam had a proposed control elevation of 2155.0 msl.

Sharpe Lake, located upstream of Lake Metigoshe on Canada Creek, was investigated in 1955 as a possible alternative to store water for Lake Metigoshe. In February of 1955, surveys were made of the Sharpe Lake area. The plan was to store water in Sharpe Lake by raising its elevation. A diversion ditch was planned to carry excess water to the Rost Lake Reservoir if it was needed. In this way, water from the Sharpe Lake drainage area could be stored in both Sharpe Lake and the proposed Rost Lake Reservoir.
Milo Hoisveen, State Engineer, made some comments to the State Water Commission about this plan. He mentioned that some of the farmers around the lake were contacted and asked about their views on raising Sharpe Lake. The landowners generally were in favor of raising Sharpe Lake but did not approve of draining it again for the benefit of other lakes. In order for the plan to work, Sharpe Lake would have to be at least partially drained to provide water for Lake Metigoshe. Therefore, Milo recommended that the Sharpe Lake Dam not be built. Instead, he suggested that the Lake Metigoshe watershed be improved. This proposed improvement involved the drainage of the smaller lakes and collecting the runoff in the Rost Lake Reservoir.

Despite Mr. Hoisveen's recommendation, the Sharpe Lake Dam was constructed in 1958. It raised the level of the lake 10 feet. The proposed diversion to Rost Lake was not built since the Rost Lake Dam was not constructed.

In 1960, the Lake Metigoshe Improvement Association requested a study of the Lake Metigoshe watershed. The purpose of the study was to find additional water for the lake and evaluate the feasibility of providing this water. It was proposed to improve a portion of the watershed that entered Lake Metigoshe from School Section Lake and Lake McDonald. This would have involved ditching or clean up of the natural drainage ways from Lake McDonald through School Section Lake and Hanson's Meadow to Rost Lake. Also, included was the improvement of the channel between Mud Lake and School Section Lake. Gates were to be installed in the control structure on the outlet to School Section Lake. (This earthen embankment has since washed out.) This would allow a drawdown of School Section Lake to an elevation of 2135 msl. A gated structure
was also proposed for the outlet to Hanson's Meadow. Rost Lake was to have a two-way control structure. This would enable flows into Hanson's Meadow to be diverted into Rost Lake. It would also allow water to be released from Rost Lake when it was needed in Lake Metigoshe.

The watershed area of Lake Metigoshe was surveyed during the winter of 1961-1962. This survey included profiles between many of the lakes, a site topography for the Hanson's Meadow control structure and a site topography for the Rost Lake control structure. This information was used to develop costs for the proposed improvements and therefore evaluate the project's feasibility.

It was determined that a drainage system would not be feasible. The amount of work required to achieve this drainage was more than the benefit that could be derived from it. Merril Rivinius, Investigation Engineer at the time, stated that accelerated drainage in the noncontributing areas would increase the yield of water from the basin. According to him, this would be equal to the amount of normal evaporation of the areas which he estimated to be 1260 acre-feet. This is not necessarily true.

In the fall of 1961, a new outlet structure was constructed for Lake Metigoshe.

During the late 1960's, cabin owners along Lake Metigoshe started to be concerned about the quality of water in the lake. The North Dakota Water Resources Research Institute did a study of the lake in 1971. They looked at the amount of bacteria present in the water over the course of the summer. It was found that large concentrations of bacteria existed in the lake. This was especially true during periods of heavy use. An attempt was made in 1972 to locate the source of the
bacteria. The North Dakota Water Resources Research Institute started a five-year study to determine the lake's water quality.

The lake has had problems with excess nutrients and stagnant water. This problem is quite evident during low runoff years. Many areas become very weedy and the surface sometimes is covered with algae. A major source of the nutrients was thought to be the numerous cabins along the lake. Therefore, a sewer district was proposed in 1972. The plan was finally approved in 1980. In order to freshen up the water in the south lake, it was proposed in 1973 to install a pipe through the Rugby Point narrows. It was hoped that this would allow some circulation in the southern part of the lake. The pipe was never installed.

In the fall of 1972, there was some concern over what the lake level should be. Some people wanted flashboards added to the outlet structure to increase the level by a half-foot. They felt that this would improve boating and fishing. This proposed use of flashboards brought up questions as to how the lake level should be managed. It also brought up questions as to how the Sharpe Lake Reservoir should be managed to benefit Lake Metigoshe. During the discussions of using water from Sharpe Lake to maintain the level of Lake Metigoshe, Canadian interests claimed that the Oak Creek Water Resource Board did not have a valid license to operate the Sharpe Lake Reservoir. This licensing question has been brought up many times since 1972 and has not been resolved.

In June of 1979, the Oak Creek Water Resource Board requested the State Water Commission to investigate the feasibility of getting additional water for Lake Metigoshe from the School Section Lake drainage area. A copy of the agreement is included in Appendix A.
III. ROST-SCHOOL SECTION LAKE

Hydrology

The portion of the non-contributing Lake Metigoshe watershed located east of the lake has a total drainage area of 10.3 square miles (Figure 2). Even after completion of the proposed project, 1.3 square miles of this will not contribute runoff during most years. Therefore, the increase in the normal contributing drainage area will amount to 9.0 square miles. Presently, 5.2 square miles of this area runs directly into Rost Lake or School Section Lake. The remaining 3.8 square miles consists of numerous lakes that presently contribute little, if any, runoff. By constructing channels, this 3.8 square mile area is proposed to be drained into Rost and School Section Lake. It would then be available to provide water for Lake Metigoshe.

Under existing conditions the lakes within the 3.8 square mile area would have to rise significantly before any outflows would result. At the levels shown on the quadrangle map (1956), there are 543 acres of lake surface in the area proposed to be drained.

The 3.8 square mile area was broken into a number of subbasins. For Alternative 1, runoff from each subbasin was estimated for the 10 year event by using the tabular hydrographs in the North Dakota Hydrology Manual. These are based on a 24-hour, type I distribution storm. The hydrograph ordinates listed are for an area of 1 square mile and are based on time of concentration and hydrograph family. A hydrograph family was chosen by determining the rainfall depth for a 24-hour storm and the curve number for the subbasin. The rainfall depth, varying according to the frequency of the storm, was determined from rainfall maps included in the North Dakota Hydrology Manual. A curve number was
determined from the physical features that affect runoff from the subbasin.

Flows from the subbasin are greatly reduced due to the effects of storage in the numerous lakes. Peak flows discharging from the lakes, in the area proposed to be drained, range from 0.2 cfs to 1.8 cfs for the 10-year event. This compares to peak inflows to the lakes ranging from 3 cfs to 103 cfs for the 100-year event. These flow rates, of course, are dependent on the individual subbasin areas and the conditions found in them. The flow rate in the channels between the lakes was estimated by adding runoff from the land between the lakes to the discharge from the upstream lakes.

A similar method was used to determine the peak discharge during a 10-year event for Alternative 2. A peak discharge curve, based on a 24-hour, type 1 distribution storm, was used from the North Dakota Hydrology Manual. The discharge is dependent on time of concentration and hydrograph family. Both the 24-hour rainfall amount and curve number are used to determine which hydrograph family to use. When determining the curve number, it was assumed that the lakes were completely drained.

At the upstream end of the drainage area, peak flows during the 10-year event are as low as 3 cfs. However, because there are no lakes to provide storage, the flows join and rapidly increase as they proceed downstream. Near the entrance to Rost-School Section Lake, the peak discharge is as high as 80 cfs. The flow rates for each alternative were used to design the proper channel width.

Water Budget

As with any proposed reservoir project, the major concern is
whether the proposed reservoir will receive sufficient runoff to maintain the water level. While precipitation falling directly on the reservoir, and running off the watershed, adds to the water stored in the reservoir, evaporation from the water surface is constantly taking water away. If the losses from evaporation are greater than the runoff coming into the reservoir, the lake level will not be maintained. Therefore, there would be little or no water available to supplement Lake Metigoshe.

Each year has varying amounts of precipitation, thus varying the amount of runoff expected. Evaporation rates also vary from year-to-year. In order to determine whether there is enough runoff to maintain the level of the proposed reservoir, it is necessary to decide what frequency event should be looked at. Normally, in reservoir design, the runoff having an 80 percent chance of occurring in a year is compared to the estimated evaporation. If evaporation is less than the 80 percent chance runoff, the reservoir will realize a net increase of water and the water level will be maintained.

The amount of runoff flowing into the Rost-School Lake reservoir was estimated by looking at the precipitation records for the City of Bottineau. These records were available since 1955 (See Appendix B).

Evaporation records, during this same time period were available for Devils Lake and Langdon (Appendix B). It was assumed that the evaporation at the project site would be similar. From this information, a Log Pearson Type III method was used to calculate the 80 percent and 50 percent chance of annual evaporation and precipitation. Also, the average values were calculated. The results are as shown below:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>80%</th>
<th>50%</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Precipitation (in.)</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaporation (in.)</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>26.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Much of the precipitation falling on land is lost to infiltration and transpiration. Therefore, not all of this water would contribute to the lake volume. As shown on the annual yield map in the North Dakota Hydrology Manual, runoff from land contributes 15 acre-feet per square mile for an 80 percent chance event. Land runoff was assumed to relate to precipitation by a runoff factor. This factor was found by dividing the runoff obtained during the 80 and 50 percent chance by the precipitation obtained during the same frequency event.

Inflow to a lake consists of precipitation falling directly on the lake and runoff from the surrounding land. Evaporation is responsible for the majority of the losses. These losses are dependent on the surface area of the lake. A larger surface area will cause a greater volume of water to be lost to evaporation.

According to the May 1977 report by the North Dakota Water Resources Research Institute, approximately two percent of the total inflow to Lake Metigoshe is due to groundwater infiltration. Most of this infiltration occurs at the shallower depths of the lake. Water flows away from the lake at the deeper sections. It is possible that the same conditions occur at Rost Lake and the upstream lakes. This may stabilize the level of these lakes during dry periods. These dry periods could also cause the elevation of the water-table to decrease. Groundwater may then flow away from the lakes, causing the lake levels to recede. Due to these uncertainties, groundwater inflow is neglected.
Alternative 1

A drainage channel would connect each of the numerous lakes within the 3.8 square mile drainage area. The lakes would not be drained, but rather controlled at the elevation shown on the quadrangle map and Figure 2. Any excess water would then be discharged into Rost-School Section Lake. Assuming that these lakes are at the elevation shown on the quad map, they would comprise 543 acres of the 3.8 square mile area.

For this alternative, a determination of the water balance for the upstream area was made separately. This was done by using the actual yearly evaporation and precipitation amounts, compiled since 1955. On a yearly basis, the amount of discharge obtained was determined by calculating the change in lake elevation due to precipitation and evaporation.

Optimum conditions were assumed for these lakes. It was assumed that each lake was at its control elevation at the beginning of 1955. Therefore, any increase in the water elevation would cause outflow to Rost-School Section Lake. The effects of precipitation and evaporation were determined by using the surface area which the lake had at the beginning of each year.

As shown in Table 1, runoff from these lakes will only be received during 6 of the 26 years. This runoff, occurring only during the wetter years, would contribute to Rost-School Section Lake. During the drier years, the upstream lake's elevation gets as much as 1.8 feet below the control elevations. Nearly 1400 acre-feet of water, equivalent to an elevation change of 1.8 feet, must be added to these lakes before any runoff to Rost-School Section Lake would occur.

The elevations shown on the quad map, for these lakes, are the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Lake El. (msl)</th>
<th>Area (acres)</th>
<th>Storage (ac-ft)</th>
<th>Runoff (ac-ft)</th>
<th>Evap. (ac-ft)</th>
<th>Discharge (ac-ft)</th>
<th>End of Year Storage (ac-ft)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>1000*</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>2300</td>
<td>1431</td>
<td>1162</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>2300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>2300</td>
<td>638</td>
<td>1033</td>
<td>1528</td>
<td>1905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>999.5</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>1905</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>849</td>
<td>1066</td>
<td>1812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>999.0</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>1528</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>751</td>
<td>1366</td>
<td>908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>998.4</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>1066</td>
<td>1287</td>
<td>541</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>999.4</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>1812</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>913</td>
<td>1366</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>998.8</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>1366</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>744</td>
<td>1262</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>998.2</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>908</td>
<td>741</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>1491</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>998.6</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>1262</td>
<td>813</td>
<td>584</td>
<td>1535</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>998.9</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>1491</td>
<td>842</td>
<td>798</td>
<td>1929</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>999.0</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>1535</td>
<td>1128</td>
<td>734</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>999.5</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>1929</td>
<td>962</td>
<td>879</td>
<td>1438</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>999.6</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>557</td>
<td>1131</td>
<td>1241</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>998.9</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>1438</td>
<td>1464</td>
<td>661</td>
<td>2241</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>999.9</td>
<td>529</td>
<td>2241</td>
<td>1063</td>
<td>1103</td>
<td>2201</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>999.9</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>2201</td>
<td>1174</td>
<td>1141</td>
<td>2234</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>999.9</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>2234</td>
<td>2285</td>
<td>1180</td>
<td>1039</td>
<td>2300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>2300</td>
<td>1239</td>
<td>1214</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>2300</td>
<td>2239</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>991</td>
<td>2300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>2300</td>
<td>1741</td>
<td>1281</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>2300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>2300</td>
<td>2629</td>
<td>1181</td>
<td>1448</td>
<td>2300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>2300</td>
<td>872</td>
<td>1406</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>999.3</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>1766</td>
<td>947</td>
<td>957</td>
<td>1766</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>999.3</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>1760</td>
<td>641</td>
<td>1034</td>
<td>1760</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>998.8</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>1367</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>733</td>
<td>1367</td>
<td>1035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>998.3</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>1035</td>
<td>1498</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>1898</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Assumed elevation
elevations where a natural balance exists between inflow and evaporation. During very wet years, the lakes may be at a slightly higher elevation. However, during dry years the lake elevations would decrease.

By constructing a drainage channel, with the control elevation to be the same elevation as shown on the quad maps, any excess water is drained off. Therefore, the lake level is never allowed to get much higher than this control elevation, as it could under normal conditions. During dry years, evaporation may draw the lake level down lower than under the normal condition.

The amount of land runoff, precipitation falling directly on the lake, and evaporation from these lakes was determined to be:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>80%</th>
<th>50%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land Runoff (acre-feet)</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precipitation on Lakes (acre-feet)</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaporation (acre-feet)</td>
<td>691</td>
<td>327</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evaporation would exceed total inflow by 193 acre-feet during the 80 percent year and by 122 acre-feet during the 50 percent year.

For the 4.5 square mile area which contributes directly to Rost Lake, a water budget was also calculated. It was assumed that the water elevation at the beginning of 1955 would be 2144 msl, as shown on the quad map. At this elevation, the lake would have a surface area of 360 acres. (An area-capacity curve for the lake is shown in Figure 3.) It was also assumed that the proposed dam, on the downstream side of School Section Lake, was in place. It would have a control elevation of 2150 msl. The amount of water obtained from the 3.8 square mile area upstream, would be added to the total inflow of the lake.

Starting in 1955, the elevation of Rost-School Section Lake was determined, assuming that Alternative 1 was in place. As shown in Table
FIGURE 3 - AREA - CAPACITY CURVE FOR ROST-SCHOOL SECTION LAKE DAM
2, for the 26 years of record, there would be 5 years when water would overflow the spillway. These are 1971 through 1975, all very wet years. Other than these wet years, the elevation of the lake varies widely.

Total inflow and evaporation for the 80 and 50 percent chance years was determined to be:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>80%</th>
<th>50%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inflow from Upstream Lakes (acre-feet)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Runoff (acre-feet)</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precipitation on Lakes (acre-feet)</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaporation (acre-feet)</td>
<td>827</td>
<td>1030</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evaporation would exceed total inflow by 220 acre-feet during the 80 percent chance of occurrence. This shows that the lake would not be able to maintain itself at its control elevation. During the 50 percent chance, inflow would exceed evaporation by 46 acre-feet.

Alternative 2

For this alternative, all the upstream lakes were completely drained. Rost-School Section Lake was assumed to have an initial elevation of 2144.0 msl, and a water surface area of 360 acres. The total land area contributing to the lake is 8.3 square miles. By using the historical evaporation and precipitation values, starting in 1955, the water budget can be determined as if this alternative was in place.

Table 3 shows the water balance from 1955 to 1980. As shown, all but one of the years from 1965 to 1975 have water discharging over the spillway. This was a period in which the precipitation was much higher than normal. The lake elevation is fairly erratic during the remaining years, changing in elevation by several feet during a 1 year period.

In order to see if Rost-School Section Lake could maintain its
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Lake El.</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Storage</th>
<th>Upstream Discharge</th>
<th>Rost L. Runoff</th>
<th>Evap.</th>
<th>Spillway Discharge</th>
<th>End of Year Storage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>2144</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>763</td>
<td>611</td>
<td>771</td>
<td>1872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>2146.2</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>1872</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>833</td>
<td>1587</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>2145.5</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>1587</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>775</td>
<td>1263</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>2144.8</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>1263</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>799</td>
<td>779</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>2143.5</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>779</td>
<td>1099</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>752</td>
<td>1786</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>2145.8</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>1786</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>905</td>
<td>1358</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>2145.0</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>1358</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>906</td>
<td>804</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>2143.6</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>804</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>536</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>1249</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>2144.7</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>1249</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>751</td>
<td>1572</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>2145.4</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>1572</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>597</td>
<td>927</td>
<td>1690</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>2145.7</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>1690</td>
<td>716</td>
<td>704</td>
<td>852</td>
<td>2258</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>2147.0</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>2258</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>689</td>
<td>915</td>
<td>2458</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>2147.4</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>2458</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>529</td>
<td>1177</td>
<td>1879</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>2146.2</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>1879</td>
<td>1087</td>
<td>838</td>
<td>854</td>
<td>2956</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>2148.5</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>2950</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>786</td>
<td>1125</td>
<td>3031</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>2148.6</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>3031</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>867</td>
<td>1228</td>
<td>3187</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>2148.8</td>
<td>579</td>
<td>3187</td>
<td>1039</td>
<td>1570</td>
<td>1258</td>
<td>1928</td>
<td>3850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>2150.0</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>3850</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>529</td>
<td>969</td>
<td>1381</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>2150.0</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>3850</td>
<td>991</td>
<td>1453</td>
<td>1338</td>
<td>1420</td>
<td>2362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>2150.0</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>3850</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>977</td>
<td>1168</td>
<td>1458</td>
<td>1147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>2150.0</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>3850</td>
<td>1448</td>
<td>1841</td>
<td>1459</td>
<td>1344</td>
<td>3404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>2150.0</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>3850</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>797</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>3282</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>2149.0</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>3282</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>859</td>
<td>1322</td>
<td>3263</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>2148.9</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>3263</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>704</td>
<td>1437</td>
<td>2712</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>2148.0</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>2712</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>571</td>
<td>1206</td>
<td>2148</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>2146.7</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>2148</td>
<td>1198</td>
<td>913</td>
<td>1032</td>
<td>3227</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Lake El.</td>
<td>Area</td>
<td>Storage</td>
<td>Runoff</td>
<td>Evap.</td>
<td>Spillway Discharge</td>
<td>End of Year Storage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Land</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lake</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>2144.0</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1408</td>
<td>611</td>
<td>771</td>
<td>2248</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>2147.0</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>2248</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>899</td>
<td>2081</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>2146.5</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>2081</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>851</td>
<td>1770</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>2145.9</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>1770</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>891</td>
<td>1256</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>2144.7</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>1256</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>726</td>
<td>828</td>
<td>3138</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>2148.8</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>3138</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>561</td>
<td>1208</td>
<td>2598</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>2147.7</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>2598</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>1190</td>
<td>1891</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>2146.2</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>1891</td>
<td>971</td>
<td>665</td>
<td>788</td>
<td>2739</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>2148.0</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>2739</td>
<td>898</td>
<td>795</td>
<td>1038</td>
<td>3394</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>2149.2</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>3394</td>
<td>796</td>
<td>852</td>
<td>1323</td>
<td>3719</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>2149.8</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>3719</td>
<td>1286</td>
<td>1023</td>
<td>1237</td>
<td>941</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>2150.0</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>3850</td>
<td>766</td>
<td>898</td>
<td>1193</td>
<td>471</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>2150.0</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>3850</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>1472</td>
<td>3164</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>2148.8</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>3164</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>1090</td>
<td>1112</td>
<td>1268</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>2150.0</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>3850</td>
<td>771</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>1288</td>
<td>383</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>2150.0</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>3850</td>
<td>936</td>
<td>956</td>
<td>1355</td>
<td>537</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>2150.0</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>3850</td>
<td>2953</td>
<td>1364</td>
<td>1384</td>
<td>2933</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>2150.0</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>3850</td>
<td>1020</td>
<td>969</td>
<td>1381</td>
<td>608</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>2150.0</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>3850</td>
<td>2800</td>
<td>1338</td>
<td>1420</td>
<td>2718</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>2150.0</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>3850</td>
<td>1883</td>
<td>1168</td>
<td>1458</td>
<td>1593</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>2150.0</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>3850</td>
<td>3547</td>
<td>1459</td>
<td>1344</td>
<td>3662</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>2150.0</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>3850</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>797</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>3499</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>2149.4</td>
<td>594</td>
<td>3499</td>
<td>845</td>
<td>883</td>
<td>1363</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>2150.0</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>3850</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>757</td>
<td>1544</td>
<td>3410</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>2149.3</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>3410</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>635</td>
<td>1342</td>
<td>2836</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>2148.2</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>2836</td>
<td>2205</td>
<td>1067</td>
<td>1206</td>
<td>1052</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
level, the inflow and evaporation were determined for the 80 and 50 percent occurrences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>80%</th>
<th>50%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land Runoff (acre-feet)</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precipitation on Lake (acre-feet)</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaporation (acre-feet)</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1219</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evaporation would exceed total inflow by 184 acre-feet during the 80 percent chance. According to the usual guidelines, this would show that there is not adequate inflow to maintain the water surface elevation of Rost-School Section Lake. During the 50 percent chance, total inflow provides a surplus of only 313 acre-feet over evaporation.
IV. STABILIZING LAKE METIGOSHE

By looking at Rost Lake by itself, without being concerned with discharging into Lake Metigoshe, insufficient inflow is available during the 80 percent chance to maintain its control elevation of 2150.0 msl. This is true for both Alternative 1 and 2. This is the normal procedure to determine whether adequate water is available for a proposed reservoir. Using these guidelines, the project should not be constructed due to an inadequate volume of inflow.

Because of the nature of this project, calculations were carried further. The entire system was looked at. It was determined how much water was required to raise Lake Metigoshe to its control elevation, 2138.0 msl. Through the use of a low level drawdown system, installed at an elevation of 2140.0 msl, the water level in Rost-School Section Lake, could be discharged into Lake Metigoshe. In this manner, the level of Lake Metigoshe could be stabilized.

Under existing conditions, Lake Metigoshe receives a small amount of discharge from the 4.5 square mile area around Rost Lake and School Section Lake. With the proposed dam in place, this water would be stored in Rost-School Section Lake, rather than entering Lake Metigoshe. This volume of water would have been accounted for in the earlier calculations for Rost-School Section Lake. Therefore, if the proposed dam was in place, and no discharge from Rost-School Section Lake, the level of Lake Metigoshe would have been slightly reduced, due to this reduction in flow.

In order to determine the volume of flow which Lake Metigoshe had received from this area, since 1955, a water balance was performed. School Section Lake was assumed to be at an elevation of 2144.0 at the
beginning of this period. This is the elevation shown on the quadrangle map and also was assumed to be the elevation which water will begin to outflow to Lake Metigoshe.

As shown in Table 4, Lake Metigoshe should have received flow from School Section Lake during the majority of the years. During the drier years, the level of School Section Lake recedes. Then Lake Metigoshe would not benefit from any inflow from this area.

Table 5 shows the historical end of year elevations of Lake Metigoshe. Even during the lowest period of this 26 years of record, 1958, the elevation of Lake Metigoshe was only 1.5 feet below its outlet elevation. For several years of record during the early 1970's, the end of year water elevation was higher than the outlet elevation of 2138.0. Either the lake was still discharging or flashboards were in place.

The elevation of Lake Metigoshe was adjusted by subtracting the inflow which it had received from the School Section Lake area. This amount of inflow would not have entered Lake Metigoshe had the proposed dam been constructed. During some years, this flow had no effect on the end of the year elevation of Lake Metigoshe because water was going over the outlet structure. Even without this additional flow, much water would have discharged from Lake Metigoshe. For these years, no alteration to the water level were necessary. For years when Lake Metigoshe did not overflow its outlet structure, a correction was made to the end of year water surface elevation. The elevation was lowered according to the volume of water that would have been retained in the proposed Rost-School Section Lake. The area-capacity curve for Lake Metigoshe, Figure 4, was used to determine the altered elevation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Lake El. (msl)</th>
<th>Area (acres)</th>
<th>Storage (ac-ft)</th>
<th>Runoff</th>
<th>Discharge To Lake Metigoshe (ac-ft)</th>
<th>End of Year Storage (ac-ft)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Land (ac-ft)</td>
<td>Lake (ac-ft)</td>
<td>Evap. (ac-ft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>2144.0</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>763</td>
<td>611</td>
<td>711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>2144.0</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>2143.5</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>781</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>2142.5</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>2137.5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>1195</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>2144.0</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>2143.1</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>645</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>2138.7</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>592</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>2143.4</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>755</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>2144.0</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>2144.0</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>732</td>
<td>604</td>
<td>730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>2144.0</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>523</td>
<td>695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>2144.0</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>2142.8</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>599</td>
<td>1136</td>
<td>631</td>
<td>644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>2144.0</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>2144.0</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>554</td>
<td>557</td>
<td>790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>2144.0</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1682</td>
<td>795</td>
<td>806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>2144.0</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>581</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>2144.0</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1595</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>2144.0</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1073</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>2144.0</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>2144.0</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>2143.5</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>790</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>2144.0</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>994</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>2143.3</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>731</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>2141.5</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>1307</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>December Elevation of Lake Metigoshe</td>
<td>Maximum Elevation of Lake Metigoshe</td>
<td>Overflow Over Weir (ac-ft)</td>
<td>Inflow From School Section Lake (ac-ft)</td>
<td>Lake Metigoshe El. w/o SS Lake Inflow</td>
<td>Volume Required to Raise Lake Metigoshe to El. 2138.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>2137.95</td>
<td>2139.00</td>
<td>11,660</td>
<td>603</td>
<td>2137.95</td>
<td>91 2/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>2137.96</td>
<td>2138.54</td>
<td>4,820</td>
<td></td>
<td>2137.96</td>
<td>73 2/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>2137.57</td>
<td>2138.28</td>
<td>1,220</td>
<td></td>
<td>2137.57</td>
<td>778 2/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>2136.47</td>
<td>2137.87</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>2136.47</td>
<td>1960 3/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>2137.76</td>
<td>2137.76</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>2137.76</td>
<td>0 3/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>2137.53</td>
<td>2139.01</td>
<td>4,840</td>
<td></td>
<td>2137.53</td>
<td>850 2/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>2136.77</td>
<td>2137.87</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>2136.77</td>
<td>1600 3/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>2137.47</td>
<td>2137.72</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>2137.47</td>
<td>373 3/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>2137.32</td>
<td>2138.71</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>2137.32</td>
<td>1222 2/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>2137.92</td>
<td>2138.43</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>2137.90</td>
<td>181 2/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>2138.02</td>
<td>2138.64</td>
<td>2,670</td>
<td>606</td>
<td>2138.02</td>
<td>0 2/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>2137.44</td>
<td>2138.45</td>
<td>2,350</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>2137.44</td>
<td>1009 2/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>2137.71</td>
<td>2138.11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>2137.71</td>
<td>524 2/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>2138.05</td>
<td>2138.33</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>722</td>
<td>2138.05</td>
<td>344 2/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>2137.82</td>
<td>2139.25</td>
<td>6,290</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>2137.82</td>
<td>326 2/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>2137.74</td>
<td>2139.00</td>
<td>1,580</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>2137.74</td>
<td>468 2/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>2138.18</td>
<td>2138.96</td>
<td>1,940</td>
<td>1671</td>
<td>2138.18</td>
<td>0 2/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>2137.66</td>
<td>2139.05</td>
<td>5,890</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>2137.66</td>
<td>614 2/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>2138.10</td>
<td>2138.17</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1548</td>
<td>2137.11</td>
<td>1597 2/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>2138.10</td>
<td>2139.13</td>
<td>6,910</td>
<td>904</td>
<td>2138.10</td>
<td>0 2/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>2138.25</td>
<td>2139.70</td>
<td>17,520</td>
<td>2088</td>
<td>2138.25</td>
<td>0 2/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>2137.59</td>
<td>2139.60</td>
<td>10,520</td>
<td></td>
<td>2137.59</td>
<td>740 2/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>2137.34</td>
<td>2137.86</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>2137.34</td>
<td>776 3/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>2136.80</td>
<td>2137.75</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>2136.80</td>
<td>1417 3/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>2136.70</td>
<td>2137.91</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>2136.70</td>
<td>1800 3/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>2136.76</td>
<td>2136.97</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>2136.20</td>
<td>550 3/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Assuming that the previous years requirements were met.
1/ Inflow from School Section Lake assumed not to affect lake level. It is discharged over weir.
2/ Water had discharged over weir during that year. Water required is from top of weir (El. 2180) to Dec. Level.
3/ Water had not discharged over weir. Water required is the difference in the maximum elevation and the December elevation of that year.
FIGURE 4 - AREA - CAPACITY CURVE FOR LAKE METICOshe
The yearly volume of water required to raise Lake Metigoshe to its control elevation was determined by looking at its end of the year elevation. If the lake discharged during the year, the volume of water needed to raise it from its end of year elevation to its control elevation of 2138 msl was found from the area-capacity curve. An increase in the previous year's elevation would have no affect on the present year's elevation, during these years, because excess water was discharged anyway. During the years that the lake had not discharged, however, an increase in the previous year's elevation would also cause the present year's elevations to increase. The additional increase in elevation required would then be the difference between the maximum elevation and the December elevation of that year.

The main goal of this project was to stabilize the level of Lake Metigoshe. This was to be accomplished by discharging the stored water in Rost-School Section Lake into Lake Metigoshe. The low level drain would be opened during the late summer in hopes of bringing Lake Metigoshe up to its control elevation. The yearly volume of water required to do this was shown in Table 5.

For both Alternative 1 and 2, a water budget analysis was run, starting in 1955. Rost-School Section Lake was allowed to be drawn completely down to elevation 2140.0 msl. This was done whenever Lake Metigoshe was in need of this much water. Due to the uncertainty of conditions, no additional inflow was assumed to be available from Sharpe Lake. The water budget analysis was run on a yearly basis. The area of Rost Lake at the end of each year was used to determine the amount of evaporation for the following year. This would tend to paint an optimistic picture of the entire project. In the actual world, spring
runoff would increase the size of Rost-School Section Lake. This increased area would cause more evaporation which would reduce the volume of water available to Lake Metigoshe.

Alternative 1

As shown in Table 6, during years in which a small amount of inflow is needed by Lake Metigoshe, Rost Lake is capable of providing it. However, during the years when Lake Metigoshe is in the most need of additional runoff, very little is available from Rost Lake. As can be seen, the level of Rost Lake is drawn down severely during a relatively dry year. If the following year is dry, Rost Lake will have no surplus water for Lake Metigoshe. This is the time when the surplus water is most in demand. During the very dry years, Rost Lake is only capable of providing a very small amount of water. Figures 5 and 6 show the effects on the elevations of Rost-School Section Lake and Lake Metigoshe.

During the average year, the level of Lake Metigoshe does not suffer much decline in elevation. Additional water for Lake Metigoshe is needed only during the more extreme years when evaporation greatly exceeds inflow. It is during these drier years that the level of Lake Metigoshe is the lowest.

A water balance was determined for Rost-School Section Lake. With units of acre-feet, the results for the 80 and 50 percent chance of occurrence are shown below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>80%</th>
<th>50%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inflow from Upstream Lakes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Runoff</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precipitation Falling Directly on Rost Lake</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaporation from Rost Lake</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume Required by Lake Metigoshe</td>
<td>1362</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 6

**Rost-School Section Lake**  
**Supplementing Lake Metigoshe**  
**Alternative 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Elevation (msl)</th>
<th>Area (ac-ft)</th>
<th>Storage (ac-ft)</th>
<th>Runoff into Rost Lake</th>
<th>Discharge</th>
<th>End of Year Storage (ac-ft)</th>
<th>Possible El. of Lake Metigoshe (msl)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Weir</td>
<td>Drawdown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Evap.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Upstream</td>
<td>Land</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lake</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>2144.0</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>763</td>
<td>611</td>
<td>1781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>2145.8</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>1781</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>803</td>
<td>1436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>2145.2</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>1436</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>756</td>
<td>344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>2141.2</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>2140.0</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>1195</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>1387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>2145.0</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>1387</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>836</td>
<td>2137.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>2140.0</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>2136.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>2138.7</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>592</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>2138.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>2141.5</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>645</td>
<td>2138.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>2140.0</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>2138.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>2142.3</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>748</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>639</td>
<td>1129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>2144.4</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>1129</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>724</td>
<td>377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>2141.5</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>2140.0</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>1235</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>1114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>2144.4</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>1114</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>777</td>
<td>326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>2144.0</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>993</td>
<td>554</td>
<td>559</td>
<td>792</td>
<td>468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>2143.7</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>846</td>
<td>1039</td>
<td>1682</td>
<td>788</td>
<td>3556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>2149.5</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>3556</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>941</td>
<td>3109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>2148.7</td>
<td>564</td>
<td>3109</td>
<td>991</td>
<td>1489</td>
<td>1222</td>
<td>1665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>2150.0</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>3850</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>953</td>
<td>1168</td>
<td>1123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>2150.0</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>3850</td>
<td>1448</td>
<td>1886</td>
<td>1459</td>
<td>3449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>2150.0</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>3850</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>797</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>3850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>2147.6</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>2548</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>758</td>
<td>1170</td>
<td>2548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>2146.0</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>1814</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>552</td>
<td>1127</td>
<td>1814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>2140.0</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>2140.0</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>1280</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1/ Adequate discharge was not available to raise Lake Metigoshe to El. 2138.0 msl.
2/ The large spring discharge increased the level of Lake Metigoshe enough so that no additional fall discharge would be required. The elevation of Lake Metigoshe would still be 2138.0 msl.
FIGURE 5 - ROST-SCHOOL SECTION LAKE ELEVATIONS FOR ALTERNATIVE 1
FIGURE 6 - LAKE METIGOSHE ELEVATIONS FOR ALTERNATIVE 1
Only 26 acre-feet, when 1,362 acre-feet were required, would be available to Lake Metigoshe during the 80 percent chance of occurrence. This small amount of inflow would have no affect on the water surface elevation of Lake Metigoshe. During the 50 percent chance of occurrence, 186 acre-feet of the 242 acre-feet required by Lake Metigoshe would be available. There seems to be no urgent need for surplus water during this frequency event. When requiring 242 acre-feet of water, the water elevation of Lake Metigoshe would only be 0.2 foot below its control elevation.

Evaporation losses were very small for Rost-School Section Lake. Through the use of its low level drawdown system, the water surface elevation of Rost-School Section Lake was greatly lowered. Therefore, its surface area was also greatly reduced, causing this reduction in evaporation. Because very little could be maintained in Rost-School Section Lake, surplus water available to Lake Metigoshe would also be greatly reduced.

Because such a small amount of runoff is normally received from the upstream lakes, almost identical results would be achieved if the upstream channels were not constructed. Only Rost-School Section Lake Dam and the channels connecting Rost Lake, School Section Lake, Lake McDonald, and Lake Metigoshe would need to be constructed to get these results.

Alternative 2

By using the same procedure, a water balance was determined for the case in which all the upstream lakes were drained. All units are in acre-feet.
Lake Metigoshe requires 1,362 acre-feet of excess runoff during the 80 percent chance. Yet, evaporation from Rost-School Section Lake exceeds total inflow by 31 acre-feet. Rost-School Section Lake could provide the entire demand of Lake Metigoshe during the 50 percent chance. But, again, there is no real need for surplus water during this event.

As shown in Table 7, there would be a sufficient supply of water to raise Lake Metigoshe to its control elevation for most years. During these years, however, Lake Metigoshe does not require much surplus water. It is during the period of two consecutive dry years that the level of Lake Metigoshe is greatly reduced. Because the level of Rost-School Section Lake would be drawn down during the first of these dry years, there would be no surplus water available to stabilize the level of Lake Metigoshe during the second dry year. This is the time when the surplus water is needed the most. It would not be available. This is what happens during 1958, 1961, and 1979. The effects on the elevations of Rost-School Section Lake and Lake Metigoshe are shown graphically in Figures 7 and 8.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Rost Lake Elevation (msl)</th>
<th>Area (acres)</th>
<th>Storage (ac-ft)</th>
<th>Runoff Land (ac-ft)</th>
<th>Lake (ac-ft)</th>
<th>Evap. (ac-ft)</th>
<th>Spillway Discharge Weir (ac-ft)</th>
<th>Drawdown Storage (ac-ft)</th>
<th>End of Year Storage (ac-ft)</th>
<th>Revised El. of Lake Metigoshe (msl)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>2144.0</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1408</td>
<td>611</td>
<td>771</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>2157</td>
<td>2138.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>2146.8</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>2157</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>884</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>1842</td>
<td>2138.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>2146.1</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>1842</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>816</td>
<td>778</td>
<td>767</td>
<td>2138.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>2143.4</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>767</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>713</td>
<td>143.1/</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>2136.98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>2140.0</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>2103</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2311</td>
<td>2138.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>2147.1</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>2311</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>1026</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>1017</td>
<td>2138.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>2144.2</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>1017</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>843</td>
<td>311.1/</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>2137.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>2140.0</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>1042</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>876</td>
<td>2138.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>2143.8</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>876</td>
<td>921</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>698</td>
<td>1222</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>2138.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>2141.9</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>836</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>2138.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>2143.7</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>1351</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>714</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2067</td>
<td>2138.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>2146.5</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>2067</td>
<td>785</td>
<td>654</td>
<td>869</td>
<td>1009</td>
<td>1628</td>
<td>2138.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>2145.6</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>1628</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>981</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>692</td>
<td>2138.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>2143.2</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>692</td>
<td>2051</td>
<td>646</td>
<td>659</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>2386</td>
<td>2138.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>2147.2</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>2386</td>
<td>790</td>
<td>702</td>
<td>1005</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>2547</td>
<td>2138.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>2147.6</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>2547</td>
<td>996</td>
<td>781</td>
<td>1108</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>2748</td>
<td>2138.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>2148.0</td>
<td>529</td>
<td>2748</td>
<td>2990</td>
<td>1168</td>
<td>1185</td>
<td>1871</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3850</td>
<td>2138.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>2150.0</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>3850</td>
<td>1020</td>
<td>969</td>
<td>1381</td>
<td>608.2/</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>3236</td>
<td>2138.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>2149.0</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>3236</td>
<td>2836</td>
<td>1245</td>
<td>1322</td>
<td>2145.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3850</td>
<td>2138.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>2150.0</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>3850</td>
<td>1883</td>
<td>1168</td>
<td>1458</td>
<td>1593</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3850</td>
<td>2138.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>2150.0</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>3850</td>
<td>3547</td>
<td>1459</td>
<td>1344</td>
<td>3662</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3850</td>
<td>2138.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>2150.0</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>3850</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>797</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>2760</td>
<td>2138.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>2148.0</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>2760</td>
<td>856</td>
<td>787</td>
<td>1216</td>
<td>776</td>
<td>2411</td>
<td>2138.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>2147.3</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>2411</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>1224</td>
<td>1417</td>
<td>722</td>
<td>2138.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>2143.4</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>722</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>778</td>
<td>225.1/</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>2136.94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>2140.0</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>2260</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>2245.1/</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>2137.94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attempted to stabilize Lake Metigoshe at El. 2138.00

1/ Adequate discharge was not available to raise Lake Metigoshe to El. 2138.0.
2/ Rost Lake discharged over weir. This discharge did not increase the end of year elevation of Lake Metigoshe, as it also was overflowing its weir. Fall discharge also needed.
3/ Such a large spring discharge increased the level of Lake Metigoshe enough so that no additional fall discharge would be required. Elevation of Lake Metigoshe would still be 2138.0.
Figure 7 Post-school section lake elevations for alternative 2
V. ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

Any environmental impacts, caused by this project, must be taken into account. By constructing a dam downstream from School Section Lake, a reservoir will be created. This reservoir would include the area of School Section Lake, Rost Lake, and Hanson Meadow. An additional amount of State Park land, hay land, and many trees would be flooded.

Under Alternative 1, a drainage ditch would connect the upstream lakes at the elevation shown on the quadrangle map. This may cause these lakes to be slightly lower than normal during dry periods. Excess water during wet periods would be drained off, not allowing the water elevation to get as high as it normally would.

All the upstream lakes would be completely drained with Alternative 2. Permission would have to be granted by the landowners in order to drain these lakes. State permission may be required if the lakes are meandered. Many of these lakes may presently be used as watering holes for cattle.

Many trees would have to be cleared to construct the channel between each lake. Each affected landowners permission would have to be obtained in order to construct the channel. By draining, or possibly even lowering these upstream lakes, the water-table level may be lowered. Water may seep from the water-table to the drainage channel.

Rost-School Section Lake would have to be severely drawn down during the drier years. This may not be acceptable to some agencies. Also, because a portion of this lake is in Canada, Canadian concerns will have to be taken into account.
VI. WATER QUALITY

During May, 1982, the North Dakota State Department of Health conducted water quality tests for several of the lakes which are proposed to be drained. These results, shown in Appendix C, indicate that the water quality is poor within these lakes. In fact, the concentrations of phosphate and nitrogen are higher in these lakes than they are in Lake Metigoshe. These are the primary causes of algae and weed growth.

By draining these lakes, all this poor quality water would be discharged to Rost-School Section Lake, and finally Lake Metigoshe. After this initial discharge, the water quality coming into Rost-School Section Lake may improve. However, it is hard to determine the extent of this improvement. Much of these nutrients come from water running off nutrient rich soil and land which was fertilized. Wetland soils have retained a large amount of these nutrients. These nutrients will be carried off by the runoff flowing over it. Therefore, even after the initial discharge, runoff from this area would still be expected to be fairly high in nitrogen and phosphate.

Apparently, the water quality of Lake Metigoshe would not be improved by any inflow from these lakes. In fact, at least for the first year, this inflow would actually tend to reduce the quality of Lake Metigoshe. Increased levels of nitrogen and phosphate would cause additional growth of algae and weeds. Water quality from these upstream lakes would improve somewhat after the first year. However, it is doubtful whether the quality of this water would ever become better than the quality existing within Lake Metigoshe. After a period of time, the water quality of each source would probably be the same.
VII. DESIGN

Rost-School Section Lake Dam

This structure would be identical whether Alternative 1 or 2 was in place. Figure 9 is a cross section through the spillway of the dam proposed at the outlet to School Section Lake. Set at an elevation of 2160 msl, the crest of the dam will be constructed with a top width of 12 feet. This will result in a structure 460 feet long and with a height of 21 feet above the stream bottom. Approximately 12,000 cubic yards of dirt will be required for the embankment. Both the upstream and downstream embankment slopes are proposed to be constructed with a 3H:1V slope. Riprap will protect the upstream slope from an elevation of 2140 msl to 2155 msl.

Proposed with a 10 foot width and 3H:1V side slopes, a cutoff trench is to be constructed below the entire length of the dam. This trench should extend downward until solid material is reached. At this time, a depth of 10 feet has been proposed for this trench. Depending on the existing soil conditions, the dimensions of this trench are subject to change. Soil conditions, predominate with sand and gravel, would increase potential foundation problems. Soil borings should be taken to see if these conditions exist at the proposed site.

To be constructed at a control elevation of 2150 msl, the service spillway will consist of a 3-foot by 3-foot reinforced concrete inlet structure with a 10-foot drop. Approximately 110 feet of 30-inch RCP would be installed for the spillway pipe. At the outlet, the spillway pipe will have an invert elevation of 2139.0 msl. Rock riprap will be installed to protect the plunge pool, which is proposed to be constructed at the outlet. This plunge pool would dissipate the hydraulic
FIGURE 9 - SCHOOL SECTION LAKE DAM  
(SECTION THRU SPILLWAY)  
SCALE: 1" = 20'
energy of the discharging flows.

With an outlet at an elevation of 2140 msl, a low level drawdown pipe will consist of 30 feet of 30-inch RCP. At the point where this pipe attaches to the drop inlet, a gate valve will be in operation. Opening this valve will allow water to discharge from Rost Lake to Lake Metigoshe.

Within a natural saddle north of the dam site, the emergency spillway will be constructed. With a control elevation around 2155 msl, the maximum cut through this area would be 10 feet. Excavation for the emergency spillway, with a width of 200 feet and 3H:1V side slopes, would be required for approximately 500 feet. Whether Alternative 1 or 2 were to be constructed, the same construction would be required for Rost-School Section Lake Dam. The cost estimate for this structure is shown in Table 8. This does not include the cost of obtaining land. The cost of this structure will be included in the cost for Alternative 1 and 2.

Alternative 1

Peak flows between each lake were obtained for the 10-year event. Channels between each lake were designed to keep the velocity of these flows below 2.5 feet per second. Although the bottom width varied, all the channels were designed with 3H:1V side slopes. Figure 10 shows a typical cross section of the channel.

For the portion of Lateral C-1, extending from Lake 2179 upstream to the first slough above it, a channel with a 10-foot bottom width was designed. An 8-foot bottom width is adequate for the remainder of Mainline 1 and its lateral branches. All of Mainline 2 and all its
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Unit Price</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Stripping, Salvaging, and Spreading Topsoil</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>S.Y.</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Cutoff Trench Excavation</td>
<td>5,200</td>
<td>C.Y.</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>10,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Borrow Excavation</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>C.Y.</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>18,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Concrete</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>C.Y.</td>
<td>300.00</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. 30'' Dia. RCP and Cradle</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>L.F.</td>
<td>35.00</td>
<td>7,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Rock Riprap</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>C.Y.</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Rock Riprap Filter</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>C.Y.</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Seeding</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Acre</td>
<td>200.00</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Water</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>1,000 Gal.</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Trash Rack and Misc. Metal (valve, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>L.S.</td>
<td>2,000.00</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$72,350</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contingencies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$7,550</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Engineering</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$7,550</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contract Administration</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$7,550</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$95,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Does not include the price to obtain land.
FIGURE 10—TYPICAL CHANNEL CROSS SECTION

NOT TO SCALE
lateral branches were proposed with an 8-foot bottom width. Each outlet was selected at the elevation that the lake is shown on the quadrangle maps. Control structures, as shown in Figure 11, should be constructed at the outlets to Lake 2187 and Lake 2202. These structures will prevent erosion of the outlet, ensuring that the same outlet elevation will be maintained. They will consist of a 5-foot high embankment with an 8-foot top width and 3H:1V side slopes. Placed at the base of this embankment, the outlet structure will consist of a 30-inch diameter CMP. Roadways will be used as a control structure below Lake 2189, Lake 2179, and Mud Lake. Depending on their size and condition, the existing culverts may have to be replaced and the roads built up. Additional earthwork may also be required on the roadways at the edge of Lake 2187, School Section Lake, between Lake 2194, and between the sloughs on Lateral C-1.

A drop structure, as shown in Figure 12, will be required below Lake 2206 due to the steep slopes of the existing ground. A 13-foot riser, consisting of a 30-inch CMP, will be installed at the outlet to the lake. Approximately 200 feet of 30-inch CMP will be installed to transfer runoff from the riser to the downstream channel.

The cost estimate for this alternative is shown in Table 9. This does not include the cost for acquiring title for land. Included in the $390,000 cost is the construction of Rost-School Section Lake Dam.

If only Rost-School Section Lake Dam and the channels connecting Rost Lake, School Section Lake, Lake McDonald, and Lake Metigoshe, the total cost is estimated to be $100,000. This includes $95,000 for the dam and $5,000 for the channels.
FIGURE II-TYPICAL CONTROL STRUCTURE
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TABLE 9

Preliminary Cost Estimate

Alternative 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Unit Price</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. School Section Lake Dam</td>
<td></td>
<td>L.S.</td>
<td>72,350</td>
<td>$ 72,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Drop Structure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Stripping, Salvaging, and Spreading Topsoil</td>
<td>105,000</td>
<td>S.Y.</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>21,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Excavation</td>
<td>90,000</td>
<td>C.Y.</td>
<td>1.75 *</td>
<td>157,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. 30&quot; Diameter CMP</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>L.F.</td>
<td>35.00</td>
<td>12,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Earthwork (Control Structures)</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>C.Y.</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Rock Riprap</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>C.Y.</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>1,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Rock Riprap Filter</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>C.Y.</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Seeding</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Acres</td>
<td>200.00</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subtotal                                           |          |               | $300,600   |
Contingencies                                      |          |               | 29,800     |
Engineering                                        |          |               | 29,800     |
Contract Administration                            |          |               | 29,800     |
Total                                              |          |               | $390,000   |

* Note: Does not include price to obtain land.
All quantities for School Section Lake and drop structure below Lake 2206 were totaled separately.
Alternative 2

The channel bottom will be excavated to an elevation which will drain all the upstream lakes. Starting at School Section Lake and proceeding upstream to Lake 2179, a 12-foot bottom width will be required on Mainline 1. An 8-foot bottom width will be adequate on the remainder of the channels. An additional volume of excavation will be required due to the greater depth of cut. A 30-inch diameter pipe will be required to be installed through 6 different roadway crossings.

A concrete drop structure would be installed downstream of Lake 2179. This will allow the amount of excavation to be greatly reduced within this stretch.

As shown in Table 10, this alternative is estimated to cost $825,000. This cost estimate includes the cost of constructing Post-School Section Lake Dam, but does not include the cost for acquiring title for land.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Unit Price</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. School Section Lake Dam</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>L.S.</td>
<td>$72,350</td>
<td>$72,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Drop Structure</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>29,000</td>
<td>58,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Stripping, Salvaging, and Spreading Topsoil</td>
<td>115,000</td>
<td>S.Y.</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>23,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Excavation</td>
<td>263,800</td>
<td>C.Y.</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>461,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. 30&quot; Diameter CMP</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>L.F.</td>
<td>35.00</td>
<td>7,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Rock Riprap</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>C.Y.</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>1,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Rock Riprap Filter</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>C.Y.</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Seeding</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Acres</td>
<td>200.00</td>
<td>9,600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subtotal $633,450  
Contingencies 63,850  
Engineering 63,850  
Contract Administration 63,850  
Total $825,000
VIII. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The level of Lake Metigoshe, with a drainage area of 59 square miles, has had a history of fluctuating over the years. The possibility of providing an alternative source of water was investigated.

A dam would be constructed at the downstream side of School Section Lake. Channels would be constructed to the small lakes upstream of Rost-School Section Lake. Presently, this 3.8 square mile area does not contribute to the inflow of Rost-School Section Lake. The channels would allow the runoff from this area to flow into Rost-School Section Lake.

It was thought that excess water could be stored in Rost-School Section Lake until summer. At this time, the level of Lake Metigoshe is normally below its outlet elevation. Water could then be discharged into Lake Metigoshe from Rost-School Section Lake. This would help stabilize Lake Metigoshe at the full pool elevation.

Two alternatives were looked at. Alternative 1, with an estimated cost of $390,000, involves constructing the channels so that all the upstream lakes would be controlled at the elevation shown on the 1956 quad map. Alternative 2, estimated to cost $825,000, consists of excavating a channel to such a depth that all the upstream lakes would be drained.

Actual precipitation records from Bottineau and evaporation records from Devils Lake were used to determine the volume of runoff which could have been stored in Rost-School Section Lake. It was found that Rost-School Section Lake would not receive enough runoff from the 80% chance precipitation to maintain its control elevation of 2150 with either Alternative 1 or 2 in place. Normally a reservoir should receive enough
runoff to maintain its control elevation during the 80% chance of precipitation.

Slightly more inflow than evaporation occurs for both alternatives during the 50% chance.

Calculations were carried further, by allowing water to be discharged into Lake Metigoshe. A hypothetical case was assumed. Starting in 1955, a water balance was determined assuming that Rost-School Section Lake Dam was in place. Runoff, evaporation, and the resulting elevation of Rost-School Section Lake were calculated. Lake Metigoshe was then filled to its control elevation by discharging water from Rost-School Section Lake. This process was continued from 1955 to 1979. Rost-School Section Lake was allowed to be drained all the way to 2140 msl. During the 80% chance of runoff, a very small percentage of the volume required for Lake Metigoshe was available. With Alternative 1, 77% of the volume required by Lake Metigoshe could be supplied during the 50% chance. Alternative 2 could supply the entire demand. Very little water, however, would be required by Lake Metigoshe during this event.

Only during the very wet years is any runoff received from the upstream lakes, with Alternative 1. Therefore, nearly the same benefit would be obtained by only constructing the School Section Lake Dam and channels between Rost Lake, School Section Lake, and Lake Metigoshe. By eliminating the upstream channels, and only constructing the dam, cost of construction would be reduced from $390,000 to $100,000. This cost would include $95,000 for the dam and $5,000 for the channels. Benefits would be limited in either case, however. In order to provide any surplus water to Lake Metigoshe, Rost-School Section Lake would have to be severely drawn down during most years. Therefore, the quantity of
surplus water available would be very limited. On the average, enough surplus water would be available to increase the normal water elevation of Lake Metigoshe by 0.3 foot. During some of the very dry years, however, little or no surplus water would be available.

Whenever the normal water elevation of Lake Metigoshe is within 0.5 foot of its control elevation, the proposed Alternative 2 should be able to provide enough supplemental water to fill the lake to the control elevation. If the normal lake elevation of Lake Metigoshe is more than 0.5 foot below the control elevation, however, adequate water may not be available to raise the lake level to its control elevation.

Generally, Rost-School Section Lake could be drawn down during the summer of the year. For that year, the level of Lake Metigoshe could be raised to a suitable level. If the following year is dry, no supplemental water will be available. This is the time when Lake Metigoshe is normally low. Even with Alternative 2 in place, the elevation of Lake Metigoshe would be low.

From tests taken in May 1982, it was found that the water quality of these upstream lakes are poor. The phosphate and nitrogen levels are higher in these lakes than they are in Lake Metigoshe. Those nutrients may be due to water runoff from fertilized land. Many of these nutrients are retained in the wetland soils. Over the years, runoff will carry these nutrients downstream, into Lake Metigoshe. Although it is expected that the water quality would improve after the initial discharge, it still would not be better than the quality of Lake Metigoshe.

Supplemental water would not be available when it is needed the most. The level of Lake Metigoshe is not seriously lowered until the
second of two consecutively dry years. All the surplus water from Rost-
School Section Lake would have been discharged into Lake Metigoshe
during the previous year. No surplus would be available during the
second dry year. That is the period of time that it was thought that
this project would provide some benefit.

If a serious problem does not exist when the elevation of Lake
Metigoshe is less than 0.5 foot below its control elevation, then it is
recommended that neither Alternative 1 or 2 be constructed. Neither
alternative would be able to provide a great deal of water during the
years when Lake Metigoshe is much more than 0.5 foot below its control
elevation. This period would be the second of two consecutive dry
years.

If a serious problem does exist when the elevation of Lake Meti-
goshe is less than 0.5 foot below its control, then either constructing
School Section Lake Dam or Alternative 2 would at least partially
alleviate this problem. Due to the limited runoff obtained from the
upstream area, it is recommended that the upstream channels described in
Alternative 1, not be constructed. Neither choice will provide an
excellent solution to the entire problem, however. By itself, School
Section Lake could usually provide adequate surplus water whenever Lake
Metigoshe is less than 0.5 foot below its control elevation. During the
drier years, however, very little surplus water would be available.
Alternative 2 could almost assure being able to fill Lake Metigoshe
during those years when its normal water elevation is less than 0.5 foot
below its control elevation. Some surplus water would even be available
during the drier years, except for the second of two consecutive dry
years. Its large cost of construction, however, would seem to outweigh
The benefits. Only constructing school section Lake Dan would seem to provide the most benefit, as compared to the cost of construction.

Concerns will also have to be weighed.

Discussed further, before any construction were to occur. Canadian environmental impacts should be addressed further; before any construction were to occur. The environmental impacts would determine the problem is evident on Lake Methgosh. That decision would determine the board would be in the best position to decide when a water shortage begins the most familiar with the area, the Oak Creek Water Resource Board would be in the best position to decide when a water shortage becomes evident on Lake Metigoshe.
APPENDIX A

Preliminary Investigation Agreement
AGREEMENT

PRELIMINARY INVESTIGATION
BY THE
NORTH DAKOTA STATE WATER COMMISSION

I. PARTIES

This agreement is between the North Dakota State Water Commission, hereinafter referred to as the Commission, acting through the State Engineer, Vern Fahy and the Board of Commissioners, Oak Creek Water Management District, hereinafter referred to as the Board, acting through its Chairman, Lyle Knoepfle.

II. PROJECT, LOCATION AND PURPOSE

The Board has requested the Commission to investigate and determine the feasibility of supplying supplemental water to Lake Metigoshe from Rost Lake and School Section Lake during low water periods at Lake Metigoshe. This investigation shall be conducted on Rost Lake in Section 25, Township 164 North, Range 75 West, and Sections 30 and 31, Township 164 North, Range 74 West and shall include the channel between these two lakes, and the channel between School Section Lake and Lake Metigoshe.

The purpose of this investigation is to determine the condition and adequacy of the channels between the Lakes included in the study, and to assess the hydrologic characteristics of the Lakes to determine the water availability for diversion from one Lake to another. In addition, a preliminary design of structures required to divert this water and a cost estimate for these improvements shall be made.

III. PRELIMINARY INVESTIGATION

The parties agree that further information is necessary concerning the proposed project. Therefore, the Commission shall conduct a preliminary investigation consisting of the following:

1. Review of Field Surveys - to gather cross sectional and profile data. If necessary, new field surveys will be made.
2. Hydrologic Analysis - to determine water availability in the Lake.
3. Preliminary Design.
5. Conclusions and Recommendations.
Subsurface exploration and design work for the final design and specification stage shall not be made under this agreement.

IV. DEPOSIT - REFUND

The Board shall deposit $1,000.00 with the Commission to partially pay the costs of the investigation. Upon completion of the investigation outlined herein, upon receipt of a request from the Board to terminate the investigation, or upon a breach of this agreement by any of the parties, the Commission shall provide the Board with a statement of all expenses incurred in the investigation and shall refund to the Board any unexpended funds.

V. RIGHTS OF ENTRY

The Board agrees to obtain written permission from any affected landowner to allow the Commission to enter upon his property to conduct field surveys which may be required for the investigation.

VI. INDEMNIFICATION

The Board hereby accepts responsibility for and holds the Commission free from all claims and damages to public and private properties, rights or persons arising out of this investigation. In the event a suit is initiated or judgment rendered against the Commission, the Board shall indemnify it for any judgment arrived at or judgment satisfied.

VII. CHANGES TO AGREEMENT

Changes to any contractual provisions herein will not be effective or binding unless such changes are made in writing, signed by the parties and attached hereto.

BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS
OAK CREEK WATER MANAGEMENT DISTRICT

NORTH DAKOTA STATE WATER COMMISSION

Lyle Knoepflie
Chairman

Vernon Fahy
State Engineer

Date

Distribution
Board
SWC Project #330
SWC Accountant
SWC Director of Engineering

Date
APPENDIX B

Precipitation and Evaporation Records
## Precipitation at Bottineau, ND (Inches)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>20.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>12.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>11.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>8.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>6.55</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>22.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>11.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>9.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>18.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>18.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>17.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>5.01</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>20.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>17.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>12.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>10.52</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>22.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>17.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>18.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>7.66</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>26.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>18.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>8.34</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>25.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>6.32</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>22.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>7.30</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>28.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>15.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>17.83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>14.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>12.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>7.33</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>23.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Av.** 0.46 0.42 0.57 1.30 2.10 3.11 2.98 2.82 1.93 1.02 0.51 0.49 17.70
## LAKE EVAPORATION AT DEVILS LAKE+ AND LANGDON, ND

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1955+</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>25.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956+</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>22.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957+</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>5.31</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>22.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958+</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>25.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959+</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>5.36</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>25.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960+</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>5.12</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>25.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961+</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>6.36</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>5.69</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>27.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962+</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>21.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963+</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>23.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964+</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>27.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965+</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>24.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966+</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>23.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967+</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>5.64</td>
<td>5.43</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>28.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968+</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>23.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969+</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>25.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970+</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>5.09</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>26.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>5.47</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>26.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>5.53</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>26.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>6.10</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>27.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>6.27</td>
<td>5.43</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>28.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>6.41</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>26.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td>6.07</td>
<td>5.64</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>31.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>6.47</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>5.37</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>27.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>5.23</td>
<td>5.66</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>5.58</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>29.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>5.54</td>
<td>5.48</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>27.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>5.52</td>
<td>5.73</td>
<td>5.01</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>26.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Av.</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>26.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C

Water Quality Test Results
December 16, 1982

Paul D. Urban, P.E.
Investigation Engineer
ND State Water Commission
900 East Boulevard
Bismarck, ND 58505

Dear Paul:

Concerning the State Water Commission's Plan No. 330 on supplementing flows to Lake Metigoshe, this Department evaluated the proposal in the context of anticipated trophic response.

On May 10 and 11, 1982, seven of these lakes and wetlands were visited to conduct the cursory limnological examination and to collect samples for major cation/anion analysis as well as nutrient concentrations. The accompanying map and laboratory sheets identify the water bodies visited as well as the chemical composition at the time of sampling.

Generally, the water quality in these water bodies was poor, relative to the water quality of Lake Metigoshe. This project would result in an increase in the level of primary productivity in Lake Metigoshe, thereby exacerbating its eutrophic condition.

A quantification of increased primary productivity could not be projected from these data without additional information on hydraulic loading rates, shoreline erosion calculations, and total nitrogen concentrations.

At this time, it appears the benefits realized from an increase in water levels for Lake Metigoshe are not commensurate with the anticipated degradation in water quality.

In the event this project is transferred to the Commission's active project list, we welcome the opportunity to work closely with you in exploring alternatives for improving the water quality of Lake Metigoshe.

If you have any questions concerning this evaluation, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

Michael T. Sauer
Limnologist
Water Supply & Pollution Control

MTS:1re
Enc.

Environmental Health Section
Missouri Office Building
1200 Missouri Avenue
Bismarck, North Dakota 58501

-64-
METIGOSHE LAKE QUADRANOLE
NORTH DAKOTA--BOTTINEAU CO.
7.5 MINUTE SERIES (TOPOGRAPHIC)

LEGEND

- PROPOSED CHANNEL
- PROPOSED CONTROL OUTLET STRUCTURE
- PROPOSED DAM
- DRAINAGE AREA
  BOUNDARY
- BOUNDARY OF AREA
  NOT CONTRIBUTING
  IN MOST YEARS.
### Analysis Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Analysis Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Alkalinity (CaCO3)</td>
<td>224.</td>
<td>6/10/82</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ammonia as N</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>5/13/82</td>
<td>1230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicarbonate (HC03)</td>
<td>240.</td>
<td>5/13/82</td>
<td>000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calcium</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>5/13/82</td>
<td>000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbonate (CO3)</td>
<td>17.</td>
<td>5/13/82</td>
<td>1230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chloride</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>5/24/82</td>
<td>1300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Hardness (as CaCO3)</td>
<td>254.</td>
<td>5/13/82</td>
<td>000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>5/13/82</td>
<td>000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnesium</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>5/13/82</td>
<td>000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pH</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>5/13/82</td>
<td>1230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potassium</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>5/13/82</td>
<td>000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sodium</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5/13/82</td>
<td>000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Sodium</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulfate as SO4</td>
<td>76.</td>
<td>6/ 7/82</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Dissolved Solids</td>
<td>310.</td>
<td>6/ 3/82</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Phosphate as P</td>
<td>514.</td>
<td>5/13/82</td>
<td>930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cation Sum</td>
<td>5.93</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anion Sum</td>
<td>6.07</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>0.144</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Error</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sodium Adsorption Ratio</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conductivity</td>
<td>514.</td>
<td>umhos/cm</td>
<td>5/13/82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitrate as N</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>6/10/82</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*EXCEEDS EPA HOLDING TIME -- RESULT NOT VALID*
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Public Health Laboratory
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Analysis Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Alkalinity (CaCO3)</td>
<td>214.</td>
<td>6/10/82</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ammonia as N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicarbonate (HCO3)</td>
<td>246.</td>
<td>5/13/82</td>
<td>1230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calcium</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>5/13/82</td>
<td>000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbonate (CO3)</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>5/13/82</td>
<td>1230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chloride</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>5/24/82</td>
<td>1300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Hardness (as CaCO3)</td>
<td>273.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>5/13/82</td>
<td>000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnesium</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>5/13/82</td>
<td>000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pH</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>5/13/82</td>
<td>1230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potassium</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>5/13/82</td>
<td>000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sodium</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5/13/82</td>
<td>000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Sodium</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulfate as SO4</td>
<td>92.</td>
<td>6/7/82</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Dissolved Solids</td>
<td>320.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Phosphate as P</td>
<td></td>
<td>6/3/82</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cation Sum</td>
<td>6.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anion Sum</td>
<td>6.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Error</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sodium Adsorption Ratio</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conductivity</td>
<td>519.</td>
<td>umhos/cm</td>
<td>930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitrate as N</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>6/10/82</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* EXCEEDS EPA HOLDING TIME -- RESULT NOT VALID
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Public Health Laboratory
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Alkalinity (CaCO₃)</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>mg/l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ammonia as N</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>mg/l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicarbonate (HCO₃)</td>
<td>266.</td>
<td>mg/l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calcium</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>mg/l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbonate (CO₃)</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>mg/l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chloride</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>mg/l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Hardness (as CaCO₃)</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>mg/l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>mg/l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnesium</td>
<td>53.0</td>
<td>mg/l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pH</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potassium</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>mg/l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sodium</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Sodium</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulfate as SO₄</td>
<td>108.</td>
<td>mg/l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Dissolved Solids</td>
<td>366.</td>
<td>mg/l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Phosphate as P</td>
<td>6.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cation Sum</td>
<td>6.83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anion Sum</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Error</td>
<td>-0.37</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sodium Adsorption Ratio</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conductivity</td>
<td>591</td>
<td>µmhos/cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitrate as N</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>mg/l</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* EXCEEDS EPA HOLDING TIME -- RESULT NOT VALID
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LOG NUMBER: 82-2224  
STATION DESIGNATION: UNASSIGNED SAMPLING SITE  
STATION CODE: 388000  
COLLECTED BY: MIKE SAUER/DENNIS FEWLESS  
DATE OF COLLECTION: 5/11/82  
TIME OF COLLECTION: 0000  
DATE RECEIVED: 5/12/82  
TIME RECEIVED: 1430  
Comment: SHORE SAMPLE (4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Analysis Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Alkalinity (CaCO3)</td>
<td>197.0 mg/l</td>
<td>6/10/82</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ammonia as N</td>
<td>0.041 mg/l</td>
<td>6/10/82</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bicarbonate (HCO3)</td>
<td>241.0 mg/l</td>
<td>5/14/82</td>
<td>730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calcium</td>
<td>33.0 mg/l</td>
<td>5/13/82</td>
<td>000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbonate (CO3)</td>
<td>0.0 mg/l</td>
<td>5/14/82</td>
<td>730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chloride</td>
<td>2.50 mg/l</td>
<td>5/24/82</td>
<td>1300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Hardness (as CaCO3)</td>
<td>230.0 mg/l</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron</td>
<td>0.13 mg/l</td>
<td>5/13/82</td>
<td>000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnesium</td>
<td>36.0 mg/l</td>
<td>5/13/82</td>
<td>000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rH</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>5/14/82</td>
<td>730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potassium</td>
<td>16.4 mg/l</td>
<td>5/13/82</td>
<td>000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sodium</td>
<td>4.50 mg/l</td>
<td>5/13/82</td>
<td>000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Sodium</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulfate as SO4</td>
<td>63.0 mg/l</td>
<td>6/7/82</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Dissolved Solids</td>
<td>274.0 mg/l</td>
<td>6/3/82</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Phosphate as P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cation Sum</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anion Sum</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>0.095</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Error</td>
<td>0.90%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sodium Adsorption Ratio</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conductivity</td>
<td>464.0 umhos/cm</td>
<td>5/13/82</td>
<td>930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitrate as N</td>
<td>0.012 mg/l</td>
<td>6/10/82</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*EXCEEDS EPA HOLDING TIME -- RESULT NOT VALID*
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Analysis Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Alkalinity (CaCO₃)</td>
<td>264,</td>
<td>6/10/82</td>
<td>900 *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ammonia as N</td>
<td></td>
<td>5/14/82</td>
<td>730 *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicarbonate (HC0₃)</td>
<td>323,</td>
<td>5/13/82</td>
<td>000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calcium</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>5/14/82</td>
<td>730 *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbonate (CO₃)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>5/24/82</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chloride</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Hardness (as CaCO₃)</td>
<td>277,</td>
<td>5/13/82</td>
<td>000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>5/14/82</td>
<td>730 *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnesium</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>5/13/82</td>
<td>000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pH</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>5/13/82</td>
<td>000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potassium</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>5/13/82</td>
<td>000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sodium</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>5/13/82</td>
<td>000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Sodium</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulfate as SO₄</td>
<td>46.8</td>
<td>6/7/82</td>
<td>900</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Dissolved Solids</td>
<td>311.</td>
<td>6/3/82</td>
<td>800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Phosphate as P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cation Sum</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>5/13/82</td>
<td>930 *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anion Sum</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>6/10/82</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>0.053</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Error</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sodium Adsorption Ratio</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conductivity</td>
<td>528,</td>
<td>5/13/82</td>
<td>930 *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitrate as N</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>6/10/82</td>
<td>900</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* EXCEEDS EPA HOLDING TIME — RESULT NOT VALID
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Alkalinity (CaCO₃)</td>
<td>270.</td>
<td>6/10/82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ammonia as N</td>
<td></td>
<td>5/13/82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicarbonate (HCO₃)</td>
<td>330.</td>
<td>5/13/82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calcium</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>5/13/82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbonate (CO₃)</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>5/24/82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chloride</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Hardness (as CaCO₃)</td>
<td>266.</td>
<td>5/13/82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnesium</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>5/13/82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pH</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>5/13/82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potassium</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>5/13/82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sodium</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>5/13/82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Sodium</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulfate as SO₄</td>
<td>32.</td>
<td>6/7/82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Dissolved Solids</td>
<td>303.</td>
<td>6/3/82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Phosphate as P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cation Sum</td>
<td>6.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anion Sum</td>
<td>6.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>0.078</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Error</td>
<td>0.64%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sodium Adsorption Ratio</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conductivity</td>
<td>524.</td>
<td>umhos/cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitrate as N</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>6/10/82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* EXCEEDS EPA HOLDING TIME -- RESULT NOT VALID
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Alkalinity (CaCO₃)</td>
<td>209.5</td>
<td>mg/l</td>
<td>6/10/82</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ammonia as N</td>
<td></td>
<td>mg/l</td>
<td>6/10/82</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicarbonate (HC03)</td>
<td>256.8</td>
<td>mg/l</td>
<td>5/13/82</td>
<td>1230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calcium</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>mg/l</td>
<td>5/13/82</td>
<td>000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbonate (CO3)</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>mg/l</td>
<td>5/13/82</td>
<td>1230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chloride</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>mg/l</td>
<td>5/24/82</td>
<td>1300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Hardness (as CaCO₃)</td>
<td>205.0</td>
<td>mg/l</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>mg/l</td>
<td>5/13/82</td>
<td>000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnesium</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>mg/l</td>
<td>5/13/82</td>
<td>000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pH</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>5/13/82</td>
<td>1230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potassium</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>mg/l</td>
<td>5/13/82</td>
<td>000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sodium</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>5/13/82</td>
<td>000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Sodium</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulfate as SO₄</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>mg/l</td>
<td>6/7/82</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Dissolved Solids</td>
<td>230.6</td>
<td>mg/l</td>
<td>6/3/82</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Phosphate as P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cation Sum</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anion Sum</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>0.092</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Error</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sodium Adsorption Ratio</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conductivity</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>µhos/cm</td>
<td>5/13/82</td>
<td>930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitrate as N</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>mg/l</td>
<td>6/10/82</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* EXCEEDS EPA HOLDING TIME -- RESULT NOT VALID
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