

MINUTES OF SPECIAL MEETING
CASS COUNTY JOINT WATER RESOURCE DISTRICT
CASS COUNTY HIGHWAY DEPARTMENT
WEST FARGO, NORTH DAKOTA
AUGUST 17, 2016

The Cass County Joint Water Resource District met on August 17, 2016, at 8:00 a.m. at the Cass County Highway Department, West Fargo, North Dakota.

Present were Gerald Melvin, Maple River Water Resource District; Jake Gust, Rush River Water Resource District; Michelle Anderson, Administrative Assistant; Mike Opat and Josh Hassell, Engineers for the Board; Pat Downs, Moore Engineering, Inc.; Mike Hargiss, North Dakota Department of Health; Randy Gjestvang, Red River Retention Authority and State Water Commission; Keith Weston and Josh Monson, Natural Resources Conversation Service (NRCS); Bruce Kreft, North Dakota Game and Fish Department; Jeffrey Miller and Eric Dahl, Cass County Soil Conservation District; Patsy Crooke, Corps of Engineers; Bailey Elkins; North Dakota Rural Water Users; Jason Benson, Cass County Engineer; and those whose names appear on the attached roster.

Swan Creek Watershed Project Team Planning Meeting

Pat Downs welcomed the Swan Creek Watershed Project Team (Team) and introductions were made.

The Team reviewed input and information discussed and presented at the previous Team meetings, the adopted draft *Purpose and Need Statement*, Goals/Objectives for planning outcomes or desired conditions, statistical information on flood damage in the Swan Creek Watershed and alternatives formulated based on the categories chosen for potential flood damage reduction solutions.

The purpose and goal of the Team meeting was to review, analyze and continue to narrow the alternatives to find potential solutions for flood damage reduction projects in the Swan Creek Watershed.

At the last meeting, maps were provided for the Team detailing problem areas identified. After review of data, each Team member identified the top three areas of concern by placing markers on a map of the Swan Creek Watershed. Mr. Downs reviewed the areas of concern identified by the Team.

The Team performed a comprehensive review of each alternative previously scored as primary or secondary using data from HED-HMS and 2D-HECRAS modeling results for

10-year, 25-year, 50-year and 100-year, and 24-hour preliminary inundation maps using historical data from 2009-2011 based on depths of .5 inches or greater in the Swan Creek Watershed.

Each member of the Team again identified their top three areas of concern by placing markers on a map of the Swan Creek Watershed. Mr. Downs reviewed the areas of concern identified by the Team. Mr. Hassell demonstrated a review of the primary and secondary alternatives to compare to the problem areas in the Swan Creek Watershed to identify if the alternatives meet the purpose and need for action.

Discussion was held on specific areas in the Swan Creek Watershed, the old Swan Creek dam, downstream impacts, potential mitigation, conservation and best management practices, wetland restoration, compensation available for landowners and the benefit of potential retention sites, dry dams, permitting requirements, water quality, Absaraka Dam, Least Environmentally Damaging Practicable Alternative (LEDPA), off channel solutions, and the timeline for the NRCS-RCPP watershed planning process.

Keith Monilaws asked how the alternative sites were chosen and the process for final determination. Pat Downs explained the process required by the NRCS, results from previous Team meetings and the goal to continue evaluating sites to narrow down alternatives. The NRCS requires written documentation for each alternative.

Keith Monilaws explained his family has lived on Section 27 in Empire Township for many years and he is not in favor of Alternative 1 or 6 to put water on his land. A family member stated even if his family were compensated, it would be very hard to purchase land in the same area. Duane Gulland stated he lives in the northwest corner of Section 27 in Empire Township and he does not want to see water on his land. Mr. Gulland stated the water table is very high and holding water will deplete the soil quality. Drain tile was suggested as a solution. Mr. Monilaws did not feel drain tile would adequately solve the drainage issue on his land. Craig and Char King own land in Section 27 and are concerned about the concept of Alternative 6. The Team compared Alternative 5 and 6. Mr. Morken stated the landowner living in the section where the concept for Alternative 5 is located is not in favor of the concept.

Mr. Downs explained each part of the process requires written reasons and criteria for keeping or removing a conceptual project site. Mr. Downs inquired several times, but the Team did not come to a consensus for Alternative 6 and it will remain on the list at this time. The Team determined more time was needed to evaluate the data to decide if the Alternative should be removed. The Team will evaluate the data on their own time, then review the data at the next meeting to make final determinations.

Mr. Downs and Mr. Hassell encouraged the Team to evaluate the data to prioritize the primary and secondary alternatives and determine if an alternative or multiple alternatives will meet the purpose and need to provide a potential solution for flood damage reduction in the Swan Creek Watershed. At the next meeting, the Team will analyze the data to make determinations on the final list of alternatives chosen.

Adjournment

There being no further business to be considered by the Board, the meeting adjourned without objection.

APPROVED:

Mark Brodshaug
Chairman

ATTEST:

Carol Harbeke Lewis
Secretary-Treasurer