

RCPP Watershed Planning - Shortfoot Creek - Project Team Meeting #5 Notes  
3/2/2017

The meeting began with a welcome and with introductions. Pat Downs, Chris Gross and Josh Hassell from Moore Engineering, Inc. facilitated the meeting. A list of the attendees is attached to the original notes.

Today's plan is to review alternatives outlined from meeting #4 - the alternative/concept information. A worksheet was received which included 34 alternatives with HMS Modeling Results for a 100 year/24 hour event. The plan is to narrow the alternatives down to one.

A review of all players and the roles in this study was discussed and that the primary focus of the application is water quantity/flood damage reduction and the secondary issues are water quality and wildlife. Field interviews have been conducted and an in depth analysis will be completed after the final list of alternatives has been selected and initial design is completed.

The adopted goals were once again reviewed to include 1) Reduce agricultural damages; 2) Reduce damages to personal property; 3) Reduce damages to public infrastructure and transportation systems; 4) Maintain or enhance natural resources; 5) Consider bacterial and sediment reductions and 6) Consider upstream and downstream impacts. With these goals in mind, the list of alternatives was reviewed one by one and scored and ranked accordingly. Areas developed for review were - (Primary) dams and impoundments, alter ground water, tile, channelization/floodways and croplands BMP's and (Secondary) diversions and drainage, setback levees, restore/create wetlands, cropland converted to grass/forest, other beneficial uses-irrigation, etc. and increase road crossing capacity.

The team has to decide does each alternative meet the purpose and need; does it help with a priority problem areas; does it get us to desired future conditions (10 years - 24 hour levels). Landowner concerns does not rule out an alternative by itself but it will be noted.

The assumptions - concept level analysis - not design yet. The preliminary costs estimates have not been done; impoundments/detention typically cost \$2,000/acre foot; Channel improvements typically cost \$300,000-\$500,000/mile; Wetland restoration assumed to be similar in cost to impoundments; costs will likely be higher by the time these projects are implemented and cost-share at time of implementation is not known.

Each site was then discussed by team members and decided whether or not to keep them on the list of alternatives. At the conclusion of this discussion the following sites remain: 3, 6, 7, 10, 12, 13, 16, 17, 19, 22, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, and 30 and 32.

Looking ahead to meeting # 6 when all alternatives selected will be reviewed and narrowed down once again. In the long term, work to be accomplished between meetings will include: beginning design on alternatives (cost estimates, geotech work, mitigation plan, environmental review, modeling, land discussions and landowner meetings). Economic-benefit/cost analysis and environmental assessment will also be studied.

The next meeting is set for March 23, 2017.