

The meeting began with a welcome and with introductions. Pat Downs 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 the alternatives and have a detailed discussion of the remaining sites. The goals adopted 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. The alternatives developed for review include: 1) Dams and impoundments; 2) Alter ground water and tile; 3) Channelization/floodways; 4) Cropland BMP's as primary alternatives and the following as secondary alternatives: 1) Diversions and drainage; 2) Setback levees; 3) Restore/create wetlands, cropland converted to grass/forest, other beneficial uses - irrigation, etc. and 4) Increase road crossing capacity - ag levees.

The remaining alternatives determined by the project team at Meeting # 6 include: 6, 7, 10, 12, 22, 25, 26, 27, 28, wetlands, BMP's and Diversion. Alternatives that are neutral or need specific locations are ground water (tile) and road crossings. To determine which alternatives should be studied, the project team must determine whether the alternatives meet the purpose and need (or possibly in combination with another alternative); does it help with a priority problem area or does it get us to desired future condition (down to a 10yr -24 hour level).

The project team then proceeded to review and discuss each alternative.

Site 6 is located in South Dakota and as the Sargent County Water Resource Board has no jurisdiction in South Dakota, Site 6 was removed from the list. Some thought it might be good to leave it on to keep an open dialog with SD but was decided to remove. Also as a stand-alone project it does not adequately meet the purpose and need.

Site 7 is in ND and would be under scrutiny of the Corps of Engineers and State Water Commission with dam protocol. It is on the channel of the Short Foot Creek and provides storage and passes the water down the creek and could provide flood protection for the entire watershed. Site 7 will remain on the list as it does meet the purpose and need.

Site 10 is a small structure and could store water with the original outlet flowing through Park Lake. However, due to landowner suggestion, Alternate 10A would divert the water to the north and down the north side of SC Road #5 and flow into Shortfoot Creek thus, bypassing Park Lake. Project team members commented that there is a fishery on Park Lake and has public access which may change the way the water would be managed and have to go through USFW and NRCS. This site would provide benefits to Tosse Slough but none to Park Lake. Both alternatives (#10 & #12) will continue to be studied as they meet the purpose and need.

Site 12 would provide 4 inches of spillway elevation storage and 7.6 inches top of the embankment storage. Site 12A would be an alternative outlet from the impoundment to proceed on the north side of SC Road # 5. There was concern about this impoundment because the feeling was that the water all goes north and is uncontrollable. Project team members requested more information on Site 12 to see where the water heads to the west once it goes north and how far it backs up. There are options available to manage the level of the water and that is the next step on these sites. The various sites that are being considered were looked at individually

and also combined with other sites. Some of the project team members were unhappy that no one from Richland County Water Board has been attending these meetings as it affects much land in that county. Other team members reminded them that the Richland County Board was invited and showed up to only one meeting and left early.

The alternative summary for impoundments for consideration are: Remove, Alter, Outlet concerns for locations and any new locations?

Alt 22 is channelization and does provide benefits, however, the benefits are more local versus watershed wide. Therefore, this Alt is a local issue and landowners should make contact with the Sargent County Water Board if they wish to pursue.

Alt 29 is the diversion which is 7 miles long and begins in South Dakota. The diversion would need modification but directly impacts Lake Tewaukon so they would have to be on board before anything additional could be studied. It appears that the diversion would be very deep and wide but will be looked at further to get that information ready for review. The channel would also have to be moved to all be located in ND. How it may integrate with Drain #12 needs to be considered.

In summary are there any locations to look at further; any new locations; other comments; diversion-location-downstream impacts-managed or any new water management features and tools at the Refuge?

Also reviewed Sites 25, 26, 27 and 28 to consider for wetland storage and control. The wetland restoration/impoundment methodology - 1) Considered a preliminary alternative; 2) Site investigation factors are: a. Prior drained wetlands, b. Topography and c. Available storage. Land ownership is not considered and all sites are preliminary and modification/optimization can occur. The team noted it will be up to individual landowners to utilize available programs if they chose. It is noted that mitigation of wetlands may be needed and required for certain alternatives and local landowners will be needed to implement.

Crop Land Best Management Practices (BMP's) some examples are: 1) No till or reduced till; 2) Buffers; 3) Cover Crop; 4) Increased infiltration with reduced runoff and 5) Increased soil health and reduced erosion. BMP's/Conservation practices (land treatment) will be required upstream of detention projects funded by RCPP.

Tile Management - changes could be taking place with the State Legislature so information is uncertain at this time.

An alternative to increase road crossing capacity would need to comply with state statute stream crossing standards, other agencies and jurisdictions are involved, downstream impact concerns and where might this be applicable? Culvert upsizing and downsizing are other options with minimum design recurrence interval for various roadways. Nothing can restrict the road authority from providing greater capacity - larger culverts could be installed to reduce road damages.

Alternative groups can help attain goals and make recommendations to the SC Water Board. Items to discuss would include: wetland restoration/creation (decrease runoff and enhances environment-possible mitigation); cropland BMPs/grassland restoration (50% upstream of impoundments required for federal funding) - increases infiltration, decreases soil losses; tile, groundwater management; channelization (local); culvert sizing can aid in the conveyance to an impoundment.

The next steps will be to meet with the Water Resource District to update on planning, landowner meetings, initial design information, geotech analysis, detailed environmental review, economic analysis, final watershed plan, permits and funding.

Meeting #8 will be scheduled in November or December to review the detailed analysis results.