

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE SARGENT COUNTY WATER RESOURCE DISTRICT
HELD ON THURSDAY, JANUARY 17, 2013, AT 1:30 P.M., AT THE GENESEO TOWN HALL IN
GENESEO, NORTH DAKOTA

Managers present: Jim Bosse, Mark Breker, Richard Engst, and Roger White. Also present: Chad Engels and Mike Opat, Moore Engineering, Inc.; Sean M. Fredricks, Ohnstad Twichell, P.C.; additional attendees on the attached sign-up sheet.

Shortfoot Creek Watershed Detention Study

Manager Breker called the meeting to order and introduced the water managers and others in attendance on behalf of the Water Resource District. He indicated this meeting was for informational purposes only and that the Board had not yet made any decisions regarding retention projects to pursue and further develop. Rather, he indicated the Board was seeking input from interested landowners in the vicinity of the study.

Manager Breker turned the meeting over to Chad Engels, and Chad reiterated that the Board is not currently developing a specific retention project. Rather, the Board is studying the possibilities of flood water storage in the Shortfoot Creek watershed. He explained the Board is studying possibilities and wants to engage the public to discuss their findings to this point and to determine if there is public interest in further pursuing additional retention study in this area. Chad explained the purpose of the study is to seek benefits for the Shortfoot Creek Watershed with potential secondary benefits in the Wild Rice Watershed.

Chad next explained the HEC-HMS modeling previously conducted by the United States Army Corps of Engineers. The Board has access to this HEC-HMS modeling and utilized it for purposes of this study, at no cost to the Board or Sargent County taxpayers. In addition, the Sargent County Water Resource District obtained cost-share from the North Dakota State Water Commission and the Red River Joint Water Resource District, and the local cost has been relatively minimal regarding this study.

Mike Opat explained the handout provided to those present. He explained the Board previously completed Phase I of this study, which was primarily an effort to identify potential sites for floodwater storage. The Board is currently in Phase II, and the objective of Phase II is to refine the sites identified in the first phase, to study additional sites, and to model sites to determine potential benefits and impacts. If there is interest in pursuing retention in this area, the Board will eventually have to conduct soil investigations to determine whether or not construction of retention is even feasible on the sites identified.

Mike gave an overview of what comprises the Shortfoot Creek Watershed, and he explained the location of the three primary sites identified, Sites 5C, 9, and 10B. Mike and Chad both stressed that these sites are simply concepts at this point, and the Board is still studying additional sites and these particular sites for feasibility purposes. Mike described the potential storage capacity of the sites identified and the concepts for each. All three sites are dry dam concepts; Sites 9 and 10B are gated concepts, and Site 5 is a pipe concept. By nature, the Site 5 concept would allow water to flow through the pipe during flooding conditions, but at a reduced level, while Sites 9 and 10B, as gated sites, would have the capability to hold water during flooding conditions until operated.

Mike next explained various hydrographs, including inflow and outflow for each potential project during various storm events. At this point, the Board has identified potential "reporting points" downstream where the Board could ultimately identify the benefits from each of the proposed sites. However, the Board is not at that stage and does not have that data yet.

Mike concluded that the Board would consider other sites if landowners in the area are interested and have ideas for other sites; the Board could additionally tweak these three potential sites presented; the Board would like feedback regarding whether or not there is interest regarding flood storage in the area; and if the Board receives positive feedback regarding potential flood storage benefits, the Board will have to study soils in the area to determine feasibility at some point.

At this point, Manager Breker opened the floor for questions. Various landowners presented a number of questions, and the managers and the Board's engineers provided answers and offered to meet one on one following the meeting. Manager Breker closed the meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 3:15 p.m.

APPROVED:

MARK BREKER – VICE CHAIR

ATTEST:

SEAN M. FREDRICKS, ACTING SECRETARY