

Red River Watershed Management Board

705 Fifth Street West Ada, MN 56510 Phone: (218)784-4156, Fax: (218)784-2015

Board of Managers

John Finney, Vice Pres.-Humboldt Farrell Erickson, Secretary-Badger Harlan Solberg-Greenbush Ron Osowski, President-Oslo Vernon Johnson-Clearbrook Daniel Wilkens, Treasurer-Fertile Robert Wright-Felton Curtis Nelson-Barnesville Jerome Deal-Wheaton Don Ogaard, Executive Director-Ada

RED RIVER WATERSHED MANAGEMENT BOARD MEETING

April 18, 2000

Norwest Bank, Barnesville, Minnesota

The RRWMB met on Tuesday, April 18, 2000, at the Norwest Bank, Barnesville, Minnesota.

Chairman Ron Osowski called the meeting to order.

Members present were: John Finney Farrell Erickson
Harlan Solberg Vernon Johnson
Daniel Wilkens Robert Wright
Curtis Nelson Jerome Deal

Others present were: Don Ogaard, Executive Director
Naomi Jagol, Administrative Assistant, Sand Hill River WD
Jon Roeschlein, Administrator, Bois de Sioux WD
Chuck Fritz, Administrator, Red Lake WD
Dick Nelson, Financial Coordinator
Brent Johnson, Engineer, Houston Engineering
Ron Adrian, Administrator, Middle River-Snake River WD
Charlie Anderson, Engineer, JOR Engineering
Jerry Bennett, Administrator, Wild Rice WD
Bruce Albright, Administrator, Buffalo-Red WD
Rob Sando, Administrator, Roseau River WD
Robert Kloubec, Buffalo-Red WD
Gerry Van Amburg, Buffalo-Red WD
Bruce Poppel, Ottertail River Watershed Improvement Project

Manager Nelson requested that the Deerhorn Creek Levee Project be added to the agenda.

Motion by Manager Nelson to dispense with the reading of the minutes of the March 17, 2000 meeting, **Seconded** by Manager Deal, **Carried**. **Motion** by Manager Deal to approve the minutes as written with minor corrections, **Seconded** by Manager Finney, **Carried**.

The Treasurer's report was presented and it was approved as read. **Motion** by Manager Erickson, **Seconded** by Manager Deal, **Carried**.

Manager Wilkens reviewed the monthly bills received. He distributed a one-page handout of monthly bills to be approved. The Board tabled the bills until Dick Nelson, Financial Coordinator, arrived in order to include his expense voucher for authorization. **Motion** to approve and pay bills by Manager Finney, **Seconded** by Manager Johnson, **Carried**. For further reference, copies of the bills approved are attached hereto in the Treasurer's Report.

North Dakota USGS Report on Study Initiatives

Greg Wiche, USGS-Bismarck, ND, discussed a study regarding the influence of wetlands and land uses on water flows. He stated that the purpose of the study is to develop a better understanding of the effects that wetlands and land uses have on the flows of water from small watersheds.

The study objectives included (1) Determine the precipitation/runoff properties of wetlands and small watersheds in the Red River Basin. (2) Develop a hydrologic model to simulate flooding and non-flooding conditions at the various basin sites. (3) Evaluate how results from the hydrologic simulation models of the various basin sites could be applied throughout the Red River Basin.

Wiche explained the wetland/watershed monitoring and modeling process. He stated that watershed sites have been selected near the Hamden Refuge in Minnesota and near the Lonetree Management Area in North Dakota. Additional sites are also being investigated. He noted that wetland water-level monitoring stations, water-flow monitoring stations, and weather-monitoring stations will be established at all watershed sites being monitored.

Wiche stated that data would be gathered to evaluate the roles of wetlands and weather on the production of runoff from the watersheds. Snowmelt and rainfall events will be monitored to determine the influence of wetland water levels and precipitation intensities on potential flood events.

Hydrologic models of the watersheds will be developed to further investigate runoff development issues from extreme precipitation events. The hydrologic models also may be used to investigate the influence of various wetland storage scenarios on potential floods.

Sando inquired whether the study reviewed the various types of wetlands. Wiche responded that the study includes both drained and undrained wetlands, however, the specific types have not been identified.

Wiche offered to update the RRWMB on an annual basis on the various studies and initiatives being conducted by the USGS. Ogaard stated that the RRWMB would appreciate being kept informed regarding USGS studies, particularly where the RRWMB is a financial partner.

Ogaard referred to the current funding request received by the RRWMB from the USGS relative to a current study. He explained that the contract is only for one year, however, the funding request is for \$11,250.00 per year for three years.

Wiche stated that the funding request is for a cooperative agreement which could be ended at any time. He added that the goal is to obtain five years of data.

Manager Finney noted his concern with funding a study for more than one year, and then when the study is completed additional funding is needed in order to publish the results. He added that a portion of the budget should include publishing the study results.

Manager Wilkens stated that the wetlands study could be valuable in resolving some issues which have been of concern. Wiche noted that the data set that is developed as a result of the study would be of assistance in answering questions regarding wetlands.

Motion by Manager Johnson to authorize signing the USGS contract, **Seconded** by Manager Wilkens, Discussion.

Manager Finney inquired whether the study is designed for 5 years. Wiche responded that the study is designed as a five-year study.

As there was no further discussion a vote was taken. Motion **Carried**.

Manager Osowski inquired whether the contract should be signed immediately or wait for a consolidated form for all the contracts the RRWMB has with USGS. Manager Wilkens noted that he had contacted the billing department at USGS and the contracts were in the process of being consolidated.

Motion by Manager Wilkens to sign the USGS contract, **Seconded** by Manager Wright, **Carried**.

Resolution of Issues on “WD’s Concerns/Questions Concerning the RRWMB

Manager Osowski referred to a handout prepared by the Region 1 Administrators relative to a discussion that occurred on March 16, 2000 at a special meeting conducted by the Buffalo-Red River WD (BRRWD), Red Lake WD (RLWD), and the Wild Rice WD (WRWD). He stated that several issues were discussed at the special meeting pertaining to the RRWMB.

Chuck Fritz, RLWD Administrator, stated that the BRRWD called the meeting. Manager Osowski noted his concern relative to including only a select group of individuals at the meeting. Manager Erickson inquired whether the meeting was legal. Manager Nelson stated that the BRRWD had discussed the issue with their attorney who had indicated the meeting would be legal.

Manager Wilkens suggested that a special meeting be scheduled to address the issues of concern. Ogaard stated that when the Governing Documents has been published, he had planned to meet with the individual watershed districts and these issues could be addressed at that time.

Manager Wilkens stated that the RRWMB could either conduct a special meeting or a board member and the Executive Director could meet individually with each watershed district.

Manager Wilkens noted that the majority of the issues discussed in the handout relate to communication. Manager Erickson stated that the board members of the RRWMB need to be communicating with their respective watershed districts. Manager Wilkens added that the Region I Administrators had discussed the importance of attending the RRWMB meetings in order to keep better informed.

Manager Finney inquired whether a spokesman from the group that met in Crookston was available to answer questions from the RRWMB. Manager Nelson stated that he participated in the meeting.

Manager Finney noted that it was difficult to determine whether the issues included in the handout were in opposition to the current position of the RRWMB. Manager Nelson stated that a major item of concern was the allocation of funds.

Manager Nelson stated that he had suggested several times that the RRWMB should have a complete annual audit conducted rather than the current financial review. Manager Wilkens responded that there are three different levels of auditing that could be completed and the board has always chosen the agreed upon procedures audit level.

Manager Nelson noted that the BRRWD board was concerned with the direction of funding relative to the proposed Prioritization Worksheet. He referred to the funding request for Turtle Lake that was submitted by the BRRWD that was denied for funding by the RRWMB.

Manager Nelson stated that a special meeting should be conducted by the RRWMB to address the issues of concern. Ogaard added that a central location should be selected for the meeting. Manager Erickson suggested conducting the meeting in Thief River Falls, MN.

Manager Johnson stated that the Executive Director, along with a board member, should meet individually with each watershed district prior to a special meeting being scheduled. Manager Deal noted that the RRWMB should meet prior to the Executive Director meeting with the individual watershed districts.

Manager Johnson noted that the RLWD would be available to host the meeting. Manager Finney stated that the meeting should be conducted at an independent location such as UMC, the Northland Inn, or the Best Western in Thief River Falls, MN.

Bruce Albright, BRRWD Administrator, discussed the background relative to scheduling the meeting conducted on March 16, 2000. He stated that discussions had occurred at the Legislative Breakfast among several member watershed districts of the RRWMB. He noted that the BRRWD scheduled a meeting to coincide with the Second Annual Early Coordination Conference and forwarded invitations to the WRWD and the RLWD. He added that the handout distributed earlier was a summary of the issues discussed at the special meeting. He noted that the handout had also been reviewed by all the Region I Administrators at their meeting conducted on March 27, 2000 at the Sand Hill River WD (SHRWD). He stated that the Region I Administrators agreed that the next step would be to present the issues of concern to the RRWMB for clarification.

Ogaard noted that it could be beneficial to meet with the individual watershed districts to consolidate the issues prior to scheduling a special meeting of the RRWMB. Gerry Van Amburg, BRRWD board member, concurred with Ogaard and stated that some issues of concern are of a substantive nature that should be addressed.

Ogaard suggested that the issues of concern should be reviewed by each watershed district. He added that the watershed districts should also discuss the type of meeting format that would be most beneficial.

Manager Johnson suggested that President Osowski should attend the meetings with the individual watershed districts in addition to Don Ogaard, Executive Director. Ogaard agreed that an additional board member should be present at the meetings.

Ogaard stated that the Governing Documents should be an excellent tool for the districts once it is published. Albright inquired when the document would be ready for distribution. Following discussion, the board agreed that a special meeting should be scheduled for the second week in July to discuss the issues of concern. Ogaard noted that the Governing Documents would be ready for distribution at that time.

Deerhorn Creek Levee Project Update

Bruce Albright, BRRWD Administrator, updated the board on the status of the Deerhorn Creek Levee Project. He stated that \$400,000 had been approved from the Flood Damage Reduction Work Group (Work Group) provided the project is under contract by June 30, 2000. He noted that the bid opening is scheduled for May 22nd with the project construction start date of August 15th. He added that the RRWMB had toured the project area last July.

Albright stated that a funding request was submitted to the RRWMB in 1994 and a motion was made to fund the project in the amount of 20% by the RRWMB. He noted that the project has not proceeded through the Step Process of the RRWMB and inquired about the status of the project.

Manager Nelson stated that the project has been scaled down since it was originally approved in 1994. Albright added that the district is preparing a revised cost estimate for the project and he anticipated the project cost would be approximately \$800,000.00.

Manager Osowski inquired about changes that had occurred with the project. Albright responded that the flood dam was removed which eliminated \$400,000.00 from the project costs.

Manager Finney inquired whether the BRRWD is proceeding with the cost estimates based on a 20% contribution from the RRWMB.

Manager Wilkens noted that there seems to be some confusion regarding the Step Process. Manager Deal stated that a board commitment has been authorized for 20% of the project costs and suggested that a Step I submittal be forwarded to the RRWMB as soon as possible.

Manager Erickson stated that since a cost share in the amount of 20% from the RRWMB has already been agreed to, perhaps the BRRWD should submit a Step III submittal since all the qualifications relative to Step I and Step II have already been met.

Albright noted that the ring dike constructed around the City of Georgetown last year was authorized by a motion of the RRWMB rather than proceeding through the Step Process. Manager Erickson stated that ring dike funding is considered a program rather than a project and the Step Process must be followed for projects.

Jerry Bennett, WRWD Administrator, stated that the WRWD had discussed the Step Process in conjunction with preparing the Step III Application for the Dalen Coulee Project. He noted that the Step Process seems to be geared toward flood retention projects. He added that although the Policy Manual of the RRWMB separates projects from programs, there is no process identified for applying for funds for these types of activities.

Albright noted that the BRRWD is committed to having the project under contract by June 30th. He added that a revised cost estimate could be presented at the next RRMWB meeting for consideration.

Manager Wilkens inquired about the detention area that was originally included in the project design. Albright responded that the detention area was constructed under a different project.

Manager Erickson stated that since the project has a completed engineer's report, it would be appropriate for the BRRWD to submit a Step III Application at the next monthly meeting. Manager Osowski inquired whether the 20% cost share from the RRWMB had been contingent upon the holding area being included in the project. St. Germain noted that although the holding area was included in the presentation in 1994, the dam was excluded in the revised cost estimate.

Motion by Manager Erickson to authorize the BRRWD to present a Step III submittal at the next monthly meeting provided that all the qualifications for a Step II submittal have been met, **Seconded** by Manager Deal, **Carried**.

“UNET Model” Issue Discussion

Manager Osowski explained that Bud Johnson from Alvarado is trying to obtain funding to complete the UNET model that was designed by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE). He noted that he had inquired about the model with Chuck Spitzack-USACE and he indicated that the model is no longer being used by the USACE.

He added that Johnson has been trying to obtain funding from the Middle River-Snake River WD (MRSRWD), however, there is a concern with funding a model that is no longer being utilized by the USACE.

Ogaard stated that the TAC had discussed the UNET model prior to 1998. He noted that it would be helpful if a recommendation was forwarded from the State of Minnesota, as well as North Dakota, relative to the modeling needs of both states.

Manager Osowski noted that Johnson has obtained resolutions from several townships both upstream and downstream and has forwarded them to legislators. Fritz added that he believes Johnson feels slighted by St. Paul since a bill had been introduced and was not passed.

Ogaard stated that he had discussed the issue with Kent Lokkesmoe-DNR and he had indicated that there was no benefit in completing the model. He added that North Dakota has the same position as well.

Ogaard distributed a draft letter in response to Johnson's letter for the board to review. Following board discussion, a few minor changes to the letter were noted.

Motion by Manager Nelson to forward the letter to Bud Johnson, **Seconded** by Manager Deal, **Carried**.

Consideration of Future Funding of Local Government Portion/Red River Basin Board

Manager Wilkens discussed the future funding needs of the Red River Basin Board (RRBB). He explained that the RRBB would need a portion of the funds from local entities. He noted that future funding would require a \$100,000 contribution from Minnesota and North Dakota local entities to match \$100,000 from state agencies from each state. He stated that a financial projection is being prepared and requested the RRWMB to consider funding the Minnesota local share which would be submitted at a future date.

Manager Wilkens reported on the status of the Inventory Process and noted that it is approximately 80% completed. He added that the Plan Management committee is developing a plan for basin-wide water management.

District Reports

- The Roseau River WD reported that the Roseau River Flood Committee/Mediation Group met on April 5, 2000. The group discussed proposed projects and will tour the proposed flood control project south of the City of Roseau at the next meeting scheduled for May 3, 2000.
- The Two Rivers WD reported that John Younggren was named by the Kittson County Board of Commissioners to fill the position on the Two Rivers WD Board of Managers vacated by the death of Harley Younggren. John will complete the remaining two years of the term. John has farmed small grains, beets, and raised cattle on his farm located along the Red River and the Two Rivers in North Red River and Hallock Townships in Kittson County. The District welcomes John to the Board of Managers.
- The Middle River-Snake River WD reported that the District is developing the plans for the construction of an additional 6 to 8 ring dikes under the existing cost share program. A total of 150 requests have been received regarding the program. Unless significant funds are made available, the District will not be able to offer the program to most of the applicants.

- The Red Lake WD reported that due to the dry spring, a large amount of time has been devoted to the wild rice grower's Clearwater River water allocation. The dry spring and low flows in the Clearwater River almost triggered a mandatory pumping shut down. Staff monitored the situation closely. Recent rain events in that area increased the water supply. Most growers are now at acceptable levels.
- The Sand Hill River WD reported that the USFWS conducted a public hearing on March 28, 2000 on the proposed two-year pumping extension for the Union Lake/Sarah project. Les Peterson, USFWS-Detroit Lakes office, gave a presentation on the history of the project.

Ned Euliss, Research Biologist, Northern Prairie Wildlife Research Center, U.S. Geological Survey, Jamestown, ND reported on his findings relative to the wetland in question. He stated that ducks prefer to feed in water approximately one-foot in depth, however, the wetland under study was determined to be eight feet deep. He noted that the water would be displaced in 3.93 days at the 20-cfs rate. He added that waterfowl production is at an all time high due to the high rainfall conditions which have produced a record number of wetlands in the region.

Paul Burke, Fish and Wildlife Biologist, Ecological Services, USFWS, Bloomington, MN discussed the process that is required to approve the 2-year pumping extension. Currently, the USFWS is doing an Environmental Assessment (EA) on the project and should the EA determine that more information is needed, an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) would need to be conducted. The question was raised regarding the responsible party for the costs incurred with conducting the EIS. Burke responded that the USFWS would be responsible for the EA, however, should more information be needed the Lake Improvement District would be required to pay for the EIS. He estimated the cost of the EIS to be approximately \$500,000 to \$800,000.

- The Buffalo-Red River WD reported that a May 22, 2000 bid opening has been scheduled for the Deerhorn Creek Levees project. Mark Aanenson, Houston Engineering, is handling the permitting activities which include the mitigation credits.

The District has scheduled a project team meeting for early May. The District is considering hiring a facilitator to conduct the project team meetings. At the next several meetings, a review of the Mediation Agreement will be conducted.

- The Bois de Sioux WD reported that the preliminary draft of the work plan for BWSR is currently being developed regarding the Overall Plan update. The District is finalizing the budget and timeline. The current goal is to review and approve the work plan, budget, and timeline at the regular monthly meeting scheduled for April 20, 2000 and forward the documents for subsequent approval by the RRWMB and BWSR for funding. The District anticipates the formulation of the Citizen's Advisory Committee (CAC) and the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) to occur in late May with the kickoff meeting to be held in June.

MADI/Willmar

Manager Wilkens distributed an informational handout regarding the Minnesota Association of Ditch Inspectors (MADI) meeting that was conducted on March 20, 2000 in Willmar, MN.

Drainage Research Forum/Owatonna

Manager Wilkens commented on the Drainage Research Forum conducted on March 23, 2000 in Owatonna, MN. He stated that a Memorandum of Agreement was signed between the University of Minnesota and Iowa State University regarding new cooperative efforts in drainage research.

Financial Coordinator Report – Dick Nelson

Nelson stated that the 75/25 cost share was not included on House side as of last month, however, it did manage to get back in the language. He explained that Representative Knobloch did not allow the language in statute amendment form which would make it permanent, but rather in a rider form which is only good for the biennium. He stated that the Audubon Society is not in favor of the language being included for longer than a two-year period, and MCEA indicated they are neutral on the issue.

Nelson discussed a hearing conducted last week during which Cheryl Miller-Audubon Society testified. He stated that a side by side was conducted which compares the differences in the Senate and House language. He added that Miller was questioned as to the increasing cost of projects that include environmental enhancements. He noted that there was also concern relative to FDR funding being utilized for environmental enhancements.

Nelson noted his concern relative to the 75/25 cost share included for only a two-year term. He explained that projects could be initiated and only partially completed before the cost share expires. He added that the costs of projects are anticipated to increase substantially and noted that local units of government would be responsible for the costs.

Nelson explained that he would try to tie the \$6.9 million to other projects in the Red River Basin. Ogaard added that should the \$6.9 million be attained, the difference to the RRWMB in recognizing the 75/25 cost share, as compared to the original 50/50 cost share, would be \$1.75 million.

Manager Osowski inquired about the status of ring dike funding. Nelson responded that no targets have been set as of yet. Nelson added that the Senate has included \$300,000 for ring dike funding, while the House is still at zero.

Nelson stated that he has been in contact with Ray Bohn and Ogaard on a daily basis, however, he requested a contact person from RRWMB with decision-making authority. Manager Osowski responded that Nelson could contact him by cell phone should the need arise.

Red River Coordinator/TAC Report

Charlie Anderson presented the TAC report in the absence of Dan Thul. He stated that the TAC had met prior to the board meeting and discussed the STAR value method. The spreadsheet developed by Ron Adrian to calculate the STAR value method was discussed. The STAR value method depicts the volume of storage and detention, drawdown, and gated and ungated storage. The definition of drawdown storage was developed by the TAC and determined that in the fall or winter in preparation for spring runoff, that part of the total storage volume available in the spring, but not during the summer, should be included in the operating plan.

The TAC discussed the Mercury Study. Brent Johnson had reviewed an open file report and determined that the report had no conclusion relative to the study.

The article that appeared in the Grand Forks Herald regarding the IJC Report was discussed by the TAC. The report had indicated that storing water in the basin would not be a solution to the flooding problem. The TAC determined the conclusions of the report to be very arguable.

Manager Wright added that he had attended a presentation in Fargo relative to the IJC Report. He explained that the report referred only to mainstem flooding. He added that the presentation also stated that storage on the tributaries of the Red River could be beneficial. Anderson stated that he believed storage on the Red River would be as beneficial as storage on the tributaries.

The TAC reviewed the project prioritization worksheet developed by the RRWMB. Anderson stated that the TAC needed to clarify some issues in the worksheet and would be forwarding recommendations to the RRWMB for consideration.

Executive Director Report – Don Ogaard

A) Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution

Ogaard stated that he had received a request to participate as a panelist on May 17, 2000 in Tucson, AZ at a seminar titled, "Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution." He added that an invitation was forwarded from CDR Associates which was the firm that facilitated the mediation process. He noted the seminar would be addressing the technical aspects of conflict resolution. **Motion** by Manager Wilkens to authorize Ogaard to attend the two-day conference, **Seconded** by Manager Solberg, **Carried**.

B) WD Resolutions for appointment of members to the RRWMB

Ogaard noted that all resolutions have been received from the individual watershed districts regarding their appointments to the RRWMB.

C) Progress on the "Joint Powers Agreement" Signing by member Districts

Ogaard stated that all member districts have signed the Joint Powers Agreement and forwarded the signature page to Naomi Jagol to be included in the "Governing Documents" publication.

D) Comments/Suggestions on the "Project Prioritization Worksheet"

Ogaard stated that the Wild Rice WD had forwarded a written comment regarding the Draft Project or Program Prioritization Worksheet.

Jerry Bennett, Administrator-Wild Rice WD, referred to the Governing Documents and noted that there is not a process for addressing FDR projects in the prioritization process. He suggested that a committee be developed to address this issue and forward a recommendation to the RRWMB.

Bennett added that a priority for the RRWMB should be to allocate budgeted dollars for projects or programs. He stated that a method needs to be developed for watershed districts to apply for funds for projects or programs that don't have a flood storage component. Anderson responded that the fact that some issues aren't included in the Governing Documents could indicate that they are considered a low priority to the RRWMB.

Ogaard stated that regarding budgeted dollars, each project should compete on its own merit with other projects. Bennett stated that should budgeted funds be allocated each year for project and programs, each watershed district would be able to compete at the same level.

Fritz added that when prioritizing a water quality program and a flood detention project, the competition should be based on criteria outlined in the Governing Documents. Deal noted that there is a need for differentiating between projects and programs.

Albright noted that comments would also be forwarded from the Buffalo-Red River WD regarding the prioritization worksheet. He added that the District has discussed the need for budgeting within the RRWMB.

E) Report on “Ottertail River Watershed Improvement Project” Meeting

Ogaard stated that he had attended an Ottertail River Watershed Improvement Project meeting and was very impressed by the participants. He added that Pelican River WD is not participating in the discussions. Manager Wilkens noted that the Pelican River WD has an excellent water quality program but noted that the District seems to be single focused on this issue. Manager Deal stated that he would discuss this issue with Ginny Imholte, Pelican River WD board member, at an upcoming BWSR meeting.

Ogaard introduced Bruce Poppel, Wilkin County Water Planner, who also attends the project meetings. Poppel stated that the participants include members from the counties of Wilkin, Otter Tail, and Becker. He noted that a challenge grant application from BWSR had been applied for and received in the amount of \$100,000 for the purpose of exploring water management for the Otter Tail River watershed. He added that a desired outcome of the process was to develop a comprehensive water management team to manage the water resources in the watershed.

F) “Application Procedure for Funding Flood Damage Reduction Projects and Related Program”/Proposed Additional Text

Ogaard distributed a handout which outlined an amendment to the originally approved text for the “Governing Documents” publication. Ogaard inquired whether the text should be included in the third criteria in the Step Process, or whether it should be a separate paragraph above Step III. Manager Wilkens suggested that the new language be inserted between Step II and Step III with the last sentence eliminated.

Motion by Manager Wilkens to adopt the proposed language, **Seconded** by Manager Solberg, **Carried**.

G) Proposed Executive Director Contract

Ogaard distributed a proposed Executive Director contract. He noted that he was originally hired for a one-year term but that when that contract expired, he was hired to extend the work indefinitely. He added that he has utilized the policy manual extensively in his capacity as Executive Director. The original contract was also distributed for review.

District’s Funding Requests:

1. Wild Rice River WD / Dalen Coulee:

Bennett distributed a brochure outlining the Systems Approach of the Wild Rice WD.

Bennett also distributed a handout constituting a Step III Application-Final Submittal for the construction of the Dalen Coulee flood damage reduction project. As a supplemental request, the Wild Rice WD also requested the RRWMB to consider an additional \$100,000 funding for the project. The District had previously requested \$200,000 which was reduced to \$100,000 by the RRWMB. Two hundred thousand dollars represents approximately 15% of the project costs.

Manager Wilkens inquired about the type of storage the project would provide. Bennett responded that the storage is ungated but designed for a 100-year flood.

Manager Wilkens inquired about the changes made to the project since it was originally proposed to the RRWMB. Bennett responded that the project had not changed substantially.

Bennett stated that the project provides more localized benefits than mainstem benefits. He noted that the purpose of the project was not drainage, but rather flood damage reduction.

Manager Johnson referred to the shortfall in funding for the project. Bennett stated that the shortfall would be discussed with the project team, with potential to go back to the FDR work group for additional funding assistance.

Manager Wilkens requested Bennett to discuss the proposed phases of the project. Bennett stated that he had discussed constructing the project in phases to the FDR work group. He added that the \$200,000 would be expended under a contract, with intent to complete the entire project in the future. He noted that the second phase would require a separate bidding procedure.

Motion by Manager Wright for Step II increase of \$100,000. The motion died for lack of a second.

Motion by Manager Wright for approving Step III, **Seconded** by Manager Deal, **Carried**.

The next meeting will be on May 23, 2000, at 9:30 a.m. at the courthouse in Hallock, Minnesota.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 4:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Farrell Erickson
Secretary

Naomi L. Jagol
Administrative Assistant