9:30 Welcome and Introductions

9:40 Review and approve October meeting notes (Jerome/ Rita)

9:50 Discussion and feedback of result from small group exercise at conference (Rita/Kerry)

11:45 Lunch on-site

12:30 IWI Monitoring presentation (Danni)

1:00 Discuss and affirm FDRWG membership and committees

1:25 Budget Update (Rob)
   - Budget Status
   - Conference expense and results
   - FY 2019 Budget Draft Review
   - Schedule Finance Committee Meeting

1:50 Acceleration Grant Applications (Rodger)
   - Swift Coulee (Tony Nordby, Joel Praska)
   - Black River (Myron Jesme)

2:20 Updates and committee reports/ discussion
   - Legislative and funding related issues (Lisa/Rob)

2:35 TSAC update / membership / process to review papers

2:50 Watershed District Updates

3:05 Agency and Organization Updates

3:20 Other Issues

3:30 Adjourn
Visitor Center and Discovery Center
1. Should the RRWMB’s goals remain the same for the next 10 years and beyond? If not, what changes are needed?

a. Goals should incorporate groundwater quality, quantity, and sustainability
   - Goals should also incorporate biodiversity (wildlife, T & E, natural resources other than water)

b. Goals are great!
   - Need to focus on all the goals, not just water quantity
   - Need to prioritize the goals
   - Erosion and sediment control are important
   - Water quantity isn’t just about volume of water
     - Maintain flow during low flow situations
   - Need more specific examples of the goals – measurable
   - What is the problem we are trying to solve? – revisit this question often
   - None of the goals 1-10 mention natural resource enhancements
   - Focus is on large storage projects and implied main stem storage, but not seeing this. Annual damages and flood frequency priority needs to be reviewed for smaller events (not just 100 & 500 year).

c. No. Too many, not measurable
   - Short term/long term
   - Combine and define

d. Yes, priorities may change due to outside factors

e. RRWMB and FDRWG encourage and improve practices that include water quality at all times
   - More of a focus on tributaries and smaller systems than just the main stem – in regards to water quantity
   - Start focusing on local priorities

f. No. changes such as: eliminate accomplishments; timelines for objectives and goals; development of cost analysis; ability to conduct cost benefits; clarify measurement goals in regards to the stated RRMB – current sheet stats all only objectives

g. More emphasis on retention, long term water supply
   - Update criteria for Financial Support
     - More benefits than just to Red River
   - Floodplain zoning – Basin planning

h. Will evolve with time
   - Review at 5 year intervals
   - 10 years along time intervals
   - Transitioning to civic engagement
• Public consultation
i. Goals are good, purpose of this Board to unify watershed objectives
j. Adjust the project ranking (star) for watersheds applying for projects
• Increase presence at landowner education days to inform them of opportunities
k. Support natural resource enhancements in flood control projects and water planning
• Consider resiliency under changing environmental conditions
• New ways of maintaining water supply, including conservation reuse
• Promote soil health, as part of goals 6 & 7
l. Goals still apply.

2. Should the goals of the FDRWG remain the same for the next 10 years and beyond? If not, what changes are needed?
   a. A goal for more engagement and outreach to the general public should be added.
      • Include the need for multiple RRWB goals (as many as possible) to be reached with each project.
      • Plain language and condense these goals.
      • Connect RRWMB and FDRWG goals
      • Add measurability to NRE components if possible
   b. Where are 10 year event damages happening?
      • Which communities do not have 100 year protection?
      • Goal 1 will always be important
      • Technology has greatly improved for forecasting, so maybe not a priority like it used to be
      • Both organizations should focus on appropriate watershed management
      • Climate change needs to be included in discussions!
   c. No. Increase protection levels
   d. Yes
   e. The problems need to be documented properly, by the Project Team and WD before a solution is developed
   f. No, but with modification: what are the measurements taken to evaluate? (Human life); is this the responsibility of the RRMB to measure? (damage to structures...); needs evaluation, revisited; make recommendation to funding sources to merge/marry overall goals and objectives of other plans/initiatives (reduce flow to farmland) – how do we adapt?; include more economic value; can flood events handle more or better now than 10-20 years ago?; realistic threshold? Changes to farming practices – farmers changing their own methods; strengthening water management efforts on the farm – ethic; (Reduce damage to transportation? – explain how? No sub-objectives or goals; need more info; (reduce damage to water quality...) very broad – need to specify (reduce enviro damage...) this is a standard practice, does it need to change – No. This is needed for permits; (Reduce social and econ damage) how do we measure??
   g. Update of LTFS and combining with RRBFDRWG (set levels of protection)
• Current BFE
h. Continue to support impoundments and flood damage reduction
   • Needs to be reviewed in 5 years
i. Existing goals are good, consider adding goals to hold more water on land, add public outreach with policy makers, landowners, increased reliability of road system during flood emergencies
j. Proceed quicker on project
k. Consideration of non-structural land management practices to manage water
   • Strategies listed seem out of place in the goals section
   • #4 – add the word “systems”
   • #5 – instead of “reduce” replace with “improve”
   • #8 – “reduce” replace with “enhance”
l. Goals still apply. Consider soil health with additional economic study.

3. Considering the future, what are the most important water and resource management problems that the RRWMB and FDRWG should work on?
   a. Look for alternative water sources to take pressure off GW
      • RR Water supply project (LAWA)
      • Study/understand overall surface and groundwater budgets for efficient use of water for NRE and Agriculture, and industry
      • Increase involvement in water quality research, implementation, and funding (ditch retrofits, soil health, drainage water management, etc.)
   b. Water quality, watershed health, ecological restoration, adaptation to changing climate, long term project monitoring and management, river and stream health, real alternative analysis, compare 1 large vs. many smaller projects, review success of existing projects (economic vs. success of project), cost-benefit analysis
      • Long term O & M!!
   c. Outreach, marketing plan to public
      • More emphasis on objectives beyond flood retention
d. Quality and quantity issues
e. The goals of the RRWMB should be lumped or tiered: we tend to lose focus when there are too many individual goals
      • Drainage water management should be better utilized – BTSAC recommendations
f. Adaptation to climate variability; sediment load; water quality/quantity, preventative measures, increase velocity
g. Uniform standards for water quality throughout the Basin
   • Emphasis on soil health
   • Benefits assessment
h. Funding for projects
• Feasible for landowners to make change
  i. Water quality, hold water on land (farming practice, berm and outlet culvert), education, upstream landowners part of ditch maintenance
  j. Planning for increased frequency and intensity of storm events
    • Increase water retention
  k. Ecosystem health
    • Resilient system
    • Soil health
    • Stream restoration
    • Water quality
    • Showing cost benefit positive ratio
    • Drinking water quantity
      o Contingency plans
  l. Water quality, FDR

4. What types of project alternatives should the RRWMB support in the future?

  a. Stream restorations, use of alternative water sources, wetland restoration, culvert sizing
  b. The one that solved the problem as efficiently and effectively as possible
    • Multi-purpose means what? What should be considered? Appropriate for the problem? Multiple funding sources?
    • Is flooding always a problem? (crops are resilient)
    • Who is getting the benefit vs. who pays?
    • Sustainable projects with minimal O&M
  c. Define problem/need, tailor alternative
  m. Explore broad range of options
  d. More multi use project – BMP
  e. Any alternative that supports the slow release of “drained” water to streams. I.e. Stream restorations, ditch retrofits
  f. Preventative measures out on the landscape; diversifying from impoundments to smaller scale resource concerns
  g. Multi-purpose/benefits projects
    • Emphasis on systems – mimic natural systems
    • Comprehensive projects
  h. Soil health
    • Water storage and reuse
    • On farm storage i.e. tiling, soil health, conservation farming
i. Soil health benefits to watersheds (reimbursement, reduced taxes), support multi-benefit/purpose project, multi-purpose impoundments
j. Promote innovative farming practices – ex. Cover crops, drainage water management
   • Be open to trying new and different farming practices, educate!
k. See #3, 2, 1
   • Comprehensive, holistic practices that have multiple benefits
l. Drain tile studies and pilot projects for possible flood control, impoundments, and channel restoration

5. How should the RRWMB prioritize funding in the Red River Basin over the next 5-10 years?
   a. Require cost-benefit analysis for all proposals. Include environmental damages in the “costs”
   b. All of the above...
      • Should be reflective of which problem is the most severe, scope of problem
      • Need to look at Cost/benefit! Whose cost and whose benefit?
      • Is main stem flooding the most important issue always?
         o Need to consider other projects
c. Utilize studies and plans (WRAPS, 1W1P)
   • Finish what is incomplete
   • Showcase benefits of completed projects
d. Continue star and rating systems might tweak on future for water quality
e. Add “according to prioritized objectives”
f. Strengthen outreach to agencies, stakeholders, partners to familiarize the need of funding for smaller scale projects and practices
g. Water quality, reduced erosion, have easy to use scoring system, rather than political decision
h. Priority projects should focus on reducing the peak flow events
i. Ability to demonstrate multiple benefits
   • Higher priority
   • Longer term for cost benefit analysis
   • Consider the question, “Are local benefits more important than reduction in flow to the Red River?”
j. Prioritize on projects that are hard to find funding for. Planning stages of projects are good examples, impoundment projects.
6. Do you have other suggestions for the RRWMB as part of the strategic planning process or the FDRWG?

a. Involve/include SWCD’s in the FDRWG
b. Term limits on both
   - Manager requirements
   - Administrators should not be managers
   - Figure out problem they are trying to solve and where. Strategic plan!
   - Consider other projects i.e. fisheries improvements
   - Who should be involved in the strategic plan?
c. Include people other than engineers i.e. economist – agronomist – soil biologist

d. Consideration of Board membership: Staff vs. Board members
   - Formalize the mediation agreement within their (RRWMB) goals
   - Star value only applies to RRWMB goal #4. Is there other criteria for funding other goals?
   - Align criteria with objective

e. Engage others in the strategic planning. Not just hire a consultant
   - Have a formal process for funding opportunities
f. Outside facilitation to lead comprehensive planning

g. Do more education for streams
   - Intrinsic value
   - Encouraging citizens that it takes everyone
   - If you’re not part of the solution you’re part of the problem
   - More comprehensive water managing
   - More to water than quantity
   - Target the younger farmers and tech schools

h. Clearly defined project implementation monitoring, identify ways to speed up process to implement projects
i. Increased advisory role in Red River Basin Watershed planning
j. Diversity among the Board and Work Group
   - WD administrators should not have a seat on the Red Board. Managers should be on the boards
   - More outreach to the public
   - Review and update technical papers – incorporate new data/science
   - Invest in science-based strategies
2018-2019 Work Plan and Budget
International Water Institute
Flood Damage Reduction Project

I. Project Summary

The International Water Institute (IWI) will monitor the Klondike project area (Two Rivers Watershed) to collect baseline water quality information about the inflows and outflows occurring in the area of the fen, primarily along State Ditches 50, 72 and 95. A total of 5 monitoring sites will be established both upstream and downstream of the fen. The goal is to try and determine what effects, positive or negative, may occur if an impoundment were to be constructed as planned and to aid in the writing of the State EAW, Federal EA, and other permits that will be required.

IWI staff will lead and facilitate the Red River Basin Monitoring Advisory Committee (MAC) meetings, coordinate annual Water Quality Monitoring Training and Certification provided by the MAC to volunteers and professionals in the Red River Basin and coordinate the Floristic Quality Assessment (FQA) monitoring on a schedule as directed by TSAC. Staff will also participate in FDR project team meetings to provide technical assistance for project monitoring and development.

Finally, IWI will complete project condition reports as directed by the TSAC. The reports will summarize the FDR/NRE projects in the Red River Basin (project features, location, operation, etc.), format, and post all available monitoring data associated with the assigned project to the web.

II. Project Work Plan Detail:

The project goal is to collect data to:

1) Describe the existing surface water quality during baseline conditions at existing inlets (SD 72 SD95) and outlets (SD 50, SD 72, SD 95)

2) Describe baseline conditions of the surface water outlet for the existing fen area on lateral 13 SD 72.

Procedures, methods, and schedules are identified in the attached KCWRP #11 Fen Surface Water Quality Monitoring Work plan.

Objective 1: Monitoring and Data Management

Tasks

- Collect field data (up to 70 samples) for DO, temp, pH, conductivity, secchi tube, field notes, water level, and photos. Continuous field data collection at Lat13 SD 72 ice free months.
- Collect water chemistry (up to 70 samples) for Total Suspended Solids, Total Phosphorous, Ammonia Nitrogen, Alkalinity, Total Kjeldahl Nitrogen, and Potassium.
- Submit water quality data each year by December 1st to the project sponsor.

**Objective 2: Coordination, Wetland Monitoring, Training, and Technical Assistance**

**Tasks**

- Lead and facilitate quarterly or as needed MAC meetings.
- Coordinate with MAC members and provide annual Water Quality Training for basin partners.
- Attend TSAC, FDR Workgroup and FDR project team meetings as needed and provide monitoring planning assistance.
- Lead and facilitate the FQA monitoring planning process. Determine monitoring schedule and reporting details.
- Coordinate vegetative plant community monitoring activities.

**Objective 3: Project Condition Reporting (occurs as directed by TSAC)**

**Tasks**

- Assemble and maintain a central database for all FDRWG projects in the MN Portion of the Red River Basin.
- Complete project condition reports which incorporate all available monitoring data for the projects as assigned by the FDR Coordinator (Rodger H.)
- Provide reports in a web-friendly format and post to web.

**Table 1: Project Budget**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BUDGET ITEM</th>
<th>Objective 1</th>
<th>Objective 2</th>
<th>Objective 3</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Klondike Water Quality Monitoring</td>
<td>Coordination, Training, Tech, rFQA</td>
<td>Project Condition Reporting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>$15,252.00</td>
<td>$34,300.00</td>
<td>$13,400.00</td>
<td>$62,952.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rFQA Monitoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel Reimbursement</td>
<td>$2,268.00</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,768.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0.54/mile (6482 miles)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shipping</td>
<td>$280.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$280.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lab Analysis</td>
<td>$6,650.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$6,650.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>$600.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Supplies</td>
<td>$750.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$750.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COLUMN TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$25,800.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>$45,800.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>$13,400.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>$85,000.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**IWI Contact information:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address:</th>
<th>International Water Institute</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Renaissance Hall #110 650 NP Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fargo, ND  58102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Lead:</td>
<td>Danni Halvorson     Phone:  218-280-0515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E-mail address:  <a href="mailto:danni@iwinst.org">danni@iwinst.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal Contact:</td>
<td>Donna Kristianson       Phone:  701-231-9734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E-mail address: <a href="mailto:Donna.Kristianson@ndsu.edu">Donna.Kristianson@ndsu.edu</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Red River Basin Flood Damage Reduction Work Group

Membership – May, 2018

Jerome Deal - RRWMB (co-chair)
Rita Albrecht - MN DNR (co-chair)
Dan Wilkens - RRWMB
Jason Braaten - RRWMB
Greg Holmvik - RRWMB
Dan Money - RRWMB Alternate
LeRoy Ose - RRWMB Alternate
Theresa Ebbenga - MN DNR
Tamara Cameron - St. Paul District, USACE
Craig Jarnot - St. Paul District, USACE Alternate
John Jaschke - MN BWSR
Henry Van Offelen - MN BWSR Alternate
Jim Ziegler - Minnesota Pollution Control Agency
Jim Courneya - MPCA Alternate
Ryan Frohling - U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Laurie Fairchild - U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Alternate
Stephanie Miranowski – County Government Representative
Terry Guttormson - Citizen and Landowner
Eddie Bernhardson - Citizen
Gerald Van Amburg – Citizen
Chuck Fritz - Citizen Alternate
Debra Walchuk – USDA NRCS
Vacant – USDA Farm Services Agency
Jeppe Kjaersgaard -- MN Dept. of Agriculture
Bob Patton - MN Dept. of Agriculture Alternate
Shane Bowe - Red Lake Nation
Vacant - environmental/conservation organization rep.
Brian Lacey - Agricultural Representative
FDR Work Group Committees

Technical and Scientific Advisory Committee (TSAC)
Consultant Engineer Chuck Johnson
Al Kean (retirement) Christine Herwig
Nate Dalager Henry Van Offelen
DNR Engineer Chuck Fritz
Rob Sip Jeppe Kjaersgaard

Finance Committee
Rob Sip Jim Ziegler
Nikki Swenson Henry Van Offelen
Jerome Deal Dan Wilkins
Rita Albrecht Rodger Hemphill

Communications Committee
Rob Sip Henry Van Offelen
Nikki Swenson Jim Ziegler
Pete Waller Kerry Ross
Rodger Hemphill Rita Albrecht
Julie Goehring Nichole Bernd

WQ Monitoring Committee (ad hoc)
Danni Halvorson Rob Sip
Chuck Fritz Henry Van Offelen
Evelyn Ashiamah-Finch Jim Ziegler
Rodger Hemphill

Work Group Contact:
Rodger Hemphill, Red River Basin Coordinator
MN Dept. of Natural Resources
14583 County Highway 19
Detroit Lakes, MN  56501
Rodger.Hemphill@state.mn.us
218-846-8484 Office
Minnesota’s Flood Damage Reduction Work Group is working to ensure the full implementation of the 1998 Mediation Agreement. This spending plan identifies sufficient funds to continue a reasonable level of planning, project development, coordination, and oversight of the project team process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Item</th>
<th>FY18</th>
<th>FY19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Team Support</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>120,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Monitoring</td>
<td>95,000</td>
<td>95,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Acceleration Grants</td>
<td>23,000</td>
<td>23,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSAC: Coordination and projects</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>11,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Group Meetings and Conference</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications and Outreach</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>264,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>264,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION 4D(1). PROJECT FUNDING

Project Acceleration Grant Application
RED RIVER BASIN FLOOD DAMAGE REDUCTION WORK GROUP

Note to Applicants:
This application must be used to provide information to the Flood Damage Reduction Work Group that will be used to determine eligibility for project acceleration grants. This application and any supporting materials must be provided to the Work Group facilitator for distribution to the FDRWG at least two weeks prior to the date of the meeting at which the proposal will be considered.

I. PROJECT INFORMATION

A. Project Name: Swift Coulee/ Marshall County Ditch #3 Project

B. Project Proposer:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Middle-Snake-Tamarac Rivers Watershed District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>453 N McKinley St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact Person</td>
<td>Joel Praska</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>218-745-4741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fax</td>
<td>218-745-5300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td><a href="mailto:joel.praska@mstrwd.org">joel.praska@mstrwd.org</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other Partners/Proposers:

Provide the name of the consultant(s) that will be performing the engineering work.
Houston Engineering, Inc.

Note: If this project has been submitted for RRWMB funding, please attach a copy of the RRWMB Step I project information and skip to Section III of this application.

C. Project Purpose(s):

A brief statement of the primary project purpose and any secondary purposes or functions.

The purpose of this project is to provide flood damage protection to agricultural lands, public infrastructure, and private property due to a 10-year 24-hour rainfall event within the Swift Coulee/MCD #3 sub-watershed.
D. **Problem Area Description:**

Describe the flooding problem that this project is intended to address.

Flooding within the sub-watershed results in damages to crop land due to channel erosion, delayed planting, prevented planting, and prolonged inundation. Flooding also results in damages to some rural transportation systems and other public drainage systems. Flooding within the sub-watershed causes breakout flows to other sub-watersheds.

---

E. **Project Description**

1. Describe the project features that are intended to reduce flood damages. Attach maps and site plans, as applicable.

Project is still in early development stages with the Project Work Team. The purpose and need statement is currently in a draft format, but no project or alternatives have been identified at this time.

2. Describe the project features that are intended to achieve natural resource goals. Attach maps and site plans, as applicable.

Project is still in early development stages with the Project Work Team. The purpose and need statement is currently in a draft format, but no project or alternatives have been identified at this time.

3. If the project will be constructed in phases, describe the project components for each phase.

Project is still in early development stages with the Project Work Team. The purpose and need statement is currently in a draft format, but no project or alternatives have been identified at this time.
F. Land Ownership

List the site owner(s) and attach a map or photo showing the project site and landowners.

Project is still in early development stages with the Project Work Team. The purpose and need statement is currently in a draft format, but no project or alternatives have been identified at this time.

1. Is the land area affected by the proposed project to be acquired by permanent easement or purchase?

Project is still in early development stages with the Project Work Team. The purpose and need statement is currently in a draft format, but no project or alternatives have been identified at this time.

2. Describe the current status of land acquisition.

Project is still in early development stages with the Project Work Team. The purpose and need statement is currently in a draft format, but no project or alternatives have been identified at this time.

II. ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS

A. Project Site Characteristics

1. Land Use/vegetative cover

Describe the land use and vegetative cover of the project site (attach map).

Project is still in early development stages with the Project Work Team. The purpose and need statement is currently in a draft format, but no project or alternatives have been identified at this time.

2. Hydrologic System

Describe the principal watercourse involved, the drainage area, design discharges, known peak discharges and stages.

Principle water courses involved with this project includes the Swift Coulee and Marshall County Ditch #3. Portions of the Swift Coulee and all of Marshall County Ditch #3 are DNR protected waters. The entire Swift Coulee/Marshall County Ditch #3 sub-watershed drainage area is approximately 48 square miles. Houston Engineering, Inc. is currently performing an existing conditions hydraulic/hydrologic model of the Swift Coulee and Marshall County Ditch #3. Preliminary results are nearing completion, but design discharges, peak discharges and stages are unknown yet at this time.
3. Soil Characteristics

Describe the soils on the project site or attach a soils map showing the project site.

See attached map.

4. Fisheries and Wildlife Habitat, Rare Ecological Features

Describe fish and wildlife habitat, rare species, recreational resources in the area to be affected directly or indirectly by the project.

Minimal fish, wildlife habitat, or recreational resources will be affected from the outcome of this project. The majority of the 48-square mile sub-watershed is privately owned and in agriculture. See the attached endangered species map.

5. Water Quality

Describe existing water quality characteristics of the project area and any positive or negative impacts.

Project is still in early development stages with the Project Work Team. Purpose and need has been drafted, but no project or alternatives have been identified at this time.

B. Effects on Hydrology and Stream Flow

Describe the project’s expected effects on hydrology and channel stability. Attach before and after hydrograph for principal stream(s).

Project is still in early development stages with the Project Work Team. Purpose and need has been drafted, but no project or alternatives have been identified at this time.

C. Effects on Natural Features, Fish and Wildlife Habitat

Describe the project’s expected impacts on fish and wildlife habitat, rare species, and other natural features, recreational resources.

Project is still in early development stages with the Project Work Team. Purpose and need has
been drafted, but no project or alternatives have been identified at this time.

D. Effects on Flooding and Flood Damages

Describe the location and size of the area to be protected by the proposed project. Attach a map showing flood damage reduction area.

Project is still in early development stages with the Project Work Team. Purpose and need has been drafted, but no project or alternatives have been identified at this time.

III. PROJECT PHASING AND FUNDING PLAN

A. Estimated total project cost $6,500,000

B. List the estimated project phases and the estimated contribution by each funding source for each phase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Phase</th>
<th>State FDR (bonding)</th>
<th>State FDR (gen. fund)</th>
<th>RRWMB</th>
<th>WD</th>
<th>Federal (specify)</th>
<th>Other (specify)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning Development</td>
<td>$0.02M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.18M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Engineering, Design</td>
<td>$0.10M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.10M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permitting, Env. Review</td>
<td>$0.05M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.05M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Design</td>
<td>$0.15M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.15M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Acquisition</td>
<td>$0.75M</td>
<td>$0.40M</td>
<td>$0.283M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$2.50M</td>
<td>$1.467M</td>
<td>$0.30M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. Project Schedule

Estimated project start date: May 1, 2017 (Project Team Initiated)

Estimated project completion date: December 31, 2022

IV. APPROVALS AND PERMITS

A. Required Permits and Approvals
List all required permits and approvals and indicate the status of each.

Project is still in early development stages with the Project Work Team. Purpose and need has been drafted, but no project or alternatives have been identified at this time.

B. Environmental Review (check ALL that apply)

State: □ EAW * □ EIS *

Federal: □ EA * □ EIS *

* For environmental review documents already completed list the type of document and the date of negative declaration, FONSI, or EIS adequacy determination.

C. Watershed Project Team Approval

1. Indicate the Step completed for this project as listed in 3B: Project Implementation Process and Procedures (Section 3 of the Project Team Handbook).

   Step: 1

2. Does this project as described above have the consensus approval of the project team?

   □ No: If no, what steps have been taken to achieve consensus?

   No consensus approval form has been filled out at this time, but the PWT is in favor of investigating projects within the Swift Coulee/MCD #3 sub-watershed.

   □ Yes: If Yes, please attach project team consent form.

3. List and briefly describe the alternatives considered by the project team.

Project is still in early development stages with the Project Work Team. Purpose and need has been drafted, but no project or alternatives have been identified at this time.

D. Red River Watershed Management Board Approval

For projects that will be partially funded by the Red River Watershed Management Board indicate which Step approval has been granted by that Board. (See RRWMB Governing Documents, Section 4.)

   Step: None
E. Watershed District Board Approval

Indicate date of approval by the watershed district board of managers: May 1, 2017

F. Consistency with Watershed Management Plan

1. Is the project consistent with the local watershed management plan?
   \[X\] Yes \[\_\_] No

2. Is the project consistent with other applicable water management plans?
   \[X\] Yes \[\_\_] No

V. ATTACHMENTS (as applicable, list all attachments here)

1. Swift Coulee/MCD #3 Sub-watershed Site Map
2. Soils Map
3. Endangered Species Map
SECTION 4D(1). PROJECT FUNDING

Project Acceleration Grant Application
RED RIVER BASIN FLOOD DAMAGE REDUCTION WORK GROUP

Note to Applicants:
This application must be used to provide information to the Flood Damage Reduction Work Group that will be used to determine eligibility for project acceleration grants. This application and any supporting materials must be provided to the Work Group facilitator for distribution to the FDRWG at least two weeks prior to the date of the meeting at which the proposal will be considered.

I. PROJECT INFORMATION

A. Project Name: Black River Impoundment Project – RLWD Project #176

B. Project Proposer:
   Name: Red Lake Watershed District
   Address: 1000 Pennington Ave. South
   Contact Person: Myron Jesme (Administrator)
   Phone: 218-681-5800
   Fax: 218-681-5839
   E-mail: Myron.jesme@redlakewatershed.org

Other Partners/Proposers:

Provide the name of the consultant(s) that will be performing the engineering work.
Houston Engineering, Inc.

Note: If this project has been submitted for RRWMB funding, please attach a copy of the RRWMB Step I project information and skip to Section III of this application.

C. Project Purpose(s):
   A brief statement of the primary project purpose and any secondary purposes or functions.
D.  Problem Area Description:
   Describe the flooding problem that this project is intended to address.

E.  Project Description
1. Describe the project features that are intended to reduce flood damages. Attach maps and site plans, as applicable.

2. Describe the project features that are intended to achieve natural resource goals. Attach maps and site plans, as applicable.

3. If the project will be constructed in phases, describe the project components for each phase.

F.  Land Ownership
List the site owner(s) and attach a map or photo showing the project site and landowners.
1. Is the land area affected by the proposed project to be acquired by permanent easement or purchase?

2. Describe the current status of land acquisition.

II. ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS
   A. Project Site Characteristics
      1. Land Use/vegetative cover
         Describe the land use and vegetative cover of the project site (attach map).

      2. Hydrologic System
         Describe the principal watercourse involved, the drainage area, design discharges, known peak discharges and stages.

   3. Soil Characteristics
      Describe the soils on the project site or attach a soils map showing the project site.

   4. Fisheries and Wildlife Habitat, Rare Ecological Features
Describe fish and wildlife habitat, rare species, recreational resources in the area to be affected directly or indirectly by the project.

5. Water Quality

Describe existing water quality characteristics of the project area and any positive or negative impacts.

B. Effects on Hydrology and Stream Flow

Describe the project’s expected effects on hydrology and channel stability. Attach before and after hydrograph for principal stream(s).

C. Effects on Natural Features, Fish and Wildlife Habitat

Describe the project’s expected impacts on fish and wildlife habitat, rare species, and other natural features, recreational resources.

D. Effects on Flooding and Flood Damages

Describe the location and size of the area to be protected by the proposed project. Attach a map showing flood damage reduction area.
III. PROJECT PHASING AND FUNDING PLAN

A. Estimated total project cost
$7,100,000

B. List the estimated project phases and the estimated contribution by each funding source for each phase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Phase</th>
<th>State FDR (bonding)</th>
<th>State FDR (gen. fund)</th>
<th>RRWMB</th>
<th>WD</th>
<th>Federal (specify)</th>
<th>Other (specify)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.050M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Development</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.020M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.080M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.750M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permitting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.100M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Acquisition</td>
<td>$1.550M</td>
<td>$0.366M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.184M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$2.000M</td>
<td>$2.000M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. Project Schedule

Estimated project start date: 12/1/16 (Begin Project Development)

Estimated project completion date: 10/1/20 (End of Construction)

IV. APPROVALS AND PERMITS

A. Required Permits and Approvals

List all required permits and approvals and indicate the status of each.

See page 18 of the Step 2 Submittal for required permits. Current permits in process of creating and submitting:

Federal: USACE – Section 404
State: MnDNR – Dam Safety
Mn Historical Society – Approval
Local: County/Township – WCA Permit (for wetland impacts) & Highway Construction (Culvert Upgrades)

B. Environmental Review (check ALL that apply)

State: [ ] EAW [ ] EIS

Federal: [ ] EA [ ] EIS

* For environmental review documents already completed list the type of document and the date of
negative declaration, FONSI, or EIS adequacy determination.

See Appendix C of the Step 2 Submittal for Environmental Review Need Determination.

C. Watershed Project Team Approval

1. Indicate the Step completed for this project as listed in 3B: Project Implementation Process and Procedures (Section 3 of the Project Team Handbook).

   Step: 4

2. Does this project as described above have the consensus approval of the project team?

   Yes: If Yes, please attach project team consent form.

   No: If no, what steps have been taken to achieve consensus?

   Project Team is in favor, but consensus from still needs to be signed.

3. List and briefly describe the alternatives considered by the project team.

   See attached alternative maps in the Step 2 Submittal Document. Figures 2 through 5.

D. Red River Watershed Management Board Approval

For projects that will be partially funded by the Red River Watershed Management Board indicate which Step approval has been granted by that Board. (See RRWMB Governing Documents, Section 4.)

   Step: 2

E. Watershed District Board Approval

Indicate date of approval by the watershed district board of managers:

F. Consistency with Watershed Management Plan

1. Is the project consistent with the local watershed management plan?

   X Yes    No

2. Is the project consistent with other applicable water management plans?

   X Yes    No

V. ATTACHMENTS (as applicable, list all attachments here)

1. RRWMB Step 2 Submittal
2. RRWMB Step 2 Amendment (Technical Memorandum)
3. Proposed Project Map
1998 Mediation Agreement is the product of eight months of consensus-based, mediated negotiations by the Red River Basin (RRB) Flood Damage Reduction Work Group (“Work Group”). It responded to a mandate from the Minnesota Legislature to resolve gridlock over state permitting of flood damage reduction projects in the RRB.

The agreement was intended as the framework for a new, collaborative approach to implementing both flood damage reduction and natural resource protection and enhancement in the RRB in ways that will benefit all Minnesota’s citizens.

The keys to this approach are clearly identified goals, comprehensive watershed planning, early consultation and collaboration on flood damage reduction projects among stakeholders, and a cooperative approach to permitting of those projects.

Mediation Agreement Weblink: 
http://www.rrwmb.org/FDRWG/FDRAGMT.pdf

Contact Information: 
Red River Watershed Management Board 
115th Ave East Suite B 
Ada, MN 56510 
Phone: 218-784-9500 
Fax: 218-784-9502

Robert L. Sip 
Executive Director 
Rob.sip@rrwmb.org 
218-474-1084 (Cell)

The Flood Damage Reduction Work Group has relied on a Technical and Scientific Advisory Committee (TSAC) to provide technical and scientific information and analysis in support of the mediation effort. The TSAC represents a range of disciplines, including hydrology, engineering, ecology, soils science, and economics.

TSAC has developed a series of working papers to address key topics associated with flood damage reduction and modeled the use of different strategies for flood damage reduction. TSAC has completed its work based on consensus, and its work products reflect consensus recommendations to the Work Group. This document includes a list of the technical papers that have been developed since 1998.


Technical Paper No. 4 Siting and Design of Impoundments for Flood Control in the Red River Basin - Anderson and Lewis (December 8, 1998).


Technical Paper No. 7 Flood Frequency Based Design - St. Germain and Woodbury (December 8, 1998).


**Watershed District Reports**  
**October 16, 2018 - FDR Work Group Meeting**

**Bois de Sioux**  
**North Ottawa**

The District is working with the Department of Natural Resources on a long term operations agreement. At issue is the amount of interior acres that are taken out of agricultural production. In 2018, about 1/3 of the interior acres are leased for traditional agriculture. However, these agricultural cells were flooded for a short duration prior to planting to provide spring migratory bird habitat and other natural resources benefits. They will also serve as part of the refuge system for loafing and feeding areas after harvest. Pool C, which constitutes another 1/3 of the impoundment, is not farmed and provides several natural resources benefits as well as summer flood risk reduction benefits to the area. The final 1/3 of the project consists of two cells that will hold water through the summer and two cells that were planted to small grain and the stubble will be flooded in late summer after harvest. This portion of the impoundment will provide both resting and feeding opportunities for waterfowl and other species. The Department of Natural Resources takes issue with the 2018 management plan and therefore the Bois de Sioux Watershed District is working with the DNR on a long term operation plan that will be initiated in 2019.

**Redpath Impoundment**

The Redpath Project continues to advance through project development. At this time final construction plans and specifications are being developed. Several key hydraulic features have been significantly modified from the original engineering design. The District is working with the Department of Natural Resources on these changes. It is anticipated that final permitting will be wrapped up in 2018 and the first phase of construction will start in the spring of 2019. This schedule is contingent on State of Minnesota FDR funding. To date, all available Red River Watershed Management Board eligible dollars have been spent and all remaining State FDR dollars will have been spent by the 3rd quarter of 2018. The last State FDR appropriation to the Redpath Project was in 2014.

**1W1P**

The Bois de Sioux and Mustinka River Watersheds have been combined to organize and coordinate a 1W1Plan comprehensive plan. The entities involved in this plan include: the Bois de Sioux Watershed District; Big Stone, Grant, Otter Tail, Stevens, Traverse, and Wilkin counties; Big Stone, Grant, Otter Tail, Stevens, Traverse, and Wilkin soil and water conservation districts. The Bois de Sioux Watershed will act as the fiscal host. An RFQ will likely be released this summer to solicit for a plan consultant.

**Bois de Sioux Direct RCPP**

The Bois de Sioux Direct subwatershed is nearing the submittal of the 4th review point to NRCS. This review point discusses the initial characteristics of the 4 alternatives chosen for further review and the financial consequences of the no action alternative or known as the do nothing alternative. USACE Concurrence point #2 was previously approved by the USACE and concurrence point #3 should be submitted this Fall. The detailed environmental review will be developed this summer. The project team will meet in the late summer to review the details of the alternatives and make their recommendation of the preferred alternative(s) to the BsDWD Board.
Traverse County Ditch #52 Outlet Stabilization

The District is currently developing Phase 1 of the Traverse County Ditch #52 Outlet Stabilization Project. Preliminary meetings have been held with DNR and a design concept has been identified. The project will stabilize the channel between Lake Traverse and State Hwy 27. This will be accomplished through the use of rock riffles that will allow for fish passage along with channel side slope flattening. Once the preliminary construction plan and estimate of cost is complete, the project will be advanced through permitting and funding.

103E Ditch Retrofits

The District completed its first 103E ditch retrofit in 2017. The project occurred on Traverse County Ditch #37 and consisted of flattening the ditch slopes, constructing a berm adjacent to the ditch, installing side inlet culverts and riprap, installing ditch buffers, and completing a redetermination of benefits. The project qualified for a BWSR clean water grant. The Wilkin County Ditch #8 retrofit will be completed in 2018. This project was also awarded BWSR clean water funds and was bid in April of 2018. About a half dozen more ditch systems are currently under development and there is significant concern regarding future available BWSR clean water funds for these projects.

Buffalo – Red

Since our last official report (November 17, 2017), the Buffalo-Red River Watershed District (BRRWD) has held three (3) Project Team (PT) meetings; December 14th, February 22nd, and April 26th. We also participated in the March Annual Conference held in Moorhead.

Three of our active planning projects include Stony Creek, Barnesville Township, and the South Branch of the Buffalo River Restoration in Wilkin County. Concurrence Point No. 3 has been approved by the Army Corps of Engineers (COE) for Stony and Barnesville. The easement value calculator has been finished by Dr. Steven Taff, Professor Emeritus, Department of Applied Economics, University of Minnesota. The “calculator” takes into account land types, types of crops planted, current effects of flood damages, and proposed use of the land after Watershed easement. We also continue to discuss overall project benefits, benefit/cost ratios, and Dr. Taff’s model provides some insight in that regard.

We’re getting real close (week of May 14th) to mailing out the temporary easement and option to purchase permanent easement documents for the Wolverton Creek Restoration and Sediment Reduction Project. A landowner meeting was held on April 13th, and they are ready to sign the required paperwork. Permanent easements will either by obtained by the BRRWD (using RIM rates) or through the Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program (CREP). Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council (LSOHC) approved an amendment to our Accomplishment Plan allowing us to use Reinvest in Minnesota (RIM) rates to acquire the permanent easements (crop and non-crop). We also signed an Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the Minnesota Board of Water and Soil Resources (BWSR) which allows us to maintain the easement area acquired under CREP as a project expense. Hopes are that bids can be opened by the June 11th Watershed Meeting.
For the One Watershed, One Plan (1W1P) the Policy Committee (PC) has been formed and they have met twice, at their first meeting, they approved the Bylaws. At their second meeting, they approved the Workplan, Budget, and Schedule, which has been forwarded to BWSR for approved. The Planning Team (PT) has also been formed, and have met once. We are now working on forming the Advisory Committee (technical/citizen). One of the first steps after BWSR approves the grant contract will be notifying other plan review authorities and other stakeholders about the process and gathering watershed information. This information will be used to identify areas to be addressed in the plan and completing an outline of what the plan will contain. We have until 12/31/19 to complete the process. Houston Engineering, Inc. (HEI) has been hired as the plan consultant.

The BRRWD has been recommended for a Clean Water Act Section 319 grant through the EPA for $498,000, funds should be available in the spring of 2019. A workplan has been submitted. The targeted project area involves the Buffalo River’s headwater’s in Becker County. The project targets this area impaired for sediment. Planned water quality BMPs include: Water and Sediment Control Basins (WASCOBS), Grade Stabilization structures, Grassed waterways, and vegetated buffers.

The BRRWD continues to work on their 90+ drainage systems to insure compliance with the 2015 Buffer Rule by 11/01/18. This has been a somewhat complicated process; surveying the existing ditch use in relationship to legal boundary lines, research of the ditch records to determine the existing right-of-way (R/W), determining the new R/W requirements, preparing Damage Reports and Property Owners’ Statements, holding hearings to acquire the needed R/W, payment for the needed R/W (new and existing not legally acquired), staking of the R/W, seeding, permanent posting, and recording of the R/W plats. The BRRWD has also been selected by BWSR for a $50,000 Drainage Records Modernization Grant.

The search has begun for a new Administrative Trainee, that can hopefully work with Administrator Albright over the next 8-24 months to eventually take over the position when Albright retires.

**Wild Rice**

Goose Prairie has initiated the formal start of a project following the public hearing held in Ulen, MN.

The inter-disciplinary teams met on the South Branch and Moccasin Creek subwatersheds. We gathered comments and based on them are gathering additional information to identify possible problem areas and alternatives to address them.

We are condensing the comments received on the Green Meadow subwatershed and will be presenting them to the managers on those committees to determine the best approach on this process.

**Red Lake**

No report provided.

**Sand Hill**

No report provided.

**Middle Snake Tamarac**

Swift Coulee / Marshall County Ditch 3 Project Team
The Swift Coulee outlets into Marshall County Ditch 3 (MCD 3) approximately 1 mile west of Hwy. 75 5.5 miles north of Warren, MN. MCD 3 then flows westerly and outlets into the Snake River. The benefited area of MCD 3 is much smaller than the drainage area and doesn’t include the upstream drainage area of the Swift Coulee. The capacity of the ditch is insufficient and there has been significant sediment accumulation in the Swift Coulee. This results in floodwater leaving the ditch and Swift Coulee on both the north and south sides. Damages and erosion to roads and farmland have been severe. Landowners at the eastern end of the drainage area generally do not have problems with flooding or drainage.

In the fall of 2016 MSTRWD staff surveyed a 2 mile stretch of the Coulee. Sediment clearly is blocking most the Coulee, which is a DNR Protected Water. Water flow in this area is hampered due to sediment, trees and brush.

The Project Team has drafted a purpose and need statement and suggested that existing conditions hydraulic and hydrologic modeling take place to replicate inundation on the landscape and support the purpose and need. This work is currently move forward and close to completion. Additional meetings will be held in the near future to finalize the purpose and need and discuss the modeling results. Houston Engineering is providing engineering services for this project.

Newfolden / Middle River Project Team

Since the placement of a significant portion of the town of Newfolden in the 1% Annual (100-Year) Chance Floodplain by FEMA, the focus of the project has been Newfolden and the surrounding areas. The floodplain designation is largely due to flow restrictions through a railway crossing within the Middle River running through the center of town.

An Alternatives Analysis has been completed and resulted in two preferred alternatives. Each of the two alternatives has an off-channel impoundment aspect near Newfolden. These sites will reduce the volume of runoff to the Middle River during spring flood events and large summer events. Preliminary Engineering has begun for each of the alternatives and will include additional design of each site, landowner meetings, FEMA coordination, and a Step 1 submittal. Coordination with the railway will continue to take place as well. The Purpose and Need Statement is nearly ready for submission. HDR is providing engineering services for this project.

Judicial Ditch 14 RCPP Watershed Planning

The Judicial Ditch #14 sub-watershed consists of 36 square miles of drainage area in portions of Marshall and Pennington Counties, Minnesota. The drainage area of Judicial Ditch #14 starts approximately 8.5 miles east Viking, MN and outlets to the South Branch of the Snake River approximately 1 mile west of Viking, MN.

The types of benefits to be obtained from the project are to improve drainage and provide flood damage reduction to agricultural land, public infrastructure, and individual properties as well as natural resource enhancement to lands in the sub-watershed. Reduced erosion problems could improve water quality and soil health as well.

The purpose of this project is to provide flood damage reduction to agricultural lands due to a 10-year 24-hour rainfall event and to reduce flood damage to public transportation infrastructure in the Judicial Ditch #14 sub-watershed. A secondary purpose of this action is to help contribute to the overall basin-wide goal of reducing peak flows to the Red River of the North by 20%.
Review Points 1 through 3 have been submitted to NRCS. Over the next few months the project team will start the alternative analysis (Review Point #4) process. Houston Engineering is providing engineering services for this project.

**Judicial Ditch 19 RCPP Watershed Planning**

The Judicial Ditch #19 sub-watershed is the northeast most sub-watershed in the Middle-Snake-Tamarac Rivers Watershed District and outlets into the Tamarac River. The drainage area of Judicial Ditch #19 starts approximately 8 miles east and 8 miles north of the Middle River, MN and has a total drainage area of approximately 104 square miles. Localized flooding, water quality, channel erosion and sedimentation are common within the sub-watershed.

The types of benefits to be obtained from this project are flood damage reduction to agricultural land, public infrastructure, and individual properties are anticipated as well as natural resource enhancement to lands in the sub-watershed. Reduced erosion problems could improve water quality and soil health as well.

The purpose of this project is to provide flood damage reduction to agricultural lands due to a 10-year 24-hour rainfall event and to reduce flood damage to public transportation infrastructure in the Judicial Ditch #19 sub-watershed. A secondary purpose of this action is to help contribute to the overall basin-wide goal of reducing peak flows to the Red River of the North by 20%.

Review Points 1 through 3 have been submitted to NRCS. Over the next few months the project team will start the alternative analysis (Review Point #4) process. Houston Engineering is providing engineering services for this project.

**Two Rivers**

Klondike Clean Water Retention Project #11 update:

- A public hearing was held in November 2017 and the Engineer’s report that is required by MN Statute 103D was accepted by the Board. Public comment was received and the Engineer was directed to move forward with more specific plans. HDR Engineering has been meeting with the Project work team and with the TRWD to further refine the plans. Since this is a large and complex project it seems feasible to break the project into several smaller phases.

- Permits – The USACE has accepted / approved concurrence point #1 and the TRWD is currently working toward concurrence point #2. Other permits that are being considered at this time will be the State of MN Wetland Conservation Act, the DNR Dam safety permit, an Environmental Assessment Worksheet, permits needed under drainage law to impound waters on a legal ditch, and permits needed from county and township road authorities. Numerous other permits will be needed and will be considered at a later date.

- Big Swamp Project Work Team – two meetings of the work team have been held recently to solicit input and recommendations. The BSPWT will be utilized as needed by the TRWD Board of Managers as the process moves forward. Specific FDR goals and objectives have been identified and documented. Broad based goals for NRE have been recommended, and the BSPWT will be narrowing these down to focus on specific items related to water quality impairments, fen enhancement and protection, and other items.
• RCPP / PL566 – The federal environmental assessment / plan is moving forward according to the agreement that was signed with NRCS. The TRWD has been approved for review point #2 and is currently working on review point #3.

**Joe River**
No report provided.

**Roseau River**
No report provided.
Agency and Organization Updates
May 16, 2018- FDR Work Group meeting

**BWSR**
No report provided.

**DNR**
- Staff changes – Henry Van Offelen left the Red River Basin Coordinator position with DNR. In the interim Rodger Hemphill is performing the contracted duties for the RRWMB.
- Project teams – DNR staff continue to participate in the project work teams. Lead staff and PT members have been assigned for all anticipated project teams.

**FSA**
No report provided.

**IWI**
Attached.

**MDA**
No report provided.

**NRCS**
No report provided.

**PCA**
No report provided.

**Red Lake Band**
No report provided.

**RRBC**
No report provided.

**RRRA**
The Red River Retention Authority (RRRA) continues to work with USDA NRCS and local watershed sponsors on promoting the completion of Regional Conservation Partnership Program (RCPP) watershed projects. RRRA has scheduled visits with all of the watershed districts with RCPP watershed projects. As of May 16th RRRA and NRCS have meet with the following: Two Rivers WD - April 11th, Bois de Sioux WD - April 19th, Wild Rice WD - April 25th, Sand Hill WD - May 1st and Red Lake WD - May 10th. Meeting with Middle-Snake-Tamarac WD is scheduled for May 21st and a follow-up with Sand Hill WD at their project team meeting on June 12th.

On May 3rd I provided a brief RCPP watershed update to US Senator John Hoeven and North Dakota Governor Burgum at the Fargo-Moorhead Chamber of Commerce Ag Committee
meeting held at the chamber’s Moorhead office. Rob Sip, Executive Director, Red River Watershed Management Board also accompanied me. I expressed a need for future RCPP funding and PL83-566 Small Watershed Program funding in the next one to two years..

SWCDs
No report.

USFWS
No report.

USACE
We continue to work with PWTs for both the PL566 projects and non-PL566 projects.
April - May 2018 International Water Institute Activity Report

FDR, Condition, Watershed, and SWAG Projects:

- The 2018 WPLMN project is underway with a sampling schedule that will follow hydrograph conditions throughout the months with ice free conditions. Staff have also started load calculations working with 2016 flows and concentrations. Sixteen (16) contract loads of the 42 are complete. 2017 field and lab data has been submitted to the State system for samples collected through December 2017.

- WPLMN contract amendment/extension process for the 2018 and 2019 sample seasons is complete. A contract amendment was executed April 2, 2018. The amended contract has sunset date of June 30, 2020.

- BRRWD monitoring project for 2018 will begin in April upon contract execution. We are currently preparing a bid to collect samples for bacteria, nutrients, and sediment at 27 sites monthly April through October 2018. Field and lab data will be submitted to the State system.

- MN Department of Ag pesticide project will resume in May. Eight (8) sites will sampled in the Red River Basin for nutrients and pesticides. Four (4) sites; Roseau at Caribou, Snake at Alvarado, Tamarac at Florian and Two at Hallock will be sampled bi-monthly May through August. And four (4) sites; Snake at Alvarado, Tamarac at Stephen, Red Lake at Fisher, and Grand Marais Creek will be sampled bi-monthly May through September.

- The 2017 rapid floristic quality assessment (rFQA) protocol work at 10 FDR project areas within the Red River Basin is complete. Project areas assessed include: Euclid East, Lockhart, Norland, Ross, Angus Oslo #4, Angus Oslo #1, Brandt Angus Coulee, West Intercept, Manston Slough and Palmville Fen. The focus of the monitoring covered biological quality/biological condition, of wetlands within these project areas. 2017 results were presented March 20, 2018 at the Technical Seminar in Moorhead. Final reports with supporting data and documentation was submitted to the DNR/FDR Project Coordinator and the RRWMB Executive Director on February 2, 2018.

River Watch:

- The 23rd annual River Watch Forum was held February 7, 2018 at the Alerus Center in Grand Forks. Three-hundred (300) students attended. The River Watch teams created a plan for a service project focusing on stewardship of a local waterway. All teams crafted a project proposal which included: (1) clear project description, (2) benefits the project will provide a local waterway, and (3) a plan of action to ensure it is completed. Annual awards were presented along with a full day of breakout session learning opportunities.

- The work plan for the 2018 -2019 RW-CWL project was approved by MPCA. Contract execution occurred January 24, 2018. New work plan activities include River of Dreams for elementary students and the establishment of continuous monitoring stations at 6 basin locations.

- The final report for the 2016 – 2017 RW-CWL project is complete. The report was sent to RRWMB Executive Director on April 25, 2018 and was distributed to all the required legislative committees, the MPCA and MDE Commissioners and was posted to the IWI website. A final request for reimbursement and project closeout paperwork were also submitted.

- Two (2) North Dakota River Watch schools (Larimore and Minto) presented at the ND Water Quality Monitoring Conference in Bismarck on March 7th and 8th. The schools gave an overview of their monitoring sites including results as well as highlighted other watershed education activities they were involved in 2017.
RRWMB Mainstem Flood Damage Estimate/BCA

- Presentation to RRWMB 4/16 (prior to the strategic planning session.
- Met with RRWMB Executive Director / TAC 5/1/18 to discuss next steps
  - No follow-up presentation to MN FDRWG.
  - TAC will recommend exploring “other ways” to justify DDS projects at the next RRWMB meeting.

PTMAp

- ND hydro-conditioning continues.
- Wild Rice (ND) inputs completed/QAed. PTMAp processing underway.
- Planning PTMAp landowner Stewardship meetings scheduled for May 25.
- Asked by county commissioners to present James River PTMAp (and other IWI Web Tools) at 7 ND county meeting June 21st.
- Per request, provided PTMAp budget for entire remaining RRB in US and Ca to Lance Yohe.
- Updates/bug fixed to ND PTMAp site.
  - Working on maintenance and training work plan/scope.
- MN PTMAp site moved to MN IT.
- Roseau Watershed PTMAp processing completed/QAed.
  - DRAFT “Top 100 Projects” map shared with partners
  - Project update memo and PPT shared with partners.
  - Workshop scheduled May 30th – Last task identified in the LCCMR Project.
- Bois de Sioux/Mustinka Watershed PTMAp agreement executed with Technical Service Area 1 ($60K).

Administration

- Staff evaluations
- Office furniture (donation) secured.