Wild Rice Watershed District

Green Meadow Watershed

Regional Conservation Partnership Program (RCPP)

Public Meeting

February 28, 2018
Agenda

* Green Meadow Subwatershed Overview
* GM Project Team Status
  * Local
  * RCPP Process Overview
* Hydraulics/Damages Summary – To Date
* Public Law 566 Planning Process Status
* Additional Problem Area/Concern Identification/Discussion
* Overview of Next Steps
* Adjourn
Existing Conditions

- Marsh River Subwatershed
- Approximately 69 Square Miles
- Contains Upper Green Meadow Dam
- Project 30 – WRWD Project
### GM Project Team Status – Local Interagency Project Team (2013)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>STAKEHOLDER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brett Arne</td>
<td>Board of Water and Soil Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shawnn Balstad</td>
<td>Natural Resources Conservation Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Bommersbach</td>
<td>Norman County Commissioner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Chisholm</td>
<td>Landowner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Christensen</td>
<td>Wild Rice Watershed District Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Christianson</td>
<td>Soil and Water Conservation District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duane Erickson</td>
<td>Wild Rice Watershed District Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diane Ista</td>
<td>Landowner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curt Johannsen</td>
<td>Wild Rice Watershed District Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tara Mercil</td>
<td>Minnesota Pollution Control Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Puchalski</td>
<td>US Army Corps of Engineers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emily Siira</td>
<td>Department of Natural Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave Vilmo</td>
<td>Landowner</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Red River Basin Commission Basinwide Flow Reduction Strategy

- Part of Long Term Flood Solutions Report
- Reduce Red River main-stem flows by 20%
- Based on 1997 Spring Flood Event
- Applied to HEC-HMS Synthetic Hydrology

### Summary of Tributary Flow Reductions

#### 1997 Spring Flood

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tributary</th>
<th>Peak Reduction %</th>
<th>Peak Flow Reduction cfs</th>
<th>Volume Reduction</th>
<th>Volume Reduction %</th>
<th>Red. Focus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gaged Tributaries</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bds R @ White Rock</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>1542</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>61760</td>
<td>Store early water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ottertail R @ Orwell</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildrice ND @ Abercrombie</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>2854</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>57930</td>
<td>Peak flow reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheyenne R @ Harwood</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>2401</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>68356</td>
<td>Peak flow reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rush R @ Amenia</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>4324</td>
<td>Peak flow reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffalo R @ Dilworth</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>2930</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>36158</td>
<td>Peak flow reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wild Rice MN @ Hendrum</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>3610</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>74366</td>
<td>Peak flow reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goose R @ Hillsboro</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>2620</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>35356</td>
<td>Peak flow reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marsh R nr Shelly</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>2100</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>15247</td>
<td>Peak flow reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sand Hill R @ Climax</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>1510</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>22161</td>
<td>Peak flow reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Lake R @ Crookston</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>9600</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>119097</td>
<td>Peak flow reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turtle R nr Arvilia</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>4515</td>
<td>Store late water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest R @ Minto</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5875</td>
<td>Store late water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle R @ Argyle</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>1330</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>15067</td>
<td>Store late water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park R @ Grafton</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>26462</td>
<td>Peak flow reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Br Two R @ Lake Bronson</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>1100</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>16208</td>
<td>Store late water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tongue R @ Akra</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1540</td>
<td>Store late water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pembina R @ Neche</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>51113</td>
<td>Peak flow reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average/Total</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>616709</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Ungaged Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tributary</th>
<th>Peak Reduction %</th>
<th>Peak Flow Reduction cfs</th>
<th>Volume Reduction</th>
<th>Volume Reduction %</th>
<th>Red. Focus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rabbit R @ TH 75 ungb</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>2108</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>24377</td>
<td>Peak flow reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bds unaged</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>1135</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>12119</td>
<td>Peak flow reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ottertail ungb</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>7217</td>
<td>Peak flow reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fargo ungb</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>2600</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>36433</td>
<td>Store late water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halstad ungb</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>7500</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>81002</td>
<td>Store late water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE ungb</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>4988</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>44267</td>
<td>Store late water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GF unaged</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>4400</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>32015</td>
<td>Store late water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snake R ungb</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>1367</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>17128</td>
<td>Store late water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamarac R ungb</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>553</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>7179</td>
<td>Store late water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drayton ungb</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>1370</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>22208</td>
<td>Store late water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emerson ungb</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>23364</td>
<td>Store late water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average/Total</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>268468</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total volume of flow reduction on the tributaries: 885177 acre-feet

13% of total volume
Problems - Infrastructure Damages
Problems - Infrastructure Damages

Legend
- Norman County Highway Department (NCHD) Damages:
  - Green Meadow Dam

Project 30 Data:
- Project No. 30 - Ditch
  - Drainage Lines
  - Project 30 Catchments
  - Project 30 Subbasins
Existing Conditions

* Green Meadow Dam

* Location
  * Sections 10 and 15 of Green Meadow Township (Norman County). West of Gary, MN

* History
  * The dam was constructed in approximately 1973 by the Soil Conservation Service.
  * It was later added to become part of the downstream ditch system as part of WRWD Project No. 30.
Existing Conditions

- Green Meadow Dam
  - Drainage Area
    - 29.6 SM±
  - Storage
    - 2,200 AC-FT (1.4” of runoff from contributing watershed)
  - Soils
    - Poor / Granular
Problems

* Green Meadow Dam
* Limited Capacity
* Sandbagging Overflows in 2002
Problems

- Green Meadow Dam
- Substantial Repair (2006)
  - Erosion Repairs
  - Clay Liner - Partial
Problems

* Channel Erosion
  * Middle Reach – Erosion on Setback Levees
    * Riprap and Levee Setbacks
Problems

* Lower Reach Channel – 2011 Repair
* Substantial Repair (2011)
  * Section 20-24 (Anthony Township) and Section 19 (Pleasant View Township)
  * FEMA Funding Assistance
Problems

- Lower Reach Channel – 2011 Repair
  - FEMA Approved Repair Method
    - Backslope at 5:1
    - Restore Gradeline and Grade Control
    - Re-Establish Grass Buffers
• Concurrence Point 1: Project Purpose and Need
• Concurrence Point 2: Array of Alternatives and Alternatives Carried Forward
• Concurrence Point 3: Identification of the Selected Alternative
• Concurrence Point 4: Design Phase Impact Minimization
Evaluate Range of Alternatives

* Overall TP 11 Strategy/Alternative Elimination

- **Reduce Flood Volume**
  * Construction or Restoration of Depressional Wetlands, Cropland BMPs, Conversion of Cropland to Perennial Grassland, Conversion of Land Use to Forest, Other Beneficial Uses of Stored Water

- **Increase Conveyance Capacity**
  * Channelization, Agricultural Drainage, Diversions, Setting Back Existing Levees, Increasing Road Crossing Capacity

- **Increase Temporary Flood Storage**
  * On Channel Impoundments, Off Channel Impoundments, Restored or Created Wetlands, Drainage, Culvert Sizing, Setting Back Existing Levees, Overtopping Levees

- **Protection / Avoidance**
  * Urban Levees, Farmstead Levees, Agricultural Levees, Evacuation of the Floodplain, Floodproofing, Flood Warning and Emergency Response Planning
Option 1 – Distributed Detention Plan
Option 3
Option 7
Green Meadow Project Team (GMPT) - Option 6:

- Project B (GM Expanded): Green Meadow Dam Expanded - 2,300 acre feet gated storage
- Project C (UGM1): 315 Acre feet of gated storage at Klask site
- Project D (UGM 2): 1,370 acre feet of gated storage
- Project I (DDS 6): 2,490 acre feet of off channel gated storage below Green Meadow Dam site

The GMPT prefers that Option #6 be implemented in 2 phases.

- Phase 1 - GM Expanded, UGM1, and UGM 2 above the existing Green Meadow Dam.

- Phase 2 - off-channel impoundment below the existing Green Meadow Dam. The GMPT recommends the Wild Rice Watershed District continue to explore opportunities to establish a practicable (e.g. willing landowners) floodwater storage project below the existing Green Meadow Dam of sufficient size to substantially meet the flood damage goals set forth by the GMPT.
Option 6

The map illustrates a proposed project with phases labeled as Phase 1 and Phase 2. The project includes areas marked as Green Meadow Expanded, DDS Reduced, and UGM 1, UGM 2.

Legend:
- Road Damage 2001
- Road Damage 2002
- Road Damage 2009
- Road Damage
- Proposed Storage
- Project 30 Data
- Project 30 Subbasins
- Flood Prone Areas
- Green Meadow Dam
- Roadway Damage
- Dammed Areas
- Dam
- Road
- Proposed Embankment
- Gated Pool
- Top Of Dam Pool

Green Meadow Watershed
Proposed Storage Sites - Option 6

Houston Engineering Inc.
Total Current Estimated Cost - $25.5M
WRWD Green Meadow - Status

- CP No. 1 and 2 – USACE Approved
- CP No. 3 – On Hold – Pending Additional Field Studies
- Conceptual Designs (5% or less) - <$40K
- No On-site Geotechnical Reviews
- Limited Public Involvement and Landowner Coordination
- Project Team and Inter-agency Support

Next Steps on $25.5M ± Project – Expensive!
Regional Conservation Partnership Program (RCPP)

- 2014 Farm Bill
- Red River Retention Authority awarded $12M
- RRRA approved 20 Watershed Planning Efforts
  - 14 Minnesota, 6 North Dakota
- WRWD
  - Green Meadow, South Branch, Moccasin Creek
Why RCPP?

- Cost Share (70% Federal)
- Public Involvement
- Additional Detailed Design
- Field Surveys
- Geotechnical Review
- Environmental Reviews
- Possible Future Funding (Federal)
- Others

COST SHARE BREAKDOWN

- 70% NRCS
- 30% LOCAL
- Others
RCPP Planning Process

INITIATE PLANNING
* Discuss purpose and need for project with sponsors/Initiate study.

Step 1 - IDENTIFY PROBLEMS, OPPORTUNITIES & CONCERNS
* Identify the need for the proposed action (quantify, extent, magnitude, timing, frequency etc.)

Step 2 - DETERMINE OBJECTIVES
* Write purpose and need statement and Write scope of plan-EA/EIS

Step 3 - INVENTORY RESOURCES
* Conduct detailed resource inventories and watershed assessment
* Economics, social effects, Archeological and historic resources
* Engineering/Geology/Support maps
* Document problems

Step 4 - ANALYZE RESOURCE DATA
* Geology, Hydrology & Hydraulics, Cultural, Economics and Social

Step 5 - FORMULATE ALTERNATIVES
* Develop reasonable alternatives, mitigation strategies and costs (Preliminary plans)

Step 6 - EVALUATE ALTERNATIVES
* Env. Resources, Geotechnical, Hydrology & Hydraulics, Economics, Significance of effects,

Step 7 - MAKE DECISIONS (EA/EIS, Public Involvement,...)
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Model Results

- H/H Report
- Various Rain and Runoff Events (24hr – 10day)
- Flows
- Inundated Areas
Model Results

- H/H Report
- Various Rain and Runoff Events (24hr – 10day)
- Flows
- Inundated Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YR Duration</th>
<th>Existing Condition (ac)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 24HR</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 24HR</td>
<td>470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 24HR</td>
<td>940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 24HR</td>
<td>2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 24HR</td>
<td>3120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 24HR</td>
<td>4510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 24HR</td>
<td>8660</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Model Results – Other Scenarios – No Dam

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YR Duration</th>
<th>Existing Condition (ac)</th>
<th>No Dam Scenario (ac)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 24HR</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 24HR</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 24HR</td>
<td>940</td>
<td>1120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 24HR</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>2490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 24HR</td>
<td>3120</td>
<td>4120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 24HR</td>
<td>4510</td>
<td>5710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 24HR</td>
<td>8660</td>
<td>9590</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Model Results – Other Scenarios – Approx Breach Analysis
Model Results – Other Scenarios – Approx Breach Analysis
## Model Results – Other Scenarios – Approx Breach Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YR Duration</th>
<th>Existing Condition (ac)</th>
<th>North Breach (ac)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 24HR</td>
<td>210</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 24HR</td>
<td>470</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 24HR</td>
<td>940</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 24HR</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 24HR</td>
<td>3120</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 24HR</td>
<td>4510</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 24HR</td>
<td>8660</td>
<td>6930</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Model Results – Other Scenarios – Increase Drainage Upstream

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YR Duration</th>
<th>Existing Condition (ac)</th>
<th>Increased Culvert Capacity (ac)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 24HR</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 24HR</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 24HR</td>
<td>940</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 24HR</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 24HR</td>
<td>3120</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 24HR</td>
<td>4510</td>
<td>4960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 24HR</td>
<td>8660</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Draft Purpose/Need 1-25-2017

- FDR
  - Primary – local flooding
  - Secondary – RRBC Basinwide

- NRE
  - Degraded streams
  - Degraded wetlands
  - Flashiness of streams (altered hydrology)

Revised Purpose/Need Considerations – Need Public Input

- 10yr – Maybe 25yr level of ag protection?
  - Look at upstream issues/modeling?
- Roadway infrastructure protection?
- Improved Dam Safety (basically making sure that the Dam meets current design standards)?
- Others? Entire Watershed Study Area – Need Public Input
Questions/Comments/Form Completion
Public Input

Public Scoping Meeting Comment Form
Green Meadow Sub-Watershed
NRCS Watershed Plan
February 28, 2018

Background
The Wild Rice Watershed District (WRWD) secured funding through the Red River Retention Authority for Watershed Planning under the Regional Conservation Partnership Program (RCPP), administered by the Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS). The RCPP funding was made available for watershed planning in the Green Meadow Sub-Watershed and it is required to follow Public Law 89-566 requirements.

The Watershed Planning must also comply with the National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA) requirements. Tasks required for the NRCS Watershed Plan are described in the Feasibility Study and Plan of Work document, and generally include: Identifying a Purpose and Need, Developing an Environmental Assessment, Identifying the Affected Environment (resource problems), Developing Alternatives, Identifying Environmental Consequences of the alternatives, determining a Preferred Alternative, and creating an overall Watershed Plan. Public participation will be a vital component throughout the entire planning process, beginning with this public meeting.

Purpose of Today’s Meeting
The purpose of today’s meeting is to obtain input from all interested parties including federal, state, and local agencies and other interested groups or persons. Initial input will be focused on resource concerns in and adjacent to the Green Meadow Sub-Watershed. In order to gather input on resource concerns, we would request that the attached comment form be completed and provided to the WRWD.

Identified Resource Concerns:
- Flooding/Flood Damages (i.e. agricultural effects from delayed planting, prevented planting, crop flood inundation, road damages, culvert/bridge damages, breakout flows, field erosion/deposition, floodplain management, etc.)
- Water Quality/Erosion and Sedimentation (water quality, water resources, soil resources, field erosion/deposition, channel erosion/deposition, etc.)
- Wildlife and Habitat (Fish and wildlife, wetlands, endangered and threatened species, invasive species, migratory birds, forest resources, etc.)
- Other

Please fill out the following information based on your priorities for the Green Meadow Sub-Watershed. Comment forms will be accepted for all forms postmarked on or before March 28, 2018. Completed comment forms can be mailed to the WRWD office at:

Wild Rice Watershed District
11 East 5th Avenue
Axa, MN 56510

Or via email to tara@wildricewatershed.org

Name: ________________________________
Phone Number: ________________________
Address: ______________________________
Affiliation: ____________________________

(circle one): 1 = Minimal Concern 2 = Minor Concern 3 = Moderate Concern 4 = Significant Concern 5 = Severe Concern

Concerns for Project Scoping:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concerns for Project Scoping</th>
<th>No Concern</th>
<th>Severe Concern</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flooding/Flood Damages</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Quality/Erosion and Sedimentation</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife and Habitat</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others (Please describe in comment section)</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional Comments: __________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
Public Input

Identified Resource Concerns:

- **Flooding/Flood Damages** (i.e. agricultural effects from delayed planting, prevented planting, crop flood inundation, road damages, culvert/bridge damages, breakout flows, field erosion/deposition, floodplain management, etc.)

- **Water Quality/Erosion and Sedimentation** (water quality, water resources, soil resources, field erosion/deposition, channel erosion/deposition, etc.)

- **Wildlife and Habitat** (Fish and wildlife, wetlands, endangered and threatened species, invasive species, migratory birds, forest resources, etc.)

- **Other**

Circle the most appropriate ranking for each concern listed below. Refer to the KEY for definitions of each ranking. Concerns where the degree of concern is not indicated will be considered a zero value (No Concern or Not Relevant).

**KEY:**

- 0 = No Concern or Not Relevant
- 1 = Minimal Concern
- 3 = Moderate Concern
- 4 = Significant Concern
- 5 = Severe Concern

**Concerns for Project Scoping:**

- Flooding/Flood Damages ................................................................. 0 1 2 3 4 5
- Water Quality/Erosion and Sedimentation ........................................ 0 1 2 3 4 5
- Wildlife and Habitat ........................................................................ 0 1 2 3 4 5
- Others (Please describe in comment section) ..................................... 0 1 2 3 4 5
Instructions:
Please indicate the following items (if applicable):
- Your property location
- Specific areas of resource concerns, labeled with the resource concern (i.e., flooding, erosion, etc....)
- Any additional information that may be pertinent to watershed planning

Return completed map along with completed Comment Form to:
Wild Rice Watershed District
11 East 5th Avenue
Ada, MN 56510
Problems - Infrastructure Damages

Legend
- Norman County Highway Department (NCHD) Damages
  - Road Damage 2001
  - Road Damage 2002
  - Road Damage 2008
  - Road Damage
  - Roadway Damage
- Project 30 Data
  - Project No. 30 - Ditch
  - Drainage Lines
  - Project 30 Catchments
  - Project 30 Subbasins

Project 30 Flood Protection Area Map

Green Meadow Dam
Problems - Infrastructure Damages
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- Road Damage 2001
- Road Damage 2002
- Road Damage 2009
- Road Damage
- Roadway Damage
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- Drainage Lines
- Project 30 Catchments
- Project 30 Subbasins

Green Meadow Dam
Next Steps

- Review Outcomes from today with WRWD Board
  - Continue or Stop?
- Project Team Meeting
  - Update membership
- Revised Review Point No. 2 – Purpose/Need
- Revised Alternatives Consideration / Development
- Public Input
- Select Preferred Alternative
- Permitting/Request Funding/Final Design/Construction…..
Questions