

Notes from Swift Coulee/CD #3 PWT – December 10, 2019

Ken Johnson – Big Woods  
Don Yutrzenka – Warrenton  
Joel St. Germain – Warrenton  
Dylan Vansickle – Warrenton  
Damon Stroble  
Danielle Kvasager – MPCA  
Matt Johnson – BWSR  
Matt Fischer – BWSR  
Craig Jarnot – ACOE  
Steph Klamm – DNR  
Doug Franke – DNR  
Darren Carlson – Marshall SWCD  
Brad Blawat – MSTRWD  
Roger Mischel – MSTRWD  
Tony Nordby – Houston  
Joel Praska – MSTRWD

Concurrence point #3 (draft) – identification of selected alternatives

Tony – up to speed – project fired up again 3 years ago

1. Purpose and Needs – 10 year rain event – completed
2. Identify ideas – potential alternatives – completed
3. Identify Alternatives – environmentally friendly

How we got to step 3 – today

Went through potential sites – 6 sites for impoundments

Site D – 37 square miles of drainage

Site E – less storage capacity

Site F – outlet directly into CD 3 – 39 square miles of drainage

Alt #8 – Impound with Diversion

Alt #9 – Impound with Diversion – and 10 year ditch improvement needed

Alt #11 – Impound no diversion – Channel restoration – (Best fit for project)

Alt #12 – Impound – Channel restoration and ditch improvement – 10 yr

Diversion or restore the channel? Both with impound. We chose #11

Doug Franke – asked about cost. Does 1 cost less than the others? Is #11 reasonable? He would like to see what each options cost estimates would be.

Dylan Vansickle – Nope, he doesn't support an impound. Cost too much. Just clean the sediment out of the coulee.

But, we can't just push the water downstream – create problems for others.

Don Yutrzenka – expensive land. To his thought, the way things are right now, the water is already being held back and acting as an impound. He wants more coulee restoration.

Problem is it pushes it down onto CD 3

Tony Nordby – at least create a document – preliminary engineers report

Joel St. Germaine – Section 3 of Warrenton is the problem. Joel is against an impound. He would like to see the coulee straightened out.

Tony Nordby – DNR would design the channel restoration process. There are State funds for restoration – Red Board? Outside options are out there.

Damon Stroble – Straighten out the coulee. Extend CD 3.

Steph Klamm – Nope, no way. Not permissible work.

Tony Nordby – Store the water within the coulee is another possible option.

Doug Franke – Nice to see farmers use sustainable land practices.

Ag-land – take on more water by changing methods

Farmer needs to be forward thinking on practices.

Think to the further – 20 years down the road. Cover crop, no till etc.

Water infiltration rates – would like to see

Brad Blawat – upstream owners – land coming out of CRP. More each year. The problem will only get worse.

Joel St. Germaine – Straighten the coulee out. Again, the problem is in section 3 of Warrenton.

Don Yutrzenka – water comes in fast and can't leave soon enough on the east side of Hwy 75.

Tony Nordby – option could just be restoration.

Doug Franke – how many acres are affected by a rain event?

Would restoration help enough people?

Would farmers be interested in flowage easements?

Tony Nordby – would setback levees be a possibility?

Matt Fischer – Setback levees with Buffers and a flowage easement could work.

Tony Nordby – 5 to 10 year event would be what we are looking at without an impound.

Ken Johnson – CD 3 mostly a problem in the spring. Don't just pass the buck downstream. West of Hwy 75, the coulee needs cleaning. It barely flows. Section 3 of Warrenton has a 5' waterfall currently.

Matt Fischer – Can't just do part of the coulee. Do the whole thing.

Tony Nordby – Yes, help people out at least for smaller events. Tony then went over land ownership options. Purchase or flowage easements.

Ken Johnson – all of Site E has drain tile installed. How would the impound be designed?

Craig Jarnot – is okay with the change in scrapping the impound idea. It still doesn't change the purpose and need of the project.

Matt Fischer – Lessard Sams or the Clean Water Act would be possible funding option for the restoration

Tony Nordby – figures roughly about 15-16 miles of restoration would be needed.

The goal first is to help out locally, secondly to regulate the flow to the Red River

Also, the comment period for concurrence point 3 is December 31

Concurrence point 3 can be found on the district's website.

Joel Praska – will take this information back to the Board for discussion and direction.

Meeting ended at noon.