

# Getchell Creek/CD26 Project Team Meeting Notes

October 21<sup>st</sup>, 2021

## Meeting #3

*Attendees: Amanda Hillman (DNR), Chris Middendorf (Landowner and Producer), Wyatt Kemper (Freeport Public Works), Jason Weinerman (BWSR), Kat Prince (MLT), Nicki Blake-Bradley (DNR), Commissioner Steve Notch, Loren Goebel (Freeport Public Works), Cole Loewen (Stearns ESD), Greg Bowles (HEI), Garret Monson (HEI), Bret Zimmerman (HEI), Drew Kessler (HEI), Leah Hall (TNC), Paul Hartmann (SRWD Board Manager), Jon Roeschlein (SRWD), Adam Hjelm (SRWD), Sarah Boser (SRWD)*

Sarah went through the list of participants of the meeting to give each participant an opportunity to introduce themselves. After introductions, Drew began his presentation with a summary of what the project team has accomplished to date. Clarification was provided regarding the difference between an edge of field/individual landowner project and Capital Improvement Projects (CIPs). For additional information on what makes a project within the Sauk River Watershed a CIP, please reference the Sauk River Comprehensive Watershed Management Plan (CWMP), located on the SRWD website. Page 7-5 of the CWMP described CIPs.

Drew also summarized the information covered at the first two project meetings, as well as the intent of the feasibility study. The feasibility study does not guarantee project implementation, but it does identify locations where projects could be implemented, and what it would look like to move forward with implementing them. A brief update was provided regarding the stream stabilization work on the downstream end of Getchell Creek (downstream of Getchell Lake), working with contractors and funders, in addition to the landowners, to get the work completed. Looking at a deadline of April 2022. A brief update was also provided regarding the vegetation management progress – Jon with the SRWD is continuing his work with Houston Engineering and DNR to determine the best way to move forward and provide some vegetation management within the system.

Bret with Houston provided a summary of the Hydrology and Hydraulics modeling completed for the concepts - what the modeling tells us and how the information is used to develop the project concepts. He also talked about looking at different sized rain events to see how the water storage sites would be impacted by different sized events. This modeling was done independently of the stream stabilization site concepts (ie – the modeling for the water storage does not take the stream stabilization work into consideration).

Next Drew provided water quality reduction information for the water storage and stream restoration projects, if all were completed, and the calculators used to get the reduction information. The functional lift table for water storage and treatment sites was explained for the Project Team, along with the other types of information that are found on the individual project concept sheets. Recommend jumping from stream site 1 to stream site 3, as this is typically the way stream restoration/stabilization is conducted

(stream stabilization is typically upstream to downstream, ditch repair is usually downstream to upstream). Talked about reasons for recommending not moving forward with Site 39 for water storage (gas line found, and being located within CD15).

Questions about future project maintenance, and how that will impact tax payers, the difference between drainage and stream restoration maintenance, how those costs change, the frequency of maintenance between the two management styles, etc. Other questions about the size of rain events the concepts are designed to (about 2.5 – 4 inch rain). Bret provided some background information about how the sites would function on or after a rain event. Some of the storage sites are already holding back water – how would the project be different than what is currently happening on the landscape? The project would recreate the footprint of the inundation area for smaller rain event than it currently takes to cover the area. The idea would be to prevent bottlenecks throughout the system, so changing the type of event and the timing of the event that causes this area to flood.

Have projects like this been done before? Where do the numbers come from – are they based on real data or theory? In-line/on channel storage is a regular practice in Southern Minnesota. Garret's focus area tends to be drainage, Bret tends to focus on water quality. Modeling is from USACE, and has been used nationwide/is industry standard. What type of outlet structures could be used? There are still options on this, could be a stop-lock structure or agri-drain, gate, etc, or it could be a stationary structure.