

# ***BUFFALO-RED RIVER WATERSHED DISTRICT***

BARNESVILLE, MINNESOTA 56514

1303 4<sup>th</sup> AVE NE  
E-mail: general@brrwd.org

PO BOX 341

PHONE 218-354-7710  
Website: www.brrwd.org

---

## **MEDIATION PROJECT TEAM MINUTES**

January 28, 2016

The Buffalo-Red River Watershed District (BRRWD) Mediation Project Team (PT) held a meeting on Thursday, January 28, 2016, at 1:30 PM at the BRRWD office, Barnesville, MN.

Attending were: John E. Hanson and Mark T. Anderson, BRRWD Managers; Bruce E. Albright, BRRWD Administrator, Erik Jones, Engineer, Ted Rud, Engineer, and Thomas Eskro, Engineer, Houston Engineering, Inc. (HEI); Don Schultz, Area Wildlife Manager, Minnesota Department of Natural Resources (DNR); Mandy Erickson, Fisheries, DNR; Mike Oehler, DNR Wildlife, Fergus Falls; Lynn Foss, Clay Soil and Water Conservation District (SWCD); Rodger T. Hemphill, Area Hydrologist, DNR; Brian Winter, Program Director, The Nature Conservancy (TNC); Nicholas Brown, DNR Wildlife; Tara Mercil, Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA); and Shawn May, United States Fish and Wildlife Services (USFWS) and Detroit Lakes Wetland Management District (WMD).

Absent were: Gerald L. Van Amburg, Troy E. Larson, Breanna L. Kobiela, Cathy L. Affield, and Peter V. Fjestad, BRRWD Managers; Pete Waller, Board Conservationist, Minnesota Board of Water and Soil Resources (BWSR); Larry Martin, USFWS and Fergus Falls WMD; Edward J. Musielewicz, District Conservationist, Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS); Ross Aigner, Landowner/Wilkin SWCD; Peter Mead, Becker SWCD; Robert A. Zimmerman, Engineer, City of Moorhead; Anthony Nelson, Pheasants Forever (PF) and Clay SWCD; Henry Van Offelen, Red River Basin Coordinator, DNR; Ryan Frohling, Detroit Lakes USFWS and WMD; Audubon Dakota; Brian Dwight, Board Conservationist, BWSR; Craig O. Evans, PM-D, Army Corps of Engineers (COE); Keith Mykleseth, Assistant Regional Manager, Division of Ecological and Water Resources, DNR; Larry Puchalski, Project Manager, COE; Emily Siira, Area Hydrologist, DNR; Josh Kavanagh, Biologist, Ducks Unlimited (DU); Don Bajumpaa, District Manager, Wilkin County SWCD; Julie Aadland, Area Hydrologist, DNR; and Keith Weston, Red River Retention Authority (RRRA)/NRCS.

Bruce Albright, BRRWD Administrator, called the meeting to order at 1:30 PM. Group introductions were made, and Albright noted that the meeting was being recorded to aid in the preparation of minutes. He circulated a sign-up sheet to record attendance. Albright commented that he has tentatively scheduled the next PT meeting for Thursday, April 7, 2016, which is a change from the initial agenda. Albright commented that the BRRWD is in a transition phase as many of our larger projects are completed or are near completion. There will be three projects discussed today, Stony Creek, Barnesville Township, and the South Branch of the Buffalo River, which are all in the early stages of development. He explained it takes a significant amount of time to start a project as there are many components to organize.

### **Business brought before the group included:**

**Meeting Minutes.** Draft minutes for the 12/10/15 Mediation PT meeting were distributed with the meeting notice. **Motion** by Anderson to approve the minutes. **Seconded** by Schultz. **Approved.**

**Barnesville Township Area Drainage Study.** Thomas Eskro, HEI, noted that the BRRWD requested at the last PT meeting for HEI to extend the restoration of the South Tributary of Whisky Creek east along the public waterway for approximately two miles and to also extend a tributary south to the Clay-Wilkin County Line. Eskro pointed out that these areas of restoration have now been included in the opinion of probable cost (OPC).

Eskro reported that a conference call was held this morning with NuStar Energy, LP, regarding the depth of their pipelines within the proposed project area. This is the first discussion with representatives higher up within the pipeline company. Eskro felt the call went well, with only a few concerns needing to be addressed, such as the depth of the pipeline cover under Clay County Ditch (C.D.) No. 34. Eskro also said NuStar seemed open to certain project features, such as water storage and placement of embankment over their pipelines. Albright added that the NuStar representative informed them that these pipelines were installed around 1945 and are still considered to be in good condition. The representative also informed them that it would be the BRRWD's expense to lower a pipeline due to a project feature(s). It would cost a minimum of \$250,000 to lower approximately 300'-400' of line. Eskro stated this is the minimum length of pipeline that would need to be lowered under C.D. No. 34. Albright explained that the pipeline company does not lower the existing line but they actually bore a new line and connect the new line to the existing line. The old section of pipe remains in place unless it requires being removed due to interference with the project.

Eskro noted a conference call is scheduled tomorrow (01/29/16) with Magellan Midstream LP to discuss the depth of their pipelines relative to the proposed project. Albright stated that he hopes this call will go as well as the one did today.

Don Schultz, DNR, asked what the pipelines carry. Erik Jones, HEI, stated the pipelines carry petroleum products.

Using the overhead monitors, Eskro reviewed a map showing the pipeline depth readings. He stated that NuStar was not overly concerned with the depth of pipeline cover within the fields and embankment in the proposed project area. Jones said the company had no issues with the pipeline depths as long as they were at least 18"-24" deep. Eskro said the NuStar representative informed them that the lines were originally installed either at 36" or below the frost line, but they are unsure of which it is for this area.

Mike Oehler, DNR, asked if NuStar thought that amount of topsoil had been lost due to erosion since 1945. Jones stated the company is unsure of the cause for the shallower lines and they are also unsure of the original pipeline elevations. Jones explained there are several factors which could contribute to the shallower lines, such as the ditches eroding deeper or more commonly, for pipelines installed over a hill, the soil is washed downhill during rain events. Jones told NuStar that the BRRWD would keep them informed as the project develops. Jones also stated that there is a product used on the pipe to protect it from corroding. Eskro noted that the pipeline company would be completing their five year, pipeline quality assessment sometime in June 2016. He also stated that NuStar would need a six month advanced notice if they would need to lower a pipeline.

Eskro reviewed the main project features while referring to a map displayed on the overhead monitors. The comprehensive project will include re-channelizing portions of Whisky Creek. The new alignment will create a two-stage channel and reconnect several meanders. The goal is to re-create the historic flow of Whisky Creek. The design also includes moving existing levees that currently impinge on the channel. Eskro noted the new alignment would increase the channel length by 25%. Jones explained that the red lines on the map represent the floodplain as part of the two-stage channel. These lines provide some idea as to where the set-back levees would be placed.

Albright asked where the retention inlet would be located. He questioned if the retention site was designed to also take flows from Whisky Creek. Eskro stated the inlet is not shown on the displayed map but he explained it would likely be located on the east side of 170<sup>th</sup> ST S. He said it could handle flows from the south and then direct them west across Sections 26, 27, 28, 33 and 34, Barnesville Township. Jones noted the inlet might shift depending on the final location of the retention site.

Albright stated the second project component pertains to the unnamed tributary to Whisky Creek. The proposed plan for this waterway is to primarily re-establish a grade line and to create a two-stage channel. Jones confirmed this waterway would also be a two-stage channel following its existing alignment. He said overtime, this channel could meander on its own within the vegetated floodplain channel.

Albright explained the third project element would be the possible retention site as displayed on the map. Eskro discussed some alternative alignments that were considered, but the proposed retention site as displayed was the best area for total storage volume. The one disadvantage is that this is where the gas pipelines are located. Jones added the proposed retention site is where there have been historic water issues. Brian Winter, TNC, stated that he thought the proposed retention site was over a portion of lands which has been mapped by the County Biological Survey as a native habitat area, possibly containing rare species. He said that water may not be able to be stored here, if this were the case. Albright commented that he is familiar with this area and he believes the current alignment of the retention site is west of this native habitat and located entirely on cropland. He stated that the land to be included in the impoundment should be all currently cultivated.

Albright suggested working with the landowners to enroll any native habitat within the project area into applicable easement programs to prevent it from being converted. Winter stated funds for easements on this native habitat might be available through the Native Prairie Bank or the USFWS Program. He said all this native land should be eligible if landowners were interested. Winter agreed that someone should meet with these landowners to try and secure the necessary easements.

Albright asked how many total square miles are at the outlet where the unnamed tributary of Whisky Creek meets the South Branch of the Buffalo River. Jones stated the project area at that point is approximately 70 square miles (sq. mi.).

Albright mentioned the BRRWD is in the process of determining a value for retention storage easements on cropland. He explained the current value of \$800/acre for cropland, set over 30 years ago, is probably no longer accurate. Albright talked about the combination of different easements that worked well for the Manston Slough Restoration Project. All the easements used for the Manston Slough Restoration will be on the list of potential values; however, this does not help in a situation where the landowner would like to continue to farm their land within the easement area. He noted one method the BRRWD is considering would be to adopt the rates developed for the Reinvest in Minnesota Program (RIM). These rates are calculated annually on an individual township basis. Once the BRRWD agrees on easement values, these values could apply to other projects, such as Stony Creek and the South Branch of the Buffalo River. Albright hopes the Board can agree on easement values by the next PT meeting in April. The second item being evaluated by the BRRWD is where to find funding for large scale projects. Albright discussed in detail the possibility of the BRRWD becoming a member of the Red River Watershed Management Board (RRWMB) and how that taxation would affect our area landowners. The Board would need to make a decision by June 2016 as to whether or not the BRRWD should re-join the RRWMB for 2017.

Albright stated that the BRRWD would like to organize a spring tour of the North Ottawa Impoundment Project, south of Wheaton, to show landowners from some of our potential storage areas what a large scale retention project looks like.

Albright explained the Diversion Authority (DA) had approved funding for the following proposed retention projects: Stony Creek, Barnesville Area Township Drainage, and the South Branch of the Buffalo River. However, the BRRWD Board of Managers did not approve the DA's 2016 budget at the last meeting on 01/25/16. Albright felt this might have put this potential funding in jeopardy.

**South Branch of the Buffalo River.** Albright gave a brief history of recent events that have occurred within this watershed. He said in the late 1800s, the river channel was diverted into a Judicial Ditch (J.D.)

system. Today, one of these ditches is referred to as Wilkin C.D. No. 44, which branches and extends east into the Rothsay Wildlife Management Area (WMA). He also stated that approximately 80% of this land east of Trunk Highway (T.H.) No. 9 was once cultivated, and now most of this land has been entered into various permanent conservation programs, such as the Wetland Reserve Program (WRP) and RIM. Albright recalled that Ross Aigner, landowner/Wilkin SWCD, had suggested at the 12/10/15 PT meeting, that the BRRWD exhaust our research/options east of T.H. No. 9 before approaching landowners west of T.H. No. 9 to install project features. Aigner felt there would be downstream benefits to potentially diverting water back into the historic river channel which still exists on most of the landscape today. Jones and Eskro stated HEI is in the process of assessing this possibility.

While referring to a map displayed on the overhead monitors, Eskro explained the stream restoration could be east of T.H. No. 9. The abandoned channel in Section 11, Manston Township, would be restored through to the TNC lands on the west side of Section 12, Manston Township. At this point, the old channel footprint disappears and the runoff in Sections 7, 8, 9 and 12, Manston Township, becomes braided streams across the landscape. Flows continue straight east until the water has crossed the TNC lands. This is where the old South Branch channel becomes more apparent. Jones noted that HEI has obtained all the inverts and sizes of culverts along the drainageway. He commented that the larger pipe sizes along Wilkin C.D. No. 44, Lateral B, are probably not necessary. He explained the next step is to analyze water flows if these pipes were downsized. He said they might need to consider diking to help direct the water back into the historic channel patterns. Jones noted that Albright had the NRCS provide a list of lands which may be enrolled into their conservation programs. Jones stated that the yellow areas on the map represent lands that were enrolled in the Conservation Reserve Program (CRP) according to aerial photographs from 2007. The NRCS needs to confirm if this land is still in CRP. Winter mentioned the Minnesota Prairie Plan would be an ideal program for easements related to this project.

Schultz asked if the headwaters to the main channel are approximately 1 mile east of the TNC lands. Jones explained both branches of Wilkin C.D. No. 44 extend considerably further east into Tanberg Township.

Eskro explained that Wilkin C.D. No. 44, Lateral B, was established through the ridge between Sections 10 and 11, Manston Township, instead of allowing the flow through the natural pathway north of this location. Eskro described a possible concept that HEI is assessing. This concept would require reducing the 54" diameter pipe that is currently placed through the ridge. During larger rain events, a smaller culvert would reduce the water flow at this point causing the water to back up into the WMA. The theory is that water would then flow over the ridge in its natural pathway and follow the historical pattern through Sections 11 and 12, Manston Township. At this point, the wetland reserve embankment project would direct the water into the restoration channel in Section 11, Manston Township. The main objective is to slow the rate of flow into the restored channel.

Albright recalled a discussion held during a PT meeting approximately one year ago. There was a detailed discussion regarding possible retention in Section 11, Manston Township. Albright stated the operator farming the land informed him that the landowner decided to place the land into RIM and that the Watershed District would be able to utilize this land for retention. Albright said that BWSR contacted him later and informed him the BRRWD would not be able to use this land due to the fact that the RIM funding had come from the Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council (LSOHC). Albright questioned if this project was established as a more comprehensive project, we might approach the LSOHC to consider modifying their restoration goals. Winter felt if the project could be modified to achieve enhanced wildlife habitat as well as wetland restoration without creating long term water retention, it might be eligible for LSOHC funding. He stated the design details would play a major role in determining whether the funding/modifications would be approved.

**Stony Creek Comprehensive Project.** Jones is still working with the DNR Dam Safety on the dam classification, which they are currently classifying as a high hazard dam. He explained that HEI is trying to provide information to show the project will be improving conditions throughout the area.

Ted Rud, HEI, explained the original breach analysis evaluated conditions at the west location (C.R. No. 21) during a back to back rain event. The results show the existing conditions in Section 32, Barnesville Township, are worse than having a dam breach event occur. Rud submitted this breach analysis to the DNR Dam Safety. HEI has been working on additional analyses requested by Dam Safety. Rud explained in great detail the additional breach analyses that were performed and their results. The results show that a farmstead in Section 32, Barnesville Township, is potentially susceptible to flooding if there was a dam breach. Jones noted in this analysis, the probable maximum precipitation (PMP) event is extremely excessive and the area would be completely flooded at this point without a project. He said they performed this analysis in order to provide data to Dam Safety. The hope is this data would help Dam Safety understand HEI's project design.

Rud distributed a RRWMB STar Value benefits handout which explained the STar Value calculations. He explained this method is used by the RRWMB to assign a relative value to a floodwater detention project's ability to reduce peak mainstem flows. The equation to calculate the STar Value is the adjusted storage volume in acre-feet (S) x relative value of detention time in days (T). Through discussions with Dan Thul, DNR, the RRWMB has set a maximum cost share per STar Value at \$20. Rud explained that this value is not set in stone, however, significant flood damage reduction benefits and special consideration would be needed to consider a higher value. Rud discussed HEI's analysis of the STar Value methodology to determine potential funding that could come to a flood storage project through the RRWMB, if the BRRWD were a member. HEI used three scenarios for water detention for the 100-year flood for 7, 14, and 30 day durations. The 7-day scenario would be mainly for local storage with the longer durations having more impact on timing of flow contributions to the mainstem of the Red River. The duration of the gated storage greatly affects the STar Value and the potential RRWMB funding amount. The RRWMB is looking for detention sites with the capability to store water up to 30 days, but only on an "as needed" basis.

Anderson questioned if water had to be held for 30 days. Rud explained that the length of time the water needed to be detained would be detailed in the Operations and Management (O&M) Plan. A specified water elevation at a given downstream gage would determine if the BRRWD could begin draw down of the retention site. Rud noted it would take six days to reduce the volume by half once the BRRWD fully opened the retention site.

Albright commented on the poor condition of the channelized portion of Stony Creek which is known today as Clay C.D. No. 31. He noted that HEI has incorporated a two-stage channel restoration starting at T. H. No. 9 and extending downstream to the Hay Creek juncture. Albright explained that the Watershed District intends to apply for potential funding through the BWSR's Targeted Watershed Program. The application deadline for this program is 03/09/16. Albright noted the land adjacent to the straightened portions of Stony Creek is the benefit area for C.D. No. 31. He also explained there is approximately 30 sq. mi. of drainage on the east side of T.H. No. 9. A redetermination of benefits would be completed to potentially include these upstream landowners into the benefitting area.

Schultz questioned if all landowners would have to pay a levy for the RRWMB membership if the BRRWD joined versus those landowners that benefit from a particular project. Albright confirmed that was correct. Jones noted that the Watershed District does levy a general tax across the District. Albright explained that Watershed Law allows the Watershed District to raise up to \$250,000 for general funds each year. Albright explains the process if the BRRWD were to become a member of the RRWMB. He commented that the RRWMB tax would raise approximately \$3.5 million. The

Watershed District would have some input regarding this tax rate. The BRRWD would keep half of these funds while the remaining half goes to the RRWMB. The BRRWD would need to apply to the RRWMB to try to get those funds to use within our district for retention. Anderson commented that as RRWMB members, the tax would approximately double the current rate.

Albright explained that the BRRWD decided to leave the RRWMB in 2002, when the Watershed District only received approximately half their funds back. After 2002, the BRRWD needed to find additional general funding. Albright stated the Watershed Law offers another form of taxation in accordance with Minnesota Statutes Annotated (M.S.A.) 103D.905, Subd. 3, for projects having a general benefit to the Watershed District, such as water quality work. A political subdivision petitions for this taxation. He noted the BRRWD would no longer need to use this special taxation if we chose to re-join the RRWMB.

**Manston Slough Restoration.** Albright reported the project is ready for spring operation. He plans to schedule a time for the partners of the Joint Powers Agreement (JPA) to perform a field assessment to see how the project components are functioning and to determine if adjustments are needed. Albright stated that Gladen Construction Inc., the project contractor, is on notice regarding a possible warranty claim to repair several soft spots in the roads they reconstructed.

Albright reported that a landowner north of County Road (C.R.) No. 26 has approached him recently to discuss the possibility of restoring & straightening the inlet channel, which is the primary feed into the Manston Slough. Albright noted this would require working along Section 20, Manston Township where the DNR's WMA is located. Schultz commented that there would need to be some benefit to the WMA in order to consider straightening this channel. He thought it would be more ideal for the landowner to enroll the land into RIM/bufferstrips in order to square off the area.

**Oakport Flood Mitigation.** A preconstruction meeting will be held with RJ Zavoral and Sons, Inc., tomorrow (01/29/16). Albright reported that construction on Phase 4 would begin when conditions permit this spring. He briefly explained the road alignment would be changed as the road is currently collapsing into the Red River of the North. The project construction will extend north to C.R. No. 93. The ring dike located west of the coulee can be certified, which will allow for the homes in this area to be rezoned outside of the floodplain. The certification process will take approximately 18 months to complete after Phase 4 is completed.

**Wolverton Creek/Comstock Coulee.** Albright reported that we now have another new COE representative, Robert Maroney. After individual reviews, the first two project managers both determined that the Wolverton project would require a comprehensive general COE permit to cover all phases of the project. Jones informed the group that Maroney is now unsure if he will be the project manager for this project. Jones plans to continue working with the COE to obtain the necessary permit.

Phase I of the project will include channel restoration and creating a two-stage channel, which would extend approximately 4.5 miles north of C.R No. 30. Albright explained the BRRWD will work in conjunction with the Clay and Wilkin SWCDs to ensure the proper width of buffer strips, which will be wider than the standard 50' mandated strips, will be achieved. He said the potential easements needed for the bufferstrips have been mapped.

Albright reported that \$100,000 was secured last year through Enbridge Pipeline and their Eco-footprint Grant Program. Jones has prepared and submitted another grant application this year to potentially obtain an additional \$300,000. Albright noted the BRRWD would apply for funding through the LSOHC and Legislative Citizens Commission on Minnesota Resources (LCCMR) this summer. The Watershed District is also encouraging Phase I landowners to submit EQIP applications to NRCS by the 08/01/16 ranking/scoring sign-up period. Albright also noted that BWSR could have a new

Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program (CREP) available for the southern two-thirds of Minnesota. This may be a potential program to use for easements along the channel.

**Georgetown Levee.** Albright stated the project has been completed. The final pay request was submitted to the DNR. He did note that we are still waiting for the courts to settle one condemnation issue but progress is being made on this issue. There will be some seeding and cleanup to complete this spring when conditions permit.

**COE F-M Diversion Authority.** The DA plans to begin work on the inlet at the south end of the project as soon as Federal funding is secured. At the 01/25/16 BRRWD regular meeting, the Board of Managers had a 4-2 vote denying the DA's \$237.5 million budget for 2016. Currently, the BRRWD is one of six entities included in the JPA, which allows the BRRWD to be part of the project development process. Albright noted it is possible that the JPA will re-write the agreement to exclude the BRRWD.

Winter asked about the Minnesota Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) process in regards to the tributaries and project design. Albright discussed the status of the EIS for the project. He explained a draft EIS was completed and a public meeting held in October 2015. After the public meeting, there was a timeframe in which comments were submitted. The DNR is in the process of responding to these comments. They expect to complete this portion of the process by March/April 2016. Albright said there is a very limited review/comment period, but in all essence, this process will be completed. The DNR will begin the permitting process within 90 days of the EIS completion. This permitting pertains to only those structures within Minnesota.

**Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL)/Watershed Restoration and Protection Strategy (WRAPS).** The BRRWD was one of the first Watershed Districts in Minnesota to implement a Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) project with a watershed approach. This TMDL watershed approach has been adopted statewide by the MPCA. Currently, the MPCA is finishing the TMDL process on the Buffalo River and the Upper Red River. A third TMDL project is tentatively scheduled to begin on the Otter Tail River later this year.

Albright informed the group that the MPCA would be presenting information regarding their Tiered Aquatic Life Use (TALU) at the Red River Basin Flood Damage Reduction Work Group (RRBFDRWG)/RRWMB March conference.

**Otter Tail River Restoration.** Albright reported that \$450,000 has been secured from the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)/BWSR for the initial study, which begins at the Orwell dam and extends to Breckenridge. Albright explained this section of the Otter Tail River was channelized and straightened by the COE in the 1950s.

Wilkin County received two additional grants from BWSR. The first grant will be used to modify two county ditches, which drain into the Otter Tail River, with the one-rod (16.5') grassed bufferstrips and side inlets. The second grant will be applied to repair a large bend which is eroding vertically into a landowner's field. Albright commented that both projects will be beneficial to the Otter Tail River.

**Hawley Buffalo River Restoration.** Albright commented that the project was essentially completed last fall. Jones described the project features while referring to a map of the area on the overhead monitors. He said rock riffles were incorporated in the straight channel sections to help direct water to the center of the channel and erosion control structures (toe-wood debris) were placed on the outside channel bends. Jones explained the channel was re-meandered into sections of the historic channel. There will be a small amount of clean up to do in the spring.

**Revised Watershed Management Plan (RWMP)/Watershed District Enlargement (WDE).** Albright reported that Jones has some work left on the draft RWMP, but for the most part, it is finished. He said the plan would be submitted to BWSR for the 60-day review period. The next steps will be to hold the Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC) and Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) meetings.

Albright also noted BWSR has approved the boundary petition filed by the BRRWD and the Bois De Sioux Watershed District (BDSWD). The order changes the BRRWD's southern boundary to more accurately align the hydrological and legal boundaries.

**Activities Update.** Albright distributed a copy of the 01/25/16 BRRWD press release. He noted the RRWMB/RRBFDRWG March Conference would be held on March 23-24, 2016, at the Courtyard by Marriott, Moorhead.

**Bufferstrip Initiative.** The new 2015 Legislative initiative requires that all protected waterways have a 50' buffer installed by November 1, 2017, and all legal drainage systems have the required one-rod (16.5') buffer November 1, 2018. Albright explained the SWCD will be required to come up with a third level of mapping regarding additional waterways/ditches that may need buffers but did not meet the preceding requirements on an individual county basis. However, counties only need to develop the map, and it will be up to each county if they want to develop an ordinance requiring that these waterways/ditches also be buffered.

Winter mentioned a Soil Conservation Meeting which presented/displayed information stating that bufferstrips may be ineffective for the control of nitrogen. He asked if anyone else had heard of this.

**Next Meeting.** The next BRRWD Meditation PT meeting is tentatively scheduled for Thursday, April 7, 2016, at 1:30 PM, in the Barnesville office.

**Adjournment.** There being no further business to come before the group, Albright adjourned the meeting at 4:30 PM.

Respectfully Prepared and Submitted by

Bruce E. Albright, BRRWD Administrator