# DEEP RIVER DAM | FEASIBILITY STUDY

## **DAM FACTS**

- YEAR BUILT: 1930'S
- PURPOSE: BUILT BY ARMY CORP / RECREATIONAL
- HEIGHT: ~14'
- OVERFLOW WIDTH: ~100'
- DAM STYLE: SHEET PILING. TIMBER CRIB
- BACKWATER LENGTH: 6 -- 6.5 MILES
- SEDIMENT BEHIND DAM: ~1 MILLION CYS (±20%)
- ACTION PRIORITY FOR USFWS? NO
- ACTION PRIORITY FOR IDNR? YES

## **SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS**

- HISTORY OF THE DEEP RIVER
- UNDERSTANDING RIVER DYNAMICS
- PUBLIC INPUT
- ECOLOGICAL ANALYSIS
- SEDIMENT SAMPLING/ANALYSIS
- EARLY COORDINATION W/ PERMITTING AGENCIES

# WHY TAKE ACTION?

## **INCREASED SAFETY** 囲

- LOW HEAD DAMS CREATE DANGEROUS CURRENTS THAT CAN TRAP WATER USERS
- OVER 400 DEATHS HAVE BEEN RECORDED NATIONWIDE DUE TO LOW HEAD DAMS SINCE 1960
- https://goo.gl/1kb3Sr

# **RECREATIONAL ACCESS**

- INCREASED FISH SPECIES AND QUANTITIES THROUGHTOUT RIVER REACH
  - MILES OF RIVER OPENED TO CANOEING, & KAYAKING

## INCREASED ECOLOGICAL DIVERSITY

■ IMPROVED HABITATS CREATE HAVENS FOR DIVERSE FORMS OF FLORA, FAUNA, & AQUATIC SPECIES

## **INCREASED CULTURAL CONNECTIVITY**

■ GREATER SENSE OF CONNECTION WITH NATURE & THE ECOSYSTEMS SUPPORTED BY THE RIVER

# ECONOMIC DRIVER

■ RIVER RESTORATION/DAM MODIFICATION CAN DELIVER SHORT AND LONG TERM FINANCIAL GAIN FOR INDIVIDUALS AND THE COMMUNITY: FROM THE CONSTRUCTION CREWS TO THE SUSTAINED TOURIST REVENUE

## **DAM OPTIONS**

#### **OPTION 1 -- NO ACTION**

- PROS: NO MONEY SPENT
- CONS: CONTINUED DETERIORATION OF DAM POTENTIAL FOR LARGE RELEASE OF SEDIMENT COMMUNITIES FORCED INTO ACTION
- WHY /WHAT?

LACK OF DESIRE TO ACT BY DAM OWNER COST OF PROJECT BECOMES PROHIBITIVE TO ACT. DAM FAILURE LIKELY TO PROGRESS SLOWLY

#### **OPTION 2 -- FISH LADDER (DAM MODIFICATION)**

- PROS: INCREASED FISH PASSAGE OPPORTUNITIES **RELATIVELY CHEAP OPTION**
- CONS: NO PASSAGE FOR BOATS/KAYAKS DOES NOT ADDRESS DETERIORATION OF DAM
- WHY/WHAT?

MAINTAIN CURRENT BACKWATER POOL & WETLANDS TYPICALLY BUILT TO ONE SIDE OF DAM CAN BE MADE OF CONCRETE, AND OR STONE CREATING A BYPASS CHANNEL IS ANOTHER OPTION

#### **OPTION 3 -- CONSTRUCTED RIFFLE (DAM MODIFICATION)**

#### PROS: INCREASED FISH PASSAGE OPPORTUNITIES IMPROVE RECREATIONAL PASSAGE (KAYAKS, CANOES)

- PROVIDE STRUCTURAL SUPPORT FOR DAM
- CONS: NO PASSAGE FOR BOATS
  - WHY/WHAT?
    - MAINTAIN CURRENT BACKWATER POOL & WETLANDS LARGE BOUDLERS (3-5' DIA) PLACED IN 'ARC' SHAPE BUILT AT ~3-5% SLOPE
    - SERIES OF 'FALLS & POOLS'

#### **OPTION 4 -- DAM REMOVAL**

- PROS: INCREASED FISH PASSAGE OPPORTUNITIES IMPROVE RECREATIONAL PASSAGE **RESTORATION OF RIPARIAN CORRIDOR** INCREASED RIVER HEALTH
- CONS: MOST EXPENSIVE OPTION ELIMINATION OF LAKE STATION CULTURE
- WHY/WHAT?

ADD FLOODPLAIN BACK TO 37TH ST CROSSING (NO EFFECT ON 100 YEAR FLOOD MAP, HOWEVER) **3 OPTIONS TO HANDLE SEDIMENT** 1) COMPLETE REMOVAL (MOST EXPENSIVE) 2) PARTIAL REMOVAL (MODERATLEY EXPENSIVE)

3) NO REMOVAL (LEAST EXPENSIVE)

#### CONSTRUCTED RIFFLE PERMITTING AGENCY FEEDBACK

- AGREE IN PRINCIPAL TO PROJECT APPROACH
- WILL VALUE PUBLIC INPUT DURING PERMITTING PROJECT
- PROJECT WILL BE FIRST OF ITS KIND/SCALE IN STATE

## COST ESTIMATE

ENGINEERING/PERMITTING:	\$30 - 50K
RIFFLE COSNTRUCTION:	\$975K - 1.13 MIL
BANK RESTORATION:	\$25 -40K
MONITORING:	\$10 - 20K
CONTINGENCY (20%)	\$200 - 250K
ESTIMATED TOTAL:	\$1.25 - 1.5 MIL

## PRECEDENT STUDIES



CASS RIVER | FRANKENMUTH, MI | FALL 2015



CAPE FEAR RIVER | RIEGELWOOD, NC | FALL 2012



RED LAKE RIVER CROOKSTON. MN FALL 2015

R



ш

О

S

