

August 20, 2026
4:00pm

GALLATIN CONSERVATION DISTRICT

Meeting Details

Time: August 20, 2026 • 4:00pm Mountain Time (US and Canada)

****Meeting Location: Manhattan Bible Church Library
Room- 123 S Fifth St, Manhattan, MT 59741****

Zoom:

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/82387342193?pwd=qXBsu79bznRemrS90CgZzBpPODGHGU.1>

Meeting ID: 823 8734 2193

Passcode: 286279

Call in: +1 253 215 8782

310 MEETING AGENDA

1. 310 Applications

Applicant Number:	61-26	Perennial Stream:	Maynard Border Ditch
Applicant	BRANDON BEAMER		
Landowner:	same		
Contractor/Agent:			
Type of Project:	Crossing/Roads		
Purpose:	Property is divided by the Maynard Border Ditch, with no existing crossing to access my lower pasture. I propose installing a 101-inch-wide, 14,000-pound-capacity prefabricated steel bridge at a narrow section of the ditch. The bridge will be supported by structural timbers and road-base gravel placed away from the ditch bank. No pilings or structures will be placed in the ditch, and there will be no impact to the ditch or its banks.		
Proposed Construction Date:	Start Date:	8/29/2026	End Date: 9/4/2026
Inspection Date:	8/11/2026		
Inspection Recommendation:	Approval as proposed		
Inspection Comment	Remove existing foot bridge and replace it with steel bridge for vehicle/haying access. Bridge fully spans creek and will provide free-board for any material/debris in creek. Minor trimming of trees but no impact to root structure. Timber abutments placed on adjacent high terrace. Ensure existing bridge rock material gets removed from bank.		
318 Authorization	Yes		
Discussion:			
Decision:			

August 20, 2026
4:00pm

GALLATIN CONSERVATION DISTRICT

Applicant Number: 62-26		Perennial Stream:	Maynard Border Ditch
Applicant	Mikaela Schultz- City of BZN		
Landowner:	Micheal Delaney and Ileana Indreland		
Contractor/Agent:	Matthew Workman - Streets Superintendent		
Type of Project:	Agriculture/Irrigation Project		
Purpose:	The City plans to use a mini excavator to remove accumulated sediment and stabilize the scour pocket and adjacent bank with 6-inch riprap. Work will occur during late summer/fall low-flow conditions and be supervised by qualified City staff and engineering representatives.		
Proposed Construction Date:	Start Date:	8/26/2026	End Date: 8/31/2026
Inspection Date:	No inspection		
Inspection Recommendation:	SPA 124		
Inspection Comments:	318 Authorization Complete		
Discussion:			
Decision:			

Applicant Number: 63-26		Perennial Stream:	Hyalite Creek
Applicant	Fletcher Kasmer		
Landowner:	same		
Contractor/Agent:	Robert Sain		
Type of Project:	Channel/Bank Project		
Purpose:	The project will reconnect Hyalite Creek to a historic flood channel, increasing flood resilience. Approximately 870 cubic yards of material will be excavated and hauled to an upland site. The result will be a slightly deeper wetland area seasonally ponded by groundwater and connected to Hyalite Creek only during flood events.		
Proposed Construction Date:	Start Date:	9/5/2026	End Date: 9/19/2026
Inspection Date:	8/11/26		
Inspection Recommendation:	Approval with modifications		
Inspection Comments:	Excavation will begin 40' beyond OHW. Minor vegetation clearing will begin 15' beyond OHW to connect a flow path. Attempting to create some flood attenuation for short duration flooding events. Digging down 4' to connect to water table. Should minimize prioritize creating wetland rather than a pond. Technically the excavation work will be outside of the beds/banks; however, applicants should be cautious about machinery work to not disturb root system of vegetation.		

August 20, 2026
4:00pm

GALLATIN CONSERVATION DISTRICT

318 Authorization Complete

Discussion:

Decision:

Applicant Number: 64-26

Perennial Stream:

UT

Applicant

Briana Schultz

Landowner:

same

Contractor/Agent:

Type of Project:

Buildings/structures, channel/banks, crossing/roads

Purpose:

The property owner is proposing the construction of an event venue. Three vehicle crossing are being proposed for the site.

Proposed Construction

Start Date: 9/1/26

End Date: 8/1/27

Inspection Date:

8/11/26

Inspection Recommendation:

Board Discussion

Inspection Comments:

Applicant not on site for meeting. Creek is dry but has defined bed and banks. Feel there are reasonable alternatives on site to reduce amount of crossings and achieve project goals. Board discussion.

318 Authorization Complete

Discussion:

Decision:

Applicant Number: 65-26

Perennial Stream:

Rocky Creek

Applicant

Shayla Utzinger

Landowner:

Betsy Angwin

Contractor/Agent:

Type of Project:

Crossing/Roads

Purpose:

The project will install two willow-weave erosion control structures, beaver dam analogues in a side tributary, and willow live stakes along eroding banks. Work will use primarily hand tools and a gas-powered post pounder to minimize stream and riparian disturbance. Fencing will protect the restoration work without affecting the streambed or banks.

Proposed Construction Date:

Start Date: 8/30/2026

End Date: 11/2/2026

Inspection Date:

8/11/26

Inspection Recommendation:

Approval as proposed

Inspection Comments:

Proposal to install beaver dam analogs (BDA's) in Rocky Creek (6) but beavers built multiple dams between planning and permitting timeline. New project plans include 6 BDA's in small tributary

August 20, 2026
4:00pm

GALLATIN CONSERVATION DISTRICT

stream (1 ft wide) and hand place willow cutting throughout tributary and rocky creek. A log structure will be placed in one outside bend that is eroding. Willows will be placed behind. Conditions are ideal w/ a downstream beaver dam in place. The structure should allow sediment to settle behind and would catch any additional sloughing material. High likelihood of successful willow recruitment. Fencing will also be installed around tributary w/ water gaps to encourage vegetation growth.

318 Authorization Complete Yes

Discussion:

Decision:

Applicant Number: 66-26	Perennial Stream:	Cougar Creek
Applicant	Haley Kinch - Mountain Limited	
Landowner:	Same	
Contractor/Agent:	Joey Gallagher	
Type of Project:	Utilities- Directional Bore	
Purpose:	CenturyLink to bore under cougar creek to install 2" hdpe with 100pr cable.	
Proposed Construction Date:	Start Date: 8/10/2026	End Date: 10/31/2026
Inspection Date:	No inspection	
Inspection Recommendation:		
Inspection Comments:		
318 Authorization Complete		
Discussion:		
Decision:		

Applicant Number: 67-26	Perennial Stream:	UT to Gallatin River
Applicant	Kathyn Kelly	
Landowner:	The Kelly Trust	
Contractor/Agent:	BD Construction	
Type of Project:	Crossings/Roads	
Purpose:	Create a field access off a float area of road so that large vehicles can access the barnyard + hay storage areas as needed.	
Proposed Construction Date:	Start Date: 8/21/2026	End Date: 8/21/26
Inspection Date:	8/11/26	
Inspection Recommendation:	Approval with modifications	
Inspection Comments:	Building access road for property acreage that is not accessible from historic house/road. Proposal has 18" culvert but should be upsized to 36" to match bank width. Countersink culvert 3".	

August 20, 2026
4:00pm

GALLATIN CONSERVATION DISTRICT

318 Authorization Complete Yes

Discussion:

Decision:

Applicant Number: 68-26	Perennial Stream:	Rocky Creek
Applicant	NorthWestern Energy	
Landowner:	Utilities Right of Way	
Contractor/Agent:		
Type of Project:	Other- utilities	
Purpose:	This project is a wildfire mitigation project with the goal of replacing poles that could fail and cause wild fires. 15 day waiver requested.	
Proposed Construction Date:	Start Date:	End Date: 7/20/2026 8/31/2026
Inspection Date:	8/11/2026	
Inspection Recommendation:	Approval as proposed	
Inspection Comments:	Remove and replace 2 utility poles on bank of Rocky Creek. Work will have minimal disturbance to banks. Discussed ensuring no sediment contribution to creek while new pole hole is being dug. Existing poles will be removed entirely.	

318 Authorization Complete yes

Discussion:

Decision:

2. Complaints
3. Emergency Applications
4. Extension Request

Other 310 Business:

5. 310 Old Business:

- **Rey Creek Presentation- Terry Schaplow- legal representation for Rey Creek Irrigators**

August 2025:

Applicant Number: 47-25	Perennial Stream:	Rey Creek
Applicant	Rey Creek Ranch LLC	
Landowner:		
Contractor/Agent:		

Type of Project:	Agriculture/Irrigation, Channel/Banks, Crossing/Roads		
Purpose:	The proposed work on Rea Creek, a large spring creek tributary to the Gallatin River and that also conveys irrigation water from the Madison River. It has base flows of approximately 40 CFS due to irrigation conveyance. The project reach is significantly degraded, including chronic turbidity and high summer water temperatures. Preliminary turbidity monitoring has identified a major source of sediment to be Sloan Ditch; an irrigation wastewater return that also acts as a drain with perennial flow entering Rea Creek just south of the project reach on the upstream property owners land.		
Proposed Construction Date:	Start Date:	10/1/2025	End Date: 9/30/2026
Inspection Date:	8/1/25		
Inspection Recommendation:	Approval with modifications		
Inspection Comments:	Move bridge downstream to terrace pinch to avoid filling impact. Rec'd coordinate with downstream users for any concerns, consider sediment mitigation feature to minimize export of construction related turbidity. Key abutment bottoms sufficiently below existing bed. Need cross sections for run, riffle, pool complexes with specific, proposed depths. Key goal should be ensuring proposed stream widths are narrow enough to transport sediment. And to avoid over-pool habitats to avoid settlement of excess fine in constructed habitat. Applicants want to avoid construction during irrigation window. Good to see inclusion of juvenile habitat features including backwaters and shallow overflow channels. Avoid instream work from October 1 -November 15 for brown trout spawning period.		
318 Authorization Complete	Yes		
Discussion:	Briana Schultz recuses. Bob Logar chair. 3 parts to this project. Remove existing bridge. New siphon for Sloan ditch at new bridge location to reduce sediment. Redirect Sloan ditch. Narrow up creek, replant vegetation, reduce temps, improve habitat. Loren- manages Sloan ditch for 20 years and is 12 miles away. No sediment in that stretch of ditch. Upper Sloan ditch. Goal is to gain more grazing ground and to reduce turbidity. 10/1-11/15 construction restrictions. No construction during irrigation season as well. Approx 1 mile stretch. Discussions on if downstream landowners' concerns have been addressed. Project is designed to keep sediment moving and create habitat along the way, contractor states. Is rerouting the ditch even jurisdictional to GCD? Discussion on water rights off Rey Creek. Neighboring landowners ask the board to table and come look at the mess that a previous project left. Destroyed habitat, destroyed irrigation infrastructure, devastated Rey Creek. Scott G. states the project that was responsible for the devastation was 10 years ago. Different circumstances, different stretch of stream. No		

official complaints were ever received until 5 or 6 years after that project. Chronic problem for 30 years on this creek. Surprised that the complaints are coming now.

Loren- coordination with downstream water users is crucial. That hasn't happened yet.

Decision:

Loren Blanksma motioned to put application on hold. Jason Camp supports. Communicate and iron out differences with adjacent landowners. Dyk ditch/Darlington ditch discussion. All in favor, motion carries

October 2025:

B. GD 47-25- Briana recuses.

i. Settlement pond design.

ii. 2 letters from downstream irrigator's lawyer

iii. Information from DNRC- can help out with a 3rd party review. Board will need to motion.

Scope of work will need to be identified by the board. \$5K budget from DNRC. Board would be responsible for anything above that. Can put app on hold for up to a year. Advised to not use previous data. Sediment yield needs to be considered. Mike motions to have DNRC pursue a 3rd party consultant for technical review the Rey Creek plan with a focus on downstream sedimentation. Bob supported. All in favor, motion carried. Scope review during December meeting.

Scope of Work and Deliverables

GCD is seeking a qualified consultant to conduct a technical review of this project. The review would consist of an investigation to help the GCD board of Supervisors approve, deny, or modify the project as proposed. The technical review parameters are:

1. Determine whether the designed project will provide net benefits to the natural sediment regime on the Rey Creek watershed.
2. Evaluate the potential of sediment contribution downstream of project site from project implementation prior and post construction.
3. Determine sediment trap options as a viable solution for settling out suspended sediments at the lower end of the project reach during and after construction.

Deliverables

1. A report to the GCD Board of Supervisors providing a second opinion on the design of the overall project and the sediment retention pond. This will need to be finalized before the August 2026 310 meeting.
2. A presentation of the report to the Board of Supervisors during a board meeting and availability to answer questions during the meeting and subsequently. Board meetings take place on the third Thursday of every month.

7/26 -Rey Creek Restoration Project – Jim Lovell Presents:

Project Discussion

Jim Lovell presented information regarding the proposed Rey Creek restoration project. Jim has extensive experience in the Rey Creek area and is very familiar with the watershed.

Several tributaries contribute significant sediment to Rey Creek. These tributaries are likely former or existing ditches, although some may have been spring-fed historically. The Crowley Ditch, Hot Springs Ditch, and another tributary are believed to contribute substantial amounts of sediment to the system.

The proposed project is intended to improve fish habitat and overall stream condition by removing accumulated sediment, narrowing the channel, and revegetating the stream corridor. The project also proposes relocating the Sloan Ditch. The Sloan Ditch cannot be taken offline, so the project will need to accommodate continued operation of the ditch.

The primary source of sediment in Rey Creek has not been definitively determined. The creek does not receive a significant flushing flow and is influenced by a groundwater system. Agricultural operations may contribute some sediment, and icing may also contribute episodically. Waterfowl activity is another potential contributor, as Rey Creek is a spring creek and attracts significant numbers of waterfowl; however, waterfowl are not believed to be a primary source of the sediment.

The soils in the area are dispersive clays with different chemical characteristics that allow them to disburse easily. Jim indicated that these soils are likely the primary source of the sediment. Rey Creek flows through some of these clay materials, while the Crowley and Hot Springs ditches pass through substantially more of this material.

Past projects have contributed much sediment to the system and resulted in impacts to local irrigation ditches. There is currently a substantial amount of sediment within the creek, although the stream appears to be beginning to improve.

Jim stated that the proposed project should provide an overall benefit to the reach being treated and should not adversely impact upstream areas. There is potential for temporary downstream impacts during construction, primarily from sediment released during construction activities. However, once completed, narrowing and revegetating the channel should improve stream conditions and should not increase the overall amount of sediment moving through the system.

Sediment Trap

The Board discussed whether a sediment trap should be incorporated into the project to reduce the potential for construction-related sediment impacts.

Jim indicated that sediment traps are widely used and can be effective when properly designed. A sediment trap would be expected to capture the majority of sand and silt generated during construction. An existing pond on the property is being considered as a potential sediment trap. The pond is located relatively close to the creek and could provide a suitable location for this purpose.

Jim noted that the sediment trap would require regular maintenance. Following construction, the pond could either be reclaimed or potentially remain in place as a permanent sediment trap. While the sediment trap would not address sediment that has already entered the stream system, it could help prevent additional sediment from worsening existing conditions.

Mike noted that the Board had previously reviewed an in-stream sediment trap design and expressed support for that concept, particularly because it would provide a permanent structure. However, he recognized that a permanent trap would require ongoing maintenance and suggested that it may be preferable to take the structure offline when it needs to be cleaned.

Irrigator and Downstream Concerns

Irrigators expressed concern about potential impacts from a project that is not located on their property but could result in sediment being transported onto their properties. There was particular concern regarding who would be responsible for maintenance and removal of accumulated sediment from the proposed trap.

Tony Thatcher stated that the landowner is agreeable to utilizing the existing pond as a sediment trap during the project. However, it is not yet clear whether the landowner is willing to accept long-term maintenance responsibilities for the sediment trap.

Tony indicated that the landowner wants to work cooperatively with neighboring landowners and improve the overall condition of Rey Creek. It was also noted that the proposed project does not address the sediment currently being contributed by the Crowley, Hot Springs, and other ditches.

The Board discussed how long the sediment trap should remain operational following construction. One year was suggested. Downstream monitoring was also discussed, including a monitoring location north of the interstate.

Monitoring

The Board discussed establishing baseline sediment measurements immediately upstream of the project area and collecting additional measurements immediately downstream of the project area. These measurements would provide a basis for evaluating the effectiveness of the sediment trap and determining whether the project is contributing additional sediment to the system.

Tony stated that the landowner would have no objection to monitoring being conducted on the property.

Tony indicated that they are willing to establish baseline conditions at their own expense and conduct monitoring following construction.

The Board discussed monitoring for one to two years following the project. Jack suggested one year, while Mike indicated that two years would be more appropriate.

Timing and Irrigation

The Board discussed completing the project outside of the irrigation season to minimize impacts to irrigation operations.

Potential work windows to avoid that were discussed included:

- ***April 1 – May 15***
- ***October 1 – November 15***

No in-channel work would occur during the irrigation season. The project could also potentially be completed between November and April to avoid impacts to irrigation operations.

Project Revisions Should Include:

The Board determined that additional design work is necessary before the project can be considered for approval.

The revised submittal should include:

- *A redesigned and engineered settling/sediment pond;*
- *Details regarding the operation and maintenance of the settling pond;*
- *A plan for removal and management of accumulated sediment;*
- *Baseline sediment monitoring locations and procedures;*
- *Monitoring locations immediately upstream and downstream of the project area;*
- *A proposed duration for post-construction monitoring; and*
- *A complete revised project plan reflecting the proposed changes.*

The revised plan will need to be resubmitted to the District for consideration.

The Board discussed whether to wait until the September meeting or request that the revised information be submitted for the August meeting. While 60 days had been discussed at the January meeting, irrigators indicated that having the revised information available for the August meeting would be reasonable. This would provide approximately 30 days between meetings for irrigators to review the revised proposal with their attorney and hydrologist.

July 2026 Board Decision:

- ***Loren Blanksma moved to place the Rey Creek restoration project on hold pending submission of a revised project design addressing the settling/sediment pond. The revised submittal shall include monitoring data and proposed monitoring locations both as sediment enters and exits the project area and shall be submitted for consideration at the August Board meeting. Jason Camp seconded.***

August 20, 2026
4:00pm

GALLATIN CONSERVATION DISTRICT

All in favor. Motion carried.

August 2026 Presentation: Terry Shaplow + Hydrologist

- *A copy of the hydrologist's presentation + Mr. Shaplow's written report were requested.
Neither were provided at the time of this report:*

6. 310 Coordinator's Report- Becky

Public Comments on District 310 Permitting Business

Adjournment of 310 Meeting

BUSINESS MEETING AGENDA

1. **Guests & Public Comments on District Business Meeting-** none
2. **Governance Calendar**
 - Minutes to DNRC, C&R- 7/17/2026
 - Positive Pay to GC Treasury- 7/17/2026 + repeated attempts to get Shelley added.
 - 941 Q3-1- 8/15/2026
3. **Consensus Agenda**
 - Consensus agenda-
 - Absences
4. **NRCS Report**
5. **Supervisor Report: Planning Boards**
 - a. Planning board-
 - b. County Planning Board-
 - c. GLWQD-
 - d. MACD Update-
 - e. Gallatin Watershed Collaborative
6. **Staff Reports**
 - a. Administrator's Report- Becky
 - b. NRS Report- Elizabeth-
 - i. Grants/Agreements/Cost Share/Contract Report
 - c. Education and Outreach Director- Bea-
 - d. Education Assistant-
 - e. AGAI Report- Rebecca
 - f. DNRC Update- see report
7. **Old Business**
 - a. Office update
 - b. Resolution
 - i. Presentation at area meeting + convention
 - c. Other old business?
8. **New Business**
 - a. Farm to Table

August 20, 2026
4:00pm

GALLATIN CONSERVATION DISTRICT

- b. Area Meeting- WSS – 10/8
- c. Other new business?

9. Parking Lot

10. Accounting (Deposit, Credit Card, Invoices) + Updated P&L, Balance Sheet –

11. Adjournment of Business Meeting