

Becca Junker

From: Bourland, Mike <Mike.Bourland@lowaagriculture.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, August 13, 2019 9:31 AM
To: Lee Gallentine; Becca Junker
Cc: perryagservices .
Subject: RE: DD 102 and Wetlands.

Follow Up Flag: Flag for follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Hi Lee and Becca

Sorry to take so long to get back to you. We have been trying to address question 4 and it has taken some time to talk to the appropriate people. Below is our response in red. Is it possible to set up another time soon to meet with the Board to go over these items? Just let me know. Thanks.

Mike

Issues recommend resolving prior to construction:

1. Who owns the proposed wetland (i.e. is it a district facility) after it is constructed?
The wetland is owned by Perry. He will have an easement but maintains ownership unless he sells it to another party.
2. Who is responsible to complete maintenance activities of the proposed wetland?
The owner of the wetland is responsible for maintenance unless some other arrangements are made.
3. Who is responsible to pay for maintenance activities of the proposed wetland?
The owner of the wetland is responsible for payment of the maintenance activities. We have worked with districts before to help develop an agreement between the landowners and the district and can provide an example as a starting point is needed.
4. Is this project considered an improvement by NRCS and if so, is it deemed to have an impact on upstream jurisdictional wetlands?
We have had various conversations with people from NRCS. It has been difficult since some of the people have been on vacation. We should have a final answer this week and we will request something in writing. All conversations so far has been that there will no impact on jurisdictional wetlands.

Design question for District Trustees:

If this was a drainage district project, the materials that the District Trustees have historically used are similar to "municipal" specifications (i.e. for 12" tile and larger sizes RCP with rock bedding up to springline or Polypropylene with rock bedding to 1' above top of pipe and for smaller sizes Polyethylene with rock bedding to 1' above top of pipe). Is this going to be required of this project or will an "ag" specification be allowed?

We have always followed the "ag" specifications for our projects and do not plan to require rock bedding. We recognize this is a district tile which is why we requiring concrete but the depth of cover does not require rock bedding. If the district wants to require this, we would want to pass along this additional cost to the district landowners.

From: Lee Gallentine [mailto:LGallentine@cgaconsultants.com]
Sent: Monday, July 15, 2019 11:38 AM
To: Bourland, Mike
Cc: Becca Junker
Subject: DD 102 and Wetlands.

Mike,

At last week's drainage meeting, the District Trustees requested that I pass the attached review comments along to you. They are highly interested in the project and would like a timeframe on answers to the attached and possible dates for a meeting with you, them, and district landowners. Please let me know if you have any questions or need anything else.

Thanks,

Lee O. Gallentine, PLS & PE
Vice President



Clapsaddle-Garber Associates, Inc. (CGA)

739 Park Avenue
Ackley, Iowa 50601

Office: 641-847-3273
Mobile: 515-689-5339
lgallentine@cgaconsultants.com
www.cgaconsultants.com

Ackley | Ames | Cedar Falls | Marshalltown | Webster City

[CLICK HERE to sign up for CGA news and updates!](#)

