

DD 56 LANDOWNER MEETING
Wednesday, March 31, 2021 10:30 AM

This meeting was held electronically and in-person due to Covid-19 concerns.

3/31/2021 - Minutes

1. Open Meeting

Hardin County Drainage Trustee Renee McClellan opened the meeting. Also present were Trustee Lance Granzow; Lee Gallentine, Clapsaddle-Garber Associates (CGA); Landowners: Carole Topp; Greg Larson; Sharon Larson; Brad Fjelland; John Kuhfus; Mike Bostrum; Lynn Holechek; Robert Topp; Dan Kumrow; Matt Topp; Terry Swenson; Dwayne Fosseen; Brad Stensland; Kathy Kolden; Michael Fjelland; Jessica Sheridan, Environmental Health; and Denise Smith, Drainage Clerk.

2. Approve Agenda

Motion by Granzow to approve the agenda. Second by McClellan. All ayes. Motion carried.

3. Introductions/Attendance

Introductions were made and attendance verified.

4. DD 56 - Discuss Upper Main Tile Diversion Bids

McClellan stated we called the meeting today to review the bids received for the DD 56 Upper Main Tile Diversion, the bids came in quite well over the estimates so we wanted to get people's thoughts and comments, and asked Gallentine to give us some update. Gallentine stated to update the project, at the last meeting you may recall that the District Trustees approved going forward with the project and splitting the district in half and diverting the outflow from the upper end straight essentially north to the open ditch and leaving the lower end on its' own. Gallentine stated we went ahead and drew up plans and specifications and had a bid letting, and at that hearing we just kind of thumbed in the costs of engineering and construction at \$850,000, we hadn't talked about easements, we know we would have to acquire them, but we didn't talk about those costs because that was a little bit up in the air at that time. So we talked about the \$850,000 for engineering and construction both, so recently we had the bid letting, we had four bidders, which is always good to have interested bidders, the low bidder was Gehrke Inc. and their bid just for construction is \$881,175, and then you add engineering on top of that, by the time you add in engineering you maybe up around \$1,000,000 roughly, and you still have the easements on top of that, so right now as it sits, if someone said Gehrke is the way we want to go, it is the low bid, you could be above that original costs we talked about at the hearing by \$150,000, Gallentine stated a couple of things contributed to the additional costs, number one, Gallentine thinks his estimate could have been a little bit low, number two pipe prices, especially within the last month have kind of gone crazy, with the whole Covid/Coronavirus thing, things just slowed down and a lot of places stopped production, and now that we have a vaccine, things are trying to speed back up, and production isn't getting quite where it should be yet, everybody is aware of what lumber prices have done, the other things that drive pipe is, Gehrke's bid for the concrete was the low bid, but that pipe price is dictated somewhat by the competition, which is plastic, and everyone is aware of what happened in Texas, is the plastic pipe industry is having a hard time getting resin, so their costs are going up, so that is not pushing concrete pipe down.

Gallentine stated he thinks there are some things we can do to try and trim the project somewhat, but right now it is a fairly deep project and we have some rock bedding specified, if we get into the field and if the conditions in the field are right with a nice clay, we can do a spoon installation, which essentially uses a half moon bucket, and spoon it in and lay it in there, so Gallentine thinks there are some things that can be done to that, we could possibly do some different gaskets on there, that could possibly save some money but we are not going to go back to \$700,000 with this bid, Gallentine does not see \$180,000 that can be cut off of this project, those things we won't know until we actually dig down to the depth and see what the soil is like. Gallentine stated that is where we are at with the bids, the bids came in higher, Gallentine thinks this is probably the best bid you are going to get for awhile because it is going to take a while for the suppliers to catch back up, next fall, next winter who knows what it will do. Gallentine stated back in January we were getting 11 bidders on projects and they were 10% to 20% under the project's estimate, it just kind of

swung faster on the materials side, so there is that. Gallentine stated the other issue is we have 3 landowners we need to get easements from, we have not been pushing hard to acquire those easements yet because Gallentine didn't know of the District really wanted to spend money to acquire easements if the project doesn't move forward, it is kind of the chicken and the egg, which do you put first, do you get the contract out there and designed, and then get the easements and do you get the easements and then bid it and get the contract, the contract is set up right now so that if it is awarded, but we don't get easements, the only thing you would owe Gehrke would be the bonding costs which is \$8,000. Gallentine stated we put that in there because we knew it was a possibility that the easements may be an issue, and it may stall the project out.

Gallentine stated that is a lot to absorb and asked if anyone had questions. Granzow stated when we talk about the easements, he will not speak for the other two Trustees, but if eminent domain is a question in getting the easement, Granzow is not in favor of using eminent domain at all for the project, it is not required to have this, this is something for an improvement, and just wanted to throw that out there if anyone is questioning that, he will not go through the process for eminent domain, Gallentine has given us who the landowners are we will need easements from, and asked how many acres we need easements for, was it a temporary easement. Gallentine stated what we planned on since there is a decent amount of depth in this project, over 20 feet in certain spots, we were planning on a 200' permanent easement and then an additional 100' temporary easement just to get it built, all told between three landowners, that amounts to about 21 acres of permanent easement and about 10 acres of temporary easement, so it is a decent area involved, so there are three landowners involved, two of them are out of state, and one local, Gallentine asked if the Trustees wanted names given. Granzow stated he has not talked to these people and does not know if they are for or against the project and does not know if we should bring up the names. Gallentine stated and we have not talked to them yet either, we haven't pushed these easements hard. Granzow stated if we want to approach these people, outside of the meeting if you like. McClellan stated she preferred not to do it in the meeting.

Granzow asked if this project has any added costs if we don't push forward trying to do and is this report would be good for 10 years. Gallentine stated the report is good for 10 years, but the bid is not, the bid is good only for another 30 days at the most. Granzow stated we can try and approach it in a different year, you guys can tell us what you want done with your money, Granzow stated there was one question/comment sent in by a landowner by email was speaking for two people, himself and his mother, he would like to know what the easement costs before we say whether we move forward with this project, what are the easements going to cost us, \$20,000 or \$200,000, we don't know. Granzow asked if the landowners want us to try and approach the easements or is this a dead subject because of the costs, the additional \$180,000 just for the project.

5. Comments/Discussion

Brad Fjelland asked if this was a permanent easement or just access for construction. Granzow stated it would be two different ones, Gallentine stated it would be for 20 acres of permanent easement, which is 20' wide and a temporary easement for a 100' strip for temporary, it would be filled back in, you could farm it and use it, it would not be like an open ditch where you are farming around it, obviously that is some mixed up soil in there, obviously they try to separate out the topsoil as we all know. Fjelland stated it isn't going to be the same for a while. Granzow stated obviously if there are ever issues, we have the permanent easement allows us to go back on it for any repairs, Gallentine stated there is a possibility maybe in some of the shallower portions we could neck down the permanent easement if we needed to, we just try to keep it a standard width to make things easier so we can move forward. Greg Larson asked what you would expect to be a reasonable amount for permanent easements. Gallentine stated he has no idea, he is not the land acquisition guy, we have a guy in the Marshalltown office that does that and Gallentine turns it over to him and he does the comparables, it is tough, it is kind of like crop damages after a project is done, some landowners want reimbursed for the full crop damages, which they are totally entitled to, and you have some landowners that say my neighbors will be paying for it, so they don't even turn one in, it is just depends on landowner attitude so Gallentine does not know what it would be. Granzow stated the last easement we got, and we can talk about it, they gave us the easement for nothing, McClellan asked if it was about the same size, Gallentine stated no it was not even close. Granzow stated the County buys right

of way easements for right around \$12,000 or \$13,000 an acre, but that us only for easements around bridges, and couldn't tell you what anyone would ask for an easement on their ground, they will still be farming across it, Granzow does not know, you know your neighbors better than Granzow does when it comes to this. Greg Larson stated we are about \$200,000 over budget now, and if you are saying that we potentially have another \$200,000 in easements, not knowing, Larson would think we at least want to explore these before we bite off more, that is his personal opinion. Gallentine stated that is what we are here for, to find out what people think.

John Kuhfus asked on those easements do people who have the easements, can they just ask twice what the easement is worth. Granzow stated that is where the eminent domain would come in, Granzow does not think this project is an eminent domain project from his standpoint, an eminent domain poll could be taken of the other Trustees, you could ask McClellan and Hoffman, they might want to do that but if one of us was against it, the other option you have is you guys could take the Trustees away from us and go to a Private Trustee District and pursue it that way, but Granzow does not believe this qualifies for an eminent domain, it is not for a public service. McClellan stated she does not feel it qualifies either, Granzow stated that might be used for a landfill where you need to expand the landfill, or something like that that would benefit the public. Kuhfus asked what it does to the land if they try to sell that land after the easement is granted., Gallentine stated that easement will be run with the land so the next landowner will be subject to the terms of the easement just like the current landowner is. Granzow stated we run into that, people have bought and sold the land two or three times over and never knew what a drainage district was until they get a drainage bill. Gallentine stated or until we go out in their field and start digging it up their field and the owner asks why we are here, well because this 100-year-old tile is here. Granzow states they come through and tell us they own the ground, and we can't be on it, well we have an easement here, it is always an issue and Granzow thinks it should be abstracted when you buy a piece of property. McCartney asked if it would be 20 acres that have permanent easement, Gallentine stated that would be correct, Granzow stated and an additional 10 acres of temporary easement, just for the project. Gallentine stated part of the problem gets to be is that you are starting at the road and going up to the open ditch, essentially there is no way to get back out, so you have to keep a lane open and an area for them to turn back around and get out for any of your supplies or trucks, it is not like you can drive in and get straight out, plus being this deep you are going to have two decent size piles of dirt, one on each side of the trench, one for topsoil and the other side for subsoil.

McCartney stated he would be in favor of talking with the landowners and see if they will be reasonable. Larson stated after the initial construction, there would be the matter of what kind of damage policy we have in place, to access that easement, do you have a standard clause for damages that can be presented to these people. Granzow stated he would let Smith answer that. Smith stated we have a Crop Damage Policy in place so that whenever work is done in a district, and it impacts your field, you can then file a crop damage claim, that claim is paid by the District to you, then eventually when you are assessed for the work done, that Crop Damage Claim is then paid for by all landowners in the District, any time work is done by the District, on behalf of the District, in your land, then yes, you can file a crop damage claim. Smith stated for initial construction we usually do that at the end of the project at the Completion Hearing and then later on if repairs need to be made or access needs to be made, a claim can be filed at that time as well. Granzow asked Smith to explain how we price the crop for damage claims. Smith stated Crop Damage Claim prices are based on prices provided to us by the USDA Crop Risk Loss Management policy, so whatever the USDA sets this year's crop pricing for crop loss damages, that is the same pricing that we use. Larson asked if there is any allowance for compaction. Smith stated she thought those kinds of things can be considered on a case-by-case basis, Smith stated we try to take into consideration if fences are damaged or other structures were damaged or had to be moved as well, that is considered in the process as well, and there is a place on the form that you can fill that in. Granzow stated he would put that into the cost of the easement, you did a one time easement, you sold your easement, you would put that number into the calculation at that time, and if we ever had to go back in again, the compaction and everything, you have already sold your easement, in Granzow's mind, that would be considered up front as part of that easement cost, the crop damage is an annual thing, compaction – yes, at some point someone will come back in again, it might be 20 years, it might be 100 years, but somebody is coming back in, but the easement has already been sold, and they need to put that figure in for that. Larson stated he just wanted to know as we were talking about easements. Gallentine stated the right of way acquisition guy would know all that and he deals with that, he does that every day, Gallentine does not do that.

Greg Larson asked what we have spent so far engineering-wise. Granzow directed that question to Smith. Smith stated so far, we are right about \$40,000 all things considered, starting at about 2018 and moving forward, that includes some publication cost, some legal advice and postage as well. Gallentine stated that should include Reclassification as well. Smith stated that does include your Reclassification Report. Larson stated if he remembered right, the original estimate for engineering costs was like \$135,000 including construction. Gallentine stated that was right and the \$135,000 included construction, but it did not include Reclassification, that \$135,000 was from the day of the Hearing moving forward including plans and construction. Larson asked how much the Reclassification was, Smith stated right around \$12,000 of that \$40,000. Gallentine stated she has the numbers you would have to look at her. Smith stated yes \$135,000 plus the \$12,000, I think you would be all right looking at that. Larson wanted to know where we are at overall budget wise. Gallentine stated he understood but he does not have those answers. Smith stated so far of the \$40,000 spent thus far, the Reclass Report itself was \$12,000 of that \$40,000 number Smith gave you, if the Report was separate from that \$135,000 original estimate on engineering, for specifications, plans, bids, construction, then you would be looking at about \$147,000 if you counted that Reclass Report separately. Larson stated that was what he was after, thank you. Gallentine stated that probably includes the cost of hearings and the original reports too. Smith stated that was all included in the \$40,000 spent thus far. Gallentine stated the \$135,000 estimate was from the time of the Hearing moving forward, nothing prior to that.

McClellan asked if Kathy Kolden would like to unmute herself or comment. Kolden did not respond, McClellan stated if you are trying to talk though your phone, we can't hear you. McClellan noted Kolden's comment typed into the zoom meeting chat – Kolden commented: Radland Farms, Inc. to Everyone: "No, I do not want to proceed", and "No to eminent domain".

Granzow asked Gallentine to give a little recap on the \$850,000 project costs. Gallentine stated so when the District Trustees said to go forward with the project, we maybe the engineering and construction to be about \$850,000, we had the Bid Letting, and the construction costs alone are \$881,000, so we are probably going to be pushing that \$1,000,000, about \$150,000 over those costs we talked about at the hearing, we didn't talk about the costs of easements at the hearing, we still don't have easements, we haven't pushed those hard because it is kind of chicken and the egg, which do you do first, do you get easements first and then do the prices come in right or not, because if the project doesn't come in, do you pay for those. The project is set up so that if you award the project and you don't get easements and the thing falls through, you only owe him \$8,000 just to cover his bonding, that's it, you don't owe him anything beyond that, so that would lock in your price for the time being. Gallentine stated he does not think you are going to get a better price this year, we had 4 contractors, their material prices have been doing weird things really similar to lumber, especially in the last 2 to 3 weeks, Gallentine does not think we will get better prices this year, unless we waited until November, December or maybe January to re-bid it, because in January we were having 11 bidders on a project and they were 10 to 20% under the expected costs, things have just really been changing a lot.

Granzow stated so after this project is done, we are looking at splitting this project into and east and a west district, and right, wrong or indifferent, this easement portion will only stay with the west district, is that correct. Gallentine stated yes, the easement totally benefits the west portion after the district is split, Granzow stated it is just a thought, would it make sense that just the west portion pays for the easement, or would it make more sense that everybody pays for the easement and then split it, Larson stated it would be part of the original construction to him, he does not know why, we are in the west district, and it does not make sense to Larson that that cost should stay solely with the west district, that is part of the cost of construction. Granzow stated that is the only reason he brought it up, to talk it out, bear with him. Larson assumed the easement costs would be split.

Granzow asked if there were any other opinions. Robert Topp asked on the easements, are there options on where to put the tile, is it close to two different landowners. Gallentine stated he is not sure where it is going to go, Gallentine stated he thought when you get to the open ditch on the north there are more options than on the south, on the south end where are at the gravel road at 230th St we wanted to come down right where it swoops north of the gravel road, and that is kind of a really limited area, it starts south of 230th and then it swoops north to 230th and then back to the south, Gallentine stated that is where Sheldahls indicated would be a good spot to hook up based on the lack of drainage they have seen, so if we scooted it over to another landowner we be looking at more pipe. Topp stated okay, he didn't know

where it connected in at. Gallentine stated once we get up by the open ditch, we can pick that, when we run south, we are pretty locked in, unless we run more pipe. It was asked where this is dumping into Tipton Creek at. Gallentine referenced the district map, Kolden asked to share the screen, Gallentine stated we will zoom into the exact spot. Gallentine stated right around the bend on the open ditch is where we plan on out-letting and that is based on where that tile swerves north of 230th, so that blue line where it says Main at the bottom of the screen, so you can see where it goes north of 230th, we are hooking in there and going north-northeast based off the lowest spot in the ground, it is still 20' deep in spots and there are still a couple of spots it will be deeper.

Larson asked how much tie we have left on the bid validity, Gallentine stated he would double check, he thought they keep it open for 60 days from the bid letting, so maybe 40 more days maybe. Larson stated so that is enough time we could probably talk to these two landowners and get an idea. Gallentine stated we could try; he knows there is a process. Larson asked if that is enough time to assess the easements. Gallentine stated he thinks if everything goes well it is enough time, Gallentine's concern is that we talked with landowners and if Gallentine was a landowner he would say well, yes, maybe, how much are we talking about, and to do the comparables, Gallentine does not know if there is enough time left to do the comps, so we should know how much to offer them, that is reasonable. Gallentine stated he does not know if it is enough time to get a solid number on what they should be offered, if you want us to do a comparable search for an easement.

McClellan asked if that was the consensus of the group that the landowners wanted to get more of an idea on the costs of the easements before we decide whether to proceed or not. Larson stated yes, we think that would be best. McCartney stated yes. Larson stated yes as long we are not jeopardizing the bid number that we do have, and if we can do it without a great amount of cost, Larson recognizes there is a cost. Gallentine stated the bid is good for another 40 days, but beyond that if you want to lock in that price, it will cost you \$8,000. Kuhfus asked if Gallentine could give him some conditions that could make that bid not good. Gallentine asked the bid not good as far as, Kuhfus stated as far as gee we didn't see this coming and then we have to stop, how good is that \$881,000. Gallentine stated that \$881,000 gets you what is on the plan, what we don't know is what is not on the plans, if I run into a 10 million year old dinosaur pit that is a quarter mile long and then we are shut down forever, that isn't on the plans, if we get down there and it is nothing but pure sand for the last 10 feet and we require extra bedding rock beyond the plans, then yes that is not on the plan. Gallentine stated there is cost in there for de-watering since we are that deep, wherever the contractor needs to de-water they need to do, but if we don't have a firm enough foundation for the pipe, that would be different. McCartney asked if they ever come in at cost or less than what they bid. Gallentine stated he has had some come in less than what they bid but typically what it involves is we are replacing a tile and there was better than what we thought, typically the only way they can come in less than what they bid is if they do less work. Granzow stated typically it would be a shovel. Kuhfus asked if they would tell you if they came in less. Gallentine stated we are out there watching them so if we see something and go this is a little bit less than the plans, we need to get a deduct, we go talk to them and say we need to get a deduct for that. Kuhfus stated his experience with Steve Gehrke has always been costs plus with him because he was always less than the bid and asked why you gave me this bid if you are always going to do it cheaper, and Kuhfus trusted him, but nobody ever goes costs plus in this day anymore. Granzow stated but you are talking about a private tile being put in where he is just charging by the foot and by the hour, Kuhfus stated he is not talking about this monstrosity we are putting in here, Granzow stated but this is a contract we are talking about and if he goes way over cost, he eats it, they usually come in more for us too. Gallentine stated from what he understands we are looking at material costs for just the pipe on this job is just over \$500,000, and it sounded like they would hope at that depth to maybe make 80' a day, so it is going to take them awhile. Gallentine stated if we can do the spoon if soil conditions allow it that will speed it up some, but Gallentine does not see us trimming enough to get back to the previous estimate cost.

Kuhfus asked has Gehrke had experience on jobs this big in other situations, and how accurate is he on the job, when we asked him to do work, we never saw Steve. Gallentine stated yes, he has, and you probably won't see Steve there is a lot of Jeremy Mass, he is typically involved in a lot of their tile work, he is very capable, Gallentine stated he does not know how many staff they currently have, but they have had 20 to 25 guys on staff. Granzow stated he could be wrong when he says this but thinks Maas is a part owner. Gallentine stated yes Maas is a part owner. Granzow stated he does a lot of their tile. Gallentine stated this would not be their only project this year, he knows of at least 3 others they have said that they

got, one of them is a subdivision in Grundy Center for CGA.

McClellan asked if anyone attending via zoom would like to speak up. Kolden stated she could not hear what they asked about only the west paying for easements, what was said in response to that, Kolden does not agree with that, and is fine with finding out about the costs of the easements but does not want to proceed. McClellan stated she thought that was the consensus of a few of the others, that they did not want to proceed without knowing the costs and that it should be a shared expense. Kolden stated she could not hear the earlier reply. McClellan asked if anyone else on zoom would like to make a question or comment. Stensland commented he is just in favor of proceeding. Michael Fjelland stated he did not join the meeting until recently as he had a work thing he attended, but that is okay he can get caught up with Brad Fjelland or Kathy Kolden.

McClellan asked if there were any other questions or comments. Larson asked about the alternates, the cost for the 2' deeper was such a small cost, it seems like that is almost a no brainer, but Larson's real question was we have got about \$24,000 for mandrel testing of the tile and about that same amount for CCTV inspection of the tile, if you pull mandrels through there do you need CCTV inspection. Gallentine stated he would talk about those as he had not hit those yet as they were kind of some things out on the backside, these were some things we put in here that we had talked about at the hearing, one of which was going an additional 2' deeper, so that if this thing continues upstream the rest of the main tile can be made deeper so if you want to make the whole thing deeper along the entire length, you will add about \$4,674 to the project, not a large amount as Larson mentioned, we also threw on mandrel testing of the tile, and what that is, is it is a set diameter mandrel that is pulled through the tile after it has been in there for 30 days so that you can make sure it hasn't deflected, for concrete pipe we really don't use it, it is for a plastic pipe scenario, so with a concrete pipe you really wouldn't worry about mandrel testing, CCTV is essentially a camera that runs through the tile on a cord and it records the condition of the interior of the tile after they lay it, we use it quite a bit trying to figure out 100 year old tile, what spots are bad and what spots are good and where it is this deep, maybe it is possible you guys want it as a baseline for you to figure out what condition it is in after it is installed. Gallentine stated the downside is that is \$23,370, in order to do that you have to have access points at intervals because that cable is only so long, so that adds another \$24,000 so really if you want to televise you are going to have spend \$48,000 to have a baseline of what it looks like today. Larson stated so the mandrel pull in the concrete is not applicable. Gallentine stated yes that is correct, the mandrel pull would not be applicable, the other item we bid is trench compaction which is \$23,370, essentially what that does is changing the trench compaction from an agricultural typical scenario where they put it in and they maybe bucket pack it, wheel pack it, to similar to what you do in a city street where they get a vibratory head out there, and they are vibrating and they test it to make sure it is 95% density, the nice thing about that is you don't have to worry about any settling, the downside to that is your native soil sitting next to this trench might only be at 80% density, now you have this at 95% in the middle and sometimes you can make it too tough or too compacted compared to the natives and you will heave up that way too, so we bid that too. Gallentine stated if everybody stated yes, let's go with the contract and Gallentine is not saying that, but if you did then we need to figure out which add alternates, if any, people want to do. Granzow stated deeper depth is obvious, we will go with that when we know more about the easement cost, he is pretty confident of that, mandrel test is not an option because we are not using plastic, the camera you would definitely want to discuss, think about whether you would want to go that route, sometimes we do it, sometimes we don't, if we ran into issues, you would really wish you had done it from the starting point or the warranty point, you know where you are at, if you have issues and you didn't do it, you will wish you would have, if you don't have issues, you are glad you didn't do it, that is for you guys to decide.

Brad Fjelland asked if the camera measures the grade. Gallentine stated no it is literally a video of the camera going down the pipe and seeing any defects. Brad Fjelland asked so you would have no idea if there was a hump in it. Granzow stated the Engineer should catch that, Gallentine stated yes, we will be in the field so we will catch that. Larson asked if the biggest things we would pick up with the CCTV is alignment and joint problems. Gallentine stated yes, joint problems and alignment and sometimes it is amazing and you say oh how did all those rocks get in there, you could run into that, Gallentine does not think you run into that quite as much, but if we are pulling an old tile out and putting in a new one and there is flow coming through, sometimes a lot of stuff can be swept into it, since this is a new installation, the only flow should be coming into that is just whatever ground water that comes up. Gallentine stated it is things like that that come up every once in a while, oh there is raccoons living in it already, it just shows

you everything, it gives you a baseline. It was asked how often CGA would be going out there and looking at what the contractor is doing. Gallentine stated we are out there every day, we try to be out there any time they are laying pipe, this deep we are probably not going to be out there every time they are backfilling for the whole time, but if they are laying pipe, we will be out there, and we are checking the grade and checking to make sure they are joining in decent. Granzow stated he will use Radcliffe for an example, they also go out there and they will check the pipe, and they rejected 7 loads of pipe that wasn't at quality, so we made them take the pipe back and bring more pipe in, and that was a lot on the contractor, Gallentine stated he thought it went back to the supplier for sending junk out. Granzow stated so as the engineer they inspect that as well. Gallentine stated they have concrete pipe showing up with the whole spigot broken off we are not going to let them put it in the ground, this thing is supposed to last from 50 to 100 years, so we have to have some quality to start with. Gallentine stated we also do the staking and mark up the alignment, so we do all that as well. Larson asked if CGA does verify all their final grade of pipe before it is covered. Gallentine stated yes, we verify that as they are laying the pipe.

Brad Fjelland asked if estimates are taking into consideration connecting any private tile that is already there. Gallentine stated yes, we threw in that in the bid, we put in 10 connections, which may be a little light. Brad Fjelland asked if the contractor would tell us if there was any more. Gallentine stated if we run into 11, they get hooked up, if they run into 8 and don't hook up 10, they don't get paid for 10, they get paid for what they hook up. Fjelland stated at 10 that may be close. Gallentine stated if they are patterned tiled fields, we may run into quite a few, if they are not patterned tiled fields, we may not.

Granzow stated so we are looking at easements and seeing what they would cost if possible, and probably be back in, we have about 40 days, and he hates to pull people back in out of the field for everything. McClellan stated zoom will still be available for that too. Gallentine suggested that if we don't have answers back on the easements in 40 days, do you want to talk about entering into the contract, and sacrifice \$8,000 just to do that, and say hey we don't have answers on the easements, do we do it or not. Granzow stated along with this contract, and correct me if I am wrong, we enter into the contract with the \$8,000, but if we can't get the easements, we are out that, it just cost us \$8,000. Gallentine stated it is written in there, that the contractor is not supposed to order any materials or incur any costs, outside of bonding, until those easements are obtained, and we have given them copies. Larson stated if it became obvious that we needed a couple ore days beyond the three weeks, to work around the easements, can we ask the contractor to extend the bid. Gallentine stated yes, we can do that. Larson stated contractors are asked to extend the bid on projects all the time. Granzow stated the \$8,000 would lock you in, Gallentine stated yes, it would lock you in at that price. Granzow stated with an extension they may have an increase in costs, and they may be to make that part of the extension. Larson stated that is true. McClellan asked if the easements would take 40 days or more. Gallentine stated what he imagined would happen would be that if the real estate guy contacts these people, they might say, yes, I am interested in that what are you offering, to find a comparable reasonable price is what is going to take the time, Gallentine does not know if they would get it done in 40 days, Granzow stated but if they are not interested, we would know that right away. Gallentine stated we would know that right away.

McClellan asked if the land this is going through would be benefitted to. Gallentine stated he would say generally so, but everyone has their own opinions on what has been built, some people love open ditches because they can out let right into them with their tile, and others hate them because they have to farm around them, Gallentine just didn't know if we fielded that and before the 40 days are up and we still don't have easement answers yes or no, and we still have to call a meeting later. McClellan stated she would imagine that time of year, you probably just want to do one meeting instead of two different ones there is a way for us to get the word out. Granzow stated he thinks if we are currently working with the acquisition of an easement, and everyone is in favor of going forward, we go ahead with the \$8,000 and lock it in because it is acceptable at that amount and then when we finally get an easement dollar amount we can go ahead and decide if we are moving forward, Granzow asked if that was a fair statement for everybody, but if we run into a hiccup where someone says yes we will give you an easement for \$100,000, Granzow stated obviously we are not working well with somebody, but maybe you guys will still want an easement and want to move forward with this, but Granzow does not know. Granzow stated we can hold of on the \$8,000 until we know if they are interested or not, and if they are not interested, we should probably pull everyone back in and go from there. Gallentine stated it maybe right away we hear that a landowner will work with us on this, or it may be no way.

6. Possible Action On Bids

Granzow asked if there was any additional questions or concerns. Hearing none, Granzow stated we will move forward with the easements and when we hear back, we will contact you when we have more answers. McClellan stated if you have any questions or comments you think of later, you can email those to the Drainage Clerk. No action on bids at this time.

7. Other Business

8. Adjourn Meeting

Motion by McClellan to adjourn. Second by Granzow. All ayes. Motion carried.