

**DRAINAGE DISTRICT 121 LANDOWNER MEETING**  
**Wednesday, September 01, 2021 10:00 AM**

**This meeting was held electronically and in-person**

9/1/2021 - Minutes

1. Open Meeting

Hardin County Chairperson Hoffman opened the meeting. Also present were Trustee Renee McClellan; Trustee Lance Granzow; Lee Gallentine of Clapsaddle-Garber Associates (CGA); Nancy Callaway; Pauline Lloyd; Carey Callaway; Tom McDonald; Julie Duhn; Mike Pearce, Network Specialist; 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 121 WO 295 - Discuss W Possible Action - Investigation Summary

This informational meeting is to discuss the Investigation Summary findings of multiple issues and previous repair, CGA recommends replacement of 800' of tile with RCP, estimated costs are between \$40,000 to \$60,000. Landowner input and feedback is requested to discuss options and/or see if there is interest in this district project or repair to address these issues.

Gallentine stated we're here to discuss Drainage District 121, we had a work order turned in for the tile North of 330<sup>th</sup> street Drainage District 121 to the far South, almost to Marshall County. Gallentine stated it's not a huge district, it looks like it had two maybe three sections of ground in it at most. Smith stated twelve hundred and twenty-two acres. Gallentine stated two sections right on the money. Gallentine stated we initially reported some issues, the District Trustees authorized to go out and do some pot holing so we could figure out the tile condition and what's going on. Gallentine noted, in through this area there is a little bit of a swale, the tile is shallow, but when we excavated it we found a fifteen-inch single wall tile which is an indication of a premature repair. Gallentine stated, unfortunately a single wall at that depth eventually is going to fail, probably prematurely. Gallentine stated that was connected to a fourteen-inch clay tile that collapsed, backing up water further up-stream into a fifteen-inch CMP metal tile that was almost rusted through. Gallentine stated, right away we started with two repairs that we know of previously, we know it's been an issue to start with. Gallentine stated the other spot that was dug out there was a fourteen-inch clay tile plugged with tree roots, upstream of that we found fifteen-inch single wall again. Gallentine stated that this area looks like it had trees at one time within the last five years and they've been cut down by the landowner or tenant, the tree roots appear to have plugged this tile, due to shallow nature it looks like its collapsing it, it's in bad shape. Gallentine stated CGA recommends that about eight hundred feet of the tile be replaced with concrete pipe, and CGA puts in fifteen-inch tile because they don't make fourteen-inch tile

any more. Gallentine stated the estimated construction costs of that are forty to sixty thousand. Gallentine stated that per Iowa code, as of July one, the District Trustees were fully authorized to spend that amount without notifying a single landowner. Gallentine stated Iowa code says they can do that, however, they decided they would rather get some exposure to it, so landowners are aware of it instead of getting a bill in the mail a few years later and realizing what's going on. Gallentine stated that some tiles are in bad shape but they're still kind of flowing and working, this one is not that case. Gallentine stated this one has collapsed it's got tree roots, the only way that anything upstream is draining is if the water gets enough surcharge and head on it, it comes out of the ground flows over stream, over land and then goes back down stream. Gallentine stated that this facility is not functioning and needs replacing. Granzow stated that Iowa code also makes it where we have to have water flowing. Gallentine stated Iowa code says the facility has to be functioning.

Hoffman asked the landowners if they have any input, comments, questions, or concerns. Smith stated that the landowners present for this meeting are Tom McDonald, Julie Duhn, and Carey Callaway on the line. Pearce stated that Carey left. Hoffman asked the landowners again if they had any questions or concerns. Tom McDonald stated he wanted it fixed. Hoffman asked Smith if she had the classification where we had a rough estimate. Smith stated she did not have it broken down by landowner. Smith stated that there are twenty-seven landowners in this district with forty-seven parcels. Smith stated we could get an estimate put together, the original classification on this was twenty-one thousand so I could kind of give you a ballpark. Hoffman asked when the last time was that it was classified. Smith stated she thought it was the original classification on this one. Hoffman stated he would like to see some numbers plugged in before taking action. Hoffman asked Smith if she could put those together for next week. Smith stated she would put the numbers together. Granzow stated he would like to see what the classification looks like. Granzow asked how many landowners were in attendance. Smith stated there were two landowners. Granzow asked if the two landowners were requesting that we look at the classification or are they fine with what it currently is. McDonald asked if they could explain the classification. Granzow stated that if its original, it could be so far out of whack that it's not fair. Hoffman stated that he's going to have Gallentine explain the classifications. Gallentine stated that when these districts were originally installed the classifications and mechanism by which they determined how much each landowner pays isn't just as simple as the total cost divided by the total number of acres. Gallentine stated that they have a three-person committee, one is an engineer, two of them are landowners from the county who are disinterested they would be appointed as the commissioner, they would go out and rate each forty-acre parcel by how much benefit that parcel could receive from the district. Gallentine stated they compiled a report, whoever they felt got the most benefit was a hundred percent benefit parcel, everybody was compared to that, then they had a hearing on it at which the landowners could say yes that's right or no it's not right. Gallentine stated the landowners could speak about their objections at the hearing, when that was settled, they adopted the classification. Gallentine added that's how everything has been paid for since the classification was original. Gallentine stated he's not quite sure how they did it one hundred years ago, some appear to be good and some of them appear to be way skewed. Gallentine added what he means by skewed, if you were the person who requested the range district, you might pay forty times as much as someone else. Granzow stated we've had a ninety five percent. Gallentine stated there is a process to redo that called re-classification. Gallentine noted, essentially reclassification is the same process with three people, the difference is, today we've got soil maps and GIS, we can tell a lot more about the soil types and which types really need the Drainage to be productive. Gallentine added, we can tell how close your parcel is to the District Facility. Gallentine stated that if the existing classification is inequitable in the minds of the District Trustees, they can order a re-classification in which we go through that process again and they appoint the members and have another hearing after the report is filed. Gallentine stated that's again the Trustees discretion whether they want to or not, Gallentine added the Trustees value landowner input on that. Hoffman stated there is a cost to re-classify. Granzow added that this is a smaller district. Smith stated that there are twenty-seven landowners in DD 121. Gallentine stated twenty-seven landowners and about twelve to thirteen hundred acres. McClellan asked CGA what the estimate for doing a re-classification. Gallentine asked the Trustees if they wanted CGA to do the Main or the laterals too. Gallentine added most classifications have just one classification originally, whether you're working on the Main or Lateral, everybody paid. Gallentine stated when you re-classify, you can separate the Laterals out differently so that only the Laterals pay for the Laterals and the Main pays for the Main. McClellan asked CGA how many Laterals there were in DD 121. Gallentine stated that it looks like there are three. Hoffman asked Pearce to pull up a map. Smith stated it looked like there were four LATS. Granzow stated there were four short Laterals. Gallentine stated a classification like that you're looking at eight to twenty thousand. Gallentine stated he hates to be that vague but sometimes digging through the history you run

into some really weird things like DD 9 where only one map was right, and all of the rest were wrong. Granzow stated that his recommendation would be to see what it looks like and see if it's out of whack. Granzow stated that if he was going to re-classify the district, he would separate the laterals because of the way they're designed. Granzow stated there were different areas, a person from LAT 1 wouldn't want to pay for LAT 4. Granzow stated that if everyone is happy with sharing it, it might just be smarter with that kind of money just to do the repair.

A landowner asked what the colors meant on Beacon map. Granzow stated the colors on the map are the different districts. A landowner re-stated the answer and asked if it had anything to do with the land and the makeup. Granzow stated it was just the different districts. McClellan stated that the laterals were not really that big. Hoffman stated that they were fairly short laterals. Granzow stated that he thought at some point the landowners may want to ask if they can just keep that as a lateral, it's probably one landowner that can do a tile line. Gallentine stated that the Main, where we found the fourteen-inch tile, I imagine the laterals are fairly small. Granzow stated that it might just be more efficient to get rid of the lateral and let it be a private tile. McClellan stated it would be cheaper for everybody. Granzow stated it would be more economical to the landowner and the district. Hoffman stated that he would hold off on any big action. Hoffman stated he would like to wait and see what the classification looks like. Hoffman asked if there were any written comments or has anyone called Smith. Smith stated she's had no written comments or any phone calls. Granzow stated it needs to be fixed, Granzow added that the law states it needs to be fixed. Granzow stated we wanted to make you aware of what is going on. Granzow asked if Tom had any additional comments. Smith stated that Tom did not, Smith said that he just wanted an update back in July. Smith stated she gave Tom a copy of the investigation summary to Tom on 07-22 with no additional comments, he just wanted to be kept in the loop. Granzow asked if this was something we would send out to contractors, or just do the repairs. Gallentine stated that it was forty to sixty thousand, so you don't have to go to public bid letting. Gallentine stated if you want to and feel it's necessary, it is your call. Gallentine stated that length of tile and that size, he would say, is probably pushing the upper limits of our current contractor pool. Gallentine stated he's not saying Adam and Paul can't do it, Adam and Paul are just set up for smaller stuff. Hoffman stated that we would put it out locally. Hoffman stated that the bid letting process itself will have expenses to it. Gallentine stated they might just want to ask the local contractors Gehrke or McDowell if they're interested. Gallentine stated he would also include Adam and Paul and see what they would be able to do price wise. Granzow asked if we were just going local or reaching out to see what else is available. Hoffman stated we should stick local and with our lottery system, if no one is interested, we have to take those extra steps. McClellan stated we should save the money. Hoffman asked the landowners if they had any questions. A landowner stated it's all kind of new to him. Hoffman asked if this was the first work order that's been done in this district. Smith stated that the last work order that she has is quite old, Smith stated she has a work order for 2004. Hoffman stated that it hasn't been a long time but seventeen years ago was the last time that any work has been done in DD 121. Granzow stated that unfortunately it keeps going up in price. Smith stated she would bring a landowner estimate back to the table next week if that would be helpful. Granzow asked Smith if she would just be able to collect their emails and send estimates instead of having them come in. Granzow stated that it's up to them, Granzow added if they want to come the landowners are more than welcome. A landowner stated that McDonald is in Des Moines now so he probably wouldn't. Granzow stated that if we had the landowner's emails, we could send all the information. Gallentine stated that the forty to sixty thousand were just construction costs (contractor costs), oversight and administration would be above and beyond. Gallentine stated that when the final bill comes out more than the quoted price that's probably what it includes. Granzow asked if Gallentine could reach out to the contractors and see if we could get an estimate. Granzow stated we could also come back next week with classification results, to see their interest levels and get pricing for it.

Motion by Granzow to direct CGA to get contractor interest level and to create an estimate for landowners. Second by McClellan. All Ayes. Motion carried.

## 5. Comments/Discussion

Granzow let all the landowners know if they wanted to take a copy of the agenda for other landowners they can. A landowner wanted to know which farm of hers is going to be affected. Smith asked what their name was. The landowner stated their names were Amdahl. Smith told Pearce to search for Amdahl, Carolyn. Granzow stated it looks like she has an eighty. McClellan stated that Amdahl's parcels were on the Main. Gallentine stated that he believes the issue is on the farm left of Amdahl. Smith stated that it was the farm

left of Amdahl. Amdahl stated she had an issue with another property of hers. Smith stated the other three parcels are not with in a Drainage District, Smith added that would be a private tile issue.

6. Possible Action

7. Other Business

8. Adjourn Meeting

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