

AGENDA
REGULAR DRAINAGE MEETING
Wednesday, March 10, 2021 9:30 AM
Large Conference Room

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

To access the meeting call: 1-(312)-626-6799, when prompted enter meeting

ID code: 820 7567 2007

You can also access the meeting online at:

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/82075672007>

1. Open Meeting
2. Approve Agenda
3. Approve Minutes

Documents:

[DD 14 LANDOWNER MTG MINUTES 02_17_21.PDF](#)

4. Approve Claims For Payment

Documents:

[PAYABLES-DRAINAGE PUBLICATION 03_12_21.PDF](#)

5. DD 17 - Discuss W Possible Action - Work Order Request # 308
Landowner John Wibholm reports 12" main tile if offset of outlet & not draining, standing water backed up in his parcel #88204200001 & outlet is in neighbor's parcel to the the west. John had Hands On investigate, tile is open, John says it needs dug down for a length of 300' to 400' and relaid.

Documents:

[DD 17 WO 308.PDF](#)
[DD 17 WO 308 MAP.PDF](#)

6. Discuss W Possible Action - 2021 Drainage Assessments
7. Other Business
8. Adjourn Meeting

DRAINAGE DISTRICT 14 LANDOWNER MEETING
WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 17, 2021 11:00 AM
This meeting was held electronically and in-person due to Covid-19 concerns.

2/17/2021 - Minutes

1. Open Meeting

Hardin County Drainage Chairperson BJ Hoffman opened the meeting. Also present were Trustee Renee McClellan; Trustee Lance Granzow; Lee Gallentine of Clapsaddle-Garber Associates (CGA); Landowners: Cindy Ioerger; Ron Vierkandt; Luke Vierkandt; Jim Vierkandt; George Ioerger; Westhenry Ioerger; Dave Sweeney; Jack Runge; Merv Vierkandt; Michael Pearce, Network Specialist; and Denise Smith, Drainage Clerk.

2. Approve Agenda

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

3. Introductions/Attendance

Introductions were made and attendance verified.

4. DD 14 WO 290 - Discuss W/ Possible Action - Improvement / Repair Options

Hoffman stated we are here to discuss Work Order 290 and asked Smith if we would like to have Gallentine begin the conversation. Smith stated we can give the landowners a brief rundown of this, in the past November at our last meeting the consensus was to spend about \$35,000, beginning at the lower end of the district replacing tile and working our way up until we ran out of that \$35,000. Smith stated one of the landowners came forward to her to express some interest in possible up-sizing of the tile at this time rather than the limited repair of the existing tile and possibly extending that main tile improvement farther than we have talked about. Smith stated she would have Ron Vierkandt, who had spoken with her, give you his thoughts and go from there and open the discussion.

Hoffman yielded the floor to R. Vierkandt. R. Vierkandt stated the reason he did that was, first off, the reason he did that was \$35,000 sounded like a lot of money, R. Vierkandt spoke with Gallentine on this and said don't know how far \$35,000 is going to take us, and we didn't specify, that is a fix and we really don't have to have a landowners meeting to do this, is a fix the right way to start this project. R. Vierkandt stated all of our blowouts have been basically have been through Cindy Ioerger's, you get up to R. Vierkandt's line fence, two blowouts in probably the last 10 years, so if we go to a replacement or a new project, we can get a bid in rather than pay just a guy to come in and fix a little bit, if we can bid this project we can get it cheaper by the foot and instead of going up from the bottom \$35,000 far, it would come clear to R. Vierkandt's line fence. C. Ioerger asked if that was the 2,000' they were talking about then. Gallentine stated it would take 2,900' to get to the property line between you two if we just go to the property line between C. Ioerger and Merle Strothcamp that is about 500'. R. Vierkandt stated that is about all the farther our \$35,000 would go at about \$7/ft. Gallentine stated that would be about that 500', or maybe up to 700' at the most with that \$35,000, just rough numbering if you go the 2,900' and if you stay with the same size as the existing tile, Gallentine isn't sure if that is what they want to or not, Gallentine thinks you would be up around \$150,000 but we would have to have an Engineer's Report, and a Hearing, a formal meeting, and this is all informational today, if you upsize it to a 24" you are probably looking at about \$200,000 and those are just spitball numbers.

C. Ioerger stated she thinks it is rather funny, like R. Vierkandt says, he has had two blowouts, C. Ioerger's nephew stands to inherit her land and all of a sudden the blowouts are on her place and thinks he wants Aunt Cindy to pay for it before she dies, C. Ioerger would not put it past them to go out before a rain, dig up a hole and create these blowouts. Hoffman stated he would ask that we keep things germane today. C. Ioerger stated she is just saying what she is thinking. Hoffman appreciates that and C. Ioerger is entitled to her opinion. C. Ioerger stated she thinks we should go with what we originally thought, take care of the problems, we had a problem going into her CPR grounds, this would alleviate a lot of the problems, take care of the blowouts that are near the house. R. Vierkandt stated that is on a different tile line. C. Ioerger stated the three blowouts that we are talking about between the 570' and the 2,900', C. Ioerger thinks we should just go in and take care of it, like we said in the original meeting, and C. Ioerger will put a no trespassing on some people. Gallentine stated we also did televise where at the blowouts we televised upstream and downstream with a camera. C. Ioerger asked if this was with Jim's company, Hoffman stated that was with Williams Excavation, Gallentine concurred it was with Williams Excavation, C. Ioerger stated she knew Jim's company got into a conflict of interest as Jim is on the Board and Annette is on the Board, used their force. Hoffman stated let me explain, Lee Gallentine from Clapsaddle-Garber, Iowa Code which is something Hoffman learned really early in a drainage meeting, Jim Sweeney is a disinterested party, he can't have anything professionally to do with this. C., Ioerger stated and he does, he and Dave go on her property and they don't even tell her that they are going on C. Ioerger's property. Hoffman stated that is a matter

between you guys, but the professional part of CGA and Jim Sweeney as a professional engineer, according to Iowa Code, can't have anything to do professionally with that, there is a disinterested party section of Code that requires Jim Sweeney to be disinterested, Matt Garber and Lee Gallentine have done everything in their professional interest to maintain that part of the Iowa Code. Gallentine stated the Trustees have a policy on file that states what a disinterested party is on file, Gallentine thinks it is like 3 separations, it is pretty far apart.

C. loerger stated when they sent the second letter to her home, she took it out there to David Sweeney and David Sweeney said Jim said this was happening, oh I mean his company, so that tells you how disinterested Jim is. Hoffman acknowledges C. loerger's frustration and is not here to take a part of any family feuding or anything. C. loerger stated she is not feuding. Hoffman stated or whatever you want to call it, what Hoffman wants to stay on task with the landowners is what kind of remedy do you want to see, and there is a portion on the agenda today for possible action and possible action Hoffman could see taking place would be ordering an Engineer's Report and something for a larger scale project, or the authorization of the smaller scale project and kind of piece-mealing.

Hoffman stated just to keep things flowing here, Hoffman asked Pearce to unmute the zoom attendants, Hoffman asked Runge to weigh in and then will move to Dave Sweeney. Runge stated this has went from something that wasn't going to be a big deal to something that will probably be quite substantial, Runge is a major player in the cost of this, and for disclosure he and R. Vierkandt visited this morning and we have a little bit of history on this, Runge realizes you have to start at the bottom and it is investing in the future, but fixing the bottom is not Runge's problem, the tile has a good deal of fall once it gets over into Sweeney's and moves down through there, Runge's problem is, and Lee Gallentine wrote a nice article that saved him some issues when they did the Main Drain, Runge's problem is getting through R. Vierkandt's where the tile does flatten out. Runge's opinion at this time is not moving forward with this given cost and the benefit it would actually give Runge. Gallentine stated he would like to add and speaking to that, Gallentine thinks this district is running on the original classification which is 100 years old and does not have a Laterals separated out from the Main, and up in Runge's ground, you have probably both Laterals and Main up in your ground which is why you are paying a pretty significant portion, that is just how the old scheme was, if a large project were to move forward Gallentine would recommend that the Trustees look at that and determine if you want to reclassify and separate those out. Granzow stated it would be an improvement as they are proposing, and we would have to. Gallentine stated yes if they up-size the tile yes it would be an improvement.

Hoffman offered Sweeney the floor. Sweeney stated as C. loerger pointed out, he does not have an ownership stake in this so he will bow out of the discussion, but for whatever reason, as the video has proved, the tile is collapsing down there, at the lower end, whether the actual landowners decide to simply repair or make a more permanent solution would be up to the actual landowners. Sweeney will just bow out from here on and wait for the later meeting.

Hoffman stated one of the things he wanted to remind everyone of is that the it the responsibility of the Trustees to ensure the tile is functioning and the degree of functioning is open to interpretation, but it is important to remind everybody that ultimately we have to have a functional facility. Hoffman stated the other part of that, and he wouldn't be doing his job if he didn't go ahead and promote the fact t that if this group would like to become owner Trustees Hoffman can have Smith bring down the proper paperwork while a lot of you are in the room and allow that petition to be done today too, it is one of those things where these are very dynamic situations with a lot of variables, and sometime when you ask somebody to make the decision to pay the bill for somebody else, it doesn't seem very equitable. Hoffman thinks that is one of the flaws of society, we have people wanting to make other people pay at someone else's benefit, so that is another option we have. Granzow stated with any petition, we are done once the paper is filed.

Hoffman asked if another Vierkandt wanted to speak. Jim Vierkandt stated we are in it for the long haul here, so he thinks to do it the proper way is to start at the bottom and get it up as far as we can at this time because you are right without an outlet, it doesn't matter what is above it. J. Vierkandt has been in the end of his driveway and the tile isn't great there either, so eventually, like you said, it is 100 some years old. Gallentine stated 1908 is what the original map was dated, so you are at 112 years old. Hoffman stated one of the things he thinks it s important state, and we state in every meeting, and it wouldn't be fair or equitable if he didn't state it, when these were installed in 1908 they functioned great, it is like having your TV that works every night and then when you turn it on and it doesn't work, you have to buy a new TV and weren't budgeting for that, well if you have these facilities in place and are operating for years and years and then all of a sudden something is not functioning it is kind of a big surprise, and Hoffman did not know he even lived in a drainage district until he got his first assessment ever, two years ago. Hoffman stated there are a lot of people in that situation, and the other thing we have to remember is that if there are issues with the facility that the drainage district as a whole can be held responsible for crop damages if they are proven to be facility flaws, somebody is going to pay something because of a loss of life and livelihood and income, those are all important things that if you are in it for the long haul Hoffman would feel bad for you to have a crop loss claim every year because no one wants to take action on the problem and going to the root.

J. Vierkandt stated that is his feelings, start at the bottom and bring it up as far to the fence, and then we go on the next time. McClellan asked if J. Vierkandt was talking staying the same size or up-sizing. J. Vierkandt asked if it was 14" now and 14" right at the end. Gallentine stated it is 15". J. Vierkandt stated he did not know if 24" was overkill, 18" or whatever, probably the dollars don't change a lot to go from an 18: to a 24" tile. Gallentine stated typically you are at \$2 to \$5 a foot most of your money is typically in the digging. Hoffman asked Gallentine if the up sizing in tile would require an Engineer's Report because that would be an improvement. Gallentine stated anything over \$50,000 would require an Engineer's Report. J. Vierkandt stated it would be that at 15" too and asked if it was 15" at the fence too. Gallentine stated he thought the first 3,000' or 4,000' is 15", it is quite a way at 15". R. Vierkandt asked if it was 14" at the highway. Gallentine stated yes, until you get up in there and then it goes down. R. Vierkandt stated as far as upgrading then by his way of thinking, that really isn't much of an expense at all, if we figure \$35,000 at \$700 per foot, what are we arguing about \$2 or \$5 to upgrade, that doesn't sound like much. Gallentine stated one of the things that everybody can probably agree on is that whatever you do for a replacement is going to lock you in for the next 50 to 100 years, especially if it is at the bottom end, so we just need to make sure that everybody is ok with going on, because it is a decision now or 100 years from now when none of us are here. R. Vierkandt asked if we can even upgrade, because a \$35,000 fix is only going to get us 500', can we even do that without an Engineer Report. Gallentine stated you can spend \$50,000 whether you are upsizing or keeping the same size without an Engineering Report as a fix, but if you do the up-sizing it means you are going to have to do a reclassification which means a reassessment of how everybody pays and their % of benefit, and it will separate the Laterals out so that that way when any work is done on the laterals just the people on the laterals pay. Granzow stated he thinks that is by Code. Gallentine stated yes that is a Code requirement, and just by looking at it he can see what they did 100 years ago and understands the logic behind it but it isn't the way we do it today, we have soil maps now and we have a lot of different technology we can use to figure out benefit versus what they originally did.

McClellan stated this is something we have to take into consideration, and asked do you have all the private tile in that you want hooked up to it, in 50 to 100 years will there be more, all of that has to be considered. Gallentine stated in the next 50 to 100 years he does not see there being less private tile. Granzow stated you would have to do your wetland determinations as well. J. Vierkandt stated but our fixing we don't really have much ability to get a bid on anything we are just at the mercy of the contractor. Gallentine stated what he thought we were going to do was talk to 3 or 4 in county contractors and say we have X amount of dollars and ask how many feet can you do, more of a reverse bid, versus of saying how much are you going to give us for this many feet, it was saying how much can we get done for this amount of money and then see what everybody came back with, so it is a little bit of a bid, but you are right, usually with larger quantity, price per foot goes down. Gallentine stated it is like if you go to the car dealer and buy 3 cars instead of one, maybe they will give you a better deal, Gallentine doesn't know, he's never done it, but it is the same theory, Sam's Club operates on the same theory. J. Vierkandt stated he can see where Runge is coming from, we know by the classification Runge is really getting it, Gallentine stated looking at the original classification there is a lot of range, a couple of the forties that Runge has were paying over \$600 each, that is quite a spread considering the smallest forty is only paying like \$100 so that is a factor of 6, so usually in modern classifications you don't quite see that range but those forties that Runge is paying over \$600 each have multiple laterals and the main in them, whereas the ones only paying \$100 don't have the main going through them, that is a big part of it. Gallentine stated there are some very small classifications, but they are only a very small area, Gallentine was just trying to compare equitable forties, the problem is if you are only going with the \$35,000 fix or project or whatever you want to call it, Gallentine does not know if it is worth the cost of the reclassification versus the cost of the project, now if you are going with the \$200,000 project that is a different deal.

Hoffman stated if you get your crystal ball out and you believe that in the future you are going to do something then a reclassification sooner than later because there is a time lag to get that done as well, Gallentine stated yes they take time as well, Hoffman asked if that was a 6 month process, Gallentine stated yes it is a 6 to 9 month process typically. Granzow stated just what he heard there, probably a reclassification is justifiable, there is a large difference. J. Vierkandt asked Granzow to repeat that. Granzow stated a reclassification is justifiable because there is that large of a difference, we try to catch these every now and then, we try to catch them every time, if there is a large spike, Granzow can give an example where the lower half of the district paid 95% of the bill because they added it later in life, but there is usually a reason it is off, and at some given point we have to look at reassessing that to make the classifications correct. Granzow stated now an improvement automatically triggers that but we can trigger that anyway, if someone requests it to be triggered, Granzow knows we would consider it, but he is giving me target points why we should look at it anyway. Hoffman stated now it just means that somebody from the group needs to formally request it, it is not about fairness, it is truly because fairness is an emotional word, Hoffman likes the word equity better because it just needs to dollar and sense wise in this situation, but looking at the return on investment in this situation for what that equity going forward is, Hoffman likes the foresight he is hearing, it is not all about what is happening today or two years ago, but what the production agriculture value looks like going forward. R. Vierkandt stated what he was trying to state earlier was that what Runge's earlier statement was that before this was brought up.

Granzow asked if we would like to keep going around the room. Hoffman asked C. loerger if she would like to add anything. C. loerger stated you do not want to hear it, no, she thinks this has all been created because like R. Vierkandt said he has only had two blowouts and all of a sudden C. loerger has 4 blowouts. R. Vierkandt stated there are more than that, R. Vierkandt stated he and Gallentine spoke this morning and there are more than 4. Gallentine stated there have been maybe 4 work orders, but each of those work orders have had multiple blowouts. R. Vierkandt asked that has been over the last how many years, Gallentine stated he thinks over the last 5 years or less. C. loerger stated she thinks we should just take care of it like we originally said and see what happens. R. Vierkandt stated maybe C., loerger should see the photos we have of the tile. Gallentine stated he did not bring those with him, Smith stated we can pull those up from the Investigation Summary. R. Vierkandt stated they have photos that dang near every tile is cracked. Hoffman stated while we pull that up and asked George loerger would like to speak on this. G. loerger stated he was not going to say anything because he has such a small amount of ground in this, but his experience has been that past jobs you are just throwing good money after bad, and 5 years you will be doing it again and in another 5 years you will be doing it again, so his suggestion would be to start at the bottom, go deeper if we can, go as big as you can and just do it all over again, everybody is going to be pattern tiling and you are going to be wanting the best crops you can possibly get and getting that water away as soon as possible is beneficial to everybody, that adds value to your land, to G. loerger it is a no-brainer, just do it, you think it is expensive now, but the 4 or 5 patch jobs have not improved anything, it just keeps putting band aids on and the tile keep breaking down, so his suggestion would be to just bite the bullet and do it.

Hoffman and Gallentine invited C. loerger to view the photos on the screen, C. loerger stated that's okay. Hoffman stated this just shows the cracking on the top of the tiles, Gallentine stated they are pretty much all cracked, that is just the way old tile is, the thing that concerns us is that when the top starts to vee down a little bit and there isn't that side support to keep that top up, that is probably one of the worst ones right there (referenced image), it could be collapsed by now, it could wait another 5 years, another 10 years, it just depends on the right amount of frost and amount of load on it someday and it will just come down, at the end of the day folks, it is your district, your drainage, it doesn't impact Gallentine one way or another, he serves at whatever you guys want to do.

Hoffman asked if this was something the landowners want to sleep on, or how do you want to go forward. J. Vierkandt stated probably just for Gallentine to get his ball rolling if it is a 6-month process. Granzow asked if you are asking for an Engineer's Report to be made just so we know the cost. Hoffman asked and a reclassification. J. Vierkandt stated I suppose, R Vierkandt stated he thinks so. Hoffman stated that sounds kind of formal to him, Granzow stated a reclassification yes. C. loerger asked that s for the 2,500'. Hoffman stated no, a reclassification is determining the percent of benefit and who pays what according to drainage, and who benefits most from the drainage facilities in place. McClellan asked what percentage of landowners is represented here today. Gallentine stated with Runge online we have almost all of them. Smith stated we have almost everyone except Merle Strothcamp and the railroad. Hoffman stated who didn't invite the railroad, Smith stated she sent the letter. J. Vierkandt stated Summit Farms is not here. Gallentine stated so you are missing Summit Farms, Midwest Railroad properties and Hardin County Secondary Roads. Gallentine stated he thought Runge may farm Strothcamp's , Runge stated yes, he farms Strothcamp's.

Gallentine stated the only other thing he would mention is that he does not remember how old it is, but looking through the file up in Smith's office there was a report done on this district by Sindelar, if it is less than 10 years old, you wouldn't have to go through a new report we could just freshen that up. Granzow stated he thought it would be over 10 years old, he has been gone for 9 years, Gallentine stated it has been quite a while, Smith asked if the Trustees would like her to go grab the file. Gallentine asked if anyone remembered the report. R. Vierkandt stated he did not. Gallentine stated that was back before they did 123 so how long ago was that, that was back before we did the big tile. Merv Vierkandt stated that has been what, 7 years. Smith left to get the file. Gallentine stated if it has been done more than 10 years ago, we will have to do a new report, he just saw it in the file and thought hmm. Granzow stated Sindelar left Granzow's first year, Gallentine stated so you would have to do a new report either way. Hoffman stated we will have to apologize to Smith for making her run upstairs, Gallentine stated he would as he asked it. Granzow stated we need to bring up the fact that we can do 10, 15 or 20 years on the payment, at 5% percent interest. Smith returned with the file. Hoffman stated we figured out it is over 10 years old, and asked Smith to explain the financing terms.

Smith stated if you would like to sign up for a waiver, if your assessment amounts to more than \$500, you can sign up for a waiver and splits your payments up between 10 years, Granzow stated or 15 or 20 if the Trustees choose, Smith stated that is correct if the Trustees choose that but currently the status is 10 year waiver, Hoffman asked what the interest rate on the waiver was. Smith stated 5%. Gallentine stated never mind on the report it was done in 2001, so it is 20 years old, so sorry. Granzow asked what the reason for the report was back then. Gallentine stated he when Sindelar did DD 123, all those districts, they did an improvement report on all of them, then they decided to work on 123 first because that was the outlet at the time and see what difference that made.

5. Comments/Discussion

Hoffman stated going back to the first step, there is interest in reclassification, Hoffman asked if that needed to be in writing. Smith asked if Hoffman could repeat that. Hoffman stated the request for reclassification. Smith stated she thought that if you would like to make a formal request for reclassification we can reflect that in the minutes, all you have to do is discuss that here and if a landowner would approve of doing that we can reflect that in the minutes. Granzow stated he would not do a reclassification until he knew whether we are doing an improvement or not, it would be pointless. Hoffman stated except for the fact that if you initiate it sooner than later. R. Vierkandt stated he disagreed with Granzow and maybe he doesn't have all the facts, but the \$35,000 we are looking at is a fix, so if we reclassified it, Granzow stated then yes. R. Vierkandt stated then that is not an improvement on it that is just a fix, Granzow stated if we are even entertaining doing an improvement, Granzow said that wrong and J. Vierkandt is correct, then that reclassification gets thrown out the window and we will have to do another one right away if we do an improvement, so Granzow thinks we need to decide whether or not we need to do an improvement or just do the fix with the reclassification, or we can have a report drawn up and decide whether we want to do an improvement or not, at that time we can decide whether or not we are going to fix and then do the reclassification on either / or. McClellan stated it wouldn't matter if they were doing a repair or an improvement, they would still have the opportunity to change the classification so that you are paying on what benefit you receive. Granzow stated yes, he just didn't want to start the classification not knowing what the option is going forward that we are doing, Granzow is okay doing the reclassification regardless but just wants to know what we are doing it on, an improvement or a repair and without knowing whether we want to do a report or not answers that question as to when we want to order the reclassification, Granzow asked Gallentine if that sounded correct and asked J. Vierkandt if he is asking to have a report drawn up to see what it would be. J. Vierkandt stated yes and thinks the reclassification is a good idea. McClellan asked if J. Vierkandt was just talking about a repair or an improvement. Hoffman stated he is asking for the bigger project, the forward thinking one. Gallentine stated if we did a report we could put in there putting the 2,900' back in there just the way it is, putting in there up-sizing the 2,900' and give you both options, Gallentine stated he means it is the same footage the only difference is really just what size it is, the footage is still the same. Hoffman stated we have done that on recent projects where we have had all kinds of alternates, poly, we have had rock with spoon, rock without spoon. Gallentine stated on DD 143 we had 7 different options. Hoffman is open to having Gallentine do a report and once it is time for bidding do have all these options available, ad what we have done in the past is have the landowners come back in and ruled out them and when we are left with 2 or 3, what we have done then is, while your vote isn't the official vote, the Board has always followed through with the landowners popular vote.

Granzow stated if we were to do the repair, we would not have a current reclassification in place, so we would have to go with the current classification for the repair, is that correct, we can't backdate or forward date it. Gallentine stated that is what you have typically done but legal precedent Gallentine does not know what has been done. Hoffman stated he does not think that puts us in a good space going ahead for other districts. Gallentine stated the only thing Code really says is when you assess you have to assess with whatever classification you have on file at the time of assessment. Gallentine stated he has some Counties that want the reclassification before the project some want it after the project, we have done them both, a couple counties do them without any project, they say there are 60 laterals out here that need separated. Granzow stated we just need it stated that it will be assessed with the new classification no matter what we do, Gallentine stated if that is what you want to do. Granzow stated we have everybody in the room, that is what Granzow is saying. Gallentine stated the existing one to Gallentine, just looking at it for 20 minutes upstairs before we came , looks to be inequitable but Gallentine has not dove into it. Granzow stated or we can have a report drawn up and talk about it then, maybe we would get a little bit more of a chance to dive into it then. Hoffman stated that may open some people's eyes and Gallentine would know the equity more than Hoffman does. Granzow stated so we need a report and asked do we need a report for repairing. J. Vierkandt stated for the same size and then up-size, Granzow stated yes, for an improvement. Gallentine asked just for the lower 2,900' up to the fence line between R. Vierkandt and C. Ioerger. R. Vierkandt stated he picked that out of the sky and thought dollar-wise we probably can't go any further but thought we would get it for less than \$150,000. Gallentine stated he just wants to make sure he is giving you what you want. R. Vierkandt stated he was thinking more like \$100,000 but that is old fashioned maybe. Gallentine stated you just don't know, depending on when you bid it and how hungry contractors are, you may, we had a bid letting last week in Grundy Center on a sub-division and we had 13 bidders, we have never seen 13 bidders on any project. Vierkandt stated \$35,000 on any project to go 500' is outrageous, \$700 per foot, he knows we can bid a bigger job, dollars per foot mean a lot. Hoffman stated the sad reality is the labor force right now, societal problems. R. Vierkandt stated he understands that. McClellan stated it has got to be cheaper to do a longer jaunt than a shorter jaunt, Hoffman stated with transportation and logistics. Gallentine stated with larger projects you attract some different contractors than you will for a smaller project, that is just the reality of it, and is sure the landowners run into it with private tile, 160 acres will draw certain contractors than if you put in just 2 strings of tile, if you can even get a contractor for that.

Granzow stated he thinks we are down to our answer, and asked if everybody understands, as he took the tally Granzow had 2 no's and 23 yes's to do something, this motion is not doing anything more than getting us harder dollars with a report. Hoffman would encourage everyone to do their research and talk to Gallentine about materials as those things come up later. Granzow asked if you want the report with concrete, you have to know that now. Gallentine stated we will put both in the report and we can talk about it at the hearing. Hoffman stated he

is pretty sure you have some pretty static numbers right now that you have put in your spreadsheet. Gallentine stated we will use the same number in the report whether it is concrete or plastic, once it goes out for bid that the suppliers start playing the games and cutting prices.

6. Possible Action

Motion by Granzow to instruct CGA to prepare an Engineer's Report for DD 14 with options for repair, replacement, and an upgrade to the Main Tile. Second by McClellan.

In additional discussion on the motion, Hoffman asked what kind of turnaround are we looking at, as once that report is back Hoffman would like to reconvene with a Landowners Meeting before we get into the weeds on that, someday it will warm up and snow will be gone, and wants everyone out there making money. Gallentine stated he knows everyone will be thinking about planting, but we are probably looking at a couple of months. Hoffman asked if this is something, we are better off leaving a date and time open and once we hear from Gallentine give the landowners a couple of weeks' notice. Gallentine stated since that is a report you will have to have a hearing so you will have to have 40 days' notice, Iowa Drainage Code is based off 100 year ago when you had to hop on your horse and ride it back to Eldora. Hoffman stated just so you know the timeline, he does not want to interrupt planting, but we may be looking at State Fair time. Gallentine stated he would try to get it done before that, but we have a few others hanging out there. Hoffman asked for any additional comments or discussion, hearing none, Hoffman called for the vote.

All ayes. Motion carried.

7. Other Business

Hoffman asked if there was any other business. Hearing none, Hoffman asked for adjournment.

8. Adjourn Meeting

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



Hardin County

Drainage Claims with Pay Date of 3/12/2021

DD 9 WO 229 - Eng Svcs After 1/29/21 - 02/27/21	Clapsaddle-Garber Assoc	1,259.30
DD 11 WO 294 - Eng Svcs 11/27/20 - 03/04/21	Clapsaddle-Garber Assoc	517.00
DD 41 WO 299 - Eng Svcs After 12/26/20 - 2/27/21	Clapsaddle-Garber Assoc	383.80
DD 55-3 Lat 9 - Attend Closed Session Mtg on Pond	The Davis Brown Law Firm	330.00
DD 56 WO 204 - Eng Svcs to 02/27/21 - ROW Acquis.	Clapsaddle-Garber Assoc	1,074.00
DD 56 WO 204 - Eng Svc 1/29/21 - 2/27/21 ProjPlans	Clapsaddle-Garber Assoc	10,445.30
DD 120 WO 298 - Eng Svcs 02/27/21 - Eng. Report	Clapsaddle-Garber Assoc	4,672.80
DD 120 WO 298 - Engs Svcs 8/28/20 - 3/04/21	Clapsaddle-Garber Assoc	85.00

Total Regular Payables: 0.00
Total Stamped Warrants: 18,767.20



Drainage Work Order Request For Repair

Hardin County

Date: 3/3/2021

Work Order #: WO00000308

Drainage District: DDs\DD 17 (51030)

Sec-Twp-Rge: 04-88-22 **Qtr Sec:** W 1/4 Corner ofNW

Location/GIS: 88-22-04-200-001

Requested By: John Wibholm

Contact Phone: (515) 460-0668

Contact Email: jwibholm@gmail.com

Landowner (if different): John Wibholm

Description: John Wibholm reports 12" main tile is offset of outlet & not draining, standing water backed up in his parcel #882204200001 & outlet is in neighbor's parcel to the West. John had Hands On investigate, tile is open, says it needs dug down for a length of 300' to 400' & relaid.

Repair labor, materials and equipment _____

Repaired By: _____ **Date:** _____

Please reference work order # and send statement for services to: Hardin County Auditor's Office
Attn: Drainage Clerk
1215 Edgington Ave, Suite 1
Eldora, IA 50627
Phone (641) 939-8111
Fax (641) 939-8245

For Office Use Only

Approved: _____ **Date:** _____

89223440005

892235300006

Co Hwy D25

D.D. No

882204100002

WD 308

882204200001

882204100003

882204100001

Ortlet

882204100007

4945773.

