

**DD 56 Hearing on Reclassification Commission Report for the Main Tile of Drainage District 56 (East & West) and Public Hearing on Engineer's Report (Including Revision and Supplement on Improvements to the Main Tile of Drainage District 56  
Reclassification Hearing - Wednesday, April 1, 2020 at 10:00 AM  
Engineer's Report Hearing Wednesday, April 1, 2020 at 10:15 AM  
Large Conference Room  
This meeting was held electronically due to Covid-19 concerns.**

4/1/2020 - Minutes

1. Open Meeting  
Hardin County Drainage District Chairperson Lance Granzow opened the meeting. Also present were Trustee BJ Hoffman; Trustee Renee McClellan; Jessica Sheridan, Environmental Health; Angela De La Riva, Economic Development Director; Lee Gallentine of Clapsaddle-Garber Associates (CGA); Patricia Klaver; Regina Neville; Mark Maakestad; Mike McCartney; Dan Kumrow; Mike Bostrum; John Kufus; Curt Groen; Greg Larson; Michael Fjelland; Kathy Colvin; and Drainage Clerk, Denise Smith.
2. Approve Agenda  
Motion by Hoffman to approve the agenda. Second by McClellan. All ayes. Motion carried.
3. Introductions/Attendance  
Introductions were made and attendance recorded.
4. Open Public Hearing  
Drainage District Chairperson Lance Granzow opened the public hearing.
5. Verify Publication  
Drainage Clerk Smith verified the hearing notice was published on March 4, 2020 in the Times Citizen.
6. Explanation Of Reclassification, Project, And Engineer's Reports

Granzow stated that in these times while trying to work through the Covid-19 situation, he wanted to provide ample explanation of the Reclassification Report, project and Engineer's reports, we may choose not to act on them at this time, or if there is ample explanation and participation today, we may choose to take action.

Gallentine provided an explanation of the Reclassification Report. Gallentine stated the District Trustees, directed CGA to create a report that reclassifies and splits the land within the existing boundaries of DD 56 for the main tile for purpose of instating a separate outlet for the upstream portion of the district. The Reclassification Commission consists of two disinterested landowner who reside in Hardin County, in this case it was Dennis Prochaska and Chuck Walters and Gallentine as an Engineer. It is a code requirement to have these three positions in place in order to conduct a reclassification, and these three drafted work on this reclassification report.

Gallentine explored the background information that CGA gathered and provided to the other commissioners, this was the existing classification, the USDA soil maps, maps of the existing district boundaries and facilities that the Hardin County Drainage Clerk has on file, aerial tract maps from Hardin County GIS website, recorded boundary surveys from the County Recorders office, and also online LIDAR data, which is elevation data the state provides the public at no charge. Using this data, the commission generated these steps to look at the reclassification.

The first step (see 2.0 in the report) was boundary generation, this generates the internal boundary between the east and west portions of the district, based on the proposed location of the separate main tile outlet. That was done using CAD, lidar, and maps compiled onto a composite drawing on the computer. The next step was to use tract verification, for this step we verified that each tract number, on the existing classification was within the district boundary and were the appropriate size. Iowa code requires tracts be sized at 40 acres or less based off of CGA's interpretations of that, CGA assumes they mean 1/4 1/4, so if you have 80 acres in the district, you would be looking for two different tracts, one per 40 or per 1/4 1/4. The next step was acreage verification, which involved verifying the acreage contained within the existing classification. Those existing acreages were probably created back 100 years ago when the assumption was every 40 had 40 acres in it, since then there have been boundary surveys done and the GIS has some different data, for this step the Commission compared the record survey data versus what was in the existing classification. The next step was acreage generation, for this step, if it did not

already have an acreage already, then the verification process would generate an acreage for those needed tracts. The Commission did that with all that data, there are maps in Appendices B & D that show the different tract numbers in the boundaries.

The next step was to use the soil type determination, for this we used the USDA maps along with the line work from the GIS maps, to differentiate the different soil types within each tract, so this differentiated between very poorly drained, poorly drained, well drained, excessively well drained. The next step was proximity or the distance from the District facility, in this case the main tile. The approximate center or centroid of each tract and did this along the straight line route, because the Commission has no idea what private tile there are connected to these district facilities, and wanted to evaluate everyone on a similar basis, so they used straight line to determine proximity.

Gallentine asked if there were any questions on the background information, no questions were presented.

Gallentine went on to discuss drainage benefit from the district facilities. Once the above data was gathered, the Commission used the data to evaluate benefit from District facilities. The soil factor was determined to be under 3.1, this factor is what we consider the need for the district facilities based off the characteristics of the soil, the drainage capacity, and also those soil types figure in slope, it was weighted dependant on what soil type was in each tract. The very poorly drained soil received an 85% factor, poorly drained received a 55% factor and well drained received a 10% factor. Those percentages are based on the Commission's determination. Typically, well drained soils don't need the district facilities, as much to be productive, whereas the poorly drained and very poorly drained soils rely heavily on district facilities to be productive, that was done for each individual tract.

Gallentine discussed the proximity factor, so that is an indication of the availability of the district facility, which would be the main tile, based on how close it is when they measured that straight line distance. There is a wide range of distances from that centroid district facility. For the east portion, those distances measure anywhere from 7' to 3,063', and the west portion it was 25' to 3,678', since the range was so wide, the commission scaled it down, on a scale of 10 to 100. This scale meant that the tract that had the farthest distance measured would have a factor of 10, the tract that had the closest distance measured would have a factor of 100. This is based on the assumption that if you are farther away from the district facility, you are running additional expenses to access that facility, such as private tile or lateral tile, that is why you receive the factor of 10. If you are close to district facility, typically you can just tie right into it.

Gallentine asked if there any questions on those two factors and how they are determined. No questions were presented.

Gallentine moved on to the combined factor, this is just the facility factor times the soil factor. Once the combined factor was calculated, the Commission used that to determine an indication of the highest benefitted parcel of each half of the district (the east half and the west half). Whoever had the highest combined factor, would be determined by the balance of having the soils at most need of the facility and those being the closest to the facility. Once the combined factors for all the tracts were determined then the Commission could determine the percent of benefit, this is the benefit that each tract receives based on a scale of 100. Code requires the most benefitted tract or parcel, to have a 100% of benefit, so whoever had the highest combined factor would get a 100% benefit and then all of the other tracts combined factors were compared to the 100% benefitted tract.

Gallentine asked if there were any question on the percent of benefit and how it was determined. No questions were presented.

Gallentine covered units assessed. This combines the percent benefit along with the land area, until now we haven't figured in land area at all. Essentially the units assessed is the percent of benefit multiplied by the land acres multiplied by 100 to get it out of the percentage.

Gallentine went on to percent units assessed, this is percentage of units that were assessed for each tract as a portion of the total district, this is similar to the percent benefit, but it is different. The percent benefit is comparing each individual tract to the most benefitted tract, the percent units assessed is comparing each tract to the district as a whole, there is a subtle difference there.

Gallentine covered the percent levied, this is an indication of the levy amount necessary to pay for a project, for this report, for this report it is 100%. If this gets adopted, in the future if the Drainage Clerk can adjust that levy up or down to suit however much is needed for the amount of bills to pay for a project.

Gallentine went over the assessment for project on the entire tract basis, this is the amount that each tract has to pay, for 100% levy, it is calculated using a sample cost of \$425,000 for the west portion and \$425,000 for the east

portion of the district. This is based on the Commission's determination, that if the separate outlet project were to move forward, both the east portion and the west portion would benefit equally from that project. That is why they had the same sample costs, this is calculated using the percent units assessed times \$425,000 which is the sample cost, last step is an assessment for the project on a per acre basis, this is the entire tract basis cost divided by the number of acres.

Gallentine asked if there were any questions on these steps. Greg Larson asked in Section 3.8, you are using a sample cost of \$425,000 for a total cost of \$850,000, is that an updated estimate for the outlet only, as there was no estimate included. Gallentine replied, that \$425,000 for each half is just a sample cost, this is not updated to reflect any potential project that moves forward. Gallentine stated we do not have a bid letting yet, but there is an Engineer's opinion on probable costs in the Engineer's report, this is just a starting point, for example, if the project ends up being instead of \$850,000 and it ends up being \$1,000,000, each sides costs would be \$500,000. Greg Larson asked if a final Engineer's estimate had been done on the outlet only, plus whatever modifications to accommodate that would have to be done, has been completed. Gallentine stated nothing has been changed since the last Engineer's Report and Supplemental Report, Reclassification is a separate report, and we are just using this as a sample cost. Larson stated, I don't think we have an estimate with a free standing outlet, it was included with a partial tile replacement, so he does not think we have an estimate for the freestanding outlet alone. Gallentine stated, he has not done any additional cost estimates beyond what was done on the original Engineer's and Supplement report.

there are exceptions to the process, Gallentine explained, anytime you come up with a system, there may be something that doesn't fit right. The first exception (Section 4.1), if you have tracts that are really irregular in shape such as the one along the railroad, county road right of way or DOT right of ways, those are highly disturbed soils so the soil maps are not that accurate, and for those we didn't calculate soil factors and proximity, so instead we used the average combined factor for all the tracts was used for those. In this case, the only tracts that this applies to are roadways, and current and former railroad tracts. Those are highlighted pink in the appendices, those in the west portion are tracts number 1 and 2, for the east portion it is tracts numbers 1, 2, and 3. The other exception was, the District Trustees that requested the Commission to determine an appropriate classification if the separate main tile was made deeper, approximately 2' deeper was discussed at the previous hearing. The Commission determined that if the separate main tile outlet is installed any deeper than the existing main tile, it would solely benefit the west portion and not the east portion, so any additional costs for this would be solely on the west portion of the district.

Gallentine asked for questions on exceptions. Greg Larson asked for a 2' deeper tile, can you give us an order of magnitude that would represent on costs, are we talking \$40,000 or \$200,000. Gallentine stated for the additional 2' deeper, his estimate or opinion on that, it would raise the cost \$10 per foot of pipe. Gallentine would have to look and see how many feet we are talking about. Larson stated about 4,700' of main tile. Gallentine stated he would not disagree with that. Larson stated it could be between \$50,000 and \$100,000 then. Gallentine stated, yes if you are talking in round terms, and he has no reason to doubt that. Gallentine stated the point of the Commissioner's report is if District desires that tile to be installed at a deeper depth, than that cost should solely be to the west portion of the district and not the east portion of the district.

Gallentine reviewed the conclusion. The Commission generated this report, the classification sheets are in the back, along with maps, and sheets showing where different tracts are located and where the split is in the district. Gallentine stated it is also worth noting on the maps there are certain areas that are solid red, those are areas that were in the original map but not in the current classification, they may have been annexed into other different districts. The Commission went on the same assumption on those. The Commissions recommendations are that the Trustees approve this report, they have already accepted it and hold the required hearing, which we are attempting to do today. Gallentine stated at some time if the separate outlet project moves forward, we recommend this report be adopted, if the project does not move forward then this report does not really apply. If it is installed deeper, than the existing tile, that cost would be assessed solely to the west porion of the district. This assessment should be used for future maintenance if that separate main tile outlet moves forward.

Gallentine asked for questions. Jon Kufus asked if Gallentine can guess, how has the proximity factor changed in the last 100 years. Gallentine stated he is not 100% positive how they did Commission Reports a hundred years ago, what he understands is that a lot of the time they would classify the ground based off of swamp acres, wet acres, dry acres and most of that viewing was done before the District tile was installed. We have the benefit of the online soil information from the USDA's website, which they did not have a hundred years ago, we also have the method of GIS so when we drop that into CAD, we can measure distances more precisely than they would have a hundred years ago, for example this tract is an 1/8 mile from the district main or 1/4 mile from the district main, we can get it down to feet. Kufus asks that his 1/4 he would be assessed \$52,000, and there is land his family owns a mile or two south of that and it is a fraction of what he pays, and they need the drainage worse than he does. Kufus wants to make sure this proximity factor is taking into account the days when Grandpa dug tile with a spade, moving tile a mile or two to that main tile is a fraction of the effort it used to be, that is irritating to Kufus. Gallentine

stated this is what the Commission felt was equitable and this what the Commission has used on other drainage districts. At this hearing or if this hearing is delayed or decisions postponed, the District Trustees have the authority to adopt this as it is, to modify it, to send it back to the Commission again for reevaluation, and that is why we are here today, to listen to those comments. Gallentine appreciates those landowner comments as well.

Granzow asked for any other questions. Greg Larson asked, if one of the possible actions here is just to construct the outlet only. Gallentine replied, yes that could be a possible action by the Trustees once we start talking about the Engineer's report. Kathy Colvin asked if this is finalized, will these assessments be spread out over 10 years. Smith replied, you can apply for a waiver that allows you to spread payments out over a 10 year period, yes. Granzow stated it has to be a dollar amount of over \$500 per tract, to meet the minimum requirement for waiver payments. Gallentine stated when you receive the assessment, there is a time limit as to how long you have to sign up for the waiver. Smith stated landowners have a 30 day period from when they receive the assessment in which to sign up for the waiver payment plan.

Granzow stated we appreciate all the written comments received, Larson had submitted written comments requesting a change on the date of the hearing, Granzow explained once we set the time and date we had to go ahead and have the meeting, Larson stated his first two comments had been answered in discussion, the last comment should be involved in when we start talking about options, he was unsure if the costs would be based on the last Supplemental Report which showed the main tile outlet and partial main tile for the western district or if there could be other options to that like the outlet only or a complete main tile for the western district. Granzow stated we are in the Reclassification Hearing now, which we will follow up immediately with the Hearing on the Engineer's Reports, if we don't move forward with any project, this Reclassification falls by the wayside. Gallentine stated yes, that is correct, if we go with any other options other than putting in a separate main tile outlet, this reclassification goes by the wayside. Granzow stated we did this reclassification so landowner's would know what their portions would be if we chose this route. Gallentine stated that was correct, there were questions about which portion would pay more, the east or west portion, and this reclassification cleared those questions up.

Granzow stated the first hearing was just on the reclassification, and asked if there were any more questions on that. Mike McCartney asked if we don't reclassify these districts and we continue on as usual, what is the time frame of how long this complete main will hold up, can we add 50 years to the bottom end of it if we take the water off the top end of it, or will we be putting in a whole new tile in 10 years if we do nothing now. McCartney asked if we will really help the bottom end by taking the top off of it. Granzow stated we can't tell how long the tile will last, this will relieve that much more pressure by removing some of the volume going through it. Gallentine can't tell you how long the tile will last either, it is a 100 year old tile, this will aid it some by taking some pressure off, but there are no guarantees how much time you are buying by doing that. McCartney stated his fear was that if we go ahead and divide the districts, then in 5 years we will have to replace the lower end with only half as many people paying for it, he has concerns for the future if we divide the district. Gallentine stated that is entirely possible, we are not buying a new car here, it is like putting new tires on a 100 year old one.

Granzow referenced written comments from Dan and Tammy Kumrow. Dan Kumrow asked what was the reasoning behind dividing the district. Kumrow stated the east side is old, and may need to be repaired someday, and wanted to know more about the reasons for dividing the district, at this point he is not certain that one option is better than the other. Granzow stated when we had the public hearing one of the Sheldahl brothers brought it up as a mechanism that would support both districts and asked that it be put in as an option, at the time people wanted to see what the option of dividing the district would cost, and that is where the reclassification came in if we were to move forward. Gallentine stated he believed Granzow was correct, and this separate tile outlet would divide it into two separate watersheds. Granzow stated he had reviewed the written comments and asked if there had been any other comments received prior to the hearing. Smith stated she had taken a phone call from Jon Kufus prior to the hearing, about p[ostponing the hearing due to Covid-19 concerns, that was the only other comment Smith had received.

Kathy Colvin stated that she appreciated if all the meetings could be held this way as she is in Arizona. Granzow stated he appreciates having as many people in a room as he can, but this may be the new common method. Colvin stated in the past when she called in she could not hear the meeting well and felt she could not participate that way, but this method is much better as she can hear the whole meeting. Granzow stated we will try to continue this in the future. McClellan said for landowners that don't live here this is a great way for them to have public access to these hearings and meetings. Regina Neville appreciated Kathy's comment and also endorses the zoom style meeting as she is in Minnesota, and appreciates being involved this way.

Granzow asked for any other written or verbal comments at this time. Greg Larson stated he would like a brief explanation of the process moving forward, the decision making involved in splitting the district, and asked for elaboration on how that decision will be made and what the steps are. Gallentine stated the decision on how to move forward on any project, would be up to the Supervisors acting as Drainage Trustees, whether the project moves forward and on what time schedule it moves forward, whether they want to make a decision today and

move forward or if they want to delay it. Granzow stated he thinks a decision on the project would be delayed, but as far as a decision on the reclassification report, we should address the question posed by Jon Kufus addressing the dollar amounts first, as far as preparing plans and specs, Granzow does not believe we are ready for that. Granzow stated we have the next hearing on the Engineer's report and asked for anymore questions on the reclassification alone.

Jon Kufus stated he is not complaining on the dollar amount, it is a go for him and a good investment for him, he had questions on the proximity as it did not seem equitable, but Jon is in for the dollar amount. Granzow stated the actions we could take today, is approve the reclassification report, knowing that if we don't move forward with the project, this reclassification report does nothing, and asked if that was understood by all. Gallentine stated that is correct, if this separate tile outlet does not move forward, this reclassification would not be in effect. Gallentine stated if there are no more questions on the reclassification, he asked for a motion to close the public hearing on the Reclassification Report.

Motion by Hoffman to close the public hearing only on the Reclassification Report. Second by McClellan. All ayes. Motion carried.

Granzow asks before the next hearing do we want to approve the Reclassification Report now or wait until the next public hearing. Not hearing a motion, Granzow called for a motion to open the Public Hearing on the DD 56 Engineer's Report.

Motion by McClellan to open the hearing on the DD 56 Engineer's Reports. Second by Hoffman. All ayes. Motion carried.

Granzow noted we have the same attendance, and opened the floor for Gallentine to introduce these reports. Gallentine spoke about the Engineer's Report first and addressed the Supplement a bit later. Gallentine stated the driving forces in the process were initially a work order was filed that requested improved drainage in DD 56, and possible ways to do that, in a way that would gain more capacity, either doing that from within the district boundaries or going to boundaries outside with the separate tile outlet. The area of investigation the report covers would be the entire length of the main tile, essentially starting at it's outlet in the open ditch of DD 26, the main tile then works its way upstream, pretty much due west, there is some jig jogs north south until it gets right east of County Hwy S21, then it jogs pretty much straight south and ends up 3/4 of a mile north of 250th St. That is the route we are talking about for the whole route. The history is typical for a district, it was started about 100 years ago, and was constructed in the years between 1914 to 1918, there were some initial issues with repairs done in the teens, 1920's, 1930's which is typical, and repairs have been made since.

Gallentine discussed the investigation, which included field observation and office observation. The field observation was really limited to observing the possible route bypassing the secondary outlet of the main tile, around E Ave. initially, which was limited to field observation and preliminary survey work. The office observation looked at the district history, and the history of repairs in the teens, 20's and 30's were a little unusual, as we assume these were an indication of poor workmanship, poor materials or an inadequate design. Ever since then, there have been over 100 repairs over the last 90 years, most of the details of those repairs have been lost to time, and may just be an invoice being paid, etc. It appears most of those repairs were either tile replacements due to blowouts or sinkholes, the repairs have been pretty consistent over time, and not accelerating. Office investigation included some calculations and records research. Based on calculations, it looks like the main tile was designed for a drainage coefficient of about .07" per day, at the downstream upper end limits, and the length of the main tile varied from .03" per day to .22" per day, those capacities are under the assumption that all of the drainage occurs through the main tile. We are aware that not every drop of water that falls in this district goes through the main tile, but could flow overland, these are the capacities, assuming it all goes through the main tile. Based on these conclusions, it became apparent the main tile had issues that required corrective action, which includes the history of failure and the number of repairs made. Gallentine stated it is unusual to have repairs made in the first fifteen years, and the regularity of repairs over the 90 years occurring, those causes can be a combination of overloading the tile, poor soil conditions, lack of soil cover, or differential capacity. We are not sure of the causes of all of these repairs are, but it does indicate a history of issues within the district. If we look at capacity, this district is far below capacity compared to what is currently recommended for agricultural production capacity, which is 1/2" to 1" today. If something is not done, the physical failures to the main tile will continue to accelerate as it gets older, which allows more soil to get into the main tile which restricts drainage, and you will have more sinkholes and blowouts.

Gallentine asked for questions on this portion of the report. No questions were presented.

Gallentine stated initially in the engineer's report, we talked about different improvement methods. The first one discussed was an upper main tile outlet, which we would sever the existing tile outlet and install a new main tile outlet for the district, that is what we assumed would happen if the reclassification moves forward. The

reclassification is based solely on this option. Gallentine pointed out in the original Engineer's Report, we were talking about 1/4 mile east of E Ave. and run northerly, that is solely based off the lay of the land in what is the shallowest depth for the tile. At the hearing the option was not preferred, and a second location was suggested, and that is what the supplemental report talks about. That gives you a new outlet for the upper portion of the district but does not do anything with the actual tile in the district, to alleviate those 100 year old tile that are still functioning.

Gallentine stated the next option is single tile upsizing, the entire length of the main tile, the main tile would be removed and replaced with a single new main tile of greater capacity, there are charts with the sizes in the Supplemental Report in the appendices. Some of the issues with this, is we may run into issues with soil cover depth, there may be issues where we have to mound dirt over it and there may be spots you may not be able to farm over. The next option is for the entire length of the main tile, we can install two new tiles that run parallel with each other, which would give you greater capacity and allow more soil cover. The next option is parallel tile upsizing, which leaves the existing main tile in place and installs one new parallel main tile with greater capacity. The downside to this is you have a new tile you are paying for, and still have an old tile you have to maintain, that can be a burden at times. The last option talked about in the Supplemental Report is an open ditch construction option, in which you remove the existing tile and install an open ditch for the length of the tile, that has it's own issues in acquiring right of way and farming around an open ditch, where as the custom has been to farm over the top of a buried tile.

Gallentine asked for questions on these options. No questions were presented.

Gallentine covered the assumptions on the above options, of which there are pros and cons for each. For the first option, due to the soil types and soil cover, all tile would have rock bedding which would give it some additional stability and strength, we are also assuming the existing ground elevations are still valid for the original design. We did not survey the entire route to determine the soil cover, it was based off the original design in order to conserve on the budget. The only tiles we would be improving, are the ones identified in the appendices, the remainder of the tile are not being modified or improved in any manner. Proposed sizes as shown in the appendices, are currently manufactured and either meet or exceed the 1/2" or 1" coefficients, they don't make tile like they used to, you used to be able to get 14" tile and 16" tile in one and two inch increments. This has changed a lot and they don't make those any more, so the proposed existing capacities we show in the appendices are based on the assumption that the main tile is installed per its original design and that it is functioning to it's full capacity, though we don't know that for certain as we have not televised the entire tile or gone to the expense to dig it up on it's entire length. Everything that is stated, as far as capacities and sizes, are just to serve lands within the district boundaries and where the assumption is that all water that lands within the district stays within the boundaries of the district. The single tile, dual tile upsizing and parallel tile upsizing may prohibit farming over it, due to lack of soil cover and may require some mounding up, especially with the single tile upsizing. Those 3 options, since we are replacing the main tile from stem to stern, should allow for a lower maintenance cost in the future since the whole thing is new. If we just do the main tile outlet or we went forward with the parallel tile option, that would have a future maintenance cost that is higher because you still have a 100 year old tile in place and being used as part of the system.

Gallentine continued, if we do the upper main tile outlet, and the open ditch construction there would a taking of the right of way, and that is not in any of the costs listed. The open ditch has right of way from within the district and the upper main tile outlet would have a right of way outside of the district. The upper main tile outlet does not increase capacity for those portions upstream of the main tile outlet, it just shortens the length of restrictions that the west portion would have to get to the get to the outlet itself, which would be the main open ditch in DD 26. It does not increase the capacity of the portions downstream, but it does take some load of off those who are downstream, it moves the headwaters or upper end of the tile downstream of the upper main tile outlet. DD 56 east and west would turn the upper area into a separate drainage district, and the assumption is that we have the right to do this in DD 26 without any charge. And since we would cut through from one district to another, there would be some deep installation depths up to 20' +/- on the upper main tile outlet installation. Historically improvements have been viewed by the NRCS as impacting jurisdictional wetlands, jurisdictional wetlands are a unique feature, in the fact that the NRCS treats that information like medical records, they are confidential. CGA, the Commission, the Drainage Clerk, nor the County can get a copy of those wetland determinations, the only ones that can get a copy of those wetland determinations are the landowners or tenants. The only way we can know that they exist is if the landowners provide them to us, Gallentine encourages all of the landowners to contact the NRCS to get a copy of their determination as soon as possible, if this project moves forward.

Gallentine asked if there were questions on the assumptions on these different options. No questions were presented.

Gallentine moved on to the opinion of probable construction costs listed in the report. These probable construction costs are based off of previous bid lettings and what we typically see on other projects. These probable costs

include the labor, equipment and materials supplied by the contractor, and the engineering fees, construction observation, project administration fees by CGA. These probable costs do not include any interest, legal fees, county administrative fees, crop damages, other damages, previous repairs, fees to date, if wetlands have to be mitigated, it does not include those fees, acquisition fees, or reclassification fees if applicable.

For the different options we have several different costs depending on what option is selected, these are broken down into the costs that the district pays, and the road crossing costs (Iowa code says any road crossing costs are paid by the road authority and not by the district).

The upper main tile outlet as covered in the original report (not the relocated location per the Supplemental Report) the district cost was \$468,425. Road crossing was \$22,281.25.

For a single tile upsizing with a 1/2" coefficient, the district cost was \$5,641,191.60. Road crossing was \$206,353.13.

For single tile upsizing with a 1" coefficient, the district cost was \$7,803,417.60. Road crossing was \$236,971.88.

For dual tile upsizing with a 1/2" coefficient, the district cost was \$7,448,733.60. Road crossing was \$281,318.75.

For dual tile upsizing with a 1" coefficient, the district cost was \$10,681,413.60. Road crossing was \$326,384.38.

For parallel tile upsizing with a 1/2" coefficient, the district cost was \$4,769,397.60. Road crossing was \$193,990.63.

For parallel tile upsizing with a 1" coefficient, the district cost was \$7,471,305.60. Road crossing was \$225,903.13.

For open ditch construction, the district cost was \$1,989,504. Road crossing was \$862,125.

Gallentine stated we did have a revised cost, in Revised Engineer's Appendix D, for the upper main tile outlet, at \$468,625.00, this was changed to \$1,070,880.00 and the road crossing costs stayed the same, changes were due to a typographical error pointed out by Larson after the report was filed, but before this hearing.

Gallentine went on to discuss the option listed in the Supplemental Report. After the initial hearing and landowner meeting, none of those options sounded as exciting as some different options, so the Supplemental Report was created. At Regular Drainage Meeting held on February 27, 2019, this was discussed, and the District Trustees asked CGA to draw up the Supplemental Report. This has some different options that were suggested, it combines the separate upper tile outlet with some improvements to the existing tile.

The upper main tile outlet with single tile upsizing, this option would sever the existing main tile and install the new outlet to the main open ditch, and divert the flows from the upper portion to the new outlet. Then for the specified length of the main tile, we would remove the existing tile and replace it with a single tile of larger capacity. The big difference between what was suggested in the original Engineer's Report and the Supplement, is the scope. For the portion of the main tile we are replacing, we are not doing anything in the east portion as far as a tile replacement, and we are replacing only a very limited section of about a mile in the west portion. We would not be doing a whole main tile replacement, we are just doing a specific section along with the main tile outlet. Gallentine stated the location of the main tile outlet has changed based on a landowner suggestion. It has changed to approximately 1/4 mile east of D Ave., but we would still end up in the open main ditch of DD 26.

Gallentine stated the second option is the upper main tile outlet with dual tile upsizing. Again the main tile outlet stays the same, but the existing main gets replaced with two tile instead of one large tile.

Gallentine stated the third option is to do the upper main tile outlet and then we would install a new tile parallel with the old tile, to get to the desired 1/2" or 1" of capacity. Gallentine stated earlier Larson asked if it was possible to just do the upper main tile outlet and not touch any of the existing tile, and yes that is an option. That option is not specifically addressed in these reports, and it does not have a separate cost listed.

Gallentine went on to ask if there were any questions on these options listed in the Supplement or the original Engineer's Report. No questions were presented.

Gallentine went on to cover costs of these options in the Supplemental Report. Again, estimated costs were based on previous bid lettings.

For the upper tile outlet with single tile upsizing , the cost to nd a 1/2" coefficient, the district was \$1,367,445. Road crossing was \$54,697.

For the upper tile outlet with single tile upsizing and a 1" coefficient, the cost to the district was \$1,872,642. Road crossing was \$64,041.

For upper main tile outlet with dual tile upsizing with a 1/2" coefficient, cost to the district was \$1,894,818. Road crossing was \$64,975.

For upper main tile outlet with dual tile upsizing with a 1" coefficient, cost to the district was \$2,433,147. Road crossing was \$75,253.

For upper main tile outlet with parallel upsizing and a 1/2" coefficient, leaving the old tile in place and put a new one next to it, cost to the district was \$1,218,087. Road crossing was \$46,288.

For upper main tile outlet with parallel upsizing and a 1" coefficient, cost to the district was \$1,800,705. Road crossing was \$59,369.

Gallentine stated regarding costs, with the current Covid-19 situation, it will definitely affect costs in the contracting world. Gallentine does not have a feel yet whether it will make costs lower or higher, it is hard to say right now.

Granzow asked if water is flowing right now. Gallentine replied water is flowing right now in a reduced capacity, these options are improvements, it is enlarging the system in some options and not just necessarily a repair. Gallentine asked for any questions. No questions were presented.

Gallentine moved on to the recommendation section of the Supplemental Report. It is their recommendation that we hold the required hearing, which we are doing today via zoom, CGA recommends one of the options from either the original Report, the Supplemental Report or some modification of those options be adopted. One of the options was to confirm if DD 56 can be split into two districts, this option was done in the Reclassification Report if that moves forward. One option is to confirm that the upper main tile outlet can discharge freely into the main ditch of DD 26, Gallentine has no reason to think that it can't. The other option would be to direct plans and specifications for the proposed option to be drawn up by CGA, and / or go forward with receiving bids from contractors, and /or go forward with awarding those bids to contractors, and/or proceed with construction. Gallentine stated those options are up to the District Trustees, if those are acted upon and on what schedule that happens.

Granzow stated since this meeting is being held by zoom, he does not want to take any actions at this point, but he would like to narrow some options down. He would like to send postcards out with options possibly, one being do we want to split, yes or no. We will not make a decision based off these postcards, but we need to narrow down some of these options to just the ones we are interested in as there are quite a few to choose from. Granzow thinks some of these options we can discard, like dual tile upsizing for a 1" coefficient, at \$10,000,000, we may want that option but no one wants to pay for it. Granzow assumes the \$7,000,000 and \$5,000,000 options are off the table, Granzow needs to know if we want to do anything at all. Granzow stated if water is flowing our job is done, and these would be improvements we can do for you, if we do not want to spend money, we don't have to. Granzow asked for landowner input on this, as it is your public hearing.

## 7. Written Or Verbal Comments/Discussion

Greg Larson spoke about the option for the Supplemental Report, where the district is split, and there is a new outlet with just a portion of new tile. Larson stated as he looks at that after we have the proposed reclassification into two districts, everything from the west end of the new main tile, they will not be able to hook into the new main tile or into the outlet, so they basically get zero benefit. They represent over the majority of the acreage in the west portion, and they will pay a strong majority of the costs for the project. Larson wonders if it wouldn't make more sense, if we were looking at the western portion, Larson hates to add in options but to him it makes sense, if we were to split the districts, to do the outlet as a first project then come back in a couple years and look at replacing the entire main tile in the west district. Larson feels then everyone would benefit from it, Larson's own costs for the supplemental options would be well over \$100,000 and he would receive zero benefit from that option.

Dan Kumrow stated he has several pieces of ground in the whole district, he has a little bit of ground in the west portion, if we start exceeding a million dollars, his costs would be well over \$100,000, that is a lot for him, to get



the project starting and in the years going forward this would be a starting point from which we could expand in the future.

Regina Neville appreciates the comments made by Larson, and asked if there was a way to consider a metric that addresses the equity of cost and benefit and appreciates all of the recommendations, and the level of detail in those recommendations, to look at it more closely. Neville thinks it is wholly appropriate when looking at the next step to figure out what benefits the most in terms of our cost investment.

Hoffman stated we should treat this hearing as we did the Drainage District hearing held last week, it is not fair to make any recommendations or decisions today, we should poll the landowners and reconvene after this pandemic activity is over, and get the best participation and feedback. Hoffman was glad some of our remote participants liked the zoom option, it is not difficult to do, but would like landowners to have the option to be present in person as well. Hoffman stated today we should just acknowledge the reports and look to reconvene at a later date. Granzow asked if Hoffman felt we should pull any options. Hoffman stated at this point, he thinks there are so many options, it would be better to reconvene and let people absorb all of the information, then move forward at that point. Granzow asked for further comments. Kathy Colvin asked if the landowners had received copies of the Engineer's Reports and Supplemental Reports. Smith stated the documents are available on the website and she can provide paper copies by mail if any of the participants would send Smith an email, with address details.

Granzow asked for any other comments or questions before we close the public hearing. No comments or questions were presented.

#### 8. Close Public Hearing

Motion by McClellan to close the public hearing. Second by Hoffman. All ayes. Motion carried.

#### 9. Possible Action

Motion by Hoffman to acknowledge the Engineer's Report, Reclassification Report and Supplement to the Engineer's Report. Second by McClellan. All ayes. Motion carried.

Granzow asked if we need to do anything with the Reclassification report at this time. McClellan stated we should wait, Hoffman concurred.

Granzow stated we are not ready to direct CGA to prepare plans and specs at this time. The date for the next public hearing was discussed. Hoffman suggested we wait until after planting is done, and be respectful of the landowner's time and hope things are back to normal, McClellan agreed.

#### 10. Other Business

Granzow stated this could be a landowner meeting as we have held the public hearing over Reports, options and costs today. Date for the next public meeting was discussed for July 8, 2020 at 10:00 am on DD 56, if it would need to be a public hearing we would have time to set that event if meeting in July.

Motion by McClellan to hold a DD 56 Landowner Meeting regarding options on these Reports on July 8, 2020 at 10:00 am in the large conference room at the Courthouse. Second by Hoffman. All ayes. Motion carried.

Granzow encouraged all the landowners to come and bring their input, he hopes that we will be able to hold an in person meeting at that time. Meeting notices will be evaluated closer to that date to reflect if that is an option or if we will hold the meeting electronically. Granzow would like landowner input at the July meeting about which options they would like to remove from consideration.

#### 11. Adjourn Meeting

Motion by McClellan to adjourn. Second by Hoffman. All ayes. Motion carried. The Trustees thanked all those who participated today.