

DD 143 Hearing
Wednesday, March 25, 10:00 AM
Public Hearing on Surveyor's Report & Engineer's Supplemental Report on Repairs To Main Tile for
Drainage District 143
This meeting was held electronically due to Covid-19 health risks.

3/25/2020 - Minutes

1. Open Meeting

Hardin County Chairperson Lance Granzow opened the hearing. Also present were Trustee BJ Hoffman, Trustee Renee McClellan; Jessica Sheridan, Environmental Health; Angela De La Rive, Economic Development; Lee Gallentine of Clapsaddle-Garber Associates; Taylor Roll, Mayor, City of Radcliffe/Hardin County Engineer; Chuck Raska, Radcliffe Public Works Superintendent; Landowners Brian Drake, Richard Drake, Phyllis Eige, Jacob Handsaker, Terry Swenson, Jim Handsaker, Ed Drake, Kathy Houck, Lloyd Guard, Roger Handsaker, Brad Fjelland, Shane Holdgraffer, Will Engelson, Trevor Houck, Calvin Hiland, attorney Mike Richards, 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

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

5. Verify Publication

Drainage Clerk Smith verifies the hearing notice was published on March 4, 2020.

6. Explanation Of Project

Lee Gallentine of CGA opened with an introduction of the project. This ROW for the main tile of DD 143 came about as a result of a landowner meeting held on April 24, 2019, in which the results of Work Order 167 were discussed, and reviewed by the District Trustees. Those meeting minutes are in the Engineer's Report if anyone wants to review them. At that time there was concern about removing trees, there was concern about how much right of way the Trustees had and about how much authority the Trustees had to remove trees. The Trustees requested CGA to do a Surveyor's Report to determine the width of the easement for the main tile through the City of Radcliffe. The location that they were concerned about would be the downstream limit would be the east side of Section 29 which is the center of E street, (aka HWY S27), about 3/8 of a mile north of Hwy 175. There were concerns going west along Ionia Street and the upstream limit would be where the tile crosses the south right of way line of Ionia St. going 3/4 of a mile, just west of May St.

Kathy Houck asked does this include the intake on Cleveland St. Gallentine states it does not, the focus of the Surveyor's Report was on Ionia from E Street, west to where the main tile leaves. Gallentine stated when we talk about repairs on this project, it may include that area.

Gallentine stated in researching the history, pertinent to right of way within the District, CGA reviewed files from the Hardin County Recorders Office, and Auditor's Office. Historically, the subdivisions within the town of Radcliffe, were platted between 1881 to 1901, those records were reviewed to determine if any easements were on file at that time, none of the records showed any easements at this time. Around 1903-1906 time, the request for and construction of the drainage district occurred. Most of the town was platted prior to the drainage district installation, this was the main take away from the history. CGA reviewed those documents under the investigation, to come up with a history. CGA also reviewed files in the Hardin County Auditor's office to see if there was any transfer history, also reviewed were current and old plat books, and there was nothing found in the Auditor's files related to right of way in DD 143. CGA also reviewed records at the County Engineer's office, as early on the Engineer's office did a lot of work in drainage districts. Also reviewed were fieldbooks and the Sherman Township fieldbook, and nothing was found related to the right of way for DD 143. Lastly, the Recorder's office's records of subdivision were reviewed, and nothing was found related to right of way there either. The City of Radcliffe's office records were not reviewed, as it was unlikely they had any documents related to drainage from over 100 years ago, as it was a City facility and not a County/Drainage District facility.

When all of the history was reviewed, it became clear that the City of Radcliffe existed prior to the establishment of DD 143 or its predecessor, therefore the City street right of way was platted before the district was constructed. Based on this information it is CGA's conclusion that the existing street right of way would be logically the right of way for DD 143. With no record of an easement being established and no record of anyone being paid damages for the right of way, the Ionia St. right of way, which is 66', is the same as the right of way for DD 143. Even though the right of way for Ionia St and DD 143 may be one and the same, there is a possibility that trees outside of the right of way could have an impact on the district tile's performance.

Jim Handsaker asked what is the standard right of way for a drainage district. Gallentine replied there is no standard right of way for a drainage district, 100 years ago there was a hodgepodge of ROW's, there are some records for other districts, in which damages were paid or ROW's recorded, but many did not document any of this. Gallentine stated on new district, we try to establish the ROW at 100' to allow a contractor to have room to come in and make repairs later.

Gallentine continued, at the April 24 Landowner Meeting, several repair options were discussed, with questions centering on feasibility and costs, so the Trustees commissioned CGA to draw up the Supplemental Engineers Report, which is a supplement to the original 2017 Engineers Report on Improvements to the Main Tile. The Supplemental Report gives other alternatives for construction and repair.

Repair methods discussed include the possibility of doing a full tile lining, in which the contractor would remove tree roots and debris from the existing main tile either by jet cleaning or mechanical cutting, again along the same route along the Ionia corridor discussed earlier. The tree roots would be prevented from infiltrating the tile again by installing a CIPP liner, which is the same type of thing done on sanitary sewers. It was asked earlier by Houck about the intakes on Cleveland St., those would not be included on this alternate, this is for just what is proposed on Ionia St. The thick blue line on the map, indicates the line repaired, the west end of it departs from Ionia St, and it extends from that point east up to the Hwy on the east end of town.

It was asked if roots still could come in from other tiles that are connected to the main tile. Gallentine stated if we line the District tile that runs down the middle of the street, the roots will try to find the next weakest point, if there are private tile connected to the district tile, yes, the roots could go into the private tile and then get into the main tile, however they would not be getting into the main at every 3' or 6' original joint, only at the points where private tile comes into district tile.

Partial Tile Lining - This option would not line the entire length but only those areas in which tree root infiltration had been identified previously, based on the April 24th meeting, that is not all along one length but about 1/3rd of the length of the tile and spread out in different areas of the tile. For those areas, it would be spot lining, and not lining the whole thing, it the same as the first option but being done in individual spots and not the whole length.

Brian Drake stated he was having difficulty logging on to zoom to view the documents. McClellan provided the URL for the meeting.

Gallentine continued, the third option is Tile Cleaning and Tree Removal, this option removes the tree roots and debris by jet cleaning and/or mechanical cutting, but instead of lining the tile, the trees identified previously as problematic, extending to 50' on either side, would be removed, the list is in the appendices. The trees removed would be 50' on either side of the tile, for a total width of 100', that is above and beyond the District right of way of 66', and there may be a need to get the additional easement/rights for the tree removal beyond 66'.

The last potential option is an offset tile replacement along the south side of the Ionia St. pavement, depending on how the utilities are laid out there, so that the tile is no longer dead center of the street. This would be connected in the golf course on the east side or right by the HWY, and on the west end, it would be connected west of May St. The same issues can apply on this one as applies on the original tile, tree roots may be able to infiltrate this replacement, so the recommendation on tree removal within 50' of the rerouted main tile remain. Right now the existing tile is in the center of the ROW, so 50' of tree removal would be an even taking on both sides of the street, and with the rerouted or offset tile, that would be an even deeper taking on one side and less on the other side of the street.

Granzow asked, we will have to tear the street up if we don't take the last option, whose expense is it - the District's, the City's or the County's expense to replace the street. Gallentine stated his understanding of Iowa Code is that if you cross a street, it is the street authority, but this runs parallel to the street. Granzow stated we would be crossing the street at the intersection of every block. Gallentine asked if those radiuses are part of the street you run parallel with or part of the street you are crossing, and there may be some clarification needed.

All of these options would only remove obstructions at the location of the proposed work, any obstructions in other locations would remain in the existing tile. Full tile lining would remove all the obstructions, partial tile lining would only remove the obstructions where we did work. All private connections would be reconnected after the main tile repairs. Repairs of other key issues previously identified in the original report, would not be addressed, as the original report addressed a longer length of the main tile. There are some spot locations farther upstream that still have some issues.

All of these options would require installation of access manholes in the area of repair, right now, there is no way to access this tile other than at the golf course and at the far west end, south of Ionia. There are no other access points on the district tile itself. The offset tile replacement option, where the tile would be moved to the side, either north or south, we would leave the existing main tile in place and abandon it, as is, it would not be removed. All options except for the full tile lay, require monitoring for additional tree growth and root infestation, even the full tile lining could have root infiltration through the private tile that are connected. The offset tile replacement option would not provide for reconnection of anything that is on the opposite side of where we put the new tile. If we offset to the north side for example, we would not be able to reconnect any private tile that is currently connected on the south side. The tile cleaning and tile removal option would involve removing trees outside the existing right of way. The existing right of way is 66" wide, CGA recommends removing trees for 100' which would involve taking trees outside the right of way. It was attempted to most closely match the existing pipe sizing, with sizes that are currently manufactured now, on main tile size we did not try to upsize this to get a greater drainage coefficient, as that would be an improvement, and we are not trying to make an improvement, but a repair it to most closely match how the tile was originally. Under Iowa code per 468.138 and 468.139, the District has the authority to remove hedges, trees and shrubs, whether they are inside the ROW or they are outside the ROW. The NRCS has deemed that, historically, repairs do not impact jurisdictional wetlands. Jurisdictional wetlands are treated by the NRCS as confidential information, and if any drainage project is contemplated or moves forward, we highly recommend you always talk to NRCS about that.

Jim Handsaker stated that he understood the 4 options presented, and asked if the option of doing nothing with the project was possible as this time. Gallentine stated that part of any drainage project that the Trustees have to consider, is whether it is necessary, whether drainage is restricted to a point that something has to be done, whether it is feasible, the unsaid option, is that the district Trustees can do nothing. As Engineers, we don't recommend that as we always like to see thing working better. Granzow asked if water was moving in the tile at this time, Gallentine stated water is flowing, it is not a total blockage and the blockage that is occurring, is not as severe as what was happening east of the HWY in the golf course that we remedied a few year ago. Granzow asked for an estimate of what percentage of the tile is blocked. Gallentine stated that there are spots that have minimal roots in the tile that would be 10% and other spots that are at least 3/4 full of roots, but some water is still flowing through.

Brian Drake. speaking on behalf of the telephone company, stated the 2 tiles that have the conduit through them shown in photos in the Engineer's report, the Telephone Company repaired those last year. Gallentine stated, yes those repairs have been made, and we greatly appreciate that. Drake was greatly disappointed to see those in the report, Gallentine stated he thought that in the assumptions portion of the report it stated that those had been repaired, and went on that the Telephone Company has been very timely in making the repairs.

McClellan shared an email received from Jacob Handsaker, and McClellan invited Jacob Handsaker to speak. Jacob Handsaker stated he had questions, with the statement that water is still flowing, is there a detriment that has happened or a detriment that we need to take action on immediately, especially with limited options for communication, visuals and interaction as this meeting is being held electronically. Handsaker stated that this was a concern he shared with several landowners, is there immediacy to this, and have the concerns in what may or may not be working, is there a proof in what problems or detriments to the district is actually happening. Granzow stated, we do not have to act on this today, and would consider recessing for a month from now, and hopefully we could have it in a public session if we can't come to a solution today. Granzow went on that the current situation is discouraging to all of us that this meeting must be held electronically. Hoffman stated he appreciates everyone doing their best to attend today, and that this electronic meeting is not going to give the equity and true magnitude of the project, without having everyone present in a room at a meeting. Hoffman does not feel he can personally act on this today, he would like to gather more information as we have received many emails on this project. Hoffman echoed Granzow, in that we do not have to take action on this today and in all fairness he is not sure that this hearing in this method gives the project the attention it deserves. McClellan stated she could not make a decision today, but did want to hear Gallentine's responses to Handsaker submitted comments, and allow people that have called in or joined the meeting online an opportunity to be heard, so that if we need to look for additional information or CGA needs to answer additional questions, we can have that information for the next meeting.

Handsaker said that will put many people's mind at ease, and everyone can understand that this is more of a fact finding meeting today rather than a decision making meeting. Handsaker stated the are a couple of options to benefit the whole district he would like to present. Handsaker's family has some ground on the south side of town,

although it is in the district, we don't benefit much from this tile that goes through town. It is of very little value to a lot of the farms on the south and southwest side of town. Handsaker asked is there or has there been a study done to reroute, or create a new main line on the south side of Hwy 175. Handsaker stated the larger concern is the drainage or rainwater coming through town, if we can circumvent the town and not send all the agricultural drainage through the city of Radcliffe, is that a viable option. Handsaker stated it would be rather costly as an initial install as there could be potential 8,000' to 9,000' of pipe from what he figured, as there would be a couple deep cuts through hills, but it is doable grade wise, and could utilize a 36" main, at least at the start of the tile. Handsaker asked, is that something that we could look at, even though the upfront costs would be higher, by taking the agricultural drainage out of the city, it would not make that flow right through the center of town. He would like some landowner input on that idea. Handsaker went on that concerns that the property on the north side of town and at the top of the district, it appears to him that the district facility ends on the east side of C Ave. Handsaker asked if it is possible move the acres on the west side of C Ave and annex those acres into Drainage District 7, which lies straight to the north, and that DD 7 had a new facility installed around the 2013 time frame, and that would be accomplished by pumping station or by gravity flow, could we annex those acres into DD 78 and not have to worry about that flow going through Radcliffe as well.

Gallentine stated regarding the immediacy of this project, he feels the Trustees are correct, that no action has to be taken today. We have been discussing this for a long while, and the tree roots have been around longer than that. Gallentine stated that as to proof of problems on this tile, that is something the landowners themselves would have to report to the Trustees. Gallentine stated the possibility of running a tile line along Hwy 175 to essentially bypass the town, or moving the acres at the upstream end to DD 7, CGA would have to look at that, Handsaker has done some legwork in determining what size tile may be needed, and potential depths and grades. Gallentine stated it sounds like those could be possibilities, but CGA has not done a study on either of those options, and CGA can certainly do a report on those options if the Trustees would like them to. Granzow stated that just to be clear, every time we commission a report, there is a cost to the District for that report, and bypassing the town would be a very expensive cost, but if we look at another 100 year snapshot of this project, that may be very efficient. Granzow continued, moving the water to the other district, and he does not know what that cost would look like, but if we could avoid running tile through a town again, that would still be a good option. Granzow asked for an estimate of how much it would cost to run a report on that.

Gallentine stated typically reports run in the \$5,000 to \$10,000 range. Granzow asked if we were to redirect that water so it does not run through town, could we make the town a lateral instead of a main? Gallentine stated you could go about that in a couple different ways, the town could be a lateral instead of a main, or you could create a separate subdistrict for either the town or the piece south of town. It was asked what would have to happen to the land that both options would have to run through. Gallentine asked if the landowner was referring to annexation. It was stated that this landowner's land is at the end of the drainage district, and they own the land that would be used if they went right to the creek, does that mean a subdistrict was created, does that mean we pay every time something happens to the town district, and we pay every time something happens to the out of town district. Gallentine stated that whether one becomes a lateral or a subdistrict, typically only people within that lateral, would pay for that lateral or typically only people within that subdistrict would pay for that subdistrict. If you are not in either of those, you would only pay when work was done on the main.

It was asked if there are any cost estimates in the plans. Gallentine stated yes, there are cost estimates in the original four options presented, but if they were asking about the cost option for the two options proposed by Jacob Handsaker, we do not have any costs for those options. Gallentine stated the opinion of costs on the 4 options presented in the report are based on previous bid lettings, and CGA can estimate based on those previous bid lettings, labor, material and equipment from a contractor, and also engineering, construction observation, and administration fees from CGA. For full tile lining CGA's opinion of costs are \$455,366. For partial tile lining, CGA's opinion of costs are \$270,944. For tile cleaning and tree removal, CGA's opinion of costs are \$342,616. For offset tile replacement, CGA's opinion of costs are \$455,022. What those fees do not include are any legal fees, interest, administrative fees, crop damages, other damages, previous repairs, any fees to date, wetland fees, reclassification fees, and any other damages would include the taking of right of way if we needed to expand the easement. It was asked of those estimates include street repair. Gallentine stated, for each one of those options it does include street repair costs. Gallentine stated there would not be much costs for street repairs with any of those 4 options, since it is not full replacement of where the tile currently exists.

Jim Handsaker, stated the last project that went through ended up substantially higher priced than what the estimate was, Jim asked is that common practice or was that a unique feature for that project. Gallentine stated it was not a common practice, and was unsure to what Jim was comparing. Gallentine stated at the cost being presented at a hearing, those are very specific to what it includes, and if you are talking about that compared to what you are assessed for, the amount you are assessed for may include things that are not in the project estimates. It was asked if we should include a certain percentage of costs over what is listed in the reports. Gallentine stated he can't tell you that, but the assessment for the last project, included costs for televising all the way from the golf course west to the end of the tile, and that was not part of the project but it was work done that

the district still paid for. Gallentine went on, with that being said he has no idea how much additional work beyond a project may be requested within this district.

It was stated by a landowner, that is looking at a big bill, that will not do anything for her on the west side of town, she will still have flooding in her field, her backyard and basement, this project will not help people on the west side of town. Gallentine is not insinuating that this project will help anyone in town with flooring in their basement, unless part of their flooding in town, unless part of their basement drainage system is hooked into this tile, and Gallentine has no way of knowing that.

Granzow stated that looking at these four options, not that we are making a decision right now, Granzow did not think we should consider the offset tile replacement because the full tile lining is so similar in cost, why not have a better product for the same money, and then everyone's tile would get hooked back in as opposed to just one side of the the street with the offset tile lining, and you would have a tile lining to protect against the tree roots as well. Granzow's opinion is that the offset tile replacement option should be pulled from consideration. Jim Handsaker stated the offset tile replacement, you would run into numerous water drains, and there is a larger storm drain on the south side, and the sanitary sewer is on the north side of Ionia, there will be so many difficulties with this option, he does not think it even feasible. Granzow stated let's strike the offset tile replacement option off.

Granzow stated when we originally looked at tile cleaning and tree removal, we thought we had a larger easement, we do not have that larger easement, and in order to remove those trees, which we have a right to remove, those people may want to be compensated for those trees. Granzow stated that he does not know if tile cleaning and tree removal is a great option as is currently written. Granzow stated if we prolong this project, and people wanted to do self maintenance of these trees in front of their properties, knowing that we have these issues, and there is something that could be put in the tile to dissolve these roots, but we still have to get rid of the trees. Granzow continued that in order to avoid a large project, maybe that is an option. If people want to start cleaning trees out on their own, or if the city wants to clean some of these trees out that are in the city's right of way. Granzow asked Gallentine if it would be possible to use something to dissolve the tree roots in this case. Gallentine stated, yes, you can dissolve the roots, but you would have to have the right dosage so as not to kill the trees, and also this tile outlets onto the open waterway, you would have to watch that you don't have a spill farther downstream, it has to be done correctly. Granzow asked if we could help self manage the problem by cutting the trees down in the right away ahead of time, kill the roots that are causing some of the blockage and maybe that will slow the issues, and we don't have to proceed. Gallentine stated that landowners can do that if they wish, and some trees are more aggressive than others as far as tree roots, the maples, ash, mulberries, box elders, Gallentine stated the walnut and oak trees are not as aggressive in root growth. Granzow stated he does not know if the landowners are interested in doing that or having the Trustees do it for them, if the Trustees do it then the whole district pays for tree removal. Granzow stated he does believe the trees are an issue, in this case and in every drainage district, and the trees need to be addressed.

Granzow stated the partial tile lining, while a lesser cost, but it does not solve the problem, and it is a band aid, and what we can afford. Granzow went on that if we are now looking at a 3/4 blocked tile, how long will it be before those aggressive roots create a 100% blockage of the tile if we don't manage the trees, Gallentine stated he could not answer that, he does not know how long it took the roots/trees to get to this point. Granzow stated it could be this year or it could be 10 years, we just don't know. It was asked how far can they push the tile lining when they open up or manhole the tile to install the tile lining. Gallentine stated typically it depends on which company gets it, and what equipment they have, but the typical range is 500' to 1,000'. It was asked what the total street length was for Ionia. Gallentine stated for the project, for full tile lining is at 4,600' in total, and CGA planned for 9 manholes for installation. It was asked if you could do 500' in each direction from one manhole, giving you a total of 1,000' from that man hole. Gallentine stated the contractor would need access at each end of the 500', so the 9 manholes are necessary for install. It was asked if CGA was aware of where the worst tree species were located, or if certain areas were worse than others. Gallentine stated he would have to review the televising notes to recall which areas were worse. Granzow asked if that was where the partial tile lining was located. Gallentine stated that was where the partial tile lining was, and our location was based off comments at the initial hearing that about 1/3rd of the tile was truly bad and needed lining and previous clerk Schlemme had pulled that information for the Trustees.

Granzow stated we do have a couple more options we might be interested in finding out costs as far as bypassing the town, but we do have to address this at some point, whether it is today, tomorrow, this year, or next year, but we do have to address the issue. Granzow went on that if people are willing to do some self maintenance on some trees, I think that could prolong that time frame, if not Granzow thinks we may have to come in sooner to address this. Hoffman stated the options presented by Handsaker, were interesting, the interest in going to a landowner Trustee district and let them make their own decisions, could be considered as well. Granzow stated that it was brought to their attention, that a landowner had inquired about going to Private Trustee District, that would require a petition, and he is not aware if anyone would like to do anything with that now. Smith stated we received about 50 signatures stating they would like to do nothing with this project at this time. Smith also stated there was an inquiry about going to a private trustees managed district, Smith shared the information for the requirements for

that process, that they would need a majority of all of the landowners within the district to sign that petition, and if and when they get to that point, we can talk about what that process looks like for the district. Granzow stated that if that process does happen, the Supervisors as Trustees, would cease any action after the petition is filed.

Gallentine stated that with the idea of running the tiles from the south or southwest side of town, if we run a tile along the south side of Hwy 175, instead of making town a lateral, you could make the town it's own district, once it is it's own district and the majority of the district is within city limits, you can turn the control of this district back over to the city of Radcliffe as storm sewer. McClellan stated she thinks this would be the best option, we need to get the report done and determine what those costs are for new options. Hoffman stated if there is interest in becoming an owner controlled district, do you let them do that first and they can decide what they want to do. Hoffman has no problem with letting CGA do the work, but other private districts use other engineers, and may shop around for some services. Hoffman stated he would like to review all the written comments received and do his due diligence in researching and reaching out to those people of they had other questions, it will take time to absorb and research. Granzow agrees, and that is why he would like to recess for one month, and hopefully we can get back to meeting in person, that gives us time to research and receive more public comments as this is a big decision. Granzow stated that as Trustees we have to ensure that water is flowing, and when it stops flowing it becomes and even larger problem, and we know we have an issue. Hoffman stated we know we have a problem and to what extent there is still water flowing in the facility, are things we have to take into account. McClellan stated if there is a problem that we have not addressed, we as Trustees can be sued for not taking care of a problem. Jim Handsaker asked if there has been a wetland determination in the areas to the south of town, or do you know. Smith stated she was unaware of any wetlands determination in the area. Gallentine stated he did not have any wetland determination for the area, the landowners would have to get that information and provide it to us. Granzow encouraged any landowners to get their wetland determinations sooner, rather than waiting. Granzow stated we can put it on file once you have the determination made, but the landowner has to request it themselves, that the County can't request that information. Jim Handsaker, stated he thought they had one for their land outside of town, but he would have to look to make sure.

It was asked by Kathy Houck, if the issue is to address drainage, why is it that the City put an intake into her field 20 years ago, that was placed 18" too high, which denies her drainage. Houck, stated there were issues with mosquitos, electric lines in the back yards in the area, and a neighbor was in the water and nearly electrocuted by contact with a line, and yet she still deals with this problem. Granzow asked if it was the City of Radcliffe that installed the intake. Houck stated she had been told the City Council had this intake installed in 1995 with the intent to hold water in her property to protect the east side of town and that's where the councilman lived at the time. Granzow stated that should be addressed with the City. Houck stated she has addressed this with the City, who ignore the issue. Granzow stated you are entitled to drainage,, but the intake that was put in was not Drainage District facilities, but private tile. Houck stated that if we are working on the problem with tile in the City, she is still denied drainage. Gallentine stated we are working on a district problem, that is bigger than the city, and as far as the District tile, you have the right to connect on to that any time you want. It was stated that the storm drain was not the same as the district tile. Houck stated she has tried to talk to the City, Raska told her the intake was 18" too high, and the City will not give her any information as to why it was built up too high. Granzow stated he did not want to ignore Houck's facts, that was out of the Trustee's realm, that was a city storm drain or private tile issue, not a Drainage District issue, Granzow would like to help more on that and the City can chime in at anytime, we can only deal with the District tile, that everyone has the right to hook onto.

Chuck stated the intake that she is discussing, the large storm drain takes water at the storm level, and there is another intake right beside it that hooks to the District tile we are talking about, and the County's District tile does run right through Houck's field, there is drainage there, maybe not as fast as she would like, most of the water that comes in at her field does go into this District tile that travels through town. Roll stated if we did entertain the idea of moving this tile to the south and rerouting this main, the water flooding on the southwest part of town and in Houck's area, as well as over on the east side of E Street, that would change things drastically, for this side of town. Roll stated Jacob Handsaker's idea is a very good idea in that regard. Houck stated that until Chuck fixed the tile out back last year, it had been built up in 1995 so that did not take drainage. It was stated the whole tile, takes on water, it is not a sealed tile, takes on groundwater from the surrounding soil.

McClellan asked if there were objections on having CGA do a report on Jacob's recommendations, it would be a potential cost of \$5,000 to \$10,000 for the report, but she would like to be more informed about the option of not having all this water go through town. Taylor Roll stated he didn't mind the idea of moving the water to District 7, and Roll suggested he could go out and research that option than research both options. McClellan asked if Roll could do some research. Roll with speak with Jacob Handsaker about this option. Calvin Hiland stated if you are going to run a tile from the creek to the south of Radcliffe, it will cost \$2,000,000. Granzow asked if the tile could tie back in on the east side of Radcliffe, do we have to go the way back to the creek or can we just bypass town, and ties in on the other side of town past the golf course. Gallentine stated, he would have to look in detail, but assumed you could do either, you could go all the way back to the creek or you could tie back in to the main once you back south of Hwy 175.

Calvin Hiland stated if we run 9,000' of tile isn't that going to run upwards of \$2,000,000. Gallentine stated he would not know without running the numbers, but none of these project options will be inexpensive. Hiland stated we are talking \$2,000,000 compared to \$400,000. Jacob Handsaker stated the last project we did went through over by Lonnie's, through Mark Brinkmeyer's ground, that [project was approximately 7,000' of tile and we go the bid at \$330,000 and the next closest bid was within \$10,000 of our bid. Handsaker stated the \$2,000,000 was a really high estimate. Hiland asked how big was the tile on this project. Handsaker stated we started out with 36" triple wall plastic tile, just like this would need to be for capacity. Hiland stated, so you are thinking it could be \$1,000,000 anyway. Handsaker stated it has a good shot to be around \$1,000,000, but if we are looking for adequate drainage, why don't we do what's best to get everyone drainage, both in town and on the south side of town, if the actual concern is getting a good drainage coefficient so farmland can adequately drain, Handsaker thinks it is worth considering and exploring options. Hiland stated so it would still be up to 5 people to pay that \$1,000,000. Granzow stated, it would still be the entire district that would pay for the project, Gallentine stated that the cost is apportioned to those receiving benefits, it would not just be those people whose ground the tile flows through, if drainage capacity or benefits were increased to people in town by removing load, they would also bear a portion of that cost.

Jim Handsaker asked, if on the west side of C Ave., that would not have to have a tile all the way down to the creek, couldn't we connect that to the tile that was just installed west of Hiland's place, so it might be a 1/2 mile. Hiland stated the main tile goes across the road, under Hwy 175, so if you are going to hook into that, you would have to come up clear past Trev Houck's place, and in between Houck's and Morris's place. Handsaker stated if it went south, could we hook onto to DD 7 tile that was just installed. Hiland asked how would water be pumped uphill there, Handsaker replied with a pump, Handsaker asked if Hiland had explored that option. Hiland stated he had not looked at trying to pump water uphill. Gallentine stated that was the option Taylor Roll was will to investigate. Hiland asked if that would be hooked up to the DD 7 main, which would need water pumped because it would require going through a hill. Handsaker stated hill cuts are done all the time, and he would have to look at the grades.

Granzow stated why don't we look at DD 7 as an option. Roll would have to go out and look at the land to get an opinion on it, as he does not know the land there as well as Hiland. Granzow stated it would be nice if Roll could look at it with Hiland. It was agreed by Roll and Hiland to look at the area, and Granzow stated it would help us get a better idea of what kind of recommendations we can look at. Granzow stated that if Roll and Hiland could look at this and get back to us at next week's meeting, it would give us a larger scope to look at it, and then we can decide whether we want to add to the report and move forward with that. Granzow stated at this time he does not want to close the public hearing. He would like to meet back again in a month, Jim Handsaker stated in a month it may be hard to get participation due to spring planting and field work, he would like it to be 2 months.

Granzow stated we could do two months, and if people want to take this time and some ownership, and cut some of these trees down that would help as well. McClellan asked if they could check it out sometime in the next week, and then return to the Regular drainage Meeting next week with some feedback. Roll and Hiland agreed. Granzow stated that please forward any written comments on to the Drainage Clerk. Smith stated that all of the written comments already submitted have been shared with the Trustees and CGA.

Date was discussed for 2 months from now to reconvene and discuss the subject further, Gallentine stated that if one of the options you wanted to look at was Jacob Handsakers, that Roll was going to look at, or going on the south side of 175, it would be required to have a public hearing if you have another engineer's report drawn up. Granzow stated we could close and reschedule another public hearing.

Attorney Mike Richards stated it would be advantageous to adjourn as opposed to recessing, if we are looking at a date 2 months out, and then we can send a new notice. Hoffman stated hopefully we can hold a hearing in person.

7. Written Or Verbal Comments/Discussion

Written comments were acknowledged as received by the Trustees. Granzow asked if everyone had made any other verbal comments they wished to, no replies were given.

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 acceptance of the Engineer's Supplemental Report. Second by McClellan. All ayes. Motion carried.

No direction for CGA to prepare any reports at this time.

Granzow asked what time frame CGA would need to prepare a report on the two additional options discussed today, bypassing town or hooking on to DD 7. Gallentine stated with the unknowns ahead in regards to the Covid-19 situation, he estimated it would take in the 6 to 8 week range.

10. Other Business

No other business.

11. Adjourn Meeting

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