5-2-1 DRAINAGE AUTHORITY MINUTES OF THE BOARD March 22, 2006 Mesa County Courthouse Annex Grand Junction, Colorado

Chairman Karisny opened the meeting at 3:35 p.m.

Chairman Karisny called roll of the Board Members

Board Members Present:

Dave Karisny, Chairman Council Member, City of Fruita Board Member, Town of Palisade

Jim Doody Council Member, of City of Grand Junction

Tilman Bishop Mesa County Commissioner
Dick Bowman Grand Junction Drainage District

Also Present:

John Ballagh (Grand Junction Drainage District, Manager), **Julie Constan** (Mesa County, Engineer), **Vohnnie Pearson** (Town of Palisade, Planner), **Tim Moore** (City of Grand Junction, Public Works Manager), **Trent Prall** (City of Grand Junction, City Engineer), **Mike Meininger** (Mesa County, Engineer), **Kate Hofius** (recording secretary).

Adopt Agenda

 Chairman Karisny asked for changes to or acceptance of the agenda. Jim Doody moved to accept the agenda. Dave Walker seconded the motion. Chairman Karisny polled the Board.

The roll call vote result:	Contracting Party	Vote
	Palisade	aye
	Fruita	aye
	City of Grand Junction	aye
	Grand Junction Drainage District	aye
	Mesa County	aye

MINUTES

Chairman Karisny asked for a motion to accept the Minutes of February 22, 2006. Tilman Bishop requested two (2) corrections on "page 3" - second bullet; replace "and their" with "for," and the 5th bullet; replace "to them" with "the Rate Study." Dave Walker motioned to accept the February 22, 2006 minutes with the changes. Jim Doody seconded the motion.

5-2-1 DRAINAGE AUTHORITY MINUTES OF THE BOARD MEETING MARCH 22, 2006

Chairman Karisny polled the Board to accept the minutes:

The roll call vote results:	Contracting Party	Vote
	Palisade	aye
	Fruita	aye
	City of Grand Junction	aye
	Grand Junction Drainage District	aye
	Mesa County	aye

Financial Report

- A. Tilman Bishop asked that John Ballagh walk the Board through the Financial Statements at the future Board Meetings.
- B. Board needed clarification concerning signing checks that appeared on February Financial Statements.
- C. It was explained that items approved for payment at February Board meeting will be written the next day and presented to Board to be signed at the next Board Meeting, being the March meeting, however; they will be shown as a February expenditures.

Jim Doody moved to approve the Financial Report for the Month of February 2006 as presented by the Staff; Dave Walker seconded the motion.

Chairman Karisny polled the Board:

The roll call vote result:	Contracting Party	Vote
	Palisade Fruita City of Grand Junction Grand Junction Drainage District Mesa County	aye aye aye aye aye
	•	,

STATUS OF RATE STUDY

John Ballagh gave an update on the Rate Study. All parties have signed the contract and attorneys on both sides are in agreement.

- A. Board asked that the information from AMEC be given to them "plenty of time before" Board Meetings so they may review the material.
- B. Staff said that the Board would have the information two weeks before a meeting takes place
- C. Staff asked Board Members if they would prefer extending the time of the Board Meeting on the day of presentation or set an extra day.
- D. Board Members agreed to extend the time with at least a month's prior notice.

5-2-1 DRAINAGE AUTHORITY MINUTES OF THE BOARD MEETING MARCH 22, 2006

DISCUSSION CAPITAL PROJECTS WHITE PAPER

Staff's recommendations and discussion with Board:

- A. Due to the importance of the major channels, staff recommends that drainage authority projects focus primarily on the major channels.
- B. Board inquired about identification of basins and cost of Capital Projects.
- C. Board asked about projects underway by individual contracting parties, will the 5-2-1DA shares in the costs of those projects, and consideration of public opinion regarding *previous* scheduled projects that are now getting additional funding by the 5-2-1DA.
- D. Staff used the Ranchman's Ditch (aka: Horizon Drive Channel) as an example stating that: there will be multi-jurisdiction projects that may be given funds by the 5-2-1DA to keep projects on schedule, but will be based more on priority of projects and public safety.
- E. Guidelines will have to be defined and accepted after discussions and feedback by all Board and Staff members before the Rate Study is completed.
- F. Board ask if the prioritization of capital projects will be defined by a rating system, with health, safety, loss of life, loss of property, etc being the goal for selected projects and in what order.
- G. Staff acknowledged the importance of working together to develop a rating system to prioritize projects.
- H. Board focused on the original report with health and safety being a concern over major and minor channel and basins.
- I. Staff will submit recommendations on projects and a priority ranking system to the Board for approval.
- J. Board questioned what criteria would be used to determine how funds would be appropriated.
- K. Staff believes that funding should be by priority, not price of existing or planned projects.
- L. Tilman Bishop asked for clarification on the words "contracting parties."
- M. Staff stated that "contracting parties" are the five governmental entities that signed the intergovernmental agreement creating the 5-2-1 Drainage Authority.
- N. Tilman Bishop asked that the reference to "Entities may lobby the Authority for possible projects" be taken out of the White Paper, and "a clearly stated process be adopted by the Board that will be prioritized projects."
- O. Technical staff recommends that capital projects that are identified in basin or master planning studies, which were funded and adopted by the *Drainage Authority*, should be completely funded by the *Drainage Authority*.

- P. Technical staff recommends, if a smaller project in a sub-basin is identified in a basin or master planning study, and the benefiting contracting party wishes to cost-share the project then the *Drainage Authority* should be able to assist with funding the cost of the project.
- Q. Board had question's concerning Operation & Maintenance and jurisdiction.
- R. John Ballagh responded that the Drainage District maintains GJDD facilities but has no room under the TABOR revenue cap to accept payment for services. The concept to date has been that the 5-2-1 DA would contract with the private sector for Operation & Maintenance of facilities.
- S. Trent Prall described near term Capital Improvement Projects expenditures taking the majority of the budget with Operation & Maintenance taking a larger part over time.
- T. Trent Prall indicated that the steering committee felt, initially the fees the 5-2-1 collected will be used to build capital projects. Over time a portion of the funds will be used to maintain the projects with a smaller amount being used to fund new projects and will need staff to monitor and maintain the built projects as well as maintain accurate records to comply with NPDES regulations.
- U. Board questioned liability on multi- jurisdiction projects. Staff agreed that the 5-2-1 DA would have liability as a co-owned project. Single ownership results in single liability.
- V. Dick Bowman observed that at some point there would have to be staff hired by and working for the 5-2-1 DA. He questioned that the idea about the 5-2-1 owning and maintaining the projects, that the need to staff & maintain these projects will be enormous. He further noted that if the 5-2-1 managed the NPDES compliance issues another level of staff would be needed.
 - a) John Ballagh agreed at some point there may need to be additional employees.

Due to time it was agreed to table the discussion and to continue all items on the Agenda not addressed until the April 26th Board Meeting.

NEXT MEETING DATE

- The next meeting date will be April 26th, 2006, 3:30 5:00 p.m. at the Mesa County Courthouse Annex.
- Forecast meeting dates are as follows:

May 24th June 28th

The meeting was adjourned at 5:05 p.m.

Dave Karisny, Chairman	