

5-2-1- DRAINAGE AUTHORITY MINUTES OF THE BOARD

April 25, 2007

Grand Junction City Hall, Executive Conference Room
Grand Junction, Colorado

Chairman Jim Doody called roll of the Board Members.

Board Members Present:

| | |
|------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Dave Walker | Town of Palisade |
| Richard Bowman | Grand Junction Drainage District |
| Steve Acquafresca | Mesa County Commissioner |
| Jim Doody, Chairman | City of Grand Junction |
| Dave Karisny – Excused | City of Fruita |

Also Present:

John Ballagh (Grand Junction Drainage District, Manager), **Eric Mende** (Fruita City Engineer), **Julie Constan** (Mesa County Engineering), **Trent Prall** (Grand Junction City Engineer), **Mike Meininger** (Mesa County Engineering), **Clint Kinney** (Grand Junction City Manager), **Eileen List** (Grand Junction Engineering).

Chairman Jim Doody opened the meeting at 3:05 p.m. He asked for a motion to adopt the agenda as is. Steve Acquafresca made the motion to adopt the agenda, Richard Bowman seconded, Chairman Doody polled the Board to accept the agenda.

| The roll call vote results: | Contracting Party | Vote |
|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|------|
| | Grand Junction Drainage District | aye |
| | Mesa County | aye |
| | Grand Junction | aye |
| | Palisade | aye |

Minutes:

Chairman Jim Doody asked for a motion to approve the Minutes of March 28, 2007. Dave Walker moved the Minutes for the March 28, 2007 Board Meeting be accepted as amended. Richard Bowman seconded the motion.

| The roll call vote results: | Contracting Party | Vote |
|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|------|
| | Grand Junction Drainage District | aye |
| | Mesa County | aye |
| | Grand Junction | aye |
| | Palisade | aye |

Financial Report:

John Ballagh reviewed the March 2007 balance sheet, profit & loss statement, and the check register. All items were reported to be within budget. We have received the

5-2-1 DRAINAGE AUTHORITY
MINUTES OF THE BOARD MEETING
MARCH 28, 2007
PAGE 2

training DVD's and the T-shirts for the Water cleanup project. The attorney fees are back up over \$100 a month. The Board was encouraged to see the earnings on the savings account and stated the decision to create a savings account was a good one.

Jim Doody wanted to know where we are with the consultant. We are waiting for impervious areas figures.

Richard Bowman moved that the Financial Report be accepted as is, Steve Acquafresca seconded the motion, and Chairman Jim Doody polled the Board.

| | | |
|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------|
| The roll call vote results: | Contracting Party | Vote |
| | Grand Junction Drainage District | aye |
| | Mesa County | aye |
| | Grand Junction | aye |
| | Palisade | aye |

Report:

Presentation of the 5-2-1 Drainage Authority (DA) Business Plan to the Grand Junction City Council. It was a good presentation by Trent Prall. There was no formal writing of the City Council proceedings. John Ballagh stated that would be remedied.

Action Item:

A detail of the budget for public education and hotline expenditures geared to NPDES is in the packets. Approval is needed to go ahead with the process instead of having to come to the board for every expenditure over \$1000. \$20,000 is in the adopted budget, \$1200 has been spent on the DVD's and we need action on the \$18,800 left. A billboard campaign will be started because it is more graphic. Hopefully more people will be willing to go along with the program.

Steve Acquafresca moved to approve the budget for public education and the hotline. Richard Bowman seconded the motion.

| | | |
|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------|
| The roll call vote results: | Contracting Party | Vote |
| | Grand Junction Drainage District | aye |
| | Mesa County | aye |
| | Grand Junction | aye |
| | Palisade | aye |

Discussion Items:

Discussion centered around the acceptance of the 5-2-1 DA Business Plan.

- The Town of Palisade is unanimous in its approval of the Impala option and not in support of the Huffey bicycle and doubling general funds

5-2-1 DRAINAGE AUTHORITY
MINUTES OF THE BOARD MEETING
MARCH 28, 2007
PAGE 3

- The City of Fruita was divided but leaning towards approval
- Mesa County Commissioners are divided
- The Grand Junction City Council is also divided
- The Drainage District wants to move forward
- Richard Bowman asked: Weren't we looking for feedback from the Boards on a direction to go and then make the decision to go forward? I thought we would move forward after the council meetings.
- There are board members out there questioning funding type and the need to move forward.
- More education needs to happen to show that quality of life is affected by flooding in the Grand Valley. The long-term residents should be able to see the problems, but that doesn't seem to be the case.

A proposal was made to double the contribution out of the general funds for the Huffey bicycle option instead of imposing a fee on the public.

- A utility fee frees up general funds for other things.
- Are there other ways to get the program to happen, such as the project being taken on by the Grand Junction Drainage District?
- The conception of the 5-2-1 has been in the works since 2000. It was studied for 3 years by the steering committee and has spent the last 2 years operating as an entity. The 5-2-1 DA is necessary for NPDES compliance to the point that authorization is more than justified.
- How far can we get with the present resources without imposing a fee?

The state is collecting permit fees. Because of the magnitude of the state project, it was feasible for the statewide collection of \$6,000,000 while only spending \$2,000,000.

- Can we collect our own permit fees?
- There would not be enough dollars to fund off a permit fee but it will give us some money. It would not be a significant source of income in Mesa County.
- There would be an outcry from the construction community if this is put on their backs.

It was proposed that an increase of funds out of general funds be acquired to get a utility in place and take it past the Huffey stage.

The public is crisis oriented and respond with their pocket books.

- If a utility is in place giving services, over time we would have an entity to work with problems as they occur.
- A fee imposed without approval from the public would be a set back. This is Tabor country where people believe they get to vote on all increases. It's more the idea than the charge.

We can move forward with a contribution to get our legs under us but we won't go for a fee at this time. There is a need to do more homework.

5-2-1 DRAINAGE AUTHORITY
MINUTES OF THE BOARD MEETING
MARCH 28, 2007
PAGE 4

- Boards change every year and we can lose support. Concern was expressed that elected boards change all the time. With general funds, things can be vetoed at any time. Why do so much work on a project that will only be vetoed down the road?

There are those in the Commission that say that this is a scheme to fund another bureaucracy.

- The Grand Junction City Council was cautious of charging a fee. We need to do what we can without a fee.
- They want to take from the general fund to move forward.
- We need to keep the momentum going. If funding comes from the general fund, the 5-2-1 won't be able to attract qualified people to work for it because funding could be pulled at any time.
- Things are more stable with a fee.

Concern was expressed that the Board is losing sight of what the organization was funded to do, which is protecting the water quality and conducting a series of studies.

- NPDES compliance and basin studies are needed.
- We're not moving forward on mitigating problems so what good are all the studies without action?
- Would the public give money to get projects done so they could be outside the flood planes?

The education of the public is a concern. A need to get the information out to the public was expressed.

- The time frame for educating the public would put the process of implementing the program down the road by a year to 2008.
- No fee should be assessed until after the education process. We need to show where the needs are and make it so the public can see what is going on while the projects are in progress.
- Perhaps a sign could be put up at the on-going projects that says: "your tax payer's dollars are going towards this project."

The Patterson Road (Ranchman) flood plain has not been adopted yet because we need to see what happens to the 5-2-1 before the final 383 properties are targeted and the people informed. With the rarity of storm events, the people don't see a need.

- Julie Constan and Eileen List have taken the 5-2-1 DA concept to organizations where people are more conscious of what is going on. These people were willing to stand by and leave things in the hands of others.
- When a new fee comes up, the connection won't be there.

We need to stay with the public on this. How do we sell this?

5-2-1 DRAINAGE AUTHORITY
MINUTES OF THE BOARD MEETING
MARCH 28, 2007
PAGE 5

- What percentage of the public can be reached, what percentage comprehends, and what percentage supports – what percent of the population are you down to?
- We aren't getting the information out. Pictures of projects need to be presented showing that the pipes are too small and need replacement.
- A billboard public education project will be implemented showing pictures that are graphic enough to draw the public's attention.

Staff stated that they need to know if what has been presented so far is enough detail to support a decision. If not, they need to know what else can be done. John Ballagh showed a map of the Ranchman's Drain flood plain showing the Ranchman's Ditch project and the detention ponds. He asked if we have been remiss in putting information together for the Boards so they can assimilate what has been presented. Would it be better to get some graphic pictures together for presentation so the Board knows the magnitude of the project? A wish list is only a list and doesn't show what needs to happen. It would be better to have pictures to put it together.

There is a concern about prioritization. If we are going to do this, it should be done right.

- Maybe we need to get a start with the NPDES compliance before we move on to something else.
- The separate entities cannot take on these projects independently so a better solution is needed.
- Is there a middle ground where we can get a project funded in one area and get it built? This is a piecemeal approach and needs to have discretion.

The political approach is one of caution or reserve. The Board isn't there yet in terms of education and neither is the public. The 5-2-1 Board needs to be up on what's going on before the public education process takes place.

- The Board needs to make a decision first, then take it to the public for input on a level of participation.
- We need a decision from the Board without public input to at least start giving a direction.

What information is needed to know how to make a decision on a funding source?

- The Board would like to see the drainages and what is affected.
- Pictures document a need. Pictures help more than anything and they are more easily understood by the public.
- A consultant was hired to define our options and their information should be used to make a decision.

Steve Acquafresca is behind the project as a good investment, but the ability to sell to the public would be more than a one season campaign to get wide spread approval of 70% to 80% of the public.

5-2-1 DRAINAGE AUTHORITY
MINUTES OF THE BOARD MEETING
MARCH 28, 2007
PAGE 6

- People are saying they are OK with funds going to improvements 60/40. They're seeing structures being built every day.
- It would be a good time to implement the big pipe project because it is around the mall and visible.
- 1997 flooding on Patterson helped move the project forward, but the 1999 study underestimated the problem.
- We need to keep floods out of Mesa Mall because all our tax dollars would be affected by a flood of that area.

A middle ground would be to start a process of mapping basins we have information for. Show how mitigation reduces the flood plane. Show what is needed to do the project. Is the perceived risk there or not? How do you show this needs priority when there are so many other projects out there. It is going to be an uphill battle.

Mitigation is needed. A flood of water running down the street takes with it all the trash people have stored on their property and dumps into the river without processing. People are beginning to slowly understand that stormwater is not treated. The 5-2-1 sell is going to take some time. This is a problem that when it is out of sight it is out of mind.

No need or demand is there right now so the Board cannot respond. If no money is there via a fee, how do you react when the flood does take place? When there is a major event, fingers will be pointed to who's at fault and people will want to know who can fix the problem.

You know it is the responsible thing to move forward but you won't because you don't know if the public will be behind it. Instead of speculating public response, we need to take it to the people to find out what their reaction really will be. Let's get up and doing something. What can we move forward on to do something?

There is no clear mandate from the Commission to move ahead with a fee so it can't be done right now.

- Increase general revenue and form a utility that can perform for all entities.
- Establish an entity to move forward with a fee when the need occurs. It's a foundation to work from to move forward with the process.
- It may not be tomorrow, but a move forward is needed.

We need to get a fee in place, then take it to the public now so we will be covered when an event takes place. If we aren't prepared, they can't point fingers at us. Then we can get approval from the public to proceed. We need to go back to the spreadsheet to see where to go now.

5-2-1 DA has \$82,500 budgeted for a basin master plan and the GJDD has \$60,000 budgeted. John Ballagh proposed that we put the two funds together to form one study of two areas – Lewis Wash and Douglas Wash. The two are adjacent to each other on the

5-2-1 DRAINAGE AUTHORITY
MINUTES OF THE BOARD MEETING
MARCH 28, 2007
PAGE 7

north end. Putting the two funds together would allow us to find more qualified bidders for the project. It's a study to tell how to mitigate a need prior to starting a utility. A plan is needed before the end of the year. We will put together a scope of work in an IGA for approval by the Board for the next meeting.

Meeting Calendar for the Future:

| | |
|----------------------------|--------------------------------|
| June 27 th | December 26 th |
| July 25 th | January 23 rd 2008 |
| August 22 nd | February 27 th 2008 |
| September 26 th | March 26 th 2008 |
| October 24 th | April 23 rd 2008 |
| November 28 th | May 28 th 2008 |

Adjourn:

There being no further business to come before the Board, Chairman Doody adjourned the meeting at 5:00 p.m.

Jim Doody, Chairman