

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

June 27, 2007

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

Chairman Jim Doody opened the meeting at 3:10 p.m. He called roll of the Board Members.

Board Members Present:

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

Also Present:

John Ballagh (Grand Junction Drainage District, Manager), Vohnnie Pearson (Town of Palisade, Planner), Julie Constan (Mesa County Engineering), Trent Prall (Grand Junction City Engineer), Clint Kinney (Fruita City Manager), Eileen List (Grand Junction Environmental Services Manager), Eric Mende (Fruita City Engineer).

Minutes:

There was discussion regarding how the minutes are being taken. Capturing what the Board members are talking about is happening. The minutes for the May 23, 2007 Board Meeting were amended with considerable additions. Acceptance of the May 23, 2007 minutes was deferred to the July 25th meeting.

Financial Report:

John Ballagh reviewed the May, 2007 financials. All items were reported to be within budget. He stated that preparations are being made to spend more money and will need approval in the next meeting.

Dave Karisny 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
	Fruita	aye
	Palisade	aye

Report: Drainage Hotline

The question was asked about how many calls the hotline is receiving. There are only about 2 calls per month coming in at this time. Discussion centered around a call that was made regarding recurring truck washing at a remote site. Foam has been found at the site and samples were taken for testing. Tests show no phosphates so there is uncertainty as to the source of the foam. It was suggested that it might be naturally occurring.

Report: Billboard

It is hoped this campaign will bring in more calls to the hotline. The billboard location will be changed once a month for a year. If there isn't enough money in the budget to cover the monthly rent, Mesa County and the City of Grand Junction have money they can contribute to the campaign. UTEC, District 51 and Mesa College students all contributed to put the billboard together. They will also be utilized to create future billboards when it is decided to change the artwork. It was suggested that the 5-2-1 Drainage Authority logo be put on the layout. There was concern surrounding the name because it may be changed in the near future. It was suggested that "*your stormwater authority*" be added until the renaming takes place. There was concern that the billboard will become too wordy for motorists to read as they passed by. Discussion centered around the character of the fish and suggestions that he should be named. It is harder to kill something with a name. It was also suggested that a naming contest could take place in order to raise public awareness of the campaign. Discussion took place concerning the changing of the billboard in mid-stream. It was stated that the cost of the billboard itself is only \$575, which is low enough to allow a change in the middle of the campaign.

Board Member Recognition

Dave Karisny was awarded a plaque mounted on a piece of an old wooden water pipe. He was recognized for being the first Chairman of the Board of the 5-2-1 Drainage Authority.

Action Item: Drainage Basin Master Plan

The two basins being studied (Lewis and Douglas washes) are adjacent on the upper end. The drainage study will make recommendations on how to take properties out of the flood plain.

John Ballagh reported that the 5-2-1 Drainage Authority advertised for requests for proposals for the drainage basin master plans. The scope of services was sent to 27 individual firms. Five firms responded with proposals. Technical staff reviewed the proposals and unanimously voted on the top 2 choices. The proposals ranged from \$99,000 to \$175,000 for the project bracketing the \$142,500 budgeted for the project. The staff recommended that URS be awarded the contract to provide the services. Their

5-2-1 DRAINAGE AUTHORITY
MINUTES OF THE BOARD MEETING
JUNE 27, 2007
PAGE 3

quote was \$134,900. John Ballagh stated if the contract is awarded now, URS could start in July and have the draft finished by Thanksgiving.

John Ballagh showed maps of the adopted flood plain for the study areas. The Basin Master Plans will suggest corrective actions to remove certain properties out of the flood plain.

Dave Walker asked if it was wise to go forward with the basin master planning even though the money is not in place for the 5-2-1 Drainage Authority to build a project next year. John Ballagh stated that the money for the study is already approved and in the budget for this year. If the 5-2-1 Drainage Authority is not able to construct a project from the basin master plans immediately the information will be there for someone to follow up in subsequent years. Questions will be asked by the public why they are in the flood plain area and what can be done about it. People will want to be taken out of the flood plain because they have to carry expensive flood insurance because mortgage lenders will require it as part of a loan package. Citizens may ask why the problem is not being fixed. This would be a good opportunity for the 5-2-1 Drainage Authority to come out and bring it to the attention of the people in the valley. Dave Walker stated the information would be useful even though the funding isn't guaranteed.

The question was asked if there is an agency that the plan needs to be forwarded to when completed. The answer was to the Colorado Water Conservation Board, Mesa County, and the City of Grand Junction, as well as the Grand Junction Drainage District should all have copies of the plans. FEMA would be notified during the construction phase of a project because the flood plain can only be revised through a process that requires the stormwater management facility be under construction or completed.

Steve Acquafresca moved to accept the URS proposal and to have the attorney review the contract prior to signing it. Dave Karisny seconded the motion.

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

Discussion Items: Business Plan

The outcome of the last meeting was a request that the Business Plan be reduced in scope to reflect first NPDES requirements, then the basin studies. Trent Prall distributed a model called the Modified Huffy Bike, showing staffing at first 5 and then 6 employees, and taking out O&M and Capital Improvements. He also distributed the proposed financial plan for the 2008 budget, and the breakdown of shares for the general fund

5-2-1 DRAINAGE AUTHORITY
MINUTES OF THE BOARD MEETING
JUNE 27, 2007
PAGE 4

transfers. The numbers were based on percent of population for each entity with the balance going to Mesa County. There are more Mesa County residents so the County pays more. The GJDD is frozen at \$55,000. Population in Mesa County not within the Drainage Authority boundaries is excluded. Revenues are strictly from the 5 entities, there are no other revenues.

Vohnnie Pearson stated that \$37,000 is a big hit on a small budget like in the Town of Palisade.

Jim Doody reported that the Grand Junction City Council's comfort level is up with the Business Plan, so much so that they moved to discussing the Impala and the 40 year CIP. Jim stated that the Council saw the importance of the 5-2-1 Drainage Authority. He indicated there is more comfort with a fee than with a big chunk coming out of the general fund budget.

Dick Bowman wanted to know what the revenues from fees would be. Trent Prall answered with a fee structure there could be a savings of \$100,000. A local permit fee of \$2100 would be required to realize the \$100,000.

Dave Karisny reported that at least one Fruita City Council person favored a utility fee, at least one Council person was against a utility fee, but all agreed that whatever the funding mechanism the 5-2-1 ultimately chooses, it should start small. He asked if the 5-2-1 authority is continuing to build consensus regarding how the Authority will be funded or is the current discussion leading to a vote? Julie Constan indicated that it would take a super majority vote of the 5-2-1 Authority Board Members, requiring 4 out of 5 entities to establish a utility fee.

Steve Acquafresca stated that even though revenue streams are up we should start out small.

Dave Walker observed that capital improvement costs will increase in the future; can we put off funding knowing there will be increases in the future. He questioned what will the numbers be 10 years from now? It was offered that the infrastructure should be built when it can be afforded.

The discussion shifted to the rate study. The consultant has described that building the data base for billing will take 18 weeks and would cost an estimated \$117,000. It was noted that the adopted budget does not include the estimated \$117 thousand. AMEC has the expertise and their efficiency may be better. The task is to assign a rate to approximately 49,000 parcels. They claim they have a digitizing group that allows them to measure a parcel every 20 seconds. It was questioned if we could do this cheaper with our staff. Technical staff did not have an answer.

5-2-1 DRAINAGE AUTHORITY
MINUTES OF THE BOARD MEETING
JUNE 27, 2007
PAGE 5

It was agreed that it will be difficult if not impossible to send out a bill in January 2008. Information has to in the Treasurer's office by early November to be checked and put on the correct bill. Time frames are very tight to have a rate in place and bills sent out January 1, 2008. Vohnnie Pearson stated that is why we don't want to rush to make a January deadline.

There seemed to be some confusion concerning use classification of property. The Board asked for a work up of impervious area figures for single family residences by tier. Further it was requested that some estimates of local staff capability to generate the data base be made by the next meeting. John stated staff will get the information together for the next meeting.

Costs for an election were touched upon. Past experience indicates it could cost from \$50,000 to \$100,000. Clint Kenny stated there could be no definite figure because of recent election rule changes that the 5-2-1 Drainage Authority would have to follow.

Dave also asked how the participating entities leave the 5-2-1, if they so desired, and recalled such a process in the by-laws. Julie Constan responded that the IGA made it very difficult to pull out to prevent that from happening. It was decided that the Board needs an answer to this question at the next meeting. Vohnnie Pearson stated we should get the attorney to review the IGA and give us an answer on what is needed to pull out of the authority.

Read Ahead:

There were no read ahead items.

Meeting Calendar for the Future:

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
December 26 th	June 25 th 2008

Adjourn:

There being no further business to come before the Board, Chairman Doody adjourned the meeting at 5:10 p.m.

Jim Doody, Chairman