

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

March 26, 2008

Mesa County Court House Annex, Multipurpose Room  
Grand Junction, Colorado

Chairman Jim Doody called roll of the Board Members.

**Board Members Present:**

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

**Also Present:**

**Eileen List** (Grand Junction Environmental Services Manager), **John Ballagh** (Grand Valley Drainage District, Manager), **Eric Mende** (City of Fruita Engineering), **Jim Currier** (5-2-1 DA Steering Committee), **Ron Stoneburner** (5-2-1 DA Steering Committee), **Jerry Otero** (Senator Ken Salazar's Office), **Richard Baca** (Congressman John Salazar's Office), **Mary Beth Buescher** (Representative Bernie Buescher's Office), **Yvonne Charlesworth** (5-2-1 Drainage Authority Recording Secretary), **John Griffith** (URS), **Joel Jones** (URS), **Sandy Perry** (Mesa County Human Resources)

Chairman Jim Doody opened the meeting at 3:07 p.m.

**Agenda:**

Chairman Jim Doody asked for a motion to adopt the agenda. Steve Acquafresca made the motion. Richard Bowman seconded the motion. Motion passed on voice vote.

**Minutes:**

Chairman Jim Doody asked for a motion to approve the Minutes of February 27, 2008. Dave Walker made the motion to accept the minutes as presented. Dave Karisny seconded the motion. Motion passed on voice vote.

**Financial Report:**

John Ballagh reviewed the February 2008 financials. The checking account balance has been lowered to a more normal balance after the check to URS was cut. The check register has been cleared through February. All items are within budget. The contributions from Grand Junction and Palisade were received. No questions were asked on the accounts.

The billboard is located at 3226 F Road. Everyone is anxiously anticipating the hire of the new manager. Paper bags have been reordered for the year. It was agreed to purchase some nice shirts with the 5-2-1 logo on them for the Board members.

5-2-1 DRAINAGE AUTHORITY  
MINUTES OF THE BOARD MEETING  
March 26, 2008  
PAGE 2

Jim Doody asked for a motion to accept the financials. Dave Walker made the motion. Richard Bowman seconded it. Motion passed on voice vote.

**Reports:**

John Griffith, PE and Joel Jones, PE of URS presented the final report for the Lewis Wash Basin Master Plan. They displayed several maps, the first showing the main channel floodplain for Lewis Wash, and the next two showing proposals for mitigation of the potential flooding problems all along the wash. There were two alternatives presented, one for detention and the other for conveying the water through the channel in a safer manner.

The Lewis Wash basin north of I-70 encompasses 10 square miles, with the basin below I-70 encompassing 6 square miles. Potential flooding problems have been identified all along the main drainage way. Two different prior major drainage studies from other companies were utilized in gathering information for this study. The 2007 Matrix study has been presented to the Colorado Water Conservation Board (CWCB) and to FEMA for review. Modifications of these studies were made to bring the information current, and to present solutions to the flooding that has been identified. This study is a basin study, not a floodplain study. The final URS report will be sent to the CWCB for review. The floodplains for the URS report and the Matrix report are essentially the same.

The location of Lewis Wash parallels 31 road and ranges from the Bookcliffs to the Colorado River. Because Lewis Wash parallels 31 Road, a buffer zone, clear zone or guard rail is needed. A 10 foot buffer zone would be allowed for construction. The area from the Colorado River to just above I-70 is the portion that has been studied.

The terrain at the head of Lewis Wash is that of desert silty / sandy soil that is highly erodible. This soil will create problems that will need to be mitigated on a regular basis. The land area under I-70 is about 75% developed. Three major canals affect the Wash, including the Government Highline Canal, the Grand Valley Irrigation Canal and the Mesa County Canal. Irrigation water is a part of base flow of water conveyed by Lewis Wash. The model being presented by URS shows flows above I-70 higher than the flows between I-70 and D Road. The area in the vicinity of D Road again has higher flows with more potential for flooding.

Several culverts were identified that are not adequate to allow for the 100 year storm event. There are in excess of 200 properties that would be affected by potential flooding problems. The problem is that there are several areas where the land adjacent to the Wash is flat and any flooding will spread over a large portion of land. It is not economically possible to model exactly where the water will go. That is why the alternative is to attempt to contain the 100 year storm event in the main channel.

April 16, 2008

5-2-1 DRAINAGE AUTHORITY  
MINUTES OF THE BOARD MEETING  
March 26, 2008  
PAGE 3

The two alternatives mentioned earlier are detention to reduce the flow or increase the conveyance to get the water through safer. The detention area would be 297 acre-feet in volume and would be designed to empty in less than 72 hours after a storm. The water will be released rather than retained because of water rights questions. The facility would alleviate the need for greater work south of the facility. The channel can be improved without disturbing present structures. Drop structures will be built to slow down the velocity of the water in the channel. The grassed channel will be 8 feet deep most of the way with rock structures to reduce the velocity. Several bridges would need to be improved. The detention method is estimated to cost \$5.5 million. The conveyance method is estimated to cost \$10.5 million.

The recommended detention method includes 3 detention areas. No operation and maintenance costs have been estimated at this point because there is no track record to compare with. There would be no public use of the detention facility and little vegetative maintenance. The main maintenance cost would be removal of the sediment brought down to the detention facility during storm events from the land north of the facility. There will be maintenance costs of the Lewis Wash channel itself as well. The detention areas should be built first and then the channel improvements starting downstream and building upstream. Both alternates include diversion of the Mesa County Canal into 36 inch pipe. The estimated cost for this diversion is \$600,000. If the main detention facility (297 acre-feet) is built first, it will take care of problems to D Road for the 100 year flood event.

All improvements will be within the easements. The purchase prices of private land have not been included in the cost estimates. A permit would need to be obtained for building the dam as it would be jurisdictional and subject to the Colorado State Engineer's review and approval. Discussions with CDOT personnel for the possibility of diverting maintenance funds from the annual maintenance of the I-70 culvert to the sediment removal costs of the detention facility has been started.

The draft report for Douglas Wash should be final in a couple of weeks. It is looking like the best recommendation for Douglas Wash will also be detention. The terrain for the basin varies from developed through developing to rural. The URS representatives are willing to make a presentation on that study at a subsequent Board meeting.

Because all the basins are separate systems, studies for one system will not benefit another.

The Board discussed sending another letter to the Colorado Congressional Representatives and Senators regarding the mandates of the NPDES Phase II permit. The Steering Committee recommended an Authority to collectively handle the permit mandates. The new letter should identify what the 5-2-1 Drainage Authority has accomplished to date. The contracting parties support the 5-2-1 Drainage Authority by contributions from general

April 16, 2008

5-2-1 DRAINAGE AUTHORITY  
MINUTES OF THE BOARD MEETING  
March 26, 2008  
PAGE 4

funds. No money came with the NPDES regulations, so all activities in relation to the permit are unfunded. The part that needs to be resolved is how to fund the projects.

The Board identified that the method of prioritizing basins and projects, though discussed, needs to have the Board set the priority with reasons. The contracting parties' planning departments may then use the information when developers come forward. The studies will be available to everyone through the 5-2-1 Drainage Authority. Major problems will have the opportunity to be mitigated when compared to major developments where there is an adopted study.

**Manager Search:**

Sandy Perry of the County HR Department joined the meeting at 4:25 p.m. She stated that there were 11 applicants for the Manager's position with 6 people interviewed by technical staff and Mesa County HR. One applicant withdrew his application leaving only 1 qualified applicant to be interviewed by the Board.

The consensus of technical staff was that the professional engineer (PE) be recommended to the Board for interview. It was recommended that the one person be interviewed and if not hired, the application process could be re-opened.

The Board questioned the way the position was advertised wanting to know if the PE part was required. If this is the case and the Board decides it doesn't want to hire the current applicant, the suggestion was that the job be reposted without the requirement of the PE. Sandy answered that the PE in one year requirement was stated in the job description.

The Board asked if there were structured questions for them to ask in the interview. John Ballagh stated he would contact Julie Constan by phone and ask her to work with Sandy and formulate more questions for the interview. The Board scheduled an interview with the applicant on March 31<sup>st</sup> at 3:00 P.M at the county offices. Steve Acquafresca excused himself and left the meeting early to attend another previously scheduled meeting. The other four Board members can all attend.

**Action Items:**

**Orchard Mesa Floodplain Study Contract:**

A request for qualifications was published to which 8 qualified firms responded. Two other firms refused to participate because of very legitimate reasons, one being URS. All the firms' qualifications were considered with one firm, Ayres Associates of Fort Collins, being picked above all the rest by the DATS team. This firm just completed a similar sized study and the customer was very satisfied. The firm came with high recommendations. The proposal envelope for this firm was the only one that was opened. The negotiated contract is in the amount of \$154,796 which is slightly less than half the total amount budgeted for

April 16, 2008

5-2-1 DRAINAGE AUTHORITY  
MINUTES OF THE BOARD MEETING  
March 26, 2008  
PAGE 5

these studies this year. The firm meets all the qualifications. If the contract is approved soon, the study can be in hand by October 1, 2008. The contract has to pass by Larry Beckner before signing. The study will establish a floodplain and will estimate how many homes would be inundated by the floodwaters. Ayres will utilize a study completed by Gerald Williams in 1999, revised in 2000.

The Ayres study will identify the floodplain. It will meet CWCB and FEMA requirements. This is considered a prime 5-2-1 project because it crosses both city and county boundaries. The study area goes from the old Graff Dairy to the east side of the fairgrounds.

Richard Bowman made the motion to direct Technical Staff to get a contract from Ayres in the amount of \$154,796 and pass it by Larry Beckner, and if accepted by him, Technical Staff will take the contract to the Board Chairman to sign to move forward and get the study done by October. Dave Karisny seconded the motion. Motion passed by voice vote.

John Ballagh announced that the City of Grand Junction has adopted the Storm Water Management Manual (SWMM) to be implemented by July 1. Eileen List clarified that new projects will be required to comply starting July 1. Existing projects will make water quality improvements.

**Read Ahead:**

IGA for NPDES Stormwater Permit

This item was not discussed at this meeting.

**Adjourn:**

The meeting adjourned at 4:55 p.m.

---

Jim Doody, Chairman

April 16, 2008