

**MINUTES OF THE INFORMAL MEETING OF THE JOHNSON COUNTY
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS:
MARCH 3, 2011**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
University of Iowa Civil and Environmental Engineering Professor Larry Weber: Flood Mitigation Projects on the Iowa River	1
VJ Engineering Representatives Jim Jacob and Tim Mcdermott: Sutliff Bridge Project.....	15
County Engineer Greg Parker	19
Quotes Received for the Purchase of One Tandem Axle Dump Truck Replacing a 1998 Ford Tandem Axle Dump Truck.....	19
Permit Fees	20
Embargo Resolutions	29
Right-of-Way Acquisition.....	29
Surface Transportation Program Funding	32
Other.....	32
Reports and Inquiries from Executive Assistant Andy Johnson	33
Reports and Inquiries from the Board of Supervisors	33

Chairperson Harney called the Johnson County Board of Supervisors to order in the Johnson County Administration Building at 9:23 a.m. Members present were: Pat Harney, Terrence Neuzil, Janelle Rettig, Sally Stutsman, and Rod Sullivan.

**UNIVERSITY OF IOWA CIVIL AND ENVIRONMENTAL ENGINEERING
PROFESSOR LARRY WEBER: FLOOD MITIGATION PROJECTS ON THE
IOWA RIVER**

University of Iowa Civil and Environmental Engineering Professor Larry Weber said he is passing out two handouts. One is an update on the recent activities of the Iowa Flood Center, and the second is a publication of research at the Iowa Institute of Hydraulic Research (IIHR)-Hydroscience & Engineering to make the Board aware of the breadth of the program.

Weber said the Iowa Flood Center (Flood Center) was established in the 2009 legislative session under House File 822 with primary purposes as identified in the handout. The purpose of showing the language of House File 822 is to simply remind the Board that this was established by the State Legislature to establish and maintain a flood center, albeit funded on a year by year basis. Each year they return to Des Moines to present the activities of the Flood Center, the vision for the coming year, and the long term vision to the State legislators.

Weber said within House File 822, one of the elements of the Flood Center was to establish flood plane inundation maps. They had the ability to start in Iowa City first, with the Iowa River model that is being used to analyze the improvements to the Iowa

River Corridor. These maps were built on a Google Maps platform and have been put up for community use. He will demonstrate those to the Board later on.

Weber said maps have been published for communities across the state including Iowa City, Cedar Falls, Charles City, and Des Moines. The map for Cedar Rapids was recently published and the Flood Center will continue their work in Elkader, Ames, Mason City, Spencer, and Sioux City this year. The Flood Center thinks these maps are important for community preparedness. As the Board recognizes, most people do not understand the relationship of the United States Geological Survey (USGS) gauge in their community to their individual property. These maps show the connection and allow that relationship to be made.

Weber said the Flood Center is also developing a flood forecast and monitoring system. In 2010 they deployed 50 sensors in Iowa rivers. These are small low-cost sensors which cost about \$3,000 each. They measure the distance of water level from the sensor, are operated on solar panels, and transmit data through cellular modems. They do not need to be plugged into any network power or network information system.

Weber said 50 systems were deployed, primarily on small streams near communities that have experienced flash flooding from small streams. Most small streams do not have USGS gauges, so this is primarily for small communities and small streams. The project was funded by the Iowa Department of Natural Resources (IDNR). IDNR bought all 50 sensors, which were made available to communities on a first-come first-serve basis. Once they were installed, the sensors became the property of the community. If there is any damage to the sensor or if it is stolen, the community is responsible for replacing it if so desired.

Weber said fortunately the sensors all have a global positioning system modem in them, as well as the modem for transmitting data. If the sensors left the bridge site the Flood Center would be able to locate them.

Weber displayed a map that shows all of the sensors in Iowa, the USGS sites, and the Flood Center sensors. He said in this first year they focused on the Cedar River basin, the upper part of the Cedar River watershed, which was relatively ungaged in the past, as well as southwest Iowa.

Rettig said previously, these gauges had cost a lot of money and the Flood Center should be proud for coming up with a way to do it for \$3,000. Weber thanked Rettig and said the normal USGS gauge installation is somewhere between \$15,000 and \$20,000, with an annual maintenance cost of \$3,000. The Flood Center feels it was an achievement to develop the sensor for \$3,000. The development of the sensors is a wonderful story. They began this project as an undergraduate electrical engineering design project, so they utilized young talent to develop this project. The Flood Center took it from there, made refinements to the sensors, and prototyped the project.

Weber said the sensors are going to the USGS test center in the spring of 2011, where they will be evaluated under a variety of weather conditions and extreme events to make sure they hold up throughout those situations. The sensors were installed throughout August, September, and October 2010 and worked really well throughout the winter. The spring season is coming along and things look really well. The Flood Center hopes to install upwards of 200 to 300 more of these sensors in Iowa over the coming years.

Sullivan said for an example, the USGS sensors are located in Creekside Park in Iowa City. There is a small building at the park, and that is where the sensors are located. Weber said that is correct. There is one at the IIHR Hydraulics Laboratory too. It is a century gauge, which is one of the few in Iowa that has more than 100 years of record. Rettig said there were not enough of these sensors in Iowa when they were previously very expensive and had additional maintenance costs. The state is able to have much better data now that the Iowa Flood Center came up with a way to provide sensors for \$3,000.

Weber said the Flood Center is assisting the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) to update Iowa's flood plain maps. Iowa received \$15 million of Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds to update the maps in the 85 counties that received Presidential Disaster Declarations. The Flood Center was contracted to develop the updated maps for Poweshiek County as a pilot study for the state. They were happy to deliver that under budget and under time. Through that action the State Legislature decided to redirect \$10 million of the \$15 million directly to the Flood Center to do the mapping for all 85 counties. That four year project is underway, so in four years the Flood Center will have mapped 85 of Iowa's 99 counties. That is a very aggressive schedule. The Flood Center began this project in July 2010, so they are about eight months into the project and on schedule at this point.

Weber said the sequencing of this project can be found on the Flood Center website, as well as the IDNR's flood plain management website. The first year of the project starts in southwest Iowa, principally because there was very little mapping activity there. Year two will be the Iowa and Cedar River basins, year three will be the eastern and western tier of counties, and year four will be the northern and southern tier of counties. Johnson County's map will be updated in year two of the project. This work will result in a work map product, so it will be left to FEMA to take the maps to the final certification stage.

Weber said if FEMA does not have the funding to take all 85 counties to final map certification, then communities or counties may have the opportunity to provide local funding to do that. The Flood Center is encouraging FEMA and the Federal delegation to allocate money to FEMA region seven to make sure that the federal funds allocated to develop the work maps are seen through to the end to get maps to the final certification stage.

Neuzil said he served on the Rebuild Iowa Commission, and one of their goals was to make sure these maps were in place so local governments would know where to allow growth and development to occur, so homes and cabins will not be flooded in the future.

Weber said the maps will provide ten, 20, 50, 100, 200, and 500 year delineations. This gives a better understanding of the spectrum of flood risk across the flood plain, rather than two hard and fast lines. He showed the Board several images of these maps and said this information is available on the Flood Center's website.

Weber said the Flood Center has been involved in outreach activities in a number of different forums across the state to educate community leaders as well as citizens of the risk that everyone shares and faces in regards to flooding. The Flood Center is currently developing a program for the State's upcoming fiscal year, in which they would like to visit communities whose maps are being developed. They want to be able to meet with these communities to inform them of what these new maps may mean.

Weber said the Flood Center has already been contacted by several communities that have been involved in other FEMA map update programs. They have asked Weber what to do, since the map has consumed more of their business or residential district. They ask how they are going to fight these maps. The Flood Center will not help advocate for the fighting of the maps, but rather a better understanding of what those maps mean regarding risk in that community. He said the Flood Center plans to work with Rebuild Iowa to develop a program for communities that they hope will come to fruition this coming year. The Flood Center will be able to put some of their resources toward that, but if they really want to do it at the level needed, Rebuild Iowa may be able to find legislative funding to help with that.

Stutsman asked if, regarding fighting these maps, communities want to readjust the maps so they are not in the flood plain. Weber said yes, there is a community in the southern part of Iowa whose new maps show that their community has gone from 10% to nearly 70% within the 100 year delineation. That community's immediate response has been to write letters of map revisions (LOMRs) and letters of map amendments (LOMAs) to get individual parcels out of that designation. His caution to that community was that if the storms of 2008 had been centered 50 to 70 miles further south, their community would be involved in a major rebuilding effort today, rather than simply a remapping effort. He thinks people have to be cognizant that even if they were not flooded to historic levels in 2008, that type of event is certainly possible in the future.

Stutsman asked if these maps determine flood insurance. Weber said yes, there is a requirement for flood insurance for those who reside within the zone A, or the 100 year delineation. The State is also in the process of a National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) certification for communities that will include a ranking system that depends on the actions the community takes, in terms of understanding and preparedness. Part of the Flood Center's interest in developing a program to educate the community on how these maps will impact them includes a benefit to that community, in terms of their ranking system in this NFIP certification. The more workshops and other programs they would

put on, the more credits the community would receive in this ranking system, thereby reducing their overall rates for the NFIP program. He does not know whether that would reduce the community's rates by several percentage points, or by a fraction of a percentage point, but there certainly is a fiscal benefit.

Rettig said Weber did a good job understating the political pressure and she thinks he is being careful with his language. She said the political pressure arguing against these maps is growing, which she thinks is extremely unfortunate. Communities need to let science and reality dictate the maps, not political pressure.

Weber said he appreciates Rettig's comment. The more people hear that type of comment the better. The Flood Center was also involved in developing recommendations for the Legislature in 2010, one of which being to begin to adopt the 500 year plain as a regulatory flood plain. It certainly does not mean that nothing can happen within the flood plain, but if building does happen within that designation, then adequacies for insurance, flood preparedness, flood protection, or flood tolerance need to be included in those designs. To Weber, it is very important that people start to recognize that it is not if another flood event is going to happen, but when. The more people turn their backs on these maps and try to legally, through some process of LOMRs and LOMAs, exclude themselves from the maps, the more risk is put on individuals. As communities, and as representatives of the community, it is important for the Board to recognize that for Johnson County, so he really appreciates that comment.

Harney said the Board has questions regarding the flood mitigation process that is being put into place through Coralville and Iowa City and what affect it may have on Johnson County, in respect to the Iowa River backing up toward the Coralville Reservoir and below. Stutsman said another concern is the Iowa River backing up downstream.

Weber said since the flood events of 2008, the Flood Center has advocated having one model for the river. They were delighted that Johnson County, the University of Iowa (The University), and the Cities of Iowa City and Coralville adopted that policy. The University contracted a company to develop that model and IIHR is the custodian of that model. It has been shared with Howard R. Green Company (HR Green) who has incorporated all of the improvements that have been proposed by Coralville, Iowa City, and the University into the model. The report from HR Green was recently published in late January 2011. Weber said he thinks the modeling HR Green has done is sound and of good engineering judgment.

Weber said the model shows that the overall impact of improvements, including the elevation of the Park Road Bridge, have benefited the bridge and improved flood conditions upstream. From a layperson's perspective, it is very easy to understand how the improvements show a benefit. There was a backwater effect at the Park Road Bridge, debris accumulated above the bridge, and the opening was partially blocked. Raising Dubuque Street and eliminating the water that gathered around Mayflower Residence Hall had little impact in flood elevations on the river. There is very little water of

consequence that gathers there, and no flowing water passes through there. It is not an active part of the floodway.

Weber said the same can be said for the University's Arts campus, which is also an area susceptible to flooding. The Flood Center calculated the gallons of water that were stored in the Arts campus area, which is slightly larger than the Mayflower Hall area. Relative to the 42,000 cubic feet per second that passed through Iowa City, he thinks it would take one minute and 14 seconds of water to fill up the Arts campus area. There was very little by way of impact there.

Weber said the same can be said for the Hawkeye Softball Complex in Coralville and for the community of Coralville in general. It is not an active part of the floodway. He thinks the total cumulative effect was a decrease in the water surface of about 0.2 feet when all of those improvements were included. Some small areas of about 0.2 feet to 0.3 feet rise in water surface above Interstate 80. There was a small rise of 0.1 feet downstream. He thinks the overall improvements that these flood mitigation projects afford the communities, relative to the change in the river, is certainly a benefit.

Weber said another element of House File 822 was to develop and enhance a knowledgeable workforce related to flood research. At one point, the Flood Center funded \$1.3 million for each of the first two years. The Flood Center has about 30 staff members. Of that staff, two-thirds are students and many of them are originally from the state. One of these staff is from the Waterloo area and he developed all of the flood inundation maps for Cedar Falls and Waterloo. Weber said that was a great opportunity for that young person to impact his community and to hopefully continue his engineering career in Iowa.

Weber said the Flood Center is working on a community centric real time flood forecast system. The National Weather Service provides a once daily river forecast at about 100 USGS gauge locations in Iowa. During extreme events they may increase that to twice daily. The Flood Center is looking at developing a flood forecast system for the 500 largest communities in Iowa that reside on rivers or waterways. The communities toward the end of that list, ranked 499 or 500, are relatively small. Weber said he is an Iowan and he grew up in one of those small communities, so saying that the Flood Center only captures the largest 500 communities really means they capture most of them. If a community does not have an individual forecast, they will be near another community that does, so they may use that information.

Weber said the Flood Center's forecast system will provide updates every 15 minutes, as opposed to once or twice per day. It will be directly connected to the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) Next Generation Radar (NEXRAD) Program that looks over Iowa. These are those 500 communities along the rivers and streams in Iowa. Weber directed the Board's attention to a snapshot example of Mason City. He said the community's name can be entered on the Flood Center's website and the program will show the stream network upstream from the community, as well as the rainfall that is occurring over that watershed, or as it is approaching the watershed. He

said the upper right-hand panel gives some simple community information, including the city's name, nearby waterways or rivers, the population, the land area in terms of square miles, and the travel time it takes water to go from the upper part of the basin to the community. In this case, it takes one day and 20 hours for water to get from the area furthest upstream to the basin to Mason City. This information will help people understand what they should look for when it is raining and when the rainfall will result in a rise in the water level. Weber said all of this is good and useful information that will eventually become 15 minute updates to stream flow. The Flood Center is not quite ready to publish that information but this is all precursor information to that end.

Weber said the Flood Center is working with Iowa State University's Climate Science Program to look at climate trends, rainfall, and flooding. They held a public event on March 2, 2011 with NOAA and the National Weather Service in Des Moines to look at the Iowa's 2011 climate and flood outlook. They are also funding a predictive model of snowmelt and snowmelt runoff, predictive models of very heavy and intense rainfall, as well as looking at land use and floods. The Flood Center recently announced that they received \$8.8 million in CDBG funds to look at pilot watershed studies for developing strategies and building projects in watershed areas to retain more water in the agricultural landscape.

Weber said the underlying question there is if it is really worth \$500 million to \$700 million of constructed engineering mitigation in Cedar Rapids or if that \$500 million could be spent in the watershed for improvements there. No one has a technical and quantitative answer to that answer at this point. This \$8.8 million came from \$84 million of supplemental CDBG funds that came to Iowa. Iowa received the largest amount of any state allocation due to the innovation shown by the State in recovering from the 2008 floods. That was due in part to the establishment of the Rebuild Iowa office, as well as the Flood Center.

Weber said when that preannouncement came out, he had a discussion with Iowa National Guard Major General Ron Dardis about long term planning for flood mitigation from Iowa. It is certainly important to get these local constructive projects completed, but they really need to understand what they are doing in their watersheds. The changes in the watersheds have absolutely resulted in changes in flood frequency in our communities. That is not to say it is all the singular blame of agriculture or large residential and commercial developments, but certainly a shared responsibility by all. They are excited about this project which will provide \$8.8 million of constructed projects and watershed plans for three to five watersheds in Iowa.

Weber said the Flood Center is still working through some of the contract language with the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). This project has certainly expanded HUD's administrative authority to do these projects, so the Flood Center is still waiting on some final approvals from HUD to begin constructing these projects.

Rettig asked if the watersheds have been identified. Weber said no, that has been a slight impediment. The intention of the Flood Center was to have an open, competitive request for qualifications, for communities to step forward and request the selection of their watershed. Due to some restrictions concerning the way HUD will use these resources, the Flood Center may actually have to target watersheds. If that becomes the case they intend to target six watersheds, develop comprehensive watershed plans for them, and find out what availability there is in the watershed for landowners to come forward and request to be part of this project. Those watersheds with the highest landowner participation would most likely be the watersheds selected for implementation.

Weber said the Board might recall that after the 2008 floods there was a large response to an emergency wetlands program. A number of farmers wanted to step forward to enroll their lands, with a factor of almost five to one in terms of applications relative to funding available. The Flood Center knows there are landowners who are interested in participating in this kind of a project, and they look forward to doing that. The short answer is no, the watersheds have not yet been identified. The Iowa Flood Center hopes it could be an open and competitive process, but it may be a slightly blended process where the Flood Center targets a few watersheds early on and start from there.

Stutsman said it is a good thing the Flood Center got the money this year, since it probably will not be available next year. Weber said those were actually 2008 dollars, so they were available for programming for awhile. The funding, as the Iowa Flood Center knows it, is secure. It is just a matter of working through the contract.

Weber said he will demonstrate how to access the flood maps. The Flood Center's website is www.iowafloodcenter.org. Visitors can select the maps tab. The Iowa Flood Information System is going to be the clearinghouse for most of the Flood Center's information. Visitors to the website can find the flood inundation maps for one's community on the maps page. He will demonstrate using the Iowa City maps. One can click on the flood inundation maps for Iowa City link, which will list the USGS gauge location. A disclaimer is that the Flood Center provides this information for the public to use as they wish. He pointed out where the USGS gauge location is for Iowa City. If the gauge is selected, it says the current stage is 13.91 feet, which is quite below the "bank full" stage that can result in flooding. The water is all within the bank and there is not much of interest there, so they do not do any additional mapping.

Weber said if the forecast had shown that it was going to be 19 feet, which is right at bank full, then that is approximately when water starts to back up into City Park in Iowa City. Any forecasted amount can be entered into the site. He selected 31.5 feet, which is about where the flood crested in 2008. The website shows what that inundation extent would look like. It is all built on a Google Maps platform, so it can be zoomed in to about any desired level of detail to look at the extent of inundation. That can be looked at on a map background or with a satellite image as the background. It is very descriptive in terms of being able to locate an individual property, with respect to that inundation.

Weber said the Flood Center also provides that information in a different context, which is with the return period. If an individual has heard of a 100 year flood plain and wants to know if they reside within it and what the risk of flooding is over an extended period, they can select that period of time on the map. By default, the period is 30 years, which is the length of a common home mortgage. The likelihood of experiencing a 100 year flood over a 30 year period is 26%. If someone is looking to purchase property in that 100 year flood zone, there is a one in four chance of being flooded over the life of the mortgage.

Sullivan said due to the floods of 1993 and 2008, he thought they were going to try to change the language regarding flood risks. The term "100 year flood plain" can be misleading, because people thought that it is actually closer to every 15 years. He is curious as to why the Flood Center is still using that term. He asked if there is new language that should be used.

Weber said the Flood Center prefers to use the recurrence percentage. They would rather say this is the 1% recurrence in their goal, for example, and what is called the 500 year flood is the 0.2% recurrence interval. Sullivan clarified that instead of saying a 100 year flood, it should be referred to as a 1% flood. Weber confirmed. Mathematically and statistically everything comes from the percentages and was converted for public consumption to these return periods. This has been done for awhile and the Flood Center will ultimately end up with flood recurrence percentages rather than intervals. However, some communities say they do not understand the recurrence percentage and what 0.2% or 10% means. Sullivan said it seems like a tough situation because they want people to understand that the year intervals do not really mean anything. Weber said right, that is something the Flood Center struggles with.

Stutsman asked if the modeling is based on current conditions or if the Flood Center has any modeling to show the improvements. Weber said the models will always illustrate the current condition is as it can be seen today. If the University's sidewalk project goes forward in 2011, then the Flood Center will include that in their models. If Coralville goes forward with an Iowa River Landing area project, then that will be included as soon as that project is underway. The Flood Center wants to present current information.

Weber said the Flood Center has the model that HR Green has developed, so if there are others who do not want to go through HR Green to have a simulation result prepared for them then the Flood Center can do so. Since the Flood Center will be around for a long time the communities will rely on them to be the custodian of the models.

Weber said he will show the Board what can be done with the My Community link on the Flood Center website, which is the precursor to the real time flood forecast system. If one types Iowa City into the search, it will ask if they want to look at Ralston Creek or the Iowa River. He selected the Iowa River, which shows the watershed. This is the drainage of all the water that flows into Iowa City. Most people do not understand

where their watersheds come from. If it was currently raining, the real time rainfall estimates from the NEXRAD Program would be shown on this map.

Rettig asked if that is the actual hydrologic unit code (HUC). Weber said no, it is not a HUC, but it is the actual watershed. HUCs are USGS designations of different stream boundaries. Rettig asked if the watershed would be smaller than a HUC or if it does not work that way. Weber said it does not quite work that way. He said USGS defines watershed size in categories such as small, medium, large, and extra large. The smallest are HUC 12s, which are about the size of townships. In the watershed Weber is showing the Board there will be dozens of HUC 12s.

Weber said there is a HUC 8 that is the upper Iowa watershed, the middle Iowa watershed, and the lower Iowa watershed. The entire Iowa watershed is defined by three HUC 8s. Then there are larger ones such as HUC 4s and HUC 2s. The HUC 2 is similar to what is found in the upper Mississippi River basin. HUC 8s are not tied to any community. The interest in Iowa City is not in the individual HUC 12s, or even a HUC 8 plus half of another HUC 8, because they want to know what the whole watershed is above Iowa City.

Weber said the Flood Center maps show the stream network, which is not information that would be found on a typical internet map. Clear Creek is shown and upon zooming in, higher levels of detail will be seen. The map also shows which communities are located upstream within the watershed. The locations of the USGS gauges show up as yellow circles on the map. The Flood Center bridge sensors can also be shown.

Weber reiterated that the map shows the population of Iowa City, the total land area, the total upstream area, and soon a real time river forecast will be available with updates every 15 minutes. Weber asked if any Supervisors wish to see a map for a smaller community in the County. Sullivan asked Weber to bring up information for Hills. Stutsman agreed.

Rettig said a major storm in the upper end of the watershed would take seven days to flood Iowa City. Weber said yes, that is how long that water takes to flow. Weber said Hills has a little bit more of the watershed, so it captures slightly more of the Iowa River basin. Rettig asked if Weber could bring up the Cedar River. Weber said yes. He said the north fork of the Cedar River, Shell Rock River, and the Winnebago River were all in flood stage and converged on this gauge in Cedar Falls and Waterloo and there was no additional stream gauging from Waterloo to Cedar Rapids. What affected Cedar Rapids was that the National Weather Service knew when the crest would arrive in Cedar Rapids, but they underestimated the peak because they had never experienced this type of discharge out of these three basins converging on Cedar Falls and Waterloo.

Sullivan said he has heard Weber talk before about how watersheds do not respect political boundaries, and obviously Weber had to do some work in Minnesota. He asked if the Flood Center has had cooperation from surrounding states. Weber said they have.

Everything they are doing in Iowa is being watched fairly carefully and with great interest by Iowa's neighboring states. He reminded the Board that this is the only state funded flood center in the United States. The Flood Center has received visits from individuals from Texas and California who would like to implement something similar. He said there has been cooperation from representatives in Minnesota. If the Flood Center does not eventually become a national flood center, it may become a regional center.

Stutsman said Weber mentioned that he annually requests appropriations from the State. She said everyone knows what is currently happening regarding cuts in funding. Weber said the Flood Center hopes for the best. They are doing a lot for communities and are meeting everyone's expectations for both large and small communities. With that said, Weber spends at least a day or two in Des Moines each week. Some assure the Flood Center that they are in good shape and to not worry, yet he has had representatives come out of meetings and say someone proposed to zero out the Flood Center. It is a new challenge for the Flood Center. Stutsman it is a challenge that Weber probably never thought about or wanted to be involved in. Weber agreed. He said the IIHR is a fully soft money supported laboratory with grants and contracts, but they have not had to deal with risky political situations as they currently do.

Rettig asked if Weber said the total State General Fund appropriation to the Flood Center is \$1.5 million. Weber said it is \$1.3 million. The funding comes out of the Transportation, Infrastructure, and Capitals Appropriations Subcommittee. Rettig said that is not a lot of money. Weber agreed. Rettig said the Flood Center is getting an \$8.8 million grant, so there are General Fund appropriations of \$1.3 million. Weber said compared to other funded items, \$1.3 million is a very modest amount of money. He thinks the Flood Center stretches every dollar they receive. Sullivan said it is especially modest in comparison to the billions of dollars in damages to the area in 2008. Rettig said there was also damage during the summer of 2010. Stutsman said that is not going to do any good if people do not pay attention to what is being said. It makes her nervous when changes are being made to the flood map and people do not want to be included in it. She wonders what will be accomplished if people will not pay attention to what is being said. Weber said that is correct.

Rettig said during the last session, the Iowa Legislature did not even allow model legislation of the 500 year flood plain development to be passed. It was just a model and cities and counties would not have to do it. It was simply an example for cities and counties who might want to write an ordinance. She does not understand why lessons cannot be learned. The science is behind this, and it is not a matter of if the area will flood, it is a matter of when it will flood and how much worse it will be than in 2008. They are not even allowed to put out a model ordinance to consider, but then they want to debate whether a certain property should be included in the flood map. The political pressure on this is enormous and absolutely wrong in her opinion.

Weber said there was flooding in 2009 in some communities, such as Monticello and Anamosa, that was more devastating than 2008. In 2010 there was additional flooding in

Des Moines, the Lake Delhi dam failed, and so forth. He asked the Board to imagine how little the Flood Center would be able to accomplish at the State's General Assembly if there had not been repeated flooding in 2009 and 2010. It is somewhat frustrating that there was three years of flooding in a row and they are still not able to move legislation through.

Weber said he has had people approach him and pointedly say that mapping their community and including areas of their business district or regulating to the 500 year flood plain will destroy economic development in their community. In several of those cases he has asked what part of the 2008 flood event was good for their community's economic development. It has to be put in that perspective. Neuzil said politics continue. He had an opportunity to participate in some of the Rebuild Iowa initiatives and that program will likely end during the summer of 2011. They have been advocating keeping Rebuild Iowa functioning, even if it is incorporated into another department, but it is the report that was generated. It really comes down to these maps and this kind of continued funding and the studies of this. Ultimately, there are a lot of really good recommendations coming out of that entire process. Beyond that, it comes down to the political will, not only to do what Weber is doing, but to address some of these major problems, particularly with the amount of fast runoff. That is really what is causing a lot of this.

Weber said it is interesting that the State's Water Resources Coordinating Council was charged with developing recommendations to the 2010 General Assembly. They did so and came up with about 20 recommendations. Those were put in front of the General Assembly and it was primarily the Rebuild Iowa office that spent the tireless hours of advocacy and education in the State Capitol to explain what each of those recommendations meant. The Flood Center did everything they could from Iowa City, but representatives could only visit Des Moines several times per week. Rebuild Iowa played a tremendously important behind the scenes role in that education advocacy process.

Neuzil asked where they will go from here. Weber said the Flood Center continues their work. There is proposed legislation to move the Water Resources Coordinating Council out of the Iowa Governor's office, potentially to the Iowa Department of Agriculture and Land Stewardship (IDALS), along with several water quality elements of the Iowa Department of Natural Resources (IDNR). That is something Weber thinks should be watched very carefully. He thinks the IDNR comes under attack sometimes fairly and sometimes unfairly. This is a reaction to wanting to move programs out of the IDNR and over to IDALS.

Weber said some would think there could be some concerns with IDALS also being involved in the regulatory process of water in the State's Department of Agriculture. Neuzil said one of the ideas from a small group he was a part of at one of these meetings was that since the 1950s there have been two fairly catastrophic events, in 1993 and 2008. Both times the Coralville Reservoir failed. The question was what could be done with the existing reservoir or if it would be possible to build another reservoir further

upstream to help slow the process down when it reaches the Coralville Reservoir. He asked if anyone is talking about that. Hundreds of millions of dollars are going to be spent in Johnson County, Iowa City, and Coralville to build levees. If the Coralville Reservoir failed twice before, perhaps they could build another reservoir further north.

Rettig she thinks it is a misconception that they can dam and levee themselves out of this. If they put levee costs toward watershed improvements such as rain and snowmelt storage and management, both flooding and water quality problems would be alleviated. A new reservoir would cost hundreds of millions of dollars. If they would just put that hundreds of millions of dollars to improve the watershed, they would be better off, unless they take into account recreational benefits. She thinks one of the political problems is that everyone thinks they should build some structure as opposed to actually fixing the problem. She thinks that is what is dangerous with what is happening in Coralville, with the University, in Iowa City, in Cedar Rapids, and everywhere else because every levee and dam will fail. If the communities continue to channel the water as they currently do, eventually all of the levees and dams will fail. It is only a matter of time before it happens again. A wall cannot simply be built around a community for protection. She thinks that is the biggest political mistake that is being made. Lessons were not learned in 1993. Some of the current suggestions were actually the recommendations after 1993 and the Legislature and the Iowa Governor completely ignored them. Now they have been brought up again and are being almost completely ignored again.

Rettig said she does not know where they will go from here. She knows that locally, a storm water management ordinance will be prepared for consideration. Some of the County's staff will be at the Iowa Water Conference, scheduled for March 7 and March 8, 2011, to learn what else can be done locally. However, if the County's neighbors upstream do not get on board then there is not a lot the County can do to fix this, other than helping the neighbors downstream.

Neuzil said his point is that the current flood mitigation system has worked, other than in 1993 and 2008 when the Coralville Reservoir overflowed. When they look at hundreds of millions of dollars being spent on levees, the question is where the better investment would be. Weber said he has many comments and appreciates the discussion, because it is an important discussion to have. He clarified that the Coralville Reservoir did not fail. The Coralville Reservoir's emergency spillway was activated, which is much different than a failure. As a hydraulic engineer, Weber would say the Coralville Reservoir performed marvelously. The emergency spillway has a discharge capacity of somewhere around 470,000 cubic feet per second (CFS). He asked the Board to imagine adding another 360,000 on top of what they have already seen. That is the design limit of the spillway, so it worked as it should.

Weber said a valid question is if the Coralville Reservoir could operate differently. He said the Flood Center has done a study of the flood events of 1993 and 2008 to see the impact that operations and sedimentation could have. A lot of people misunderstood and thought that sediment was a huge cause of why it flooded. That is absolutely not true. The sediment that has accumulated in the reservoir has zero impact on flood mitigation in

Iowa City. It is at the lowest part of the cone. It impacts recreational boat traffic, but has consumed no part of the flood storage capacity of the Coralville Reservoir.

Weber said a restriction of the Coralville Reservoir is that they have downstream controls as well. In 2008 they were discharging at 6,000 CFS and then cut the flow back to about 800 CFS for several days, because the Lone Tree, Burlington, and Wapello gauges were all at one point forecasted to be in flood stage. The Coralville Reservoir was holding water back in an attempt to minimize damages to those communities downstream. In doing so, that was filling the Coralville Reservoir up more quickly. He thinks that is something that needs to be looked at. He wonders how much was really saved in damages for the agricultural areas in Lone Tree, when so much water was in the system that it was inevitable that it would flood. That is a big question that needs to be revisited.

Neuzil said there are contracts from the 1950s where the water must be held back or damages must be paid for. He said the farm ground ultimately flooded anyway. Weber said the farmland was already wet and was not going to produce a crop. The United States Army Corps of Engineers (the Corps) is looking for appropriation to do reservoir analysis studies for all of the reservoirs in Iowa, which was supported by former Governor Chet Culver and the Federal delegation. He is amazed by the cost of the studies and how long they take to complete.

Weber said there much that needs to be done for Iowa's watersheds. The demand for corn and other commodities by the agricultural industry results in tremendous land values. However, that land also has value to local communities and to Iowa's flood mitigation. There needs to be policies in the United States Farm Bill that determine what value that land has for agriculture and what value some of that land has for flood mitigation in the country's highly valued urban areas. Then they can start looking at distributed reservoirs that are actively controlled to hold water back. The combination of wetlands and flood plain restoration will have a benefit.

Weber said right now they have not even begun this kind of study. Nowhere in the country have there been the types of studies needed to put quantitative information behind whether \$600 million of watershed improvements would actually have prevented what happened in 2008. The answer is probably not. However, it would most likely prevent a flood event less severe than those of 2008 and 1993. It will take both state and Federal interest to begin this process.

Stutsman said that was a fascinating presentation. Weber thanked the Board and offers the support of the Flood Center to the County. Harney said he is always amazed at the Flood Center's ability to come to all of these conclusions and make these measurements. Neuzil said the Board will continue to lobby on behalf of the Flood Center. Weber said that is very much appreciated.

Recessed at 10:16 a.m.; reconvened at 10:22 a.m.

**VJ ENGINEERING REPRESENTATIVES JIM JACOB AND TIM
MCDERMOTT: SUTLIFF BRIDGE PROJECT**

VJ Engineering Representative Tim McDermott said he will give a brief status update on the preliminary design phase of the Sutliff Bridge Rehabilitation Project. Several weeks ago, during a meeting with FEMA, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), and some other stakeholders, they figured out that an Iowa Department of Transportation (IDOT) bid letting will not be required on this project. FEMA confirmed that is not a requirement as part of their funding. Everyone involved prefers a local letting. The given timeline is based on a local project letting and not an IDOT schedule.

McDermott said VJ Engineering is currently wrapping up the preliminary design phase and will begin work on the final design phase next week. The target deadline for submitting final plans is scheduled for July 18, 2011, which will be followed by a review of approximately 30 days. Then, they are aiming for a bid letting of mid-August 2011 and the contract would be awarded in early September 2011. VJ Engineering would like construction to begin in early October or November 2011 and hopefully finish by August 2012.

McDermott said he will summarize some of the project milestones that have been completed as part of the preliminary design phase. The site has been surveyed, and they created some topographic drawings of the area. Soil borings have been completed and will be used to complete the final design of the west approach spans and a new east abutment. Hydraulic information has been collected and the required flood plain permits have been applied for with the IDNR and the Corps. The preliminary approach span design, the preliminary existing truss span reinforcement design, and the preliminary new truss span design have been completed.

McDermott said with a preliminary design, VJ Engineering figures out what the structure type is going to be, determines the span lengths, geometrical configurations, and some of the individual beam sizes without going into the details of the final connection design, which is typically reserved for the final design phase. Preliminary plans were submitted earlier this week to FEMA, SHPO, and a few of the Supervisors, and are currently being reviewed.

McDermott said the west approach is essentially identical to what was originally there, in terms of span lengths and configuration. There will be eight equal length spans measuring a little below 20 feet apiece. The timber super structure is going to be supported by timber piling. He presented the Board with a cross section view of one of the piers. He said it is a pretty simple timber super structure and will be supported by timber floor beams at each of the piers, which will consist of various timber piling. The east approach span is pretty similar to the west approach span but there will be a new east abutment. They surveyed the site, looked at existing timber piles, and determined that they are not suitable for reuse. Those will be pulled out, they will drive a new timber pile, and they will pour a new concrete pile cap to support the timber approach span.

McDermott presented the Board with a cross section view at the new east abutment which is a similar configuration to the west approach spans. He said the major difference is that there is a 16 foot deck at this location, versus the ten foot deck at the west approach span. The east abutment member sizes are partially due to the additional span length, but overall configuration is pretty typical for all of the approach spans.

McDermott said VJ Engineering has also completed the preliminary design of the repairs to the existing truss spans. In addition to the reinforcement there was also some floor system damage at the east end of the existing middle span. When the east main span was lost during the 2008 flood, they pulled out about eight of the stringers that run parallel to the bridge in the last panel and the end floor beam. Those will need to be removed and replaced.

McDermott referred to two diagrams which he said show the difference between a ten foot wide deck and a 16 foot wide deck loaded with 85 pounds per square foot, which is the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials' pedestrian load requirement. He said with a ten foot deck there are only two members that are required to be reinforced, which amount to about 150 pounds per span. There is a large difference in comparison to a 16 foot wide deck, which would require 6,400 pounds of steel per span. In the feasibility study, VJ Engineering recommended narrowing the deck to ten feet to avoid bulky reinforcements on the trusses. He said FEMA recently confirmed that narrowing the deck to ten feet wide is acceptable within their project worksheet, so that will be VJ Engineering's recommendation as they move forward into the final design.

McDermott presented the Board with an image of a typical cross section of the existing trusses shown at the piers. He said the deck has been narrowed to ten feet wide, and there will be additions of new handrails and a new timber deck, but everything else shown is existing. VJ Engineering has also completed the preliminary design of the new truss span. The geometry of the new truss has been replicated from the existing truss spans. Overall heights, out-to-out widths, and the length of the span are identical to the existing truss spans.

McDermott presented the Board with an image of a typical cross section. He said the main difference at this location is the 16 foot wide deck versus the ten foot wide deck on the two existing spans. Cross bracing, wind portals, and all of the lateral members are very similar to the existing truss spans. The floor system has an identical configuration with pretty similar depths of members as the existing spans.

Harney asked if the new span will initially be six feet on the deck to match the others or if that will be ten feet. McDermott said it will be 16 feet and then narrowed back. Harney clarified that it will match the other spans. McDermott confirmed.

McDermott presented the Board with a three dimensional model of what the new truss span will look like. He said it is very similar in appearance to the existing truss spans. He displayed an individual truss member size comparison of the new span versus the existing spans. VJ Engineering was able to replicate the type of members on the new

truss. The top cord members will use the same paired channel configuration as the existing spans. VJ Engineering was able to use the same depth of channels, but with slightly heavier members. The top cord members will have a cover plate, much like the existing spans.

McDermott said the vertical members will be the same type as the existing span. There will be paired channels with bar lacing in between them. The only difference is the bar lacing will be welded to the channels versus the riveted bar lacing on the existing span. Diagonal members will be very similar; they are the same slender bars that were used in the original design. The only main difference, in terms of individual truss member type, will be the bottom cord members. Back to back steel angles will be used on the bottom cord versus the high bars that were used on the original design. This is a very subtle aesthetic difference that will not be seen while on the bridge because it will be located below the deck.

McDermott said the major aesthetic difference will come from the connections themselves. He presented the Board with an image of a bottom cord connection of Sutliff Bridge. He said it is a pin connection and gives a very light and slender look to the bridge. He presented the Board with an image of a typical gusset plate connection for a truss bridge. He said the photo shows a riveted connection, but the new connection will be bolted and welded. This gives the Board a general idea of what it will look like.

McDermott said handrail options were discussed at the last meeting. These included a chain link fence, which would meet all modern code requirements and would be very cost-effective. However, there was some concern about a high water event collecting debris within the chain link. Chain link also does little to enhance the aesthetics of the structure. He thinks someone said it would make the bridge look like a dog kennel.

McDermott said a steel handrail was another suggestion. In the feasibility study, VJ Engineering estimated the handrail at about \$150 per foot. A steel handrail will be a little more than that and McDermott estimates it will cost approximately \$200 per foot. This handrail has a modern appearance, which may not be a great aesthetic fit with the trusses which look vintage. VJ Engineering recommends a steel picket fence type rail. The original handrail at Sutliff Bridge consists of top, middle, and bottom steel angles supported by vertical angles. That does not meet modern code which specifies that there cannot be more than a four inch opening on the handrail. The steel picket fence handrail is the closest solution which meets modern code. It will utilize a top and bottom angle with slender vertical bars welded in between the two. It is very simple to fabricate and should be cost-effective. It should come in below the \$150 per foot cost estimate and will aesthetically fit with the bridge.

Harney asked what spacing will be on the bars. McDermott there will be a four inch clear opening between each of them. Stutsman asked how many total feet that will be. Sullivan asked if it is 1,000 feet. McDermott said it is around 1,200 or 1,300 feet. McDermott presented the Board with a three dimensional view of what that handrail might look like.

Rettig said FEMA did not like the chain link option at all. McDermott agreed. Rettig asked if FEMA thinks the steel picket fence type rail is a good option. McDermott said FEMA has not commented on it yet. At this point it is just VJ Engineering's recommendation. The preliminary plans were given out to FEMA and SHPO earlier this week for review. He is awaiting comments and this was put in the preliminary plan as VJ Engineering's recommendation.

Sullivan asked what the proposed height is for the handrail. McDermott said 3' 6" is modern code. Sullivan said it looks like there is a tiny opening in the bottom. McDermott said the tiny opening at the bottom is to minimize material costs. There can be a four inch opening anywhere on it. Sullivan clarified that the handrail can begin four inches off the ground but the top must be 3' 6" high. McDermott said yes, 3' 6" from the deck level.

McDermott said the Board discussed putting a display board on the bridge, which might consist of history of the Sutliff Bridge as well as some educational information about how a truss bridge works. They had the idea of using salvaged components of the lost truss span to support the display boards. He said FEMA said they will not fund this, since it was not part of the original structure, but this is not likely to have a high cost, particularly if pieces of the original bridge are being used. This is something the Board can discuss and pursue as they reach the final design phase.

Neuzil said the Sutliff Bridge Authority (SBA) had some interest in potentially matching dollars with State grants to pay for that display. Stutsman said that sounds like a perfect project for the SBA. McDermott agreed and said VJ Engineering plans to hold a public meeting with representatives from the SBA and anyone else who has interest. Sullivan said that is a great idea. Rettig said the SBA already has \$12,500 and held a big fundraiser on February 26, 2011. She thinks the SBA is just waiting to identify some projects that they think they can raise the money to complete. The historic display boards, regardless of whether they are able obtain any other grants, will be great too. The SBA has a number of people who are just waiting to be told what it is that needs funded. Rettig thinks it is great.

McDermott said he is currently in contact with SBA Representative Sarah Brannaman about looking at the pieces of the old truss to see what is salvageable. Rettig asked if those are the display boards at the Iowa River Power crossing. McDermott said yes. He said it would be similar to that.

McDermott said main action items for the final design include finalizing the approach span designs, finishing the final details for reinforcing the existing trusses, and working out the details of removal and replacement of the damaged floor system of the existing middle span. The final design of the new truss span also needs to be completed. Some pier repair details need to be worked out, which will entail adding riprap at one of the scoured out piers, as well as possibly repairing some of the mortar joints. The east abutment will be designed and once all of the design items are completed, they will

tabulate a construction estimate and will receive shop drawings from the steel fabricators, which will be reviewed. The target deadline is to submit the final plans by July 18, 2011.

Stutsman asked if there have been any surprises or big cost items that VJ Engineering did not anticipate. McDermott said no, with the exception of the handrail. Their \$150 per foot estimate was low, and automatically excluded many of the more ornamental steel rails and limited their available options. He does not think the ornamental steel rails or anything fancy will be a good aesthetic match for the bridge anyway. Design wise there have not been any big surprises. VJ Engineering had the benefit of already doing the feasibility study, so many of the lingering questions had already been answered.

Neuzil said he is curious about where to go from here. He said McDermott put his issues out there and there will be a community meeting. VJ Engineering Representative Jim Jacob said he thinks the next step is to set a date for a community meeting. They may want to wait for the comments from FEMA and SHPO to make sure there is not a big objection before they lay their plans out and then have to retract something. Once everyone is on board, they can set up a community input meeting and see if people have other ideas and what their thoughts are on it.

Neuzil said there had been a tentative date set for March 2011, but that was probably very preliminary. Rettig said that is a preliminary date for the students interested in pursuing a project for their class that would involve the Conservation Board. It was originally mentioned that it could possibly be the public input with VJ Engineering, but the timing does not work and combining the two does not work particularly well either. She thinks it makes sense to wait until receiving comments back, so that VJ Engineering is coming forward to the public with what is close to what will actually happen. She asked if VJ Engineering has thought about holding the meeting in April 2011. Jacob asked if FEMA or SHPO gave McDermott any indication regarding when their comments would be ready. McDermott said they have not. He will send out a bulk email reminding everyone that VJ Engineering intends to have this meeting. He would like to hold it before early April 2011, perhaps during the last week of March 2011. It will remind everyone that they need to review the plans and give their comments to VJ Engineering prior to that meeting.

Harney asked if there are any FEMA deadlines that VJ Engineering has to meet. McDermott said no, because they moved away from the IDOT schedule, so they are more flexible with the local letting now, and do not have to meet the project milestone deadlines.

COUNTY ENGINEER GREG PARKER

Quotes Received for the Purchase of One Tandem Axle Dump Truck Replacing a 1998 Ford Tandem Axle Dump Truck

County Engineer Greg Parker said as part of Secondary Roads' approved budget, they have obtained four quotes for the replacement cost of a 1998 Ford tandem axle dump truck that is currently in their fleet. He has summarized those costs to the Board and

Maintenance Superintendent Kevin Hackathorn can go over the information. Hackathorn said the quotes Secondary Roads received are fairly straightforward. After the trade-in value of the current vehicle, International Trucks has estimated the cost of a new vehicle to be \$94,748. This quote meets the majority of the specifications Secondary Roads is looking for. The money has already been budgeted to cover the cost of this replacement.

Harney said Western Star's quote is \$100,947 and International Trucks quote is \$94,748. He said Hackathorn said the quote from International Trucks does not quite meet all of the needs of Secondary Roads. He asked if those needs are addressed in the other bid from Western Star. Hackathorn said some companies cannot get the tire specifications, for example, that Secondary Roads desires. What matters is that the truck is equivalent to what Secondary Roads wants. He said the Western Star quote is not perfect either. Sullivan said no matter where the County buys the vehicle, Secondary Roads ends up having to do a lot of work to it to fit the needs of the department. Hackathorn agreed.

Hackathorn said a few of the Supervisors have seen the amount of work done to the last two trucks to mold them into what Secondary Roads wants. Stutsman said the Board does not need to take any action on this, because the update is just for their information. Hackathorn agreed.

Permit Fees

Parker said these next agenda items are an extension of a previous Secondary Roads Work Session. He wanted to bring them forward to the Board for discussion and consideration. Secondary Roads put together a memorandum explaining the information for the permit fees attached to the executive summary. The document has not significantly changed since the Board last saw it at the Work Session.

Harney said his only concern is the right-of-way work fee of \$100 per event. He does not want to charge someone \$100 to clear brush out of the County's right-of-way or to make an improvement that is to the County's benefit. Many farmers use brush cutting and erosion control measures, and he cannot see charging them for that.

Neuzil asked what has been done in the past regarding this issue. Parker said right-of-way permits are permits that come through the Secondary Roads' office. Neuzil asked if there has been a cost in the past. Parker said to his knowledge, Secondary Roads has never charged a fee for services that are specific to the applicant's needs.

Stutsman said it seems excessive to charge a for-profit utilities company the same amount the County will charge someone to put in a driveway. She is not opposed to fees, but it is excessive for both fees to be \$100. Neuzil asked what other counties do. He asked if Secondary Roads has looked at cost comparisons, particularly with Linn County. Parker said they have, and he thinks that was submitted with the first packet Secondary Roads sent to the Board. The numbers range from zero since many counties, such as Johnson, do not charge anything, to pretty excessive amounts as seen in Polk County.

Parker said these suggested fees are based on data. Secondary Roads looked at how long it takes them to do certain functions, and the amount it costs to pay staff for these functions. Secondary Roads considerably decreased that amount to make the fees reasonable, compared with what other counties are charging. The suggested fee amounts will not pay for Secondary Roads' staff time, and are not intended to do so. Parker said Harney made a good point concerning right-of way fees. Right-of-way work tends to be tricky, because it is unpredictable. Sullivan said sometimes that work takes longer because other issues can arise, resulting in repair work needed for a related function. Right-of-way work is not always as simple as just removing brush.

Neuzil asked if they could compromise on that and have a driveway cost a different amount than removing brush or adding some gravel. Parker said he would be open to looking at that, the recommendations are just based on the data that has been collected. Harney said sees differences between cutting brush in the right-of-way on a level B road compared to on gravel road surfaces. The Board encourages people to cut brush there, because the County will only grade the road once or twice per year. He cannot see charging someone for something like that, because the Board is asking them to do so. Neuzil said the Board can make an exception for brush cutting.

Rettig said the Metropolitan Planning Organization of Johnson County (MPOJC) has been working on a bicycle routes project that would go from the urban bicycle routes out through the country with no cost to the County. The Johnson County Trails Foundation was going to pay for everything. She asked if they would have to get a right-of-way permit, even though Secondary Roads would have been the ones installing it. The Johnson County Trails Foundation was going to reimburse the County for installation. She asked if that would have to be done for every sign, or if it is a one time fee. The money is already going to be donated to do all of this.

Sullivan said in that situation, the County would be doing the work. The fees would only be charged to private individuals. Parker said someone can get a utility permit for miles of utility replacements, such as poles and underground fiber and telephone lines. On an issue like this, Secondary Roads would be looking at a global permit that would be applied to all signs throughout the County. It would not be a one permit per sign type of function. Rettig asked if the Johnson County Trails Foundation would pay a \$100 fee. Sullivan said no, because County employees were going to do that work. The County does not give itself permits.

Assistant County Engineer Ed Bartels said Secondary Roads has had this discussion. They have determined that when there is a benefit to the County, a permit fee would not be charged. In this case, the Trails Foundation is supplying the signs and poles and actually doing the work. Rettig said she thinks Secondary Roads will do the work, but the Trails Foundation will reimburse the County. Bartels said that is a benefit to the County and there will not be a permit charge. The same exception could be made for brush cutting, which is a benefit to the County, increases sight distance and makes things safer, so Secondary Roads would not charge a permit fee. Regarding work within the

right-of-way, Secondary Roads would primarily apply fees in situations which only benefit an individual and their property.

Neuzil said he is comfortable with that as long as it is clearly defined and acceptable to the County Attorney's Office. Rettig asked if she would pay a single \$100 permit fee if she is going to do four miles of utility work and put in new poles. If she wants to put in an allowed access or is replacing her driveway and wants to do something to it, then she still pays the same \$100 fee. She said with a \$100 fee, the County understands they are recouping nowhere near their cost. However, if an individual is getting some benefit, then she is not sure everyone should subsidize it individually. The same fee would be applied whether she is doing a driveway or 40 poles worth of utility work. She wonders if there should be division between those two fees.

Rettig asked if Secondary Roads decided to not pursue fees for special events at this time. Parker confirmed. The impression he received from the Board was that the County only has a half-dozen of those per year. Sullivan said it is mainly for non-profit groups. Parker said he typically handles those, so Secondary Roads staff does not get too involved. Rettig said she agrees with not charging for those events, since they are raising money for a good cause. Parker said Secondary Roads completely agrees with the Board's recommendation and direction. Stutsman said she does not agree. The Register's Annual Great Bike Ride Across Iowa (RAGBRAI) or an organized bike ride are not necessarily events that raise money for non-profit organizations. If Secondary Roads staff is asked to go to the location to spot and repair, then she thinks the organization should pay a fee. Paying a fee is part of doing business, just like everything else.

Parker said what Stutsman referenced is part of the evaluation in the permit process for several permits. If someone requests that Secondary Roads staff do additional work to the roadway prior to the event, such as sweeping the route, he tells the applicants that it would be an additional fee. Specific repairs that go above and beyond what Secondary Roads is required to maintain result in a fee to the individual making that request. Reimbursements for these functions are on a case by case basis.

Rettig asked if any other groups have made special requests besides RAGBRAI. Parker said yes, the group which coordinates the annual triathlon requests that Secondary Roads sweep their route, which runs from the Coralville Reservoir into Iowa City. To Parker's knowledge, Secondary Roads has invoiced the group for this specific request. Rettig said participants pay hundreds of dollars to enter a triathlon. She said that is why they have decided there should be reimbursement to Secondary Roads, should the event ever be held locally. Parker said yes, that was discussed with the applicant at the time, so it would not be a surprise to them. He said the group which coordinates the triathlon said they would not have a problem with paying a fee. If a fee is instituted, Parker would discuss that upfront with any applicants.

Stutsman said she thinks the fee for access permits is too high. A 100% increase is too much. She is OK with utility permits being \$100, but she thinks access permits

should be lowered to \$25, and the Board can reconsider raising the fee in the future. Sullivan said he has a different opinion. Taxpayers currently pay for functions of the Secondary Roads department. He said former Secondary Roads Assistant Maintenance Superintendent Frank Floerchinger used to tell the Board about people that would have him come to a site many times to look at where they wanted to put a driveway, for example. He asked why other taxpayers should have to fund those functions benefitting only one individual. Stutsman said perhaps they should charge \$25 for one visit to survey the area, and charge more if the requests become excessive.

Sullivan said that was mentioned in the memo. He said he would like to have a flat fee applied for the first hour, followed by an hourly rate for time exceeding one hour. He knows Secondary Roads staff considered that option and decided not to go that route.

Bartels said one thing not mentioned in the memo is that they would like to charge the fee for the access permit. In the case of the utility permit, the utility company does really get any benefit out of this. The County has to allow utility companies access to the right-of-way, because it is part of the Code. In the case of an access permit, the utility company puts the pipe in to begin with, but Secondary Roads maintains and replaces the pipe for the duration that it remains in the right-of-way. Parker said that only applies if the pipe meets certain standards. Bartels said these pipes last anywhere from 20 to 40 years and cost between \$5 and \$8 per foot, depending on size. The average driveway pipe is probably at least 80 feet long, which would cost somewhere between \$400 and \$500 for replacement in 30 years. That is one of the reasons he was comfortable recommending a fee of \$100.

Stutsman said regarding the utility companies, paying a permit fee is part of doing business. The utility companies receive benefits from what goes through those utility pipelines. They are not providing utilities to rural citizens out of the kindness of their hearts, because they are receiving payment for those services. A driveway benefits an individual landowner because they use it for access to their house. She knows utility companies pay taxes, but so do farmers in rural areas. Rural taxes are increasing again in 2011, and now the Board will be charging access fees.

Sullivan said fees take the cost away from the taxpayer. Charging access fees makes the person incurring the cost responsible for it. Stutsman asked who is paying the taxes in the rural area. She said Sullivan is not, or is paying very little. Neuzil said yes they are. Stutsman said those who live in cities do not pay rural taxes. Sullivan said sure they do. Neuzil agreed. He said it is called the General Fund transfer. Stutsman said no. Rettig said the Board is doing a maximum transfer to Secondary Roads from the General Fund for the second year in a row. Neuzil agreed. He said it is the other way around because Stutsman, as someone who lives in a rural area, does not pay for city roads. Rettig agreed.

Sullivan said this is not often discussed, but the Board does not want to encourage building many houses in the agricultural areas. The people who are just farming are not costing the County more money this way, but the people who want to build a house are.

Rettig asked if they can find a compromise. She understands that Secondary Roads does not want to have to justify how many trips they make for a specific permit. She asked if there is a way to compromise with Stutsman's point that \$100 is a large increase. She suggested charging a smaller fee of \$25 or \$50 for a one-time simple driveway access permit. Anything beyond that could result in a fee of \$100.

Sullivan said this also applies to situations in which someone is building a house though, and in some cases spending \$300,000 to do so. Rettig said she understands, but is trying to find a compromise so the Board can move forward and start charging any fees. Sullivan said he does not think that a fee of \$100 is too expensive for these individuals who are spending \$300,000 to build a house. Stutsman said that not everyone is spending \$300,000 to build a house. Sullivan said last week the Board was informed that the average price of houses built in Johnson County last year was \$344,000. Even if the cost of a house is half of that, that is a significant investment. When there is a specific government service that benefits individuals instead of the general taxpayer, the individual should pay as much as they can for that service. The individual is still getting subsidized tremendously by being charged \$100.

Rettig said it would be really hard to justify using the true cost as the fee. She is curious if there is a compromise that does not quite equal \$100 and gives Secondary Roads the discretion to determine if a request is not a simple access permit that requires a single trip. The department could charge a larger amount for an access permit that requires multiple visits.

Harney said he has concerns with someone being charged to cut brush or fix a washout in a level B road, for example. He does not think that is right. On the other hand, he thinks they need to look at the fact that much of the economic development in Johnson County is based on agriculture. He does not mind a minimum charge, but these access permits are not just for building driveways for new homes. These permits include accesses to farm fields and many other things.

Sullivan said these fees will actually benefit agriculture. If \$30,000 is brought in through permit fees, then that is \$30,000 in taxes that farmer do not pay. He would argue that instituting fees shifts the expense of County government and helps farmers.

Rettig said regarding Harney's concerns, the language would have to be that the right-of-way access fees will be waived if there is a benefit to the broader County. Parker agreed. He does not see any reason why the County would want to charge someone a permit fee for something that benefits the County as a whole. Rettig clarified that it would be for something which benefits more than that single property owner. Parker agreed. He said if someone applies for a brush cutting permit, then that is one less function for Roadside Vegetation Manager Chris Henze and his crews to undertake.

Rettig asked which Supervisors are comfortable with access permits at the \$100 recommended by Secondary Roads staff, and how many would like to find some compromise in the middle. She asked if it would be possible to institute a two tiered cost

system. Bartels said he thinks it is going to be really difficult to separate the tiers. The intent is to charge for these permits upfront, because receiving payment later is very difficult. That was discussed with Board liaisons at one point. When starting a project, Secondary Roads staff cannot determine how many times they will go out to a site. Rettig said Bartels does not want to do a two tier system for charging fees. She said the County is not currently charging anything for access permits, so if they went to charging \$50, then that is at least more than the current amount.

Sullivan said it is, but Rettig should understand that \$100 is already a compromise, because the applicants are getting a good deal. Rettig said she knows Sullivan wants to keep it at \$100, but she is curious what other Supervisors think. Stutsman said she does not support charging \$100. Neuzil said he pays for access permits as a resident of the City of Iowa City, so he does not know why Johnson County residents would not pay access permit fees. Stutsman asked if Neuzil pays for driveways. Neuzil said yes. When his driveway was redone he paid for a permit and about \$1,300 worth of things. Harney asked if that includes inspection permits. Neuzil said yes, but he paid for accessing the street to the driveway.

Stutsman said that is fine and they can keep the fee at \$100, but the other Supervisors can explain it to the rural taxpayer. Sullivan told Stutsman that is such a misrepresentation. Stutsman said no it is not. Sullivan said yes it is, because the rural taxpayer benefits from this. The only person who will pay this fee is the user. He thinks it is being misrepresented, which he does not think is fair. Currently, the County does not charge individuals, so the rural taxpayers pay for these services through their taxes. He said Floerchinger used to keep track of this because it bothered him that this was being paid for by the farmers and by others who did not benefit from the services.

Stutsman asked how much of Secondary Roads' budget goes toward permit activities. Sullivan said he thought it was \$30,000. Bartels said that is if Secondary Roads charges these proposed fees. Rettig said Sullivan is right that most of the development in the north corridor is not related to agriculture, so by not having permit fees everyone else is subsidizing that development. There is just more development going on in certain areas. She is OK with finding a compromise and she is OK with the fees costing \$100, but she understands why Stutsman is saying there is a difference between utilities and driveways. At least those individuals building driveways are paying some taxes to start with.

Bartels said he is OK with making the fees for utilities a little higher, because those situations tend to be more difficult. On the whole, for-profit companies are responsible for that activity. Harney said his opinion is that if he wants to put a driveway in, he pays for it because it is for his use and not someone else's. He thinks they need to look at the whole structure of what the County is doing. He does not think they should have to install a driveway for someone unless it is part of the road.

Bartels said these are just suggestions which Secondary Roads staff based on the data, and it is up to the Board to set the policy. Sullivan said Linn County policy is changing to be similar to how things are done in Johnson County, because they believe

that Johnson County's policy is better. Linn County ends up going to court after taxpayers do not comply with regulations. Harney said an inspection should be required. Sullivan said the individual requesting the service should have to pay for the inspection.

Rettig said Johnson County makes the individual put in the driveway, for example, and then it must be inspected. After it is put in, it becomes the County's responsibility, which is the process Linn County would like to adopt. By charging permit fees the County helps control the costs on future repairs. Neuzil said he comfortable with the \$100 right-of-way access fee. He would like Secondary Roads staff to analyze the utility aspect a little further, match it up more closely with costs, and increase it if they find that \$100 is too low. Ultimately, he is basing this on the recommendation from Secondary Roads. The Board is not voting on anything today anyway.

Harney said technically, even to work in the right-of-way to cut weeds, someone is supposed to get a permit from Secondary Roads. Parker said every individual is required to apply for and receive an approved permit from Secondary Roads prior to any activity accomplished in the right-of-way. Harney said he does not want someone to be charged for that, because it is regarding road safety.

Stutsman asked if the County will charge \$100 for the removal of a driveway. Parker said does not think he gets many requests for driveway removals. Secondary Roads is trying to minimize the amount of accesses. In some cases, Secondary Roads can work with the property owner or applicant to remove and relocate an access that was not in a good location. At that time, the two functions are done together. The fee would technically be for the new access, but Secondary Roads also works with the property owner to remove the old access.

Rettig asked if someone would be charged \$100 to remove the old access in the situation of a farmstead split. Bartels said Secondary Roads has gone over that, because removing that extra driveway or moving it to a safer and better location is a benefit to the County. Rettig said in theory it is a single transaction. Sullivan agreed. Bartels said there are not a lot of instances where that happens, so it would be easy to say that removing the access is a benefit to the County and the fee would not be charged. He said this would also apply if someone fills in a hole in a level B road, as Harney previously alluded to. That is benefitting the County and Secondary Roads will not charge someone for that.

Parker said part of Secondary Roads' decision process would be to determine if something is actually a benefit to the County, which is a fairly rare occurrence. Usually someone wants to create a new access at a different location for a different purpose. At that point, Secondary Roads would charge a fee. Bartels said regarding utility permits, the fee was set at \$100 because there is a broad range of functions done under access permits. Sometimes someone requests four miles of poles and other times there is a request for just one pole that was hit by lightning. It seems like \$100 for that function is high, but in the overall scheme of things the cost seemed to average out. The fee does not have to be increased.

Neuzil said the Board will let Secondary Roads give that some thought. If they think the fee should be increased, then Secondary Roads can make that recommendation to the Board. The data provided to the Board shows that on average Secondary Roads spends over \$150 in staff time for all of these things, so a fee of less than \$150 means that the County is not even recuperating that cost. This is why Neuzil is comfortable with a fee of \$100.

Bartels said Secondary Roads made the recommendation to link this to either the cost of living adjustment (COLA) or the Consumer Price Index so the fees will not need to be adjusted in five years. He asked if the Board had any thought on that. Stutsman said if that is done, then it would need to be applied to all fees the County charges. Rettig agreed. Neuzil said the department head is responsible for identifying when it is the appropriate time to come to the Board. Since 2003, the Board has stated that they want to enhance revenues and diversify funding streams. One way to enhance revenues is to identify areas in which the County is going above and beyond to serve the public. If they are going above and beyond, then fees may be charged.

Rettig said she has no problem with coming up with a formula for COLA in the County's fee structure, but she thinks it should be done across the board. Until that has been discussed, she thinks the fees for Secondary Roads should be set. Eventually they can be brought into a broader discussion and review of every fee structure. Sullivan said in a way it is a moot point to apply COLA, when they know they are not even coming close to covering their cost. However, it is a good discussion to have.

Rettig said she wants to do because she does not like big increases, such as a fee going from \$75 to \$125. She would prefer having a three year increase of \$10 than having a large increase ten years from now. She thinks the fee structure should be discussed as a global thought process. Neuzil agreed.

Stutsman said Rettig mentioned charging \$50 for access permits. She said she could support that and leave the utility permits at \$100. She asked if the Board will leave work within the right-of-way permits at \$100. Rettig said if it benefits the County then the fee is waived. Parker said during the application process he will consult with staff to evaluate whether the request is a benefit to the County. Sullivan said his impression is that he and Neuzil want the fee to be \$100 and Harney and Stutsman want something lower than \$100. Rettig said she OK with compromising to get this going. Sullivan said Rettig does not have to compromise to get this going. He said she could agree with him and Neuzil to set the fee at \$100. Rettig said she understands Stutsman's point that an access permit for a driveway and a utility permit should have two different fees. She said Neuzil proposed slightly increasing the utility permit fee and reducing the fee for an access permit. She agrees that not all fees should be equal in cost.

Stutsman said she thinks a special fee should be assessed if an event, such as the triathlon, has a registration fee and Secondary Roads is expected to do more than their usual duties. Neuzil said that could be a way to do it. Rettig said that will involve a

much longer discussion because there are events that literally close roads and other events that do not. She does not want to arbitrarily apply a fee to certain groups that may not be favored by members of the Board. Sullivan said he thought that was why Parker decided to not charge an event fee. Obviously, if someone requests that the County spend money, then Parker reserves the right to charge them for that.

Sullivan said the events permit is a different issue because the County does not automatically spend money for every event. Some events are held every year, such as a parade in Sharon Center. He said there is no reason to charge a fee for that event, unless Sharon Center asks the County to spend money. Rettig said she would prefer leaving this issue alone and address it on a different day. If they are going to discuss this all day, then they are going to talk about every event held on any County road and whether there is an economic benefit to it.

Neuzil said he is hearing from the majority of the Board that there is a need to review the fee chart as it identifies that the access permit fee would be \$50 and utility permits would stay at \$100, unless staff thinks it should be higher. Work within the right-of-way permits would remain at \$100, except the fee will be waived if the work is of benefit to the County. At this point, permits for special events would remain at \$0. He said Parker and his staff would identify if there are additional costs associated beyond normal routine business and if so, then a charge might be assessed. He asked if this is what he is hearing from the Board.

Harney said yes, in a way, but he does not necessarily like the use of the word "benefit," even though he used it. He could argue that cutting trees out of the road is not necessarily benefitting the County because they do not really provide services on level B roads. Rettig said it is benefitting the County because the Board wants to be able to get the road grader down the road and they want to have increased sight distance. Therefore, it is benefitting the individual to clear the brush, but it is also benefitting the County because they want to be able to take the grader down the road twice per year. If staff cannot get through the brush, then they are not going to do the grading. This is a little bit of a nuance, but she thinks there is a greater good to clearing brush on a level B road. It does not just benefit the property owner. Neuzil said sometimes they have to enact these kinds of policies and see how they manifest. He thinks the County Attorney's Office will probably want a definition of what "benefit" means.

Parker said the next step would be formal action by the Board and a review of the word "benefit" by the County Attorney's Office. Bartels said he would suggest writing a resolution that describes what fees will be charged and lays out any possible exemptions. It would be easier to exempt actions rather than classes of people. There have been times when the Board has debated whether they were going to charge building permit fees for non-profit groups or the school district. It is better to have that laid out ahead of time. He suggests a resolution so that it will be laid out as clearly as possible. Then, it will be published.

Parker said Secondary Roads is looking to potentially incorporate this starting July 1, 2011. He thinks there is plenty of time to accomplish those things between now and then. He asked if the Board agrees with that timeline. Sullivan said he thinks that it is a good starting date because it is the start of a fiscal year and it gives the County time to notify people of the changes. Chappell asked when Secondary Roads will send out their next newsletter. Stutsman said Secondary Roads does not do that anymore. Neuzil said they can post it on the County webpage. Stutsman suggested sending out a press release to notify the public. Neuzil and Sullivan agreed.

Embargo Resolutions

Parker said embargo resolutions are annually brought before the Board for approval. He asked the County Attorney's Office if that restriction is something the County is required to do annually, if they can consider a perpetual embargo, or if they can consider some other variant, which may be for a period of time determined by the Board. The Code does not have a restriction, so it appears that the County can move forward with any of those options.

Rettig said she understands why the question was asked, but she does not understand why it is a big deal to vote on embargo resolutions every year. Voting puts the embargo on an agenda, on television, and on an audio recording. It serves as a reminder that spring is coming. She does not see it as a burden to have to revisit it annually. It takes a short amount of time and gives people a warning of what is to come. She appreciates Parker looking into the matter, but she has no interest in not voting on it every year for the reasons that Parker presented and the fact that at some point the Board may not want to give blanket embargo rights or would like to change the weight limits.

Stutsman said she agrees with Rettig. She thinks it is a good heads up to the community that the County still embargoes roads. Signs are posted to notify people about the embargo, but if something does not come before the Board for two or three years people assume the Board is not dealing with that issue anymore. For this reason, she thinks they should continue to vote annually.

Right-of-Way Acquisition

Parker said Secondary Roads staff has had internal deliberation amongst themselves concerning right-of-way acquisition. This is a project that was assigned to Assistant County Engineer Rob Winstead due to his background in land surveying. He said Winstead created the memorandum, which Parker thinks is very descriptive.

Winstead said the issue is how to buy the right-of-way, which usually comes down to County construction projects. In the past they have bought permanent easements. They have been doing that because the majority of existing right-of-way is in that same that same type of ownership. Secondary Roads is being consistent with the existent right-of-ways. Oakdale Boulevard, for example, is a brand new road with a brand new alignment that goes across land where there is no existing right-of-way. When the time comes,

Secondary Roads plans to purchase right-of-way on projects like that in a fee simple interest, which is basically full ownership in the property, without any limitations or conditions. The permanent easement is basically a right that the County has over someone else's land for a specific use. For roadway easements, the rights the County has are so strong and encumbering on that property that the owner essentially does not have control of it, other than containing the fee ownership in it.

Winstead said what started this discussion was the question of whether the County is paying different amounts of money for the different rights they purchase. From the appraisals done to proceed with these acquisitions, Secondary Roads has seen that they are basing the amount the County pays on full market value. Essentially, when the County buys an easement they are paying the same amount as if they bought it in fee.

Winstead said as Parker indicated, Secondary Roads has gone back and forth on this issue because there are pros and cons. They have also talked with other departments to get their input. He does not want to speak for them, but he thinks the desire is to be consistent in what they do, by being fair and treating everyone in a similar way. He wants to use caution in certain situations, such as if the County buys a fee simple interest from one property and then the next property owner does not agree, so they settle for an easement. That concerns Winstead, because they want to be fair across the board and avoid creating dissatisfaction or resentment by treating people differently. He asked whether the Board wants to proceed down the path of condemnation to secure these purchases and fee interest rather than a permanent easement. That question must be thought about as the Board decides how they wish to proceed.

Winstead said he thinks the answer to that question is clear cut for projects such as Oakdale Boulevard, but that is not what they are talking about here. Harney said he thinks having the right-of-way is to the County's advantage in situations involving arterial roads. Winstead said he is talking about situations such as the County purchasing a little bit of right-of-way at a bridge and the rest of the frontage is an easement.

Stutsman said from a public relations standpoint, she does not think it is worth it. Property rights are a big deal to people, even though it may not be a big deal on paper. Permanent easements do not seem as difficult as the other option. She asked what is not working with the current situation. Winstead said this question has come up regarding acquisitions in the last several months. He thinks this started with the question of how much the County is paying for an easement.

Rettig said the problem is that taxpayers are paying full market price and not getting full market value. That is a philosophical point of view. She was shocked to know that there is not a discount involved when someone only gets an easement. She does not think anyone else pays full market price for only an easement. There is a percentage, so if she was to give the County a conservational or recreational easement and still own the underlying property, she would not usually receive the full appraised value. Philosophically, paying full market price and not owning the property is problematic. Since the County has been doing it a certain way for a long time she understands why

Secondary Roads thinks it will be difficult to purchase a property if they only own easements. She thinks the Board should pursue a fee simple for brand new roads. It makes sense that taxpayers should get full market value if they are investing at full market price. She understands that combining the two can cause confusion. Then, the County may only have an easement that comes to a certain point and own very little land, which does not make sense. She does not know that one should pay full market price for the property when all they are getting is an easement.

Rettig said a recent issue included a road which was realigned near Coralville, and the County did not own the property. She did not understand why the County was giving away land for no consideration. She was shocked to find out that the County did not own the land, and that they only owned the easement. If the County is building a brand new road, the County should follow Coralville's model, which is to obtain fee simple and own the property. She understands that it does not make sense for existing properties to have an easement on some property and own the land on others.

Winstead said he agrees and thinks that is exactly how the County should proceed. New roads and new right-of-way should be fee simple and then the County will maintain current easements. Sullivan said most people do not understand that landowners own the ground to the center line of gravel roads. Winstead agreed. Sullivan said people do not understand that the County does not actually own that ground and that they have an easement to place a road there. The Board does not want to give people the false idea that they are going to go out and now purchase those rights, because the County has all of the rights they need through the easement process. This discussion is just regarding how they will choose to proceed with something new.

Rettig said she thinks any time the County acquires land there is a nuance in negotiating. Sometimes that becomes a deal breaker and it may be the section of land that the County needs to get something through. They may have a preference for how to do it, but they may come up against a road block. The question is how much they support their preference to take it to court. She thinks it depends on the timing and the location of the land. In general, if the County is building a new road, Rettig thinks the County should own the land and pay the fair market price for it. She does not think the County should pay the fair market price and not own the land.

Winstead said he understands Rettig's point. Secondary Roads relies on certified appraisers to produce the value finding appraisals that tell the County what it should be offering for purchases. Secondary Roads has talked to the appraisers about that before, but that is just how the properties have been valued.

Rettig said she thinks there should be a discount if all the County is getting is an easement, but she appreciates people's cooperation and that the County does not have to go to condemnation to put in a new bridge that benefits the landowner. There is a little bit that is given up just to get something done, which makes sense to her. She thinks new roads should be handled differently.

Harney asked if the County accepts the responsibility for fencing if they buy the land instead of just the easement. Chappell said it would not make a difference because fences should not be in the County's right-of-way anyway. Landowners usually move fences that interfere with current projects to expand the County's right-of-way. Harney asked if there would be an added cost. Chappell said no, it would not have an impact. Harney said if it is a new project, the County should look at purchasing the land rather than only purchasing an easement.

Surface Transportation Program Funding

Parker said this agenda item came about when the City of Solon approached the Board for request of consideration for a streetscaping project running through the City. is the conversation was regarding how these funds have been used in the past and what the recommendation may be on how to proceed with these existing funds in the future. Parker put together some information for the Board that presented to the seven counties in East Central Iowa Council of Governments (ECICOG) in Johnson County's region. There were several counties that allowed cities to expend the Surface Transportation Program (STP) dollars. His understanding is that this was allowed due to counties offering to have contiguous projects with the cities. When the County does projects like that, they always ask the cities if they are interested in joining the County.

Parker said in the past, the Board has instructed Secondary Roads that those funds should be used for County projects because they have historically benefited all the County and city individuals that drive on those roads. Secondary Roads' recommendation is that they wish they could help those communities through funding, but they are also low on funds for the types of construction the County wants to do. If the Board wants those funds to be shared, then that means those funds will be taken away, moved, and not available for future construction projects for the County. He understands it is a difficult position for the Board to be put in. Secondary Roads hopes the Board decides that those funds still be maintained for County projects. Neuzil and Rettig said they are comfortable with that.

Harney said he would like to share funds, but he thinks in light of the current economy the County needs to maintain these funds for County projects. Sullivan said he thinks it is important to explain to people in the towns that the County provides benefits to them also, because the County fixes their roads. The cities fix their interior streets, but the County provides roadways between the towns. That is the purpose of the STP dollars, and is what the County is using them for. He does not have a problem with the fact that these cities have requested funding and it has been an interesting process, but he thinks the County should continue to use them for their intended purpose.

Other

Parker said he thought Secondary Roads had discussed an equipment replacement schedule with the Board, but Hackathorn informed him that they had not. He asked the Board if that is something that should be placed on a future Board Meeting agenda.

Sullivan said he knows Parker gave that information to his liaisons. He asked if the rest of the Board received it. Parker said it was included in a packet distributed at the most recent Secondary Roads Work Session. Sullivan suggested giving Board members a chance to look over that information and put it on a future Work Session agenda for further discussion.

Parker said Secondary Roads made modifications to the list as requested, and he can resend the document to the Board. Secondary Roads would be happy to return for a Work Session if the Board would like further discussion on the topic.

Rettig said the State put mowing restrictions on the ditches and the right-of-ways on a certain date. This was a major controversy across the rest of the state in the spring of 2010. She is not sure that there was local awareness of this topic. She asked if Secondary Roads is on top of that. Parker said yes, they are. He discussed this with Henze and it is his understanding that those rules will not impact the County.

REPORTS AND INQUIRIES FROM EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT ANDY JOHNSON

Johnson said last week the Board discussed the County Snow Policy with the County Attorney's Office and there was some discussion about either putting it on an agenda for this week or waiting to receive an opinion from the County Sheriff. Since a Supervisor was gone this week, the plan is to put this item on the agenda for the Informal Meeting scheduled for March 10, 2011. He has received a response from the County Sheriff on the question he was to be asked. Johnson said he was going to send out Chappell's revision to the policy, but people had commented that the numerous versions were causing confusion. He will wait until next week to send out the final version.

Johnson said the Board's next meeting is scheduled for March 10th at 5:30 p.m.

REPORTS AND INQUIRIES FROM THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Harney said due to the time, the Board will forgo its reports for today unless someone has something they would like to announce.

Adjourned at 11:46 a.m.

Attest: Tom Slockett, Auditor
Recorded by Nancy Tomkovicz