

**REGULAR DRAINAGE MEETING**  
**Wednesday, January 27, 2020 9:30 AM**

**This meeting was held electronically and in-person due to Covid-19 concerns.**

1/27/2021 - Minutes

1. Open Meeting  
Hardin County Drainage Chairperson BJ Hoffman opened the meeting. Also present were Trustee Renee McClellan; Trustee Lance Granzow; Lee Gallentine of Clapsaddle-Garber Associates (CGA); Taylor Roll, Mayor of Radcliffe; Michael Pearce, Network Specialist; and Denise Smith, Drainage Clerk.
2. Approve Agenda  
Motion by McClellan to approve the agenda. Second by Granzow. All ayes. Motion carried.
3. Approve Minutes  
Motion by Granzow to approve the minutes Drainage Meeting dated 01-13-2021. All ayes. Motion carried.
4. DD 143 WO 241 - Discuss W Possible Action - Tree Removal

Mayor of Radcliffe Taylor Roll met with Chuck Raska, City Manager, and together they made their list of trees that have been removed, Roll referenced the map with Raska, and for sure 11 of the 89 have been removed this year. Roll stated there are two question marks on the rental property between May and Isabella, they could not see anything being there and Raska did not remember anything being there, but they could be under snow right now, so they left question marks on that one for now, so it might be 13 that are gone now. So far they have 5 of the 78 remaining on the list that they for sure want to do next year, we want to do some of the smaller stuff too, but with the City's budget we can only afford to do a couple of the big trees a year. Roll stated he did not think they would do anything outside those five, but we will take some of the little ones you can just cut with a chainsaw by yourself. Roll wanted to let the Trustees know progress is being made, if the Trustees want anything else done, let Roll know and they will see what they can put together, Roll stated we are only working within the right of way, if anything is outside the right of way we will have to talk to the landowners first. Granzow stated maybe that would be something you could send out to everybody in a letter, Hoffman stated or put it on the water bill. Granzow stated if there are trees, they want gone, now is the time to do it. Roll agreed and stated if we can get anyone to agree before we have to start pushing harder. Granzow stated you might get a few trees down, it is your town that it benefits, you may have a few scrap trees out of the right of way that people may want down, that they just down have the means to get down on their own. Roll stated he felt they needed to talk to each person and just keep moving forward.

Hoffman asked if Smith would put the list of trees with the district record, Smith stated she would.

5. DD's Big 4, 41, 77, 123 & 143 - Discuss W Possible Action - Pay Estimate #6

Smith stated we had addressed the Claims for Crop damages on this project, but we did not circle back to the Pay Estimate # 6, which covered those 4 districts, and does not include DD 128, Smith didn't know if there was any action the Trustees wanted to take on the Pay Estimate #6 at this time. McClellan asked for clarification on DD 128. Smith stated we were waiting on confirmation from Gallentine on completion of some work in Dean Bright's land on DD 128, so this Pay Estimate # 6 does not include any payment for DD 128, it would only include DD 143, 123, 77, 41, and Big 4, so that DD 128 would be handled in a separate final pay estimate. Granzow stated have we done the other ones yet. Smith stated we addressed the crop damages, but we didn't get a motion on whether the Trustees would like to authorize payment on the Pay Estimate. Granzow asked for Gallentine's thoughts, Granzow thought Gallentine was going to contact Bright on this, Smith stated we are waiting on a response from Gallentine on Bright on DD 128, since this Pay Estimate only included the other districts she was not sure if the Trustees wanted to authorize payment on this portion, or if they want to hold off, Smith just needs some clarity. Gallentine stated this does not involve DD 128, DD 128 is involved in this project but is not included on this Pay

Estimate, this would be for DD 143, 123, 77, 41, and Big 4. Gallentine stated we are still holding retainage for DD 128. Granzow asked if we have any issues with this Pay Estimate. Gallentine stated he had no issues with it and did not think that Smith received any contact back from landowners.

Smith stated she had not heard anything back from landowners, Smith had sent a mailing out to landowners along with the crop damage claims requesting landowner feedback, the only response we had was from Chris Blome who had submitted his claim originally back in 2018.

Motion by Granzow to approve and issue payment on Pay Estimate # 6 for DD's Big 4, 41, 77, 123 & 143. Second by McClellan. All ayes. Motion carried.

Smith stated she will include that with next week's claims.

6. DD H-F 4-53 - Discuss W Possible Action - Joint County Meeting

Smith stated she had received dates back from Franklin County so that we might have a joint County meeting with their Trustees to discuss the two work orders, which actually amounted to one work order on our side and the one work order on the Franklin County side. The Franklin County Trustees are available on Mondays and the dates their Clerk provided us with are February 8th, 9:30 or after; February 22nd, 10:00 am or after; or we could look at March 8th, 22nd, or 29th after 9:30 am. Hoffman preferred February 8, 2021 at 9:30. Smith will reach out for confirmation to Franklin County at 9:30 on February 8th. McClellan stated at 9:30 she has a schedule conflict, possibly running until 10:30 am till noon. Granzow stated the next Mondays would not work for McClellan in the mornings then either, Smith stated she could check afternoon availability and let the Trustee know. Hoffman stated let's tentatively schedule it for February 8th at noon. Smith asked of Gallentine's availability, Gallentine stated yes, he would be available the 8th at noon, he usually keeps Mondays open as that is when Franklin County meets. Smith will get confirmation and let all know.

7. Discuss W Possible Action - IDDA Membership

Smith received numbers back from John Torbert of IDDA, we had discussed that they reported us as 168,000 acres, Smith did some checking on that 110,000 that Schlemme had stated at the time that we have in Drainage does not include Private Trustee districts, that was a question the Trustees had for me. Smith stated Torbert's revised numbers for membership would be membership would be \$3,300, if you also wanted the optional Mutual Protection Fund that would be \$1,375 in addition to the \$3,300. Granzow asked what the Mutual Protection Fund does, Smith stated the Mutual Protection Fund exists to protect drainage rights in the courts, recently that fund raised more than \$300,000 in the successful legal effort to stave off the Des Moines Waterworks lawsuit. Smith stated as a Member County you would potentially have access to those funds should the need arise, disposition of those funds is decided by the IDDA Board, several years ago IDDA also published a Drainage Law Book that would be free to members. Hoffman asked if we would get a seat on that Board then, Smith does not know and would have to find out. Hoffman asked Gallentine if he was aware of how that worked. Gallentine asked Gallentine for info on how that works. Gallentine stated he believed you become members of the groups and have internal Board of Directors; you are eligible to become a member of that or be on that. Hoffman stated if we were to become members of both the cost would be \$4,675.00, Smith stated that is correct.

Granzow stated the problem he has, is the mutual protection fund, if they decide it is worth defending so their board is what decides. Hoffman stated it is a lot like Heartland. McClellan stated they don't pay for everything that happens; a Board decides what will affect all the districts. Granzow stated so if there is a windmill issue, that is your problem, not ours, it is your problem and you are on your own, even though you have the fund protection. McClellan stated it can also be where they figure how many more counties it will affect. Hoffman stated or how it sets precedence. Granzow stated he did think it was worth a vote and was on the agenda as Possible Action, Hoffman would entertain a motion and we could discuss it more.

McClellan made a motion to pay the IDDA membership dues of \$3,300 annually and the \$1,375 Mutual Protection Fund dues annually. Second by Granzow.

In additional discussion on the motion, Granzow stated it will be paid out of Rural Services to be

reimbursed back and asked if that was correct. Hoffman stated that is what he had hoped the discussion would be. Granzow stated other than that we don't have a fund to pay it out of, how would you like to pay it out of Rural Services fund or General Fund, Granzow personally liked the General Fund because it affects towns and rural. McClellan stated it does because the towns have drainage districts. Granzow stated but we have been charging everything out of the Rural Services fund up until this point, in hopes we would do a mass billing to help fund this. McClellan stated but Rural Services does pay General Fund taxes, Granzow stated they are 63% of the General Fund, yes, Granzow thinks it should be General Fund but was trying to keep the books even, the Districts should pay for it because it is their portion, it is not taxes. Hoffman stated going forward with the mass Drainage District assessment it will be easier to do, we can pay it the one time out of Rural Services. McClellan stated then it would be reimbursed, and the Clerk keeps track of what she has paid out and add it to the assessment and we can reimburse whatever fund it gets paid out of. McClellan asked it has come up before and was just mentioned, this does not cover the Private Drainage Trustee districts. Granzow stated a letter can be sent out to them and they can decide. Smith stated that may affect your membership costs if we include the acres from the Private Trustee Districts, or that may be something we address individually with them that they can be invoiced for their own membership in that, that may be a good option, that way they are paying for it out of their own district fund, Smith does not know if there would be any disparity there if that was a level playing field if we are paying for all of the other districts our Rural or General Fund. Granzow stated we plan on paying it back through the districts we assess. McClellan asked so we are not going to worry about those, we try to get districts to be their own Trustees. Hoffman stated they can join and pay their own dues and have their own membership. McClellan agreed.

McClellan stated we certainly want them to know about it. Smith stated she could send a letter out. McClellan stated we are always trying to get districts to be their own Trustees but when we do something that only covers the ones we are Trustees for why would they ever leave if they will not be covered under what we pay for. Smith stated if it is assessed back to the districts, we can make those Private Trustees aware of the option, let them know we can facilitate that kind of communication with the IDDA and it would be charged to them out of their district funds, Smith thinks that is an option, if you look at their acreage it will be much less than the total of the Board of Supervisor managed districts, so it might be a much more affordable option for them. McClellan stated it should always be kept separate even if they do decide to join because what if they get a new set of Trustees, and they say no we don't want to join, then you have to pull them back out of the larger assessment, so always keep them separate unless they disband and the county takes them over. Granzow stated we are only approving for what we are responsible for, they are more than welcome to join on their own. McClellan stated she felt a letter should be sent, Granzow stated he would send a letter right away, and asked if we send out letters congratulating the Private Trustees on their elections. Smith stated the Drainage Trustees post-election packet will go out this week with their certificates, letter of congratulations and welcome aboard.

All ayes. Motion carried.

Smith asked for clarification on which code this should be billed out of, Rural Services or General Fund. Granzow stated which is simpler, Smith stated whichever the Trustees prefer. Granzow stated out of Rural Services, Hoffman stated once this rolling mass assessment goes out it will be easier to take out of that fund.

#### 8. Discuss W Possible Action - Drainage Assessment Project

Smith stated attached to their agendas today there is a draft of some notices Smith has drawn up for this mass potential assessment. Smith stated this is a sample that she wanted the Trustees to look over, the letter would be titled to All Hardin County Drainage District Landowners, this would be a letter that goes out with their assessment notices with their individual amounts, the Notice of Assessment is what Smith has put together for publication. Smith has tried to follow the same notification or publication formats that we have used in the past, but this is just a sample for when this time comes or determine when you would like to do publication. Smith stated once the Trustees have reviewed this, her next question is that at some point in this conversation maybe we need to include the Treasurer's Office, because if Smith is the one that generates this assessment, and we send out 7,000 sheets of assessment notices, unfortunately the Treasurer's office is going to have to process those payments. Smith wants the Treasurer to have the opportunity to ask any questions before this is finally implemented and we draw or draft that final motion to

implement the plan. McClellan stated that would be a good idea, Smith stated she does not want to give anyone any surprises at all, that would be unfair.

Granzow asked how much are we assessing. Smith stated the Trustees have talked about \$1,500 and Smith has not filled in the final amount on the notices, just highlighted the areas those numbers would be inserted in and the assessment date. McClellan asked we are talking about \$1,500 split among all of them, Granzow asked if that was \$1,500 per parcel, Smith stated that would be \$1,500 per district. Granzow asked if that would be not to exceed \$500 per parcel, McClellan stated if someone has that much ground and they would get an assessment of \$500 or more; they could get a waiver. Smith stated that would only happen in a very small district, if you have a very small number of landowners at that \$1,500 there is a very small possibility that one or two could have a payment of more than \$500. Granzow asked how we determine the \$500 per parcel, Smith stated if their assessment schedule breaks them out that way, Granzow stated that would be a district where there are only 3 large landowners, Smith stated or if their percentage were that large, it would all be based on their percentage in their classification schedule. Granzow stated that would be a 40-acre district, if we have one that small maybe we need to get rid of it. Smith stated chances are you will see more on the other end of the spectrum, there is a line here that states any assessment made on a parcel that is computed at less than \$5.00, will be fixed at a \$5 minimum, because that is the lowest amount that we can charge, Smith stated you will probably see more of those \$5.00 charges than anything else.

Smith stated if this is something you would like to review, and Smith can see if the Treasurer is available, and agenda this next week, that would be a great opportunity for her to be involved in this discussion. McClellan stated we should talk with the Treasurer before we go further, Granzow stated we can call her and find out, Granzow invited the Treasurer to the Meeting. Treasurer Machel Eichmeier joined the meeting. Granzow explained the Trustees are considering a mass assessment on all the Drainage Districts as it is unfair that the Rural Services or the General Fund pays for only the costs of the Drainage Districts, like attorney fees, special assessments we do that we are constantly paying for, we are considering do a mass assessment of \$1,500 per district. McClellan stated if we add the IDDA dues, would that cover it at \$1,500, Granzow stated that would still fit in there. Granzow stated the question was this was what was presented, and we wanted the Treasurer in on the ground floor with us also. Granzow stated looking at this is there anything you would try to do differently because the Trustees want to work with the Treasurer's Office as well, it will be a lot of work, but it is not right to charge someone in Eldora Drainage fees when they don't have drainage, this is the Trustee's district, not the County's district. Granzow stated we have been working on this for years but are just getting closer.

Eichmeier asked for clarification on which districts would be assessed – all the districts that are County controlled or all districts that are County Trustee managed and Private Trustee managed. McClellan stated just the County Trustee managed districts, not the private Trustee districts. Eichmeier stated so you will be assessing every parcel within the County Trustee managed districts, Granzow stated yes, Eichmeier asked what amount they were assessing. Granzow stated we would be assessing each district \$1,500. Eichmeier asked what these fees would be used for. Granzow stated for prime example, some would be used for the Drainage Clerk's salary, her job is 90% district, so we could use it for her salary, we have a lot of legal fees, we just joined the Iowa Drainage District Association, those are the fees that would be paid for with this. Eichmeier asked if this would be an annual fee. Hoffman stated every three years. Smith stated the Trustees looked at doing a rotation and what she came up with was a list of all the drainage districts not managed by private Trustees, which is 153 districts. Smith stated in her mind, to assess 153 districts in one year would be a gargantuan task, Smith suggested we split that up into a rolling rotation for three years, and then they can implement this for three years and see how it works. Smith stated we can split the 153 districts into groups of 51, the first year we will assess the first 51, the second year it will be the second group of 51 districts and the third year will be the final group of 51 districts. Smith stated if the Trustees approve this for a three year run, they can see how it works, they can see if they have assessed for enough funding to cover what they would like to cover or if they need to change the amount, if the Board members should change, it would allow a new Board to take action on that if it would sunset after three years.

Eichmeier stated when you collect that fee you will have to structure that drainage payment to go to a new account code, Smith stated that is probably something we will have to involve Tyler with, because Smith does not know how to set that up in Tyler. Smith stated it is a big task, and in discussion Smith had said to

the Trustees, her concern was that if we were doing that this year, we have an election in March, we have an office member who will be out on medical leave, we have a brand new Auditor, the thought process and discussion was that this would begin to be assessed in 2022, so we would have some time ahead of time to figure out what structure this would look like. Eichmeier stated to get everything prepared and have it done by September of 2021 is not going to happen, Smith stated we should have started 6 months ago. Smith stated she thinks the way Tyler is set up Drainage assessments have to go out in May, with first portion of taxes, Smith does not think Tyler is set up to send them out in September, from what Smith has read, everything goes out in May, Smith asked if that sounded correct. Eichmeier stated there has been some discussion about that, it goes out in May, payments are due by September, that is our County, Eichmeier does not know of any other County gives them that much time to pay, other Counties send them out in May and give them 30 days to pay that bill. Smith stated we have 30 days within which a landowner can sign up for a waiver, within 30 days of receipt of the notice they have to let us know they want a waiver. Smith thinks it is by Iowa Drainage Code that they have until September to make the payment on an assessment, Smith can look that up and provide that information. Eichmeier stated here in Hardin County we bill them in May and they have all this time until they have to pay in September, Eichmeier stated she does not know how you figure the right amount to be able to have them outstanding that long. Smith stated she did not know that, and that may be a conversation between the Drainage Clerk and Treasurer and bring that back to the Trustees that we need to change our due date to a 30 day limit on it, that may be just a policy change on it if it is just a policy. Eichmeier stated that may need to be a conversation you need to have with other Clerks, as Eichmeier has always thought it strange that we mail in May and dead line was September 15th, Eichmeier stated if this is something you can do, you may have already checked that out. Smith stated we have and under Iowa Code Section that we mention in the notice, Section 468.154 allows for additional help for the Auditor allows for administrative costs to be paid for by the district and Section 468.155 allows for legal costs to be paid by the districts. Smith stated she thought that those two Code Sections allows this to be done. Smith spoke with Wright County, at one time they did it this way and they switched away from because it was too much work to do all districts in one year, so they went with every time there was a notice or a letter sent out they would do a minimum assessment of \$5 and charge that to the whole district when the project was completed and they added that to their annual assessment, Smith stated that is what she thought they found to be a simpler assessment process.

Smith stated have the Treasurer in on this conversation was important, because Smith is concerned about generating the assessments in a timely manner, making sure Smith can get 51 districts out, and on the same end Smith has to make sure that the Treasurer is aware that if these notices go out, they will come back to the Treasurer's office for payment, and that means additional time for their staff to process those as well. Eichmeier stated how many parcels would it be for 51 districts. Smith stated all together we are looking at 153 districts with 7,700+ parcels, so that is quite a bit of work. During this discussion the Trustees had a sidebar discussion on same topic.

Granzow asked how many parcels in all, Smith stated 7,700 plus, when we had the private Trustee districts included with this, it was really close to 11,100 parcels because DD 3 is huge, those would include all those parcels, and we are not the managers of the Private Trustee Districts or some of the joint districts managed by other Counties, by removing those it cuts it down to about 7,700. Eichmeier stated you are going to charge even the people that haven't had any assessments, or you haven't had to deal with their district, you are going to charge them. Granzow stated we (Trustees) deal with them whether they think we do or not, they get the free legal advice right now, prime example is ditches, ditches are not supposed to be taxed and we have fought with the Assessor for taking them off the tax roll, because the open ditch should not be taxed, so when you say an open ditch, are they getting this, yes they are, all ditches get assessed every three years because we spray them, so they are getting some activity. Granzow stated some of these districts may not get any activity but they will, when we talk about windmills coming in, we have a large amount of money wrapped up in that for no matter whose district it is for those legal fees, because one for all and all for one. Granzow stated when we deal with policy it is for every district, attorney Mike Richards does work for them. Hoffman pointed out publications is a cost that is for all. Granzow stated they are getting work done, they just aren't physically having anything done in the ground, we have Rural Services paying that bill now and that is not right. Hoffman stated the district in Radcliffe that encompasses a large portion of Radcliffe, those people are getting everything for free, Granzow stated also New Providence, Buckeye, Iowa Falls. Gallentine stated there is one in Alden also. Granzow stated it is not right for rural services to have to pay that bill that is why we have been working on this, Granzow stated that he has been working on this since he came in, it doesn't make sense because drainage is not County it is it's own assessment.

Eichmeier stated she thought the Drainage Districts got charged whatever had to be done in that ditch, is it just the work that gets charged. Smith stated when we assessed a drainage district for work done in that district, we assess about \$3,000 over the project costs so that they have a sinking fund should they have any additional invoices trickle in after work is completed. Granzow stated that all the work Smith, Schlemme, and previous clerks have ever done have been charged to Rural Services, the Clerk's salary is charged to Rural Services, this job is Drainage, why is Drainage not paying some of this salary. Granzow explained it should be charged to the districts. McClellan stated County tax dollars are paying the attorney fees for drainage districts. Eichmeier asked if the Clerk's salary was paid out of the Auditor's budget, Granzow stated yes out of Rural Services through the Auditor's budget currently, that is not right either, her salary should be based on a percentage of what district work she does versus county work she does and should be reimbursed back because she is a Clerk for all districts, Private Trustee or County Trustee, she is still the Clerk for all of us. Smith stated the only difference between the Private Trustee districts and the districts the County Trustees manage is the Supervisors as Trustees can direct me to do an assessment on all the districts the County Trustees manage, if we want to talk about doing an assessment on all the districts you manage, if we want to talk about doing an assessment on the Private Trustee districts, those Private Trustees would need to make a motion to direct me to do that. Smith stated at some point we have talked in the past about having an all Trustee meeting where they can all come together, whether is virtually online through zoom or something in person at the EOC, maybe that is a discussion that needs to happen, when we talk about sending a letter out to them about IDDA membership, maybe that is a portion of education that needs to happen for those Trustees, sometimes they are just unaware of what goes on when the Board of Supervisors as Trustees manage the rest of the districts.

Granzow stated it is no different than when Eichmeier manages the Treasurer's Office for the work they do for the drainage districts, maybe a percentage of that income should be charged to them as well, Granzow does not know how much of their time it takes. Eichmeier stated drainage is time consuming, Hoffman stated if we knew how much, maybe we can peel off a little bit of that. Granzow stated maybe we can assess that out of your budget so that it is not the County because you are doing it for the Trustees. Granzow some of this just falls back on law and it just comes this way. Eichmeier stated the other thing about the Treasurer's time consuming part of it is the stamped warrants which we are earning interest on, Granzow stated so you do have a revenue. Eichmeier stated yes, she would feel more comfortable about having salary for something we are already doing. Granzow stated because you keep the revenue in your department. Eichmeier stated if we didn't do the stamped warrants part of it is just collection and the behind the scenes stuff that happens to disperse it back to the district, that is just all automatic, where it is not automatic is the certificates and the stamped warrants. McClellan asked how much do we make on that, Eichmeier stated it is 5% but Eichmeier has not had much to recall because there has not been a lot assessed, so we are not paying those stamped warrants, there are still stamped warrants out there from 2016 that have not been paid yet, Eichmeier stated her stamped warrant interest this year was not where Eichmeier thought it was going to be. Eichmeier stated we are getting 5% but we only get 5% when that money comes in to pay those warrants. Smith stated we have books open on a lot of projects right now we are waiting on completion hearings for, that is kind of where we are stuck, which does not help the Treasurer. Eichmeier stated when all that gets done, that will be good, Smith stated that will be on top of the 51 districts we may assess. Smith stated it will be a lot of work for both of us, Eichmeier agreed it would not be a walk in the park.

Granzow stated he would rather do this once and be asked why didn't you do it this way, and have to do it all over again. McClellan stated it would not be just once, it would be 3 years in a row. Eichmeier asked then what are the Trustees thinking. Hoffman stated it would just be a rolling assessment, Eichmeier stated so it would just continue and continue, Granzow stated he doubted the pot would actually build, we are not trying to have a large pot, Granzow has a feeling it will be a continuing thing. Eichmeier asked if each year would be a different figure you will be assessing. McClellan stated this is a question Granzow has not had a chance to ask as they had a sidebar conversation. Granzow asked how much work would it be to do it by parcels versus districts, McClellan stated you would still have to do it by districts, but assess a fixed amount per parcel rather than \$1,500 per district, because districts are different sizes, Smith does not know if she could do that because their classification is based off of their percentage, Smith stated we could try just charge a flat \$5.00 minimum per parcel, but that would not generate the dollar amount you are looking for. McClellan asked if we knew how many parcels are in each district, Smith stated yes. McClellan stated if we did \$5.00 per parcel for each district, you could come up with how much we would receive for a \$5.00

assessment. Smith stated yes.

Eichmeier stated the code says you can charge a \$5.00 admin fee per parcel, but we don't. Granzow asked if Eichmeier was talking about when we do a project, Granzow thought that was 5%. Eichmeier stated that was \$5.00 per parcel, Granzow stated that was it, \$5.00 per parcel, so you do the work, then where does that money go, the Auditor's Office. Smith stated it would go back to the Drainage District that was assessed. Eichmeier stated the admin fee wouldn't, the admin fee is for the administration. Smith stated that is correct but thought we don't have a way to pull that out right now, Eichmeier stated we do we just don't do that. Eichmeier stated we never charged the \$5.00 admin fee, but when the code changed we could add a \$5.00 admin fee per parcel on anything we assessed, and the Trustees decided at some point in time, we were feeling that if we were sending out \$5 bills for admin fee it was maybe wonky, because you would get the \$5 admin fee whether you would get a \$5 bill or a \$100,000 bill, but that \$100,000 bill may have 20 parcels on it, but then we chose not to do that admin fee. McClellan stated she remembered talking about that years ago. Eichmeier does not know if that would be enough because the Trustees want to assess people that are getting an assessment for work done, but there is another way to generate money to reimburse your administration fee, Granzow stated while you are doing projects though, Eichmeier stated yes while doing projects. McClellan stated we decided not to that when we had a difference in how we handled the drainage warrants, it used to be that someone else bought the warrants but now the County is making the money off of them. Eichmeier stated before we sold those warrants to private individuals to earn that 5% but basically it would be the same work for the Treasurer whether we sold the warrants or we bought them. Gallentine stated before they actually used to go to whomever sent you the bill so they would actually have gone to the contractors and the engineer. Eichmeier stated a lot of those people would sell them and Eichmeier would have to keep track if they sold them to a bank or another individual that wanted them. Gallentine stated most of theirs they kept because they needed the cash for cash flow, but the interest would have been nice.

Granzow stated we did not do the \$5 administration fee per parcel was because although project A is going on we are still getting information for project B for everybody, it is a universal answer, now project B is paying for everybody. Granzow agrees with Eichmeier, it is right that it would have gone back to the Auditor's office and gone back to the fund. Eichmeier stated just like we tack on the special assessments it is an admin fee to come back to the Treasurer's budget to help offset the cost of preparing all those special assessment for the cities. Granzow stated we talked also about the work that goes into it, a small project may take a lot more work than a large project, it could work the other way as well. Eichmeier asked if the Trustees were going to ask the Clerk to figure out the amount assessed each year. McClellan stated we plan on assessing the same amount for the three years, it would not be fair to assess the first year at a lower amount than the following years, Smith stated \$1,500 was the amount the Trustees had previously talked about. Eichmeier asked if the Clerk will have to do a time study to determine how much time she spends on each project, she would spend more time on the time study than the assessment would be worth. Smith stated she has a spreadsheet in Excel that will figure the amount a parcel would pay based on their percentage of drainage benefits, that will give the breakdown for each district, and would be the basis for the assessment notices and that is how that split is determined in Tyler, that information is in Tyler too. Smith stated if we put in a blanket amount of \$1,500, Tyler will generate a notice for each landowner in that district that says the amount they will pay based on their percentage of benefit, you can put in any amount, whether it be an amount for a project or for \$1,500 like this for a potential assessment, it is just as simple to figure for either. Eichmeier asked if there would be a minimum payment, Smith stated yes of \$5, if someone's percentage comes out that their payment would only be \$3, then we will round up to \$5 as that is the minimum we can assess.

Granzow asked if the \$5 minimum assessment was worth it, is it worth our time for \$5 or would it make more sense to up the cost of the assessment. Eichmeier stated your statement, envelope and postage, there is 50 cents for postage. Hoffman stated probably 15 cents for an envelope, Smith stated she had it figured at 7 cents per envelope based on their last invoice, Eichmeier can get them for 5 cents. Granzow asked if we are losing money at a \$5 assessment. Eichmeier stated then the printed tax statement which is on regular paper, but includes your ink, McClellan stated your labor on top of that cost, Eichmeier stated if we look at \$1 to generate that notice and send it out. Smith stated you don't come out ahead unless you are in a large district like a town district that has lots of little parcels that does not have a high percentage rate, if Smith plugs in that \$1,500 number those parcels might actually generate more than \$1,500, those parcels might actually generate more than \$1,500 when you round up to \$5, so there might be some that

would generate \$2,000 or \$2,300 depending on area and how many little parcels it has, in the rounding up on average, Smith thinks you would cover your costs, Smith would suggest maybe the \$2,000 assessment than the \$1,500 amount, it might be simpler to put it in the total costs amount. McClellan stated if we do that and have enough money left, maybe the fourth year we don't need to do that assessment, maybe we skip to the next year. Granzow stated we could do three years in a row and see where we are at. McClellan agreed, maybe if we have enough money we won't assess the fourth year, then we can assess the fifth, sixth and seventh year. Eichmeier stated you can't assess to make money, Granzow stated he is not trying to do a pot builder but the pot we are pulling from is our Rural Services right now and that is not right.

Hoffman stated every time we utilize Mike Richards like we will in a couple hours, Granzow asked how much we have paid out for legal as of right now, Smith stated she would have to pull those invoices, Granzow asked if we are at \$20,000 spent yet, Smith stated you would likely be really close. Granzow stated so right now we have \$20,000 we have spent on legal fees, for not just ours or a single district but all districts. Smith stated we have had Mike Richards look at things for us on the CWECS, Drainage Utility Permit several times, we have had Richards in on a couple of closed session meeting, all of those decisions or opinions that Richards provide affect every district in the County. Granzow agreed they are general opinions. Eichmeier understands where the Trustees are coming from. Hoffman stated we are all sitting here talking about things, Hoffman is almost as impressed by that.

McClellan asked if we now have more people paying the banks directly or paying online for property taxes, is it getting to be a lighter load. Eichmeier stated with Covid, people either mailed it in, paid online or paid at their bank, if they paid at their bank, that is a lot more work for us than if they mailed it in. McClellan asked if they can pay online through the Treasurer's Association. Eichmeier does not want to take that option away because that is a service that a lot of elderly people take advantage of. Hoffman asked if the elderly use the internet. Eichmeier stated no they use the bank, all of our local banks have agreed that if someone brings their property tax stub to the bank, they can deposit it right into our account, it is a lot more work that has to happen, then the bank has to send that stub and the deposit slip to us or fax them to us, then we get them then we have to process them through the system, then when we reconcile that bank statement, if we do a package of 50, 100 or 200 stubs in the bank, then we have to figure out which packet goes with all the entries in the bank statement, because in Tyler it is all one lump sum and on the bank statement, it is all the individual deposits. Eichmeier stated it is a lot more work, as a customer service to the citizens, that is why we leave it there.

Hoffman stated we have been taking five steps forward every week, this collaborating now, do you ladies know where we need to go from here now to move forward. Smith stated we will definitely have to reach out to Tyler to learn how to set up a new general ledger account code to receive this money, Smith stated she can figure out how to generate the assessments to go out but how do we receive that to an account code that is specific to drainage that isn't drainage assessment per district. Eichmeier stated she did not build those accounts within Tyler, that is an Auditor performance. Smith stated she can reach out to Tyler and the Auditor.

Granzow stated he wanted it to work out for the Drainage Clerk and Treasurer, Granzow knows what he wants for a result, Hoffman stated we just have to know how to get there, and by having the people who are in charge of the logistics and operations here. McClellan asked are we assessing to cover her annual wages each year, Granzow stated we talked about, Granzow found out that Rural Services has been paying 100% of the Clerk's salary, Granzow is not happy about that because he knows it was split 50/50, Hoffman stated at one point. Granzow stated it was budgeted to Rural Services only, and Granzow does not think that is fair to the rural people at all, that is just Granzow's personal feelings, and knows we have been on this project since Granzow came in, but we are getting closer to it. McClellan stated that is how things ended up fitting in the budgets and bookkeeping without us knowing. Granzow stated he thought the Clerk's salary should be General Fund anyway. McClellan stated the General Fund was over the 3.5 so obviously things just got moved. Granzow stated there is more money in Rural Services, because we have more room in the levy, everybody pulls from General but 62% of General is rural people, and when Granzow looks at that he thinks the Clerk's salary should have been all General. Eichmeier just assumed the Clerk's salary was General fund, and when Granzow stated it was Rural Services, Eichmeier was surprised. Granzow stated he does not think that is where it should be, and has talked with Auditor Pieters about that, Granzow does not know how she will propose it back through the budget this time but Pieters knows Granzow's feelings on it. Granzow asked if he thought we were still going to charge the County money for the Drainage

Clerk's job, yes because it does still fall back to the County but we can take some of the shock away from the General for the people that are actually using this which is the districts, it is their district, not the County's.

McClellan asked Smith how much time do you think you end up doing election stuff, Hoffman stated one year it might be 90/10, one year it might be 70/30, a general or midterm election year could be 70/30. Smith stated yes, and we are starting to see passport applications come back through more regularly than in the past and that is one thing Smith does also. Hoffman stated we have to trust that the Auditor will reflect that. Granzow stated he is fine with even taking 50% away from the General Fund, is Granzow doing this to be a money builder to do that, no, Granzow stated he is doing this because he believes is right, that the work the Clerk does in this meeting right here is not the Rural or General Services expense, it is drainage's expense, Granzow stated that is how he feels and he knows half of the County will get charged for it, that is who the Drainage Clerk works for not the other half. Granzow can't answer the question of how we will do this, but know we need to take these bills first and handle them, and work with everything else accordingly, that is what Granzow would go with.

The Trustees thanked Eichmeier for coming down to the meeting. Granzow asked Eichmeier if she feels something else needs to be changed on the notices. Hoffman stated Smith can add this project to the agenda next week, and anytime Smith would like to add this to the agenda, please do. Smith stated she can have Eichmeier go over the drafts of notice provided to Eichmeier and we can go over any changes that need to be made next week, Smith stated Eichmeier has for more experience in this and will rely on her judgement. Eichmeier stated she has experience on her side of this, Smith stated she does, and looks forward to Eichmeier's thoughts on this. Granzow does not want to tell them to do something we can't do or could have been done more easily had we told you something else. Eichmeier asked of any other counties are doing this. Granzow stated all the other counties that we have talked to have opted out of this, they charge a percent on to a bill, so if you have a large project they charge 5% and they put that money with that district, it is supposed to stay with that district, that is not right either. Smith stated some Counties charge a fee for every letter, mailing or meeting notice they send out and they will invoice a district for that. Granzow stated looking at all the options, Schlemme had shared them with Granzow a while back, looking at all the options presented none of them are fair, this seems like the most work, once it is constructed, Granzow thinks it will back off a little bit, Granzow personally thinks this is the best way. McClellan stated she thinks this is the most fair, whether it is \$5 or \$10 per parcel, so that way everybody is paying the same, Smith stated if you want her to look at those numbers what that would generate rather than a \$1,500 fixed amount, Smith can provide you with an amount it generate at a \$5 per parcel fixed amount or a \$10 per parcel fixed amount if the Trustees would like to see those numbers, Granzow would like to see them.

Eichmeier asked if we did a \$1,500 assessment in that district, how would that be split out. Smith stated their classification schedule would split that out by the percent of benefit. Granzow stated if you have 1,000 parcels versus 10,000 parcels your assessed value back to the people would still be assessed back to their schedule but the dollar for the district would be different because the parcels are smaller, or you have more area paying, Granzow does not know which is right, he would like to see it both ways. McClellan stated in a big district it might only come out to be \$3 a parcel, but you would be assessing for the \$5 minimum, the ones in the small district will pay more because they are in a small district. Granzow stated it could encourage them not to be a district anymore, some of these districts are small enough. Eichmeier thanked the Trustees for including her and will review the assessment notice drafts and get back to the Trustees on this. The Trustees thanked Eichmeier.

9. Approve Minutes

Smith stated this was a typo, and appeared earlier in the agenda as Item # 3.

10. Other Business

Drainage Utility Permit - Smith stated we received an invoice from Davis Brown Law for attendance of a closed session meeting and revision of the Drainage Utility Permit, Smith would like clarification on how the Trustees would like this invoice paid, Granzow stated through rural services.

Motion by Granzow to approve payment of the Davis Brown Law invoice through Rural Services. Second by McClellan. All ayes. Motion carried.

11. Adjourn Meeting

Motion by Granzow to adjourn. Second by McClellan. All ayes. Motion carried.