

**Administrative Control Board Meeting
Box Elder and Perry Flood Control
Special Service District
Perry City Offices 3005 South 1200 West
5:00 PM Wednesday, December 16, 2015**

Members Present: Chairman Greg Hansen, Board Member Boyd Hirschi, Board Member Maurice Roche, Board Member Bryce Thurgood, and Board Member Kevin Pebley (5:05 pm)

Others Present: Matt Robertson, Jones & Associates; Greg Westfall, Perry City Administrator, Chuck Palmer, Christensen, Palmer & Ambrose, and Susan K. Obray, Board Clerk

1. Welcome & Call to Order

Chairman Hansen welcomed and called to order the Box Elder and Perry Flood Control meeting.

2. Approve October 21, 2015 Minutes

MOTION: Board Member Roche moved to accept the minutes as amended of October 21, 2015. Board Member Hirschi seconded the motion. All in favor.

3. Public Comments

There were no public comments.

4. Update from Jones & associates regarding progress on the Mathias & Evans Debris Basins

Matt Robertson with Jones & Associates gave an update on the progress on the Mathias & Evans Basin. He said that they received three proposals for the remaining geotechnical work. Matt stated that when Geostrata turned in their bid it was quite a bit higher than they had anticipated, and so Chairman Hansen asked to get a couple more numbers. He said that Geostrata is the most expensive but the most inclusive as far as their scope of services they are familiar with the project.

Company	Total Cost w/o Borings*	Total Cost w/Borings*
Geostrata	\$21,000	\$22,750
IGES	\$11,900	\$17,200
AGEC	\$10,000	NA

Matt stated that the State Division of Dam Safety recommends boring as opposed to excavated pits. He said however, the access may not be feasible at this time for a drill rig. He stated that when IGES and AGECE submitted their bid they were going to go up there with a track hoe and do some test pits. Matt said that he asked them to include a bid with borings and AGECE said if there were going to be borings then they were not interested in doing the job. Matt explained that if we wanted to go with the most complete proposal and safest Geostrata would be the company, but if we wanted to save money then AGECE is quite a bit less and we would save money. Matt commented that their test pits would be excavated test pits. He said if the state had issues with the

test pits what we could do in the construction phase is pull the excavated part back out, bring the slopes back out and re-compact it, the borings would illuminate that. Matt stated that he didn't even know if they could get a drill rig up to the site because of all the snow and the road is pretty steep until you get to the Questar pipeline and that road is just fine. Matt stated that he talked to Dave Marble and he said that they prefer borings because there are fewer disturbances to the foundation and greater achievable depth.

Matt reported that he met with the State Engineer over Dam Safety and discussed the project. He stated that they are not concerned about the size of the basin that we build, only with the way it is constructed. Matt explained that we will have to submit a report along with the plans to recommend a hazard rating for the dam.

Matt stated that he spoke with Russell Hadley from Water Resources. Mr. Hadley stated that the plans need to be reviewed by him prior to the bid and does not have to be reviewed at a board meeting. Matt stated that Mr. Hadley's review is just to show what we are building is what the loan was approved for.

Matt reported that he spoke with the Division of Water Rights about a Stream Alteration Permit. He said two separate permits will need to be obtained for both canyons. He said that the application fee for each permit is \$500. Matt stated that he told them that it was one project and asked if they could pay one fee. They did not go for that. Matt explained that this permit will trigger a review from multiple agencies including the U.S Corps of Engineers, U.S Fish and Wildlife Services and others.

Matt stated that he contacted Questar Gas regarding the access road and easement. He said Questar has a 30' wide easement along their high pressure gas line. They want a list of equipment that will cross their line and want us to pothole their line to determine the depth of the line. Matt said when they go and geotechnical work we can ask them to do the potholes as well.

Mr. Robertson reported that he has been working on the design of the basins. He has investigated the debris stacking method to help determine the debris basin sizes. He is working on a hydraulic model to simulate a breach in the dam. Matt said this is necessary to be able to recommend a hazard rating of the basins to the State. Matt stated that he is also working on the design of the drainage features (outlet pipe, overflow, spillway, etc.). He said that he needs more information from the geotechnical investigation to complete the design.

Chairman Hansen stated that the plan is to bid it out in February and it will be about two months after that they will start construction. Matt stated that when we get ready to go up there we will have to contact Division of Wildlife and let them know since they own the land.

5. Selection of a Geotechnical Firm for Evans & Mathias Basins

Chairman Hansen stated that initially when the proposals came in Geostrata's came in \$10,000 over what they had anticipated. He said we need to make a decision on what geotechnical company we want to go with. Matt felt there was a little bit more of a risk if they went with AGEK and would maybe have to come back and do a little more work. Matt stated that the State is concerned with test pits and recommends boring. He said one thing that we could do with the excavated test pits is to send Ben up from Jones & Associates and he could take some shots as to where the test pits are. He said the State does require us to pull them out and redo them, we would know exactly where they were. Chairman Hansen stated that is the only area we would have to pull out is the test pits. Matt stated that the State does not like to see vertical walls they like to see a slope. Chairman Hansen stated that there is such a difference in Geostrata and IGES bids and asked if Geostrata was going to compact the native soil back in and IGES is not. He asked if IGES would compacting that back, is it a requirement? Matt stated that it is not a requirement. Matt said that we could ask them too. Board Member Thurgood suggested that all three companies should go out and see what they are getting themselves into because he felt that they couldn't get a boring rig up there even in the summer. Chairman Hansen stated that Geostrata has been up there several times. He said since we feel they could not get a boring rig up there he suggested that they do the report without the boring. Matt stated that Geostrata added some more for the meetings that they would have with the State. Chairman Hansen stated his recommendation would to go with IGES without borings. The other board members were in consensus with the recommendation. Board Member Roche asked if the test pits will be above where the dam will be built on where the dam will be built. Matt replied that the test pits will be done where the dam will be built. Chairman Hansen stated that we want clarification in their proposal that they replace the material and compacted in place. Board Member Pebley asked if we will need compaction test results. Chairman Hansen stated they would do it to Dam Safety criteria. Matt stated he would get clarification from Dam Safety and ask the firm what they typically do.

MOTION: Board Member Thurgood moved to say after we get the information back from the two firms, whether they adjust their price or not for the compaction of their trenches, which either of the two is the lowest bid is the one we will go with. Board Member Roche seconded the motion. All in favor.

Chairman Hansen stated if IGES comes back and say they did not plan to compact and it will cost "X" amount of dollars to do it, he will have to contact all of the board members and get their ok.

Matt stated that he would check with both companies and let Chairman Hansen know. Chairman Hansen stated he has been questioned about the \$600,000 loan and was told if that is what you are bonding for that is what they will give you regardless where the project comes in at. Chairman Hansen said he didn't think this was the case.

6. Discussion/Action on the 2016 Budget

Chuck Palmer presented the budget for the 2016 year. He said he took last year's budget and put in the actual not including the invoices from tonight. He stated that property taxes from last year came in roughly at \$74,000 with fee in lieu combined. Chuck stated that we have budgeted \$86,800 he said he didn't know what the property taxes would look like this year. He said that on the total revenue he put in \$87,300 and asked if they wanted to drop it down to \$75,000. Chuck stated that the capital projects the bond proceeds he budgeted at \$660,000. He said reading your loan document it could be less. Chuck stated in the line item transfer in the State will only allow you to carry over in your fund balance one year of your property taxes and he moved a lot of what we received in the capital projects. He said what he proposes is to take \$60,000 and put it in your capital projects and \$47,633 into the debt service. He said that will service the loan payment for the first year and will cover the interest and principal. Chuck stated that they require so much to go into a reserved fund. Chuck stated that the capital fund projects based on your loan, worst case scenario the project would cost \$1,010,000 and would use \$660,000 from the loan. He said \$12,367 would be transfer from the general fund and then you would use fund balance of \$337,633 to make up the difference to balance out the capital facilities fund. Chuck stated that in the loan document it says that we have to kick in \$350,000.

Chairman Hansen stated that if the bids come in at 90% of what was estimated by the State, if we came in at \$800,000 then it would be a 2/3 with the State and 1/3 with the Flood Control money. He said in that case we would amend the budget in March. Chuck stated as long as you are under budget the State does not get to excited, it is when you over spend your budget.

Chairman Hansen stated that we will have a public hearing next month on the budget and will wait to see what the taxes are from the county.

Chuck said we would use the preliminary numbers for the public hearing if we needed to.

Chairman Hansen stated in the letter from Russell Hadley he was asking who our bond attorney was. He said that would probably be Malone Molgard.

MOTION: Board Member Pebley follow the guidelines of the proposed budget and set a public hearing for the 2016 budget on January 20, 2016. Board Member Thurgood seconded the motion. All in favor.

7. Approve the 2016 Meeting Schedule

Chairman Hansen asked the board members to look over the 2016 meeting schedule. All agreed that it looked correct.

MOTION: Board Member Thurgood moved to approve the 2016 meeting schedule for the Box Elder/Perry Flood Control. Board Member Hirschi seconded the motion. All in favor

8. Payment Approval

Chairman Hansen stated that the board has 5 invoices to approve. The first invoice was for Jones & Associates for October the billing in the amount of \$3,158.75, and a second invoice for November for Jones & Associates in the amount of \$2,638.00 for Engineering Consultations, an invoice for Christensen, Palmer & Ambrose in the amount of 200.00 for budget & accounting update, an invoice for Susan Obray in the amount of \$90.00 for secretarial services, and an invoice for Ormond Construction in the amount of \$4,800 for mowing detention basins at Perry Canyon, Evans Canyon, and Cherry Ridge Basin.

MOTION: Board Member Roche moved to approve the invoices as outlined. Board Member Hirschi seconded the motion. Roll Call Vote.

Board Member Roche Yes
Board Member Hirschi Yes
Chairman Hansen Yes

Board Member Pebley Yes
Board Member Thurgood Yes

Motion Approved: 5 Yes 0 No

9. Adjournment

MOTION: Board Member Hirschi moved to adjourn. Board Member Roche seconded the motion. All in favor.