

Sewer plant upgrade planning, city debt,
'Old' Energy building

To the Editor,

A recent Letter to the Editor written by citizen Steve Hanken is, unfortunately, inconsistent with actual facts.

Mr. Hanken stated, "So, after dragging our feet for two years, the city council finally has hired a bonding company for \$18,000 to figure out what we need for a sewer plant." There are three factual errors in that statement. First, the city council has not been dragging their feet for two years; the council in fact, by Resolution No. 2018-48, hired Snyder & Associates, an engineering firm, to begin the study and planning process for a new sewage treatment plant. The process of designing and building a new sewage treatment plant is heavily regulated and subject to review and approval by the IDNR. The study and design have been underway ever since the approval of Resolution 2018- 48 on April 2, 2018.

The second and third errors may be found in the statement that the city "finally has hired a bonding company for \$18,000 to figure out what we need for a sewer plant". The city council approved Resolution 2020-100 on Oct. 5, approving an engagement letter with Public Financial Management (PFM), the city's financial advisor. PFM will work with city staff on all of the potential funding options, from General Obligation Debt, Revenue Debt, to rate increases. PFM is neither a "bonding company" (Error #2) nor are they in the business of "figuring out what we need for a sewer plant." (Error #3)

The cost estimate for the plant has never been certain and will continue to get fine-tuned as the planning proceeds. No one working for the city, the city engineer, nor the editor of the Express recalls the sewer plant upgrade cost ever being estimated between \$5 to \$6 million, the estimate always being in the \$8 to \$10 million range. Maybe Mr. Hanken can offer some support for that position.

Mr. Hanken's fourth error lies in his statement that the city has "carried a \$10 million-dollar debt" for at least 10 years." The highest debt carried by the city in the last 10 years was \$7,425,000 entering FY2010. Entering FY12 the city carried \$7,095,000 in debt and

entering FY11 the city carried debt totaling \$6,400,000. Debt entering all other years since FY10 has ranged from \$2,390,000 to \$5,835, a far cry from \$10 million.

Debt entering this fiscal year totaled \$4,130,000. The city clerk does not believe the city debt balance has in the history of the city ever topped \$10 million.

It appears that Mr. Hanken is also wrong when he asserted that, "Two years ago, it was reported in the Express, that Anamosa citizens had suffered from sticker shock when their rates went up \$50 a month because of a new sewage plant." The editor of the Express doubted such a report and could not find evidence of such a report in her search of their archives.

The Anamosa City Clerk also cast doubt on that assertion, telling me that the sewer plant was constructed in approximately 2008 being rebuilt since that time due to a significant flood event, with FEMA covering most of the costs. The Anamosa Clerk reported that the Anamosa Water Treatment Plant was upgraded in 2016 and that residents saw an average increase of \$10 to \$15 per month. (Drinking water treatment, something we don't have to do in Monticello due to the quality of the water we pump.)

While not sewer plant related, Mr. Hanken also mentions the city owned the "Compadres" building and its disrepair. The disrepair part is true and unfortunate, the city acquired it in a state of significant disrepair caused by the prior owner. The city obtained a structural analysis of the building and a cost estimate to demolish the structure. The demolition cost was significant, over \$400,000, due at least partially to the numerous connections to adjacent buildings. The city has received grants to perform an environmental study, asbestos inspection, and to cover \$60,000 of asbestos removal and roof repairs. Unfortunately, it has been a struggle to find a contractor willing to tackle the roof project. Efforts will continue with the goal of re-roofing the structure in the spring and early summer of 2021.

Now, onto the next erroneous Hanken statement. Mr. Hanken correctly notes that the city is pursuing the purchase of the old Energy building but fails to note that the purchase

would be a FEMA supported purchase with the city covering 15 percent of the costs, the state covering 10 percent, and FEMA covering 75 percent of the acquisition and demolition costs. So, when Mr. Hanken says that "we can all watch another building gradually fall in," he is again far off base. The rationale behind FEMA buyouts is to clear the flood plain of hazards and flooded structures, returning the area to a largely natural area. FEMA would not support the acquisition of a structure to leave it stand. The city investment is estimated to be under \$50,000 and is based upon assumed asbestos removal and demolition costs.

Finally, Mr. Hanken suggests that this council or councils over the years have opted "for the City Administrator to make the decisions." I have been in the position of city administrator for over 14 years and have worked with numerous mayors and councilpersons. I have never once voted nor have any of those members allowed me to vote for them by "proxy" if you will. I have not worked for a Councilperson that did not have a mind of their own. They can vote yes, no, move to table, or abstain on any agenda item. They can direct action and investigation of topics and choose which direction the city should go. I work for them; they do not work for me.

I won't refer to Mr. Hanken's statement that the council opts for the city manager to make their decisions as another in the long list of erroneous statements, generously allowing this one to fall into the category of "opinion."

If you have questions on any of these topics or others, feel free to reach out to your elected officials or city staff. The council meets twice monthly on a regular basis on the first and third Mondays at 6 p.m., with special meetings from time to time as needed. The council packets, which are comprised of background information and documents on topics to be considered by the council, are always on the city website. City council meetings can be watched live on Mediacom and are recorded for playback on our website. Volume of playback is an issue we are working on and the council will need to decide whether or not to proceed with an upgrade of the Council Chambers

equipment to improve the overall presentation, recording, and playback of the meetings at an estimated cost of \$20,000 plus.

It is tough in this day and age to know what to believe with so many allegations, partial truths, and biased information being shared on so many platforms. It is unfortunate that a Letter to the Editor in our local newspaper could be so full of falsehoods. With just a little effort and interest in the truth, the facts could have been established. Instead, truth is thrown to the wind with allegations and statements not based in fact, easily disproven, presented as true, presented as if the presenter was a knowledgeable citizen looking out for you. It is not clear how many believed Mr. Hanken's assertions and how many questioned them. Fortunately, most reasonable folks know better than to believe everything they're told, especially in the midst of a barrage of political ads; unfortunate. Mr. Hanken's letter does nothing but support that proposition; unfortunate. This article with supportive documents referenced herein, will be posted to the city website for those of you that wish to give these matters further review.

Doug Herman
Monticello City Administrator

2018-48

City Council Meeting
Prep. Date: 03/30/18
Preparer: Doug Herman



Agenda Item: #
Agenda Date: 04/02/18

Communication Page

Agenda Items Description: Resolution to approve Professional Services Agreement between City of Monticello and Snyder & Associates related to the preparation of a Wastewater Facility Nutrient Reduction Strategy and/or a Facility Plan.

Type of Action Requested: Motion; Resolution; Ordinance; Report; Public Hearing; Closed Session

Attachments & Enclosures:

Proposed Agreement
E-mail from Patrick addressing Survey / Plan
Resolution

Fiscal Impact:

Budget Line Item:	
Budget Summary:	
Expenditure:	
Revenue:	

Synopsis: Proposed Agreement to move forward with the creation of a Wastewater Facility Nutrient Reduction Strategy and/or a Facility Plan.

Background Information: The City is in a position where we must put tother a Wastewater Facility Nutrient Reduction Strategy. We may be well served by also moving forward with a Facility Plan. I have raised that question with Patrick and Lindsay and they have provided a pro and con type e-mail that is attached hereto. Also attached hereto is a proposal for services from them to do just the Survey or the Survey and the Plan. I won't go into the pro's and con's as you can read Patrick's e-mail on that front.

Recommendation: I recommend that the Council consider the proposed agreement and options to proceed with just the survey or the survey and the Facility plan at this time or to direct me to perform additional research on this topic before a decision is made, most likely at the next meeting.

THE CITY OF MONTICELLO, IOWA

RESOLUTION #18-48

Resolution to approve Professional Services Agreement between City of Monticello and Snyder & Associates related to the preparation of a Wastewater Nutrient Reduction Strategy Report and Wastewater Treatment Plant Facility Plan.

**IN THE NAME AND BY THE AUTHORITY OF THE CITY OF MONTICELLO,
IOWA**

WHEREAS, The City Council has determined it appropriate and necessary to prepare a Wastewater Facility Nutrient Reduction Strategy Report and Wastewater Facility Plan, and

WHEREAS, Snyder & Associates has proposed the approval of an agreement between the City and Snyder setting forth a scope of work and lump sum costs related to the preparation of the Wastewater Nutrient Reduction Strategy Report and Wastewater Treatment Plant Facility Plan, and

WHEREAS, The City Council finds it appropriate to approve the agreement as it pertains to the preparation of the proposed Wastewater Nutrient Reduction Strategy Report and Wastewater Treatment Plant Facility Plan, finding same to be in the best short term and long term interests of the City.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the City of Monticello, through its' City Council, in session this 2nd day of April, 2018, that the proposed "Standard Professional Services Agreement" between the City of Monticello and Snyder & Associates related to the preparation of preparation of the Wastewater Nutrient Reduction Strategy Report and Wastewater Treatment Plant Facility Plan is hereby approved.

IN TESTIMONY WHEREOF, I have hereunto subscribed my name and caused the Great Seal for the City of Monticello, Iowa to be affixed. Done this 2nd day of April, 2018.

Brian Wolken, Mayor

Attest:

Sally Hinrichsen, City Clerk

Re: 2020-100

City Council Meeting
Prep. Date: 10/02/20
Preparer: Doug Herman



Agenda Item: #
Agenda Date: 10/05/20

Communication Page

Agenda Items Description: Resolution approving engagement letter with Public Financial Management (PFM) related to Sewer Plant funding planning.

Type of Action Requested: Motion; Resolution; Ordinance; Report; Public Hearing; Closed Session

Attachments & Enclosures:

Proposed Resolution

Engagement Letter

Fiscal Impact:

Budget Line Item:

Budget Summary:

Expenditure:

Revenue:

Sewer Operating

\$14,000-\$18,000

Synopsis: The City is required to work with a financial advisor when bonding. The City will be bonding for the sewer plant at some point in the relatively near future. PFM will work with the City along the way to consider funding options

Background Information: The Sewer Plant upgrade project has been discussed for years and has come to a head a few years ago when the State of Iowa required increased testing and treatment of nutrients and phosphorous. Our plant, a trickling filter system, will not treat nutrients/phosphorous. Therefore, we need to change the sewage treatment process which requires a new plant. In addition, from an economic development standpoint we need to increase the capacity of our plant. The planning for the new facility are well underway. The new plant will be an "activated sludge" plant, which is merely a different type of treatment process. The plant may run between eight (8) and ten (10) million dollars. There are a number of ways to pay for the plant including debt service (General Obligation or Revenue Bonds), TIF, sewer fees, grants, general fund investment, and possibly more. The engagement letter will allow the City to work with PFM on plans, potentially multiple plans, to generate the funds necessary to pay for this project. The fees for their services will total \$18,000 and under current processes, if the City borrows through the State Revolving Loan fund, which is likely, the City will be reimbursed \$4,000 form the Iowa Finance Authority, resulting in total cost to the City in the amount of \$14,000 (Rules are always subject to change however.) Fees are not due until the loan is funded.

Staff Recommendation: I recommend that the proposed Resolution be approved so that work between the City and PFM can begin sooner than later.

Street ditch project. Langerman moved to direct the City staff to not trim or remove tree on the Smyth property adjacent to the 6th Street ditch, Lux seconded, roll call unanimous.

Herman stated the City is required to work with a financial advisor when bonding, which the City will need to do for the sewer plant updates. Sewer plant updates are estimated to be between 8 to 10 million dollars. The State of Iowa is requiring increased testing and treatment of nutrients and phosphorous, that the current trickling filter system will not treat. Schwickerath advised the earliest the plans would be ready to bid is late this winter and project could take 18 months to complete construction. The financial advisor PFM will work with City staff to come up with funding options for the Council to consider. PFM service fees is \$18,000, but if the City borrows through the State Revolving Loan fund, City could be reimbursed \$4,000 for those fees. Yeoman moved to approve Resolution #2020-100 approving engagement letter with Public Financial Management (PFM) related to Sewer Plant funding planning, Lux seconded, roll call unanimous.

Herman advised Kevin Kurth requested Council consider a warranty that would exceed the 4-year maintenance bond on the North Sycamore Project regarding repairs to his newly installed service line that was found to be leaking. Herman suggested including the other leaks in the agreement, if the Council was going to proceed with Kurth's request. Kevin Kurth, 204 E Seventh Street, stated washed rock was used to backfill around his copper service line and that should have been bedded down with dirt and sand. Kurth also felt that when the line was leaking, it should have been replaced and not spliced. When asked what backfill material was in the specifications, Schwickerath said he would have to check but washed rock is a SUDAS approved material. When asked how many issues there were, Tjaden stated that he was aware of 5 or 6. Goedken thought the City Code allowed washed rock for backfill and should look to change that to lime. Kahler stated he gave directions to the plumber hired by Horsfield to make the repairs. Tjaden stated the City only does mains and uses washed rock for the mains. City doesn't take care of private service lines and is not familiar with service lines and backfill to be used. Yeoman moved to table action on a proposed warranty for Kurth's repaired water service line and directed Herman, Kahler, Tjaden and Schwickerath to look into the issues and work on proposal, Langerman seconded, roll call unanimous.

Herman advised Horsfield did not install Bud Coyle's sidewalk and surface drain, adjacent to and east of Coyle's property, at the correct elevation. Bud Coyle, 515 N Sycamore Street, stated he would like the sidewalk and surface drain to be installed as the City Engineer designed them to be. Goedken moved approve Resolution 2020-101 to direct Horsfield to install Bud Coyle's sidewalk and surface drain as the engineer designed it to be, Lux seconded, roll call unanimous.

Kahler advised he sought bids from local contractors to complete various street repairs, most of which were reviewed by the Mayor, Council and city staff at the special Council meeting tour of streets. Kluesner Construction bid on the crack sealing and asphalt repairs, which was in the agenda packets. Kahler received 3 bids for the concrete work and was expecting one more that has not arrived yet. Goedken felt the Council should review the concrete bids before awarding them. Langerman moved to approve Resolution #2020-102 to approve bids for the crack sealing and asphalt street repairs from Kluesner Construction Inc., Yeoman seconded, roll call unanimous.

Smith stated the Sidewalk Committee reviewed various policies related to the installation and maintenance of sidewalks in Monticello and proposed a policy to the Council to consider. The

Re: Debt.

SUMMARY

The following tables reflect the Debt Limit entering the FY noted.

	FY '10	FY '11	FY '12	FY '13	FY '14	FY '15
Constitutional GO Debt Limit	\$8,816,309	\$9,003,840	\$9,125,327	\$9,329,709	\$9,582,865	\$10,038,752
Self-Imposed GO Debt Limit	\$7,053,048	\$7,203,072	\$7,300,261	\$7,463,768	\$7,666,292	\$8,031,001

	FY '16	FY '17	FY '18	FY '19	FY '20	FY '21
Constitutional GO Debt Limit	\$10,462,523	\$11,207,699	\$11,426,224	\$11,983,927	\$12,282,292	\$12,865,021 ⁴
Self-Imposed GO Debt Limit	\$8,370,018	\$8,966,159	\$9,140,979	\$9,587,142	\$9,825,834	\$10,292,017 ⁵

GO Debt: By Iowa Code the City may only borrow or take on a certain amount of General Obligation Debt. G.O. Debt is paid by taxes collected from property tax owners as part of the City tax rate. (Enterprise Revenues may be used to pay GO Debt.⁶) The following table identifies the revenue streams from which the GO Debt existing during those years will be satisfied.

The following table reflects G.O. Debt data entering the FY noted.

Paid From	FY '11	FY '12	FY '13	FY '14	FY '15	FY '16
Taxes	\$ 779,407	\$ 560,345	\$1,503,033	\$1,257,118	\$1,037,203	\$1,801,000
TIF	\$3,916,978	\$3,384,914	\$3,575,000	\$2,797,000	\$2,113,000	\$2,094,000
Hotel/Motel	\$ 19,087	\$ 9,689	\$ -0-	\$ -0-	\$ -0-	\$ -0-
Water Revenues	\$ 73,000	\$ 37,000	\$ 625,000	\$ 565,000	\$ 505,000	\$ 440,000
Sewer Revenues	\$ 156,528	\$ 133,052	\$ 576,967	\$ 505,882	\$ 434,797	\$ 465,000
Total GO Debt:	\$4,945,000	\$4,125,000	\$6,280,000	\$5,125,000	\$4,090,000	\$4,800,000

Paid From	FY '17	FY '18	FY '19	FY '20	FY '21	FY '22
Taxes	\$2,541,480	\$2,290,332	\$1,979,184	\$1,663,038	\$2,341,888	
TIF	\$1,640,000	\$1,150,000	\$ 645,000	\$ 130,000	\$1,390,000	
Storm Water	\$ 102,272	\$ 92,044	\$ 81,817	\$ 71,589	\$61,361	
Water Rev.	\$ 595,353	\$ 502,819	\$ 410,283	\$ 312,747	\$215,216	
Sewer Rev.	\$ 635,895	\$ 499,805	\$ 358,716	\$ 212,626	\$121,535	
Total GO Debt:	\$5,515,000	\$4,535,000	\$3,475,000	\$2,390,000	\$4,130,000	

Revenue Debt: "Revenue Debt" is not applied to the GO Debt Limit as it is repaid with enterprise revenues. (Water, Sewer and Sanitation fees, not tax revenues. The following table shows the source of revenues used to satisfy prior Revenue debt obligations.

⁴ Total Valuation, a/k/a 100% valuation, used to calculate the maximum debt limit is \$257,300,421

⁵ Self-Imposed Debt Limit is calculated by multiplying Constitutional Debt Limit by 80%.

⁶ The use of GO Debt to fund Enterprise Improvements may avoid a rise in utility rates to cover debt; shifting the burden to the Debt Service fund and reducing available Debt Capacity. Said GO debt may also be paid by way of a fund transfer(s) from the Utilities.

Each FY Column sets forth the balance remaining after that FY Payment

Pd. From	FY '10	FY '11	FY '12	FY '13	FY '14	FY '15	FY '16
Water Revenues	\$825,000	\$ 765,000	\$ -0-	\$ -0-	\$ -0-	\$ -0-	\$ -0-
Sewer Revenues	\$1,655,000	\$1,510,000	\$815,000	\$710,000	\$600,000	\$490,000	\$ -0-
Total	\$2,480,000	\$2,275,000	\$815,000	\$710,000	\$600,000	\$490,000	\$ -0-

Total Debt, G.O. and Revenue

Balances shown below reflect the balance due after that year's payments.

	FY '10	FY '11	FY '12	FY '13	FY '14	FY '15	FY '16	FY '17	FY '18
Debt	\$7,425,000	\$6,400,000	\$7,095,000	\$5,835,000	\$4,690,000	\$5,290,000	\$5,515,000	\$4,535,000	\$3,475,000
	FY '19	FY '20	FY '21	FY '22					
Debt	\$2,390,000	\$4,130,000							

The Constitutional and Self-Imposed AVAILABLE Debt Capacity entering the Fiscal Year indicated⁷:

	Constitutional Capacity	Self-Imposed Capacity
FY '11	\$4,058,840	\$2,258,072
FY '12	\$5,000,327	\$3,175,261
FY '13	\$3,049,709	\$1,183,768
FY '14	\$4,457,865	\$2,541,292
FY '15	\$5,948,752	\$3,941,001
FY '16	\$5,662,523	\$3,570,018
FY '17	\$5,692,699	\$3,451,159
FY '18	\$6,891,224	\$4,605,979
FY '19	\$8,508,927	\$6,112,142
FY '20	\$9,892,292	\$7,435,834
FY '21	\$8,065,021	\$6,162,017

FY Combined Tax Rate	Monticello	Anamosa
FY '05	13.76255	14.72917
FY '06	13.76255	15.84409
FY '07	14.17218	16.24285
FY '08	14.20090	15.49546
FY '09	13.88817	16.12672
FY '10	13.95114	16.00088
FY '11	13.95103	16.08619
FY '12	13.94399	16.15882
FY '13	13.94398	15.87988
FY '14	13.94326	16.67827
FY '15	13.86994	15.68006
FY '16	13.86898	16.11446
FY '17	13.86898	14.97611
FY '18	13.86897	14.80826
FY '19	13.86894	14.86894
FY '20	13.86897	14.57178

⁷ These numbers represent "actual" debt and do not account for annual Development Agreement Obligations which are considered a "debt" when calculating debt capacity. I have not included that analysis herein as we are not now and have no plans to be pushing the self-imposed debt limit.

Re: Anamosa Utility Increases

Related to Anamosa Utility Account Increase of \$50 per month

From: Beth Brincks <beth.brincks@anamosa-ia.org>
Sent: Thursday, October 15, 2020 2:07 PM
To: Doug Herman <dherman@ci.monticello.ia.us>
Subject: Re: Sewer Bills in Anamosa

Here is our most recent Ordinance for increase. The average increase we were seeing was about 10-15 dollars. Now, if you were a minimal user your bill may have gone down. High users have seen a larger increase since it is an escalating scale (so the person in the article may have been a high user). Our increases happen in December.

I have the previous Ordinance attached as well.

The increase was not due to the sewer plant specifically. It gives some explanation of this in the Ordinance.

Enjoy!

Beth

Message from Express Editor Kim Brooks in reference to alleged Express reporting on Anamosa "Sticker Shock" over \$50 increase.

From: Kim Brooks <kbrooks@monticelloexpress.com>
Sent: Thursday, October 15, 2020 11:55 AM
To: Doug Herman <dherman@ci.monticello.ia.us>
Subject: Re: Sewer.Plant.Debt.Compadres.Etc(Hanken.Letter.Editor)10.15.2020

The only thing I can find are articles were I reported on the sewer/water rates for Center Junction & Fairview, which don't have anything to do with the City of Anamosa's plant at all!

Kim Brooks
Monticello Express Editor
kbrooks@monticelloexpress.com
319-465-3555

Re: Energy Bldg

Special Council Meeting
August 31, 2020 – 5:15 P.M.
Community Media Center

Mayor Pro Tem Dave Goedken called the meeting to order. Council present: Brenda Hanken, Gary Feldmann, Candy Langerman, Chris Lux and Tom Yeoman. Also present were City Administrator Doug Herman, City Clerk Sally Hinrichsen, Public Works Director Nick Kahler and Police Chief Britt Smith. Mayor Brian Wolken joined electronically during the meeting to listen. The public was invited to attend the meeting in person, with limited seating or to participate in the meeting electronically via "Zoom Meetings" and were encouraged to communicate from Zoom Meeting via chat, due to the heightened public health risks of the Coronavirus Pandemic (COVID-19). The meeting did have public attendance, both in-person and via Zoom.

Lux moved to approve the agenda, Yeoman seconded, roll call unanimous.

Herman reviewed the FEMA Hazard Mitigation Grant Program (HMGP) application he has been working on at the prior direction of the Council seeking a grant to cover a large portion of the costs to purchase and demolish the property located at 100 North Main Street and locally known as the "Old Energy Building". Owner Ron Welter commented that the building has flooded five times since 1993. Owners Ron and Dave Welter acknowledged that they would probably build a new building in the Welter Commercial Park if the grant and buyout went through. Ron Welter also noted that in past buyouts the Council did not condition the buyout on the construction of a new building. Herman explained that the HMGP grant is not a competitive grant instead being tied to meeting certain grant qualifications, in this case repetitive and significant flooding. Herman reviewed the purchase prices of properties bought out through the HMGP program by the City in this area in 2002 and 2010, a total of 12 properties. Herman advised that even with the approval of this application and Resolution that he would continue to explore two other grants that are both competitive but that would not require a City match. The HMGP grant would cover the purchase price, demolition, asbestos removal and administrative fees, with a Federal match of 75%, State match of 10% and local match of 15%. This area would become a green space. Herman stated the estimated City 15% share would be \$67,275.00, which he proposed would come from the general fund. Council questioned whether the project would come back to them if the City cost share came in greater than the estimated amount and Herman explained that it would, explaining that the project is voluntary on the part of the owner and the City, and either can back out if they later determine that to be appropriate. Herman commented that cleaning up and removing old dilapidated industrial /commercial properties was identified as a priority during the recent Council goal setting and the removal of this property fits that goal. Yeoman moved to approve Resolution #2020-91 to approve Local Match for the Hazard Mitigation Grant Program, Lux seconded, roll call unanimous.

Feldmann moved to adjourn at 5:45 P.M.

Brian Wolken, Mayor

Sally Hinrichsen, City Clerk

Actually \$46,425.

(See Attached
E-Mail +
Correction)

Re: Energy Bldg.

Related to City Cost Share on "Old Energy Building" purchase and demolition

Hi Doug,

I'm not sure how I missed it, but in the Costs section, I hadn't updated the Acquisition cost to reflect the appraised value. The good news is that this means the local share is now lower: <https://my.iowahomelandsecurity.org/app/#231066?t=form--costs>

Funding Sources

Method:

By Percent By Amount

Funding Source /
Other Agency

Estimated FEMA Share:

75 % \$232,125.00

Estimated State Share:

10 % \$30,950.00

Non-Federal Share - Estimated Local Share (Include In-Kind Value):

15 % \$46,425.00

Total Allocated:

100 % \$309,500.00

The Council's local match resolution does not require any change. The city is only responsible for 15% of the total cost of the project, and FEMA needs to see an amount at or above that amount on the local match resolution, which obviously this one has. I'm sorry for the oversight!

I'm sorry to ask, but could you revise the budget on the SF 424 form? The management costs budget amount is likewise affected, as 5% of the new total cost of the project is \$15,475.

Please let me know if anything on the Costs section of the application doesn't look right. Thank you for your patience!

Hanna Henscheid | Disaster Recovery Project Specialist II
Recovery Division, Hazard Mitigation Bureau
Iowa Dept Homeland Security & Emergency Management | 7900 Hickman Rd, Suite 500
Windsor Heights, IA 50324 | Phone: (515) 725-9307