

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF
TARRANT COUNTY WATER CONTROL AND IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT NUMBER ONE
HELD ON THE 28TH DAY OF OCTOBER, 1981 AT 9:30 A. M.

The call of the roll disclosed the presence or absence
of Directors as follows:

<u>PRESENT</u>	<u>ABSENT</u>
Wayne E. Newton	Preston M. Geren, Jr.
C. Victor Thornton	
Robert D. Alexander	
Burford I. King	

Also present were Messrs. R. M. Doby, Manager of Fiscal
Affairs; Bill Hilliard, Assistant General Manager; Ray Mason;
James Nichols and Robert Thompson, Consulting Engineers and Ben
Hickey, General Manager.

Director Newton acted in his capacity as President and
Director Alexander acted in his capacity as Secretary, whereupon
proceedings were had and done as follows:

1.

On motion duly made and seconded, and with assurance
from management that all requirements of law relating to the "open
meeting" law had been met, the minutes of the meeting held
September 15th and October 2, 1981 were read and approved by the
Directors and it was accordingly ordered that such minutes be
placed in the permanent files of the District.

2.

Director Thornton moved and the motion was seconded by
Director Alexander and unanimously approved that the following
vouchers be approved and paid.

GENERAL FUND: Voucher-checks #26303 thru #26350; computer started #102 thru #325 inclusive, in the amount of \$2,096,085.51.

CEDAR CREEK PROJECT - CONSTRUCTION FUND: Voucher-checks #4784 thru #4800 inclusive: computer started #101 thru #103 inclusive, in the amount of \$50,403.65.

REVENUE FUND: Voucher-checks #137 thru #263 inclusive, in the amount of \$3,256,007.23.

RICHLAND-CHAMBERS PROJECT - CONSTRUCTION FUND: Voucher-check #380 thru #481 inclusive, in the amount of \$22,727,929.51.

DEBT SERVICE: Voucher-checks #110 thru #113 inclusive, in the amount of \$479,755.78.

CEDAR CREEK PROJECT - INTEREST AND REDEMPTION FUND: Voucher-checks #102 thru #105 inclusive, in the amount of \$25,020,828.65.

CAPITAL PROJECTS: Voucher-check #3723, in the amount of \$119,161.00.

3.

Management of the District presented Mr. Ray Mason, Chairman of the Board of Mason-Johnson & Associates, Inc. Geotechnical Consultants, who presented the following summary for variations between the estimated and actual costs involved to date for the Richland Project; to wit:

RICHLAND CREEK SUMMARY

1. "The project is one of the longest dams in the United States and will have one of the longest spillways in the world.

2. The original plan of exploration was based on conditions believed accurate and, as in all exploratory investigations, was known to require modification as information became available. Modifications of the plan were made so as to provide adequate information for design decisions that, quite accurately, involve millions of construction dollars. These modifications came about as a result of two basic factors; first (and relatively minor) was changes in scope, second, (and relatively major) was hydraulic and geotechnical studies associated with the spillway.
3. The modifications under the first factor, changes in scope, include:
 - (1) Re-alignment of centerline of Dam, station -10+00 to station 17+21 and from station 218+50 to station 334+16.
 - (2) Increase length of dam by 1000 feet
 - (3) Exploration for Highway Bridge over Spillway discharge channel
 - (4) SMU - Archeology borings

The total of these changes in exploration amounts to approximately 6000 feet of coring

4. The modifications under the second factor, hydraulic and geotechnical studies largely associated with the spillway, include:
 - (1) Additional borings at spacings less than 200 feet on center (original estimate was for 40 borings) to determine permeabilities and provide large diameter samples for ultra-slow direct shear testing have been made. A total of 43 additional core borings, 9 additional large diameter borings, and some 10 additional piezometers, all over original estimates, have been made or installed so as to provide detailed information for design in this critical area.
 - (2) Direct shear tests, and other tests, over the original estimated amount, have been made to evaluate as accurately as practical hydraulic and strength properties having a very direct impact on the safety factor of the structure.
 - (3) Additional engineering studies, including more than 20 models of seepage conditions have been made for the spillway structure which have led to engineering drawings of a structure with adequate uplift resistance

and with an adequate safety factor.

- (4) Site and off-site exploration for suitable slurry trench backfill material have exceeded the original estimate by some 2000 linear feet of boring of which one-half was on the Keith Fields property (off-site).
5. These factors have contributed to the overrun of work required when compared to both the original estimate and to this revised estimate made by this firm in January 1981.
6. No item of work has been done that was not necessary. Unit costs for work items performed are competitive with, or less than work of a similar nature by equally qualified firms.

ESTIMATE OF WORK REMAINING

Based on our data base of today, 28 October 1981, the known items of field work remaining are:

Embankment Re-alignment:	
21 Centerline borings,	
12 Off-set borings, or	2640 feet
Spillway Discharge Channel:	
8 Centerline borings,	
2 Off-set borings, or	800 feet
Slurry Trench Backfill Exploration:	
Location not known,	
allowance of 50 borings	
20 feet deep, or	<u>1000</u>
Estimated Total	4440 feet

A summary of estimated core drilling quantities presents the problems we have encountered:

Original Estimate	18,625
Actual Amount thru December 1980	22,385
Estimated to Complete, January 1981	(5,420)
Actual Amount thru August 1981	32,326
Estimated to Complete, October 1981	(4,440)

The cost of completing the investigation, including field, laboratory and remaining engineering studies is currently estimated to be \$185,000 which includes \$7,417.16 previously invoiced that exceeded the authorized amount and \$21,926.10 of work completed in September 1981 and awaiting submittal."

Following the above summary and discussion, and with the

recommendation of management and District Consulting Engineers Freese and Nichols, Director Alexander moved, seconded by Director King and unanimously approved, that the heretofore agreement with Mason-Johnson for geotechnical engineering work for the Richland project be now amended as hereinabove listed.

4.

President Newton stated that the Directors had heretofore been furnished a copy of a Report on the "Richland Reservoir Clearing Project", prepared by Freese and Nichols, District's Consulting Engineers; and following a detailed review of the Report by Messrs. Thompson and Nichols, a general discussion was held during which management of the District recommended that District personnel and equipment be used because of the saving, as shown in the engineer's recommended report, and the experience gained by District in the Clearing of the Cedar Creek Project; whereon Director Thornton moved, seconded by Director Alexander and unanimously approved, that the Report and recommendations of management and consulting engineers be now accepted.

5.

Mr. Bill Hilliard reviewed to the Directors his conferences with representatives of the Texas Highway Department relating to the relocation of a section of State Highway 488, located adjacent to the Richland Dam and Spillway, and especially that of the construction of a bridge on State Highway 488 in the near center of the dam and spillway construction area, stating that it was the opinion of the engineers for the highway

engineers that a more economical, practical and better operation of all parties would be to have just one contractor in the area - that is to add the 488 bridge to the dam and spillway contract; this was the opinion of Messrs. Nichols and Thompson, Consulting Engineers for the District who also stated the Highway Department had agreed to co-inspection during construction and full future responsibility for maintenance.

Following a more detailed discussion, Director Thornton moved, seconded by Director King and unanimously approved, that with recommendation of management and engineers of the District, the District continue negotiations toward a contract to be presented the Board of Directors for their consideration along the manner and terms as discussed.

6.

Management presented the matter concerning the design and construction of an embankment for the Fort Worth and Denver Railroad relocation across Richland Creek. Mr. Hilliard stated that representatives of the Railroad stated that they (R.R.) were not in the embankment building business, whereon the District was and would be by virtue of other contracts to be awarded by District, Mr. Hilliard further stated that the Railroad would agree to acceptance of the finished project and the assumption of liabilities and maintenance with only the Industry Standard five year extraordinary maintenance agreement to be required.

Following a general discussion, Director King moved, seconded by Director Thornton and unanimously approved, that with recommendations of engineers for the District, negotiations be

continued with the Fort Worth and Denver Railroad towards a contract to be presented the Directors for their consideration.

7.

There was submitted for consideration by the Board the budgets for the General Fund and Debt Service Fund for the period October 1, 1981 thru September 30, 1982. The budgets presented were the same as those discussed at the meeting of the Board on July 29, 1981. The Board was advised that no changes were made as the Revenues from Taxes and other sources and expenses would remain at approximately the same amount. After discussion of the budgets, Director King moved, seconded by Director Thornton and unanimously approved that the budgets as submitted be adopted for the fiscal year 1982. Copies of the budgets are attached.

In addition to the above a revised budget was submitted for the Revenue Fund for the fiscal year October 1, 1981 thru September 30, 1982. The Board was advised that due to the recent rainfall which filled all the reservoirs on the West Fork System that it would not be necessary to pump as much water from the Cedar Creek Reservoir as was projected in the original budget which was presented to the Board on June 24, 1981. The Directors were advised that the budget was reduced by approximately \$4,400,000 from the original estimate. After considerable discussion, Director King moved, seconded by Director Thornton and unanimously approved that the Revised Budget for the Revenue Fund as submitted be adopted for the coming fiscal year. Copies of the Revised budget is attached.

The following bid proposals received by the District for the purchase of a new 1982 Fordor Sedan were submitted; to wit:

Century Chevrolet	\$8,539.49
Ryan Olds	9,577.86
Meador Olds	9,550.00
Tyson Buick	9,978.75

Following a discussion, and recommendation by management, Director Thornton moved, seconded by Director King and unanimously approved, that the District accept the bid of Century Chevrolet Co. in the amount of \$8,539.49.

9.

Management presented the following recommendation, to wit:

TARRANT COUNTY WATER CONTROL AND IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT NUMBER ONE
INTER-OFFICE CORRESPONDENCE

DATE: October 27, 1981
TO: Ben Hickey
FROM: Les Brammer
SUBJECT: Recommendation regarding bids for heavy equipment haul Truck.

The District has accepted bids from local dealers for a heavy duty tractor truck to be used for hauling heavy equipment to and from various job sites. The specifications were written to suit the many needs of the District.

As the District and the scale of operations grows many factors are involved in determining the size of truck needed to keep pace with this growth. It is important that some of these factors be pointed out in the beginning. First, the District operations extend from Bridgeport Reservoir in Wise County to our new lake project outside of Corsicana in Freestone County, some 180 miles. Considering the distance it is apparent the stress the truck will be under. Next, the type of terrain we must cross varies from highways and small levee roads to undeveloped construction sites. As the size and weight of construction equipment grows so must the truck that hauls this equipment.

Durability of a truck this size is important when schedules between jobs must be maintained. Downtime is critical and can set schedules back if the truck can't be repaired quickly or parts aren't available when needed. But probably the one most important factor to be considered is the dependability of this machine to deliver in times of an emergency.

The bids were analyzed and an assessment follows indicating the low bid through the high bid.

#1 - Mack Trucks: \$55,136.20 for Model RWS754LST - This vehicle was presented to the District as meeting or beating the specifications set. The District asked for a maximum of 80" cab to axle but this truck is 92" cab to axle. This factor restricts the turning radius to below accepted standards. The back of cab to rear axle distance is not enough to allow mounting of a winch, fifth wheel, etc. that the District truck will need. Also, there is no sliding rear window to allow winch operation.

#2 - G.M.C.: \$55,621.30 for Model N9F064 - This vehicle was also presented to the District with over the maximum cab to axle distance specified restricting the turning radius considerably. And once again, the sliding rear window is not available. These and other factors make this vehicle out of specs.

#3 - Ford: \$56,942.78 for Model LTS-9000 - This vehicle was presented to the District as meeting our needs. Its side rail and frame strength aren't sufficient. The engine horsepower is too low and the cost to bring it within specifications will run \$600.00 more. The power steering, front wheels, batteries and fuel tank are out of specs and don't meet our needs.

#4 - I.H.C.: \$57,738.50 for Model F2574 - This truck is considered as a large dump truck body. A portion of the motor is in the drivers compartment making servicing difficult. The front brakes, P.T.O. and fuel tank are out of specs.

It should be pointed out that the preceding trucks are considered medium sized vehicles. They are not heavy duty enough to perform for an extended period of time in stressful situations. Their turning radius, cab positioning and engine placement are undesirable and blatantly out of specifications.

#5 - Peterbilt - \$65,202.80 for model #359 Conventional - This truck meets the specifications 100%. The one detrimental factor is that moving the front axle to the specified location would lower the front spring rating. But at a cost of approximately \$200.00 extra leaves could be added to bring the rating back into spec. A good point for this truck is the fact that the severe service conventional cab is standard equipment. Peterbilt has offered us a trade-in price of \$3,500.00 for the used Chevrolet.

#6 - Kenworth: \$66,221.00 for Model #C-500 - This truck also meets the specs 100%. It is designed for the type of heavy duty

on-off road work we demand from a vehicle of this type. It should be pointed out that the \$1,000.00 difference between this truck and the Peterbilt is negotiable. The Kenworth has several standard features not offered by the Peterbilt that will easily consume that amount. It is equipped with an oil pan protection plate and front frame mounted cast tow hooks that are together in excess of \$1,000.00. Also, parts are readily available from a local source. Kenworth has offered us \$2,100.00 for the used Chevrolet.

It is in the best interest of the District, and the opinion of the Operations Division, that the Kenworth is the best buy for the money and maintains an unblemished reputation.

Following a detailed review and with recommendation of Management of the District, Director King moved, seconded by Director Thornton and unanimously approved, that the District accept the bid proposal submitted by the Kenworth Truck Co. in the amount of \$66,221.00 as per District specifications.

10.

Management of the District requested authority for the District to enter into Contract for the purchase of the following described tracts of land required for Program E - Richland Creek Project, on the follownig basis for payment, to wit:

- I. Tract No. 163 - Approximately 10 acres in fee @ \$650.00 per acre from Edward R. Grantham and wife, Navarro County, Texas.
- II. Tract No. 105 - 151.56 acres in fee @ \$653.00 per acre; 3.58 acres in easement @ \$325.50 per acre from R. E. Bush, Navarro County, Texas.
- III. Tract No. 164 - Approximately 80 acres in fee @ \$650.00 per acre from Dora Lee Grantham, Feme Sole, Navarro County, Texas.
- IV. Tract No. 58 - 367.24 acres in fee @ \$675.00; 29.04 acres in easement @ \$450.00 from Eric L. Jones, et al, Navarro County, Texas.
- V. Tract No. 162 - 116.2 acres in fee @ \$675.00 per acre; 25.31 acres in easement @ \$450.00 per acre; and the relocation of 1 metal clad pole barn from Ann Weatherford Pevehouse, Navarro County, Texas.

- VI. Tract No. 35 - 8/9 undivided interest of 86.20 acres in fee @ \$625.00 per acre; 6.89 in easement @ \$312.50 per acre from Paul L. VanDyke, et al, Freestone County, Texas.
- VII. Tract No. 45 - 541.15 acres in fee @ \$650.00; \$130,540.00 for existing improvements from Robert N. McGehee, M.D., et ux, Navarro County, Texas.
- VIII. Tract No. 97 - 99.87 acres in fee @ \$675.00 per acre; 9.21 in easement @ \$337.50 per acre; necessary R.O.W. for relocated U.S. 287 @ \$657.00 per acre from Marshall McCaslin, Jr., et al, Navarro County, Texas.
- IX. Tract No. 165 - 75 acres in fee for 75 acres of surplus land in the E. G. Senter tract No. 64 from Arthur Bancroft and Royce Bancroft, Navarro County.

Following a detailed presentation of the tracts, and upon recommendation of management of the District, Director Thornton moved, seconded by Director Alexander, that the District be now authorized to enter into contract for the purchase of the above described tracts and on the basis as shown. This meeting with the approval of all Directors it was so ordered.

11.

The matter of windstorm and hail insurance coverage for the pump station buildings located at Cedar Creek Lake, Ennis and Waxahachie was discussed and following a review of the coverage now existing of the three stations, by Mr. Doby, it was the concensus of the Directors and their order that the pump station buildings not be covered by an additional commercial damage policy.

12.

The matter of payment to the Tarrant County Tax Appraisal District, ie, the amount now assessed the Tarrant County Water Control and Improvement District Number One in the amount of \$16,703.00, was discussed at length; whereon Director Alexander


moved, seconded by Director Thornton and unanimously approved, that with recommendation of management, and the statement from counsel for the District "it is clear that we are now going to have a Tax Appraisal District for Tarrant County and that the Tarrant County Water Control and Improvement District Number One will owe same amount of money for its portion of the operating costs, past, present and future"; that the District now issue a check in the amount of \$16,703.00 as now assessed by the Tarrant County Tax Appraisal District.

13.

There being no further business before the Board of Directors, the meeting adjourned.



Secretary



President