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The Warrick County Drainage Board and Department of Storm Water met in regular session with Bob Johnson, President; Dan Saylor, Vice President; Marlin Weisheit, Secretary; Phillip H. Baxter, Surveyor; Jason Baxter, Deputy Surveyor; Steve Sherwood, Director of Storm Water; Morrie Doll, Attorney; and Kim Lutton, Recording Secretary.

Present in the audience was Joe Grassman, Jordan Aigner, Nick Cassala, Arel Wood and the Durcholz brothers.

President Johnson opened the meeting of February 27, 2017 with the Pledge of Allegiance.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

President Johnson: Ok, no approval of minutes.

**HINES DITCH:**

President Johnson: First up is Jordan Aigner for Hines Ditch; hearing on deregulations.

Morrie: Before Jordan starts I’d like to submit to the Board; you already have a copy of my February 6th Notice of Public Hearing. We distributed that by certified mail to 9 affected property owners. Jordan has provided our Surveyor’s office with an itemized list of who he felt was the affected parties and then I think the Surveyor’s office conducted their own review to see who would be affected and determined it was one in the same. What I have now is 9 certified receipts of mail showing that everybody got notification of today’s hearing including one property owner in Orange Park, FL. So if we could make this part of today’s record to prove notification of the hearing. And then the hearing is to deal with the vacating pursuant to State Statute of a section of Hines Ditch that’s been outlined on a map that has been provided to us that is color coordinated.

Jordan Aigner: Good afternoon, so I can answer any question you guys may have or certainly, if there’s any public comments that you guys want to offer? Basically this is what we had come before the Board a few meetings ago and even sometime last year. This is the area where we looked at releasing that Hines Ditch and that is an area of conservation that we talked with Corps of Engineers and IDEM and they are on board with our plans to not develop in that area and that would include the area of Hines Ditch. So we’re doing our part to talk to you guys about it and I’m glad we had a chance to send those certified receipts out to everybody else. We’ve talked to a couple of the known neighbors that we knew it might affect and that would be two farming families to our south and to our east. I believe two representations are here so if they would like to talk, that’s fine with us but if you guys have any questions at all we’d entertain any questions. Nick Cassala is here as well. He is the managing member of the Greenlife Development and the Victoria property as well.

Morrie: The purpose is to return this to a wetland?

Jordan: Really what it is, is to preserve the habitat that’s there now. Typical maintenance, as you guys know from a Drainage Board would be to, if there’s any problems with the flow of that ditch we have to get to it and usually what that entails is a clear cutting action of all of the existing vegetation. Small herbaceous type grasses up to big oak trees. The idea with the Corps and IDEM, they like the idea of preserving this area that would abut to our area that we’re going to preserve but don’t like if we’re going to call this a conservation of restoration area, that the county would come in there and just clear cut everything just when nature has its chance to build back up. To say it’s going to revert to a wetland, I really wouldn’t say that. It’s just to preserve nature that’s there right now.

Phil: I think the main concern with everybody, including the landowners, is that drainage doesn’t get cut off. That’s the main concern with everybody here. They want some kind of guarantee that you wouldn’t do that.

Jordan: Ok. We have talked to Mr. Wood and the Durcholz family and, I don’t want to speak directly for Nick, if you want to come up and speak about it but we’ve definitely talked about getting assurances, if there’s any obstructions in those ditches that we would take any precautions necessary to get in there and remove it because we’re going to have a development in some of that area as well. So if water backs up onto them it’s going to be onto our development first. So we definitely want to make sure we have those provisions intact. I don’t know what that would entail other than a gentleman’s handshake or some type of affidavit that will make sure we won’t have any water backing up but we’re open for that for sure.

Morrie: So if you make such a commitment, your position would be that by vacating it as a regulated ditch it would not, therefore, be detrimental to the public interest.

Jordan: That’s correct.

Morrie: Because the drain will still function in the same capacity as it currently is and you’re committing to remove obstruction in a least disruptive manner which you’ll be required to do under IDEM and the Corps. At the same time preserving the capacity of the drain.

Jordan: We need that to remain an active stream that will release runoff from our development as well so we don’t have any issues with removing any obstructions. We would really want that to happen, regardless.

Morrie: Was this drain originally designed and constructed to do something far greater than it currently is?

Jordan: Yes. I think that, from my research of historical land use in the area, there was farming that was upstream and then in the late 50’s – 60’s surface mine happened so all that changed. There’s a land use change of probably around 900-acres that was changed to a strip mine and left a lot of canals, lakes, pits and there’s a lot of capacity left in those pits and it seems to me that there’s a lot of storage that happens in those streams and ponds right now that normally would’ve been carried in that ditch. I can’t speak for anything that is south of Hines but this is everything that’s north of Hines.

Morrie: And moving Hines Ditch to a different, if there was a need for it to still function as a ditch as opposed to a natural habitat; moving Hines Ditch to a different location, acquiring the right-of-way and digging etc. would be a costly matter.

Jordan: I’m glad you bring that up because we have talked a little bit about that but that’s something that would not ever be economically feasible for any party that I would see.

President Johnson: Would anybody want to speak against this?

Earl Wood: I don’t want to speak against anything but I have concerns. I have 120-acres that’s in that vicinity. It has two ditches that’s sensitive to that property. Mitchem and Hines. On Mitchem Ditch I got the Warrick County Parks Dept. up there working and I’ve got an extension of Ubelhor and Jagoe Homes. On the Hines I’ll have this subdivision here. In my opinion, concrete, asphalt and buildings don’t absorb too much water and I think there’s going to be additional runoff or it’s going to have to be controlled. My property is sensitive to both those ditches. I don’t know of ever having to work on Hines Ditch except when we had the tornado. When we had the tornado it got filled up with scrap metal and it had to be pulled and cleaned out. The roof off the maintenance building on the golf course all ended up in Hines Ditch because the tornado came right down in the ditch. We picked all of ours up because we had part of their building out there in my field. They made a scrap pile on the golf course when we got rid of all of it. I don’t know what happens when it’s deregulated but my concern is that gentleman’s handshakes don’t always work. I felt that the courthouse would always be here and this was my “go to” place if I had a problem. If it’s not controlled and taken care of in this courthouse I don’t know where to go. I don’t anticipate a problem. I have no regrets with anything that’s going on. But I think the standard of water flow might change with the velocity. I don’t know how they control it but I know blacktop and concrete and buildings don’t take care of it. That’s all I want to know, who am I going to go to?

Commissioner Saylor: I agree with your concerns. What my concern would be if, after the development is done, 10 or 15 years down the road it gets sold to somebody else or something, that’s my concern.

Earl: I’ve talked to Nick. I’ve talked to Jordan. I’ve talked to all of them. The old fashion gentleman’s handshake is great but I don’t think it stands these days. Somebody’s going to have to be bonded or be accountable in my opinion. I have no problems and I’ve talked to these people. We started talking about it three years ago. My final statement of any conversation I ever had with any of them, “I don’t care as long as you take care of the water”. Always in the past I think every landowner and every farmer, if you had a ditch or a land problem you came to the Surveyors office. If it’s deregulated I don’t know where to go. That’s the only problem I have with it. I need a “go to” person.

Commissioner Saylor: These gentlemen here have a great incentive to keep that ditch open and not backup on their property.

Earl: And I’ve talked to Jordan as far as water control. I’ve been there since 1947. I’ve seen some changes.

Commissioner Saylor: In your history down there, in the 100-year rains that we have every 5 to 6 years, does that ever overflow and flood?

Earl: I’ve had Mitchem Ditch break and flow to Hines Ditch. Then you wait until Hines goes down and it runs out the other end of the field. There’s times when we’re farming down there that we’re praying for that rain but you can get a 4 to an 8-inch flash flood down there and you don’t recognize the place.

Commissioner Saylor: So your point with that being said, as long as these gentlemen keep that ditch free flowing, you’re fine with everything?

Earl: As long as the ditch remains status quo. But who is the authority that I go to?

President Johnson: Thank you.

Jordan: Earl brought up a good point and maybe I’ll just take a little bit of time to speak on this. This may be two separate issues. We’ve got this issue before the Board that we’re discussing, the maintenance of that drain. And then we have some of the comments that he was worried about, development upstream and so that’s impervious services of roadways, so really those are two kind of separate issues. About the development; this decision before you today is not that decision. Just want to make sure you know that we will have to submit a lot more detailed plans before this Board and two other Boards for sure that will go again for public comment and we will do drainage calculations to see what the preexisting runoff is right now and then what our post development runoff is. And by Warrick County Drainage Ordinance and state law, we’ve got to retain that difference. But the maintenance issue; I hear what you’re saying. Who do you go to? If there’s something we can work out, you’ll know the contact. Morrie we’re up for any suggestion that you think you could provide that would be of some assurance.

Morrie: What you’re really concerned about is the clearcutting of the vegetation and the maintenance of the ditch? Is that the problem you’re facing with IDEM and everybody?

Jordan: Yes.

Morrie: What if we put a limitation on this section of the ditch? By passing a resolution through this Board that we will not maintain that ditch. We have a 75-foot right-of-way top of bank. And what he’s asking is not to clear-cut a 75-foot ROW on top of the bank. And apparently there may be more surgical methods by which, if there is a blockage at this particular location, maybe you could weave smaller equipment through the woods to get it to the locations you need. What if we leave it as a regulated drain? Is that a problem?

Jordan: My first answer is, I don’t know because I would be speaking for the Corps and IDEM.

Morrie: My suggestion to the Board might be, what if we leave it as a regulated drain so there still is some government authority, some place to come and ask questions, but we put a moratorium on traditional maintenance on this section of Hines Ditch? And we describe that and we indicate that we will not maintain this section in the traditional way we always maintain ditches. Instead we would maintain it in a sensitive manner to maintain the growth of vegetation and trees in the vicinity of the ditch. I don’t know if that is something that we could get approved by the Corps or IDEM and I would defer to you to take that ball if you’re interested, Jordan, and run with that. That might be a way to have our cake and eat it too. Give it the protection that it needs that you want and need but at the same time still leaving it within the control of the county Drainage Board so that if there is an issue 10, 15, 20-years from now, you can come back in and there will be a record of this. It will be in the minutes. It will say what everybody agreed to do. It will talk about still being a regulated ditch but not be a traditionally maintained ditch, a ditch that will be more surgically maintained on an “as need be” basis sensitive to the environment around the ditch to keep it as unchanged as possible. People would still be able to get in there with smaller equipment and do what they need to do but at the same time it wouldn’t be subject to us dropping a D5 out there with a bunch of track hoes and going to town.

Jordan: I think you’re prosing an option. I will tell you that probably for the path that we have laid out, we would probably request that the legal drain is released. So that’s different than what your scenario is laying out and I may say, as another option, could there be an approval subject to an agreement that is acceptable between the parties here?

Morrie: How much of a time constraint are you under?

Jordan: This whole project is under a lot of time constraints.

Morrie: I mean, there’s nothing that keeps this Board from recessing this hearing for a designated future Drainage Board date. Then we could reconvene at that time and continue on with it and give everybody an opportunity to think about this, talk about, and see if there is as way. But I understand time is money and time is valuable and once it’s gone you can’t get it back so I guess I’m trying to hear whether that would be an option? Or the Board can vote on it today and decide if you’re willing to vacate it.

Commissioner Saylor: I’m new at this so I want to make sure I understand it. If we vacate it, as a Board, then we give up the authority to say “hey there’s a problem there, fix it”?

Morrie: What we have to do, if we’re going to vacate a regulated drain, the state statute requires us to say that the drains not performing the function that it was originally designed and constructed for. That was my question, what was the purpose originally and that drain existed prior to the coalmines in the area so it drained a lot more territory now than it probably services now. I’m not saying that geographically it’s smaller but there’s a lot of surface water out here now that probably wasn’t there before surface mining. Secondly, we have to say that the expense of reconstruction outweighs the benefit. I asked the question about moving Hines Ditch and how expensive would that be. It would be a very expensive process. Lastly, the vacation of the drain, these are all “ands” they’re not “ors”, that the vacation of the drain would not be detrimental to the public welfare and that’s what Mr. Woods is talking about. So if this Board can make all three of those decisions then you can vacate the drain. That’s really what we have before us. We leave it as a regulated drain or we approve it if it’s not functioning or we vacate it. I guess I was trying to carve out something new where we designate it as an environmentally sensitive area that should not be subject to full blown maintenance but still would be a regulated drain. And that takes some time if that will work or not. I don’t think anybody standing in the room today knows the answer to that. Because we have to pay attention to a small organization called the United States Army Corps of Engineers who have an opinion about such things.

Jordan: Their authority goes pretty high. We’ve tested it before.

Nick Cassala: I’ve been listening to the dialog that’s been taking place and Mr. Doll I appreciate what you just proposed and I offer this for consideration to the Board; there does appear to be a couple of things that we need to work out and I would prefer that you not vote or take action today and give us an opportunity to work through some things. I think that within 30 to 45-days we could probably get to the point where we have the answers to the questions that have been asked that have not been able to be addressed here before you. And at the same time we will be able to have the same type of dialog with the Army Corps and with IDEM to better understand what the outcome would be on the various options that might be before them and for them to consider. So my request would be, in lieu of taking a vote or taking action, whether it’s up or down, would actually take action to recess and give us some time to work through the remaining issues. I understand what our neighbors are saying and certainly want to be respectful to them. This development intends to be their neighbors for a long time and future generations for those who are sitting in this room. It’s important for us to do this the correct way. This was a program, this was a plan, this was a path to achieve an objective. I still think that it has some viability but I’d rather you defer the vote so that we can answer the questions directly.

Morrie: Is that alright with Mr. Wood if we continue to look at the answers? To postpone this today and explore other options that would keep it under the Drainage Board but at the same time, designate it as a protected area.

Nick: Or provide them with concrete assurance.

Morrie: If that would be agreeable then the Board would make a motion to table this request and to recess this public hearing. Then I don’t know…..Jordan, Mr. Wood, sometime in April is that enough time? How much time do you think you’ll need to explore options?

Nick: I don’t think we’ll need more than 30-days. If it’s an early April date or late March date, that would be acceptable to us.

Morrie: Members of the Board, we meet again on the 13th of March and the 27th. We meet in April on the 10th and the 24th. Any suggestions of which of those four dates?

Nick: I wouldn’t want to go any further than that.

Morrie: We also have March 27th.

Nick: I think we could meet the 30-days. The 27th.

Morrie: Board, you would have that option if you wish, it’s strictly up to the Board, it’s not my call, that you would table this motion and recess this hearing until the 27th day of March at 2:30.

President Johnson: I would entertain a motion to table this issue and recess until March 27th.

Commissioner Saylor: I make a motion to table this motion and recess this hearing until the March 27th meeting.

Commissioner Weisheit: Second.

President Johnson: All in favor? 3-0.

Morrie: So you guys will all communicate with each other and see if you can come to some agreement one way or the other?

Jordan: Yes.

Morrie: Then, if it does come back to being a semi-maintained area that’s environmentally sensitive, we’ll have to all get together and see if we can define how that is defined so that when we put a motion forward then we can all live with whatever words we choose. Words mean things. We want to use the right words.

Jordan: If I may ask, is there any other additional notice that needs to happen for that?

Morrie: This is sort of uncharted territory. But it makes a lot of sense in this age in which we’re all concerned about runoff. We can craft some kind of protected language for this section of Hines Ditch. But no further notices will be required because we didn’t adjourn, we recessed. So this is a continuation of today’s meeting until the 27th day of March.

Jordan: That’s great. Ok, sounds good.

**CARTER TRAYLOR DITCH:**

Phil: Ok, I think we’ve got something else with Jordan.

President Johnson: Yes, we have Carter Traylor Ditch; right-of-entry reduction request.

Jordan Aigner: Yes. I knew I would be here today so I thought I would try to get this on the agenda. Thank you, Kim, for getting it on there.

Kim Lutton: You are welcome.

Jordan: This is an area that is now in the city limits of Boonville. If you know where Law Chevrolet is, we’re just north of Law Chevrolet. We’re just a small residential development that my group has had planned for 20 years and that’s as long as they have been waiting for sewer. Thanks to the City of Boonville, they’re getting sewer to this area and we are hoping to be one of the first developments that the annexation has prompted and the sewer has prompted. So that’s the development that you see before you. Nothing too special. Just a typical development. I think we’re showing 35 or 36-lots there and you’ll see that Carter Traylor Ditch is in there as well and so I will preface with, I’m not asking to remove the legal drain on this one, just to relax it a little bit. I will say that this is maybe a little more of a typical action from a development standpoint where we would just ask for a relaxation. I have not given you a pre-determined distance from top of bank, I would want that to be relaxed too. I was thinking maybe 30-feet would give us enough room to continue to maintain there but we’d be open for any discussions or any questions you may have.

Commissioner Saylor: So Jordan you’re saying that 75-feet creates too big a space there and creates issues for development?

Jordan: For development, yes. We’ve had it as a farm field for years and that was no big deal but now when we have development and you start thinking about utilities and fences, in that area it’s just going to be a retention pond and a park. We were wanting to put some facilities around where people could walk around with their kids or dog.

Commissioner Saylor: And the only lot it really affects is lot 36.

Jordan: Yes. Whether I can get 36 or not, I’m hoping to get something there. I’m going to have to deal with a floodplain in that whole area anyway, that’s all going to have to be built-up. That does depend on that particular lot.

Morrie: Phil, can’t you designate this as an urban drain and go from 75 to 35? Isn’t that a 35-foot right-of-way?

Phil: I guess you could. If you’re just selecting a minor section of the ditch.

Morrie: It’s now in the city. But it’s still our ditch. That’s why I was thinking of designating it as an urban. Maybe ditches in cities have a much narrower right-of-way because of that. An urban right-of-way is 35-feet I think.

Jordan: If I may show you guys, and I don’t have an exhibit. (Takes one of the exhibits and shows the Board.)

Jordan: Morrie, I was in a meeting earlier and was talking to Jim Morley Jr., he mentioned 25-feet for urban drain. I think 30 is as tight as I would want to go.

Morrie: I think Chris Comb’s current development on Bellevue was reduced from 75 to 40-feet Phil?

Phil: Yes. 40 is normally as low as we go.

Morrie: I’m thinking also in front of the former Zeidlers floral shop where we have that dispute going now with Towne Market, I thought we lowered that ROW to 37 or 40-feet.

Jordan: If you’ve got a precedence I don’t really want to press it. If 40 is what it is, I think I can probably make that work.

Phil: I would rather stay with 40.

Jordan: That’s fine, Phil. I haven’t stood out there to see how that affects that last lot but we’ll just shorten it up if we have to.

Phil: I’m good with 40.

Commissioner Weisheit: 10 years from now somebody’s going to put a fence on it anyhow.

President Johnson: I would entertain a motion to decrease the right-of-way to 40-feet.

Commissioner Weisheit: I’d make that motion.

Commissioner Saylor: I’ll second.

President Johnson: All in favor? 3-0.

Jordan: Thank you guys.

**SUMMER PECKA BID OPENING:**

Morrie: I’ve been provided with three sealed bids for the Summer Pecka Ditch. The first one is from Scott it shows it was received today prior to 11am. All three of these were prior to noon. The first one says Scott, it’s from Scott’s Transfer Inc. of Boonville. Dated the 26th. It’s the Summer Pecka Ditch, Martin Rd to Sharon Rd. His bid on the project is $58,999.00. Second one I’m opening is from Naas, Tom Naas Homes out of Haubstadt addressed to the Surveyor’s office for the amount of $69,900.00. The last one is marked Elliott’s Excavating Inc. Appears to be timely. Also dated the 27th and it’s addressed to the Surveyor’s office to clear Summer Pecka from Martin Rd to Sharon Rd per bid specifications for the bid amount of $78,888.00. Those are all the bids I was furnished with. You can take them under advisement or you can act on them if you wish today.

Phil: We’d like to award it today. We’d like to get a jump on it before crop time.

Commissioner Weisheit: You okay with the lowest bid, Phil?

Phil: Yes.

Commissioner Weisheit: I’ll make a motion that we award it to the lowest bidder at $58,999.00 to Allen Scott.

Commissioner Saylor: Second.

President Johnson: All in favor? 3-0.

**CLAIMS:**

President Johnson: No claims today. Any other business? Ok, we’ll move over to Storm Water.

**DEPARTMENT OF STORM WATER**

**SAM ROACH/TAKE HOME VEHICLE:**

Steve Sherwood: Thank you, Mr. President. First item I have under Storm Water business; just want to revisit an issue from last week with Sam Roach, who’s now considered a Foreman and operating with the Highway Dept. on the Foreman Emergency callout weekly rotation. Did the Board have any preference on the take-home vehicle status for Sam Roach?

Commissioner Weisheit: What do you recommend as the supervisor over Storm Water? You think it’d be easier to let him use a take-home vehicle?

Steve: I think if he’s going to be treated as the other three highway foreman, he should be given the same privileges.

Commissioner Weisheit: I make a motion to allow him to have the take-home vehicle just to and from work.

Commissioner Saylor: I second that.

President Johnson: All in favor? 4-0.

Morrie: Make sure our insurance covers take-home.

Steve: I will.

**KINGSTON EASTBROOKE:**

Steve: Next item I have is; I’ll be receiving bids by the end of this week for the Kingston Eastbrooke retention basin, the emergency overflow which is essentially a concrete spillway. I’ve sent those out since the last meeting. I’m meeting with any contractors who call who need clarification in the bid specs that were sent out.

**REMINGTON RIDGE:**

Steve: I also sent out specifications for the creation of a concrete drainage chute on the Remington Ridge Subdivision. It will be less than a 50-foot drainage chute connecting to concrete headwalls. Marlin is aware of this project. The other two Board members, this was a bided project two years ago. We drain to that concrete headwall which the homeowners have paid for 160-feet of pipe downhill. This is in a coalmine reclaim subdivision. The ditch eroded very severely. This is the receiving pipe that drains into that and basically the one land owner complained that he hears water trickling but he doesn’t see any going into the downstream pipe. So just to alleviate concerns we talked about putting a concrete chute which is about 48-feet between these two structures that you saw in the two photographs. Basically it’ll give the water a path to drain to and funnel it into the downstream structure. Those two will be out for bid and I will be bringing those to you when the bids are received, at the next meeting.

**RICELAND/MAGAZINE PROJECT:**

Steve: Since the last meeting, too, I spoke with Morrie. We reached out to Mr. Dale on the Riceland/Magazine project. We sent him an email to see if he’s interested in meeting Morrie and I to discuss a reduced scope of work on his property to reduce the proposed footprint. I have not heard back from Mr. Dale to date but he has called the Surveyor’s office asking for the minutes from the last meeting. So when those are available, those will be sent to him.

**STORM WATER WORKLIST:**

Steve: Next item I have; you all have in your packet before you a spreadsheet of the current/updated Storm Water crew worklist. This is what was currently given to the Storm Water work crew. We have projects coming back in for our crew to work on weekly as they’re sent out and temporary right-of-entry forms are returned for projects that apply to them. So this is their current workload. There are other things on here such as cleaning of curb and gutter streets that I’m working on with the Highway Dept. that we’ll be involved in as well. I don’t have anything else other than to ask Joe if he has anything?

**MISC:**

Steve: He’s got a notice from the Chrysler dealership that the truck will be delivered soon for the fitting out for the service body.

Joe Grassman: The RAM 4500 is going to be delivered hopefully March 11th to the dealership and then it will go to the component modifier to get the bed bolted on, so probably add a couple more weeks to that before delivery to us.

Morrie: End of the month?

Joe: Possibly.

President Johnson: Thank you, Joe.

Joe: You are welcome.

Steve: That’s all that I have unless the Board has any questions.

Commissioner Weisheit: I have one thing; the commissioners all got a letter today from Gibson County on the watershed. Did you get a copy of it? If not, I just want to give you a copy.

Steve: Yes I did. I think Phil has a copy too.

Commissioner Weisheit: Ok, that’s all. I just wanted to make sure everybody got a copy.

Commissioner Saylor: I’d like to say “thanks Steve” for this list. I think this is really neat. I appreciate this list to see the scope of the workload you guys have and what’s going on.

Steve: It doesn’t include other projects that our department is working on. This is just for the crew list. I’ve had discussions with some of the commissioners, there’s about a dozen other projects we’re working on at a larger level that will probably be contracted out and I’ll have more information to you as those develop. Marlin, I know the one gentleman has been in contact with you on Manchester Blvd. About the house that burned down that’s holding up one of our design projects. Hopefully that’ll be worked out soon.

Commissioner Weisheit: I think he’s going to sign up but it’s hard to get everything coordinated. I’ll make another call to him. Steve, I was looking over our budget and we’re eating into our reserve quite a bit and I think we might need to be careful and not overdue projects this year. We’re going to be down about $600,000.00. I think that’s getting critical.

Steve: I’m quite aware of that.

Commissioner Weisheit: I know you are. I know Storm Water gets tapped for helping pay for a lot of other important things.

Steve: And this is a reminder, we’ll be paying for the lowest bid that was just awarded on the Summer Pecka creek as well to assist the Surveyor’s office.

Commissioner Weisheit: And I’m okay with all that but I think on these contracted projects where we’re spending a lot of money, I think we probably need to make sure we stay under budget if anything this year. I’m sure you’re watching it.

Steve: We are. Epworth Village took almost a million dollars of that surplus.

Commissioner Weisheit: I think we need to try to grow our surplus up a little bit and not get down to pinch because you never know when we’re going to have another one of those projects that’s going to cost us a million dollars.

Steve: Just to update you; we have a meeting tomorrow with Clark Dietz on those other two projects that they were consulting on for us for Storm Water. One project being the Seaton Place/Fieldstone/Triple Crown/Hillsdale drainage issue. Basically the one that ends up going into Mrs. Groves backyard in Triple Crown. The other issue was the Stonegate/Yorkridge development. The easement we talked about where in 2005 the tornado and Vectren trucks damaged some facilities. I’ll keep the Board aware of the budget and how it evolves throughout the year. As a reminder, we’re also paying for all highway culverts that are installed and that includes the rock and rip rap and asphalt patching for those culverts.

Commissioner Weisheit: Thank you. That’s all I have.

Steve: That’s all I have.

Phil: Move to adjourn.

Commissioner Weisheit: Second.

President Johnson: All in favor? 4-0.