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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, Neil Chapman and Justin Shofstall.

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:**

President Johnson opened the meeting of May 22, 2017 with the Pledge of Allegiance.

**VICTORIA BLUFF / HINES DITCH:**

President Johnson: Ok, first up, we have Victoria Bluff / Hines Ditch. Request to deregulate Hines Ditch.

Morrie Doll: I’m going to ask that it be continued. I’ve received a redraft of the proposed motion to deregulate Hines Ditch with some changes that’s been requested by Victoria. I’ve circulated a copy just today to Steve and to our county Surveyor for their input. I’m concerned about some of the language, particularly sub section E that was added to paragraph 9. So I’m going to ask that we continue this to at least the next meeting so I can reach out to Nick at Victoria and try to understand the purpose of adding that language.

Commissioner Weisheit: I make a motion to table.

Commissioner Saylor: Second.

President Johnson: All in favor? 3-0.

**GATEWAY PLACE NO.1 SUBDIVISION:**

President Johnson: Next up we have Gateway Place No.1 Subdivision. Continuance of drainage plan approval. ACCU Surveying and Engineering, Bill Bivins.

Phil: I don’t know if he’s ready or not. We haven’t seen anything change since the first of April. I don’t know whether to table it or just take it off the agenda.

Steve: It’s been continued the last two meetings.

Morrie: That’s up to the Board. They can do either. If you wish to table it, you can table it and somebody can reach out to Mr. Bivins and find out what’s going on or we can just take it off the agenda.

Steve: Just for the record, no drainage plans have been considered for our consideration.

Commissioner Weisheit: I motion to table.

Commissioner Saylor: Second.

President Johnson: Ok, we’ll table it. All in favor? 3-0.

**HALSTON MANOR:**

President Johnson: Halston Manor. Retention basin release structure. Neil Chapman.

Neil Chapman: Good afternoon. I just want to clarify that we retained Andy Easley Engineering and commissioned him to make this report. I think as we discussed the last time we convened two months ago and so, if I may, just turn it over to Justin.

Justin Shofstall: Justin Shofstall, Easley Engineering. This month, on the 9th, I submitted the recommendation report with some of the previous as-builts and modification to one of the as-built drawings reflecting the changes that were implemented by the Homeowners Association, Halston Manor dating back to that construction in 2005. It’s my understanding that with the original subdivision that was put in by Barrington Development in 2001 with our as-builts everything was conforming with the approved drainage plan at that time. But over that 4-years apparently the basin itself had become so silted to where at that point there’s about a foot and a half to two and a half foot of water of what was originally supposed to be an 8-foot depth pond to the normal release structures. At that time, 2005, the Homeowners Association in order to correct what was essentially the horse hair algae, they went ahead and reached out to a few experts in regard to water quality of life and the recommendation was more in line with what we originally designed which is, to have a healthy pond you need to maintain a minimum depth of 8-foot. What they were dealing with was, they had about 2, give or take 6-inches, at any given depth going across the pond. The bottom of the basin is about a foot and a half to two and a half feet in depth from the original design release structure on the invert. They had added the additional depth to that release structure, adding about three and a half foot to give themselves an overall depth of 5 to 6-feet across the entire pond. It’s my understanding, as far as some of the work that’s going on Lincoln Avenue, the Highway Engineering Department was through and noticed that some of the sections were submerged and that’s when they approached the Homeowners Association. With that, we do recognize that there’s a few issues. However, the drainage plan itself with the adjustment to the release structure is following the overall intent of the drainage plan. The storm water is being held and collected within the pond. Within the past twelve years of this adjusted height, there has been no overtopping of the pond itself. So everything has been contained because, as per the intent of the original drainage plan, if there was such a catastrophic flooding event, it would overflow into that portion of Halston, head downstream to the southwest and then overflow through the easement to the offsite drainage ditch that the existing pond is going through. One of the concerns that we were told from the Highway Engineering Department was possibility as far as winter months if there was any sort of freezing action. Based off of our temperate climate that we have, the chances of the pond freezing over are very slim. We did include calculations and chart showing what it would take to cause any sort of depth down to 12-inches. We’d have to have a continuous zero-degree average temperature for 7 days before we’d get the chance to allow for a total depth of 12-inches of ice to accumulate on the surface of the pond. The likelihood of that occurring is still slim, however, we were purposing as coming in for those type of concerns with the weather to put in a drawdown plug. That can be done two ways. Which is essentially core and booting the release basin, putting in a solid 8-inch plug or by coming in and get a physical entry into the release structure would be to attach a C900 with a Meyer or another 8-inch gate valve that can be opened with a key from the top of the box at the top of the bank. That way we could address any concerns as far as maintenance of the pond as far as the upstream storm structures that would be submerged and then as far as to prevent any actual freezing of the pond. That option is a lot more cost effective for the Homeowners Association. We estimate that to be about an $8,000.00 fix on their part. If it was to go into forcing the Homeowners Association to make it conform with the original drainage plan and the intent of the drainage plans with having the depth of the pond, we are looking at about 11,500 cubic-yards of dirt that would have to be removed from the pond, dredged and excavated. Since there’s no place to locate it there on-site since this is a finished and completed subdivision, it would have to be hauled off. Prices on hauling off material depending on where the contractor has any type of burrow pit, is going to range anywhere from $20 to $25 a cubic yard. We estimated at $22.50 a cubic yard for $11,500.00. That’s a construction cost of $260,000.00 that the Homeowners Association would have to generate. At this point, I’m fairly certain that they don’t have those type of funds available. They were a little scarce in being able to generate just the funding to hire us to give recommendations for what they have now. If that was the case, I would say it would take at least 15-years if not more for the Homeowners Association to generate the $260,000.00 current value cost to dredge and excavate out the pond and at that point, this wouldn’t be the first time we’ve seen a Homeowners’ Association if they couldn’t generate the cost, would either go ahead and declare themselves defunct organization and become bankrupt. At that point we have two out lots that are part of the subdivision that are being maintained by the Homeowners Association, not Warrick County. With no one maintaining it or paying taxes on it, it would go through tax sale and with that type of liability we would just foresee that, more than likely Warrick County would wind up owning this problem that’s going to generate a minimum of $260,000.00 of construction cost to fix to make it match with the original intent of the drainage plan. So that’s why we were recommending as far as with having the drawdown, it suits their needs and also the past 12-years from our knowledge, none of the homeowners have complained about the function of the drainage system in Halston Manor.

President Johnson: Phil, do you have any questions?

Phil: No.

President Johnson: What about you Mr. Sherwood?

Steve: Well, it wasn’t just freezing that we were worried about, it’s that a certain amount of the structures are wet year around. That causes some concern. Bobby Howard, the Highway Engineer, is not here today to talk about the structures in his road right-of-way. He’s ill today. I was looking at Easley’s plans and there are some elevations that could be achieved between the design elevation that was sighted (I believe that the plat said 390.25) and then per Mr. Shofstall’s analysis the current box release height is 393.90. Does that sound correct?

Justin: That is correct. The original release structure for the lake and normal pool elevation was more or less 390.3 being 390.25 and then the top of the box has adjusted to the additional 3 ½ -feet to make it the 393.90.

Steve: It’s been raised about 3.6-feet or more or less the 42-inches I sighted at the previous meeting give or take an inch or two. During your report you said that the basin has silted up approximately 8-feet from the time it was constructed to where it exists now that the bottom has been raised by siltation about 8-feet. Is that correct?

Justin: Yes, based on the cross sections that we had on the initial, and that was correlating with no additional submentation in the last 12-years.

Steve: Do we know that the basin was actually excavated to your original depth in the beginning?

Justin: On that, do not know because we did not do as-built cross sections for the basin. I did confirm with the crew on that that was doing the construction staking. We do know that what we staked as far as with the structures out in the roadway were built as per what we had as noted any type of differences on the structures themselves with the as-builts.

Steve: I know looking at your plans, we’re talking about changing it roughly 3.6-feet from pool on the plat to the top of the structures today. I know somewhere in between we could achieve an elevation that the lowest incoming structure can be dry or if you back that up to the lowest structure to be dry and just have a little amount of water in some of the pipes leading in. There’s a medium between the two elevations we’re talking about. Between the 393.9 and the 390.25. Have you looked at those elevations yet?

Justin: We did go over that.

Steve: I know your plan shows to create an 8-inch hole through the release structure at the 390.3 elevation and then an 8-inch plug that would have to be removed from mid-December to March by the Homeowners Association. The assurances would have to be made if the Board was to consider that, that that in fact would happen. And then anytime in between we would have to maintain any structures that may have water in them. The plug would have to be removed and it would take a while to drain down and perhaps someone be there to be sure the 8-inch orfus doesn’t get obstructed or blocked that would prevent that from draining. It may put somebody in harm’s way to be out at the end of that box to make sure that that 8-inch opening gets maintained until the water elevation does drop. If we were to leave the elevation of the water where it is today, I color coded the chart based on your elevations that the lines that you see highlighted in blue would basically have some form of water in them. (Shows Board, Justin and Neil the chart)

Without Bobby here to comment I really don’t want to say what he would like to see happen for the structures he’s responsible for maintaining in the road right-of-way.

Morrie: Can I ask a question? If it was designed at 390.25 elevation and it’s currently at 393.9, if you dry the 1000-feet of pipe that contains water in 14 structures, what elevation achieves that?

Steve: Basically, if you take the lowest elevation of the four structures (391.77), that gives you an increase of about a foot and a half roughly.

Morrie: Or decrease of about a foot, about two-feet.

Steve: It would raise from 390.25.

Morrie: But it would decrease from current pool height approximately 2-feet.

Steve: Approximately 2-feet.

Morrie: And how that can be achieved if it was agreed upon would be, you just would lower the modification.

Steve: Or create a notch.

Morrie: You would modify the baffle that’s been installed so that it achieves a pool height of 391.77.

Steve: If that’s one of the options, yes.

Justin: As far as the capacity, there isn’t an issue on that because even with this higher elevation there’s still more then efficient capacity required for the storm water retention.

Steve: His report does detail that he meets the approved capacity at the current elevation because the surrounding berms were built “x” feet above the pool elevation.

Morrie: So the berms are higher than they were designed?

Justin: As far as with the overall top-of-bank which are both the street sides and the other portion which are the higher banks which are the rear yards of those homes that surround the pond, yes. The ones on the street side are conforming with the as-built and design plans more or less within a couple of inches.

Morrie: One more question if I may. Was Easley the original engineering company on this?

Justin: Yes. I think as far as what they’re looking at is, if we go with a lower elevation they are going to have to have some additional maintenance done to the lake itself because with what we have now, with the active water level. And ever since you raised the structure, when was the last time you had a prevalence of the horse hair algae?

Neil Chapman: Hasn’t happened since then. We’ve had no problems.

Justin: That’s what we’re looking at from their part. The homeowners that are around the lake, those are the premium lots, anything with a lake view is also going to have a higher lot sale, higher value and they’re the ones that are maintaining the lake and surrounding area more than the rest of the residents of the Homeowner Association.

Neil: That’s not true actually. Our annual dues are $200.00 whether you live on the lake like I do or whether you live at the top of the hill.

Morrie: I don’t understand how it could have silted 7-feet in 15 years.

Justin: 2001 is when the subdivision was originally being approved and then under construction and then 4-years later in 2005 when the majority of the homes had been essentially, let’s say 75% to 85% sold and were under construction or built out.

Steve: Is there a known elevation somewhere between the top of where it is now and down to the lowest structure? For the sake of argument, the 2-feet difference we’re talking about that you know no algae will occur?

Justin: On that, I do not know. Would have to be observation based off of Mr. Chapman and what they’ve done in the past because this was built in two tiers for the additional wall structures put on. That first portion was done late summer/fall of 2005 and then again spring of 2006.

Morrie: Doesn’t copper sulfate treatment kill horse hair algae?

Justin: It does but that was one of the things we mentioned as far as in that report itself regarding horse hair algae.

Morrie: It just seems like I’m always paying for copper sulfate in my subdivision is why I ask.

Neil: I bet your lake is deeper than 2-feet.

Morrie: It probably is.

Justin: A lot of the DNR websites for several states around here that have to deal with it, it is one of the most difficult and persistent species of vegetation to control. It has a limited reaction to other herbicides and aquacides that are applied to it. Essentially what they consider to be the best control for it, is to have a healthy pond maintaining a certain depth. What we’re looking at is, if we lower the pond some more, there’s still a potential in the future for them to eliminate that. If it does come back then they would have to go ahead and excavate it out, that additional sediment, from the pond to make up for us lowering it 2-feet. That’s 2-foot of excavation through that pond. That certainly would be cheaper overall going back to the design depth of $260,000.00 but there would still be a substantial construction cost.

Commissioner Saylor: I have a question. Do you think the original depth was not met in the original construction or it was not dug out as deep as it should be? Because I can’t imagine that silting up that much over that short period of time.

Justin: I would have to say, any response to that, it would be speculation because we weren’t there to visualize it. But I would say the possibility of it not being constructed properly…. there’s a good chance.

Neil: If I may interject here, one thing that I do want to emphasize is that in 2001 when this was designed and excavated, there was nobody living out there. Then this pond is put in. Then I was among the very first homeowners and moved in January 2003. So I think I purchased at the end of 2002 and there were a couple homeowners, two maybe. It’s now 62 homes. My point is, all the homeowners, we came in at this and purchased these lots and relied on a developer. We had no idea how deep it was, whether it complied or what not so for what it’s worth, I feel that we were not party to this. We trusted the developer. I would strongly disagree. I could just say that my observation from 2003 to now, I didn’t see any changes. I guess anything is possible but my suspicion is this thing was not dug out to 8-feet. It was dug out to 2-feet. And the other thing I wanted to say, we added exactly 2-feet on two occasions so we increased it by 2-feet. The notion in the letter states that we raised this thing 4-feet. Not from when we took over. I would like to turn everyone’s attention to the letter that we received from the Warrick County Highway Engineer that was dated March 3. The six homeowners who live on the basin received this letter. It says, “Dear parcel owner” and at the end of that first paragraph, the next to last sentence explains why it was a problem that we modified it. It states “the raising of the approved pool elevation sited on the plans defeats the purpose and the ability to store and release the approved amount of storm water retention”. So I guess my question for Justin, as you observed this basin the other day, is it true that by raising the water level that we have defeated the purpose and the ability to store and release the approved amount of storm water retention?

Justin: No.

Morrie: But doesn’t that presuppose then you don’t drain the pipes? Because you’re storing water in the county’s drain pipes and storage structures. I understand what Neil’s point is but I think that presupposed that the design would fully drain the piping system under the streets into the storage lake and then discharge it properly which it cannot now do with an elevated pool.

Justin: Correct. As per the drainage ordinance at the time in which this was designed, the capacity is still there within the pond as far as the volume. I’m not disputing that and I don’t believe anyone on the Board is disputing that.

Morrie: So how deep, Neil, is the water in the pond today?

Neil: 5 to 6-feet?

Justin: Yes. As far as with adding the additional depth there.

Steve: Well it’s the 393.9 minus the 390.25……

Neil: Well we don’t know how much we can rely on a plan where they were supposed to give us a basin with 8-foot of depth and it was more like 2-feet of depth.

Morrie: Who was the…….

Justin: If I recall correctly, I believe it was Stradtner Excavating.

Neil: The homeowners were unknowing victims.

Justin: If we go to the original design depth, I believe with what’s being mentioned here as far as to bring it down to the elevation for the permanent pool to an elevation of 391.77, (which is the lowest pipe entering which is section 300). Is that correct Mr. Sherwood?

Steve: Yes.

Justin: Essentially we were lowered from the top at 393.9 to 391.7.

Neil: From my perspective it’s confusing because the major problem that was sited in this letter, it seemed to me, that the retention basin no longer stores and releases the approved amount of storm water retention, we’d assumed the problem was drainages and flooding and that kind of thing. In fact, the day you were out it was after a hard 3-inches of rain?

Justin: Yes. I had been there twice after we had 2.8 and 2.9-inches of rain.

Neil: Did you observe any kind of drainage problems?

Justin: No. The streets were dry. I was there about 2hrs after the last rain event. The streets were dry.

Neil: But I see your point and your diagram shows that what you’re suggesting is that that green highlighted area are pipes that now have water in them and didn’t before.

Steve: Blue. Yes, if you hold the 3.9 elevation which is the top of the release structure now and if you figure the grades backwards to roughly at their sited design grade, that’s what you get.

Morrie: The other handicap is that our county Highway Engineer is unavailable today and I don’t know if that merits continuing this until he can be here? Because it’s his jurisdiction on the drains. Well it’s our and his.

Steve: In speaking with him, he was concerned on getting the structures dry so we’re somewhere between the 390.25 platted pool elevation on the top of the existing structure at 393.9. We’re at that 1.9 or 2-feet below the top of the sited structure now so you’re gaining about a foot and a half of water at this point compared to design.

Morrie: But losing 2-feet compared to actual.

Steve: But when that letter was written, that Mr. Chapman’s referring to, now Justin’s answered the question that there is sufficient capacity in there. So the volume is no longer an issue, it’s the structures being dry and/or freezing.

Neil: It’s seems like it’s a moving target though.

Steve: That gets back to my point. Is there an elevation that we know that’s going to be content that won’t grow the algae and horsehair that you’re suffering? Do we know?

Neil: But do we know that there is, in fact, a problem? We contemplate on reaching out to the manufacturer of these drainage structures to determine what affect, if any. My understanding was the freezing. It was the expansion and contraction of the freezing.

Steve: That’s one of the sited issues. Mr. Howard’s not here to talk about structures being wet today.

Commissioner Weisheit: Are they plastic?

Steve: There are some concrete and there are some HDP or plastic pipes, yes.

Commissioner Weisheit: On page 12, I guess these inlets are under water now?

Steve: Yes.

Commissioner Weisheit: I drove by there a couple weeks ago and I understand the homeowners concerns because it is a very attractive looking lake and there is plenty of retention in the back but the concern is the drainage structures.

Neil: I asked Mr. Howard what the life expectancy of these drainages were presuming they were dry and I believe his response was 50 years. And then I asked if he had any data about how this might accelerate that process and he didn’t know.

Commissioner Weisheit: How many drainage pipes have we got going in there? They’re pretty long too aren’t they?

Steve: Four.

Commissioner Weisheit: It’d be nice if they could be even raised up.

Steve: Grades very shallow coming in.

Justin: The only way to effectively raise it up would be for us to go back behind the sidewalk, cut, excavate there, put in a new structure there at each one of those locations, the structures themselves are $2,000.00, then put in new pipe because we wouldn’t be able to reuse the pipe that we’re laying and depending on the slopes, we might be able to pick up an extra 6-inches.

Commissioner Weisheit: Andy do you see this being a restriction with them being underwater? It’s bound to slow them down draining out.

Justin: The submerged pipe still has flow capacity and if Andy was here, Andy would give one of his favorite things, “half the state of Florida is drained by submerged pipes”. There is a certain loss in the overall design capacity so that is a given. We acknowledge that. Right now, what we were looking at was as far as trying to present the most economical solutions for the Homeowners Association because it’s going to be coming out of their pocket because they’ve inherited this problem and they’re trying to clean it up. It’s more the esthetics for their part but there’s some issues that we’re trying to get taken care of.

Neil: We’re going to take a look at what data there is as far as the likely accelerated wear and tear on the drainage structures having them submerged. And also I’d be curious when is the last time we had 7 days straight of zero degrees or less?

Justin: It’s been a while and that was addressed as far as average temperatures that we have so typically for a normal year, a freezing degree day is 1.5 and you have to have 15 freezing degree days to accumulate 1-inch of ice.

Neil: The question is; how deep would it have to freeze before it would affect those pipes?

Justin: It would have to freeze down to a depth of 12-inches to have a 50% capacity or more with the existing pipe.

Commissioner Saylor: You’re talking about capacity. I think we’re more concerned about damage.

Steve: Yes and some of these inlets that are shallower and they’re open to the atmosphere you don’t have to go down very far before the water would freeze inside the inlet. It’s not just how much pipe is underneath the ground and how far back the water would freeze coming from the basin, it’s the other 14 structures that have water in them.

Commissioner Weisheit: And my first thought on that would be, if we don’t bring it down far enough we’re probably going to make it worse than it is because then you’re going to have ice freezing right inside the drainage thing. If you have it half way out of the water, then it’s got a bigger chance to do more damage because you know there’s going to be a lot and freezing and thawing there. Where now, at least it is down below the freeze pattern 95% of the time.

Neil: If we can win a continuance here, I know I would like to obtain some data about the likely effect on these pipes. Assuming that it would freeze at zero degrees for more than a week.

Justin: And that gives us plenty of time for Bobby Howard to get with any comments he might have as far as other concerns.

Commissioner Weisheit: Would a motion to table for 30-days be out of line counsel?

Morrie: No, sir.

Commissioner Weisheit: I make a motion we table for 30-days so both sides can do a little research and put some thought into it.

Morrie: That would be the fourth Monday of June.

Steve: Should be June 26.

Commissioner Weisheit: Neil and Justin, thanks for responding today.

Commissioner Saylor: I second that motion.

President Johnson: All in favor? 3-0.

**CLAIMS:**

President Johnson: Next we have claims.

Commissioner Weisheit: $101.22 and I’ll make a motion to pay the claims.

Commissioner Saylor: Second.

President Johnson: All in favor? 3-0.

President Johnson: Any other business?

**8211 LINCOLN AVE / MR. COLLINS:**

Steve: The last business I have, we tabled the 8211 Lincoln Avenue, Mr. Collins. Was there any thought by the Board on the previous issue with drainage issue we discussed? Do we wish to continue it?

Morrie: That was the issue going to put a new pipe in wasn’t it?

Steve. Yes. An existing 8-inch vitrified clay tile. Do we look at taking it on as a Storm Water project and replace it, the tile? The intent was there, I thought, that it could’ve been part of the subdivision but the plans are so old. Some of the material used in the subdivision is the same material that runs through the yard. I think we established that the owner/developer of the subdivision lived in this lot and developed the subdivision around his lot, is what the records show. It was family relations.

Morrie: But we did not have a dedicated easement which was my concern.

Steve: No. But the owner is willing to dedicate one. He’s interested in maybe us blowing out the pipe. We thought that would be counterproductive of our equipment. We think we would do more damage than good. I think installing a 12 or 15-inch plastic pipe with a few inlets to replace what’s there in-kind and drain it down to Lincoln Avenue where it does drain today. It will be hooked into the new Lincoln Avenue structure, what is there. We talked about a cost for either contracting it out or material and the county do the labor with my Storm Water crew would be substantially less. I believe that’s about where we left it.

Commissioner Saylor: Did you give us those costs?

Steve: We talked about contracted costs of bidding it all out, around $25,000.00 to $30,000.00 for roughly 475-feet of pipe and 3 or 4 inlets. Material cost alone was $4,000.00 to $5,000.00 and the county to do the labor with our own crew. And we’d have to cut across one asphalt driveway and patch it back.

Commissioner Saylor: Did Mr. Collins express any interest in assisting with any of the cost?

Steve: No. That question was not asked of him.

Morrie: Sometimes, in prior subdivisions, homeowners have purchased the product necessary and we’ve secured the labor to do the installation either with our crews or with contracts. I don’t know if that is something the Board would ask, that maybe Steve’s department approach Mr. Collins and see if he’s willing to contribute to the cost of the pipe? And we have previously enjoyed discounts from suppliers and we have agreed to pass those discounts onto the homeowners when they do purchase the pipe.

Commissioner Saylor: I just thought if he could assist in some cost and we do the work then it becomes a time issue and a little bit of funds because some of it’s going to help him out and we’re still removing water from Beach Drive. That’s my only suggestion.

Commissioner Weisheit: I’d go along with that too.

Steve: Would you, then, like me to contact the property owner and put together a bill of materials and if he’s willing to participate that we can do the labor?

Commissioner Weisheit: We could do it in-house too. I think our guys can do that. He’d have to sign a drainage easement.

Steve: And then a temporary right-of-entry to allow us to facilitate. I can put a package together for Mr. Collins for that effect. Is that a consensus from the Board?

Morrie: I think that’s a consensus of the Board to bring it back. Is that true?

Commissioner Weisheit: Yes.

Steve: Ok, I will address that and see what his response is.

Morrie: And the driveway you’re cutting is his own.

Steve: Well that’s all for Drainage Board.

**DEPARTMENT OF STORM WATER**

**MANCHESTER BLVD / SQUIRE ESTATES:**

Steve: Storm Water. First item on the agenda. Opening of bids. Sealed bids were received on Friday prior to 3pm. They were all received timely. This is for the Manchester BLVD which is called the Squire Estates Drainage Improvements Project. There were 4 bidders who attended the pre-bid meeting. We have 3 bids received. I’ll let Morrie take it from here.

Morrie: I’ve been handed 3 sealed bids addressed to the Warrick County Department of Storm Water Management. All of them are marked received and initialed on the 19th of May prior to close of business. The first one I’m opening is marked in the exterior is marked JBI Construction Inc. For this record, it includes addendum #1 to the Squire Estates Subdivision Drainage Improvement Project of May 12th with a description of the addendum. It’s on a standard bid form. It has exhibit A to the bid form. A unit pricing breakdown. And a lump total sum of $167,269.00. Signed by Tim Sigler, President of JBI. Second one I’m opening is from Jerry Aigner Construction, Inc. It also contains, within it, a Squire Estates Drainage Improvement bid form from Jerry Aigner Construction, Inc. here in Boonville. It also contains an exhibit A proposed unit price breakdown. And it is for a total sum of $86,596.00. The last is from Deig Brothers Lumber and Construction. It contains a Squire Estates bid form and incorporates addendum #1. Signed by Charles R. Martin, President. It contains an exhibit A for a breakdown. The total sum of unit price is $99,968.00,

Steve: The fourth contractor was Metzger Construction. They chose not to bid. So we do have a low bid gentleman and I will make the recommendation to move forward if the Board so desires.

Commissioner Weisheit: I’d make a motion to award it to Jerry Aigner Construction, the low bid of $86,596.00.

Commissioner Saylor: Second.

President Johnson: All in favor of Jerry Aigner for $86,596.00? 4-0.

**RICELAND MANOR / MR. DALE:**

Steve: Thank you. Second item I have is the Riceland Manor Drainage Improvement Project. As we discussed previously, I’m proceeding with a revised scope of work. I have spoken with the property owner on the Newburgh side, Mr. Bob Dale. As I reported also, we do have a sign executed temporary right-of-entry and no drainage easement be required on his side. I have a confirmation regarding the trees that can be removed from his side of the property line. I have a revised scope of work set of plans from Neikirk which is the consultant we used on that project. I am sending those plans out to be reviewed by the current low bidder of the project, JBI Construction to see if I can get a price back from them if they’re interested in doing it. If not, we will probably re-bid the project on the open market again with a current list of contractors on file. If I can work out what I consider reasonable cost of redoing the reduced scope of the project and it will be greatly reduced as we talked about because we’re no longer putting the structure buried in the pavement to drain it down to the creek, assuming we’re going to have clean water and not brown water. We’ll be able to discharge it into the cul-de-sac and drain where it’s been draining now for years. So just an update to you, I’ve started that process. I have not spoken to Mr. Magazine yet. He’s not aware that we’re at this point. I’m waiting until we get something more concrete before I tell him that we are ready to advance with the project.

**CLEARVIEW DRIVE / WATERFRONT OLD HICKORY:**

Steve: Next item I have, the Clearview Drive structures. The Waterfront Old Hickory. Morrie did send the letter to Mr. Reynolds whose President of the Lake Owners Association on May 15th asking him to appear at the June 12th meeting.

Morrie: And we have confirmation on the certified mail receipt.

Steve: So that will be basin #3 that we will be working on. Probably starting as soon as next month to get some more background information.

**KINGSTON EASTBROOKE:**

Steve: I will report to you also, Kingston Eastbrooke Emergency Overflow, if the Board will recall, I sent some photographs that the overflow was constructed by JBI Construction. I sent some pictures. Those are just a few of them just to shake your memory of what I’m talking about. It’s in and ready to function.

Morrie: That’s near Vann right?

Steve: Yes. To prevent the overflow going across Vann Road.

**MS4 VIDEO REQUEST:**

Steve: Next item I have; I sent the Board an email back on Friday, May 12th requesting the MS4 video project going on across the state of Indiana. We participated in this the last two years previously. This is part of our public outreach. We have donated $250 each the last two times. I’m recommending we do that again. MS4 is the statewide partnership that provides the creation of these new videos every year and helps us all meet our educational requirements required by IDEM. With that, I would ask the Board to allow us to spend $250 in that endeavor once again.

Morrie: And the videos have been distributed to school systems and 4-H clubs?

Steve: Correct. Throughout the state.

Commissioner Weisheit: Make a motion to approve.

Commissioner Saylor: Second.

President Johnson: All in favor? 4-0.

Steve: And then I found an article in the newspaper interesting last week signing that the Newburgh Town Council increased their Storm Water fees at their May 10th meeting from $5 a month to $7.50 a month. Just thought I’d enter that into the record to show you what some of our fellow MS4’s are doing in Warrick County. We’re currently at $4.50 a month.

Commissioner Weisheit: Chandler pays around $6 don’t they?

Steve: I think that’s right. I’m not sure exactly what their fees are.

Commissioner Weisheit: Boonville has no fee, right?

Steve: They are not an MS4 as required by IDEM. They do not meet the census data.

Commissioner Saylor: So our fees are paid on our tax bill, correct?

Morrie: It is.

Steve: And theirs is too I believe. Or through their utility pickup.

Morrie: The only other thing is at some point in time take Williams Ditch, if we ever fix Williams Ditch, and fix is a loose term, redirect it and take it to the river perhaps, that’s going to be a huge expense. At one point in time the number was $10 million and I don’t know if that’s accurate now. That’s the ditch that runs between Vanderburgh and Warrick County at the Lloyd Expressway. Just on the Warrick side by 69. But it runs north to Chandler and then goes west through Pigeon into Vanderburgh County and then runs through Vanderburgh County and dumps out basically at Casino Aztar.

Steve: All the water around Deaconess basically does a U-turn and runs north along the Vanderburgh County line then northeast all the way back to Chandler into Pigeon Creek. There’s just a ridge around I-69 and Covert that keeps it from going south to the Ohio River.

Commissioner Saylor: So that’s what’s causing the fact that it can’t get out because Pigeon Creek is so clogged up.

Commissioner Weisheit: Without a doubt, with IDEM and INDOT working together when they put the new bridge in around I-69 and Kentucky I’m sure they’ll solve that problem for us won’t they?

Morrie: I don’t know. If you redirect the flow, it’s going to be expensive.

**JOE GRASSMAN / NEW TRUCK:**

Steve: The last item I have is Joe, if Joe has anything to report to the Board?

Joe Grassman: Spoke to Sam, I think we’re okay with the truck.

Steve: Truck’s running.

**VANDERBURGH COUNTY DRAINAGE BOARD:**

Commissioner Weisheit: June 6th. Vanderburgh County Drainage Board. We all going to make it?

Morrie: Do you want me to go with you?

Commissioner Weisheit: I’d like for you to be there. I think it would be wise.

Steve: There’s a 3pm Commissioners meeting and their Drainage Board immediately follows that.

Commissioner Weisheit: Probably 4pm then I’d think.

Morrie: You just want to meet there commissioner? Are we on the agenda?

Commissioner Weisheit: Yes. We were invited.

Steve: So the Board knows that Representative Ron Bacon also has a great interest in this issue.

Morrie: Is he aware of the meeting?

Commissioner Weisheit: Yes. And it might not hurt to invite a few farmers.

Morrie: I don’t disagree.

Steve: That’s all the business I have, thank you.

Phil: Move to adjourn.

Commissioner Weisheit: Second.

President Johnson: All in favor? 4-0.