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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; Jason Baxter, Deputy Surveyor; Steve Sherwood, Director of Storm Water; Morrie Doll, Attorney; and Kim Lutton, Recording Secretary.

Present in the audience was Bill Bivins, Mike Whetstine, Chris Whetstine, John Kilmer and Sandra Kilmer.

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:**

President Johnson opened the meeting of June 11, 2018 with the Pledge of Allegiance.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

President Johnson: First up we have the approval of the minutes for May 29, 2018.

Commissioner Saylor: I make a motion to approve.

Commissioner Weisheit: Second.

President Johnson: All in favor? 3-0.

**THE ENCLAVE AT OAK GROVE:**

President Johnson: First up we have The Enclave at Oak Grove. Mr. Bivins.

Bill Bivins: This is a plan used development with 17 buildable lots and 1 out-lot which is retention.

Jason Baxter: Steve and I looked at this and there are several things that we have questions about that were changed from the previous plans, then left off.

Bill: The previous plans that I had designed to tie into the new location of Oak Grove. Steve requested that I go back and design into the existing road. I know that they have it all flagged out there right now.

Steve Sherwood: And we had some other issues we need to spend some time to discuss with you as well. I believe Jason has asked that the plans be continued at this point.

Jason: If you want to come Wednesday morning at the Site Review, we have a spot for you at 10:30am. We can go over them then.

Morrie Doll: And if we do, it could be continued two weeks?

Jason: Yes.

Bill: That won’t do me any good for the night.

Morrie: No. It will not, unfortunately. As you know, APC is only going to meet once a month. I don’t know what the solution is for you. You have to have the drainage plans approved, as you know, before APC can consider your plat. Because it’s just a plat. It’s not a rezone.

Bill: It is a rezone.

Morrie: It is a rezone. You’re converting it to a planned unit development.

Bill: Could it be approved, subject to the meeting and corrections?

Morrie: The Area Plan Commission hesitates to do that. As you know, they are sometimes willing to preliminary plan approval (PPA) when there needs to be changes still made to the construction plat. Which they, then, require to be done by final plat approval. Preliminary are not recorded. It’s the final plat that counts. Sometimes they have been willing to approve a rezone recommendation to the Commissioners dependent upon final plat. Maybe, if you ask, they might be willing to take action on your rezone recommendation to the Commissioners, subject to drainage approval and a final plat approval. I do not know. All I know is, you could ask. The handicap you have is, Sherri Rector has been seriously injured and is not going to be at work until the latter part of this month. So you’re going to be dealing with Molly, who is very competent and capable. And you’re only dealing with 4 Board members tonight instead of 7. So there’s no room for error here. I leave it up to you. If you’re client wants to proceed as quickly as possible, you can certainly appear and ask and we’ll see where we go. Guy is also not present tonight so you’re going to have Jeff Willis chairing the meeting.

Steve: In speaking with Bobby concerning the street plans, even though they are going to be privately maintained streets, he’s not inclined to give approval if the drainage is not in order.

Morrie: I don’t know that you’re going to get your streets approved tonight at the Commissioners meeting until you first get drainage approval, per the Highway Superintendent.

Bill: So as it stands right now, this Board will not approve subject to my approval with Jason?

Morrie: I don’t want to speak for the Board. I don’t know if they’re going to approve it.

Commissioner Weisheit: Steve, how many obstacles do you and Jason have?

Steve: We have several that have to be clarified before we’re happy with the drainage plans. More than 6. Less than 12.

Jason: Yes. I have 4 or 5 here and that isn’t all of them.

Morrie: Are they major or are they minor? Are they things that need to be done but are not of major calculations or consequences?

Jason: I’ll let Steve talk on that.

Steve: There are things that need clarification. Some may need adjusting. They may change basin sizes, pipe sizes, dependent upon rainfall intensities. Rainfall intensity came back less then what he originally proposed in the last series which would effect basin and pipe sizes. We have other detailed information like that regarding the basin. It doesn’t have an emergency overflow shown. Is it going to be a wet or dry basin? How it drains into the current Coalmine Road right-of-way is a concern because we don’t know if there’s a roadside ditch.

Morrie: So this is not something that you could approve subject to signoff on any modifications by Steve or Jason?

Commissioner Weisheit: We’re going to leave it up to their recommendation. If it’s something they think they can work out, I don’t have a problem approving it today. Is that going to be a problem, Steve, if we did today? To save Bill some time here?

Steve: It’s just a matter of getting everything back for review. You have to establish a deadline for these so they don’t drag on and on.

Bill: If I can have a meeting with him Wednesday, I’ll have everything back Friday.

Morrie: A week? Or two weeks at the latest?

Bill: A week at the latest.

Steve: You’re still going to have the issue with Bobby with the street plans at the 4pm meeting. He doesn’t want to approve them subject to the street plans unless he’ll follow the same methodology before you now.

Morrie: Do you anticipate changes in the street plans or is it just tying into the drainage plan changes?

Steve: It’s whatever changes in the drainage plan, would affect the street plans. The street plans, I think, he’s done everything we’ve asked him to do relative to the street plans. It’s the drainage plans that we have issues with.

Morrie: So it could be approved by the Board, subject to a signoff by Jason and by you within 10-days of today’s date? And that assumes, Mr. Bivins, you can respond and address their questions. They’re going to give you the questions Wednesday.

Steve: We’re going to have Site Review. We’re scheduling him to appear before us.

Morrie: Then you will be able to get back to them and they can, in writing, signoff on your changes within 10-days of today’s date. Does that work or not?

Commissioner Weisheit: That would work for me if Steve and Jason are okay with it. I’ll make that a motion as long as 10-days from today’s date everything is finalized. But nothing is to be approved until Steve and Jason signoff.

Morrie: And dirt work will commence.

Steve: There can’t be any dirt work yet. He hasn’t filed a SWPPP for the property.

Morrie: You don’t have to support it if you have questions.

President Johnson: I have a motion. Do I have a second? Mr. Bivins, I think what we need to do is, go ahead and get these drainage issues cleared up and get them approved by Steve and Jason and then we can move forward at our next meeting. I don’t think we’re in a position to approve this today.

Morrie: So the application will be tabled until the next meeting. Will that be a motion?

Commissioner Saylor: I’ll make that motion.

Commissioner Weisheit: Second.

President Johnson: All in favor? 3-0.

Bill: I wish I had been told before today that there’s something that needed to be changed.

Steve: Mr. Bivins, you submitted the plans 1-week ago today which is at the deadline. We just got to review these today. That’s why they need to be filed more than 1-week before the deadline. And this is the second review of your revised plans that we’ve gone over and I detailed information that needed to be provided but yet it was not, and what has been changed, I don’t have an explanation for. So I’ll hope we’ll cover all that Wednesday.

Bill: Okay. Thank you.

President Johnson: Thank you, Mr. Bivins.

**HICKORY HILLS / MR. WHETSTINE & MR. KILMER:**

President Johnson: Next up we have Hickory Hills / Discussion / Mr. Kilmer and Mr. Whetstine.

Mr. Whetstine: I put together some information and I wanted to talk about the Hickory Hills Subdivision and dry detention basin. I first met with Mr. Sherwood a few years back on this and now I’m kind of glad it’s coming to a head. Here are the things that I would be agreeable to:

1. Require the owners of both Lot 1 and Lot 2 to install the retention basin to the original platted specifications.

2. Any solution the Drainage Board recommends that shares the cost and location of any retention basin equally between the owners of Lot 1 and Lot 2.

3. Any solution agreement the owners of Lot 1 and Lot 2 can agree to between themselves that is also acceptable to the Drainage Board.

4. Postponing any decision or action on this retention basin issue until enough time has passed to see if any drainage complaints or drainage issues arise.

5. Postponing any decision or action until the Drainage Board Members have had the opportunity to visit the site and familiarize themselves with the issue.

(Shows pictures to the Board members)

Chris Whetstine: My name is Chris Whetstine. I was the photographer for some of these pictures. The inlet is clearly on Lot 2 by about 4-feet or so and it was supposed to run in the straight line on Lot 2. I believe it did, as Mike said, kind of curve. Maybe it wasn’t installed exactly like it was designed. We don’t know. It should run along Lot 2.

Steve: It’s not approved in the plans as a single-wall pipe. The design engineer is sitting right behind you. What was constructed is unknown because we can’t see it or get to it.

Mr. Whetstine: You can see it at the street grates.

Commissioner Saylor: I’ve not looked inside the grate. (Asks about one of the pictures)

Jason: I was there twice.

Morrie: 5/18/2018 and 6/11/2018.

Jason: Yes.

Mr. Whetstine: Was there water in it this morning?

Jason: Yes.

Morrie: Was there water on both days?

Jason: Yes. You can see the water bubbling. It’s completely full just below the grate.

Chris: We stood over the top of this grate and looked straight down and saw pipes. I don’t know what this bubble is.

Morrie: Is that a can or something floating in the water?

Jason: Yes.

Chris: That would mean that the pipe also running along the street would have to be plugged too then. Because there’s a pipe running back to the basin and a pipe running down the street.

Steve: According to the approved street plans, there’s just two inlets, the pipe in between them and then the pipe draining due west to the east. Nothing north or south.

Chris: I think if maybe we could get everybody to go over there and look because I know I saw the pipe going between the two properties and a pipe going south.

Morrie: It goes under the road and it runs west.

Commissioner Saylor: So nobody has a picture showing inside that basin?

(Board members looking at pictures)

Commissioner Saylor: So what was the bottom of that catch basin? What was the measurement?

Steve: 417. Says here that the elevation of the outlet is 408.

Morrie: So the pipe here is 408 and here the inlet is 420.4. So there’s a 12-foot drop.

Steve: It has not been field verified. It’s what is shown on the approved plans. And, again, the design engineer is in the audience if you wish to talk to him.

Commissioner Saylor: Mike, do you remember when that ditch was filled up seeing the outlets of that pipe?

Mr. Whetstine: Yes.

Commissioner Saylor: Where was that in this ditch?

(Mr. Whetstine is showing pictures and speaking to the Board away from podium. Inaudible.)

Steve: The whole point of my conversation with Mr. Whetstine when he came to the Surveyor’s office on December 16th of 2015 was to say, “you’re not to fill in the retention basin”, when he had purchased the lot at a Sheriff’s sale or whatever, means that the basin was supposed to stay and exist. And we did elude to Lot 2 had already been filled in at that time and we had not addressed it.

Morrie: Am I correct that there’s really two sources of water that flows into this detention basin? There’s two drains in the street that are supposed to flow to that pipe?

Steve: And the to the north in the backyard of Lots 1,2,3 and a portion of 4.

Morrie: Surface drainage off of 1,2,3 and a part of 4.

Steve: According to the approved drainage plans by the engineer, it shows the drainage pattern from Lot 4 going south through the backs of 3, 2, and 1 to the basin in what’s labeled a 20-foot wide drainage easement. Public utility and drainage easement. Again, the developing engineer is here if you’d like to ask him concerning his plans that were approved.

President Johnson: Mr. Kilmer do you have anything to add?

Mr. Kilmer: I don’t have any problem with filling in the basin at all. Just hold the integrity of the retaining wall.

Commissioner Saylor: Before the Whetstine’s purchased this lot, did you ever see any water in that retention basin?

Mr. Kilmer: Yes.

Morrie: Did you build your home?

Mr. Kilmer: Yes.

Mrs. Kilmer: But we did not modify anything in the backyard. Whatever approvals were made and we moved.

Morrie: So you’re saying there was not a continuation of the detention pond?

Mrs. Kilmer: No. The only thing we’ve ever done out there is put that retaining wall up so it wouldn’t wash out.

Commissioner Saylor: What happens if the basin is redone, how do we know water is going to flow from that pipe back in there?

Steve: First of all, the street inlet, with the pipe draining from it to the east or west into the basin from the inlets to the east, there’s no apparent outlet for that pipe. It’s buried as far as we can tell.

Morrie: It doesn’t appear that if you dug down and opened it up, that’s going to accomplish anything because the detention has been filled in.

President Johnson: Would that be a reason why we see so much water being held in these grates from Jason’s drawing?

Steve: That’s coming from the street inlets which collect a portion of the lots on either side of the roadway. But Lot #2 has a portion of the retention basin on it but it doesn’t appear to be as large as the part that is on Lot #1. That’s why I’d like Mr. Bivins to speak to his approved drainage plan concerning how it affects Lots 1 and 2. All we have to go by is what the approved drainage plans are on file. I know Mr. Whetstine argued that it was too large in his lot. He was directed to go back to Mr. Bivins who designed the subdivision and if it needed to be smaller, amended or approved drainage plans need to be filed. Nothing has been done to this point. I would like Mr. Bivins to address how the basin is supposed to be split between the lots.

Commissioner Saylor: Bill, can you explain to us that retention basin and the size and the design of it and how it’s supposed to work?

Bill Bivins: It went all the way across Lots 1 and 2. It was designed for…..we were having a drop inlet in there to with a perforated pipe so it would eventually be a dry basin.

Commissioner Saylor: So if that basin filled up, where’s the water going then? Was there an overflow pipe within that?

Bill: No. Just the one pipe there because it’s such a small lot.

Steve: It would collect the water at the south end of the basin and discharge through the drop structure Mr. Bivins just described and discharge in the northern Telephone Road right-of-way at a controlled rate per his design. I don’t know if Mr. Bivins visited this site after the fact for Mr. Whetstine to evaluate if the basin was built too large and could it be decrease to fit the plans. I do not know if any of that happened.

Bill: It was built wider than what we had designed.

Morrie: Do you have any idea why? Do you have any reason to believe that the dry detention basin is no longer necessary at that location?

Bill: I was under the impression at the last meeting that I was supposed to do a study of this area, which I did. And Mr. Whetstine said, no he did not want that study. I gave a copy of it to Phil. I have not been paid for it but I did do a study and made two recommendations. Number 1: that pipe going to the west from the street drain, has to be open.

Morrie: You’re talking about the grated drainage drops off of the street.

Bill: Yes. Has to be open. The option is to open that pipe up and see where it is and make a ditch and then put an outlet at .13% to control the outflow. Or just a pipe all the way to the road.

Morrie: So do away with the detention basin but install an underground drainage pipe connected to the surface drains on the street?

Bill: Yes.

Steve: Would you do away with the entire basin or reduce it in size in some type of an open ditch? What would you propose?

Bill: To benefit that lot, it would be better to put a J-box in, Steve, and put a 12-inch pipe running out of that at a .13% slope.

Steve: A 12-inch pipe, the whole length of Lot 1, north to south? And no basin whatsoever.

Bill: It’s on my study. I gave Phil a copy.

Morrie: Would that address any surface water accumulation from natural rainfall?

Bill: Yes. I had it divided up in two areas. One was the area behind their house which is very small drainage. Then the lots up the hill and on both sides.

Morrie: Do you know what your fee was for doing this study?

Bill: $570.00.

Commissioner Saylor: What’s a J-box?

Steve: It’s an inlet box or a structure for pipes to connect to or change direction or elevation. Any deviation from the approved plan on file, if all parties are wanting to hire an engineer to deviate from it and reduce that plan and Mr. Bivins is the engineer, if he’s come up with a plan that shows that the basin is either diminished or no longer necessary, those drainage plans on file need to be amended to that effect. But we need to have some plans filed for this Board to review to make a judgment on whether the basin is going to go away based upon how the property has been developed since it was originally designed and that it corroborates removal or limitations to the existing detention basin. That was the whole point of what we talked about in 2015.

Morrie: What type of calculations did you work on, Mr. Bivins?

Bill: I divided the drainage area into two parcels. One is directly behind their house into that small drain that they have. They have a 6-inch drain there. Then I took the street at the break of the hill and calculated that to see how much water was coming that direction.

Morrie: Wouldn’t it be accurate that, not only would any new pipe have to connect to the pipe running to the west from the street drains, but it would also need to pick up the Kilmer’s pipe that’s tied to their 6-inch drain in their backyard? Then it’s your contention that a 12-inch pipe from that area out, based on your calculations, would be sufficient to cover drainage of the property. And that no further dry detention would be required on Lot 1.

Bill: Yes, sir.

Morrie: Are you willing to seal that opinion?

Bill: Yes.

Morrie: What seems to be the question for the Board is, ‘if that’s true, is Mr. Whetstine, the owner of Lot 1, willing to pay Mr. Bivins for his work and willing to carry it out?’. It may be that the Kilmer’s might have to contribute something because it’s going to tie into their underground drain as well.

Mike: Mr. Bivins left the meeting thinking he was going to work for me, that I had requested that so I gave him a copy of the minutes. I left the meeting thinking that you guys were going to mail the Kilmer’s a letter and they were hiring him.

Morrie: We did mail the Kilmer’s a letter.

Mike: Mr. Bivins not being paid is a misunderstanding. I have no problem paying him or sharing the payment with the Kilmer’s.

Steve: If the Board was to consider something other than what the approved plans have on file, we need something factual that represents actual conditions and will do what the design engineer is going to submit that it will do. If the Board wants to consider that action.

Morrie: In a perfect world, it would have to be grafted, it would have to be designed and displayed on a formal process like the original drainage plans were. This is a mess that we’re trying to fix in the middle of it. It’s up to the Board. Do you want the formality of the drawing, which is better, or if Mr. Bivins certifies that he has performed the calculations and that he thinks there is not a sufficient amount of surface water to require this detention and that his recommendation with the connection to the two pipes in the 12-inch pipe to the road, will handle all the other water. And you have to decide whether you want a surface drain at the connection box or not.

Steve: And I do recognize, as Mr. Bivins will tell you, that what he designs before the project has first shovel turn, on paper looks good but it may not actually reflect what is finally built out there. These are just guidelines to go by and plans to follow and if something actually has been constructed that is different, he should have the opportunity to amend.

Morrie: And that’s really what I’m talking about is the degree of formality. If you want to entertain an amendment to the drainage plans, it’s the degree of formality and Steve and I have debated the points for you. One is a formal amendment that has all the drawings. The other is a solution that gets us to a finish line that handles the problems.

Commissioner Saylor: Mr. Bivins, can you tell me basically what lots this retention basin takes water from?

(Bill shows Commissioner Saylor from the plans)

Commissioner Saylor: So we’re not talking an extraordinary amount of water here?

Bill: No.

Steve: It appears there’s not as much water going there as what the original plans called for. It’s just that we don’t have anything on record that allows us to deviate.

Morrie: The ultimate question is whether the Drainage Board choses to amend the previously approved drainage plans………..

President Johnson: Thank you, Mr. Bivins. Mr. Kilmer, can you step back up please. Have you heard a resolution here that you can live with? Would you be willing to share in some cost of putting in a J-box and getting all the pipes connected?

Mr. Kilmer: No I wouldn’t because there was no problem until he bought the lot. As far as I’m concerned, that’s his problem. It shouldn’t be mine. I’ve lived there for 6 or 7-years and had absolutely no problem.

Morrie: Mr. Kilmer, you understand though that you’ve got a buried pipe that protrudes through that detention wall that you had installed. Is that right?

Mr. Kilmer: I put the pipe in, yes.

Morrie: And that channels water off of your lot onto your neighbor’s lot.

Mr. Kilmer: No. Well, yes. Well, actually, the retaining wall is on my property.

Morrie: I understand that but the pipe sticks beyond that onto Lot 1, right? You understand, you can’t do that.

Mr. Kilmer: I can do that.

Morrie: No. You can’t leave that pipe there to discharge surface water off your property. You cannot pipe it. The Indiana Supreme Court says we cannot channel water off of our land onto others. You have liability if you do that. So the question gets to be; do you believe that pipe serves a value to your lot? It’s hooked to a surface drain somewhere in your backyard, right?

Mr. Kilmer: The water, when we do get any, is right along this depression.

Morrie: You have a drain somewhere up here don’t you?

Mr. Kilmer: No.

Morrie: What’s on the other end of the white pipe?

Mr. Kilmer: Oh, I’m sorry. On this side of the retaining wall there’s a drain, yes.

Morrie: And the drain used to collect water and run it off underneath the detention wall?

Mr. Kilmer: Very little, yes.

Morrie: It doesn’t anymore because it’s all been filled in.

Mr. Kilmer: Right.

Morrie: You understand that if it’s excavated, that drain, your white pipe, could be tied into another drain that would run all the way to Telephone Road? I think what the Commissioner has asked you is; are you willing to pay some portion of the cost to have that water piped to Telephone road? Not all of it. Some portion of the cost. If Mr. Whetstine pays some portion, are you willing to pay some portion?

Mr. Kilmer: No.

Morrie: You’re not willing to help at all?

Mr. Kilmer: No. I’ll take the drain out of there all together.

Morrie: Well then I don’t know that you can amend the drainage plans if we don’t have a mutual solution to both parties.

Mrs. Kilmer: If we could pay a minimal amount for our little pipe there, maybe $200.00 or whatever. But if we have to get into the thousands, we are not in a position financially to do that.

President Johnson: Mr. Bivins, do you have idea what this may cost for a J-box?

Bill: I didn’t run a cost estimate.

President Johnson: Just off the top of your head. Are we talking in the thousands?

Bill: Yes.

Mrs. Kilmer: It wouldn’t help if we just took our drain back out?

Commissioner Saylor: I think what our counsel said, you’re still running water onto your neighbors.

Bill: We’re looking around $2,000.00.

Morrie: Mr. Whetstine, if in fact, the county chose to approve a modification of the drainage plans and allowed you to dig up the pipe from the street drains and tie them to Mr. Kilmer’s white pipe and then install pipe from that point across the rear of Lot #1 to discharge into the northern ditch along Telephone Road, and if Mr. Bivins is approximately right that he thinks this could be a couple thousand dollars, how much of that are you willing to pay and how much would you be asking the Kilmer’s to pay?

(Mike answers but is not at the podium so he cannot be heard on audio.)

President Johnson: So you’re saying that you would take care of the cost of putting in the…….

Morrie: Mr. Bivins, is there going to be anymore cost on your part? You’re at $570.00 today. What will it be at the end of this in your best estimation?

(Bill gives an answer but is inaudible.)

Morrie: Mr. and Mrs. Kilmer, are you willing to pay $400.00 to fix this problem?

Mr. Kilmer: No.

Morrie: Well, you modified a drainage plan, somebody has, in your backyard which could impact your ability to give clear title to your home at some future date if you sell it to a third party. This goes away if this Board is inclined to approve it. I can’t speak for the Board, I just work for the Board. These two lots are technically in non-compliance with drainage plans that have been approved by Warrick County. That means that we can force folks to dig these dry detention basins back out and you’ll have a big hole in your backyard. Or approve a modification that will solve the problem and drain these pipes because they have to be empty and we need to get this water to the street. It seems to me Mr. Whetstine is saying he’ll pay $2,400.00 of the cost to do this if you’ll pay $400.00. While you can say it helps Mr. Whetstine’s property a lot more than it helps ours, it helps both your properties no longer be in violation of the pre-existing drainage plan. If you want to think about…..

Mrs. Kilmer: Can we discuss it between ourselves and let you know?

President Johnson: We meet every two weeks.

Morrie: That’s up to the Board.

Mrs. Kilmer: We decided. We’ll go ahead with the $400.00.

Morrie: Mr. Whetstine, $2,400.00?

Mr. Whetstine: Yes.

Morrie: How long will it take you to do this? I don’t want this open-ended. I don’t want us to be worrying about this next Fall. If we agree to this, how long will it take whatever work Mr. Bivins has to do out there to stake it out and, Mr. Whetstine, for you to trench through there with a backhoe and bury a pipe and put a J-box in?

(Mr. Whetstine is inaudible.)

Morrie: So the proposal would be; Mr. Bivins would file this with Steve and the Surveyor’s office, Jason, within how long Mr. Bivins? So it’s already there. And you will stake this in what period of time for the folks to lay the pipe? Mr. Whetstine, can you expose the end of that pipe? You can dig it out so he can see it? Ok, and not cover up the Kilmer’s pipe. Well, it’s covered up too. We need to have the Kilmer’s pipe dug out. Assuming he does that in a week?

Steve: Just for clarification; Mr. Bivins, your proposal was still to run a ditch over this 12-inch pipe of some size that you stated to Mr. Baxter. Is that correct?

(Bill is inaudible.)

Morrie: What’s being discussed right now is a pipe. It’s not a ditch. We’re not dealing with mosquitos or anything else. There’s a swale in the Kilmer’s yard. Everybody agrees that we’ll have this done within a month? So is that an acceptable agreement to all the parties here? If the Drainage Board approves it, is that agreeable to everybody?

(Everyone agrees.)

Morrie: Ok. So you’ll uncover two pipes, Mr. Bivins will mark the location, and you will then cause to be installed, the 12-inch pipe, you’ll pay half of Mr. Bivins $800.00 estimated fee and all the cost of putting in the pipe and then you’re done.

Mr. Whetstine: Yes.

Morrie: And you will pay half of Mr. Bivin’s fee $400.00, and you’re done.

Mrs. Kilmer: Yes.

Morrie: And your pipe will be tied into drain. The street pipes will be tied into drain. There will be a slight swale in your backyard for surface, and the drainage is done. Is that it?

Commissioner Saylor: I make that motion.

Commissioner Weisheit: I second Dan’s motion.

President Johnson: All in favor? 3-0.

**CLAIMS:**

President Johnson: Next we have claims.

Commissioner Weisheit: Make a motion to pay the claims.

Commissioner Saylor: Second.

President Johnson: All in favor? 3-0. Steve, you’re up with Stormwater.

**DEPARTMENT OF STORMWATER**

**NEW SKID LOADER:**

Steve: I’ll be brief. I want to report to the Board that we took delivery of the new Cat 529-D skid loader on May 30th. The old skid loader has been turned over to the Highway Department. We are in the process of doing the asset management forms to recognize the new equipment and turn over the old equipment to the Highway Department.

**OLD HICKORY #5:**

Steve: Second item I have; I met with a contractor on the Old Hickory #5 basin issue that we discussed at the last meeting. I will be getting a proposal from them to do that work soon. I also asked for a separate proposal to replace the pipe down on 3400 Old Hickory that we discussed as well. As soon as I have that, I will report back to the Board and see if further estimates are necessary.

**NEW HIRE FOR STORMWATER:**

Steve: Last item I have; my Stormwater crew, I will have a member of my crew retiring at the end of the month. In the month of July we can begin, if the Board so does choose so, to advertise for a replacement. We are losing a person with a CDL license. I need for the new hire, if the Board wishes to pursue that, to also have a CDL license. It’s part of the job requirement. I only have one CDL driver and he is out on medical leave. That’s all that I have.

Morrie: So when would you advertise?

Steve: I can advertise in June through inter-department email and if we need to go further from there I’ll contact Roger. He’ll put out a flash email throughout the county and then if we need to advertise beyond that we can.

Morrie: So are you asking the Board to approve the replacement hire today?

Steve: I would just ask the Board for their permission to approve proceeding with a new hire in the month of July.

Commissioner Weisheit: Steve, how many of your guys have CDL’s?

Steve: Just Sam.

Commissioner Weisheit: Did Dave have a CDL?

Steve: Dave did. Chance is working on getting his. Tim Gore does not have his. And our street sweeper requires a CDL according to the manufacturer. That’s all that I have if the Board doesn’t have any questions.

**MOTION TO ADJOURN:**

Commissioner Saylor: I make a motion to adjourn.

Commissioner Weisheit: Second.

President Johnson: All in favor? 4-0.