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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, Bill Bivins, Tom Keith, Jim Morley Jr., Bobby Howard and Troy Reynolds.

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:**

President Johnson opened the meeting of June 12, 2017 with the Pledge of Allegiance.

**ORCHARD VIEW PUD SEC 1:**

President Johnson: Ok, first on our agenda is Orchard View PUD Sec 1; Vacation of drainage easement; Cash Waggoner.

Scott Buedel: Scott Buedel with Cash Waggoner and Associates. I’m here today to request a vacation of a variety of easements. We are currently in the process of doing Orchard View Townhouses for Brent Holweger and there are a number of existing easements that cross the property that need to either be relocated or just released in their entirety. For the Drainage Board itself there are three easements that are just strictly drainage easements. There are three easements that are drainage and underground public utility easements. And then there’s a portion of a lake maintenance easement that we’re asking to be vacated. We’ve gone through the process for the subdivision and the PUD for the overall development and that approval was contingent upon the vacation of all these easements to allow the houses and units to be constructed as we had planned.

Steve Sherwood: Just for the record, none of these easements or drainage that you’re asking for have any drainage structures or drainage swales above or below ground in them, is that correct?

Scott: Correct. There are a few of them that connect between the pond and the road that’s constructed. However, the actual pipe that’s in place that’s draining the road to the pond is not located in the easement. The easements that are in existence have no use at this time as it stands today. And then once we do our development and reroute those pipes, and put in new pipes to account for the development, they would all be platted on the new subdivision plat and then reported accordingly.

Steve: So you’re asking for this Board, at this point, just for the drainage information. There is no drainage in these easements. You’re asking to be vacated. The utility issue will be addressed at the Commissioners meeting at 4pm?

Scott: Yes.

Steve: Phil, did you have any comments?

Phil: No. I’m fine with it.

Morrie: I haven’t seen it. This is the first I’ve heard of it. I perceive this as being an engineering determination just as long as it doesn’t negatively impact the drainage of the entire subdivision.

Steve: Phil and I reviewed his package submittal. It doesn’t apply to any current drainage plans is what we determined.

Scott: And the drainage plan for the new development has already gone through the process and been reviewed and approved.

Morrie: And it has platted right-of-ways?

Scott: It will once it’s recorded.

Commissioner Weisheit: I’d make a motion vacating the easements.

Commissioner Saylor: Second.

President Johnson: Motion and Second. All in favor? 3-0.

Scott: Thank you.

**GATEWAY PLACE #1 SUBDIVISION:**

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

Bill Bivins: Bill Bivins, Engineer. This subdivision was submitted as a 3-lot subdivision which included a 350-foot street. As of last Friday, the owners asked me to do away with lot 3 and combine it all into lot 2 and do away with the street in this phase of the subdivision. Therefore, the only thing that we’ll have to do is just build the retention basin on lot 1 at this time because we’re not disturbing the rest of the ground. And I ask to be allowed to amend my plat just showing lot 1 and lot 2 being 29-acres instead of the 2-lots.

Steve: I don’t have a plat filed since he said it was just discussed Friday reflecting accurately what he’s describing. I just got the last one filed which is June 6, it shows lot 1, 2 & 3. And I believe it was the Board’s request (this has been tabled several times) was to come back with a drainage scheme for the entire…..

Morrie: If there were multiple lots they had to have the entire development in a drainage.

Bill Bivins: Now I’m just asking for approval of the drainage plan for lot 1 and we’re not disturbing the remaining property at this time.

Steve: So it’s a 1-lot subdivision?

Morrie: Well, it’s a 2-lot subdivision. It’s almost like this is an out-lot.

Bill: Basically, yes.

Morrie: But lot-2 would be a large out-lot for future development that’s not buildable at this time?

Bill: Yes.

Morrie: Will your plat denote it as not being buildable because it’s not included in the drainage plans?

Bill: Yes.

Morrie: I would guess you could approve it subject to them filing an amended Gateway Place Subdivision showing 1-lot and also denoting that the rest of the acreage is not a buildable site at this time.

Steve: Will there be drainage required for the lot?

Morrie: I don’t know that. That’s your…….

Steve: I would say, yes, under the circumstances as the previous motion. I guess if it meets what you’re saying, subject to.

Morrie: It’s an engineering question it seems to me as to whether it’s designed correctly to be able to handle the surface water off of lot 1.

Steve: We did not understand this at the time of the filing. Phil and I did not understand that request. Now they’re eliminating lot 3 out of this. And this shows a lot 3 that was submitted. He sent their request on Friday which is June 9. These were filed June 6th so it’s the Boards pleasure.

Morrie: What we have is a different notation of lots than what’s being orally represented and the question is whether you want to approve it conditionally on what you have or whether you want Mr. Bivins to bring you the right one at the next meeting in two weeks.

Bill: I just got the request Friday afternoon and if we need to do any kind of adjustments with Steve or Bobby on the drainage plans, we will do that.

Steve: He’s dropping lot 3 in his request which has to be absorbed into the new lot 2 because the acreage will increase by whatever the acreage was in lot 3. I’m assuming he can make all those adjustments. Mr. Howard, any question from you in the back of the room?

Bobby Howard: I think so.

Steve: I say he needs to make the submittal and come back in two weeks.

Morrie: Is that something you could do in that time period?

Bill: How will this affect the Area Plan meeting?

Morrie: Well, it would affect that as council for ACP. They’re going to want to know if you have drainage plans approved.

Steve: You’re saying your client changed these plans Friday, the last working day before the meeting today. That’s not really our problem that he decided to do that.

Bill: I realize that.

Morrie: Do you have the plat amended for APC?

Bill: I’ll have the plat amended for them. I haven’t given it to Sherri yet, they’re working on it right now. She said it was up to you guys as to whether we’d go forward.

Morrie: Well that’s the Board’s decision. I don’t think we’ve ever approved a drainage plan that we didn’t have the plat accurately reflected in front of us.

Steve: Our standard policy is to have everything in order one week prior to the meeting.

Morrie: And if it was a minor modification, that’s one thing, but this is eliminating one of the platted lots. That’s a pretty big change. And its partial street.

Commissioner Saylor: I just think with all the problems that we’re dealing with drainage I’d like to see it come back with the plan.

Morrie: So the motion would be to table it to the meeting two weeks from now.

Commissioner Weisheit: I’ll second that motion.

Morrie: I can’t make a motion.

Commissioner Weisheit: I took Dan’s statement as a motion.

President Johnson: Motion and a second. All in favor? 3-0.

**GATEWAY BUSINESS PARK:**

President Johnson: Next we have Gateway Business Park; Request to substitute pipes; Morley and Associates; Jim Morley Jr.

Jim Morley Jr.: Jim Morley Jr., Morley and Associates. The drainage plan for this project was originally approved 5 years ago or so. The first section was approved and now they’re getting ready to build a second section and in doing so there are some pipes, we’re going to go to plastic pipes instead of concrete pipes, that are outside the street. We kept concrete pipes underneath the roadway. They want to switch to some plastic pipes that are outside the road. Steve’s had an opportunity to review it and I think everything’s in order.

Steve: Phil and I looked at it and the pipes he’s requesting that were initially approved as concrete pipe, and they are outside the paved area that he’s requesting some minor changes from certain pipes from concrete to HDPE. His calculations prove the capacity is there. I believe he had some minor adjustments on grade.

Jim: Yes. We did a couple tweaks here and there.

Steve: But technically, because he’s changing some pipes, we thought it was an amendment to the drainage plan and he’s here for approval. I don’t believe Phil or I have any problems with what he has submitted and we would prefer they enter this in the record to modify the drainage plan accordingly. I’ll defer to Mr. Baxter if I said anything that wasn’t correct.

Phil: No. I’m fine with it.

Commissioner Saylor: So you guys are okay with it? I make a motion to amend the request to substitute the pipes from concrete to HDPE.

Commissioner Weisheit: I’ll second it.

President Johnson: All in favor? 3-0.

**ACAPULCO RESTAURANT:**

President Johnson: Next we have Acapulco Restaurant; Request to place bridge in drainage easement; Morley and Associates; Jim Morley Jr.

Jim: What you see on the front sheet (showing handout) the red area is the existing Acapulco Restaurant and as you know they’re busy which is a great thing. The purple area above it is a piece of partial property that the owner of the restaurant is going build a parking lot on there and a commercial building at some point in the future but a parking lot to start with. And the yellow line between the two is a drainage easement. There’s a ditch there. That pink line represents where they want to put a bridge that will allow people to park in that parking lot and walk over to the Acapulco restaurant. If you want a little more detail, the second page back is kind of a blow-up of that and shows that. So we’re seeking the opportunity to put a bridge across there and then right at the edge where the yellow and purple meet, right at the edge of the easement, to put in three light pole bases and a fence. Because people would look at the back of the Acapulco restaurant so they’re wanting to screen that and then those lights would then provide lighting and safety for the future parking lot.

Steve: Does the bridge need to be elevated above the top of the bank or does it have enough hydraulic capacity?

Jim: It should be fine. It’s basically up right near the finished floor of the buildings because it’s tying into the parking lot right next to the building so it’s about 6-inches below the building. But we cross the drainage easement and then there are a fence and light post right at the top-of-bank. Which I believe we submitted a Hold Harmless agreement also for approval.

Commissioner Saylor: Does that say a 45-foot bridge? By 8-feet?

Jim: Yes.

Phil: I’m good with it.

President Johnson: Mr. Sherwood?

Steve: I would ask that it be approved subject to Morrie’s review of the Hold Harmless.

Morrie: I can take a quick look at it downstairs if Phil has it on my way out today.

Steve: There’s no problem with the CORPS allowing you to cross, they’re just concerned with the work inside the ditch is that correct?

Jim: Yes. We’re staying out of the ditch.

Steve: And you say it has sufficient hydraulic capacity?

Jim: Yes.

Commissioner Weisheit: I’ll make a motion to approve as long as the Hold Harmless meets council’s approval.

Commissioner Saylor: Second.

President Johnson: All in favor? 3-0.

**LEXINGTON SUBDIVISION:**

President Johnson: Next up we have Lexington Subdivision; Replat of lots 10-24, 27 & 28, and 31-39; Andy Easley Engineering.

Tom Keith: Good afternoon. My name is Tom Keith, I’m with Andy Easley Engineering. I’m coming before you today to ask you to reapprove a drainage plan that you had approved originally back in 2005/2006-ish when you approved the subdivision of Lexington. As you know, that subdivision has had problems throughout the years. The bank has finally had to take over from the original developer. They’re cutting back the number of lots in the 22-acres that they intend to develop from 26-lots to 14-lots. We are going to install the south detention area that should’ve been installed originally. The amount of pavement that we’re installing is naturally much less than what we had originally designed for back when it was originally approved by this Board. In that standpoint, we will probably be putting less water into the existing drainage system.

Steve: And essentially the drainage system was mostly installed for this development. There is one 511-foot run of pipe and I discussed that with Mr. Baxter before it turns and goes into the basin, we probably want to ask for a midpoint structure since it is 511-feet, we’d prefer to have access somewhere in the middle. He’s correct in re-platting, as he stated here, there were interior streets that were originally platted. They basically connected three stubbed-out drives on the original development and they’re essentially putting short cul-de-sacs off of all three of those instead of the street that would intertwine and connect all three.

Tom: Absolutely.

Steve: Do you need a plat in front of you with his request or have you all had a chance to view the basic layout if you had any questions.

Morrie: Were any of the basins already built previously?

Tom: The north basin has been constructed.

Morrie: Have you any information about the depth of that basin?

Tom: No, I do not.

Morrie: The reason I’m asking is, we’re dealing with a problem in a Barrington Subdivision now where the basin isn’t nearly as deep as the plans specified.

Tom: That was a pond actually. The one on Lexington is a detention.

Morrie: The one that we’re dealing with in Halston……..

Tom: Is a pond. Is wet. Is it not?

Morrie: We were told it was dug.

Steve: What he’s describing, it is a wet detention basin. It’s not a natural pond.

Morrie: The plans specifications provided at the bottom of this detention basin was to be “x” and now it’s like 7-feet shallower than “x” which creates a real problem in that subdivision for detention and for moss and algae. So that’s a problem this Board’s facing elsewhere. And I know they’re the same developer.

Steve: There will be a new basin and your intention for this one is to be a wet or a dry basin?

Tom: Dry basin. So that way if anybody ever wants to go out there and do cross-sections on it, it’s much easier to do than a wet.

Steve: Phil and I don’t have any questions. We believe what’s being proposed is within the ordinances.

Commissioner Weisheit: I’ll make a motion to approve the replat of lots.

Commissioner Saylor: Second.

President Johnson: Motion and second. All in favor? 3-0.

**WATERFRONT AT OLD HICKORY:**

President Johnson: Waterfront at Old Hickory; Discussion of retention pond; Mr. Troy Reynolds.

Troy Reynolds: Troy Reynolds. I’m president of the Old Hickory Waterfront Lake Association.

Morrie: For the Board’s education. I asked Mr. Reynold on May 15 to be present today as I was instructed for the purpose of talking about some modifications that have occurred to two detention basins in Waterfront at Old Hickory Subdivision. How certain outlet structures were modified and cause the water levels to rise about the previously established pool elevations approved in the subdivision drainage plan and what the subdivision proposed to do to undertake to restore the detention basin to its approved condition. So there were really three questions in my letter that we asked Mr. Reynolds to come to us to talk about. How did the changes occur? What are you proposing to do about that with your basin at the present time?

Troy: If I could give you a little background. I’ve been at this job for 1-year. Apparently the individual that was on that south lake, who had been there since this subdivision started in 1994, he took care of everything. So he would tell you he had everything taken care of. Come to find out he has dementia/Alzheimer’s so what was being taken care of wasn’t being taken care of. So he would put a note in some people’s boxes and some people he didn’t. Some people paid. Some people didn’t pay. So last year when I took over it was basically, he immediately resigned because his wife said he wasn’t competent and he’s not. So here was the situation. The Lake Association owed about $4,500.00. They had a $2,000.00 bill sitting on his desk and he had zero money and zero records. There was not one record he could dig up. So my wife and I have accumulated two 3-ring binders that you can see over there. We had to go to Old National Bank, dig out 5-years of records then I had to come down here to find out who’s living there. Some people, going back in time, owed $2,500.00. Some people say they never received a bill. Some people just refused to pay. So I had to get an attorney involved. I’m current on those bills because we pay for aquatic controlling so we don’t have a lot of moss buildup and stuff. The previous dam, I know this, I moved there in 2000, it failed shortly after I moved there. And Roy Foster built that subdivision and about everything in it has failed. Then we had Jerry Aigner come in and charged $8,000.00 to fix that dam which failed in the first rain and he never came back. I don’t know who put the current dam in, there are no records. Some guy on 261. I did not know of any of these modifications because when the second dam was put in, it held. It did a pretty good job. I know from the gentleman on the west side, that the reason the backside of that dam, if you’ll look at the pictures and you see a blue utility pipe, about 3-years ago there was a water vapor on top of that spillway. Well the utility company just trenched right through it. That’s why you have the failed back half of the dam. All that being said, I went over there when I got Steve’s letter that said there’s a baffle in this emergency overflow. I had no idea. Not only was there a baffle in there, which I don’t know how it got in there, I took the two boards out myself. Then, inside of there, there was a piece of black tarp and a lot of rock. So somebody had taken the time and trouble to make that lake hold more water than it should. I’ve done what I can to get that out of the way. I had a meeting with an excavator contractor about 2-weeks ago. They weren’t interested in the job. I have a meeting on Thursday with O’Riskey because I went to North Posey with him and they’re going to come Thursday. They repaired the levy on another lake in that subdivision. So that’s on Thursday. We’ve got about $8,000.00. I have 2 people that just rent houses in there and I’ve got 2 absentee owners and I’ve got 2 people that have died. So I really don’t have the ability to go out and say “hey, pay another $2,000.00 or $3,000.00 or $4,000.00. So I apologize to everyone but a lot of the delay has been, we had to get current on our bills and then get the $8,000.00 that we have now in the bank account so we can have enough to have someone come out and fix our levee. I don’t know how much it’s going to cost and I’ve told the people around that lake that 407 is going to be the number. I don’t care what you bought the house on, it’s going to be 407. And that’s where we’re at. It’s in process. I’ve got $8,000.00. We don’t have any fountain on the north lake because we had to make the choice of no fountain running on the north lake because the south lake, we had to pay to have the dam fixed. One thing that you mentioned Steve, that this thing requires 48-inch pipe and I think 42 is in there.

Steve: Yes. The plans call for a 48-inch at the exit but it’s supposed to be 60-feet of straight-line pipe but someone installed the riser and the baffle, the concrete, the rock and basically the dam is being washed out because it is the outlet. The riser is slightly higher than the emergency overflow after whoever modified it. There’s a couple things going on. We heard at the public meeting when we were doing Oak Grove Phase 2 and consequently the upcoming Oak Grove Phase 3, that too much water comes into these lakes. Some of the residents were complaining about the potential for flooding. Well the flooding potential exists because someone has made changes to the outlet of the two lakes. So yes, the water elevation is higher than what the approved plans called for, therefore, there’s less capacity. The second issue is, the outlet structure that’s been modified which is causing it to hold more water, we don’t know how that happened. Mr. Reynolds is telling you he wants to get the pool elevation back to 407 which is what the original plans call for. Then we have a pipe across Clearview Road which was one of Mr. Reynold’s phone calls to me that the pipe is failing and I need to replace it. And in reviewing the replacing of that pipe, it’s had water halfway up in it since the mid-90’s, the corrugated metal pipe has deteriorated from being in the water for 20 some years. I’m also reporting to you, the pipe that I need to replace across Clearview Drive was set 1.2-feet too high. It will not maintain a pool elevation of 407.5. I can’t replace the pipe unless I’m told to put it back to the approved elevations in the Biggerstaff set of plans that were approved or if I replace it at the current elevation that it’s at, it’s going to drop the water elevation even more. A lot of these lots on the southern basin have modular walls and their foundations are exposed and of course when the water doesn’t move it has a very severe aroma attached with the basin as well. So we have multiple issues that need to be addressed. I can’t replace that pipe until I am told what elevation to re-establish it at. The approved plans elevation? Replace it in its current elevation which will allow for less water to be retained? Everybody out there basically built to the water elevation that was established I assume by the developer at that time. I have to put the pipe back across Clearview Drive and it was not put in at the proper elevation to begin with. It’s about 1.2-feet higher on the northern end.

Morrie: Was the outlet, the dam, put in at the proper elevation on the south end? Or is it also too high?

Steve: From what I could tell, the outlet of the emergency overflow was supposed to be put in at an elevation of 411.5 which would have given the southern basin 4 1/2 –feet of storage before it would hit the emergency overflow. The top of the overflow, now, is about 410 even. So the overflow is either been established 1.5-feet not high enough or it’s been worn down by all the overflows that have gone through.

Morrie: So reestablishing the overflow at 411.5 is not a problem? It’s going to hold more water but if he’s about to have the overflow reconstructed because it’s failing…….

Steve: But the main relief of the two basins is the baffle in the 42-inch pipe that has been rigged so that you basically have to overtop the 42-inch pipe for it to flow into that baffle that you see.

Morrie: And the 42-inch pipe is higher than the overflow.

Steve: Right now the baffle’s been modified and the water is leaking around the side so the southern basin is dropping more than the northern basin because it’s leaking into the pipe as it was supposed to. But the baffle has not been removed. There’s no guarantee this can’t be put back in and the water level raised back up after I replace the pipe. So there’s a couple issues at hand; where do I put the pipe back to according to the approved plan? And then the outfall of the basin needs to go back in to maintain a pool elevation of 407 which someone’s modified and raised it up 3 to 4-feet.

Commissioner Saylor: Would you go back in with metal?

Steve: They would be plastic pipe. 100-feet with concrete headwall sections. And I can’t order those two inlets you see in the street until I know what that depth has to be.

Morrie: If we approve something other than as originally designed and approved, don’t we have the same problem we did with Halston where you’re going to really need to have the homeowners bring us………if the homeowners come forward and say “please let us keep a higher pool”?

Commissioner Saylor: What’s the original? 410?

Steve: 407 on the southern basin. 407.5 on the northern basin. It’s clearly stated on the plat. I believe Mr. Howard’s and my goal, like Halston, is to get the drainage structures to drain and be dry.

Morrie: Because currently they’re not.

Steve: They were not. Since the basin was modified on or about the end of February or early March, the water has gone down in basin #2 or the southern basin.

Morrie: And that’s why we can see the rust.

Steve: You can see the pipe is rusted out and the bottom is gone.

Troy: I’m no detective. I’m pretty sure I know who put that baffle in and then that tarp and way too many rocks put in on both sides of the tarp. I was one of those that went up to the school saying we’ve got a real flood problem because of what you’re doing up on Coalmine Road. Our lake, the north lake which is just a culvert, it would get really high and flow over the road.

Morrie: Without engineering it’s difficult to approve a modification different than ‘as approved’. That’s the problem we’re having with Halston. It’s the same kind of problem. So you’d have to have engineering that would say it will do its functional intended purpose at some other higher elevation besides 407 or 407.5. This is like a 3-foot deviation. If the county goes in and repairs the pipe under Clearview Drive and puts it in at the right elevation, that’s going to lower the north pool even more. Isn’t it?

Steve: Correct. 1.2-feet.

Troy: Is the pipe underneath the road too high?

Steve: Yes. The pool elevation is supposed to be 407.5 in the northern basin. The bottom of the pipe was shot by me in April and it had 408.7. So a difference of 1.2-feet.

Morrie: So now that you’ve heard this information, if the Homeowners Association wants to ask the Board, I guess it could ask the Board for additional time to go back and ponder this and see if they want to make a proposal. Or if they intend to just restore the dam to the designed and approved height with the understanding then we would reinstall the culvert at the approved depth and there is going to be some pool height modification as a consequence of that.

Commissioner Saylor: So what’s going to happen to those people that have those retaining walls and those foundations exposed?

Steve: They’ll be further exposed.

Troy: There are some on the south lake that are already exposed fully.

Steve: And I can’t tell you what the depth of the lake is at its current elevation. No idea. I don’t know if anyone’s gone out on a boat and measured it?

Troy: On the south lake?

Steve: In either basin.

Troy: Usually the south one is 12-feet and the north one is 9-feet deep.

Steve: So the north basin sounds like it would have 6 or 7-feet and the other one would have a little bit more.

Morrie: Is this information of assistance to you?

Troy: Yes.

Morrie: Would you need additional time to make suggestions to the Board as to what you might do?

Troy: Yes. I need to go back to all the folks around the lake. There’s 20 of them and they’re either going to have to pony up the money to pay for an engineering report to make a proposal to the Board that they can have altered levels of lake or we’re going to go to the original plat.

Morrie: One of the things you need to understand that’s been a big concern of the Board previously has been standing water in the drain structures. When you back the lakes up that stores water in these pipes and it isn’t just a wintertime problem of freeze and thaw but it’s a deterioration problem as well. As you see from the rusting of the pipe under Clearview, there is a more rapid deterioration of the drainage structures if there’s standing water. That’s why the county cares.

Troy: Sure. I understand completely. I’ve been working on and I know we have to fix this problem but I didn’t know we had a problem on the north lake. Steve, did you shoot the lower level of the horizontal pipe on the south lake? How high is it?

Steve: Yes. The invert, or bottom of the pipe at the north end, I said it was 408.7. The invert elevation of the 36-inch at the south end was 407.5. So I had about a 1.2-foot drop.

Troy: And then on the dam itself where you’ve got the horizontal pipe, the lower level, that 42-inch pipe, what’s the number there that it’s at?

Steve: The 42-inch pipe is 406.5 which is what the outlet was, I believe, called for on the drain.

Morrie: How much time would you need to talk to the homeowners and report back to the Board, if the Board would entertain that, how much time would you need?

Troy: Well I’m going to see the contractor on Thursday that I think would be able to give me an estimate on getting the baffle out and getting that dam in order and then I’ll have to go to the homeowners individually because a lot of them that own the homes don’t live there. They’re renting them. Two of them are impossible to get ahold of. They’re Indian so they’re here and then they’re not in the United States.

Steve: And the invert on the incoming pipe again was 408.7, I want to make a correction of outlet of that same pipe on the south side was 407.9 so there’s 9/10’s of a foot difference between……..

Morrie: It was supposed to be 407 even according to the plans.

Steve: It’s high by 9/10 on the south side. It’s high by 1.2-feet on the north side.

Morrie: So just to be clear, that pipe underneath Clearview, the inlet will be lowered 1.2-feet if you bring it into specifications and the outlet would be lowered 9/10 of a foot.

Steve: Correct.

Troy: What would be your expectation? Because their decision tree is, if we don’t come with an engineering report and maybe the lakes can be at 408.7. I don’t know. That’s going to cost money or we’re going to have to put a lot of rip rap.

Morrie: It would be Warrick County’s expectation that it be held in conformity with the approved drainage plans. We don’t have the authority to approve anything different than that unless you can demonstrate engineering wise that it can accomplish the same purpose without that happening. In other words, you can keep a higher pool without damaging the drainage structures and it still performs the same function. We have had this problem elsewhere and other subdivisions have elected to hire engineers to see if that can be done. That’s your decision.

Steve: I can’t do anything with the structure at Clearview until the decision has been made.

Morrie: It’s a step 1, step 2.

Troy: I understand. So what time frame do you guys usually expect? 30-days?

Morrie: It’s up to you.

Commissioner Weisheit: Steve, is 30-days adequate for you?

Steve: By the time he goes back and talks to everybody and if they decide to get an engineer, they may need 60-days.

Morrie: That would put you to the first meeting in August. Do you think that’s enough time Mr. Reynolds?

Troy: I think that’s a reasonable expectation because it gives me………everybody works on a deadline so if I tell the homeowners I have a deadline here it makes people do things.

Steve: That still leaves me enough time to replace the structure across Clearview in this construction season provided we don’t get too much later in August.

Morrie: And that would be August 14th at 2:30pm, Mr. Reynold.

Troy: Ok. Yes. Let me come back and then I can report to you what we found out and what we haven’t found out.

Morrie: Based upon Mr. Reynold’s request, the appropriate thing would be a motion to table this until that meeting on August 14th. If it’s the will of the Board.

Commissioner Saylor: I make a motion to table this until the August 14th meeting.

Commissioner Weisheit: Second.

President Johnson: All in favor? 3-0.

**CLAIMS:**

President Johnson: Next up we have claims. Have a total of $311.11.

Commissioner Saylor: I make a motion to pay the claims.

Commissioner Weisheit: Second.

President Johnson: All in favor? 3-0.

**JOINT DRAINAGE BOARD MEMBERS:**

Morrie: On other business, does anyone want to make a motion to appoint members to the joint Warrick/Vanderburgh Drainage Board? Somebody probably should make a record about the meeting we had last week and if it’s the will of this Board to appoint two members to that joint Drainage Board.

Commissioner Weisheit: I thought the meeting went really well last week and at least made some steps forward and acknowledged a problem that we have. And it’s been going on forever. In fact, Jason handed me something he found in 1972 that we sent on to Representative Bacon that Mike Phillips was working on back in ’72. So this is something that’s been going on for 40-years. We do need to keep that meeting going and try to be active. I’d actually like to see somebody that’s going to be, hopefully, in office longer than me sit on that Board. Because it’s going to be a long process to get something done. If one of these commissioners would like to sit on there with Phil or whoever Phil chooses. We need two from our county.

Morrie: And Phil is, because we have the larger amount of miles of drainage, Phil would be the assigned county surveyor to the project.

President Johnson: When are these meetings, Phil?

Morrie: The first one has been set for……..

Phil: Tentatively for the 20th of July.

Morrie: I think that’s right. At 2pm in Vanderburgh County. There is no other date beyond that date. They’re trying to see if they can get a concept, maybe they can try to get some funding etc. Two members from Warrick.

President Johnson: I’ll go.

Commissioner Weisheit: As President of our Drainage Board, that would be good. I don’t think they’ll meet that often but I do think we need to have a meeting and encourage Bacon and he seems encouraged on working with us to try to get something through the state.

President Johnson: What was the date on that again?

Commissioner Saylor: July 20th.

Morrie: At 2pm. Vanderburgh County Commissioners Meeting room.

Commissioner Weisheit: That’s #301 there.

Morrie: That’s one member. Who else would be appointed?

Commissioner Weisheit: I still say Phil is the man or someone from his office or whoever he decides to appoint to take his place but that’s my feeling. That’s who they acted like they wanted on the Board.

Morrie: Phil will be involved.

Commissioner Weisheit: Jeff did a good job explaining the whole process. He really did have a lot of history there together.

Morrie: It gives us three voices if we appoint two plus Phil.

Commissioner Weisheit: I thought they just wanted 5 on the Board.

Morrie: They do. Two members but Phil is an ex officio member by virtue of being the Warrick County Surveyor which means he’s going to be at every meeting speaking on behalf of Warrick County’s interest.

Steve: Phil will be there, two from Vanderburgh, two from Warrick and one from Gibson was what they discussed.

Morrie: So the question is, do you want to give up one mouthpiece representing Warrick County if Phil wears both hats?

Commissioner Weisheit: Steve, do you think you ought to be involved with these meetings as an engineer?

Steve: I’ll probably be there regardless.

Commissioner Weisheit: Would it be helpful if we appointed him to be on that Board?

Morrie: That’s up to the Board.

Commissioner Weisheit: I would nominate Steve Sherwood then if we need to do this by formal motion.

Morrie: And Commissioner Johnson.

Commissioner Weisheit: And Commissioner Johnson. And then of course the surveyor, Mr. Baxter.

Morrie: Will be there.

Commissioner Saylor: Second.

President Johnson: All in favor? 3-0.

**HALSTON MANOR:**

Steve: The last other business I have for Drainage Board is Halston Manor asked to return at the July 10th meeting instead of the second meeting in June. Just want to make sure that’s okay with the Board.

Morrie: So it’d be a motion to move that off of that calendar date and move it to July 10th.

Commissioner Weisheit: I’d make that motion.

Commissioner Saylor: Second.

President Johnson: All in favor? 3-0.

**DEPARTMENT OF STORM WATER**

**SQUIRE ESTATES:**

President Johnson: Steve, you want to take over?

Steve: Thank you, Mr. President. The only information I have; this morning we had a pre-construction meeting with Aigner Construction on the Squire Estates Drainage Improvement Project. They should be beginning this week. Joe, you have anything for the Board?

Joe Grassman: No.

Steve: That’s all the business I have.

**MOTION TO ADJOURN:**

President Johnson: Anything else by anybody? I’d entertain a motion.

Phil: Motion to adjourn.

Commissioner Saylor: Second.

President Johnson: All in favor? 4-0.