The meeting was called to order Monday January 28, 2019 at 9:01 a.m.

The members of the Board present were Ms. Christine Altman-President and Mr. Mark Heirbrandt-Vice President and Mr. Jerry Rulon-Alternate Member. Also present was the Hamilton County Surveyor and members of his staff: Mr. Steve Baitz, Mr. Gary Duncan, Mr. Andy Conover, Mr. Greg Hoyes, Mr. Jerry Liston, Mr. Steve Cash, Ms. Suzanne Mills and Mr. Reuben Arvin. The Board’s attorney, Mr. Michael Howard, was also present.

**Cool Creek Drain – Springmill Villas Arm:**

There were neither landowners present nor objections on file.

The Surveyor presented his report to the Board for approval.

“November 28, 2018

To: Hamilton County Drainage Board

Re: Cool Creek Drain, Springmill Villas Arm

Attached is a petition filed by Springmill Villas Developer, LLC, along with a non-enforcement request, plans, calculations, quantity summary and assessment roll for the Springmill Villas Arm, Little Eagle Creek Drain to be located in Washington Township. I have reviewed the submittals and petition and have found each to be in proper form.

I have made a personal inspection of the land described in the petition. Upon doing so, I believe that the drain is practicable, will improve the public health, benefit a public highway, and be of public utility and that the costs, damages and expenses of the proposed drain will probably be less than the benefits accruing to the owners of land likely to be benefited. The drain will consist of the following:

- 12" RCP 866 ft.
- 15" RCP 876 ft.
- 18" RCP 378 ft.
- 21" RCP 402 ft.
- 24" RCP 55 ft.
- 6" SSD 1,683 ft.

The total length of the new storm sewer listed above will be 5,259 feet.

**E.M. Osborn Arm**

The E.M. Osborn Arm is being replaced with the storm sewer system being installed with Springmill Villas. The drain will be replaced from Sta. 47+70, which is the connection to Str. 48 in Quail Ridge Section 4, to Sta. 38+40, which is the location of new manhole 833 of the Springmill Villas plans by Stoeppelwerth and Associates, having job number 50690PLA-MF. This will remove 930 feet from the E.M. Osborn Arm of the Anna Kendall Arm of the Cool Creek Regulated Drain. The property north of Springmill Villas is owned by a large retail chain and is planned to be development in the next few years, which will replace the rest of the original tile on the south side of State Road 32.

**E.M. Osborn - Arm 4**

A breather will be set on the existing 10" tile at Sta. 2+45 and the tile removed running north and west in Common Area #2 to Sta. 0+00. The drainage from area will be picked up with the storm sewer system and the footage listed above. This will remove 245 feet from the E.M. Osborn Arm of the Anna Kendall Arm of the Cool Creek Regulated Drain.

The total change to the Cool Creek Regulated Drain is a net increase of 4,084 feet.

The retention ponds (Lake #1 and Lake #2) located in Common Area #2 are not to be considered part of the regulated drain. Pond maintenance assumed by the Drainage Board shall only include the inlets and outlet as part of the regulated drain. The maintenance of the retention ponds (lakes) such as sediment removal and erosion control along the banks, mowing and aquatic vegetation maintenance and control will be the responsibility of the Homeowners Association. The Board will retain jurisdiction for ensuring the storage volume for which the pond was designed will be retained. Thereby, allowing no fill or easement encroachments.
The subsurface drains (SSD) to be part of the regulated drain are those main lines located in rear yards and common areas. The SSDs in the street will not be part of the regulated drain due to street trees and the Hamilton County Drainage Board discussion on July 9, 2018, (see Hamilton County Drainage Board Minute Book 18, Pages 204 to 206). The street SSD will be the maintenance responsibility of the City of Westfield. Only the main SSD lines which are located within the easement are to be maintained as regulated drain. Laterals for individual lots will not be considered part of the regulated drain. The portion of the SSD which will be regulated are as follows:

Rear Yard SSDs:
- Rear yard lots 7A/B to 9A/B from Str. 808 running north to riser
- Rear yard lots 10A/B to 11A/B from Str. 808 to Str. 817A
- Rear yard lots 12A/B from Str. 817A running south to riser
- Rear yard lots 13A/B to 14A/B from riser running west to riser
- Rear yard lots 15A/B to 16A/B from Str. 819 running south to riser
- Rear yard lots 17A/B to 18A/B riser running east to riser
- Rear yard lots 15A/B to 16A/B from Str. 820A running north to riser
- Rear yard lots 19A/B to 20A/B from Str. 820A running north to riser

I have reviewed the plans and believe the drain will benefit each lot equally. Therefore, I recommend each lot be assessed equally. I also believe that no damages will result to landowners by the construction of this drain. I recommend a maintenance assessment of $65.00 per platted lot, $15.00 per acre for common areas, with a $65.00 minimum, and $10.00 per acre for roadways. I recommend the commercial, institutional and multi-family residential tracts be set at $35.00 per acre, with a $75.00 minimum. With this assessment the total annual assessment for this drain will be $6,607.70.

In accordance with IC 36-7-3-709, the petitioner did not submit surety for the proposed drain prior to construction commencing. If the petitioner/developer wants to submit final secondary plat for recording prior to the final inspection and approved as-built drawings, a bond will be required at that time.

I believe this proposed drain meets the requirements for Urban Drain Classification as set out in IC 36-9-27-67 to 69. Therefore, this drain shall be designated as an Urban Drain.

I recommend that upon approval of the above proposed drain that the Board also approve the attached non-enforcement requests. The request will be for the reduction of the regulated drain easement to those easement widths as shown on the secondary plat for Springmill Villas as recorded in the office of the Hamilton County Recorder.

I recommend the Board set a hearing for this proposed drain for January 28, 2019.
Little Eagle Creek Drain – Springmill Villas Arm:

There were neither landowners present nor objections on file.

The Surveyor presented his report to the Board for approval.

"November 28, 2018

To: Hamilton County Drainage Board
Re: Little Eagle Creek Drain, Springmill Villas Arm

Attached is a petition filed by Springmill Villas Developer, LLC, along with a non-enforcement request, plans, calculations, quantity summary and assessment roll for the Springmill Villas Arm, Little Eagle Creek Drain to be located in Washington Township. I have reviewed the submittals and petition and have found each to be in proper form.

I have made a personal inspection of the land described in the petition. Upon doing so, I believe that the drain is practicable, will improve the public health, benefit a public highway, and be of public utility and that the costs, damages and expenses of the proposed drain will probably be less than the benefits accruing to the owners of land likely to be benefited. The drain will consist of the following:

21" RCP 723 ft.
6" SSD 41 ft.
27" RCP 231 ft.

The total length of the drain will be 995 feet.

The pipe and SSD above are for excess flow that is not accommodated by the E.M. Osborn Arm of Cool Creek and breaks watersheds into Little Eagle Creek. This is to mimic the existing condition prior to development and as per the approved model used for the current FIRM panels. The details for this watershed configuration are as outline in the Anna Kendall Regulated Drain Moratorium Area Drainage Report, prepared by Stoeppelwerth and Associated for Platinum Properties, LLC, dated December 20, 2015 and having last revision date on May 3, 2016. This report and lifting the E.M. Osborn Moratorium was approved by the Drainage Board on June 13, 2016 (DB Book 16, pages 580 and 581).

The retention ponds (Lake #2) located in Common Area #2 are not to be considered part of the regulated drain. Pond maintenance assumed by the Drainage Board shall only include the inlets and outlet as part of the regulated drain. The maintenance of the retention ponds (lakes) such as sediment removal and erosion control along the banks, mowing and aquatic vegetation maintenance and control will be the responsibility of the Homeowners Association. The Board will retain jurisdiction for ensuring the storage volume for which the pond was designed will be retained. Thereby, allowing no fill or easement encroachments.

The subsurface drains (SSD) to be part of the regulated drain are those main lines located in common areas. Only the main SSD lines which are located within the easement are to be maintained as regulated drain. The portion of the SSD which will be regulated in Common Area A of Quail Ridge Section 4 and runs northeast from Structure 836.

In accordance with IC 36-7-4-709, the petitioner did not submit surety for the proposed drain prior to construction commencing. If the petitioner/developer wants to submit final secondary plat for recording prior to the final inspection and approved as-built drawings, a bond will be required at that time.

I believe this proposed drain meets the requirements for Urban Drain Classification as set out in IC 36-9-27-67 to 69. Therefore, this drain shall be designated as an Urban Drain.
The off-site easement for this project will cross parcel number 09-09-02-00-09-024.000, owned by Quail Ridge/Pine Ridge Homeowner’s Association, Inc. The easement shall be the existing easement as shown on the secondary plat for Quail Ridge Section 4 recorded as instrument number 990921162 in the office of the Hamilton County Recorder. Also, the off-site easement for this project will cross parcel number 09-09-02-00-31-001.000, owned by Countryside Homeowner’s Association, Inc. The easement shall be the existing easement as shown on the secondary plat for Countryside Blocks “A”-“F” recorded as instrument number 200600055012 in the office of the Hamilton County Recorder.

I recommend that upon approval of the above proposed drain that the Board also approve the attached non-enforcement requests. The request will be for the reduction of the regulated drain easement to those easement widths as shown on the secondary plat for Springmill Villas as recorded in the office of the Hamilton County Recorder.

I recommend the Board set a hearing for this proposed drain for January 28, 2019.

Kenton C. Ward, CFM
Hamilton County Surveyor

KCW/pll

Altman opened the public hearing; seeing no one present Altman closed the public hearing.

Heirbrandt made the motion to approve the Surveyor’s report along with a non-enforcement request for Springmill Villas, seconded by Rulon.

Altman stated one item I would note is that this will go through an existing subdivision drain. Did the developer develop both of these? Do we know?

Hoyes stated same developer, yes.

Altman asked if anyone examined that easement to assure that; is this regulated in terms of the private easement currently, that they’re borrowing?

Hoyes stated they’re within an existing regulated drain easement.

Altman stated so it is regulated so we’re assured that they will accept this water.

The Surveyor stated yes, it’s part of the E. M. Osborn Drain.

Altman stated okay, I wanted to make sure there was no issue of the subdivision complaining halfway through the project.

The motion had been made and seconded to approve the Surveyor’s report along with a non-enforcement request for Springmill Villas and approved unanimously.

"FINDINGS AND ORDER"

CONCERNING THE MAINTENANCE OF THE
Little Eagle Creek Drain, Springmill Villas Arm

On this 28th day of January, 2019, the Hamilton County Drainage Board has held a hearing on the Maintenance Report and Schedule of Assessments of the Little Creek Drain, Springmill Villas Arm.

Evidence has been heard. Objections were presented and considered. The Board then adopted the original/amended Schedule of Assessments. The Board now finds that the annual maintenance assessment will be less than the benefits to the landowners and issues this order declaring that this Maintenance Fund be established.

HAMILTON COUNTY DRAINAGE BOARD

Christine Altman
President

Mark Heirbrandt
Member

Jerry Rulon
Alternate Member

Attest: Lynette Mosbaugh
Executive Secretary

Hamilton County Drainage Board
January 28, 2019
Thistlewaite Drain – California Street Arm Extension:

There were neither landowners present nor objections on file.

Duncan presented his report to the Board for approval.

“October 3, 2018

To: Hamilton County Drainage Board

Re: Thistlethwaite Drain - California Street Arm Extension

Attached is a drain map and petition for the re-construction of a portion of the California Street Arm of the Thistlethwaite Regulated Drain in the Town of Sheridan. The portion of the regulated drain to be reconstructed is located in Adams Township, Section 31, Township 20 North, Range 3 East. For purposes of this Report, the California Street Arm of the Thistlethwaite Drain shall be referred to as the "Drain".

History

The history of the Thistlethwaite Drain is described in detail in two Surveyors Reports to the Drainage Board. The first report is dated January 12, 1987 and was presented to the Drainage Board at the meeting of March 9, 1987 (see Hamilton County Drainage Board Minutes Book 2, pages 198-199). The second report is dated August 1, 1996 and was presented to the Drainage Board at the meeting of August 12, 1996 (see Hamilton County Drainage Board Minutes Book 4, page 272).

The Drain is described in a Surveyors Report dated December 21, 2000 presented to the Drainage Board at the meeting of January 22, 2001. The construction of the Drain was part of the Thistlethwaite East Leg Construction project. The Surveyors Report states that the Drain starts at the proposed Seventh Street Arm and runs north 356-feet to 6th Street (see Hamilton County Drainage Board Minutes Book 5, pages 547-549). The Drain was approved for construction and classified as an Urban Drain at hearing on January 22, 2001 (see Hamilton County Drainage Board Minutes Book 5, pages 549-550). A final report dated December 9, 2002 was presented to the Drainage Board at the meeting of December 9, 2002 where the Drain was accepted (see Hamilton County Drainage Board Minutes Book 6, pages 504-516).

The Drain was placed on maintenance at hearing during the meeting of September 23, 1996 (see Hamilton County Drainage Board Minutes Book 4, page 297A-297G).

The Town of Sheridan petitioned the Drainage Board for an extension of the Drain at the meeting of July 25, 2016 (see Hamilton County Drainage Board Minutes Book 17, page 52).

The Surveyors Office prepared construction plans for the extension of the Drain and reviewed these plans with the Town of Sheridan on July 18, 2018.

Existing Conditions

The current non-regulated drainage facilities in the area consist of the following: (1) An existing manhole structure at the intersection of 5th Street and California Street that has four, 8-inch inlet pipes and a single, 8-inch outlet pipe draining the structure; (2) An existing manhole structure at the intersection of 6th Street and California Street that has a 12" inlet pipe and a 12" outlet pipe.

When the 8" outlet pipe of the existing manhole structure at 5th Street and California Street reaches capacity, storm water fills the manhole structure and then surcharges out of the structure. This surcharge can result in flooding of the intersection of 5th Street and California Street. A drainage investigation on September 9, 2018 observed water surcharging from this manhole structure.

Upon completion of the project, these existing non-regulated drain facilities will outlet to the California Street Arm. The regulated drain outlet for these facilities is Structure 72. Downstream of Structure 72, the regulated drain consists of 327-feet of 21" RCP pipe.

Project Description

The project begins at existing Structure 72 and will extend the existing Drain along the west side of California Street between 6th Street and 5th Street. The project includes the installation of 376.42-feet of 18" RCP; 12-feet of 15" RCP; 39.72-feet of 12" RCP; 4, 48" diameter manholes with castings; 1, 72" diameter manhole with casting; 2, 2'x3' box inlet structures with top, casting, and concrete collar; and 3, 2'x2' box inlet structures with casting, and concrete collar. The project also includes incidental/ancillary construction including, but not limited to, pavement, curb, walk and drive demolition; removal of two trees; replacement pavement, curb walk and drive; and erosion and sediment control.
The intent of the design is to provide an additional drainage outlet for the storm water entering the Town of Sheridan manhole structure at the intersection of 5th Street and California Street and reduce the frequency of storm water surcharging out of this manhole structure. The slope and size of the proposed tile was governed by existing invert elevations, the size of the existing regulated drain tile downstream of Structure 72 and reasonable/minimal cover over the tile. The largest size tile considering these restraints was an 18-inch tile.

The project begins at manhole structure 72 of the existing Drain at the southwest corner of the intersection of 6th Street and California Street. The existing regulated drain manhole structure at this location will be removed and replaced by the proposed manhole Structure 601. Structure 601 is a 48” diameter manhole. All existing tiles will be reconnected to the new manhole structure.

The drain then continues as 12.98-feet of 18” RCP to Structure 602, a 48” diameter manhole. The existing Town of Sheridan manhole structure at this location will be removed and replaced by the proposed manhole Structure 602. All existing tiles will be reconnected to the new manhole structure.

The drain then continues as 14.73-feet of 18” RCP to Structure 603, a 2’x3’ box inlet structure.

The drain then continues as 174.24-feet of 18” RCP to Structure 604, a 48” diameter manhole.

The drain then continues as 135.56-feet of 18” RCP to Structure 606, a 2’x3’ box inlet structure.

The drain then continues as 12.04-feet of 18” RCP to Structure 607, a 72” diameter manhole. The existing Town of Sheridan manhole structure at this location will be removed and replaced by the proposed manhole Structure 607. All existing tiles will be reconnected to the new manhole structure.

The drain then continues as 12.73-feet of 18” RCP to Structure 608, a 48” diameter manhole. This manhole structure will intercept an existing 8-inch tile that drains from the north into the existing Town of Sheridan manhole structure being replaced by Structure 607.

The drain then continues as 8.14-feet of 18” RCP to Structure 609, a 2’x2’ box inlet structure.

The drain will also include two lateral tiles. Structure 605 is located on the west side of California Street approximately halfway between 6th Street and 5th Street. Structure 605 is a 2’x2’ box inlet structure that drains to Structure 604 through 8.29-feet of 12” RCP. Structure 610 is located on the east side of the intersection of 5th Street and California Street. Structure 610 is a 2’x2’ box inlet structure that drains to Structure 607 through 25.43-feet of 12” RCP.

Also included in the drain is ancillary connections to the new manhole structures. These connections replace short sections of the existing tiles that are connected to existing Town of Sheridan manhole structures. These connections include 2, 6-foot section of 15” RCP at Structure 602; 6-feet of 18” RCP at Structure 608; and 6-feet of 12” RCP at Structure 610.

**Easements**

The new drain will be constructed in existing right-of-way. A regulated drain easement will be created for the extension and will be the same as the existing road right-of-way easement.

**Permits**

No permits from Federal or State Agencies are required for this project.

**Project Cost**

The estimated cost of the project is outlined below. Survey, Design and Construction Plan production was completed by staff from the Hamilton County Surveyor’s Office. Inspection, construction staking and As-Built drawings will also be completed by staff from the Hamilton County Surveyor’s Office. As such, there are not costs for these services in the itemized project cost below.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Unit Cost</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Demolish existing tile</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>$65.00</td>
<td>$2,600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Disposal of Excess Soil Material</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
<td>$8,200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Existing Manhole Removal</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
<td>$3,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Pavement demolition (Pavement, curb, walk, drive)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Tree Removal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$1,600.00</td>
<td>$3,200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Coir Log</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
<td>$3,100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Inlet Protection</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$200.00</td>
<td>$600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Seeding</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>SYS</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td>$708.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Topsoil</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
<td>$2,400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Maintenance of Traffic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$4,900.00</td>
<td>$4,900.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Sign removal</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
<td>$600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Sign replacement</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Temporary Signage</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
<td>$600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>3-foot Sidewalk</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>SYS</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
<td>$8,900.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>ADA Tactile Warning</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>SYS</td>
<td>$200.00</td>
<td>$666.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Concrete Curb, Straight</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>$30.00</td>
<td>$1,440.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Concrete Drive Repair</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$1,250.00</td>
<td>$1,250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>HMA Road Repair</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$3,750.00</td>
<td>$3,750.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Wall Driveway</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>TON</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
<td>$1,666.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>12&quot; RCP with Granular Backfill (0-5' Deep)</td>
<td>39.72</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>$90.00</td>
<td>$3,574.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>15&quot; RCP with Granular Backfill (0-5' Deep)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>$108.00</td>
<td>$1,296.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>18&quot; RCP with Granular Backfill (0-5' Deep)</td>
<td>376.42</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>$128.00</td>
<td>$47,488.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>2'x2' Concrete Box with casting and concrete collar</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$3,000.00</td>
<td>$9,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>2'x3' Concrete Box with casting and concrete collar</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$4,500.00</td>
<td>$9,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>48&quot; Manholes with casting</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$5,500.00</td>
<td>$22,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>72&quot; Manholes with casting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Sanitary Lateral Restoration</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
<td>$4,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subtotal $153,980.22
15% Contingency $23,097.03

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Engineering</th>
<th>Survey</th>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>Staking</th>
<th>As-Buils</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Cost $177,077.25

Project Funding

Presently, the maintenance fund balance for the Thistlethwaite Drain is $185,325.60. Per IC 36-9-27-45.5 the Board may utilize 75% of this fund for the work which would be $138,994.20. I recommend that the remaining balance of $38,030.05 be taken out of the General Drain Improvement Fund and paid back from the increased drainage assessments as outlined below at a rate of $19,041.53 per year over the next two years assessments beginning in 2019. This approach would negate the need for a reconstruction assessment on the residents within the Thistlethwaite Drain Shed for this project.

I believe no damages will result to the landowners. Damages are set at zero (0).

Changes to the Drain

The Drain currently consists of 391-LF of 15" and 21" RCP tiles. The project will install 376.42-feet of 18" RCP tile, 12-feet of 15" RCP tile and 39.72-feet of 12" RCP tile. The total length of the extension is 428.14-feet.

One manhole structure installed in 2001/2002 will be removed and replaced.

The new extension shall become part of the Drain.
Maintenance of Drain

The maintenance rates for the entire drainage shed were increased at hearing during the September 24, 2018 meeting of the Drainage Board. These new rates increased the annual assessment from $26,660.02 to $31,539.02.

I recommend that the Board set a hearing for this proposal for January 28, 2019.

Sincerely,

Gary R. Duncan, Jr., P.E.
Hamilton County Surveyor’s Office

Duncan stated we wanted a true picture of the costs so we requested that the Board receive bids for this project so we could actually see and have real numbers. At the January 14th meeting this year we received two bids for this project, one from Millennium Contractors for $192,568.90 and another from Morphey Construction for $196,000.00. The construction estimate was $177,077.25. These bids exceed the estimate which we thought was going to be high initially. I still think the bidding environment might be less than favorable. However, the current maintenance fund balance for the Thistlewaite Drain is $196,000.00. The Board may utilize 75% of this fund for work which would amount to $147,000.00 leaving a balance of $45,568.90. As we had originally proposed in the report dated October 3, 2018 we recommend that the project be awarded and that the balance be taken out of the General Drain Fund and paid back from increased drainage assessments at a rate of $23,661.00 and that would be paid back in two years at no cost to the Town of Sheridan.

Howard asked the new drainage assessments are our reconstruction assessment?

Duncan stated no, they’re based on the increased maintenance rates.

The Surveyor stated we had an increase of maintenance in September and the original report done in October didn’t reflect December’s settlement.

Altman asked we’re not increasing anything we’re just paying out of the maintenance fund?

Duncan stated correct.

Howard stated and it’s got to be 75% of the new collections. You can’t take 75% out today and then what’s left in the bucket take 75% of the rest of it because essentially you’re taking...

Duncan stated correct.

The Surveyor stated if anything goes wrong maintenance wise, we need money to go in and fix it.

Duncan stated the number that I referenced, $23,661.00 is 75% of the annual assessment.

Heirbrandt made the motion to approve the reconstruction for the California Street Arm Extension of the Thistlewaite Drain, seconded by Rulon and approved unanimously.

Duncan stated we will come back at the next meeting with a recommendation for award for the contractor.

"STATE OF INDIANA )  ss: BEFORE THE HAMILTON COUNTY
COUNTY OF HAMILTON ) DRAINAGE BOARD
) ss: NOBLESVILLE, INDIANA

IN THE MATTER OF THE
RECONSTRUCTION OF THE
Thistlewaite Drain, California Street Arm Extension

FINDINGS AND ORDER FOR RECONSTRUCTION

The matter of the proposed Reconstruction of the Thistlewaite Drain, California Street Arm Extension came before the Hamilton County Drainage Board for hearing on January 28, 2019, on the Reconstruction Report consisting of the report and the Schedule of Damages and Assessments. The Board also received and considered the written objection of an owner of certain lands affected by the proposed Reconstruction, said owner being:

Evidence was heard on the Reconstruction Report and on the aforementioned objections.

The Board, having considered the evidence and objections, and, upon motion duly made, seconded and unanimously carried, did find and determine that the costs, damages and expenses of the proposed Reconstruction will be less than the benefits accruing to the owners of all land benefited by the Reconstruction.

Hamilton County Drainage Board
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The Board having considered the evidence and objections, upon motion duly made, seconded and unanimously carried, did adopt the Schedule of Assessments as proposed, subject to amendment after inspection of the subject drain as it relates to the lands of any owners which may have been erroneously included or omitted from the Schedule of Assessments.

The Board further finds that it has jurisdiction of these proceedings and that all required notices have been duly given or published as required by law.

Wherefore, it is ORDERED, that the proposed Reconstruction of the Thistlewaite Drain, California Street Arm Extension be and is hereby declared established.

Thereafter, the Board made inspection for the purpose of determining whether or not the lands of any owners had been erroneously included or excluded from the Schedule of Assessments. The Board finds on the basis of the reports and findings at this hearing as follows:

HAMILTON COUNTY DRAINAGE BOARD

Christine Altman
PRESIDENT

Mark Heirbrandt
Member

Jerry Rulon
Alternate Member

ATTEST: Lynette Mosbaugh
Executive Secretary

West 146th Street Fund 4598 – Highway Loan from Drain Maintenance Funds:

Mr. Joel Thurman and Mr. Brad Davis were present for this item.

The Surveyor stated you have a letter before you from the Highway Department requesting the balance due from the original $10,510,000.00 loan from the maintenance funds. We’ve paid in August of 2014 $3,592,500.00 so the balance left to pay towards the 146th Street Project is $6,917,500.00. I request the Board to approve that particular loan.

Heirbrandt asked Howard if he reviewed this loan?

Howard stated it’s consistent with the documents I have not gone back to the TIF Fund to see what’s coming in extra, but I know the last time we looked it was in the neighborhood of $2.5 to $3 million per year. It will repay, but before we go on any more sections of 146th Street we probably need to sit down and look at the overall funding plan because those costs are; I know land acquisition is substantially ahead of what they were when we approved this originally.

Altman stated we have some folks from Highway here today.

Thurman stated this agreement was done as the Surveyor said in 2014. At that time we had not secured funding for Phase 3 and 4 through the MPO. The agreement was set up and all the exhibits were set up showing everything being funded with the exception of construction match and inspection for Phase 3 and 4 for the agreement. When we did that we knew we would probably have to come back at some point in time if we were going to do Phase 3 and 4 and see where we’re at and most likely amend the agreement for more money.

What we are here today for is to ask for the remainder amount of the existing agreement which is the $6.9 million and then we would like to wait; Phase 3 bid a couple of weeks ago and we got really good numbers, we’re really happy about that. The remaining items we have left to do is buy the rest of the right of way for Phase 3 and 4 construction inspection and buy right of way for Phase 4.

The Surveyor stated and you have in those documents the original request.

Howard stated before we go any higher I need to sit down and look at the TIF Fund because that TIF, they don’t go on forever. It’s a 30 year TIF and see what the life is and what’s coming in. It’s been extremely healthy because we captured all of that retail from 96th along the US 421 corridor. It’s been a good cash provider for borrowing from this fund, but we have to make sure there’s enough years at “x” amount of dollars per year to repay and what that number is.

Altman stated our alternative if it is not, do we have a plan “B”?
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Howard stated existing funds.

Altman asked just cash out of COIT?

Howard stated yes.

Altman asked do we have any other concerns or questions since we have Highway here?

Heirbrandt stated no.

Heirbrandt made the motion to approve paying Highway the remaining balance of $6,917,500.00 towards the 146th Street Project, seconded by Rulon and approved unanimously.

**Thistlewaite Drain – California Street Arm Extension:**

Altman stated it has come to my attention that we did not open the public hearing for the Thistlewaite Drain, California Street Arm Extension; is anyone here to speak about the Thistlewaite; seeing no one Altman closed the public hearing.

Heirbrandt made the motion to approve the California Street Arm Extension of the Thistlewaite Drain, seconded by Rulon and approved unanimously.

**West 146th Street Project – Investment Interest:**

The Surveyor stated the interest rate for 2018 was figured by the Treasurer at 1.12% which would mean that the interest on those funds that have already been borrowed would be $40,236.00 for 2018.

Heirbrandt made the motion to approve the interest for the borrowed funds for the West 146th Street project at $40,236.00, seconded by Rulon and approved unanimously.

**Elwood Wilson Drain, Craig-Holleran Arm Hydraulic Study – Amendment No. 1:**

The Surveyor stated we had a meeting with the landowners on this arm. The landowners asked that there be an interim solution looked at so we met last week with Clark Dietz, went over some possibilities and they are going to amend their report. The original report did not include interim projects so they’re asking for an increase from their original of $17,750.00 to cover looking at the interims.

Heirbrandt asked do you think that’s adequate?

The Surveyor stated I thought it was cheap.

Heirbrandt made the motion to approve Amendment No. 1 for the Elwood Wilson Drain, Craig-Holleran Arm Hydraulic Study in the amount of $17,750.00, seconded by Rulon and approved unanimously.

**Clara Knotts Drain – Pipe Lining Discussion:**

The Surveyor stated I’ve been going back and forth with Chris Allen. Hopefully at the next meeting I’ll be able to get the information from Chris as to whether or not we have that $200,000.00.

Heirbrandt asked to be able to use from CDBG on that project?

The Surveyor stated yes. I sent him before Christmas break an email asking about that and also if we could assess INDOT and the City of Carmel the cost. When I got back from vacation he sent “what do you mean by rods?” I misspelled roads and he didn’t put City of Carmel and INDOT together with roads and he wanted to know what they had to do with “rods”. I’ve not heard back yet from Chris.

Altman asked are we going to have any problems with that with the annexation of that area on the allocation?

Howard stated I don’t believe so because I think the nexus on that is to assist Carmel even with Home Place. Low Income housing issue and then if that’s the nexus in the grant not the jurisdiction of the…

Altman stated the way we allocate funds, that’s what I’m concerned about. Remember on the Community Development people opted in and opted out. Carmel opted into the program and they get a cut of it. I think we probably need to look at whether they were grandfathered in on the other plan with that annexation.

Howard stated my understanding is that this is essentially the Carmel allocation as it’s built up because there hasn’t been anything done in the last few years, but we’ll check.

Altman stated I want to make sure before we get everybody all excited we don’t have the rug pulled out from under us.

Howard stated it’s been a couple of months since I’ve talked to him about that.

The Surveyor stated I’ve been including the three Commissioners and Howard in on all the email correspondence with Chris just so everyone is in the loop. If you see anything…
Altman stated this is intervened and now the annexation is affective, but if it’s prior balance reusing we should be okay because that was based on the old allocation. I just want to make sure we don’t have an issue right at the end.

Rulon asked have you had success with the lining? I didn’t know if you’d done any.

Baitz stated we did one in Highland Springs and it looks good.

The Surveyor stated it was a smaller pipe, this is a 60” pipe. Highland Springs was a 15” pipe and it’s working. The $200,000.00 is a lot cheaper than if we go in and rip out the road and play with utilities.

Rulon stated the State has done several of them. Some of them were successful and some weren’t.

**Geist Woods Drain – Pipe Lining Project:**

The Surveyor stated this is another lining project. We’ve been working with Fishers on this one. The cost for the conventional work is $95,494.00 and the lining is $35,764.00. It’s quite a cost savings. We’re looking at some money from Fishers to help pay for this since it’s under their road. However, Janet (Hansen) found that they never transferred the road from the HOA to Fishers. We’re still working on that issue. Once that’s resolved I’ll have that before you.

Altman asked how old is that subdivision?

Liston stated 30 to 35 years.

**Lion Creek Drain – WO-2019-00005:**

The Surveyor stated I shared with you a letter that we received from a property owner. He objected to trees being cut out of the rip rap in the backyard. I didn’t respond to the letter yet.

Altman asked is there a subsurface drain in there?

The Surveyor stated no, it’s an outlet for a storm sewer and it serves as a ditch between the outlet and also the open ditch to the south. We needed to get the trees out, that’s our standard operating procedure. He just doesn’t understand that trees and drainage do not mix being an urban landowner, which is fairly typical. It was all done by hand. I wanted to let the Board know that he was dissatisfied.

Altman asked did they cut the trees or pull them?

The Surveyor stated they cut them.

Heirbrandt asked if the Surveyor could at least respond to him why that had to be removed so he has it?

The Surveyor stated I’ve started two letters.

Altman asked how did the trees get that big? Are we not spraying that drain?

The Surveyor stated that is about three years worth of growth. That was not sprayed in the past.

Altman asked is this an HOA responsibility?

Baitz stated we have several of these type of things to monitor and to spray all of them you’re probably looking at close to $300.00 to spray less than 40 feet there. We try to take care of it on an as needed basis because it’s cheaper for us to deal with it as an on needed basis. A lot of property owners don’t allow this to get to that point.

Altman stated we might want to check the HOA, the covenants, to see whether they’re required to maintain some of this. A lot of the covenants; where is this located?

Baitz stated it’s in Carmel.

Altman stated there may be HOA requirements if it’s in Carmel. It would be worth a look. It’s a fairly new subdivision so we’d have fairly recent covenants. That may be something we want to look at as we’re going through TAC make them stick it in there that they’ll spray so we don’t have this. They have common area maintenance they just go spray this stuff and then we don’t have the issue of unhappy people. The Surveyor is going to respond and say that “this is a regulated drain and if we don’t remove them not only he will flood, but his neighbor will flood”. 
Hearing Request:
The Surveyor asked that the Board set a hearing for the Calumet Farms Drain for March 25, 2019. Back in January of 2018 we had an increase hearing and at that time it was brought up that it didn’t include the section of Forest Bay Estates. There were two portions to the increase hearing, one was the annual maintenance and the other was a special assessment in order to pay back GDIF. The special rate was tabled. The assessment was approved. We also went back and picked up at a later date in April the Forest Bay Estates portion of the shed. They are now also being assessed the same rate as Calumet Farms.

Howard stated for maintenance.

The Surveyor stated for maintenance. What we’re asking for now is that the special assessment be brought back to be spread across both subdivisions so as to pay back the General Drain Improvement Fund which has a balance owed it of $29,561.00. The payback for the special assessment would be $40.00 per acre, $500.00 minimum for roads payable over 2019, 2020 and 2021 at which point GDIF would be paid back.

Altman asked do we have any nexus on where the work was done that dug the hole on the deficit? If Forest Bay is attributed they’re getting dinged for the negative balance.

Baitz stated under the road there was a failure of a CMP and we replaced it with RCP.

Altman asked does Forest Bay benefit from that?

Baitz stated yes, it’s the downstream portion.

Howard asked but does it also serve the downstream portion of the preexisting watershed?

The Surveyor stated Forest Bay Estates is the downstream.

Howard asked where this pipe was reconstructed is it benefitting the entire Calumet Farms Watershed or solely the Forest Bay part of it.

The Surveyor stated it would be both because Calumet Farms is the upper watershed, it drains through Forest Bay.

Heirbrandt asked who aren’t they ever put together?

Altman stated it was a mistake or an oversite.

Heirbrandt stated this was a long time ago.

The Surveyor stated yes. It was one that fell through the cracks.

Howard asked the Surveyor how are we doing on maintenance in that combined watershed?

The Surveyor stated the combined watershed now brings in $5,200.00 per year.

Howard asked in maintenance?

The Surveyor stated for maintenance.

Altman asked what do you think we’re going to need for maintenance? Really with the addition of the other people this brings it up to the rate of return on the first request for the special assessment, correct? You wanted to do a special assessment before that would bring in $3,500.00 and now we already have that made up except for $420.00.

The Surveyor stated we could let it ride and just let it pay off naturally.

Howard stated given the evidence that the pipe downstream benefitted both sections of the watershed I think the nexus is both parts of the watershed should pay and rattling sabers for a reconstruction that’s going to be repaid; it’s going to take a while. I thought you would have to advertise and start over.

Altman stated the reconstruction has already taken place. My point is we’re going to get to the same point we were under the first assessment so why would we put on another $250.00. They’re already paying $145.00.

Heirbrandt stated I’d feel bad if I was those people to some extent even though they really were benefitting. We should have caught it.

Howard stated they had a freebie for years, but they were never notified.

Altman asked are we at a point where we’re going to have to do any work in there in the next couple of years?

The Surveyor stated its on an as needed basis.

Altman stated I’d just say let it ride and then if we have a problem we bring it up and notice it for hearing. We’re basically where you wanted to be when we tabled the first hearing.
Heirbrandt stated I agree.

Final Reports:
The Surveyor presented the following final reports to the Board for approval.

"To:  Hamilton County Drainage Board  January 18, 2019
Re: #315 O.F. Henley Drain: 146th Street Improvements Phase II
Attached are as-built, and other information for the 146th Street Improvements Phase II. An inspection of the drainage facilities for this section has been made and the facilities were found to be complete and acceptable.

During construction, changes were made to the drain, which will alter the plans submitted with my report for this drain-dated August 20, 2018. The report was approved by the Board at the hearing held August 27, 2018. (See Drainage Board Minutes Book 18, Page 235)
The changes are as follows: the open ditch was lengthened from 562 feet to 565 feet. The line of the drain due to the changes described above is now 565 feet. The reconstruction removed 646 feet of existing tile. Therefore, the project removed 81 feet from the overall length of the drain.

All work was done within existing right of way and regulated drain easement. The project was paid for by the Hamilton County Highway Department. I recommend the Board approve the drain’s construction as complete and acceptable.

Sincerely,

Kenton C. Ward, CFM
Hamilton County Surveyor"

"To:  Hamilton County Drainage Board  December 11, 2018
Re: Mud Creek- Sand Creek: T.J. Patterson Drain: Brooks School Rd Reconstruction
Attached are as-built, certificate of completion & compliance, and other information for Brooks School Rd Reconstruction. An inspection of the drainage facilities for this section has been made and the facilities were found to be complete and acceptable.

During construction, changes were made to the drain, which will alter the plans submitted with my report for this drain-dated August 9, 2016. The report was approved by the Board at the hearing held August 22, 2016. (See Drainage Board Minutes Book 17, Pages 98-99)
The changes are as follows: the 24” RCP was lengthened from 139 feet to 182 feet. The 42” RCP was lengthened from 44 feet to 59 feet. The 6” SSD was not installed. The line of the drain due to the changes described above is now 241 feet. The T.J. Patterson Drain was removed between Sta. 73+06 to Sta. 74+78. The project also enclosed 59’ of open ditch installed with the 2002 Brooks Chase Offsite Relocation. Therefore, the project added 10 feet to the drain’s overall length.

The project was done within existing regulated drain easement and road right of way. The cost of the project was paid for by the City of Noblesville.

I recommend the Board approve the drain’s construction as complete and acceptable.

Sincerely,

Kenton C. Ward, CFM
Hamilton County Surveyor"

"To:  Hamilton County Drainage Board  January 18, 2019
Re: Vermillion Drain: The Woods at Vermillion, Sec. 3
Attached are as-built, certificate of completion & compliance, and other information for The Woods at Vermillion Section 3. An inspection of the drainage facilities for this section has been made and the facilities were found to be complete and acceptable.

During construction, changes were made to the drain, which will alter the plans submitted with my report for this drain-dated October 18, 2018. The report was approved by the Board at the hearing held November 26, 2018. (See Drainage Board Minutes Book 18, Pages 296-297)
The changes are as follows: the 12” RCP was lengthened from 677 to 686 feet. The 18” RCP was lengthened from 20 feet to 22 feet. The 21” RCP was lengthened from 20 feet to 21 feet. The 24” RCP was shortened from 486 to 480 feet. The 6” SSD was shortened from 1918 feet to 1898 feet. The length of the drain due to the changes described above is now 3,540 feet.

The non-enforcement was approved by the Board at its meeting on November 26, 2018 and recorded under instrument #2018055965.

The following sureties were guaranteed by Standard Financial and released by the Board on its January 14, 2019 meeting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bond-LC No:</th>
<th>Amount:</th>
<th>For:</th>
<th>Issue Date:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1313WVRM3</td>
<td>$174,894.90</td>
<td>Storm Sewers &amp; SSD</td>
<td>February 23,2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I recommend the Board approve the drain’s construction as complete and acceptable.

Sincerely,

Kenton C. Ward, CFM
Hamilton County Surveyor

Heirbrandt made the motion to approve the final reports presented, seconded by Rulon and approved unanimously.

**Capital Asset Notifications:**
The Surveyor presented the following Capital Asset Notification to the Board for approval: O. F. Henley Drain, Debbie Kitchens Relocation (2000); T. J. Patterson Drain; T. J. Patterson Drain, Brooks Chase Offsite (2002).

Heirbrandt made the motion to approve the Capital Asset Notifications presented, seconded by Rulon and approved unanimously.

**Variance Request – Mud Creek/Sand Creek Drain (Fill in the Floodplain):**
Mr. Sam Baley and Mr. Hatem Mekky were present for this item.

Cash stated before you today is a variance for fill in the floodplain for the 96th Street project which is the added travel lanes over Mud Creek. This project is located between Cumberland Road and Lantern Road and the City of Fishers. This came before the Board for the preliminary concurrence this fall in October. The Board gave preliminary concurrence at that point. This project will be creating a floodplain compensatory storage area and will be excavating 7,444 cubic yards from the floodplain to make up for the 2,402 cubic yards of fill that will be added because of the added travel lanes.

Altman asked if Cash has recommendations on conditions if the variance is granted?

Cash stated yes.

Altman stated I really think on all of these fill in the floodways you need to add the other one that whoever does it has to maintain it because they will silt out probably just because it’s capacity. Let’s just make that a standard because we’ve brought it up several times on that.

Howard stated when you say “whoever does it” do you mean the municipal corporation? When the developer is gone government is always still there.

Altman stated this is a road project so it’s pretty straight forward that government is going to take care of it. If the developer does it, it needs to be an obligation on that development. It shouldn’t go back on the taxpayers, it should be an obligation of the development.

Cash stated I can put language in moving forward on the staff report.

Heirbrandt stated we should probably make it standard, I agree.

Altman stated it’s an alteration that wouldn’t be there and rivers and streams like to go right back where they were. If we have a flooding issue they would have to address that.

Cash stated the floodplain compensatory storage area will be owned by the City of Fishers as well. They’ve also received a review by Christopher Burke Engineering which concurs with the proposal. Indianapolis DPW has also been part of the review process for this and we’ve coordinated well with them and they were waiting on the Drainage Board before they gave the final sign off on the project.

Altman asked are most of these regulated per say? Would they be considered regulated drains when we grant these variances or will we have pockets where they’re not?

Cash stated in this case it affects a regulated drain, which is Mud Creek/Sand Creek Drain. Our Ordinance specifies drains, but any...
Altman stated I guess our language ought to be if it’s a regulated drain they consent that there will be a special assessment for any maintenance where we would continue. I’m just trying to figure out mechanically what the consequences will be up front to the alteration.

The Surveyor stated we do get the easement to the Board for the compensation area, but that would be a good idea that “any maintenance to that area would be to the owner’s expense as a special assessment”.

Altman stated I’m just trying to figure how we did it because it’s fairly new what we’re doing.

The Surveyor stated we’re getting a number of these now.

Cash stated in the cases of commercial projects where they do this will we then assess them if they fail to do that or put a lien?

Altman stated if they’re granting an easement in the area then it’s part of the easement which is typically, it’s not atypical when you do an easement document you assign responsibility for future maintenance. This would just go along with standard property law when you create an easement who bears the burden, is the person benefitted or is it the landowner; we just make it clear in the easement document who maintains and at who’s cost. If we want to be in charge to maintain it we can say it will be under the jurisdiction of the Drainage Board at the landowners cost or the municipal cost.

Howard stated the equity is that this project would not be there but for the local property owners and to put a standard reconstruction and/or maintenance and to use those funds basically you’re taking money from the entire watershed and the entire watershed has no benefit from this fix. If the fix stays it’s fine, but if the fix goes away through erosion or deposited sediment that restricts the flow it ought to be the property directly benefitted as opposed to the entire watershed.

Cash asked should I run the language through things?

Howard stated we’ll talk about it. We can meet.

Altman asked what are you requesting at this meeting?

Cash stated they’re requesting the variance.

Heirbrandt made the motion to approve the variance request with the conditions discussed, seconded by Rulon and approved unanimously.

Non-enforcements:
Conover presented a non-enforcement request for the Elizabeth Wendt Drain filed by Christopher and Erin Wilson for parcel #03-02-05-00-00-001.105 for a fence. The Surveyor's Office recommends approval.

Heirbrandt made the motion to approve the non-enforcement request presented, seconded by Rulon and approved unanimously.

Conover presented a non-enforcement request for the Elizabeth Wendt Drain filed by Christopher and Erin Wilson for parcel #03-02-05-00-00-001.105 for a pole barn. The Surveyor's Office recommends approval.

Heirbrandt made the motion to approve the non-enforcement request presented, seconded by Rulon and approved unanimously.

Conover presented a non-enforcement request for the J. H. Leap Drain filed by Michael and Danielle Woodruff for parcel #03-06-03-00-00-009.000 for an existing block building. The Surveyor's Office recommends approval.

Altman asked is this really forgiveness?

Conover stated part of this one is. The new request is for the garage addition. In the process of looking at this one we discovered there is a pole barn towards the rear of the yard that’s within the easement and that has been there since the 1970’s.

Altman asked how long have these homeowners owned the property?

Conover stated just a few years.

Altman stated there’s a deed reference for 2013 so they didn’t put the pole barn in. It wasn’t theirs.

Conover stated correct.

Heirbrandt made the motion to approve the non-enforcement request presented, seconded by Rulon and approved unanimously.
Conover presented a non-enforcement request for the J. H. Leap Drain filed by Michael and Danielle Woodruff for parcel #03-06-03-00-00-009.000 for a garage addition. The Surveyor’s Office recommends approval.

Heirbrandt made the motion to approve the non-enforcement request presented, seconded by Rulon and approved unanimously.

Conover presented a non-enforcement request for the N. H. Teter Drain filed by BowFamFar II LLC for parcel #12-07-26-00-00-007.001 for a fence and horse barn. The Surveyor’s Office recommends approval.

Heirbrandt made the motion to approve the non-enforcement request presented, seconded by Rulon and approved unanimously.

**William Krause Drain, Krause Reconstruction Phase 2 – Change Order No. 5:**

Conover presented Change Order No. 5 to the Board for approval.

“*To: Hamilton County Drainage Board*  
*January 22, 2019*  
*Re: Wm Krause Drain Phase II Reconstruction Project*  
*Change Order #5*  

Change Order #5 is to address some items which were not needed during construction of the pond.

**Change Order #5**

Delete one check dam ................................................................. $ 1,190.33  
Delete 2 - 10” drain outlets @ $748.72 each .................................. $ 1,497.44  
Delete 2 - 24” drain outlets @ $1,172.99 each ................................. $ 2,345.98  
Delete 738 sq yds of Erosion Control Blanket @ $2.89 ....................... $ 2,132.82  

Cost reduction for Rust construction of Change Order #5 ...................... (−$ 7,166.57)

| Contractor’s Bid                              | $ 659,819.20 |
| Change Order #1 Total                         | (−$ 17,838.88) |
| Change Order #2 Total                         | $ 725.00    |
| Change Order #3 Total                         | $ 559.36    |
| Change Order #4 Total                         | $ 9,516.00  |
| Change Order #5 Total                         | (−$ 7,166.57) |

Rust Construction - Total Reconstruction Cost ........................................ $ 645,614.11

Engineer’s Estimate ................................................................. $1,011,017.60

Rust Construction - Total Reconstruction Cost ........................................ $ 645,614.11

Easements & Associated Costs ...................................................... $ 367,450.00

Total Reconstruction Cost ........................................................... $1,013,064.11

Difference ................................................................................... (−$ 2,046.51)

Submitted By:

Andrew D. Conover  
Inspector”

Heirbrandt made the motion to approve Change Order No. 5, seconded by Rulon.

Altman asked it shows that we are now under estimate?

Conover stated no.

Altman stated we’re still in the red, right?

Heirbrandt stated this is the fifth change order.

Howard stated so the others were probably adds, they usually are.

Altman stated I see a red number at the bottom, but there are two red numbers on this one so that’s my confusion.

Conover stated we had one change order that was a reduction of $17,838.88 and then we had this one, which was $7,166.57 then we had a few others that were positive. It was a little over a million dollar project and we ended up $2,046.51 over budget.

Altman stated and we got that covered, but this change order helps our position?

Conover stated yes and it should be the last change order for this phase.

The motion had been made and seconded to approve Change Order No. 5 and approved unanimously.
Surety Acceptance:
Liston stated that at this afternoon’s Commissioners meeting the Board would be accepting the following surety: Performance Bond No. CMS331418 in the amount of $122,362.62 for Copper Run Section 1, storm sewers.

Surety Release:
Liston stated that at this afternoon’s Commissioners meeting the Board would be releasing the following surety: Irrevocable Letter of Credit No. 1214BFF1 in the amount of $65,432.63 for Bluffs at Flat Fork Section 1, erosion control.

Construction Updates:
Thorpe Creek Drain, Martha Ford Arm Relocation - Liston stated Hoosier Pride started this project a week ago last Thursday. They started on the downstream end and are moving along good. The problem we’ve had is managing the spoil from the project. On Friday they released the water on the south side of 136th Street into the new channel. The excavator on this project is GPS equipped and everything is programmed into the unit and he pretty much just sits in the seat and it digs.

Cool Creek Park Bank Stabilization Project - Duncan stated we had the preconstruction meeting for this project and they are looking to start construction at the beginning of next week.

Altman asked if the ground is even close to being frozen? Can we still work if it is?
Rulon stated it depends on how big equipment they have.

Duncan stated there’s a lot of clearing on this job that they’ll do first. There was one instance where there is a dance on Valentines Day and they needed the entire parking lot at the Nature Center for the 13th and 14th of February, but looking at the schedule and the work they’re going to be doing I don’t think it’s going to conflict at all.

Altman asked speaking of clearing do we have any projects we need to be focused on getting trees down before April 1st?

The Surveyor stated we should be in pretty good shape.

Altman stated we’re early enough now if we look at it so we don’t have the scramble at the end.

The Surveyor stated right now there is a conflict of opinion between the Corps and IDEM. I had a discussion with the US Fish & Wildlife about cutting trees and I told the US Fish & Wildlife we try to get the trees down before April 1st and they said “why?”. They said that’s not from us, we’ve heard about this, but who’s telling you this?. I said “IDEM”.

Howard stated I thought it was IDNR because it’s nature.

The Surveyor stated it’s both of them. I sent the US Fish & Wildlife a copy of the letters we received in the past and they came back and said “they’ve totally misunderstood what we want”. Those discussions are ongoing right now.

Altman stated lets just get the trees down by the 1st.

The Surveyor stated the US Fish & Wildlife said all we care about is if it’s a bat habitat and we know where those are. I said great tell us where they are, but they said they can’t. The US Fish & Wildlife said if you tell us where you’re working we can tell you whether or not it’s in.

Altman stated we want to tell Highway that because we have issues with bridges and other projects.

Howard stated I’ve had projects where the consulting engineers will go in and certify that the trees there are not of the species that would have the loose bark and would become habitat for the brown bat. I think the automatic cut off is just kind of a fail safe mechanism where why go around and figure out what species they are. If they’re trees and they’re going to come down in three or four months anyway let’s get them down. There is a disagreement between the subtleties, but this is just a safety. You don’t want somebody red-tagging your job.

Rulon asked if the bat likes those dead ash trees?

The Surveyor stated if the bark is loose, yes. They like to get up under the bark and nest.

Altman stated I imagine Hickory’s are an issue.

The Surveyor stated Shag Bark Hickory is one of the trees that if it’s in there you definitely want to take a look at it.
Drainage Board Attorney (Pending Items):
Windermere Pond Outlet (Documented & Recorded Negotiations) – Altman stated this has been hanging here since 2017, what are we doing with that?

Howard asked Duncan are we ready to meet on that?

Duncan stated yes.

Altman stated let’s get everything by next meeting that has the date of 2017.

Waters of the U.S.:
The Surveyor stated there is a comparison, I don’t know where I put it, but I’ve been looking for that.

Altman asked you’ll find it and email it to us?

The Surveyor stated yes.

Heirbrandt made the motion to adjourn to Executive Session for discussion of IC 5-14-1.5-6.1(a)(1)(2)(b)(1)(2)(D), seconded by Rulon and approved unanimously.

Christine Altman – President

Lynette Mosbaugh
Executive Secretary