The Drainage Board met in Executive Session at 9:00 a.m. The regular Hamilton County Drainage Board meeting was called to order Monday March 25, 2019 at 9:08 a.m.

The members of the Board present were Ms. Christine Altman-President, Mr. Mark Heirbrandt-Vice President and Mr. Steven C. Dillinger-Member. Also present was the Hamilton County Surveyor, Kenton C. Ward and members of his staff: Mr. Steve Baitz, Mr. Gary Duncan, Mr. Andy Conover, Mr. Jerry Liston, Mr. Steve Cash, Mr. Luther Cline and Ms. Suzanne Mills.

Approve Minutes of March 11, 2019:
The Minutes of March 11, 2019 were presented to the Board for approval.

Heirbrandt made the motion to approve the minutes of March 11, 2019, seconded by Dillinger and approved unanimously.

Executive Session Memoranda:
Dillinger made the motion to approve the Executive Session Memoranda for discussion of IC 5-14-1.5-6.1(a)(1)(2)(b)(2), land acquisition, seconded by Heirbrandt and approved unanimously.

Bid Opening – 2019 Vegetation Control:
Altman stated the first bid was from R & H Spray with all required forms present and a bid of $22,635.00. Are there any other bids? There were no other bids.

Dillinger made the motion to refer the bid to the Surveyor’s Office for review and recommendation on April 8, 2019, seconded by Heirbrandt and approved unanimously.

Benton Hinesley Drain, Grass Waterway:
There was one objection on file. Mr. Ryan Henry, Ms. Brandy Henry, Mr. Dayne Jessup, Ms. Donna Jessup, Mr. Andy Padgett, Mr. Jason Reciniti and Mr. Joe Miller were present for this item.

The Surveyor’s report was presented to the Board for approval.

*February 1, 2019

TO: Hamilton County Drainage Board
RE: Benton Hinesley Regulated Drain Grass Waterway

Attached are the plans, schedule of assessments and drainage shed map for the Benton Hinesley Grass Waterway project. This project is identified as Project No. 6 of the 2013 Symons and Krause Watershed Hydraulic Study approved by the Board at the October 8, 2012 meeting of the Drainage Board (See Hamilton County Drainage Board Minutes Book 14, Pages 311-332). The project is a continuation of the South Briar Arm project approved by the Board at the June 22, 2015 meeting of the Drainage Board (See Hamilton County Drainage Board Minutes Book 16, Pages 228-235).

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 attached plans were prepared for the Hamilton County Drainage Board by Banning Engineering. Benton Hinesley Grass Waterway plans are dated May 8th, 2017, Project Number 111948B.

This project includes the construction of a new, lower grass waterway between 246th Street and the existing rock chute at the Marion-Adams Arm just west of Lamong Road. This will be an improved outlet for the Sheridan High School detention facility and will reduce the frequency and severity of flooding in the Curry and Puzey subdivision by providing an emergency overflow route.

The Benton Hinesley Watershed covers 607.13-acres and 68-lots in the northwest portion of Hamilton County. The north-central portion of Sheridan is located in this watershed. It is located in portion of Sections 29, 30, 31 and 32 of Township 20 North, Range 3 East, in Adams Township.
History

The drain now known as Benton Hinesley was originally petitioned by Joseph Furnas and established as the West Cicero Ditch in 1877 through the Commissioner's Court (See Commissioner's Record, pages 206-207). This drain began at the section line between Sections 28 and 29, Township 20 North, Range 3 East and ran to a point 20 rods North of the South line of the Northwest ¼ of Section 23, Township 20 North, Range 3 East at an old mill dam.

In 1892, George Symonds petitioned the Circuit Court for the drain as it exists today. On March 12, 1921 Benton Hinesley petitioned for a reconstruction of Arm #4 of the George Symonds Drain. The petition was filed with the Hamilton County Circuit Court as Case Number 19361. In 1923, the Benton Hinesley Regulated Drain Tile was installed.

The Reviewer's Report of January 27, 1923 stated the lengths of the Benton Hinesley Drain as follows:

- The Main Tile of Benton Hinesley Regulated Drain (being Arm #4 of the George Symonds Drain) begins 830 feet South and 15 feet West of the NW corner of E ¼ of Section 32, Township 20 N, R 3 E. The tile has a total length of 5,464-feet. The drain consists of 1050-feet of 10-inch tile, 765-feet of 14-inch tile, 1638-feet of 18-inch tile, and 641-feet of 20-inch tile. The drain terminates at STA: 41+57 of Arm #4 of the George Symonds Drain. The Arm consists of 1050 feet of 10-inch tile, 765 feet of 14-inch tile, 1638 feet of 18-inch tile, and 641 feet of 20-inch tile.
- Arm #1 drain tile begins at a point 468-feet north and 15-feet west of the SW corner of Section 29, Township 20 North. This tile has a total distance of 1,600-feet and consists entirely of 10-inch tile. The drain terminates in the main ditch at Stake 18+15 at a point 50-feet east and 26-feet north of the NW corner of the NE ¼ of Section 32, Township 20 North, Range 3 East.
- Arm #2, being a part of Arm #5, or Hannibal Underwood Arm, of the George Symonds Drain, begins at the point of separation of two rows of tile now in Arm #5. Then running in a southeasterly direction, a total distance of 880-feet and terminating at STA: 41+57 on Arm #4 of the George Symonds Drain. Arm #2 consists of 16-inch tile its entire length.
- Arm #3 begins 200-feet west and 20-feet south of the NE corner of the W ¼ of the E ¼ of NE ¼ of Section 32, Township 20 North, Range 3 East. Then ran a total distance of 335-feet, terminating at STA: 41+57 of Arm #4 of the George Symonds Drain. The Arm consists of 10-inch tile in its entirety.

The Drain was requested for classification at the Drainage Board meeting of July 1, 1968 (see Hamilton County Drainage Board Minutes Book 1, page 30).

A request for hearing to place the Drain on maintenance was made at the Drainage Board meeting of February 1, 1971. The Drain was listed as consisting of 8,339-feet of tile at this meeting (see Hamilton County Drainage Board Minutes Book 1, page 65).

The Drain was placed on maintenance at hearing during the May 3, 1971 meeting of the Drainage Board (see Hamilton County Drainage Board Minutes Book 3, page 128).

In 1977, an arm to the Benton Hinesley Drain was added to accommodate physical education fields and a small detention pond for the Marion-Adams School Corporation (See Hamilton County Drainage Board Minutes Book 1, page 239).

The Marion-Adams Arm to the Benton Hinesley Drain was constructed in 1995. The Marion-Adams Arm includes both open drain and tile. The Marion-Adams School Board petitioned the Drainage Board in a petition dated May 10, 1993 to expand the 1977 detention facility for the proposed Sheridan High School. A Surveyors Report dated May 14, 1993 and presented to the Drainage Board at the meeting of June 28, 1993 indicates that 2,210-feet of 24" RCP will be installed south of 246th Street; that 550-feet of the existing grass waterway north of 246th Street will be realigned with the project and that 700-feet of 6-inch SSD to drain the grass waterway will be installed and that a structure will be installed at Station 23+65 of the main drain; that 960-feet of grass waterway will be constructed west of Lamong Road and that a 6-inch SSD will be installed on each side of this grass waterway; and clarifies that the existing grass waterway between main ditch stations 18+15 and 34+53 (across the Ringer Farm parcel and to the start of Arm 2) is part of the Hinesley drain. (See Hamilton County Drainage Board Minutes Book 3, page 134). For the purposes of this report, the grass waterway portions of the Marion-Adams Arm will be identified separately as the Ringer Farms Grass Waterway and Cline Property Grass Waterway.

In 1996, a portion of the Benton Hinesley Drain was relocated to remove a part of the drain that ran under the residential structure located on parcel 01-01-32-01-04-012.000. The tile was collapsed and inoperable. The project was approved at hearing on the July 22, 1996 meeting of the Drainage Board. (see Hamilton County Drainage Board Minutes Book 4, pages 267-268). Mr. Burton paid the cost of the drain relocation. The project was certified as complete during the meeting on July 28, 1997 (See Hamilton County Drainage Board Minutes Book 4, Page 403).
The Sheridan Elementary School Arm was constructed in 2008 to serve as a drainage outlet for the detention facility for the new Sheridan Elementary School located north of 246th Street on the east side of Hinesley Road. A Surveyor's Report dated April 21, 2008 was presented to the Drainage Board at the meeting of June 23, 2008 and the project was approved at hearing at this meeting. (See Hamilton County Drainage Board Minutes Book 11, pages 217-219). A Surveyor's Report dated April 11, 2012 and presented to the Drainage Board on June 11, 2012 states that an inspection of the drainage facilities for this section had been made and found to be complete and acceptable. This report also indicates that Main Ditch between Stations 48+96 and 54+64 was removed with this project (See Hamilton County Drainage Board Minutes Book 14, pages 183-184).

At the meeting of the Drainage Board on November 28, 2011, the Board awarded a professional services contract to Banning Engineering for the William Krause and George Symonds Hydraulic Study (See Hamilton County Drainage Board Minutes Book 14, page 45).

At the meeting of the Drainage Board on October 8, 2012, the findings of the William Krause and George Symonds Hydraulic Study were presented to the Board. (See Hamilton County Drainage Board Minutes Book 14, page 326-332).

In 2012, the Cline Property Grass Waterway of the Marion-Adams Arm was dipped.

In 2014, the crossing of Lamong Road was reconstructed.

The South Drive Arm starts on the west side of Hinesley Road and drains east along the south side of South Drive. The Board of Commissioners of Hamilton County petitioned the Hamilton County Drainage Board for an extension of the Benton Hinesley Drain on September 12, 2012 (see Hamilton County Drainage Board Minutes Book 14, page 280). Banning Engineering was hired by the Drainage Board on March 24, 2014 to determine alternatives to reduce flooding and prepare construction plans for the project (See Hamilton County Drainage Board Minutes Book 15, Page 371). A Surveyor's Report dated February 25, 2015 was presented to the Drainage Board and approved on June 22, 2015. The project was approved at hearing during this meeting (See Hamilton County Drainage Board Minutes Book 16, Pages 228-235). Bid opening for the reconstruction was on October 26, 2015 (See Hamilton County Drainage Board Minutes Book 16, Page 332). The construction contract was awarded to Morphey Construction on November 8, 2015 in the amount of $210,887.00 (See Hamilton County Drainage Board Minutes Book 16, Page 345). The inspector’s final report dated November 18, 2016 was presented to the Drainage Board at the December 21, 2016 meeting of the Drainage Board. (See Hamilton County Drainage Board Minutes Book 17, Pages 239-241). This project removed the segment of the Main Ditch between Stations 12+45 and 12+92. The Main Ditch upstream of Station 12+45 now outflow to the South Drive Arm.

A Professional Services contract for the design and development of construction plans for the Grass Way for a fixed fee amount of $13,275.00 was awarded to Banning Engineering on February 17, 2015 (See Hamilton County Drainage Board Minutes Book 16, Page 101).

The design process identified that four easements were needed on two parcels to complete the project. On July 25, 2016, the Board approved a supplemental service to the existing professional services contract with Banning Engineering in the amount of $4,500.00 to develop the easement exhibits needed to secure these easements. The extension of services was approved (See Hamilton County Drainage Board Minutes Book 17, Page 52).

The Drainage Board approved the Surveyor’s Report dated April 21, 2015 for the easements on March 27, 2017 (see Hamilton County Drainage Board Minutes Book 17, page 320).

The Drainage Board approved the Surveyor’s Report dated April 21, 2015 for the easements on March 27, 2017 (see Hamilton County Drainage Board Minutes Book 17, page 320).

The Cline easement was secured August 14, 2017 (See Hamilton County Drainage Board Minutes Book 17, page 427).

The Ringer Farms easement was secured on February 12, 2018 (See Hamilton County Drainage Board Minutes Book 18, page 47).

Existing Conditions

The December 2017 report by Banning Engineering states that the lack of an adequate overflow from the Sheridan High School detention facility places residents within the Curry and Puzey subdivision at risk from flooding from the detention facility.

A Surveyor’s Report dated February 25, 2015 explains the school’s detention pond slowly releases water through a culvert under 246th Street and north along the Benton Hinesley Regulated Open Drain (See Hamilton County Drainage Board Minutes Book 16, Page 229).
The current information from the Hamilton County GIS indicates the following lengths of the Benton Hinesley Drain:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arm</th>
<th>Total Length (feet)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main Ditch</td>
<td>1,834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burton Relocation Arm</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marion-Adams Arm</td>
<td>3,199.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheridan Elementary School Arm</td>
<td>4,576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Drive Arm</td>
<td>1,704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7,292.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reconstruction Project

Currently, upland flows from areas upstream of the school detention and the Curry and Puzey Subdivision flow into and through these areas. The reconstruction proposed provides 2,786-feet of grass waterway; 1,834-feet of 8-inch SSD with a breather at the upstream end of the SSD; mulched seeding of the grass waterway; 811-1f of 20-foot wide Filter Strip (approximately 0.45-acres); general seeding of disturbed areas; 0.40-acres of tree clearing; 32-feet of rock chute (23-feet of which is being modified with the project); 1 farm crossing; and miscellaneous work within the 246th Street right-of-way to improve the capacity of the existing culvert under 246th Street. The project will benefit the detention basin at the Sheridan High School by lowering 100-year elevations by 0.9 feet. 10-year elevations for the detention basin will be lowered by 1.5-feet. This will greatly reduce the frequency and severity of flooding within the Curry and Puzey Subdivision and High School detention by providing an emergency routing for the 100-year storm and storm events exceeding that event. Additionally, erosion and sediment accumulation will be improved with installation of the grassed waterway and filter strips.

The Main Ditch, Arm 1, Arm 2 and Arm 3 and the Sheridan Elementary School Arm are not affected by this project. The 6-inch SSD installed with the Marion-Adams Arm in 1995, the Main Ditch, and the Sheridan Elementary School Arm and Armstrong 2010 project. The proposed project overlaps the Ringer Farms Grass Waterway of the Marion-Adams Arm and runs parallel with the Cline Property Grass Waterway of the Marion-Adams Arm.

For purposes of this report, the primary reference for the new arm is the stationing of the construction drawings. Where possible, cross references to the existing Drain or Arms is made. For purposes of this report, it is assumed that Station 0+00 of the Sheridan Elementary School Arm, the Ringer Farms Grass Waterway of the Marion-Adams Arm, and the Cline Property Grass Waterway of the Marion-Adams Arm is at the downstream end of these Arms.

For reference, the following has been approximately established; Project Station 1+36 is also Station 48+96 of the Main Ditch (present end of the Main Ditch); Station 4+55 of the Sheridan Elementary School Arm; and Station 1+25 of the Cline Property Grass Waterway of the Marion-Adams Arm.

The slope of the grass waterway was the primary design constraint due to the culvert under 246th Street and the flowline elevations of the Cline Property Grass Waterway of the Marion-Adams Arm being fixed elevations. The proposed slope of the waterway is 0.26%. A portion of the proposed grass waterway shall be parabolic in shape. The parabolic shape was proposed to limit the overall top width of the grass waterway. The depth for the parabola shape is consistent through the project at 1.5-feet. Above the parabola shape, the waterway is sloped back to existing grade at a maximum slope of 4:1. The average slope is approximately 3 feet in depth. The top width of the grass waterway varies in width between 20-feet and 30-feet.

Flowrates for the 10-year critical duration storm event were calculated using the overall hydrologic and hydraulic analysis for the George Symonds Watershed Study. The proposed conditions for project 6 were used. Flow rates vary from 66 cfs to 101 cfs. Depths of flow were estimated to be 2.4 feet for the 10-year storm and were calculated using standard Indiana NRCS grassed waterway design spreadsheets. Velocities within the waterway are estimated to be 2.1 fps for the 10-year storm.

Grass Waterway

The proposed grass waterway begins at project Station 9+17 (being approximately Station 8+89 of the Cline Property Grass Waterway of the Marion-Adams) as a 30-foot wide top grass waterway at the limit of the modifications to the existing rock chute on the Cline property. The grass waterway then runs to the west, (crossing Arm 3 at approximately Station 12+14) upstream to approximately Station 21+50 where it turns to the north. It continues north to approximately Station 17+50 where it turns to the northwest. The waterway continues northwest to approximately Station 21+50 at the property line between the Ringer Farm and Cline properties. This also generally the area where the Sheridan Elementary School Arm discharges to Arm 2 and Arm 2 discharges to the Main Ditch (approximately Station 34+53 of the Main Ditch). The waterway then continues west (parallel) to and south of the Main Ditch and the Sheridan Elementary School Arm) to approximately Station 22+05 where the 30-foot wide top grass waterway begins to transition.
to a 20-foot wide top grass waterway. The transition occurs between Stations 22+05 and 22+25. At Station 22+25, the grass waterway continues west as a 20-foot wide top grass waterway to Station 28+50 where it starts to turn to the southwest. A farm crossing, for purposes of access to the agricultural is proposed between Stations 29+85 and 30+25. The crossing consists of 40'-LP of 71"x47" CMP Arch Pipe. The drain then continues to the southwest to Station 36+50 where the drain turns to the south. The drain then continues south to Station 37+03 to the invert of the CMP Pipe Arch under 246th Street and the end of the project. This points is also Station 5+62.60 of the Ringer Farms Grass Waterway of the Marion-Adams Arm; thereby reconstructing the entire Ringer Farms Grass Waterway of the Marion-Adams Arm.

An area of eroded soil between project Stations 21+25 and 22+00 shall be repaired and stabilized as the grass waterway is constructed.

Soil excavated to establish the proposed grass waterway shall be spread within the limits of the regulated drain easement and such that the flow of storm water runoff along the ground surface is not prevented from entering the grass waterway.

Any existing private drainage tiles encountered during the Work shall be connected to the existing Drain or discharged to the proposed grass waterway (depending on the depth of the private tile).

SSD
1,834-feet of eight (8") inch sub-surface tile is proposed between project Stations 1+18 and 19+88. The length of SSD is shorter than the distance between the Stations due to deflections in the project alignment at the rock chute. This tile parallels the Cline Property Grass Waterway of the Marion-Adams Arm between Stations 1+13 and 8+04. This sub-surface tile will serve to help dry the grassed waterway bottom between flow events. Additionally, this tile can be utilized for subsurface drainage of adjacent agricultural fields. A breather is proposed at the upstream end of this tile at Station 19+88.

Filter Strip
A 20-foot wide filter strip, 811-feet in length, with associated markers, is proposed along the north/west bank of the existing Marion-Adams Arm just west of Lamong Road. The filter strip shall be parallel with the existing open ditch and the project alignment between Station 1+09 (Station 0+94 of the Marion-Adams Arm) and Station 8+34 (Station 8+34 of the Marion-Adams Arm). The filter strip will not be installed across the limits of the existing rock chute. The filter strip will then be installed off the project alignment, but along the existing Marion-Adams Arm between Station 8+76 (Station 8+60 of the Marion-Adams Arm) and Station 9+57 (Station 9+31 of the Marion-Adams Arm) being the end of the open ditch segment of this Arm). The filter strip comprises a total of approximately 0.45-acres.

Tree Clearing
Approximately 0.40-acres of tree clearing for the proposed grass waterway shall occur between Stations 19+25 and 20+15.

Rock Chute
The existing rock chute between Project Stations 8+85 and 9+17 (approximately) will be altered by the project but will remain and become part of the regulated drain. The portion of the existing rock chute between Project Stations 8+94 and 9+17 will need to be lowered to the grade of the proposed grass waterway. The end of the rock chute work is also the end of the work associated with the new grass waterway. The end of the grass waterway work is approximately Station 8+69 of the Marion-Adams Arm.

These improvements will become part of the regulated drain.

Easements
All work shall occur within existing regulated drain easement. Additional regulated drain easement necessary for the project has been secured across the following parcels:
1. Parcel #: 01-01-29-00-00-011.00; Ringer Farms Inc.; recorded as Instrument No. 2018007419.
2. Parcel #: 01-01-29-00-00-009.00; Jean Cline Farms, LLC; recorded as Instrument No.: 2017044181.

The Surveyor is of the opinion that these easements are adequate for future maintenance of this arm of the Benton Hinesley Drain.

Changes to the Drain
The following changes are proposed to the Drain as part of this project:
1. Remove the entire length (562.60-feet) of the Marion-Adams Arm grass waterway on the Ringer Farms property.
2. Add 2,786-feet of Grass Waterway
3. Add 1,834-feet of 8" SSD
4. Add one (1) breather.
5. Add 811-feet of 20-foot wide filter strip on the west bank of the Marion-Adams Arm. The filter strip shall be established on the Jean Cline Farms, LLC Property; Parcel 01-01-29-00-00-009.000.
6. Add 32-feet of rock chute.

Permits

There are no permits required for this project.

Project Cost

The estimated total cost of the project is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit Price</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>30’ top width grassed waterway</td>
<td>LFT</td>
<td>1,288</td>
<td>$18.00</td>
<td>$23,184.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>20’ top width grassed waterway</td>
<td>LFT</td>
<td>1,478</td>
<td>$18.00</td>
<td>$26,604.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>20’ transition from 20’ to 30’ grassed waterway</td>
<td>LFT</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$18.00</td>
<td>$360.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>8’ HDPE Fibr. SSD w/backfill</td>
<td>LFT</td>
<td>1,834</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td>$27,510.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Breather</td>
<td>Each</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$750.00</td>
<td>$750.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Grasped Waterway Seeding &amp; Mulching</td>
<td>Acre</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>$7,500.00</td>
<td>$13,125.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Filter Strip Seeding &amp; Mulching</td>
<td>Acre</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>$4,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Spoils Seeding</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$12,500.00</td>
<td>$12,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Tree Clearing</td>
<td>Acre</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>$4,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Reshape Riprap Outlet</td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>20-foot Arch Pipe</td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
<td>$12,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Driveway Crossing (stone &amp; riprap)</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Modifications within 248th Street ROW</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Construction Subtotal $143,833.00
15% Contingencies $21,529.95
Construction Total $165,362.95
Survey and Design $13,275.00
Construction Staking $6,000.00
As-Built Drawings $13,500.00
Appraisals $2,900.00
Easement Descriptions (Manning Engineering) $4,500.00
Easement Acquisition; Jean Cline Farms, LLC $24,800.00
Easement Acquisition; Ringer Farms, Inc. $1,625.00

Grand Total $223,662.95

Parcels benefitted by this drain are currently assessed for the Benton Hinesley Drain. No changes in the current maintenance assessment shall be required.

The total cost of the project, $223,662.95, will be spread out to the entire drainage shed. The drainage shed for this reconstruction project is 607.13 acres and 68 lots. I have reviewed the benefitted drainage shed and upon considering each parcel individually, I believe each parcel within the drainage shed will have equal benefits based on land use as provided by the drain. Therefore, I recommend each tract be assessed on the same basis equally by land use. I also believe that no damages will result to landowners by reconstruction of this drain. I recommend the following reconstruction assessment be set:

1) Residential & Agricultural areas $270.10 per acre with $270.10 minimum.
2) Commercial, Institutional & Roads $540.20 per acre with $540.20 minimum.

I recommend that the Board set a hearing for this proposal for March 25, 2019.

Sincerely,
Kenton C. Ward, CPM
Hamilton County Surveyor’s Office

KCW/pl1

Miller stated this all items from the overall watershed project for the Symonds and Krause Watersheds completed in 2013. I believe this is project six. Existing conditions you see the Currey and Puzey Subdivision is directly adjacent to Sheridan Schools and the detention basin had inadequate overflow characteristics. That’s one of the primary needs for this project. Additionally, there’s numerous testimonies from the residents about flooding and other things that occurred in 2011. During 2011 I believe we had 8 to 10 houses that flooded. Our 100-year study showed about 5 to 6 houses that would flood and have been impacted by the detention basin overflow predominantly. South Drive was reconstructed and provided a 30-inch outlet through the Currey and Puzey Subdivision out
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into the detention basin and this is an extension of that project. Essentially the 100-year flood elevation inundates multiple structures by about six inches to not quite a foot. The intention of the grass waterway project is to eliminate that issue. We had to acquire several easements throughout the project. There’s approximately a half mile of grass waterway and it varies in width from 30 feet on the downstream half and 20 feet on the upstream half. This lowers the 100-year elevation about .9 feet, so it makes the proposed 100-year essentially the existing 10-year roughly. It also promotes less sediment downstream. There are issues there with the open ditch filling up with sediment rapidly.

Altman asked how many structures flooded in 2011, do you know?

Miller stated I believe it was eight to ten structures. It was a larger event than what the 100-year event was, so it was a bigger inundation area. The 100-year shows about five to six that would be impacted by it. With the 100-year we’re able to at least eliminate that risk for the 100-year flood. Part of the issue with the existing structures too was the inability for that 30” pipe that came down through South Drive, without that the water just expanded over the entire width of South Drive and went all the way down. It’s kind of a dual effect of having the large pipe and the grass waterway.

Heirbrandt asked how has this effected the school?

Miller stated it should lower their overall issues with drainage and the detention basin, but it is mostly confined to their detention basin. It should dry things up a little bit, but I’m not sure how it will impact them on a day to day basis.

Altman opened the public hearing. We have a comment from Mr. Jim Durr who has requested that these assessments be payable over an extended period up to seven years and requested the lowest interest rate possible. We have an objection from Jason Resciniti. Would anyone care to address the Board?

Resciniti stated for me the objection came in being that I’m already paying on another drain as well as when I purchased my home I had two separate deeds. Recently I filed to combine those two deeds. Just to ensure, I discussed with Andy Conover that it was likely that we would be able to remove one of the minimums for that quarter acre parcel. Basically, I'm here to make sure we're able to remove that charge so as I’m only paying for one deed instead of two, but then on top of that the question comes in how often am I to expect that I would see a charge for a separate drain? Being that I’m already paying on a different drain the George Symonds Drain and now the Benton Hinesley Drain I guess my question is next year will there be a third drain that I’m paying for? Should I be held accountable for only one or how does that work?

The Surveyor stated the George Symonds Drain is the main open ditch that the Benton Hinesley flows into so that’s why you have two assessments. It looks like different drains, but it’s all the same watershed. You receive a maintenance bill for the Symonds Ditch and this would be a bill on top of that for reconstruction. This would be over a certain time period whereas the maintenance goes on until it reaches four times the annual assessment, stops and then when it falls below that it starts up again. This would be a time certain payment.

Resciniti stated it’s not as though a drainage reassessment is going to be made on a yearly basis or anything like that it’s only when the maintenance cost is exceeded by…

The Surveyor stated it would be a yearly basis, but it would only be a five or whatever time period the Board would interject on.

Altman stated we can only collect up to a multiple of four unless we change it. It’s possible the Board in the future could change it to an eight-time multiple before we stop collections. This assessment on this particular reconstruction is a one-time assessment for the work being done. You’ll continue to have maintenance charges. The combination of parcels really won’t help significantly on this reconstruction because it’s based on acres benefitted, correct?

The Surveyor stated yes.

Altman stated your combination will only help you on your monthly maintenance or your yearly maintenance minimum.

Resciniti stated from my understanding there was regardless of acreage a $250.00 minimum per parcel. That quarter acre parcel combined into the 3.75 acre parcel would remove roughly $280.00 from that charge.

The Surveyor stated yes, it would lower that.

Altman asked and you’ve already filed your paperwork and recorded it?

Resciniti stated yes.

Altman stated so at the time the Board rules you will be a combined parcel.

The Surveyor asked did you go over to the Auditor’s Office?
Resciniti stated I did, yes.

Altman stated for tax purposes it’s been combined so that’s how we pick up our assessments.

Altman asked if anyone else cared to address the Board; seeing no one Altman closed the public hearing.

Altman stated let’s discuss the request for the extension of time to pay and interest rate if we choose to proceed. Statutorily, what’s the longest period we can do?

The Surveyor stated it would be five years with an Rural Drain Classification.

Altman asked is this urban? If it’s rural what’s the max?

The Surveyor stated five years, but if it’s urban you can go up to 20 years.

Altman asked who might be able to check that before we act?

Mills stated I’m looking at it right now.

Altman asked have we talked to the schools because they’re getting hit with some significant assessments also? Have we had any concerns expressed from the schools?

Heirbrandt stated I have not heard anything.

The Surveyor stated our office has not heard anything.

Altman stated this is not insignificant. What’s our current interest rate if we borrow internally for this?

The Surveyor stated the last rate I believe was 3%. 

Altman stated I don’t feel comfortable with 3% with rates going up, probably 4% would average.

Heirbrandt stated if this is considered urban I wouldn’t have any problem extending this to seven years.

Altman stated we can’t on urban, only on rural.

Mills stated it’s rural.

Altman stated so we could go to 7 years. Just for the people in the audience if you’re interested in this if we extend it, it’s an option that landowners could extend a payment. Just remember if you sell it, it will come due immediately. We have the ability to set interest rates below what the statute provides which is quite honestly quite high. I would entertain a motion to address the objection.

Dillinger made the motion to overrule the objection, seconded by Heirbrandt and approved unanimously.

Heirbrandt made the motion to approve the reconstruction with a payback period of seven (7) years, seconded by Dillinger and approved unanimously.

Heirbrandt made the motion to approve a 4% interest rate for the repayment on the reconstruction, seconded by Dillinger and approved unanimously.

"STATE OF INDIANA ) ss: BEFORE THE HAMILTON COUNTY DRRAINAGE BOARD
COUNTY OF HAMILTON ) NOBLESVILLE, INDIANA
IN THE MATTER OF THE RECONSTRUCTION OF THE Benton Hinesley Drain, Grass Waterway

FINDINGS AND ORDER FOR RECONSTRUCTION

The matter of the proposed Reconstruction of the Benton Hinesley Drain, Grass Waterway came before the Hamilton County Drainage Board for hearing on March 25, 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.

Hamilton County Drainage Board March 25, 2019
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.

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 Benton Hinesley Drain, Grass Waterway 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

Steven C. Dillinger
Member

Mark Heirbrandt
Member

ATTEST: Lynette Mosbaugh
Executive Secretary

Private Drain Petition – Anderson/Singh:
Conover presented his report to the Board for approval.

To: Hamilton County Drainage Board

March 8, 2019

Re: Arla Anderson Private Drain Petition

On March 7, 2018 an Obstruction of Private Drainage Petition was received by the Hamilton County Surveyor’s Office. The petition was filed by Arla Anderson, 14180 Promise Road, Noblesville, IN 46060. The petition was in proper form and all required information was submitted.

The petition identified an obstruction located on downstream property identified as parcel #13-11-21-00-00-022,000, located at 14088 Promise Road, Fishers, IN. Deeded owner: Resham Singh, 11391 Niagara Dr., Fishers, IN 46037.

On August 9, 2017 Mrs. Anderson had hired Fluid Waste Services and Ward construction to work on a private tile on her property. The private tile was not flowing. It was found that there was a blockage downstream from Mrs. Anderson’s property on Mr. Singh’s property. The total cost paid by Mrs. Anderson for this work was $1,447.36.

On May 29, 2018 a hearing was held for this petition. The Board approved a motion to utilize one of the county drainage board contractors to investigate the private tile on the Singh property to find the blockage. On July 14, 2018 Ward Construction worked at the Singh property and located the blockage in the tile. The blockage was caused by tree roots in the tile. A total of 56 feet of 8-inch SDR-35 PVC pipe was installed to replace the tile that was blocked with tree roots. A small manhole/inlet structure was found on the private tile. The structure was buried. After speaking with Mr. Singh on the phone it was decided that the top of the manhole should be raised up to the surface. This work would be paid for by Mr. Singh. The total cost of the work from Ward Construction for the day was $2,173.05. $34.00 of this cost was to raise the manhole to surface level on the Singh property.

On July 23, 2018 the Board addressed the allocation of the costs for this project. It was determined that the all the bills for this project should be combined and Mrs. Anderson should be allowed credit for the amount she has already paid.
Citing Indiana Code 36-9-27.4-19

Additional duties of board; drains
Sec. 19. (a) If:
(1) a petition filed under this chapter concerns a drain; and
(2) the drainage board:
   (A) finds for the petitioner under section 14(a) of this chapter; but
   (B) does not find under section 15 of this chapter that the obstruction of
   the drain was created intentionally by any of the respondents;
the drainage board shall enter an order under subsection (b).

(b) Upon a determination made under subsection (a), the drainage board shall enter an
order:
(1) authorizing the petitioner to remove the obstruction;
(2) authorizing the respondents to remove the obstruction;
(3) directing the county surveyor to remove the obstruction; or
(4) directing that the obstruction be removed through the joint efforts of at
least two (2) of the persons referred to in this subsection.

(c) If an order is issued under subsection (b), the costs of removing the obstruction
must be borne by the owners of all the tracts of land that are benefited by the drain.
The order of the board must do the following:
(1) Identify all tracts of land that are benefited by the drain.
(2) Identify the owners of the tracts of land referred to in subdivision (1):
   (A) who are known to the drainage board; or
   (B) whose identity can be determined through the records
       of the county auditor.
(3) Apportion the costs of removing the obstruction among the tracts of land that
are benefited by the drain, assigning to each tract a certain percentage of the total
 costs.
(4) Order the owners of each tract of land referred to in subdivision (1) to pay
 an amount equal to the product of the total costs of removing the obstruction multiplied
 by the percentage assigned to the tract under subdivision (3).
(d) The percentage of the total costs assigned to a tract under subsection (c)(3)
 must correspond to the ratio of the total length of the drain to the length of the
 particular segment of the drain that benefits the tract.

Following the above direction of the Indiana Code the cost allocation will be as follows:
Total Length of drain 505 feet. 258 feet on Anderson property (51%), 247 feet on Singh
property (49%).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work Order 2018-00189 by Ward Construction on 7-14-2018</td>
<td>$2,173.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of raising manhole (to be paid by Mr. Singh)</td>
<td>$34.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total cost to be shared for Work Order 2018-00189</td>
<td>$2,207.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total cost to be shared for Work Order 2018-00189 (Paid by Mrs. Anderson)</td>
<td>$1,447.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total cost of work to be shared</td>
<td>$3,586.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson 51%</td>
<td>$1,829.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson paid for work done on 9-6-2017</td>
<td>$1,447.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance to be paid by Anderson</td>
<td>$381.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singh 49%</td>
<td>$1,757.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of raising manhole</td>
<td>$34.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance to be paid by Singh</td>
<td>$1,791.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Submitted by:
Andrew D. Conover
Inspector

Altman opened the public hearing, seeing no one present Altman closed the public hearing.
Heirbrandt made the motion to approve the allocation of costs to the property owners as
recommended by the Surveyor’s Office, seconded by Dillinger and approved unanimously.

Williams Creek Drain, Springmill Streams Arm - Land Acquisition Order to Proceed:
The Surveyor stated we have an order to proceed with condemnation on two parcels on the
Springmill Streams Drain. Those parcels are Elizabeth Mitchell and parcel No. 2 would be
Richard W. and Phyllis J. Schnute. At this point in time I would recommend to the Board
that they proceed with condemnation.

Heirbrandt made the motion to proceed with condemnation, seconded by Dillinger and
approved unanimously.

Altman stated should the homeowners or landowners choose to negotiate at this point we
would be welcome to those discussions even with condemnation proceeding.
Professional Services Agreement – Elwood Wilson Drain, Hare Arm:
The Surveyor stated we have a developer who wishes to reconstruct the entire W. Hare 
& Sons Arm here in Noblesville on the east side of town. This would be one of the arms of 
the Elwood Wilson Drain. The plans are complete and we ask that our consultant be 
allowed to review the drainage reports and also the calculations. We have a lump sum not 
exceed $6,100.00 to do that.

Heirbrandt made the motion to approve the Professional Services Agreement with Clark 
Dietz in the amount not to exceed $6,100.00, seconded by Dillinger and approved 
unanimously.

Hearing Requests:
The Surveyor presented the following items for hearing on May 28, 2019: Little Eagle 
Creek Drain, Seals Subdivision Arm; Little Eagle Creek Drain, Seals Extension.

Dillinger made the motion to set the items presented for hearing on May 28, 2019, 
seconded by Heirbrandt and approved unanimously.

Waters of the U.S. – Proposed Revised Definition:
The Surveyor stated there is still a problem between tributary and drains, the 
definition. We’re working that out. I missed an opportunity to sit down with EPA and 
Consolidated regional, specifically from the western states, were quite pleased with the outcome and the willingness of those representatives with EPA and the 
corps to listen and to actually engage in conversation to understand our viewpoints.

William Krause Drain, Reconstruction Phase 3 – Contract:
Duncan stated at the March 11th meeting the contract was awarded to Millennium Contractors 
in the amount of $735,885.00 for Phase 3 of the William Krause Drain Reconstruction and 
we have the contract for the Board’s signature.

Altman stated one note on here, and this is really for the contractor’s protection, above 
the signature line it should read that he is signing on behalf of Millennium Contractor’s 
LLC. It appears he’s signing personally and I don’t think he wants to take personal 
responsibility.

Duncan asked would you like us to revise that?

Altman stated I’ll just pencil it in for them.

Dillinger made the motion to approve the contract in the amount of $735,885.00, seconded 
by Heirbrandt and approved unanimously.

Preliminary Variance Request – Hamilton Southeastern Schools Solar Fields Project:
Mr. Garyne Evans, Mr. Dave Radanot and Mr. Bob Rice were present for this item.

Heirbrandt recused himself from this item.

Cash stated Hamilton Southeastern and Ameresco request to present a preliminary proposal 
for installing a solar panel field within the Sand Creek Floodplain. This is the Mud 
Creek/Sand Creek Drainage Area. This is located at the Sand Creek Elementary School. 
The proposal will require the approval of a variance for fill in the floodplain. The 
purpose of this presentation is to introduce the project to the Board and they will be 
requesting preliminary concurrence to move forward with the proposal.

Evans stated we’re looking at a solar array that will connect to both Sand Creek 
Elementary and Sand Creek Middle Schools. The field will be in one location, but that 
array will be split into two to serve the two different facilities. In general, the 
project consists of pilings. The solar sits on a steel rack and the pilings that are 
driven into the ground, there’s no concrete footers or forms that are poured, there’s no 
pads, there’s no buildings. There is essentially just the steel C-channel that’s driven. 
The racking, all the electrical components, the panels themselves everything will be 
supported up above the BFE level, the floodplain level. The electrical will run 
underneath those panels attached to the rack. Our preliminary calculations right now 
estimate that about 11 gallons of water would be displaced by the pilings that are 
actually below the BFE level and there will also be a chain link fence that will surround 
the array to keep folks from wondering in there. Some of the posts will be driven into 
the ground for the fence will be below the floodplain. Out of 96 posts approximately 60 
of those will be greater than one foot below that floodplain level. We estimate about 30 
gallons of water would be displaced by that so all total about 40 to 45 gallons of water 
displacement. Obviously, there will be minimal impact, but nonetheless we’re here to ask 
for this variance or to present so you can discuss.

Altman asked I presume you understand the 3:1 even with the minimal impact on the 
mitigation?

Evans stated yes.

Altman asked and that’s not a problem for Southeastern?

Rice stated no.
Altman asked will you be able to use this for educational purposes with your students?

Rice stated yes. I was a teacher in the district for ten years and I do energy management for them. We’ve worked with Ameresco to develop a solar curriculum and we’re partnering with the National Energy Education Development Project to use this as a learning experience. It will also come with a live web monitoring so it’s not just the students, anybody in the community can log on to see the energy produced and some of the carbon offset that we’re producing.

Altman stated obviously we’re a big believer in it too. I think it’s a good idea to use some of these lands that are basically unusable for this purpose.

Dillinger made the motion to allow Hamilton Southeastern Schools to proceed with their Solar Fields Project, seconded by Altman and approved unanimously.

**Preliminary Variance Request – Towns of Avalon North (Pulte Homes):**

Mr. Rick Ellis was present for this item.

Cash stated the Towns of Avalon wish to present their proposal for site grading and installing floodplain compensatory storage as part of the Towns of Avalon North project. The project is also within Mud Creek/Sand Creek Drainage Area, specifically located south of Southeastern Parkway, south of 136th Street about one quarter mile east of Olio Road on the north side of Mud Creek.

Ellis stated this is 120 townhome units on about 35 acres. When we initially laid out the project, we tried to avoid the floodplain all together, but based on comments that we received during TAC from the City of Fishers and the County Surveyor’s Office they asked that we plot the base flood elevation onto the contours or topo survey that we had completed for the project. The results indicated that the base flood elevation would extend slightly past the mapped FEMA map line. We have provided compensatory storage at 3:1 in that area and are requesting that the Board consider a waiver for this area.

Dillinger asked the Surveyor if he had any comments?

The Surveyor stated no, as Cash said this is preliminary, so they need to yet provide us with the detailed information for the mitigation.

Altman asked for the record what’s the blue and red on the map?

Ellis stated the blue would be the area of fill and the red is the area of cut.

Heirbrandt made the motion to approve the request to move forward with the project for Towns of Avalon North Project, seconded by Dillinger and approved unanimously.

Cash stated both of these projects will be reviewed by Christopher Burke as part of their review of the fill in the floodplain ordinance.

Altman asked is this within the corporate area or unincorporated area?

Cash stated I believe it is annexed.

Altman stated so these roads will be under the jurisdiction of Fishers?

Ellis stated yes.

**Non-enforcements:**

Cash presented a non-enforcement request for the Castetter & Randall Arm Drain filed by the City of Fishers for parcel #15-10-36-04-02-017.001 for AMP West Lot and AMP Northwest Lot. The Surveyor’s Office recommends approval.

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

Liston presented a non-enforcement request for the Cool Creek Drain, Oak Park Arm file by Dave and Mary Foulk for parcel #09-10-07-00-05-005.000 for a pool, deck and other amenities. The Surveyor’s Office recommends approval.

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

Liston presented a non-enforcement for the Long Branch Drain, Shelborne Woods Arm filed by Swati Vallabhpaneni for parcel #17-09-32-00-08-008.000 for a fence with removable panels. The Surveyor’s Office recommends approval.

Heirbrandt made the motion to approve the non-enforcement request presented, seconded by Dillinger and approved unanimously.
Liston presented a non-enforcement request for the Little Eagle Creek Drain, Maple Village Arm filed by Jean Maddox for parcel #08-09-01-00-007.000 for a fence. The Surveyor’s Office recommends approval.

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

Liston presented a non-enforcement request for the Williams Creek Drain, Jackson’s Grant Arm file by Jennifer Sams for a fence with removable panels. The Surveyor’s Office recommends approval.

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

Liston presented a non-enforcement request for the John Edwards Drain filed by Duke Energy for parcel #08-09-09-00-00-010.004 for overhead pole line along 161st Street on south side. The Surveyor’s Office recommends approval.

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

Liston presented a non-enforcement request for the Long Branch Drain, Lakeside Park Arm filed by Adam and Shelby Chobany for parcel #17-09-20-00-02-021.000 for a fence. The Surveyor’s Office recommends denial. This item was tabled on December 17, 2018.

Chobany (Shelby) stated we’re trying to get a fence put in our backyard. We have three children ages four and under and live across the street from a large pond. We were hoping to avoid this whole process, but when we learned about the 7.5 foot easement we have about eight mature trees in our backyard that we would either have to take down or the fence would have to be put on the outside of them. The trees were put in I believe when the house was built before we ever moved in or purchased it. We’re asking for as much footage as we possibly can without taking down those trees. I believe in the back it’s close to 6 feet and on the side maybe close to 4 feet. We also have worked with our fence company to better understand that if we wanted to take the fence down at any point if we needed to one fence portion can be taken down in 60 seconds, it’s only four screws. It’s something that could be done very easily. We do understand too that we’d be taking the risk that if you need to take it down really fast and it damaged our fence that would be our liability. We’re here asking for approval to put this fence in.

Altman asked how do the trees affect your side yard request?

Chobany (Shelby) stated we have trees going down our side yard and then also in the backyard as well.

Altman stated I see the ones in the backyard area.

Chobany (Adam) stated you can’t see them very well, but there’s a row of arborvitae’s and then these three mature pines are in the back.

Altman stated it looks like someone planted the arborvitae right on the line unless it’s a shadow issue.

Chobany (Adam) stated that’s a shadow. We pushed the fence line as far as we could away from the drain line to give as many feet towards the easement as we could without taking out trees or impacting the rest of the yard. I think it’s important to know it’s a black aluminum ornamental fence and the sections come down very easily. It isn’t a wood or semi-permanent fence.

Heirbrandt stated but you do realize that this is 100% your cost if the Board would have to get in there for any reason.

Chobany (Adam and Shelby) stated yes.

Heirbrandt stated even if there’s damage to the fence and they need to get in there in an emergency basis.

Chobany (Adam and Shelby) stated yes.

Dillinger made the motion to approve the Chobany non-enforcement, seconded by Heirbrandt.

Altman stated I want to hear from the Surveyor’s Office on what this does to subsurface drainage if anything. There’s got to be a reason we put this on discussion.

The Surveyor stated the location of the fence is going to make it difficult to gain access.

Liston stated on the rear the notes read 5.2 inches and on the side yard it notes 2 feet off the property line.

Dillinger stated the reason for the request for discussion is Mr. Holt and I were the only two that were here and we knew we weren’t going to see eye to eye on it and I felt this was important enough that the entire Board could discuss.
Heirbrandt stated I read the entire meeting minutes so I’m comfortable with it and what Chobany’s have put on record as well.

The motion had been made and seconded to approve the Chobany non-enforcement and approved unanimously.

**Surety Acceptance:**
Liston stated that at this afternoon’s Commissioners meeting the Board would be accepting the following sureties: Performance Bond No. 7659710 in the amount of $438,000.00 for the Thorpe Creek Drain, John Underwood Arm Reconstruction; Payment Bond No. 7659710 in the amount of $438,000.00 for the Thorpe Creek Drain, John Underwood Arm Reconstruction; Performance Bond No. 30065306 in the amount of $20,499.00 for Wood Hollow Section 2, storage basin improvements.

**Construction Updates:**
Thorpe Creek Drain, Martha Ford Arm Relocation - Liston stated nothing has really happened in the last two weeks due to the weather.

Thorpe Creek Drain, John Underwood Arm Reconstruction - Liston stated nothing has started on this project at this time.

Cool Creek Park Bank Stabilization Project - Cline stated the contractor has the straw matting down and seeded. The landscaper was to submit the plantings to the engineer and the architectural company to make sure they were putting down the proper plantings and trees for the bank.

Heirbrandt stated I saw those photographs and they did a great job. The Parks Department also contacted me about it and complemented the contractor and the exceptional job they did.

Thistlewaite Drain, California Street Arm Extension - Conover stated this project is being done by Millennium and we had a preconstruction meeting last week. Pending weather, they will be getting started within the next week or so.

William Krause Drain, Reconstruction Phase 3 - Conover stated this project is being done by Millennium Contractors. We had a preconstruction meeting last week and pending weather they will be getting started within the next week or so.

**Pending Asbuilts:**
William Krause Reconstruction Phase 1 - Conover stated we’re waiting on weather to break so the contractor can come back and finish the paving on the church parking lot. The church has changed ownership and the new owners of the church had asked me about getting the contractor’s name and number so they can do the entire parking lot. That had been discussed in the past.

William Krause Reconstruction Phase 2 - Conover stated the contractor will be coming back in the next couple of weeks to do a little touch up on that project. It was wet when they finished up last year and it’s held up pretty well over the winter, but they are going to come back and do some additional work.

**Pending Final Report:**
Windemere Pond Reconstruction - Cline stated we’re waiting on the recorded document back from Mike Howard’s Office.

**Items Pending:**
Ream Creek Reconstruction (Fund Balance & Participation) - Altman stated this is from 2013.

The Surveyor stated we’re still working with Burke Engineering on that. The developer on the south end on the Monon Project has done some of the work for us. Below that are the apartments and we have done that on maintenance. All we have to do now is get with the pipeline company and my idea on that since they don’t want to adhere to their past commitment is shove a pipe underneath the open ditch and bypass the pipeline and part of that commitment is we would fix the pipeline where it’s washed out upstream that’s theirs now.

Altman asked that’s theirs?
The Surveyor stated I’ll let them do that.

**William Lehr Drain – J. S. McCarty Arm:**
Heirbrandt stated I wanted to follow up on this item. At our last meeting it was stated we would have some type of an update, but I didn’t see that update to see how you’re coming along with that.

Duncan stated we have draft plans that we need to review on that.

**Anchorage Drain:**
Heirbrandt asked how the office is coming along with this project? Did we get some communication back to that neighborhood?

Duncan stated we have the plan completed, but the Surveyor needs to look at it before we issue it for bids.

**Merrimac Drain:**
The Surveyor stated Baitz spoke with a gentleman that attended the last HOA Board meeting and that is now a moot point.

**Ingerman/Lockwood Drain – Forested Wetland Mitigation:**
The Surveyor stated the Board asked that we check on the banks. The banks are sold out. There is an in-lieu program and that’s $80,000.00 per acre and IDEM wants 30% on top of that for review over the five-year period.

Altman stated so we’re going to get in the wetlands and we’ll find out how to do it. Is that your recommendation?

The Surveyor stated yes.

Altman asked is that what you typically do?

The Surveyor stated we’ve not done this in the past.

Altman asked what’s the balance in the shed?

Heirbrandt stated if it’s specifically for that drain it should be taken out of that drainage shed.

The Surveyor stated the drain is in the red $31,000.00. I’ll take it out of GDIF for the time being and get it paid.

Altman stated we need to think on policy because this is really a policy decision. Maybe we deal with that at the next meeting? Think about whether we would assess it to a specific drain or whether we go 50/50.

Heirbrandt stated we need to ask Howard his opinion as well from a legal standpoint.

Heirbrandt made the motion to adjourn, seconded by Dillinger and approved unanimously.