

MINUTES OF THE HAMILTON COUNTY DRAINAGE BOARD

March 28, 2022

The meeting was called to order Monday, March 28, 2022 at 9:02 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 Cash, Mr. Reuben Arvin, Mr. Sam Clark, Mr. Gary Duncan, Mr. Jerry Liston, Mr. Luther Cline and Ms. Suzanne Mills. The Board's attorney's, Mr. Michael Howard and Mr. Connor Sullivan, were also present.

Approval of Minutes of March 14, 2022:

The minutes of March 14, 2022 were presented to the Board for approval.

Dillinger made the motion to approve the minutes of March 14, 2022, seconded by Heirbrandt and approved unanimously.

Elwood Wilson Drain - E. M. Hare Arm Reconstruction:

There were no objections on file. Ms. Patsy Savage, Mr. Matt Light, Mr. Jim Hellmann, Mr. Jonathan Mirgeaux and Mr. Sam Robertson were present for this item.

The Surveyor presented his report to the Board for approval.

"February 8, 2022

TO: Hamilton County Drainage Board

RE: Elwood Wilson Drain EM Hare Arm Reconstruction

Attached are the plans, schedule of assessments and drainage shed map, for the Elwood Wilson Drain EM Hare Arm Reconstruction Project.

The Elwood Wilson Drain EM Hare Arm is located in Noblesville Township of Hamilton County and benefits properties in Sections 32 and 33 of Township 19 North, Range 5 East. The drain is currently tiled and is 8,197-feet-feet in length. The EM Hare Arm drainage shed is 765.94-acres. The area subject to assessment also includes acreage in Section 5 of Township 18 North, Range 5 East in Noblesville Township and acreage in Section 34 of Township 19 North, Range 5 East in Wayne Township.

The Elwood Wilson Drain EM Hare Arm discharges to the Home Depot Relocation Arm of the Elwood Wilson Drain on the east side of Presley Drive. The Home Depot Relocation Arm of the Elwood Wilson Drain discharges to the Elwood Wilson Main Ditch which then flows downstream through the Elias Gascho Arm, then flows through the Firestone Reconstruction Arm, and then flows through the Elwood Wilson Main Ditch to Stony Creek.

The attached plans, dated December 17, 2021 were prepared by Clark Dietz, Inc. The plans are for dredging a section of the Elwood Wilson Main Ditch, reconstructing the majority of the Home Depot Relocation Arm of the Elwood Wilson Drain, and reconstructing a portion of the EM Hare Arm of the Elwood Wilson Drain as an open ditch. The project will improve the flow characteristics of the Drain and will allow future reconstruction projects of the remainder of the EM Hare Arm of the Elwood Wilson Drain.

The drain stationing in this report reference the historic stationing of the drain. The project stationing of the construction plans by Clark Dietz does not follow the historic stationing.

I have made a personal inspection of the Drain. Upon doing so, I believe that the drain is practicable; will improve the public health; will 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.

History

The Elwood Wilson Drain was established in approximately December of 1891 (Commissioner's Record No. 7, Page 153).

The EM Hare Arm of the Elwood Wilson Drain was petitioned on May 16, 1908. The record includes a Viewers Report dated June 8, 1908 (Ditch Construction Book 1885-1914, Page 323).

The Home Depot Relocation Arm of Elwood Wilson Drain was approved at hearing at the August 27, 2001 meeting of the Drainage Board (Hamilton County Drainage Board Meeting Minutes Book 6, Page 127).

Work Order History

Based on a search of the County's database for drainage complaints, there have been eighteen (18) Drainage Complaints logged in to the County's database for such complaints since 2001. The complaints are listed below.

Job #	Issue	Description	Location
DC-2001-00086	1/17/2002	Breakdown of tile; several holes	East of SR 37 & South of SR 32
DC-2001-00194	10/16/2001	Flooding in area	#18067 Promise Rd, Noblesville
DC-2002-00009	1/17/2002	Blow hole	North of SR 32 & West of Promise Rd
DC-2002-00235	5/14/2002	No headwall on surface drain	North of SR 32 & East of Presley Dr
DC-2003-00577	10/9/2003	Blow holes	181st St & Promise Rd
DC-2003-00639	11/10/2003	Broken tile	North of SR 32 & West of Promise Rd
DC-2006-00300	7/6/2006	Erosion	North of SR 32 & East of Presley Dr
DC-2008-00023	1/29/2008	Broken field tile	North of SR 32 & West of Promise Rd
DC-2011-00428	11/17/2011	Standing water	Near 181st St on both E and W sides of Promise Rd
DC-2012-00134	4/5/2012	Blow holes	North of SR 32 & East of SR 37
DC-2014-00254	5/14/2014	Erosion at gabion baskets	North of SR 32 & East of Presley Dr
DC-2014-00289	5/30/2014	Blow hole	North of 181st St & East of Promise Rd
DC-2014-00505	11/19/2014	Blow holes	North of SR 32 & West of Promise Rd
DC-2015-00238	5/13/2015	Blow hole	Near 181st St & West of Promise Rd
DC-2015-00469	10/8/2015	Rocks and sediment in Breather	North of 181st St & East of Promise Rd
DC-2016-00115	4/14/2016	Seven (7) blow holes	North of SR 32 & East of SR 37
DC-2018-00111	4/5/2018	Water overtopping road on 186th St	On 186th Street & West of Promise Rd
DC-2019-00035	2/1/2019	Drain clogged	North of 181st St & East of Promise Rd

There have been a total of 12 Work Orders since 2001 with a total value of \$19,897.93. The Work Orders are listed below.

Job #	Type of Repair	Cost (\$)	Date Complete
WO-2001-00156	Water boiling up; Investigate tile for blockage	\$3,251.20	1/10/2003
WO-2002-00010	Blow hole	\$294.00	8/12/2003
WO-2003-00239	Several blow holes	\$1,422.10	1/20/2005
WO-2004-00040	Repair holes and investigate tile for blockage	\$885.10	12/9/2005
WO-2008-00042	Several blow holes	\$852.55	2/5/2009
WO-2012-00049	Several holes; investigate tile for blockage	\$1,436.86	4/10/2012
WO-2012-00133	Three blow holes	\$1,485.20	5/29/2012

WO-2015-00008	Blow hole on regulated tile	\$546.00	2/25/2016
WO-2015-00198	Blow hole	\$1,125.70	6/23/2015
WO-2015-00384	Breather full of rocks and sediment	\$813.75	6/24/2016
WO-2016-00167	Seven blow holes	\$1,945.47	8/18/2016
WO-2017-00138	Repair holes and de-brush around structure and easement	\$5,840.00	6/13/2019

Existing Condition

The existing drain is comprised of the original clay field tile constructed in 1908. The 20" portion of the tile between Stations 81+97 and 79+60, just east of Presley Drive, was constructed in 1959. The Drain functions but is undersized by today's standards. The tile is at least 114-years old and has exceeded the expected service life of such a tile. Routine maintenance is required for the tile to function

It is common for ponding to occur after rain events in several of the fields within the watershed. Such ponding and saturated soil conditions affect crop production.

Promise Road, just north of 181st Street, regularly overtops during rain events.

The portion of the Elwood Wilson Main Ditch and the portion of the Home Depot Relocation Arm to be reconstructed with this project have accumulated sediment within the ditch that affects the capacity of the drain.

Reconstruction Project

Each aspect of the reconstruction project is recommended in the Elwood Wilson Drain, EM Hare Arm Hydraulic Study completed by Clark Dietz, Inc. dated December 2016.

The proposed open ditch and culverts were sized for runoff from the 100-year storm event from the watershed in the existing condition. The culverts were sized to convey runoff from the 100-year storm event within the watershed without overtopping the roadways. The open ditch was designed so that the runoff from the 100-year storm event within the watershed would remain below the top-of-bank.

While the project mainly involves the reconstruction of the EM Hare Arm of the Elwood Wilson Drain, certain portions of the Elwood Wilson Main Ditch and the Home Depot Relocation Arm of the Elwood Wilson Drain must also be reconstructed to improve the capacity of the Drain.

The project will be let by the Hamilton County Drainage Board and the construction contract will be managed by the Hamilton County Surveyor's Office.

The project includes the following:

1. Reconstruct the Elwood Wilson Main Ditch between Station 13+06 and Station 7+46 to re-establish the flowline and cross-sectional area of the ditch to improve the capacity of the Drain. The ditch configuration varies through this segment and includes a bag type cast-in-place retaining wall as follows, looking upstream:

Station		Side Slope		Bottom Width (ft)		Retaining Wall	
From	To	Left (H:V)	Right (H:V)	Left	Right	Left	Right
13+06	12+80	2:1	2:1	2	2	No	No
12+80	12+60	Transition	2:1	Transition	2	No	No
12+60	11+81	0.5:1	2:1	4	2	Yes	No
11+81	11+60	0.5:1	Transition	4	Transition	Yes	No
11+60	10+69	0.5:1	0.5:1	4	4	Yes	Yes
10+69	10+48	Transition	0.5:1	Transition	4	No	Yes
10+48	10+10	2:1	0.5:1	2	4	No	Yes
10+10	9+89	2:1	Transition	2	Transition	No	No
9+89	7+46	2:1	2:1	2	2	No	No

2. Reconstruct the Home Depot Relocation Drain between Station 7+29 and Station 0+00 to re-establish the flowline and cross-sectional area of the ditch to

- improve the capacity of the Drain. The ditch configuration is a 4-foot wide bottom with 3:1 side slopes.
- i. The 135-foot segment of 21" RCP that currently drains the EM Hare Arm of the Elwood Wilson Drain and crosses Presley Drive will remain and not be reconstructed with this project.
3. Construct new open ditch as part of the EM Hare Arm of the Elwood Wilson Drain. The new open ditch will be constructed between Station 81+78 and Station 79+60 of the EM Hare Arm of the Elwood Wilson Drain. Station 81+78 of the new open ditch of the EM Hare Arm of the Elwood Wilson Drain is also Station 0+00 and the current end of the Home Depot Relocation Arm of the Elwood Wilson Drain. The ditch configuration is a 4-foot wide bottom with 3:1 side slopes. The length of the new open ditch is 218-feet.
 - i. The portion of the existing EM Hare of the Elwood Wilson Drain between Station 80+04 and Station 79+60 will be removed with this project.
 - ii. The portion of the existing EM Hare of the Elwood Wilson Drain between Station 81+97 (the current end of the Drain) and Station 80+04 will be abandoned in place with a bulkhead and breather placed at Station 80+04.
 4. Reconstruct the existing EM Hare Arm of the Elwood Wilson Drain as an open ditch between Station 79+60 and Station 62+45. The ditch configuration is a 4-foot wide bottom with 3:1 side slopes. The existing tile will be demolished as the new open ditch is constructed.
 5. Construct new open ditch as part of the EM Hare Arm of the Elwood Wilson Drain. The new open ditch will be constructed off of the alignment of the existing tile between Station 62+45 and Station 38+19 of the EM Hare Arm of the Elwood Wilson Drain. The alignment of the open ditch was shifted from the alignment of the existing tile to avoid impacting existing wetlands. The ditch configuration is a 4-foot wide bottom with 3:1 side slopes. The length of the new open ditch is 2,350-feet.
 - i. The portion of the existing EM Hare of the Elwood Wilson Drain between Station 62+45 and Station 60+72 will be removed with this project.
 - ii. The portion of the existing EM Hare of the Elwood Wilson Drain between Station 60+72 and Station 38+63 will be abandoned in place with a bulkhead and breather placed at Station 38+63.
 - iii. The portion of the existing EM Hare of the Elwood Wilson Drain between Station 38+63 and Station 38+19 will be removed with this project.
 6. Reconstruct the existing EM Hare Arm of the Elwood Wilson Drain between Station 38+19 and Station 29+92 as an open ditch to improve the capacity of the drain. The ditch configuration is a 4-foot wide bottom with 3:1 side slopes. The existing tile will be demolished as the new open ditch is constructed.
 7. The existing tile upstream of Station 29+92 will remain in place and discharge to the new open ditch at this station.
 8. A rock chute for surface water flow to enter the new open ditch will be constructed between Station 30+44 and Station 29+22.
 9. The installation of three 30-foot wide ditch crossings, per HCSO Detail C-2, as follows:
 - i. 63-LF of 7-foot x 5-foot Reinforced Concrete Box Structure at Station 70+04 on Parcel 10-07-32-00-00-013.001.
 - ii. 51-LF of 5-foot x 4-foot Reinforced Concrete Box Structure at Station 49+93 on Parcel 10-07-32-00-00-007.000.
 - iii. 51-LF of 5-foot x 4-foot Reinforced Concrete Box Structure at Station 43+93 on Parcel 10-07-33-00-00-012.000.
 10. The installation of 187-feet of 12-foot x 7-foot Reinforced Concrete Box Structure under the Home Depot Entrance Drive.
 11. The installation of 71-feet of 12-foot x 6-foot Reinforced Concrete Box Structure under Presley Drive.
 12. The installation of 73-feet of 7-foot x 4-foot Reinforced Concrete Box Structure under Promise Road.
 13. The cost estimate includes the installation of 15 surface water pipes with animal guard per HCSO Details OD-8 and O-2. These will be installed on an "as-needed" basis.
 14. The cost estimate includes the installation of 95 tile outlets of various sizes with animal guards per HCSO Details O-1 and O-2. These will be installed on an "as-needed" basis.
 15. The project will also include clearing of the easement area and removal of existing pavement, culverts, sidewalk, curb, gabion baskets, breathers, hand rail; fence removal and repair; the installation of rip-rap stabilization at various locations and at culvert crossings; temporary erosion control; native seeding areas; seeding for a 20-foot filter strip as noted in the Filter Strip section of this report; seeding and other stabilization of disturbed soil areas; maintenance of traffic; pavement, sidewalk, curb, and handrail repair; special backfill; removal and resetting of existing RCP end sections of tiles that drain to the existing open ditch; and other ancillary construction.
 16. The soil excavated with the project will be placed within the adjacent regulated drain easement.
 17. The project includes the installation of 2 sanitary sewer manholes, 160-feet of sanitary sewer, and 1 pipe plug for future connection. This sanitary sewer will not become part of the regulated drain system.

Permits

The provisional Regional General Permit, LRL-2019-795-sjk was issued by the Army Corps of Engineers on April 2, 2020. This permit was provisional pending the issuance of the IDEM Individual Water Quality Certification.

The Section 401 Water Quality Certification, IDEM Authorization Number 2020-111-29-ALF-A was issued on May 19,2020.

The IDEM Authorization fo Construction of Sanitary Sewer System, Permit Approval No. 24344, was issued on January 7, 2022.

Staff of the Surveyor's Office or the Contractor will obtain construction entrance and road closure approvals from the Hamilton County Highway Department or the City of Noblesville.

Construction Cost

The Elwood Wilson EM Hare Arm reconstruction project was approved for letting at the November 22, 2021 meeting of the Drainage Board (Hamilton County Drainage Board Meeting Minutes, Book 20, Page 236).

One addendum was issued. The addendum issued the most current Common Construction Wage Rate determination prior to receiving bids and included a change to the deflection testing specification for the sanitary sewer as a condition of the IDEM Sanitary Sewer Construction permit.

Two bids were received at the Drainage Board meeting on January 10, 2022. One bid was from Morphey Construction in the amount of \$2,478,000. The second bid was from 5 Star Company, Inc. in the amount of 2,729,295.00 as entered on Page BF-3.

Morphey Construction submitted the lowest bid.

From the Morphey Construction bid, the construction cost of the project is estimated to be \$2,478,000.00. With a 15% contingency, the total construction cost is \$2,849,700.00

A detailed cost of construction is outlined below.

City of Noblesville Street Costs					
<i>Line Item</i>	<i>Item Description</i>	<i>Quantity</i>	<i>Unit</i>	<i>Unit Cost</i>	<i>Total Cost</i>
N1	Clearing [Presley Drive Culvert, Pavement, Curb and Gutter, and Sidewalk]	LS	1	\$ 15,000.00	\$ 15,000.00
N2	12 x 6 Box Culvert (Presley Drive)	LF	71	\$ 5,000.00	\$ 355,000.00
N3	Revetment Rip Rap with Geotextile	TON	25	\$ 180.00	\$ 4,500.00
N4	Presley Drive Roadway Pavement Repair	TON	328	\$ 133.00	\$ 43,624.00
N5	Concrete Curb and Gutter	LF	120	\$ 74.00	\$ 8,880.00
N6	Sidewalk Concrete	CYS	15	\$ 100.00	\$ 1,500.00
N7	Hand Rail Pedestrian	LF	144	\$ 300.00	\$ 43,200.00
N11	Maintenance of Traffic	LS	1	\$ 15,000.00	\$ 15,000.00
City of Noblesville Street Subtotal					\$ 486,704.00
15% Contingency					\$ 73,005.60
City of Noblesville Street Total					\$ 559,709.60

Home Depot Costs					
<i>Line Item</i>	<i>Item Description</i>	<i>Quantity</i>	<i>Unit</i>	<i>Unit Cost</i>	<i>Total Cost</i>
HD1	Clearing [Existing Entrance Drive Culvert, Pavement, Curb and Gutter]	LS	1	\$ 100,000.00	\$ 100,000.00
HD2	12 x 7 Box Culvert (Home Depot Entrance)	LF	187	\$ 3,163.00	\$ 591,481.00
HD3	Revetment Rip Rap with Geotextile	TON	33	\$ 180.00	\$ 5,940.00
HD4	Entrance Drive Pavement Repair	TON	243	\$ 140.00	\$ 34,020.00
HD5	Concrete Curb and Gutter	LF	175	\$ 68.00	\$ 11,900.00
HD6	Maintenance of Traffic	LS	1	\$ 5,000.00	\$ 5,000.00
Home Depot Subtotal					\$ 748,341.00
15% Contingency					\$ 112,251.15
Home Depot Total					\$ 860,592.15

City of Noblesville Sanitary Sewer Costs					
<i>Line Item</i>	<i>Item Description</i>	<i>Quantity</i>	<i>Unit</i>	<i>Unit Cost</i>	<i>Total Cost</i>
N8	Sanitary Sewer, Pipe, Type 2, Circular, 21 IN., ASTM F679, PS 46	LF	160	\$ 285.00	\$ 45,600.00
N9	Sanitary Sewer Manhole, Type A, with Casting	EA	2	\$ 12,222.00	\$ 24,444.00
N10	Sanitary Sewer Pipe Plug	EA	1	\$ 3,800.00	\$ 3,800.00
City of Noblesville Sanitary Sewer Subtotal					\$ 73,844.00
15% Contingency					\$ 11,076.60
City of Noblesville Sanitary Sewer Total					\$ 84,920.60

Hamilton County Highway Costs					
<i>Line Item</i>	<i>Item Description</i>	<i>Quantity</i>	<i>Unit</i>	<i>Unit Cost</i>	<i>Total Cost</i>
B13	Maintenance of Traffic	LS	1	\$ 3,500.00	\$ 3,500.00
B14	7 x 4 Box Culvert (Promise Road)	LF	73	\$ 2,000.00	\$ 146,000.00
B21	Promise Road Roadway Pavement Repair	SYS	138	\$ 100.00	\$ 13,800.00
Hamilton County Highway Subtotal					\$ 163,300.00
15% Contingency					\$ 24,495.00
Hamilton County Highway Total					\$ 187,795.00

Elwood Wilson EM Hare Costs					
<i>Line Item</i>	<i>Item Description</i>	<i>Quantity</i>	<i>Unit</i>	<i>Unit Cost</i>	<i>Total Cost</i>
B1	Clearing [General Clearing, Promise Road Culverts and Pavement, Gabion Baskets, Breathers, Trees, Farm Fence]	LS	1	\$ 13,000.00	\$ 13,000.00
B2	Temporary Erosion Control	LS	1	\$ 7,000.00	\$ 7,000.00
B3	Open Ditch Construction	LF	6010	\$ 22.00	\$ 132,220.00
B4	Tile Removal	LF	800	\$ 15.00	\$ 12,000.00
B5	Retaining Wall System	LS	1	\$ 299,731.00	\$ 299,731.00
B6	Surface Water Pipe	EA	15	\$ 2,000.00	\$ 30,000.00
B7	6" CMP Tile Drain Extension with Animal Guard	EA	20	\$ 800.00	\$ 16,000.00
B8	8" CMP Tile Drain Extension with Animal Guard	EA	20	\$ 1,000.00	\$ 20,000.00
B9	10" CMP Tile Drain Extension with Animal Guard	EA	20	\$ 1,100.00	\$ 22,000.00
B10	12" CMP Tile Drain Extension with Animal Guard	EA	25	\$ 1,200.00	\$ 30,000.00

Elwood Wilson EM Hare Costs (cotinued)					
<i>Line Item</i>	<i>Item Description</i>	<i>Quantity</i>	<i>Unit</i>	<i>Unit Cost</i>	<i>Total Cost</i>
B11	15" CMP Tile Drain Extension with Animal Guard	EA	5	\$ 1,500.00	\$ 7,500.00
B12	18" CMP Tile Drain Extension with Animal Guard	EA	5	\$ 2,000.00	\$ 10,000.00
B15	7 x 5 Box Culvert (Private Crossing - Station 54+15)	LF	63	\$ 1,300.00	\$ 81,900.00
B16	5 x 4 Box Culvert (Private Crossing - Station 74+26)	LF	51	\$ 1,200.00	\$ 61,200.00
B17	5 x 4 Box Culvert (Private Crossing - Station 80+26)	LF	51	\$ 1,200.00	\$ 61,200.00
B18	Revetment Rip Rap with Geotextile	TON	579	\$ 100.00	\$ 57,900.00
B19	Rock Chute with Geotextile	LS	1	\$ 15,000.00	\$ 15,000.00
B20	Fence Repair	LF	188	\$ 20.00	\$ 3,760.00
B22	Seeding Type 1 Area (Native Seed Mix)	ACRE	5	\$ 8,500.00	\$ 42,500.00
B23	Seeding Type 2 Area; Filter Strip Only (with fertilizer and straw mulch)	ACRE	3	\$ 8,600.00	\$ 25,800.00
B24	Seeding Type 3 Area (with fertilizer and straw mulch)	ACRE	6	\$ 7,800.00	\$ 46,800.00
B25	Remove and reset 36" RCP End Section	EA	1	\$ 1,500.00	\$ 1,500.00
B26	Remove and reset 24" RCP End Section	EA	3	\$ 1,500.00	\$ 4,500.00
B27	Remove and reset 18" RCP End Section	EA	2	\$ 1,500.00	\$ 3,000.00
B28	Remove and reset 12" RCP End Section	EA	1	\$ 1,300.00	\$ 1,300.00
Elwood Wilson EM Hare Subtotal					\$ 1,005,811.00
15% Contingency					\$ 150,871.65
Elwood Wilson EM Hare Total					\$ 1,156,682.65

Easements

The project will take place within existing regulated drain easements for the Elwood Wilson Drain, the Home Depot Relocation Arm, and the EM Hare Arm and within the public right-of-way of Presley Drive and Promise Road. No additional easements are required for this project.

The statutory easement over the existing tile of the EM Hare Arm will be shifted between Stations 62+45 and 38+19 and between Stations 79+60 and 81+97 to follow the new open ditch. Between these stations, the existing tile will be removed or abandoned in place. The shifted easement will be 150-feet in width centered on the flowline of the new open ditch. The easement will be shifted on the following parcels:

Parcel No.:	Owner
11-07-32-00-00-016.002	Harger Farms, Inc.
10-07-32-00-00-009.000	Harger Farms, Inc.
10-07-32-00-00-007.000	Caledonia Development, Inc.
10-07-33-00-00-012.000	Fleck, Timothy J & Rebecca J

Filter Strips

20-foot filter strips are hereby established across the following parcels:

Parcel No.:	Owner	Side of Open Ditch
11-07-32-00-00-016.002	Harger Farms, Inc.	Both
10-07-32-00-00-013.001	Harger Farms, Inc.	Both
10-07-32-00-00-011.001	Harger Farms, Inc.	Both
10-07-32-00-00-013.002	Harger Farms, Inc.	Both
10-07-32-00-00-009.000	Harger Farms, Inc.	Both
10-07-32-00-00-007.000	Caledonia Development, LLC	Both
10-07-33-00-00-012.000	Fleck, Timothy J & Rebecca J	Both
10-07-33-00-01-001.000	Barton, Douglas D & Julie D	Both
10-07-33-00-00-012.001	Louks, Jason C & Lisa S	Both
10-07-33-00-00-002.000	ATS World Wide Real Estate III LLC [To Station 29+22]	Both

Changes to the Drain

The reconstruction of the E.M. Hare will replace the existing tile or re-route the flow of water through an open ditch running roughly parallel to the existing tile. The Existing E.M. Hare Arm drain will be removed or abandoned in place between Stations 29+92 and 81+97. This will abandon or remove 5,205-feet of existing drain.

The newly reconstructed and or re-routed open ditch will begin at Station 29+92 and continue down-stream to Station 79+60. The newly constructed open ditch is reflected on the Construction Plans between Plan Station 94+00 and Plan Station 44+78. At this juncture, approximate Station 79+60 of the EM Hare Arm, an open ditch will be constructed to convey the flow of the newly constructed EM Hare open ditch to its confluence with the Home Depot Relocation Arm at Station 81+78. This new open ditch is reflected on the Construction Plans between Plan Station 44+78 and Plan Station 42+60. This will construct an additional 218-feet of open ditch.

With the changes mentioned above, the reconstruction project will have constructed or reconstructed 5,140-feet of drain and will have removed or abandoned 5,205-feet of drain. Therefore, the project will remove 65-feet of drain from the E.M. Hare Arm.

Project Costs

Clark Dietz, Inc. was contracted for Topographic Survey Services of the drain on April 23, 2018. The contract amount was \$63,700.00.

Clark Dietz, Inc. was contracted to provide Engineering Design, Soil Borings, Geotechnical Investigation, and Permitting Professional Services on November 14, 2018. The total value of the contract for these services is \$306,040.00.

A contract amendment for the design of the sanitary sewer design, development of bid documents, and permitting Professional Services was approved on July 26, 2021. The contract amount for these services is \$20,740.00. The cost for these services will be reimbursed by the City of Noblesville.

Clark Dietz, Inc. will be contracted for construction phase professional surveying services. These services include construction staking, periodic grade checks, and as-built drawings. The contract amount is \$126,670.00.

Clark Dietz, Inc. will be contracted for construction phase inspection services. These services include full time construction inspection for the construction of the retaining wall, the box culverts, and the wingwalls. These services include part time construction inspection for the construction of the open ditch. The contract will be a not-to-exceed amount of \$124,080.00.

Clark Dietz, Inc. will be contracted for construction administration services. These services include attendance at progress meetings, shop drawing review, and responding to contractor questions. The contract amount will be a not-to-exceed amount of \$13,240.00

The total value of the project is estimated to be as follows:

Construction	\$2,478,000.00
15% Construction Contingency	\$371,700.00
Professional Services: Topographic Survey [Clark Dietz, Inc.]	\$63,700.00
Professional Services: Design, Geotechnical, Soil Borings, Permitting [Clark Dietz, Inc.]	\$306,040.00
Professional Services: Sanitary Sewer Design [Clark Dietz, Inc.]	\$20,740.00
Professional Services: Construction Staking, Grade Checks, As-Built Drawings [Clark Dietz, Inc.]	\$126,670.00
Professional Services: Construction Inspection [Clark Dietz, Inc.]	\$124,080.00
Professional Services: Construction Administration [Clark Dietz, Inc.]	\$13,240.00
Total Project Cost	\$3,504,170.00

Project Funding

The costs for this project will be paid from the sources outlined below.

1. The cost of the new culvert under the Home Depot entrance drive shall be paid by Home Depot per IC 36-9-27-71. The lump sum cost to be charged to Home Depot is \$860,592.15. This amount includes a base cost of \$748,341.00 (Refer to Line Items HD1-HD-6 of the detailed cost estimate) and a 15% contingency equal to \$112,251.15.
2. The cost for the new culvert under Presley Drive shall be paid by the City of Noblesville per IC 36-9-27-71. The lump sum cost to be charged to the City of Noblesville is \$559,709.60. This amount includes a base cost of \$486,704.00 (Refer to Line Items N1-N7 and N11 of the detailed cost estimate) and a 15% contingency equal to \$73,005.60.
3. The cost for the new culvert under Promise Road shall be paid by the Hamilton County Highway Department per IC 36-9-27-71. The lump sum cost to be charged to the Hamilton County Highway Department is \$187,795.00. This amount includes a base cost of \$163,300.00 (Refer to Line Items B13, B14, and B21 of the detailed cost estimate) and a 15% contingency equal to \$24,495.00.
4. The cost for the Sanitary Sewer shall be paid by the City of Noblesville. Including the construction of the sanitary sewer with this reconstruction project, and payment for this work by the City of Noblesville, was first discussed in an email dated December 8, 2020. The lump sum cost to be charged to the City of Noblesville is \$105,660.60. This amount includes professional services equal to \$20,740.00, a base construction cost of \$73,844.00 (Refer to Line Items N8-N10 of the detailed cost estimate) and a 15% construction contingency equal to \$11,076.60.
5. A portion of the project will be funded by the Coronavirus State and Federal Fiscal Recovery Funds of the American Rescue Plan. As of the date of this report, the first round of funds from this program is available. The total amount of the ARPA funds allocated for this project is \$1,420,672.65.
6. The remainder of the total project cost, \$369,740.00 shall be assessed equally by acreage over the remainder of the properties that benefit from the reconstruction project. The total acreage to be assessed is 765.94-acres. Based on this estimate, the rate per acre would be \$482.74.

To date, the County has paid the invoices for the various professional services from the Elwood Wilson Shed maintenance fund. The costs incurred to date total \$386,776.60. The maintenance fund balance is presently in the red \$382,819.41 due to the payment of these invoices from the Elwood Wilson Shed maintenance fund. The reconstruction assessment plus \$20,740.00 of the lump sum will be transferred to the Elwood Wilson Maintenance Fund.

The Elwood Wilson Shed collects \$47,520.44 annually for maintenance.

The final costs to be assessed shall be based on the actual construction contract amounts and any approved change orders.

For the costs to be paid by the Hamilton County Highway Department, the City of Noblesville Street Department, the City of Noblesville Sanitary Sewer, and the Home Depot, it is recommended that, at the discretion of the entity being assessed, the assessment be paid as one lump sum or allowed to be repaid over a period of five years, with interest, starting in 2023.

I believe that no damages will result to landowners by the reconstruction of this drain. Therefore, damages shall be set at \$0.00.

I recommend that a hearing be held for this matter on March 28, 2022.

Sincerely,

Kenton C. Ward, CFM

Hamilton County Surveyor

KCW/pll"

Altman stated the project cost that you broke down, are we trying to recoup monies already expended for Geotech, etc.?

The Surveyor stated that will be spread over the drainage shed and would be a reconstruction cost to spread.

Altman asked is that included in your breakdown of who pays what?

The Surveyor stated yes.

Altman asked you pulled that back in although it's already expended?

The Surveyor stated right.

Altman stated under this process when you put all the costs together, all we're asking the landowners, other than the major entities called out, is \$214,000.00, correct?

The Surveyor stated it would be \$369,000.00.

Altman stated I'm looking at the spreadsheet and the red box; I presume where it says deferred it's really the covered costs of ARPA when I add up numbers.

Heirbrandt stated it says there is \$1.6 million to be reimbursed by ARPA.

The Surveyor stated we have \$214,000.00 to be collected as reconstruction assessments, so you are correct in that. Then the ARPA Funds are \$1.5 million and then we have the costs as outlined in the presentation to be assessed to the city, the county, Home Depot and the city for the sanitary sewer installation and design.

Altman stated other than the major players that get charged and Home Depot is a private entity in the reconstruction, of this whole reconstruction in a commercial area just asking the other people to pay \$214,000.00 because of the structure of the payments.

The Surveyor stated correct.

Altman stated what was advertised as what they would be contributing, what went out in advertisement? Did they just see the \$2,000.00 versus...

Heirbrandt asked and do they really understand there's a lot of money that's helping to offset the cost of the assessment to the property owners?

The Surveyor stated all they saw was what's being assessed to them.

Altman stated anticipated to be assessed.

The Surveyor state yes.

Dillinger asked, is Oak Wood a new name for Fishers Oak Woods? Did they change the name or is that the same place?

Howard stated it appears to be the same place on the map.

Dillinger stated they're talking about Oak Wood Community here on Promise Road is that Fishers Oak Woods?

The Surveyor stated yes.

Dillinger asked they changed the name of the addition from Fishers Oak Woods to Oak Woods?

The Surveyor stated that's another one we're talking about today, not Fishers Oak Woods.

Dillinger asked is what we're talking about today include Fishers Oak Woods?

The Surveyor stated no.

Altman asked which one helps Fishers Oak Woods?

The Surveyor stated that would be the Craig-Holleran Arm.

Altman asked is it even part of this?

The Surveyor stated it's not part of this today.

Altman stated no, I'm talking about the presentation; Clark Dietz depicts the whole thing, is it Phase 2?

The Surveyor stated it would be Phase 2.

Howard stated but Phase 1 would have to be done to drain Phase 2.

Altman stated we verified at the last meeting we can do Phase 2 before Phase 1.

The Surveyor stated right. The other phase would be the open ditch going north taking some of that drainage shed off.

Altman stated someplace else.

The Surveyor stated yes.

Heirbrandt stated I had spoken to Matt (Light) in the audience today about the investment being made by the City of Noblesville and I told him about some of our plans with 911 and so forth and what we were planning on doing with that and maybe some of that might help offset. I understand that this is a different arm of that drain. What I mentioned to Matt on the phone is a totally different arm of this system.

Altman opened the public hearing.

Light stated we do think this would be helpful improvements with the near term and the long term for the different interests of the City and the County. The ARPA dollars, I think there were some possibilities or discussions early on in the process about the entirety of the project potentially being covered by that. As we see from the presentation those bills are looking like they're going to be going out to us and others. We're curious on whether there's a possibility for more than what's currently earmarked for ARPA to cover. The timing of this bill is a challenge in some ways for us, but we want to be a good partner with you all.

Hellman stated in 2020 the City of Noblesville did an overall small structure, 36" diameter and larger and this was not a structure that was identified. We had five, what we call priority projects that we also have to find the funding for. This particular structure was built in roughly 2000 with the Home Depot and the assessment showed we still had a 40 year service life so I guess the priority, funding and where we have structures identified as needing more immediate replacement and this one not falling into it kind of comes into the challenge of finding funding. I think we concur if there would be discretion of the Board to a reduced or 0% interest payment if that would be possible to help us in that situation.

The Surveyor stated on the sanitary sewer portion, that would be paid up front on the construction end also the engineering side of it.

Hellman stated yes, as the project is moving forward the sanitary sewer, we understand all there, the payment I'm referring to would be with regard to the structure portion. I do appreciate the Surveyor and his team getting this worked in as an alternate bid.

The Surveyor stated and on Presley Blvd. we talked about a couple of situations, one was to offset the time for the payment to coincide with your study and the other was to do it over a five year period at 0% interest if the Board would go with that.

Hellman stated there was the mention of the 10% interest per statute and with financing and funding that interest rate makes a big difference.

The Surveyor stated with your small structure projects if we do it over a five period which your first bill would be next year with zero interest, would that be acceptable for the City?

Hellman stated that would be a much preferred alternative.

Light stated the first option was preferable when we there was a thought that maybe the whole thing could be covered by ARPA funds.

The Surveyor stated we just didn't have enough funds with ARPA to cover that.

Light stated to the extent there is an evolving process for the consideration of those funds that would be an ongoing request on our behalf.

The Surveyor stated to the Board, basically this would be payable over a five-year period with 0% interest.

Altman asked so five years is the maximum we can extend?

The Surveyor stated per statute its five years, but you've been going over to seven years usually.

Howard stated the maintenance fund balance has allowed us the flexibility to do that so it's not a zero-based deal.

Altman asked where are we in maintenance? What's our maintenance balance?

The Surveyor stated all of this will be coming out of General Drain.

Altman stated I understand, but where are we on maintenance?

The Surveyor stated on maintenance we're in the hole.

Altman stated primarily I see after I run the numbers because we probably paid for the Geotech and all the engineering out of maintenance.

Howard stated the maintenance I was referring to would be borrowing from the General overall maintenance fund.

Altman stated correct, but it explains why we're in such a steep hole with commercial property and agriculture that should be paying because I think we probably dipped all the \$300,000.00 plus to study this thing out of maintenance.

The Surveyor stated it is.

Hellman stated one thing to be considered maybe is from the cities part providing a study that we were looking at a project the city was looking to TIF that would have done full sanitary sewer, these drainage improvements and some other things, unfortunately that project didn't materialize. That was what the city was anticipating those TIF proceeds to be able to fund the roadway improvements or the culvert replacement.

Howard stated but that ground is still for sale, there's potential coming sometime.

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

Altman stated after I saw the properties involved and where we are, I'm not real excited about using ARPA on this project. Primarily because if we structure it with ARPA I don't believe we can recoup any of this reconstruction from the commercial people who will be coming in and having the benefit of this reconstruction. I just don't see us doing a recoupment like we normally do when we do commercial? We are quickly running out of ARPA money and I don't know if this is the highest on my priority list without that flexibility. I don't mind doing the reconstruction with a lot more money coming out of the pockets of the commercial; these are all commercial properties and it opens it up for commercial, we can get it done, but I think those properties need to contribute back on this reconstruction.

Howard stated through at least a deferred assessment if nothing else.

Heirbrandt asked is there anyway for us to recoup anything at all from this?

Howard stated you could do a deferred assessment, declare it an urban drain. That's on our to-do list. We're about 50% away from getting those processes modified and streamlined a little bit, but the urban drain would be the way to do it. Again, you still have to put cash in it today.

Heirbrandt stated I wouldn't have a problem putting cash in with ARPA dollars knowing that there would be some type of reimbursement.

Altman stated I don't think we can stretch it, it has to be assessed, I believe, to be deferred. What I heard from the advertisement we didn't advertise it as a deferred assessment.

The Surveyor stated right.

Dillinger asked Howard, wouldn't the nexus thing that we went out to Colorado years ago to learn about apply here?

Howard stated for impact fees, yes, but you would have to have jurisdiction to impose impact fees. The drainage assessment law is essentially analogous to an impact fee especially when you use the deferred assessment part of it. The City of Noblesville would have the ability to TIF it to fund even their part, but for the Board's part your best vehicle would be the deferred assessment.

Altman stated this is essentially a TIF because when they come through it's an impact fee.

Howard stated a deferred assessment looks a lot like a TIF in that you are paying up front and then you are increasing the assessment on the back end so when development comes in then the actual assessment, a big percentage of the assessment becomes payable. The assessment's still there in gross, part of it's paid, part of it from existing, part of it's paid from other funds and then you reimburse your other funds with the deferred assessment.

Heirbrandt stated ideally that's really how it should be set up.

Howard stated you're looking at a lot of this in your ARPA stuff because you've got a lot of places, like in Cicero, but for fixing that drain it is never going to develop. Now the upper part of this watershed there's sanitary sewer questions that I'm going to ask Jim (Hellman) to look into and see if there's capacity coming across the field. It would have to go under SR 37 and even if there's capacity there that line is so old, they don't have inventory on it, they have to go on site and measure.

Dillinger stated but a counterpoint to what Altman is saying would it not be that using these ARPA funds to help get this done, which has needed to be done for years and years and years certainly speed up the potential for commercial development which speeds up the tax revenue and speeds up everything?

Altman stated all correct, but I think once we fix the drain and it's shovel ready it's going to do the same thing even with the deferred assessment.

Howard stated and I'm not sure that ARPA can be used as a bank essentially and then with money coming in three, five, seven, nine years down the road that's a question for the grant...

Altman asked we have enough money in General Drain we can do this, correct?

The Surveyor stated yes.

Altman stated it's just the vehicle. I would rather shift most of the ARPA money down to Phase 2 because it addresses that neighborhood you talked about that truly is under water, it accelerates the detention that will solve much of the problems, it's just a shifting. I want to do both; I don't see anymore ARPA on this section coming through.

Howard stated I guess from a public hearing standpoint we're imposing the assessment; do we have in the advertised to do part of this and then defer the subsequent?

Altman stated I don't think we do. They don't have an idea what we're shifting.

The Surveyor stated I was told that we can't use the ARPA funds to do the deferred payments for the future.

Altman stated that's really not an issue because we've got the money in the bank for the deferred. It's not like we don't have cash.

The Surveyor stated we can switch the ARPA funds to General Drain Funds in this hearing.

Altman stated I don't mind no interest rate on this stuff or as low as we can go because that is the benefit to the developer, they're not going to be watching interest accrue on it. We just get it fixed and we get done and then we can do Phase 2 that helps the neighborhoods you're talking about that are under water.

Howard stated the deferred assessment, this is a textbook example of it's a good deal because but for this improvement this is a foundational improvement to the development of that area. It will not happen, it will not bring additional money to pay and then you are essentially charging the new developer that amount to the extent that his proforma has "x" amount of dollars in it for infrastructure plus land cost, you're passing it to the land on a deferred basis, conceptually.

Dillinger stated my largest motivating factor is the Fishers Oak Woods. That issue has existed in all my 32 years as a Commissioner. It's never been corrected. I feel terribly bad for those people every time I go by there and they're under water.

Howard stated it should have never been built.

Dillinger stated it should have never been built to begin with.

Altman stated how many subdivisions do we have that should never have been built.

Dillinger stated John Fisher built it and the rules weren't the same back then, but it is what it is, and we need to correct that.

The Surveyor stated and the people in that drainage shed can't afford this.

Heirbrandt stated this is the perfect opportunity to use ARPA dollars, for something like that.

Dillinger stated I would agree with that.

Altman stated we got a bid on this that wasn't a particularly a good bid so even if we have to re-advertise; who knows in this market, it may be a wonderful bid, but compared to engineer estimates it was high, correct?

The Surveyor stated correct.

Altman stated in my opinion we need to re-advertise this if we want to move forward so people know it's not free, it's a deferred assessment, cash out of your pocket is going to be the same, but when you sell your buyer will be picking up or eventually you will be paying this. That's my opinion.

Heirbrandt stated I would really like them to know with this ARPA money those people whose assessment, by inserting the ARPA dollars in we're going to be able to get this done and this is a once in a lifetime opportunity to get this drainage work done. They have to invest little money into it compared to what they would have.

Howard asked Altman, when you said re-advertise, are you talking about re-advertising the drainage assessment or are you talking about re-advertising the construction?

Altman stated I don't know how long our bid hold is.

The Surveyor stated I think it runs out May 10th. We don't have time for another hearing.

Altman asked how many days for the advertising?

The Surveyor stated 30 days.

Howard asked if you re-advertised with the deferred assessment the landowners are going to be paying less than or an amount less than the maximum advertised? If by putting in the ARPA funds and the deferred assessments the landowners are not paying more than what is proposed.

Altman stated we have a May 9th meeting, did that get changed? I don't believe so. We could have it re-advertised for May 9th, see what our response is and move forward with our current bid. You've got May 10th, you're sure on that bid hold?

Duncan stated yes, it was 120 days from the day of opening and the bid was received January 10th.

Altman stated I think it's got to be fully re-advertised because we didn't tell people "oh, by the way, your checkbook will suffer this, but eventually" we need to tell them eventually it will catch up to them.

Howard stated it's not free, it's just deferred.

Altman stated that's my opinion, I've got two other members. In terms of this they can award it today, I just think it's good use of ARPA dollars. Had I known all the facts I would not have voted for the increase at the ARPA level.

Howard stated so you would essentially be instructing the Surveyor to recalculate reducing; that would be your motion to reduce ARPA and supplement that funding to the extent permitted increasing the assessment and making the lions share of it deferred.

Altman stated yes, I don't want to stick with the current collections \$214,000.00.

Dillinger asked and move the ARPA funds to Phase 2?

Altman stated part of it, I think we need to decide how much, put \$200,000.00, but really the lions share if we're going to get it done in the more challenged neighborhoods you should shift more over there. I'm in favor of the reconstruction, just not how we're funding it.

Heirbrandt asked Dillinger, what do you think?

Dillinger stated it makes sense what she's proposing. I don't know of a better way, do you?

Heirbrandt stated no.

Altman stated this is commercial. Do we need to deny what we're doing or just let it set?

Howard stated I think you need to deny where you are today, that clears the slate and then you need to make a motion to instruct the Surveyor's Office to re-advertise with certain components that we've discussed here today.

Altman made the motion to deny the current proposed payment for the reconstruction and request the Surveyor to re-advertise with the same initial payment to be applied to the landowners with \$200,000.00 of ARPA applied to the project and the balance to be deferred under Urban Drains, seconded by Dillinger.

Dillinger asked the Surveyor, are you on board with this?

Altman stated for the May 9, 2022 meeting.

The Surveyor asked on the deferred assessments, will those be to the owners of the large tracts.

Altman stated everybody gets a deferred assessment; can we afford everybody gets a deferred?

Howard stated I think you would need to do it on a per acre or some quantitative basis because if somebody comes in and pulls down the 25 acres of beachfront property then that deferral will be immediately due and payable upon...

Altman stated I think you're asking about Home Depot.

The Surveyor stated I'm asking about the small lots. We've got several acres.

Altman stated yes, I think what you've said makes sense.

Howard stated but on those small one acre lots...

Altman stated we can make the deferral due and payable upon sale.

Howard stated we can do that, if they put the one-acre lot in the developable ground you get paid, if they sell it, you're not imposing the deferral against the existing landowner.

Altman stated the whole idea is to match the cash with a payment. They'll have cash at closing to pay the deferral.

Howard stated trust me all those houses have appreciated more than enough to pay the deferred payment just in the last 60 days.

The Surveyor asked is that part of your motion?

Altman asked how specific do you need in your advertisement?

The Surveyor stated the advertisement is in the report.

Altman stated but I imagine it coming up just like this and the details of the deferral need to come after we hear public comment.

The motion had been made and seconded to deny the current proposed payment for the reconstruction and request the Surveyor to re-advertise with the same initial payment to be applied to the landowners with \$200,000.00 of ARPA applied to the project and the balance to be deferred under Urban Drains for May 9, 2022 and approved unanimously.

Clara Knotts Drain - Park Broadway Avenue Drain, Phase 2:

There were neither landowners present nor objections on file.

Duncan presented the Surveyor's report to the Board for approval.

"January 26, 2022

To: Hamilton County Drainage Board

Re: Clara Knotts Drain, Park Broadway Avenue Drain - Phase 2

Attached are the petition, plans, drainage shed map and schedule of assessments for the construction of Phase 2 of the Park Broadway Avenue Drain. The Park Broadway Avenue Drain is an arm of the Clara Knotts Regulated Drain. This drain was petitioned for by 36.8% of the property owners in the drainage shed (Hamilton County Drainage Board Minutes Book 17, Page 405). I have reviewed the petition and found it to be in proper form.

The project is located in Section 11 of Township 17 North, Range 3 East in Clay Township. The project is located entirely within the watershed of the Clara Knotts Regulated Drain and the Northridge subdivision. The project is generally located along Barbee Lane, with an extension from Barmore Avenue to College Avenue; along 103rd Street between Park Avenue and Central Avenue; along Ruckle Street from 103rd Street to the northern boundary of the Northridge subdivision; along 102nd Street between Central Avenue and Park Avenue; and along Central Avenue south of 102nd Street with an extension south to Pennsylvania Parkway.

The project will include the construction of four new arms to the Park Broadway Avenue Drain arm of the Clara Knotts Drain. The 103rd Street and Ruckle Street Arm, the 103rd Street and Central Avenue Arm, the 102nd Street and Central Avenue Arm, and the Barbee Lane Arm.

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 dated April 28, 2020 were prepared by HWC Engineering for the Hamilton County Drainage Board. The Sheets being used are G1, G2, G3, PP1, PP2, PP3, PP4, PP4.1, PP7, PP8, PP9, PP15, PP16, PP17, PP24A, PP25, PP26, PP27, PP28, PP29, DT1, DT2, DT3, EC1, EC2, EC4, EC-5, EC-6, EC7, and EC8. These sheets represent the work associated with the bids that were received by the Drainage Board on January 10, 2022.

Hamilton County Drainage Board
March 28, 2022

Reconstruction Project

The project will provide drainage for Barbee Lane, Ruckle Street north of 103rd Street, the north side of 103rd Street between Central Avenue and Park Avenue, the west side of Central Avenue south of 102nd Street, and the north side of 102nd Street between Central Avenue and Park Avenue. The project will also drain the intersection of 103rd Street and Central Avenue, the intersection of 102nd Street and Central Avenue, the northwest and northeast corners of the intersection of 102nd Street and Ruckle Street, and the southwest corner of the intersection of 102nd Street and Park Avenue.

The project is more particularly described as follows:

103rd Street and Ruckle Street Arm

Station 6+49 of the Park Broadway Arm of the Clara Knotts Drain.	The arm starts at an existing manhole (Structure #205) at Station 6+49 of the Park Broadway Arm of the Clara Knotts Drain.
Station 8+05 Structure 206	The project will proceed west with 156-LF of 36" RCP and be connected to a manhole structure (Structure #206) at Station 8+05. Structure #206 will include a beehive casting and will be installed in the centerline of the roadside swale on the north side of 103 rd Street.
Station 8+72 Structure 207	The project will proceed west with 67-LF of 36" RCP and be connected to a manhole structure (Structure #207) at Station 8+72. Structure #207 will include a beehive casting and will be installed in the centerline of the roadside swale on the north side of 103 rd Street.
Station 9+23 Structure 208	The project will proceed west with 51-LF of 36" RCP and be connected to a manhole structure (Structure #208) at Station 9+23. Structure #208 will include a beehive casting and will be installed in the centerline of the roadside swale on the north side of 103 rd Street.
Station 9+53 Structure 209	The project will proceed west with 30-LF of 30" RCP and be connected to a manhole structure (Structure #209) at Station 9+53. Structure #209 will include a beehive casting and will be installed in the centerline of the roadside swale at the northeast corner of the intersection of 103 rd Street and Ruckle Street.
Station 11+13 Structure 801	The project will proceed north with 160-LF of 15" RCP and be connected to a manhole structure (Structure #801) at Station 11+13. Structure #801 will include a beehive casting and will be installed in the centerline of the roadside swale on the east side of Ruckle Street.
Station 12+59 Structure 802	The project will proceed north with 146-LF of 15" RCP and be connected to a manhole structure (Structure #802) at Station 12+59. Structure #802 will include a beehive casting and will be installed in the centerline of the roadside swale on the east side of Ruckle Street.
Station 13+07 Structure 803	The project will proceed north with 48-LF of 12" RCP and be connected to an inlet structure (Structure #803) at Station 13+07. Structure #803 will include a beehive casting and will be installed in the centerline of the roadside swale on the east side of Ruckle Street.
Station 13+53 Structure 804	The project will proceed north with 46-LF of 12" RCP and be connected to an inlet structure (Structure #804) at Station 13+53. Structure #804 will include a beehive casting and will be installed in the centerline of the roadside swale on the east side of Ruckle Street.

Station 14+65 Structure 805 The project will proceed north with 112-LF of 12" RCP and be connected to an inlet structure (Structure #805) at Station 14+65. Structure #805 will include a beehive casting and will be installed in the centerline of the roadside swale on the east side of Ruckle Street.

Station 15+01 Structure 806 The project will proceed west with 36-LF of 12" RCP and be connected to an inlet structure (Structure #806) at Station 15+01. Structure #806 will include a beehive casting and will be installed in the centerline of the roadside swale on the west side of Ruckle Street.

Lateral Station 9+90 Structure 214 Starting at Structure #209, the project will proceed south with 37-LF of 12" RCP and be connected to an inlet structure (Structure #214) at Station 9+90. Structure #214 will include a beehive casting and will be installed in the centerline of the roadside swale at the southeast corner of the intersection of 103rd Street and Ruckle Street.

Lateral Station 11+51 Structure 807 Starting at Structure #801, the project will proceed west with 38-LF of 12" RCP and be connected to an inlet structure (Structure #807) at Station 11+51. Structure #807 will include a beehive casting and will be installed in the centerline of the roadside swale on the west side of Ruckle Street.

Lateral Station 12+86 Structure 808 Starting at Structure #802, the project will proceed west with 27-LF of 12" RCP and be connected to an inlet structure (Structure #808) at Station 12+86. Structure #808 will include a beehive casting and will be installed in the centerline of the roadside swale on the west side of Ruckle Street.

Lateral Station 13+37 Structure 809 Starting at Structure #803, the project will proceed west with 30-LF of 12" RCP and be connected to an inlet structure (Structure #809) at Station 13+87. Structure #809 will include a beehive casting and will be installed in the centerline of the roadside swale on the west side of Ruckle Street.

103rd Street and Central Avenue Arm

Station 9+93 Structure 210 Starting at Structure #209, the project will proceed west with 40-LF of 30" RCP and be connected to a manhole structure (Structure #210) at Station 9+93. Structure #210 will include a beehive casting and will be installed in the centerline of the roadside swale the northwest corner of the intersection of 103rd Street and Ruckle Street.

Station 12+07 Structure 211 The project will proceed west with 214-LF of 24" RCP and be connected to a manhole structure (Structure #211) at Station 12+07. Structure #211 will include a beehive casting and will be installed in the centerline of the roadside swale on the north side of 103rd Street.

Station 12+92 Structure 212 The project will proceed west with 85-LF of 24" RCP and be connected to a manhole structure (Structure #212) at Station 12+92. Structure #212 will include a beehive casting and will be installed in the centerline of the roadside swale at the northeast corner of the intersection of 103rd Street and Central Avenue.

Station 13+32 Structure 213 The project will proceed west with 40-LF of 24" PVC C905 and be connected to a manhole structure (Structure #213) at Station 13+32. Structure #213 will include a beehive casting and will be installed in the centerline of the roadside swale at the northwest corner of the intersection of 103rd Street and Central Avenue.

Station 13+66
Structure 217
The project will proceed south with 34-LF of 12" RCP and be connected to an inlet structure (Structure #217) at Station 13+66. Structure #217 will include a beehive casting and will be installed in the centerline of the roadside swale at the southwest corner of the intersection of 103rd Street and Central Avenue.

Lateral
Station 10+29
Structure 215
Starting at Structure #210, the project will proceed south with 36-LF of 12" RCP and be connected to an inlet structure (Structure #215) at Station 10+29. Structure #215 will include a beehive casting and will be installed in the centerline of the roadside swale at the southwest corner of the intersection of 103rd Street and Ruckle Street.

Lateral
Station 13+28
Structure 216
Starting at Structure #212, the project will proceed south with 36-LF of 12" RCP and be connected to an inlet structure (Structure #216) at Station 13+28. Structure #216 will include a beehive casting and will be installed in the centerline of the roadside swale at the southeast corner of the intersection of 103rd Street and Central Avenue.

102nd Street and Central Avenue Arm

Existing
Structure 606
Meridian
Corporate
Plaza Arm of
the Clara
Knotts Drain.
The arm starts at an existing manhole structure (Structure 606) of the Meridian Corporate Plaza Arm of the Clara Knotts Drain. An opening for the new arm shall be core drilled into the existing manhole structure at this location. This structure will be Station 0+00 of the New Arm.

Station 0+74
Structure 501
The project will proceed north with 74-LF of 30" RCP and be connected to a manhole structure (Structure #501) at Station 0+74. Structure #501 will include a beehive casting and will be installed in the centerline of the roadside swale on the west of Central Avenue.

Station 3+42
Structure 502
The project will proceed north with 268-LF of 30" RCP and be connected to a manhole structure (Structure #502) at Station 3+42. Structure #502 will include a beehive casting and will be installed in the centerline of the roadside swale on the west side of Central Avenue.

Station 5+55
Structure 503
The project will proceed north with 213-LF of 24" RCP and be connected to a manhole structure (Structure #503) at Station 5+55. Structure #503 will include a beehive casting and will be installed in the centerline of the roadside swale at the southwest corner of the intersection of 102nd Street and Central Avenue.

Station 5+94
Structure 504
The project will proceed north with 39-LF of 24" RCP and be connected to a manhole structure (Structure #504) at Station 5+94. Structure #504 will include a beehive casting and will be installed in the centerline of the roadside swale at the northwest corner of the intersection of 102nd Street and Central Avenue.

Station 6+42
Structure 505
The project will proceed east with 48-LF of 18" RCP and be connected to a manhole structure (Structure #505) at Station 6+42. Structure #505 will include a beehive casting and will be installed in the centerline of the roadside swale at the northeast corner of the intersection of 102nd Street and Central Avenue.

Station 9+20
Structure 506
The project will proceed east with 278-LF of 18" RCP and be connected to a manhole structure (Structure #506) at Station 9+20. Structure #506 will include a beehive casting and will be installed in the centerline of the roadside swale at the northwest corner of the intersection of 102nd Street and Ruckle Street

Station 12+82
Structure 507

The project will proceed east with 362-LF of 15" RCP and be connected to an inlet structure (Structure #507) at Station 12+82. Structure #507 will include a beehive casting and will be installed in the centerline of the roadside swale at the northwest corner of the intersection of 102nd Street and Park Avenue.

Station 13+35
Structure 508

The project will proceed east with 53-LF of 12" PVC C900 and be connected to an inlet structure (Structure #508) at Station 13+35. Structure #508 will include a beehive casting and will be installed in the centerline of the roadside swale at the northeast corner of the intersection of 102nd Street and Park Avenue.

Lateral
Station 6+81
Structure 509

Starting at Structure #505, the project will proceed south with 39-LF of 12" PVC C900 and be connected to an inlet structure (Structure #509) at Station 6+81. Structure #509 will include a beehive casting and will be installed in the centerline of the roadside swale at the southeast corner of the intersection of 102nd Street and Central Avenue.

Lateral
Station 9+42
Structure 510

Starting at Structure #506, the project will proceed northeast with 22-LF of 12" RCP and be connected to a manhole structure (Structure #510) at Station 9+42. Structure #510 will include a beehive casting and will be installed in the centerline of the roadside swale at the northwest corner of the intersection of 102nd Street and Ruckle Street.

Lateral
Station 9+89
Structure 511

Continuing from Structure #510, the project will proceed east with 47-LF of 12" PVC C900 and be connected to an inlet structure (Structure #511) at Station 9+89. Structure #511 will include a beehive casting and will be installed in the centerline of the roadside swale at the northeast corner of the intersection of 102nd Street and Ruckle Street.

Lateral
Station 13+22
Structure 512

Starting at Structure #507, the project will proceed south with 40-LF of 12" PVC C900 and be connected to an inlet structure (Structure #512) at Station 13+22. Structure #512 will include a beehive casting and will be installed in the centerline of the roadside swale at the southwest corner of the intersection of 102nd Street and Park Avenue.

Barbee Lane Arm

Existing
Structure 10
of the College
Avenue Arm of
the Clara
Knotts Drain.

The arm starts at an existing manhole structure (Structure 10) of the College Avenue Arm of the Clara Knotts Drain. The existing structure will be removed and replaced with a new manhole structure (Structure #100) at the same location. Structure #100 will include a solid casting and will be installed at Station 0+00 of the New Arm.

Station 1+70
Structure 101

The project will proceed west with 170-LF of 15" RCP and be connected to a manhole structure (Structure #101) at Station 1+70. Structure #101 will include a slotted grate casting and will be installed in an existing parking area on Parcel 17-13-11-02-07-005.000.

Station 3+73
Structure 102

The project will proceed west with 203-LF of 15" RCP and be connected to a manhole structure (Structure #102) at Station 3+73. Structure #102 will include a beehive casting and will be installed at the southeast corner of the intersection of Barmore Avenue and Barbee Lane (generally).

Station 4+84
Structure 103

The project will proceed west with 111-LF of 15" RCP and be connected to a manhole structure (Structure #103) at Station 4+84. Structure #103 will include a solid casting and will be installed in the pavement of Barbee Lane.

Station 6+70
Structure 104 The project will proceed west with 186-LF of 15" RCP and be connected to a manhole structure (Structure #104) at Station 6+70. Structure #104 will include a solid casting and will be installed in the pavement of Barbee Lane.

Station 9+27
Structure 105 The project will proceed west with 257-LF of 15" RCP and be connected to a manhole structure (Structure #105) at Station 9+27. Structure #105 will include a solid casting and will be installed in the pavement of Barbee Lane.

Station 10+41
Structure 106 The project will proceed west with 114-LF of 15" RCP and be connected to a manhole structure (Structure #106) at Station 10+41. Structure #106 will include a solid casting and will be installed in the pavement of Barbee Lane.

Station 11+32
Structure 107 The project will proceed west with 91-LF of 12" RCP and be connected to an inlet structure (Structure #107) at Station 11+32. Structure #107 will include a beehive casting and will be installed in the pavement of Barbee Lane.

Station 11+74
Structure 108 The project will proceed west with 42-LF of 12" RCP and be connected to an inlet structure (Structure #108) at Station 11+74. Structure #108 will include a beehive casting and will be installed in the pavement of Barbee Lane.

Station 11+98
Structure 109 The project will proceed northwest with 24-LF of 12" RCP and be connected to an inlet structure (Structure #109) at Station 11+98. Structure #109 will include a beehive casting and will be installed centerline of an existing swale on north side of Barbee Lane.

Lateral
Station 4+97
Structure 110 Starting at Structure #103, the project will proceed north with 13-LF of 12" RCP and be connected to an inlet structure (Structure #110) at Station 4+97. Structure #110 will include a beehive casting and will be installed in the centerline of the roadside swale on the north side of Barbee Lane.

Lateral
Station 6+84
Structure 111 Starting at Structure #104, the project will proceed north with 14-LF of 12" RCP and be connected to an inlet structure (Structure #111) at Station 6+84. Structure #111 will include a beehive casting and will be installed in the centerline of the roadside swale on the north side of Barbee Lane.

Lateral
Station 9+40
Structure 112 Starting at Structure #105, the project will proceed north with 13-LF of 12" RCP and be connected to an inlet structure (Structure #112) at Station 9+40. Structure #112 will include a beehive casting and will be installed in the centerline of the roadside swale on the north side of Barbee Lane.

Lateral
Station 10+76
Structure 113 Starting at Structure #106, the project will proceed southwest with 35-LF of 12" RCP and be connected to an inlet structure (Structure #113) at Station 10+76. Structure #113 will include a beehive casting and will be installed in the centerline of the roadside swale on the south side of Barbee Lane.

Lateral
Station 10+54
Structure 114 Starting at Structure #106, the project will proceed north with 13-LF of 12" RCP and be connected to an inlet structure (Structure #114) at Station 10+54. Structure #114 will include a beehive casting and will be installed in the centerline of the roadside swale on the north side of Barbee Lane.

Lateral
Station 11+45
Structure 115 Starting at Structure #107, the project will proceed north with 13-LF of 12" RCP and be connected to an inlet structure (Structure #115) at Station 11+45. Structure #115 will include a beehive casting and will be installed in the centerline of the roadside swale on the north side of Barbee Lane.

The roadside ditches at several locations will be re-graded to provide positive drainage to the new inlets. The remaining roadside ditches will not be re-graded with this project. The proposed drainage system will provide an outlet for future ditch re-grading by the City of Carmel.

The driveways of the following parcels will be affected by the project. Several driveway culverts will be replaced with the project, but these replacements are incidental to the project and the culverts will not become part of the regulated drain.

Parcel No.	Owner	Address
17-13-11-02-04-012.000	Heston, Kerry N & Sherry L	504 Barbee Lane
17-13-11-02-04-014.000	Thomas, John H Jr & Rachel Ann	578 Barbee Lane
17-13-11-02-04-016.000	Reeves, Stephen J & Lisa K	580 Barbee Lane
17-13-11-02-04-021.000	Allen, Beverley	590 Barbee Lane
17-13-11-02-04-023.000	Craig, Benny & Susan	602 Barbee Lane
17-13-11-02-04-026.000	McMillan, Lawrence J & Peggy S	606 Barbee Lane
17-13-11-02-04-029.000	Hendricks, Douglas W & Denise jt	612 Barbee Lane
17-13-11-02-07-005.000	Contour Acquisitions LLC	10450 North College Avenue
17-13-11-02-11-014.000	Cole, Christopher Brian & Heather	10301 Ruckle Street North
17-13-11-02-11-033.000	Devilbiss, David S & Therese P	10301 North Central Avenue
17-13-11-02-11-016.000	Martinez, Carlos Gustavo Valiente Sr & Maria Fatima Marin Villa h&w	10305 Ruckle Street North
17-13-11-02-11-018.000	Webster, Kristina M	10309 Ruckle Street North
17-13-11-02-11-020.000	Salazar, Katheryn Brooke	10315 Ruckle Street North
17-13-11-02-11-022.000	Lopez, Antonio	10345 Ruckle Street North
17-13-11-02-11-028.000	Nickless, Gary D & Rebecca D	10340 Ruckle Street North
17-13-11-04-02-027.000	Klink, Gregory W & Pamela S	10120 North Central Avenue
17-13-11-04-02-021.000	Johnson, Jeffrey L & Beverly A	10144 North Central Avenue
17-13-11-04-02-024.000	Crawford, Norman E & Barbara G Trustees of Norman E & Barabara G Crawford Lvg Trust	10130 North Central Avenue
17-13-11-02-10-030.000	Perry, Kristen M	520 East 102nd Street

Permits

Permits for this project will include approval from the City of Carmel for any roadway closures and roadway lane restrictions.

Construction Costs

The Clara Knotts Park Broadway Avenue Drain, Phase 2 project was approved for letting at the November 22, 2021 meeting of the Drainage Board (Hamilton County Drainage Board Meeting Minutes, Book 20, Page 236). The bid included a Base Bid and one Alternate Bid. The Alternate Bid was for trenchless installation of the piping between the existing Structure 606 of the Meridian Corporate Plaza Arm and Structure 501 of this project.

One addendum was issued. The addendum issued the most current Common Construction Wage Rate determination prior to receiving bids.

One bid was received from Morphey Construction on January 10, 2022. The Base Bid amount was \$1,440,000.00. The Alternate Bid amount was \$111,000.00.

The Alternate Bid will not be accepted due to the cost.

From the received bid, the construction cost of the project is estimated to be \$1,656,000.00. This cost includes a 15% contingency.

An outline of the detailed construction costs are as follows:

Detailed Construction Cost Estimate					
Line Item	Item Description	Unit	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost
BB-1	Tree removal	EA	4	\$1,400.00	\$5,600.00
BB-2	Culvert removal	EA	1	\$1,400.00	\$1,400.00
BB-3	Asphalt Driveway removal and repair per detail M-1	EA	9	\$3,200.00	\$28,800.00
BB-4	Concrete Driveway removal and repair per detail M-2	EA	1	\$3,000.00	\$3,000.00
BB-5	Driveway Remove and Repair per Detail 10-24; 12" PCCP Cap Only	EA	3	\$1,500.00	\$4,500.00
BB-6	Parking area removal and repair per Detail 10-24	LF	240	\$45.00	\$10,800.00
BB-7	Roadway removal and repair per Detail 10-24	LF	440	\$41.00	\$18,040.00
BB-8	Roadway Removal and Repair per Detail 10-24; 12" PCCP Cap Only	LF	796	\$100.00	\$79,600.00
BB-9	Sidewalk removal and repair	EA	3	\$3,100.00	\$9,300.00
BB-10	ADA Ramp Removal and Repair	EA	3	\$2,700.00	\$8,100.00
BB-11	1.5" Surface Milling	SYS	1589	\$8.00	\$12,712.00
BB-12	Inlet Remove [21, 24, 27, 29, 53, 56, 20, 25, 26, 30]	EA	10	\$450.00	\$4,500.00
BB-13	Manhole Remove [3, 10, 22, 49]	EA	4	\$500.00	\$2,000.00
BB-14	Erosion Control	LS	1	\$82,555.00	\$82,555.00
BB-15	Maintenance of Traffic	LS	1	\$45,000.00	\$45,000.00
BB-16	Inlet D-22 with casting [107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 214, 215, 216, 217, 507, 508, 509, 511, 512, 803, 804, 805, 806, 807, 808, 809]	EA	25	\$2,800.00	\$70,000.00
BB-17	Manhole D-20, 48" Diameter with casting [102, 103, 104, 105, 501, 502, 503, 504, 505, 506, 510]	EA	11	\$6,900.00	\$75,900.00
BB-18	Manhole D-21, 60" Diameter with casting [100, 106, 206, 207, 211, 801, 802]	EA	7	\$7,100.00	\$49,700.00
BB-19	Manhole D-21, 60" Diameter with casting and Stub Pipes [209, 210, 212, 213]	EA	4	\$7,100.00	\$28,400.00
BB-20	Manhole D-21, 96" Diameter with casting [101, 208, 500]	EA	3	\$17,000.00	\$51,000.00
BB-21	Pipe, Type 2, Circular, 12" PVC C900 with Flowable Fill Backfill	LF	123	\$150.00	\$18,450.00
BB-22	Pipe, Type 2, Circular, 12" PVC C900 with General Backfill	LF	56	\$115.00	\$6,440.00
BB-23	Pipe, Type 2, Circular, 12" RCP with Flowable Fill Backfill	LF	496	\$120.00	\$59,520.00
BB-24	Pipe, Type 2, Circular, 12" RCP with General Backfill	LF	230	\$75.00	\$17,250.00
BB-25	Pipe, Type 2, Circular, 12" RCP with Granular Backfill	LF	34	\$100.00	\$3,400.00

BB-26	Pipe, Type 2, Circular, 12" RCP with Granular Backfill, Stub Pipe	LF	32	\$160.00	\$5,120.00
BB-27	Pipe, Type 2, Circular, 15" RCP with Flowable Fill Backfill	LF	928	\$210.00	\$194,880.00
BB-28	Pipe, Type 2, Circular, 15" RCP with General Backfill	LF	750	\$100.00	\$75,000.00
BB-29	Pipe, Type 2, Circular, 15" RCP with Granular Backfill	LF	31	\$165.00	\$5,115.00
BB-30	Pipe, Type 2, Circular, 18" RCP with Flowable Fill Backfill	LF	48	\$235.00	\$11,280.00
BB-31	Pipe, Type 2, Circular, 18" RCP with General Backfill	LF	242	\$115.00	\$27,830.00
BB-32	Pipe, Type 2, Circular, 18" RCP with Granular Backfill	LF	36	\$180.00	\$6,480.00
BB-33	Pipe, Type 2, Circular, 24" PVC C905 with Flowable Fill Backfill	LF	40	\$400.00	\$16,000.00
BB-34	Pipe, Type 2, Circular, 24" RCP with Flowable Fill Backfill	LF	39	\$270.00	\$10,530.00
BB-35	Pipe, Type 2, Circular, 24" RCP with General Backfill	LF	482	\$150.00	\$72,300.00
BB-36	Pipe, Type 2, Circular, 24" RCP with Granular Backfill	LF	30	\$215.00	\$6,450.00
BB-37	Pipe, Type 2, Circular, 30" RCP with Flowable Fill Backfill	LF	40	\$500.00	\$20,000.00
BB-38	Pipe, Type 2, Circular, 30" RCP with General Backfill	LF	328	\$380.00	\$124,640.00
BB-39	Pipe, Type 2, Circular, 30" RCP with Granular Backfill	LF	44	\$370.00	\$16,280.00
BB-40	Pipe, Type 2, Circular, 36" RCP with General Backfill	LF	254	\$215.00	\$54,610.00
BB-41	Pipe, Type 2, Circular, 36" RCP with Granular Backfill	LF	20	\$300.00	\$6,000.00
BB-42	Concrete Cradle	EA	3	\$750.00	\$2,250.00
BB-43	6" HDPE Perforated SSD with stone backfill	LF	80	\$70.00	\$5,600.00
BB-44	SSD Riser	EA	4	\$900.00	\$3,600.00
BB-45	1.5" Resurfacing	SYS	1589	\$12.00	\$19,068.00
BB-46	Grading at Inlets	EA	20	\$170.00	\$3,400.00
BB-47	Swale Regrading at Inlets	EA	6	\$600.00	\$3,600.00
BB-48	Proposed Drive Culvert	EA	7	\$2,000.00	\$14,000.00
BB-49	Gas service relocation	EA	2	\$2,500.00	\$5,000.00
BB-50	Sanitary lateral Relocation	EA	4	\$3,500.00	\$14,000.00
BB-51	Water service relocation	EA	6	\$3,500.00	\$21,000.00
Base Bid Construction Costs					\$ 1,440,000.00

Easements

The project will be installed within the existing rights-of-way of 103rd Street, 102nd Street, Park Avenue, College Avenue, Central Avenue, Ruckle Street, and Pennsylvania Parkway.

The acquisition of additional permanent regulated drain easement is necessary for the construction of the project. Easement must be acquired from the following parcels. The estimated easement acquisitions including appraisals is \$247,000.00.

Parcel Number	Deeded Owner	Easement Area (acres)
17-13-11-00-00-007.000	Hughes, Lawrence K & Mary Beth Trustees Lawrence K Hughes Living Trust, et. al	0.01
17-13-11-02-04-021.000	Allen, Beverley	0.087
17-13-11-02-04-012.000	Heston, Kerry N & Sherry L	0.052
17-13-11-02-04-029.000	Hendricks, Douglas W & Denise	0.075
17-13-11-02-04-016.000	Reeves, Stephen J & Lisa K	0.082
17-13-11-02-07-009.000	Swiss Capital Enterprises LLC	0.097
17-13-11-02-04-023.000	Craig, Benny & Susan	0.083
17-13-11-02-04-030.000	Hayes, Sean	0.073
17-13-11-02-04-026.000	McMillan, Lawrence J & Peggy S	0.076
17-13-11-02-04-014.000	Thomas, John H Jr & Rachel Ann	0.082
17-13-11-02-07-005.000	Contour Acquisitions LLC	0.162

Changes to the Drain

The drain constructed with this project will consist of the following:

Inlet Structures	25
Manhole Structures	25
12" PVC C900 Tile	179-feet
12" RCP Tile	760-feet
15" RCP Tile	1,709-feet
18" RCP Tile	326-feet
24" PVC C905 Tile	40-feet
24" RCP Tile	551-feet
30" RCP Tile	412-feet
36" RCP Tile	274-feet

The total length of the new drain will be 4,251-feet.

The project includes the installation of 4, 20-foot lengths of sub-surface drain pipes (a total of 80-feet per Line Item BB-43) for the benefit of draining water from the soil under roadside swales that drain into Structures 209, 210, 212, and 213 from the north. The project also includes the installation of 4, 8-foot stub pipes (a total of 32-feet per Line Item BB-26) for possible future piping connections on the north side of Structures 209, 210, 212, and 213. These installations are ancillary and will not be included in the regulated drain inventory. As such, the table above does not reflect these pipe lengths and these pipes lengths are not included in the total length of the new drain noted above.

Total Project Costs

The total project costs are outlined below. The cost for a remote camera inspection of an existing tile by Fluid Waste Services, Inc. [Reference Invoice WO-19180 dated 3/17/2017 in the amount of \$431.25] during the design of this project is included in the total cost of the project. The cost of the project will include professional surveying services. These services will include construction staking, periodic grade checks, as-built survey, and as-built drawings. The cost for easement acquisition, and the professional services associated with the acquisitions, is included in the total project cost.

Total Project Costs	
Construction Cost	\$1,440,000.00
15% Construction Contingency	\$216,000.00
Fluid Waste Services, Inc.	\$431.25
Professional Survey Services	\$82,000.00
Appraisals [11-easements @ \$3,500 per easement]	\$38,500.00
Easement Acquisition	\$208,500.00
Total Project Cost	\$1,985,431.25

Project Funding

Per IC-36-9-27-71, the costs for the section of the drain crossing 103rd Street, 102nd Street, Barbee Lane, Central Avenue, Ruckle Street, Park Avenue, and College Avenue shall be assessed to the City of Carmel. These costs are as follows:

Line Item No.	Description	Unit	Quantity	Unit Price	Total Cost
BB-7	Roadway removal and repair per Detail 10-24	LF	440	\$41.00	\$18,040.00
BB-8	Roadway Removal and Repair per Detail 10-24; 12" PCCP Cap Only	LF	796	\$100.00	\$79,600.00
BB-11	1.5" Surface Milling	SYS	1589	\$8.00	\$12,712.00
BB-16	Inlet D-22 with casting [107, 108, 113, 214, 215, 216, 217, 507, 508, 509, 511, 512, 803, 805, 806, 807, 808, 809]	EA	18	\$2,800.00	\$50,400.00
BB-17	Manhole D-20, 48" Diameter with casting [102, 103, 104, 105, 503, 504, 505, 506, 510]	EA	9	\$6,900.00	\$62,100.00
BB-18	Manhole D-21, 60" Diameter with casting [100, 106, 801, 802]	EA	4	\$7,100.00	\$28,400.00
BB-19	Manhole D-21, 60" Diameter with casting and Stub Pipes [209, 210, 212, 213]	EA	4	\$7,100.00	\$28,400.00
BB-21	Pipe, Type 2, Circular, 12" PVC C900 with Flowable Fill Backfill	LF	123	\$150.00	\$18,450.00
BB-22	Pipe, Type 2, Circular, 12" PVC C900 with General Backfill	LF	56	\$115.00	\$6,440.00
BB-23	Pipe, Type 2, Circular, 12" RCP with Flowable Fill Backfill	LF	425	\$120.00	\$51,000.00
BB-24	Pipe, Type 2, Circular, 12" RCP with General Backfill	LF	7	\$75.00	\$525.00
BB-25	Pipe, Type 2, Circular, 12" RCP with Granular Backfill	LF	10	\$100.00	\$1,000.00
BB-27	Pipe, Type 2, Circular, 15" RCP with Flowable Fill Backfill	LF	693	\$210.00	\$145,530.00
BB-28	Pipe, Type 2, Circular, 15" RCP with General Backfill	LF	20	\$100.00	\$2,000.00
BB-29	Pipe, Type 2, Circular, 15" RCP with Granular Backfill	LF	5	\$165.00	\$825.00
BB-30	Pipe, Type 2, Circular, 18" RCP with Flowable Fill Backfill	LF	48	\$235.00	\$11,280.00

BB-33	Pipe, Type 2, Circular, 24" PVC C905 with Flowable Fill Backfill	LF	40	\$400.00	\$16,000.00
BB-34	Pipe, Type 2, Circular, 24" RCP with Flowable Fill Backfill	LF	39	\$270.00	\$10,530.00
BB-37	Pipe, Type 2, Circular, 30" RCP with Flowable Fill Backfill	LF	40	\$500.00	\$20,000.00
BB-45	1.5" Resurfacing	SYS	1589	\$12.00	\$19,068.00
City of Carmel Construction Costs					\$582,300.00
15% Contingency					\$87,345.00
Total City of Carmel Costs					\$669,645.00

A portion of the project will be funded by the Coronavirus State and Federal Fiscal Recovery Funds of the American Rescue Plan. As of the date of this report, the first round of funds from this program is available. The portion of the project cost to be funded from these ARPA funds is \$1,315,355.00. The total amount of the ARPA funds allocated for this project is \$1,447,720.00; leaving a balance of \$132,365.00 available from the ARPA funds that could be applied to any project over runs.

Parcels benefitted by this Drain are currently assessed for the Clara Knotts Drain. Therefore, no changes in the current maintenance assessment shall be required. The maintenance fund for the Clara Knotts drain presently receives \$17,878.66 per year. The \$431.25 paid to Fluid Waste from General Drain Improvement Fund on April 11, 2017 for camera work north of 103rd from Ruckel to Central Avenue shall be reimbursed from the Clara Knotts maintenance fund.

The costs for this project will be paid from the following sources:

City of Carmel \$ 669,645.00

Maintenance Fund\$ 431.25

ARPA Funding \$1,315,355.00

Total: \$1,985,431.25

I have reviewed the drainage shed for the Clara Knotts Drain and upon considering each parcel individually, I believe each parcel within the sub-area of the drainage shed will have equal benefits, by land use, as provided by the drain. I believe that no damages will result to landowners by construction of this drain.

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

I recommend that the Board set a hearing for this proposal for March 28,2022.

Sincerely,

Kenton C. Ward, CFM

Hamilton County Surveyor's Office

KCW/pl1"

Altman asked is the landscape mound area part of the regulated drain or do we have to buy easement for that area?

Duncan stated there's easement there.

Altman stated then they put a mound on our easement.

Howard stated the easement's been there for a long, long time.

Altman stated so they put a mound on our easement.

Howard asked whose mound is it?

The Surveyor stated in that area between the street and the north line of that property is drainage easement. In essence, yes.

Altman stated but it was the developer that put the mound in. I can't imagine a homeowner hauled in dirt and put all that dirt there.

Duncan stated I always assumed it was there as a buffer to the residents.

Altman stated that was lovely, but it's in a regulated drain and it's costing us money, correct?

Duncan stated it would be to jack and bore underneath it.

Altman stated it's still going to cost us money to dig out the mound and put it back if we're going to.

Howard stated that's an encroachment into the easement, wouldn't that be a compensable mitigation? Obviously, you don't want to remove the mound, but at a very minimum shouldn't that landowner, the contiguous landowner who filled in our easement, pay at least the small of the cost of jack and boring or going over and replacing?

The Surveyor stated we didn't put that in the report as such because at that time we didn't know what was going to happen. That's standard just to make drainage easement and how many years ago was that put in?

Altman asked did they have permission? I think we would have to go back in our records and see if they asked, but if they did, we would have said you've got to move it if we have to work on the drain, I presume.

Duncan stated we were not going to recommend that the alternate be accepted because of the cost to jack and bore underneath it.

Altman asked how does Banning's survey costs compare to the ones we saw on Clark Dietz? It was jaw dropping when I saw some of the costs that were going into the other drain.

Duncan stated I know with Banning it's always a fair price.

Altman stated since we're re-advertising that (Elwood Wilson, E. M. Hare Arm) I'd like to compare pricing on that; on all those soft costs that don't really have to go to expertise because I thought they were extremely high.

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

Altman stated I think we do need to pursue the encroachment because it has to have had an affect on the bid amount and try to isolate that. Make contact with the owner of that property and ask them how they want to address this. They can jack and bore, or we'll figure out the cost to cut. That cost ought to be offsetting our cost.

Heirbrandt made the motion to approve the Park Broadway Phase 2 project of the Clara Knotts Drain making contact with the property owner of the mound in the regulated drainage easement to offset the cost of that portion of the project, seconded by Dillinger and approved unanimously.

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

IN THE MATTER OF THE
RECONSTRUCTION OF THE
Clara Knotts Drain, Park Broadway Avenue Drain - Phase 2

FINDINGS AND ORDER FOR RECONSTRUCTION

The matter of the proposed Reconstruction of the **Clara Knotts Drain, Park Broadway Avenue Drain - Phase 2 Reconstruction** came before the Hamilton County Drainage Board for hearing **on March 28, 2022**, 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.

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 **Clara Knotts Drain, Park Broadway Avenue Drain - Phase 2 Reconstruction** 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

Steven C. Dillinger
Member

ATTEST: Lynette Mosbaugh "

Clara Knotts Drain - Park Broadway Avenue Drain Phase 2:

Duncan presented the contract for the Park Broadway Avenue Phase 2 of the Clara Knotts Drain in the amount of \$1,440,000.00 to the Board for approval.

Altman stated on the contract the only concern I have is it needs to potentially be revised or they need more work to tell us how much that's going to cost on the encroachment.

Howard stated isolate that cost.

Heirbrandt made the motion to award the contract to Morphey Construction for the Clara Knotts Drain, Park Broadway Avenue Drain Phase 2 in the amount of \$1,440,000.00, seconded by Dillinger and approved unanimously.

ARPA Projects:

The Surveyor presented the projects that are proposed for the ARPA funds. I added the Elwood Wilson Drain, Craig Holleran Arm with an estimated cost of \$2.5 million.

Altman asked can we break that down for our next meeting with details?

The Surveyor asked what details would you like to see?

Altman stated on Elwood Wilson the shed and what affect; without any ARPA money what would happen on assessments. I think that's going to be helpful on all of these as we go forward; to see what kind of impact. Is that hard for us to do? I assume it's just doing a couple of entries in the computer running a report, but that's me making an erroneous assumption.

The Surveyor stated we can divide the cost into the number of acres.

Altman stated I need to know how many people, what acres, if they're small guys and that kind of thing.

The Surveyor stated then we would have to do the full assessment. It's going to take a lot of time. It's not hard, it's just time which we don't have a lot of.

Altman stated I think, in my opinion, I would ask the Surveyor to go through this list on the face of the county and pick out areas that are balanced or absolutely need to be to be done and prioritize this list if you have not done that yet. We do not know, based on watersheds, how it's going to affect the people that live there in terms of assessments, etc.

The Surveyor stated that's a lot of work.

Altman stated another thing on the Elwood Wilson it shows the maintenance balance, but I assume that's the same as the maintenance balance deficiency on the Elwood Wilson, E. M. Hare Arm.

The Surveyor stated yes.

Altman asked is that the same on anything else? We've got two on the Taylor & Jessup and Beaver and Brooks or is that just a shocking coincidence?

The Surveyor stated if it's in red...

Altman stated the Clark & Compton and the Taylor & Jessup have identical deficiencies.

The Surveyor stated they're in the same drainage shed.

Altman stated we might want to pay attention to that as we redo these numbers. The same with Flora Mendenhall and...

The Surveyor stated the Flora Mendenhall is part of a bigger watershed.

Altman stated when we're done with Ream Creek, Orchard Park Arm will that maintenance balance be erased or substantially reduced?

The Surveyor stated it will be starting to be paid back.

Altman stated again, the significant deficiency is because of engineering and design, correct?

The Surveyor stated correct.

Altman stated if we're serious about Elwood Wilson Drain, Craig-Holleran Arm then I think we probably ought to go into design, don't you think?

Elwood Wilson Drain - Craig-Holleran Arm Study:

The Surveyor asked the Board to accept the report that was given at the last meeting.

Heirbrandt made the motion to accept the report on the Craig-Holleran Arm of the Elwood Wilson Drain, seconded by Dillinger and approved unanimously.

Professional Services Agreement - Elwood Wilson Drain, Craig Holleran Arm:

The Surveyor asked the Board to approve the contract for design on the Craig-Holleran Arm of the Elwood Wilson Drain.

Heirbrandt asked what is the dollar amount on that?

The Surveyor stated the cost is \$165,800.00.

Altman asked does that have the survey work and everything else that I had concerns over price?

The Surveyor stated yes.

Altman stated I think we need to look very carefully at that because it seemed pretty high. For those dollar amounts we usually put it out on the street. I understand that they've done all the work on it, but I want all these numbers verified in terms of things that we could do elsewhere.

Heirbrandt asked Duncan, what's your thoughts on that? Is it reasonable?

The Surveyor stated I thought it was cheap.

Heirbrandt made the motion to approve the Professional Services Agreement from Clark Dietz for the Elwood Wilson Drain, Craig-Holleran Arm in the amount of \$165,800.00, seconded by Dillinger.

Altman stated I thought that the other costs came in...

Duncan stated for the E. M. Hare Arm because of the number of structures and I don't have the breakdown, but we're asking them for fulltime inspection for a portion of the project. That has raised the price more so than we normally do. It's an additional service beyond the Clara Knotts where they're just doing construction staking and grade checks.

Heirbrandt stated that could be a big cost.

Duncan stated and it was as I recall.

Altman stated just go through the numbers and if there's ways we can shave it then we can move money to other things and get more stuff done.

The motion had been made and seconded to approve the Professional Services Agreement from Clark Dietz for the Elwood Wilson Drain, Craig-Holleran Arm in the amount of \$165,800.00 and approved unanimously.

Taylor & Jessup Drain - Petition:

The Surveyor presented a petition from Scott Sedwick to include an arm going up to his property when that project is engineered.

Heirbrandt made the motion to accept the petition presented, seconded by Dillinger and approved unanimously.

Summerlakes - Dismiss Petition:

The Surveyor stated I received an email from the Homeowners Association asking that the petition be dismissed.

Heirbrandt made the motion to dismiss the Summerlakes petition, seconded by Dillinger and approved unanimously.

Request for Quote - Professional Engineering Services:

The Surveyor stated this is a request for engineering for the following drains: Taylor & Jessup Drain; Cornthwaite Drain; Raymond Briles Drain; and M. E. Scherer Drain. Cornthwaite is for Cicero, the Taylor & Jessup is for what Mr. Sedwick was in on at the last meeting. The Raymond Briles Drain is in conjunction with the State Highway Project on US 31. They're bringing a 24-inch pipe reconstructing a portion of the upstream Briles under US 31 and they need a place to outlet it instead of our existing 12-inch or 14-inch drain there.

Altman asked will this be recouped as part of their project?

The Surveyor stated no, this will be a reconstruction of the downstream area. The Raymond Briles...

Altman stated but if they need an outlet why wouldn't they be paying for the cost?

The Surveyor stated we can ask them to do that.

Altman stated it seems like there's a real nexus there. Wouldn't we require a developer to do that?

The Surveyor stated yes.

Altman stated I just got treated like that from Citizens Energy when we met.

The Surveyor stated I'll get with Jennifer Beck and let her know. The M.E. Scherer would be the drain on the south side of Arcadia.

Heirbrandt made the motion to approve the Requests for Quotes for engineering presented, seconded by Dillinger and approved unanimously.

The Surveyor stated the Wilson-Nagle Drain and the West Arcadia Drain are Requests for Quotes for survey and engineering.

Dillinger made the motion to approve the Requests for Quotes for survey and engineering presented, seconded by Altman and approved unanimously.

Capital Asset Notifications:

The Surveyor presented the following Capital Asset Notifications to the Board for approval: William Baker Drain; Mud Creek/Sand Creek Drainage Area, T. J. Patterson Arm; and J. W. Wagner Drain.

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

Citizens Energy Group - Service Advisory Board:

The Surveyor presented the minutes of the Service Advisory Board from February 15, 2022 to the Board for their information. He asked if there were any questions.

There were no questions.

Big Cicero Creek Joint Drainage Board:

The Surveyor presented the minutes of the Big Cicero Creek Joint Drainage Board from March 2, 2022 to the Board for their information. He asked if there were any questions.

There were no questions.

Clara Knotts Drain, Park Broadway Arm Phase 1 - Change Order No. 2:

Cline presented his report to the Board for approval.

"March 21, 2022

To: Hamilton County Drainage Board

Re: Clara Knotts Drain Reconstruction, Base Bid
Change Order #2

Change Order #2 was required due to additional sanitary laterals relocations.

The following items are changes to the reconstruction of the Clara Knotts Drain Reconstruction:

2 additional sanitary lateral connection at \$1,500 each -----	\$ 3,000.00
Engineer's Estimate for Base Bid -----	\$599,432.17
Contract Bid -----	\$358,290.00
Change Order #1 -----	\$ 1,500.00
Change Order #2 -----	\$ 3,000.00
Total Base Bid Reconstruction Cost	\$362,790.00
Difference -----	\$236,642.17

Submitted By:

Luther Cline
Inspector"

Dillinger made the motion to approve Change Order No. 2 for the Clara Knotts Drain, Park Broadway Arm Phase 1, seconded by Altman and approved unanimously.

Non-enforcements:

Clark presented a non-enforcement request for the Crooked Creek Drain, Brandywine Arm filed by Mark and Aunya Maurer for parcel #17-13-06-04-01-013.000 for a fence. The Surveyor's Office recommends denial. They have a 7.5-foot drainage easement on their property.

Altman asked so it's fifteen-foot total with the centerline of the lot?

Clark stated yes. I spoke with the property owner and he's fine with that.

Dillinger made the motion to approve the Surveyor's Office recommendation of denial for the Maurer Fence, seconded by Altman and approved unanimously.

Liston presented a non-enforcement request for the Wheeler and Wheeler Drain, Arbor Grove Arm filed by Jose and Laurie Vazquez for parcel #10-11-08-00-15-022.000 for a fence. The Surveyor's Office recommends approval.

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

Liston presented a non-enforcement request for the Canal Place Drain, Reserve at Geist Arm filed by James and Laura Miesle for parcel #13-15-01-00-23-004.000 for a fence. The Surveyor's Office recommends approval.

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

Clark presented a non-enforcement request for the Williams Creek Drain, West Rail at the Station Arm filed by Andrew and Stephanie O'Neil for parcel #08-09-10-00-17-036.000 for a fence. The Surveyor's Office recommends approval.

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

Clark presented a non-enforcement request for the Little Eagle Creek Drain, West Rail at the Station Arm filed by Gerritt Smits for parcel #08-09-10-00-17-020.000 for a fence. The Surveyor's Office recommends approval.

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

Clark presented a non-enforcement request for the Williams Creek Drain, West Rail at the Station Arm filed by Todd Wilson for parcel #08-09-10-00-21-037.000 for a fence. The Surveyor's Office recommends approval.

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

Clark presented a non-enforcement request for the Williams Creek Drain, Springmill Run Arm filed by William Cahill for parcel #17-13-05-00-17-030.000 for a fence. The Surveyor's Office recommends approval.

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

Clark presented a non-enforcement request for the Williams Creek Drain, Jackson's Grant Arm filed by Henry and Mary Frommeyer for parcel #17-09-34-00-13-024.000 for a fence. The Surveyor's Office recommends approval.

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

Clark presented a non-enforcement request for the Hunters Creek Village Drain filed by Marcus and Kaitlyn Brinneman for parcel #17-09-24-01-05-001.000 for a fence. The Surveyor's Office recommends approval.

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

Clark presented a non-enforcement request for the Williams Creek Drain, West Rail at the Station Arm filed by Thomas and Linda Paradis for parcel #08-09-10-00-21-022.000 for a fence. The Surveyor's Office recommends approval.

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

Clark presented a non-enforcement request for the Long Branch Drain, Sanctuary at 116th Street Arm filed by Douglas and Maria Rubenstein for parcel #17-09-31-00-00-027.001 for a fence. The Surveyor's Office recommends approval.

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

Clark presented a non-enforcement request for the Little Eagle Creek Drain, Preserve at Bear Creek Arm filed by Manuj Tandon and Sanghamitra Sahoo for parcel #17-09-19-00-10-005.000 for a fence. The Surveyor's Office recommends approval.

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

Clark presented a non-enforcement request for the Williams Creek Drain, Clay Corner Arm filed by Vivek and Vidya Amin for parcel #17-09-27-00-20-075.000 for a fence. The Surveyor's Office recommends approval.

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

Clark presented a non-enforcement request for the Home Place Drain filed by Silverthorne Homes for parcel #17-13-01-03-08-015.001 for a single-family residence. The Surveyor's Office recommends approval.

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

Spills:

Washington Township Drain - Liston stated our office was notified on Sunday, March 27, 2022 of an accident of a tanker truck full of gasoline that was forced off the side of the road and landed on its side. There was no leakage from the tanker other than some engine oil and hydraulic oil. This happened on SR 32 just west of Springmill Road.

Construction Updates:

George Symonds Drain, Two Stage Ditch Reconstruction - Liston stated this project is progressing. Hoosier Pride is almost to the Majestic Property, which would be east of Eagletown Road.

Intracoastal at Geist Drain - Duncan stated Comcast still needs to move their line and they were scheduled to be out there last week.

Liston stated our contractor did remove the trees that needed to be down before April 1st.

Mallery-Granger Drain Reconstruction - Liston stated I need to contact our contractor and do a final inspection.

Canal Place Drain, Strongbow Gate Arm - Liston stated the contractor is still waiting on structures. I did reach out to a couple of the phone numbers that you gave me at the last meeting. Rinker Materials has told me the problem they're having is a materials problem. There's a shortage of steel for structures. Instead of using one vendor they're needing to use multiple vendors to get those materials. It also comes down to lead time, production problems and issues, a shortage of staff or manpower. I did reach out to the distributor in Columbus, Indiana and have not heard back.

The Surveyor stated I've talked to some of the other County Surveyor's around and we're not alone.

Altman stated yes, if it's not there, it's not there.

Clara Knotts Drain, Park Broadway Arm Phase 1 - Cline stated Phase 1 is winding down. They'll be back as soon as it dries out enough to grade and level the spoils.

Ream Creek Drain Reconstruction, Orchard Park Arm - Cline stated this project hasn't started yet. We're having the same problems with construction materials.

Pending Final Report (Ellis Barker Drain Reconstruction) - Cline stated the final report is in the works.

Fill in the Floodplain Ordinance:

Altman stated an issue came up before the Commissioners about the ordinance of fill in the floodway and whether it affects; do we have that today?

Sullivan stated yes, we have that ready to sign for Drainage Board and Commissioner's meeting too.

Altman asked would you present that now?

Sullivan stated two Highway meetings ago a discussion was held about some issues with fill for bridges that do not raise the 100-year base flood elevation (BFE). Instead of having them go through all the formal steps of showing that they need a hydraulic study, if there's documentation that shows that the BFE level is not raised we'll be good to go. All the other bridges that do raise the BFE are still subject to review and all the structures are still the same. It's only changing the structures that don't raise the BFE for county bridges.

Altman asked what about the cities?

Sullivan stated it would include cities too.

Altman stated let's make sure.

Sullivan stated it states any street, bridges or roadways.

Altman asked so it's defined as public?

Sullivan stated yes.

Dillinger made the motion to approve the Fill in the Floodplain Ordinance.

Altman asked do we have to adopt at first reading?

Howard stated no, you're recommending yourselves as Commissioners this afternoon and you would adopt at first reading at that time.

Altman seconded Dillinger motion to approve the Fill in the Floodplain Ordinance and approved unanimously.

Drainage Board Attorney - Pending Items:

Lake Stonebridge Agreement (Backflow Preventer) - Sullivan stated we were waiting on the last piece for a backflow preventer. We removed the language saying that there's a cap for how much we will be reimbursed by the HOA for Lake Stonebridge. They will reimburse us for everything now. We have the final invoice. They asked us to sign a waiver, via this morning, Howard will look at it this afternoon too, but it essentially says that we are acknowledging what they did for us is actually what we asked for and that they received payment for it and its good to go from there. Once the Drainage Board signs this agreement, the HOA will sign it and this item should be removed from our pending items.

Altman asked has this been fully inspected?

The Surveyor stated yes.

Altman stated and done according to the Surveyor's Office standard.

Howard stated two phases, one is the HOA no longer has a limit on maintenance, whatever it is, it is, and the other thing was the contractor wanted a waiver notice.

Altman stated so really the waiver goes to the contractor.

Sullivan stated yes.

Maintenance of Erosion Control Landscaping - Sullivan stated Duncan and I spoke with Mike Stikeleather for the maintenance of erosion control landscaping. Three years ago, the Drainage Board entered into an agreement with him. He's a developer and he wanted to put natural grass and vegetation...

Duncan stated native grasses around the detention pond to limit erosion that had been occurring.

Howard stated as opposed to our standard erosion control grass.

Duncan stated it was native, more natural planting with deeper roots.

Altman asked should we be considering a change in standards primarily because we may want that kind of stuff around the ponds to keep the geese out? That's shown as a deterrent for our non-migratory birds.

The Surveyor stated my problem with that is when you take turf out and you put the grasses in it takes those grasses three to five years to mature and do the same thing as the turf is doing.

Howard stated much more intense maintenance during the early phases.

Altman asked is it our cost or their cost?

The Surveyor stated it should be their cost. The kind of maintenance that we do if you get a storm that washes all that out, we need to fix it and they need to pay for it.

Howard stated it's just one more thing to check out. I've negotiated with that guy for, I have no idea how many hours it was, but essentially he convinced the Board that, as the developer and president of the HOA and Mr. Everything he was going to handle it, I'm not sure, it's up to the Surveyor, whether you wouldn't want to have that on a case by case basis.

Altman stated you might look at best practices, something that balances out. I think a lot of our pollution is coming from the geese, which is not good.

The Surveyor stated on the E.coli side.

Altman stated yes. The sediment is sediment, but water quality I think is a huge issue.

Howard stated two weeks ago the Star said we're the worst in the country.

Sullivan stated that one situation has been taken care of, but we can go through it and look at it.

Duncan stated as I recall it was a non-enforcement to allow the native grasses to be planted and more or less solidify who's responsible for maintenance and whatnot. I don't know if it remained on the to-do list because the agreement was signed, the non-enforcement was approved, I don't know if it was left on here...

Altman stated just to make sure it got done.

Duncan stated just to make sure it was inspected, and it actually got done.

Altman stated if everything is complete and the grasses are growing, I think we should remove it. We have an agreement for the installation and maintenance of the backflow preventer, which I think needs to be approved. I don't think we formally did that.

Howard stated I don't think the contract's been approved yet.

Dillinger made the motion to approve the agreement for the installation and maintenance of the Lake Stonebridge Backflow Preventer, seconded by Altman and approved unanimously.

E. E. Bennett Drain (Equicor) - Sullivan stated the Surveyor's Office has reached out to the City of Noblesville asking for some information that they may have, and Mr. Abrams is aware of that and we have been in communication with him.

Altman asked, have we determined if it's really on their plate? Whose plate is that on?

Duncan stated Steve (Cash) has been talking with the City of Noblesville to see if the easement has already been recorded. The easement for the relocation of the E. E. Bennett Regulated Drain. It may already be recorded, that's what we're trying to figure out. We've seen some documentation related to the relocation of this drain and the City gave us an instrument number that reflects a different easement so we're trying to figure out; if the easement wasn't recorded then the documentation provided by Mr. Abrams has been reviewed and we can bring that forward to get that recorded and bring it to the Board, but we want to make sure it's not already recorded.

Altman stated let's ask Mr. Abrams to check the documents we have to determine if it's been recorded.

Sullivan stated we're waiting on him to respond on that.

The Surveyor stated just to be clear, Abrams is the developer who bought it from Noblesville?

Altman stated no, he's the attorney for the developer.

Flora Mendenhall Drain:

The Surveyor stated we have a landowner that is going to be impacted on that particular project, in fact the whole project is on her property. Everything drains into it and through it. She asked about...

Altman asked where is the Flora Mendenhall Drain?

The Surveyor stated the Flora Mendenhall Drain is at Dunbar Road and 221st Street, just south of Bakers Corner. She asked about crop damage and I explained to her that we're taking the existing 150-foot right of way, putting in the open ditch plus the filter strips on both sides and that would take about 7.5 acres if I remember right, or 6.3 acres.

Duncan stated it is a total of 7.8 acres, but if you look at the area of the farm that cannot be farmed presently, it's an increase of 6.3 acres. There's about 1.5 acres on the property right now that really can't be farmed due to the waterway.

Altman asked what's the Statute say? Aren't we responsible for crop damage? I can't remember.

The Surveyor stated actually it says crops are at risk.

Altman stated you can farm, but if we come in and reconstruct then it's your problem.

The Surveyor stated right.

Howard stated but in this case are we permanently putting in this channel?

The Surveyor stated it's permanently gone.

Howard stated it's permanently gone, but it's all within easement.

The Surveyor stated yes.

Howard stated so their previous condition of farming that ground was a permissible use, but not protected.

The Surveyor stated correct.

Altman stated okay, I guess that's the answer. That would be a bad precedent to start if we compensate for that.

The Surveyor stated I told her I would take it to the Board.

Howard stated we would need a motion to affirm the existence of our easement and find that the work therein was pursuant to the Statute.

The Surveyor stated under Section 33 of the Indiana Drainage Code.

Dillinger made the motion to affirm the existence of our drainage easement and find that the work therein is pursuant to Section 33 of the Indiana Drainage Code, seconded by Altman and approved unanimously.

Altman asked can she get another crop season in?

The Surveyor stated no we can't.

Altman stated let her know that too.

Howard stated so we're going to be doing work this summer.

Altman stated so she and her farmer are not wasting chemical, seed and time.

The Surveyor asked the Board if they would be acceptable to having that hearing also on May 9th?

Altman stated I think if we're going to advertise things, we have to show the full amount with a notation that some ARPA monies may be expended so we don't have the same problem we had on the last one.

Howard stated you make it a not to exceed and then you can always reduce. As long as the assessment does not go up on the landowner then you're fine. You can reduce the cost, but you can't increase it over what's advertised.

Altman stated we don't have approval on Flora Mendenhall, correct; for ARPA money yet, or do we?

The Surveyor stated according to Heirbrandt's text last Friday it was approved. It's \$637,000.00, I think.

Duncan stated yes, it was approved at last Thursday's meeting.

Altman stated let's advertise it and once we see the full report, we may think they need more skin in the game and we have that flexibility but make it clear that we're anticipating offsetting a significant portion from the American Recovery Act.

The Surveyor stated the bid hold ends May 24th and the meeting is the 28th.

Dillinger made the motion to set the Flora Mendenhall Drain Reconstruction hearing for May 9, 2022, seconded by Altman and approved unanimously.

Hortonville:

The Surveyor stated I understand the Noblesville Housing Authority is going to be here today, is that correct?

Altman stated I don't recall seeing it on the agenda.

Dillinger stated it could be under Dan's (Stevens) items.

The Surveyor stated we had talked about using CBDG money for Hortonville. If you could bring that up to Amy.

Altman stated I don't see a lot of move; we've put a lot of CBDG funds in drainage. I don't know. Its been the primary draw on those funds. I don't know with all the ARPA going in if we want to do that. We do have restrictions, but not the same kind as ARPA.

The Surveyor stated Hortonville is one of the few that meets the requirements for CDBG monies, so that's why I was bringing that up.

Altman stated but they have a healthy maintenance balance too. The maintenance balance is \$305,000.00. The request was \$1,575,000.00, which I assume you requested the full reconstruction cost.

The Surveyor stated yes.

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

Christine Altman - President

Lynette Mosbaugh
Executive Secretary