The meeting was called to order Monday May 28, 2019 at 9:03 a.m.

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

**Approve Minutes of May 13, 2019:**
The minutes of May 13, 2019 were presented to the Board for approval.

Heirbrandt made the motion to approve the minutes of May 13, 2019, seconded by Dillinger and approved unanimously.

**Bid Award - Benton Hinesley Drain, Grass Waterway:**
Mr. Scot Van Horn was present for this item.

Duncan presented his report to the Board for approval.

"May 22, 2019

Hamilton County Drainage Board

RE: Benton Hinesley Drain Grass Waterway

Dear Board Members:

At the meeting of the Drainage Board on May 13, 2019 three bids were received for the Benton Hinesley Drain Grass Waterway project.

The bids received were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contractor</th>
<th>Bid Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Van Horn Excavating</td>
<td>$ 132,990.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millennium Contractors, LLC</td>
<td>$ 365,640.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morphey Construction</td>
<td>$ 294,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Engineer’s Estimate for construction was $165,062.95. The apparent low bidder is Van Horn Excavating. The Hamilton County Surveyors Office reviewed the Van Horn Excavating bid submittal and found it to be complete.

The Surveyor recommends that the Board award the Contract to Van Horn Excavating in the amount of $132,990.34.

Sincerely,

Gary R. Duncan, Jr., PE
Staff Engineer

Heirbrandt made the motion to award the bid for the Benton Hinesley Drain, Grass Waterway to Van Horn Excavating in the amount of $132,990.34, seconded by Dillinger and approved unanimously.

**Anchorage Drain – Rejection of Bids:**
Duncan presented his report to the Board.

“May 22, 2019

Hamilton County Drainage Board

RE: Anchorage Drain Reconstruction

Dear Board Members:

At the meeting of the Drainage Board on May 13, 2019 two bids were received for the project to reconstruct a portion of the Anchorage Regulated Drain. The bids received were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contractor</th>
<th>Bid Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Millennium Contractors, LLC</td>
<td>$175,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morphey Construction</td>
<td>$177,745.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Engineer’s Estimate for construction was $77,745.75.

These bids exceed the Engineers Estimate as well as the funds available for this project.

Hamilton County Drainage Board
May 28, 2019
At the meeting of the Drainage Board on May 13, 2019, the Board authorized and directed the County Surveyor to invite quotes for this project from three contractors.

The Surveyor recommends that the Board reject the submitted bids. The County Surveyor has prepared and will issue the Invitations to Quote.

Sincerely,

Gary R. Duncan, Jr., PE
Staff Engineer"

Heirbrandt made the motion to reject the bids for the Anchorage Drain Reconstruction, seconded by Dillinger and approved unanimously.

Elwood Wilson Drain, Fisher County Farm Arm – Field Drive & Cumberland Road Roundabout Reconstruction & Partial Vacation:
There were neither landowners present nor objections on file.

Cash presented the Surveyor’s report to the Board for approval.

“April 16, 2019

To: Hamilton County Drainage Board

Re: Elwood Wilson Drain, Fisher – County Farm Arm, Field Drive and Cumberland Road Roundabout Reconstruction & Partial Vacation.

The Fisher – County Farm Drain was established by the Hamilton County Commissioners Court per January 23, 1964 report by Roy D. Horney, Hamilton County Surveyor, and approved on February 3, 1964 for the purpose of widening the County Farm Road (north & south). The Fisher – County Farm Drain was later combined with the Elwood Wilson Drain.

Attached are petition from the City of Noblesville along with plans for the proposed reconstruction of a portion of the Elwood Wilson Drain, Fisher – County Farm Arm. The proposal is to reconstruct a portion of the existing drain currently in the Field Drive and Cumberland Road right-of-way per the Field Drive and Cumberland Road Roundabout plans by USI, Project No. 1401714, file stamped 4/4/2019, Sheets 17 and 22.
The Elwood Wilson Regulated Drain, Fisher – County Farm Arm is located on the west side of Cumberland Road. The regulated drain begins at the northwest corner of the existing intersection, crosses under Field Drive, and continues south. Per the construction plans, a new manhole (Str#23) will be added to the existing 12” drain south of the proposed roundabout and approximately 220’ of the existing 12” drain will be removed. (Note: Drainage from the roundabout will be piped via proposed City of Noblesville storm sewers to two detention areas before draining to an existing storm sewer on the east side of Cumberland Road).

This request will consist of the following:

Add Str #23 Remove 220’ of 12” Concrete Tile

The existing drain will be vacated between original station 0+00 and 2+20. This proposal will remove 220’ from the drain’s total length.

The cost of the project is to be paid by the City of Noblesville. Therefore, the requirement for posting surety has been waived.

The manhole is proposed to be located within the existing Elwood Wilson Drain easement. No easement acquisition is necessary for this reconstruction. Where the existing drain will be vacated, the corresponding easement will likewise be vacated.

I recommend the Board set this item for hearing on May 28, 2019.

Sincerely,

Kenton C. Ward
Hamilton County Surveyor

KCW/pll”

Dillinger asked why are they just bringing this to us now? They’re constructing that now.
Cash stated they are under construction; starting their work now. As far as the timing goes I don’t have an answer for you.

Dillinger asked are they asking for forgiveness rather than permission?

Cash stated this was submitted quite a while ago and they had revisions. It lay dormant for a while and then came back.

Dillinger stated I’m not questioning the need for this, this is of paramount importance. It’s needed to be done for a long time, but I live up that way and I know it’s partially constructed already. I’m just a little surprised to see it now.

Altman stated apparently they did file before the project commencement.

Liston stated what I think you’re seeing is utility relocation work that’s part of the project.

Dillinger stated they’ve been working on this for several weeks now.

Liston stated yes, but it’s been utility relocation work.

Cash stated the storm sewer work has not yet started and won’t be starting until June.

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

Dillinger made the motion to approve the Surveyor’s report, seconded by Heirbrandt and approved unanimously.

“FINDINGS AND ORDER

CONCERNING THE PARTIAL VACATION OF THE

Elwood Wilson Drain, Fisher-County Farm Arm,
Field Drive & Cumberland Road Roundabout Reconstruction & Partial Vacation

Station 0+00 to Station 2+20

Hamilton County Drainage Board
May 28, 2019
On this 28th day of May, 2019, the Hamilton County Drainage Board has held a hearing on the Maintenance Report and Schedule of Assessments of the Cool Elwood Wilson Drain, Fisher-County Farm Arm, Field Drive and Cumberland Road Roundabout Reconstruction & Partial Vacation (Station 0+00 to Station 2+20).

Evidence has been heard. Objections were presented and considered. The Board then adopted an order of action. The Board now finds that the costs of continued maintenance to the portion of the above drain exceed the benefits to the real estate benefited by the portion of the drain to be abandoned and issues this order vacating the above section of the Elwood Wilson Drain, Fisher-County Farm Arm, Field Drive and Cumberland Road Roundabout Reconstruction & Partial Vacation (Station 0+00 to Station 2+20).

HAMILTON COUNTY DRAINAGE BOARD

Christine Altman
President

Mark Heirbrandt
Member

Steven C. Dillinger
Member

Attest: Lynette Mosbaugh

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

IN THE MATTER OF THE
RECONSTRUCTION OF THE

Hamilton County Drainage Board
May 28, 2019
FINDINGS AND ORDER FOR RECONSTRUCTION

The matter of the proposed Reconstruction of the Elwood Wilson Drain, Fisher-County Farm Arm, Field Drive and Cumberland Road Roundabout Reconstruction & Partial Vacation came before the Hamilton County Drainage Board for hearing on May 28, 2019, on the Reconstruction Report consisting of the report and the Schedule of Damages and Assessments. The Board also received and considered the written objection of an owner of certain lands affected by the proposed Reconstruction, said owner being:

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

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

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
Elwood Wilson Drain, Fisher-County Farm Arm, Field Drive and Cumberland Road Roundabout Reconstruction & Partial Vacation 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

MARK

Mark Heirbrandt

Member

Steven C. Dillinger

Member

ATTEST: Lynette Mosbaugh

Executive Secretary"

Little Eagle Creek Drain - Seals Subdivision Arm:
There were neither landowners present nor objections on file.

The Surveyor presented his report to the Board for approval.

"March 15, 2019

To: Hamilton County Drainage Board

Re: Little Eagle Creek Drain, Seals Subdivision Arm

Attached is a petition filed by Tara M. Seals, along with quantity summary and assessment roll for the Seals Subdivision Arm, Little Eagle Creek Drain to be located in Washington.

Hamilton County Drainage Board
May 28, 2019
Township. I have reviewed the submittals and petition and have found each to be in proper form.

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

The drain will consist of the following:

Open Ditch – Seals Subdivision Arm 4,570 feet

The total length of the drain will be 4,570 feet.

The Seals Subdivision Arm will begin at the northern right of way of 156th Street, approximately 214 feet east of the western Hamilton County Line, following the existing open ditch across the right of way and through the Seals Subdivision Parcel Number 08-09-18-00-00-01.0001.000 to the confluence with Little Eagle Creek. The proposed open regulated drain is to be accepted in place.

The current maintenance assessment as per the current rates set for the Little Eagle Creek Drain were assessed to this tract under the hearing for the Seals Extension per my report to the Board dated March 13, 2019.

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

The nature of maintenance work required is as follows:

1. Bank erosion protection and/or seeding as might be required;

2. Removal of debris and/or blockages from existing open drain;

3. Removal of beaver dams;

4. Any other repairs necessary to restore proper flow to the open ditch.
The frequency with which maintenance work should be performed is annually as required by the condition of the drain.

I recommend the easement be those easement widths as shown on the secondary plats for Seals Subdivision as recorded in the office of the Hamilton County Recorder as Instrument Number 2019007354 plat. The property owned by Bret O & Mary A. Mattingly, Parcel Number 08-09-18-00-00-003.000 shall not be encumbered by a regulated drain easement. Additional drainage easement will be added to the following tract at 75’ from top of bank as set out in IC 36-9-27-33.

Parcel  
156th St.  
Owner  
Hamilton Co. Highway Dept.

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

Sincerely,

Kenton C. Ward, CFM  
Hamilton County Surveyor

KCW/p11”

Altman asked what shape is the drain in currently?

The Surveyor stated it’s in fairly decent shape. It was farmed and kept pretty clean.

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

Heirbrandt made the motion to approve the Surveyor’s report, seconded by Dillinger and approved unanimously.

"STATE OF INDIANA   )                       BEFORE THE
HAMilton COUNTY  
COUNTY OF HAMILTON  
INDIANA  
HAMilton County Drainage Board  
May 28, 2019
IN THE MATTER OF THE
RECONSTRUCTION OF THE
Little Eagle Creek Drain, Seals Subdivision Arm

FINDINGS AND ORDER FOR RECONSTRUCTION

The matter of the proposed Reconstruction of the Little Eagle Creek Drain, Seals Subdivision Arm came before the Hamilton County Drainage Board for hearing on May 28, 2019, on the Reconstruction Report consisting of the report and the Schedule of Damages and Assessments. The Board also received and considered the written objection of an owner of certain lands affected by the proposed Reconstruction, said owner being:

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

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

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 Little Eagle Creek Drain, Seals Subdivision Arm 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

Executive Secretary"

**Little Eagle Creek Drain – 156th Street Extension:**

There were neither landowners present nor objections on file.

The Surveyor presented his report to the Board for approval.

“April 18, 2019

To: Hamilton County Drainage Board

Re: Little Eagle Creek Drain, 156th Street Extension

Attached is a drain map, drainage shed map and schedule of assessments for the extension of the Little Eagle Creek Drain. This proposed drain is located in Washington Township.

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

Open Ditch 35 ft.

The total length of the drain will be 35 feet.

The extension will begin at the existing north Right of Way line of 156th Street and extend across to the south Right of Way line of 156th Street.

The current rates for the Little Eagle Creek Drain are $10.00 per acre for roads. The annual maintenance collection for this extension will be $3.00.

The nature of maintenance work required is as follows:

1. Bank erosion protection and/or seeding as might be required;

2. Removal of debris and/or blockages from existing open drain;

3. Removal of beaver dams;

4. Any other repairs necessary to restore proper flow to the open ditch.

The frequency with which maintenance work should be performed is annually as required by the condition of the drain.

The easements for the drain should be set at 75’ from top of bank as set out in IC 36-9-27-33.

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

Sincerely,

Kenton C. Ward, CFM
Hamilton County Surveyor

KCW/pl1"
Altman opened the public hearing; seeing no one present Altman closed the public hearing.

Dillinger made the motion to approve the Surveyor’s report, seconded by Heirbrandt and approved unanimously.

“FINDINGS AND ORDER

CONCERNING THE MAINTENANCE OF THE

Little Eagle Creek Drain, 156th Street Extension

On this 28th day of May, 2019, the Hamilton County Drainage Board has held a hearing on the Maintenance Report and Schedule of Assessments of the Little Eagle Creek Drain, 156th Street Extension.

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

HAMILTON COUNTY DRAINAGE BOARD

Christine Altman
President

Mark Heirbrandt
Member

Steven C. Dillinger
Member

Attest: Lynette Mosbaugh
Executive Secretary”
The matter of the proposed Reconstruction of the Little Eagle Creek Drain, 156th Street Extension came before the Hamilton County Drainage Board for hearing on May 28, 2019, on the Reconstruction Report consisting of the report and the Schedule of Damages and Assessments. The Board also received and considered the written objection of an owner of certain lands affected by the proposed Reconstruction, said owner being:

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

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

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

Hamilton County Drainage Board
May 28, 2019
Little Eagle Creek Drain, 156th Street Extension be and is hereby declared established.

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

HAMILTON COUNTY DRAINAGE BOARD

Christine Altman________

PRESIDENT

Mark Heirbrandt________

Member

Steven C. Dillinger________

Member

ATTEST: Lynette Mosbaugh________

Executive Secretary"

Little Eagle Creek Drain – Seals Extension:
There were neither landowners present nor objections on file.

The Surveyor presented his report to the Board for approval.

"March 13, 2019

To: Hamilton County Drainage Board

Re: Little Eagle Creek Drain, Seals Extension

Attached is a petition filed by Tara M. Seals, along with quantity summary and assessment roll for the Seals Extension Arm, Little Eagle Creek Drain to be located in Washington

Hamilton County Drainage Board
May 28, 2019
Township. I have reviewed the submittals and petition and have found each to be in proper form.

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

The drain will consist of the following:

- Open Ditch – Main Drain, 1,405 feet

The total length of the drain will be 1,405 feet.

The first segment of the extension will begin at the upstream point Little Eagle Creek enters onto the Seals Subdivision plat, currently tract 08-09-18-00-00-001.000, owned by Seals, Tara Michelle Trustee Seals 2012 Irr Trust, and follows the existing open ditch (Little Eagle Creek) downstream to the southern property line of the Seals subdivision. The proposed open regulated drain is to be accepted in place.

The current maintenance assessment as per the current rates set for the Little Eagle Creek Drain which are as follows:

1. Maintenance assessment for roads and streets are set at $10.00 per acre.

2. Maintenance assessment for agricultural tracts are set at $2.00 per acre with a $15.00 minimum.

3. Maintenance assessment for non-platted residential tracts are set at $2.00 per acre with a $15.00 minimum.

4. Maintenance assessment for commercial, institutional and multi-family residential tracts are set at $10.00 per acre with a $75.00 minimum.

Hamilton County Drainage Board
May 28, 2019
5. Maintenance assessment for platted lots in subdivisions whose drainage systems will not be part of the regulated drain shall be set at $35.00 per lot/minimum. Common areas within non-regulated drain subdivisions shall be assessed at $5.00 per acre with a $35.00 minimum.

6. Maintenance assessment for platted lots within subdivisions whose drainage system will be part of the regulated drain shall be set at $65.00 per lot/minimum. Common areas within the regulated drain subdivisions shall be set at $10.00 per acre with a $65.00 minimum.

The total annual assessment for this arm will be $301.72.

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

The nature of maintenance work required is as follows:

1. Bank erosion protection and/or seeding as might be required;
2. Removal of debris and/or blockages from existing open drain;
3. Removal of beaver dams;
4. Any other repairs necessary to restore proper flow to the open ditch.

The frequency with which maintenance work should be performed is annually as required by the condition of the drain.

I recommend the easement be those easement widths as shown on the secondary plats for The Seals Subdivision Minor Plat as recorded in the office of the Hamilton County Recorder as Instrument 2019007354. Per the plat the drainage easement is from top of bank of Little Eagle Creek to the floodway limits or 75’ from the top of bank of Little Eagle Creek as set out in IC 36-9-27-33, which ever is greater. The easement includes from top of bank to top of bank.
I recommend that the Board set a hearing for this proposal for May 28, 2019.

Sincerely,

Kenton C. Ward, CFM
Hamilton County Surveyor

KCW/pl1”

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

Dillinger made the motion to approve the Surveyor’s Report, seconded by Heirbrandt and approved unanimously.

“FINDINGS AND ORDER

CONCERNING THE MAINTENANCE OF THE

Little Eagle Creek Drain, Seals Extension

On this 28th day of May, 2019, the Hamilton County Drainage Board has held a hearing on the Maintenance Report and Schedule of Assessments of the Little Eagle Creek Drain, Seals Extension.

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

HAMILTON COUNTY DRAINAGE BOARD

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

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

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

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 Little Eagle Creek Drain, Seals Extension be and is hereby declared established.

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

HAMILTON COUNTY DRAINAGE BOARD

Christine Altman

PRESIDENT

Mark Heirbrandt

Member

Steven C. Dillinger

Member

ATTEST: Lynette Mosbaugh

Executive Secretary”
Anchorage Drain – Reconstruction of a Portion of Section 1:

There was one objection on file. Mr. Steve Iden, Mr. JoAnn Iden, Ms. Michelle Bortenschlager, Mr. Drew Allen and Mr. Erin Mohebar were present for this item.

Duncan presented his report to the Board.

“April 16, 2019

To: Hamilton County Drainage Board

Re: Reconstruction of a portion of the Section 1 Arm of the Anchorage Regulated Drain

Attached is a drain map and petition for the reconstruction of a portion of the Anchorage Regulated Drain in the Anchorage Subdivision. The portion of the regulated drain to be reconstructed is located in Fall Creek Township, Section 10, Township 17 North, Range 5 East.

History

The Section 1 Arm of the Anchorage Regulated Drain was constructed in 1991. The portion of the drain to be reconstructed is presently a 6” SSD installed in 1991. Approval for maintenance of the Section 1 Arm of the Anchorage Drain was granted by the Drainage Board on June 17, 1991 (see Hamilton County Drainage Board Minutes Book 2, page 538).

There is a chronic issue of standing water and poor drainage at the rear of Lots 60, 61, 62, 64, 65, 67, 68, and 69. These poorly drained areas have no positive outlet and hold storm water runoff during and after storm events. This is a chronic and persistent issue that the property owners have had to deal with since purchasing the properties. The areas that hold water have stagnated and cannot be maintained or enjoyed by the property owners. The conditions have resulted in the death of many of the trees and it is not possible to establish stands of grass in these areas.

The reason the conditions exist is not apparent. The likely reason is that the installation of proper drainage infrastructure in the rear yards would have resulted in the undesirable removal of many trees by the Developer. Most
property owners inherited this issue when purchasing the properties. There is a regulated drain in the rear yards. This regulated drain is a 6-inch diameter sub-surface drain that does not have capacity to adequately convey surface storm water runoff. Such drains are also prone to root clogging and require frequent maintenance to remain effective. The regulated drain is also on the north side of a ridge. The ridge prevents surface water from the lots south of the ridge from entering the drain.

There have been five drainage complaints filed with the Hamilton County Surveyor’s Office for this area since 2002.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drainage Complaint Number</th>
<th>Date of Complaint</th>
<th>Property Address</th>
<th>Complaint</th>
<th>$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DC-2002-00062</td>
<td>3/11/2002</td>
<td>10210 Summerlin Way</td>
<td>Standing Water</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC-2011-00135</td>
<td>4/20/2011</td>
<td>12421 Anchorage Way</td>
<td>Standing Water</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC-2016-00240</td>
<td>7/9/2016</td>
<td>10200 Summerlin Way</td>
<td>Drain Clogged</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC-2017-00069</td>
<td>3/3/2017</td>
<td>10138 Summerlin Way</td>
<td>Standing Water</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC-2018-00090</td>
<td>4/3/2018</td>
<td>10188 Summerlin Way</td>
<td>Standing Water; Drain Clogged</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There have been four work issued by the Hamilton County Surveyors Office for this area since 2002 with a total value of $3,245.88.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Order Number</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Property Address</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WO-2002-00036</td>
<td>$ 1,008.88</td>
<td>10210 Summerlin Way</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WO-2011-00159</td>
<td>$ 375.00</td>
<td>12421 Anchorage Way</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WO-2016-00232</td>
<td>$ 932.00</td>
<td>10200 Summerlin Way</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WO-2017-00355</td>
<td>$ 930.00</td>
<td>10275 Summerlin Way</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Anchorage Drain Shed consists of 21.93-acres and 70-lots.

At the September 26, 2016 meeting of the Drainage Board, the maintenance assessments were increased as outlined in the Maintenance of Drain section of this report (see Hamilton County Drainage Board Minutes Book 17, pages 127-128).

On June 28, 2018, the Hamilton County Surveyor’s Office received a petition dated May 21, 2018 from 9 property owners within the Anchorage.
The Surveyor’s Office and the Hamilton County Drainage Board held a public information meeting with the affected property owners on December 4th, 2018 to discuss the project and how to fund the project.

**Project Description**

The project includes construction of the following: 443-LF of 12” Dual Wall HDPE tile; 44-LF of 6” Dual Wall HDPE tile; 7, 6” Dual Wall HDPE tile stubs; 10, 6” HDPE tile caps; 5, 2’x2’ precast inlets with casting; 12 connections of the existing tile to the new tile; 125-CY of topsoil; clearing, including the removal of one large tree and portions of an existing landscaping wall; erosion control measures including 105-LF of tree protection fence, 60-LF of 12” diameter fiber rolls; mulched seeding, and inlet protection; and restoration of the existing landscape wall.

The intent of the design is to provide a positive outlet to the existing poorly drained area at the rear of the lots to facilitate drainage of surface runoff. The existing 6” SSD is connected to a structure on Lot 65 (identified as Structure 1100 on the Construction Plans). This Structure is drained by a 12-inch reinforced concrete pipe. This 12” tile outlet dictated the size of the proposed tile and is the largest tile that could be installed. Five new inlets (Structures 601, 602, 603, 604, and 605 on the Construction Plans) are proposed at existing low areas along the alignment and where the new tile changes alignment.

The new tile does not follow the alignment of the existing 6” SSD due to the location of the low areas and to avoid several existing mature trees at the rear of Lot 67.

Shallow slope surface swales are proposed along the alignment to direct runoff to the new inlets. These surface swales will be constructed as the trench to install the tile is backfilled.

During rain events where the capacity of the new tile is exceeded, runoff will continue to collect and pond in the area along the rear of lots 60, 61, and 62 due to the existing ridge along the property line. The length of time that water stands in this area will be greatly reduced from the existing condition due to the proposed positive outlet.
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The existing 6” SSD will be connected to the new tile or the new inlets in all instances where the 6” SSD crosses the new tile. Several private yard drains will be connected to the new tile as the tile is installed to provide an improved outlet to these private drainage systems.

Easements

No additional easements are required for the project. The new drain will be constructed in existing platted drainage and drainage and utility easements. The easements per the plat for the Anchorage, as recorded in the office of the Hamilton County Recorder as Instrument No. 9117550, P.C. No. 1, Slide No. 173, that will be utilized are as follows:

- Variable Width Drainage Easement on the south side of Lots 69, 68, 67, and 65
- 15’ wide Drainage Easement on the north side of Lots 60, 61, and 62
- 15’ wide Drainage and Utility Easement on the east side of Lot 57

Permits

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

Project Cost

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line Item</th>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Unit Cost</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Clearing</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>Acre</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Large Tree Removal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$2,500.00</td>
<td>$2,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Disposal of Excess Soil Material</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>CYS</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
<td>$3,250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Tree Protection Fence</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td>$210.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Core Drill Existing Structure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Landscape Wall Removal and Restoration</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Mulched Seeding</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>Acre</td>
<td>$9,750.00</td>
<td>$2,925.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Inlet Protection</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$140.00</td>
<td>$700.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Project Funding

This project is considered a reconstruction project. While assistance is being sought by the City of Fishers, it is customary for reconstruction projects to be funded by a special assessment to either the properties within the watershed of the drain or to those properties that directly benefit from the reconstruction project.

State Law does allow the use of monies from the drain’s maintenance fund (up to 75% of the balance in the fund) for reconstruction projects. However, the current balance of the maintenance fund for the drain is in the red $10,852.46 due to the maintenance fund being utilized to fund the reconstruction project along Brooks School Road in 2017 as well as other recent maintenance on the drain. The drain collects $4,878.96 per year from maintenance assessment.

There are 8 property owners that benefit from the project. Dividing the construction cost by the number of properties results in a per property assessment of $9,718.22.
Dividing these costs by the acreage of each property that will drain to the new tile, the following assessments would be necessary using a rate of $17,589.63 per acre.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>Area (acres)</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lot 69</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>$11,609.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 68</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>$8,794.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 67</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>$9,498.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 65</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>$8,794.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 64</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>$9,146.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 62</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>$9,674.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 61</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>$9,146.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 60</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>$11,081.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>$77,745.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An updated report will be provided to the Board when the participation from the City of Fishers is finalized and the final assessment roll is developed.

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

Changes to the Drain

The length of the drain will be increased by 487-feet. This increase consists of 443-LF of 12” Dual Wall HDPE tile and 44-LF of 6” Dual Wall HDPE Tile.

The 7, 6” Dual Wall HDPE Pipe stubs are 2-feet in length for connections to inlets by the property owners. The actual length of pipe stubs may vary when installed. These pipe stubs are not considered part of the regulated drain. The yard drain connections per line items 16 & 17 are considered ancillary to the project and will not part of the regulated drain.

Maintenance of Drain

The Anchorage Drainage shed consists of 21.93 acres and 70 lots. At the September 26, 2016 Board meeting the Board increased the maintenance assessment rates to the following:

1. Maintenance assessment for platted lots within subdivisions be set at $65.00 per lot/minimum. Common areas set at $10.00 per acre with a $65.00 minimum.
2. Maintenance assessment for roads and streets be set at $15.00 per acre.

3. The above rates will collect $4,878.96 annually for the drain.

4. The collection period was also increased from 4 times the annual assessment to 8 times the annual assessment as allowed under IC-36-9-27-43.

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

Sincerely,

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

GRD/pll”

Altman asked is this area acting as a bowl?

Duncan stated it does. It doesn’t have a swale as it were to really convey the standing water. The six-inch tile that is there can’t keep up with the surface water.

Altman stated if it’s just a tile it’s probably plugged up in several places.

Duncan stated its root bound. We’ve gone out there before. It was never installed with a consistent slope and it was never intended to take surface water. The subsurface drains are generally intended to dry up a surface swale after a rain event. There is a ridge that prevents water from flowing to the north to see a benefit from the subsurface drain.

Altman asked is that ridge structural to any of the improvements on the property?

Duncan stated no.

Altman asked would that removal...
Duncan stated it’s a small ridge, but it’s enough to prevent water from flowing.

Altman stated to clarify the record the bids we rejected are on this project.

Duncan stated correct.

Altman stated and the intent was we would find out what the true cost was before we held the public hearing so we would accurately know what we were talking about.

Duncan stated correct.

Altman stated it was backwards from what we normally do.

Duncan stated we were hoping to have firm prices for this hearing today. We received the petition on May 21, 2018. From July to December 2018 we did survey, field work and engineering design and on December 4, 2018 we had a public information meeting with the affected property owners and got their input and discussed the project. Mainly we discussed how to fund it, which I’ll get to, but that’s really one of the main issues with this project, is how to fund it. On April 22, 2019 we requested approval to ask for bids and the bids were received and rejected. At the last meeting we were authorized to ask for quotes which we have done. We have set the quotes to be due the first meeting in June, June 10th.

Dillinger asked Duncan in his opinion why was there such a disparity between the quotes and the engineering projection?

Duncan stated I think it’s the market with the spring that we’ve had. The contractors are so backlogged with projects.

Heirbrandt stated when we got these bids I saw Duncan out here and we talked about this specific project as we do almost every week and he said “I’d like to start a company and start it by going over here and doing this project because I can’t believe how much fat’s on it”.

Duncan stated I honestly thought that my estimate would be; it’s 400 feet of pipe that the Board might ask me why my estimate was so high.

Howard stated probably because you can’t get any labor.
Duncan stated right; I think the system is taxed right now. The maintenance fund is in the red $10,852.46. It will take some time; I did not check to see how much the drain takes in each year, but as I recall from the public meeting in December with what it takes in each year I think it would take 20 years to pay that back.

Dillinger asked to pay back what is in the red?

Duncan stated right.

Howard stated and that’s if you didn’t have any maintenance claims in that 20 years.

Altman asked how many properties are paying into the maintenance fund right now?

Duncan stated I think it’s around 60 lots.

Altman asked this has not been collapsed into a larger drainage shed?

The Surveyor stated no, there’s no drain to collapse it into.

Altman asked it’s just a stand alone drain?

Duncan stated yes.

Dillinger asked what is the lot assessment on this? It can’t be much if it would take 20 years to pay back $10,000.00.

The Surveyor stated it’s $65.00 per lot and it brings in $4,800.00 per year.

Dillinger asked it brings in $4,800.00 per year?

The Surveyor stated yes.

Dillinger asked why are you saying it will take 20 years to pay this back?

Duncan stated maybe the numbers I did were to pay that back plus pay for the new project.

Altman stated maintenance assessment for roads and streets are only $15.00 per acre. That seems low.
Duncan stated for reconstructions its customary to fund them through a special assessment as the Board knows either to the entire shed or the affected properties. That’s how we’ve structured it to date, that’s what’s reflected in the report, but I think it’s important to know that we are working with the City of Fishers. They have a funding assistance program that they pay up to 50% of what the property owners contribute. It is some funding assistance. Listed in the report are the two options that we listed out. This is for the eight lots and not the entire shed and it also does not include any assistance from Fishers so you can see roughly what we’re talking about. It will be about $10,000.00 per lot.

Altman asked are we assuming that this pooling water is only from those lots?

Duncan stated yes. It really is. To get the estimate of $77,000.00 whether we do it on a per lot basis or a per acre basis its still roughly about $10,000.00 per lot.

Dillinger asked which would be, if Fishers paid half that, half of it, right?

Howard stated no, it would be 50% of what the property owners pay which would be a third, right?

Duncan stated right.

Howard stated so that number would go down to $6,100.00 or $6,200.00 per lot. Gary, is this downstream of the entire watershed?

Duncan stated its in the middle. I don’t think that there’s any; there’s no drainage that comes into this.

Howard stated everything else goes into another drain, another structure.

Duncan stated another drainage system and out to the reservoir.

Howard stated so there’s no straight face test to assess the entire watershed.

Duncan stated correct.
Howard stated because they’re not benefitted.

Duncan stated this is a public hearing, we do have one remonstrance on file. Our recommendation is going to be to table the project approval or any decision of the Board until we receive those quotes and have a chance to talk to the City of Fishers.

Altman stated you say they didn’t benefit. Do we have a timeframe of when the benefit occurs because they did benefit the overall development cost were lower if this wasn’t installed properly? Then the lot costs for the entire subdivision went down.

Howard stated that’s pretty thin I think.

Altman stated in theory they did, it’s just when the timing is. Does the Board have any questions for Duncan before we open the public hearing?

Dillinger stated yes, because I think what ultimate decision we make from my perspective at least will be how this got this way to begin with and whose responsibility it was. I don’t know whether you can answer this or the Surveyor. Let’s go back in time when this was first approved. When the developer went through the Planning Commission of Fishers, right?

The Surveyor no, Noblesville at the time. Dillinger stated it was an adjoiner agreement with Noblesville?

The Surveyor stated yes because this was 1991.

Dillinger stated and then it came to the Surveyor’s Office, right?

The Surveyor stated right.

Dillinger stated and you approved it, is that correct?

The Surveyor stated yes.

Dillinger stated so you thought it was okay at the time.

The Surveyor stated yes.

Dillinger asked why? How were we off?
The Surveyor stated our point is to give every lot an outlet and at that time this provided the outlet for those lots. We had one plan reviewer for the entire county at that time and we had one inspector for the entire county. Things went through pretty quick and at that time we didn’t have the luxury to go out on site on every one of them and look at it before the plan was approved.

Dillinger stated so in fact we are partially responsible for this.

The Surveyor stated yes.

Altman asked who is the developer?

Howard stated RDJ was the builder or did I read that in another report.

Liston stated Richard Lewis.

Heirbrandt stated I can tell you from my experience in here and the Surveyor, Duncan and I have had the opportunity to meet with several of the lot owners. When I look back to the history and as we have spoken I think there’s a lot of fingers you can point this to and I just don’t feel that it’s right for these folks to pay for a lot of this stuff that’s happened over there. They came in there and inherited a mess.

Altman asked what are our alternatives?

Heirbrandt stated I know what the Statute reads, I’m just telling you if it was me and I moved in there and I didn’t really know drainage law I’d be really ticked.

Altman asked Howard what are our options?

Howard asked the Surveyor, I know we’ve traditionally used General Drain Improvement Fund in the past to seed a project and then get a reimburse later, would there be a possibility to pay part of these costs from GDIF with either a waiver of or a partial waiver of reimbursement?

The Surveyor stated you could do that.

Heirbrandt stated we’ve been talking and the Surveyor and Duncan have been very helpful with trying to strategically
figure out how to help correct this mess. We’ve went to Fishers, Fishers has agreed that they would invest money to help fund this improvement. We’ve also talked to the homeowners as well about having a little bit of skin in the game on this especially because of the way the Statute is written and really just trying to solve a problem and help these people.

Dillinger stated I think Heirbrandt is right and I think Altman was probably right about her comment on the costs of the property was less because it wasn’t done the way it should have been which in my opinion probably part of that should be born by the homeowners, but if Fishers is willing to pay their part and we, according to the Surveyor, didn’t necessarily do our due diligence then we are probably responsible for part of it as well.

The Surveyor stated if that were to be done today they would be paying a lot more for the lots because...

Dillinger stated I understand that and that’s the point I’m trying to make. I think everyone from a fairness standpoint should probably participate to some degree in this.

Altman stated to me it’s a drainage shed issue because if it was designed and constructed properly the whole subdivision cost would have been increased because it would have been a system and it’s still a drainage system for that subdivision. I think with the Statute the only thing we really can do is accept Fishers participation, have skin in the game from the direct lots that are assessed and partially the whole subdivision. I don’t know how else. Drainage, just for those in the audience, is a fee-based system. It’s not a tax-based system so everyone contributes that benefits from the watershed. That’s the only way we can pay for it unless we get grant money. That’s why I’m asking, is there any other alternatives and I don’t see them.

Howard stated I think we need to look at where the breaks are. Are the breaks at the roads? The horseshoe road that goes around those lots?

The Surveyor stated the break is really the houses isn’t it Gary? You’re talking about drainage breaks?

Howard stated yes.
Duncan stated the drainage break is about the middle of each of these homes. It goes to the back and to the front. There’s a little bit of area that drains through these properties, but it’s not much.

Howard stated at the east side of those lots where does that go from there.

Duncan stated there’s a small swale and I guess in theory once this gets to a certain point it will flow out to the reservoir, but there’s still a bathtub here that needs to overcome a point. There is a swale that drains through a lot.

Howard asked but at the end of the pipe, where does the end of the pipe go or the end of the swale.

Duncan stated it goes into an inlet.

Howard asked which goes where?

Duncan stated which goes to a manhole and then through two structures in the roadway and then down to the reservoir.

Altman stated if it can make it.

Duncan stated once the water gets to the pipe it can make it to the reservoir. This swale on the north side the ridge is preventing the water from the other side getting over to that swale. The swale is incredibly flat.

Altman opened the public hearing.

Allen stated I’ve been in the neighborhood for six years and when we moved in it had been rather dry, it was a summer when there was a drought. This is something maybe by no fault of how it was constructed or what’s happened. There’s also been some outside issues like Emerald Ash Bore where in those woods neighbors lost a lot of trees. I think I lost five trees. The more trees we lose the less roots we have to soak up water. It’s really mushy back there. I had a tree take out my kids swing set, just a massive tree that had come down. It’s our opinion that this wasn’t done maybe perfectly the first time, but it’s continued to deteriorate as the line gets clogged with roots. Maybe there happens to be more water lately, but we’re trying to get our neighborhood on the same page. Some neighbors are nervous about the correspondence with the assessment, so they want some ease with that. Mr.
Heirbrandt’s been amazing, Mr. Ward, Mr. Duncan, Mr. Conover, everyone’s really helped on this, so they see an issue. As neighbor’s we really don’t know what the next step is. The first complaint came back in 2002 and really think if we jumped on it early, we could have prevented this. It’s kind of gotten out of control now. We just want to move forward with what’s best next. We do understand that construction costs right now, I deal with tough labor myself and it’s a little out of control.

Altman stated you heard the explanation from Duncan, is that pretty well how you observe things?

Allen stated I think they did a great job laying it out. I will say, Erin, one of our neighbor’s, has a lot of water. One neighbor has offered to use this easement to get in and Erin, who’s here today has a lot of drainage issues so she’s afraid that this project may not encompass her problems. With the ridge there’s another massive problem. I’ve personally put in $2,000.00 worth of French drainage tiles just to try to get it out and it comes out to the drain, but it just can’t handle the water. It started as a nuisance, but now the water is about five feet away from my basement. We’re just trying to stay on it and prevent something worse.

Altman asked if anyone else cared to address the Board?

Moheban stated we’ve been here for 25 years and I was explaining to Duncan at one of the first meetings that we’ve always had a problem and I was told that because we’re not on the same easement they couldn’t bring the drain over to help us and I would have to contact my correct easement to get help with our water issues. I just don’t buy it. I know there’s a way I can be helped by writing a letter or attaching to that.

Altman asked would you be willing to grant an easement for...

Moheban stated absolutely. What I wanted to do was to show you some of the standing water in our backyard and in our woods. It’s gotten progressively worse in the 25 years. We just lost a tree near our home and I think it’s because the ground is getting wetter and keeps coming forward. I know we have some low spots in our yard and we were willing to put some French drains up to the front.
Dillinger stated the photos you’re showing us and that shows how much water is there. The other issue is how quickly does it disseminate?

Altman asked how long does the water sit there, how long does that area hold water?

Moheban stated for days, we can’t mow out there.

Heirbrandt asked Duncan did you get a chance to look at her property after that last meeting?

Duncan stated I did and these pictures help. If I recall when I went out there was not a whole lot of standing water.

Howard asked do we know if the project as designed is going to be low enough for her to tie in?

Duncan stated I think that’s part of the issue as well. I’m only about, if I recall, maybe 2.5 feet in the ground at the end. To go downhill more or less when the pipe is going uphill is a challenge. I cannot remember where the drainage infrastructure is out on the road and if there is any type of connection that can be made readily at this property line.

Altman stated we’re probably going to table this anyway and obviously she’s got an issue and we need to address it if we can.

Duncan stated there may need to be two separate systems and it is not in a regulated drain easement.

Altman stated Moheban stated she is willing to grant an easement to correct a problem.

Howard asked does the far east end of the proposed drain as deep as it can go and still tie in on the other side of the road.

Duncan stated we did not, because of the driveway, because of the narrow area between these lots. We tried to, with the design, stay out of that. There are also several mature trees. We were always focused on tying into the structure at the rear of the lot versus going through there. One of the things I looked at initially was just cutting a swale, but there’s not enough room between any of the homes to put one in plus I don’t expect, even though I did propose it to them, I
don’t expect that the property owners would be happy with water running by their properties every time it rains. It’s very narrow between those two homes on the eastern end. I’d have to take out several mature trees, there’s a driveway, all sorts of stuff.

Heirbrandt stated I think if you could just provide some options and solutions that would be helpful.

Allen stated I saw there was an objection and we want to make sure our neighborhood is on the same page.

Altman asked did you get a copy of that objection?

Allen stated I did not.

Altman stated we can share that with you.

Heirbrandt stated I don’t think the objection was towards the project, but probably the cost.

Altman stated yes and that’s not unusual.

Iden (Steve) stated I’m on the lowest part of the neighborhood. As I think you noticed in the pictures it is a fishbowl. The water has nowhere to go. It seemed like when it was put in 25 years ago, that’s when we built there, it seemed like the drain would dissipate the water, but now it’s standing in the wooded area, what woods are left. Very difficult to mow the lawn at any given time when you’ve had any kind of rain. Very much a mosquito haven now. The other thing is the earlier comment about sharing the cost. Only after this construction is completed, whatever costs we need to bear we will then also have to bear recontouring our property as well as adding subsurface drain to get to this drain. From our perspective there will be additional costs beyond the scope of this project just for us to satisfy the appearance of the drainage of our properties. That will certainly be into several thousand dollars beyond the scope of this project. I guess that was the important point that I wanted to make. This is not going away, it’s getting progressively worse and it’s deteriorated our property value as a result of the way this has been handled and the delays.

Altman asked have you been calling the Health Department for mosquito treatments?
Allen stated I’ve called them and I’ll follow up. I contacted a landscaper and he said right now you can’t plant trees until you get this figured out.

Bortenschlager stated the letter was from me. I was objecting to the assessment; I’m not objecting to the project. It was a day after I actually had the letter and its so darn frustrating because I can’t even mow. I can’t even go out there. I’ve tried and my lawn mower is stuck, his is stuck and I came in and out of frustration and that’s what I did. The project has got to go. I’m getting frustrated because as I said, my water is getting so close to my house now whereas it would have been taken care of when we tried to get it taken care of several years ago. It’s probably within ten feet of my house now.

Dillinger stated taking care of it isn’t the problem, it’s who’s going to pay for the project. Like Commissioner Heirbrandt said, everyone is pointing the finger at somebody else and I think it’s probably in part everybody’s problem a little bit.

Heirbrandt stated I know it’s got to be extremely frustrating to everybody because we met several months ago. Just so you can appreciate this when I came into local government, I couldn’t believe how slow everything is, but now I understand how the whole process works. Everything is scheduled on meetings and a process. Unfortunately, this is a long process. We’re trying to do this in house to keep the dollar amount down really low so any costs that are associated with this are less on the property owners. I understand the heated emails, but we are trying. You can look back on all the meeting minutes I ask about the Anchorage Drain almost every single meeting at the very end. We’re trying to get it done just be patient and we’ll figure something out.

Dillinger stated I really think we need to table the public hearing. We can do that right?

Altman stated yes.

Dillinger stated table the public hearing, get the new bids in so we know how much money we’re talking about and then give some real thought to the distribution of how this will be paid. It seems to me that the entire watershed is underassessed. If it’s $10,000.00 in the red now and they’re
only drawing in $65.00 per lot that’s not enough money, obviously. I think all that needs to be thought through so we can talk more specifics rather than; the problem has been well identified, it’s just how is the best financial solution to it. It might even be wise if we waited a few months until we can get better bids, I don’t know. It’s not going to be done tomorrow anyway. It’s not just this drainage thing that we’re getting high bids on, it’s on our roads, on everything right now because the economy is pretty good. All these contractors are really busy, which means they don’t give you very good bids. We’ve seen bids come in $100,000.00 to $200,000.00 difference which just amazes you. You don’t know how that can happen.

Dillinger made the motion to table the public hearing and reset it for another time once we analyze this and get the new bids in and reconvene this discussion at that time, seconded by Heibrandt.

Howard stated for the record if we set it to be reconvened at a subsequent time that is not there then we have to notice everybody. If, on the other hand we set a time today while people are here then we do not have to legally re-notice.

Dillinger asked how long do you need to do this?

The Surveyor stated we’re getting the quotes on the 10th of June.

Howard asked can you have Fishes figure it out by the 24th of June?

Duncan stated that would really only be two weeks after we take the bids in.

The Surveyor stated I don’t know if this will have to go to the Board of Public Works or not.

Altman stated I think your concern (Moheban) is we also look at your property.

Dillinger stated that’s part of the issue I’m talking about analyzing. Obviously, there’s an issue there as well.

Howard stated I’ll be the bad guy. I think everyone needs to understand that the Drainage Code is a user fee code. Those that benefit absent money falling out of the sky from grants
and other sources those who benefit usually pay all the costs. We are looking for exceptions and a little wiggle room in the law. We didn’t write the law, it was written in 1965, but the Drainage Code is user fees. We’re going to look for either getting more users or getting more participants, but money just can’t come out of General Tax Funds for this project.

Altman stated unless it comes from another entity like Fishers.

Howard stated unless it comes from another entity or another very limited source. It’s not that anybody feels it’s fair for you to pay, but legally we can only assess so much against outside entities and then it ends up there. The fact that the developer didn’t do much, if the developer would have done it so it would still work today your lots would have been substantially higher and that would have been passed on. That’s all “if” stuff so we’re going to do the best we can under the circumstances.

Allen stated I understand it’s hard to go into the red. There was another project in Anchorage maybe two years ago.

Heirbrandt stated that was in 2016.

Allen stated is that we were pretty good as far as assessments and then that particular project put this negative number in there. So, from our perspective it’s like we wish we got our project ahead of them. That’s where some of the heartache is because the assessment seems to have been okay. I’m not well versed in all of that.

Altman stated another option we have is to borrow against another fund (GDIF) and then repay it over a period of time if we can’t whittle down the cost, we can push them out.

Dillinger stated that would require an increase of assessment.

Altman stated even with the assessment if the best we can do is 50% because Fishes is paying 50% we can have that 50% you’re obligated to paid over a period of time by the property owners.

Allen stated I think the neighbors understand that we bear, if we’re going to improve our assessment is going to go up, I think we all understand that. I think it was just sticker
Dillinger asked do I need to restate my motion?

Howard stated you need to set it for a certain date.

Duncan stated I don’t think we can do the second meeting of June, I think that will be too tight.

Dillinger stated don’t pressure yourselves to where we don’t have the information the next time. I want the information the next time.

Duncan stated the second meeting of August might be...

Altman stated wait, you jumped a whole month. How about July.


Dillinger amended his motion to the 22nd of July we will reconvene the public meeting after the tabling, seconded by Heirbrandt and approved unanimously.

Dillinger stated we’ve well established the issue and now we need to establish more affirmatively what the solution is.

Altman stated don’t forget the Health Department can spray and there are supplicants you can put on yourself.

William Lehr Drain, LN Joseph Arm - Hoods Garden Partial Vacation:

There were neither landowners present nor objections on file.

The Surveyor presented his report to the Board for approval.

“April 5, 2019

To: Hamilton County Drainage Board

Re: William Lehr Drain, LN Joseph Arm, Hoods Garden Partial Abandonment

Attached is a petition to abandon a portion of the William Lehr Drain, LN Joseph Arm by Steve Hood. The proposal is to abandon the existing LN Joseph Arm on parcel 10-11-16-
00-00-010.001 owned by Steven L & Tina S Hood and within the Greenfield Avenue right-of-way owned by the City of Noblesville.

The portion of the LN Joseph Arm to be abandoned will be between existing stations 60+45 and 70+59. This is generally located along the west property line of parcel 10-11-16-00-00-010.001. The portion to be abandoned will begin in the Greenfield Ave. right-of-way on the south and will continue north to near the north property line of the above parcel.

This request will remove 1,014 feet of 16 inch tile.

The upstream drainage going to the existing tile was previously reconstructed and now drains through the open ditch that parallels this tile. In addition, proposed drainage improvements by Hood’s Garden will cut off the downstream end of the tile rendering it useless on this parcel.

The LN Joseph Arm was previously referenced in my September 21, 2016 report for the William Lehr Drain, Joseph & Brooks Arm, Hood’s Meadow, Lot 1 – Fiore Nursery Reconstruction. (See Drainage Board Minutes Book 17, Pages 204-206). The LN Joseph Arm was installed in 1952. The LN Joseph Arm was combined with the William Lehr Drain in 1967.

The drain is currently on a maintenance program which was approved at hearing on December 4, 1967 (See Minutes Book 1, Page 23).

Upon review of the request, I believe the above portion of the drain meets the requirements for vacation as set out in IC-36-9-27-34(d). In my opinion, the vacation will not adversely affect other property owners within the drainage shed. I recommend the Board set a hearing date for May 28, 2019.

Sincerely,

Kenton C. Ward
Hamilton County Surveyor
Altman opened the public hearing; seeing no one present Altman closed the public hearing.

Dillinger made the motion to approve the Surveyor’s report, seconded by Heirbrandt and approved unanimously.

“FINDINGS AND ORDER

CONCERNING THE PARTIAL VACATION OF THE

William Lehr Drain, LN Joseph Arm,
Hoods Garden Partial Vacation

Station 60+45 and Station 70+59
(Located along west property line of parcel 10-11-16-00-00-010.001. Portion to be abandoned will begin in the Greenfield Avenue Right of Way on the south and continue north to near the north property line of above parcel)

On this 28th day of May, 2019, the Hamilton County Drainage Board has held a hearing on the Maintenance Report and Schedule of Assessments of the William Lehr Drain, LN Joseph Arm, Hoods Garden Partial Vacation (Station 60+45 to Station 70+59 located along west property line of parcel 10-11-16-00-00-010.001. Portion to be abandoned will begin in the Greenfield Avenue right of way on the south and continue north to near the north property line of above parcel).

Evidence has been heard. Objections were presented and considered. The Board then adopted an order of action. The Board now finds that the costs of continued maintenance to the portion of the above drain exceed the benefits to the real estate benefited by the portion of the drain to be abandoned and issues this order vacating the above section of the William Lehr Drain, LN Joseph Arm, Hoods Garden Partial Vacation (Station 60+45 to Station 70+59 located along west property line of parcel 10-11-16-00-00-010.001. Portion to be abandoned will begin in the Greenfield Avenue right of way on the south and continue north to near the north property line of above parcel).

HAMILTON COUNTY DRAINAGE BOARD

Christine Altman
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May 28, 2019
Private Drain Petition Hearing – DeYoung/Johnson:
Conover presented his report to the Board.

"To: Hamilton County Drainage Board

May 24, 2019

Re: DeYoung Private Drain Petition

On April 19, 2018 an Obstruction of Private Drainage Petition was received by the Hamilton County Surveyor’s Office. The petition was filed by Daniel and Katherine DeYoung. The petition was in proper form and all required information was submitted.

The petition identified an obstruction located on downstream property identified as parcel #10-07-16-00-00-006.000, located at 11737 E 211th Street, Noblesville, IN 46060.

The obstruction was identified as being a drainage tile which crosses the parcel located at 11737 E 211th Street, Noblesville, IN 46060. The petition alleges that the
obstruction is caused by a blockage in the tile which causes water to back up onto the property of the petitioner and several other properties in the area.

There are two possible private drainage tiles identified on the parcel that appear to be blocked. One tile location has been confirmed and has been located and uncovered on the property line. This tile was full of water and not draining. The second possible tile may be located behind the petitioner’s property and running in a northwest direction.

The deeded owner for this parcel is listed in the county records as Arden A. Johnson, 10410 Trillium Court, Noblesville, IN 46060, however county records also indicate that the parcel has a contract buyer listed as Julie Ann Molini, 11737 E 211th Street, Noblesville, IN 46060.

On November 1, 2018 notice was sent to Arden Johnson. On November 11, 2018 I received a call from Arden Johnson in response to the letter I had sent him. After discussing the private drain petition process Arden said that he would hire contractor Austin Williams to run a camera on his property and see if there is a blockage and if there is a blockage, he would have Austin repair it. No work was done at that time.

On April 23, 2019 I again spoke with Arden Johnson. He said that he would contact a contractor, Austin Williams, about having Austin go out and investigate this tile. I asked Arden to have Austin call me so I can give him the information that I have on this issue.

On May 22, 2019 I was contacted by Arden Johnson. He was on location at 11737 E 211th Street, Noblesville, IN 46060. He had a contractor there and wanted to know if I could meet with him there to show him the location of the blocked private drainage tile.

I met with Arden and the employees of Fredericks, Inc, a construction company which Arden had hired and was there to make repairs on the private tile.

There were two potential private tiles that were investigated. One private tile was located approximately 450 west of the petitioner’s property. This tile was excavated and approximately 150 feet of new tile was installed. The downstream portion of the tile past the obstruction appeared to be working.

Hamilton County Drainage Board
May 28, 2019
The second potential location of a private tile was behind the petitioner’s property. A trench was dug for a distance of 110 feet across the area, but the investigation found no tile present at this location.

Arden Johnson said that he would allow the petitioner to install a private tile across his property at their expense if they would want to do that to drain their property.

Submitted by:

Andrew D. Conover

Altman stated we’re familiar with the project. What’s the status?

Conover stated last Wednesday I received a call from Arden Johnson. He was digging on this western private tile and they did find the tile was blocked and put in a new tile at that location. On the east tile it appeared there was one in there. They dug a 110-foot long ditch, but could not find a private tile at that location. At this time it appears that the private tile that was blocked on the Johnson property has been repaired. The tile was crushed in place and there was a large Willow Tree in there, they went around it and hooked it back in and it appears to be draining now. At this time the petition should be dismissed.

Altman stated you’re confident that this has been corrected.

Conover stated yes.

Dillinger made the motion to dismiss the DeYoung/Johnson Private Drain Petition as recommended by the Surveyor’s Office, seconded by Heirbrandt and approved unanimously.

**Hearing Request:**
The Surveyor asked the Board to set a hearing on the Ellis Barker Drain Reconstruction for June 24, 2019.

Dillinger made the motion to set this item for hearing for June 24, 2019, seconded by Heirbrandt and approved unanimously.
**Variance Request – Mud Creek/Sand Creek – Sand Creek Elementary Solar Field:**

Mr. Ben Spurgeon was present for this item.

Heirbrandt recused himself from this item.

Cash stated the variance before the Board today is for the solar field to be installed within the floodplain of Sand Creek at the Sand Creek Elementary School. What is considered fill is a C-Clamp brace that will elevate the solar panels two feet above the flood elevation.

Altman asked so it’s just the hardware holding up the panels?

Cash stated correct.

Altman stated I assume it’s negligible with respect to impact.

Cash stated Christopher Burke has reviewed this and said there will be 6 cubic feet of floodplain volume reduced. They recommended that no additional floodplain compensatory storage...

Altman stated that there be no mitigation.

Cash stated correct.

Dillinger made the motion to approve the variance request for the Sand Creek Elementary School Solar Field, seconded by Altman and approved.

**Non-enforcement – Discussion on Recorder’s Rejection:**

Liston stated a non-enforcement that was approved at the last meeting was rejected at the Recorder’s Office. The City of Noblesville has put into place a Code Enforcement Officer and they are out looking at past issues around certain areas, this being the Lochaven Lake on the Paulsel, Vance & Paulsel Drain. The City of Noblesville directed Mr. Chan to contact our office and go through the non-enforcement process because the developer of this subdivision put certain language into their covenants saying that the water access easement around the lake had to come before the Drainage Board to get approval. We were told this in January of 2019. We did not know that the language existed in the covenants. When I spoke with Mr. Chan, I told him that he needed to fill out page 3, the fence acknowledgement form, he tried to get this done, but his fence was installed in 2006 and the company is no longer in
business. I asked Mr. Chan to send me a letter giving me the history of this fence and he did. I included that with the non-enforcement and they rejected it.

Altman stated because it wasn’t affirmed.

Liston stated because it wasn’t notarized. I’m here to ask for direction.

Howard asked is Mr. Chan’s acknowledgement, did the property owner sign off on the acknowledgement of the encroachment?

Liston stated yes.

Howard asked and it was notarized?

Liston stated it was not notarized.

Howard stated their acknowledgement was not notarized.

Liston stated right.

Howard stated if the fence company isn’t in business then they need to acknowledge the encroachment and if the letter from them is to be included it can be made an exhibit. I’ll talk to Liston and we’ll figure it out.

The Surveyor asked “them” being the landowner.

Howard stated yes.

Howard stated it has to be signed by the property owners, it has to be notarized and it has to have a prepared statement on it.

Altman stated it also has to have a redaction statement.

Liston stated I’ll work with Howard to make this happen for the property owner. There are some other forms I think we need to have some revisions done on so when we go over they’re properly filled out. I think they’ve been talking with you on some of those forms.

Howard stated yes.
Service Advisory Board:
The Surveyor presented the minutes for the Service Advisory Board of April 16, 2019 to the Board for their information.

Big Cicero Creek Joint Drainage Board:
The Surveyor presented the minutes for Big Cicero Creek Joint Drainage Board of April 24, 2019 to the Board for their information.

Indiana Water Summit 2019:
The Surveyor presented the date for the Indiana Water Summit for 2019 of August 14 and 15 at Conner Prairie to the Board for their information.

Altman asked is there an entrance fee or anything?
The Surveyor stated no, there isn’t.

Altman asked is there any continuing education?
The Surveyor stated I don’t know that there is, but I can find out.

Non-enforcements:
Conover presented a non-enforcement request for the J. J. Billhymer Drain filed by Marion House Farms, Inc. for parcel #07-03-10-00-00-004.000 for private drain tile parallel to the J. J. Billhymer Regulated Drain. The Surveyor’s Office recommends approval.

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

Spills:
George Symonds Drain – Conover stated on May 13, 2019 I happened to be in Sheridan and I was asked if I was aware of the spill from the previous day at the gas station. I was not aware, I wasn’t on call. I went over and investigated this and about 20 gallons had gone into the storm drain on site. Fortunately, the Ricker’s Gas Station was required to have a storm water separator unit that was able to pick up the hydrocarbons that had spilled. Unfortunately, no one at the gas station even knew that existed. I talked to the manager and he didn’t know anything about it. We popped the lid on it and found the gasoline in there. They had a company come and pump it out. The Fire Department had gone to the site of the...
spill, they were looking downstream and booming stuff off, but nothing was coming out. They thought everything was good and didn’t realize about the underground unit. The unit did its’ job.

**Preliminary Variance Request – Little Eagle Creek Drain, Emory Trace:**
Liston presented his report to the Board.

“May 24, 2019

Hamilton County Drainage Board

Re: Little Eagle Creek Drain
Emory Trace – Preliminary Variance Request

Attached is a request by Emory Trace Developer, LLC by Platinum Properties Management Company, LLP and Stoeppelwerth & Associates, Inc. requesting variance from the following ordinances and standards in connection with the development of the proposed Emory Trace Subdivision.

1. A variance from the No Fill in the Floodplain of Regulated Drain Ordinance 4-26-99-C #6, and Hamilton County Stormwater Technical Standards Manual, Section 105.01.A.

Additional Information

The proposed project is the development of the Emory Trace Development in Washington Township. This area was recently studied a part of the Little Eagle Creek Watershed Master Drainage Plan by CBBEL. The current mapping is part of the Hamilton County FIRMS that became effective on November 19, 2014.

Staff Recommendations

This project is proposing to meet or exceed the recommended compensation ratio of 3 to 1 for any volume loss of floodplain storage volume. The floodplain compensation volume is being provided within the proposed development.
detention pond. The flood mitigation volume will be in addition to the volume needed for the development. With this information, the Surveyor’s Office does give a positive recommendation to this project, with the following conditions:

1. Developer’s Engineer provides an as-built topographical survey of the floodplain compensation area. These are to be reviewed by the Hamilton County Surveyor’s Office and the Drainage Board Consultant (CBBEL).
2. Any consultant review fees from Christopher B. Burke Engineering to be paid by the Developer.
3. When the Hamilton County Surveyor’s Office and Drainage Board Consultant approve the as-built topographical survey, the submitted bond will be considered for release. The bond will not be recommended for release to the Drainage Board until all outstanding billings by the Drainage Board Consultant have been paid in full.

Sincerely,

Jerry L. Liston, CISEC Inspector
JLL/llm"

Altman asked does the Surveyor’s Office have any issues with this request at this point?

The Surveyor stated they’ve been worked out.

Heirbrandt made the motion to consider the variance when presented at a later date, seconded by Dillinger and approved unanimously.

**Preliminary Variance Request – Anna Kendall Drain – Wheeler Landing Regional Detention:**

Mr. D. J. O’Toole, Mr. Andy Taylor and Mr. John Nail were present for this item.

Liston presented his report to the Board for approval.

“May 24, 2019

———

Hamilton County Drainage Board
May 28, 2019
Hamilton County Drainage Board

Re: Anna Kendall Drain
Wheeler Landing Regional Detention – Preliminary Variance Request

Attached is a request by the City of Westfield and Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc. requesting variance from the following ordinances and standards in connection with the Wheeler Landing Project and the Trails PUD Project.

2. A variance from the No Fill in the Floodplain of Regulated Drain Ordinance 4-26-99-C #6, and Hamilton County Stormwater Technical Standards Manual, Section 105.01.A.

Additional Information

The proposed project is a commercial park in the Westfield Area. This area was studied as part of the Cool Creek Watershed Master Drainage Plan by Clark Dietz Engineers. The current mapping is part of the Hamilton County FIRMS that became effective on November 19, 2014.

Staff Recommendations

This project is proposing to meet or exceed the recommended compensation ratio of 3 to 1 for any volume loss of floodplain storage volume on the Wheeler Landing Project. The project also includes the remaining 2 to 1 storage commitment made to the Board by the City of Westfield under Variance DV-2017-00003 which was approved by the Board on November 27, 2017 (see Drainage Board Minutes Book 17, page 554). The floodplain compensation volume is being provided along with the Regional Detention Storage Volume for the Wheeler Landing Project. With this information, the Surveyor’s Office does give a positive recommendation to this project, with the following conditions:

1. City of Westfield’s Engineer provides an as-built topographical survey of the floodplain compensation area. These are to be reviewed by the Hamilton County Surveyor’s Office and the Drainage Board Consultant (Clark Dietz).
2. Any consultant review fees from Clark Dietz Engineering to be paid by the Petitioner.

3. When the Hamilton County Surveyor’s Office and Drainage Board Consultant approve the as-built topographical survey, the submitted bond will be considered for release. The bond will not be recommended for release to the Drainage Board until all outstanding billings by the Drainage Board Consultant have been paid in full.

Sincerely,

Jerry L. Liston, CISEC
Inspector

JLL/llm"

Altman asked does the Surveyor’s Office have any issues with this request at this point?

The Surveyor stated they’ve been worked out.

Heirbrandt made the motion to consider the variance when presented at a later date, seconded by Dillinger and approved unanimously.

Surety Acceptance:
Liston stated that at this afternoon’s Commissioners meeting the Board would be accepting the following sureties:
- Performance Bond No. Q915770310 in the amount of $22,635.00 for the 2019 Vegetation Control Contract;
- Payment Bond No. Q915770310 in the amount of $22,635.00 for the 2019 Vegetation Control Contract;
- Subdivision Improvements Performance Bond No. 3018773 in the amount of $8,769.00 for the Retreat at Mill Grove Section 2, Sly Run Drain Reconstruction.

Elwood Wilson Drain – O’Reilly Auto Parts (2000 E. Conner St.):
Howard stated this was an item that Cash and I worked out and got to the final language on Friday afternoon. We’d like to get this moving.

Altman asked describe what “this” is.
Howard stated this is a drainage easement in restrictive
covenant and concerns the property on the north side of Conner
Street on the east side of town. It used to be a gas station,
but it’s just east of the old carwash that’s been turned into
an office building. The developer came to the Board for a
variance to construct below two feet of the BFE (Base Flood
Elevation). You denied the variance. Since that time he’s
gone to IDNR, he has approval for construction so that the
building will be two feet above the Base Flood Elevation.
They are granting us an easement for the area below the Base
Flood Elevation and the parking lot will be constructed at
elevations which are shown within our records and will not be
constructed above that point. The specifications have been
reviewed and approved by Steve (Cash). If anything is
constructed above those approved elevations there will be a
demand for the developer and/or his successor’s title to
remove and/or reconstruct the project. If not, we have a
right to go into the easement to reconstruct the parking lot
or whatever is built at that elevation and recover our costs
which would be a lien against the real estate. The developer
isn’t here today and we expected him to be here. Cash and I
have both reviewed this document and we believe it’s in proper
form and with your action today it will be recorded and cross
referenced to the last deed of record which we have confirmed
by my office. We would ask that you sign it today and Cash
will hold it and not be released or recorded nor will the
permit be released and the authorization to move forward until
the developer has signed it in recordable form.

Cash stated we will come back with the full variance hearing
presumably at the next meeting. We have all of our ducks in a
row.

Howard stated I thought the variance hearing was going to be
today. I’m sorry if we don’t have the variance there’s no
hurry to sign this.

Altman stated if the developer is not in a hurry I don’t why
we would be in a hurry.

The Surveyor stated the developer sent me an email this
morning asking if he was on the agenda and he wasn’t. I told
him there’s no reason to show up if you’re not on the agenda.

Altman stated we’ll handle everything when he is available.
161st & Carey Road Detention Area:

Heirbrandt stated on the southwest corner of 161st Street and Carey Road there is a detention area when they built the roundabout. It was an entire lot. There’s all kinds of trees and all kinds of vegetation growing in there and these trees are going to get to the point where they’re going to be so big it’s going to cost a lot of money to take these out. We probably need to get in there.

The Surveyor stated you’re talking about Oak Park.

Baitz stated I don’t believe the detention pond is part of the regulated drain, but I can check that out. The Surveyor stated we’re working right now with Fishers trying to get their permission to go onto their property to dredge out so that the whole system works again. Right now it’s filled up to the point where it doesn’t drain out.

Heirbrandt stated this particular area is right on the corner. It’s a large corner just south of the church. There’s a lot of trees. These trees are going to get big if we don’t address them.

Baitz stated I’ll check into it, but I think this is Westfields’.

Heirbrandt stated Westfield said they were required to put it there and purchase that property from the developer because the Surveyor requested it.

Howard stated a lot of it is from the roundabout.

The Surveyor stated it was from the roundabout.

Howard asked who’s in title?

The Surveyor stated Westfield is in title.

Howard stated first rule of complex problem solving, who’s problem is it.

Heirbrandt stated I think if that’s the case we better send a letter to them because the vegetation is going to get out of hand.

The Surveyor stated that one is Westfields’
Heirbrandt asked can the Surveyor’s Office verify that and send Westfield a letter so that they can do some maintenance there?

The Surveyor stated if you look at the GIS it’s part of the right of way.

Heirbrandt stated I wanted to make sure because I noticed it this weekend.

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