The meeting was called to order Monday August 26, 2019 at 9:03 a.m.

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

Approve Minutes of August 12, 2019:
The minutes of August 12, 2019 were presented to the Board for approval.

Heirbrandt made the motion to approve the minutes of August 12, 2019, seconded by Altman and approved. Dillinger abstained.

52.5 Hearing – Waltz, Warman, Booth & Dickover Drain – Beck’s Hybrids Reconstruction:
There were neither landowners present nor objections on file.

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

"August 9, 2019

To: Hamilton County Drainage Board
Re: Waltz, Warman Booth & Dickover Drain, Beck’s Hybrids Reconstruction

Attached is a petition and plans for the proposed replacement/reconstruction of the Waltz, Warman Booth & Dickover Regulated Drain through the Beck’s Hybrids property, parcel # 03-02-14-00-00-001.000. The reconstruction is being proposed by Beck’s Hybrids. The proposal is to replace a portion of the existing 14-inch clay tile Waltz, Warman Booth & Dickover Regulated Drain with 15-inch reinforced concrete on the Beck’s property. This is required to be replaced as a gravel drive/parking area is to be constructed over the drain.

The plan will consist of the following:

15” RCP 332 feet

The location of the reconstructed regulated drain through the Beck’s property will be between station 67+40 and station 70+72 of the original description.

The total length of the drain shall remain the same.

The cost of the reconstruction across the development is to be paid by Beck’s Hybrids. Because this portion of the reconstruction is to be paid by the petitioner and is within the boundaries of the petitioner’s property, this project falls under the requirements as set out in IC 36-9-27-52.5 therefore a hearing is not required for the petition.

I recommend approval by the board.

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.

"STATE OF INDIANA ) ) ss:
) ) NOBLESVILLE, INDIANA
COUNTY OF HAMILTON

IN THE MATTER OF THE
RECONSTRUCTION OF THE
Waltz, Warman, Booth & Dickover Drain – Beck’s Hybrids Reconstruction

FINDINGS AND ORDER FOR RECONSTRUCTION

Hamilton County Drainage Board
August 26, 2019
The matter of the proposed Reconstruction of the Waltz, Warman, Booth & Dickover Drain, Beck’s Hybrids Reconstruction came before the Hamilton County Drainage Board for hearing on August 26, 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 Waltz, Warman, Booth & Dickover Drain, Beck’s Hybrids 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
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Steven C. Dillinger
Member

ATTEST: Lynette Mosbaugh
Executive Secretary

Martha Darrah Drain – Shed Correction:
There were neither landowners present nor objections on file.

The Surveyor presented his report to the Board for approval.

“July 3, 2019

TO: Hamilton County Drainage Board

RE: Martha Darrah Drainage Shed Correction

In the process of putting the report together for the Martha Darrah Drain, Anthony Road Extension 2 it was found that the drainage shed for the drain requires a correction. Attached is a map showing the existing drainage shed and drain and the proposed correction. The correction would be as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Current Acres</th>
<th>Proposed Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>03-02-32-00-00-012.000</td>
<td>Clark, William &amp; Laura Co. Trustee</td>
<td>15.38 Ac/$123.04</td>
<td>18.86 Ac/$150.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I recommend the Board set a hearing for this item for August 26, 2019.

Sincerely,

Kenton C. Ward, CFM
Hamilton County Surveyor
KCW/pll”

Hamilton County Drainage Board
August 26, 2019
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.

“FINDINGS AND ORDER
CONCERNING THE MAINTENANCE OF THE
Martha Darrah Drain, Shed Correction

On this 26th day of August, 2019, the Hamilton County Drainage Board has held a hearing on the Maintenance Report and Schedule of Assessments of the Martha Darrah Drain, Shed Correction.

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.
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Williams Creek Drainage Area – West Rail at the Station Section 3 Arm:
There were no objections on file. Mr. Randy Gerber was present for this item.

The Surveyor presented his report to the Board for approval.

“June 6, 2019

TO: Hamilton County Drainage Board
RE: Williams Creek Drainage Area, West Rail at the Station Section 3 Arm

Attached is a petition filed by Beazer Homes of Indiana, LLP along with a non-enforcement request, plans, calculations, quantity summary and assessment roll for the West Rail at the Station Section 3 Arm, Williams Creek Drain in Washington Township. I have reviewed the submittals and petition and have found each to be in proper form.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diameter</th>
<th>Length</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12” RCP</td>
<td>1311 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15” RCP</td>
<td>171 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18” RCP</td>
<td>208 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21” RCP</td>
<td>484 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24” RCP</td>
<td>261 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30” RCP</td>
<td>204 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6” SSD</td>
<td>5665 ft.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The total length of drain will be 8,304 feet.
Thesubsurface drains (SSD) to be part of the regulated drain are those located under thecurbs and those main lines in rear yards. Only the main SSD lines which are located within the easement or right of way are to be maintained as regulated drain. Laterals for individuals lots will not be considered part of the regulated drain. The portion of the SSD which will be regulated other than those under curbs are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Curbline SSD in Streets:</th>
<th>Rear Yard SSD’s:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Locomotive Street</td>
<td>Rear yard lots 138 and 143 from Str. 296 NE to riser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Rail Drive</td>
<td>Rear yard lots 144 and 145 from Str. 295 SE to riser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conductors Drive</td>
<td>Rear yard lots 91 and 94 from Str. 273 SE to riser</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The retention ponds (Ponds 3 & 4) located in Common Areas B & C are not to be considered part of the regulated drain. Pond maintenance assumed by the Drainage Board shall only include the inlets and outlet as part of the regulated drain. The maintenance of the retention pond (lakes) such as sediment and erosion control along the banks, mowing and Aquatic vegetation maintenance and control will be the responsibility of the Homeowners Association. The Board will retain jurisdiction for ensuring the storage volume for which the pond was designed will be retained. Thereby, allowing no fill or easement encroachments.

With this project, the portion of the Chas. Osborn and J.R. Collins Drain No. 2, Arm 3 of the Williams Creek Drain shown on the Sheet C300 from approximately Sta. 15+91 to Sta. 26+34 was vacated with the West Rail at the Station Sec. 2 DB hearing on July 23, 2018. (See Hearing Drainage Board Minutes Book 18, Pages 219 to 221).

A portion of the storm drain facilities in Section 3 were installed with the expansion of Pond 4 located in Common Area “C” in Sec. 2. The portion of storm drain installed with West Rail at the Station Sec. 2 are located between Lots 95-96 and 154-155 (See Hearing Drainage Board Minutes Book 18, Pages 217 to 219).

I have reviewed the plans and believe the drain will benefit each lot equally. Therefore, I recommend each lot be assessed equally. I also believe that no damages will result to landowners by the construction of the drain. I recommend a maintenance assessment of $65.00 per platted lot $10.00 per acre for common areas, with a $65.00 minimum, and $10.00 per acre for roadways. With this assessment the total annual assessment for this drain will be $3,077.90

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

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

I recommend that upon approval of the above proposed drain that the Board also approve the attached non-enforcement request. The request will be for the reduction of the regulated drain easement to those easement widths as shown on the secondary plats for West Rail at the Station Section 3 as recorded in the office of the Hamilton County Recorder.

I recommend the Board set a hearing for this proposed drain for August 26, 2019.

Kenton C. Ward, CFM
Hamilton County Surveyor

KCW/jll”

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

Heirbrandt made the motion to approve the Surveyor’s report along with the non-enforcement for West Rail at the Station Section 3, seconded by Dillinger and approved unanimously.

"FINDINGS AND ORDER
CONCERNING THE MAINTENANCE OF THE
Williams Creek Drainage Area,
West Rail at the Station Section 3 Arm

On this 26th day of August, 2019, the Hamilton County Drainage Board has held a hearing on the Maintenance Report and Schedule of Assessments of the Williams Creek Drainage Area, West Rail at the Station Section 3 Arm.

Hamilton County Drainage Board
August 26, 2019
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.
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Springs of Cambridge/Bee Camp Creek Drain – Sears/McCord Pointe Arm:
There were neither landowners present nor objections on file.

"June 12, 2019

To: Hamilton County Drainage Board

Re: Springs of Cambridge Drain – Bee Camp Creek, Sears / McCord Pointe Arm

Attached is a petition filed by Ralph E. Sears, Charlotte D. Sears along with a non-enforcement request, plans, calculations, quantity summary and assessment roll for the Springs of Cambridge – Bee Camp Creek Drain, Sears / McCord Pointe Arm to be located near the northwest corner of 96th Street and Georgia Road in Fall Creek Township. I have reviewed the submittals and petition and have found each to be in proper form.

I have made a personal inspection of the land described in the petition. Upon doing so, I believe that the drain is practicable, will improve the public health, benefit a public highway, and be of public utility and that the costs, damages and expenses of the proposed drain will probably be less than the benefits accruing to the owners of land likely to be benefited. As per the plans by Stoepelwerth & Associates, S&A Job No. 77822CAL-01A for McCord Pointe, Section 1A, the drain will consist of the following:

242 ft. of 15” RCP  624 ft. of open drain

The total length of the new drain will be 866 feet.

McCord Pointe subdivision is located south of 96th Street and west of Georgia Road in the Town of McCordsville, Hancock County, Indiana. Under pre-developed conditions, storm water from the site drained north to Bee Camp Creek via an existing culvert under 96th Street and an existing swale on the Sears property. Per the plans, the developer, CalAtlantic Homes of Indiana, Inc., installed a storm pipe from the subdivision’s detention area to the north side of 96th Street. Per requirements by this office, improvements have been made by the developer to the swale from 96th Street to where the swale outlets into Bee Camp Creek at the south edge of Brooks Park, Sec. 5 Common Area 13. In addition, the developer also installed a new surface water culvert under 96th Street as an emergency overflow per the Hamilton County Highway Department requirements. The improvements received both Highway Dept. approval for work in the right-of-way and Outlet Permit from this office for stormwater discharge to the regulated drain. These two pipe systems and offsite swale in Hamilton County are being petitioned as a new arm to the regulated drain. The rest of the storm system in McCord Pointe subdivision, including the pond, is under the jurisdiction of the City of McCordsville and will not be maintained by Hamilton County.

The new arm involves the following structures as shown on the plans for McCord Pointe Section 1A: 800, 801, 801A, 801B and 801C.

One hundred sixty-six (166) feet (+/-) of this proposed drain is located within Hancock County. Because of this, a request for a waiver to a Joint Board was sent to the Hancock County Drainage Board as per IC 36-9-27-14. Hancock County has waived the rights for a joint Board, per the attached Hancock County Drainage Board Minutes, page 4, November 1, 2018.
The Sears parcels are currently assessed to the Springs of Cambridge / Bee Camp Creek Drain by Hamilton County. For the parcels in the contributing watershed in McCord Pointe subdivision in McCordsville, Hancock County, I have reviewed the plans and believe the drain will benefit each lot equally. Therefore, I recommend each lot be assessed equally. I also believe that no damages will result to landowners by the construction of this drain. I recommend a maintenance assessment consistent with other non-regulated drain subdivisions within the Springs of Cambridge / Bee Camp Creek watershed at a rate of $35.00 per platted lot, $5.00 per acre for common areas, with a $35.00 minimum, and $10.00 per acre for roadways. With this assessment the total annual assessment to be collected by Hancock County for this arm will be $2,710.60.

Hancock County parcels 30-01-13-100-021.000-025 & 30-01-13-100-023.000-025 owned by CalAtlantic Homes and 30-01-13-100-022.000-025 owned by Cindy Callaway are currently being assessed to the Johnathon Stansbury/Bee Camp and John Kelly Drain in Hancock County. Hancock County will notify Hamilton County when future sections are proposed on these parcels. At that time a hearing will be held to change the watershed and assessment to the Springs of Cambridge-Bee Camp Creek Drain in Hamilton County.

The developer of McCord Pointe subdivision, CalAtlantic Homes of Indiana submitted surety for the proposed offsite swale improvements to Hamilton County. The surety which is in the form of Subdivision Bond from the developer is as follows:

Agent: Arch Insurance Company
Date: November 16, 2018
Number: SU1153392
For: McCord Pointe, Sec. 1A Offsite Ditch Improvements
Amount: $26,056.26
HCDB-2018-00039

The surety submitted to McCordsville covers the entire storm drain system improvements, including the pipes located within the 96th street right-of-way. This surety is in the form of Performance Bond from the developer as follows:

Agent: Hartford Fire Insurance Company
Date: May 3, 2018
Number: 72BSBH1005
For: Storm Sewer System Improvements
Amount: $329,716.25

I believe this proposed drain meets the requirements for Urban Drain Classification as set out in IC 36-9-27-66. Therefore, this drain shall be designated as an Urban Drain.

The easement for this arm will be as follows: For the drain within the McCord Pointe subdivision the easement will be as per the drain easement as shown on the secondary plat for McCord Pointe, Sec. 1, as recorded in the Hancock County Recorder’s Office. For the drain located within the 96th Street right-of-way, the easement will be the statutory 75’ per half as measured from the centerline of the storm pipes. For the drain located north of 96th street, the easement will be 25’ from the top of bank as per the attached Non-enforcement Request and legal description (Exhibit A) submitted by Ralph E. & Charlotte D. Sears, landowners of affected parcels 13-15-12-00-00-013.006, 13-15-12-00-00-013.001, and 13-15-12-00-00-014.000. Pursuant to the easement on the Sears property, the Non-enforcement requests to allow a pedestrian bridge and tile drain outlet. I recommend that upon approval of the proposed drain arm that the Board also approve the attached non-enforcement request. The easement for the area where the swale outlets into Bee Camp Creek at the south edge of Brooks Park, Sec. 5 Common Area 13 is currently within Regulated Drain Easement and is designated as drainage easement per the secondary plat for Brooks Park, Sec. 5.

I recommend the Board set a hearing for this proposed drain for August 26, 2019.

Kenton C. Ward, CFM
Hamilton County Surveyor

KCW/Altman asked is there an existing drainage easement?
The Surveyor stated the drainage easement has been provided.

Howard asked so we don’t have the easement?
The Surveyor stated the final document in Hancock County will be the plat. The Sears have given us a non-enforcement for the easement. In the report I mentioned that the easement is 75 foot per half. They’ve given a non-enforcement for that easement and we’ve been in contact with the Sears.

Altman asked so you’ve spoken directly with the Sears?
The Surveyor stated Cash has.
Cash stated there’s an exhibit that shows 25 feet from top of bank.
The Surveyor stated yes, with the non-enforcement.
Altman asked so it’s 75 feet with the non-enforcement?
Cash stated no, it’s 25 feet from top of bank.
Altman opened the public hearing; seeing no one present Altman closed the public hearing.
Heirbrandt made the motion to approve the Surveyor’s report along with the non-enforcement for the Sears property, seconded by Dillinger and approved unanimously.

"FINDINGS AND ORDER
CONCERNING THE MAINTENANCE OF THE
Springs of Cambridge/Bee Camp Creek
Sears/McCord Pointe Arm

On this 26th day of August, 2019, the Hamilton County Drainage Board has held a hearing on the Maintenance Report and Schedule of Assessments of the Springs of Cambridge/Bee Camp Creek, Sears/McCord Pointe Arm.

Evidence has been heard. Objections were presented and considered. The Board then adopted the original/amended Schedule of Assessments. The Board now finds that the annual maintenance assessment will be less than the benefits to the landowners and issues this order declaring that this Maintenance Fund be established.
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Anchorage Drain Reconstruction (Continued):
Ms. Erin Moheban, Ms. JoAnn Iden and Mr. Steve Iden were present for this item.
The Surveyor presented his report to the Board.

"August 16, 2019

TO: Hamilton County Drainage Board
RE: Anchorage, Reconstruction of Portion of Section 1

At the meeting on August 12, 2019 a report written by Mr. Gary Duncan dated August 6, 2019 was given to the Board recommending the cost breakdown on this project and associated assessments. At that time the Board wanted additional options for payment of this project. Before going into the Options 1 I thought it would be good to recap the given items for this drain and the project.

The Anchorage Drainage Shed consists of 21.93 acres, which is made up of roads and common areas, and 70 lots. The maintenance assessment was increased by the Board at its meeting of September 26, 2016 per my report dated August 11, 2016. The rates increased from $40.00 per lot, common areas $5.00 per acre with a $5.00 minimum and roads at $10.00 per acre. This assessment brought in $3,019.30 and at the time of the report the fund balance was $13,852.44. The approved rates, which are the current rates, are $65.00 per lot/minimum, common areas $10.00 per acre with a $65.00 minimum and roads $15.00 per acre. The annual collection is $4,878.96. The period of collections also increased from four (4) years to eight (8) years. Attached to this report is the current assessment schedule.
At its meeting of December 21, 2016, the Board approved the reconstruction of the drain by replacing 6" SSD with 15" storm sewer along the subdivision’s west boundary along Brook School Road. The cost of this project was $59,296.30 of which Fishers paid $29,648.15. The remaining cost was paid by utilizing 75% of the maintenance fund balance at that time, $9,690.33 and the rest by using up to $4,878.96 over a five (5) year period beginning in 2017 from the maintenance fund. Currently the maintenance fund ($246) is $8,040.53 in the red.

Upon review of the maintenance costs over the last ten (10) years I found the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>$ 0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>$ 0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>$ 2,139.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$ 5,418.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$ 0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$ 0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$ 0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>$ 932.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>$ 3,992.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>$ 1,825.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>$ 0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$14,309.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This shows a 10-year average cost per year of $1,430.86. Using 70 lots and not including roads and commons areas the total cost per lot per year over this time frame is $20.44.

On May 13, 2019 two bids were received by the Board, both over the Engineer’s Estimate. On June 10, 2019 one quote was received for the project in the amount of $75,625.00. On July 22, 2019, a quote for the additional work associated with the arm to the south was received in the amount of $29,225.00. Including a 15% contingency, the total cost of the project will be $120,577.50.

On August 2, 2019, the City of Fishers confirmed by email that through their Grant Program, the City of Fishers can contribute $49,500.00 to help fund the project.

The balance of the maintenance fund for this drain is -$8,040.53. The maintenance fund collects $4,878.96 annually.

With a $49,500.00 grant from the City of Fishers, the remaining project balance to be funded is $71,077.50.

The Surveyor believes that no damages will result to the landowners as existing easements will be utilized. Damages are set at zero (0).

Upon consideration of the above parameters the options are as follows:

Option #1 – Do nothing, no costs involved.

Option #2 – Funding the remaining $71,077.50 through GDIF with repayment from an assessment for the 9-lots that petitioned for the drain reconstruction results in a total cost to each lot as outlined in the table below. These numbers would be adjusted for any interest that is charged dependent upon the interest rate and the repayment term. This is the recommendation in Mr. Duncan’s report of August 6, 2019 and is the recommendation of the office.

The Board should note that these amounts are not included in the maintenance assessment examined under each of the following options. The Board should also consider utilizing no more than 75% of the total annual maintenance assessment for each option examined which would increase the assessments annually or increase the period of pay back for the reconstruction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lot</th>
<th>Lot Size (acres)</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>$ 9,515.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68; PE 67</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>$ 7,208.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE 67</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>$ 7,855.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>$ 7,208.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At the August 12, 2019 meeting the Board expressed their wish that the remainder of the $71,077.50 be split between the 9 lots benefited and the maintenance fund for the Anchorage Drain. The remaining options examine various methods in doing so.

Starting with Option #3 the options include the increase in the maintenance drainage assessment. In doing that calculations for the future maintenance assessments. The Board should also consider including the amount, the fund balance is now in the red, $8,040.53. The Board should also consider the average cost per lot over the last 10 years of $20.44. The fund balance per lot, not including roads and common areas is $114.86 per lot.

Hamilton County Drainage Board
August 26, 2019
Option #3 - The balance of the $71,077.50 be split evenly 50:50, between the nine (9) lot owners. This amounts to $35,538.75 being paid by those benefited and within the overall drainage shed. Below shows the total cost to each lot. These numbers would be adjusted for any interest rate and the repayment term. These numbers would be adjusted for any interest rate and the repayment term.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lot</th>
<th>Lot Size (acres)</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>$ 4,751.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68; PT</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>$ 3,604.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pt 67</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>$ 3,892.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>$ 3,604.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With the above split $35,538.75 will be charged to the drainage shed. The lot rate, not including roads and common areas, is $507.70 per lot. With this rate the Board needs to determine the increase of maintenance per lot. The Board can rise the annual maintenance rate per lot for a one-year payment of $507.70, not including those factors presented above for the 10-year average cost per lot the current fund balance, which is in the red, and using 75% of the annual assessment for the reconstruction pay off.

The Board may wish to consider paying this amount off over an extended period of time. Below are options for 3 years, 5 years, 7 years and 10 years. The rates per lot per year is as follows:

3 years - $169.23  
5 years - $101.54  
7 years - $ 72.53  
10 years - $ 50.77

Option #4 - The balance of the $71,077.50 be split 2/3, $47,621.92 paid by the nine (9) lot owners and 1/3 $23,455.58 paid by increase of maintenance assessment for the overall drainage shed. Below shows the total cost to each lot. These numbers would be adjusted for any interest rate and the repayment term.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lot</th>
<th>Lot Size (acres)</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>$ 6,375.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68; PT</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>$ 4,829.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pt 67</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>$ 5,216.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>$ 4,829.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With the above split $23,455.60 will be charged to the drainage shed. The lot rate, not including roads and common areas, is $335.08 per lot. With this rate the Board needs to determine the increase of maintenance per lot. The Board can rise the annual maintenance rate per lot for a one-year payment of $335.08, not including those factors presented above for the 10-year average cost per lot the current fund balance, which is in the red, and using 75% of the annual assessment for the reconstruction pay off.

The Board may wish to consider paying this amount off over an extended period of time. Below are options for 3 years, 5 years, 7 years and 10 years. The rates per lot per year is as follows:

3 years - $111.69  
5 years - $ 72.53  
7 years - $ 47.87  
10 years - $ 33.51

Option #5 - The balance of the $71,077.50 be split 1/3, $23,455.60 paid by the nine (9) lot owners and 2/3 $47,621.92 paid increase of the maintenance assessment for the overall drainage shed. Below shows the total cost to each lot. These numbers would be adjusted for any interest rate and the repayment term.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lot</th>
<th>Lot Size (acres)</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>$ 3,141.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68; PT</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>$ 2,178.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pt 67</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>$ 2,569.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>$ 2,178.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lot</th>
<th>Lot Size (acres)</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>$ 2,474.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68; PT</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>$ 2,618.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pt 67</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>$ 2,569.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>$ 2,997.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hamilton County Drainage Board  
August 26, 2019
With the above split $47,622.40 will be charged to the drainage shed. The lot rate, not including roads and common areas, is $680.32 per lot. With this rate the Board needs to determine the increase of maintenance per lot. The Board can raise the annual maintenance rate per lot for a one- year payment of $680.32, not including those factors presented above for the 10- year average cost per lot the current fund balance, which is in the red, and using 75% of the annual assessment for the reconstruction pay off.

The Board may wish to consider paying this amount off over an extended period of time. Below are options for 3 years, 5 years, 7 years and 10 years. The rates per lot per year is as follows:

- 3 years - $226.78
- 5 years - $136.62
- 7 years - $ 97.20
- 10 years - $ 68.04

Option #6 - The balance of the $71,077.50 be split ¾, $53,308.12, paid by the nine (9) lot owners and ¼, $17,769.38, paid by increase of the maintenance assessment for the overall drainage shed. These numbers would be adjusted for any interest rate and the repayment term.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lot</th>
<th>Lot Size (acres)</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>$ 2,378.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68; Pt 67</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>$ 1,802.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pt 67</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>$ 1,946.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>$ 1,802.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With the above split $53,307.80 will be charged to the drainage shed. The lot rate, not including roads and common areas, is $761.54 per lot. With this rate the Board needs to determine the increase of maintenance per lot. The board can raise the annual maintenance rate per lot for a one- year payment of $761.54, not including those factors presented above for the 10- year average cost per lot the current fund balance, which is in the red, and using 75% of the annual assessment for the reconstruction pay off.

The Board may wish to consider paying this amount off over an extended period of time. Below are options for 3 years, 5 years, 7 years and 10 years. The rates per lot per year is as follows:

- 3 years - $253.86
- 5 years - $152.36
- 7 years - $108.80
- 10 years - $ 76.16

Option #7 - The balance of the $71,077.50 be split ¾, $53,308.18, paid by the nine (9) lot owners and ¼, $17,770.20, paid by increase of the maintenance assessment for the overall drainage shed. These numbers would be adjusted for any interest rate and the repayment term.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lot</th>
<th>Lot Size (acres)</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>$ 7,136.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68; Pt 67</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>$ 5,406.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pt 67</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>$ 5,839.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>$ 5,406.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With the above split $17,769.38 will be charged to the drainage shed. The lot rate, not including roads and common areas, is $253.86 per lot. With this rate the Board needs to determine the increase of maintenance per lot. The Board can raise the annual maintenance rate per lot for a one- year payment of $253.86, not including those factors presented above for the 10- year average cost per lot the current fund balance, which is in the red, and using 75% of the annual assessment for the reconstruction pay off.

The Board may wish to consider paying this amount off over an extended period of time. Below are options for 3 years, 5 years, 7 years and 10 years. The rates per lot per year is as follows:

- 3 years - $84.62
- 5 years - $50.78
- 7 years - $36.26
- 10 years - $25.40
Option #8 - The balance of the $71,077.50 be split by matching the $49,500.00 grant from Fishers paid by an increase of the maintenance assessment for the overall drainage shed and $21,577.50 paid by the nine (9) lot owners. Below shows the total cost to each lot. These numbers would be adjusted for any interest rate and the repayment term.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lot</th>
<th>Lot Size (acres)</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>$2,888.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>$2,888.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>$2,863.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>$2,188.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lot</th>
<th>Lot Size (acres)</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>$2,275.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>$2,407.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>$2,275.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>$2,757.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>$2,232.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With the above split $49,500.00 will be charged to the drainage shed. The lot rate, not including roads and common areas, is $707.14 per lot. With this rate the Board needs to consider an increase of maintenance per lot. The Board can raise the annual maintenance rate per lot for a one year payment of $507.70, not including those factors presented above for the 10-year average cost per lot, the current fund balance, which is in the red, and using 75% of the annual assessment for the reconstruction payoff.

The Board may wish to consider paying this amount off over an extended period of time. Below are options for 3 years, 5 years, 7 years and 10 years. The rates per lot per year is as follows:

- 3 years - $235.72
- 5 years - $141.44
- 7 years - $101.02
- 10 years - $70.72

In determining its decision, the Board should also be mindful of the following - 1. Amount of time these funds would be unavailable to the General Drain Improvement Fund (GDIF). 2. In order to increase the maintenance assessment the Board would need to set a public hearing to do so. The soonest the Board could set a hearing would be October 28, 2019, 3. The 90-day bid hold started June 10, 2019 and will expire September 8, 2019. Also, attached is an assessment schedule for each of the above rates for maintenance.

Sincerely,

Kenton C. Ward, CFM
Hamilton County Surveyor

KCW/llm*

Altman stated I think the discussion at the last meeting was the fact that we have now a budget of about $120,000.00 to solve the problem. Fishers has come in with a commitment to pay $49,500.00 leaving about $70,000.00 for either the benefitted homeowners, the drainage shed, which is negative or some combination of the two. Member Heirbrandt brought up the fact that on the same shed we used 75% of the maintenance to cover the correction that was needed along Brook School Road and was concerned that we weren’t considering using part of the maintenance fund. We had a lot of discussion on that, but it was pointed out on the Brook School Road project the water was coming from the road, which really benefitted all of the members of that subdivision.

Heirbrandt stated in fairness, there was some backyards that had quite a bit of puddling that was tied into that as well. They greatly benefitted rather than several other people in the watershed.

The Surveyor stated that water was coming off of Brook School Road.

Altman stated yes, it was a direct impact from the road and the water we’re talking about, in all fairness to the whole shed, the water we’re talking about that pools in this area is coming from those lots exclusively. It’s just a conundrum and I think anything we do for these folks is going to benefit their properties because right now they have a real problem. It probably is an inexpensive fix in the long-term to make those properties more marketable.

Heirbrandt stated in all fairness I don’t think these folks have had the opportunity to look at any of the options that are presented. You haven’t seen any of these options, have you?

Altman opened the public hearing.

Iden (Steve) stated we attended the last meeting, we were the only ones from the neighborhood and I left the meeting thinking that, understanding that you were going to pursue or submit whatever paperwork needed to be submitted to Fishers to go ahead and secure that; I assume that’s taking place.
Duncan stated it’s in process, yes.

Iden stated the other question on my mind, I left that meeting thinking that there would be some action on your part to help us, that the neighbor’s would pay an element of that $70,000.00, but that you would also either through some kind of an adjustment to the funding or to the assessments or some other vehicle, 30-year loan, however you had discussed at the last meeting, I don’t remember all the details. My wife and I were under the assumption that there would be some element of help from you all with regards to the $70,000.00.

Heirbrandt stated that would be my intent, but I can only speak for one of three Board members.

Iden stated those are the two points that I was hoping to leave here today with a clear understanding.

Altman stated the difficulty is the drainage shed is in a negative balance and it’s going to take a long time to pull it out of the negative balance without a rate increase over everybody.

Iden stated I guess in terms that you referred to the other lots and some of the funding that is done through you all, the 75% or whatever. Back in the day my son and I mowed those lawns back in there and those back areas puddle when it rains. That Brook School Road has an incredible run down; there’s a hill right there and it goes directly down so I would have a hard time thinking that the accommodation by you all was significantly different and didn’t benefit those owners in similar fashion that this is causing us. I appreciate your consideration and anything you all could do to help us with a portion. We understand we need to pay a piece of that, but we need some of your help. We’d love it if you could come somewhere in the neighborhood of what Fishers did or somehow help us with some of that delta.

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

Howard asked the Surveyor does our advertisement encompass or make it possible for us to do all of your alternatives under that advertisement as far as the amount of dollars that were advertised?

The Surveyor stated for the reconstruction, yes. However, if you’re going to be taking funds out of maintenance we would have to increase the maintenance assessment and that has not been advertised at this point.

Heirbrandt asked didn’t we talk about maybe a loan to some extent from the General Drain Improvement Fund?

Howard stated you did, but it would have to be repaid from this watershed either from the nine lots, the entire watershed or some portion thereof. If we’re going to loan it out of GDIF we have to solve the repayment. We can’t be the federal government; we just can’t print more money.

The Surveyor stated in that sense that’s what a reconstruction is.

Heirbrandt stated I’ve had some discussions with Duncan and with the Surveyor, but my thought was Fishers came up with $49,500.00 and I’d like to see if somehow, we could contribute that and then let these folks pay the rest. That’s my personal opinion.

Altman stated Fishers money comes out of their Stormwater Fund citywide.

Heirbrandt stated it’s a grant isn’t it?

Altman stated correct, but we don’t have grants in Drainage Board.

Heirbrandt stated I understand.

Howard stated the “we” has to be essentially a loan from GDIF with a payment vehicle. That’s all “we” can be. We don’t use General Fund dollars other than to the extent they’re budgeted to GDIF.

Heirbrandt stated we could spread that out as well.

Altman stated the thing is you’re looking at the subdivision on a screen so any loan, any manipulation we do comes from the people on the screen. The question is, you want to take from everybody for the water that occurs on these properties? That’s the issue.

Dillinger asked isn’t that the theory of the drainage laws? You take from everyone in that shed.

Altman stated no, it’s a benefit system. In theory you should assess for the areas benefitted.
Dillinger stated yes, but it’s not really a benefit system because the people at the top of the hill in many cases that we rule on don’t get any benefit out of it, but we are benefitting the people at the bottom of the hill who’s getting drained.

Altman stated no, but it’s their water. You tie to the water.

Howard stated the question is whether it’s a conveyance system and if it’s a conveyance system there’s general benefit to the entire watershed. If it’s drying up a spot issue then that’s the benefit; I guess there’s some general benefit to the watershed, but how much is really the issue. I think you could find some benefit to the entire watershed.

Altman stated it’s really de minimis.

Dillinger asked the Surveyor, what do you think?

The Surveyor stated I go back to my original recommendation, which is option two.

Howard asked is that 2/3:1/3?

The Surveyor stated Option Number 2 is funding the remaining $71,077.50 through GDIF with repayment with assessments on the nine lots petitioned. In other words, it’s a reconstruction for those nine lots. We can do that today and the repayment period and the interest would be up to the Board.

Heirbrandt stated so you’re looking at repayment anywhere from $7,000.00 to $9,000.00 depending on the specific lot.

The Surveyor stated right.

Dillinger asked over a five year period?

Altman asked what’s the maximum on repayment?

Howard stated I think you can do 10 years.

The Surveyor stated for rural regular is five years, but if it’s an urban situation you can go 10 years.

Howard stated this really isn’t an urban because that drainage is adequate for rural, but inadequate for urban. This is already urban.

Heirbrandt stated I think that’s a lot of money for each one of those folks and I understand the whole over these nine properties, but I think it’s too much.

Dillinger asked how else do you propose to do it?

Heirbrandt stated Option Number 3, correct me if I’m wrong, but that would be somewhere around $3,000.00 to $4,000.00 spread out over time so they could pay that portion.

The Surveyor stated Option Number 3 is splitting it 50% so $35,538.75 would go as a reconstruction against these nine lots, the other being taken out of maintenance.

Altman asked how do we handle the maintenance payment?

Howard stated you’re going to have to increase the maintenance, but as I read the report it appears that the maintenance on this is substantially lower. We’ve been raising across the board the maintenance assessments to get into touch with realistic costs. We can’t do much with $1,000.00 anymore in this environment.

Altman asked but again, how do we repay the amount you take out? Are you just going to do it over annual assessments?

The Surveyor stated you’d have to do it over annual assessments or a one-time cost of $507.70 per lot and that would get it back in one year.

Altman stated that’s the entire neighborhood gets a hit for $500.00.

Howard stated you may have to that public hearing in the year.

Heirbrandt stated yes, that’s too much in my opinion.

The Surveyor stated on page four at the top it gives what the three-year, five-year and 10-year payments would be. Keep in mind the existing payment now for maintenance is $65.00.

Howard asked per lot?

The Surveyor stated per lot.

Altman asked these would be increased assessments to pay it off in ten years over the entire watershed, everybody’s lots?
The Surveyor stated yes.
Altman stated page four tells you what everybody gets to pay in that watershed. How many homes?

The Surveyor stated 70 lots.
Duncan stated it doesn’t stand out, but it’s what’s shaded in red on the exhibit.
Mills stated the light pink is the watershed and Anchorage is its own shed, stand alone.
Altman stated so those are all the neighbors that get to pay if we do this.
Mills stated yes.
Altman stated the part in pink is where the water is coming from and where the fix is for $120,000.00.
Mills stated yes; the lots affected by this project.
Howard asked is there a common developer?
Iden stated Lewis Development developed it back then and that’s the whole issue here is that whatever drain was approved at that time didn’t service the area. That’s what has gotten us to this point.
Howard stated if he would have done a really good job on the entire area as he did this one...
Heirbrandt stated I really want to get this done.
Altman stated the only way we can get it done today is Option 1 or 2.
Heirbrandt stated really, I’d like to sit down with everybody so they could see all the options and you talk about it if that’s what you want to do.
Iden stated after we pay this amount then we will also have to pay to have the flexible corrugated pipe brought in taken from this main pipe to other parts of our yards so we not only will have this cost to repair the problem that should have been part of the original assessment we’ll also have additional expenses to actually make this so what we are going to pay for works. We feel like we already have some stake in the game in addition to what we’re discussing.
Altman stated it’s really a question whether we’re assessing all the neighbors or you. That’s really the question.
Howard stated if you look at trying to sell your house in May then those numbers start shrinking.
Altman stated to Heirbrandt, you’re the one that raised the issue and we’re happy to do whatever you want to do, but the point is unless we proceed with just the assessment against those lots, we can’t do anything at this meeting. If you want to give them more time to look at all these figures it’s really your call.
Howard stated you can make a decision today, but basically if you’re not going to assess it against these lots 100% and you can defer that in payments, but that’s what’s advertised. If you’re going to increase the maintenance assessment for the watershed to create a revenue stream, then that has to be advertised.
Altman asked how long would it take for this shed to pay it off if we did nothing?
The Surveyor asked the current arrears?
Altman stated yes; with everything we have going keeping the assessment flat.
The Surveyor stated if I remember right it’s three years.
Howard stated presuming no other maintenance claims.
The Surveyor stated and that was using 75% of the fund per year.
Mooheban asked can we get a copy of the report?
Altman stated we’ll get you a copy of the report.
Duncan stated I think that’s right as I recall I think it’s between two and three years.
Altman stated that we do 75% even with the negative balance if we put the whole “k”; how much are we putting against it, the $71,000.00?
The Surveyor stated I’m sorry, I thought you meant the current arrears.
Altman stated no, I’m talking if we load it with more money, that’s the question.
Howard stated the current arrears plus $70,000.00.

Duncan stated I think it was between 15 to 20 years.

Altman stated it’s forever and so there’s going to have to be an adjustment.

The Surveyor stated it’s 22 years.

Altman stated to Heirbrandt, I know you want to work with these people and I’m glad you will, it’s important, but I really think you need to be working with the neighborhood association because it will affect everyone if we do anything but just assess them. I assume Anchorage has a Board or a Homeowners Association. If you want to defer this what I suggest is maybe work with and have Duncan help or whoever, have a meeting at the association level because whatever we decide if it’s not just an assessment against the pink area will result in a load on the entire neighborhood.

Iden stated I think that’s only fair to the association.

Heirbrandt stated I just want to be fully transparent.

Altman stated we don’t have another revenue source, but you.

Iden stated that surprised us because we were thinking that because Fishers saw the need that maybe you all had another means to accommodate.

Altman stated Hamilton County does not have a generalized drainage fund that we assess against the whole county; all county residents. Fishers does and Fishers is; it’s not as salty as others, but it has an annual assessment whether you have drainage problems or not that they can use. We don’t.

Heirbrandt stated this is a unique situation.

Iden stated we’re very appreciative that we got to this point. We’re just hoping for some kind of a middle of the road finish to this.

Altman stated that’s what I would suggest.

Heirbrandt made the motion to table this project, seconded by Dillinger and approved unanimously.

Heirbrandt stated we’ll get the homeowners the list of options and if you could review them and then maybe we could sit down whether it’s over at Fall Creek Township to have a meeting there and get all of this out on the table and get everybody’s opinion on how they’d like to move forward. We’ve got our hands tied to some extent on what we can do and that’s what’s so frustrating to me. We want to help, but there’s only so much we can do.

Altman stated it should be a community decision.

The Surveyor stated I also need to point out that the soonest the hearing can be set to raise those assessments if it was done at the next meeting would be October 28, 2019 and the 90 day hold for the bid expires September 8th.

Altman asked when’s our next meeting?

Mosbaugh stated September 9th.

Altman stated so our bid hold expires before then.

Howard stated if it’s going to take very long, we’re going to have to advertise because when does the time run to when we can impose the assessment in 2020?

Altman stated if we do that, we’d have to re-advertise anyway.

The Surveyor stated yes, we’re back to square one whatever we do.

Altman asked Duncan, are you working with the contractor?

Duncan stated yes.

Altman asked would you ask if they’d extend their bid hold for 30 days?

Duncan stated yes.

Altman stated they either say yes or no.

Baitz stated we’ve already done that twice.

Altman stated all they can do is say no.
James Lockwood Drain - Crawford Property Wetland Clearing:
The Surveyor stated we have received our permit from IDEM for that work to be done. We are finishing up on the plans for that. We did have a couple of contractors that Baitz, on the maintenance side of things, look at it and tell us no thanks.

Altman asked are we going to go ahead and bid it?
The Surveyor stated we’ll probably have to bid it.

Altman asked do we want to bid just the initial work, or do we want to bid a whole package because we have a five-year commitment on this?
The Surveyor stated we could do it two ways.

Altman stated let’s do an alternate because we’re not wetland experts.
The Surveyor stated no; I want someone else to handle that.

Altman stated yes, so let’s bid it both ways. There’s only a list of how many criteria we have to follow.
The Surveyor stated I did ask our consultant on this if there’s anything out of the ordinary and he looked through it and said no.

Altman stated it’s just wetland requirements.

Heirbrandt made the motion to bid the project for the Wetland’s project and the alternative, seconded by Dillinger and approved unanimously.

Bidders List - SLB Pipe Solutions:
Altman asked is this the one that I got the quote on a private property and flipped over the name?
The Surveyor stated yes.

Altman stated it looks like they’re constrained in size though, right?
The Surveyor stated 18-inch pipe and what we have is 60-inch.

Howard asked are we going to have to bid that too?
Altman asked what did we find out on that? Can we request quotes because it’s a federal project?
The Surveyor stated the last email we received said yes and then at the end it said but I will make sure. That was the last email we received.

Howard asked was that from Chris (Allen)?
The Surveyor stated yes.

Altman asked so we’re on hold?
The Surveyor stated yes.

Howard stated you probably ought to get ahold of Chris and get an MOU and start down the road.

Martha Darrah Drain - Chance Property:
The Surveyor stated this is in response to the Chance flooding problem up on 246th Street. I have sent this to the Highway Department. This is a simple side ditch across the area that has the 40-foot easement and platted ending at the east line of that platted right of way so there’s no additional right of way to be had. Basically, all we’re doing is taking 18-inches out to get rid of that hump that’s there and get the water flowing to the east.

Altman stated it’s a good fix.

Heirbrandt asked have you heard back from the Highway yet?
The Surveyor stated yes, I have; he said thanks for the heads up.

USGS Stream Gauge Agreement:
The Surveyor stated it’s that time of year for the renewal of the contract for the stream gauges. The cost is the same as last year, so the price didn’t go up on us.

Altman asked is the participation the same also?
The Surveyor stated yes. Everyone is still in the game.

Heirbrandt made the motion to approve the stream gauge agreement for the total cost of $66,625.00, seconded by Dillinger and approved unanimously.
**Service Advisory Board:**
The Surveyor presented the minutes of the Citizens Water Group Service Advisory Board of May 21, 2019, June 18, 2019 and July 16, 2019 to the Board for their information.

**Bidders List – Elliott’s Earth Creations:**
The Surveyor stated I think this is more of a landscaper, but he wanted to be put on the bidders list.

Heirbrandt made the motion to place Elliott’s Earth Creations on our bidders list, seconded by Dillinger and approved unanimously.

**Capital Asset Notifications:**
The Surveyor presented a capital asset notification for Windemere Section 1 to the Board for approval.

Heirbrandt made the motion to approve the capital asset notification presented, seconded by Dillinger and approved unanimously.

**Non-enforcements:**
Conover presented a non-enforcement request for the Thistlewaite Drain filed by Terry Dunn for parcel #02-01-31-04-01-021.001 for a residence. The Surveyor’s Office recommends approval.

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

Conover presented a non-enforcement request for the Miller-Carson & Whisler-Brenner Drain filed by Mike Link/Atlanta MHC, LLC for parcel #06-02-01-00-00-022.000 for a retention pond. The Surveyor’s Office recommends approval.

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

Clark presented a non-enforcement request for the Williams Creek Drain, Stultz & Almond Arm, Westmont Arm filed by Matthew and Breck Simpkins for parcel #17-09-21-00-19-022.000 for a fence. The Surveyor’s Office recommends approval.

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

Clark presented a non-enforcement request for the Village of West Clay Drain filed by Phillip Hum for parcel #17-09-29-00-39-015.000 for a fence. The Surveyor’s Office recommends approval.

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

Clark presented a non-enforcement request for the Little Eagle Creek Drain, Tallyn’s Ridge Arm filed by Robert Laoshing for parcel #17-09-20-00-22-019.000 for a fence. The Surveyor’s Office recommends approval.

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

Clark presented a non-enforcement request for the Williams Creek Drain, Jackson’s Grant Section 1 Arm filed by Gavin and Tara England for parcel #17-09-34-00-08-002.000 for a fence. The Surveyor’s Office recommends approval.

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

Clark presented a non-enforcement request for the Williams Creek Drain, Centennial Arm filed by Todd and Catherine Kennedy for parcel #08-09-15-00-08-037.000 for a fence. The Surveyor’s Office recommends approval.

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

Clark presented a non-enforcement request for the Crooked Creek Drain, Weston Ridge Arm filed by Dave and Jessica Henning for parcel #17-13-06-00-09-023.000 for a fence. The Surveyor’s Office recommends approval.

Dillinger made the motion to approve the non-enforcement requested presented, seconded by Heirbrandt and approved unanimously.
Benton Hinesley Drain, Grass Waterway – Change Order No. 2

Conover presented Change Order No. 2 to the Board for approval.

“To: Hamilton County Drainage Board

Re: Benton Hinesley – Grass Waterway Project
Change Order #2

Change Order #2 is for additional dredging of the open ditch downstream of the grass waterway project, additional rip rap and erosion control blanket needed for the for transition at the grade change needed for in field changes and for the repair of a 10-inch private tile encountered during the construction of the grass waterway.

Change Order #2

101 tons riprap @ $48.00 ------------------------------- $ 4,865.16
5 hours 2.5 yd excavator @ $161.00 ------------------------ $ 805.00
5 hours 1.5 yd excavator @ $146.00 ------------------------ $ 730.00
5 hours skid steer @ $76.00 ------------------------------- $ 380.00
Labor 15 hours @ $28.00 ------------------------------- $ 420.00
Operator 15 hours @ $34.00 ------------------------------- $ 510.00
Erosion Control Blanket 165 sq. yds. @ $1.50 -------------- $ 247.50
Tile repair – 80 lb bag concrete 1 @ $8.00 ---------------- $ 8.00
Labor 4 hours @ $28.00 ------------------------------- $ 112.00
1 hour 1.5 yd excavator @ $146.00 ------------------------ $ 146.00
Operator 1 hour @ $34.00 ------------------------------- $ 34.00
10" HDPE 4 ft @ $12.00 -------------------------------- $ 48.00
Cost by Van Horn Excavating of Change Order # 2 ---------------- $ 8,296.66
Contractor’s Bid ---------------------------------------- $132,990.34
Change Order #1 Total ----------------------------------- $ 3,239.62
Change Order #2 Total ----------------------------------- $ 8,296.66
Van Horn Excavating – Total Reconstruction Cost --------- $144,526.62
Engineer’s Estimate ------------------------------------- $165,062.95
Van Horn Excavating – Total Reconstruction Cost---------- $144,526.62
Difference ------------------------------------------------ $ 20,536.33

Submitted By:

Andrew D. Conover
Inspector

Dillinger made the motion to approve Change Order No. 2, seconded by Heirbrandt and approved unanimously.

Construction Updates:

Thurpe Creek Drain, Martha Ford Arm Relocation – Duncan stated this project is complete.
VS Engineering is under contract to complete the asbuilt survey drawings for us. The field work and survey are taking place.

Thurpe Creek Drain, John Underwood Arm Reconstruction – Duncan stated the ditch work is substantially complete. We are still working through spreading spoils on the property south of 136th Street on the west side of the open channel. We had some discussion last week with two of the property owners and trying to resolve that. We have a lot of soil material that needs to be spread there.

Thistlewaite Drain, California Street Arm Extension – Conover stated we’re still working with the Town of Sheridan on curbs. We talked about doing some striping along the side of the street. We received an estimate on that of $4,500.00 to put a white stripe down the side of the road. We’re looking at other options.

Altman asked are we working with Highway on that?

Conover stated this is in the Town of Sheridan and that’s the cost estimate we received.

Howard stated we have annual bids with the Highway Department and I don’t know; that’s one thing we bid annually is striping. I don’t know if that’s too small of an increment.

Heirbrandt stated this is so small.

Altman stated if we’re doing anything in that area.

Heirbrandt asked you’re talking about coordination?

Altman stated yes, just coordinate with Highway, put it in our annual bid and it’s not excessive.
Howard stated it’s bid, we bid it per foot. It’s part of our quantity annual bids, not project annual bids. There ought to be a contractor that is available to do that. That’s a lot of money.

Altman stated that’s ridiculous.

Howard stated these are usually $0.10 per foot or $0.09 per foot or something close.

Conover stated I’ll contact the Highway Department and see if we can get some pricing for that.

Howard stated I don’t know who handles the annual bid, maybe Jeff Fisher.

Conover stated it’s only 600 feet.

Altman stated we might want to, on the smaller municipalities, why wouldn’t we coordinate with them like we do with salt and see if they’re interested. Let’s bring that up at Commissioner because if they’re getting those kinds of quotes it’s crazy.

William Krause Drain Reconstruction Phase 3 - Conover stated Millennium Construction is doing the work on that and they have the bore under S.R. 38 done and they’ve gone back down and checked it. They had a problem with the project running between one of the new homes and the road. They had to do the bore first because of the timeline of the boring company. We’re looking at the second bore; a question to the State Highway Department as to whether we can open cut under S.R. 47. There’s a conflict with fiber optic lines that was installed for MISO.

Benton Hinesley Drain, Grass Waterway - Conover stated this project is moving forward.

William Krause Phase 1 (Pending Asbuilts) - Conover stated we’re waiting on the final bill from the contractor on that.

William Krause Phase 2 (Pending Asbuilts) - Conover stated we’re waiting on the final bill from the contractor on that.

Ellis Barker Drain Reconstruction:

Howard asked where are we on this project? Do you have your final report ready to go? I’ve provided findings for the urban drain and I’ve got to get a notice of assessment recorded.

Duncan stated I have to check into that.

The Surveyor stated we had a little problem with IDEM and the Corps.

Duncan stated I wasn’t aware that there was something we still needed to do. I apologize for that.

Howard stated I think the Surveyor’s final report is pending isn’t it? Has the Board voted on your report?

The Surveyor stated I believe they did.

Howard stated we can put the Urban report on the next agenda then.

Duncan stated two of the outstanding items in the approvals were conditioned upon receiving permits from the State for the project and finalizing the easement on the M/I Homes property. The M/I Homes easement is in process and I need to touch base with M/I Homes, I didn’t hear from them last week. The second one is the State permit. We have actually been working on the permit now for several months regarding this. We initially submitted a permit to dredge the open ditch portion of the regulated drain. The middle phase of the project was a new open ditch. We are to convert the existing regulated drain to a new open ditch and that has been our hang up. The State wants us to mitigate any impacts to an existing shallow waterway. Really, it’s an eroded channel that has occurred over the years, part of which is also a manmade ditch, but they’re considering the impacts as something that needs to be mitigated. The Surveyor and I went to a seminar last week, the Drainage School down at the Farm Bureau Insurance, and DNR happened to be there with their new program for Wetland Mitigations in lieu of construction. They call it the In Lieu Fee in Lieu Of and $450.00 a foot mitigation costs. We knew that the County could pay to mitigate the loss, pay it to the State and then they create some type of wetland or stream. We’d expand on the wetland bank, but that would cost, for the impact they were looking at $869,000.00. The Surveyor and I, after we had our chins come off the table, started looking at some other options because as best as we can recall we’ve never had to mitigate when we’re creating a new open ditch. We’re creating the environment and the habitat with the new open ditch that they like to see so we were surprised by that in the first place. We submitted a permit for it and then they said that wasn’t enough. It’s kind of an interesting situation that I spent the end of last week looking for other options for that project to avoid having to mitigate what I consider minor impacts to the existing waterway. We have to convince the Army Corps of Engineer’s of this because it is the Army Corps and the State. We’re looking at other options for not having to mitigate.
The Surveyor stated I discussed this with the guy from the Army Corps who was at the meeting; he knows where I stand.

Howard stated is there a way to leave that ditch there and put another ditch around it and be done?

Duncan stated we’re looking at that as well as piping it. The open ditch that we proposed was going to require the excavation and transportation of a lot of soil material so my initial estimate is that switching from an open ditch to a tile ditch through this portion would roughly be about a $90,000.00 add to the project which is well within contingency and all that as well as we wouldn’t have to do another hearing for that as well because it’s underneath the estimate. It’s something we’re considering in the grand scheme of things. I think the add is less than 10% of the project and then we would avoid all those mitigation requirements. Another option would be to move the proposed open ditch away from and I tried my best in the first design the existing open ditch away from and I tried my best in the first design the existing open ditch.

The Surveyor stated it doesn’t matter it still comes off.

Altman asked this was IDEM?

The Surveyor stated that was IDEM.

Howard stated IDNR was the wetlands and IDEM was the pollutant.

The Surveyor stated the Corps and IDEM was the wetland.

Howard stated so the Barker is on hold, that’s the short answer.

The Surveyor stated for the time being.

Duncan stated I’m really pushing because the bids expire on September 22nd. They’re really good bids. In my correspondence to the Corps and IDEM on Friday I asked them if I changed a portion of the proposed drain to a tile and minimize our impact could we receive an expedited review due to the fact that they’ve already looked at this twice now. If I more or less minimize the impacts could they move this along. I’ve made that request.

The Surveyor stated they are also claiming they have not received our permits yet although they were mailed July 21st.

Duncan stated on July 21st they were mailed, and the postal service has not yet delivered them to Fort Ben.

Altman stated knowing the problems I’m having with the U.S. Mail, go hand deliver them.

Howard stated or FedEx. Just increase your budget.

Altman stated it’s phenomenal what’s getting messed up in the U.S. Mail system.
Duncan stated we hand delivered the permit to IDEM and I have not yet done it to the Corps because I don't know if I need to resubmit a new one or what. I'll wait for her to respond.

Altman stated we don’t have much time to wait. I’d take the original over there and say “we’re so sorry you didn’t get that in the mail” let’s move.

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

Christine Altman – President

Lynette Nobsaugh
Executive Secretary