

**MONROE COUNTY DRAINAGE BOARD
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
FEBRUARY 5TH, 2004**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Bill Williams, James Faber, Bill Riggert, Jack Wittman, Steve Smith, Vic Farkas

MEMBERS ABSENT: None

STAFF PRESENT: Todd Stevenson, Drainage Engineer, Bob Cowell, Planning Director, Rudy Sepetjian, Deputy Surveyor, Herb Kilmer, County Commissioner, Joyce Poling, County Commissioner

CALL TO ORDER

James Faber called the meeting to order at 9:02 a.m.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Riggert and Williams were not present at the opening of the meeting, and since they were the only members present at the January meeting, no action was taken on the January meeting minutes.

REPORT BY DRAINAGE ENGINEER

Stevenson handed out copies of a Penn State study titled The Effect of Nutrients and Pesticides Applied to Turf on the Quality of Runoff and Percolating Water. He commented that the finding that appeared significant to him was that the study plot with sod had significantly higher absorption rates than the two seeded plots even at the end of the third year. This may have been attributed to thatch buildup in the sod that had not occurred in the seeded plots. Andy Scales from Bynum Fanyo had provided this study to Stevenson to support a contention that well maintained lawns have less runoff than pasture. Stevenson did not believe the study addressed that issue, and Wittman noted that pasture covers a range of conditions including heavily grazed areas with trails formed by livestock.

NEW BUSINESS

PINE WOOD SUBDIVISION

Steve Peters and Jon Thomas from Bynum Fanyo were present to represent this petition. Steve noted that there were numerous sinkholes on the site and that most of them were small. A larger sinkhole on lot 5 extended onto lot 4. Sinkhole conservancy areas had been described for all of the sinkholes, and an overflow area was depicted for the large sinkhole on lot 5 to the south extending across lots 6 and 7. Peters said that five culverts were proposed to keep the drainage patterns going in the natural direction, and two permanent sediment basins were included in the plan. Stevenson asked how the sediment ponds were located, and Peters replied that there were

three major ravines. The proposed roads crossed two of these major ravines, and the sediment ponds were located adjacent to these crossings. They were not placed directly in the ravines to keep them out of the waters of the state. Stevenson asked if they thought this was a good idea, and Thomas said it could have been constructed with less disturbance in the ravine. Both of the sediment ponds would be outfitted with a riser pipe.

It was noted that these sediment ponds would need to be protected and maintained during the construction period. Faber asked how much area drained to the ponds. Thomas said that the watershed area was about 10 acres and that they were following the State's guidelines of providing 1500 cubic feet per acre.

Joyce asked if the plan was being designed under Rule 13 or Rule 5 guidelines. It was noted that the State is currently regulating Rule 5. Riggert asked if the ponds were for construction or postconstruction, and Thomas said they were for both. Riggert asked about detention, and it was noted that detention was not being proposed due to lot sizes (equal to or greater than 2.5 acres). Cowell said that he normally would have had reservations about a proposal with this number of lots in an area that drains primarily to sinkholes, but the area is currently zoned as a PUD that allows 52 dwellings.

There was some discussion about a pond to the southeast and a quarry to the northwest which received drainage from the site. Smith wondered if Stevenson had reviewed calculations, and Stevenson replied that he had not but that there would not be much to review. He pointed out that he had encouraged the engineers to design the road drainage as sheet flow where possible to reduce the amount of concentrated flow. Faber asked how thick the soil was, and he perused the report from the soil scientist.

Maintenance of the ponds would be the responsibility of the individual property owners upon which the ponds resided. It was noted that a maintenance schedule would be needed.

Wittman asked how far this site was from Stinesville. Joyce noted that the Stinesville sewer service was not a regional sewer district. Cowell said that each house in Stinesville has a primary treatment area (septic system), and the wastewater treatment plant receives the effluent from these systems.

Faber asked for comments, and Riggert pointed out a concern with maintenance of the permanent sediment ponds. Cowell stated that this was an issue that the Plan Commission would be addressing, and Riggert wondered if they would be targeting a storm water utility. Cowell said the three options would be individual property owners, homeowners associations, or for the public to play a more active role. Kilmer mentioned concern with potential problems with the sale of property if the homeowners associations were responsible.

Wittman voiced support for the Board taking a position on seeing how well particular best management practices worked. Smith expressed a desire for the Board to get up to speed on storm water quality issues and to get the proposed Storm Drainage Control Ordinance passed. Riggert noted that he had trouble getting good guidance from the State with regard to long term BMPs.

Wittman moved to approve the drainage plan with easements provided where necessary and details to be worked out with the Drainage Engineer. Riggert seconded and the motion was unanimously approved.

STORM WATER QUALITY ISSUES – BEST MANAGEMENT PRACTICES

Joyce said that she would like for the Drainage Board have a work session to build an agenda for addressing Rule 13 requirements and to address the issue of cost. Faber noted that a storm water quality presentation would be made to the League of Women Voters on March 10 and that Jamie Palmer would be addressing funding mechanisms at that meeting. CAT would be covering the meeting but the live broadcast would likely be preempted by the Bloomington City Council meeting. Stevenson said he wanted to go to Indianapolis during some rainy weather to get an idea how existing BMPs are working.

There was some discussion of the maintenance of BMPs in Marion County. The storm water utility is used to maintain BMPs constructed by Indianapolis, and other BMPs are privately maintained.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Bernie Guerrettaz from Bledsoe, Tapp, & Riggert was present to talk about a proposed subdivision north of Cardinal Glen (south of Rhorer and east of Old Walnut Pike). The property had been rezoned to RS 3.5. He mentioned that Williams had looked at the road schematic and that the alignment running along the south side of the site would be part of the regional South Interceptor and would have 100 feet of right of way. Detention would be provided to match storm events (proposed to natural), and B.G. was setting up a time to meet with someone from DNR to discuss the erosion control plan and long term best management practices. Faber asked about sewers and B.G. said the issue was scheduled for the Utility Services Board agenda. Board member thanked B.G. for presenting preliminary information about the project.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 9:45 a.m.

Approved _____

Signed:

Attest:

James Faber, President

Todd Stevenson, Acting Secretary