

**MONROE COUNTY DRAINAGE BOARD  
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES  
February 4, 2009**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Robert Autio, Scott Dompke, Kevin Enright (*ex officio*), James Faber, Bill Riggert

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** Bill Williams

**STAFF PRESENT:** Todd Stevenson (Drainage Engineer), Donna Barbrick (Secretary), Heidi Russell (Planning), Chris Spiek (Planning)

**OTHERS PRESENT:** Steve Brehob – Smith Neubecker

**CALL TO ORDER:** The meeting was called to order by Dompke at 9:04 a.m.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** Enright had a comment on the minutes regarding the elevation around Winding Brook subdivision and the nearby railroad bed and wanted that mentioned in the minutes. Riggert motioned to approve the minutes from the November meeting. Faber seconded. Motion to approve the minutes with this modification was approved.

**DRAINAGE ENGINEER'S REPORT**

Stevenson asked if Brehob had looked at the new flood plain maps to see whether amendments had been included. Brehob brought up some locations of LOMAs that had not been incorporated into the new flood plain maps. Brehob said he didn't know how anyone would know about the LOMAs existence if they were not incorporated into the maps. Dompke asked about putting together a public comment letter for the DNR. It was suggested that emails between Stevenson and Dave Knipe at the Division of Water be printed out and sent to the DNR with a cover letter. Stevenson said it might be good to get someone down here to talk with the Drainage Board. Brehob mentioned a box culvert installed under Gifford Road that lowered the flood elevation substantially.

Stevenson said that the Storm Water Quality group is meeting next Thursday at 9:00 a.m. and that there will be a presentation about permeable pavers. A sales rep from Indianapolis will be presenting. There was a discussion about permeable pavers and some problems with them in parking lot installations.

Stevenson also mentioned a dispute between a homeowner and a homeowners association in LaSalle Woods at the Pointe. A homeowner said that she might attend the Drainage Board meeting today. She wondered if the Drainage Board members had any suggestions for her situation.

### **HEARTLAND SENIOR HOUSING – S.R. 446**

This project is in the Lake Monroe watershed. Stevenson handed out photos and maps outlining the plan. Brehob outlined the project, the property and the drainage plan. This property abuts Gentry East to the north. There is an existing house, an old barn, and a pole barn on the site. There is a long drive that goes back to a cell tower. There is a road stub from Gentry East and an embankment was built across the valley. Part of the site is upland area; it is open and slopes generally from northwest to southeast. There is a broad valley that drains from SR 446 through the woods and eventually to a cave opening. He said that there were no other karst features on the property other than the depression from the cave opening (Feature A on the report). The cave is offsite. A report prepared when Gentry East was being developed was distributed to Drainage Board members to look over. This shows cave features in the area. The cave features act as natural pipes, going through hillsides and emptying into the ravines.

The developers are proposing a PUD having two components. Assisted living will be on the eastern edge of the property. Individual units will be in another portion. Some area will be left mostly undeveloped, other than a shelter house/rec building and a path. The concept was to look at this unique site that has a large long area that is relatively flat. So development is concentrated on the ridge area and the entire long valley is used for water quality and storm water management. There will be a series of rain gardens in the residential unit area and bioswales and then a series of offline rain gardens and a bioswale all the way down the middle of the valley until the road embankment. Then the road embankment would be used, turning it into an extended detention time basin by putting a standpipe over the end of the existing culvert under the road fill.

Brehob said that Stevenson had his own ideas and suggestions about the valley area. The developers have looked at the benefits of his suggestions and Brehob thinks they are in agreement. Stevenson suggested creating a long filter strip with native plants and grasses, 50 feet or so, and then a series of low berms across the valley so that water could pond up behind each of those berms and provide detention and filtration before the larger detention basin. The berms would provide filtration because water would pond up as it comes through the valley. There might have to be a series of underdrains in those areas as well, based on the rain gardens that were done in Gentry East three or four years ago. A four-inch underdrain was put in all those at Gentry East and they seem to work well.

Faber asked how thick the soil cover is there. Stevenson stated that looking at the soils map he thought it was about 6-7 feet deep at least, moderately well drained soil. Russell stated that it was a boggy area and can hold water.

Stevenson said his suggestions were to minimize impact. He would like to see rain gardens incorporated by the court yards. He would like native vegetation on some of the slopes. Maybe the infiltration could be achieved similarly by having the berms and native vegetation. This would reduce the amount of excavation. It would have standing water when it's raining and maybe for a short time after that. All the existing trees could stay. He said the valley looked like a good opportunity for infiltration practices.

Stevenson mentioned that there were neighbor concerns. Brehob stated that he had recently had a meeting with some of the neighbors and was able to address their concerns. He thinks that the plan at Heartland will help alleviate some of the problems the neighbors have been having.

Faber asked about a building located in the wooded area. Russell said that would be a recreation meeting facility.

Riggert asked about some polygons on the plan. Brehob said that these would be outdoor gazebos.

Riggert said that the plan sounded good to him. Brehob asked about the language on Condition #7 on the preliminary Conditions of Approval drafted by Stevenson. He asked about changing the word collateral to the words "letters of credit."

Stevenson said that this plan would be coming back before Drainage Board after it goes before the Plan Commission. Stevenson said, we generally do not like to have detention in sinkhole rims. In this case, there will be no grading, just outfitting the existing structure with a standpipe. The berm is already in there. He asked for input from the Drainage Board members and from Russell. Russell said that she wanted to see the results of the karst study for the entire site.

Enright said that Gentry East next door had set a precedent. Stevenson said that this would be an exception to the policy on detention and sinkholes, not a change in policy. The karst ordinance is administered jointly by Drainage Board, Plan Commission and the Administrator (the Planning Director). The Administrator has the final say.

Dompke asked, where does the language appear for "no detention" inside of the sinkhole contour area. Russell responded, it's not "no detention," it's more like "only with approval of the Drainage Board." Stevenson added, and the Administrator. Dompke said, so that makes it more of a Drainage Board issue than a site plan feature. Russell said, if you're putting detention in a drainage feature, then that's why I would call it both. Dompke asked about the staff report. The staff report has only been written for PRC, a committee that is supposed to comment about whether the plan integrates with the contour lines. Riggert said he didn't see a problem with the plan. Riggert asked whether this hadn't been done before as far as detention in a sinkhole area.

Dompke said that Sinking Creek and Cave Creek both have large, closed contours that define a sinkhole. We can't eliminate development in those two watersheds. He said that this plan has dedicated one-third of the property to storm water features in the site plan. He asked if this was an adequate accommodation to meet site plan requirements for a detention feature in a sinkhole rim. Faber commented it would actually cut down the amount of water going to the sinkhole itself with the native plants and berms. Dompke asked what information that Planning hoped to gain from the karst study. Russell said that they wanted to know more about the broad valley and where there were some depressions and that they will be looking at contours.

Stevenson noted that this area was on the edge of the Mitchell Plain and the Norman Upland.

Autio asked if Drainage Board ever does follow-up. Stevenson said that he does visual follow-up, after rain events. He said that pre- and post- studies would be great. Dompke said that when neighbors come to a meeting it becomes clear when there is a problem. Russell noted that complaints are the primary mechanism to find out when things aren't working.

**Riggert made a motion to approve the preliminary plan for the Heartland with the Recommended Conditions of Approval, as amended at today's meeting regarding condition #7.**

**Faber seconded. Stevenson took roll of the voting. Voting Aye were Riggert, Dompke, Faber and Autio.**

**There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 10:10 a.m.**

Approved:

Signed: Attest:

---

Steve Dompke, President

---

Donna Barbrick, Secretary

## **WEBB, HIPSKIND, & MCREA (HEARTLAND) SENIOR HOUSING RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS OF PRELIMINARY APPROVAL**

1. Prior to final Plan Commission approval, the final development plan shall come back to the Drainage Board for final approval of the storm water management plan.
2. The borders of all rain gardens and other native plant areas shall be permanently marked in a manner that is acceptable to the Drainage Board.
3. Temporary construction or erosion control fencing is needed to delineate areas that are not to be disturbed. Existing trees to be preserved shall be identified on the plans.
4. To the maximum extent practical, native plants shall be used on all cut and fill slopes to reduce long term herbicide, insecticide, and water use.
5. The proposed native plant/infiltration area in the broad swale running from west to east across the south side of the site shall be drill seeded with an appropriate native plant mix when the existing turf grass has been killed with water-safe glyphosate by a certified applicator.
6. Prior to killing existing turf grass and seeding native plants, a copy of a contract between the developer and a company experienced in native plant establishment and invasive species eradication shall be provided to the County indicating specific seed mixes, seeding methods, timetables, herbicides intended for use, their application rates and methods, and a three year maintenance plan.
7. Prior to the issuance of any letters of occupancy, a letter of credit shall be provided for establishment and maintenance of all native plants for a period of three years from the time they are seeded or planted from plugs.
8. All topsoil that is excavated from the site for building pads, parking, or roads shall be preserved and, to the maximum extent practical, reused on the site in rain gardens, swales, and grassed areas.
9. A geotechnical analysis is needed to determine the feasibility of infiltration and detention practices in the broad swale.
10. To the maximum extent practical, storm water infiltration practices, including rain gardens and permeable pavers, shall be used in the building courtyards.
11. Details of the design are to be worked out with the Drainage Engineer.