



Upper White River Watershed Alliance, Inc.  
Technical Committee Minutes  
June 12, 2003

The meeting was called to order at 2:09 PM Thursday June 12, 2003. Those present were as follows: Mr. Kenton Ward, Hamilton County Surveyor; Mr. Robert Thompson, Hamilton County Surveyor's Office; Mr. Don Anthis, City of Noblesville; Mr. Bob Meyer, Upper White River Board of Directors; Mr. Larry Stout, ISSD; Mr. Steve Hall, Goode & Associates; Mr. Rusty Spiars, Woolpert; Ms. Cindy Fort, American Consulting; and Mr. Walter Evans, Hamilton County Surveyor's Office.

**Review of Minutes of May 1, 2003 Meeting:**

There were no changes made. The minutes were approved.

**Polis Contract Update:**

Mr. Myer stated that they had a meeting on May 29 with Bob Wilkins, Bill Branick, and Janice Bacon (the point person for negotiating the contract). At that point she had not completed that negotiations of it and she may have done so since then; they have not connected by e-mail so he did not know the answer.

Mr. Hall stated that the contract had not been signed; it's still being negotiated; there was some concern about the level of detail and how Polis would actually contact the individual representatives or stakeholders of the GIS users in a community in the Upper White; there was some concerns that in the scope it was not spelled out clearly enough or in detail enough as to how that interaction would occur; Janice contacted John Buechler at the Polis Center and expressed her concern; he expressed his concerns that they were already stretching themselves to do what they said they would do in the contract for the money allotted and Janice basically told them that ultimately she wasn't satisfied with that and there would need to be further discussions by the Board on how they would proceed. This discussion was within the last five days.

Mr. Myer stated that Janice had not called the Board back together. He stated that the thrust of the meeting that he attended on the 29<sup>th</sup> was that thoroughness of interviewing was far more important than speed of completion and that getting a shallow job done by July 15 was far less important than a thorough job done by September 30; considering vacation schedules and all, an assembled meeting would unlikely get all the right people there at the same time. He can understand where Mr. Buechler is coming from; what they are offering for contract is not a lot of dollars per man hour; on the other hand everybody that met on the 29<sup>th</sup> was of the feeling that there is a real risk here that if they plunge into this project and all the providers and users aren't well surveyed they may end up with something that people don't like.

Mr. Anthis asked if they had a list of individual counties and municipalities that handle GIS.

Mr. Myer stated that he did not know that they did; he did not know if one exists. It sounds like a good idea if someone knows where to start.

Mr. Hall stated that they have in the database of contacts for the Upper White a list of all the GIS coordinators that they are aware of; this was accurate up to the end of this past year, but changes have occurred. They had 23 to 25 names; this included coordinators and other utility folks they knew that had particular projects.

Mr. Myer asked if this was a list of users or providers.

Mr. Hall stated that this was a list of providers.

Mr. Stout stated that Mr. Jim Stout could probably bring that to completion; update any changes that have been made.

Mr. Hall stated that Mr. Buechler also thought that he had a pretty good level of awareness as to who the GIS folks were from the project he is working at MIBOR.

Mr. Myer stated that since it's his time he would hate to solely rely on his assurance that he has gone broadly enough, particularly since this committee doesn't know that much about GIS themselves.

Mr. Anthis asked if they had an understanding of what the end user is; who he is. Are they going down to laborers?

Mr. Myer stated that he assumed that it was a very broad spectrum of interests.

Mr. Anthis stated that he didn't know if that seems fair for Polis to go down and interview a few hundred people.

Mr. Hall stated that he believed that the discussion was representative stakeholders, but he did not believe that it had been specified.

Mr. Anthis stated that it would be helpful.

Ms. Fort stated that if they don't specify, Polis would never know when they are done and the Committee would never know when they are finished.

Mr. Anthis stated that finding a few key people from this county at this time for the dollars that are being spent would probably be the best thing; to see what they have; who actually manages GIS Systems; you will come up with a list of layers that are out there today; once that information is compiled he would imagine they could tell them how they could put it together and make it as accurate as possible. In the follow-up contract he would go down to the end users and start finding out what additional information they would like.

Ms. Fort stated that they could make it the responsibility of the person who is in charge of their GIS Department to find out what their guys need and bring it to the table at the Polis Center.

Mr. Hall stated that the Contract Planning Book says that Polis will interview City, County and Upper White River Watershed Alliance membership to determine organizations and special data user objectives, current GIS activities, existing data, etc.

Mr. Anthis stated that this would leave out a lot of people that are not members of the Upper White right now; there's a lot of data out there.

Mr. Ward asked about regionalizing meetings by County.

Mr. Hall stated that one of the original concerns was that they were planning on holding one workshop and holding it in Indianapolis.

Mr. Stout stated that he believed that they volunteered to have some regional meetings; or at least agreed to.

Mr. Anthis asked if they were required to put together specific needs so they know what they are going to be asking at these meetings. He believed that they would be able to come up with some questions they want to ask each person they interview and go in there where all the questions are asked the same. They should be able to put a questionnaire together so when people are interviewed those are the questions they ask at this stage of the game and go from there. They need to find a way to be fair to them and make sure they get the information that they would like to see at this time. He stated that there is an individual that could probably sit down with Polis and develop a questionnaire in a rather short time; the Committee could review it and sign off on it.

Mr. Myer asked if it would even be necessary to meet with them face to face; if they get a survey done and then follow up by phone.

Mr. Anthis stated that he believed that it could all be done by e-mail. Once they get it down they could e-mail it to the rest of the Committee and they could respond back.

Mr. Stout stated that he understood Polis' concerns also; if they give them the responsibilities of interviewing, some of these people don't want to be interviewed; some don't have the time. If they make it their responsibility to get that done that is somewhat open ended.

Ms. Fort stated that she believed that Mr. Anthis had a point; if the Upper White Committee or Polis Center sends out a letter or survey by e-mail; you could spend an hour doing that, whereas to come down and do an interview you're going to waste half a day on it.

Mr. Anthis stated that if they get a representative to work with them; they come up with these questions and then they send it out for the Committee to look at or sign off on it; the people could be called prior to the contract to ask if they would be willing to be interviewed.

Mr. Stout stated that if they ask them to develop this questionnaire before they sign the contract they are sort of asking them to do part of the work before they have agreed to pay them.

Mr. Anthis stated that they should phrase it to them this way 'they feel it would be in their best interest to develop this questionnaire today so they don't have an open ended contract' and that is a definable scope of services.

Ms. Fort asked if they could put in the scope that they have to develop the questionnaire and get Board approval of it before they send it out and use it.

Mr. Hall stated that there is a clause in there that says there will be a project initiation meeting where they will sit down with members of the Upper White to determine the information; to resolve what information needs to be gathered; who will be contacted, etc.

Mr. Anthis stated that he would be uncomfortable personally if there was not a good definition of what end user means, who exactly is going to be interviewed; they could interview a lot of people.

Mr. Hall stated that they admittedly up front months ago, when they asked for a couple of different estimates, came in less than half of everyone else.

Mr. Myer asked if they were in a position where it would enhance their other work if this is added to it.

Mr. Hall stated that the implication is that they low balled this to get to the bigger piece.

Mr. Myer stated that the Indiana Water Quality Atlas would be enhanced by this in depth project that will be on the White River.

Mr. Ward stated that also to create a model with this one to duplicate throughout the state on other watersheds.

Ms. Fort stated that they may need to define what interview means and meetings. If you send a questionnaire out one way or another as the interview and then follow up with a telephone call; that takes a lot less time.

Mr. Anthis stated that they should develop the questionnaire and when they go and interview the people those are the questions they ask at a face to face meeting.

Mr. Ward stated that they need to put the development of the questionnaire as the first work item.

Mr. Anthis stated that they could send that by e-mail.

Mr. Stout stated that they could reserve the telephone interview for the people they know will not come to a meeting; they know they will not get everybody.

Mr. Anthis stated that if Goode & Associates have a list, maybe they would share that with Mr. Stout and he could look at it.

Mr. Ward asked Mr. Stout if he was still thinking of a meeting.

Mr. Stout stated that he agreed that it is always good to be face to face because they are really talking about metadata here; they are asking them what data they have; how accurate it was; when was it captured; how often they update it; and so on.

Ms. Fort asked if they could start that meeting with sending out questionnaires.

Mr. Stout stated that if he were doing the project he would send out an e-mail of a questionnaire; you can get a lot of that information without wasting everybody's time; when you do have the meeting they can talk about things that are difficult or impossible to communicate any other way.

Mr. Anthis stated that if they don't have the time maybe they would authorize them to talk to their consultant.

Mr. Ward stated that as one of the deliverables, is there a final meeting for results.

Mr. Hall stated that they put the last three pages, which is appendix A, apparently an attachment that describes the process more thoroughly; it also defines responsibilities for the Upper White Alliance, which discusses what the deliverables will be and they are defined in terms of a project specification report on page two of the appendix.

Mr. Ward stated that it has deliverables as an interview/workshop. He asked if they could regionalize that or if that is what they are thinking about doing.

Ms. Fort stated that the text of that says that interviews be scheduled in two hour intervals over two days; Upper White will provide convenient meeting place for all interviews and will help coordinate the meetings.

Mr. Myer stated that the Board's feeling was that the data they collect should be limited to the kill zone of the Guide Settlement, but that where data extends outside of that they shouldn't try to truncate it; to him that means that they can't invite and bring in Morgan County data because it probably stands alone and separate of Marion County.

Mr. Stout stated that if they are going to sit down and e-mail questionnaires he would prefer they send them to each entity; he would not want to get stuck having to speak for them.

Mr. Anthis stated that it wasn't questionnaires; it was developing questions that they agree with Polis that Polis would ask people at a face to face meeting.

Mr. Stout stated that they can get much of this data with e-mail.

Ms. Fort stated that if they tell them ahead of time what you want then they will bring it to the meeting and your meeting is more productive. Polis sends the e-mail out; they review the questions with them.

Mr. Anthis stated that they need to develop a relationship; you can't develop a relationship with an individual in a different county by e-mail.

Ms. Fort stated that if they send the questions out so that you're prepared; invite them to the meeting with that questionnaire; they come prepared to the meeting and you have a productive meeting.

Mr. Stout stated that it would be even more productive if they send in any answers they can before the meeting; then you have time to tabulate those; you spend the meeting on stuff that is harder.

Ms. Fort stated that they set it up so that it would be two hour interviews and not a rap table; if they have one person doing interviews they have eight in a day; maybe sixteen is enough. The combination of either a group meeting, if they feel that would be more productive, once the data is collected ahead of time.

Mr. Hall stated that most of what they are talking about fits into the framework they are seeing here; there is still some initial concerns that the last page of the attachment, responsibilities of the Upper White and depending how timely those responsibilities or how much time those responsibilities might take; there may not be someone to make fifty phone calls every week; coordinate and schedule meetings. He stated that this is what he understood to be one of the primary concerns at this stage.

Mr. Myer stated that one of the things that came out in the May 29<sup>th</sup> meeting was the hiring of their organization for \$2,000.00 to oversee the work of Polis Center during the feasibility study.

Mr. Hall stated that he and Janice discussed it; Janice asked if they would be willing to oversee things; do a project coordination; she was talking about 15 to 20 hours a week for a given period; he told her that this was something they could probably help out with since they have a lot of relationship with everybody in the Upper White already; she asked them to call Polis and arrange that, but he did not believe that it was their place to call Polis Center and arrange that.

Mr. Anthis asked if this money was in addition to the \$15,000.00 or to take the \$3,000.00 to \$5,000.00 out of this.

Mr. Hall stated that this would be taken out of the \$15,000.00.

Ms. Fort stated that she would volunteer their conference rooms for the interviews.

Mr. Myer stated that there really is a need for somebody to take some managerial responsibility here and it was his understanding that the Upper White treasury is now seeing flows of money into it from membership and therefore he would assume that they could probably spring to hire some sort of job that none of them individually have the time to really do themselves. They need to move along as an organization towards making that decision.

Mr. Hall stated that they did the books for the Upper White when they worked with Indianapolis for 2 to 3 years; there were some concerns that it gave them some edge on having business opportunities with the Upper White or those communities, so they transferred the books over to Bob Weaver and they have been very hesitant to even talk about doing something for money for the Upper White just because of those issues before.

Ms. Fort made the motion for the Technical Committee to recommend to the Upper White Board that a coordinator (project manager) be hired by the Upper White Board to do the responsibilities of the UWRWA as outlined in page 3 of Appendix A with the exception that the time and review coordination phrase, which implies responsibility of the technical review will remain with the Technical Committee, seconded by Mr. Anthis.

Mr. Myer asked if there were any other alternatives.

Mr. Ward stated that unless someone wanted to take it on as a project for gratis.

Mr. Myer asked how the management from one side and then the technical input; how do those two groups both inter-relate with Polis.

Mr. Anthis stated that the intent was for Mr. Stout to work for a short time with Polis to develop the questionnaire; he has an extremely busy schedule and he probably has the time to do that, but not much more.

Mr. Stout stated that he would be happy to do that, but he did not know for sure that they would necessarily want his help; if they do he will.

Mr. Myer stated that this group probably wants the assurance that they have looked at what they are doing technically and it makes since.

Mr. Ward stated that they could have Mr. Stout do this as a function of this group; they are dealing with Polis through the Committee to Mr. Stout.

Ms. Fort asked if Mr. Stout would become the primary point of contact to provide input at designated project check points; the authority to make decisions.

Mr. Hall stated that this was one of the things they discussed with Janice when she first approached them; that just being a project manager, which means calling a lot of people and setting up meetings and making sure that beans are being counted, sure no problem, but in no way, shape or form do they want to be reviewing Polis Center's work.

Mr. Myer stated that there is still a gap there.

Mr. Anthis stated that this would fall back on who oversees management of the project; if that is Goode & Associates that's fine; they don't want to do peer review, but it could be brought back to this Committee and looked at.

Mr. Stout stated that he was a little uncomfortable as a project manager role because he has been away from this group till the last couple of months and he feels that this group is a little uncomfortable speaking for the Board; he feels that this would put him in a decision making role.

Ms. Fort stated that she suspected that unless the Board is going to take this responsibility of these deliverables, there has to be either a group or a person or these all become the consultants responsibility; then the question is what the consultants responsibility is in checking back with the Committee.

Mr. Ward stated that he believed that the primary contact would probably still be Janice; when she has questions on how something should be done she has this Committee to fall back on or Goode; there would be one point of contact and that point of contact would go out and get the answer from whichever group.

Mr. Anthis stated that he would imagine that the Board would send a draft back to this Committee to review and advise the Board in the appropriate time; that is when Mr. Stout would get to make comments as part of the Technical Committee; they have a couple of other people that know what they are talking about when it comes to GIS that could be here at the meetings.

Mr. Stout stated that it seems that they are looking at two different kinds of information from these people they are asking them to interview; what do they have and tell them about it; the other is what do they want out of this project. They may be talking about two different groups of people. He knows what Hamilton County has and Mr. Ward knows what Hamilton County wants.

Mr. Anthis asked if the primary purpose is to collect the appropriate layers that are most accurate now and put that together and once that is done enter into another contract to ask the questions of what do they want. For \$15,000.00 they are asking for a lot, but he agreed with it; there is a benefit for Polis to get this.

Mr. Stout stated that maybe initial interviews would work best for what they have, collecting that kind of information; or at a meeting with a lot of the players present would be the best way to find out what you want.

Ms. Fort stated that some of the things in the interview; second page on appendix A says data needs and potential applications, so that gives them the first couple of what do you have and where do you come from and what are your needs; she believes that they are planning to do both.

Mr. Stout stated that in the introduction paragraph they talk about the beginning point and the ending point; it seems like they have a grasp. They have not given them any way to quantify how many and who they are going to have to talk to.

Ms. Fort stated that they said two days and two hour per interview, so they have said sixteen hours; they have defined it; they are going to give sixteen hours for this task, but what they don't know is if this is sixteen times one person or sixteen times four people.

Mr. Spiars stated that they want something that makes sure they do cover all of the entities out there that they want covered.

Ms. Fort stated that if they provide them the list then they get the distribution they want.

Mr. Anthis stated that if they don't they may interview the wrong people.

Mr. Stout stated that it also says in there that Polis will compare interview tools to ensure that interviews are performed as effectively as possible.

Mr. Ward stated that they need to go back to the question of a coordinator

There was a motion and a second to afford this under the Board and approved unanimously.

Mr. Ward stated that they will forward this on to the Board as a recommendation.

Mr. Myer stated that they are recommending as a Committee that a coordinator be hired; the dollar amount is to be decided by the Board.

Ms. Fort stated that the scope of work needs to be written to define what those responsibilities are.

Mr. Myer asked if she was referring to the scope of work for the coordinator. He asked if this group should decide this.

Ms. Fort stated that the question was 'does Janice want to do this; does she have the time to do this'.

Mr. Myer stated that he did not believe that the reason she is on the Upper White River Watershed Alliance still exists; she was County Commissioner and was not re-elected. She is otherwise occupied, so he was sure she would not have time for this.

Ms. Fort asked if someone on this Committee was willing to volunteer to do this; she did not have the technical expertise or the time. They need to define what they want the coordinator to do; if it is the items listed could they put a price together based on those things; was it defined well enough.

Mr. Anthis asked if in the bi-laws they can request a special Board meeting to discuss these items with them; August seems like a long way off.

Mr. Myer stated that it would actually be the officers.

Ms. Fort asked if they could request an executive meeting; she asked if August would be too late to discuss this contract?

Mr. Myer stated that the executive Board could get together and say they would spend a certain amount of money, but then within the executive Board he was not sure of anybody there who knows who to hire; it would probably come back to this technical meeting to make a recommendation as to who should be hired.

Mr. Anthis stated that who they hire to do this is going to oversee the scope of services, report back to the Board if they have completed or not and make a recommendation to the Board on accepting the final draft.

Mr. Hall stated that the last statement is the one they had concern about; they can call, schedule, assist in the interviews, track deliverables and timelines, but they were in no position to report on the credibility of the work.

Mr. Myer asked if this was because of concern of conflict of interest or technical capacity.

Mr. Hall stated that it was all of the above.

Mr. Ward asked if that should come back to this group as a draft and then be taken to the Board.

Mr. Stout stated that as far as what they are looking for in the end product, does the membership of the Upper White River Watershed Alliance constitute all of the people whose opinions they care about. He stated that he believed that they needed two lists; they have the data providers; they need to find out what data they have and enough about it to know how to use it; they also have to interview people to ask what they want to accomplish with GIS. What he was asking was if the second group of people are all part of the Upper White River Watershed Alliance.

Mr. Ward stated that they also have a group of people that are not part of the first group that was mentioned, such as IDEM and IDNR; they have data and they are not members.

Mr. Stout stated that they could ask them for their data without asking them what they want them to do with it.

Mr. Anthis stated that they could narrow it down right now to interviewing Mr. Ward because he was very knowledgeable about Stormwater Phase II and people like that who have been very involved in it; there will probably be a very short list of people in the Upper White that would be interviewed in what they would like to see at this time; that list will start to grow as this Rule starts getting implemented.

Mr. Hall stated that the division for this up front was that in no way, shape or form could the project that was proposed at this time be a catch all for everything.

Mr. Stout stated that he believes that they need to do this backwards from how they have proposed it; they need to find out what provision is; what product and then go find out what data is available out there already and then they do the map. He asked if the group who envisioned this to start with wanted to go out and beg people to share with them what their vision for something they are not even asking for.

Mr. Anthis stated that they are making it too complicated; he believed that this is just to get the GIS data that is out there in those layers and see if they can bring it in to a common format so they can use it; they can go back and ask the end users what data would be helpful for them to comply with Stormwater Phase II or erosion or whatever the case may be; he did not believe that this was truly known today; a lot of people are going to be real hesitant on telling what they want; they have not had this discussion with the Upper White to define what is appropriate to sample.

Mr. Ward stated that the original of this has snowballed; he believed that it really started out as going out to find what is out there, whose got what and on what platforms, and what kind of problems they are going to have in integration; from that basis they can start adding to it; they need to find out what is out there first and then come up with what they really need; there is going to be so much information there they will have to throw some out for right now.

Mr. Anthis stated that if it was just himself looking at this he would want to know what base data they had and keep it simple; find out what platform it is on and see how they inundate it into one GIS system.

Ms. Fort stated that what Mr. Anthis just said is what she reads the first task to be.

Mr. Stout stated that he believed that this is two different groups of people.

Ms. Fort stated that it very well may be; if they define the groups that they want them to talk to then they can get the right people in the room.

Mr. Stout stated that this may be all that is making Janice reluctant to sign the contract; if those groups are not identified nobody will know when it is done including Polis.

Mr. Anthis asked if he was talking about somebody who gets base technical data and then somebody who has a wish list group.

Mr. Stout stated that he was; he did not know that the wish list group would extend outside the people that are already interested enough to be in this room and on the Board. They can't force anybody to participate.

Ms. Fort stated that what they really need Polis to do is find what two days of interviews mean as far as (inaudible); because the rest of this is compiling all the data.

Mr. Stout stated that it was fine for them to (inaudible) of their obligation in two days of interview, but he believes that they need to define who they need to interview.

Ms. Fort stated that they would list that as their responsibility; the Upper White's responsibility of developing the interviewee list.

Mr. Hall asked who was going to do that; that's the project manager question; there is no staff and Janice does not have the time to do it. If there is enough money in the till for the Upper White to hire somebody to do that as a task that would be that scope of work; work with this Committee to develop the two interview lists and once the list is provided to Polis be sure that they are meeting their timelines, goals and deliverables.

Mr. Anthis stated that he concurred with that, but in the contract you want to set aside 16 hours to conduct these interviews then they need to have a short list of people that have the information and know what they want.

Ms. Fort stated that there needs to be a reasonable number and Polis needs to define if this is two man days or ten man days. The Committee puts it down as their responsibility to provide the list of interviewees, but once they define how many hours there are then they can tailor the list.

Mr. Stout stated that if they are going to have a workshop of a brainstorming of what they want this to accomplish it's not really relevant whether there is ten people or 20 people.

Ms. Fort stated that they may suggest that they not do the two hour interview format and maybe shorter interviews with a bigger group meeting.

Mr. Stout stated that as far as what data is out there and what format it's in; that kind of stuff can be done by telephone and e-mail. They have done this before and are pretty good at it.

Mr. Myer asked for another motion to clarify what they are deciding. They have all agreed that they should hire a coordinator, but since then should they clarify what they have decided.

Mr. Ward asked if he was suggesting a recommendation for whom to hire as one of those.

Mr. Myer stated that they probably do need another motion as to who it would be, but they did vote that they would hire somebody to be that coordinator.

Ms. Fort asked if the Board would prefer a recommendation for that motion.

Mr. Myer stated that he believed so; he did not believe that the people who were in the May 29<sup>th</sup> meeting have much qualification as to say who the right person or entity would be.

Mr. Anthis made the motion for Goode & Associates to be the coordinator, seconded by Mr. Myer and approved.

Mr. Hall abstained from the motion.

Mr. Anthis stated that there are a couple of items left that they need motions on; he asked if they could frame those questions.

Mr. Thompson stated that he believed that one of them is that the Technical Committee would define and prioritize the list of people to be interviewed.

Mr. Anthis asked if they needed authorization from the Board to do that.

Ms. Fort asked if the Board needed to authorize the Committee to be the Technical liaison on this contract.

Mr. Ward stated that they should have recommendation to the Board as far as that as well.

Ms. Fort made the motion to have the Technical Committee recommend to the Upper White Board that they authorize the Technical Committee to consider and review consultants work concerning all contracts on GIS project and to communicate back to the Board.

Mr. Anthis stated that he believed that motion should be that the Board to consider authorizing the Technical Committee to review and make recommendations back to the Board at the appropriate time on this contract.

Mr. Spiars asked if this is the Polis contract and Goode contracts.

Mr. Anthis made the motion to have the Upper White Board to consider authorizing the Technical Committee to compile lists of interviewees for the Polis Center's work, seconded by Ms. Fort and approved unanimously.

Mr. Myer stated that they needed a motion now to the affect that they ask the Board to authorize the Technical Committee to assemble interview lists appropriate for the contracts that Polis will do.

Mr. Myer made the motion for the Board to authorize the Technical Committee to compile lists of interviewees for the work to be done by Polis Center.

Mr. Anthis asked if they should also consult with Polis Center, so they are both in agreement.

Mr. Ward stated that they may have some suggestions.

Mr. Stout stated that they started this discussion in a case where Janice was not comfortable signing the contract because there was not enough definition of who they were going to interview and now they are going to send the Board a motion that this group would determine who they had to interview; how is that going to make her feel comfortable signing the contract.

Ms. Fort stated that they are going to ask the Polis Center to define how many man hours are in that two days of interview time.

Mr. Anthis stated that she was looking for some help to identify concerns of the contract that is being reviewed; she didn't feel comfortable because she didn't think all the issues had been addressed.

Mr. Spiars asked if there was a schedule that was attached to this.

Mr. Stout asked if they were saying to Janice to sign the contract and they will cover her.

Ms. Fort stated that before the contract is signed Polis needs to define a little better how many man hours; are they talking sixteen interviews or 32 or so on; how many interviews or man hours in the sixteen hours they have defined.

Mr. Stout stated that he was concerned that they were not addressing her concerns.

Mr. Anthis stated that he also believed that she needed more definition of certain verbiage in this; what they agree on.

Mr. Thompson stated that letting Polis define the number of interviewers; they are in essence limiting the number of interviewees; if they take the other approach and say this is the minimum of number they want interviewed and it is prioritized then the onus is on them to meet that.

Ms. Fort stated that if they developed the fee for the work, they have said they have sixteen hours that they have to do interviews and they have either put one person on it or they've put some other number of people, but there is sixteen hours times the number of staff times dollars per hour equals some amount of money and that is how they have figured their fee. They don't know how they figured their fee; they know the bottom line is \$15,000.00.

Mr. Thompson asked if they should come up with the list first; then ask if they can do this.

Ms. Fort stated that if they called them right now they could say they have 32 man hours on that task; then they can ask if that is enough, but until they know how many man hours are in the task they don't know; they can't answer that question if that is enough; if it is not enough, what are they willing to give up in order to get more interviews because the \$15,000.00 is not going to change. They need more information from Polis and that would probably make Janice more comfortable.

Mr. Hall stated that his understanding from second hand hearing was that she was fundamentally concerned that there was not enough level of efforts specified in the contract to make sure whoever they decide needs to be interviewed is properly coordinated and if there is a recommendation here that a project coordinator be hired that would be an entity that would ensure the interviews.

Ms. Fort stated that if Mr. Stout is one of the people that is suppose to be interviewed and he's on vacation for two months and that is when the interviews happen, how are they going to ensure that the interviews happen; you cannot make somebody come to an interview that doesn't want to come.

Mr. Stout stated that it sounds like it falls down to whom she trusts and who she doesn't trust.

Ms. Fort stated that there was a motion on the table.

Mr. Myer had made the motion for the Board to authorize the Technical Committee to compile lists of interviewees for the work to be done by Polis Center, seconded by Mr. Ward and approved unanimously.

Mr. Ward stated that the paper stated project manager; he assumes that they will also be the primary point of contact; is that everyone else's assumption.

Mr. Stout stated that he would read that to be the primary point of contact.

Mr. Myer asked who would be the primary point of contact.

Mr. Hall stated that it would be the project coordinator.

Mr. Myer asked if there were any other motions that the Committee needs to put to the Board.

Mr. Hall asked if it was clear that it was the responsibility of the Technical Committee will be to provide more of a technical review of the documents that are produced.

Mr. Myer went over the four motions; he will e-mail this out and carbon copy the Committee and send it to Janice and invite her to call; he may include one of the Committee to have her call them if he needs to.

Mr. Ward asked if there had been such a time that the Board has done something over the phone.

Mr. Myer stated that on May 29<sup>th</sup> they met at a restaurant; he would think they could do the same thing again.

Mr. Ward stated that they could follow up with an official motion at the next Board meeting.

Mr. Myer stated that they may be able to do it all by fax, phone call or conference call.

### TMDL Update:

Mr. Hall stated that currently TMDL development is ongoing in Marion County for White River, Fall Creek and Eagle Creek tributaries. There's an assessment report that has been released by IDEM in Indianapolis that divvies up pollutant loads among various sources; some sources identified within Marion County as combined sewers, failing septic systems or straight pipes and non-point source pollutants, which are cats, dogs and wildlife and existing remnants of agriculture. It also identifies pollutant loads in a big category generally called upstream sources, which points at Hamilton County. One pollutant load primarily identified is urban storm water runoff. A lot of guidance documents for TMDL development for storm water permits talks about the need to identify particular pollutant loads from Stormwater entities and how those can be worked into TMDL efforts and it appears that they are being consistent with the guidance documents in that regard, at least at this point identifying the storm water pollutant loads in the TMDL study, but stating that specific loads would need to have the modeling validated or additional monitoring had to be done in upstream communities or counties to be able to relate those loads to MPDS discharges. The TMDL is Marion County's portion of the White River drainage shed with the portions of upstream scheduled out in the next four or five years, so it seems they're laying partially the framework to move upstream with the TMDL development efforts. It's a final draft document that's out there; he believes that they are accepting comments on it. A couple of meetings ago for the Upper White general Board meeting he gave a quick talk on the watershed rule; it's basically a revisions to the TMDL rule that are including some categorical revisions to the MPS rules and Clean Water Act that would basically change the way all water programs are operated under a framework of Indiana's Continuing Planning Process; it's a document that is put together by IDEM and is suppose to dictate how they will operate all their water programs; of the TMDL revisions that are happening on the federal level will dictate that NPDES permitting, Stormwater, wastewater, drinking water permitting and other things will have to occur under a watershed based framework and that there is suppose to be a new framework developed on the federal level that's translated down to the state level as to how the water programs are going to work under this new watershed based framework. There is a release in the federal register that says that they are moving forward with the watershed rule; it was a proposed rule; it will come out for public comment in the next 60 to 90 days and they anticipate having a final rule by June or September of next year. The rule was iffy; if they were actually going to move forward with it. It is now moving forward and is going to change to this watershed based framework; how all water programs are going to operate; IDEM is aware of it and hoping to re-tool their programs to issue permits on a watershed based framework and have even talked about it in context to Stormwater Phase II permits that the initial deadline for issuing all these Stormwater permits; then five year permits may actually end earlier as they go into this rotating basin approach of issuing and renewing permits.

Mr. Spiars asked if this was all manner of permits like industrial and wastewater.

Mr. Hall stated that he was correct; this is what has been discussed in the framework; they will see if they actually get it done. That is the vision that is outlined in the federal TMDL rule; that all permitting programs will operate on this rotating basin approach; at least all water based permits. The CPP (Continuing Planning Process) is to outline how the state is going to run all its water based programs. When he was working with IDEM in 1998 the last time Indiana CPP had been updated was in 1983, so it's not a document that Indiana historically has kept up to date and on the cutting edge of water program technology; it's going to be quite a transition for IDEM to move into this watershed based framework where things are operating on the watershed basis. Fundamentally this document, the CPP is supposed to take out the ambiguity as to how all the water related programs work together; it is supposed to clearly define how wastewater NPDES permits, CSO Control Plans, Stormwater Phase II, 319 Grants, Watershed projects, etc. are all supposed to be working together in a (inaudible) program and this rule and it's requirements for

continuing plan process says that Indiana will have to have a document that clearly spells out how all of its programs are going to work together toward one common goal.

Mr. Spiars asked if they were going to divide their staff into teams to stay with a watershed or region.

Mr. Hall stated that decisions have not been made in that regard yet.

Mr. Spiars asked if the impairments are comparing White River choices.

Mr. Hall stated that they have e-coli dissolved to oxygen and the general impaired by communities listing.

Mr. Spiars asked if this typically means one or two types of pollutants.

Mr. Hall stated that you can't tie a specific pollutant to impairment by community. As IDEM, through their 305E process is doing their assessment of water quality for impaired streams, they are identifying water quality standards violations, but they are not identifying causes or sources. Fundamentally EPA and States, when they were doing TMDLs, are doing allocations of pollutants between point sources and non-point sources. Currently there is no regulatory mechanism for EPA or the State to go back to the farmer and tell him he was causing a problem; the Watershed Rule, as it is being revised currently, has a mechanism that would allow them to go back to the individual basis in terms of developing pollutant loads.

Construction and Development Effluent Guidelines Proposed Rule – EPA was sued; they were to make a decision on all SIC (Standard Industrial Classifications) codes needed effluent discharge limits. They give three options; either let Stormwater Phase II do its thing and don't worry about it, let Stormwater Phase II inspections in compliance enforcement reports determine whether construction activities were impairing or not impairing waterways or if you need effluent limits for construction activities. If they decide to go with effluent limitations, Stormwater Phase II communities and S4s will not only be required to watch their developers, but ensure that their effluent limits associated with the BMPs that they install and they will have to ensure that monitoring is occurring and that discharge limits are being met and that whole enforcement is worked into their enforcement compliance. They are accepting comments on this so any Storm II communities that they know or represent may want to send a letter saying that they prefer to let Storm Phase II do its thing first approach.

**Set Meeting Date:**

The next meeting is set for Thursday July 10, 2003 at 2:00 PM.

The meeting was adjourned.

---

Kenton C. Ward  
UWRWA Technical Committee Chairman