



Upper White River Watershed Alliance, Inc.
July 26, 2007

The meeting was called to order at 2:08 PM Thursday, July 26, 2007. Those present were as follows: Mr. Kenton C. Ward, Hamilton County Surveyor; Mr. Robert Thompson, Hamilton County Surveyor's Office; Ms. Jill Hoffman, Empower Results; Lisa Bihl, Empower Results; Robert Barr, IUPUI; Larry Stout, Hamilton County ISSD; Angelo J. Dattilo, Williams Creek; Stephen Goodman, City of Anderson; William Savage, City of Elwood; Zach Bishton, Christopher Burke Engineering; Jennifer Boyle, Indiana Association of SWCD; and Jerry Bridges, McCog.

Review of Minutes of May 24, 2007:

Changes were made; the minutes were approved as amended.

UWRWA Golf Outing:

Hoffman stated that the total profit from the golf outing was \$7,376.00. We made about \$566.00 selling auction items, the contest brought in \$498.00 and registrations, with sponsors and teams brought in \$11,850.00, which gave us a total revenue of \$12,914.00. The expenses we had were visors, food and signs for the poles; take home was approximately \$7,300.00.

Barr asked if the golf outing brought any new members in?

Hoffman stated that there were three new memberships. The brochure on membership was at the sign up table and is on the website now. The brochure includes the dues and a little bit about what we're doing. We ended up with approximately 23 teams and 13 sponsors. We have a few pictures on the website with more coming.

White River Restoration Projects Update:

Thompson stated that Carl wasn't able to make it today, but they had their last restoration meeting on July 11th. They thought that might be the last meeting, but CILTI wasn't able to purchase the Prater property. They have some back up plans that Carl will be working on so there will probably be at least one more meeting.

Barr stated that they had dollars left for the Prater property, which is an in-holding. There are some sites near Burr Oak Bend that CILTI already owns.

LARE Grant Draft Scope of Services:

Hoffman stated that we have a draft scope for the Committee to look at today. The plan is to put this project out for public bid in the next two weeks, depending on how long it takes to get comments in. Our membership functioning at the Board level was asked to look at the scope and provide comments. IDNR is providing comments as well, which I have with me today. We need to look at the scope to make sure, from the Technical Committee's perspective, that some of our other project perspectives that might be served by this grant are met as much as possible. We talked a lot about a Mitigation Clearinghouse before, so some of the syntheses of that information could be met by GIS layers being put together for this. LARE (Lake and River Enhancement) is

the IDNR funded Grant project that funded this project and by their requirements we need to seek at least three bids on the proposal. There is a list of approved contractors and Lenore is planning on sending letters to everyone on that list. The officers will probably look at the bids. The Grant was for \$81,000.00, there is a 10% match on it, which brings the total up to \$90,000.00. Up to 5% of that can be provided in in-kind service so we will probably be doing a lot of that. In order to send out the request for proposals to consultants we need to solidify the scope because the scope will go out with that letter. We sought the Grant through the fish kill settlement to do riparian corridor assessment, but we didn't get it. We did get the LARE Grant, which now means that a lot of the objectives are trying to get pushed into one Grant. The larger objective being that we start pulling together information that could work as a watershed management plan that would be somewhere down the road except for EPA's targeted watershed money. IDNR understands the scale of this and how big it is; they've never done a project this big before so we're messaging the scope with them. The scope I got back from them today has a lot of other things added into it so we're going to have to work on that negotiation.

Ward asked what the timeline for this was?

Hoffman stated that she was hoping to get the proposal out early August and get proposals back in by mid to late August. The officers could review them, make selections and announce that at their next quarterly meeting and be ready to go at that point.

Ward asked what the timeline was for the Grant?

Hoffman stated that there is no end date on the Grant, but if we want to stay within the LARE funding cycle the Grants are due at the end of January. If we were to start this fall we'd probably spend a year and three months to make sure we were done by December of 2008 so we could apply in January of 2009 for the next round of LARE funding if something comes out if this.

Thompson stated that this fall or spring the Office of Water Quality sent out a letter to the MS4's and probably other watershed groups to consolidate and ask for copies of their water quality data. Is that information part of what we are trying to gather?

Hoffman stated that she wasn't sure. I didn't know they requested specifics or from who.

Barr stated that in many ways this is a parallel request. One of the objectives of this is to get the water quality data from the different MS4s to find out who's collecting it, who's got what and how long those data runs are. That's exactly what EPA's Office of Water is trying to do. Who's actually monitoring these things, how frequently and what are they monitoring for? There is a list of parameters they are suppose to be monitoring for, but there is some question about how that is being stored. There has been no attempt to synthesize a lot of it. The Center of Watershed Protection has been heavily funded by EPA to investigate and figure out what the next steps in this process are going to be.

Hoffman stated that \$81,000.00 isn't enough to do a full assessment of even the water quality data. It's going to be taking the data that looks like it has some longevity to it, coming from reasonable sources and look at trends. It's not really specific; it's more like what the long term trends over some subset of these data sources. We have to be reasonable about it. To look at it, on the eleven digit level, is there one, six or how ever many of these eleven digits that seem like the trends in them are downward in terms of quality. Bob had put together a map of numerous sites so we're not seeking any new data. Any efforts with this part of the grant are going to look at larger trends than what we have. This GIS development is a big chunk of it because what we

have now is every county, municipality, etc. with their own layers within their own jurisdictional boundaries. There is a GIS project on our website that was originally designed to be an interactive GIS, but we had some limited success with everybody putting data into it. That project links people to each counties GIS so it's always up to date, but currently there is only three counties with information in that GIS on our website. Because it goes out to their GIS system and then comes back it's slow. Most people who are in the GIS world of users don't use it because they would rather construct their own. This won't be adding to that interactive GIS, it will just be creating the layers for download; people can put them into their own systems for analysis or use them at the county level along with data we already have. It will cross jurisdictional boundaries. IDNR added to the list I had started in the draft scope based on the notes from the Technical Committee about what we were hoping to gather long term for understanding problems, restoration areas or things related to the Mitigation Clearinghouse idea. IDNR wants a table of the sub-watershed acreages, land use categories by acreage and percent of watershed area, past and current treatment plant dischargers, point sources to inlet streams, output from the land use in Central Indiana LUCY model and existing and historic wetlands and potential areas for mitigation and restoration, which will have to go back for negotiations, and public access sites and other major natural resource based recreational amenities. Today we need to know what this Technical Committee thinks of essential elements to some of our other projects or what we've been talking about. IDNR would like an assessment of institutional resources, which I asked for clarification on because I've done that on LARE projects before; this is a list of who's who, who are the players and who are the organizations in the area. They want a prioritization of potential projects. This is not the same as 319, this is not the scale of backyard BMP kind of recommendations and they understand that, but they want to make sure that the people working on the project would then say what are the next potential Grant opportunities, what are the next steps, who to coordinate with next; thinking forward and not let it end with the collection of layers and trends. IDNR increased the public meetings to three and they added in creating a public information handout, which I will try to negotiate out as well. I heard briefly from Tim Method today, who is on the Board for the City of Indianapolis, how he would like to see something put in on how to get municipalities in a communication pattern; whether we meet with them throughout this project or set up a forum, more or less, where they could get information from other municipalities.

Ward stated that this is very ambitious for \$90,000.00.

Hoffman stated that if the Technical Committee had to prioritize the list of things, could we do that? We had been talking, historically, about the clearinghouse idea and drummed up a number of what we thought were key layers to help target where restoration should be done. Maybe this is more reasonable than it appears once you get into some of the big documents.

Barr stated that just the manipulation of the data is going to be huge. Who would actually bid on this? You'll need a firm that's GIS heavy, and that restricts it. You will also need a firm that has the ability to do the historic water quality synthesis, which is a separate skill set. That final summary document is ambitious.

Bishton asked if prioritization was really an option? If we prioritize, narrow the list down and come back to IDNR, will we get anywhere with that?

Hoffman stated that she didn't know. When we went after the Grant I was interested in it being a way to fill in a couple of pieces for a watershed plan, not do a watershed plan. That may be some of the conversation we need to have. Gwinn said they don't just want a GIS database and I understand that from a planning perspective, but at the same time that's a big step. If that was the end goal that's a significant step forward to cross over jurisdictions and get a zoning layer that everybody can see.

Thompson asked who would use this information? The public water supply and wellhead protection zones are not for public consumption.

Hoffman stated that you can't publish that, but depending on what capacity you're working they'll give you the information. It's important for recharge areas.

Bishton stated that part of is important to everyone and other parts have restricted access.

Thompson stated that floodplains and floodways would be high priority because that seems to be lacking good data and uniform data.

Barr stated that Thompson is right, but the danger in that is if we read in our scope, what we are suggesting is that we are going to collect and synthesize. We're going to gather existing data, but I'm afraid as we go down through the system they don't exist. If you really want a watershed scale coverage of floodplains and floodways the first step is to identify what coverage's exist and for different areas this will vary. You then have to see where you have holes and if you want complete coverage you'll have to build it. Across the State right now they are in the process of re-delineating and re-designating floodplains and floodways. It's a work in progress and that's a huge FEMA initiative.

Ward stated that even with ours, it's not the entire county. We just identified the areas that we're having rapid growth in.

Thompson stated that the MS4 Communities either have or are in the midst of mapping their storm sewers or regulated drains so that's a work in progress and it changes everyday in Hamilton County.

Hoffman asked if some of these items were more important? We need to take the comments back to IDNR and let them know what is most useful to our group and this is what's realistic given that these on the list are a moving target that we can't chase or this is what it looks like and maybe I should go find some supplemental funds. If we can't cut the scope we need to figure out how to get what we want.

Bridges asked if Hoffman has fired this scope off to any vendors to see what they might give her as a price?

Hoffman stated that she did not.

Bridges stated that on our GIS you can't do this for \$90,000.00. Nobody would touch it. I don't even think the university could do it for that price.

Barr stated that we are interested to see who would bid on it because we thought that IUPUI could do it only by using grad students, but otherwise we didn't think we could do it.

Thompson stated that in Section I, Synthesizing the Data, that's big.

Barr stated that if we had to pick out things we could do, that we thought we could bid and accomplish for this amount of money, that is certainly one that could be done; to actually synthesize the data and see what was out there from the determined problem areas, potentially developed problem areas and hot spots using that data.

Thompson stated that Number I could come into Number II; you get the data and then map the data.

Hoffman stated that when you get the data the natural inclination is, if this eleven digit is problematic, what do we know about it? What might that be?

Bishton stated that current zoning and future zoning would be good to have.

Hoffman stated that she didn't have a sense of what it will take to round up some of the data.

Ward stated that some of that data is going to be in your comp plans.

Hoffman stated that the comp plans are holding a lot of this information.

Thompson asked if some of this data was available at the State level? How current is that data?

Barr stated that our experience with sewer and un-sewered areas is that it's painful to get from the towns. It's not something that they divulge easily, particularly the un-sewered; that's always a little sensitive and a lot of it is unknown, which is the reason for some of the sensitivity behind it. There are maps, but they're not right, but there are no dollars to go out and map them.

Bridges stated that Park County hadn't been the recipient of the first agreed order on it; _____ is polluted and they hired Baker & Daniels to come in and negotiate the agreed order to just tighten up because they were concerned that this was going to be _____ twice and for IDEM to go out to any county that had problems where they could find issues of E.Coli coming from a drain into public waterways and slap them with an agreed order; the subdivision is eight miles out from the closest utility; you're either going to have to close the drain or sewer it. That's not an answer, but that tends to be their answer. IDEM didn't care what it was going to cost. Unfortunately for us the inspector they had for IDEM used to work for our Health Department; he copied all the records he had from Madison County and knew where all our violation spots were. We've been pounded to death while Marion County wasn't pounded at all. The biggest violator in the state is Marion County. Every time we turned around the inspector was giving another Agreed Order; there are far more septic systems in Marion County than there are in Madison County, so if you're going to enforce lets go where the biggest violator is; that's not going to happen. In our county we have a good idea of where it is, but I don't necessarily know if we want that to be shared with the State because of the Agreed Orders. IDEM doesn't care and counties aren't in the business to sewer. IDEM said that this was our problem, fix it, but they don't want to provide any money to fix it.

Barr stated that the counties are often sensitive as well.

Goodman asked about point source discharges, like CSO's?

Barr stated that they are valuable to have and the data is available at the State level. Those have been publicly identified so we don't have much trouble finding those.

Bridges stated that Indianapolis has a lot of agreements. Madison County has agreements with Hamilton County, Delaware County and Hancock County for data sharing, but Marion County has it for all nine. Some of this information they may have and they may have access to. In Indianapolis, _____ was working on a recent land use that is currently doing that. HNTB has been hired to collect everybody's comp plans to see, on a countywide basis, what their zoning was on that. In some of the GIS systems in the 11 county area, a lot of this may exist. I would look at asking us to provide information back to you in some type of format or you can put together something for a spreadsheet; fire back what you have for me and you can sort it. This will at least give you a reference point because that's something we could do without a lot of effort instead of paying a consultant to go through that initial step. This would give us an idea of what is available and what format it's available in. Hamilton County's data is available on the internet; most of Madison County's is available, but you can't download the raw data file. We don't make our raw data files available very often. If it's a project for government, we'll provide that information.

Hoffman asked Bridges if he suggested sending a list of some of these things and asking up front.

Bridges stated that he would send it to their GIS coordinators and ask them what information on this list do you have, what format, is it in ESRI or not. Some of this might get us further down the road and then we might have an idea what to take off or leave on. Madison County is working on their drainage right now.

Hoffman stated that we could do that and maybe adjust the scope to focus on certain counties or take some things off this list.

Barr stated that this is a good idea and the City of Indianapolis does have everything they could get their hands on for the greater metropolitan area. The interesting aspect of that is obtained using a series of agreements. These are data that we're going to pull together to use for this long range planning. Whether or not they will let us have any of that, I don't know.

Bridges stated that he believes they would. This is for public purpose.

Hoffman asked if someone could regulate something that is paid for with public funds?

Barr stated that he believes that the City would determine what they could give us from their data, but I believe they would say for other counties please talk to their representative.

Bridges stated that to be fair to them, from their perspective, they have to have permission from the County that gave them permission to share with anybody else. On the source data, almost anyone will provide map graphic data, but whether they want to provide you with the source information; what we would really like is the source information so you can manipulate it.

Ward stated that there are also counties that don't have GIS.

Barr stated that this sounds remarkably like another project where we weren't able to do all of this. Has something changed?

Hoffman stated that the project was more the development of the mechanism to have an interactive situation.

Ward stated that was the initial; we wanted to add on and bring some of those other counties in. We basically have the three counties.

Thompson stated that it might have been lack of perceived value to it. Part of this project, to characterize the water quality for a period of time, fits in right exactly where IDEM wants the Phase II communities to be assessing their water quality over a period of time, in this case, a public permit cycle; we're supposed to be doing that. As perceived value of the Upper White in this project to MS4's, this project could show each community where their water quality is heading and in what direction; you're meeting your permit requirements.

Hoffman stated that she is as overwhelmed as the entire group is, but I believe we need to think about what our angle is. What we are trying to do in general is get enough information to show some direction that we can continue to seek and leverage other funds in some sense of watershed planning. Is it exactly this? I don't know that it has to be. We have to be improving our understanding of what's going on; that's the long, broad end range goal. How do we do that? All of this would improve our understanding of what's going on, but there may be things between this and nothing that would serve that purpose as well to help us understand regionally what's happening with water quality instead of continuing to fund the local 319's that are looking at small water when the source water coming in is already bad.

Bridges asked if we reduced the scope on this would they still be willing to look at it as fundable?

Hoffman stated that she needed to talk to them about some of the things the Committee is sharing with them about some entities not divulging this information, that it will require lots of communication between shared agreements and that some of this is not available.

Bridges stated that to him this would be a good enough proposal to see if EPA would be interested because you're looking at it from a regional perspective and you're not just talking about your permit requirements. You're also talking about long term watershed safety and the quality of water. I would think that this is something that could be dovetailed into this; maybe we can get some Lily money. You would think that there might be, from a long term perspective as an employer in the region, some interested in it. We already made the top ten list for air quality and we certainly don't want to be known as one of the top ten for dirty water.

Thompson stated that Lily endowments have tended to shy away from environmental projects in the past; I don't know if that's changed. We've had two representatives from Lily on the Board from time to time.

Bridges stated that he would think the Chamber would have an interest in this. I don't see it as an anti/pro; I see it as a pro-quality of life pro-bro issue. They might be willing to sponsor some of it. I believe the Board of Realtors might have an interest in this. The more people you put into the region the more the demand there is on the supply you have. I've ask my GIS guy repeatedly what IDNR, who knows where you're developing in a region, has done about recharge areas. The Hudson River has protection zones specifically for recharge areas, where they have restrictions. If you're a county like us where you need growth, you hate to say that an area is blanketed off because it's a major recharge area, but where are you going to recharge your aqua from if you build over it; you're not going to build over it or you're not going to be able to have

the recharge at the same rate. In our county, all public water supplies are from an underground source; nobody in our county draws out of the White River.

Hoffman stated that the first step is to go back to the counties and try to round up what information they have on this list, talk with IDNR about some of these issues and how hard some of this is going to be to get. I also heard someone say that the synthesis piece is also important in terms of a land use piece because it would also meet some of the MS4 issues. Maybe that task gets as much attention as the others.

Ward asked if there were hydric soils on the comp plans.

Barr stated that hydric soils are variable by county and depending on which county you're in hydric soils and the HELs exist in one county on a glued up board where they've taken the county soil survey and marked on there; you can go in and look at it, but you can't have it.

Hoffman stated that a lot of them have already been done with the new soil marks by NRCS. I know they have a full hydric layer.

Thompson stated that a lot of the watershed studies he's been involved with, in five years, usually included hydric soils and point sources as part of the exhibit.

Bishton stated that the question is, have they been done in all the counties in the Upper White shed?

Hoffman stated that she believed that they were all available.

Bridges stated that depending on the depth of what they paid for a comp plan, they may make a copy; most of it wasn't digital before so what you normally find is that they may have scanned it in as a J-Peg or maybe a TIF and then overlay it; that's the extent of your soils map. We have ours available now, but it wasn't there when the comp plan was done; we scanned an image.

Hoffman stated that LARE limits you; the largest single project can be \$100,000.00, so we knew we were up against that cap and setting the budget at \$90,000.00 was pushing it. As many of the pieces we can fill in, talk with IDEM and see how they feel about putting in, potentially, a 319 to round out some of these other pieces or talk to some of our other partners to see what they might be willing to do.

Ward asked if they could get utility boundaries out of the utility rigatory.

Stout stated that electric has just recently been completed.

Bridges stated that a lot of your GIS's in your counties may or may not have them. If they are contiguous to a corporate boundary it's pretty simple, but if they're not contiguous then the question is how far outside did they go on that boundary for that jurisdiction. IDEM should have sewer because that's regulated, but there is no limit to water districts.

Thompson stated that Hamilton Southeastern Utilities have a pretty good GIS system.

Bridges stated that this should be left on the list and contact our GIS coordinators to see if they have any of that. Even if they had partial boundaries you're a step ahead.

Barr stated that the comment about going through this data list and seeing what we can grab is right at the top of the list. If we've got to build these things it becomes undoable. If we can check off a bunch of these that are available, for example the IDNR land trust easements. IDEM is going to have the 319 watersheds.

Bridges stated that IDEM will give you other information they took off their website after 9-11 provided that you're not putting it on a public website. One important item that is that some information you may want to have public on your site and some other items we may be able to access through a back door, but not open to the general public. Most people don't want you to know where their wellheads are. Some of that information may require an agreement, but as long as they know there is confidentiality with it they would probably release that information.

Goodman asked if this committee had a legal department.

Bridges stated that IUPUI has agreements with quite a few places in terms of confidentiality. Somebody would probably be able to provide some legal services for us; we're not for profit aren't we?

Hoffman stated that we have used legal services for our tax issues; pro-bono help.

Bridges asked if Hoffman would care if he fired this document off to someone to get a price on it.

Hoffman stated that right now it's gone to the Technical Committee and it will go to the Board, but that's as far as we're taking it right now. I'd be happy to get some other insight.

Clean Water Indiana Funding-SWCD-Watersheds:

Ward stated that today we have Jennifer Boyle, Executive Director of the Indiana Association of Soil & Water Conservation Districts to talk to us about the upcoming program for the watersheds.

Boyle stated that it would be helpful, before I delve into Clean Water Indiana funding, to get an idea of what information this group might find most relevant with what's been going on.

Hoffman stated that there is a proposal right now that will dictate the way Clean Water Indiana funds get spent. A variety of watershed groups lobbied to get these funds that were sold to the legislature as local funds that were going to be divvied out to the Soil & Water Conservation Districts. The way this relates to the Stormwater issues is that some of the Districts had in the past or wanted to use those for some of their Rule 5 enforcement, some of the Stormwater stuff, sort of creative local projects to meet their local needs. There is now a proposal up for vote by the State Soil Conservation Board that would look at using those funds to put on what originally they were calling watershed agents. These people would have coverage areas that were somewhere equivalent or bigger than the eight digit watershed scale and they would work out of the Department of Agriculture. That raised a lot of questions for how watershed groups like us and our partnerships with IDEM would fit into this new plan.

Boyle stated that the Soil Conservation Board held five region meetings throughout the state to get feedback from our local Soil & Water Conservation Districts and any other partners that were interested. We have a lot of cities and other organizations that partner with our local Soil & Water Conservation Districts to do projects. This doesn't affect one entity; it's pretty widespread in terms of how the Clean Water Indiana Funds are going to be administered. Hoffman attended the last meeting we held in Indianapolis. This Technical Committee knows how hard it is to work in an eight digit watershed scale. That's what we're trying to get across to the State Soil

Conservation Board that the proposal is to put 23 watershed agents' technicians out there consolidating the 32 eight digit watersheds into 23. In addition to that a new Watershed Advisory Board would be formed within that eight digit watershed to prioritize what that individual would be working on in that area. This is an entire new layer of bureaucracy. The Upper White Technical Committee is already set up, has been going and we have all these other 319 projects going on with their own watershed groups and committees. Each of the local SWCD's has a board. Hoffman was able to give some very good comments about the difficulty of bringing the folks together, getting people to talk, how you work across county lines, etc. This group has the potential to show how difficult this would be. The seven citizen members of the State Soil Conservation Board, do they know enough to make a decision like this? What we are potentially losing is the Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program, which is in the Upper White River. This is a federal program that has the potential to bring a 4 to 1 match back to the State in terms of dollars, but the State has to put money into that program. This is part of what Clean Water Indiana has been doing, but it's been very slow for people to get on board with and take advantage of. Economics have changed with corn prices and soy bean prices and most farmers don't make a decision over night. We don't want to see a two year old program all of a sudden get cut off. Another part that could go away is the Clean Water Indiana Grants. This is where the Districts can apply for funding to do particular projects. One of the categories is that you need partnerships, depending on the relationships this Committee has built with local Soil & Water Conservation Districts in the counties within the watershed, if those Grants are taken away, there's another resource you're losing now to potentially partner up to do some of these other things. The State Soil Conservation is taking comments on a website and the comment period ends tomorrow. They've overwhelmed everyone with the amount of information they put up here in a very short frame of time. If anyone would like to make some brief comments they give you the email address of where to submit those. When you hear from the Districts they want the money at the local level because they are already working on identifying resource concerns. They are already trying to work with their fellow counties across boundaries and already have other groups formed so provide them with the dollars they need to actually implement the things they have already identified. We had a lot of other groups lobbying for this money in addition to our Districts and they also feel this is not what we told the legislatures. This group is an example of what we're going to face. Our other concern is what will be addressed beyond that.

Bridges stated that you're going to end up creating another layer of government that is most likely not going to do us a lot of good. In a non-profit like this, supposedly we'll eventually get a little more substantive in terms of where we're at. There's a lot more flexibility in terms of how we want to handle contract services, people volunteering services, etc. We deal with State agencies almost all the time and they have their hands full as it is. One guy for this size area isn't going to do it. When we bring the state in, and we work with them all the time, the problem you end up with is there comes no flexibility and everything becomes top down and prescriptive.

Hoffman stated that her concern is that as she is sitting at the Department of Agriculture that it's going to be mostly focused on technical expertise, filter strips, waterways, etc. for programs we already have when my experience with watersheds, this one in particular, is the large amount of urban issues that don't have any funding sources because they cut MS4's off from getting any money. If the Districts do want to take on a creative demonstration project, Stormwater or anything that's related to urban practices, we can do it under Clean Water Indiana when it's under that Grant Program if they would loosen up the policies. There's no governing board, no authority that says you can't, like there is with 319. If these people become part of the Department of Agriculture, my fear is that it's just more money focused at agriculture when what I see in the watersheds is need for urban focus, need for education focus, need for industry, interfacing or forums, etc.

Thompson stated that you have the urbanized areas and another issue crawling in is the MS4 Program; they are not eligible for these things.

Hoffman stated that the letter she wrote, she didn't write on behalf of the Upper White, because the time frame was so short, so I didn't have a chance to go to the Board and this Committee to ask if this was the shared feeling of the group, but I believe Jennifer is write in the sense that we're really unique statewide in that we are attempting to work at this level. What it has taken from my perspective are the details of my contractor, part time. I spend most of my weekends doing Upper White stuff. I couldn't do any of it if I didn't have partners doing the web stuff or didn't have partners at Veolia. This proposal got put together without any coordination with IDEM because IDEM isn't technically part of the conservation partnership.

Boyle stated that this was put together without any other input from the Indiana Conservation Partnership. This was solely the Division of Soil Conservation and supposedly the State Soil Conservation Board. Unfortunately, our federal partner, NRCS, ourselves and Purdue Extension were all left out of any discussion on this. This Committee can come from the perspective of the challenge of working in an eight digit watershed of this scope and size. What truly are your needs? What are your needs within this watershed? You can definitely say you know you have urban watershed needs and work with MS4's. It doesn't have to be something you're saying for or against this proposal, but that you need them to think about these things as you're making this decision. I think it would help a lot for them to hear from you. Jill's comments are really good and we also have Farm Bureau, Indiana Conservation Alliance and some individual groups like Pheasants Forever. I see it as a big loss of opportunity for a group like this if those Clean Water Indiana dollars are put into State staff. It doesn't give you any opportunity to even look to the Districts to partner on some projects. What's going to happen to the CREP Program in the Upper White?

Hoffman stated that what's on the line is about \$500,000.00 per year. That's new money, not to mention the money they had before when they cut over 20 positions from the Department of Agriculture the first time around. That money and the new money are going into this proposal.

Boyle stated that the actual cost is about \$1.7 million for the first year. The first year is to buy trucks, computer laptops and all the equipment they need. You're still looking at \$1.4 million thereafter.

Hoffman stated that we need to be careful not to say that we don't want attention or staff put into watershed planning issues or that we don't think it's important to work at the regional level. This group needs to share a comment to the extent of the challenges. What we think we could get for the money, what flexibility we might lose and what you think the needs are. It's been a short turn around in public comment and the comment period officially closes tomorrow. The State Soil Board meets in two weeks. This kind of got fast tracked and caught us all off guard.

Ward asked what kind of impact would somebody really have on an eight digit?

Barr stated that there was a lot of conversation at the Guide meeting. There were a couple of watershed groups talking about how some group had been going back and forth with themselves about which size they could manage. What could they effectively staff and what could they pull together to coordinate and communicate the watershed issues for the State?

Boyle stated that it is the Department of Agriculture that is trying to do this. Their responsibility for non-point source and watershed management is with IDEM. They clearly have the authority to be working in that area. One of the big concerns is the duplication of efforts, especially with creating a new Watershed Advisory Board.

Bishton asked how these positions would be funded?

Boyle stated that the current budget is for two years. They are trying to say that the money will be there, but unless we lobby for that money; if this passes I'm not lobbying. There are serious implications with this and they are trying to say that these positions would still be there after two years and I believe that means that more money would be taken out of Clean Water. If we don't get the \$1,000,000.00 over the two years of new money again then that's more money that comes out of Clean Water.

Bridges stated that they tried to do this with economic development districts and it's since been trashed. It was there for two years and then trashed. Those are expensive mistakes because they send people out staffed and then basically in most cases almost put a gun to people's head and said 'you will share an office with them', and you're paying for the expense for them being in your office. Who knows, that may be what they do; they may come to a place like Madison County or Hamilton County and say 'you find a space for them'. We're always skeptical when we deal with the State. We deal with them on DOT issues all the time and there again, we have a good working relationship with them, but you always have to wonder if there's some agenda you don't know about sometimes. The other issue is here we're trying to make decisions that we think are best for us; this is the most rapidly growing area in the State of Indiana, it has special needs; are we going to get special needs treatment if they decide to go to 23 districts; my answer is probably 'no'. There are real issues and I don't think people realize what those issues are.

Hoffman stated that her perception was, having been at the meeting, that it sounded like a lot of the Districts were saying 'don't take our money', which I agree with. There are also other potential impacts that people outside of the Districts look like they're looking for their cash back, need to say, question, ask or figure out if they're going to sit on another cross county board or how much time you have available to participate.

Boyle stated that we have two programs that have been in place for two years with the CREP and the Grants Program that are working. Why are they trying to fix something if it's not broken? Why are they trying to change something if it's not broken? To be able to quickly utilize \$1,000,000.00 over the next two years, why would you not want to use two programs that are already in place and go with it?

Bridges stated that he might try to shoot some quick bullet point comments, but my question is whether it would help to send them to your legislatures and say I don't think this was the _____ real intent?

Boyle stated that a lot of the Districts have gotten in touch with their legislatures and some of them have already responded with comments. I hope the Districts will be including all of their comments.

Hoffman stated that on the chance they don't accept this proposal we may end up being engaged in a bigger discussion. If there is a lot of objection, what do you want to do? I've been so vocal about what we're trying to do on an eight digit with huge discrepancies and income across counties and land use across counties. Even if they listen to a majority of the people and they don't vote it through we'll be back to heated discussions or debate about what happens to the money.

Technical Committee Short-Term Plan of Work:

Hoffman stated that this is what Kent, Bog and I came up with when we worked on the strategic plan about what Committees would do. We had a few conversations about how we want to have a clear path for this Technical Committee to keep working on projects at our meetings.

Ward stated that one of the things he would like to push on with is the Mitigation Clearinghouse and also the BMP Guidance. On the BMP Guidance I feel the State is doing a lousy job in getting that out. It's been four years.

Hoffman stated that she spoke with Randy about it and it's going to be pretty traditional; black and white cross sections. He indicated to me not to expect something amazing or what I think a lot of our groups would like to see.

Ward stated that in order to help the folks out there, especially the MS4's I would like to push this on and try to get something done in that regard. Basically building on what we had before, adding some real meat to it. We have a good skeleton outline, but we need to start adding to it. On the Mitigation Clearinghouse I would like to continue with that. I believe this is something that has a good possibility of bringing developer types and engineering firms into it. They are the ones with the money. We could help meet their needs and probably help meet some of the needs of the landowners in the watershed too.

Hoffman stated that not knowing where exactly the LARE Grant is going, there is some potential crossover to knock out some of these items and maybe even some of the things we were hoping to develop for tools for the Mitigation Clearinghouse. Potentially there is a relationship with those Grant products. The Data Subcommittee, we don't know right now what some of our members or potential members might want or need in terms of what they are required to report. We talked about, at one of our next meetings, asking some of the people reporting those things to come in; that may go to a subcommittee type scenario like the point source discharges. What are they reporting in terms of water quality? What are the MS4's reporting? The issues here are some of the standard datasets and formats and who has what. That seemed to be a potential subcommittee topic. The Technical Committee might have a couple of speakers come in and talk about what we know we have going on. Our Committee meetings need to be working meetings because our general meetings we committed to having some sort of educational program, some networking stuff and updates from all the committees. This is where we need to start cranking out some products. We thought we could make some headway with the BMP. We talked about having that become a subcommittee, but our Committee isn't that big.

Thompson stated that our Stormwater Standards Committee has, over the past two months, been looking at this with the realization that the State Manual is probably going to be a ways off and highly diluted. Siavash Beik, with our Stormwater Committee, has taken some preliminary looks at the BMP's and the list. He's also looking at what we consider the top six sets of existing material and kind of narrowed it down to one in Connecticut realizing that it will need to be tailor made to Central Indiana in the Upper White regions. Getting with Greg Hoyes, our Standards Committee Chair, and reaching out to other engineers or whomever's responsible in each MS4 that want to participate in this to get on that Committee. This would be an Upper White Committee, but maybe made up of the representatives from the MS4's.

Hoffman stated that she has had a lot of success creating graphics that are meaningful and show these BMPs in real landscapes and talking about material mixes. We need to take this to a level that communicates with people and not just engineers, that cities get it and be able to do things with their parking lots, etc.

Bridges stated that he has a lot of good graphics people. If Hoffman can get us the information he would be willing to volunteer it and if we have enough lead time I would be willing to volunteer my folks to try to put it together so we can put boards or whatever else you want so they can provide that. You can have fax sheets, display boards, etc. Put it together where they can read it by 8 ½ x 11 format or they can blow it up by 3x4 which would allow you to have a public meeting for displays as well as have them there or put on websites.

Hoffman asked if this is where the Technical Committee starts focusing; in our meetings we get you some information to look at ahead of time and when we come in here we work on these things. We're at a point where I would like our committees to start working on production because our organization is up and running to handle organizational issues at the big meetings.

Thompson stated that there will be three hurdles to look at; one is the graphics and design; two is how to build it; three regulatory issues because some of these do conflict with city ordinances, drainage standards, etc. There is more than meets the eye.

Barr stated that most of the time when we're dealing with Stormwater BMP's or any type of structures at all, we ultimately have to fall back to some kind of EPA approved design or the Center for Watershed Protection; almost all Stormwater issues go back to that ultimately. We have to be able to link back to that work.

Thompson stated that he believes that what we chose as a group of standards met those requirements and as a place to start, not a stopping point.

Barr stated that he noticed that EPA Stormwater Center has a whole new green infrastructure front end; they have this whole new set of things you can look at; we could populate website after website with just that information alone.

Hoffman stated that people don't have time to go through all of that. Our effort needs to provide them something sort of synthesized, simplistic fact sheets, good graphics, etc.

Barr stated that the general rule in Stormwater is that everything is unique.

Hoffman stated that conceptually it's all the same ingredients; you're just mixing them up on the landscape.

Barr stated that the science is pretty easy; it's the implementation that's difficult. This is the starting point and it has to be taken from here. The critical piece we always seem to be missing in Stormwater, anytime, is the coordination with that local MS4. The information is out there; we could sit here and look at BMP's until we go blind looking at the computer screen. What is their application, how much money do they have and what can be put in? Somehow we need to figure out how to meet that need. I don't know how we do it. I don't know if we offer to have them come in and talk with them. Just to offer a format where they feel comfortable to come in and chat. Many of these communities don't have a consulting engineer that they can call on to answer. You want to reach those who can't afford it or don't have it.

Hoffman stated that there is a lot about 'is there a general application' and 'where can it be used?' We just did that thing with the Eagle Creek Group in front of the Solid Waste District and the people sitting up there all acted like they'd never even heard of these concepts and those are the people sitting on town councils and plan commissions. They're not going to turn around and ask for creative solutions or infiltration related practices when they haven't even heard of them or have no sense of how they fit into their landscapes.

Barr stated that they are going to be dissuaded from them by a number of the firms.

Hoffman stated that as we start the work on this, if we are going to work on this, we need to look at it from a couple of audiences. Some of it is educational and some of it is technical. People that are waiting on the manual are looking for a technical piece and there are a lot of other people waiting on a 'show me how this works'.

Bridges stated that if somebody locally has an ordinance that deals with one of them; even if you can show it to them and depict that, it gets them to thinking in that framework they may still want to do some of their own due diligence.

Hoffman stated that she will try to reach out to some of the key engineers that she knows are working in this area and see if they will join this discussion. Plan to have this as the focus for the next couple of meetings with any other updates on the LARE.

Barr stated that it would be interesting to know who the on-call engineer is for the different MS4's. It would be interesting to find out from them what they perceive is the need. You've had community representatives that are told to hire an engineer or consultant to take care of a problem and that consulting firm needs to take care of the problem in the most efficient and affective way to satisfy the client's needs. They will deliver what they feel they can best deliver for the dollar those people have. They may not always choose a creative solution because they don't feel that they have enough money to mess with that and don't want to stand behind it, worried about maintenance.

Thompson stated that there are a number of BMP's that people are using now; unless you have a client or regulator pushing you in one direction or another that's where it's going to stay.

Next Meeting Date:

The next meeting was set for Thursday, September 20, 2007 at 2:00 p.m. in Noblesville.

Kenton C. Ward, CFM
Hamilton County Surveyor

Attest: _____
Executive Secretary