

Upper White River Watershed Alliance, Inc.  
Technical Committee Minutes  
August 29<sup>th</sup>, 2002

The meeting was called to order at 2:05 PM Thursday August 29, 2002. Those present were as follows: Mr. Kenton Ward, Hamilton County Surveyor; Mr. Robert Thompson, Hamilton County Surveyor's Office; Mr. Marcus Turner, American Consulting; Mr. Robert Shumowsky, Madison County Council of Government; Mr. Jerry Bridges, Madison County Council of Government; Mr. Rusty Spiars, Woolpert; Mr. Steve Hall, Goode & Associates; Mr. Bob Weaver, Johnson County Soil and Water; Mr. John Wilkins, Lilly; John K. Oakley, Indianapolis DPW.

**Review of Minutes of April 18, 2002 Meeting:**

There was one change made by Mr. Hall. The minutes were approved.

**State Water Quality GIS Atlas Update:**

Mr. Hall stated that the folks at the Polis Center have gotten individual interviews with those folks within the White River area. The State Water Quality Atlas is suppose to produce statewide GIS information, but they are going to start by building a pilot for the West Fork of the White River. They are trying to identify communities or entities that have GIS information that would be appropriate for that web site. They had a workshop to kick off the project and since then they have been going around to individuals to contact folks that may have GIS information and related water quality and put it on the web site. They are focusing on State and Federal pieces of information, but they are looking for additional things, like local land use information, contour information or anything that may be local monitoring stations. They plan to inventory that information at this point, but they still have not concluded whether they are actually going to put that information into this pilot project.

Mr. Bridges asked what they were using as a base map?

Mr. Hall stated that Tiger was the most common, but he believed that they plan to use some other census bureau information from 2000 cities and towns and urban areas.

Mr. Wilkins asked Mr. Hall what the criteria that Polis uses to accept data? He assumed that they do not accept any data.

Mr. Hall stated that the grant that they are working under requires that everything to be posted on the web site must meet FDGC, which are basically federal standards for quality and accuracy. It is basically the federal standards by which any GIS information is created by a federal agency has to be subject to those standards since it is federal dollars. He stated that he has had several conversations on behalf of the Upper White with the folks at Polis Center, trying to point them in the direction of folks that may have appropriate information or have the best of interest on how this end product looks.

Mr. Bridges asked what the long term plan for maintenance of information?

Mr. Hall stated that they have a three year grant for the project, outside of that Polis has committed to maintenance over a period of three to five years after that. That is just to maintain existing information. They will then look for additional sources of revenue to enhance the final product and to provide additional tools for either on line mapping or they are particularly interested in a couple of different remote sensing and land use analysis tools that are out. They would like to provide those ultimately in the same menu.

Mr. Bridges asked if he was saying that they were going to be a permanent place for housing data?

Mr. Hall stated that their project is going to create infrastructure by which the Upper White's GIS proposal could be housed. It would somewhat be driven by cost. They have a leg up because they are going to build that infrastructure on grant dollars, but they may not be able to do a lot of the other things they want done with that data set.

Mr. Bridges asked if this would be proprietary or, since they are using public funds, is it going to be available for download?

Mr. Hall stated that he believes that it has to be because of the grant money. He stated that he has not heard that discussed.

Mr. Bridges stated that this was an important issue.

Mr. Hall stated that it was. This is a 319 grant project and on all other 319 grant projects all the information was considered public and he did not believe that they could get away from it.

Mr. Wilkins asked if Mr. Bridges was asking if the actual code of the software?

Mr. Bridges stated that they are going to use ESRI or ArcInfo and they will probably use a database that either comes with it or they will run with any other SQL database. They can use Access. What he wanted to know is not so much format, but is it going to be available so if you have information of his County he would like it.

Mr. Hall stated that he did not believe that they could withhold that information.

Mr. Weaver stated that they are working with the concept of old V data that they are going to provide portals to through the web site so if the meta data would instruct someone, 'what is the status of the original data available and who can you get it from, so from his understanding, they are not going to reproduce data, they are just collated and a reference to it. Use some of the new map server technology to make seamless in the background to the casual user that goes there. There will probably be groups of data that would have different availability.

Mr. Hall stated that he believed that one of the original thoughts about how this thing would look and feel is similar to Lake Crown GIS, it is from three counties northwest Indiana and they have category driven, environmental information, infrastructure information and on down. The thought process has evolved somewhat. They are bringing at least all the state and federal pieces of information to a common menu and then making that available for download for end user manipulation, but also to make it available for environmental areas.

Mr. Bridges stated that they had their own GIS and Tiger is available to anyone who wants it.

Mr. Weaver stated that for a larger project like that; the challenge is to get some better form of street coverage than Tiger.

Mr. Bridges stated that then the real questions is you have scaled differences and you have everything else and it depends on what the centerline data is based off of. They have street centerlines that are based on orthos, but would it be seamless to an adjacent county that does not have that. He agrees that Tiger is not the best, but that may be best in the short term.

Mr. Weaver stated that in terms of data availability, the Indiana Geological Survey has released the data they developed for the southwest quarter or the I-69 quarter. There are 170 data layers and that is available on their web site or there you can get eight CD rom set that they charge \$90.00 for. That is released to the public as of very recently. They also furnish that to INDOT. There are a few layers, in terms of approximately four or five, and they are working on more, that they went ahead and did state wide. There is more coming from the Indiana Geological Survey on a state wide basis. Their base map is the USGS digital ortho quad is what they are using as their base map. He stated that he has not researched it and does not know exactly which counties are involved.

Mr. Ward asked if it was basically 465 and south?

Mr. Weaver stated that he was not sure, he missed the information meeting. He stated that he assumes that it is. They should have some information on the Indiana Geological web site or call them because he cannot answer that.

Mr. Hall stated that he thought he had heard that it started at 465 and went south. It was considered more the straight line alternative versus the going over to Terra Haute alternative.

Mr. Weaver stated that the one state wide layer they have done was the section corners. Whatever method they used it was not a quick and easy one, they have been working on it a long time.

**UWRWA Proposed GIS Proposal:**

Mr. Wilkins stated that his vision was that they need to go to the next meeting of the Guide settlement, coming up on September 11, with a clear and concise presentation on what the program is and what they are proposing and why it is a strategic proposal for the entire watershed strategy and why the Advisory Group should give them the money. If they could come out of there at the end of the day today with five or six PowerPoint slides roughed out, they probably do not have very long to give this presentation, but it seems to him, based on the last Board Meeting, that there is not anymore strategic proposal that they Guide Settlement Committee could approve than this. This is a strategic way for them to look at the improvement of the watershed for the next several years. It seems to him to be a lot more strategic than any of the proposals that he has heard that they are presented with. Apparently they have not been very convincing at the last meetings. He stated that he hopes that it was a communication gap and it is not that they understand it and they rejected it, if that is the case then they might as well adjourn and go home. He stated that he did not think that they could have understood this, maybe he did not understand it fully, but it seems to him to be a very strategic project and one that if anyone understands what they are trying to do here with the White River they would want to jump on this.

Mr. Hall stated that he has been to two of the seven of the Public Citizen Advisory Committee meetings on the Settlement and he assisted Bob Meyer in trying to explain the two presentations. The first presentation was that they thought GIS was a great tool to use in managing water resources and evaluate health and quality of the river and this use would affect the river over a long term. They went through about a five minute presentation on how GIS is wonderful and everybody just kind of looked at them and when they asked for questions the first question was 'What is GIS?'

Mr. Wilkins stated that was a great question, they cannot use the acronyms. What he has heard the first ten to fifteen minutes there was unsatisfactory for a proposal. You are talking way over their heads. These people are John Q public, do not ever use the term GIS. Say it, maybe say it ten times, then say GIS. That is who they are dealing with here. They need to distill it down to very simple lines.

Mr. Hall stated that the second time they came back with a presentation John Beakler with Polis Center was actually suppose to be there to present the State Water Quality GIS Atlas in five or six slides and explain how that was different from the Upper White Proposal and they asked that this presentation not be given because they thought this was not necessarily what they had asked for. That was the meeting at which Admire with IDEM, who is kind of leading this charge, said that they have received letters from different members of the Upper White explain that they thought this GIS would be good, but what she really wanted to see was testimonials as to how this tool could be used by each entity or county or municipality to help them in their programs or projects effecting water quality. What she did not say was might be to help explain to the Citizens Group how this could be used as a tool to assess what positive things have come out of the projects they funded.

Mr. Bridges asked who the chairman of that group was?

Mr. Hall stated that Beth Admire with IDEM has been acting as the lead in that group. Cary Dorman with DNR. There are three trustees; Cary Dorman, Beth Admire and Scott Davis with US Fish and Wildlife. There is also a panel of ten to twelve citizen appointed advisory committee members. The Joe Public folks have been invited to participate in the process and help weigh in on different proposals as to what they believe the benefit or lack of benefit to be.

Mr. Bridges asked what the types of proposals?

Mr. Hall stated that there are two \$3,000,000.00 pots and they are trying to spend the first one. Over a million and a half of that so far has been dedicated to land acquisitions. They have also put in a significant amount of money into boat ramps, creating or enhancing access points to the river and still targeting that Anderson to Indianapolis corridor.

Mr. Bridges stated that the non urban areas of the river front, that on the green buffer nothing can be built on it. He stated that he was at another meeting where they discussions about that, that they were not going to allow that restriction in the urban areas. He asked if that was correct?

Mr. Hall stated that as he understood it they had prioritized not just floodway, but flood plain acquisition as being the outer boundaries. In a floodway they would be somewhat precluded from development because of existing regulations. In a lot of places where they could not outright purchase property, they are trying to buy easements that would preclude development in any of those easements.

Mr. Spiars stated that it sound like they need something to visualize, which is why they are asking for the testimonials.

Mr. Hall stated that so far no one has asked the question, ‘what is this project doing for water quality?’ They have tried to present the benefit GIS could be a tool where they could start to ask that question ‘how do these easements and how do these different projects benefit water quality?’ Communities could use, as they are doing storm water planning or CSR planning, and they are doing upstream characterizations, there would be an available base of information that would assist them in looking at not only their back yard, but give them a picture of what is coming from other communities. One of the proposals he left out was is that they have had a proposal to do some fairly extensive water quality monitoring. They have proposed that the results of that monitoring could be GIS enabled and made available to this web site as well as all the information through the State Water Quality Atlas could be all put in one nice package for the White River so that there would be access to USGS monitoring information web enabled, GIS enabled, IDEM’s monitoring and local monitoring. Monitoring through the Settlement funds throughout that localized area, it would be a visual tool that would be on line so folks could see where monitoring occurred, see what the results were and have some explanations as to what those values actually meant.

Mr. Wilkins asked if this group know what they want? Do they have to find it? He stated that he would suggest that the group explain to him what they want and what their justification was. The first the thing would be is ‘what is the proposal? That should be the first heading of the first slide.

Mr. Weaver asked if they were on their agenda and what do they expect them to do?

Mr. Bridges stated that his question was that everybody there may know the value of GIS. He stated that Mr. Hall said earlier that they simply did not grasp it. The real question is on the testimonials, is it going to be somebody from one of the counties that will walk in and say this is a good thing?

Mr. Spiars stated that is should be an organization that would, before this thing was in place, would have the capabilities; now that they have this tool they can now implement these types of projects more efficiently to improve water quality.

Mr. Hall stated that they were on the agenda. They are hedging on the September 11 date and are considering moving it to the next Friday or the following week. This has not been announced yet, but they are on the agenda and Bob Meyer’s last conversation with Beth Admire was that what she really wanted was testimonials. What that does not tell him is whether she may want more after she gets the testimonials. What they asked for first was general letters of support, they got that and now they have asked for specific testimonials and he did not know if they will ask for more. They had the power point together that kind of explained what GIS was in the simplest terms possible.

Mr. Wilkins asked if they saw that?

Mr. Hall stated that they did not. They asked that it not be given because what she wanted to see was testimonials. It has been very confusing the whole time.

Mr. Ward asked about using the power point presentation that is already in the can as a lead in to the testimonials. He asked how much time they had?

Mr. Hall stated that they have been given a maximum of 30 minutes, which includes questions.

Mr. Ward asked how long his power point was?

Mr. Hall stated that it was nine slides.

Mr. Wilkins stated that they need to cut it to about three.

Mr. Weaver stated that it was also his understanding that the testimonials are in the nature of who and how that this be used. If their project is done, who and how will it be used. What is the result going to be? It could be the greatest idea in the world, but they feel like they want to be able to relate in how and who's going to be using it this resource.

Mr. Bridges stated also how they are going to benefit from it.

Mr. Shumowsky asked how they would use it as for the fish kill that happened. If they had GIS in place this may have prevented the fish kill further down stream as an example.

Mr. Hall stated that they have discussed trying to use that example, but Bob Meyer felt that the time it would take them to go from K to Z explaining that, they would either not have the time or they would lose folks that do not much understand GIS in the middle.

Mr. Wilkins asked if it would be worth while to actually provide an example of where GIS has been used to support the acquisition or the identification of parcels along White River for acquisition of those buffer areas?

Mr. Oakley stated that prior to working for DPW he was with the Department of Metropolitan Development in a roll called Township Administrator and they guy who handles Washington Township, which was a big bulk of White River, was out so Marsha Mathew with NRCS had asked him if he could start identifying the parcels and ownership and the addresses of all of these parcels contiguous to the river so they could start putting that into a form to begin the process of getting into this process of getting the easements and buffers. So they just basically went into the GIS system and threw on the White River layer and then the parcel layer and went through and populated all of that stuff and corresponded back to their parcel database through the Washington Township Assessor's Office and spit out a ream of ownership records and passed that over to the NRCS people.

Mr. Bridges asked if the State GIS Atlas going to have floodplain information?

Mr. Hall stated that things that are available state wide.

Mr. Bridges stated that it may be available digitally, but otherwise the only way to do it is kind of interpreting between the flood maps to what ever the base map would be and try to edge it in there and say this is approximately where the floodplain is. That would be something that you would put in over the orthos so you could say that here is the estimated floodplain area along the Whiter River and GIS would have the capability of doing that even with the implicit error you would have in that it is just as accurate as the flood maps you get from FEMA.

Mr. Oakley stated that theirs is digital right now. They took the effective FIS, the one that was just revised for Indianapolis and Marion County and had that input into their GIS database. They can click that on and it is broken down into the floodway fringes and attended 500-year floodplain area on top of that.

Mr. Bridges stated that they can also attach elevation levels too. If they see an example, that would be fine, but he believes that it needs to be a quick example like that. One of the other things they are looking at is the long term quality of the stream and the only way to do that is, all GIS is, is information that can be displayed graphically. Most of them hopefully might understand what a database is, and just tell them, database analysis displayed graphically through maps, show them a map. That is GIS in a nut shell, it has a lot of power to it just like a database does and most people tend to concentrate on the maps, the maps are not worth anything if they do not have good data. All they have is digital lines, they are worth something, but they are not worth it unless you can do analytics with it and that is what GIS does. One of the other real issues there is that by having a database that tracks over time, you can track if all you instances occur in terms of CS overflows or where your agree orders or at, what the agree orders are for. If you have fish kills, what was the extent of the fish kill, where it was from and that can all be displayed. That is a record that anyone can get, if someone downstream or Indianapolis wants to say Anderson has had another fish kill how far did it go south this time, in terms of that and looking at that, but the long term you are also going to want to monitor the health of that stream and that gets displayed graphically, but there are wider issues involved, but he did not want to get into that because of what he has heard they would not understand them anyway.

Mr. Wilkins stated that he did not about the agreed orders was part of GIS.

Mr. Oakley stated that they have a lot of different apps. One that their permits group uses as well as their planning group is called City of Indianapolis integrated Permit System and it has a standard format when it is pulled up you get an aerial photo and parcels and streets and so on and then you can select. If you want to see variances, rezones, plats, approvals and then there is a query function for each one of those that you can essentially go on the dot on the screen and click the query and it will basically give them the entire background of that case, approval, case number, what it was granted, commitments and the recorded number of those and all of that. They have had some similar experiences in trying to explain GIS to what he would term as a civilian group, specifically their metropolitan development commission, and they did a little five to ten minute, they brought a lap top in and said here it is. What if they want to find their house, you plug in their address and it pops it up on their screen and then went in to see buildings or other things. With the permit link they could see what their neighbor was doing. To them it looked like a great tool. They were trying to justify the money that it was going to take them to launch that as a web based application, which is where they are going with it currently. They made sure they made it simple.

Mr. Bridges stated that another thing to think about is that all their communities have CSO's. CSO's are one of the first things you want located on any kind of map because they are sources of contamination to the stream. The other thing is you attach the attributes to those CSO's to know how big that pipe is that might be going in because they are going to be of varying sizes so you could make the assumption, you can go through and calculate a lot of things depending on how much area is feeding that pipe as to how much is going in, in an event. There are a lot of things you can get estimated data from, but to all of them it makes sense, but to them it does not so there has to be a way to relate to them simply that if they really want long term tracking, that information would be available to EPA, IDEM and all the governmental entities in the water shed

because it is not a very big river and it is your primary surface water in about an eleven county area.

Mr. Spiars stated that there is a big step they have to take once they are shown how they track data. What gives them a more clear understanding of your water in their tributaries and pollutants to how that can help them more effectively for water quality.

Mr. Bridges stated that if you look at buffers for just slowing down water flow in terms of drainage. You would have a much better way analytically to look at how much erosion is going into the river and where the problems are. There are a lot of farm fields that drain off into tributaries that go into that river, some direct and some not.

Mr. Weaver stated that a concept to explain to them and make part of their proposal is how this links what information is available at the state level, regional and local and how this is going to tie this together. There is no other vehicle to do that. They are going to make it rich in content features and information. How many times have they or ourselves or someone else they know, we have one part of the puzzle and they do not have the other part. They know what is going on locally, but they do not know what is going on at a regional level or state level. For their water shed, for the Upper White River, for the west fork they want these parts as part of this project is going to put this project put those parts together.

Mr. Hall stated that one of the benefits they have talked about on the Upper White, those who have been around for a while, they have kind of referred to their map of the Upper White Watershed as the various puzzle pieces. They have the about half the puzzle pieces being the smaller watershed areas where there are watershed type projects going on and most of those projects are generated GIS and water quality information on a local level and that is a wealth of information that can be brought to this side as well.

Mr. Weaver stated that if they followed on what he was just talking about then they could begin to give examples of how the state would use this, how they would be providing information to the state, how the regional groups or interests use this and how local would use this. How they are establishing those communication links.

Mr. Wilkins stated that the introduction could be 'This Proposal puts the Puzzle Together'. They probably do not care about all the technical issues of how they put the puzzle together. An example they gave with Washington Township on how to identify parcels that are a higher priority for acquisition for riparian zones. That would be a good start. He asked what time the meeting was on the 11<sup>th</sup>?

Mr. Hall stated that it is usually 1:30.

Mr. Wilkins stated that could be a problem for him. He asked if there was someone who could do this?

Mr. Oakley asked Mr. Hall what time the meeting was on September 11<sup>th</sup>?

Mr. Hall stated that it is usually 1:30.

Mr. Oakley stated that he has a meeting scheduled for that day already. He stated that he may be able to talk to Mike Graham who is the Township Administrator and see if he could take care of the meeting.

Mr. Wilkins asked if they should coordinate this through Mr. Hall?

Mr. Hall stated that he would be happy to do that. They do have Tia who comes to some of the Upper White Alliance meetings and is working on IDEM funded grant in Muncie. She has volunteered if they deem it beneficial to, come and give a presentation about generating GIS information or using State, Federal or local pieces of information and it is becoming a huge chore to track all those pieces down and bring it together so they can use it and generate new information. They are willing to speak of how this would be beneficial and consolidating information and speak to the fact that they are creating new information that they can provide to this project.

Mr. Wilkins asked what her affiliation was?

Mr. Hall stated that she was working with the Delaware County.

Mr. Ward asked if she was NRCS?

Mr. Weaver stated that she was working on a grant for the Soil and Water Conservation District in Delaware County. Watershed Coordinator.

Mr. Spiars asked if it would be fair to say that once this system is in place and this information is available it would be likely used for getting grant money in this area?

Mr. Hall stated that part of those 319 projects affectively is to identify within a particular watershed what the water quality issues are. This could be a very valuable tool in helping those publics working on a grant or trying to identify, for example: if he was in Hamilton County and he wanted to prioritize a watershed to do a watershed project, this could be base information you use to help prioritizing where they go.

Mr. Wilkins stated that if they only have 30 minutes, here is what the proposal is, the theme is put the puzzle together, the benefits are consolidation, fragmented data, ability to select land parcels for acquisitions, and the next is select projects, watershed improvement projects. It is also a way to validate the effectiveness of projects.

Mr. Bridges stated that if someone has an agree order, if there is a violation of their permit and they come into compliance effectively around their claim you should see improvement. That could be monitored. If you could monitor that by just saying here it is before and here it is after water quality discharge then you assume that all things are going well and it not only validates that the agree order has been complied with, but that the fluid that this entity is discharging is now cleaner than it was before.

Mr. Spiars asked if it would also be helpful if they grant them the money they are asking for, how long before this thing is up and running and able to begin serving by the admitted day.

Mr. Hall stated that they have some very rough estimates. It kind of depends on whom actually does this and where is it going to be housed. The alliance would decide to work with the Polis, because the have infrastructure and equipment and that would eliminate a cost then they could piggy back on that get things a lot sooner. If they had to independently come up with the infrastructure the equipment and build things from scratch it would take longer. The short answer

is if they build one on what is there already they would see tangible results in six months. If they start from scratch they would see more tangible results in 8 months to one year.

Mr. Spiars asked if the proposal would say here are the steps of how they would use their money?

Mr. Ward stated that one of the strategies that was also discussed at the board meeting last time was maybe not going with the full request and just go for the request for funds for a study in order to get a consultant to put this together.

Mr. Hall stated that this is not a new and original thought. This was put together by the old GIS subcommittee of the Upper White Alliance about three years ago and they just rekindled this idea and what was discussed at that point was that they have already talked to everybody who has some sort of GIS system to find out what the platforms are and what the softwares are and to find out how complex it would be to bring that information together. The next step in that process was to really get the professionals involved and development details scoping document. Estimate a level to bring this information together and manipulate the information, to build the infrastructure, to get web enabled, to bring it on line and the proposal that is on the table within that would be effectively step number one. The day after they have the money would be to not just to start building something, but to get all the right folks involved to participate in the scoping endeavor and to consolidate and build on what was done before.

Mr. Weaver stated that one thing they need to do to make clear is who they are, who is this organization? Are they paying them to do something? They have to be able to explain how they are going to handle this procurement process. They will have questions about that.

Mr. Wilkins stated that they need to explain to them that the alliance is a not for profit organization. They have a very diverse membership and very well supported. He asked if they have an appreciation for that or is this something they need to develop?

Mr. Hall stated that he believed that they need to clarify that.

Mr. Bridges stated that there are a lot of long term issues and the only way to deal with it is through GIS. There are two other benefits that they could definitely see and one is that it makes more information available to the public, you talk about putting it on a web site, and anyone who has an interest in the health of that river they can get to a library if they do not have a computer of their own and look at information that previously may or may not be available to the public or it is available, all the pieces of the puzzle may be there, but they are not where they could go to one spot. That is real for them.

Mr. Wilkins stated that would ring a big chord with the O'Bannon administration. He stated that his experience with lobbying activities on the environmental level, when you start talking about public data or public awareness the administration likes that.

Mr. Turner stated that as far as data availability that is going to allow money to be diverted from typical studying an area into actual restoration, rehabilitation.

Mr. Wilkins stated that they will have to do studies time after time.

Mr. Turner stated that they would just be diverting more cash into actual projects.

Mr. Wilkins asked how much money they were asking for?

Mr. Hall stated that they were asking for \$156,500.00.

Mr. Wilkins asked how much they had to give away?

Mr. Hall stated that it was \$6,000,000.00.

Mr. Wilkins stated that the lead slide should be that this is the most important project they improve. It seems to him that this would be the first they would want to improve. How could they determine what riparian areas to set aside?

Mr. Hall stated that they are either using GIS or they are relying on someone who lives on the river and decides that they want to sell the property.

Mr. Bridges stated that if they talked about saving money and more information available to the public, if they look at, for example Morgan County is the very southwest portion of this and Marion County is right north of them, something that goes on in Delaware County or Madison County, may have a lot to do with what your planning is down in Marion County or Hamilton County or anyone downstream. When that information is available, you go out and hire a consultant to do it or do it internally, there may be an information set that is available that your consultant or whoever would have to go acquire it. Now some of that data set if available so there is information that may not have been available that is documented and it is in a public format and it may be that your consultant is just going and getting it. The charge for that is far less than if they had to go out and generate it from scratch.

Mr. Wilkins stated that Surveyors would have a tremendous use for this.

Mr. Ward stated that they are spending \$200,000.00 on Cool Creek, where if he would have had a lot of this information maybe he would have spent less. He stated that he was getting ready to spend another \$200,000.00 being spent on Stony Creek.

Mr. Wilkins stated that part of that \$200,000.00 is gathering data. He stated that this was an excellent example.

Mr. Shumowsky stated that especially when they show that as compared to what they are asking for.

Mr. Ward stated that he could get with one of his consultants and find out if this was available, how much he would have saved.

Mr. Hall stated that if they are going to evaluate water quality in any given watershed, you are not going to just start from scratch, you will want to see what was done before. Every scientific report is what work was done previously and if this consolidates this information it makes every community that does one of these projects, they have a step up.

Mr. Weaver stated that the main thing with Tia is that it does not turn in to what she is doing in her project. She was a good speaker.

Mr. Ward stated that it is important that they hear that it is not only Hamilton County and Indianapolis and those places, it is also the three upper reaches.

Mr. Bridges asked who would benefit from the information besides the general public would surveyors, planning departments, engineering departments, street departments the list of government entities not to mention the private sector or state governmental entities is pretty extensive. Emergency management may need them.

Mr. Oakley stated that if they are also interested in preserving buffer areas along the river you could even do something similar like what they have done with their permitting and planning database. Find out which parcels of ground along the river are now being proposed for redevelopment, subdivision or whatever. Maybe that gives people time to approach that owner.

Mr. Hall stated that at the first presentation Beth Admire was the only trustee at the meeting. The TMDL was probably where 80% of the questions asked from the trustee side of things and in the know members of the agencies and the audience were saying they could probably use this. This would be very beneficial.

Mr. Spiars asked if the trustee's eyes glazed over when they did that type of technical term?

Mr. Hall stated that they did not. The first presentation was two weeks after the new 303d list came out.

Mr. Spiars asked if the three trustees made the decision and the already know what TMDL's are all about and for, that is a big deal if they already know.

Mr. Wilkins stated that he will copy everything off of the board and make some sense of it tomorrow in a power point presentation, seven or eight slides. If he could get a copy of the e-mail list he will circulate this around and they can all take shots at it. If they could get Mike Graham, Tia, Mr. Ward.

Mr. Ward stated that if it is September 11<sup>th</sup>, he will not be able to be there.

Mr. Wilkins stated that they could even mention this project, if there was a few bullet points he could give them.

Mr. Ward stated that Don Anthis and he are going together on Stony Creek.

Mr. Hall stated that he would check on the September 11<sup>th</sup> date. He stated that Bob Meyer who is on the citizens group is supposed to contact him tomorrow and confirm the date and time is. He stated that he could e-mail out the power point presentation that was put together before. He stated that Tia had said that if it would be more appropriate she would be happy to write a letter. For time sake or for confusion purposes they may want to limit her from giving another presentation.

Mr. Wilkins stated that if she wrote a letter he would certainly want her there to stand up and give her 30 seconds to say that she was there and she agreed with what has been said and this is how it would benefit me and details are in this letter. That would be very important.

Mr. Hall stated that John Richardson from Anderson said that he could not attend on that given day as well, but he has fervently told him that he would write a testimonial type of letter. A gentleman by the name of Bret Robinson with USGS, who has been keeping track of this and they have been e-mailing and he said that if it would be beneficial he would be more than happy to stand up as USGS in support of this project.

Mr. Weaver stated that if they get any additional letters it would be important for them to say specifically how they would use this or benefit from this and not just say that they are in favor of it.

Mr. Ward stated that was what the last group of letters said, that it was a great idea and let's go with it.

Mr. Bridges asked how much influence did the citizens have versus who is in favor of doing this?

Mr. Hall stated that they do 99% of the talking in the meetings.

Mr. Bridges asked if they had 99% of the influence?

Mr. Hall stated that they have probably 1%.

Mr. Wilkins asked if there were any legislatures?

Mr. Hall stated that there are representatives, for example Cheryl Meyers is representing the City of Anderson.

Mr. Wilkins asked if there were any members of the general assembly?

Mr. Hall stated that there were not.

Mr. Wilkins asked if they could get a list or copy of that?

Mr. Ward stated that he would have thought that Kevin Strunk would have a grasp on GIS and what it could do.

Mr. Hall stated that he has just sat there during the meetings.

Mr. Ward stated that surely he uses it.

Mr. Hall stated that he does and so does Paul Johnson.

Mr. Ward stated that Paul Johnson uses his, so he knows.

Mr. Hall stated that he asked Paul and Kevin why they have not spoken up and they told him that they supported it and they did not want to get into the argument about it. He told them they needed to speak up on it.

Mr. Ward asked where John Bundy stood? He asked if he had an understanding of the concept? He stated that he could call John and have him come and look at it, him and Dan both.

Mr. Hall stated that would be a great thing.

Mr. Bridges stated that he knew Cheryl and he would speak with her.

Mr. Hall stated that John Richardson was at the last meeting and stood up and said that he could not speak for all of Anderson, but he can speak for his part of Anderson, but there may be other agendas there as well. Mr. Bundy spoke with Bob after the last meeting and said that he did not know much about GIS himself, but he believed that they were making headway with the group, keep at it. Pam Cavanaugh from the Marion County Health Department told him that she would at least come to the meeting and stand up and say that from the Health Departments perspective they are involved in monitoring water quality on a daily basis because of public health implications and explain how they are using GIS.

Mr. Ward asked when they would know the firm date?

Mr. Hall stated that Bob told him a week ago that they were to send out an e-mail this week and when he gets back tonight he would have that information and forward it to him tomorrow.

Mr. Wilkins the relevance of CSO's and GIS.

Mr. Hall stated that there was a new rule under development called CSO notification rule. You are basically required to notify the public if you have CSO's.

Mr. Ward stated that you could identify them graphically on a map then depending on how it was built, maybe connect to a centroid on that dot or create that dot as a centroid come up then with the attribute of that data who the owner is, who the contact.

Mr. Bridges stated how much is draining into that pipe, incidence of occurrence. They will vary in terms of size and they will vary in terms of the area that they are draining.

Mr. Ward asked if they build this system and say it is from Polis. Things change, who is going to maintain that data, who is going to change it.

Mr. Bridges stated that they talked about that before they came over. They are looking for a long term commitment to maintain it and they may or may not be the best entity long term to maintain it, they may be best entity to create the infrastructure that they may not be the best entity to maintain it. There needs to be a place that has land use. Land use effects every watershed and every time you have development you change the drainage characteristics of that watershed and you change the flow velocities a lot of other things.

Mr. Ward stated that there is going to be ongoing information collected, they are not going to just stop at that point. Who is going to keep feeding it?

Mr. Bridges stated that you almost think about setting up an infrastructure just like if you have a local GIS, like Indianapolis and IMAGIS. It calls for updating their data and it goes into their base map and they may be the only ones that can edit that layer. Anyone could edit it, but they cannot save the fact of that layer.

Mr. Ward asked who would do the translations?

Mr. Hall stated that originally when this was a proposal from the GIS subcommittee, this was a \$375,000.00 proposal because it was to address some of these issues. It associated developing or acquiring the infrastructure as the Upper White Alliance, as an entity that is not with Polis or any other particular city or town as an independent body paid for and notored by a board that has represented stake holders, the communities, counties associated with the Upper White. It was

proposed to be maintained and developed, it would be jump started with the original grant dollars and maintained over time from the dues and the grants that the Upper Whiter Collects. It would be a central body and would not have any particular ties. Mr. Anthis stated at another meeting that maybe he has water quality information that shows that there is a problem and he is not necessarily interested in advertising that problem because then someone comes in and regulates him. Obviously that is a concern.

Mr. Wilkins stated that he mentioned a platform, one of the figurations other than platform was the data entries themselves. The example land use was thrown out where Marion County may have 20 different classifications of land use and Hamilton County may only have six. None of them match, how do you bring those together? When you do update data then you have to somehow bring those on the same level, not for just two communities but sixteen every time you do an update.

Mr. Bridges stated that you would have to have a big enough place to maintain it, otherwise sooner or later it will not be worth much. Ultimately you assume if it is going to benefit government one way or another, government grants, government is going to end up financing it. The real question is contributions. Everyone has responsibility there because it goes through the counties. How do you get them, because you may have someone like Marion that sees the importance and Johnson or Hendricks, but you may have Morgan that says that even if they thought they should they may not have the money. Then you have a situation where they are benefiting, but they are not computing anything.

Mr. Ward stated that the 2003 things are getting jettison all over the place.

Mr. Wilkins stated that the original proposal was \$370,000.00 and that included money for so many years.

Mr. Hall stated that the original proposal was for \$375,000.00 range so that the Upper White owned the infrastructure and the web site. Not for profit. It would be infrastructure owned by the Alliance, it would be a web site owned by the Alliance and members of the Upper White Alliance would share that information and then their project was to compile the federal and state data. Since then the State Water Quality Atlas came along and they got funded through grant moneys to do a portion of that. Effectively the feed back from the trustees was that \$300,000.00 was not going to happen. That is when the folks found out about the Polis Center project and they offered their infrastructure.

Mr. Weaver stated that they are also using them as a test structure. Also, they would want to show up on that State Water Quality Atlas. Everything they do would be very visible through that State Water Quality Atlas. There is also a lot of dialogue and a lot going on at the State Coordination level as far as dealing with these problems and opportunities and also as technology changes it changes. There are several proposals on dealing with the state wide solution to this. Some of this may end up coming under the new home land security committee. They have not talked about how this would serve in an emergency if they had an emergency happen that had to do with their water supply or public waters or streams. They have not talked about how this might serve that type of purpose. There is funding that may come from that and there is also funding being discussed with the State Land Resource Council, they asked they put a half million dollar budget together as the Indiana Geographic Information Council to address some of these things. There is a lot of things going on so what they do here is going to lead to bigger things. This is not the end all, this is an important resource. One of the most important decisions they could do, but it will grow from there. It will part of something that grows state wide.

Mr. Wilkins asked if they thought that \$300,000.00 was way too much?

Mr. Hall stated that basically they did.

Mr. Wilkins stated that if they are asked about the ongoing they would tell them that this would be managed by the Upper White Watershed Alliance which includes representatives from all counties in the watershed plus IDEM, city governments. He stated that he believed that this would be a powerful fundraising tool for the Alliance. He stated that he believed that any developers or industries would want to be a part of this, even though they would theoretically have access to this. Those funds would be used to maintain the GIS system.

Mr. Hall stated that he wholeheartedly agreed, it would bring new faces to the table.

Mr. Ward stated that they may want to flush that out a little more. Polis would be their partner in this for at least three to five years and after that they would be getting funded through dues and contributions.

Mr. Weaver stated that between their members they are doing a lot of in time contributions to pull this off.

Mr. Bridges stated that there is a lot of services because if any of them contribute information to it and they are the owners of that information and now making it available to some other entity, which is a larger group of entities, staff time involved.

Mr. Hall stated that Paul Johnson told him that it was very for him to know what is going on upstream, but he was also not sure he wanted to advertise where his intake was.

Mr. Ward stated that he had talked to Paul about this. Before September 11, they were going to put their well fields and delineations on their web site and then pulled them off after September 11<sup>th</sup>. But according to Paul, if someone really wanted to do there are a million places in this town alone that they could do it at. You just put more pressure in than is coming out of the tap.

Mr. Bridges stated that on long term maintenance, in Ohio their regional entities serve transportation, land use, economical development and then bring them all under some umbrella so there are cost savings for all of them. Polis may be still the person that does the data, but there may be another entity that coordinates it. You may have another entity that if this were eventually housed there and they subcontract with Polis to maintain it, even though they are the entity that oversees it and coordinates everything for everybody. Using Polis to create the infrastructure would make real sense, especially if they do not own it. If it is portable then they would have the option of whatever they wanted to do with it, which would be good. He stated that he did not believe that anyone in the Alliance, even if Paul maintained it, would want to relinquish ownership if they contribute money to it.

#### **Stormwater Phase II Rule Updates:**

Mr. Hall stated that out of the Stormwater Phase II program there are three rules. Rule 5, which is the erosion and sediment control program, Rule 6, which is stormwater for industrial facilities and Rule 13, which is the MS for the initial stormwater program. Rule 13 was preliminarily adopted on August 14<sup>th</sup>, which is about 98% there and they are doing some final tweaking as they go through the legal process. He stated that he spoke with Lori Gates this morning and she had a good feeling of the status of Rule 13 as preliminarily adopted and the changes in the Rule 5 and 6.

She told him that she felt that Rule 13 was pretty much there. The minor changes made by the Water Pollution Control Board were putting in some language that allowed waivers for TMDL purposes. Two different types of waivers that communities can get from some of the programmatic requirements if not all the programmatic requirements and they are tweaking the federal language to make it fit with what has been done on the state level and trying to add that. Rule 5 and Rule 6 is where the big debate is right now and most of the contention. Rule 5 generally speaking, Lori felt that they were making progress on Rule 5, there is some concern, historically speaking, when IDEM or DNR or Stormwater Conservation Districts were in charge of erosion and sediment control programs, generally speaking there was an understanding that you did not begin construction before erosion and sediment control plan had been submitted and approved by whatever entity. Now that an agency is writing in a 30 day notice of intent prior to construction and is becoming official in that regard. Although that has been a standard operating rule a lot of people are upset about that. The public notification is something that they are very upset about, but the fact that basically they are laying out in the rule clearly that they do not start construction until they have submitted a plan and it is approved. A lot of folks have not previously operated that way. As long as the plan was in they could start working. In Rule 5, adding the post construction management requirements associated with Rule 13, which means that after construction is complete there is still some responsibility for a particular site ensuring that stormwater run off on the site after the main construction activity is still not contributing to water quality problems. IDEM believes that to be the intent of the federal rules, that since they are going to require of municipal programs it was intended that it apply universally. Developers and other folks really do not like that at all because it puts post construction liabilities on them and others. IDEM believes that in doing the financial analysis of the program the EPA has included a post construction and Rule 5 is a component of the program. IDEM seems to be the only one interpreting that financial analysis to include that post construction because no one believes that this could be implemented with the figures that are out there right now. Those are probably the hotter topics under Rule 5. Rule 6, Lori said they had a meeting yesterday. There is NOI requirement in that Rule as well. They have also re-written the stormwater pollution prevention components for industrial storm water and most folks consider that to be a new requirement rather than clarifications. IMA is threatened them in several different ways on the laws for that section. There is an opportunity for exclusion or exemption for stormwater facilities that can demonstrate that whatever is happening outside their building is not contributing to water quality problems or stormwater runoff in a significant fashion. It is kind of a non impact statement. Mr. Hall stated that it is basically anything happening around their buildings, parking lots, storage, warehouses or anything like that. She believes that to be nothing good, nothing good can come from those exemptions or exclusions and it will lead to future legislation. He stated that Lori feels that the rule making process has been going on long enough and it just needs to be over and people are causing lots of trouble over minor issues. The next meeting on Rule 5, IDEM is holding, will be on September 26<sup>th</sup> at 1:00 pm location to be announced. Rule 6 will be September 24<sup>th</sup> at 1:00 location to be announced.

Mr. Ward stated that he has some issues on Rule 13, which the Board had supposedly told Lori and her group to go back and make sure they are addressed.

Mr. Hall stated that he had filed lots of comments lately. Particularly as IDEM has tried to revise language to satisfy folks, they have introduced lots of new terms and still confusion. They used to have waters of the state and sensitive areas as very common language use in CSO rules and MPS program and now they have introduced the terms waters, which means something a little different than waters of the state, a little more inclusive. They are also in the process of working with IAC on the development of the CD rom project.

Mr. Weaver stated that one other thing that was discussed was entities that would come under the Phase II MS 4 rules because of the 2000 census there was a discussion how much extra time to give them to file. Hoosier Heartland has two workshops coming up next month on Phase II Stormwater. September 5<sup>th</sup> is at the MCL at Castleton at 11:00 to 1:00 and the focus is on public officials and the main presenters are IDEM and IAC. September 10<sup>th</sup> is on the south side of Indianapolis at the Jonathon Birds in Greenwood at the same time. New rule that he might mention that EPA is dealing with, they are holding hearings now on a national level on developing builder standards for lots that are being developed or sites being developed over 1 acre and they are considering going several different ways, but they have basically come up with a builder/developer standard listing all the things that the developer has to do. He has to document how and when he is inspecting his own site.

Mr. Hall stated that he talked to Dale Purkey with the Indianapolis Water Company and he wanted them to know that they would see in the paper in the next couple of days a discussion of blue - green algae that has been detected in Geist Reservoir that produces certain toxins when they are in sufficient quantity. Those toxins can operate in a couple of different fashions, they can be neuro-toxic and attack your liver or just generally make you sick. They have detected bacteria that produces these toxins, but they have not detected the toxins in concentrations that they would consider to be harmful to anyone. They have sampled Fall Creek which is their intake and they do not detect the bacteria or any toxins in any concentration that would be an issue for drinking water. They have notified IDEM and DNR of that. They suspect that there is an excess quantity of nutrients coming into the reservoir that is feeding these blue-green algae in excess of what would naturally occur. Triennial review meetings are under way with IDEM. They have held two meetings so far, an introductory meeting two months ago where they discussed issues and tried to prioritize the issues they would tackle during the Triennial review process. On October 3<sup>rd</sup> is the next meeting where they plan to get in depth into some of the issues, some of those issues being in-stream degradation, mercury, ecoli water quality standard. The time and location is on the web site.

Mr. Bridges asked if there were any other counties that have agreed orders in regard to ecoli in the county ditches. They were, he believes, that they put an agreed order on for that.

Mr. Ward stated that it was because of the septic systems, basically the drain is the septic system.

Mr. Bridges stated that one of the things they were worried about was when they negotiated that agreed order was trying to narrow its focus, because it was very broad. IDEM wanted was to be able to go to any county and slap agreed orders any place they find ecoli in a drain.

Mr. Ward stated that if you went to any of the old tiles, where did the old farm house go to?

Mr. Bridges stated that what if they were out when a subdivision was put in 20 years ago and now there is pollution in the drain and the closest water treatment plant is five or six miles, try running it for 60 homes. No municipality in their right mind is going to do that.

Mr. Hall stated that Allen County specifically pursued legislation to give them some alternatives to deal with their problem. They have in the neighborhood of 200 homes on pump and haul orders and they have 8,000 septic systems that they have reasonable suspicion that they are failures and they now they were getting ready to be in a lot of trouble so they took the legislation around and got some legislation passed to allow them to use alternative treatment methods, which would basically translate into a direct discharge permit for septic systems. Basically the legislation ruled that they could use them, but the county has to do the entire county septic system

management district and they are anticipated to use state revolving fund dollars to fund some of those septic system projects. He stated that he was not aware of a legal drain with an agreed order.

**Set Meeting Date:**

The next meeting was set for Thursday October 24<sup>th</sup>, 2002 at 2:00 PM.

The meeting was adjourned.

---

Kenton C. Ward  
UWRWA Technical Committee Chairman