

Upper White River Watershed Alliance, Inc.
Technical Committee Minutes
December 19, 2002

The meeting was called to order at 2:10 PM Thursday December 19, 2002. Those present were as follows: Mr. Kenton Ward, Hamilton County Surveyor; Mr. Robert Thompson, Hamilton County Surveyor's Office; Mr. Rusty Spiars, Woolpert; Mr. Steve Hall, Goode & Associates; Ms. Cindy Fort, American Consulting, Inc.

Review of Minutes of October 24, 2002 Meeting:

There were no changes made. The minutes were approved.

Guide Settlement – Citizens Advisory Committee for White River Fish Kill:

Mr. Amos stated that they received a response from the Polis Center regarding the cost estimate for the feasibility study, that came in at \$15,000.00, Bob Myer took that to the Committee. The Committee stated that it was fine, but they wanted a few additional estimates. He stated that Mr. Hall sent a massive e-mail to engineering firms to try and get some more estimates in. To date he has not seen any of those.

Mr. Ward gave Mr. Amos an estimate from the County's ISS Department.

Mr. Spiars asked what estimate they had come up with?

Mr. Ward stated that their estimate was 30 to 40 thousand.

Mr. Spiars stated that the interviews could be sent by questionnaire and get something back and follow up with a phone call.

Mr. Ward stated that the one that Hamilton County just went through for the ArcInfo feasibility was \$25,000.00 from Woolpert. They are at least going to be \$25,000.00.

Mr. Spiars stated that they are going to have different formats for the different materials out there.

Mr. Ward stated that the County has got Arc, Microstation and GeoMedia. Then you start adding Indianapolis and Anderson and everyone else.

Mr. Spiars stated that this includes the estimate of the project total cost for development and upkeep that may not have been in the County's scope of work. He stated that there is also the preparation of the bid package, maybe multiple sections or phases.

Mr. Ward stated that on the County's part there was no preparation of the bid package, the County told Woolpert what they wanted.

Mr. Spiars stated that this will be larger than what Woolpert did for Hamilton County. Polis operates a little differently, they are made up of a whole lot of different folks.

Mr. Ward stated that they have student volunteers, which makes a big difference. He stated that Mr. Stout broke it down to hours and then priced it by the hour, hopefully that will help.

Mr. Amos stated that he did not see any reference to the upkeep and maintenance.

Mr. Spiars asked if they had talked about the project to the folks on the trustee's board?

Mr. Ward stated that he went to the next meeting and they had at that time not to make a presentation, but Beth Admire did introduce him to the group and asked him to explain in five minutes what GIS was all about and how they use it. He stated that he did very quick cursory overview of how they use GIS and what they envision being able to with this additional capability. At this point in time he believed that they are looking more at doing a feasibility study first and coming back with a better handle on what the true costs would be. That is why they need the estimates.

Mr. Spiars asked if this project was going to take existing data and compiling it or will it also include generating new data?

Mr. Ward stated that this is existing data.

Mr. Amos stated that this was the way he understood as well.

Ms. Fort asked if new data is created because Noblesville is sampling, or Indianapolis is sampling, new data could be added, but this group was not going to go do sampling.

Mr. Shumasky stated that another thing they may want to consider is, depending on who would respond to this, if the responder is someone who, in the end, would want to do the work, he was wondering if they would be able to find someone who would be able to put this together, but not someone who would actually be doing the work. He stated that he has found, as a rule, if there is a consultant that could do this or assist them with this, but not actually going to do the work, then they will only be interested in seeing that they get a good product, where as if he was responding to this and he was going to be a respondent for providing the services he would have definite interest in how that scope is focused. Whereas, if he was someone who is not going to do any of that work his interest would be totally different.

Mr. Spiars stated that this could happen, but one way to prevent that is if you have someone who is pretty knowledgeable who can oversee it and give some input and kind of prevent that from happening.

Mr. Ward stated that he believed that more of what Mr. Shumasky was saying was, the County's relationship with Woolpert when they were putting their GIS together, Woolpert was the one that led them and helped them as they went through everything and wrote the RFP's and made the suggestions to the County.

Mr. Shumasky stated that individual is in no way going to get the backside work, which is where the real money is at, which would be, they are creating your layers, they are doing data collection, even if they are getting it from existing entities. That individual or organization is totally divorced from the backside work.

Mr. Spiars stated that he understood that, but he believes that there may be a way if someone else knows what they are suppose to be doing in that feasibility study up front, and is knowledgeable in it, he may see where they are trying to steer this thing to an exclusive little scope that only they could do. Hamilton County does have folks that may be able to identify if Schneider or Woolpert is trying to customize it too much and not writing it general enough where others could get a fair chance.

Mr. Shumasky stated that he knows Mr. Stout so that does not bother him, he just wanted to make sure, and he believes that they should have someone independent to assist them. He stated that he believes that they would get a better product in the end. Whoever scopes it, he believes, if they are not going to get that back work, then their only interest is seeing to it that they have a good scope and will accomplish what they want to accomplish. That is the extent of their work unless they would have them be a project manager for them, but that is a lot different.

Mr. Ward asked Mr. Shumasky if he had any thoughts on the costs for the feasibility study?

Mr. Shumasky stated that it would be depending on what they wanted, it could be anywhere from 10 to 60 thousand dollars. It would depend on the scope and also on the how much work there is in terms of getting all that information. He stated that he was pretty sure some of this has been done, but they are talking about a pretty expensive endeavor and he did not believe that this has been done in the state of Indiana yet, there is a lot of information to collect. Part of that is they are going to have to go to all the jurisdictions and try to find out what is available.

Mr. Amos stated that on another project they are working on they are trying to obtain the CAD plat files from Benton County and the Commissioners are reluctant to provide that information. He stated that he was not sure if territory or property would come into play.

Mr. Shumasky stated that part of it may be if it is going to public use, which this is, then it should be offered up. Sometimes they worry about is if it goes to private firm that also does development, if they have all the plat mapping and everything else then they are way ahead of the game in terms of if they go in for development proposals someplace and they've got it at cost, but they may still turn around and bill their client for that and there are some entities that think they are going to make money off their GIS in terms of big bucks and they are never going to make big money off their GIS. You may re-coup your material costs and some other things, but they are not going to re-coup the cost from selling the service. Hamilton County is pretty far along in GIS and has made it available on the internet, who would make it available on the internet if they did not have people to view it.

Mr. Spiars asked if someone had been doing sampling and it was showing concentrations above the state standards and giving it over to IDEM, they may not want to turn it over to an entity like this.

Ms. Fort stated that it was kind of like attorney/client privilege.

Mr. Ward stated that he remembered some of this being out there for everybody and some of it being somewhere else.

Ms. Fort stated that the IDEM data, for instance, which is public, took a long time to get data, they were finally able to get the data and are using it. This is very public knowledge, but if you go the Martinsville Treatment Plant and ask for their sampling data, they are not as willing to give it out if they have been doing their own testing.

Mr. Shumasky stated that there would be some information that you would want to share with the public and some that you would not.

Ms. Fort asked what the point would be in collecting it if they cannot share the information?

Mr. Shumasky stated that there was a lot that could be shared.

Ms. Fort stated that there is a lot that you could share, but if you're looking at a water quality project and this group has the data and cannot release it for that study.

Mr. Shumasky stated that he did not believe that they could. It would depend.

Ms. Fort asked if it would be too high of a risk of it becoming public, if it is a watershed study there is a report that is written and put in the public library; that is a huge risk.

Mr. Spiars asked if the ultimate study was going to be the TMDL analysis. He asked if this was being done by the government?

Ms. Fort stated that the government is hiring the work out.

Stormwater Phase II Update:

Mr. Ward stated that they have not had a meeting lately on the external work group. They are supposed to have one soon, but the notice has not come out yet. Right now they are looking at the final adoption sometime at the end of the year first of next year, and that will shove everything back from that final adoption date. Because of the holdup on that the guidance document, that work group has not met since March or April of this year.

Ms. Fort stated that the ACEC meeting she went to a week ago stated that they revised draft for Rule 13 will be issued soon, the final in January and to go from there with respect to schedule. They are still working on the issues on 5 and 6 and is supposed to go to the December board for preliminary adoption. It is supposed to go to the November, but they do not think it will make it.

Mr. Amos stated that Ms. Fort has a copy of Rule 5 and Rule 6 changes. There is a lot of mention of 'any developments occur upon a jurisdiction boundary, who do they report to', that kind of information. There has been a lot of Rule 5 omitted. Laurie had told them that the changes for Rule 5 are pretty much there.

Steve Hall entered at this time.

Other Projects:

Mr. Ward handed out a list of restoration projects to the committee members.

Mr. Ward stated that the areas in black are those projects that have been approved. When they approve them they lock in the dollar amount and also pass a resolution. They have resolutions 1 through 15 on this sheet.

Mr. Shumasky stated that there are a lot of proposed items that have nothing to do with the quality of water.

Other Business:

Mr. Hall stated that the Policy has been discussing the idea of hosting a workshop for legislatures to talk about the water quality and quantity issues important to the Upper White Alliance. They have not moved forward with that, but in that discussion they suggested that the Technical Committee come up with some of the topics of conversation for discussion.

Mr. Spiars asked if the biggest problem was bacteria from agriculture?

Mr. Hall stated that one of the topics of discussion was Ecoli standards.

Mr. Ward stated that funding for Phase II. Maybe just an education meeting with them letting them know what is in the Rule and how it is going to affect them.

Mr. Hall stated that by the time that could be organized several communities will have a good assessment of what their costs are going to be as well.

Mr. Spiars asked what the most likely avenue will be of getting funds?

Mr. Ward stated that what the surveyors are working on is a new revenue stream. Basically has to do with two things: 1) it has to be outside the cap or else they are competing with the same funds as salary pools and everything else. They have talked about creating the user fee based on impervious surfaces and they have also talked about creating a district and putting it on assessed valuation for that district. The only things you don't catch are your non-profits and your streets and highways.

Ms. Fort asked about TMDL's. She stated that they could cover that in a morning.

Mr. Hall stated that a breakfast and maybe through lunch.

Mr. Shumasky stated that they should give them a good fact sheet to go with it.

Mr. Ward stated that on Phase II they could give a preview and then let them know of the costs and such.

Mr. Hall stated that demonstrating costs and really explaining to them where the complexities of the rubber meeting the road, so to speak, especially on the construction activities or plan reviews, site inspections and so on. There are staffing needs, legal needs, implementing the program, enforcing the program that a lot of folks are not factoring at this stage.

Mr. Ward stated that with elections coming up, when did they think this would happen?

Mr. Hall stated that the original idea was to get it in after the spring session, this time he did not know.

Mr. Ward asked if they were going to recommend the Policy Committee move on this?

Mr. Hall stated that especially, like Mr. Ward is suggesting, that this would be somewhat of an orientation for any of the new folks coming in.

Mr. Ward asked if they were going to target all of them or just the ones that have Phase II communities?

Mr. Hall stated that would be the logical approach.

Mr. Ward asked if morning would be better or late afternoon into the evening?

Mr. Hall stated that he believed that they were discussing morning originally.

Mr. Amos stated that funding this is another question.

Mr. Hall stated that they could recommend this to Policy to make a decision on this.

Mr. Ward stated that late December or first of January.

Mr. Hall stated that if Policy Committee decides to move forward with this then they will do some quick figuring to determine how many there are in the entire area, how many will be affected by Phase II issues. They can start with the Phase II and if they think they have the capacity and it is realistic to get with the rest.

Mr. Ward asked if Mr. Hall had legislative directories?

Mr. Hall stated that he did.

Mr. Ward stated that they have a consensus to send this on to Policy with a recommendation that they seriously consider this.

Mr. Shumasky stated that if they don't get the fish kill money, maybe they should be after their legislators to see if there is a way to budget for the GIS.

Mr. Ward asked if they had another shot at getting more Build Indiana Funds appropriated this session?

Mr. Spiars asked about the million dollar grants from EPA. He asked if there was anymore discussion about that?

Mr. Hall stated that they chatted about it internally in his office. There is a ten page application that is due November 21st. The inherent problem in all of this is they are looking for groups or organizations that have a plan of what they want to do and how much it will cost. The feeling is that the \$21,000,000.00, they will want to spend that on projects that they can do immediately so they can have third year tangible successful things out of the Bush Administration. They are getting pretty sticky about having some kind of plan.

Mr. Ward stated that if they get the money for the feasibility study at least they will have that in hand and have a plan then if everything else goes sour.

Set Meeting Date:

The next meeting was set for Thursday December 19, 2002 at 2:00 PM.

The meeting was adjourned.

Kenton C. Ward
UWRWA Technical Committee Chairman