

**TIPPECANOE COUNTY STEERING COMMITTEE  
NPDES Phase II SWQMP**

---

**SUMMARY OF STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING**

DATE: January 24, 2003  
TO: Project File  
COPY: Steering Committee Members/ CBBEL  
FROM: Siavash E. Beik, P.E., CBBEL  
SUBJECT: Summary of Steering Committee Meeting  
Tippecanoe County Building  
January 23, 2003 10:00 a.m. – 12:00 a.m.

---

---

**ATTENDEES**

Steering Committee

David Downey -	City of West Lafayette
Linda Eastman -	Tippecanoe County SWCD
Sallie Fahey -	Area Plan Commission
Jim Knapp -	Purdue University
Opal Kuhl -	City of Lafayette
Ken Larson -	Ivy Tech State College
Roger McClellan -	Pheasants Forever
Steve Murray -	Tippecanoe County
Dana Smith -	Chamber of Commerce
Mike Spencer -	City of Lafayette
Dean Zimmerman -	IDNR, District Wildlife Biologist
Rachele Baker -	CBBEL
Siavash Beik -	CBBEL

Additional Attendees

Robin Ridgeway -	Purdue University
------------------	-------------------

**MEETING AGENDA**

- I. Discussion Of New Direction of Steering Committee
- II. Presentation of MCM 1 and 2 BMP's
- III. Discussion on Chapters i, 1 and 2 of Part C
- IV. Logo Subcommittee Update
- V. Discussion of MCM 3 and 4 BMPs
- VI. Next Meeting Date
- VII. Preparation for Next Meeting

**TIPPECANOE COUNTY STEERING COMMITTEE  
NPDES Phase II SWQMP**

---

**MEETING MINUTES**

1. Steve Murray opened the meeting with an announcement that the SWCD Annual Meeting and Dinner would be on January 30<sup>th</sup>, at Sgt. Preston's. Registration will begin at 6:00, and dinner will be at 6:45. Dinner tickets are \$10.
2. Siavash Beik discussed the re-focusing of the steering committee toward developing Part C of the Stormwater Quality Management Plan (SWQMP). IDEM plans to present the Rule 13 to the Water Pollution Control Board for approval at their February meeting. If it is approved, it will be open for comment for 90 days which means the Rule would be finalized in May. Once the rule is finalized, regulated communities will have 90 days to submit their NOI and Part A of their (SWQMP), which would be sometime in August. The project team has made a decision to have everything completed by the August due date, not just the NOI and Part A. The steering committee has a lot to accomplish in that short period of time and will need to meet every month to meet this deadline.
3. Rachele Baker then discussed the MS4 area map for all of Tippecanoe County. The map showed the Census Bureau's defined Urbanized Area, the boundaries of the cities and towns, and the minimum limits of the MS4 area. The limits of the MS4 area are defined by the corporate boundaries for cities and town. For the unincorporated areas, the MS4 limits must be "squared off" by section lines and roads.

Comment: Steve Murray pointed out that we have the option to expand the MS4 area to include areas where growth is expected.

Comment: Sallie Fahey noted that some of the Census data is wrong which would affect the limits of the Urbanized Area.

Comment: Siavash indicated that 4 newly designated entities (Ivy Tech and the towns of Shadeland, Dayton, and Battle Ground) are not included in the current list of countywide Phase II co-permittee parties and need to be contacted to see if they would want to join the countywide approach or if they would rather pursue the Phase II requirements on their own.

Comment: Steve indicated that Ivy Tech has agreed to be covered by the countywide approach. However, the other entities need to be contacted. Steve will contact the three towns to determine their preferred approach.



**TIPPECANOE COUNTY STEERING COMMITTEE  
NPDES Phase II SWQMP**

---

4. Rachele Baker then gave a brief discussion of the Part C working document that everyone had been forwarded for review. The document was put together as a starting point and to facilitate discussion within the steering committee. The IDEM rule leaves a lot of flexibility to the regulated communities in how they meet the objectives for Rule 13. It basically says you have to do something but does not specify what or how much. Existing university, city, county and SWCD programs that could be used to meet the objectives for Rule 13 were incorporated into Part C. Where there didn't appear to be enough existing programs, additional programs were suggested. The steering committee will need to review each Minimum Control Measure and attempt to identify additional existing programs that have not been included that would fit into Part C. They will also need to comment on proposed new programs and all measurable goals.
  
5. Siavash then provided a review of the structure and formatting of the document. Since this Part C will be made available to the public for review, quite a bit of introduction and background information was included. Following the introduction chapter, each chapter addresses one Minimum Control Measure. Within each chapter there is an introduction stating the purpose of the MCM, the federal requirements and the state requirements. Then individual BMPs are discussed in sub-sections, along with their associated measurable goals and proposed administration duties.
  
6. Siavash then asked for comments on the introduction chapter (Chapter i).  
  
Q: Opal Kuhl asked if Table 1 was required.  
A: Steve Murray stated that it only needed to be an estimate but is required.
  
7. Siavash then asked for comments on Chapter 1, MCM 1.  
  
Comment: Regarding Section 1.2.2, Opal and several others felt it would not be possible to dictate the area school's curriculum since they are not a part of the city or county government. It was suggested that the BMP, Measurable Goals, and Administration be worded that the SWCD or co-permittees will approach schools with the opportunity to help incorporate the listed programs into their curriculum, rather than saying that the curriculum will be incorporated.  
  
Response: Rachele noted that none of the parties listed under ANY of the Administration headings of each BMP have been approached about, much less have agreed to take on these tasks. Administration of programs, at this point, has simply been placed with the department or group whose current responsibilities most closely match these

**TIPPECANOE COUNTY STEERING COMMITTEE  
NPDES Phase II SWQMP**

---

new responsibilities. The project team will need to get firm commitments from the identified parties before finalizing Part C. If agreements can not be reached, we will need to revise Part C.

- Comment: Regarding Section 1.2.2, Sallie wanted to make sure the home schools and private schools were included.
- Comment: Regarding Section 1.2.2, Linda Eastman pointed out that if every school took them up on the opportunity to include these programs for every grade identified it would likely be too much for the SWCD to take on.
- Comment: Regarding Section 1.2.2., Linda Eastman, Dean Zimmerman, and others suggested additional educational programs that could be included as K-12 Education, specifically YMCA programs, Go FishIN, and Imagination Station at the Museum.
- Comment: Regarding Section 1.2.3, Linda Eastman noted that the Health Department, Wildcat Creek Solid Waste District, and Purdue's EPIC team all have developed or are in the process of developing educational brochures regarding water quality.
- Comment: Regarding Section 1.2.4, Steve Murray asked the first sentence under Administration be changed from "be responsible for" to "coordinate."
- Comment: Regarding Section 1.2.5, Opal asked that the Measurable Goal be changed from "advertise" to "announce."
- Comment: Regarding Section 1.2.5, Sallie and Roger felt that the Measurable Goal needed to be clarified to say that the announcements would be by the co-permittees and other organizations.
- Comment: Regarding Section 1.2.6, Linda and Dean pointed out that the IDNR already has a certification program for Erosion and Sediment Control.
- Comment: Siavash stated that the items included in Table 2 will be bulleted.
- Comment: Regarding Programmatic Indicators, Rachele explained that these items are not really up for debate and are verbatim requirements out of the Rule 13 language and that the corresponding Indiana Administrative Code is cited with each Indicator. The only change is

**TIPPECANOE COUNTY STEERING COMMITTEE  
NPDES Phase II SWQMP**

---

that we have specifically said we will not attempt to keep data on the number or percentage of visitors reached since we felt this was impossible. Hopefully this requirement will be dropped before Rule 13 is finalized.

Comment: Regarding Programmatic Indicators, several committee members felt that the word "visitors" needed to be further defined as non-residents.

8. Siavash noted that we were running out of time and would need to push the review of Chapter 2 to our next meeting.
9. Linda Eastman was asked for an update on the Logo Subcommittee. She stated that Dave Ayala (who was not present at this meeting) was working on getting information regarding the contest out but that no further progress had been made.
  - Q. Linda asked if this necessarily had to be done before we submit Part C to IDEM, as is stated in Part C.
  - A. Rachele stated that Part C can be changed to say the Logo will be developed in the first year of the permit.
10. Rachele stated that next month's meeting would now cover Chapter 2 and Chapter 3 instead of 3 and 4. She asked everyone to be thinking of existing programs that have been overlooked that can be included in these Chapters. The EPA website on NPDES Phase II includes a Menu of BMPs separated by MCM that everyone could refer to for example of programs that might qualify.
11. Siavash suggested dates for the previously unscheduled steering committee meetings for the months of February, April, June, and August. Everyone agreed on the following new dates:

February 20, 2003

April 17, 2003

June 19, 2003

August 21, 2003

**NEXT MEETING:**

Thursday, February 20, 2003  
County Building



**TIPPECANOE COUNTY STEERING COMMITTEE  
NPDES Phase II SWQMP**

---

10:00 am – 12:00 pm

file: Minutes01-23-03.doc

