

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

SUMMARY OF STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING

DATE: February 21, 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
February 20, 2003 10:00 a.m. – 12:00 a.m.

ATTENDEES

Steering Committee

David Downey -	City of West Lafayette
Jim Knapp -	Purdue University
Brian Keene -	Homebuilders Association
Opal Kuhl -	City of Lafayette
Ken Larson -	Ivy Tech State College
Roger McClellan -	Pheasants Forever
Steve Murray -	Tippecanoe County
Mike Spencer -	City of Lafayette
Dean Zimmerman -	IDNR, District Wildlife Biologist
Rachele Baker -	CBBEL
Siavash Beik -	CBBEL

MEETING AGENDA

- I. Review of Agenda
- II. Summary of January 23, 2003 Meeting
- III. Presentation of Potential MCM 2 and 3 BMP's
- IV. Comments on Chapters 2 and 3 of Part C
- V. Presentation of Potential MCM 4 and 5 BMPs
- VI. Ordinance Update
- 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 by stating that he had initiated contact with Shadeland, Battle Ground, and Dayton and would continue to communicate with them regarding their preference with regard to co-permitting with the current team. He asked Rachele to look into whether IDEM planned to make an exception for Shadeland and the Wea Conservancy District.
2. Siavash Beik briefly went over the agenda for this meeting and allotted time for each item.
3. Rachele Baker then asked if everyone had received the meeting minutes from last month and if there were any corrections, omissions, or other comments. She stated that since changes to Part C resulting from Steering Committee input would not be made until all chapters had been reviewed, it is important that the committee review the meeting minutes to be sure their individual comments were noted.
4. Rachele informed the committee that Rule 13 had been approved by the Water Pollution Control Board but still needed to make it through the Governors office and the Secretary of State's office. Copies of Rule 13 as it was presented to the WPCB and a summary of changes since it was last brought before the WPCB are both available on the internet at:
<http://www.in.gov/ideM/water/planbr/rules/021203wpcbpacket/courtesycopy.pdf> and
<http://www.in.gov/ideM/water/planbr/rules/021203wpcbpacket/suggstdchgs.pdf>
5. Rachele then gave a brief presentation of BMPs identified by the EPA for MCMs 2 and 3 as they listed on the EPA website. Dean Zimmerman pointed out that the SWCD is working to contact and encourage Wabash Riverfront landowners to reforest the Wabash River riparian zone through Tippecanoe County which would qualify as a BMP under EPAs "reforestation programs."
6. The group then began reviewing Chapters 2 and 3 (MCMs 2 and 3) of the Part C working document. Siavash pointing out that the major concerns with the Chapters reviewed last month dealt with the Administrative sections. He reiterated that governmental departments outside of the ones represented on the steering committee have not been exposed to this plan, but efforts are underway to begin orienting them with this new regulation and approaching them with the responsibilities "assigned" to them in Part C. Based on those discussions, adjustments will be made to the Administrative sections and binding agreements will be drawn up. Further, one of the attachments to the finalized Part C, after all agreements have been reached, will be a Master Administrative Table, detailing who has agreed to be responsible for what.



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

7. Siavash then asked for comments on Section 2.1.

Q: Have any of the IDEM requirements listed in the introduction changed with the latest version of Rule 13.

A: Rachele stated they have not.

8. Rachele began to review the content of Section 2.2, asking for comments along the way. There were no comments on Section 2.2.1.

Comment: Regarding Section 2.2.2, Steve and others preferred that the requirement to make Part C available for review at all local schools be removed since it is not required and everyone felt that the local libraries and the internet would be enough.

Comment: Regarding Section 2.2.3, Dean Zimmerman felt the Adopt-a-Stream program should be identified specifically as the IDNR Adopt-a-Stream program. Several others agreed.

Comment: Regarding Section 2.2.4, Rachele noted that the Measurable Goal of 5 organizations participating in the program was chosen because there are already that many involved. Opal felt this was an achievable and sustainable number.

Comment: Steve recommended that the Greater Lafayette Vision 2020 implementation plan be incorporated into Chapter 2 where applicable.

Comment: Regarding Section 2.2.5, Opal noted that it is already policy for the governments to respond to **all** complaints.

Comment: Regarding Section 2.2.6, several people suggested that “Storm Drain Stenciling” be changed to “Storm Drain Signage” in order to avoid excluding other marking mechanisms. There also needs to be a reference in this section to Chapter 3 which also discusses storm drain signage.

Comment: Regarding Section 2.2.6, under the Administration heading, “the County Auditor’s Office” should be replaced by “the co-permittees”.

Comment: Regarding Section 2.2.7, there was much discussion regarding the evolution of the Steering Committee into an advisory group and the decision was made to strike that activity altogether.



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

Comment: Regarding Section 2.2.7, under Measureable Goals heading, Steve and Opal both preferred the rewording to say that the *opportunity* will be made available to address stormwater quality issues at monthly government meetings. Since water quality issues may not arise every month, it is better to the opportunity is there, rather than saying that water quality issues will *definitely* be discussed every month.

Comment: Regarding Section 2.3, Opal added that Board of Public Works meetings are held weekly and are open to the public.

9. The steering committee then moved on to cover Chapter 3. Rachele noted that the IDEM requirements for this MCM have not changed. There were no other comments on the Introduction to Chapter 3.

10. Rachele began to review the contents of Section 3.2, asking for comments along the way.

Comment: Regarding Section 3.2.1, Steve would like to see the requirement for use of a multi-parameter probe to test for pollutants dropped.

Response: Rachele said she would look into the exact wording in the Regulation and drop that requirement if possible.

Follow-up: Rule 13, Section 14, subsections (d) and (e) read as follows.

(d) An MS4 operator shall develop a plan to detect, address, and eliminate illicit discharges, including illegal dumping, into the MS4 conveyance. (e) The plan developed under subsection (d) must, at a minimum, locate problem areas via dry weather screening or other means, determine the source, remove or otherwise correct illicit connections, and document the actions taken. The dry weather screening or other means must utilize a field testing kit, or similar method, to analyze for pollutants of concern and other parameters, such as pH, conductivity, or nitrogen-ammonia, used to identify possible pollutant sources."

After contacting IDEM, Mark Balazs clarified that the initial dry weather screening would be visual only - looking for flows from outfalls after all stormwater runoff should have subsided. Any observed flows would then need to be field tested for the presence of pollutants but not concentrations.

The wording in Section 3.2.1 will be changed to allow for other field testing methods instead of restricting to a probe.



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

Comment: Regarding Section 3.2.1, under the Administration heading, Steve noted that “The County GIS Department” should be changed to “The GIS Departments within each jurisdiction”.

Comment: Regarding Section 3.2.3, Mike Spencer would like to change the wording in the Measurable Goal to training rather than certification.

Comment: Regarding Section 3.2.4, there was discussion between Opal, Mike, Steve, and David Downing regarding whether they felt they could meet the 20% requirement by the end of the fifth year. After kicking around estimates of how many drains required maintenance work each year and figuring the maintenance crews could sign drains as they worked on them, the 5% per year for 4 years seems attainable.

11. There were no other comments on Chapter 3, so Rachele moved on to the next item on the agenda and gave a brief presentation of BMPs identified by the EPA for MCMs 4 and 5 as they listed on the EPA website. She asked that everyone keep those BMPs in mind as they reviewed Chapters 4 and 5 for next month.
12. Rachele then briefly discussed the strategy for meeting the requirements in MCM 3, 4 and 5 of developing an ordinance. Rather than developing 3 separate ordinances and also having an ordinance that covers stormwater quantity issues, we are working on a comprehensive stormwater ordinance which covers all four topics. Technical jargon will not be included directly in the ordinance but rather included by reference as a Stormwater Handbook of some sort. The handbook would include specifications for “pre-approved” structural BMPs, calculations to be used for designing stormwater quality and quantity facilities, proper installation and maintenance of erosion control measures and other technical information. This keeps the ordinance short and to the point and allows for changes to the handbook without changing the ordinance.
13. Siavash then closed the meeting with a reminder that the next meeting would be March 20th.

NEXT MEETING:

Thursday, March 20, 2003
County Building
10:00 am – 12:00 pm

file: Minutes02-20-03.doc