

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

---

**SUMMARY OF STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING**

DATE: May 28, 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  
April 17, 2003 10:00 a.m. – 12:00 a.m.

---

---

**ATTENDEES**

Steering Committee

Dave Ayala -	Lafayette Citizen Representative
David Downey -	City of West Lafayette
Sallie Fahey -	Area Plan Commission
Brian Keene -	Homebuilders Association
Opal Kuhl -	City of Lafayette
Linda Eastman -	Tippecanoe County SWCD
Steve Murray -	Tippecanoe County
David Renicker -	Milestone
Robin Ridgway -	Purdue University
Mike Spencer -	City of Lafayette
Dean Zimmerman -	IDNR Wildlife Biologist
Rachele Baker -	CBBEL
Siavash Beik -	CBBEL

**MEETING AGENDA**

- I. Review of Agenda
- II. Review of Minutes from March 20, 2003 Meeting
- III. Comments on Chapters 5 and 6 of Part C
- IV. Ordinance and Handbook Update
- V. Preparation for Next Meeting
- VI. Updated Meeting Dates

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

---

**MEETING MINUTES**

1. Steve introduced Dave Renicker of Milestone who was asked to join the steering committee as a contractor representative.
2. Steve updated everyone on the progress in collaborating with Dayton and Battle Ground. They are both interested in joining but nothing has been agreed to yet. Shadeland is trying to get IDEM to exempt them, in which case, Wea CD would also likely be exempted.
3. Siavash started the meeting with a review of the agenda for this steering committee meeting and allotting time for each topic.
4. Rachele asked if everyone had received the meeting minutes from last month and if there were any corrections, omissions, or other comments. There were no changes other than the date of the meeting being February instead of March.
5. The group then began reviewing Chapter 5 (MCM 5) of the Part C working document. There were no comments on the Introduction section.
6. Rachele began reviewing Section 5.2 asking for comments along the way.

Comment: The two highlighted areas in section 5.2.1 regarding removal rates and impervious surfaces were open for discussion. The general consensus was that an 80% total suspended solids removal rate would be acceptable and that the percent impervious surface restriction should be removed.

Comment: It was noted that Purdue had been omitted from the Administration of section 5.2.1 and that they would not adopt the ordinance, but rather use the language as policy.

Comment: Regarding Section 5.2.2, the Certification should include builders and contractors as well as developers, reviewers, and inspectors.

Comment: Linda and Dean noted that IDNR will conduct the type of training described in Section 5.2.2 upon request. There was some concern about their availability and the decision was made to include language saying IDNR would be used for the training if possible.

Comment: Robin asked that the administration of section 5.2.2 include Purdue faculty and staff rather than just faculty. This change was made throughout the document.



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

---

7. The group then moved on to Section 5.3 where Opal and Steve noted that the maximum fine is \$2500 per day, not \$1000 per day.
8. Under Section 5.5, Opal suggested that reporting the number of inspectors and reviewers trained each year would be a good programmatic indicator, similar to Chapter 4.
9. The group then moved on to Chapter 6 where there were again no comments on the introduction section and we immediately began reviewing Section 6.2.

Comment: Regarding Section 6.2.1, Robin noted that “grounds crews” should be replaced with “physical facilities.”

Comment: Regarding Section 6.2.3, the Purdue Fire Department and Radiological & Environmental Management as well as the Tippecanoe Emergency Management Agency should be added to the Administration heading.

Comment: Regarding the Section 6.2.4 Measureable Goals, it was suggested that the annual number of projects not be based on a percentage of the total but rather be based on an annual budget.

Comment: Regarding Section 6.2.5, Siavash noted that there are very few true Flood Management Projects in this state, and wondered if IDEM actually means stormwater management.

*NOTE: After talking to Mark Balasz and Lori Gates, both of IDEM, they did in fact define Flood Management Projects as stormwater management projects and were unaware of other, more restrictive, definitions of Flood Management. This clarification is made in the Guidance Document currently being developed by IDEM.*

The title of Section 6.2.4 will be changed to Stormwater Quantity Management instead of Flood Management.

10. The group then moved on to comment on Section 6.3.

Comment: Someone pointed out that OSHA stands for Occupational Safety and Health Administration, not the Operation, Safety and Health Administration. Robin noted that EPA already requires training HazMat training.



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

---

11. As there were no further comments on Chapter 6, Siavash stated that all comments and revisions would be incorporated into the Part C document and distributed to the steering committee members for final comments in the next meeting.
12. Rachele then gave a short update on the progress of the Model Ordinance and again noted, for those not in attendance at last month's meeting, that the ordinance will include general policy and requirements and will incorporate by reference a technical document which includes calculations and methodologies. She again stated that this was so the BMP list could be updated frequently without going through an ordinance revision.
- Comment: Sallie felt changes to the "handbook" (or technical document) would require a public hearing same as an ordinance revision and that this should be checked out with co-permittee attorneys.
- Comment: Brian again voiced his concern over changes to the handbook being made without input from the regulated community.
- Question: Linda asked if the ordinance would be attached to Part C when submitted to IDEM.
- Answer: Siavash stated that it would be attached as a model ordinance and that each co-permittee could then modify it but not be less restrictive.
- Question: Someone asked who would be responsible for the maintenance of post-construction BMPs.
- Answer: Rachele answered that the property owner is responsible for maintenance, even through ownership changes, through deed restrictions.
- Question: Linda asked how to determine 1 inch of runoff.
- Answer: Siavash answered that it is based on rainfall, permeability, slope and other things and that it can easily be determined using calculations commonly used in stormwater quantity calculations.
13. Siavash then moved on to discuss next month's meeting. The steering committee will receive a final draft copy of Part C, which includes revisions based on their comments, for review. We will go over final comments Part C in the next meeting. The next steering committee meeting will be moved from May 15<sup>th</sup> to May 29<sup>th</sup> and will only be an hour long (10:00AM to 11:00AM). From 11:00AM to 12:00PM, the



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

---

co-permittees will hold a short informational presentation for the departments that will be involved in Phase II (e.g. Parks, Health, Streets, etc). The Steering Committee Members are more than welcome to stay.

14. With that, the meeting was adjourned.

**NEXT MEETING:**

Thursday, May 29, 2003  
County Building  
10:00 am – 11:00 am

file: Minutes04-17-03.doc

