

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

SUMMARY OF STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING

DATE: November 14, 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
September 25, 2003 10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.

ATTENDEES

Steering Committee

Dave Ayala -	Lafayette Citizen Representative
David Downey -	City of West Lafayette
Brian Keene	Builders Association
Jim Knapp -	Purdue University
Opal Kuhl -	City of Lafayette
Ken Larson -	Ivy Tech
Roger McClellan -	Pheasants Forever
Steve Murray -	Tippecanoe County
David Renicker -	Milestone
Dana Smith -	Chamber of Commerce
Kerry Smith -	Battle Ground Town Board
LaDonna Snyder -	Dayton Clerk-Treasurer
Dean Zimmerman -	IDNR Fish and Wildlife
Rachele Baker -	CBBEL
Siavash Beik-	CBBEL

Additional Attendees

Zach Beasley -	Tippecanoe County Surveyor's Office
Bob McCormick -	Purdue Planning with Power
C. Scott Snyder -	West Lafayette City Engineer
Paul Winstead -	Dayton Town Council

MEETING AGENDA

- I. Review of Agenda
 - II. Review of Minutes from July 17, 2003 Meeting
 - III. Discussion on Chapters 1 through 3 of Model Ordinance
 - IV. Financial Consultant Findings
 - V. Preparation for Next Meeting
-



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

MEETING MINUTES

1. Steve Murray began the meeting by introducing LaDonna Snyder representing Dayton, and Kerry Smith representing Battle Ground, and stating that those two communities have decided to co-permit.
2. Siavash reviewed the agenda and noted that the presentation of financial findings would be moved up the agenda to assure enough time for discussion. The ordinance would be reviewed in the time that remained.
3. With that, Greg Lindsey presented their findings to date. He discussed specific estimated existing expenditures, willingness to pay, funding requirements, and needs for generating additional funds for each entity. Several tables were used for illustration, and hard copies were provided to the committee. All estimates were based on comparisons to other cities and refined based on local data. Numbers are preliminary at this point and based on impervious acres.

Question: Roger asked what constitutes impervious. Is gravel impermeable?

Answer: Greg stated that it is estimated from infrared photography and would need to ask the analyst how gravel is interpreted.

Answer: Steve Murray added that in general impervious areas include roofs, parking lots, etc.

4. Greg went on to state that several focus groups had been interviewed to determine existing expenditures. These focus groups also estimated that local residents would accept a rate between \$2 and \$4. This rate range could be applied to "Equivalent Residential Units" (ERU) which is roughly equivalent to 2000 to 2500 sq. ft. of impervious surface. Projects would then have to be prioritized based on the ability to generate funds.
5. Greg then quickly covered the remaining steps needed to conclude the financial study and asked for questions.

Question: Dana asked how large industrial sites would be handled.

Answer: Greg stated that one way would be to figure out how many ERUs the site was equal to by dividing the total impervious area by 2000 or 2500 and then multiply by the utility rate. A system could be set up to give credit for existing BMPs.

Answer: Steve Murray noted that nothing had been decided yet on how anyone would be charged.

Question: Dave Ayala asked if credit could be given for a high percentage of pervious surface.



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

Answer: Greg answered that there are a lot of way to calculate charges and a lot of variables can be introduced but the most important thing is to be fair.

Answer: Siavash noted that Fort Wayne introduced a lot of variables into calculating their rate which drove up administrative costs and caused everyones rate to have to be higher.

Question: Kerry Smith asked if there were any examples of businesses be charge the same flat rate as residences.

Answer: Greg said he know of examples where different rates were applied to different land uses but it didn't turn out to be equitable.

Question: Brian Keene noted the differences between existing expenditures and households in each entity and wondered how charges would be broken down fairly.

Answer: Greg stated that we must look at shared programs as well as programs unique to each entity. Funding for programs will not come from one pool of money but some programs will be co-funded.

Answer: Steve gave educational efforts as an example of a shared program, and plan review as something handled by each entity separately.

Question: Brian noted that the numbers IUPUI had estimated would be needed for an exceptional program are less than the numbers estimated by Burke to implement the proposed Part C.

Answer: Greg stated that we must look at what we are able to generate and balance that with what we want to accomplish.

Answer: Siavash noted that IUPUI based their numbers on impervious surfaces as a gage of developed areas which may be as little as half of the actual developed area coverage.

Question: Scott Snyder asked if developments with BMPs would exempt the residents from a charge.

Answer: Greg stated that he was not aware of anywhere that allows that type of exemption. He also pointed out that the fees goes to support other parts of the stormwater program as well.

6. Opal stated that the entities will try to make it as fair as possible but some will still feel there are inequities.

7. With no more questions for Dr. Lindsey, the group began reviewing the Model Ordinance. Siavash opened with a background discussion about the ordinance. Rule 13 requires 3 ordinances related to MCM 3, 4, and 5. Rather than having 4 ordinances dealing with stormwater (when you include quantity issues), we have



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

combined it all into 1 comprehensive ordinance. The current stormwater ordinance has a lot of calculations included in the text. The proposed ordinance has deals mainly with legal requirements and separated procedures into a technical document incorporated into the ordinance by reference.

8. Siavash pointed out that since it is a “model” ordinance it can be customized by each entity.
9. Steve Murray stated that this ordinance will be similar to the unified subdivision ordinance and that the different entities will try to be consistent with the technical standards.
10. Rachele then went through Chapter 1, which dealt with general information about the ordinance itself, and asked for questions and comments from the committee. There were none.
11. The group then moved on to Chapter 2 - Prohibited Discharges and Connections.
 - Section 2: The term water body needs to be more specifically defined and should explicitly exclude BMPs built to handle pollution such as pocket wetlands.
 - Section 3: Item “N” in the exemption list should clarify that what type of lawn; whether it be residential only or any lawn.
 - Section 6: The opening paragraph should specify that a written report must be filed by the discharger(s).
12. There were no further questions or comments, so Siavash concluded the meetings by stating that we would start with Chapter 3 in our next meeting and would also allow additional comments on Chapters 1 and 2.

NEXT MEETING:

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

file: Minutes09-25-03

