

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

SUMMARY OF STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING

DATE: January 6, 2004
TO: Project File
COPY: Steering Committee Members/ CBBEL
FROM: Siavash E. Beik, P.E., CBBEL
SUBJECT: Summary of Steering Committee Meeting
Tippecanoe County Building
November 20, 2003 10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.

ATTENDEES

Steering Committee

Dave Ayala -	Lafayette Citizen Representative
David Downey -	City of West Lafayette
Sallie Fahey -	Area Plan Commission
Brian Keene	Builders Association
Opal Kuhl -	City of Lafayette
Ken Larson -	Ivy Tech
Roger McClellan -	Pheasants Forever
Steve Murray -	Tippecanoe County
Chris Remley -	Soil and Water Conservation District
Dana Smith -	Chamber of Commerce
Kerry Smith -	Town of Battle Ground
Diane Windler -	Purdue University (for Jim Knapp)
Paul Winstead -	Town of Dayton
Rachele Baker -	CBBEL

Additional Attendees

Greg Lindsey -	Financial Consultant
Jamie Palmer -	Financial Consultant
Bob McCormick -	Purdue Planning with Power
Bob Bowman -	Dayton Town Board Member

MEETING AGENDA

- I. Review of Agenda
- II. Review of Minutes from Sept 25, 2003 Meeting
- III. Financial Consultant Findings
- IV. Discussion on Chapters 3 and 4 of Model Ordinance
- V. Preparation for Next Meeting

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

MEETING MINUTES

1. Steve Murray began the meeting by discussing some of the changes that happened with the election most notably that LaDonna Snyder would no longer be representing Dayton on our steering committee.
2. Rachele let everyone know that the NOI and Part A had been submitted on Nov 5th with Tippecanoe County, Lafayette, West Lafayette, Purdue, Ivy Tech, Dayton, and Battle Ground all listed as co-permittees and the county acting as the operator.
3. Rachele reviewed the agenda and asked if anyone had any comments or corrections to the minutes from September. There were none.
4. With that, Greg Lindsey passed out some information updating the committee on financial findings to date. He stated that the new data he would be presenting today includes better number of need and ability to generate funding. He expects to have a summary report to the steering committee prior to the January meeting for discussion during the meeting.
5. Greg went on to state that operation and maintenance expenditures for Lafayette, West Lafayette, and the County are normal/average and that some expenditures already go toward Phase II type activities. The numbers used for estimated cost of Phase II are the same as those reported in Part A. He further clarified that the data being presented are estimates, not forecasts because all data needed to forecast is not available – namely impervious percentages.

Question: Sallie asked if the \$3 amount for a utility was chosen because that is an average from across the county. She expressed concern over blindly following an average.

Answer: Greg stated that the \$3 figure came from averages and was confirmed during interviews.

Question: Dave Ayala asked if these studies were being done to find short comings if funding?

Answer: Greg replied that they used Burke's estimates of what implementation of Phase II would cost and have found that revenues generated by a \$3/month/household charge will not fully fund Phase II.

Question: Sallie asked where the 58% and 76% figures (as estimates of non-residential land use) came from.



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

Answer: Greg said they are averages from comparable communities – not New York or Los Angeles.

Question: Brian asked if the charge would be consistent across jurisdictions.

Answer: Both Steve Murray and Opal stated that they hope to be consistent across jurisdictions.

Question: Brian noted that each jurisdictions numbers seem to balance except for Purdue.

Answer: Greg pointed out that Purdue’s numbers are reflected in West Lafayette and the County’s numbers

Question: Sallie and Brian asked if areas can be added to the MS4 area, such as areas where we know growth will occur.

Answer: Steve Murray noted that the County boundary can change.

Answer: Jamie stated that she had run a computer model to project land use changes and that the current delineated MS4 areas seems to cover projected areas of growth.

Question: Jim Knapp wondered what satellite imagery was used to estimate non-residential land use.

Answer: Jamie said the image was from 2000.

Question: Sallie felt that, at some point, there has to be some discussion of what the \$3 charge will go toward.

Answer: Greg stated that they will try to clarify what revenue sources would to toward what activities.

6. With no more questions for Greg and Jamie, the committee again turned toward reviewing the ordinance, beginning at Chapter 3 – Stormwater Quantity Management. Rachele gave a brief overview of the chapter, noting that much of the language is the same as in the current ordinance. Technical language in the existing ordinance is not included in this model ordinance but will be incorporated into the technical standards document.

Section 1: Sallie asked that “planned unit development” be changed to “planned development”, and that “rural estate subdivisions” be added to the list of activities that require control of stormwater release rates.

Section 4: Several people felt the title was confusing and should be changed from “...County Projects” to “...County Regulated Drains.”



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

Section 6: Someone pointed out that “property owner” should be added to the second sentence of the second paragraph along with “project site owner” and “homeowners association” since not every site will be within a community with a HOA.

Brian wondered who would be responsible for doing inspections, and would inspections be required for ever? Brian also stated that his concern over this matter extended into later chapters where more inspections are required.

Steve explained that the property owner would be responsible and that detention facility inspections by the owner are already required in the existing ordinance. If this duty is neglected, the county will conduct the inspection and bill the owner. To date there has not been much enforcement but that will have to change. In Steve’s opinion, eventually it will be the local governments conducting the inspections. Several people expressed support for this idea.

Sallie stated that Property Owners Associations aren’t always established so proof of establishment will start being a requirement. She also stated that is a problem with POAs not paying taxes on common ground. Then they become the property (and responsibility) of the government through tax sell.

7. The group then moved on to Chapter 4 – Stormwater Pollution Prevention for Construction Sites. Rachele explained that this Chapter is a combination of the existing ordinance and the requirements of Rule 5. The reason it mirrors Rule 5 is because Rule 13 requires MS4s to develop a local program that “must contain, at a minimum, the requirements of 327 IAC 15-5.

Section 1: A typo was noticed in the last sentence of the fourth paragraph where “parted” should be changed to “part.”

In reference to the last paragraph of Section1, Brian expressed concern about housing addition developers applying for a local stormwater permit and then being responsible for the compliance of individual lot developers within the larger development. He feels they will have no way of forcing lot developers to comply. Some discussion followed, however, due to a shortage of time, this issue will have to be picked up next meeting.

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

NEXT MEETING:

Thursday, January 15, 2004
County Building
10:00 am – 12:00 pm

file: Minutes11-20-03

