

**THE SEWER BOARD OF THE CIVIL CITY OF NEW ALBANY, INDIANA, HELD A WORK SESSION IN THE THIRD FLOOR ASSEMBLY ROOM OF THE CITY-COUNTY BUILDING ON THURSDAY, OCTOBER 4, 2012 AT 9:00 A.M.**

**PRESENT:** Mr. Brinkworth and Mr. Wilkinson

**ALSO PRESENT:** Todd Solomon, Randy Stambaugh, Chris Morris, Bill Gibson, Joe Ham, April Dickey, Shane Gibson, Scott Wood and Vicki Glotzbach

**Mr. Brinkworth called the meeting to order at 9:10 a.m.**

**Mr. Stambaugh** started with Chapter 5: Final Record Drawings.

**Mr. Brinkworth** asked if there is definition on privately developed drainage plans and asked if this is for privately owned property or a developer.

**Mr. Stambaugh** explained that private development is what isn't done by MSD as a Capital Improvement Project depending on who funds it.

**Mr. Solomon** stated that they talked about the fact that they wanted private developers to turn in record drawings and they also want drainage plans as well.

**Mr. Brinkworth** explained that they are going to start mapping all of that stuff so they might as well have it.

**Mr. Stambaugh** stated that that the big thing that MSD found is that the one important thing that they weren't doing with drainage in the past that they started doing is detention.

**Bill Gibson** stated that the engineer has to certify that it is substantially built to drawing specifications.

**Mr. Stambaugh** stated that they are very formal with sanitary sewers but not as much with storm drainage.

**Bill Gibson** stated to get your bond released you have to have an engineer sign off on it.

**Mr. Brinkworth** stated that if you put it in the design manual then the engineer will have a leg to stand on to charge them for it.

**Bill Gibson** stated that they have to do some level of work to make sure that drainage is flowing correctly.

**Mr. Stambaugh** stated that they will strike the last sentence in the first paragraph so by being silent it will apply everywhere.

**Mr. Morris** stated that he wants to make sure that when they submit their plans that they know to submit a hard copy but they really need and an AutoCAD DWG file that can be transferred

with coordinate points and state plan coordinates. He explained that sometimes they don't get what they need because the developer is not made to do it so he would like to see it required.

**There was a lengthy discussion regarding the process of what is required and what they want to add to those requirements.**

**Bill Gibson** asked if they put it in as an as-built later and stated that he likes the red lines to show the difference between plan and as-built.

**Mr. Stambaugh** stated that they need to mark up things that need to be changed

**Mr. Brinkworth** stated that it wouldn't take that long for a surveyor to go out and look at it after it is all done and this would probably be a better idea.

**Mr. Solomon** stated that one thing that is missing from this chapter is the requirement to submit record drawings in PDF, AutoCAD, and hard copy format.

**Mr. Brinkworth** stated that he thinks he read that somewhere.

**Mr. Stambaugh** stated that some of that is covered in the last sentence.

**Bill Gibson** stated that the redline drawing he sees being references is for the changes and asked if there is a redline drawing that they keep during the process of the project.

**Mr. Solomon** stated that they need to have something in the manual that says changes must be approved before they are executed.

**Mr. Stambaugh** replied yes and that is what they are talking about here. He added that when the plans say that the distance from this manhole is going to be 346 feet and it gets built at 343 feet those are things that just happen during construction as opposed to plans being changed.

**Bill Gibson** asked if redlines for development changes would be something separate. He stated that they don't want this on their every day plans unless they have been approved.

**Mr. Stambaugh** explained that they need to clarify this in the manual.

**Bill Gibson** stated that in 6.2.2 it says copies may be obtained of the door hanger and wanted to know if they had any examples of those and what should be done.

**Mr. Stambaugh** explained that MSD mixes private development with capital projects. He explained that they can stipulate variations in the contract for this if you want to.

**Bill Gibson** asked about 6.3.3 Placement and explained that on the next page it says 500 feet apart.

**Mr. Brinkworth** stated that this would probably come into play if they are doing something like a big sewer extension.

**Mr. Stambaugh** stated that placement in 6.3.3 is primarily talking about during the construction and temporary issues.

**Bill Gibson** asked about the control monuments that they use and asked if they were aluminum caps.

**Mr. Stambaugh** replied yes.

**Mr. Morris** asked about putting a GPS coordinate where a tree is to identify the mark instead of using a tree as a description.

**Bill Gibson** explained that they aren't using the trees for anything other than a benchmark.

**Mr. Stambaugh** stated that Mr. Brinkworth mentioned something about the frequency of benchmarks and asked if that was in the wording.

**Bill Gibson** stated that it is in 6.3.5

**Mr. Stambaugh** stated that 6.4 regarding Degree of Accuracy is basically out of MSD standards and asked if they had any questions.

**Bill Gibson** asked about 6.6.1 and the requirement that the boundary lines be established by a survey sufficient to define the easement. .

**Mr. Brinkworth** stated that could be pretty rough. He explained that that when they are doing road projects they go down the right-of-ways and try to pick up as many property corners as they can.

**Mr. Stambaugh** asked the board if their copies had exhibit 6.3 in them because he had it highlighted in his as a point to discuss.

**Mr. Solomon** stated that he would email everyone the exhibit to let them take a look at it.

**Mr. Stambaugh** stated that 6.7 deals with staking sewers and this is a lot of capital project kind of things where they are very thorough in describing how they would want it done. He referenced 6.8 Certification Notes and stated that an example can be found in section 4.4.6.1 but they don't have that here today.

**Mr. Brinkworth** asked if it is just a certificate for a plat map.

**Mr. Stambaugh** stated that this is not an as-built but the engineer and surveyor are both stamping the design plans.

**Mr. Solomon** discussed Chapter 7: Easements and asked if there were any questions. .

**Mr. Brinkworth** explained that if it is a subdivision you may or may not have section numbers so he would like it to say plat number instead under 7.5.2

**Mr. Stambaugh** asked if they wanted 7.6.1 to say both utility and drainage easements.

**Mr. Moore** stated that sanitary sewer and drainage is one easement and the utility would be the other easement.

**There was a lengthy discussion on how to separate them on projects that would involve both.**

**Mr. Stambaugh** stated that they just need to take out all references to utility easements if they are going to do sewer and drainage easements.

**Mr. Brinkworth** stated that if they had a plat recorded and an old utility easements some would take that to be both sanitary and stormwater.

**Mr. Wood** stated that if they are putting in a drainage facility they are reserving the easement for that facility itself and they don't want any other easement there but they are still going to be granting easements from the right-of-way to that back easement and they have to make sure to allow for that access to cross it over if need be.

**Mr. Brinkworth** stated that the utility companies will not put their lines in the back anymore.

**There was a lengthy discussion regarding potential problems crossing a utility line with a sewer line in easements as well as allowances for mailboxes.**

**Mr. Morris** stated that one of their biggest problems is people filling in the drainage ditches with dirt so that they can have flat ground. He explained that they are also trying to require the right size pipe to go into the right-of-way for driveway permits as well as requiring the separate easements with crossings accepted with approval.

**Mr. Wood** stated they would prefer to see the drainage easement indicate when it is a drainage facility easement and alert the property owner.

**Mr. Brinkworth** stated that it should be in the deed restrictions or covenants.

**Mr. Ham** stated that they don't want to have to mow the grass on the easements because that should be maintained by the resident.

**Mr. Brinkworth** stated that they could charge them if that happens or it should be included in the deed restrictions.

**Mr. Stambaugh** stated that in the drainage easement is only used to make corrections and not for routine yard work.

**Bill Gibson** asked if there was anything with teeth in it that could keep people from making these revisions.

**Mr. Stambaugh** stated that the record plat has the easement and it describes that you can't fill it in or do any work without approval but it isn't very effective in stopping property owners from doing that.

**Bill Gibson** asked him to email a copy of that to him.

**Mr. Brinkworth** asked Mr. Wood if they could make it mandatory to include that language in the deed description or to have a Homeowners Association.

**Mr. Wood** stated that they could.

**Mr. Stambaugh** stated that they would be more likely to see it there than on the plat.

**Mr. Wilkinson** asked if there was language that stipulates that you can't obstruct the normal flow of surface water.

**Mr. Morris** stated that is when it is in a defined channel. He explained that they don't have a regulated drainage board and they are one of the few counties that don't so the instances that they are seeing in Clark County would not apply to Floyd County.

**Mr. Ham** stated that you can't deliberately run off on another's property.

**Mr. Morris** asked about access easements and stated that they need to be added in there. He stated that he is up for whatever distance it needs to be.

**Mr. Brinkworth** stated that if they are going to have access easements there has to be a requirement that no fences can be built in the easement.

**Mr. Stambaugh** asked if they wanted to put a 400' maximum in a block.

**Mr. Wood** stated that it would have to be at 800' maximum for a block.

**Mr. Morris** stated that the access easements could also be used for utility easements.

**Mr. Brinkworth** stated that a 20' easement would get them around any drainage easement.

**Mr. Stambaugh** stated that he doesn't think that they need to put drainage facilities in an access easement as it has the ability to create more issues.

**There was a lengthy discussion regarding access easements including drainage easements.**

**Mr. Wood** suggested that any rear drainage easement connect to a public right-of-way because it will affect how the lots or houses on the lot are sold.

**Mr. Brinkworth** stated that typically when designing you will run your streets parallel with the drainage anyway so it will be in the back and eventually you will have a block.

**Mr. Morris** stated that he doesn't think there is an access easement in the back of Muirfield Subdivision so on something like that they would need an access easement.

**Mr. Wood** stated that in a situation like Muirfield with rights-of-way on either side if they want to run a drainage easement behind that at some point in time it needs to touch the public right-of-way so that they have access to get behind it if the need to do any work.

**Mr. Stambaugh** reviewed the changes and additions and stated that they are not going to call it an access easement but it will have maximum 400' accessibility to the right-of-way.

**There was a lengthy discussion regarding the width of the easement for the county and the city.**

**Mr. Wood** stated that he thinks there should be some kind of variance for this process.

**Mr. Brinkworth** stated that he would agree.

**Mr. Stambaugh** stated that he would put a line in it stating 15' in the county and 12' in the city. He went over the release and encroachment of easements.

**Mr. Morris** asked if they could send an easement checklist to them.

**Mr. Stambaugh** replied yes. He went over property acquisition sheets and asked if there were any questions.

**The board went over all the exhibits included in these chapters.**

**Mr. Morris** stated that they already have a consent form to enter private property and he would get that to Mr. Stambaugh to review.

**Mr. Stambaugh** went over the sections regarding geotech and asked if there were any questions.

**There was a lengthy discussion regarding soil sampling and requirements for geotechnical reports.**

**Mr. Solomon** set a work session for October 24th from 9:00 -12:00 p.m. sanitary Sewer only and November 7<sup>th</sup> for 9:00 a.m. Stormwater only

**ADJOURN:**

There being no further business before the board, the meeting adjourned at 11:40 a.m.

---

Gary Brinkworth, Vice President

---

Vicki Glotzbach, City Clerk

October 4, 2012