



Stormwater Board Agenda

When: 7-2-2024

Time: 4:30pm

Where: Commissioners Conference Room

Pine View Government Center

Welcome:

Program Maintenance :

Approval of Minutes – June 2024

Claims – June 2024

Old Business:

Erosion Control Report – June Report

Stormwater EPSC Fees (Chris) – Plan Update

Business Plan (Stantec) – Final Review

New Business:

4023 Andy Drive (Marilyn McClure) – Building in an easement

Public Comment:

ADA Notice: Floyd County, will upon request, provide appropriate aids and services leading to effective communications for qualified persons with disabilities so that they can participate equally in Floyd County's public meetings.

For special accommodations for a meeting contact the Commissioners Administrative Assistant Suzanna Worrall at 812-948-5466 or sworrall@floydcounty.in.gov at least two (2) business days prior to the scheduled meeting or event to request an accommodation.

Floyd County Storm Water Board Minutes
Held: June 4, 2024
4:30 P.M.

Welcome:

Present: Commissioners John Schellenberger, Al Knable and Jason Sharp, County Engineer Horacio Urieta, Storm Water Coordinator Chris Moore, Attorney Rick Fox and Secretary Teresa Plaiss. County Surveyor John Brinkworth was absent.

Regular Meeting

Program Maintenance:

Approval of Minutes – May 6, 2024

Mr. Knable made a motion to approve the minutes of May 6 as presented, seconded by Mr. Sharp. Motion carried by a vote of 3-0.

Approval of Claims – June 4, 2024

Mr. Knable made a motion to approve the claims as presented, seconded by Mr. Sharp. Motion carried by a vote of 3-0.

Old Business:

Erosion Control Report– May 2024 – Chris Moore

Mr. Moore state there are 12 subdivisions with evidence of off-site sedimentation. (Complete repost on file with the minutes.)

Vac-Truck – Update and Approval

Mr. Urieta presented the Board with Resolution NO.2024-01 to purchase a 900-ECO 9 Yard truck mounted combination sewer cleaner for Stormwater. Mr. Knable made a motion to approve Resolution NO.2024-01 as presented, seconded by Mr. Sharp. Motion carried by a vote of 3-0. Mr. Urieta stated the purchase will be made through the Indiana Bond Bank of Source Well as the source of financing.

New Business:

MCM's 1.2.3 and 6 Audit – June 25, 2024

Mr. Moore explained him and the official from IDEM will finishing-up the audit by doing a walk-through of the different facilities owned by the County.

Mr. Moore informed the Board that he, Horacio Urieta and Cameron Voyles will be attending the Annual Meeting in Plainfield, Indiana on May 14th.

Stormwater Fees - Update

Mr. Moore stated there will a Stormwater Fee workshop on June 5, 2024 at 2:00 P.M. in the Commissioners Meeting Room.

Chicken House Deli (JLM Engineering) Variance Request

John McCoy, engineer for the Mattingly family, owners of the Chicken House on Grant Line Road, requested a variance in the pipe size for the drainage from their project site.

Mr. Knable made a motion to accept the variance from a six inch opening to a five inch as requested by Mr. McCoy, seconded by Mr. Sharp. Motion carried by a vote of 3-0.

3027 Shagbark Trail – Jodie Wilson – Easement Encroachment

Mr. Wilson requested a reduction of the easement from 30 ft. to 20 ft. on Lot #29.

Public Comment:

Dale Mann, Georgetown, spoke about Knob Hill Subdivision removing top soil.

Joseph Moore, Georgetown Township, spoke about Stormwater fees.

Adjournment

With there being no other business, a motion made by Mr. Sharp to adjourn, seconded by Mr. Knable. Motion carried. Meeting adjourned at 5:14 P.M. The next regular meeting of the Board on July 2, 2024 at 4:30 P.M, unless otherwise notified.

John Schellenberger President

Al Knable, Member

Jason Sharp, Member

Attest: _____
Teresa Plaiss, Clerk

REGISTER OF CLAIMS FOR STORMWATER

Meeting 7-2-24

DATE FILED	CLAIM #	FUND NO.	AMOUNT ALLOWED	DISCRIPTION
12/23/2023	1	1197	\$ 922.50	Professional Services
1/9/2024	2	1197	\$ 2,036.75	Professional Services
2/6/2024	3	1197	\$ 2,645.00	Professional Services

Total \$ 5,604.25

 President

EPSC Site Review Inspections

Summary Report

Date of Inspections: June 2024

Performed by: Frank Walden

Assembled by: Frank Walden

**** Information in the parentheses next to each item is what was found during the follow up inspection.****

Follow up inspections not done for June

1. **Billy Joe Mini Warehouses** (HWY 150 Floyds Knobs at intersection with Stiller RD)

- a) Site is dormant.

2. **Bridlewood** (Payne Koehler Road & Chapel Lane) ***

- a) Inlet needs protected. (since 6/24 –)
- b) Individual sites missing protections. (since 6/24 –)
- c) Concrete slurry in gutter. (since 6/24 –)
- d) Silt fence in multiple areas not maintained. (since 5/24 – **not fixed**)
- e) Sediment in public roadway. (Since 6/24 -)

3. **Cedar Pointe II** (Everett Avenue & Highway 150)

- a) Site is complete. Notice of Termination (NOT) has been requested.

4. **Chambord** (Paoli Pike and Old Hill RD) ***

- a) Two lots have active construction.
- b) Sediment behind silt fence needs cleaned out. (since 4/24 – **not fixed**)
- c) Inlet protection not maintained. (since 3/24 – **not fixed**)
- d) Sediment in roadway. (Since 6/24-)
- e) Stockpiles without protection. (Since 6/24-)
- f) Slurry in gutter. (Since 6/24-)

5. **Eastridge Borrow Site** (Highway 111)

- a) No inspections done since 4/24

6. **Eastridge Fill Site** (Highway 111)

- a) No inspections done since 4/24

Sites with evidence of off-site sedimentation

*** Sites with a high probability of off-site sedimentation

14. **Highlands** (Old Vincennes Road and Schreiber Road) ***

- a) Inlet protection(s) installed incorrectly/need replaced. (since 5/24 – fixed)
- b) Sediment in roadway and gutter in multiple locations. (since 5/24 – **not fixed**)
- c) Multiple disturbed areas with no perimeter sediment control protections. (since 5/24 – **not fixed**)
- d) Overfilled dumpsters need a cover until emptied. (Since 6/24-)
- e) Stockpiles near conveyance channel have no protections. (Since 5/24-)

15. **Kamer Crossing** (Kamer Miller Road and Highland Oaks Drive) ***

- a) Sediment behind silt fence in back of site needs cleaned out. (since 5/24 – **not fixed**)
- b) Concrete washout needs maintained. (since 5/24 – fixed)
- c) Perimeter sediment control protections need maintained on lots near entrance of subdivision. (since 5/24 – **not fixed**)
- d) Overfilled dumpsters need cover until emptied. (Since 6/24-)
- e) Couple of inlet covers not maintained. (Since 6/24-)
- f) Sediment in roadway. (Since 6/24-)

16. **Knob Hill Multi-Family Development** (North side of SR 64 just West of Oaks RD) ***

- a) No perimeter protection around stockpiles. (since 5/24 – **not fixed**)
- b) Inlet protections not maintained. (Since 6/24 -)
- c) Individual lots missing protections. (Since 6/24-)
- d) Multiple spots with sediment in roadway. (Since 6/24-)

17. **Knob Hill Subdivision** (North side of SR 64 just West of Oaks RD) ***

- a) Perimeter sediment control protections need maintained. (since 5/24 – **not fixed**)
- b) Concrete washout needs maintained. (since 5/24 – **not fixed**)
- c) Sediment in roadway, inlet protections needs replaced. (since 6/24-)
- d) Missing protections near entrance to new subdivision section. (Since 6/24-)

18. **Legacy Springs** (Corydon Ridge & Old Salem on right – Legacy Springs Blvd)

- a) No active construction.

19. **Northside Basin – North** (Charlestown Road)

- a) Site is complete. Notice of Termination (NOT) has been requested.

Sites with evidence of off-site sedimentation

*** Sites with a high probability of off-site sedimentation

27. **Villas of Floyds Knobs** (SW Side of Vincennes RD 1320 ft West of SR 150 – Tuscany Drive) ***

- a) Concrete washout needs maintained. (since 5/24 – fixed)
- b) Concrete slurry in roadway and gutter. (since 5/24 – **not fixed**)
- c) Existing BMP's at headwall pipe entrance need maintained. (since 5/24 – fixed)
- d) Missing protection on individual sites. (Since 5/24- **not fixed**)

28. **Westfield Springs** (Alonzo Smith Road & Frank Ott Road) ***

- a) Perimeter sediment control protections need maintained. (since 5/24 – **not fixed**)
- b) Sediment in the gutter/roadway getting into inlets with protections that are not being maintained. (since 5/24 – **not fixed**)

29. **Woods of Skyline** (Skyline DR & Skyline CT)

- a. No active construction

Sites with evidence of off-site sedimentation

*** Sites with a high probability of off-site sedimentation

Chris Moore

From: Joseph Moore <josephmoore4@yahoo.com>
Sent: Sunday, June 2, 2024 8:06 PM
To: Chris Moore
Cc: Dale M
Subject: Stormwater workshop

Dear Chris,

In preparation for Wednesday's workshop on ways to amend department procedure so as to assess fees on builders and developers in accordance with the ordinances, I would suggest that the Board consider could doing the following:

1. Put the property in question on the fee schedule when they are granted approval for their proposed grading plan.
The builder/developer can request an abeyance until the next billing period if they affirm that they will not begin grading during the current year/billing period.
2. If no grading plan is required, put the property on the fee schedule when they apply for a building permit. Since grading and construction usually commence soon after obtaining these permits, they would be placed on the fee schedule unless they claim they cannot commence until the next year or billing period.
3. As for logistics, it should be relatively simple to have the Plan Commission, county engineer, and any other office involved in the aforesaid applications and permits to share them with the Stormwater Director's office via email or whatever digital process is used to distribute such data.
It is also possible to put the duty of notification on the builder/developer, simply requiring them to file notice with your office when they file the grading plan.

There is nothing in amending the fee schedule procedure that would impinge or impose upon anyone rights because it is merely an in-house administrative move to enforce the previously and properly enacted and publicized ordinances. Therefore, no special hearings or public input sessions should be required. Instead, it would merely require, at most, that the county include notice of this procedure correction to builders/developers in the future.

I trust you will forward this to other members of the workshop. If I overlooked something, I will send another email soon.

Sincerely,
P.J. Moore

###This message originated from outside of the Floyd County network (be cautious with links and attachments)
###

Developer storm water fees

An acre has 43,560 square feet. When they strip all the topsoil and get down to the red clay this leaves very little of an absorption rate. If it is zero then these numbers will work. The absorption rate of red clay is 14 times lower than that of good loamy soil. So red clay does have a small absorption rate which is a 14th of good top soil. (2.41 divided by .17) So to be fair a developer should only pay 13/14 of total storm water fees.

The county storm water fees for a farmer or commercial land owner including apartments is the first 3700 ERUs is \$39.00.

So if a development uses say 10 acres and clears all the trees and topsoil, creating little means of absorption, then here is an example:

10 acres X 43,560 square feet = 435,600 square feet of impervious surface. Divide 435,600 by 1 ERU (3700 square feet) = 117.7 ERUs x \$39.00 = \$4591.59. X 13/14 (.928) = \$4,263.62 This is how much this developer should pay in yearly storm water fees. When the developer sells off a home and lot. Example 6000 square foot lot. Then that 6000 square foot should come off the 435,600 square feet the development started with. $435,600 - 6000 = 429,600$ square feet / 3700 = 116.11 ERUs x \$39.00 X 13/14 (.928) = \$4202.25 this developer should pay in storm water fees. This system should be used until all homes are sold and until the roads are turned over to the county!!

NOTE: It would be the responsibility of the developers to recoup the fees charged by adding it on to the cost of the home or rents.

Loamy soils have moderate percolation speeds, ranging from 1.02 to 2.41 inches per hour. This is the "Goldilocks" situation, in which soil holds water and nutrients long enough for plant roots to absorb them, but the soil does not easily become waterlogged. Clay soils have notoriously slow percolation speeds of 0.02 to 0.17 inches per hour. Therefore, [clay soils](#) easily become waterlogged, and plant roots can suffocate as a result.

The percolation rate for soil regardless of type can vary significantly from the percolation rate averages. This variation can be due to issues that include soil compaction, organic matter content, and/or soil temperature, yet soil types are by far the single biggest determinant for percolation rates.

Dale Mann cell # 812-786-0571

-
-
-

Chris Moore

From: Don Lopp
Sent: Monday, June 24, 2024 9:31 AM
To: Al Knable; Jason Sharp; John Schellenberger; John G. Brinkworth, III; Chris Moore
Subject: Stormwater Fee - Proposal for July Meeting
Attachments: Permit-Application-Storm-Water-Quality-Management-2019-2020.pdf

Good morning All

Please see draft proposal regarding storm water fees associated with development activities. The Storm Water Quality Management fee has been in place since 2009. It is issued at time of approval of grading plan. A development is charged either based on lots or acreage.

This proposal requires both a acreage and per lot fee be charged at different stages of development.

Proposal:

Submission of Grading/Drainage Review Plan based on development acreage the fee will cost the following:

Up to 15 acres: \$1,500.00

15 acres or more: \$2,500.00

(Amount is based on current third party charges and calculated internal rate for employee to conduct monthly erosion control inspections)

Submission of Final Plat or Site Plan Approval:

Plats will be charged \$64.36 per lot on the final plat. Price is per last year's Board and Commissioners approved Storm Water Business Plan for lot charges. Road surface are not addressed in fees. If the board wants to include it should fall under the impervious surface model for commercial activities below.

Site Plan will be charged based on impervious surface divided by 3,700 square feet (1 ERU) at a rate of \$64.36 per ERU. Fees to be collected at time of approval via Building and Development Services.

Please let me know if you have any questions regarding the proposal.

Sincerely

Don Lopp, AICP

Director of Operations and Planning
2524 Corydon Pike Suite 202
New Albany, IN 47150
(812)948.4110
dlopp@floydcounty.in.gov

Floyd County Indiana
Stormwater Department
Business Plan Study and Analysis
Executive Summary Draft Report



DRAFT



Prepared by:



May 31, 2024



Floyd County, Indiana
Stormwater Department Business Plan Study & Analysis
Executive Summary Final Report
Table of Contents
March 29, 2024

I.	Table of Contents	Page 2
II.	Project Background, Purpose & Summary of Results	Page 3
III.	Introduction	Page 6
IV.	Policy Paper #1 – Data Collection Questionnaire Summary	Page 8
V.	Policy Paper #2 – Business Plan Document	Page 9
VI.	Policy Paper # 3 – Billing and GIS Review	Page 9
VII.	Policy Paper # 4 – Financial Fact Sheet	Page 9
VIII.	Business Plan Recommendations	Page 10
	Appendix A – Policy Paper #1 – Data Collection Questionnaire	
	Appendix B – Policy Paper #2 – Business Plan Document	
	Appendix C – Policy Paper #3 – Billing and GIS Review	
	Appendix D – Policy Paper #4 – Financial Fact Sheet	
	Appendix E – Final PowerPoint Presentation	

DRAFT

II. Project Background and Executive Summary of Results

A. Project Background

The Floyd County Commissioners and Stormwater Board hired Stantec and Environmental Rate Consultants, Inc. (Stantec/ERC Team) to revise and update the original 2006 Stormwater Business Plan and determine a five-year future forecast from 2024 through 2028. Over the course of the project, the Stormwater Board determined the consideration of a three year hybrid analysis was appropriate. This Stormwater Department Executive Summary Final Report provides an overview of the overall business plan and financial analyses summarizing the results of the study and analysis. Several iterations of the rate model were created for review by the Floyd County Stormwater Board, Floyd County Commissioners, and Floyd County Council. It should be noted the rate increase was not approved by the Floyd County Council on August 8, 2023.

The business plan analysis and project included the following tasks:

- Project kickoff meeting.
- Data collection, data review and data evaluation.
- Performed ten Microsoft Team County staff and agency interviews.
- Performed financial and GIS gap analysis.
- Identified the current level of service analysis based on the current 2022 budget.
- Performed cost of service analysis.
- Performed rate study analysis.
- Performed cash flow analysis.
- Database and GIS analysis.
- Developed elected and key county official presentations; and
- Documented project results in this executive summary final report.

B. Summary of Project Results

The Stantec/ERC Team business plan analysis included the following:

- a. Created nine scenarios based on detailed review and discussions with County staff, Floyd County Stormwater Board Members, and elected officials comprised of the Floyd County Commissioners, and Floyd County Council.
- b. The Stantec/ERC Team analysis included a five-year forecast for the calendar years 2024 through 2028 (with 2023 as the transition year).

- c. The 2022 County Stormwater Department budget was used as the basis for the rate scenario analysis for the five-year period with the initial assumption that the budget level of service would not change. Additional needs and requirements were outlined separately and referred to as “needed” minimum over and above the budget amount and level of service.
- d. Ultimately, the Floyd County Stormwater Board developed a final three-year hybrid business plan rate analysis from the twelve five-year business plan scenarios.
- e. The final analysis is premised on the Consumer Price Index (CPI) for Urban Consumers from the U.S Department of Labor by calculating the change in the stormwater department annual residential ERU rate implemented in January 2006 through January 2023 dollars in the amount of \$58.84 annual residential ERU rate.
- f. The 2022 Floyd County budget was used as the basis for the rate study and the budget was increased 5% per year for project years two through five (2025 through 2028).
- g. The “needed minimum requirements”, are cost and expenditure program deficiencies and needs identified during the Floyd County staff interviews and analysis process of the project.
- h. The approach included the goal and purpose of identifying the following types of stormwater costs:
 - 1) Identify current levels of water quality and water quantity services.
 - 2) Drainage and flooding costs.
 - 3) Administrative costs.
 - 4) Engineering and planning costs.
 - 5) Operation and maintenance costs.
 - 6) Capital improvement (CIP) costs.
 - 7) Billing data and GIS costs.
- i. The needed minimum requirements are specific labor and equipment recommendations for the stormwater program to meet minimum water quality and water quantity standards.
- j. The Stormwater Board requested an option to automatically increase the stormwater department’s annual rate based on the Consumer Price Index (CPI) based on the previous three year’s annual rate (the previous 36 months) from the federal government website or at least a minimum 1% cost inflation factor, whichever is higher.
- k. Based on the three-year rate analysis, it is recommended the County review and perform the Business Plan and Rate Study Analyses every three years with the next scheduled review to be performed in early 2026 to determine the three-year analysis 2027 through 2029.

The Stantec/ERC Team identified the current level of service and calculated the needed minimum cost of service analyses and incorporated the business plan and the entire final analysis into an Excel Workbook five-year cash flow analysis.

The following **Table 1** illustrates the Floyd County Business Plan Analysis Project County Council three-year rate plan recommendation:

**Table 1: Floyd County Business Plan Analysis Project County Council
Three-year Rate Plan Recommendation**

Year	2023	2024	2025	2026
Monthly Rate	\$3.25	\$4.90	\$5.15	\$5.40
Annual Rate	\$39.00	\$58.84	\$61.80	\$64.86
\$ increase		\$19.84	\$2.96	\$3.06
% increase		50.88%	5.00%	5.00%
Revenue/Expenses		\$1,202,832	\$1,275,897	\$1,352,451

Table 2 further illustrates the Floyd County Business Plan Analysis three-year rate plan recommendation and summary of labor/staffing, equipment, expenses, and capital improvement projects (CIP) for the three-year period 2024 through 2026.

**Table 2: Floyd County Business Plan Analysis Three-Year
Recommendation and Summary**

	2023	2024	2025	2026
Current Stormwater Budget	\$805,206	\$868,302	\$917,700	\$970,062
1 Capital Projects Funded		\$169,400	\$121,000	\$31,500
2 New EIT			\$61,798	\$65,506
3 Vactor		\$106,000	\$106,000	\$106,000
4 New Employee 1 (2026)				\$55,000
5 Rate Consultant				\$50,000
6 MS4 Consultant		\$13,020	\$20,522	\$22,574
Additional Minimum		\$334,530	\$358,197	\$382,389
Total Budget & Additional Minimum		\$1,202,832	\$1,275,897	\$1,352,451

The Business plan, rate study, and cash flow analyses are based on annual revenue estimates for calendar year 2023. The revenue estimates include 20,646 monthly ERUs and 242,873 annual ERUs which equates to annual revenue of \$805,206 for calendar year 2023.

Figure 1 is the Consumer Price Index (CPI) for Urban Consumers from the United States Federal government calculating the recommended stormwater department annual residential ERU rate implemented in January 2006 (and verified by the County Auditor) through January 2023 dollars in the amount of \$58.84 annual residential ERU rate.

CPI Inflation Calculator

\$

in

has the same buying power as

\$58.84

in

Calculate

Figure 1: CPI Inflation Calculator

III. Introduction

Stormwater management has many different facets that affect day to day operations of a community such as in Floyd County, Indiana. These can be in the form of major river, stream and creek regional flooding, neighborhood drainage problems, roadside and highway drainage, individual homes with yard and basement flooding, and when applicable stormwater system infrastructure decay and excessive inflow and infiltration into the sanitary sewer system. Additional costs arise from the unfunded mandate of the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the Indiana Department of Environmental Management standards and requirements for the Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) storm water permit program. These permits and programs are a part of the Clean Water Act and the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit program. The MS4 water quality regulations require Phase II Communities such as Floyd County, Indiana the six minimum control measures (MCM's) as follows:

- Public Education and Outreach
- Public Participation/Involvement
- Illicit Discharge Detection and Elimination
- Construction Site Runoff Control
- Post-Construction Runoff Control
- Pollution Prevention/Good Housekeeping

To meet water quality regulations and water quantity (e.g. local drainage issues and riverine flooding) management needs, additional funding is required for:

- Engineering and design, rolling out a much more aggressive capital improvement program
- Regular and frequent inspections
- System maintenance



- Review and update of County policies concerning stormwater management countywide.

Water quantity (flooding and drainage and flood mitigation) typically consists of the planning, design, construction, and maintenance of the stormwater infrastructure system (both natural and man-made). The major activities or levels of stormwater services and cost of services are required for Floyd County to continue addressing stormwater management quality and quantity within Floyd County in an organized manner:

- Operations – planning / engineering and design / water quality / monitoring / inspection
- Maintenance – highway/roadside department and sanitary sewer division, street sweeping, culvert repair, ditch maintenance and ditch petition program, flood events, storm sewer lining, and catch basin maintenance and repair.
- Capital Projects – construction management / construction / quality control inspection.

Stormwater water quality (NPDES Phase II MS4 permit regulations) and stormwater quantity (flooding and drainage) are dependent on each other and integrated into stormwater activities the Floyd County GIS Staff performs with minimum and inadequate dedicated funding.

The scope of work was to develop a Stormwater Business Plan for the Floyd County Stormwater Department Program including the review of the current program, perform a gap analysis to identify any program deficiencies, perform a five-year financial analysis and forecast for years 2024 through 2028 (nine business plan rate scenarios were created and discussed) and to make program financial and billing program recommendations. The stormwater department business plan project and analyses focused on the following aspects of the existing stormwater department program:

- Review financial information and data into a three-year analysis and forecast for calendar years 2024 through 2026.
- Billing and collection database gap analysis and deficiencies.
- Identify water quantity (flooding and drainage) issues, policies, and deficiencies.
- Performed approximately ten Microsoft Team County staff and agency interviews.
- Identified the current level of service analysis based on the current 2022 budget.
- Performed cost of service analysis.
- Performed rate study analysis.
- Performed cash flow analysis.
- Database and GIS analysis.

During the process of developing a stormwater program business plan the base or “current”, “existing” stormwater level of services are identified in the 2022 budget. The 2023 level of service was developed by identifying the needed or minimum level of service for 2023. Additional levels of service such as labor/staffing, equipment, and capital improvement program (CIP) project costs were identified over and above the 2022 stormwater budget costs. The term “required” or “needed” “minimum” is defined as years (2024 through 2026) of the 3-year analysis designed to fund both the water quality and water quantity activities and responsibilities to a “minimum” and “required” acceptable standard according to the USEPA and/or the Indiana Department of Environmental Management standards and requirements. This approach identifies the stormwater program elements to fund that are necessary by law for water quality compliance and/or to continue to address the flooding and drainage problems.

IV. Policy Paper #1 – Data Collection Questionnaire

The purpose of Policy Paper #1 is to identify, organize and collect the necessary stormwater data and information to perform the business plan, rate study, cost of service level of service, and cash flow analyses. Stormwater costs from the following Floyd County departments and agencies:

- Don Lopp, Director of Operations
- Chris Moore, MS4 Department Coordinator
- Horacio Urieta, County Engineer
- Ronnie Tuell, Road Department Supervisor
- Kent Barrow, EMA Director
- Scott Stewart, Floyd County Solid Waste Management District
- Gina Anderson, Purdue University Extension Educator
- Angela Jackson, Soil and Water Conservation
- Chris Moore provided pertinent stormwater information regarding the three County consultants, Stantec, OHM and Lochmueller Group.

A copy of the Data Collection Questionnaire document used for the business plan development process and financial analysis is included in Appendix A.

Approximately 16 meetings were held to solicit data and communicate with elected officials and the public. Meetings with elected officials are summarized in the PowerPoint in Appendix E.

V. Policy Paper #2 – Business Plan Document

The process of developing a Stormwater Business Plan for the Floyd County Stormwater Department Program included the review of current program policies, the current budget, performing a gap analysis of the financial and GIS elements of the program to identify stormwater program needs, perform a 5-year financial analysis and forecast for years 2024 through 2028 and to make program recommendations.

This business plan and process establishes the “current” or “existing” stormwater level of service for 2023. The current level of service establishes the basis for years two through five referred to as the “minimum” stormwater level of service. The minimum level of service is defined as years (2025 through 2028) of the five-year analysis. This process of defining each year of the five-year analysis identifies the elements the program will fund, including what is necessary by law for water quality compliance and/or the funding necessary to address the flooding and drainage problems.

At the end of the overall project and process, the Floyd County Elected officials made the decision to proceed with a three-year business plan and rate study analysis for the years 2024 through 2026. A copy of the Draft Business Plan document in Appendix B.

VI. Policy Paper # 3 – Billing and GIS review

The purpose of the billing and collection and GIS data files gap review and analysis is for the Stantec/ERC Team to review, evaluate, and identify issues that may currently exist within the billing and collection GIS data files, and to assess the estimated accuracy and potential impact these issues may have regarding the overall stormwater department program revenue. Furthermore, a review, evaluation and analysis were performed regarding the current policy of assessing agricultural properties and measuring all of the impervious areas on each property and the impact on the overall stormwater department revenue. The three-year hybrid business plan scenario included changing how the agricultural parcels are charged. The assumption was made, based on Floyd County Stormwater Board and Floyd County Commissioners approval, agricultural properties were considered residential properties resulting in a billing rate of one ERU per month, or 12 ERUs annually.

VII. Policy Paper #4 – Financial Fact Sheet

The purpose of this Stormwater Department Program Policy Paper is to present the details of the culmination of the nine rate scenarios. The hybrid financial plan developed by County Officials included the three-year forecast for the years 2024 - 2026.

PowerPoint presentations were made to the Floyd County Stormwater Board, Floyd County Commissioners, and Floyd County Council before ultimately providing the scenario based on the CPI website.

VIII. Business Plan Recommendations:

1. The Stantec/ERC Team recommended the Floyd County Stormwater Officials accept and approve the results of the Stormwater Department Program Business Plan contained in this report. It should be noted the rate increase was not approved in 2023. Tables 1 and 2 of this document provides the specific three-year business plan rate recommendation developed through significant input from the Floyd County Stormwater Board and Floyd County Commissioners.
2. The hybrid business plan rate scenario based, with the following key assumptions:
 - a. The hybrid business plan rate scenario is based on a three-year forecast and analysis for the years 2024 through 2026.
 - b. The hybrid business plan rate scenario will be reviewed every three years with the next scheduled review to be performed in early 2026 that will project and forecast the rate period 2027 through 2029.
 - c. The hybrid business plan rate scenario includes an “automatic” cost inflation factor for each of the years as part of the three-year analysis.
 - d. The hybrid business plan rate scenario includes an automatic 5% inflation expense factor in the analysis for the years 2025 and 2026 or implement at least a minimum 1% inflation expense factor per year.
3. The Stantec/ERC Team developed the business plan rate scenarios that were reviewed and solicited input and comments from the following Floyd County officials:
 - a. Floyd County Stormwater Department Board
 - b. Floyd County Commissioners
 - c. Floyd County Council
 - d. County staff

Accepted: _____ Date: _____

APPENDIX A – Policy Paper #1 – Data Collection Questionnaire**APPENDIX B – Policy Paper #2 – Data Evaluation Analysis****APPENDIX C – Policy Paper #3 – Rate Structure Analysis****APPENDIX D – Policy Paper #4 – Financial Fact Sheet****APPENDIX E – Final PowerPoint Presentation**

4023 Andy Drive

