Gasb 34 Footages for Historical Cost Drain Length Log

Drain-Improvement: R) CRAIG - 1991 RECALSTRUCTION							
		Length	Length	Length			
Drain Type:	Size:	()	(DB Query)	Reconcile	Price:	Cost:	
Rep	15"	314'	3141				
	54"	862'	862'				

	<u> </u>	-D/ (1 214	ľ	1
	54"	862'	862'		
OPEN DITCH		2231'	2231		
DREDGING 2440'		0'	0'		
OF OPEN DITCH					

	Sum:	3407	3407		\$ 200, 65.39
Final Report:					
Comments:	CONSTRUCTED /IN	itreveo il i	<u>191. 1228' 51</u>	uperacoed by	eeconistruction
1242,749	. 1997, 2000. . 03 _ # 42133 69 _	1228 / 7	075' = 17.47 L	6 x \$242,749. 0	= = 442,183,69





Kenton C. Ward, Surveyor

776-9626

942 Maple Avenue Noblesville, Indiana 46060

August 17, 1990

To: Hamilton County Drainage Board

Re: R.J. Craig Drain

This report is a revision of the report dated June 14, 1990 and is included herein by reference.

Since the June Drainage Board meeting, a plan was developed and discussed for relocation of the open ditch on the railroad property. A meeting was held at Fishers on this date before the Fishers PUD Committee with Mr. Fred Sullivan, Fishers Town Engineer; Brian Wilson, MSE; Rusty Richardson, Eaton & Lauth; Jim O'Bara, Weihe Engineers; Roy Holland, Fishers Town Board; Roger Johnson, Fishers Development Coordinator; Steve Cash, Plan Reviewer for the Surveyors Office; and myself in attendance. The result of this meeting was to proceed with the original plan as set out in Option 4 of my June 14, 1990 report.

As a result of review of the plans, some minor revisions were made which would affect the cost estimate for the open ditch work:

The new cost estimate is as follows:

Option 3 Cost Estimate	617,695.30
Dredging 2240' @ 10/ft	33,400.00
Clearing 8 Ac @ 10,000/Ac	80,000.00
Seeding 10 Ac @ 1,000/Ac	10,000.00
Riprap Corners 3 @ 1,000 ea	3,000.00
Silt Basins 3 @ 1,000 ea	3,000.00
Sub Total	747,095.30
10% Cont.	74,709.53

Grand Total

\$821,804.83

R.J. Craig, August 17, 1990 Page 2

The residential acreage consists of 344.82 acres & 160 lots and commercial is 601.40 acres & 33 lots. The rate for these properties will be \$490 per acre, \$500 minimum Residential and \$882 per acre, \$900 minimum Commercial. The maintenance assessment for the entire drainage shed should be increased from \$1 per acre, \$3 minimum, to \$5 per acre, \$25 minimum.

I recommend the Board set an October hearing for the proposed drainage project as set out in Option 4 of my June 14th, 1990 report as revised above.

Kenton C. Ward,

Hamilton County Surveyor

KCW/jh





Kenton C. Ward, Surveyor

776-9626

942 Maple Avenue Noblesville, Indiana 46060_

June 14, 1990

To: Hamilton County Drainage Board

Re: R.J. Craig, Geo. White & James Bradburn Drains
Attached are calculations, plans, drainage shed map, schedule of assessments and

miscellaneous supporting material for the reconstruction of the R.J. Craig, Geo. White and James Bradburn Drains. This report is being submitted to the Board for consideration as a result of the May 21st 1990 Drainage Board meeting.

Since the May 21st Drainage Board meeting much has happened concerning this drain in both discussion and engineering. This report is the accumulation of information gathered during the last month. The following will discuss the various options of which I believe there to be five. The conclusion of the report will state recommendations as to which option the Board should take.

The first option is to do nothing to the drain, leaving the situation at status quo. Doing so, the Board and Fishers would wait for developers or a developer to fund and construct the improvements needed at his expense. This would be done at such time as the Railroad property, Murphy property & Morgan property are developed, or the down town area re-developed, or a combination of these properties or projects are done. The down side of this option is the continuance of the drainage problems in the old down town area for an un-determined period of time. As this problem is severe now, the continuance can be detrimental to the Health and safety of the residents.

The second option is outlined in the report dated May 4, 1990 and which is attached hereto. The proposal will serve those areas of the most severe flooding. However, problems with surface water crossing 116th Street and various surrounding areas experiencing problems will not be solved with this system.

The third system is the inclusion of various Arms to the system in order to improve drainage along 116th Street and the area east of Lantern Road. This plan would include the system as described in the May 4th report for the 48" and open ditch. Along with that system the plans call for improvements to the George White Drain from Archers to Lantern Road. Also Arms 1, 2 and 3 will be improved to 116th Street. An arm will be extended north along Lantern to 116th Street and south to South Street. A line will be installed east on South Street.

Repair of the 20" George White Drain will include the construction of an open ditch from a point 30 feet south of the south line of Morgan Meadows Second Section. The open ditch will be constructed to the point of intersection with the R.J. Craig Drain.

In addition, the 20" tile shall be relocated beginning at the northwest corner of lot 21 of Morgan Meadows and ending at the southwest corner of lot 20.

The purpose of this relocation is to remove the drain from the existing lots where the homes on lots 20 & 21 are within the easement and to keep away from storage buildings. The relocated tile will be constructed with a manhole at the intersection of the existing tile turn, southwest in a 45° angle running to another manhole; thence run south 10' west of and parallel to the west line of the above mentioned lots 20 and 21 to another manhole; thence turn a 45° angle to the southeast and run to the last manhole which would be located on the existing 20" tile. This line would be 21" in size.

9,317.00

48,640.00

The cost of this relocation should be charged back to the individual owners of lots 20 & 21 as a violation of IC 36-9-27 as an un-authorized structure within the easement. However, for the purpose of this project I have included the cost within the reconstruction estimate.

The cost estimate for this option is as follows:

Open Ditch

42" R.C.P.

38" x 60" R.C.P.

Clearing Seeding Open Ditch 24" CMP 24" Animal Guard	1.0 470 20 1	feet feet each	. @ . @ . @	10,000/ac 1,000/ac 18.00/ft 26.00/ft 125.00		\$15,000.00 1,000.00 8,460.00 520.00 125.00
Re-alignment of 20' tile	for M	organ	Me	eadows Lots	20 & 21	
21" RCP 48" Manholes w/casting Option 2 Cost	400 s 4	feet each	@	55.00/ft 2,000.00		22,000.00
48" RCP Open Ditch Rebuild Existing MH Clearing Seeding 60" Metal End Sections Pavement replacement Riprap Granular Backfill 54" Crossing 96" Manholes Additional Arms Cost	2520 1 1.5 10 1 625 250 1000	feet each acre each LF Ton CY each	99999999	104.00 18.00 5,000.00 10,000.00 1,000.00 1,200.00 40.00/ft 20.00 12.00 6,000.00 4,500.00		119,600.00 45,360.00 5,000.00 15,000.00 10,000.00 1,200.00 25,000.00 5,000.00 12,000.00 6,000.00 22,500.00
Mobilization Curb Inlets Storm Inlets Manholes 12" R.C.P. 15" R.C.P. 21" R.C.P. 24" R.C.P. 27" R.C.P.	15 4 15 172 275 70 714 185 25	Ea @ Ea @	1,	000.00 000.00 800.00 000.00 23.50 25.20 44.60 47.50 40.00 66.40 65.20		6,000.00 15,000.00 3,200.00 45,000.00 4,042.00 6,930.00 3,122.00 33,915.00 7,400.00 1,660.00 7,172.00

110 LF @ 320 LF @ 84.70

152.00

R.J. Craig - June 14, 1990 - Page 4

48" R.C.P. Restoration Maintaining Traffic	170 LF @ 118.00 1 LS @21,500.00 1 LS @ 5,000.00	20,060.00 21,500.00 5,000.00
	Sub Total	559,723.00
	10% Cont.	55,972.30
	Const. Staking & Eng.	2,000.00
	Grand Total	617,695.30

The drainage area for this work is the same as discussed on pages 6 & 7 of the May 4th report. The drainage shed map is attached. I believe it to be representative of the area benefitted by the proposed improvements. An area omitted is the property which Burberry Place will be developing. This acreage will run to the east as shown on the attached copy of the primary plat. According to Doug Miller, engineer for Mr. Murphy, the open ditch is of sufficient elevation to benefit the Murphy property when developed. This will be connected through Arm 1 of the James Bradburn Drain.

The drainage shed consists of 124 lots and 163.38 acres. The acreage figure does not include the lot count. Of this amount, the commercial properties consist of 35.84 acres and 33 lots. Comparing C-values of 1/2 acre residential versus commercial, the values are 0.5 for residential and 0.9 for commercial. Because of the greater C-value for commercial ground, a decision was made to assess the commercial properties a factor of 1.8 more than residential. Commercial properties were determined by using the Fishers Zoning as a guide. (See attached.) Those areas zoned I-1, I-2, C-1, C-2, C-3, and C-4 on the zoning map were assessed as commercial. The reconstruction assessments were set at \$1670.00 per acre & minimum for residential and \$3006.00 per acre & minimum for commercial. Roads, streets and alleys were assessed at residential rates since the indicated acreages have been shown triple of actual acreage. The railroad was also assessed at the residential rate.

Although this project is being proposed, I must point out at this time the old down town area will still be prone to flood. This will also be true concerning Option 4. The system which is proposed is, as I have pointed out previously, designed to handle a 10 year storm event under existing conditions. Per the letter from James Wm. O'Bara of Weihe Engineers dated March 7, 1990, the Hydraulic Grade Line (HDL) will remain within the system for a 10 year storm and result in an elevation of 813.76. Mr. O'Bara has indicated on the attached sheet the areas of flooding during the 25, 50 and 100 year storm events. I want to stress the importance of this fact to both the Board and the landowners. I recommend that if the project is approved, the landowners within these areas which will be prone to flooding obtain flood insurance.

The fourth option is a combination of Option 3 and the dredging of the existing R.J. Craig Drain. The dredging will involve the portion of the drain between the interstate and the railroad. The work will help improve the hydraulic characteristics of the drain and allow for better efficiency of the proposal of Options 2 and 3. The cost estimate for this work is as follows:

Option 3 Cost Estimate Dredging Clearing Seeding Silt Basins	8	acre acre	@ @	10.00/ft 10,000/ac 1,000/ac 1,000/ea	617,695.30 33,400.00 80,000.00 8,000.00 3,000.00
				Sub Total 10% Cont. Grand Total	742,095.30 74,209.53 816,304.83

The drainage basin involved includes all properties east of the railroad within the R.J. Craig Drainage Shed along with those properties assessed in Options 2 and 3 west of the railroad. The drainage shed for this option consist of 344.82 acres & 160 lots residential and 601.40 acres & 33 lots comercial. The rate for these properties will be \$488.00 per acre & minimum residential and \$879.00 per acre & minimum commercial.

R.J. Craig - June 14, 1990 - Page 6

The fifth option is to wait 30 days so that a more comprehensive plan may be developed. This would allow the railroad to plan a detention facility and realignment of the open ditch. It would also allow the planning of an extension of the drain to Hague Road, planning of a re-alignment of a section of ditch which now runs along the south side of 106th Street off the right-of-way, plans for improvement to the Loma Industrial Park Drain and Margaret O'Brien Drain along with the ability to merge all three drains into one urban drainage shed.

My recommendation to the Board at this time is option 5. Although quite a lot of work has been done in a short time and the option would delay a hearing for another month, I believe a more complete plan could be presented given more time.

My second choice for a recommendation would be Option 4. I believe more benefit would be realized for the area with this option over Options 1, 2 and 3.

Kenton C. Ward,

Mamilton County Surveyor

KCW/jh

Fidelity and Deposit Company

HOME OFFICE

OF MARYLAND

BALTIMORE, MD. 21203

Performance Bond

KNOW ALL MEN BY THESE PRESENTS:	
That Poindexter Excavating, Inc. (Here insert the name and add 10443 E. 56th St., Indianapolis,	
10443 E. 56th St., Indianapolis,	ress or legal title of the Contractor) IN 46236
tion of the State of Maryland, with its home office i	n the City of Baltimore, Maryland, U. S. A., as Surety,
hereinafter called Surety, are held and firmly bound	unto Hamilton County Drainage Board
(Here insert the name and a	ddress or legal title of the Owner)
as Obligee, hereinafter called Owner,	
in the amount of two number forcy two the	ousand Seven Hundred Forty Nine & 08/100
Dollars (\$242,749.08), for the patheir heirs, executors, administrators, successors and	yment whereof Contractor and Surety bind themselves, assigns, jointly and severally, firmly by these presents.
WHEREAS, Contractor has by written agreem	ent dated July 10, 19 91,
entered into a contract with Owner for Excavation	on & Mucking of Ditches, Storm Sewer, Ditch
Grading & Mulch Seeding, R. J. Cr	aig Drainage Area Drain
in accordance with drawings and specifications prep	ared by Owner
which contract is by reference made a part hereof, a one year maintenance from date of accep NOW, THEREFORE, THE CONDITION (ame, title and address) and is hereinafter referred to as the Contract, including trance award. OF THIS OBLIGATION is such that, if Contractor, then this obligation shall be null and void; otherwise
The Surety hereby waives notice of any alterat.	ion or extension of time made by the Owner
•	Owner to be in default under the Contract, the Owner
having performed Owner's obligations thereunder, promptly	the Surety may promptly remedy the default, or shall
(1) Complete the Contract in accordance	with its terms and conditions, or
tions, and upon determination by Surety of the determination by the Owner and Surety jointly between such bidder and Owner, and make ava a default or a succession of defaults under the oparagraph) sufficient funds to pay the cost of coexceeding, including other costs and damages for set forth in the first paragraph hereof. The terr	the Contract in accordance with its terms and condi- lowest responsible bidder, or, if the Owner elects, upon of the lowest responsible bidder, arrange for a contract silable as work progresses (even though there should be contract or contracts of completion arranged under this simpletion less the balance of the contract price; but not re which the Surety may be liable hereunder, the amount in "balance of the contract price," as used in this para- by Owner to Contractor under the Contract and any paid by Owner to Contractor.
Any suit under this bond must be instituted be which final payment under the contract falls due.	efore the expiration of two (2) years from the date on
No right of action shall accrue on this bond to the Owner named herein or the heirs, executors, adn	or for the use of any person or corporation other than ninistrators or successors of Owner.
Signed and sealed this	h day of July A.D. 1991
In the presence of:	POINDEXTER EXCAVATING, INC. (SEAL) Principal
Betty Gean atkinson	BY: Bruy Paroles
Betty Jean Atkinson	Billy Poindexter Tille President
FIDELITY	AND DEPOSIT COMPANY OF MARYLAND
Clara Lu Kay	By C (SEAL)
Clara Lu Day	Jan L. Jacobs - Attorney-Title act

C309f---

Approved by The American Institute of Architects, A.I.A. Document No. A-311 February 1970 Edition.

Fidelity and Deposit Company

HOME OFFICE

OF MARYLAND

BALTIMORE, MD. 21203

Labor and Material Payment Bond

Note: This bond is issued simultaneously with Performance Bond in favor of the owner conditioned on the full and faithful performance of the contract,

KNOW ALL MEN BY THESE PRESENTS:	
That Poindexter Excevating Inc.	
(Here fisert the name and add	tress or legal title of the Contractor) IN 46236
tion of the State of Maryland, with its home office is	LITY AND DEPOSIT COMPANY OF MARYLAND, a corpora- n the City of Baltimore, Maryland, U. S. A., as Surety,
hereinafter called Surety, are held and firmly bound	unto Hamilton County Drainage Board
as Obligee, hereinafter called Owner, for the un	ddress or legal title of the Owner) se and benefit of claimants as hereinbelow defined,
	ousand Seven Hundred Forty Nine & 08/100
*****	least one-half of the contract price)
Dollars (\$242.749.08), for the particular	ayment whereof Principal and Surety bind themselves, I assigns, jointly and severally, firmly by these presents.
WHEREAS, Principal has by written agreement	nt dated
entered into a contract with Owner for Excavation	on & Mucking of Ditches, Storm Sewer, Ditch
Grading & Mulch Seeding, R. J. Ci	aig Drainage Area Drain
in accordance with drawings and specifications prep	ared by Owner
which contract is by reference made a part hereof, a	name, title and address) and is hereinafter referred to as the Contract.
ment to all claimants as hereinafter defined, for all labor and	DBLIGATION is such that, if Principal shall promptly make pay- material used or reasonably required for use in the performance of all remain in full force and effect, subject, however, to the following
1. A claimant is defined as one having a direct contract w material, or both, used or reasonably required for use in the p	ith the Principal or with a sub-contractor of the Principal for labor, performance of the contract, labor and material being construed to telephone service or rental of equipment directly applicable to the
defined, who has not been paid in full before the expiration of a claimant's work or labor was done or performed, or materials	and severally agree with the Owner that every claimant as herein period of ninety (90) days after the date on which the last of such were furnished by such claimant, may sue on this bond for the use a sum or sums as may be justly due claimant, and have execution costs or expenses of any such suit.
two of the following: The Principal, the Owner, or the Su or performed the last of the work or labor, or furnished substantial accuracy the amount claimed and the name of work or labor was done or performed. Such notice shall lipostage prepaid, in an envelope addressed to the Principal tained for the transaction of business, or served in any man aforesaid project is located, save that such service need in the context of the expiration of one (1) year following the understood, however, that if any limitation embodied in the such limitation shall be deemed to be amended so as to be (c) Other than in a state court of competent jurisdic in which the project, or any part thereof, is situated, or in the or any part thereof, is situated, and not elsewhere. 4. The amount of this bond shall be reduced by and to	contract with the Principal, shall have given written notice to any rety above named, within ninety (90) days after such claimant did the last of the materials for which said claim is made, stating with the party to whom the materials were furnished, or for whom the served by mailing the same by registered mail or certified mail, al, Owner or Surety, at any place where an office is regularly maintener in which legal process may be served in the state in which the ot be made by a public officer. The date on which Principal ceased work on said Contract, it being his bond is prohibited by any law controlling the construction hereof equal to the minimum period of limitation permitted by such law, tion in and for the county or other political subdivision of the state the United States District Court for the district in which the project, the extent of any payment or payments made in good faith herewhich may be filed of record against said improvement, whether or
Signed and sealed this	hday of
In the presence of:	POINDEXTER EXCAVATING, INC. (SEAL)
Getty gean Ctiking	BY: Bully / andick
Betty John Atkinson FIDELITY	Billy Poincexter Title President AND DEPOSIT COMPANY OF MARYLAND
Claral L. D.	
Clara Lu Day	Jan L. Jacobs - Attorney-Triffact

C309e¾--

Approved by The American Institute of Architects, A.I.A. Document No. A-311 February 1970 Edition.





Kenton C. Ward, Surveyor

One Hamilton County Square, Ste. 146

უუხ∞ებჯგ 776−8495

942 Maple Avenue
Noblesville, Indiana 4608 1945. 7, 1992

TO: Hamilton County Drainage Board

RE: R.J. Craig Drainage Area-Final Report

On July 17, 1992 an inspection was made of the R.J. Craig Drain. At that time the reseeding had been completed and was found to be acceptable. The \$5,000.00 retainage should now be released. A claim for this has been submitted by the Contractor along with the Statement for Wages and Costs.

This report along with the report dated March 11, 1992 shall constitute the final report. The Board should accept the project as complete and acceptable.

Kenton C. Ward

Hami/Iton County Surveyor

KCW/no



776-9626

942 Maple Avenue Noblesville, Indiana 46060_

March 11, 1992

To: Hamilton County Drainage Board

Re: R.J. Craig Drain

On December 23, 1991 a final inspection was made on the R.J. Craig Drain reconstruction done by Poindexter Excavating. At that time the drain was found to be complete and acceptable.

The original contract dated July 15, 1991 was bid at \$242,749.08. Three change orders were given the contractor dated as follows with estimated amounts:

Change Order 1, August 02, 1991, \$4,015.00 Change Order 2, August 27, 1991, 524.16 Change Order 3, September 24, 1991, 22,859.73

These change orders are attached as part of this report.

Additions to the length of the work include 37' of 21" RCP running north in the alley out of manhole #1, Station 0, line 1, sheet 8, at the southeast corner of Archers to manhole #2. Other additions are minor which do not add to the length of drain. The total length per my report dated 02-28-91 is 7158. With the addition listed above, the total length as constructed is 7195 feet.

The cost per the report dated 02-28-91 is \$200,110.00 for Section 1 work and \$268,378.00 for Section 2, for a total cost of \$468,488.00. The bid price for Section 1 work was \$70,694.10 and Section 2 work was \$172,054.98 for a total of \$242,749.08. The change orders are broken down into sections as follows:

	Section 1	Section 2
Change Order 1	3,370.00	645.00
Change Order 2	-0-	524.16
Change Order 3	<u>69.38</u>	22,790.35
	3,439.38	23,959.51

The total construction cost of each section is as follows:

Section	1	cu.	Bid Change	Orders	\$70,694.10 3,439.38 \$74,133.48
Section	2	-	Bid Change	Orders	\$172,054.98 23,959.51 \$196,014.49





