PAPILLION CREEK
WATERSHED PARTNERSHIP

MEETING MINUTES

Partnership Meeting
April 10, 2008 – 9:00 AM to 12:00 PM – Board Room
Natural Resource Center, 8901 S 154th Street, Omaha, NE

Attendants:

The following were in attendance: Laurie Carrette Zook (HDR), Amanda Grint (PMRNRD), Lyle Christensen (HDR), Paul Dierking (HDR), Dave Petrocchi (Bellevue), John Winkler (PMRNRD), Mark Wayne (Sarpy County), Ken Tex (Sarpy County), Emily Holtzclaw (CH2MHILL), Kent Holm (Douglas County), Marlin Petermann (PMRNRD), Karen Klein (Omaha), Brian Doyle (FDJ), Doug Dreessen (TD2), Doug Kellner (TD2), Mark Westergard (E&A), Bob Doyle (FDJ), Travis Gifford (Hearthstone Homes), John Fullenkamp (FDJ), Mike and Linda Ryan, Pam Daly (Washington County), Dorothy Lanphier (PMRNRD Board), Barbara Byrd (MOBA), Emmett Egr (PMRNRD), Duane Wilcox (Washington County), Joe Soucie (La Vista), Marty Leming (Papillion), Kevin Simons (JEO/Bennington), Mark Stursma (Papillion), and Tom Price (CDF)

Purpose

A meeting of the Partnership was held on the above date in order to discuss topics stated in the attached agenda. The meeting began at approximately 9:10 AM.

1. Introductions

- Marlin Petermann (P-MRNRD) opened the meeting and an agenda, sign-up sheet, and handouts were distributed. Everyone introduced themselves. The Legislation Update, NPDES Compliance and Zoning Ordinance Amendment were discussed prior to the Stage IV Technical Evaluation to allow time for Tom Price (CDF) to arrive from the airport.

2. Watershed Studies

- *Stage IV Technical Evaluation (HDR)*
  Lyle Christensen (HDR) began the presentation and noted that the discussion would include the LID cost summary, the detention cost summary and the combination plan cost summary. Tom Price (CDF) then discussed the details of the assumptions and costs that were considered when analyzing the LID techniques. Tom explained the difference between the water quality level of LID and that of Maximum LID, including their associated costs. There were questions from the group on the incremental costs and on the pervious pavement type chosen. Tom described his reasoning on the pavement type choice and both the short and long term costs. It was explained to the group that the cost to provide detention is an addition because the watershed currently has no requirements and therefore no cost. An incremental cost is higher than in those cities where there is a detention requirement and you can meet that with LID or conventional development. Paul Dierking (HDR) then discussed the regional

basin costs. He explained that the two costs previously prepared for Max LID only and regional detention only haven't really changed, but that additional costs were calculated to include water quality LID and water quality basins in accordance with all potential plans. Summaries of cost were presented to the group for all scenarios including O&M. Lyle Christensen (HDR) ended the presentation by discussing other cost considerations and an implementation plan which includes modifying stormwater policies, updating comprehensive plans, determining cash flow needs and updating the Omaha Regional Stormwater Design Manual. A detailed cost summary and map for the proposed watershed management plan was distributed to the group.

- *Discussion on Proposed Stormwater Policy Revisions (All)*
  Marlin Petermann (PMRNRD) described the potential policy changes as shown in the handout. Marlin told the group that the policies have been revised for ONLY the Papillion Creek Watershed (watershed) and that a template or modified policies would be necessary for areas outside of the watershed.

  On Policy #4, Landscape Preservation, Restoration and Conservation, the group discussed the creek setback. It was noted that a map or GIS overlay for Douglas and Sarpy County would be helpful for those reviewing plans. Although everyone agreed that this would be helpful it was noted that the work to create such a map would be extensive. Tom Price (CDF) noted that a USGS map with a drainage area could be provided with the plans by the designer and would not take much time to develop. The USGS map would indicate the total drainage area to the waterway which would then determine the creek setback requirements.

  Dave Petrocchi (Bellevue) noted that on Policy #5, Floodplain Management, he would like to see all parties entered in to an agreement on the watershed plan prior to enforcing the policy change. The policy would allow for no adverse impact in the floodplain and Dave would want to have some assurance that the watershed was committed to providing flood reduction. Mark Stursma (Papillion) noted that the Maximum LID in the upper reaches of the watershed would take a long time to build out and the City of Papillion would not see any relief for some time. Ken Tex (Sarpy County) noted that if a person is in a new floodplain and we adopt the no adverse impact requirement, they would not be able to rebuild their home after a fire (for example) and therefore the property has been devalued by the floodplain and by placing more limited restrictions on the property.

  After a quick overview of Policy #6, Stormwater Financing, the development community presented some of their concerns to the group. Bob Doyle (FDJ) stated that the development community is in favor and believes there is a need for reservoirs. Doug Dreessen (TD2) noted that the watershed plan is more of a guideline and he is interested in seeing a set of regulations that the engineering community can believe in and get behind. John Fullenkamp (FDJ) stated that the original workgroup put together came up with a fee of $500/ lot for residential and that was in lieu of any additional costs placed on the developer. Now with the added water quality LID being a developer cost where does that leave the development community? The original deal has not been met through the added cost of water quality LID and also that the NRD did not receive bonding authority, therefore negotiations will need to begin again.

Partners were urged to review the potential policy changes in more detail , and direct any questions or comments to Amanda Grint or Paul Woodward prior to the next Partnership meeting.

3. NPDES Compliance

- *Storm water Ordinance Amendment (Omaha)*

  Amanda Grint (PMRNRD) reported on behalf of the City that the ordinance amendment is moving forward and is expected to be on the May Council agenda. The City asks that other communities in the Partnership review the proposed amendment and adopt a similar amendment within their community.

4. Legislation

- LB 880 has been bracketed or moved to the last day of the legislative session. This essentially kills the bill due to lack of time.

5. Other Items of Interest

- *Zoning Ordinance Amendment for Use of Draft Floodplain Maps as Best Available Data (PMRNRD and Papillion)*
  Papillion has adopted a proposed amendment that would require projects proposed in the newly defined floodplain or floodway to get Council approval. This allows for public input and for the new maps to be included in the decision of a potential building or grading project. Mark Stursma (Papillion) noted that the Papillion City Council added two amendments to the language handed out and he will get a current copy to the PMRNRD so that it can be distributed to the group. The City of Papillion asks that other communities in the Partnership adopt a similar amendment to use the best available data from FEMA when making planning or development decisions.

6. Next Meeting Date

- The next Partnership meeting is scheduled for Thursday, May 15 at 10:00 AM at the NRD office.

7. Adjourn

- The meeting adjourned at approximately 12:15 PM. An agenda, attendance list, and the handouts passed out at the meeting are available upon request.

Please contact Amanda Grint at 444-6222 regarding any questions or comments concerning these meeting minutes.