

# PAPILLION CREEK WATERSHED PARTNERSHIP



## MEETING MINUTES

### PCWP Meeting

**June 25, 2009 – 10:00 AM to 12:00 PM – Board Room  
Natural Resource Center, 8901 S 154<sup>th</sup> Street, Omaha, NE**

#### Attendants:

The following were in attendance: Amanda Grint (PMRNRD), Emmett Egr (PMRNRD), James Kee (Omaha), Nina Cudahy (Omaha), Scott Bovick (Sarpy County), Mark Stursma (Papillion), Marlin Petermann (PMRNRD), Shawn Melotz, Mike and Linda Ryan, Marian Maas, Lucas Billesbach (JEO representing Bennington), Dorothy Lanphier (PMRNRD Director), Paul Woodward (Olsson Associates), Jesse Poore (Felsburg, Holt & Ullevig), Robert Hayes (Boys Town), Doug Dreesen (TD2), and Scott Japp (PMRNRD Director)

#### 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 10:05 AM.

#### 1. Introductions

- An agenda, sign-up sheet, and handouts were distributed. Marlin Petermann (PMRNRD) opened the meeting and led the introductions.

#### 2. Update on new PCWP Interlocal Agreement

It was noted that the PMRNRD Board approved the interlocal agreement at the June 11<sup>th</sup> Board meeting.

Nina Cudahy (Omaha) indicated that the interlocal would be on Omaha's Planning Board agenda on July 1<sup>st</sup> and to City Council on July 14<sup>th</sup> or 21<sup>st</sup>. Final reading could potentially be on July 28<sup>th</sup> with the public hearing on July 21<sup>st</sup> or 28<sup>th</sup>.

Scott Bovick (Sarpy Co) reported that the interlocal should be on Sarpy's Board agenda the following week.

Mark Stursma (Papillion) noted that the interlocal should be up for second reading at July's Council meetings. Those meetings are the first and third Tuesday of the month.

Lucas Billesbach (JEO) reported that earlier in the week, at a Board meeting, Bennington had decided not to adopt the interlocal agreement. He noted as points of dissention were that the PCWP had proposed more stringent requirements for developing in the floodplain than FEMA (Stormwater Policy on Floodplain Management). Bennington



would prefer to regulate only to federal and state requirements. Also, Bennington felt that fees collected from development (Stormwater Policy on Financing) should be kept within their boundaries and not used throughout the watershed.

Robert Hayes (Boys Town) noted that the interlocal would be approved on July 7<sup>th</sup>.

It was noted that Douglas County had decided not to join the Partnership and would not be approving the interlocal agreement. Updates are still needed from Gretna, Bellevue, Ralston, and La Vista.

### 3. Post Construction Stormwater Management Plan

#### ➤ *Guidance documents.*

The Post Construction Stormwater Management Plan guidance document, application, drainage study checklist and maintenance agreement were distributed. It was noted that these documents are intended to be Partnership documents that can be used by all communities to help enforce the recently adopted stormwater ordinance amendment for control of the first half inch of stormwater runoff. Each community was asked to look over these documents and note any changes that should be made so that the process is specific to their community. Ex. Submittals with the plats or building permits. The idea is to have one guidance document and include in that document any information specific for each jurisdiction. These documents have been drafted to deal with the details of how and what do I need to submit, how will maintenance be handled, etc. Doug Dreessen (TD2) presented some concerns of the engineering community in that he believes there are issues with the time of detention and that no release rate has been established. He noted that he would be willing to participate and Nina Cudahy (Omaha) noted that a meeting could be planned this summer with the engineering community, possibly through ACEC, to address their concerns with the ordinance.

#### ➤ *Application process*

The Post Construction Stormwater Management Application was reviewed and again it was noted that the communities should review and provide any comments and any changes in process that they see with their individual submittal processes. It was noted that a software tracking system, similar to the erosion and sediment program, is being developed and the hope is to track post construction plans through that system for all members of the PCWP.

#### ➤ *PCMP Workshop, October 8, 2009*

A workshop will be held on October 8, 2009 at the Scott Conference Center to follow up on the workshop last year. Case studies will be presented by several engineering firms for post construction stormwater control. The workshop will be from 8am-noon at no cost to participants.

### 4. Other Items of Interest

#### ➤ *Stormwater Runoff Plans for Maintenance Facilities*

Jesse Poore (Felsburg, Holt & Ullevig) updated the group on Omaha's plan to inspect maintenance facilities once per year and to implement Runoff Control Plans. A draft Runoff Control Plan is being developed and should be available in September. The Phase 2 communities can use Omaha's as a template for their own communities.

➤ The Partnership Fund was discussed and a report will be provided next month. It was noted that fees have not been received from Bennington and Douglas County.

- A meeting list was distributed which provides PCWP meeting dates for the next year. The meetings are generally the fourth Thursday at 10am at the NRC. This list will be posted to the Partnership website. Subcommittee meetings are not prescheduled as they are only on an as needed basis.
- Nina Cudahy (Omaha) reported that the interlocal agreement with Douglas County on shared stormwater grant funds has been terminated.

#### 5. Next Meeting Date

- The next Partnership meeting is scheduled for Thursday, July 30<sup>th</sup> at 10:00 AM at the NRD office.

#### 8. Adjourn

- The meeting adjourned at approximately 12:00 PM. An agenda, attendance list, and the handouts passed out at the meeting are available upon request.

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