

**SWAB Meeting June 15, 2012 3:00pm  
W. A. T. E. R. Center**

**Members Present**

Richard Basore  
Hoyt Hillman  
David Leyh  
Gary Oborny  
Joseph Pajor

**City Staff & Guests**

Ben Davis (Senator Moran's Office)  
Scott Lindebak  
Jim Hardesty  
Tim Davidson

**Members Absent:** Jeff Bradley, Larry Henry, Mitch Mitchell, Jim Weber, Chris Bohm (arrived at 3:50)

**HH:** Well, while we're waiting on a quorum. I am Hoyt Hillman. Chris is not going to be here until about 4:00, so he asked me to chair the meeting. It looks like... Gary, will you be presenting anything today?

**GO:** I need to defer to the next meeting. I'm trying to play catch up, here. So, I don't have all my stuff with me.

**HH:** Oh, you don't? You want to defer your presentation?

**GO:** Yeah.

**HH:** Okay.

**GO:** I got my email for this meeting; I think it was yesterday or the day before.

**HH:** Well, we're pretty well locked in here as the third Friday of the month.

**GO:** Third week, is that what it's going to be now?

**HH:** Yeah, so you can post yourself for the rest of the year. Right, Keisha? She sent that out. So, you won't have to wait on a reminder.

**GO:** Okay, great.

**HH:** I would suggest we take a few and look at the minutes and make sure that everything reads well.

**HH:** Let's go ahead and start the meeting without a quorum and call the meeting to order. Our only guest here today is Tim and this gentleman..?

**BD:** Ben Davis, I'm with Senator Moran's office.

**HH:** Okay, welcome. Thank you for joining us. Since we don't have a quorum, we won't be voting on anything, but we can certainly provide advisories. Do we have any recommendations on changes to the minutes from our last meeting? I don't see any spaces or blank words in the whole thing. So, request approval of the minutes?

**JP:** Are we going to vote on it illegally?

**HH:** No, we're going to do it on an advisory.

**JP:** Okay, well, just to let you know I'm going to abstain from the vote, because I wasn't at the meeting. It's not a lack of support for the motion.

**HH:** You're not going to make the motion, then?

**JP:** No.

**GO:** I'm going to need to abstain, too, because I wasn't there either. I just got this yesterday, also. My only comment was: was there a certain time frame that these will come out post meeting?

**SL:** Normally, the agenda goes out and then the minutes. We'd like to have them out the week of. You know, so Monday or Tuesday before the meeting. If we can do it sooner, that would be even better. We can visit about that internally and see if we can't get it out within a week or two after the actual meeting.

**GO:** Okay, after would be great.

**JP:** Especially, for the minutes....

**GO:** Because if they're sizeable going through them in detail and then giving you feedback in time that changes could be made.

**SL:** Historically, we've always sent out a meeting reminder two or three days before the meeting.

**HH:** Well, I'll make the unofficial motion that I don't see any corrections that need to be made. Does anyone else see any corrections?

**DL:** We don't have a quorum so we can't actually even approve them officially.

**HH:** No, we're not going to approve them, so don't worry about it. We'll hold off on the liaison committee report until next time. Do we have any downstream protection activity? I guess everybody knows about the Lincoln street boat bypass crack. We are doing different projects downstream but certainly not related to stormwater. Gary, do you have anything you want to tell us about the Phil Barnes presentation?

**GO:** No, I think I'll defer to when I can present my data numbers from an economic standpoint. So, no rule, I think it's straightforward there.

**HH:** Okay, well Phil Barnes had a very interesting proposal and it related to perhaps spending our money more wisely upstream, because of that maybe Richard can tell us a little bit about it. But I understand that the City is going to be visiting with KDHE and talking about that proposal. Scott or Richard, do you have anything you can add about that? I understand there is a meeting this week?

**SL:** There is a meeting set up June 21, City Staff as well as the Kansas Water Office and the Kansas Department of Health and Environment are going to be meeting-just to look at possible ways, seeing if there was support for a regional watershed approach, specifically about nutrient reduction within the Arkansas and Little Arkansas River. If they're able to do upstream watershed BMP's, for example, no till drills or no till seeding. Or if they develop stream buffers, those BMP's that are implemented could also help reduce financial obligations to our water treatment plant upgrades, because of nutrient reduction requirements from the treatment plant. So, there is certainly going to be some discussion to see if there would be support from the state level, at the minimum to, maybe implement a regional Best Management approach to water quality.

**GO:** What time is that meeting?

**SL:** I don't have that with me right now, but I can get that information and email it to you.

**Jim Hardesty:** I think its 10:00 to noon in the Northwest Conference Room, I believe.

**GO:** Yeah, maybe you could put that out to everybody in the committee so anyone that might be interested...

**HH:** That would be really, good. One of the things that we looked at on Phil's report was maybe a little lacking was a need for comparison of our costs with the costs of what would be spent upstream. He had no way to provide that information at the time of his report. Scott, have you been able to provide him comparison costs or costs so he can make comparison?

**SL:** We don't have that information at this time.

**HH:** I think that's the selling point for the whole process.

**SL:** I think there needs to be comprehensive study that evaluates the data rather than just look for numbers that haven't been calculated.

**GO:** Yeah, some of the data that I have has some of the economic numbers from the development community involved in residential/commercial development taking into account developed acres over the last ten year average and then looking at what that impact is, so that we can start to evaluate that. The other thing that would be kind of nice is to look at the ERU program that you have with the sewer.

**SL:** Right.

**GO:** Which is supposed to be identified for water quality and water flooding issues, right?

**SL:** Both quantity and quality.

**GO:** Quality and quantity.

**SL:** Operation and maintenance.

**GO:** Right, so we should look at those funds and see how those are being utilized, also. So, I think that's part of the equation.

**HH:** Right and that's a big step, so...I appreciate you taking the time to look at that Scott.

**SL:** I might clarify, uh, Joe, is the meeting with Kansas Water Office, KDHE, and City staff, I suspected that was going to be closed to just City Staff and State staff to see what their interests are and talking specifically about nutrient reduction, because I was also arranging per Chris Bohm's guidance a special meeting with the Stormwater Advisory Board, not only including the state staff, but also the Region 7 EPA office. And to try to have that meeting arranged maybe the 2<sup>nd</sup> week as a special meeting. We could also have the meeting scheduled at the next SWAB meeting, but I think Chris Bohm wanted to have a special meeting where we invited both EPA, KDHE, Water Office Staff and the SWAB board could ask their specific questions to the state and federal regulators. Maybe the meeting that's held with City Staff and state staff would just be a parameter, just to, kind of give them a warm-up to get their thoughts put together so there could be a subsequent meeting that talks specifically about stormwater related issues. I know the meeting next week will also involve wastewater treatment & it appeared from last SWAB meeting some of the members they wanted it specifically focused on development of stormwater BMP's. They may have not been as interested in the wastewater treatment aspect of it.

**JP:** Well, in the beginning of that there was a question as to who's invited to the meeting. That could go either way. I don't know that a decision has been made, but I guess I'd like to ask the other members on the committee. It seems to me that if you're not there it's not as much of a meeting as if you are there. If there's going to be different answers as to whether or not you're there, that's a red flag in my mind from the very beginning. What's going on? Given what Scott has said about the focus being primarily the wastewater treatment plant NPDES permit limits of nutrient removal we know is coming over the horizon versus the stormwater issue: Do you guys want to attend this meeting?

**DL:** It all interrelates. These dovetail into each other in how we address it. One impacts the other.

**JP:** Alright, let's leave it this way...we'll go back and ask that question and get an answer out to the group and let you know. Because in my mind, right here, right now I'm thinking you ought to be there because otherwise we've got to have it again with you there. What kind of efficiency is that? But let me go back and ask that question, since I didn't set the meeting up I don't want to step on the toes of those who did.

**HH:** That's an excellent point, Joe. Thank you.

**GO:** It might be worth getting a little survey from everybody on this committee to see who all can attend. We've got June and July, which is high vacation times for everybody, so it might be interesting to see what kind of response we might get in advance.

**HH:** Who can make it to the meeting?

**GO:** I should be able to.

**DL:** June 21<sup>st</sup>, yes.

**HH:** Okay, David and Gary will make it. Richard says he's available. Hoyt's available. Joe's going to be there and Scott's going to be there.

**SL:** I will be out of the office.

**HH:** Oh, you'll be out.

**SL:** Jim Hardesty will be there on our behalf.

**HH:** Okay, well that's a reasonable turnout. Maybe we can get Chris Bohm and a few others. Has Chris already accepted?

**SL:** Chris hadn't. The meeting invite was set up by the manager's office, so the SWAB wasn't included in that.

**HH:** Oh, okay.

**JP:** That's why I want to go back and ask that question.

**HH:** Okay. Well, that's fine. If it turns out that we are eligible to come, then it sounds like we are going to have a turnout. So, thank you for your participation and interest. This is all a pre-discussion for the RFQ. Is that correct, Scott? We don't know what we want to buy, yet, right?

**SL:** Correct.

**HH:** Okay, so that's...you wouldn't have anything to add to that process at this time, right?

**SL:** No, not until we get additional feedback from SWAB.

**GO:** Has Phil Barnes submitted anything?

**SL:** He did submit something and I passed it out last meeting. I can see if I have a copy.

**GO:** Okay.

**HH:** It was not everything we wanted, but it was a start.

**DL:** It was a sampling proposal study. So, it was making a baseline.

**JP:** We'll get you a copy here.

**HH:** Okay, we're now to the last item before new business. Are there any comments to review the AMC on Joe Hickel's mathematical calculations?

**SL:** I have a handout to pass around to everyone. I did get a response from AMEC.

**HH:** Good.

**SL:** They are in agreement with Joe Hickel's statement on clarification of water quality calculations of extended detention as well as the nesting of channel protection within a detention facility. But they were not in agreement with the equation that had been developed and the units were not properly

labeled and I think there was a bit of confusion. So, there are some additional discussions that I need to have with Joe about the equation before we proceed on the recommended option.

**RB:** I've got to hit the road.

**HH:** Okay, well Scott, thank you and Richard, appreciate you being here. Is there any new business to come before the board?

**SL:** I have one new business item. Chris Bohm made a motion last month which was accepted that there be a policy by the stormwater advisory board on what vendors' process is. If vendors want to present something to the stormwater advisory board what do they need to do in order to speak to the board. It was made as a recommendation and approved that the board would only review new technology or BMP's that were not already currently accepted within the manual and that those vendors would need to first submit something to me to see if it was valid and if it was then I could make the request to the Chairman, Chris Bohm, to hear the vendor at the next meeting. That motion was approved and seconded. I just wanted to know if we wanted to develop and put that policy in writing, if that was something necessary or if that's just a verbal...it's in the meeting minutes that have yet to be approved at next meeting when we have full quorum, but it's just an option.

**HH:** I think that's a good point.

**GO:** Are we seeing a lot of solicitation of items coming through?

**SL:** There are like two or three that had, but we've said no and it hasn't been an issue. So, I don't think we have to draft something up, but just wanted to make sure that the board wasn't expecting to see something.

**GO:** I guess it might be nice if something comes forward to you that we're made aware that it's been turned in or that they're approaching you so that if someone wanted to look at it themselves individually they could do that.

**SL:** Sure.

**GO:** As long as we are abreast of anybody that's coming forward.

**JP:** So, even if Scott says, "No, it's an existing already covered in the manual technology" we can be in the loop about it.

**SL:** I can do that. It's not a problem.

**JP:** Other than that I think we'll have that as a practice & we don't need to make it anymore palpable than that.

**HH:** That would be good. Sort of like my sample question this week coming up with the special sampling technique the one particular company was trying to propose. Any other new business items before the board? If not I think we've made it through our shortest meeting ever.

**JP:** ...that wasn't a meeting, so it doesn't count.

Shortest non-meeting

**HH:** That's true. Thank you very much for coming. We have cookies and other stuff available. We will meet again on the 3<sup>rd</sup> Friday at 3:00.

**GO:** Since July is really a pretty well traveled month would it be worth sending out an email real quick just to say who all can make the next meeting?

**SL:** Absolutely, because we don't want to have another meeting same thing...

**GO:** Same thing, right, save everybody time.

**SL:** In fact, I'll talk to Keisha next week, but maybe what we'll do is even before the meeting we'll get a real count of whose going to be there.

**GO:** I think it might save some time.

**SL:** We just say, hey, is this thing cancelled and we'll say cancellation policy 48 hours in advance. So, people aren't just getting an email the day of and you guys are on the run. You don't happen to be in your office.

**JP:** I think even 24 hours would be okay.

**SL:** Okay.

**JP:** A couple-hour block that opens up in the day isn't that bad to deal with 24hrs after.

**SL:** Okay.

**HH:** Okay, well, then we are adjourned.