

Post-It-Notes Chart Compilation of Comments

NO. 1 – New Development Standard Criteria

Initial Criteria Discussed: 1.25 inches of rainfall or less, equivalent to the 90% rainfall event for Lincoln (detained over a 40 hour period)

Revised Criteria for Discussion: Somewhere between 0.83 inches to 1.25 inches of rainfall or less, equivalent to the 80% to 90% rainfall event respectively for Lincoln (detained over a 40 hour period)

| AGREE | AGREE IF ... | NEED MORE INFO/DISCUSSION | DISAGREE BECAUSE ... | ADDITIONAL OPTIONS |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>Agree</p> <p>Agree</p> <p>Agree</p> <p>Agree</p> <p>The recommendation of 1.25” or 90% rainfall event is a fair recommendation for Lincoln.</p> | <p>Would like to see cost info on storage of rainfall at different % levels – storm event.</p> <p>New Development: Clarify – is 90% 1.25” or 1.37”</p> <p>-Competition with Omaha/ others for Jobs-Employers</p> <p>-Why move to expected criteria first phase in?</p> <p>-Site selection criteria – cost of development</p> <p>-Change inch measurement by zoning area – don’t be more than Omaha.</p> <p>Real comparison between Lincoln and Omaha of commercial and retail zone.</p> <p>Need more information on EPA standard of 90% . . . will that be the ‘new’ required minimum? Would like to see 80%.</p> | <p>Would like to know what the cost/benefit of the %.</p> <p>Need more information on cost analysis.</p> <p>Need more information. I really need to know the incremental cost difference between 80%, 85% and 90% rainfall events before I can make an informed answer.</p> | <p>Prefer 80% rainfall event.</p> <p>Disagree until can show 90% does not add significant cost above 70% or 80% - or provide these incremental costs.</p> <p>Need cost information to determine whether 90% is most cost efficient vs 70% or 80%</p> <p>Need to hear opinions of more of the experts in our group.</p> | <p>Agree (minimum should be 80% rainfall event) Room for incentives.</p> <p>Standard should be as low as possible to satisfy EPA.</p> <p>Need more information on cost benefit – pollutant reduction vs. 60%, 80%, 90%</p> <p>Financial impact study?</p> <p>Cost per square foot for: Commercial Office Retail Residential</p> <p>Policies – HOAs City OK – transfer to HOA</p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; background-color: #e0e0e0; padding: 2px; margin-top: 5px;">80% for Criteria*</div> |

* { note: information in the highlighted boxes are additional options presented to the City/NRD between the April and June meetings }

Post-It-Notes Chart Compilation of Comments

NO. 2 – Redevelopment Standard Criteria

Initial Criteria Discussed: 0.83 inches or less, equivalent to the 80% rainfall event for Lincoln (detained over a 40 hour period)

Revised Criteria for Discussion: Same

| AGREE | AGREE IF ... | NEED MORE INFO/DISCUSSION | DISAGREE BECAUSE ... | ADDITIONAL OPTIONS |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>Agree</p> <p>Agree</p> <p>Agree</p> <p>Agree</p> <p>Okay</p> | <p>Agree but with financial limitations on BMPs</p> <p>Agree – redevelopment needs to contribute to reduction, but site may not be conducive to meeting new site standards.</p> <p>Agree if redevelopment standards are important as a matter of fairness. Lower standard OK but need a standard and ways to do it practically.</p> <p>Agree if standards apply to larger land area 1.5 x minimum size for new development.</p> <p>Would agree with the .83” but would like to see projected costs under this recommendation.</p> <p>Generally agree but depends on incremental cost of alternatives – 70%, 75%, 85%, etc.</p> | | <p>Same standard in old as in new. If hard, pay for improvements elsewhere if not onsite.</p> <p>Disagree – same standards should be applied for both.</p> <p>Disagree – seem random decision. What about base on percent of impervious area rather than random decision of 80%?</p> <p>Tied to #1 – Disagree – need same cost information tied to #1. Don’t know if 80% is a significant enough cost reduction to not hamper redevelopment.</p> | <p>Agree if waivers and incentives exist where sites are limited.</p> <p>A more costly standard than Madison? Why not have a lesser standard for redevelopment?</p> <p>Financial impact case study: 3 examples of recent project – cost per sq ft</p> |

Post-It-Notes Chart Compilation of Comments

NO. 3 – Standards Applicable to New Development and Redevelopment for Areas Equal to or Greater Than:

Initial Criteria Discussed: 43,560 square feet (an acre) or more (for redevelopments this is the area disturbed: e.g. demolition, grading, new impervious area, etc)

Revised Criteria for Discussion: Same

| AGREE | AGREE IF ... | NEED MORE INFO/DISCUSSION | DISAGREE BECAUSE ... | ADDITIONAL OPTIONS |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>Agree but favor application of BMPs to less size, e.g. 10,890 sq ft</p> <p>Agree</p> <p>Agree</p> <p>Agree</p> <p>Agree</p> <p>Agree</p> <p>Agree</p> | <p>Need to provide provision to transfer responsibility for maintenance to owners on small projects</p> <p>43,560 sq ft would be OK if the standards to be applied to be similar to new construction.</p> | <p>As I read this standard, all developments and re-developments less than one acre are exempt. With infill we will have more small developments.</p> | <p>Disagree – keep the standards the same – new and old.</p> <p>Disagree – acre is too large. Smaller ¼ or ½ acre would also make redevelopment subject to same standards.</p> <p>Agree for new development. Disagree for redevelopment – all redevelopment should be subject to standard.</p> | <p>Agree. Redevelopment should have incentive even though not the rule.</p> |

Post-It-Notes Chart Compilation of Comments

NO. 4 – Exceptions

Initial Criteria Discussed: single family dwellings not part of a new subdivision

Revised Criteria for Discussion: Not necessary

| AGREE | AGREE IF ... | NEED MORE INFO/DISCUSSION | DISAGREE BECAUSE ... | ADDITIONAL OPTIONS |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------|
| <p>Agree</p> <p>Agree</p> <p>Agree if clarified as less than 1 acre.</p> <p>Agree</p> <p>Agree</p> <p>OK for single family dwellings</p> <p>Agree</p> <p>Agree, although I would set standard in #3 large enough to make this a moot point.</p> | <p>Agree if . . . no exemption for change of zone.</p> <p>Agree but initiate education programs to promote single family dwellings practices.</p> | <p>New single family houses – not part of subdivision need to be held to standard (new development or redevelopment?)</p> | <p>Disagree – no exception, rely on size/area disturbed.</p> <p>Disagree – No exceptions.</p> <p>Disagree – just set the standard in 3 and then if under the standard not apply exception.</p> | |

Post-It-Notes Chart Compilation of Comments

NO. 5 – Waivers

Initial Criteria Discussed: allow for waivers

Revised Criteria for Discussion: allow for waivers (see Questions and Answers sheet for more details)

| AGREE | AGREE IF ... | NEED MORE INFO/DISCUSSION | DISAGREE BECAUSE ... | ADDITIONAL OPTIONS |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>Agree (examples? criteria?)</p> <p>Yes. Sell and purchase impact fees. Grandfather in projects already approved but not developed.</p> <p>Agree</p> <p>Agree – allow for waivers</p> <p>Agree</p> <p>Agree – encourage developers to work together and with City, etc.</p> | <p>Agree if standards developed for justifying waivers.</p> <p>Agree if no banking or mitigation</p> <p>Agree – would like a financial feasibility option. Look at credit bank.</p> <p>Allow for waivers – give credits such as Wichita.</p> <p>Agree if allow for banking</p> <p>Allow bank of credits – formula and also have Director allowance. 10 year expiration of credits.</p> <p>Agree if also develop objective criteria in addition to director discretion for meeting waiver requirements – e.g., mitigation bank.</p> <p>Agree but I would allow for a mechanism to “bank credits” for developers or firms to address difference in geography at different locations.</p> | <p>Need more information – what will waivers be for? It is unclear.</p> | <p>Disagree – only waiver if development pays “equivalent cost” impact fees to benefit others.</p> | <p>Banking/Credits would be good possibilities.</p> <p>Alternate: Allow for credits/bank of benefits</p> <p>Agree – look at banking and incentives.</p> <hr/> <p>May allow for waivers if have other BMP on or off-site (but in same watershed) to provide same level of water quality.</p> <p>May provide cost-share if doing water quality voluntarily or if doing beyond criteria</p> <p>Revisit the idea of banking credits in a few years</p> |

Post-It-Notes Chart Compilation of Comments

NO. 6 – Effective Date of Ordinance

Initial Criteria Discussed: ordinance not applicable to New Developments and Redevelopments that obtain planning commission approval within three months of ordinance adoption

Revised Criteria for Discussion: ordinance not applicable to New Developments and Redevelopments that obtain planning commission approval within a timer period sometime between three months to one year of ordinance adoption

| AGREE | AGREE IF ... | NEED MORE INFO/DISCUSSION | DISAGREE BECAUSE ... | ADDITIONAL OPTIONS |
|-------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Agree | <p>Agree with effective date, but 6-12 months waiver with some projects.</p> <p>Agree if exemption period for in-process projects = 1 year.</p> <p>OK with effective date – have 12 months for implementation.</p> <p>Effective date immediate. Planning Commission approval 15 months - no changes with final plats.</p> <p>Effective Date 12 month implementation.</p> <p>Agree if date is extended 6-12 months.</p> <p>Agree if grandfathered 12 months.</p> <p>Agree if increase time period to at least 12 months. Need more than 90 days for the developers to react and incorporate into cost calculations.</p> <p>Agree if 6 months allowed for developments in que before implementation.</p> | | <p>Disagree with 6 month implementation.</p> <p>Disagree because development planning does not work that fast. 15 months?</p> <p>Disagree. Time needs to be longer to allow for education and revision of plans.</p> <p>Disagree. 24 months.</p> <p>Disagree. Due one (1) year after the effective date of the EPA criteria; completely voluntary until then.</p> <p>Disagree. 90 days is too short a time frame. It appears 12, 15 or 18 months is more reasonable. Based on discussion I would recommend 18 months.</p> | <p>Effective date one year after ordinance adoption.</p> <p>Preliminary plats, special use permits, PUDs already approved or approved prior to effective date are exempt from water quality criteria, unless significantly revised</p> |

Post-It-Notes Chart Compilation of Comments

NO. 7 – Requirements for Owner Inspection of Best Management Practices

Initial Criteria Discussed: owner inspection and inspection report required annually

Revised Criteria for Discussion: same

| AGREE | AGREE IF ... | NEED MORE INFO/DISCUSSION | DISAGREE BECAUSE ... | ADDITIONAL OPTIONS |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Agree – more frequent inspection allows for more immediate correction of problems. | Every two years. What is standard for inspection? No fee Simple, on-line form | Need more information – large variety of projects – inspections different for each. | Disagree because annual inspection is too frequent. Maybe every two years. | Training and certification should be available to allow owners to have proper and knowledgeable inspections. |
| Agree | Agree if inspection required by certified individuals. | Owner report on an annually basis – need further discussion on the cost between public and private for the upkeep. | Disagree until identify specific method and <u>for a</u> limited period, then make City responsible to inspect. | Additional option: Have inspections for first 1-3 years after project is complete, but <u>not</u> permanent annual inspections. |
| Agree | Need to know maintenance requirements | | Disagree because annual inspections seem onerous. | Maintenance to be responsibility of City similar to Sidewalks and Street trees |
| Agree | Yes if training but no certification or permit cost. | | Disagree because all inspections and maintenance should be <u>public</u> not private responsibility. | |
| Agree | Agree if training. | | | |

PROGRAMS

| No. | Issue | Recommendation |
|-----|--------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| A. | Education Program | - set up a homeowner education program (e.g. active email list, email reminders, newsletter, website, landscape contractor/ inspector list, etc) |
| B. | Training Program | - training program for contractors, inspectors, engineers, developers (training opportunities on the many BMP options* available to meet Post Construction Standards) |
| C. | Cost Share Program | - cost share program for Best Management Practices that go beyond set standards and for major repair (not maintenance) of Best Management Practices |

* BMP Options: extended detention ponds and lakes, pervious pavement, bio-swales, rain gardens, green roofs, soil management, subsurface storage, infiltration basins, natural vegetation, grassed swales, wetlands, buffer strips, planting filters, etc (reference lincoln.ne.gov, keyword BMP)

POLICIES

| No. | Issue | Current and Proposed Policy |
|-----|--------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| X. | Construction/Maintenance | - design, installation, operations and maintenance will be the developers responsibility similar to the manner in which detention ponds and erosion & sediment control are required in order to offset the impact of the development |
| Y. | Compliance | - compliance program to be similar to current city programs for other private improvements (also similar to other cities), e.g. work with owners, sureties, do work and assess, enforcement through the Law Department |

Note: The above programs and policies are the same as those handed out during the April 17, 2012 meeting