Memorandum

TO: Programs, Planning & Operations Subcommittee

SUBJECT: Village of Washington Request for Cost-Share on Water Supply Feasibility Study

DATE: January 6, 2010

FROM: Marlin Petermann & Dick Sklenar

The District’s staff met on the above date with Kevin Propst, Chairman of the Village of Washington, and Dennis Wilson and Bill Gilmann of HGM Assoc., to discuss the financial request (see attached letter) for a study to identify alternative water supply solutions for the residents of the Village of Washington. Each household/business in the Village has their own well and they are primarily experiencing water quality problems. Some water quality testing has already been done indicating bacteriological and nitrate infiltration (see attached). Also, staining of fixtures and clothing (high iron and manganese) is experienced. There are currently about 50 homes in the Village (see attached map of area.)

The proposed study, to be conducted by HGM Assoc., will entail looking at alternatives sources of a good drinking water supply. The alternatives to be studied will most likely include connection to the Metropolitan Utilities District (from 180th and Hwy 36), a new well field, hooking up to the community of Kennard, or an in-home reverse osmosis (RODI) water treatment system. Hooking up to the District’s existing Washington County Rural Water #1 or #2 systems will not be looked at in the study (see attached November 30, 2009 letter from Douglas County Commissioner Clare Duda). This option would among other things promote the wrong type of growth in the wrong geographic area and would deplete the capacity of the rural water systems from the area they were meant to serve. The feasibility study will consider the items noted in Commissioner Duda’s letter in evaluating each of the alternatives for water supply.

Dennis Wilson indicated that HGM Associates could provide a feasibility study to address those options indicated above for approximately $10,000.00.

- It is recommended by Management that the Subcommittee recommend to the Board of Directors that the District provide 50% cost-share assistance, not to exceed $5,000, toward an alternative water supply feasibility study for the Village of Washington.
January 4, 2010

John Winkler, Executive Director
Papio-Missouri River Natural Resource District
8901 S. 154th Street
Omaha, NE 68138-3621

Dear Mr. Winkler,

As you are aware, the Village of Washington has conducted cursory research and some testing in connection with providing our residents with clean and safe drinking water. Our board has been seeking advice from HGM Associates for the past four years and the firm has provided some information to the board at no cost. However, after conducting testing recently on our wells used for drinking water, it has become evident that our village requires a more formal and detailed course of action.

Testing has revealed the presence of high levels of coliform and nitrates in the village’s wells as well as potential problems with dissolved solids based on EPA standards. We are requesting that the Papio-Missouri River Natural Resource Board consider funding a study for the purpose of identifying potential solutions to these recurring problems.

I would like to request a meeting with your staff to discuss the potential scope and subsequent cost of hiring a consultant to perform this work for the Village of Washington Board. If this meets with your approval, I would be happy to work with Mr. Sklenar or Mr. Petermann of your office to schedule an appropriate time to discuss the matter. It is our hope that we could then take a formal request for funding to the board for their action. I would like to thank you in advance for your consideration of this request and look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely yours,

Kevin Propst
Village of Washington Board Chairman
**REPORT ON DOMESTIC WATER ANALYSIS**

**VILLAGE OF WASHINGTON**

**LOUIS KOLGENSKI**

**1297 COUNTY ROAD P25**

**WASHINGTON NE 68068-4011**

*Time of analysis: 1/19/09 12:51*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARAMETER</th>
<th>METHOD</th>
<th>LIMITS</th>
<th>UNITS</th>
<th>TIME OF ANALYSIS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ANALYTICAL RESULTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARAMETER</th>
<th>METHOD</th>
<th>LIMITS</th>
<th>UNITS</th>
<th>TIME OF ANALYSIS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SODIUM</td>
<td>EPA 2007</td>
<td>Na ppm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALCIUM</td>
<td>EPA 2007</td>
<td>Ca ppm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAGNESIUM</td>
<td>EPA 2007</td>
<td>Mg ppm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pH</td>
<td>EPA 1501</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NITRATE</td>
<td>EPA 2007</td>
<td>HNO3 ppm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SULFATE</td>
<td>EPA 2007</td>
<td>SO4 ppm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONDUCTIVITY</td>
<td>EPA 1201</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL DISSOLVED SOLIDS</td>
<td>TDS ppm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HARDNESS</td>
<td>SM 23010</td>
<td>gr/gallon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL COLIFORM</td>
<td>SM 92228</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRON</td>
<td>EPA 2007</td>
<td>Fe ppm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANGANESE</td>
<td>EPA 2007</td>
<td>Mn ppm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHLORIDE</td>
<td>EPA 2007</td>
<td>Cl ppm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLUORIDE</td>
<td>EPA 2000.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CAUTION LEVEL

- **LEVEL FOUND**: 26.1, 112, 28.0, 7.41, 11.2, 21, 0.705, 458, 23.1, 4
- **CAUTION LEVEL**: 100, 80, 30, 6.5/9.0, 10, 400, 0.75, 500, 20, 1

### INTERPRETATION

- **GRAPHIC**
  - No apparent problems
  - Potential problems
  - Likely problems
  - Unspecified

### ADDITIONAL PARAMETERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARAMETER</th>
<th>METHOD</th>
<th>UNITS</th>
<th>TIME OF ANALYSIS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*This report is based on the analysis of the sample submitted.*

*For application purposes, Midwest Laboratories is in compliance with NLAC requirements.*

*Copyright © 2009, Midwest Laboratories Inc.*

*This report is not to be reproduced in whole or in part, nor may any portion of this report be used in any advertising, news release, or other public announcements without obtaining our prior written authorization.*
November 30, 2009

John Winkler
General Manager
Papio-Missouri River NRD
8901 S 154th St
Omaha, NE 68138-3733

RE: City of Washington water system

Dear Mr. Winkler:

It is my understanding that the Village of Washington has approached the Papio-Missouri River NRD about providing a rural water service to the Village. Although the village is within Washington County, a portion of their 1 mile zoning jurisdiction does extend into Douglas County and is contiguous to the Douglas County zoning jurisdiction.

In 2006 Douglas County updated its Comprehensive Land Use Development Plan, most notably to address a number of land use and infrastructure provision issues. The Plan calls for new development within the Papillion Creek watershed of Douglas County’s jurisdiction to be at least at suburban densities of approximately 4 units per acre. The Plan also stresses the importance of the orderly provision of infrastructure, including but not limited to, potable water and sewer services. The City of Omaha and MUD have substantial existing infrastructure for sanitary sewer and water, respectively, and those systems can potentially be extended to serve other areas within the Papillion Creek watershed. The extension of those systems is a cost effective way to provide these necessary water and sanitary sewer services to new and existing development in the Papillion Creek watershed.

Having a dependable and safe potable water supply is obviously a high priority and Douglas County would be supportive of the Village of Washington’s request for the NRD’s assistance in providing such a water supply. It is however important that the proposed water supply system not encourage low density acreage development in Douglas County nor interfere with the orderly provision of municipal sewer and water services in the future.

Sincerely,

Clare Duda
Board of County Commissioners

Cc: Kathleen Kelley, CAO
Kent E. Holm, Environmental Services Director
(402) 444-7025 suite 2 Civic Center
1816 Farnam Street Omaha, Nebraska 68102-0100
www.co.douglas.ne.us