CITY OF RALEIGH
STORMWATER MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COMMISSION (SMAC)
Minutes

Raleigh Municipal Building ·222 W Hargett St · Room 305
3:00pm · Thursday, June 5, 2014

Commission Members Present**:** David Webb, JoAnn Burkholder, Kevin Yates, Francine Durso, Marc Hortsman, Vanessa Fleischmann, Michael Birch and Will Service

Stormwater Staff Present: Mark Senior, Sonya Debnam, Scott Bryant, Ben Brown, Kevin Boyer, Wenju Zhang and Brad Stuart

Members Absent: Matthew Starr and Chris Bostic

Guests: Joseph Kwon and Tonya Williams

Mr. Birch called the meeting to order at 3:02 p.m. The following items were discussed with action taken as shown. He noted two excused absences (Matthew Starr and Chris Bostic). Ms. Burkholder made a motion to excuse both members. Mr. Service seconded, the motion was approved unanimously.

Item 1 – Commission/Stormwater Staff Update on Matters of Importance to the Stormwater Management Advisory Commission

1.1 Mark Senior -

- May meeting minutes – *Mr. Birch made a motion to approve the minutes. Ms. Burkholder seconded, the motion was approved unanimously.*
- July's Commission meeting – *July 3rd as scheduled*
- Staff Changes –
  - Stormwater Program Manager – *advertised*
  - Vacancies – *CIP Project Engineers (2), BMP Inspection, Conservation Engineer etc.*
  - Stormwater Division in RMB – *moving in fall to the Professional Building, rent $100,000 and a cost of fitting up to move, not anticipated in budget*
- LID Study –
  - Council work session on June 17th *(3 components): describe what LID is; describe work planning for advancing LID; and Green Structure - what is being considered performance standards for water supply watershed*

Item 2 – Water Quality Cost Share (2 petitions)

2.1 **Brad Stuart**: There are two petition request for the Stormwater Quality Cost Share.

- **Project 1** (2705 Talbot Ct West)
  City Share $16,425.00
  Owner's Share $ 5,475.00
  Total Cost $21,900.00
  - Approximately 1,150 SF permeable paver driveway and walkway (demolition and replacing an existing driveway & walkway), not least cost alternative and maintenance term is 10 years.

Question: What was the prompting in doing this project?
Petitioner: The area was flooding, and people came out from the city. Property is over 30 years, was approved based on soil testing.
Question: How much money is left in the cost share?
Mark Senior: Probably $200,000 left.

- **<u>Project 2</u>** (562 New Bern Ave)

City Share	$23,071.88
Owner's Share	$ 7,690.82
Total Cost	$30,762.50

- Approximately 1,525 SF permeable lattice paver driveway (new driveway), not least cost alternative, cost share to cover on additional cost for pervious pavement instead of traditional pavement and maintenance term is 10 years.

Question: What is the reason for permeable payment?
Petitioner: Trying to make it as green as possible. It's one option going a step forward with the green issue.

2.2 Ms. Burkholder made a motion to approve both projects with full construction on project #2.

2.2.1 Mr. Service seconded, the motion was approved unanimously.

<u>Item 3 – 2014-2015 Budget Review</u>

3.1 Mark Senior indicated he wanted to bring this to the Commission months ago to review and finalized but due to staff turnover and budget issues we just finalized two weeks ago and Council will vote on in a few weeks on it. We were operating on a budget the past couple years assuming bonds were being issued. We were financing projects assuming we were going to have a substantial bond with inflow of cash from it; however, a decision was made that we were not going to issue the bond. As a result, we had a deficit in the budget and try to make up for that money that was supposed to come in. We looked in all the accounts where money was either left over from a project and hasn't been allocated in some type of reserve to pull out, because we had a 4.6 million gap using those bond funds we didn't have. We filled the gap and balanced our CIP. This year we covered the deficit, allocated money in the project using 5 million transferred from our overall 16 million dollar budget that comes from the Stormwater Utility. We took some projects scheduled for next year, and moved a year out to make sure we have adequate funds in each of those years and then draw on revenue to keep the deficit running. We have a fair amount of money in reserves from our operating account. Because of utility, whatever we put in there and we don't spend, it doesn't rollout in general fund like others department budgets but stays in our budget and goes into a reserve. We've accumulate more than 6 million dollars in reserve so we want to keep it just in case in a year or two we can move forward with bonds to cover some of the cost of the larger projects *(i.e. lake preservation).* The Commission will have to provide us with guidance based on the numbers we get you on the number of projects and dollars and whether or not it justifies going to bonds to accelerate in getting some projects done.

Stormwater Capital Funded Projects
(5 year total)

Lake Preservation	**$5,675,000**
Water Quality Improvement	**$900,000**
General Water Quality	**$3,350,000**
Stream Restoration	**$3,674,000**
General Drainage infrastructure	**$4,990,000**
Neighborhood Drainage Improvements	**$10,551,000**
Street Drainage System Improvements	**$650,000**
Revenue Resources	**$29,790,000**

A topic of discussion is the allocation of funding caps for Water Quality and Drainage Cost Share Petition projects. I thought that Council had set the caps and we allocated funding to those projects. What wasn't used was rolled over to the next year and we accumulated money in those accounts to do more projects. That's not the case, the caps were set by the Commission and the Stormwater Division head. Originally, the amount was $500,000 for drainage then bumped up a few years ago to $750,000. There's nothing in Utility that says we need to keep that number. We did it as part of the budget to send to Council. The money is not rolling over from year to year and if it wasn't spent it was allocated to other projects and used up. I'm not sure if we want to continue with that and we are looking for feedback from the Commission. Should we set funds aside if we get more than $750,000 within a project in one year? We could use leftover money to cover more projects. The downside, if we don't touch it, and we accumulate 1.5 million in the account and it's not being spent, and we have needs elsewhere, how do we transfer those funds to other projects. Part of the reason for the caps was not to overload staff with 1.5 million dollar projects that we can't accommodate. Do we do as other cities and prioritize and don't have limitations. Another feedback, it's a cost share program where the city pays the majority and we ask for a contribution from the property owner. However, budget wise it's been problematic because it results in asking for a separate line item account for every project and we're only getting back less than $5,000.

Scott Bryant noted other cities don't have a cost share they just assume it's a project that warrants public involvement and they pay 100% of the cost based on a priority level. Everything is treated as a capital project based on approved criteria and whatever funding is allocated by the community towards that program is how the projects are built based upon that.

Mark Senior said we need to add this to the work plan for next year. Staff will bring information on the pros and cons and get feedback from the Commission and potentially bring back to Council. The problem is the actual language that sets up the drainage assistance system policy that Council created. It says they will contribute a certain amount of money and deposit something up front and collect the rest later which will require a Council action/amendment to that policy if you want to make any changes.

3.2 **Ms. Burkholder** made a motion to approve the budget.

3.2.1 Mr. Horstman and Mr. Yates seconded, the motion was passed unanimously.

Item 4 – Work Plan Review *(agenda packet memo dated June 6, 2013)*

- Commission – *review and suggest what items to keep or add*
- Staff – *providing additional input on discussion today and what we think the Commission is looking at as a part of next year work plan. Will prepare draft for next meeting for Commission to review and finalized and eventually send to Council*

Item 5 – Annual Report *(agenda packet)*

- Commission – *review and send suggestions on draft*
- Staff - *will make changes to bring back to Commission to finalize and send to Council*

Meeting adjourned at 5:04 p.m.

Suzette Mitchell