CITY OF RALEIGH
STORMWATER MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COMMISSION (SMAC)
Minutes

Raleigh Municipal Building · 222 W Hargett St · Room 305
3:00pm · Thursday, November 6, 2014

Commission Members Present: Matthew Starr, Francine Durso, Vanessa Fleischmann, Michael Birch, Marc Hortsman, Chris Bostic, David Webb and JoAnn Burkholder

Stormwater Staff Present: Blair Hinkle, Suzette Mitchell, Mark Senior, Kevin Boyer, Kelly Daniel, Ben Brown, Lauren Witherspoon, Wenju Zhang, Sheila Thomas-Ambat and Brad Stuart

Members Absent: Will Service

Guests: Mike Wayts and Jacob Rogers

Meeting called to order: 3:00 p.m. by Michael Birch

Motions (Absentees and Minutes)

- Absence: Mr. Birch made a motion to excuse Will Service from today's meeting, Mr. Starr seconded. The motion was approved unanimously. *(motion taken after Water Quality item)*
- October Meeting Minutes: Mr. Birch made a motion to approve, Mr. Horstman seconded. The motion was approved unanimously.

The following items were discussed with action taken as shown.

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

1.1 Updates (Blair Hinkle)

- Staffing Update
  - Vacant Project Engineer II (CIP)- *advertising*
  - Retirement – *Mark Senior (effective Dec 1st)*
  - Senior Conservation Engineer (Plans Review) – *McKenzie Myers*
  - Senior Project Engineer (Strategic Planning) approved by Council – *Scott Bryant*
  - Senior Project Engineer (CIP) – *advertising (vacated by Scott Bryant)*
- LID/GI Status Process Update -
  - LID stakeholder group – *1st meeting on Wednesday, October 12th at 6:00 pm in RMB room 305. The group will review the LID/Green Infrastructure Implementation Plan by TetraTech, and then have another meeting in December to provide comments to staff which will allow staff to develop a report and send to Council*.
- Level of Service History *(brief presentation provided*). *We recognize we need to update, and make it more in-depth. We need to spend more time on this – particularly in context – with comments made by Council Maiorano where he indicated he wants to take a fuller look at the Stormwater program.*
- Council approved Petition Projects from last SMAC meeting.

Action Items

- *Provide information on Watershed Protection Task force to extent that Stormwater staff was involved.*
- *Provide an updated overview of CIP projects at each meeting.*
- *Council wants staff to come back to them with a look at what it will take comprehensively to assess the Stormwater program.*

Item 2 – 2013/14 Annual Report/ 2014/15 Work Plan Final Draft to Council

2.1 Michael Birch noted that comments SMAC provided to staff has been incorporated in the annual report and workplan.

2.2 Blair Hinkle noted he would like to place this on December Council agenda

2.3 **Motion**:

2.3.1 Ms. Burkholder made a motion to approve the work plan and annual report, Ms. Durso seconded. The motion was approved unanimously.

Item 3 – Review of Water Quality Cost Share Policy

3.1 Mark Senior said the Councilor put a moratorium on the Water Quality Cost Share program on September 6th. Councilor Maiorano's concerns came from when they were reviewing the two pervious pavement projects that were sent forward. The item was pulled and sent to Public Works Committee, which review it, and sent back their recommendation to Council to put a hold on it, and then it was sent back to SMAC to review and comment. When the program was developed and approved, the minutes stated we were to come back and review the program just to see how it was doing and to tweak if needed. The overall concern from the Council meeting was spending public funds on private property and the amount of public benefit. The cost benefit was the biggest concern with two single properties getting $40,000 from the city per projects which Council did not feel created a lot of benefit. Another concern was the limited participation in the program and that we're not always spending that full amount of money, so Council thoughts may be that the program isn't working as well as it could. In the agenda packet you received background material and the resolution we used for developing the policy. We included options if we need to modify the program, or if the program is working we can ok as is, and go back to Council and educate them on the program's intent and what we are doing.

Commission Comments

- Does EEP program have a cost per pound of nitrogen by-down
- Does city get TMDL credits for the projects
- Is there an opportunity to take money from the program and apply it to city property or incorporate this money to build retrofits if it helps reach TMDL goals and overall systematic improvement
- What amount of the current budget is going to the environment part of Water Quality
- If the money is for Water Quality retrofits why are city projects on here
- At what level does city put in investigating retrofits
- When the program was first proposed it was specifically said that city projects would not be funded, so what changed
- Would like the program just to focus on residential improvements; however, recognize there's not much interest or low cost needs such as bio-retention in parks, or the types of easy retrofit opportunities that we can take advantage of on city properties, that we can utilize these resources for a more cost effective means to remove nitrogen and phosphorous from Water Quality, so can see some of this money going elsewhere
- Do not want to see the program go completely away *(item 6)*. Can some funds be allocated for retrofits for city property or can we move some of the funds

- Can remaining balance be shifted to city retrofit projects
- Consider removing pervious pavement and permeable pavers as options *(high maintenance cost)*
- Prohibit BMP outright or restrict the private cap
- Do limit on cost per acre, cost per pound of nitrogen removed
- Reduce budget to $150,000 and shift the other $100,000 to city projects
- Reduce budget to $150,000 and go to higher split or fund program 100% to see what public response we receive
- Make sure they are being maintained
- How do we calculate cost per nitrogen removal
- What does staff suggests the cap should be
- Do we need to consider paying 100%

Staff Comments

- $250,000 allocated for the program
- We have an obligation under TMDL to improve water quality so there's no credits given for these Projects
- Per Attorney's office, the city cannot be excluded from the program since they are a rate payer
- Lack of public participation
- Consider switching to 90/10 cost share to make it incentivize for property owners. Other communities with mandates that have sanitary sewer overflow issues they are going out and paying for all the retrofits on the property because it's cheaper than going in and finding bigger solutions to their water quality problems
- If we pay 100% and they don't maintain, how will we get our money back
- In addition to water quality benefit when locating these projects on public property there is a public education benefit as well, which is an aspect to this program
- Not aggressive in advertising the program

Action Items

Staff will use the Commission's comments to develop a draft for the Commission's Review Policy

Item 4 – Other Business

- December Meeting – *presenting the Division's operation & CIP budget.*
- January 2015 Meeting Date – *to be decided at December's meeting since Thursday, January 1st is holiday.*
- Future Meetings – *Agenda Backup*
  - *Would like to send out back-up material via email in same pdf format. Any members with electronic devices (laptops, Ipads, tablets etc) that would rather go paperless, please let us know and an agenda packet will not be printed.*

Meeting adjourned at: 4:25p.m.

Suzette Mitchell