CITY OF RALEIGH
STORMWATER MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE (SMAC)

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

Committee Members Present: Matthew Starr, Francine Durso, Chris Bostic, Kevin Yates, Michael Birch, JoAnn Burkholder, David Webb, and Marc Horstman

Stormwater Staff Present: Mark Senior, Suzette Mitchell, Sonya Debnam, Scott Bryant, Rebecca Ferres, Lauren Witherspoon and Ron Davis

Members Absent: Vanessa Fleischmann and Will Service

Guests: Mike Wayts, Amos Clark, Amit Sachan, Mathew Hornack and Beth Chessen

The following items were discussed with action taken as shown. Mr. Birch called the meeting to order.

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

1.1 Mark Senior -

- **Matthew Starr** – *Appointed newest SMAC member (Upper Neuse Riverkeeper)*
- **Reappointments** –
  - *JoAnn Burkholder – 2 terms (2/17/14 – 2/16/16)*
  - *Michael Birch – 2 terms (3/7/14 – 3/6/16)*
- **February meeting minutes** – *Ms. Burkholder made a motion to approve. Mr. Yates seconded, the motion was approved unanimously.*
- **Water Quality Cost Share modification** – *Remains in attorney's office.*
- **LID Study** – *Will soon be receiving final report from consultant on advancing LID. May have more information provided at next meeting or thereafter.*
- **Development Exemptions** – Mr. Birch summarized that the current UDO Stormwater regulations took effect 2001-2002 in which all subdivisions of land that occurred after that time had to comply with Stormwater regulations. When adopted, there were five exceptions to comply with and two are before us now. One is having an existing lot if you're looking at re-developing a lot for additional impervious surface. The second is subdivisions of a lot less than one acre in size into two lots that are then used for detached homes. Council received complaints from homeowners experiencing neighbor to neighbor issues where stormwater runoff is increasing on their property due to development next to them, or downstream properties experiencing increase stormwater flow from something happening upstream. The item was referred as a result of development occurring within the exceptions. Our staff has prepared revisions to those exceptions. The impervious thresholds as proposed by staff are: *(R1-20%, R2 -25%, R4-38%, and R6-51%).* These are the appropriate thresholds and from a Stormwater study standpoint once you do the study

and it shows there's no downstream impact you can exceed the impervious surface threshold. From a cost standpoint, you are looking from a range of $2,500 - $5,000 for a study analysis. From an onsite standpoint, you are looking from a range of $5,000 - $10,000 to mitigate onsite. I wanted to see if we could do a little higher based on development occurring now on the beltline under these exemptions is at a much higher rate of impervious surface. Setting these at the level brought forward, are we capturing a large amount of re-development and development, and will that be an administrative burden to administer, and require the Stormwater impact study on almost every redo inside the beltline. The thresholds I recommend are: *(R1-30%, R2-40%, R4-50% and R6-60%). The last meeting we tied on the vote* 4-4.

- **Ms. Burkholder** suggested we table this until the next time.
- **Mr. Senior** said he would get Ben Brown to do a full "readers digest" version in preparation of an anticipated vote.
- **Mr. Birch** said the vote we take on this will be a recommendation to Council to authorize a text change consistent with what we come up. Staff will prepare text change which will work through the UDO process for text change. It will then go to the Planning Commission and then to Council for a Public Hearing and in that process there may be referrals to committees.

1.2 **Mr.Birch** made a motion to excuse Will Service and Vanessa Fleischmann from today's meeting. Mr. Hortsman seconded, the motion was approved unanimously.

<u>Item 2 – Crabtee Creek Flooding</u>

2.1 **Mr. Bryant** indicated in summary, representatives from Crabtree Valley approached staff on a different flooding situation from local runoff from north to south coming toward the mall. Structure flooding qualifies in city drainage petition program, but the scope is above the budget we have. The solution entails a system that extends above Crabtree Mall and parallel to Glenwood which would have benefits on public roadways as well as private property. We are looking at what solutions may be, what the percentage at looking at private ~vs~ public benefits, and how to view typical public Stormwater Capital Projects in terms of what level of funding the city might contribute to that project.

- **Amos Clark** *(Representative for Crabtree)* – We've done utility mark and survey and forwarded on to the contractor and secondly we have worked on the alignment. We have a verbal agreement with the owner of old BB&T to come across that property. We've had conversations with PNC, but no commitment yet, but they have not said anything to lead us to believe they won't allow us to come across their property. It looks like the alignment may be able to come across PNC & BB&T which would save over a million dollars.

<u>Item 3 – Annual Work Program and Report to Council</u>

3.1 **Mr. Senior** noted this committee has some responsibilities. One is the annual work plan, the annual report to Council, and approval of the Stormwater budget. We will pattern a new annual report that's similar to the copy *(provided in agenda backup)* and send back to the Committee for review and approval. We

want you to look at it along with the different categories we report on to see if we need to add anything before we start putting it together.

3.2 **Mr. Birch** said there are two things. The annual work program Kevin Boyer spent a good deal of time in 2013 that provided us a good framework to move forward. As far as the work plan, these are a grouping of items not necessarily a priority of items you want to tackle in a given year. It's one of those things where it's on the work plan but doesn't mean we have to do, but we can't do something that's not on the work plan and that isn't referred by Council. Take a look at it and come prepared at the next meeting with comments. The other item is the report we can hand to council as a review of our past year. Some of these may carry over from year to year.

3.3 **Mr. Senior** said the annual report, we plan to go back and look at things done from past years and bring forward, with similar format to view and add or subtract. We will get a file version the Commission to vote on so you can send to Council.

For the work plan suggest looking at what we done from the past year and see if you want something similar or if it's addition you want to add we can start putting together too.

- **<u>Commission Comments on Annual Report</u>**
  - *Remove "Dr." from JoAnn Burkholder*
  - *Review of Cost Share Projects – add more detail, little more specifics and show example or of some of the projects*
  - *Capital Improvement Program – list completed and active projects going on*
  - *Highlight some capital and petition and water quality projects*
  - *Request for Variance – provide detail summary of what the variance was for*
  - *Stormwater Drainage Cost Share – for total requested funding assistance add "at a fix budget of $750,000 total requested funding assistance was over $1,149,20"*

<u>Item 4 – Annual Capital Improvement Program</u>

4.1 **Mr. Senior** noted that we are trying to incorporate and tie this into the budget. (*Mr. Senior follows up with a Powerpoint budget presentation).*

4.2 **Mr. Birch** asked if we will see the list of CIP projects in the coming months.

4.2.1 **Mr. Senior** said we have it available and will be presenting it back to you. We will bring back information on the individual CIP projects as part of the final budget presentation so you can proof and so we can send forward to Council.

<u>Item 5 – Other Business</u>

5.1 Mr. Yates requested at a future meeting for the consultant *(TetraTech)* to provide the Commission a quick summary presentation on where we are at on LID.

Meeting adjourned at 4:59 pm.