

**CITY OF RALEIGH**  
**STORMWATER MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COMMISSION (SMAC)**

Minutes

Raleigh Municipal Building · 222 W Hargett St · Room 305 3:00pm · Thursday, September 4, 2014
--

**Commission Members Present:** Michael Birch, Marc Horstman, Matthew Starr, JoAnn Burkholder, Chris Bostic, Kevin Yates, Vanessa Fleischmann and Will Service

**Stormwater Staff Present:** Ben Brown (left early), Sonya Debnam, Kevin Boyer, Scott Bryant, Chris Stanley, Lauren Witherspoon, Sheila Thomas-Ambat, Robert Kirkpatrick, Wenju Zhang, Brad Stuart, Veronica Barrett, and Gilles Bellot

**Members Absent:** David Webb and Francine Durso

**Guests:** Michael Allen, Roberta Fox, Amy Crowley, Emily Darr, Fred Belledin, Joseph Kirby and Matthew H.

Meeting called to order: 3:04 p.m. by Michael Birch

**Motions** (Absentees and Minutes)

- Absence – Mr. Yates made a motion to approve David Webb and Mrs. Francine Durso from today’s meeting, Mr. Starr seconded, the motion passed unanimously.
- August Meeting Minutes – Mrs. Fleischmann motioned to approve, Mr. Yates 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 from Scott Bryant:**

- **Staffing Update –**
  - Water Quality Project Engineer
    - *Bradley Stuart - Promotion*
  - Business Service Manager
    - *Kelly Daniel - Promotion*

• **LID/GI Status**

**Kevin Boyer:** We have tetra tech on board as a contractor expertise and facilitation services with regard to LID and GI. They presented to the taskforce on what other cities are doing in this area. Reviewed a proposed process for bringing outside stakeholders into the process and prepared a document for that purpose to present to City Council and to discuss possible revisions to the six item work plan for moving ahead. Decided no revisions were needed. Steps subject to review with the City Manager are to brief Council on the proposed stakeholder process. That tentatively is scheduled for the September 16<sup>th</sup> meeting. As for Councils comments and input to that process for stakeholder input and assuming that Council concurs or that we can move ahead with Council’s comments quickly, invite stakeholders and plan the first meeting. We hope to have two by the end of the year. You might recall from a past meeting, I believe two SMAC members volunteered to be on the commission, Jo Ann Burkholder and Kevin Yates, with Mark Senior as an alternate.

**Michael Birch:** Could you give us a sense of where the watershed development discussion is?

**Kevin Boyer:** Council never really gave staff clear direction on how to proceed with that. Staff briefed Council at that work session on June 16<sup>th</sup>. Council sent the message that they weren't interested in moving any further with that, so staff, nor Tetra Tech, has done no additional work in that area.

**Kevin Yates:** As far as the stakeholder meetings, will it be something the entire SMAC will be able to attend in the background?

**Kevin Boyer:** I'm sure it will be open to the public. It's just come out of the taskforce, so it's still subject to review with the City Manager and then by the City Council. Where we are right now, it is to make it a very open process, to send invitations to a long list of organizations and maybe even post it on our website to make it a wide open invitation.

**Question:** Will there be some dates that come out of that September 16<sup>th</sup> meeting?

**Kevin Boyer:** I don't know if they will decide on dates, but I doubt Council will dictate the dates or that staff would even propose dates at that point.

- **PWC Meeting**

**Scott Bryant** – Noted that the September 23<sup>rd</sup> PWC meeting in Water Quality Cost Share program will be presented and reviewed.

**Kevin Boyer:** Mark Senior did give a briefing on the program. Council member Maiorano asked to postpone any discussion and action until later. It's on September 9<sup>th</sup> at 5 p.m. in the Council Chamber. Mark Senior asks that the commission discuss three topics pertaining to the Stormwater Quality Cost Share program so that he might have a read on your thinking going into that meeting with the committee:

1. Whether or not unspent funds at the end of the fiscal year should rollover to the next fiscal year.
2. Whether the commission would prefer to continue to consider petitions as they come in or would you prefer to have them grouped quarterly or semi-annually as we've done in the past and as we do with the Drainage Cost Share program.
3. Whether the commission would want to consider putting a cap on the amount of funding awarded to a single project.

## **Item 2 – Final Approval of Annual Report & Work Plan (provided in agenda packet)**

- 2.1 **Kevin Birch** indicated that Mark Senior recirculated and edited the Annual Report and asked that we hold off on the Work Plan until our next meeting. We have a revised Annual Report that was worked on at the last couple of meetings.
  - o Ms. Burkholder motioned to approve, Mr. Horstman and Ms. Fleischmann seconded, the motion was approved unanimously

## **Item 3 – WQ Cost Share Petition Raleigh Union Station (continued)**

- 3.1 **Kevin Boyer:** There is one petition request for the Water Quality Cost Share Program. Request is for 75% of the cost of installing four Stormwater devices at the site of the future Union Station. Roberta Fox from our Urban Design Center is here representing the petitioner. She would like to reduce the request to bring it in line with the funds available in the program. Much of what is prepared today is the same as presented in July. The amount being requested is now \$650K; which there was a different number in July. The amount remaining in the budget through this fiscal year that the Commission has available for recommending projects under the program to City Council is \$330,564.00 and this is also a different number from what you saw in July, it's more. Part of the policy is that the staff is to consider the least cost alternative in evaluating and making recommendations to the Commission.
- 3.2 **Roberta Fox, Project Manager (Petitioner):** I have members of the Architectural, Civil and Landscape teams if we have specific questions about the project. This project is a part of a much larger project, which is the Multi-Modal Center. This is one piece of it that we're bringing forward now, which is the rail facility piece. We have also a bus facility and a parking facility, which would be phase 2 and phase 3 of Union Station. The project proposes a multi-modal

center that connects southeast high-speed rail, commuter rail, Amtrak, and light-rail. All in this one vicinity and the west grinch downtown. We're taking abandoned warehouses and proposing a use for them, where there has been no use for up to twenty years, in some cases. The project proposes to be operational in 2017, which is based on a series of grants that we received to be able to build the facility. The project that is known as a \$73 million dollar project, which may or may not change, is currently funded to \$66.25 million dollars from a series of grants and matching sources. There is a NCDOT match, City of Raleigh match, two grants that were from the Transportation Investment Generating Economic Recovery Program through the USDOT – we received a grant in 2012 and a grant in 2013 – and also the America Recovery Act – that's a \$15 million dollar grant that the state received to do some of the rail infrastructure pieces. So any match that we propose with the 75% cost share would come from Tiger Funds and City of Raleigh dedicated funding for the project. This is all in-hand funding; it is not associated with a sales tax referendum and alternative projects. **(Slide Presentation)** Because we have grants through the USDOT, we are subject to buy America. What that means is often the cost of materials as estimated through 65%; the costs are higher for a lot of the materials. We are required to purchase things that are manufactured, made, created, or components put together (everything), must all be American made, so in some cases you don't get a discount. This is one of the reasons the costs may seem high. I think the numbers for the bio-retention permeable pavers and the green roof were in target with the staff numbers. The only outstanding number, which you noted some difference in, was the area #1, the stormwater garden to the north. Bio-retention area #1 is going to be used as our area of refuge for emergencies. It's not a day to day use place, it's a park area.

**Questions:** Have educational opportunities outreach been explored through academic universities? Could we get a further understanding for the \$65 for landscaping? Where does the bio-retention soil media cost come from?

**Robert Fox:** I think most of the questions are coming from bio-retention area. We have not prioritized that one and we are not proposing to include that one in a request for this fiscal year. We will definitely be able to provide more information when we come back to officially ask for a Cost Share on those and we'd have more information. We have done some outreach in talking to NC State professors. We have started a conversation on how we'd do that. All of those grants do require ongoing monitoring of the device. We are working through how we have the ability to do that and allow people to use the area which is supposed to not be used on a daily basis. We are also looking at other grants associated with water quality and also with ground-fields cleanup. We have looked at a series of grants, both inside the City with the Sustainability Department and outside at NC State and we continue to do so. The prioritization of the project kept those in consideration. That's actually why the bio-retention area #1 has actually moved down in the priority for a request from the Cost Share program. There are other opportunities which we need to pursue a little bit more to be able to come back with more information.

**Michael Birch:** I want to make sure that all the Commission is clear that the request today is bio-retention area #3, green roof, and the permeable pavers. The total on that from a Cost Share stand-point on the City's behalf is \$317,850, which is within the approximately \$330K that we have set aside.

3.2.1 Mr. Birch motioned to approve petition for \$290,000. Mrs. Burkholder and Mr. Horstman seconded, the motion passed unanimously.

#### **Item 4 – Funding Considerations for the WQ Cost Share Program**

4.1 **Kevin Boyer:** Mr. Senior asks that the Commission begins discussing three aspects of the Stormwater Water Quality Cost Share Program. (1) *Rolling over unspent funding at the end of the fiscal year,* (2) *Consider petitions quarterly or as they come up, and* (3) *Should there be a cap on the amount awarded to any single project.* The discussion of the Union Station Project has raised some issues that hadn't been raised before. Also the program will be reviewed by the Public Works Commission soon. Mr. Senior would like to have some read from the SMAC Commission

on these topics and look ahead to a future meeting taking a vote on either sticking with the existing policy and practices or recommending some changes to the policy or practices.

**Item 5 – Laying Groundwork for Next Month’s Drainage Petition Projects**

- 5.1 **Chris Stanley:** What we want to do is take an opportunity to preview what projects we are looking at bringing forward for consideration for next month’s Drainage petitions.  
**(Slide Presentation)**

Meeting adjourned at 5:19 p.m.

Sonya Debnam