

CITY OF RALEIGH
STORMWATER MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COMMISSION (SMAC)
Sub-Committee *for* Integrated Stormwater Project Prioritization Model Development

Professional Building · 127 W. Hargett St · Suite 800
3:00 pm · Wednesday, June 18, 2015

Minutes

Commission Members: Francine Durso (Chair) and Marc Horstman (Vice-Chair)

Absent: Vanessa Fleischmann (emergency)

City Staff: Sheila Thomas-Ambat, Suzette Mitchell, Ben Brown, McKenzie Gentry, Wenju Zhang, Chris Stanley, and Scott Bryant

Meeting Called to Order: 3:12 pm by Francine Durso, Sub-Committee Chair

Sub-Committee Meeting Minutes –

- Ms. Durso made a motion to approve the June 3rd Sub-Committee Meeting Minutes and Mr. Horstman seconded. The motion was approved.
- Mr. Horstman made a motion to approval May 26th Meeting Minutes and Ms. Durso seconded. The motion was approved.

Public Comment/Public Input – There was no further public input or comments received in response to the open public call for comments. The only written comments received were reviewed during the June 3rd meeting. The public comment/input period for the initial prioritization model development phase is closed as of the end of business on June 18, 2015.

Prioritization Model Development – the four primary goals for today’s (June 18) meeting:

- Review and discuss the initial criteria weighting results
- Discussion of 9 or 10 main integrated criteria items
- Discussion of potential supplementary/benefit scores or other scores in addition to the project total score to help with implementation decisions
- Any further comments or suggestions the Sub-Committee may have for staff

Sub-Committee Questions –

1. Mr. Horstman – Regarding the overview/evaluation process and how this model will be incorporated into the project review process. Some items won’t be identified until a study is done, for example.
 - 1.1 Scott Bryant – Good point to note. We will always need to use the best available information we have about the (potential) project that is under evaluation. Some information will be preliminary and in some cases we might have (more detailed) information available through an existing/earlier study or evaluation.
 - 1.2 Sheila Thomas-Ambat – Looking at past watershed studies that the City has done, we are trying to figure out a prioritization (of potential projects to score through the new prioritization model) based on technical study data, complaint data, flooding data, maintenance data and to bring all of this information together. The goal is to identify the potential hot spots (i.e., priority areas and potential projects for scoring and further evaluation) using available data we have to date using GIS and analysis.

2. Mr. Horstman – For the Stormwater Infrastructure Asset Management criteria - do we currently have a GIS listing on failing culverts, and what is the development of stormwater infrastructure asset management?

2.1 Scott Bryant – Yes, however we are in the early stages of a future more comprehensive stormwater asset management program. We have an initial city-wide inventory of the stormwater infrastructure inventory in a GIS database with associated attributes including a preliminary measure of condition in many cases.

Review/Discussion of Initial Criteria Weighting Results –

- General consensus reached on working overall relative range of rankings for the criteria and the average weights are very close in general
- Unanimous consensus on the top three most important criteria for both the nine and ten criteria options (Public Safety & Public Health, Flood Hazard Reduction Benefits and Regulatory Mandates & Compliance)
 - o Note - in looking at the nine criteria option that was preferred by the group, there was also unanimous consensus on the top four most important criteria with Water Quality Benefits ranking as fourth most important, respectively
- General consensus on the three (or four) that would be of relative least most importance for the model (Indirect Community Benefits, Resource Leveraging Opportunities, Community Support & Implementation Complexity)
- General consensus on the middle range criteria as well but may want to further discuss final relative order of Asset Management and Watershed Management Benefits as these are very close in weighting for both the Sub-Committee and Staff team
- Unanimous support for the nine main integrated criteria approach (to accompany the earlier agreed upon basic eligibility criteria).

Sub-Committee Comments –

- **Ms. Durso** noted on the Sub-Committee scoring rating for the 10X10 (ten) criteria option that Community Support and Implementation Complexity scored almost the same, it would seem logical then that they can therefore be combined in the model.
- **Mr. Horstman** agreed; if you separated them out it would also be another parameter that must be filled out especially if you have many projects.
- **Ms. Durso** indicated based on the discussion the Sub-Committee agreed with the Staff team to move with the 9X9 (nine main) criteria option. **Mr. Horstman** agreed.

Further Discussion of Integrated Prioritization Criteria and Working Sub-Elements

- Public Safety & Public Health
 - o Combine all sub categories/sub-elements under this main criteria into 1 spectrum for scoring
- Flood Hazard Reduction Benefits
 - o Keep as three separate sub areas (street flooding, structural flooding, and non-structural flooding) for scoring
- Regulatory Mandates and Compliance
- Water Quality Benefits
- Indirect Community Benefits
 - o Consensus that this criteria is one of the relative least most important
- Resource Leveraging Opportunities
 - o Consensus that this criteria is one of the relative least most important

- Stormwater Infrastructure Asset Management Benefits
 - May be easier to quantify/score sub-items for asset management than the (broader) sub-items under watershed management
 - Mr. Horstman noted the importance of infrastructure asset management for the community
- Community Support & Implementation Complexity
 - Note that the first sub-item relates to community support, the other three relate more to implementation complexity
- Watershed Management Benefits

Scott Bryant indicated that the primary goals for today’s agenda have been reached. We have reviewed and discussed the initial criteria weighting information and also the subcommittee made the decision to go with the nine working criteria option. To close out today’s agenda the next discussion is on potential Supplemental/Benefit scores. The idea is when two projects score the same in the total score how do we break the tie, and what information we use to help with final ranking recommendations for decision makers. Early thoughts are that the more we can agree to quantify, the more we can capture in a consistent, replicable process will help us with the implementation plan and ongoing use of the model.

Potential Supplemental Scores/Factors to help with implementation

- Concept of a Criticality Score/s
 - Based on score from Public Safety & Public Health criteria alone (“Safety Criticality Score”);
 - And/or based on weighted score from Public Safety & Public Health, and/or Flood Hazard Reduction Benefits and/or Regulatory Mandates & Compliance
- Supplemental Benefits Type Score/s
- Cost Factor Type Considerations
 - Cost/area served
 - Cost/“total benefit” derived
 - Cost/supplemental benefits derived
 - May define “total benefits” derived using total project score (for consistency)
 - May need to further discuss/define “supplemental benefits”
- Staff will work further on the supplemental scoring type considerations and bring back options/additional information

Upcoming SMAC July 9th Meeting – The full Commission will be presented with an overview of the meetings and brought up to speed on what the Sub-Committee and Staff team have collaboratively worked and agreed upon.

Meeting Adjourned: 5:03pm