

CITY OF RALEIGH
STORMWATER MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COMMISSION (SMAC)

Minutes

Raleigh Municipal Building · 222 W. Hargett Street · Conference Room 305 3:00pm · Thursday, May 5, 2016

Commission Members Present: David Webb, Marion Deerhake, Francine Durso, Evan Kane, Marc Horstman, (*chair*) and Matthew Starr (*vice chair*)

Stormwater Staff Present: Blair Hinkle, Suzette Mitchell, Kelly Daniel, Veronica High, Scott Smith, Kevin Boyer, Ben Brown, Lauren Witherspoon, Scott Bryant, Sheila Thomas-Ambat, Carrie Mitchell, Carmela Teichman, Chris Stanley, Justin Harcum, Veronica Barrett, Wenju Zhang and Dale Hyatt

Members Absent: Vanessa Fleischmann (e), Chris Bostic (e), Ken Carper (e) and Kevin Yates

**Note: (e) denotes that the Commission excused the absence.

Guest:

Adam Martin (*Information Technology*)

Meeting called to order: 3:05 by Marc Horstman

Motions (Absentees and Minutes)

- Absence: Ms. Durso made a motion to excuse Vanessa Fleischmann, Chris Bostic and Ken Carper from today's meeting and Mr. Kane seconded. The motion was approved unanimously.
- April Meeting Minutes: Mr. Horstman made a motion to approve and Mr. Kane seconded. The motion was passed unanimously.

The following items were discussed with action taken as shown.

1. **Stormwater Staff Report**

- 1.1 **Environmental Awards** – *The Environmental Awards were held on April 21st. A special thanks to Ms. Fleischmann for participating on the jury.*
- 1.2 **Grant Application** (Kevin Boyer) – *National Parks and Recreation Association put out a Request for Proposal (RFP) for implementing Green Stormwater Infrastructure at city parks for underserved and low income neighborhoods. We submitted an application to design and construct green street treatment along Peterson and South State Street. The request is for \$485,000 with total project cost at \$555,000. A decision will be made in June.*
- 1.3 **Drainage Assistance Policy** – *Staff has spoken with Council and had public meetings on the policy revisions. Staff will present the revisions at the Growth and Natural Resources Committee meeting on May 25th at 2:00 pm. Then it goes back to Council for consideration. The Commission is welcome to attend.*
- 1.4 **GI/LID** – *Staff presented and received positive feedback from the City Manager. It will be presented at Council Work session on Tuesday, May 10th, then to Council to authorize the text changes recommended by the Code Review Work Group. We anticipate having the request for authorization on the May 17th Council agenda. In addition, there were a couple of items that came out of the Work Plan Implementation process that involved staff operational changes. It was the Centralized Maintenance of BMP's and Green Raleigh Review process. At the end of FY17, we plan to develop the framework and internal processes that will guide those operating procedures. With the budget submittal in FY18, we will begin to put in place the centralization for maintenance, and some processes for the Green Raleigh Review in coordination with the Development Services Department.*

1.5 **Text Change (TC-2-16) Impervious Area Exemption Limitation** – *This item will be heard at the Text Change Committee on May 17th at 9:00 pm. The Commission is welcome to provide any support to the Text Change Committee and Planning Commission.*

2. **What Works Cities Initiative**

Blair Hinkle noted that our Stormwater program was selected to pilot a “What Works Cities Initiative”. Part of the project, particularly the open data portion, relates to stakeholder involvement and participation. We are proposing to place this on June’s agenda for feedback. The kick-off was in March with a public announcement by the Mayor and supported by Bloomberg Philanthropies. The program entails working with 100 midsize cities to share best practices related to Performance Management, Data sharing and advance analytics. The two areas of focus with Stormwater are Performance Measures and Data Management.

Adam Martin (*Project Manager with Information Technology*) reiterated that the City Manager’s Office selected Stormwater as a pilot Division because of their great working relationship with the public, this committee and internally having a maturing ecosystem of data and data management. The prioritization model is a great example of what we want to be doing across the city.

Presentation: “What Works Cities Initiative”

- Raleigh has a long history of commitment to transparency and open data
- Why Public Data Management Matters - *Strategic Asset, Security and Compliance, Enabling Better Services and Public Trust*
- Open Data Definition - *refers to the way we share data. Our open data program focuses on the process of moving already digital data through a process of quality controls, governance around sensitivity, and publishing in an automated way*
- Stormwater Progress so Far - *49 Key datasets identified, 12 designated “sensitive public datasets” where clarity is needed, brainstormed data-enabled visualization and stories for 6 stakeholder groups mandatory*
- Stormwater Pilot Process - *Pre-work done to identify / pre-populate data (from existing sources – GIS, etc.), facilitated a couple of workshops with the managers of the business units to identify all key stakeholders and to describe the datasets managed by the department. We will continue to work with the department to prioritize and work through the data to prepare it for publishing in a useful and sustainable/automated way for internal and external stakeholders. Then work to do a soft launch and the more public launch alongside a few key visualizations or maps that help tell a story about the value that Stormwater is bringing to one of the user groups*
- Some data priorities for Release - *Stormwater Impervious, Capital Projects, Pending Drainage Assistance Projects, Adopt a Stream Volunteer Data, Illicit Discharge Responses, FY17 Stormwater Program Business Plan and Stormwater Program Spending*
- Community Engagement Opportunities - *Impervious Area Check Web Application; Stormwater Projects Explorer Web Application and Adopt a Stream Web Applications*
- SMAC Input - *Other opportunities to engage stakeholders or improve communication (events, applications), Alternative Priorities on Datasets and Datasets in inventory that you know would like to provide input on fields to include*

Ms. Deerhake asked about adopt a stream data set for volunteers logging their activities. Will it be designed that it will serve as a citizen science venue that you can monitor information?

Adam Martin replied that it’s all early stages of scoping. Any applications that you do, such as a Phase 1 or a Phase 2, you will have a set of requirements and features. The idea is to make it a volunteer portal that covers all the volunteer activities.

Action Item:

- *Provide construction bid data set for June meeting*

3. **Lake Preservation Policy Revision**

Marc Horstman reminded the Commission, when you look at the overall cost of the Capital Improvement Program investment, the lake preservation takes up a huge amount of taxpayer dollars. At several meetings we talked about the direction of the program, revisions needed and help to continue to optimize the use of taxpayer dollars for the current lake preservation program.

Scott Bryant noted that he's compiled the feedback from previous meetings and develop a revised policy for discussion.

Recommended Improvements for Lake Program – Presentation

- Name of Policy/Program
 - *Existing lakes program/policy – “Lake Preservation and Development Policy”*
 - *Proposed lakes program/policy - “Lake Retrofit Evaluation Program”*
- Lake Preservation emphasis
 - *Existing lakes program/policy - Strong emphasis and priority upon assuring preservation of lakes*
 - *Proposed lakes program/policy - Clarifies need for evaluation of benefits and costs associated with both lake preservation and non-lake preservation alternatives*
- NPDES MS4 permit/program linkage
 - *Existing lakes program/policy – Assumes lake preservation is salient to and/or required for the City’s NPDES MS4 permit/program compliance*
 - *Proposed lakes program/policy - Clarifies that lake preservation or non-lake preservation is not salient to and/or required for the City’s NPDES MS4 permit/program compliance*
- Watershed-based strategy
 - *Existing lakes program/policy – 2006 updates noted the need for a watershed-by-watershed approach but not fully applied*
 - *Proposed lakes program/policy - Clarifies need for watershed-by-watershed strategy; not a rigid citywide approach to lake preservation*
- Prioritization of projects
 - *Existing lakes program/policy - Reference to the listing of (102) facilities*
 - *Proposed lakes program/policy- Utilize integrated stormwater project prioritization methodology and/or other methods/tools as may be applicable; develop revised listing along with overall Stormwater CIP portfolio*
- Post-construction BMPs/SCMs
 - *Existing lakes program/policy – No reference to BMPs/SCMs that are required for development/redevelopment*
 - *Proposed lakes program/policy – Clarifies that lakes program is not applicable for BMPs/SCMs that are required for development/redevelopment*
- Construction of new “regional” facilities
 - *Existing lakes program/policy – Construction of new “regional” facilities is an integral element of the program*
 - *Proposed lakes program/policy - Clarifies that new “regional” facilities would not generally be pursued by the City due to permitting/mitigation requirements*
- Closer to source stormwater control(s)
 - *Existing lakes program/policy – Focuses upon lakes and other “regional” type measures*
 - *Proposed lakes program/policy - Balanced view of closer to source controls (i.e., GI/LID, other) and/or downstream controls, as may be required to best meet watershed and public stormwater management needs.*

Discussion:

Mr. Horstman said in a previous meeting, we saw the list of 102 projects and that list contained some potential projects that should not follow under the jurisdiction. What happen to that list?

Scott Bryant replied that the current list is 102. The majority of them are in the city limits; however, some are outside the cities jurisdiction and owned by County and State (*i.e. Cary, Durham*) and we wanted to see what a reduced list would look like.

Veronica High added that before removing some from the list and starting over, we need to distinguish is it there because of significant importance to the watershed versus being a CIP project for Raleigh. We need the opportunity to identify each of the 102 lakes. If we do remove something, we want to make sure it's documented, and then make the distinction of which ones are important to the watershed and at the same time see what Cary, Durham or others might be doing to it.

Blair Hinkle suggested we should have two meetings. The first one would be on the full list, just being an inventory of the benefits of those lakes to the watersheds. The second meeting would be to potentially remove some lakes off the list and begin review for future potential lake projects for the City to undertake.

Sheila Thomas-Ambat responded that you can use the Mine Creek watershed as an example. Two of the lakes in the Mine Creek watershed were originally on the list but not now. The benefit they provide is tremendous. For Shelly Lake, the cost benefit analysis is \$8 per pound of nitrogen reduction. If you look at the stream restoration and what we have to do to achieve that same balance it's unmatched, and unreal the dollar value benefit by nitrogen reduction you get by that one lake. That lake is owned by the County, but it's something to consider with the benefits within the larger watershed because Mine Creek watershed is completely developed. There's no opportunity to put in BMP's. The only opportunities we have to maintain the water quality in the watersheds are maintaining those lakes and stream restoration projects that can stabilize our stream banks to reduce the nitrogen phosphorus load.

Ms. Durso mentioned that moving 102 to a different list is important. You will have a record of the decision in not putting in a smaller group that would be in the watershed prioritization. For example, Lake Johnson is critical and does not need to be evaluated on the same basis as a smaller watershed type project.

Mr. Kane replied that at a previous meeting he made a comment on the fish passage habitat. The policy reads open ended enough that that kind of natural system restoration is addressed here, but it was not incorporated in the backup documentation.

Ms. Deerhake asked about the Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC) size of the watersheds, and how many fall in Raleigh spans and how well defined are HUC's delineated.

Scott Bryant said we have watersheds and sub-watersheds. The two major ones are Crabtree Creek and Walnut Creek with each at 50+ square miles. We are looking at this from a Mine Creek, Haresnipe Creek, and Rocky Branch with those types being 8 to 10 square miles up to 20.

Sheila Thomas-Ambat stated there are water sheds that are from 4 square miles upwards to 12 square miles. They are in the Neuse River basin and we have the two major watersheds. From there we have divided out our sub-watersheds from smallest 4 to upwards of 12. We can provide maps of how all the sub-watersheds fit into the two major watersheds and the Neuse.

Ms. Deerhake suggested too consider the overall water balance benefits to the water table at the wetlands. She said the word “retrofit” is not really meaningful to her; it may be useful to name the purpose statement or applicability statement up front, and also provide a definition for the general public on what you intend “retrofit” to mean here.

Scott Bryant said retrofit is an option, but do you have any suggestions.
The Commission suggested Lake Management, or Lake Management Evaluation Program

Mr. Horstman asked if we have flow continuation in the FEMA models for these lakes.

Ben Brown answered that it’s already built in for the major lakes.

Mr. Horstman asked if some of the lakes have recreation on it because that’s a benefit that shouldn’t be overlooked.

Blair Hinkle replied that some of them do, usually the larger county owned lakes with the exception of Lake Johnson.

Mr. Horstman referenced on page 9, (item 10) the last sentence of the revised draft reads “*Both lake and non-lake solutions should be evaluated, however, to identify and quantify public stormwater management benefits to the extent that Stormwater funds may support the stormwater-related components of the project*” is that Public Education outreach?

Blair Hinkle said it means Stormwater funds cannot be used to create a public entity that’s not water quality related. If the city acquires a piece of property with a lake on it, and as part of the acquisition the city wants to restore that lake, this policy sets out that an evaluation of potential options for that lake should include non-lake options, in terms of funding level to establish appropriate level of cost participation by the Stormwater Utility fund.

Ms. Durso noted that she did not want to insert the word “recreation” specifically in that text because that’s not what Stormwater is about as Blair just explained. Mr. Horstman agreed.

Scott Bryant proposed using some of Blair’s suggested language and add to the last sentence to clarify.

Ms. Deerhake suggested a term we could use is Ecosystem Services because it captures recreation from a benefit perspective.

Mr. Horstman said we can make a motion to send back to modify changes, or approve as is.

Blair Hinkle added the Commission can recommend not too take any action right now. You can continue to look over the policy and staff can bring back either at the June or August meeting for discussion.

Motions:

Ms. Durso made a motion for the Commission to thoroughly review, and then bring back in June to discuss and Mr. Webb seconded. The motion was passed unanimously.

Action Items:

- *Staff will email the word document to Commission for comments then incorporate them in a document prior to June’s meeting.*
- *Provide a map of HUC watersheds and City watersheds*

Adjournment:

Mr. Horstman made a motion to adjourn and both Mr. Starr and Mr. Kane second. The meeting adjourned at 4:33 p.m.

Suzette Mitchell