

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
3:00pm · Tuesday, May 26, 2015

Minutes

Commission Members: Marc Horstman and Francine Durso

Staff: Blair Hinkle, Wenju Zhang, David Hawksworth, McKenzie Gentry, Veronica High, Chris Stanley, Kelly Daniel, Suzette Mitchell, and Scott Bryant

Guests: Ken Carper and Sujit Ekka

Purpose - To delve into the Stormwater Project Prioritization Model Development and to receive input and guidance from the SMAC Sub-Committee. Focus for today's Sub-Committee Meeting #1 is to begin review of the draft working criteria for the model.

Elected: Francine Durso as Chair and Marc Horstman as Vice-Chair

Overall Vision/Goal Discussion (*Blair Hinkle – Stormwater Program Manager; Scott Bryant – Stormwater staff support/facilitator*) – To develop a prioritization model that will be a key tool to be used objectively to compare and rank potential stormwater projects in an integrated, comprehensive way. Development of the prioritization model will be in alignment with the City's Strategic Plan and Comprehensive Plan and with the Stormwater Program mission. Staff has committed to Council during their recent budget workshops and meetings to work with SMAC and staff to have the (initial) prioritization model ready for usage during the FY16-17 budget season (beginning in October of this year). The model will facilitate objective scoring for projects that will ultimately be recommended to SMAC and Council.

The focus is on an integrated approach in order to evaluate/compare on a relative scale potential water quality improvement, flood hazard reduction, infrastructure, drainage petition and other projects. The model will produce an objective score, benefit score, cost benefit information, and serve as a key tool to help staff develop a citywide master stormwater project list for implementation.

The feedback of greatest importance from the SMAC is the review, input, and guidance to the criteria and the weights for the criteria. The criteria are the foundation or building block for the whole model. Then the relative importance, or weighting, of the criteria will have the largest impact on the resultant scoring.

Timetable – Three (3) Sub-Committee work sessions: scheduled for May 26th, June 3rd, and June 18th. (Present to and discuss with the full SMAC in July and then a final draft in September, as tentatively planned.)

Public Involvement – Staff has received request for the public to provide comments. At the next meeting, we will be setting time up front for the public and a call for submission of written comments.

SMAC Questions–

1. Francine Durso – Will all the projects be funneled through this prioritization model?
 - 1.1 Blair Hinkle - There are similar projects being prioritized against each other, also we don't want to end up funding only one or two kinds of projects. Making sure we are equitable, in terms of the need to pursue a range of types of projects. At the same time, we need to explain why we may be spending more on infrastructure projects this year and less on other type of projects (flood mitigation, for example). Council has authorized spending \$750,000 on the drainage assistance/petition program and \$250,000 on the water quality cost share program. Some program elements have their explicit spending caps or levels, and for others the money needs to go to the projects that provide the greatest relative public benefit on a prioritized basis. The model will thus help serve as a key tool for the relative ranking/evaluation of competing projects.
2. Marc Horstman – Does the City have a process to rank CIP projects?
 - 2.1 Scott Bryant - The City has not had a quantitative or other comprehensive scoring system for stormwater CIP projects. CIP projects have generally been based on street flooding or street right-of-way drainage system needs along with structural flooding. Much of the CIP to date has encompassed legacy known drainage problems and needs and/or based on improvements recommended in watershed studies. The City does have a ranking system for drainage petition projects along with criteria for water quality cost share projects.
3. Marc Horstman – From a public perspective it's important to show a return on investment on stormwater dollars. The legacy projects that we continue to spend money on how do we obtain the return on them?
 - 3.1 Blair Hinkle - On projects we've already spent money on that have been engineered, and we have made a significant investment on; we need to be committed in seeing those through. We will put them in the prioritization model and they may end up as exceptions if they do not find a way unto the top of the model scorings.
4. Marc Horstman – From a public view what would staff like to see coming out of this?
 - 4.1 Veronica High - It would be public perception and increased public support. The model would be a fair way of laying something out and have something concrete to point to. It would let residents know we are assessing each project on a fair level through this process and it would show them the criteria we are using.
5. Francine Durso – How would the lake preservation policy and watershed studies fit into this?
 - 5.1 Veronica High - We are working on going through past watershed studies. All of the studies have identified projects. We will be breaking those individual projects out. Not all of the studies used the same criteria, but we are going to try and gather as much as we can and perhaps get some consultant assistance, if needed, to fill in some of the blanks and put in the model.
 - 5.2 Blair Hinkle - Some of our projects are housed in specific policies (i.e. lake preservation, drainage petition, water quality) and everything else is lumped in CIP. The policy is where the projects live and then they are applied into the prioritization model. We are not changing the framework by which projects get into those policies. Things in the policy will remain in the policies and still utilize this framework as much as possible.

6. Marc Horstman – If you are doing a drainage petition, are we looking at different eligibility criteria?
- 6.1 Chris Stanley/Scott Bryant - Each project, including drainage petition projects, will go through the same criteria and same scoring system. It was acknowledged that the typical drainage petition type project would not be expected to score as high as a more comprehensive system-based CIP project, however. The relative ranking of projects is the key and the petition projects will be sorted out, along with other projects, for implementation consideration.

Review of the Working Draft Criteria for the Integrated Stormwater Management Project Prioritization Model *(comments/input from SMAC Sub-Committee)*

- *Add - Water Quality Cost Share*
- *Add -Type of project and the group within Stormwater that will lead that type of project*
- *Estimate (breakdown) up front engineer/design cost ~vs~ construction cost*
- *Exception for water quality – private runoff is eligible for the water quality cost share program; all other projects require public runoff to be eligible for consideration*
- *Note if stormwater fee payments are up-to-date for drainage assistance and water quality cost share projects*
- *It cannot be expected to capture everything in the model and that the model will need to be reviewed and updated/adapted over time*
- *Endorsed the overall working framework for the integrated project prioritization model and the approach to development*
- *Endorsed the “basic eligibility” criteria*
- *Good idea to normalize the project scores to a 100 point scale*
- *Supported the concept of an overall project score, a benefits score or index, and benefit-cost factors*
- *Suggested including loan opportunities within the Resource Leveraging criteria category*

Next meeting (June 3rd) –

- *Work on completing the review of the draft working criteria*
- *Receive public input/comments*
- *Following Meeting #2, homework assignment (relative weighting exercise) ahead of Meeting #3*

Meeting Adjourned: 5:10 pm