

**STORMWATER ADVISORY COMMITTEE (SWAC)**

Meeting #7 – Agenda  
March 6, 2018 @ 2:30 P.M.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT  
CONFERENCE ROOM  
1500 BEATTY STREET

---

“Come with an open mind, a willingness to hear all opinions or ideas,  
and be a champion for sustainable stormwater management in Greenville.”

1. Call to Order
2. Introductions
3. Announcements
4. Public Comment Period
5. Approval of February 6 meeting minutes
6. Chairman’s Comments
7. Level of Service Recap of Decisions
  - a. Program Management
  - b. Operations and Maintenance
  - c. Capital Improvement
8. Staff Presentation Recap
  - a. Capital Replacement
  - b. Engineering Operational
  - c. Maintenance Operational
9. Funding Sources and Revenue Options
  - a. Assigning Costs to Desired Level of Service
  - b. Other Considerations
  - c. Revenue Requirements
  - d. Rate Calculations
  - e. Residential Customer Impacts
  - f. Discussion **(need decisions from SWAC on the following)**

- i. Other scenarios to model
- ii. Any modifications to the assumptions or model
- iii. Any other information required to help the SWAC make decisions

10. Questions and comments

11. Closing remarks

**City of Greenville (COG)  
Stormwater Advisory Committee (SWAC) Meeting  
February 6, 2018 3:00 pm – 5:00 pm  
City Hall, Room 337**

**Advisory Committee Members Present:**

Tom Best	Donnie Brewer	Drake Brinkley
Michelle Clements	Jon Day	Joni Torres
Beth Ward	Cassius Williams	Matt Butler
Landon Weaver*		

\*Attending for Bill Clark

**Staff & Consultants Present:**

Kevin Mulligan/COG	Daryl Norris/COG	Lisa Kirby/COG
Amanda Braddy/COG	Mark Senior/WK Dickson	Tom Murray/WK Dickson
Katie Cromwell/Raftelis	Inga Kennedy/PEQ	

1. Advisory Committee Chair Tom Best called the meeting to order and initiated introductions. He confirmed a quorum of committee members.
2. No public comments were registered. Rebecca Bounce, a student at East Carolina University, was in attendance and was introduced. She is studying Environmental Planning at the University and attended as an observer.
3. The Chair called for approval of the previous minutes. No corrections were offered, and the minutes were approved.

4. Chairman's Comments:

The Chair asked, and it was confirmed that only 2 more meetings are currently scheduled with the consultant team. He suggested the SWAC should not disband, but the goal is to arrive at rate recommendations by the end of the meetings with the consultant.

He also suggested the Soil and Water organization has a groundwater flow model that is an excellent tool to demonstrate to the SWAC. Tom has reserved the tool and asked to have a presentation at the March SWAC meeting. He suggested that the SWAC could arrive at 2:30 pm so as not to interfere with the regular meeting time. Committee members and Greenville staff agreed, and Lisa Kirby indicated she would verify availability of the room. Inga Kennedy will send out reminders for Committee members to arrive a half hour early.

5. The meeting was turned over to Mark Senior with W.K. Dickson who thanked the SWAC and Greenville staff for participating in the matrix exercise. He also discussed the agenda for the meeting and emphasized the goal of arriving at consensus for the desired level of service. He began a presentation that included a recap of the decisions agreed on by the Committee on the Extent of Service.

Beth Ward asked what homeowners do to manage drainage and the response was proactive projects such as cisterns, rain gardens and downspout disconnects. City staff acknowledged that very few of these type projects exists privately and that typically a HOA will have a pond or something similar to manage drainage. Beth suggested that gaps should be identified somehow. Tom Best indicated that the Soil and Water have C-CAP funds available. The agency works directly with homeowners in urban areas to address some of these issues and may conduct public outreach as well. There are funds set aside to help homeowners address needed improvements.

6. Level of Service Overview – Mark initiated the presentation on level of service general categories and explained the types and magnitudes of benefits derived the from the City’s stormwater program. The services he described are typical activities that fall within three general categories including:
  - a. Program Management
  - b. Operation and Maintenance
  - c. Capital Improvements

Mark then described the kinds of services that could be provided under each category for stormwater programs. During the presentation of the categories, several discussions and questions resulted. Regarding billing, Lisa Kirby recognized missing revenue opportunities due to the City’s inability to access billing data through the GUC which does not charge for vacant properties and large impervious surfaces located in the City. Kevin Mulligan indicated minimum staff availability also contributes to the challenge of dedicating resources for review of missed revenue. He indicated that current staff resources are strained, and the office needs personnel dedicated to auditing, billing, impervious surface measures, GIS, etc. Drake Brinkley asked if there is an opportunity to contract out the position. Michele Clements suggested that enough funds (delta) to cover such a position should be considered and acknowledged that Greenville’s hands are tied being unable to recoup info from GUC.

7. Evaluating Level of Service – The next part of the presentation included a recap of the evaluation activity completed by the SWAC and Greenville staff. Mark described the matrix exercise and how it was developed. He reminded everyone that a letter grading system of A thru E was applied to facilitate evaluation and consideration of alternative levels of service. For each, SWAC and staff members were asked to determine the current level and consider if a higher or lower level is desired using the grading system.

Mark explained the layout of the matrix exercise and how each service grade was applied. Respondents were asked to grade each Level of Service category from a minimal program to a state of the art program. He then shared the results from the SWAC and Greenville staff and provided a comparison of responses. Each Level of Service category grading score was presented in summary. SWAC and staff members were asked to arrive at consensus for each category using the responses as a basis.

Program Management and Regulatory Compliance

Mark kicked off this presentation suggesting that Greenville’s regulatory compliance is high due to the recently completed study of the City’s watersheds. He then provided a summary of responses for each category and initiated the discussion by asking how each person considered grading the matrix. Mark also provided some general comparisons of Level of Service provided by other cities from around the state. Lisa reiterated the billing, finance and auditing challenges. She pointed out that stormwater billing is included with water and sewer and most customers never see the difference; they just pay the bill. She suggested there is room for improvement and collection is in the high 90s%. Staff is currently reviewing some of the accounts and there are some basic math issues. Specifically, staff is going through and identifying outliers.

Kevin Mulligan suggested that ultimately, there is a need for dedicated staff to review billing, GIS and auditing to ensure accuracy. Kevin also pointed out that capital spending is a major part of the revenue with pipe maintenance consuming much of the spending.

Michele Clements highlighted some areas where staff graded A and SWAC graded C. She applauded the City for aspiring to the highest standards. Generally, most areas are rated C because meeting the minimum is no problem and the City often goes above and beyond minimum requirements to address issues.

Landon Weaver asked about construction and post-construction enforcement and highlighted the differences in responses. He also asked about camera inspections. Daryl Norris pointed out that the City generally knows what to inspect and only 10% of pipes in new developments are subjected to camera inspections. He shared that there are occasional issues with pipes that are not old. Landon suggested providing additional inspections to get the best product on the front end and such an investment could extend the life of pipes. Need to make sure any pipe going in the ground can last 40 years. Daryl also pointed out the need to maximize the most efficient spending opportunities; getting the most bang for the buck. Currently, there is not a program for inspecting the existing system with cameras. This is only done when there is a problem. When taking over a road they will inspect the whole thing - all the pipes.

Daryl mentioned inventory and asset management as also being important. He suggested the City is ahead of many communities relative to asset management and inventory. During the Watershed Master Plan process, an inventory was conducted because it is important to know what the City has. There is also a need for a condition assessment to proactively plan for replacements and repairs. An ideal situation would allocate money replacements can occur on schedule.

**Following the discussion, the consensus from the group was B.**

### Annual Operations and Maintenance

Mark summarized the specific responses to annual operations and maintenance levels of service and initiated the discussion by asking SWAC members why they graded so low on Public BMPs. Tom Best responded that the public needs more education. They do not hear how the funding is spent and make their own conclusions. He also suggested that it has a lot to do with expectations and the public responds to problems with their properties by suggesting the City pays for repairs and improvements. He suggested that when the rate study process is completed, the City needs to implement an education program for the public. Kevin Mulligan acknowledged that not many people visit the web page for information. Tom Murray pointed out that many cities have dedicated staff for public information and education. Joni Torres suggested that public education is needed for both extent and level of service and that user-friendly map and other graphics would help the public in understanding boundary issues. The public is in the dark about these issues.

Beth Ward asked about private BMP inspection and maintenance. Lisa Kirby acknowledged that public BMP inspection and maintenance is not where it needs to be and that there is a need for internal education on public BMPs including other departments where coordination is important. An Inspection position is currently vacant.

Daryl Norris pointed out the consistency between the SWAC and staff on open ditch systems grading. Kevin Mulligan highlighted that stream inspection and clearing presents the same challenges as ditch systems. Everyone agreed that more education is needed around this issue. There is an assumption that the city maintains it all but a lot of it does not fall within the City's purview.

Mark also pointed out that for private drainage assistance, staff rated much lower than SWAC. Daryl emphasized that the issues are addressed on a case-by-case basis. Lisa Kirby reminded everyone that the SWAC

agreed during the previous meeting that no Extent of Service will be provided to private properties. This is another topic that requires education. Beth suggested putting materials on the website so that the public can access it and eliminate staff having to visit private properties.

**Following the discussion, the consensus from the group was B. Note this score is not relative to private drainage because the City is not providing these services. Michele Clements also suggested adding separate line items for public education.**

### Capital Improvement Program (CIP)

Mark presented a summary of Greenville's Capital Improvement Program needs based on the recently completed Watershed Master Plan. He also provided a summary of Level of Service funding projections based on current annual revenues. He pointed out that Greenville knows all their CIP needs and that a lot of communities don't have this information.

Drake Brinkley asked if the figures account for inflation. Katie Cromwell responded that timing and growth in the city impact the figures and without that information, it is hard to capture.

Landon Weaver asked if all the projects are needed. Tom Murray responded that projects are prioritized in the Watershed Master Plan. Lisa Kirby suggested the need to focus on maintenance of existing projects (those slated to fail) regardless of capacity projects.

Daryl Norris asked the group whether prioritization or a percentage is needed to identify projects based on the matrix responses. Drake Brinkley responded that the prioritized list of projects should be used. Michele Clements suggested removing projects that are not as urgent as others and leave it staff to determine and know what those priorities are. Daryl suggested discussing prioritized projects at the next meeting and the SWAC agreed.

Kevin Mulligan also emphasized the need to talk about the pipe replacement costs and that the line item could go under O&M or capital. Probably looking at D or E from a practical standpoint. He acknowledged emergency repairs are given priority and funding is allocated for projects that are likely going to fail.

Mark highlighted that Greenville is at a disadvantage having completed studies and identified many problem areas and CIP needs. He shared that other cities around the state don't have a handle on their CIP needs yet and few if any have budgeted for future replacement of aging infrastructure.

**Following the discussion, the consensus from the group was C although this could change depending on the discussion at the March meeting.**

Prior to adjourning, Beth Ward suggested that the SWAC prepare a public relations campaign about the work it is doing. She thinks the effort needs to begin in advance of completing the rate study. Kevin Mulligan suggested there is also an opportunity during the City's public hearing process.

The meeting was adjourned.

### Handouts

February 6, 2018 Meeting Agenda  
February 6, 2018 Meeting Presentation  
December 7, 2017 Meeting Summary