

**STORMWATER ADVISORY COMMITTEE (SWAC)**

Meeting #10 – Agenda  
June 5, 2018 @ 3:00 P.M.

CITY HALL  
ROOM 337  
200 WEST FIFTH 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. Announcements
3. Public Comment Period
4. Approval of May 1<sup>st</sup> Meeting Minutes
5. Chairman Comments
6. Citywide Master Plan Prioritization
7. Presentation of Higher Priority Capital Projects
8. Questions and Comments
9. Closing Remarks

**City of Greenville (COG)  
Stormwater Advisory Committee (SWAC) Meeting #9  
May 1, 2018 3:00 pm – 5:00 pm  
City Hall, Room 337**

**Advisory Committee Members Present:**

Tom Best	Drake Brinkley	Don Edwards
Jon Day	Joni Torres	Beth Ward
Matt Butler	Landon Weaver	Michelle Clements

**Advisory Committee Members Not Present:**

Donnie Brewer                      Cassius Williams

**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	Keith Readling/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. Jordan Anders with the City's Public Information Office assigned to Public Works was in attendance.
3. The Chair, Tom Best, called for approval of the April 3, 2018 minutes which were unanimously approved.
4. Chairman's Comments:  
The Chairman commented that once a decision is made on funding then it needs to be shared with the community. He asked for confirmation that stormwater and sewer pipes were separated, and Daryl Norris confirmed. He asked about the process for approving a rate change and whether a public hearing would be required. Staff responded that the process would include a Council workshop and public hearing.
5. The meeting was turned over to Katie Cromwell with Raftelis, who briefed the committee on the agenda and the items to be covered during the meeting which included follow up details requested by the SWAC.
6. Funding Sources and Revenue Options Recap
  - Minimum and Vacant Unit Charges – Katie acknowledged the majority of committee members agreed that vacant unit charges for the stormwater fee should be considered. She acknowledged that the feasibility of implementing the revenue change could be challenging and the revenue impact was conservatively modeled. The SWAC is suggesting a minimum 1 ERU for each multi-family unit.

- Fixed Administrative Charge – Katie confirmed the SWAC agreed that there should be a fixed administrative charge on a per parcel basis. Jon Day asked if there was one now and Katie acknowledged this would be new.

## 7. Revenue Requirements

- Requirements if No Rate Change – Katie summarized the revenue impacts of no rate change. She then described the revenue requirements of no change for budgeted fiscal year 2018 through projected fiscal year 2022 and used a table to illustrate the calculations.
- Capital Needs – Katie then identified the revenue needed for projects to resolve identified problems and estimated total life cycle cost to replace infrastructure. Jon asked what the time frame for the total life cycle replacement infrastructure is and Katie confirmed that it is a 40-year cycle.

## 8. Potential Rates

- Rate Ranges Based on Capital Investments – Keith Readling summarized the group’s response to the four scenarios presented during the April last meeting. He described the modeling summary of each of the four scenarios using a table containing the revenue generation of each.

Jon asked what the current rate is and Daryl Norris answered that for a typical residential home it is 2 ERUs at \$5.35. Drake Brinkley asked what services would be provided under the various scenarios and Keith responded that additional O & M budget is included as well as additional capital project costs. Landon Weaver also asked if it included the life cycle costs and suggested that ramping on \$2 million versus \$6 million is not of a much difference. Daryl agreed. Keith responded that the life cycle costs and the capital project costs have been combined into a single line item for capital costs. Landon suggested that the 5-year ramping would yield funding on the front end and level out on the backend. Keith expressed concern that starting out high could be an issue with public perception.

Kevin Mulligan reminded everyone that the consultant is hired to identify possible rates changes and the committee’s responsibility is to recommend any changes. He confirmed that overall, the rate would be a 70% increase that could be hard for Council to accept and approve. He further suggested the needs of miles of pipe repair and replacement along with other smaller and larger projects are critical to fund. Landon asked if there is a way to differentiate between what is a project that could lead to a catastrophe and must be funded versus what is a desirable project that may not need to be funded. Kevin mentioned there is a priority list but there are some very critical projects that need to be conducted. Lisa Kirby added that the prioritization also includes consideration of criticality such as emergency evacuation and access. Kevin suggested that strengthening the inspection of storm drainage installations and other proactive measures could defray future maintenance and repair costs.

Tom Murray suggested that \$2 million of projects are already ongoing. Kevin mentioned that there are several projects that need immediate attention including 230 miles of pipe and other critical projects. Landon asked what the previous rate was prior to the most recent updates and Lisa responded \$2.85. Landon asked if that included a ramping process. Lisa responded that the City just completed a series of 50 cent rate increases on the stormwater fee.

Beth Ward acknowledged that some education needs to occur with the Council prior to a recommendation being submitted. She also suggested that the ramping could be extended.

Don commented that dollar amounts should be used to describe revenue changes and not percentages which could be more confusing.

Michelle Clements shared that she has worked with communities affecting a lot of people and minor increases of \$2.00 per year would probably not be a major issue for most people who pay much more for cable, phones, etc. increases.

Drake suggested that it was important that these costs should be identified with examples of potentially catastrophic projects that would be addressed by the fee increase and to make sure there is adequate funding for critical projects.

Landon also suggested that this is not a time for construct non-critical projects as construction costs are going up and project costs may exceed what is currently projected.

Michelle suggested that the \$2 million is a band aid and understands some of the costs facing the City and would suggest that \$6 million with ramping could help with addressing current and future project needs.

Kevin acknowledged that regardless, the budget is in a deficit and \$6 million is still not enough.

Landon asked if there were projects that could be pointed to that are absolutely needed. He also asked what the highest rates are in NC. Daryl showed the committee how to access a dashboard managed by UNC and iterated that the ranking changes as local governments impose changes.

Don suggested that from an economic development stand point, taking care of the infrastructure is critical and not taking care of stormwater challenges could affect business development.

Jon says he doesn't think a revenue increase would hurt. Landon reiterated that it is all in how it is sold.

Matt Butler asked how the impact to the Pitt County school system and how the City of Greenville would be affected.

Tom Best suggested that many people have problems in their yard and there should be a solution for those as well.

Joni suggested that the education is going to be critical and the web site is important to update.

Beth suggested that there are not that many complaints about the City not being responsive.

Jon asked if there should be a recommendation from the committee and Chairman Tom Best asked for each committee member to provide their individual recommendation. The response is captured below.

**Unanimous Vote for \$6 mil Ramping As Follows:**

- Michelle initiated the response and supports the \$6mil with ramping. She thinks it will make a difference but education is important.
- Jon supports \$6mil ramping based on the needs. Concerned about hurricane impacts downtown.
- Drake supports the \$6mil ramping but still wants to know the critical need projects that can be completed. With any funding, identify what is critical first!
- Tom supports the \$6mil ramping. Feels every property should pay including renters.

- Landon seconds Drakes comments and supports the \$6mil ramping. He reiterated that the capital needs must be identified and plan better for timing of projects.
- Don supports \$6 mil ramping
- Matt supports \$6mil ramping
- Beth supports \$6mil ramping
- Joni supports \$6mil ramping and wants more public education. Identify things people can do to reduce their bills like rain gardens.

Following the discussion, Joni Torres and Tom Best requested to invite specialists to the next meeting on June 5, 2018 which would begin at 2:30 pm.

The meeting was adjourned.

Handouts

May 1, 2018 Meeting Agenda

April 3, 2018 Meeting Summary

May 1, 2018 Power Point Presentation