



Roanoke County Stormwater Advisory Committee

Meeting #5 Draft Program Review

Date: December 12, 2013, 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m.

Location: South County Library

Attendance:

See sign in sheets at end of these minutes.

Welcome and Introduction

Mr. Tarek Moneir welcomed Roanoke County Stormwater Advisory Committee (RCSWAC) members to the meeting. He reminded the general public present at the meeting that they may submit comments in writing to himself or David Henderson.

Mr. Moneir introduced the County Administrator, Clay Goodman, Assistant County Administrator, Richard Caywood, and the new County Stormwater Program Manager Cindy Linkenhoker.

Meeting #4 Recap

Mr. Moneir introduced Mr. David Bulova of AMEC Environment and Infrastructure. Mr. Bulova provided an overview of the agenda and a brief recap of the last meeting, including the results of the level of service prioritization exercise.

Draft Program Discussion

Mr. Bulova presented the draft stormwater program costs reflecting the initial level of service preferences of the RCSWAC from the Meeting #4 prioritization exercise. While there was a high degree of consensus on most items, the results of the prioritization exercise showed that the committee was nearly evenly divided between the medium and high level of service options for Stormwater Project Backlog and BMP Inspection and Maintenance. The program areas where the RCSWAC expressed a preference for medium or high levels of service were presented for further discussion.

In addition to previously discussed level of service options, alternative program options were presented for the following:

- Stormwater Maintenance – Budget for a less frequent system replacement percentage (less than 1% annually).
- BMP Inspection and Maintenance – Implement a service district where Home Owner Associations (HOAs) could voluntarily join and have the County take over facility maintenance. The County would impose a service district fee that would generate revenue sufficient to make the program cost-neutral for the County.

The following comments and questions were discussed on the draft program and the program areas:

Draft Five-Year Program:

Question: How are the cost savings for the overlap between Storm Sewer System Maintenance and Project Backlog reflected? **Answer:** The 1% annual maintenance cost for the medium option was reduced from \$1 million to \$500,000 to account for the anticipated overlap.



BMP Inspection and Maintenance:

Question: Does the cost for this program include the cost for equipment? **Answer:** No, this includes labor cost only.

Equipment Replacement:

Question: What is the difference between the medium and high level of service? **Answer –** The difference is how fast (10 years versus 7 years) the County would be able to replace outdated equipment, which in turn will allow crews to be more efficient.

Project Backlog:

Question: Is the 10-15% annual growth based on inflation? **Answer:** No, it is based on an increase in the number of projects.

Comment: The County Engineer, David Henderson, noted that most Virginia counties do not maintain the storm drain systems. The Roanoke County Board of Supervisors made the decision 10-15 years ago to provide maintenance in response to citizen complaints.

Question: Did the Board of Supervisors decide to provide this service because Roanoke County is more urban? **Answer:** Probably – there were large numbers of complaints.

Question: Is this related to the TMDLs? **Answer:** This is primarily to fix the drainage system but the County will make the best use of dollars and install retrofits where possible to address TMDL requirements.

BMP Inspection & Maintenance:

In addition to options presented at the last meeting, Mr. Bulova described another alternative that would involve creating a separate service district for HOAs with stormwater management facilities. In this option, an HOA would voluntarily opt-in and property owners would be assessed a fee to cover the cost of the County to provide maintenance. Because of the economy of scale, the cost per property owner would likely be less than with individual HOAs being responsible for maintenance. Mr. Caywood provided background on the use of the service district approach in Orlando, Florida. In Orlando, this option was offered to HOAs as an alternative to enforcement actions and penalties. Mr. Henderson noted that another benefit of this approach is that the County would have the ability to retrofit facilities in the district for TMDL compliance.

Question: Would all HOAs have to pay the fee? **Answer:** No – participation would be voluntary and would give HOAs an option if they were unable to provide the required maintenance of their stormwater management facilities. The County would assess the fee to property owners in the HOA and provide maintenance.

Question: What about HOAs with different sections – one with and one without a stormwater management facility? **Answer:** That would depend on a number of factors. There would be many unique situations and a clear policy would need to be established.

Question: Does the high level of service give the County the ability to save on other portions of the program such as TMDL compliance? **Answer:** The high option would give the County the ability to implement retrofits on facilities more easily.

Question: How would the tax or fee impact residents in more rural areas of the County? **Answer:** The committee will need to discuss if any fee should be assessed differently in



urban areas and rural areas. Fee alternatives will be discussed in more detail in the next meeting.

Question: If the separate service district is cost neutral would the cost for this program area go to \$0? **Answer:** While the program cost would be reduced, the County would still need to pay for maintenance and replacement of County-owned facilities, conduct inspections, and have an enforcement program.

Mr. Bulova presented some general program cost comparisons to other localities but noted that it is difficult to compare costs because each locality has a unique definition of what is included in their stormwater programs and many portions of other programs are funded through the general fund in addition to stormwater fees. Many localities have also not accounted for future needs in their programs. Mr. Henderson provided information received recently from Albemarle County. They have a population of 103,000 and estimate that they currently spend \$1.3 million/year on their stormwater program. However, they don't provide maintenance of the storm sewer system. They estimate that they will need approximately \$2 million/year more in the coming years.

Mr. Moneir introduced two newly elected County supervisors that were in attendance: Mr. Al Bedrosian and Mr. Jason Peters.

RCSWAC members participated in a second prioritization exercise by ballot that allowed a chance for committee members to reconsider the levels of service for the non-basic program areas. The results of this exercise are provided in the table below and will be used to refine the draft program:

<i>Program Area</i>	<i>Basic</i>	<i>Medium</i>	<i>High</i>	<i>Alternative</i>	<i>High + Alternative</i>	<i>Total</i>
Storm Sewer Maintenance	2	11	1	0	0	14
Mapping/GIS	3	11	0			14
Equipment Replacement	2	11	1			14
Stream Maintenance	5	9	0			14
Stormwater Project Backlog	3	7*	4			14
BMP Inspection and Maintenance	2	3	3**	5	1	14

*One medium vote to include the addition of one crew

**One high vote to explore the alternative of the separate service district for stormwater management facilities

Revenue Generating Options

Mr. Bulova provided an overview of the following revenue generating options, discussed policy considerations, and presented a preliminary cost distribution based on percentage of market value and impervious cover:

- General Fund
- Service District Fee
- Stormwater Utility Fee
 - Straight impervious cover
 - Flat rate for single family detached residential (ERU)
 - Tiered residential rates
 - Tiered rates for all land uses



- Factors to account for percent of lot covered by impervious surface

The following questions were discussed:

Question: Why are there no credits in a service district? **Answer:** Credits are generally not a part of a service district fee approach because the fee is based on property value and not the impact of the property on the public stormwater management system. While there may be alternatives, these would need to be thought through carefully based on the enabling authority in the Code of Virginia. A stormwater utility, on the other hand, must grant credits to structural stormwater management facilities under the Code.

Question: Could a general service district be done along with the stormwater management facility district? **Answer:** Yes – decisions would need to be made as to how the fees would be layered or adjusted for properties impacted by both fees.

Question: What about large properties with little imperviousness – could the fee be brought down to zero? **Answer:** It depends on how complicated you want to make the program. Some programs differentiate based on the percentage of imperviousness on the parcel to account for density of development. However, it is unlikely that a fee would ever be zero since there are program elements that must be implemented independent of a property's configuration.

Comment: Some properties with long driveways have ditches alongside that contribute sediment into the County's system.

Question: How are BMPs with high efficiencies accounted for in the fee? **Answer:** This is typically addressed in a credit policy. The City of Charlottesville has a sliding scale based on BMP efficiency.

Question: Could you develop a formula to determine the amount of land area it would take to neutralize the impervious area or determine at what point there is no runoff from a property? **Answer:** It is important to remember that the impervious area is a surrogate for distributing the costs of the stormwater program and is not meant to indicate a one-to-one relationship between the fee and the benefit to a property owner. That said, Virginia regulations establish 0.41 lbs/phosphorus/year (approximately 10% impervious area) as being neutral for nutrient TMDLs.

Question: Is a credit program worth it? A property owner would need to spend a lot on stormwater management to get a percentage adjustment to the fee. **Answer:** While credits are required under a utility, they are rarely sufficient to serve as a true financial incentive to install a stormwater management facility voluntarily. However, they may provide a financial incentive for a developer to oversize a facility to treat more than required during new development or redevelopment.

The next meeting is scheduled for January 9, 2014 at the South County Library.

Pending Questions List:

Question: Roanoke County is unique in that it has a combination of rural land and urban areas. These areas have different stormwater issues. How will fairness be addressed in dealing with these unique areas? **Answer:** Discussion on this topic is pending.

Question: Provide more information on the stormwater program costs for neighboring localities. **Answer:** A general cost comparison was provided in Meeting #5.

ROANOKE COUNTY STORMWATER ADVISORY COMMITTEE- SIGN IN SHEET
MEETING 5 - DECEMBER 12, 2013

Member	District	Organization	Alternate (if Member cannot Attend)	Present
Mr. Michael "Mike" Keen	Catawa	Selected By Board		
Mr. Leonard F. Firebaugh	Cave Spring	Selected By Board		X
Mr. Steve Rossi	Hollins	Selected By Board		X
Mr. James R. Nelson	Vinton	Selected By Board		X
Mr. Eldon L. Karr	Windsor Hills	Selected By Board		X
Mr. Stephen Peak	Windsor Hills	TMEIC		X
Mr. Todd Creasy	Vinton	Vinton Chamber of Commerce		
Mr. Kit Hale	Cave Spring (valley-wide)	MKB Realtors		
Ms. Wendy Akers	Cave Spring	Tanglewood		X
Mr. Peter Fields	Valley-wide	Roa Regional Homebuilders Association		X
Mr. Ross Smith	(valley-wide)	Smith/Packett		
Mr. Terry St. Clair	Valley-wide	Terry St. Clair		X
Mr. Bill Tanger	Valley-wide	Upper Roanoke River Round Table		X
Mr. Steve Edwards	Hollins	Greenridge Baptist Church		X
Mr. Tom Dale	Cave Spring	Lumsden and Associates		X
Mr. Steve Musselwhite	Valley-wide	Roanoke County Economic Development Authority		
Mr. Martin Misicko	Valley-wide	Roanoke County Public Schools		
Ms. Kerry J. Edmunds	Hollins	Hollins College		X
Ms. Mava Wingate	Valley-wide	Salem - Roanoke County Chamber of Commerce		X
Mr. Tori Williams	Valley-wide	Roanoke Regional Chamber of Commerce		
Mr. Todd Ross	Valley-wide	Valley Bank		

**ROANOKE COUNTY STORMWATER ADVISORY COMMITTEE- SIGN IN SHEET
MEETING 5 - DECEMBER 12, 2013**

Roanoke County	Position
Al Bedrosian	Supervisor - Elect, Hollins District
Jason Peters	Supervisor - Elect, Vinton District
Clay Goodman	County Administrator
Richard Caywood	Assistant County Administrator
Arnold Covey	Directory, Community Development
Tarek Moneir	Deputy Director, Development Services
Cindy Linkenhoker	Stormwater Program Manager
David Henderson	County Engineer
Town of Vinton	Position
Ryan Spitzer	Assistant to the Town Manager
Anita McMillan	Planning and Zoning Director
Consultant Staff	Position
David Bulova	Senior Water Resources Planner, AMEC
Lynne Mowery	Project Manager, AMEC