

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
3:00 pm · Wednesday, June 3, 2015

Minutes

Commission Members: Francine Durso, Vanessa Fleischmann, and Marc Horstman

Staff: Blair Hinkle, Veronica High, Rob Normandy, McKenzie Gentry, David Hawksworth, Ben Brown, Wenju Zhang, Suzette Mitchell, Gilles Bellot, Chris Stanley, Ben Canada, and Scott Bryant

Guests: Mike Wayts, Dean Goodison

Meeting Called to Order: 3:03 pm by Francine Durso, Sub-Committee Chair

Public Input –

- Ms. Durso asked if anyone from the public would like to make comments.
The guests in attendance indicated that they were here to observe
- Ken Carper was unable to attend the meeting but emailed his comments that were briefly reviewed by the Sub-Committee
- Public comments period will remain open until June 18th

Scott Bryant – noted that the working draft prioritization model has been modified/updated based on the Sub-Committee feedback received from the May 26th meeting. The Sub-Committee has generally endorsed the overall working model framework and the basic eligibility criteria from the last meeting.

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

- *Items added to “Project Input”*
 - *Lead Group for Project*
 - *General category for project*
 - *Primary Type of project*
 - *Project Cost Estimate- separate estimate for Engineer and Construction Cost to represent total project cost*
 - *Define the acronyms (i.e, CIP-HM)*
- *Items added to Basic Eligibility Criteria –*
 - *B4 – For Drainage Assistance and Water Quality Cost Share projects (only) the petitioner utility fees payments are current*
 - *B2 – added an asterisk (*) to note that Stormwater Quality Cost Share projects will be the only exception to the public runoff basic requirement*
 - *N/A Column - added*

Sub-Committee Questions –

1. Mr. Hortsman – We have a project score and benefit score as numerical indicators, and we have several categories identified as potential benefits. There was a discussion saying we could have a project score and other benefit score that could help further rank projects, can you expand on that?

1.1 Scott Bryant – We discussed having an overall project score to normalize to a 100 point scale (0-100) with 100 being a perfect project that meets (and scores high) all the (approved) criteria. The overall project score would be the total score for all the criteria that are decided upon. Some of the criteria may (potentially) be deemed to provide “benefits” which will be determined. We will have overall project score normalized based on all of the approved criteria. Then we could then extract a score for those criteria deemed to provide benefits, if supported by the group. This information would be supplemental/additional information to the total project score.

2. Mr. Hortsman – Could there be something that brings a project up the top of the list that may not have other ancillary benefits?

2.1 Scott Bryant – We will need to look at the implementation plan which will provide us a project score, (potential) benefit score, cost per area and other quantifiable rating information. Every type of project that will go through the model will be sorted out by the (primary) type of the project. The scores from the model will provide a key basis for implementation, but there will always be the ability to override if the score did not reflect a real critical need and/or unique situation.

3. Ms. Durso – Explain how you are going to deal with the criteria weighting and criteria score?

3.1 Scott Bryant – The suggestion is to weigh all the main criteria against each other criteria, and each will receive a score; then the effect on the total bottom line score is a function of the weight for the criteria.

4. Ms. Durso – Regarding a project scoring level if it should be a “zero” or “one”, and you don’t know every detail about a project shouldn’t that project be a zero. Would that be easier for staff, otherwise; you would have a lot of projects that could be a one?

4.1 Scott Bryant – The relative scores shouldn’t change as long as we are consistent with either scoring a zero or one, but it can be evaluated either way. Perhaps “zero” could be the default and if we do know more information it could earn a one (or other scoring) as appropriate.

4.2 Blair Hinkle – Beyond affecting the score, it would be a clear way to denote there is no benefit. If it is a “zero” then basically it’s not applicable.

Scott Bryant provided the subcommittee with an overview of the nine working draft criteria and the staff group thought process for organizing and defining each. In general, the group is seeking an integrated approach to Stormwater Management - quantity, quality, all the things we do currently, and what we could also do to set the stage for the future/continued development of the program.

Integrated Stormwater Prioritization Criteria (Working Draft Criteria, in no particular order at this point)

- *Public Safety & Public Health*
- *Flood Hazard Reduction- Consider combining FHR2 & FHR3 or keep non-structural as stand-alone; Sub-Committee generally recommended leaving non-structural flooding as a stand-alone sub-item for the flood hazard reduction category.*
- *Water Quality Benefits - WQ2, clarify we are talking about nutrient reduction efficiency / pollutant reduction performance; noted that cost efficiency is a separate item below (RL4)*
- *Regulatory Mandates and Compliance*
- *Stormwater Infrastructure Asset management - AM4 (Operation & Maintenance) Consider adding “impacts” to operations (i.e., net impact of project on operations)*
- *Watershed Management Benefits - Can WM2 & WM3 be potentially combined or WM1 & WM2 combined?*
- *Community Support and Implementation Complexity*
- *Resource Leveraging Opportunities - RL4, see note above for Water Quality Benefits*
- *Indirect Community Benefits*

Scott Bryant asked the subcommittee members to participate in an example group “vegetable pairwise comparison exercise” that would help demonstrate the format for the initial upcoming stormwater criteria weighting exercise.

Pairwise Rating Example - Comparing Vegetables

	Green Beans	Broccoli	Brussel Sprouts	Carrots	Asparagus	Spinach	Corn	Sum	Weight %
Green Beans		2	3	2	3	2	4	16	12.7
Broccoli	4		3	4	3	2	5	21	16.7
Brussel Sprouts	3	3		4	3	2	1	16	12.7
Carrots	4	2	2		2	2	3	15	11.9
Asparagus	3	3	3	4		3	2	18	14.3
Spinach	4	4	4	4	3		5	24	19.0
Corn	2	1	5	3	4	1		16	12.7
								126	100.0

Scoring	
5	Much more important
4	Somewhat more important
3	Equally important
2	Somewhat less important
1	Much less important

Homework Assignment – The Sub-Committee members individually will do a pairwise comparison of the group’s working draft criteria for the integrated project prioritization model and email Scott with their feedback which will be summarized anonymously. The goal is then to discuss results and seek a group consensus with the subcommittee and staff.

Ms. Durso asked would any of the guests like to make further comments on anything –

- **Mike Ways** said he has assisted clients in putting in a (project prioritization) system similar to this and this is something you can repeat in a couple years to make sure you are (still) on the same page. He believes Stormwater is going in a good direction.
- **Dan Goodison** said regarding the structural flooding versus the non-structural flooding. His understanding is you could combine the two. It makes sense to combine the two (as you typically expect to have non-structural flooding if structural flooding is occurring).

Next meeting (June 18th)

- Prior to the next meeting, please email individual homework assignments back to Scott

Meeting Adjourned: 5:14pm