Springfield/Greene County, Missouri
Stormwater Management Task Force Meeting #4
Meeting Notes
January 17, 2013

Welcome & Introductions

The Springfield/Greene County, Missouri Stormwater Management Task Force met in the Springfield – Greene County Public Safety Center. The meeting commenced at 5:00 p.m.

Task Force Co-chair Dan Hoy welcomed the Task Force members and community members in attendance. Those present included the following.

Task Force

Daniel Beckman	Dave Murray	Ronda Headland
Fred Palmerton	Patrick Harrington	Casey Haynes
Matthew Pierson	Chris Carson	Dan Hoy
Karen Spence	Stacey Armstrong	Tom Kissee
Jerany Jackson	Tiffany Frey	Bill Bretall
Geoffery Butler	Fred Schlegel	Chris Macioce
Dana Elwell	Andy Hosmer	Tom DeWitt

Absent: Brian Perdue, Rick Scarlet, Aaron Wahlquist, Patty Hamilton, Erik Fjeseth, King Coltrin, Harlan Hill, Matt Bailey

City and County Staff

Kevin Barnes	Tim Davis	Todd Wagner
Vanessa Brandon	Carrie Lamb	Kimberly White
Phil Broyles	Barbara Lucks	Jon Williams
Greg Burris	Fred Marty	Jan Millington
Chris Coulter	Steve Meyer	Sheila Shockey
Sarah Davis	Tim Smith	Shelby Ferguson

Community Stakeholders:

Michael Pinkley
Milton Dickensheet
Mike Pessina

Repair and Replacement Infrastructure

Todd Wagner, Stormwater Engineer, City of Springfield, began by focusing on infrastructure repair and replacement, including the age and size of the infrastructure.

He reviewed the three areas of stormwater management: flood risk and damage reduction, water quality protection, and maintenance infrastructure investment. Mr. Wagner said he would present what has been done in the City. Kevin Barnes Stormwater Engineer, Greene County, will talk about what has been done in the County.

Currently, the City has a drainage system map which includes the City's entire infrastructure, with the exception of a few older areas. The infrastructure system is made up of open systems, grass or concrete channels, box culverts, inlet structures and junction box structures.

The majority of the infrastructure is 0-20 years-old, making up 46 percent of the system. Infrastructure 20-50 years-old comprises 27 percent of the system, and infrastructure more than 50 years-old also comprises 27 percent. Although the majority of infrastructure is 20 years of age or less, the system size has doubled with newer, small pipes and inlets. In addition, replacement cost is greater for areas 50 years of age and older. The older infrastructure has larger pipes and requires more work to replace, with a replacement cost of $160 million. The estimated replacement cost of the current constructed system is $500 million, an average of $5 million for the next 100 years.

The following is an inventory breakdown of the infrastructure system by category and maintenance requirements:

- Pipes – 294 miles
    - Erosion around the pipe, generally on the top
- Box Culverts – 59 miles
    - Size-width and height cause problems for crews to efficiently access with vehicles
- Grass and Concrete Open Channels – 321 miles
    - Concrete channels require restoration of walls, concrete repair and removal of debris and sediment
    - Grass channels require frequent mowing and removal of debris
- Inlet Structures – 13,324
    - Damage from maintenance vehicles and traffic
- Junction Boxes – 1,947
    - Damage from maintenance vehicles and traffic
- Flood Control/Walter Quality Basins – 1,050
    - Regular maintenance, sometimes specialized
- Best Management Practices - 250
    - Regular maintenance, sometimes specialized

Maintenance of these systems is a continuous effort on the City and County's part with no long-term dedicated source to fund maintenance of the stormwater system. Currently, maintenance of the system is broken down into two general categories: Reactive Maintenance and Vegetation Maintenance.

Reactive Maintenance – These are areas of routine maintenance with concerns about sediment, weeds and other debris. These are maintained by street crews and the majority of these areas are in the right-of-way. This type of maintenance is funded through the gas tax, use tax and transportation fund.
Vegetative Maintenance – These are areas of routine maintenance including mowing, bush/weed control and planting of trees and other natural vegetation. This type of maintenance is funded through the gas tax, use tax and transportation fund.

Kevin Barnes, Greene County, gave a brief overview of similar infrastructure, located in the urban services area, which is development served by the sanitary sewer and rural areas outside of the city limits. The system in these areas was mostly built since 1990. Areas built before 1990 had minimal consideration for stormwater management.

The value of Greene County's stormwater system is approximately $100 million, of which $40 million is private infrastructure needing retrofitting consideration as the structures age. The remaining $60 million is highway funds/right-of-way.

The following is the breakdown of infrastructure by category for the county:

- Box Culverts - 126
- Inlets and Junction Structures – 4,809
- Pipe – 85 miles
- Detention Basins – 400
- Open Channels – 22 miles

Maintenance of the County infrastructure is inspected during construction phases to ensure functionality and maximize serviceable life before repairs are necessary. In systems within the right-of-way, crews replace and repair as necessary, while also removing debris and sediment from large box culverts and bridges. The County's maintenance for private properties is minimal due to the inability to enforce maintenance codes on properties containing pipes, inlets and other hard structures.

Questions and Answers

Task Force members asked questions and the following answers were given by the support team:

Question: Of those 13,324 inlet structures, how many are precast?

Response: Almost all have precast lids, but there are some which have precast bases.

Question: Is all of the vegetation maintenance done by the City and City employees?

Response: Yes.

Question: Is there a human health concern for young adults, kids and maintenance crews who go into box culverts and get hurt? Is there contact with police or hospitals to keep track of how many incidents occur in or around the culverts?

Response: This is a concern, but we do not keep records or notifications of these incidents involving residents who have entered the box culverts.

Question: Are you able to teach homeowners how to maintain the channels? If so how do you educate them?

Response: We are able to educate homeowners with basic maintenance guidelines for mowing and keeping the channel free of debris.

Question: Is maintaining the channel the property owner's responsibility?

Response: When the channel is located behind their home, yes, they are responsible. Unfortunately it's difficult to enforce maintenance, due to drainage laws.

Question: Are there property maintenance codes?

Response: No.

Task Force Survey Results Discussion

Sheila Shockey reported that 23 members of the Task Force participated in a Guiding Principles survey. The purpose of the survey was to gain initial input and help guide decision-making regarding the City of Springfield & Greene County's stormwater management programs. The survey was comprised of nine questions, all of which asked respondents to provide their "level of agreement." Five response options were provided: strongly agree, agree, neutral, disagree and strongly disagree.

The results showed agreement on the Public Acceptance and Ease of Administration survey topics with some of them showing "neutral" responses. The survey results showed some disagreement on the survey topics: Economic Development, Equity/Fairness and Ability to Pay.

Economic Development:

The Task Force discussed rewording the *Economic Development* guiding principle:

"Tax rates and/or fees should be competitive with other jurisdictions to help attract and retain businesses and citizens." The following points were discussed:

1. Don't try to be the cheapest and miss out on the opportunities.
2. Economic energy drives everything. If you don't have that then you can't pay for anything.
3. It would be more appealing if it said "was adequate to services."
4. What's important is: as long as you can do the things that you need to--- balance the needs.
5. If we are going to make a statement about economic development we need to have a statement about striving for competitive tax rates and another about the value of what we receive.

Task Force members generally agreed to add "We safeguard our water resources" and to change "should be competitive" to "while keeping tax rates and fees competitive."

"*We safeguard our water resources while keeping tax rates and fees competitive with other jurisdictions to attract and retain businesses and citizens."*

There was also general agreement to add a second principle for Economic Development:

"We attract businesses and citizens to our community because of the value gained through investments made in environmental stewardship."

Equity/Fairness

The Task Force talked about rewording the *Equity/Fairness* guiding principle:

"Everyone in the community should pay their fair share for stormwater management."

1. *Fair share* is the issue in this statement.
2. Just because it's controversial doesn't mean we shouldn't use it.
3. It doesn't matter who is at the bottom or top and/or has the problem, everyone should pay.
4. We need to consider those who have made infrastructure improvements and are proactive in helping stormwater issues.
5. We need to consider incentives for those who go above and beyond.

There was a general agreement to take out "fair share" and leave the guiding principle intact otherwise.
"Everyone in the community should pay for stormwater management."

The Task Force talked about rewording the *Equity/Fairness* guiding principle:

"The funding of stormwater management should be linked directly to the amount of runoff a property produces. Those who cause more of the problem pay more for the stormwater services management."

Comments included:

1. This one is difficult as you are going to have runoff no matter what, but it just depends on the factors and what type of conditions you have.
2. How we fund the stormwater utility is the ultimate question.
3. What about using the word "negatively" impact?
4. We need to consider that we all own the watershed and not just the small section we live on or own. It's our responsibility as a whole.

The Task Force agreed to put this guiding principle on hold and continue the discussion at the next meeting.

Ability to Pay

The Task Force discussed rewording the *Ability to Pay* guiding principle:

"A program should be developed to reduce the burden of paying for the stormwater management on low-income households, spreading the subsidy across to other citizens."

Comments included:

1. Many households would have difficulties paying more for stormwater. Maybe we should look at the 2% of median household income that regulatory agencies use to determine affordability.
2. Consider that many low-income families rent. The property owners are the ones affected.

There was a general agreement to put this guiding principle on hold and continue the discussion at the next Task Force meeting.

Equity/Fairness

The Task Force talked about rewording the *Equity/Fairness* guiding principle:

"The funding of stormwater management should be linked directly to use of the service. Those who need the services pay more."

The Task Force agreed to delete this guiding principle.

Equity/Fairness

The Task Force discussed rewording the *Equity/Fairness* guiding principle:

"New development and redevelopment should not cause downstream impacts. The costs should be fully recovered."

1. There is the issue that you can't make everyone fix something.
2. "As known by current science" should be added to this statement, allowing for the principle to evolve as science does.

There was general agreement for the time to add "negative" before impacts. The following sentence was also added: "*This should consider water quality and flooding using sounds science."*

"New development and redevelopment should not cause negative downstream impacts. This should consider water quality and flooding using sound science" in the revised statement, which is still under discussion with potential deletion of the complete statement.

Ms. Shockey wrapped up the meeting with a quick session of five keypad polling statements regarding *Priorities.* She asked the Task Force to rate their level of importance for each Priority. Five options were provided: "very important," "important," "neutral," "not important," "should not be funded."

The following are the Priority statements the Task Force participated in and the results listed in priority order:

1. How important is it to fund projects/programs that reduce the risk of injury or death due to flooding those that keep streets from flooding and bridges from overtopping? (very important 54%, important 46%)

2. How important is it to fund projects that have multiple benefits: those that reduce flood damage and risk, improve water quality and help main existing infrastructure while creating community amenities? (very important 41%, important 59%)

3. How important are projects and programs that protect water quality and help our community comply with water quality regulations? (very important 53%, important 67%, neutral 6%)

4. How important is it to make sure the system we have in place to manage stormwater is in good repair by investing in proactive rather than reactive maintenance of the system? (very important 28%, important 67%, neutral 6%)

5. How important are projects that reduce property damage due to flooding - those projects/programs that keep buildings from flooding? (very important 57%, important 36%, neutral 7%)

After the Task Force rated their level of importance for the Priority statements they were asked to finish by ranking their top two priorities from the following statements. The statements are listed in the order in which they were ranked by the Task Force.

1. Projects and programs that protect water quality and help our community comply with regulations should be the highest priority. (12 votes)
2. Projects that reduce the risk of injury or death due to flooding should be the highest priority. (9 votes)
3. Projects that have multiple benefits should be the highest priority. (6 votes)
4. Projects that reduce property damage due to flooding should be the highest priority. (5 votes)
5. Our community's highest priority is to make sure the system we have in place to manage stormwater is in good repair by investing in proactive rather than reactive maintenance of the system. It is important to protect our investment in the existing stormwater management systems. (4 votes)

Next Steps and Closing Remarks

Ms. Shockey and Mr. Hoy thanked the Task Force for their participation and reminded them the next meeting would cover funding mechanisms next month: February 7, 2013, 5:00-7:00 p.m. at the Springfield – Greene County Public Safety Center.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:05 p.m.