

Springfield/Greene County, Missouri Stormwater Management Task Force Meeting #1 Meeting Notes October 25, 2012

Welcome & Introductions

The Springfield/Greene County, Missouri Stormwater Management Task Force met in the C.W. Titus Education Facility at the Watershed Center. The meeting commenced at 5:00 p.m.

Greg Burris, City Manager and Tim Smith, County Administrator welcomed the Task Force members and community members in attendance. Those present included the following.

Task Force

Stacey Armstrong
Matt Bailey
Bill Bretall
Geoffrey Butler
Chris Carson
King Coltrin
Eric Dove
Dana Elwell
Tiffany Frey

Patty Hamilton
Patrick Harrington
Casey Haynes
Ronda Headland
Andy Hosmer
Dan Hoy
Jerany Jackson
Tom Kisse
Chris Macioce

Dave Murray
Fred Palmerton
Brian Perdue
Matthew Pierson
Rick Scarlet
Karen Spence
Aaron Wahlquist

Absent: Daniel Beckman, Tom DeWitt, Erik Fjeseth, Harlan Hill, Fred Schlegel

City and County Staff

Kevin Barnes
Vanessa Brandon
Phil Broyles
Greg Burris
Chris Coulter
Sarah Davis

Tim Davis
Carrie Lamb
Barbara Lucks
Cody Marshall
Fred Marty

Steve Meyer
Cora Scott
Tim Smith
Todd Wagner

Community Stakeholders:

David Casaletto
Milton Dickensheet
Mike Pessina

Sheila Shockey introduced herself and explained the Task Force purpose, ground rules and described the agenda for the meeting. She introduced the two co-chairs, Dan Hoy and Fred Palmerton. They introduced themselves and then each Task Force member and attendee introduced themselves. Sheila walked the group through the notebooks prepared for each Task Force member. She asked them to bring them to each meeting and include the information emailed out in advance of each meeting.

Presentation Defining Stormwater Management

Carrie Lamb made a presentation describing what stormwater is, its potential impacts, and how it can be managed to minimize these impacts. She explained that the more impervious or hard surfaces a community has, that more stormwater runoff is generated. Stormwater doesn't soak in or evaporate as much as it did before the hard surfaces were installed. Springfield's watersheds are covered with about 25 to 35% impervious surface area. She said Springfield is at the top of two watersheds. Carrie described how impervious cover influences the flows in streams during dry weather (reduces the amount of inflow from ground water or subsurface seeps since less has infiltrated), increases flood flows, negatively impacts fish and critters in the streams and causes stream bank erosion. She talked about common pollutants including lawn fertilizer, litter, and motor oil, and how stormwater runoff carries these pollutants into streams. The potential impacts of poor stormwater management include: public health and safety, property damage, devaluation of property and neighborhoods, degradation of waterways, and negative impacts to the regional economy from fishing, recreation, and tourism. Good stormwater management includes: minimize flood impacts; maintain infrastructure; attractive, multi-purpose spaces; floodplain/riparian corridor protection; water quality and habitat protection; regulatory compliance; and improved quality of life and economic development.

Carrie showed a map of the infrastructure Springfield needs to maintain. The City of Springfield has over 600 miles of stormwater conveyance and over 15,000 inlets. The total with Greene County is more than 800 miles of conveyance structures and more than 20,000 inlet structures. She described a typical stormwater system and showed examples of the infrastructure and explained their purpose. She said that this system manages the quantity of stormwater. In addition, infrastructure can be designed to also improve water quality. This is a shift in how stormwater is managed. The goal is to achieve multiple benefits and create amenities with investments. She showed examples of how this has been done in Springfield and Greene County. She described how the impacts of development is being minimized using Best Management Practices (BMPs). She showed several photos of the BMPs in the community.

Presentation on Past Funding

Sheila gave a brief overview of past funding sources and levels for the stormwater management program for both the City and for the County. These funding sources have included the following.

- Level Property Tax
- Detention Buy-out or In-lieu payments
- Parks and Stormwater Sales Tax
- Capital Improvements Sales Tax
- General Obligation Bonds
- General Fund
- Federal and State Grants

For the City of Springfield, total revenue generated for the stormwater management program was \$90.6 million for the years 1995 to 2012. In Greene County, the total revenue generated for the years 2000 to 2013 was \$9.9 million. Charts were displayed to provide a visual picture of the revenue sources in the past.

Presentation on Past Accomplishments

Todd Wagner explained the three areas of stormwater management: flood risk and damage reduction, water quality protection, and maintenance infrastructure investment. This part of the Task Force meeting

will describe what has been done in the past in these three program focus areas in the City. Kevin Barnes will talk about what has been done in the County. Todd described what was accomplished with the investments made.

- Voluntary flood buyout program: >\$10M
- Flood reduction projects: \$70M
- Stormwater Permit Compliance: >\$400k annually.
- Water quality improvements projects -Stormwater Best Management Practices (BMPs)
- Infrastructure repairs: minimal, some projects are replacement of old infrastructure
- Public Education and Outreach

The voluntary flood buyout program accomplishments include the following.

- Stopping the cycle of repeated flooding of individual homes or entire neighborhoods, which leads to lower property values and dilapidated properties.
- Over \$10 million has been spent since 1994.
- Over 200 acres have been acquired, mostly in or adjacent to floodplains.
- Nearly 200 individual parcel acquisitions are included in this program.
- Approximately 150 structures have been removed from flood prone areas.
- The City program was matched by approximately \$750,000 in FEMA funds.

He said that the floodplain acquisition program was important to the greenway trail system development. Todd showed a map to illustrate this point. He said about 211 acres were acquired for approximately \$2.5 million. Todd described the details behind historic floods and the changes made through the flood acquisition program.

Kevin Barnes gave the history of investments made in stormwater management in Greene County. He described the historic floods and impacts on properties and public safety in the County. He gave an overview of major projects completed by the County.

Carrie gave an overview of regulatory issues and how the City and County comply with the Clean Water Act through their Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) permits. A portion of the resources the City and County have expended are to comply with regulatory requirements including the following activities: development review process, land disturbance permit program, municipal operations good housekeeping, illicit discharge/industrial runoff, public education and involvement, and water quality monitoring. Clean Water Act requirements are fulfilled through local policies, programs, ordinances, permits, inspections, and standard operating procedures. Select examples described during the Task Force meeting include the following.

- Land disturbance permits are issued by both the City and County for construction where 1 acre or greater of land is disturbed. The property owner must provide erosion and sediment control per City and County ordinances to minimize runoff of sediment and other pollutants from the

construction site. City and County staff periodically inspect the erosion control practices for compliance. Training is provided to contractors so they understand the state and local regulatory requirements, inspections, and enforcement for noncompliance.

- The City and County have programs for investigating illicit discharges (dumping or discharging pollution to the stormwater system), sweeping public streets, and proper handling of materials and waste in municipal operations and maintenance (good housekeeping).
- The City and County have partnered with several community groups and non-profits to carry out public education and involvement programs. These programs include storm drain inlet marking and murals, Adopt-a-Stream cleanup activities, and workshops on rain barrels and rain gardens.

Presentation on Current and Future Needs

Todd Wagner gave an overview of the current and future stormwater management needs. He showed a map of the service requests for the City of Springfield that total about 3,000 addresses. He explained the needs are estimated to be two-to three-times the number of calls made to the City. One need the City has is to comply with state and federal regulations for water quality. This can also mean cleaning and maintaining the system properly. Another issue is infrastructure maintenance. A third issue Springfield is facing is channel stabilization and erosion control, which include utility protection. Todd said the unfunded needs to address flooding issues are approximately \$700 million.

Of course, all of these cannot be addressed; between \$100 million to \$200 million are priority needs. Todd explained that the City and County haven't had the resources to reinvest in the stormwater system. The cost to gradually replace the system overtime would be \$5 million per year for the City. To stay in compliance with stormwater regulations the City currently spends about \$500,000 and the County spends \$300,000. More regulations will be imposed upon both the City and the County in the next permit cycle beginning in June 2013. For the City, the cost could be as much as \$1 million annually.

Questions and Answers

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

Question: Does the limestone under the soil impact how we manage stormwater?

Response: Yes, our community has karst topography which means we have sinkholes, caves and underground streams. Because sinkholes are a direct connection to groundwater, we need to be careful about keeping pollution out of them. Karst topography also limits our ability to use stormwater best management practices that are designed to allow large quantities of runoff to soak into the ground in a small area because this can cause a sinkhole collapse.

Question: Is the City measuring the quality of water being discharged from the stormwater system?

Response: Yes, Springfield has had a stream sampling program for 10 years and has good baseline data. The County has a similar program for stream sampling.

Question: What is the population of the City and the County?

Response: The population of the City is 160,000 and the County (including the City) is 275,000.

Question: Do you know how many more properties will need to be bought out?

Response (Todd Wagner): The City has a list of properties in the FEMA floodplain and has a list of properties that are flood-prone. We can provide a total and general location to the Task Force at a future meeting.

Question: Do we have better ordinances and practices in place so we don't cause these problems in the future?

Response: As our knowledge has evolved, we have changed the way we manage stormwater. Springfield and Greene County have in place ordinances and development review procedures that require developments to meet certain standards to minimize potential flood impacts and protect water quality. These techniques are evolving but the goal is to better manage water quantity and quality as we development.

Question: How does pervious concrete hold up?

Response: It is primarily used on the outside lanes of streets and parking lots. Techniques and practices are evolving and many of the design professional on the Task Force have good experience implementing pervious concrete.

Question: How does Springfield stack up against others in the country in terms of stormwater management practices?

Response: Are we doing all the right things? We can share with you best practices at a future meeting and how our community compares.

Next Steps and Closing Remarks

Sheila asked the task force about time of day for the meetings. Most participants felt like the current time worked. One participant said he would like to see it at 5:30 p.m. since he works until 5 p.m. The Task Force also reviewed the dates proposed for future meetings and agreed to meet at the New Public Safety Center for future meetings.

Dan Hoy and Fred Palmerton made closing comments as co-chairs of the Task Force. Dan Hoy said we need to think about how we can care for the quality of our waterways. Fred Palmerton encouraged members to prepare for the meetings, give some thoughts to the questions at hand and share your ideas and experiences, and let's focus on the task force questions.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:11 p.m.