MEETING SUMMARY

SUBJECT: STORMWATER COMMISSION MEETING
MEETING DATE: Monday – September 10, 2018 at 5:00 pm
ATTENDANCE LIST:

- Mike Butterfield, Commission Chair, term expires 6/30/18
- Mike Dryden, Commission Member, term expires 6/30/20
- Stacie Johnson, Commission Member, term expires 6/30/18 (absent)
- Justin Gehret, Commission Member, term expires 6/30/19 (absent)
- Frank Bellon, Commission Member, term expires 6/30/20
- Sandy Pumphrey, Project Engineer, City Staff
- Cara Matteson, Storm Water Coordinator, City Staff
- Susan Heath, Administrative Assistant II, City Staff
- Matt Feuerhelm, Project Engineer II, City Staff
- Dave Wallace, Sewer Utility Engineering Manager (absent)
- Martin Smith, Friends of Cedar Lake Organization Member

DISCUSSION ITEMS

1. Meeting called to order at 5:05 by Commission Chair Mike Butterfield
   - The July minutes were tabled until the next meeting.
   - City staff Matt Feuerhelm and Susan Heath were introduced to the commission. Both Sandy Pumphrey and Tammy Schnell have moved into different divisions at the City. Matt and Susan are filling in at least temporarily.

2. Public Input
   - Martin Smith offered that we have a lot of people trying to grow turf grass under heavy tree canopy and steep slopes. He thought there could be better ground covers. Pachysandra grows 1 foot tall and does well in dense shade and sandy soil. It stays green all year and has little flowers in the spring. It stays where planted. No maintenance.

3. Water Quality Overlay Districts & Incentivizing Water Quality for Development in Priority Basins – Follow-up Discussion
   - City staff have been looking into how to advance our recommendation. City is still working on this internally. In the master plan the basins have been identified. On the website you will find all the maps and tech memos. Tech Memo No. 1 goes over a detailed description of the existing system with a nice big map that shows all the 20-some watersheds in the City.
   - The City has identified 5 growth areas in the study. They are basically large yellow blobs on the map. Since that time, one of the exercises that City staff have done and are in the process of analyzing is determining the cost to serve each of those areas with water, sewer and storm sewer and sanitary sewer. In some instances, it could be problematic to serve some of those areas. What the City doesn’t really want to do is find itself in a scenario where we’ve paid for a bunch of improvements and the development doesn’t pay for itself or there is no development out there. We wanted to be smart and insure that the costs are known up front and the developers are clear on what it will take to put services out there. In many cases it is the sanitary sewer that is the determining factor because of gravity and lift stations. So that exercise is being worked on.
   - The growth areas are being finalized and they will be posted on the website.
   - The cost factor looked at all costs – sanitary and storm sewer and stormwater management. HDR looked at good places for regional basins and identified. This has not been published yet. Executive summaries and maps have been done. They do need to be finalized for all five growth areas.
Stormwater sites have been identified for regional attention. It looks like three have been completed and two are being finalized.

- City staff haven’t really had a discussion with the council about this. They are waiting for the tech memos to come out. The council has authorized staff to continue with stormwater management activities. That includes growth planning which has been done. We would go back to the council committee and say our consultant has recommended regional basins in a number of locations. We will say this is what it means – some upfront funds, cash flow. What is anticipated is that the tech memos will be taken and boiled down to a policy and discussion with infrastructure committee, and from there going to council with a detention basin policy with some financial planning. Regardless of what happens with infrastructure committee and council, there have been two basins that are regional that we are pursuing. One is the 18th Street basin on the southwest side which has been built. We are playing catch up in that it is providing protection to multiple developments that have been built out. There is another one that is Rockhurst Drive on the southwest which is almost out by ADM. That is going out for bid in the next few weeks. That does two things. It mitigates. It was never constructed when developed. It also takes into account that future development will need regional basins. There is also one in Cedar Hills in the northwest. The one up on C Avenue and Boyson is regional. So there are other examples of where regional basins have been done and are being done. But in terms of an actual policy, that hasn’t been done.
- It is an individual basis on the costs. The cost of constructing the basins are different. Need to determine if it should be paid for by surrounding development or whether it should be an aggregate fee.
- Marion is pushing for regional basins. Of the five growth areas, one was up on the north side, the northwest which is being questioned because the cost of service is pretty high, one is west, southwest, and then south. There was a sense that there were development pressures for these areas. Also have to determine what it cost to be served by fire and police. Community development is pulling all that together and will ultimately adjust when more is known.
- With the basins, watersheds don’t always follow jurisdictional boundaries. Would this be an issue working with other municipalities and the county?
- Are things happening in other communities that would encourage them to develop there over Cedar Rapids or is it simply that that is where the market is. Market is a big thing. School systems really drive development. Thought that local communities don’t do a good job of putting in infrastructure. Cedar Falls and Elk Run Heights do put in services prior to development. These communities know that development is going to come in and they go ahead and build stormwater and water systems that will enable that development whenever it happens.
- The Envision CR process as a whole included a number of public input sessions with a lot of discussion with stakeholders.

4. Use of Regional Detention Basins

- What do we ultimately want to get out of any recommendation to give to city council on growth areas? The City should pick an area and do it. Actually show how it works in the development community – like a pilot. The 100 area seems to be an area to go to. Usually somewhere around 8 to 10 percent of the area is going to be dedicated to stormwater. With the regional basin it makes it into an amenity for the area.
- The sooner the costs are ready for distribution outside of city staff, we should get those to Frank and Mike and let them shift through them. Hopefully based on that we could come forward with a policy recommendation. Should plan follow-up discussion at our next meeting.

5. Reports

A. City Staff Reports
   i. SUDAS Adoption and Supplement
• It is in the final stages of being completed. It was presented to the infrastructure committee in August. They were fine with moving ahead. Within the next month or so we will go ahead with city council. What is going to go city council is two documents. The first is SUDAS itself and then a supplement that will make some amendments to SUDAS that will make it work for Cedar Rapids. It is both design standards and standard specifications.

ii. BMP Cost Share Applications/Update
• Page 20 from the MS4 report – which is on our website. It is a good summary and pretty much up to date. Has a cap of $2,000. That is allocated for $25,000/yr. We haven’t met that goal yet but are continuing to make trends to go up. A description of the program statistics and trends was had. There has been an upward trend for the program. FY18 was the first year we had the full program. This is for commercial and non-residential. For that one we have earmarked $250,000 and have allocated over $75,000. Those five sites that have been constructed so far are the Buffalo Methodist Church which had two bio swales; Cedar Rapids Bank & Trust; St. Marks Methodist on Johnson Avenue is going to put in some permeable pavers in the parking lot; and a new development that is going to have some underground detention coupled with BMP practices in their parking lot. St. Marks and the new development haven’t been constructed yet.
• We are still working that program trying to get the word out. We want both of these programs to be successful and to have all the money spent.

iii. IDALS Grant
• We were awarded $100,000 for two projects, both of them bio swales. One has been completely installed at Wilson and 6th and was accepted by IDOT. The other one is in construction right now. That is on 5th Avenue SW by Taylor School. Should be complete within the next couple of months.
• As part of the IDALS Grant, part of that was to do a tour. We are taking a different approach with this tour; it will be more of a lessons learned and cost. Some of the development community will speak on some of the successes they have had. Cara would highly recommend to sign up quickly and come at least to the presentation portion; it should be very beneficial. Please share that with people. It will be here in Time Check Hall. The course is free and you can just come, but will need to register if you want a lunch.

iv. FY19 Master Plan
• The scope is being finalized. There are a couple of bottlenecks. We should have a draft. McCloud Run and Cedar River SE, up the hill from Cargill.
• We are also going to do work on grant applications ahead of time working on a city model with cost ratios on all the projects we could identify. They would be ready to go and put into applications as soon as applications open up.

v. Sampling Program
• Received a call from DNR and the Harding Middle School science teacher who said he would be interested in having a volunteer monitoring program, which the DNR no longer does. We are working on getting some sampling equipment out to the middle school and once we have that established (which would be a pilot program), we could open it up and get more middle school teachers involved and get a more robust sampling resource for local schools.

vi. Cedar Lake Watershed Management Plan
• One of the things that the Friends of Cedar Lake have been pushing for is transfership of ownership of Cedar Lake from Alliant Energy to the City; the reason being is that the city has more leverage for grants in that area. The City is also interested in being a part of the lake
preservation program which is a DNR program. One of the requirements for that program is that you have a good handle on what is occurring in the watershed of the lake. We do have a hydraulic analysis which HDR did but we don’t have a comprehensive analysis of land use. We brought HDR on recently to do a watershed plan.

B. Commissioner Reports
   • Nothing to Report

Next Meeting: November 5, 2018

Meeting Adjourned: 5:55 p.m.

1. Adjourn Meeting
   • Agenda Items for Next Meeting
     o Streambank Restoration Study (depending on study schedule)
     o BMP Cost Share Program Enhancements
   • Confirm Next Meeting
     The next regularly scheduled Stormwater Commission meeting is scheduled for Monday, **November 5, 2018**, at 5:00 p.m. City Services Center (Public Works) - 2nd Floor – Greene Square Conference Room, 500 15th Avenue SW, Cedar Rapids, IA 52404 - Ph. (319) 286-5802
     • The meeting was adjourned at 5:55 p.m.

*Respectfully submitted by Susan Heath, AAll, Cedar Rapids Public Works*

This summary documents our understanding of items discussed. Please contact our office within five working days with any omissions or discrepancies.

*cc: Stormwater Commission Meeting Distribution List
   City Councilperson Scott Overland*