



**City of Harrisonburg Stormwater Advisory Committee**  
***Meeting Minutes***  
**October 4, 2017 5:00 – 7:00 p.m.**

**Members in attendance:** Daniel Michael, Dale Chestnut, Eldon Kurtz, Rob Alexander, Ted Byrd

**Staff/Others in attendance:** Staff: Kelley Junco, Tom Hartman, Erin Yancey, Rebecca Stimson, Dan Rublee; Consultants: Don Rissmeyer, Dave Hirschman; students from Rob Alexander’s environmental science class were also in attendance

**Introductions**

Students from Rob Alexander’s environmental science class were present at the SWAC meeting, staff and SWAC members introduced themselves and their roles.

**Review and Adopt Minutes**

Daniel Michael called for a motion to adopt the March 2017 SWAC meeting minutes. The motion was made, seconded, and passed.

**Public Comment**

No public comment.

**MS4 Annual Report & Updated Chesapeake Bay TMDL Action Plan Submitted**

Kelley Junco informed committee members that the MS4 Annual Report for 2016-2017 was submitted, along with the Chesapeake Bay TMDL Action Plan, which included an update to Homeowner BMP credits.

**Stormwater Improvement Plan (SWIP); AMT Presentation & Discussion**

Kelley introduced the next agenda item and asked SWAC members to please review the Stormwater Improvement Plan Phase I Report. Tom Hartman reminded SWAC members that the SWIP Open House Meeting will be held October 18 from 5pm to 7pm in City Council Chambers.

Kelley explained that Phase I of the SWIP has been completed and staff is currently reviewing BMPs, including 12 stream restorations, 20 BMP retrofits, and 146 new BMPs. The new BMPs category includes bioretention ponds, vegetated filter strips, and wet ponds.

Kelley then asked Don Rissmeyer, consultant with A. Morton Thomas & Associates (AMT), to overview the work done in the SWIP so far. Don last spoke to SWAC in March, and since that meeting AMT has used EPA’s SUSTAIN modeling to find potential BMP sites, which were then vetted through a GIS desktop analysis and field visits. Eldon Kurtz asked if BMP sites included all of Harrisonburg or just public land. Don replied that the new BMP locations are on both public and private land. Rob asked if each

BMP site was visited in the field. Don answered that once the BMPs were analyzed through the SUSTAIN model and a desktop analysis, all BMP sites were visited. Each site has a rough estimate of BMP shape and drainage area in GIS, as well as a field review form and photos. Dan Rublee asked if the field data and photos were added to the GIS. Don replied that it is not linked to the GIS; however, city staff has access to the information in digital form.

Don then continued to explain the work done on the SWIP, including programmatic recommendations, a ranking and prioritization tool, and an excel workbook to show pollution reductions. Don stated that as the SWIP developed, it was clear that meeting the TN load reductions would be more difficult than meeting the TP and TSS reductions required by the Chesapeake Bay TMDL. Thus, TN became the driving factor behind BMP choices and prioritization in the SWIP. Ted Byrd asked if other localities are facing the same difficulty in regards to TN. Dave Hirschman replied that it seems as if TN is the driving pollutant in cities, whereas counties are less urban and TP is the driving pollutant. Dave cited Albemarle County and City of Charlottesville as an example of this. Ted then asked about nutrient credit trading between MS4's. Dave said Albemarle County and Charlottesville partnered on a stream restoration, which could be an example of such a partnership. Don continued his presentation and explained that BMPs were ranked based on the Prioritization and Ranking Guidelines tool. Stream restorations, new BMPs, and BMP retrofits were ranked in separate lists but used the same ranking guidelines. Don outlined the ranking factors: Pounds TN removed (highest ranking assigned to project with most TN removal, 20 points possible); cost effectiveness in \$ per pound TP removed (highest ranking assigned to project with lowest \$ per pound of TP removed, 20 points possible); project cost (highest ranking assigned to lowest cost project, 10 points possible); land acquisition (highest ranking assigned to a project on city-owned land, 10 points possible); drainage issues (highest ranking assigned to a project in an area with known drainage issues, 10 points possible); maintenance burden (highest ranking assigned to project with lowest maintenance burden, 10 points possible); site constraints and potential utility constraints (highest ranking assigned to project with no apparent site or utility constraints, 7 points possible); implementation schedule (highest ranking assigned to a project that can be implemented in under a month with no permitting requirements, 7 points possible); synergy (highest ranking assigned to a project that can incorporate other city projects and provides environmental benefits beyond SWM, 5 points possible); and aesthetics (highest ranking assigned to a project that adds landscaping or enhances the aesthetics of the site, 2 points possible). Rob asked if public/private partnership opportunities were considered as a part of the "synergy" ranking factor. Don said no, the synergy ranking factor considers other City plans in the vicinity of the BMP, additional environmental benefits of the BMP, or multiple projects located in the same area.

Kelley then showed SWAC members the excel workbook and explained the goal of the plan is to be adaptable, which the workbook allows. The workbook contains many tools, including an instructional page, a summary page for all BMP rankings, and a tracking page that shows pollutant reductions achieved and what is still required for compliance. Kelley asked SWAC members to look at the preliminary rankings of projects to see if anything seemed out of place. Dale pointed out that one of the stream restoration project locations was on JMU. Don said this would be removed from the SWIP plan. Ted asked why the cost effectiveness ranking was based on \$/TP if TN is the City's driving factor. Don

explained that the goal of the ranking was to devote 50 out of 100 points to pollutant removal, cost effectiveness and that cost effectiveness could be changed to \$/TN if needed . Don also explained that total cost of project was included in the ranking as well as cost effectiveness, because some projects have a good \$/pollutant removal but have a high overall cost. Don explained that cost estimates included design, construction, and maintenance elements. The design and construction costs include a base estimate for that type of BMP, as well as estimated costs to move utilities or divert flow based on the field review findings.

Don then reviewed some of the higher ranked projects, including a stream restoration at Mountain View Drive, regenerative stormwater conveyance channel at East Market Street, and a BMP retrofit at the Simms Center. Don also informed the SWAC that the City will be submitting for 100% grant funding for the Mountain View Drive stream restoration through the DuPont –Waynesboro Natural Resource Damage Assessment and Restoration Settlement grant due 9 October 2017. Ted Byrd cautioned the SWAC that easement negotiation will be difficult with the stream restoration project. Don also informed the SWAC that the City will be submitting another application for the East Market Street Regenerative Stormwater Conveyance, also through the DuPont grant.

Don outlined the next steps of the SWIP: the Open House Meeting on Oct. 18, presentation to the Planning Commission, presentation to City Council for adoption of the plan, and City staff training. Kelley then asked SWAC to look at the public comment form as they have time.

### **Tree Canopy GIC Grant Update**

Kelley reviewed the work being done through the GIC Tree Canopy grant and other stakeholders. The Tree Canopy Public Meeting on May 25 was successful, and work continues on the grant. There is a tree inventory being done in Purcell Park by a JMU grad class, the internal tree policy is being updated, and there is language about tree utilization being placed in the comprehensive plan. There will be another public meeting to present the final Tree Canopy Plan, although there is no date set for that yet.

### **Next Steps**

The SWIP Open House Meeting will be held October 18, 2017 at City Council chambers. The next SWAC meeting will be November 29, 2017.