MEETING SUMMARY

SUBJECT: STORMWATER COMMISSION MEETING
MEETING DATE: Monday – July 2, 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
- Justin Gehrtts, Commission Member, term expires 6/30/19
- Frank Bellon, Commission Member, term expires 6/30/20
- Sandy Pumphrey, Project Engineer, City Staff
- Dave Wallace, Storm Utility Engineering Manager, City Staff
- Tammy Schnell, Administrative Assistant II, City Staff
- Martin Smith, Friends of Cedar Lake Organization Member

DISCUSSION ITEMS

1. Meeting called to order at 5:03 p.m. by Commission Chair Mike Butterfield
   A. Mike Butterfield made a motion to approve the minutes from the 5/7/18 meeting and the 4/2/18 goal-setting meeting. The motion was approved by Justin Gehrtts; seconded by Stacie Johnson. All were in favor to approve the minutes.
   B. No introductions were needed.
   C. A brief discussion was held on the tour of the bioswales in the City Services Center’s parking lot the Commission went on prior to this meeting starting, which was given by Brent Schlotfeldt, the City’s Facilities Maintenance Manager.

2. Public Input
   A. There was no public input.

   A. Per the 303 d list Stacie handed out, the following items are what the waters in the Cedar Rapids area are impaired from:
      i. Biological Low Aquatic Macros
      ii. Bacteria – every time it rains the e-coli in our streams go up
      iii. Fish Kill due to Thermal (McLoud Run)
   B. She is going to propose both a retrofit standpoint, and the new development that is opening up on Highway 100.
   C. The Commission could prioritize each watershed year after year, or just concentrate on a couple they’re worried about.
   D. McLoud Run should be prioritized because it’s the only Cold Water Trout Stream in the State of Iowa, and it is on the 303 d list.
   E. Stacie proposed to include the Cedar Lake Watershed, because of the push for it to become an economic engine in the City. Also, the Treasurer’s Office just identified it as an “Opportunity Zone”. There will be a lot of redevelopment going on in this area, which could potentially affect the watershed.
   F. Stacie’s recommendations are Highway 100 Phase I (new development), and McLoud Run and Cedar Lake Watersheds due to redevelopment.
   G. Discussion was held on how it is determined which phase in a development is typically built first, and how developing certain phases first in watersheds could be incentivized due to what is going to be protected, e.g. drinking water.
   H. Sandy advised that the City received a permit today from the Army Corp to build a regional detention basin on the west edge of town. Discussion was held on whether this area should be incentivized due the
detention basin being built in the near future in this area.

I. Sandy suggested they determine what the criteria is first, before they target certain areas, i.e. water quality, flood control, or mitigating existing issues. Justin asked if different overlay districts could focus on different criteria. Sandy responded that that would not be a problem.

J. Mike Dryden asked if it was necessary to incentivize new development, because they would already have to meet the City’s stormwater ordinance. The design criteria is already to meet the 1.25” storm.

K. Stacie asked if they should broaden their mess from water quality to localized flooding and mitigation and test it in a watershed. Mike Butterfield concurred with this, because flooding is far more personal and impactful. Sandy said they could add an incentive to areas that experience more flooding by making them ineligible for a higher cost share.

L. Mike Butterfield explained that Stacie asked what happens when that 1.25” water quality event is essentially taken off the system, if they were to have enough green infrastructure/permeable surfaces to control, what would that do to the overall system? How they would model this is take the regular five year or 100-year rainstorm and the model doesn’t even recognize 1.25” be shown going into the sewer system. If this is applied to Kenwood and the peak flow at Cedar Lake, there is very a very small reduction. The peak flow is primarily staying the same, however, the duration of how long that ponding exists is greatly reduced. If you include the 1.25” in the modeling, 95% of the sewers are full, whether because of the downstream full or they are the bottleneck themselves; with the 100 year storm they’re all full. Taking the 1.25” off, that number is reduced to about 80%; this is more applicable to the 5-year storm. Grand Ave was a 440 CFS and it was cut down to a 200 and some CFS, with the 5-year storm.

M. Everyone agreed that McLoud Run and Cedar Lake are the first two areas to incentivize. The incentive would be water quantity or quality, but the 1.25” is the key target.

N. Discussion was held on what the incentive should be, and everyone agreed that it should be 80/20 for the priority basins (and not just 50/50) — City pays 80%, property owner pays 20%.

O. Maintenance was discussed and Sandy explained that applicants awarded money for the full program are required to sign a Maintenance Agreement, which requires them to maintain their area up to five years. The EZ program does not have this requirement. Down the road an inspection process will be formalized, which would include certification by an Engineer.

P. Mike Butterfield summarized this discussion stating that Kenwood and McLoud Run are going to be the priority basins. The priority applies to the BMPs and either water quantity or quality. It will have an 80/20 split, instead of 50/50, only for the priority basins. Mike made a motion to approve; Frank Bellon seconded it. All were in favor and the motion carried.

Q. Sandy said a timeline should be established and attached it to the Motion. The next step is to present the changes to the cost share program to the City Council via a resolution.

R. Mike Dryden made a second motion to have it implemented by the 2019 construction season.

S. Mike Butterfield made both Motions and both were approved by the Committee.

4. Reports:
A. City Staff Reports
   i. SUDAS Adoption & Supplement – Sandy Pumphrey
      1. The original date of July 1 to adopt the new standards has passed. It has been pushed back a few months, but Sandy did not have the actual date of the new deadline.
      2. The Stormwater Commission’s input has been incorporated to date.
   ii. BMP Cost Share Applications / Update – Sandy Pumphrey
      1. The City has received 13 applications for the EZ Program to date; and nine for the full program, for a total of about $102,000 spent by the City.
      2. Sandy explained how the City determines what the budget will be for the Cost Share Program. Fiscal Year 2019 just started yesterday (July 1), and another $250,000 was given to the Cost Share Program, which is added to any surplus funds that may still be in the account from the previous year. However, the City can decide to move the surplus out of the program and use it somewhere else in within the stormwater area, if needed.
      3. There have been a lot of rain gardens installed as part of the program, about 30% of the infiltration practices have been soil quality restorations, and some biovention cells. Sandy wasn’t sure if that was by dollar amount, or actual quantity.
      4. Mike Butterfield suggested that as the program grows, that they receive a second pie chart which shows the dollars spent on each infiltration practice.
      5. Sandy said that he would like to see $300,000 worth of cost share requests per year with $600,000 worth of projects, so they would have to reject some, which would build competitiveness. But not so it’s so extreme that no one applies.
iii. IDALS Grant – Sandy Pumphrey
   1. The bioretention cell at Wilson Ave & 6th St SW is complete.
   2. The Taylor School bioretention cell on 5th Ave SW is currently out to bid. Bids will be received July 18, and construction will occur late summer/early fall.
   3. There is an obligation with our grant funding to do some outreach connected to the bioretention cells. Sandy handed out a “Save the Date” for October 18 for an Eastern Iowa Green Infrastructure Conference at Indian Creek Nature Center, which is being put on in partnership with ISWEP. On July 17, the day before the this program, they are planning a bus tour to take participants of the program around the City and show them types of green infrastructure, including both of the bioretention cells, which will satisfy the grant agreement. In addition to a lot of other locations. Cara is coordinating the bus trip and what locations they will stop at.

iv. Ameri-Corps Rain Garden – Sandy Pumphrey
   1. Carol Teeter facilitated this program. In addition to a cost share program for residential rain gardens, but the City was able to offer free installation of them. Homeowners only had to pay for half the cost of materials.
   2. Five, total, were installed in early June – three in the Kenwood Basin, and two in the Rockford Rd basin – and 12 will be installed this fall.
   3. There was some really good publicity surrounding it, including in the Gazette, on social media and Mt. Mercy bloggers about it. They are hoping this will be an annual program.

v. Downtown Storm Drains – Sandy Pumphrey
   1. This was an initiative to make some of the alleys in downtown more aesthetically pleasing.
   2. Some artists were commissioned to paint some art around the storm drains at the ends of the alleys, so it would catch peoples interest as they walked by. The theme of the art was about storm drains and water quality, so people understood storm water goes to rivers and streams. One issue the City has is there is a lot of restaurants that use the drains for grease dumping.
   3. The art was painted in the middle of May, during a one-week period, in conjunction with Iowa Big.

vi. Streambank Restoration Study – Sandy Pumphrey
   1. There is a current project that is requiring wetland mitigation and some streambank mitigation, too. Streambank mitigation as always been required, but has been kind of fuzzy, so it’s never really been enforced by the Corp, but they are now requiring it.
   2. If you disturb over a certain amount of streambank, then you have to mitigate for streambank degradation, just like you have to for wetland, by either purchasing credits, or by doing your own project.
   3. The City decided to not buy wetland credits for the current project, and then do our own project for streambank mitigation, so benefits are kept within the City limits. The streambank mitigation is being done in Noelridge Park.
   4. There appears to be a lot demand for streambank mitigation credits, and right now there is only one bank in this whole area which provides those credits, and they’re $200 per lineal foot.
   5. The thought is the City will do a feasibility study to determine the feasibility of the City holding a streambank mitigation bank to be able to sell credits to the IDOT, other cities and private developers, to restore our own streambanks within the City of Cedar Rapids limits.
   6. The feasibility study is being done right now by EOR, and they’ve seen the first draft. At the next Commission meeting, Sandy hopes to present a more thorough set of findings on that.
   7. The question is balancing two numbers – what is the reasonable amount of credits we could generate as a City, versus, what does the market look like and what is the demand for the credits over time. The primary objective is have the program solvent, so it pays for itself. The secondary objective is to get the streambank restoration here, instead of in Waterloo, or somewhere else in the watershed.

B. Commissioner Reports
   i. Frank Bellon suggested they look at incentivizing development to oversize their basins, so less than the 5-year storm. Sandy clarified that along with that you wouldn’t just make the basin bigger, you would also restrict further. Otherwise, if you just made it bigger, it’s just going to be empty or emptier. Discussion was held on how this would possibly happen.
5. **Adjourn Meeting**

A. **Agenda Items for Next Meeting**
   i. **Program Information Sharing or Regional Detention Basins**
      1. Sandy and Mike Butterfield are going to determine whether the growth area plans are finalized, which will determine whether regional detention can be discussed. If the report is final, Regional Detention Basins will be discussed in September, if not, Program Information will be discussed.
      2. **Streambank Restoration Study**

B. The next regularly scheduled Stormwater Commission meeting is scheduled for Monday, **September 10, 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

C. The meeting was adjourned at 6:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Tammy Schnell, AAII, 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