Stormwater Utility Advisory Panel
Meeting #3
September 11, 2017 – 4:30 - 6:30pm


County Staff Present: Stavros Calos, Greg Harper

Other: David Bulova (Amec Foster Wheeler)

1) Updates and meeting goals
   a) Speaking with Board on Oct 4 to give progress update / refinements to assumed program costs.
      i) Note big question mark for long-term requirements based on update of bay model.
         (1) We’re not currently assuming that we’re almost done.
      ii) Most GIS work is expected to be cleanup at this point.
      iii) Conversation with Cville suggests 0.5FTE new work just to administer utility.

2) Review from July Meeting
   a) Cursory review with presentation of some GIS work that’s been done to answer questions since last time.
   b) Credit vs. rate policy distinction is important.
      i) Credit nexus – credits need to be given for practices that contribute utility objectives
   c) Billing County Property
      i) If County doesn’t pay, fed properties don’t have to.
      ii) Tentative preference for yes – County should pay.
      iii) Draft impact analysis indicates the following amount each government class would pay
           (based on estimated rate of $3.15/billing unit-year)
            (1) public schools: ~$50k
            (2) local gov’t: ~$9.2k
            (3) State: ~$15k
            (4) federal: ~$8.4k
            (5) Road rights of ways not included.
   QUESTION – do we still tentatively want to charge the County of its own properties?
      (a) Agreed that it presents an education and incentive benefit. YES – tentative agreement
   d) Possible exclusion of driveways
      i) Panel member – State staff (forestry?) are concerned about the definition of “impervious.”
         Some of the water quality staff were very concerned that a gravel forest road would be considered impervious.
      ii) Early consideration – don’t charge any single family residences (SFR) for their driveway imperviousness. This drives down number of billing units for SFR and shifts cost to commercial and multi-family. Not recognized as ideal.
      iii) Alternate considerations
         (1) Assign average driveway to all SFR parcels. Essentially an ERU for driveway. Used in Texas for similar situation.
(a) Any solution has to address why this is an issue – rural parcel boundaries aren’t as accurate as we’d like in order to fairly assign responsibility.
(b) Also concern that removing driveways would penalize people with small lots.
(2) Driveway density factor, but doesn’t solve parcel accuracy issue.
(3) Driveway tiers, also doesn’t solve parcel accuracy issues.
(4) Possible alternate – reverse ERU approach: remove driveways from SFR but also credit all other properties (non-residential) an equivalent amount.
iv) Discussion – greater fee for driveways/parking areas that are concentrated or dense, such as a paved parking lot around building as opposed to a long driveway. Total imperviousness may be equal, but one has greater impact. Could buffer structures and look at impervious area within a certain distance.

e) Agricultural structures
   i) Agreed that credit approach is cleaner way to address issue. Work with TJSWCD.

f) Density factor
   i) Panel generally agreed that density factors can be manipulated in too many ways / complexity could increase too much. Panel agreed that other credits would negate need for density factor.
   ii) Idea for a ‘Nature Conservancy credit’ – they were granting easements based on impervious surfaces. Basically allows a total cap for imperviousness. If you need to add in one place, then remove in another.

g) Forest land
   i) Hard to infer what’s officially “forested”
   ii) Panel considered providing credit for forested buffers rather than forested area. Be careful not to misconstrue this to mean requiring more buffer areas.

3) New topics for discussion
   a) Credit for structural facilities.
      i) Typical considerations – pollutant removal efficiency, regulatory vs. voluntary, technical design threshold, volume only facilities (note there are still a lot in the County), off-site treatment
      ii) Brainstorming results – don’t differentiate based on removal efficiency and just give additional credit for voluntary facilities, credits should be given if facility meets clearinghouse requirements / creditable for TMDL, should be a distinction for volume-only credit, off-site treatment should be credited but net fee should not go below a minimum to cover inspections / also to prevent big offsite treaters to get owed money by the county.
*Note that credits for voluntary facilities could be very difficult for HOAs to administer without appropriate incentives.
   iii) Next meeting we will review how localities have dealt with similar issues.

b) VPDES industrial stormwater permits
   i) Airports / auto maintenance / public works / other spots where Clean Water Act requires owner to prepare SWPPPs and SOPs and BMPs + training program. Doesn’t require structural facilities. ~16 in the County.
   ii) Brainstorming – recommended against credit b/c they aren’t the same as properties not needing SWPPPs. These have already been identified as potentially contributing more pollutants than background.

c) Pollution prevention / residential BMPs.
   i) Structural or non-structural tools that promote water quality, but typically not quantifiable for compliance. Examples:
(1) Charlottesville – CCAP, which is in addition to the state program (VCAP). You get a cost share to help install practices. Leveraging of funding sometimes allows landowners cover as much as 100% of the cost. Albemarle could establish “ACAP” in addition to VCAP.

(2) Falls Church – users self-report their activities on online form. Credit is assigned based on reporting results.

   ii) Considerations – does the benefit outweigh the administrative burden?

      (1) Keep it simple!

      (2) Almost no one uses. Mostly pre-existing facilities that people are taking credit for.

      (3) Brainstorming recommendation – continue with standard cost-sharing type program.

         (a) Panel member suggestion: why can’t Albemarle do both types of programs? Also, should the County give additional discount to the disadvantaged?

   d) Vacant parcel threshold –

      i) At what IA threshold will parcel be considered vacant? 200 SF is common answer.

      ii) Brainstorming recommendation – 250SF, since we’re doing natural rounding anyway.

   e) Next steps:

      i) Reassemble county staff team, hopefully quickly, so we can wrap up everything by November or December. Draft ordinance will be in the spring. Not adopted by Board until April or May.

      ii) Review GIS analysis – come up with more specific numbers.