AGENDA

Meeting Type:	W
Date:	05-01-1989
SUBJECT	

City of Charlotte, City Clerk's Office

File copy

CHARLOTTE

MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL
WORKSHOP AGENDA
May 1, 1989

MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL
WORKSHOP AGENDA
May 1, 1989

5:00 pm	Presentation of operating and capital budgets
6:00 pm	Dinner
6:20 pm	Review and discussion of reports of advisory committees for productivity task force recommendations
8:15 pm	Stormwater management presentation

Operating and Capital Budgets

FY90-91 operating and capital budget notebooks will be handed out at the Workshop.

NOTES

Productivity Task Force Recommendations

M E M O R A N D U M

DATE: April 27, 1989

TO: Mayor and City Council

FROM: O. Wendell White
City Manager

SUBJECT: May 1 Workshop

One of the topics for your May 1 workshop is a discussion of the findings and recommendations of the Advisory Committee on Performance Appraisal and Incentive Programs and the Organization Review Advisory Committee.

City staff has worked closely with these committees and believes that the philosophy and goals represented in their recommendations are those which we can join the private sector in pursuing. These recommendations will require, in some cases, legislative changes and changes in Council's policies, and others can be incorporated into existing systems.

Because of the variety of responses which these recommendations require, we have separated into three groups those to which we would like you to respond at your May 1 meeting.

I. The recommendations which can be incorporated immediately include:

- Increasing the focus on efficiency by identifying trade-offs between costs and service levels and instituting incentives for productivity gains.

- Focusing on reducing levels of management by reporting spans of control and levels of management, requiring organization changes which result in smaller spans or more management levels to be approved by the City Manager and requiring department heads to propose actions to reduce the levels of management in their departments.

- Comparing City departments to those in similar cities.

- Continuing the exposure to private sector perspectives by including in our recruiting efforts candidates with private sector experience and encouraging our management group to interact with private businesses.

We are committed to institutionalizing these recommendations and will immediately begin their implementation.

II. Two of the recommendations require changes in Council policies. At the May 1 workshop, we will recommend improving budget flexibility and accountability by authorizing the City Manager to reallocate up to 10 percent of budget and headcount among departments during the fiscal year and maintaining a "productivity improvement fund" in order to provide fund productivity improvements.

III. Several recommendations require significant staff time to review and assess. For these, City staff will return at the August or September Council meeting with an assessment of the impacts, both positive and negative, of the recommendations, presentation of cost-benefit analyses; identification of resources needed, and an implementation plan with a proposed time line. City Council will be asked to consider:

- Establishing a Performance Management Unit
- Accepting the private sector concept of midpoint and adjusting pay ranges accordingly
- Eliminating general adjustments and most step increases
- Eliminating the current performance Incentive Awards Program (except for management employees) and developing functionally specific incentive programs
- Expanding the internal consulting activity within the City
- Setting priorities by use of market research and customer surveys to determine citizens'priorities and willingness to pay.

At your meeting on Monday, I ask that you take the following action steps:

- Discuss with the Committee Members their findings and proposals and compare notes of implementation successes from the private sector.

- Concur with the recommendations which can be implemented administratively or with Council approval.

- Support the review process for those recommendations requiring further study.

Finally, I ask your concurrence that no changes in the City's pay plans will be made until such time as a logical and ordered sequence of accompanying changes in appraisal and related pay and incentive systems can be planned and implemented.

In your discussions, please be aware that I have directed the Budget Office to include $100,000 in the FY90 Budget to be used for productivity improvements. These funds could be used, if you so choose, to act on the recommendations of these Committees.

OWW:kwd

NOTES

Stormwater Management

Presentation to the Charlotte City Council

May 1, 1989

Stormwater Management Program Analysis

Overview

Purpose of the Study

Assess stormwater management program needs

Assess ways of funding drainage program and capital improvement needs

Report Organization

Section 1 Description of the drainage problems, needs, goals, and existing programs

Section 2 Assessment of the future program requirements

Section 3 Examination of the funding options

Section 4 Proposed program and financing strategy.

Major Findings

Critical Obstacles to be Overcome

Overcoming institutional obstacles, rather than physical or financial problems, will be the key to the ultimate success of stormwater management in Charlotte Institutional obstacles include

- the current lack of state authorizing legislation,
- the existing reactive rather than "proactive" operating philosophy,
- the present division and diffusion of responsibility internally and between the City and County;
- a lack of active constituency groups pressing for a better drainage program,
- failure to address the entire drainage system as a whole and instead selectively managing only parts of it, and
- the pressure of other priorities.

Level of Funding Needed

Achieving the future level of and extent of service will require an increase in the annual operating expenditures from about $ 1 million presently to one of four alternative funding levels:

- a program of very limited scope and coverage costing $ 1 to $ 2 million annually;
- a program which provides basic service and includes hazard mitigation costing $ 2 to $ 3 million annually;
- a program based on "minimal optimization" of the existing system with deferral of major improvements costing $ 4 to $ 6 million annually; and
- a program which fully optimizes the performance of the existing systems and constructs the necessary remedial repairs to minimize problems in the future, costing as much as $ 10 to $ 12 million annually.

In addition to these estimated annual operating expenditures, the City will need to fund water quality programs to meet discharge permit requirements and major capital improvements to increase the level of service and reliability of the drainage systems. During the next fifty years major capital improvements to the drainage systems could cost $ 100 million or more.

Ability to Fund Drainage Needs

Charlotte has the ability to finance an adequate stormwater management program However, the City's General Fund cannot meet the current and future needs unless priorities and expenditures are reallocated or taxes are increased

A Stormwater Utility is the Best Alternative

The more feasible alternative to reordering General Fund spending priorities or increasing taxes is for the City to gain authority for and implement and alternative source of funding, a stormwater utility.

A "Building Block" Strategy is Needed

A long-range, comprehensive, and cohesive approach to stormwater and flood control will prove most cost-effective for the City. Progress can be achieved in increments, and special attention must be paid to laying a proper foundation for future steps.

Areas Requiring Major Policy Decisions

- Whether to manage the system as a whole or just portions
- Transitional and final levels of service.
- Whether to focus and consolidate stormwater management and flood control
- Whether to establish a Stormwater Utility and implement adequare funding

Consultants' Recommendations

- Adopt a long-range policy of managing the entire drainage system
- Choose minimal optimization as the service level for the transitional period.
- Consolidate authority for all aspects of stormwater control to one individual in a division responsible only for drainage, and limit that individual's scope of work solely to drainage.
- Establish a stormwater utility when authorized.

Specific Steps

- Seek and support state legislation authorizing stormwater utilities
- Establish a stormwater utility by ordinance when authorized
- Authorize an interfund loan to the stormwater utility fund for development expenses.
- Authorize a rate structure analysis and rate study.
- Authorize assembly of data for a master account file, examination of billing options, and potential use of a geographical information system (GIS) for this work.
- Appoint a drainage manager at a division level of responsibility in the Engineering Department, authorize the formation of a division staff, and prepare for transition.
- Inventory the drainage systems.

City of Charlotte

STORMWATER MANAGEMENT PROGRAM ANALYSIS

City Council Executive Summary

Purpose of this Report

The City of Charlotte and Mecklenburg County retained the EDGe Group to conduct stormwater management planning for the greater Charlotte area. As a member of the consulting team, Water Resource Associates, Inc. has primary responsibility for an assessment of program needs and the feasibility of various methods of funding storm drainage capital improvements and operating programs in the City and County

This report briefly summarizes the drainage program and financing strategy proposed for the City of Charlotte The major findings and recommendations for a strategy are presented first in this summary although they are addressed in Section 4 of the report The contents of the analytical sections of the report (1 through 3) are highlighted after the discussion of findings and recommendations.

Major Findings

Key Obstacles are Institutional Rather than Financial

Overcoming current institutional obstacles will be the key to the ultimate success of the City's drainage program. Institutional obstacles include:

- the status of state authorizing legislation, local charter provisions, and codes,
- the existing stormwater management operational philosophy, which relies on reacting after problems occur rather than preventing them;
- the division of operating responsibility between the City and County,
- the lack of an active constituency in support of drainage, and
- the pressure of other priorities.

The Physical Drainage Problems are Symptoms of Basic Deficiencies

The physical drainage problems in Charlotte, mostly local flooding and erosion, are merely symptoms of underlying deficiencies in the drainage systems and programs Rather than just treating the symptons, the City must attack the underlying deficiencies

A Long-term Solution is Needed

A quick fix is neither realistic nor practical. The range, geographical extent, diversity, and magnitude of the drainage problems that must be addressed are too great to expect quick solutions to problems that have been developing for decades, especially given the institutional changes that must first be accomplished.

A Building Block Strategy will Work Best

A "building block" approach will be most successful in Charlotte, in which various elements of the overall stormwater and flood control program are developed and improved in a coordinated but incremental fashion. A long-range program and financing strategy must be implemented which includes adequate funding The City's General Fund is not currently providing adequate funding for the drainage program. Alternative funding methods, especially a stormwater utility, hold the greatest promise for the future

Future as well as Existing Needs must be Considered

Emerging stormwater needs will challenge current program priorities Water quality, hazard mitigation, flood protection rating concepts, and other factors will influence the direction of the City's future drainage programs.

Recommendations

Financing Legislation

Several bills have been introduced in the North Carolina Legislature by others which would designate stormwater management as a "public enterprise" or utility comparable to water and wastewater utilities. These bills are needed to authorize cities (and counties) to employ the stormwater utility service charge funding method recommended in the consultant's report The City Council has directed that a letter be sent in support of the legislation

Long-term Program and Funding Strategy

The City Council has several choices to consider related to 1) Charlotte's approach to stormwater management; 2) the level of involvement and responsibility the City wishes to seek, 3) and how it prefers to fund the program in the future.

The City's drainage program is currently reactive and severely restricted in its coverage. Present policies limit the City's operations and maintenance to portions of the drainage systems in rights-of-way and easements. The report concludes that this approach cannot be effective for the long-term in controlling drainage through the intricate system of channels, ditches, and storm sewers which exist in Charlotte The entire system must be managed as a whole. The consultants recommend that the scope of responsibility be gradually broadened to include public management and/or regulation of all components of the drainage systems, and that a preventive orientation replace the current reactive posture

During the next few years, it is proposed that the City's approach be one of "minimal optimization", i e , do the minimum necessary in terms of major physical improvements to the systems while optimizing the performance of the existing facilities. This can be accomplished through increased maintenance and regulation of private sector activities which impact drainage system performance Once the existing system's performance is optimized, improvements can be installed on a priority basis.

Present limitations on drainage funding are primarily a function of the community's financially conservative approach to local government. Sufficient financial capability exists within the community to fully fund an effective drainage program through existing taxing mechanisms The City Council could opt to:

- reallocate existing resources in order to spend more on stormwater management (and less on other priorities);
- increase taxes to accomplish the drainage program objectives without impacting other programs;
- implement alternative sources of funding for stormwater management; or
- simply decide that the status quo is acceptable.

Increasing property taxes or diminishing other City programs to fund the drainage program are not politically attractive options, nor do they offer a stable and adequate source of long-term support for stormwater management Accepting the status quo appears to be only a short-term option, since the continuing growth of the community, worsening conditions in the drainage systems, and external factors will inevitably force the City to upgrade its drainage program.

The consultants recommend that the City seek the necessary legislative authority and then implement alternative sources of funding, most notably a stormwater utility service charge This source of funding would be dedicated solely to stormwater and flood control, and would provide a stable base of funding. The utility approach would enable the City to plan program and capital improvements several years into the future The flexibility available through utility rate structure design would also allow the City to establish a range of fees, rentals, and charges to achieve greater equity in the distribution of drainage costs than is possible through current sources of General Fund revenues such as property taxes

The alternative of transferring drainage responsibility to the Charlotte/Mecklenburg Utility Department (CMUD) was considered during the study. However, that option was not recommended by the consultants because. 1) it too would require state legislative authorization; 2) the service areas of water, wastewater, and drainage throughout the County would not be totally comparable, 3) and CMUD already has two major areas of responsibility which would dominate over drainage, making it an organizational stepchild.

Immediate Decisions and Steps

If the City Council opts to increase funding for drainage by reallocating or increasing existing resources, priorities and budgets must be redefined for 1989/1990 If it prefers to pursue the stormwater utility approach, immediate attention should be given to· 1) gaining legislative authority from the State Legislature, 2) preparing a rate structure analysis to select a preferred concept and a detailed rate of service study of that methodology, 3) assembling data for a

master account file; and 4) determining the preferred method of billing and making the necessary modifications if an existing system (such as CMUD's) is to be used. All of this would have to done before a stormwater utility service charge could be adopted and activated. Regardless of whether the City opts for a utility or other management/financing approach, a thorough inventory of the drainage systems should be assembled as soon as possible. It is needed to achieve other objectives such as enhanced maintenance, capital construction projects, and an application for a stormwater discharge permit.

Different Levels of Expenditure Yield Various Levels of Program Capability

The City Council has a range of choices in terms of the level of program that can be pursued, with varying cost implications. During the past decade, total City expenditures for drainage have averaged somewhere between $ 800,000 and $ 1,200,000 annually, though some historic indirect drainage costs are obscured by budget and accounting practices. Precise figures are difficult to derive because drainage activities are spread among several departments and divisions.

Based on the consultant's evaluation, a minimal drainage program requires annual operating expenditures of $ 1 million to $ 2 million in Charlotte, a more intensive maintenance program including hazard mitigation would require $ 2 million to $ 3 million, and a level of maintenance to achieve "minimal optimization" of the existing systems would demand $ 4 to $ 6 million

The $ 4 to $ 6 million level of service generally equates to the Level of Service "B" proposed in the 1986 report prepared for City, ***Stormwater Management in Urban Collector Streams*** Level of Service "B" is defined as a "tolerable" condition in the stream sections of the drainage systems, allowing for minor nuisance ponding in yards and alongside roads which does not damage properties or present undue hazards The 1986 report estimated an annual expense of $ 3 6 million to attain a Level of Service "B" within five years, but dealt strictly with the open streams and channels in the City's small watersheds of less than one square mile, and did not consider storm sewers Water quality management activities soon to be mandated by a federal/state stormwater discharge permit and capital improvements and additions to the drainage systems will require additional funding over and above those estimated operating expenditures.

To accomplish the minimal optimization approach to operations, water quality management, and some high priority capital improvement needs the City Council could adopt a stormwater utility and establish a stormwater service charge of approximately $ 3 per month ($ 36 per year) for average single-family residences Suitably higher service rates would be charged to larger and more intensively developed non-residential properties which discharge more runoff to the drainage systems However, this approach requires state authorizing legislation.

Increased property taxes remain an alternative Assuming a comparable level of service, the City would require an increase in property taxes of approximately 13 % If a lower level of operations and service is acceptable, the necessary property tax increase and/or stormwater utility service charge would be less. Others sources of funding such as impact fees and in-lieu of construction fees would not generate sufficient revenue to meet the program and capital needs in Charlotte.

Organization and Staffing

Two major changes are recommended in the way stormwater management is organized First, one individual must be put in charge and have control of administrative, engineering, operational, regulatory, and capital improvement activities and expenditures. Second, that person should not have other responsibilities which demand his or her attention

The appropriate organizational level and setting for the drainage program is a division responsibility in the Engineering Department. For the foreseeable future, the consultants anticipate that the drainage manager would obtain much of the needed work from other departments, divisions and the private sector. He or she would act as a purchaser, broker, and coordinator of services provided by others in many cases. Some existing functions might be shifted to the drainage division along with the personnel who currently perform them. High priority work which would be done only once, such as assembling a complete system inventory or preparing a master account file, can be accomplished more quickly and efficiently by outside vendors than by staff.

This approach will minimize the additional staffing required, but it is clear that an increase in total funding resources of 300 % to 1000 % within five years will result in new staff positions being needed in both the Engineering and Operations Departments It is estimated that the drainage division itself would need at least six full-time positions during the first year, and could require a dozen or more positions within five years depending on policy and administrative decisions The need for allocations of a minor portion of some peoples' time might remain, especially in engineering and regulatory activities

In comparison, the current personnel level indicated for drainage activities totals 8 1 full-time equivalents, most of which is in partial allocations of individual's time Some current personnel could be transferred into the drainage program from their present positions, but this may present a need to backfill a portion or all of the original position because drainage in many instances in only a minor part of an individual's role The total staffing requirement in the Engineering Department would probably increase two to three full-time equivalents No immediate staffing increase would be dictated in the Operations Department if the City adopted the proposed program strategy.

Recommended 1989/1990 Program, Budget, and Interim Funding

The consultants recommend that the three highest immediate priorities be· 1) agreement on a program and financing strategy; 2) timely implementation of adequate funding, and 3) development of a system inventory. If the State Legislature authorizes cities to form stormwater utilities during the 1989 session, and if the City Council chooses to pursue the utility approach, implementation will become the key priority for 1989/1990.

In order to implement a stormwater utility, the City would have to conduct rate studies, assemble a master account file, and determine and select and prepare a method of billing. These steps could require as long as to one year cost up to $ 1,000,000 (roughly $ 150,000 to $ 200,000 for rate studies, $ 500,000 to $ 700,000 for the master account file, and $ 50,000 to $ 100,000 for billing system modifications).

A system inventory could cost between $ 75,000 and $ 250,000, depending on the level of detail, format, and technology employed. It is essential for defining the scope and nature of the drainage service to be provided by the utility, and for subsequent development of a maintenance management plan, preparation of an application for a stormwater discharge permit, and prioritizing capital improvements and betterments to the drainage systems.

If the utility option is selected, it is recommended that the City proceed with establishing the utility by ordinance as quickly as possible and make an interfund loan to the utility fund for the implementation costs. The loan would subsequently be repayable from stormwater utility service charge revenues. This approach limits the financial impact on the General Fund due to activating stormwater utility funding. In addition, all other drainage program costs and resources should be transferred to the stormwater utility fund when it is established.

If the City Council decides to implement a stormwater utility, develop the associated service charge, and assemble a system inventory while continuing to conduct the current level of field operations, the estimated budget requirement for 1989/1990 is $ 1,900,000, plus whatever expenditures may be made for capital projects now planned. If it opts to maintain the status quo in operations and assemble the recommended drainage system inventory during 1989/1990 (either because authorizing legislation is not passed for a utility or simply to defer the utility decision), the budget requirement would be approximately $ 900,000 plus whatever must be budgeted for capital projects In comparison, the estimated total cost of the current level of operations is about $ 800,000.

If formation of a utility is deferred, the drainage expenditures would have to be funded from the General Fund If a utility is formed, but implementation the service charge is deferred, an interfund loan from the General Fund could be used during 1989 for operating and program development costs, allowing for repayment from future utility revenues Again, it must be stressed that formation of a stormwater utility requires state authorizing legislation

Coordination and Consolidation with Mecklenburg County

The consultant's report recommends that the City and Mecklenburg County explore the opportunity to consolidate all stormwater and flood control functions, with a proposed objective being five years. In the interim, the report recommends that incremental steps be taken. The consultants report does not recommend whether a consolidated program should be housed in the City or County. This decision is dependent on many other issues which must be resolved in the future. (Mecklenburg County currently has responsibility for the regulated floodways both outside and within Charlotte, and for stormwater management in small watersheds outside Charlotte.)

The report proposes many closely associated program enhancements and capital improvements for both jurisdictions during the next five years. These should be coordinated and, in some instances, might be cost-shared. For example, both the City and County need a complete, accurate, and up-to-date inventory of the existing drainage systems. It may be appropriate for them to seek a joint contract with a single vendor to provide the inventory This also suggests that a geographical information system (GIS) may now be needed.

Summary of the Report Contents

Section 1

Problems

Both the City and County have given increasing attention to drainage and flood control in the past decade. The agencies' individual programs and the level of cooperation between them have improved. Common, or at least consistent standards and practices have been developed. A division of responsibility has evolved which recognizes the jurisdictional and operational resources of each agency.

Despite the recent advances, much remains to be done. It is vitally important to understand the pervasive and often subtle impact that storm drainage problems have on citizens, public and private property, and City operations. The impacts on the community are extensive and over the long term may become very expensive if the basic causes of drainage problems are not eliminated.

The storm drainage problems are classified in six categories. They include principal causes, secondary influences, and results or symptoms, under the following headings·

- physical drainage problems;
- institutional circumstances;
- operational deficiencies,
- financial limitations;
- public health and safety impacts, and
- perceptual factors.

Individually, numerous instances of flooding, eroding channels, and other incidents indicate that the City and County presently lack the capability to prevent drainage problems from developing, continuing, or reoccurring Cumulatively, the range and severity of the problems are evidence that both program and system deficiencies exist, and that a comprehensive and cohesive long-term approach will be required to successfully correct them

Needs

Detailed "needs statements" are presented in the report which specify the steps and activities required to correct both physical drainage problems and the management, financial, and institutional problems associated with stormwater and flood control The five most critical needs at the present time are related to program development, and include·

- agreement on a program and financing strategy which may include reordering of City and County responsibilities, roles, and priorities,
- determination of legal and legislative requirements for implementation,
- implementation of stable funding;
- adoption of a drainage master plan to guide capital improvements, and
- adoption of a common drainage ordinance and manual for the City and County.

Meeting these needs will provide the basic resources required to address more visible stormwater problems such as flooding, erosion, sedimentation, and water quality impacts through capital projects and engineering, operational and regulatory programs.

Goals

Both primary and secondary goals are suggested in the report The primary goals present an overview of the purpose of a stormwater management program, and are stated in broad terms. The secondary goals are more specific, and present individual objectives which are building blocks in achieving the primary goals. The primary goals include:

- Correct or Mitigate Known Problems
- Implement a Stormwater Control Program and Financing Strategy.
- Refine the City and County Work Programs
- Eliminate Operational Deficiencies
- Improve Health and Safety
- Generate Support for Drainage Projects and Programs

Section 2

Drainage Program Requirements

A key task in the study is an analysis of the City's and County's future drainage program requirements. The report identifies "what" must be done to overcome the drainage problems that have been cited Five categories of functions and expenses are specified for the drainage programs As indicated in Table 1, they include a broad scope of administrative, engineering, operational, regulatory, and capital investment activities and costs

Section 3

Funding Options

A full range of potential funding methods is evaluated in the report to ensure that the financing strategy recommended to the City and County is consistent with the local operating program and capital improvement needs Financing options considered in this study include·

- the City and County General Funds,
- stormwater utility service charges;
- a dedicated County-wide property tax;
- expanded Charlotte/Mecklenburg Utility Department service charges;
- revenue bonding and general obligation bonding for capital improvements,
- pay-as-you-go funding of capital improvements,
- in-lieu of construction fees;
- system development charges;
- special assessment or improvement districts;
- plan review and inspection fees;
- special inspection fees;
- impact fees;
- developer extension/latecomer fees, and
- federal and state funding.

TABLE 1

STORMWATER MANAGEMENT FUNCTIONAL REQUIREMENTS

Administration, Financial Management, and Program Development

- General Administration
- Secretarial and Clerical Support
- Financial Management
- Program Planning and Development
- Capital Outlay and Overhead Costs
- Public Awareness and Involvement

Planning, Design, and Engineering

- Drainage Master Planning
- Design, Field and Operations Engineering
- Water Quality Planning and Monitoring
- Hazard Mitigation
- Support Requirements

Operations and Maintenance

- Maintenance Management
- Routine Maintenance
- Remedial Maintenance
- Erosion and Sediment Control
- Emergency Response Maintenance
- Water Quality Maintenance
- Support Services

Regulation and Enforcement

- Code Development and Enforcement
- Permit Administration
- Drainage System Regulation
- Floodplain Management
- Water Quality Regulation

Capital Improvements and Expenditures

- Major Capital Improvements
- Minor Capital Improvements
- Land, Easement, and Right-of-way Acquisition

TO: Mayor and City Council

FROM: Lee McLaren, Chairman
Stormwater Management Citizen's Advisory Committee

DATE: April 25, 1989

SUBJECT: Stormwater Management Program Analysis by the Edge Group

I am writing on behalf of the Stormwater Management Citizen's Advisory Committee appointed by the City Manager last year. The Committee's charge was to work with the Edge Group to develop recommendations for stormwater management in Charlotte-Mecklenburg. We appreciate the opportunity to be involved in this process. Our Committee has met several times with the consultant and discussed at length this complex subject. Our comments are directed only to what we have reviewed to date, which is in the first 4 sections dealing with policy issues. Through our discussions with the consultant and City and County staff, we have reached the following conclusions:

- Water does not recognize jurisdictional boundaries and therefore the current system is inefficient. The division of authority between be City and County and the current City policy of maintaining only drainage facilities in street rights-of-way is not effective; all pieces of the "system" must be maintained as a system for it to function well.

- The City and/or County must redefine what is public drainage responsibility and then take responsibility for maintenance of that drainage system.

- Many areas of the City have drainage facilities that are deteriorating due to age and have received little, if any maintenance.

- Capital Improvement needs for the replacement and upgrade of deteriorating drainage facilities will continue to increase as the system ages.

- Upcoming United States Environmental Protection Agency regulations on water quality will likely require additional monitoring, enforcement and corrective measures.

For these and others reasons, we believe that a Stormwater Utility is the most equable, rational and efficient way of dealing with this problem. Contrary to the consultant's recommendation, the Committee feels strongly that institutional problems should be solved through the development of a single utility. Two utilities may reinforce the current institutional conflicts and may result in wasted public funds.

The Committee has these additional qualifiers:

- A level of service is chosen which recognizes the reality that some yard flooding and minor erosion is expected.
- The level of spending be based on a detailed analysis of the system inventory and need.
- Maintenance and improvement practices be sensitive to existing vegetation and aesthetics.

Again, thank you for the opportunity to be involved.

Sincerely,

Lee McLaren

Lee McLaren, Chairman

Stormwater Management Citizen's Advisory Committee:

Lee McLaren
Ann Hammond
Sydnor Thompson
Ronnie Flehan
Susan Foster
John Burmeister
Steve Cornwell
Rob Rowe
John Huson
Bob Grimes

LRM/bw/stormwat

NOTES

NOTES

NOTES