

CARSON CITY STORM DRAINAGE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Minutes of the March 14, 2001 Meeting

Page 1

A meeting of the Carson City Storm Drainage Advisory Committee was scheduled for 6:00 p.m. on Wednesday, March 14, 2001 in the Community Center Bonanza Room, 851 East William Street, Carson City, Nevada.

PRESENT: Chairperson Russell Plume
Vice Chairperson Howard Anderson
Bob Fredlund
Tony Marangi
DeLacy Perry
Rob Saunders

STAFF: Andy Burnham, Development Services Director
Larry Werner, City Engineer
John Givlin, Senior Project Manager
Steve Kastens, Parks and Recreation Director
Juan Guzman, Open Space Manager
Randy Bowling, Consultant
Hector Cyre, Consultant
Paul Lumos, Consultant
Kathleen King, Recording Secretary
(SDAC 03/14/01)

NOTE: Unless indicated otherwise, each item was introduced by Chairperson Plume. A tape recording of these proceedings is on file in the Clerk-Recorder's Office and is available for review and inspection during regular business hours.

A. ROLL CALL AND DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM (1-0005) - Chairperson Plume called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. Roll was called; a quorum was present. Member Aldean was absent. Member Perry arrived at 6:10 p.m.

B. APPROVAL OF MINUTES - JANUARY 8, 2001 (1-0033) - Vice Chairperson Anderson moved to approve the minutes; Member Marangi seconded the motion. Motion carried 5-0-2-0.

C. MODIFICATION OF AGENDA (1-0047) - None.

D. PUBLIC COMMENT (1-0054) - At the request of Chairperson Plume, the citizens present introduced themselves. Chairperson Plume solicited public comment; however, none was made.

E. DISCLOSURES (1-0117) - Chairperson Plume advised that he was interviewed by the Nevada *Appeal* on Friday, March 9th. Mr. Givlin stated that the article was published in the March 13th newspaper.

F. CONSENT AGENDA (1-0140) - The Committee members acknowledged that they had reviewed the addition to Program Issue No. 4, which was discussed at the January meeting. Chairperson Plume solicited questions or comments. Mr. Givlin advised that the matter could be pulled from the consent agenda for discussion if necessary, and reviewed the needed action. A brief discussion took place, and

CARSON CITY STORM DRAINAGE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Minutes of the March 14, 2001 Meeting

Page 2

Member Marangi moved to accept Program Issue Statement No. 4, "Extent of Stormwater Service" as revised. Vice Chairperson Anderson seconded the motion. Motion carried 5-0-2-0. (Member Perry arrived at 6:10 p.m.)

G. PUBLIC MEETING ITEMS

G-1. INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION TO KEY STAKEHOLDERS AND MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC BY RANDY BOWLING, AND DISCUSSION WITH THE CONSULTING TEAM, CITY STAFF AND COMMITTEE MEMBERS OF THE KEY PROGRAM ISSUES BEING CONSIDERED BY THE STORM DRAINAGE ADVISORY COMMITTEE THAT AFFECT THESE STAKEHOLDERS AND THE GENERAL PUBLIC (1-0205) - Mr. Bowling introduced himself and provided information on his involvement in the stormwater management program. At his request, Mr. Cyre and Mr. Lumos introduced themselves. Mr. Bowling provided background information on the Storm Drainage Advisory Committee, and discussed the public meetings conducted by the Committee last year, City Manager Berkich's request that the Committee continue their work to develop a storm water management program, and the role of the consulting team.

Mr. Bowling presented slides on development of the storm water management program, the status of the same, and the work which remains to be done. He reviewed the status of the existing storm water management program, including construction of detention and sediment basins, the freeway drainage project, design standards for new development, system maintenance, and plan review. He discussed the annual costs of the existing program, the area to which the costs apply, and a comparison with national costs. At Mr. Bowling's request, Mr. Cyre reviewed the details of incidental, minimum, moderate, advanced, and exceptional programs. He commented that the toughest drainage problems exist in semi-arid communities like Carson City. Mr. Bowling discussed the benefits of more effective storm water management, including improved flood control, maintenance of the storm drain system, increased protection through a higher level of service, additional facilities, new development review, and higher National Pollution Discharge Elimination System ("NPDES") standards. Mr. Cyre discussed the NPDES permit requirement. Mr. Bowling continued reviewing the benefits of more effective storm water management, including waste discharge monitoring, program funding, consolidation of operations which increases efficiency, and addressing the quality of storm water discharges. Mr. Cyre pointed out that the freeway extension and its associated drainage system has a major water quality control facility incorporated at the lower end. He acknowledged that the water quality system will be maintained by the State of Nevada. In response to a question, Paul Frost, of the Nevada Department of Transportation ("NDOT") Hydraulics Division, advised that the State will be responsible for returning the freeway drainage to its natural water course in the area of Butti Way.

Mr. Bowling reviewed the building block process to development of the program. Mr. Cyre discussed the transmittal of policy statements to the Board of Supervisors. Mr. Bowling and Mr. Cyre provided an overview of the four policies which have been reviewed and approved by the Committee to date. Mr. Bowling reviewed Program Issue No. 5, agendized as item G-2. Mr. Cyre acknowledged that the differences between the minimum, aggressive, and expedited programs is the emphasis on capital improvements. Mr. Bowling reviewed Program Issue No. 6, agendized as item G-3. He explained that the program issues provide guidance and direction for capital improvements, maintenance and operations, the administrative element, regulations and permitting. These elements ultimately lead to a master plan within

CARSON CITY STORM DRAINAGE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Minutes of the March 14, 2001 Meeting

Page 3

the storm water management program. Mr. Bowling reviewed the costs per developed acre of the programs outlined in Program Issue No. 5. Mr. Cyre reviewed the costs involved for capital improvements in each of the programs, and advised that the costs for operations and maintenance, etc. would be increased accordingly. Mr. Bowling advised the key stakeholders that the reason for inviting them to the meeting was to solicit their input prior to the Committee submitting a recommended funding mechanism to the Board of Supervisors. Chairperson Plume invited comments from the citizens present.

In response to a question regarding the estimated \$20 million cost for capital improvements, Mr. Cyre explained that it is the “best round number” available after the level of planning done to date. The figure does not include the cost of storm water improvements along the freeway which have been funded through the construction project. He further explained that the \$20 million figure is an “order of magnitude estimate.” In response to a further question, Mr. Cyre advised that Clark County chose a sales tax mechanism to fund their flood control district. This flood control district is responsible only for the major washes which come from the mountains, into, and through the city. The Cities of North Las Vegas, Henderson, etc. are responsible for the “urban storm water system” which includes the drainage pipes, culverts, inlets, etc. along the streets. Carson City will not have a flood control district independent from storm water systems and will, therefore, be responsible for the entire program. Mr. Cyre commented that the urban storm water systems in Clark County continue to be a major problem. In response to a question, Mr. Cyre estimated that the costs for Clark County’s flood control district are approximately \$200 per acre, per year. He described some of the regional facilities in the area.

In response to a question, Mr. Cyre compared the urban area of Provo, Utah to Carson City and advised that approximately \$2 million a year is spent on the storm water management program. He discussed the City of Provo’s investment in controlling run off from the canyons adjacent to the City. The investment was proportionally greater to what will be required in Carson City because of the difference in conditions such as snow pack, weather, etc. He estimated that the City of Provo allocates approximately 60 percent of their revenue in constructing debris basins and drainage facilities immediately below the debris basins.

Mr. Givlin advised that once the Board of Supervisors adopts a recommendation and begins consideration of imposing a fee, staff will be tasked with developing the master plan and assigning figures to the proposed systems. He commented that a minimum criteria will drive a certain price and that a higher level of protection will result in a dramatic cost increase. The final master plan will reflect a figure which is more reliable than the current \$20 million estimate. Mr. Cyre concurred, and commented that the level of cost analysis necessary to evaluate the feasibility of dealing with the problem is not nearly the level of detail necessary to determine a service charge rate study if that is the funding mechanism chosen. Staff and the consultants have considered round numbers to generally determine the problem and whether or not it is feasible for the community to address it. If it is feasible to go forward, fine adjustments will be made to the cost estimate by reviewing all program levels to precisely determine the costs of the program, including capital improvements. Mr. Cyre clarified that he would never suggest proposing round number cost analyses to set up a funding mechanism.

(1-2062) Sam Lompa inquired as to how the \$20 million in capital improvements breaks down in cost per developed acre. Mr. Cyre indicated that he has not broken down the cost per developed acre, and discussed estimations for the same. He clarified that the round numbers represent one-time land acquisition and construction costs. He acknowledged that maintenance and administrative costs would also be involved,

CARSON CITY STORM DRAINAGE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Minutes of the March 14, 2001 Meeting

Page 4

and estimated these figures to be approximately \$500,000 - \$600,000 a year for the first five years. Maintenance of the systems includes routine maintenance and remedial repairs. Operational costs will be approximately the same as the capital investment costs on an annual basis. Mr. Cyre commented that capital costs annualized over the life of the system are typically 30-35% of the annual expense. The majority of the annual expense is for the operation and maintenance of the system not for the capitalization because drainage facilities typically last 50-75 years.

(1-2180) Bill Goni suggested that the program will be more expensive than a flood, and commented that once a tax is established it will be in place forever. He suggested that once a proper maintenance program is established for Ash Canyon and Kings Canyon a program won't be necessary. Mr. Werner agreed that there has been no maintenance program, and explained that the storm water management program is necessary because there is no available funding for maintenance. He advised that the \$400,000 per year for maintenance comes from gas tax allocated by the Street Department. Gas tax revenues cannot be used for facilities not associated with the road system. Without an additional source of funding, the City is unable to maintain or provide additional facilities. In consideration of the impact of not constructing capital facilities, Mr. Cyre commented that flooding would occur on a more frequent basis and the cost of maintaining those areas is going to be radically higher. One of the reasons for investing monies in capital facilities is to reduce maintenance costs. Even the most aggressive, expedited investment schedule for construction of capital facilities results in annual operational costs being approximately the same as constructing facilities. A balance is needed between maintenance and capital improvements for an effective overall result. Chairperson Plume pointed out that there is no adequate system to deal with storm water. Discussion took place regarding the Ash and Kings Canyon ditches, the \$20 million estimate, existing facilities, the storm water master plan, new development, the 1997 flood, and other funding sources.

Mr. Cyre emphasized the need to remember that the \$20 million figure is simply an estimate. In response to a question, Mr. Werner indicated that the City has not yet conducted hydrology studies. Discussion took place regarding flooding which takes place in the Lompa Lane area, the proposed detention basin, the funding needed to improve and maintain the existing facilities, the damage done by the 1997 flood and costs incurred as a result of the same, problems caused by new development, maintaining the ditches, the wetlands on the Lompa property, and the water table on the west side of town.

(2-0020) Mr. Werner discussed the check dams constructed in Vicee Canyon for the purpose of recharge, the problem of sediment build up in the area, and the funding from the Water Utility being used for maintenance of the check dams. He discussed the subsidizations currently being allocated from the Water, Sewer, and Street Departments to storm drainage, and indicated that the purpose of this meeting was to discuss a dedicated funding source for storm water maintenance. Mr. Cyre discussed other storm water funding mechanisms which allocate costs differently than tax revenues, such as water utility service charges. He reviewed the proposed funding mechanisms outlined in Policy Issue No. 2, including sales taxes, the City's general fund, storm water service fees, impact fees, "in lieu of construction" fees, system development charges, special assessments, and the advantages and disadvantages of the same. Mr. Werner clarified that under a user charge system, ranch lands would not be charged because there is no impervious surface. On the other hand, commercial developments with large parking lots would pay a significant fee due to the impervious surface. In response to a question, Mr. Cyre discussed possible credit mechanisms included in the service charge approach. (Chairperson Plume recessed the meeting at 7:40 p.m. and reconvened the meeting at 7:53 p.m. A quorum was still present.)

CARSON CITY STORM DRAINAGE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Minutes of the March 14, 2001 Meeting

Page 5

G-2. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING STORMWATER MANAGEMENT PROGRAM POLICY ISSUE NO. 5, "PROGRAM LEVEL AND COST OF SERVICE." (2-0425) - Mr. Cyre reviewed the policy issue and referred to the tables associated with the minimum, aggressive, and expedited levels of service. He indicated that the costs per year reflected in the tables are fairly accurate. The detailed cost analysis which will be done on a preferred scenario will change the figures somewhat but not significantly. The level of service reflected in the costs is a function of time, i.e., accomplishing the same program over a period of 10 years, 15-20 years, or 25 years. In response to a question, Mr. Cyre discussed the Committee's recommendation to the Board of Supervisors. He clarified that the cost analyses required to recommend a specific program cost of service have not yet been done.

Mr. Werner discussed the differences between the minimum and aggressive programs. Mr. Cyre discussed the development curve and the costs associated with the same, minor capital improvements which need to be addressed as soon as possible, and responding to the NPDES permit requirement by 2003. He anticipates that the initial impact will be an increase in maintenance, completion of the master planning, getting the permit process taken care of, minor capital improvements, completion of the freeway and taking over maintenance of the drainage associated with it. Member Marangi expressed a concern over increasing costs of capital improvements due to inflation. Mr. Werner and Mr. Cyre reiterated that capital costs have not yet been analyzed in detail. Mr. Cyre explained that land values, not construction costs, inflate in developing communities. Member Perry suggested that the time line should be developed working backward, i.e., what phases of the storm water management program need to be implemented by the time the "last stripe is put on the freeway." She suggested that fifteen years may be a realistic time frame. Mr. Cyre acknowledged that the aggressive program is comparable to the moderate program in national experience. Member Perry suggested changing the term "aggressive."

In response to a question, Mr. Cyre indicated that the schedule for completion of the master plan is not dependent upon which of the three programs is chosen. He advised that the cost estimate for completing the master plan is the same in all three scenarios. In response to a further question, Mr. Cyre estimated that the master plan should be completed in two years. Mr. Werner advised that the master plan has not yet been completed because the funding has not been available. Member Perry commented that identifying a program level will provide more definite time and cost goals. Mr. Cyre indicated that he would prefer doing a detailed analysis on only one program. Chairperson Plume expressed a preference for the aggressive program. Mr. Cyre discussed the two-year planning period inherent in the aggressive program which may reveal that the capital improvements can be made in a shorter period of time. Vice Chairperson Anderson suggested renaming the "aggressive" program to "moderate." In response to a question, Mr. Cyre advised that selection of a program obligates the Committee only to the initial starting point that the Board of Supervisors and City staff directs the consultants to address in cost of service analysis and rate study.

(2-0977) - Glen Martel, of Landmark Homes and Development/R.L. Shaheen Company, requested clarification regarding the schedule for implementing program elements after approval by the Board of Supervisors. Mr. Werner reviewed the phases, including this portion of the storm water management program, and the detailed cost analysis/level of service. Mr. Cyre acknowledged that the Committee's recommendation will determine an objective to work toward in the detailed analysis. Vice Chairperson Anderson advised that there has been quite a bit of work done on the master plan relative to the Eagle Valley area, part of which was to construct the detention basins associated with the freeway. Mr. Givlin

CARSON CITY STORM DRAINAGE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Minutes of the March 14, 2001 Meeting

Page 6

advised that staff has a goal to submit the storm water management program to the Board of Supervisors in a report form by their second meeting in June. In response to a question, Mr. Werner advised that the development standards will be submitted to the Board of Supervisors in June/July. As the Stormwater Master Plan is completed, the development standards may be revisited as an independent element to determine level of protection.

Mr. Werner acknowledged that the level of protection adopted by the City will greatly impact the capital costs of the program, but indicated that this is not part of the discussion at this point. Mr. Cyre explained that a cost of service analysis will typically be done for a five-year period, but the emphasis is on the first two or three years. After the master plan is complete in years one and two, the cost of service and rate analysis will need to be revisited in light of more detailed information regarding capital costs for a given level of service. Mr. Cyre acknowledged that the level of protection discussion will take place at the master planning stage.

In response to a question, Mr. Cyre read a portion of the recommendations paragraph into the record. Discussion took place regarding the necessary action, and **Member Marangi moved that the Committee accept the program issue entitled "Program Level and Cost of Service with the following change: aggressive to moderate; and that the Committee recommends to the Board of Supervisors consideration of the moderate program, with completion of any needed capital projects within 18 years. Vice Chairperson Anderson seconded the motion. Motion carried 5-0-1-1, Member Fredlund abstaining.**

Member Fredlund pointed out that the expedited program doesn't commit the City to capital improvements or a ten-year time frame. Mr. Cyre discussed the differences between the moderate and expedited programs in the first two years, including routine maintenance and remedial repair. The essentials are completion of the master plan and obtaining the NPDES permit. Capital improvements won't be a big focus in the first two years because the master plan will still be underway. Mr. Cyre acknowledged that the expedited program will cause the routine maintenance and remedial repair work to be done faster, but doesn't affect capital improvements which could take thirty years to repay. Member Fredlund requested that the motion be reconsidered. **Member Marangi moved to reconsider the motion. Member Saunders seconded the motion. Motion carried 6-0-1-0.** Mr. Guzman commented that a moderate recommendation will most likely be more acceptable to the Board of Supervisors. Vice Chairperson Anderson concurred. Member Fredlund explained that he based his former comments on expediting the maintenance and repairs rather than cost.

(2-1890) Joe Cacioppo, of Resource Concepts, Inc., pointed out that a moderate program could be accelerated. Mr. Werner discussed examples from a storm water program in which he was involved, and suggested that a middle-of-the-road approach will most likely be more successful in obtaining the support of the community. Member Saunders suggested accepting the policy paper as it is, considering it over the next month, and making modifications at the next meeting if necessary. He pointed out that this is the schedule which has been set forth by staff and the consultants. **Member Marangi moved that the program issue entitled, "Program Level and Cost of Service" be accepted with the following change: aggressive to moderate; and that the Committee recommends this program to the Board of Supervisors. Vice Chairperson Anderson seconded the motion. Motion carried 4-1-1-1, Member Fredlund abstaining. (1-2480) Member Fredlund changed his vote to aye.**

CARSON CITY STORM DRAINAGE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Minutes of the March 14, 2001 Meeting

Page 7

Mr. Cyre reiterated that the Committee will be asked to do an additional review of all the policy papers before they are presented as a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors. In response to a question, Mr. Cyre discussed the importance of considering ability to pay in choosing a program. Mr. Werner acknowledged that the Board of Supervisors and the public will have an opportunity to review all three program levels. He explained that the Board of Supervisors receives copies all the materials which staff and the consultants provide to the Committee. Mr. Givlin referred to the differences between the basic and moderate programs on a national scale which were a part of Mr. Bowling's earlier presentation. He pointed out that in moving from a moderate level to an expedited level, a good portion of the cost is debt service. Discussion took place regarding the capital costs over a period of years, the amount of land needed to accommodate capital facilities and maintenance, and the monthly fee.

G-3. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING STORM WATER MANAGEMENT PROGRAM POLICY ISSUE NO. 6, "FUNDING METHOD" (2-2497) - Mr. Cyre reviewed the policy issue and indicated that the key word is "blended" funding. In response to a question, he referred to the "Recommendations" portion of the policy paper and read a portion of the same into the record. Mr. Cyre acknowledged that the program paper does not recommend a special storm water sales tax. Mr. Werner suggested not getting too specific in the recommendation regarding continuing allocations of general fund, gas tax, and sales taxes. Mr. Cyre acknowledged that approval of the funding method still leaves the details of the same open for discussion. He further acknowledged that the policy paper does not include a recommendation to form a utility as opposed to utilizing existing facilities. He explained that the institutional mechanism needed to activate the Committee's recommendations would be determined by the Board of Supervisors. He suggested that the simplest way for Carson City to implement a service charge is through a general improvement district. He reiterated that the key is the suggestion to blend funding mechanisms.

Member Saunders expressed a concern over recommending a special purpose sales tax, and consensus of the Committee was to remove the entire paragraph. Discussion took place regarding the remaining paragraphs, and **Member Saunders moved that the Committee approve Program Issue #6 with the elimination of the third bullet, the fourth bullet, and the last bullet. Member Fredlund seconded the motion. Motion carried 6-0-1-0.**

G-4. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON A RESOLUTION RECOMMENDING THAT THE INITIAL METHOD OF FUNDING A MORE EFFECTIVE STORM WATER MANAGEMENT PROGRAM IN CARSON CITY BE A USER CHARGE; AND DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON THE USER CHARGE/SERVICE CHARGE RATE STRUCTURE ANALYSIS (2-3456) - Mr. Cyre suggested deferring this matter and advised that, after discussion with City staff, the consensus of the consultants was to present this item to the Committee in the policy paper format. The Committee members concurred. (2-3875) Mr. Cyre explained the important points for review of this matter.

H. INTERNAL COMMUNICATIONS AND ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS (2-3675) - In response to a question regarding scheduling an additional meeting, Mr. Cyre indicated that it was not necessary given the progress made on policy papers 5 and 6. He anticipated spending approximately two hours in discussion of rate methodologies at the next meeting. Mr. Werner discussed the Committee's continued involvement after review of the next policy paper. In response to a question, Mr. Bowling

CARSON CITY STORM DRAINAGE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Minutes of the March 14, 2001 Meeting

Page 8

discussed possible future public meetings. (3-0225) Mr. Cyre displayed a sample report from an advisory committee and the consultants' report which were presented to the City Council of Gainesville, Georgia. He invited the Committee members to review the same.

H-1. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS - Previously covered.

I. ADJOURNMENT (3-0195) - Member Perry moved to adjourn the meeting at 9:15 p.m. Member Fredlund seconded the motion. Motion carried 6-0.

The Minutes of the March 14, 2001 meeting of the Carson City Storm Drainage Advisory Committee are so approved this _____ day of April, 2001.

RUSSELL PLUME, Chairperson