

Elk Grove Storm Drain Master Plan Workshop #1 Recap - DRAFT

The City of Elk Grove Public Works department held a Storm Drain Master Plan (SDMP) public workshop on September 3, 2008 from 6–8 p.m. at the City Council chambers. City staff presented a summary of the settlement agreement, recent project activity and a SDMP update. After the presentations, City staff and workshop participants brainstormed and categorized SDMP guiding principles and themes. The group discussed potential future workshop topics and next steps. A summary of the workshop discussions are outlined below.

Attendees *(City to attach sign-in sheet as last page)*

Over 35 attendees were present. Please see attached sign-in sheet.

Settlement Agreement Summary presentation *(City to attach)*

Darren Wilson, City of Elk Grove Public Works

Recent Promenade Mall and Surrounding Areas Water Quality Monitoring Project Activity Update *(City to attach)*

Fernando Duenas, City of Elk Grove Public Works

Storm Drain Master Plan Update presentation *(City to attach)*

Mark Kubik, West Yost Associates

Participant Presentation Questions

Q = Question

A = Answer

C = Comment

Q: Do you have the data on the Internet from the first two water monitoring samples?

A: Not right now, but the City will follow up and place them on the Web site when they are available.

Q: Are the detention facilities peak flow or volume detention? Volume detention is better for water flow.

A: They are peak flow.

Q: Does the City plan to do more improvements on that Shed C channel?

A: Only Alternative 1 requires enlarging the existing Shed C Channel. Within the City limits channel enlargement would include a multi-functional channel that provides stormwater quality treatment as well as flood conveyance. Outside of the City, the downstream channel would be sized for flood control only. Alternative 2 proposes to construct a parallel channel extending from the upstream limits of the existing channel all the way downstream to Interstate 5. Alternative 3, Detention Basin Storage, would require very minor offsite improvements to the existing Shed C channel.

Q: Do you have any idea of the volume of the improvements?

A: We have the modeling to produce the numbers, but we'll configure the numbers during the EIR process.

Q: What are the City and County's efforts to incorporate development? Do large design and construction go through City?

A: To explain development process, City will add amend the SDMP.

C: Currently, the approval of proposed development projects begins with the Planning Department. The Planning Department routes the application to all the City departments, including Public Works, County Sanitation District, County of Sacramento, state agencies, and other governmental agencies, as appropriate. The Planning Department collects and consolidates the conditions for the project. These conditions set forth the requirements that the proposed development must satisfy. The planning commission and/or the City Council,

separate from the Planning Department, must approve the conditions for use by the applicant in developing their improvement plans.

Q: With respect to the new or replacement pipes recommended, did you (City) look at the feasibility of surface channel conveyance?

A: There are existing roadside ditches in the East area that are inadequate to convey the drainage runoff during a ten-year rain event and keep certain roads passable. The proposed improvements only considered new storm drainage pipeline infrastructure to assist roadside ditch conveyance to provide ten-year level of storm protection. Any improvements to mitigate above the ten-year level would be very expensive and difficult to achieve in the East area's flat terrain. Additionally alternate methods have not been considered because of the limited drainage easement widths within the East area and also because pipeline improvements would occur exclusively in the City's right-a-way.

C: There is an enormous variation between channels (roadside ditches). Half are partially clogged with leaves. When I look at that and hear improvements will bring another pipe in, we'd like to keep the water and not ship it out. For us, that would not be an improvement.

C: There is an important principle: seek community input when decisions are made. The Sheldon Community Association and Greater Sheldon Road Estates Homeowners Association want source control to be the major solution for stormwater. They want to create guidelines and look at problems on a case by case basis. The City should solicit the knowledge and input of the community. The community knows the ins and outs of the area.

Q: How will the SDMP address low impact development (LID) and leadership in environmental and energy design (LEED)?

A: We address LID in the master plan. There's a stormwater manual the City is required to follow and a number of hydromodification measures in our plans now. The requirements may change to be stricter over time.

C: New NPDES permit will require LID integration in most new projects. Applying LID for existing development is especially difficult since land has already been built out and the City has very little enforcement and funding mechanisms to require LID on such development. Nevertheless, the City is open to conducting pilot projects with area organizations to study the benefits, drawbacks and costs of LID on existing development.

Q: What is the EIR timeline?

A: We started the EIR but want to get feedback on the SDMP before moving forward.

A: This is first of four facilitated quarterly meetings, until June of next year. The EIR process will begin after the workshop sessions have been completed.

Q: Part of the EIR is development of a financing plan. Is that the fee collection you mentioned?

A: Yes, creating and adopting a SDMP is the first step toward that process. Following the adoption of SDMP, a capital improvement plan (CIP) is developed outlining the major new development projects and associated costs.

A: The finance mechanism is based on the SDMP. It could take over Sacramento County 11A or be rezoned. We won't likely continue this discussion in detail until we've developed the CIP.

Q: Will the SDMP analyze the area directly south of the current City limits?

A: Roughly 2/3rds of the Shed C area watershed lies outside of the City of Elk Grove limits, only the hydrology for the portion of the watershed that lies within the City limits has been analyzed.

A: The current SDMP is based on the City's General Plan and analyzing the hydrology of outlying areas will require planned land use information. Such actions would be considered premature the City has no control nor jurisdiction over lands outside the City limits.

Q: On the "Summary of Findings" slide, most are adequate but some require upgrades. Are you going to fast track some of those upgrades because they are addressing existing facilities (e.g. Elk Grove Creek)?

A: No, because they are not urgent. The upgrades would only address street flooding.

Guiding Principles Brainstorming

The group then brainstormed guiding principles to serve as the master plan over-arching themes or goals. Due to time constraints, the brainstormed list was not narrowed down to a more specific list. City staff indicated they would do so afterward and disseminate it to the participants for feedback. The brainstormed list is as follows:

1. Get corps of engineers on side of City
2. Water quality monitoring incorporated as part of plan
3. Water quality findings not be more stringent than current NPDES permit
4. Water quality findings ensure multiple conditions are met (habitat, recreational use)
5. Think to the future
6. Water is our friend – keep it where it is, minimize input to conveyance
7. Connect NPDES and SDMP objectives – link to common perspective
8. Protect property
9. Provide safe access for fire department and paramedics
10. Consider safe evacuation plans
11. Seek out examples of holistic SDMPs out there
12. Consider recommendations from Laguna Creek Watershed Management Plan
13. Consider long- and short-term maintenance plan
14. Balance maintenance needs with ecological and instream values
15. Provide efficient and proper storm drainage for the City
16. Consider the cost of the wish list
17. Recognize regional hydrological considerations
18. Consider benefit vs. expenditure of resources
19. Consider areas that are potential development even if not in City limits
20. Protect agricultural resources – don't convert into artificial wet lands
21. Consider/include redundancy in design
22. Protect homes from flooding
23. Public safety
24. Consider clearing existing channels before building new facilities
25. Mirror pre and post hydrographs due to development
26. Seek community input at all levels of the process
27. Capitalize on captured water sources for other municipal uses
28. Design stormwater facilities that minimize hydrological changes in water
29. Consider 200-year flood event in planning process
30. Promote development of multi-functional facilities when designing storm drains (combine land use)
31. Adopt a holistic watershed approach
32. Water quality parameters discharge equal or better than input
33. Respect property rights and respect rights of that property owner to use their property
34. Strive to minimize impacts on property owners downstream
35. Consider environmental alternatives to individual plans as opposed to conventional drainage
36. Designs must satisfy acceptable technical criteria
37. Consider cost of not incorporating/addressing the wish list
38. Must follow City's general plan

Guiding Principles Themes

Once the list of brainstorming was complete, meeting participants discussed potential ways of grouping the list into themes:

- Flood control
 - Adopt a watershed approach to SDMP – ecological/environmental protection
 - Maintain public safety
 - Protect property values
- Planning process
- Feasibility and sustainability of system
- Cost/economic development impacts

- Collaborative approach
- Historical perspective
- Regional level solutions vs. individual solutions

Potential Upcoming Workshop Topics

The group brainstormed desired topics to address at upcoming SDMP workshop sessions. The brainstormed topic list is as follows:

- Need more frequent meetings than only one a quarter
- Policy development (staff to bring to meeting rather than participants brainstorming or developing)
- While the plan is being developed, discuss current development as mentioned in settlement agreement
- Specifics of east area stormwater
- Nature conservancy by-pass under Highway 99 – Deer Creek Crossing
- Overall discussion about watershed approach

Next Steps

- City will email the workshop recap to all stakeholders and workshop participants.
- City will compile all brainstorming ideas into the guiding principles and send to stakeholders and workshop participants for review and comment.
- Workshop #2 – December 3, 2008 from 6–8 p.m.