

**Beaufort County Stormwater Management Utility Board (SWMU Board)**  
*Meeting Minutes*

March 2, 2011 at 2:00 p.m. in Beaufort County Council Chambers  
Draft April 4, 2011

**Board Members**

<b>Present</b>	<b>Absent</b>
Don Smith	Brad Samuel
John Youmans	
William Bruggeman	
James Fargher	
Donald Cammerata	
Allyn Schneider	

**Ex-Officio Members**

<b>Present</b>	<b>Absent</b>
Scott Liggett	CoB Representative
Ron Bullman	
Tony Maglione	

**Beaufort County Staff**

Daniel Ahern  
Rob McFee  
Lori Sexton  
Carolyn Wallace  
Amanda Flake  
Eddie Bellamy

**Visitors**

Reed Armstrong, CCL  
Laura Lee Rose, Clemson Extension  
Van Willis, Town of Port Royal  
Paul Moore, Ward Edwards  
Denise Parsick, BC S&W Cons. Dist.  
Van Willis, Town of Port Royal

**1. Meeting called to order - Don Smith.**

- a. Agenda approved.
- b. February 2, 2011 Minutes were approved.

**2. Introductions**

**3. Public Comment - None**

**4. Reports**

**a. Stormwater (SW)/Form based code - Subcommittee Report - Don Smith -** Nothing to report from the subcommittee. Don Smith has proposed changes on the SW/form based code and asked Dan Ahern if Planning intended to schedule a meeting with the subcommittee. Dan Ahern said Planning is still waiting for the stormwater portion of the form based code submittal.

**b. Monitoring Update – Dan Ahern - five items to report:**

- Planning a coordinated test with BJWSA on their ASR storage facility in the May River
  - Coordinate two pumping tests in the next two months
  - Meeting with ToB and scientists to set up best protocol
- GEL will be presenting their annual report at April meeting

- Next monitoring meeting is March 29<sup>th</sup>
- Alan Warren and Chris Marsh will be developing paper on Rose Dhu phenomena for Watershed Science Bulletin
- Our article on LID benefits has been published in the peer reviewed Florida Watershed Journal that featured articles on LID.

**c. Clemson Extension Updates** – Laura Lee Rose – gave an update on the various activities that the Clemson Extension is doing in Beaufort County that is helping protect our watershed. Allyn Schneider asked what the Turf Love was. It's a onetime visit to a homeowner's problem turf area by a team of Lawn Rangers (trained Master Gardeners). Laura Lee said they perform a soil test and provide a detail report on when & how to fertilize or if there are any issues with disease or problems with their lawns they can give a general recommendation but it is not intended to compete with professional services. The same with the Rent a Master Gardener, one time visit and most people are pleased to pay the small fee for the report.

William Bruggeman asked what kind of trees is given away on Arbor Day. Persimmon, red cedar, fall cypress, long leaf pine which are all native trees and she tries to keep some evergreen and some deciduous. These are bare root saplings from the SC Forestry Commission; the seedlings are local to the Southeastern United States and all seedlings are purchased with the funds received by Beaufort County.

Donald Cammerata wanted to know if a tree systemically takes toxins into its body is there any way to save it. Laura Lee said trees are organisms and what's in the soil is what it takes up into the leaves and maybe bioaccumulates. Laura Lee Rose is a General Horticulturist, but has taken a couple of classes for Urban Forestry.

**d. Upcoming Professional Contracts Report** – Dan Ahern – presented the report as requested by Gary Kubic to keep board aware of contracts in the pipeline. There were four contracts reported last month that were over \$5,000, these have been approved. There are three proposals in process; one is the recent proposal submitted by ATM that the county administrator asked us to share with the Board for comment. There are two other proposals; one is a supplemental proposal by Andrews & Burgess for the parking lot demo & other subcontracts. The parking lot demo is supplemental to the design of the parking lot. We've also received a proposal we requested for Allison Ramsey to do some additional cost analysis and to participate in a workshop with homebuilders association.

Don Smith asked Dan Ahern to summarize the work that is contracted by ATM's Task Order 7. Dan Ahern says their asking to help with questions raised by the Natural Resource Committee; there were concerns about costs, this was reported at last month's board meeting; schedule workshop with homebuilders; concerns about the municipalities being on-board and that is being included in a workshop being set-up in the Town of Bluffton March 18<sup>th</sup>, this would connect the IGA and concerns about water quality. This proposal was to help set these up.

William Bruggeman wanted to know if ATM was going facilitate these meetings and Dan Ahern wasn't sure. Tony Maglione addressed these issues to the board and says ATM's intent is to help facilitate, provide information to research and try to get the message out there again. They need to find out what the concerns are, see if there are any resolutions and bring it back to the board and NRC to

present the issues that have been resolved and the issues that haven't. He did not know that these had been already set up.

Don Smith said it looked like we've expended close to \$200,000 or more on volume sensitive issues with studies and seems like there may be more to come. He further explained that it wasn't that we didn't need it, only that it surprised him and he wondered how this would affect our budget. Don Smith asked Dan Ahern if he was going to coordinate with the consultants, but Dan Ahern said he was under the assumption that we were asked for the board feedback. Don Smith recited part of the Code of Ordinance - for the SWU one of the duties for the board is to provide, review & recommendations on studies conducted and/or funded by the Utility and presumed this is why the board was presented with this.

William Bruggeman wanted to know if the meeting was called by ATM to get the information and will Dan Ahern and his staff be involved. Tony Maglione replied that their goal is to be a resource and assist the staff, not replace staff.

Don Smith said the board will need to provide a recommendation on the TO but questions Dan Ahern, with all of this started does the Utility feel they need the assistance and spend \$25,000 to help get this done. Dan Ahern said we weren't planning on having this. Rob McFee addressed the Board that certain services outlined proposed were over taken by events and are now refining the scope to better determine what assistance is needed by ATM. He further explained why certain timelines have been moving forward, with schedules being difficult to coordinate with the regional efforts, local efforts & different entities that can't make certain meetings.

Don Smith said that's why he was a little hesitant about making a recommendation without having an opinion from staff. William Bruggeman was a little disturbed that Dan Ahern didn't know anything about this; thought Dan Ahern would have been the main person right in the middle of this.

Don Smith said since the contracts have been posted on the website he went through them to figure out what had been done that he was and what he wasn't aware of and there are a couple of questions on various Task Orders for volume sensitive issues. He doesn't remember hearing or seeing some of the results and asked Dan Ahern about a number of the outputs in previous TO's.

Donald Cammerata wanted to know if the \$25,000 for TO #7 was buying us a fixed # of man hours @ a cost per hour or are we buying deliverables and Tony Maglione said your buying assistance on an as needed basis.

William Bruggeman asked Dan Ahern if the SW fees go into a fund, who can spend that? Dan Ahern said it's an enterprise fund which Mrs. Wallace will be going over that with the 2012 budget.

William Bruggeman asked if this was done based on certain individual's signature or would anyone in the Accounting Dept. sign a check for us. Dan Ahern said that all fees are accounted for and goes through Alan Eisenman for the budget.

William Bruggeman said he was asking because of concerns with the TO #7 and already spending this money on this contract and Dan Ahern said this wasn't an executed contract, it's a proposal that Gary Kubic wanted the board to be able to weigh in before it's signed or already done.

Don Smith said the contracts their currently getting are over \$5000, would it be a problem to provide all contracts and Dan Ahern said that would be fine, we can start next month.

**e. Utility Updates** – Dan Ahern –reported on a few activities:

- **BMP Re-formatting** – February 25, 2011, held a workshop with local engineers to get their input on formatting that would make the BMP manual more user friendly. Also got concurrence from them that moving the hydraulic and easement requirements from the existing ZDSO would allow for one stop manual. This is linked to the Form Based Code initiative. Bob Klink & Dan Ahern will meet with Rich Wagner on March 7<sup>th</sup> to relay suggestions and develop a new format for the BMP manual.
- **First Retrofit – O'Bryan Pond** - It appears that we are close to starting the first regional Water Quality Retrofit. After receiving COE approval we have ran into problems with OCRM on utilizing of existing pond for water quality purposes. Permit had to change to M&R permit due to their concerns on utilizing the pond for quality improvement. This is a potential dangerous trend where existing built water systems (pond) become waters of the State and then cannot be utilized for "treatment". We've discussed this with Charleston County, who have experienced similar issues and we need to make sure future SW ponds are noted as "SW Treatment Systems" so they do not become waters of the state at some later time. We've just received this M&R permit and will have a pre-construction meeting on March 8, 2011. Don Smith asked that pictures be provided.

Don Smith wanted to know when the construction would begin and Dan Ahern said he will know at next week's meeting with engineers & field personnel. He will be able to update the board at next month's meeting.

- **Beaufort County Participation on Center for Watershed Protection/Chesapeake Stormwater Network Webcast** – Received an invite to participate in an April 13<sup>th</sup> Webcast on "Stormwater Design for the Coastal Plain". We have been asked to provide 10 to 20 minute perspective and potentially provide a top 10 tips for local stormwater managers and designers. This might be a good opportunity to highlight the on-lot tool that was developed for our proposed Step 2 controls.
- **Education Area of Emphasis** – Laura Lee Rose had mentioned that they are willing to do outreach to realtors and contractors on buffer protection next year.

**f. Maintenance Project Report** – Eddie Bellamy – He reported to the Board on 12 major projects and 34 minor projects.

**5. Unfinished Business**

**a. Lots of Record but not Built Status** – Carolyn Wallace - Since the last Board meeting we have been working to address the two main actions requested by the Natural Resource Committee. Bob Klink and Dan Ahern have met with Cooter Ramsey on homebuilder's concerns and he has met with the

homebuilder representative. There are alternatives that can lead to higher cost per square foot than the expected \$1.50 per square foot. We have received the homebuilder high cost example. This might turn into an opportunity to demonstrate ways to reduce impervious surface and we plan to take this example and develop a number of alternatives that could reduce impervious surface and reduce cost of controlling stormwater runoff. There will be a homebuilder's workshop on Friday March 4<sup>th</sup>.

The second action is being tied to the IGA process that we have been discussing for some time. We have had some trouble engaging the decision makers at the county and municipality level. We are now setting up a meeting on March 18<sup>th</sup> in Bluffton where the SWIC will be able to brief their recommendations and discuss the proposed ToHHI draft IGA to see if this could be the format for the next round of agreements. The ToHHI draft will be presented to Natural Resources Committee for comment at their meeting that is now rescheduled for March 14<sup>th</sup>.

Provided in the board packets is the article that was developed for the SC Environmental Conference on the County's Step 2 efforts. This presentation will be made March 14<sup>th</sup> in Myrtle Beach.

**b. Regional Coordination** – In the absence of Dan Ahern – Carolyn Wallace – SWIC has finalized their recommendations and operational alternatives. The two significant alternatives are the one concerning the basis of administrative cost and the one concerned with controls for water quality. We have received some push back from municipalities on earlier wording and the SWIC took another attempt to clarify the alternative. The SWIC has changed this recommendation from its original wording and the original and new versions are as follows:

- Previous approved Operational Alternative #3:

“Minimum Water Quality Controls in jurisdiction must be protective enough to reach and maintain state designated water uses”

- New proposed wording is:

“Minimum Water Quality Controls in jurisdiction must be protective enough to reach and maintain state designated water uses”

Later in the meeting Dan Ahern asked the board to concur with these revised recommendations. The Board motioned to accept the new proposed wording.

## **6. New Business**

**a. FY2012 Budget** – Carolyn Wallace – reported the FY12 budget to the Board.

The utility is experiencing a revenue shortfall this year caused by the decline in reimbursable projects and the depletion of the stormwater portion of the Del Webb Agreement Fund. To balance the budget, the staff is recommending utilizing the reserves (unrestricted net assets are at \$1.6 million and the staff goal remains to retain \$1 million in the reserves to cover major drainage work needed in case of a major storm), eliminating the three vacant positions, and trimming the professional services and operations budget. The staff recommended introducing only one new initiative this fiscal year and that is to hire a part-time SW Environmental Engineer.

Ron Bullman wanted to know if the budget for over-toppings is not expended would it carry over to the following year. Mrs. Wallace explained since the utility operate as an enterprise fund any money not expended goes into its reserves.

Don Smith wanted to know how the sluggish economy affects the SW fees. Mrs. Wallace said the utility benefits from the collection of SWU fees being tied to the collection of property taxes because delinquent SWU fees are collected during the annual tax sale. However the collection rate varies because eleemosynary entities (properties that are tax exempt) are not subject to tax sales and there are some that continue to have delinquent SWU fees and also the non-payment of SWU fees by the military installations. She also noted that the growth in single family units (SFU's) has slowed with the economy. Don Smith asked what three positions were permanently eliminated. Mrs. Wallace said it was the bush hog operator and its striker and a maintenance tech 2 position. She mentioned that these positions were not eliminated merely because they were the current vacancy but because these eliminations made the most sense and just happen to be neatly packaged to be eliminated. She noted that the infrastructure section had already made the adjustments to the crews.

Don Smith asked what the anticipated use for the new SW Environmental Engineer position. Mrs. Wallace responded that with the county's impending designation as a small MS4 that this person will work more with the increasing regulatory side of SW.

William Bruggeman wanted to know how many employees come out of the SW budget. Mrs. Wallace said there are 4 positions in administration and 37 in the infrastructure section. He also wanted to know if the infrastructure section employees were mainly the people completing the SW projects that reported to Eddie Bellamy and Mrs. Wallace said yes and the only exception was the SW Inspector who mainly report to Dan Ahern.

Mrs. Wallace asked Mr. Bruggeman if he got his answer to his earlier question to Dan Ahern regarding payment authorization within the utility. He said he was curious whether payments had to be authorized by somebody in the utility and he assumed she would have to be involved. Mrs. Wallace explained that she was involved and she walked him through the process step by step. He wanted to know if she had ever been surprised by something she wasn't aware of and she said not often but yes it has happened.

Donald Cammerata wanted to know if there are any opportunities to outsource work or services that are currently being provided by the organization. Mrs. Wallace said the staff had looked at it in the past and found that when the work can be done in-house then it is more cost feasible for SW to do the work since the work is done at cost, but that there are some services that are contracted when it is not cost effective for the infrastructure section to provide the service.

In looking at the budgeted revenue levels, Scott Liggett wanted to know why the FY2011 & FY2012 increase in administrative fees appear to be only in recognition of the rate increases by the municipalities. Mrs. Wallace explained that both numbers were estimates and the FY2011 estimates were made last year during the budget process. She said in the past normally she will get the utility activities revenue budget within a \$100,000 but trying to predict the economy turns the last 3 years have been difficult.

Scott Liggett questioned how the priority of the Drainage Enhancements element can be increased. Mrs. Wallace noted that in the past there was push back from some municipalities for cost share to address identified over-toppings in the master plan when the work was not necessarily in their political jurisdiction. For example a project located in the unincorporated county that is a part of an evacuation route during a major storm that would benefit property owners in the unincorporated county, the Town of Bluffton and the Town of Hilton Head Island. Since the utility could not gain cost share, the staff

decided to only address over-topping in conjunction with a road project only when the opportunity presents itself. She noted that the utility has acted on these opportunities in the past but in this coming fiscal year the utility is limited to \$25,000. Mr. Liggett said this feedback was helpful.

**b. Utility IGA Agreement** – Rob McFee – There was nothing new to add.

**7. Public Comment** – None

**8. Next meeting agenda** – Approved the proposed agenda for April 6, 2011 meeting.

**9. Meeting adjourned.**