

CCV Stormwater Management Committee Meeting
February 9, 2021 7:00-8:30 PM

In Attendance: Julie Sparacino, David Goldwyn, Kevin Cannard, Nancy Somerville, Peter Marks, Bruce Hebbard, Todd Eskelsen, Tom McCarty, Brian Manion, Ron Sherrow.

- I. Introduction and Purpose of the Work Session - quorum (10 members) was noted and meeting initiated (Goldwyn)
- II. Approval of Minutes for 1.26.2020
 - A. Edits were reviewed on screen.
 - B. Minutes were adopted
- III. Discussion of possible recommendations
 - A. We could organize by three major baskets of issues
 1. What do we do with existing homes and existing property to improve.
 - a) Inlets and pipes were designed for different period and are not adequate
 - b) Study could take a year
 - c) Appropriation would take longer
 - d) Infrastructure needs to be done and done as soon as possible. However, this means that we are stuck with the problem we have.
 2. What do we want to recommend with new construction?
 - a) Standards, practices, rules
 - b) Who should be implementing them (e.g. State, County, CCV).
 3. What do we do with respect to the existing properties (e.g. green practices if voluntarily adopted)
 - a) Advising vs incentives
 - B. We could also organize by category
 1. upstream/downstream issues
 2. County/CCV (destination of recommendation)
 3. Etc.
 - C. Discuss conceptually what can be done in each of the three categories
 1. Existing Infrastructure
 - a) Study, Understanding, Improvements

- b) Do our recommendations go back to Town Council or can we make recommendations to the County Government?
- c) Our task is to prepare a report to the town council, but our recommendations can address items that are beyond the remit of the town council.
- d) Nothing wrong with sharing a report with people that we have reached out to.
- e) Lowest hanging fruit is surface water that is accumulating in the streets (e.g. build up curbs, additional inlets). We could address this immediately.
- f) Since this is a safety issue, can we draw from the speed camera revenue?
- g) There is budget for these types of improvements
- h) The Clark/Azar will recommend improvement to streets, curbs and driveway aprons.
- i) Regarding the storm drains that lie in the interior. We need to as a community to take responsibility to help those owners on mitigations because it benefits the community.
- j) For example, is the design such that the old drain gets clogged? Can the community help build a cistern or water garden to help with “green friendly” mitigation that would benefit all.
- k) The C/A study identified a few properties where there are known problems.
- l) Can neighbors with the problems combine funding with town to “support for low lying areas”
- m) Can we do anything to incentivize improvement upstream?
- n) For example large areas are paved over.
- o) Could we have a reclamation or re-grading initiative.
- p) For example, lawn is better than impervious surface. More robust trees are even better.
- q) Could CCV add to this incentive?
- r) The county program is first-come/first-serve. The county also has some prerequisite requirements such as soil testing.
- s) If the property is low-lying, what is the best mitigation?

- t) We need to consider a negative reaction from neighbors on any such initiative. We may see backlash if we are too prescriptive.
- u) Weather stations are inexpensive. Can we use local weather station data to fill in some of the data gaps at the county. This could give us information that will help us in the future.
- v) Could we have links on the CCV website for green mitigations?
- w) Can we cut-down on the cost if we address the problem as a group?
- x) One-time property tax reduction?
- y) Safety issue. Even a small flash-flood could be dangerous.

2. New Construction

- a) Looked at Town of Chevy Chase and Chevy Chase Section Five
- b) Chevy Chase - has the requirement to handle stormwater for a 10 year storm (4.5 in.).
- c) CC Section 5 any changes has to handle ALL of the storm water
- d) Any new construction should handle any ADDITIONAL stormwater as a result of the new construction.
- e) For example, if you add 50 ft of impervious surface then you have to handle that much additional runoff.
- f) Or the standard could be higher that new construction must capture additional runoff.
- g) We currently have water draining from property to property, but we need to be careful not create new legal issues.
- h) Ron did emphasize that water can and does go downhill from property to property.
- i) If we start writing regulations, then we must be precise. We need to be mindful of specific recommendations as they could lead to new ordinances.
- j) Two issues
 - (1) What are the standards for new constructions?
 - (2) What are the standards for additions?

- k) County standards address roofline, and did not appear to cover all of the construction that displaces stormwater runoff.
- l) CCV could take any one of the nearby towns standards and put them in place.
- m) One of the towns uses the CCV engineer to review the plans.
- n) For new construction, should there be a certain percentage of pervious surface that is retained.
 - (1) A homeowner should not have to hire an engineer to build a patio. However, there should be general guidelines that discourage additional water runoff and encourage retention.
- o) There should be a minimum bar that guidance should suffice, but exceeding the bar might require an engineering approval.
- p) For example, if someone builds a pool that increases runoff 10%, does the homeowner have to address none, 10% or all of the runoff.
- q) Can homeowners “bank” stormwater mitigations for future construction.
- r) It is political challenging to get everyone to fix problems that are there. However, if we don’t address them then we will not make a dent in the problem.
- s) If we can incentivize people to address problems without labeling them as problems then perhaps we can get neighbors to cooperate.
- t) Can we at least get the best practices out there?
- u) Best practices have limited value because they are just suggestions and don’t have to be followed.
- v) There are a lot of property to property issues. It might be useful to think of a mechanism to have more neighbor to neighbor cooperation. Are there ways to help people engage with each other?
- w) General education and resources for residents of CCV would be useful. The kind of things that would be helpful to neighbors.

- x) For example, nearby towns have on-going committees to keep programs moving (e.g. energy conservation, etc.).
- y) The council could simply require that neighbors are proactively notified.
- z) There is environmental impact to runoff from on-going construction.
- aa) For new construction, the builder, not the new homeowner needs to be engaged.
- bb) Should the town ask for a construction runoff plan.
- cc) Much of this is already enforced. Sediment and sediment runoff is watched closely.
- dd) From Tony
 - (1) Encourage town council to be proactive about best practices
 - (2) List of resources
 - (3) Best practice manuals
 - (4) Compiling the case studies of other municipalities.

3. Existing property

IV. Next steps

- A. Drafts due February 16th
- B. Try to create in Google Docs in shared drive
- C. If not email to Elise
- D. Try to compile recommendations
- E. Synthesize and polish
- F. Draft report at next meeting
- G. Get more clarity on Clark/Azar and Survey
- H. (Pete) it is the councils expectations that there is more than just a document, but additionally a presentation at a town meeting.

V. Next Meeting

- A. Tuesday March 2 next meeting and draft report due

VI. Resident questions - no non-committee residents present

VII. Adjournment