Memo: To Mayor and Town Council

Through: Megan Wooley

From: Julie McClintock, Chair, Stormwater Advisory Board

Subject: Quick summary, Obey Creek discussions

Date: April 30, 2015

The Chapel Hill Stormwater Advisory Board has discussed Obey Creek at three meetings, including one special meeting. We have not reviewed the buffer section of the agreement, retaining wall issues or the portions of the design guidelines that deal with stormwater. These motions passed unanimously at our April 10th meeting:

* The Stormwater Advisory Board voted to endorse language submitted by Kimberly Brewer and, in addition. recommended a sinking fund, rather than a bond, for funding stormwater maintenance in the Development Agreement. This would ensure that funds would be readily available to address maintenance problems when they arise.
* Water Quality: Motion made and approved that developer should design and implement model projects to include pervious surfaces, rain gardens, and green roofs to inform and educate the public, as well as to benefit water quality.
* The Board agreed to recommend that the Property Owners be required to hire an inspector who is a Professional Engineer to conduct annual inspections of Best Management Practices. This requirement would be over and beyond ordinary requirements due to the complexity of stormwater management for this project.
* The Board discussed a recommendation that would not allow buy-downs for nutrients and that the developer agree to mitigation measures in the Wilson Creek watershed. No action was taken.

At our April 28th meeting, the Board discussed these additional topics:

* In discussion, the Board agreed to support the current language on stormwater in the April 16 draft and recommends that the LUMO standards are sufficient to apply to enforcement, maintenance and inspections for all Obey Creek parcels.
* The Board recommends that the east side of the creek be put into a permanent conservation easement that allows restoration activities and invasive species management; one pedestrian bridge; natural surface trails; and temporary access roads for maintenance. The discussion did not support the inclusion of a picnic facility with restrooms. The motion passed 4 – 2.

The reasons for the negative votes are instructive. One voted against the motion because he opposed transporting fill dirt to quarry, and one opposed motion because he supported picnic shelter.