



**ADVISORY PLANNING BOARD
APPROVED MINUTES OF MEETING
Greenbelt Community Center
September 16, 2009
Minutes Prepared by Amy Hofstra**

Meeting was called to order at 7:40pm

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT WERE Emmett Jordan, Sandy Lange, Jim Cohen, Keith Chernikoff, and George Branyan.

CITY STAFF PRESENT WAS Amy Hofstra.

OTHER ATTENDEES present included Bill Duncan and Bill Orleans.

Mr. Branyan began the meeting by writing a new agenda. In response to a request from Council on September 14th, Mr. Duncan had volunteered to speak with the Board regarding the stormwater ordinance which was drafted by the County Department of Public Works and Transportation. Though the draft ordinance was not yet available, a model ordinance had been prepared by the Maryland Department of Environment (MDE). Mr. Duncan had asked Council to send a letter to MDE requesting more stringent requirements.

Mr. Duncan reviewed the new requirements recommended in his letter. In the case of new development, a one year, 24 hour storm event, or 2.7 inches of rain, must be treated by Environmental Site Design (ESD) methods such as infiltration. The model ordinance only requires 1 inch of rainfall to be treated by ESD methods on new development sites. In a redevelopment project, Mr. Duncan's letter recommends that 95% of the one year, 24 hour storm event would be treated by ESD methods either onsite, or within the same subwatershed if not possible given site conditions. The model ordinance requires ESD methods treat 50% of the rainfall which falls on impervious surfaces and/or a reduction in impervious surfaces over the entire site.

Mr. Duncan emphasized that the new guidelines for redevelopment were particularly important. Unlike the guidelines in the model ordinance, these guidelines were written to ensure that a large rain event, such as the one year, 24 hour storm, would not compromise stream quality by preventing stream bank erosion.

The Board then asked various questions of Mr. Duncan. Mr. Chernikoff asked if the requirements were extreme. Mr. Duncan indicated that extreme requirements would require using ESD methods to treat a 100 year storm event. Mr. Cohen asked if ESD

methods would vary in effectiveness due to site conditions. Mr. Duncan indicated that they would, and that developers would only be required to use ESD to the extent feasible as determined by a technical analysis reviewed by County staff. Some Board members expressed a concern that the new ordinance would add considerably to the cost of development. Mr. Duncan estimated that the costs would be about 1% of the total development project, but that many ESD methods can save money in the long run and leave more land available to develop. Mr. Chernikoff asked how the requirements described in the letter compared to LEED requirements. Mr. Duncan indicated that LEED requirements were less stringent.

Several Board members asked about the approval process at the County. Mr. Duncan agreed that it would be difficult at this point in time to influence the opinion of the County Executive.

Mr. Chernikoff and Mr. Cohen both indicated that they did not feel they knew enough about the details of stormwater management to make a recommendation on the specific details in Mr. Duncan's letter. Mr. Cohen said that he would prefer to make a recommendation based on independent analysis or comparisons with ordinances in other locations. Mr. Branyan indicated that the District of Columbia was currently strengthening their requirements for stormwater management. Mr. Duncan suggested that the Board also review the requirements in Portland, where stormwater management ordinances might be the most stringent. Ms. Hofstra and Mr. Branyan agreed to research these two locations. Mr. Cohen and Mr. Orleans both felt that the Board would benefit if someone with technical expertise in stormwater management attended a future meeting. Ms. Hofstra indicated that she would request an extension from the City Council to provide the Board with more time to research the issue. Mr. Cohen indicated that he would invite his colleague, Mr. Schueler, to speak with the Board. The Board supported a motion first, to request a delay from Council to review the issue further, and second, should the Council decide not to grant a delay, to write a letter supporting stream protection in general without commenting on the technical details of Mr. Duncan's letter for lack of sufficient expertise.

The minutes of August 19th and September 2nd were approved without modifications. The meeting was adjourned at 9:10 pm.