

Meeting Objectives

- Review staff progress to add new/improved options for Green Stormwater Infrastructure (GSI)*
- Identify stakeholder interest in further discussions of each option
- * Following up WPO GSI meetings on May 17 & 31, 2013

Potential Improvements

- 1. Best use of storm runoff volume (e.g., conservation & infiltration)
- 2. Rain gardens for single-family residential
- 3. Alternatives for SOS compliance
- Rainwater harvesting for conservation & water quality
- 5. Rainwater harvesting + green roof irrigation (also flood detention credit)
- 6. Porous pavement for non-pedestrian surfaces

Potential Improvements

- Flood detention credit for water quality controls
- 8. Rainwater Harvesting Systems & Impervious Cover Determination
- Artificial Turf & Impervious Cover Determination (New)
- Volumetric flood detention (Drainage Criteria Manual)
- 11. Skinny Streets (Transportation Criteria Manual)

Best Use of Storm Runoff Volume (e.g., Conservation & Infiltration)

➤ Major Imagine Austin Comprehensive Plan goal:

- Green Infrastructure
- Sustainable water resources
- Environmental protection
- Treat water as valued resource
- Use on-site: Conservation & Infiltration
- Maryland model: infiltrate portion of WQ volume
- Others?
- Discuss with stakeholders

Rain Gardens for Single-Family Residential

Staff proposal:

- Allowed:
 - Treat clusters of single-family residences
 - Located in Right-of-Way (ROW), dedicated easement accessible from ROW, or dedicated common lot
 - City to assume maintenance responsibility. Can arrange for residents to provide more frequent mowing, landscaping, etc.
- Not allowed:
 - Individual lot treatment systems [with isolated exceptions]
 - Any system enclosed in private fence
- In a backyard
- Focus: performance → inspectability → access
- Note: is current policy; need update to ECM to formalize

Additional Options for SOS Compliance

Widespread interest in alternatives to retentionirrigation systems

Staff proposal:

- Re-write ECM 1.6.9 (SOS WQ controls) to provide avenue for alternative compliance
- Develop stormwater control calculator tool to support
- Treatment train allowed as alternative to retention-irrigation (e.g., sand filter + infiltration field)

Rainwater Harvesting for Water Quality and Conservation

Staff proposal:

- Develop criteria and spreadsheet calculator to show how to demonstrate "equivalency" of rainwater systems with standard water quality controls
 - Flexibility to release water from tanks longer than allowed under existing criteria (5 days)
- Explain additional options in ECM, e.g., installation of second, separate tank for water conservation.

Rainwater Harvesting + Green Roof Irrigation

Options to use green roofs for stormwater control exist now but are not widely known, lack criteria

Staff proposal:

- Add ECM option to treat water with rainwater harvesting (storage) & green roof (irrigation). Show:
 - Storage of WQ volume;
 - Demonstrate application rate and drawdown time;
 - Demonstrate infiltration rate of green roof;
 - Consider other factors such as ET, flow-back to tank, etc. to show how water moves through and out of the system.
- Add DCM option for rooftop detention

Porous Pavement for Non-pedestrian Surfaces

Water quality credits given for sidewalks and other pedestrian surfaces, but not larger areas such as parking lots and driveways.

Staff proposal:

- Expand ECM criteria to allow WQ credit for porous pavement for non-pedestrian surfaces
- Expected date: Summer or Fall 2014
- Limited to privately maintained facilities (e.g., parking lots and drives and not public roads?)
- Cannot propose over karst/recharge zone

Flood Detention Credit for Water Quality Controls

Water quality controls assist with flood mitigation but need a way to standardize credit during design and permitting.

Staff proposal:

- Staff developing a "quick sheet" calculator tool in spring 2014
- Credit based on standard SCS Unit Hydrograph methodology

Rainwater Harvesting Systems & Impervious Cover Determination

➤ Are rainwater harvesting systems given impervious cover credits for tank and/or catchment areas?

Staff proposal:

- WPO/code clarifies that water quality controls do not count against impervious cover limits. So rainwater tank footprints are counted as pervious
- Staff does not support counting the catchment area as pervious

Artificial Turf & Impervious Cover Determination

> Can artificial turf systems be counted as pervious cover? If so, under what conditions?

Staff interpretation:

- In considering artificial turf and other proposals to count impervious cover as pervious cover, the applicant has to show:
 - No increase in pollutant loads;
 - Same volume, peak flow, timing, and initial abstraction as undeveloped conditions; and
 - There must be connectivity to soils/groundwater

Volumetric Flood Detention

> Volumetric flood detention represents an alternate approach (from peak-matching requirements) to mitigate flood impacts from development. It is not yet included in the Drainage Criteria Manual (DCM).

- Working on draft criteria now with consultant (Freese & Nichols)
- Stakeholder meeting anticipated in Fall 2014

Skinny Streets

> Skinny Streets have a narrower road profile and reduced impervious cover footprint, which can mitigate stormwater impacts as compared to wider, conventional streets.

Status:

• Skinny Streets are being considered as part of larger changes considered in ongoing efforts to revise the Transportation Criteria Manual (TCM)

Contact Information

Mike Kelly

Watershed Protection Department City of Austin

(512) 974-6591

mike.kelly@austintexas.gov

Matt Hollon

Watershed Protection Department

(512) 974-2212

matt.hollon@austintexas.gov

http://austintexas.gov/department/watershed-protection-ordinance