



# CITY COUNCIL MEETING

Donna Pittman-Mayor

Robert J. Patrick-District 1

Trudy Jones Dean – District 2

Karen Pachuta – District 3

Pam Fleming – District 1

Brian Bates – District 2

Maria Alexander – District 3

Mayor Pro-Tem

---

## AGENDA

May 6, 2013 6:30 PM

---

1. CALL TO ORDER
2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE
3. EXECUTIVE SESSION
4. CEREMONIAL PRESENTATIONS, CITY ANNOUNCEMENTS, SPECIAL GUESTS:
5. ROLL CALL
6. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:
7. PUBLIC COMMENTS ON AGENDA ITEMS
8. REPORTS: DEPARTMENTS
  - a) Mayor
  - b) City Attorney
  - c) Stormwater
  - d) Police
  - e) Courts
  - f) Public Works
  - g) Library
  - h) Parks & Recreation
  - i) City Hall
  - j) Planning & Zoning
  - k) IT Department
  - l) Finance
    - Review of Preliminary Pension Cost Calculations
9. PUBLIC HEARING
  - Second Read Ordinance Salary for Part-time Mayor
10. OLD BUSINESS
11. NEW BUSINESS
  - Storm Water Repair Policy
12. EXECUTIVE SESSION



## AGENDA ITEM REQUEST SHEET

**Subject: Review of Preliminary Pension Cost Calculations**

**Date of Meeting:** May 6, 2013

**Budget Impact:** ☒ Yes ☐ N/A

**Budget Impact Amount:** \$\_\_\_\_\_

**Funding Source:**

- ☒ Annual
- ☐ Capital
- ☐ Grant(s)/ Technical Assistance
- ☐ N/A

- Regular ☒
- Work Session ☐
- Recommendation ☐
- Policy/Discussion ☐
- Report ☐
- Ceremonial ☐
- Other ☐

---

**Department:** Finance

**Department Head:** Lisa Ferguson

**Background:**

David Griffin will be here to present the preliminary pension cost calculations for the actuarial valuation of the defined benefit plan. The pension calculations that are attached are not final and may change prior to the May 6th meeting.

**Action Required:**

None.

**PRELIMINARY DRAFT**  
**City of Doraville Retirement Plan**  
**Development of Costs for Fiscal Year Beginning July 1, 2013**

|   | July 1, 2012  | July 1, 2013    |               |                     | July 1, 2013       | July 1, 2013      |
|---|---------------|-----------------|---------------|---------------------|--------------------|-------------------|
|   |               | Old Assumptions | New Mortality | All New Assumptions | 3/19/2013 Scenario | 4/1/2013 Scenario |
| 1. Normal Cost                            | \$ 424,300    | \$ 408,076      | \$ 448,903    | \$ 499,066          | \$ 456,946         | \$ 415,406        |
| 2. Admin Expenses                         | 19,426        | 20,000          | 20,000        | 20,000              | 20,000             | 20,000            |
| 3. Employer Normal Cost (1. + 2.)         | \$ 443,726    | \$ 428,076      | \$ 468,903    | \$ 519,066          | \$ 476,946         | \$ 435,406        |
| 4. Actuarial Accrued Liability (AAL)      | \$ 15,192,645 | \$ 15,644,355   | \$ 17,006,663 | \$ 18,305,199       | \$ 17,051,598      | \$ 15,690,686     |
| 5. Actuarial Value of Assets              | 13,105,502    | 14,086,381      | 14,086,381    | 14,086,381          | 14,086,381         | 14,086,381        |
| 6. Unfunded AAL (4. - 5.)                 | \$ 2,087,143  | \$ 1,557,974    | \$ 2,920,282  | \$ 4,218,818        | \$ 2,965,217       | \$ 1,604,305      |
| 7. UAAL Amortization Period (years)       | 10            | 10              | 10            | 20                  | 30                 | 25                |
| 8. Amortization Factor                    | 7.0445        | 7.0445          | 7.0445        | 11.1397             | 13.1163            | 12.2886           |
| 9. UAAL Amortization (6. / 8.)            | \$ 296,281    | \$ 221,163      | \$ 414,550    | \$ 378,718          | \$ 226,072         | \$ 130,553        |
| 10. Recommended Contribution (3. + 9.)    | \$ 740,007    | \$ 649,239      | \$ 883,453    | \$ 897,784          | \$ 703,018         | \$ 565,959        |
| 11. Adjustment to fiscal year             | \$ 28,140     | \$ 24,689       | \$ 33,595     | \$ 29,805           | \$ 23,339          | \$ 18,789         |
| 12. Total Recommended (10. + 11.)         | \$ 768,147    | \$ 673,928      | \$ 917,048    | \$ 927,589          | \$ 726,357         | \$ 584,748        |
| 13. Expected Payroll                      | \$ 4,463,377  | \$ 3,788,113    | \$ 3,788,113  | \$ 3,734,241        | \$ 3,769,790       | \$ 3,769,790      |
| 14. Contribution as % payroll (12. / 13.) | 17.21%        | 17.79%          | 24.21%        | 24.84%              | 19.27%             | 15.51%            |

**Notes**

July 1, 2012 values from report prepared by Segal, based on January 1, 2012 valuation date.  
July 1, 2013 values calculated by McCready and Keene, based on January 1, 2013 valuation date.  
The New Mortality assumption is RP-2000 projected to 2015 (male/female).  
New Assumptions: updated mortality + updated economic assumptions.  
Due to cost considerations, the UAAL Amortization period is extended to 20 years in the final scenario.

**Notes - 03/19/2013 Scenario**

Salary increases reduced by 1.5% from base scenario. Further reduced by 2.5% for the first three years.  
COLA increase assumption reduced by 1.0% from base scenario, to 2.5%.  
Amortization period extended to 30 years.

**Notes - 4/1/2013 Scenario**

Mortality reset to assumptions determined by Segal in 2010.  
Amortization period adjusted to 25 years.



## THE CITY OF DORAVILLE AGENDA ITEM SHEET

Subject: Salary for Part-time Mayor

Regular Meeting ( x )

Date of Meeting: 3/18/13

Budget Impact: Yes

Budget Impact Amount: \$ TBD

Work Session ( )  
Recommendation ( )  
Policy/Discussion ( )  
Report ( )  
Other ( )

Funding Source:

(X) Annual

( ) Capital

( ) N/A

**CITYOFDORAVILLE CITYOFDORAVILLE CITYOFDORAVILLE CITYOFDORAVILLE CITYOFDORAVILLE**

Determine a salary for the part-time mayor position as the City transitions to a City Manager form of government.

History, Facts, Issues: The City is scheduled to complete its transition to a City Manager/part-time Mayor form of government on 7/1/2013. The transition process begins 4/17/13 as the new City Manager, Dr. Gillen, begins employment. Council recently passed Charter changes that include the removal of certain administrative functions and the supervision of daily operations from the Mayor's position. Those powers, as detailed in the new Charter, will now be entrusted to the City Manager. A salary adjustment for the Mayor will need to be made to accommodate the change to a more ceremonial role. Per the new Charter, the salary may be set by ordinance after a public hearing on the matter.

The Georgia Department of Community Affairs conducts an annual survey of elected officials' salaries. That data may be reviewed at [http://www.dca.state.ga.us/dcaawss/reports/static/2012/2012\\_Muni\\_Elected\\_FINAL.pdf](http://www.dca.state.ga.us/dcaawss/reports/static/2012/2012_Muni_Elected_FINAL.pdf). In addition, I contacted the city clerks for surrounding municipalities to obtain supplemental information on benefits for part-time mayors. Those results are entered into the attached spreadsheet.

Options: 1) Agree to salary and terms for the part-time mayoral position and direct the City Attorney to draft an ordinance for a 7/1/13 start date; 2) Retain the current full-time salary and terms for the Mayor's position.

Recommended Action: Set a reasonable salary for the part-time Mayor's position and direct the City Attorney to draft the necessary ordinance.

Department: City Council

Submitted by: Karen Pachuta

### Mayoral Salaries - Sorted by Population

[illegible]

### Mayoral Salaries - Sorted by Salary

| City  | Population | Mayoral Salary | Health Insurance?         | City cost                                 | Mayoral contribution                      | Expense Account                          | Other benefits  |
|---|------------|----------------|---------------------------|---|---|--|---|
| Alpharetta  | 59,397     | \$ 30,000.00   | Yes                       | same as employees                         | same as employees                         | \$9,000                                  | 457 and 401 plan  |
| Sandy Springs   | 96,856     | \$ 25,000.00   | No                        | N/A                                       | N/A                                       | budget for travel and training           | None  |
| Johns Creek   | 79,192     | \$ 25,000.00   | No                        | N/A                                       | N/A                                       | may submit mileage/meals, approved by CM | None  |
| Smyrna  | 51,982     | \$ 22,800.00   | Yes                       | same as employees                         | same as employees                         | reimbursements for mileage, etc          | Retirement  |
| East Point  | 34,784     | \$ 20,799.00   | Yes                       | for POS:<br>\$339.70 - 730.56<br>for HMO: | for POS:<br>\$194.84 - 993.64<br>for HMO: | \$1300/yr expenses; \$6000 car allowance |   |
| Kennesaw  | 30,196     | \$ 19,200.00   | Yes                       | \$620/mo single<br>\$1560/mo family       | \$52/mo single<br>\$179/mo family         |  |   |
| Marietta  | 57,357     | \$ 18,000.00   | Yes                       | \$337.25/mo single<br>\$828.77/mo family  | \$47.76/mo single<br>\$138.05/mo family   |  |   |
| Brookhaven  | 49,000     | \$ 16,000.00   | they have not decided yet |   |   |  |   |
| Dunwoody  | 46,809     | \$ 16,000.00   | Yes                       | 90%                                       | 10%                                       | \$5000/yr                                | None  |
| Suwanee   | 15,734     | \$ 15,000.00   | No                        | N/A                                       | N/A                                       | No                                       | can elect to participate in retirement                            |
| Woodstock   | 24,346     | \$ 12,000.00   | Yes                       | unknown                                   | unknown                                   | reimbursement for training               | may participate in 457 plan                                       |
| Chamblee*   | 15,500     | \$ 10,800.00   | Yes                       | for family \$1613.78                      | \$34.66                                   |  | health, dental, vision and life                                   |
| Albany  | 77,437     | \$10,000.00    | Yes                       | 75%                                       | 25%                                       | yes; unknown amount                      | Mayor may pay 100% cost of Vision, Life, disability               |
| Duluth  | 27,258     | \$ 9,600.00    | No                        | N/A                                       | N/A                                       | travel reimbursement                     |   |
| Clarkston   | 7,641      | \$ 6,500.00    | Yes; single only          | \$545/mo                                  | \$0                                       | \$3000/yr travel; \$700/yr ed            | officials may pay 100% premium cost to add dependent to insurance |
| Norcross  | 9,340      | \$ 6,400.00    | Yes; single only          |   | \$60/mo                                   |  | if Mayor chooses to opt out of insurance, receives extra \$250/mo |
| Snellville  | 18,686     | \$ 5,000.00    | No                        | N/A                                       | N/A                                       | No                                       | cell phone  |
| Lilburn   | 11,951     | \$ 5,000.00    | No                        | N/A                                       | N/A                                       | \$225 per quarter                        |   |
| Vienna  | 4,000      | \$1,680.00     | No                        | N/A                                       | N/A                                       | reimbursements for expenses              | Retirement  |
| <b>**Additional cities contacted that did not respond:</b>  |            |                |                           |   |   |  |   |
| Roswell   | 91,168     | \$ 40,000.00   |                           |   |   |  |   |
| Riverdale   | 15,251     | \$ 14,400.00   |                           |   |   |  |   |
| Loganville  | 10,601     | \$ 14,000.00   |                           |   |   |  |   |
| Fayetteville  | 16,124     | \$ 11,400.00   |                           |   |   |  |   |
| Dallas  | 11,638     | \$ 10,000.00   |                           |   |   |  |   |
| <b>Notes:</b>   |            |                |                           |   |   |  |   |
| *The mayoral salary for Chamblee is set to raise to \$18,000/yr on 1/1/14.  |            |                |                           |   |   |  |   |
| **Salary data was collected from DCA survey; benefit information was collected by request from each city's city clerk |            |                |                           |   |   |  |   |



## THE CITY OF DORAVILLE AGENDA ITEM SHEET

Subject: **Ordinance to Revise Non-Conforming  
Use Provisions in Zoning Ordinance**

Date of Meeting: January 22, 2013, February, 19, 2013,  
March 4, 2013

Budget Impact: \_\_\_Y \_\_\_X\_\_\_ N

Budget Impact Amount: \$\_\_\_N/A\_\_\_\_\_

|                   |     |
|-------------------|-----|
| Regular Meeting   | (X) |
| Work Session      | ( ) |
| Recommendation    | ( ) |
| Policy/Discussion | (X) |
| Report            | ( ) |
| Other             | ( ) |

Funding Source:

( ) Annual  
( ) Capital  
( ) N/A

**CITYOFDORAVILLE CITYOFDORAVILLE CITYOFDORAVILLE CITYOFDORAVILLE CITYOFDORAVILLE**

**The Mayor and City Council in a March Council Meeting requested a review of the City's Non-conforming use provisions in the Zoning Ordinance. Attached is a draft Ordinance revising certain portions of the Non-Conformity provisions, including recommending deletion of the amortization section, changing certain provisions about how a non-conformity exists and is eliminated and generally creating revisions to a rather standard language utilized by most surrounding jurisdictions and which best comport with the law. One of the changes, from "60%" to "50%" in the provisions for the threshold repairs and other changes to structures needed to remove the nonconformity are at the request of the Council and to initiate a discussion for purposes of reasonability and whether such change is prudent.**

Options: \_\_\_To initiate ZPA process to have the Ordinance reviewed by Planning Commission or recommend changes to bring back at a later meeting.

Recommended Action: \_N/A.

Department: \_Legal

Department Head: \_Cecil G. McLendon, Jr.

Administrative Comments and Recommendation: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Action Taken By Board: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

**13. REPORTS; COMMITTEES, COMMISSIONS, BOARDS AND APPOINTMENTS**

**14. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

**15. ADJOURNMENT**



**STATE OF GEORGIA**

**CITY OF DORAVILLE**

**ORDINANCE NO. 2013-\_\_**

**AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND THE CITY OF DORAVILLE, GEORGIA,  
ZONING ORDINANCE TO REVISE ARTICLE V, NONCONFORMING  
USES; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES**

**WHEREAS**, the Mayor and Council of the City of Doraville are charged with preserving the health, safety and welfare of the citizens of the City; and

**WHEREAS**, Chapter 23, Zoning, currently contains Article V addressing Nonconforming Uses; and

**WHEREAS**, said Zoning Ordinance addressing Nonconforming Uses has the intent to permit current nonconforming uses to continue until they are removed, but that such uses shall not be enlarged upon, expanded or extended; and

**WHEREAS**, the Mayor and City Council, in order to clarify the Zoning Ordinance, desires to revise said Article; and

**WHEREAS**, a properly advertised public hearing pursuant to the requirements of the Georgia Zoning Procedures Act has been held on \_\_\_\_\_, 2013, and the adoption of this Zoning Amendment is proper pursuant to the requirements of the ZPA.

**THEREFORE, THE MAYOR AND COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF DORAVILLE,  
GEORGIA HEREBY ORDAIN:**

**Section 1**

**Chapter 23 (“Zoning”) of the Code of Ordinances, City of Doraville, is hereby amended by revising Article V (“Nonconforming Uses”), Sections 23-503 and 23-504, to read as follows:**

***Sec. 23-503.***

*Where a lawful structure exists at the effective date of adoption or amendment of this Chapter that could not be built under the terms of this Chapter due to restrictions on area, lot coverage, height, yards, its location on the lot, or other requirements*

concerning the structure, such structure may be continued so long as it remains otherwise lawful, subject to the following provisions:

- (1) No such nonconforming structure may be enlarged or altered in a way which increases its nonconformity, but any structure or portion thereof may be altered to decrease its nonconformity.
- (2) Should such nonconforming structure or nonconforming portion of structure be destroyed by any means to an extent of more than ~~fifty-sixty~~ (560) percent of its replacement cost at time of destruction, it shall not be reconstructed except in conformity with the provisions of this Chapter.
- (3) Should such structure be moved for any reason for any distance whatever, it shall thereafter conform to the regulations for the district in which it is located after it is moved.

#### **Sec. 23-504**

If lawful use involving individual structures with a replacement cost of one thousand dollars (\$1,000.00) or more, or a structure and premises in combination, exists at the effective date of adoption or amendment of this Chapter, the lawful use may be continued so long as it remains lawful subject to the following provisions:

- (1) No existing structure devoted to a use not permitted by this Chapter in the district in which it is located shall be enlarged, extended, constructed, reconstructed, moved, or structurally altered except in changing the use of the structure to a use permitted in the district in which it is located;
- (2) Any nonconforming use ~~may be extended throughout any parts of a building which were manifestly arranged or designed for such use at the time of adoption or amendment of this chapter~~ cannot be expanded to occupy a greater area of land or building area, may continue only in the original building or structure or land area that was originally occupied by the nonconforming use, and but no such nonconforming use ~~may~~shall be extended to occupy any land outside such building or structure;

~~(3) If no structural alterations are made, any nonconforming use of a structure, or structure and premises, may be changed to another nonconforming use provided that the City Council, either by general rule or by making findings in the specific case, shall find that the proposed use is equally appropriate or more appropriate to the district than the existing nonconforming use. In permitting such change, the City Council may require appropriate conditions and safeguards in accord with the provisions of this chapter;~~

(34) Any structure, or structure and land in combination, in or on which a nonconforming use is superseded by a permitted use, shall thereafter conform to the regulations for the district, and the nonconforming use may not thereafter be resumed;

(45) When a nonconforming use of a structure, or structure and premises in combination, is discontinued or abandoned for six (6) months (except when government action impedes access to the premises), the structure, or structure and premises in combination, shall not thereafter be used except in conformity with the regulations of the district in which it is located and all other applicable provisions of this Chapter;

(56) Where nonconforming use status applies to a structure and premises in combination, removal or destruction of the structure shall eliminate the nonconforming status of the land. Destruction for the purpose of this subsection is defined as damage to an extent of more than ~~sixty-fifty~~ (6050) percent of the replacement cost at time of destruction.

(67) Structures incurring damage of less than ~~sixty-fifty~~ (6050) percent of fair market value ~~above the foundation~~ may be restored, reconstructed and used as before, provided that such restoration is commenced within ~~six-three~~ (36) calendar months from the date damages were incurred. If reconstruction is not commenced within ~~threesix~~ (36) months, the use of said land or structure shall thereafter conform to the provisions of this Chapter. Fair market value shall be determined by reference to current statutory provisions pertaining to real estate assessment and the records of the county assessor.

## **Section 2:**

Chapter 23 (“Zoning”) of the Code of Ordinances, City of Doraville, is hereby amended by revising Article V (“Nonconforming Uses”) by deleting Section 23-506 in its entirety and leaving it “Reserved.”

## **Section 3**

a. It is hereby declared to be the intention of the Mayor and Council that all sections, paragraphs, sentences, clauses and phrases of this Ordinance are or were, upon their enactment, believed by the Mayor and Council to be fully valid, enforceable and constitutional.

b. It is hereby declared to be the intention of the Mayor and Council that, to the greatest extent allowed by law, each and every section, paragraph, sentence, clause or phrase of this Ordinance is severable from every other section, paragraph, sentence, clause or phrase of this Ordinance. It is hereby further declared to be the intention of the Mayor and Council that, to the greatest extent allowed by law, no section, paragraph, sentence, clause or phrase of this Ordinance is mutually dependent upon any other section paragraph, sentence, clause or phrase of this Ordinance.

c. In the event that any phrase, clause, sentence, paragraph or section of this Ordinance shall, for any reason whatsoever, be declared invalid, unconstitutional or otherwise unenforceable by the valid judgment or decree of any court of competent jurisdiction, it is the express intent of the Mayor and Council that such invalidity, unconstitutionality or unenforceability shall, to the greatest extent allowed by law, not render invalid, unconstitutional or otherwise unenforceable any of the remaining phrases, clauses, sentences, paragraphs or sections of the Ordinance and that, to the greatest extent allowed by law, all remaining phrases, clauses, sentences, paragraphs and sections of the Ordinance shall remain valid, constitutional, enforceable, and of full force and effect.

## **Section 4**

All ordinances or parts of ordinances in conflict herewith are hereby expressly repealed.

**Section 5**

This Ordinance shall be codified in accordance with state law and the Code of the City of Doraville, Georgia. This Ordinance shall become effective upon its adoption by the Mayor and Council.

SO ORDAINED, this \_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2013.

**CITY OF DORAVILLE, GEORGIA**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Mayor

\_\_\_\_\_  
First Reading

\_\_\_\_\_  
Second Reading

ATTEST:

\_\_\_\_\_(SEAL)  
Sandra Bryant, Acting City Clerk

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Cecil G. McLendon, Jr., City Attorney

|                  | Yea                      | Nay                      |
|------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Maria Alexander  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Brian Bates      | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Pam Fleming      | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Karen Pachuta    | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Trudy Jones Dean | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Robert Patrick   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

**STATE OF GEORGIA**

**CITY OF DORAVILLE**

**ORDINANCE NO. 2013-\_\_**

AN ORDINANCE TO REVISE CHAPTER 2 (“ADMINISTRATION”), ARTICLE II (“CITY COUNCIL”) AND III (“MAYOR”) TO ADOPT SALARIES AND EXPENSES FOR MAYOR AND COUNCIL PURSUANT TO THE CHARTER; TO PROVIDE FOR REPEAL OF CONFLICTING ORDINANCES; TO PROVIDE FOR AN ADOPTION AND EFFECTIVE DATE; TO PROVIDE FOR CODIFICATION; AND TO PROVIDE FOR OTHER LAWFUL PURPOSES

**WHEREAS**, the Georgia Legislature adopted House Bill 544 in 2011, and the voters approved same by Referendum in November, 2011, to provide a change in the Charter for the City of Doraville to provide for a new position of City Manager and a transition of the Mayor’s position to be changed from full-time to part-time; and

**WHEREAS**, pursuant to said authority, the Mayor and City Council amended the City’s Charter by Home Rule to provide, among other things, that the Mayor and Council’s salaries and expenses would hereafter be prescribed by Ordinance; and

**WHEREAS**, in order to ensure that proper salaries for Mayor and Council are established by the July 1, 2013 effective date of the new Charter revisions, the Mayor and City Council wish to provide for same in this Ordinance; and

**WHEREAS**, in accordance with the revised Charter provisions, the Mayor and City Council held a Public Hearing on the contents of this Ordinance on \_\_\_\_\_, 2013, prior to its adoption.

**THEREFORE, THE MAYOR AND COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF DORAVILLE, GEORGIA HEREBY ORDAIN:**

**Section 1**

That the Code of Ordinances for the City of Doraville, Georgia, is hereby amended by revising Chapter 2 (“Administration”), Article II (“City Council”), by adding a new Section 2-43, to read as follows:

***Sec. 2-43. Council Salaries; Expenses; Benefits.***

*(a) The salary of each member of the elected City Council shall be \$8,400 per year, paid in accordance with the established pay periods of all other employees of the City.*

*(b) Each member of the City Council shall be afforded \$250 in expenses per year, reimbursed pursuant to the established policy and ordinances of the City.*

*Qualified expenditures shall be categorized as follows:*

- (1) General Office supplies necessary for the performance of Council duties;*
- (2) Travel expenses to educational seminars and conferences as provided by the yearly budget appropriation, including per diem meal expenses in accordance with the City’s policies and mileage reimbursement;*
- (3) Professional memberships necessary for the performances of their duties as Councilmembers;*
- (4) Educational materials, as well as copying and printing costs, necessary for the performance of their duties;*
- (5) Business meals;*
- (6) Customary mileage reimbursement while performing their duties as Councilmembers, excluding travel to and from the City Council regular Meeting Location;*
- (7) Use of cellular phone for performance of Council duties; and*

- (8) *Other expenses as specifically provided in the yearly budget.*
- (c) *Each Councilmember shall be entitled to participate in the group benefits afforded each employee of the City, with the exception that each Councilmember shall be responsible for payment of 100% of the premiums for said benefits.*

## **Section 2**

That the Code of Ordinances for the City of Doraville, Georgia, is hereby further amended by revising Chapter 2 (“Administration”), Article III (“Mayor”), by adding a new Section 2-64, to read as follows:

### ***Sec. 2-64. Mayor’s Salary; Expenses; Benefits.***

- (a) *The salary of the Mayor shall be \$14,800 per year, paid in accordance with the established pay periods of all other employees of the City.*
- (b) *The Mayor shall be afforded \$3,000 in expenses per year, reimbursed pursuant to the established policy and ordinances of the City. Qualified expenditures shall be categorized as follows:*
  - (1) *General Office supplies necessary for the performance of Mayoral duties duties;*
  - (2) *Travel expenses to educational seminars and conferences as provided by the yearly budget appropriation, including per diem meal expenses in accordance with the City’s policies and mileage reimbursement;*
  - (3) *Professional memberships necessary for the performances of his/her duties as Mayor.*
  - (4) *Educational materials, as well as copying and printing costs, necessary for the performance of his/her duties;*



- (5) *Business meals;*
  - (6) *Customary mileage reimbursement while performing his/her duties as Mayor, excluding travel to and from the City Council regular Meeting Location;*
  - (7) *Use of Cell Phone for performing Mayoral duties; and*
  - (8) *Other expenses as specifically provided in the yearly budget.*
- (c) *The Mayor shall be entitled to participate in the group benefits afforded each employee of the City, with the exception that the Mayor shall be responsible for payment of 100% of the premiums for said benefits.*

### **Section 3**

That the Code of Ordinances for the City of Doraville, Georgia, is hereby further amended by deleting Section 2-191 in its entirety.

### **Section 4**

a. It is hereby declared to be the intention of the Mayor and Council that all sections, paragraphs, sentences, clauses and phrases of this Ordinance are or were, upon their enactment, believed by the Mayor and Council to be fully valid, enforceable and constitutional.

b. It is hereby declared to be the intention of the Mayor and Council that, to the greatest extent allowed by law, each and every section, paragraph, sentence, clause or phrase of this Ordinance is severable from every other section, paragraph, sentence, clause or phrase of this Ordinance. It is hereby further declared to be the intention of the Mayor and Council that, to the greatest extent allowed by law, no section, paragraph, sentence, clause or phrase of this Ordinance is mutually dependent upon any other section paragraph, sentence, clause or phrase of this Ordinance.

c. In the event that any phrase, clause, sentence, paragraph or section of this Ordinance shall, for any reason whatsoever, be declared invalid, unconstitutional or otherwise unenforceable by the valid judgment or decree of any court of competent jurisdiction, it is the express intent of the Mayor and Council that such invalidity, unconstitutionality or unenforceability shall, to the greatest extent allowed by law, not render invalid, unconstitutional or otherwise unenforceable any of the remaining phrases, clauses, sentences, paragraphs or sections of the Ordinance and that, to the greatest extent allowed by law, all remaining phrases, clauses, sentences, paragraphs and sections of the Ordinance shall remain valid, constitutional, enforceable, and of full force and effect.

**Section 5**

All ordinances or parts of ordinances in conflict herewith are hereby expressly repealed.

**Section 6**

This Ordinance shall be codified in accordance with state law and the Code of the City of Doraville, Georgia. With the exception of Section 3, which shall be effective immediately upon adoption, this Ordinance shall become effective on July 1, 2013.

SO ORDAINED, this \_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2013.

**CITY OF DORAVILLE, GEORGIA**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Mayor

\_\_\_\_\_  
First Reading

\_\_\_\_\_  
Second Reading

ATTEST:

\_\_\_\_\_(SEAL)

Sandra Bryant, Acting City Clerk

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

---

Cecil G. McLendon, Jr., City Attorney

|                  | Yea                      | Nay                      |
|------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Maria Alexander  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Brian Bates      | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Pam Fleming      | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Karen Pachuta    | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Trudy Jones Dean | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Robert Patrick   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |



## THE CITY OF DORAVILLE AGENDA ITEM SHEET

Subject: Storm Water Repair Policy

Date of Meeting: 5/6/13

Budget Impact: ☒ Yes ☐ No

Budget Impact Amount: \$ Unknown

Funding Source:

☐ Annual ☒ Capital ☐ Grant ☐ N/A

Regular Meeting ☒  
Work Session ☐  
Recommendation ☐  
Policy/Discussion ☐  
Report ☐  
Other ☐

**CITYOFDORAVILLE CITYOFDORAVILLE CITYOFDORAVILLE CITYOFDORAVILLE CITYOFDORAVILLE**

### Action Requested:

We have several failing storm water pipes that are occurring on private property, but either come from or lead to public storm water structures.

### History, Facts, Issues:

Many of these "private" storm water pipes were installed by the city or developer when the subdivisions were built. They are typically corrugated metal pipes under yards and driveways and many are now failing or have failed. The city needs to create and adopt a policy that clearly spells what the city is responsible, what they city is responsible for with necessary easements, and what property owners are responsible for. There are two documents attached pertaining to this, Sandy Spring policy and Chapter 7 of the Georgia Storm Water Management Manual, specifically on establishing a maintenance policy (starts on page 3, section 7-2).

Options: \_\_\_\_\_

### Recommended Action:

Have Storm Water and Public Works, along with City Manager propose policy options and cost scenarios for consideration.

Department: \_\_\_\_\_ Department Head: \_\_\_\_\_

Administrative Comments and Recommendation: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Action Taken By Board: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

# STORMWATER SYSTEM OPERATION & MAINTENANCE

## 7.1 Local Stormwater Operations and Maintenance Programs

### 7.1.1 Introduction

An essential component of a comprehensive stormwater management program is the ongoing operation and maintenance of the various components of the stormwater drainage, control, and conveyance systems. Failure to provide effective maintenance can reduce the hydraulic capacity and the pollutant removal efficiency of stormwater controls and conveyance systems.

The question is not whether stormwater management system maintenance is necessary in a community. Rather, the question is how a community's maintenance programs will be budgeted, staffed, and administered, and who has responsibility for managing inspections, scheduling periodic required maintenance, and funding remedial work. Ideally, a local program should address operations and maintenance concerns proactively instead of reacting to problems that occur such as flooding or water quality degradation.

Operations and maintenance activities can include cleaning and maintenance of catch basins, drainage swales, open channels, storm sewer pipes, stormwater ponds, and other structural controls. Street sweeping and certain other pollution reduction activities such as illicit discharge identification and removal also fall under operations and maintenance activities. Stormwater system operations and maintenance can also include the retrofitting of existing development to meet water quality and/or water quantity goals and streambank restoration.

A clear assignment of stormwater inspection and maintenance responsibilities, whether they be accomplished by the local government, land owners, private concerns, or a combination of these, is essential to ensuring that stormwater management systems function as they were intended. It is imperative that communities require the maintenance of private stormwater systems and develop the necessary legal framework to ensure compliance.

### 7.1.2 Key Maintenance Program Components

Most people expect that stormwater conveyance and control facilities will continue to function correctly as designed forever. However, it is inevitable that deterioration of the stormwater infrastructure will occur once it becomes operational. On-going maintenance is a vital part of ensuring the operational success of stormwater management facilities, and is critical to achieving an extended service life of continuous operation as designed.

There are three key components to adequately maintaining a community's stormwater management infrastructure:

- Inventory of stormwater system components;
- Periodic and scheduled inspections; and
- Maintenance scheduling and performance

---

### System Inventory

Without knowledge of the type and locations of stormwater infrastructure components, no comprehensive maintenance plan can be developed. Necessary information required in a stormwater management system inventory are facility and conveyance locations, elevations, outfalls, contributing drainage, receiving drainage, control structures, material types, vegetative species and any other pertinent information necessary to defining the kind of maintenance required for the facility or conveyance. This type of information is easily incorporated into a GIS system database. Included in the database can be dates on previous inspections, inspection findings, maintenance dates, specific tasks performed, and digital photos of the structure or conveyance. The system inventory process is a costly and intensive effort. It is absolutely imperative, however, for any effective long-term and cost-effective maintenance program. See Chapter 9 for a more in-depth discussion of stormwater system inventories and geographic information tools.

### Inspections

It is clear that an inspection program is necessary to ensure a stormwater facility or conveyance remains operational. Inspections should be performed on a regular basis and scheduled based on the stormwater control type and characteristics. In addition, inspections should occur after major rainfall events for those components deemed to be critically affected by the resulting runoff. Not all inspections can be conducted by direct human observation. For subsurface systems video equipment may be required. There may be cases where other specialized equipment is necessary. The inspection program is tailored to address the operational characteristics of the system.

It is not mandatory that all inspectors be trained engineers, but they should have some knowledge or experience with stormwater systems. Trained stormwater engineers should, however, direct them. Inspections by registered engineers should be performed where routine inspection has revealed a question of structural or hydraulic integrity affecting public safety.

The inspection process should document observations made in the field. Comments should be archived on structural conditions, hydraulic operational conditions, evidence of vandalism, condition of vegetation, occurrence of obstructions, unsafe conditions, and build-up of trash, sediments and pollutants. This is also an efficient way to take water quality measurements required for monitoring programs and to incorporate them into the inspection history. The inspection data should be ideally incorporated into the GIS, if possible, as it allows spatial identification of where maintenance activities are required. Trends may be identified in this way that can assist a community in tracking down specific problem system components.

### Maintenance Scheduling and Performance

Maintenance activities can be divided into two types: scheduled and corrective. Scheduled maintenance tasks are those that are typically accomplished on a regular basis and can generally be scheduled without referencing inspection reports. These items consist of such things as vegetation maintenance (such as grass mowing) and trash and debris removal. These tasks are required at well-defined time intervals and can be considered a given for most, if not all, stormwater structural facilities. A permanent maintenance crew is typically put under a fixed scope of responsibility to address these items.

Corrective tasks consist of items such as sediment removal, stream bank stabilization, and outlet structure repairs that are done on an as-needed basis. These tasks are typically scheduled based on inspection results or in response to complaints. Corrective maintenance sometimes calls for more specialized expertise and equipment than for scheduled tasks. For example, a task such as sediment removal from a stormwater pond requires specialized equipment for which not every jurisdiction is willing to invest. Therefore, some maintenance tasks might be effectively handed on a contract basis with an outside entity specializing in that field. In addition, some corrective maintenance may also require a formal design and bid process to accomplish the work.

---

## 7.2 Implementing An Effective Operation and Maintenance Program

### 7.2.1 Maintenance Responsibility

Communities must make decisions concerning the construction, operation and maintenance of the stormwater management infrastructure. For which parts of the stormwater system should the local government be responsible? What services should the local government provide to various parts of a stormwater management system? How do we define exactly what makes up the stormwater management system? And how do we transform our current maintenance policies to a newer definition of responsibility?

Unmaintained stormwater facilities will eventually fail operationally. A major contributor to unmaintained facilities is a lack of clear ownership and responsibility definition. In order for an inspection and maintenance program to be effective, the roles for each responsibility must be clearly defined prior to construction of a system. The lead role in determining what responsibilities belong to whom lies with the local government. Several different approaches are possible and are briefly described below. A community must determine which approach best suits its capabilities, both physically and financially.

#### Limited local responsibility

The narrowest approach for communities to take in defining responsibilities for stormwater systems would be for the local government to accept responsibility only for property owned by the community. This would include the right-of-way and any other publicly owned land such as local facilities and parks. With this approach, the community would not be involved with any stormwater systems on private property, except for possible regulatory action.

While this approach may seem most easily defined, there are some drawbacks. Parties who have little knowledge or funding to maintain stormwater systems, own many of the stormwater system components that are on private land. For example, many residential subdivisions contain a stormwater pond, frequently located on one of the less desirable lots. The homeowners association is typically the owner of such a pond. These groups generally have little understanding of the purpose of the pond and how it operates, and have even less funding available to repair and maintain it. The stormwater pond will typically fall into disrepair and become overgrown with vegetation and lose any viable functionality. Many light commercial stormwater systems also fall into this same state for the same reasons.

If a community decides to use the approach of limited local responsibility, the local government will have to put forth some effort to prevent these drawbacks from occurring. It may be possible for the community to make this approach work with a proactive inspection program to review private systems, and a strong public education program to insure that owners understand their responsibility and perform their required duties. Private owners should also be made aware of the need to plan how they will fund their maintenance programs. For the residential example above, dues to the homeowners association could be earmarked for maintenance.

#### Expanded local responsibility

In addition to maintaining and operating publicly owned stormwater systems, the community may determine that it should maintain and operate some of the private portions of the system. This approach could be chosen in an attempt to eliminate the problems mentioned above.

The difficulty with expanding the responsibility of the local government is in determining where to end local responsibility and how to fund the extra responsibilities. These decisions must be made in a fair and equitable manner. One option for this approach would be for the community to accept operation and maintenance responsibilities for all residential stormwater systems, but not for any commercial or industrial systems.

---

### Comprehensive local responsibility

The opposite of a limited approach would be a comprehensive approach, where the community conducts all operation and maintenance activities for stormwater systems within its jurisdictional boundaries. This type of approach may be deemed to be the best approach if the community has serious nonpoint source pollution issues, especially if there is a possibility of regulatory action by the federal or state government. This type of approach would also be well suited to the community that has a stormwater utility in place and/or operates and maintains regional stormwater management systems instead of a myriad of small on-site systems. Because of the inherent problems associated with private maintenance responsibilities, the most efficient organizational structure would be to give the jurisdiction ownership or easement access to the stormwater system. This would place the responsibility for the overall stormwater system with one entity. A comprehensive and cohesive program could be developed and implemented by the jurisdiction for inspection and maintenance.

The most difficult aspect of this approach may be how it would be funded. Options for funding could include a stormwater utility fee based on the amount of stormwater and pollution contributed by each site, or a tax that would pay for the facilities that served the general public. Of the above given approaches to local responsibility, each community must determine the amount of responsibility and effort it is willing to commit in order to provide adequate stormwater management. A local government could choose one of the approaches described above, or could choose some point between. Whichever approach is chosen, the decision must be carefully considered and open for change with time and experience. A stormwater management system should have ownership and maintenance responsibilities clearly defined from the initial stages of design. It should be clear and unequivocal what entity has responsibility for each portion of the system.

### **7.2.2 Level of Service**

In addition to determining the extent of responsibility that a community is willing to assume, a decision must be made about how the stormwater system will serve the community. This decision determines the *level of service* (or LOS) that the system must achieve. The level of service is defined two ways: performance level of service and maintenance level of service.

The susceptibility of a community to flooding or water quality problems due to stormwater can be measured by assessing the performance level of service available. For example, for flooding issues, a level of service can be expressed in terms of the degree of roadway flooding and/or the extent of first floor flooding for a given hypothetical storm event. For some communities, a level of roadway service may be defined as no less than one open lane on evacuation routes during the largest one-day rain event with a 25-year recurrence interval. LOS definitions vary considerably by community and are defined as a design frequency tied to a specified condition (e.g. the 10-year storm design frequency for culvert overtopping). Compared to a flooding LOS, the concept of a water quality level of service is fairly new. A water quality LOS system might promote land use controls, followed by structural treatment measures, and may penalize untreated discharge from urban areas.

A maintenance level of service is defined by the types of services a community will provide to different parts of the drainage system or by the specific condition of the system. For example, within the right-of-way and in critical areas highly susceptible to flood damages, the maintenance level of service might include periodic inspection, priority cleaning and the highest level of emergency response. In similar right-of-way areas not susceptible to flooding, the level of service for maintenance might be much lower. A community might perform maintenance for residential structural stormwater controls, but only provide inspection and enforcement of maintenance agreements for structural controls located on non-residential parcels.

Maintenance levels of service can also be defined in terms of the condition of the system. Channel mowing may take place when the grass is about 8" high. Or culverts might be cleaned out when they are, on average, 20% blocked with sediment. In these cases inspection of the systems drives work orders rather than flooding complaints.



---

The extent or responsibility and level of service combine to define the capital project (construction or land acquisition) and operation and maintenance programs. For example, it might be that on private land a local government is only willing, and only has the resources, to perform emergency response services and to give technical advice. But in the high priority public right-of-way areas the local government may be willing to provide a much higher level of service. If a community chooses a low-level stormwater maintenance program with minimal responsibilities it should anticipate increasing complaints and an unknown but growing backlog of unmet capital construction and remedial maintenance needs. No stormwater management system can function for long without adequate attention. Maintenance avoided is simply maintenance deferred.

### **7.2.3 Establishing Maintenance Responsibility and Level of Service Policies**

A drainage system, starting from the headwaters and moving downstream toward the mouth, carries incrementally larger and larger flows. The extent of responsibility policy seeks to define the point in this dendritic system between local government and private responsibility. The basic components and limits of that responsibility are also defined in extent of service.

The extent of responsibility will almost certainly change over time, both in terms of the local government's policies and the application of those policies. For example, in terms of routine maintenance of the systems, the extent of responsibility may consistently be limited to those components within rights-of-way and easements which allow adequate access to the facilities, but rights-of-way and easements will be added over the years, so the practical extent of responsibility will expand even if the policy does not change.

The extent of responsibility for regulatory activities must go far beyond the rights-of-way and easements to meet the local government's stormwater quantity and quality control responsibilities. Often the community must determine its regulatory extent of responsibility (through its authority for land use control) based on what must, or can, be done on private property in order to protect the general public health, safety, and welfare.

How far into the system should a local government provide service? All of the drainage system can be categorized according to location, conveyance and legal standing:

- In or outside the public right-of-way;
- Does, or does not contain significant public water; and
- Is or is not within a permanent dedicated drainage easement.

Thus, there are four "policy" categories of drainage system:

- (1) In the right-of-way;
- (2) Outside the right-of-way, carrying public water and within an easement;
- (3) Outside the right-of-way, carrying public water but not within an easement; and
- (4) Totally private systems.

Based on its definition of the system components, the community can determine how it will handle the various portions of the drainage system. Generally:

- The minimal extent of responsibility is within the public right-of-way. Every local government has a public health and safety responsibility to keep its traveled way open to traffic and free from dangerous amounts of standing water.
- Often communities also provide maintenance service, of some sort, within permanent drainage easements. This is especially the case when there is both public water and a public interest in keeping a certain drainageway functional.
- Some also have established the policy that they will provide some service to other parts of the drainage system that carry public water (i.e. downstream from the first public street). In other locations, only an inspection and enforcement service is provided outside the right-of-way and easements.
- Most communities will respond to any location whatsoever in an emergency situation.

---

When developing changes to a maintenance program it is helpful to remember these three basic steps:

**(1) Define Program**

- Determine segment category definitions
- Determine level-of-service and policy definitions
- Determine resource demands and available budget
- Develop policies for each segment category

**(2) Define System**

- Inventory and map stormwater management system
- Identify "official" system (right-of-way & key outside ROW segments)
- Assign segments to system

**(3) Initiate Changes**

- Begin changes in service
- Expand slowly as experience is gained

## **7.2.4 Maintenance Agreements**

Whenever stormwater structural control implementation is required, maintenance requirements must be explicitly stated and enforced. There should also be some type of compliance mechanism to assure that maintenance is actually performed on a regular or as-required basis.

One method for ensuring maintenance is the implementation of a stormwater operating permit system and/or maintenance agreements. This kind of system would produce information for inclusion in a stormwater inventory database thus adding to the efficiency of a local maintenance program as well as providing a funding mechanism through permit fees. Some key aspects of these permits or maintenance agreements is the clear delineation of responsibilities, such as:

- Identification of who will perform inspection duties and how often.
- Listed duties that are to be performed by the owner, such as mowing, debris removal, and replanting of vegetation.
- Defined roles for the local government, possibly inspection, and/or modifications to the system such as resizing an orifice.
- Determination of a recourse of action to be taken if the owner does not fulfill their obligations (i.e. repayment to the local government for activities that the owner did not perform).
- Development of a pollution prevention plan by the owner.
- Requirement of a report, possibly annually, that would serve to keep the owner involved and aware of their responsibilities.

For example, a permit or maintenance agreement could specify that the local government accepts responsibility for inspecting and maintaining the stormwater system's structural components, including the periodic removal of debris and accumulated sediments. However, vegetative and aesthetic maintenance would still rest with the private entity.

An example maintenance agreement is included in Appendix C.

## **7.2.5 Education**

One of the most important ways to assure the regular inspection and maintenance of the stormwater infrastructure is through education programs for both private owners and the general public. The public can be helpful or detrimental to the success of the community's stormwater management program.

---

A good example of the need for public education is residents who use the ditch behind their house to dispose of grass clippings and vegetative debris. This debris can then block a pipe inlet and cause flooding, or cover an infiltration trench and cause excessive runoff. Another common problem is individuals disposing of materials by discharging them into the stormwater catch basins. Citizens need to be informed that sediment, vegetative material and harmful substances should not be dumped into catch basins but must be disposed of properly. In many cases, once the public is informed of the purpose of the system and the need to properly maintain the system, they are less likely to perform acts that inhibit the system or cause adverse impacts.

An additional benefit of an educated public is the opportunity to have many more "inspectors" who will alert system operators of potential problems prior to catastrophic failure. As part of an effective education component, the public should be informed of signs to be aware of that may indicate serious problems. If a citizen is told that the dry detention pond behind his house should not have standing water at all times or should not fill to the top of the dam after every rain event, he or she would then know to alert the proper authorities and could prevent possible damage to life or property.

In addition to public education for publicly owned or operated systems, education can be very important for privately owned systems. Once stormwater structural controls are installed, the end-user or owner may not be aware of the necessity of the facilities or the consequences of a failed system. As part of the public education, it is vital that private owners be educated to understand and become proactive in the operation and maintenance of their system. It is in the best interest of the public to make the owners of private stormwater systems aware of the responsibility that goes with ownership and the effect that failure could have on public health and safety.

### **7.2.6 Periodic Review of Regulations and Procedures**

Once a community's stormwater management operation and maintenance program has been developed and implemented, it may become apparent that changes or modifications are necessary to make the program more effective. After the initial implementation of the operation and maintenance program, review of the program should be scheduled one to two years after implementation. After the initial review, additional reviews may be scheduled in three to five-year intervals. Reviews should include input from staff members who are performing the various activities.

Following are some examples of issues that may arise during the review:

- The system inventory may not be complete or up-to-date
- Inspection scheduling may need to be revised for more or less frequent inspections for all or only specific types of systems
- Inspection checklists may need modification
- Maintenance activities may need to be modified
- Some systems or system components allowed may need to be deleted based upon experiences
- Some systems or system components allowed may need to be added based on new techniques or developments
- Additional equipment may be necessary to perform duties adequately

## **7.3 Stormwater Retrofitting**

### **7.3.1 Introduction**

Ideally, as land is developed structural controls are implemented to control present and future stormwater runoff impacts. However, controlling stormwater from new development and redevelopment alone will not solve existing problems. Retrofitting by definition is the process by which structural controls are constructed to serve and reduce the water quantity and quality impacts from *existing* developed areas.

---

Due to the fact that they are intended to serve existing problem areas, retrofits are typically the responsibility of the local government who must mitigate property flooding, reduce streambank erosion, or comply with TMDL or other water quality regulatory requirements.

Retrofits must be integrated with existing and often diverse urban development, and they assume a wider range of forms than structural controls installed during new development. Space constraints, construction costs, acquisition of easements, safety precautions, economic vitality, and property rights all compete with the need to reduce nutrient loadings in the urban environment.

### **7.3.2 Stormwater Retrofitting Process**

Stormwater retrofitting is ideally performed as a part of an overall watershed planning and implementation effort. When applied along with other available water restoration strategies such as pollutant reduction, habitat restoration, and morphologic stabilization, retrofitting can be most effective. The following eight steps detail a “how-to” approach to retrofitting.

#### **Step 1: Watershed Retrofit Inventory**

The first step to putting a retrofit in place is locating and identifying where it is feasible and appropriate to put a proposed facility. This involves a process of identifying as many potential sites as possible. The best retrofit sites fit easily into the existing landscape, are located at or near major drainage or stormwater control facilities, and are easily accessible. Usually the first step is completed in the office using available topographic mapping, low altitude aerial photographs (where available), storm drain master plans, and land use maps (zoning or tax maps are generally acceptable).

Before venturing into the field, there are two tasks that should be performed. First, the drainage areas should be delineated, and second, the potential surface area of the facility measured. The drainage area is used to compute a capture ratio. This is the percentage of the overall watershed that is being managed by the retrofit project(s). The surface area is used to compute a preliminary storage volume of the proposed facility. These two bits of information can be used as a quick screening tool. In general, an effective retrofitting strategy must capture at least 50% of the watershed, and the minimum target storage volume for each retrofit is approximately 0.5 inch per impervious acre.

#### **Step 2: Field Verification of Candidate Sites**

Candidate retrofit sites from Step 1 are field investigated to verify that they are indeed feasible candidate sites. This field investigation involves a careful assessment of site specific information such as:

- Presence of sensitive environmental features
- Location of existing utilities
- Type of adjacent land uses
- Condition of receiving waters
- Construction and maintenance access opportunities, and most importantly,
- Evaluation of retrofit suitability

Usually a conceptual sketch is prepared and photographs are taken. During field verification, utilities should be located and an assessment made as to potential conflicts. Avoidance should be stressed due to cost considerations. It may also be appropriate to contact the appropriate utility to verify field observations and to discuss the potential facility. This may alleviate potential conflicts later.

Existing natural resources such as wetlands, streams, and forests should be evaluated as to their sensitivity. Avoidance and /or minimization of impacts where feasible should be considered. Finally, identify, review and assess adjacent land uses for consideration of structural controls that are compatible with nearby properties.

---

### Step 3: Prioritize Sites for Implementation

Once sites have been located and determined to be feasible and practical, the next step is to set up a plan for future implementation. It is prudent to have an implementation strategy based on a predetermined set of objectives. For example, in some watersheds, implementation may be based on a strategy of reducing pollutant loads to receiving waters where the priority of retrofitting might be to go after the highest polluting land uses first. Whereas if the strategy is oriented more towards restoring stream channel morphology, priority retrofits are targeted to capture the largest drainage areas and provide the most storage. Whatever the restoration focus, it is useful to provide a scoring system that can be used to rank each retrofit site based on a uniform criteria. A typical scoring system might include a score for the following items:

- Pollutant removal capability
- Stream channel protection capability
- Flood protection control capability
- Cost of facility (design, construction and maintenance costs)
- Ability to implement the project (land ownership, construction access, permits)
- Potential for public benefit (education, location within a priority watershed, visible amenity, supports other public involvement initiatives)

### Step 4: Public Involvement Process

This aspect of the process is critical if a project is to be constructed. A successful project must involve the immediate neighbors who will be affected by the changed conditions. Nearly all retrofits require modifications to the existing environment. A dry detention pond may be a very desirable area for some residents in the community. It is a community space and only rarely is there any water in the pond. A stormwater pond or wetland retrofit, on the other hand, may have large expanses of water and may have highly variable water fluctuations. Adjacent owners may resist these changes. In order to gain citizen acceptance of retrofits they must be involved in the process from the start and throughout the planning, design and implementation process. Citizens who are informed about the need for, and benefits of, retrofitting are more likely to accept projects.

Still, some citizens and citizen organizations will never support a particular project. This is why it is mandatory that there be an overall planning process which identifies projects early in the selection process and allows citizen input before costly field surveys and engineering designs are performed. Project sites and retrofit techniques that simply cannot satisfy citizen concerns may need to be dropped from further consideration.

A good retrofit program must also incorporate a good public relations plan. Slide shows or field trips to existing projects can be powerful persuasions to skeptical citizens. Every site that goes forward to final design and permitting should be presented at least once to the public through a public hearing or "town hall" type meeting.

### Step 5: Retrofit Design

In the design process, the concept is converted to an engineering design and construction plan. Design of retrofit projects should incorporate the same elements as any other structural control design including, but not limited to:

- Adequate hydrologic and hydraulic modeling
- Detailed topographic mapping
- Property line establishment
- Site grading
- Structural design
- Geotechnical investigations
- Erosion and sediment control design
- Construction phasing and staging

---

Normal structural control design usually follows a prescribed design criteria (i.e., control of the 25-year storm or sizing for a specified water quality volume). Retrofit designers must work backwards from a set of existing site constraints to arrive at an acceptable stormwater control obtainable. This process may yield facilities that are too small or ineffective, and therefore not practical for further consideration. Designers should look for opportunities to combine projects, such as stream stabilization or habitat restoration with the retrofit in a complementary manner.

The key to successful retrofit design is the ability to balance the desire to maximize pollutant removal, channel erosion protection and flood control while limiting the impacts to adjacent infrastructure, residents or other properties. Designers must consider issues like avoiding relocations of existing utilities, minimizing existing wetland and forest impacts, maintaining existing floodplain elevations, complying with dam safety and dam hazard classification criteria, avoiding maintenance nuisance situations, and providing adequate construction and maintenance access to the site.

Retrofits can vary widely as to cost from a few thousand dollars to several hundred thousand dollars. A preliminary cost estimate should be a part of the design phase.

#### Step 6: Permitting

Perhaps the most difficult permitting issues for retrofit projects involve impacts to wetlands, forests and floodplain alterations. Many of these impacts are either unavoidable or necessary to achieve reasonable storage targets. The primary issues that permitting agencies are looking for is to ensure that the impacts have been minimized to the maximum extent practicable and that the benefits of the proposed project are clearly recognizable. In some instances, mitigation may also be required in order to satisfy permitting. If so, additional costs may be involved.

#### Step 7: Construction and Inspections

Like any design project, proper construction, inspection, and administration is integral to a successful facility. Retrofitting often involves construction of unique or unusual elements, such as flow splitters, underground sand filters, or stream diversions. Many of these practices may be unfamiliar to many contractors. Most publicly funded projects are awarded to the low bidder who may be qualified to do the work, but may never have constructed projects of this nature. Therefore, it is almost a necessity to retain the retrofit designer of record or other qualified professional to answer contractor questions, approve shop drawings, conduct regular inspections, hold regular progress meetings, conduct construction testing, and maintain construction records. As-built drawings should also be a part of the construction process. These drawings are used for maintenance purposes.

#### Step 8: Maintenance Plan

Always the last element and often the least practiced component of a stormwater management program, maintenance is doubly important in retrofit situations. The reasons are simple: most retrofits are undersized when compared to their new development counterparts and space is at a premium in urban areas where many maintenance provisions such as access roads, stockpiling or staging areas are either absent or woefully undersized.

### **7.3.3 Types of Retrofitting Techniques**

Retrofitting techniques can be applied to many different situations depending on the end result required and space available. Retrofitting techniques include:

- **Source Retrofit** – Use of techniques that attenuate runoff and/or pollutant generation before it enters a storm drain system, i.e., reducing impervious areas, using pollution prevention practices, etc. These are used in areas where build-out prevents the establishment of a significant number of new facilities, and where redevelopment will not have a significant impact on water quality.

- 
- Redevelopment – Redevelopment will result in retrofit by means of new structural control facilities required by local stormwater management standards. Projected redevelopment trends, while not within the direct control of local government, are useful in predicting areas of existing development that may be mitigated in the future.
  - Existing Structural Control Retrofit – The retrofit of an existing structural control to improve its pollutant removal efficiency or storage capacity, or both.
  - Installation of Additional Stormwater Controls – Additional stormwater controls can be added for existing development or redevelopment. Consideration should be given to regional controls, rather than site-specific applications.
  - Conversion of Existing Stormwater Facilities to Water Quality Functions – Existing flood control facilities built to serve previous development may be modified to act as a water quality structural control on a regional or site-specific basis.
  - Open Channel Retrofit – Open channel retrofits are constructed within an open channel below a storm drain outfall, e.g., extended detention shallow marsh pond system.
  - Natural Channel Retrofit – Depending on the size of the channel and the area of the floodplain, a natural channel may provide several retrofit options.
  - Off-line Retrofit – Involves the use of a flow-splitter to divert the first flush of runoff to a lower open area for treatment in areas where land constraints are not present.
  - In-line Retrofit – Used where space constraints do not allow the use of diversions to treatment areas.

---

This page left intentionally blank



City of Sandy Springs  
**Stormwater Policy**

Department of Public Works  
Stormwater Services Division

770-730-5600

Adopted by the Mayor and City Council  
February 20, 2007  
Resolution No. 2007-02-15

## **Goal**

The goal of the stormwater policy is to improve the City's stormwater infrastructure to meet strong community standards. A long-term planning project is required in order to meet this goal. However, limited resources and staff require that such a policy must be established and implemented in phases through a systematic approach.

The first step in this process is to provide a policy to handle requests on a short-term basis. This policy is designed to serve that purpose until another system with additional funding is adopted. This policy will establish the division of responsibility for maintenance and establish categories of projects to prioritize City implementation.

## **City Responsibilities**

There are two types of infrastructure:

- Infrastructure that is City responsibility, and
- Infrastructure that is not City responsibility.

Determination of City responsibility will be determined on a case-by-case basis and will include, but is not limited to, the following factors:

- Project located in or adjacent to City right-of-way,
- Project located in an easement dedicated to the City or previous governmental entity,
- Project located in drainage easement not specifically dedicated to the City or previous governmental entity,
- Drainage systems as approved on recorded plats, and
- Changes made to drainage systems.

The City Attorney will provide an opinion to determine the City's responsibility on a case-by-case basis.

## **Emergency Maintenance**

The City may conduct emergency maintenance operations within drainage easements in order to protect the common good. Emergency maintenance includes maintenance necessary to remedy a condition which is potentially damaging to life, property, or public roads. Such emergency maintenance, conducted for the common good, shall not be construed as constituting accepting a continuing maintenance obligation by the City, nor prevent the City from seeking reimbursement for expenses from the property owner(s) of the land that generated the condition.

## **Categorizing Project Requests**

There are currently more projects than the City can address at one time. The order of response to these projects will be determined by the category of the request. Requests for projects will be categorized as:

- Category I: Posing an immediate danger or threat to public safety,
- Category II: Rapidly degrading to a dangerous condition, or
- Category III: Maintenance or cosmetic repair.

Projects in Category I will receive priority.

City Public Works staff will review project requests and will perform the initial project categorization. Public Works staff will periodically monitor the conditions at the project location, prior to repair/maintenance, and will modify the categorization when needed.

**Funding Issues (Set Funding Allocated in Budget)**

The Mayor and City Council may allocate funding for stormwater projects during each budget cycle. Projects will be recommended for implementation based on the determination of City responsibility, by Category, and by approved funding level.