

To: Metro Area Mayors, Council Members and City Managers

From: Capital Crossroads Governance Tri-Chairs:  
Hon. Mayor Robert Andeweg, City of Urbandale  
Hon. Mayor Sara Kurovski, City of Pleasant Hill  
Art Wittmack, Taxpayers Association of Central Iowa

Re: Capital Crossroads Stormwater Project 10.28.19 Meeting

The Capital Crossroads Local Government Collaborative Stormwater Project continued its work on stormwater management on October 28, 2019. Below is a summary of the meeting which had 27 in attendance. A list of represented organizations is included at the bottom of this summary.

The meeting opened with presentations highlighting two projects in the metro area that have, or are doing, stormwater using the standards and techniques that have been discussed thus far.

Joe Pietruszynski from Hubbell and Dan Pritchard from the City of Des Moines gave a presentation on the Gray's Station development showcasing the major amenities that the developer and city have been able to create by making use of stormwater and treating it differently vs a standard pond. As evidence of the value of this approach, Joe discussed the rapid sales for homes taking place in the development as well as strong interest in securing homes and apartments that have not even been built yet.

Greg Pierce from RDG then presented on Prairie Trail development in Ankeny and the various stormwater approaches that had been taken throughout. In the case of this development, there was one master developer for over 1,000 acres and so the design team was able to view stormwater from a regional perspective and have different practices accomplishing different things throughout the watershed area of the development since they had control throughout.

Questions were raised about maintenance on the projects and for the most part maintenance is being done by the cities.

The next segment of the meeting featured Jennifer Welch from SWCD revisiting the Iowa Stormwater Management Manual Local Ordinance and Policy Guide highlighting the elements that perhaps should be consistent throughout the metro. From the Guide, on Pages 36 and 37, these elements are 1, 2, 3, 7, 8, 10, 11, 13 and 14 and will form the basis of work going forward. The other elements listed will likely be individual to each city. The document being referenced is available at

<https://drive.google.com/open?id=1zY49jfH6GiHz30Z9DN3SPYHMystG8Hz4>

Next, a series of small group discussions ensued focused on Element 1.

1. Use of TR-55 vs Modified Rational Method

Josh DeBower from Foth Engineering gave an overview of why use of TR-55 is preferred to the Modified Rational Method (MRM).

Ryan Hardisty from CDA Engineering stated the MRM is not accurate enough with many storms and consistency with software will make design and review easier. Many designers have been using TR-55 for a while and many cities have as well. It was felt this is a good time to bring consistency to the metro.

2. Defining the condition to design to – Pre-Settlement vs Pre-Development

Rachel Conrad from Clive spoke to the group comparing Pre-settlement (Meadow Good Condition) vs Pre-development as the design criteria. Most of the group felt that use of Meadow Good Condition was an appropriate baseline standard, but this was not unanimous. There remains some discussion to be had over whether it should be the standard, or rather a goal to shoot for, and if not achieved “how close” is good enough? There is also discussion over Meadow Good Condition vs using the local soil type from soil borings to determine the required release rate. Further discussion with more details will be needed to come to consensus on this definition.

3. Large Storm Release Rates – 100-Year Meadow vs 5-year Existing Condition

Kyle Riley from Polk County compared setting allowable release rates for larger storms (100 Year) using modeling from a 100 Year Meadow Good Condition or a 5 Year Existing Condition standard. Consulting engineers from CDA and Larson mentioned it is best to mimic nature in release rates and that volume standards for each aren’t that different. There was a request to have calculations provided showing the impacts of different assumptions for the same development as to what choosing different methods means in terms of volume required, release rates and other impacts before decisions can be made by the full group. This will be part of the next meeting to resolve this question.

At the next meeting on November 12<sup>th</sup> we intend to provide calculations and examples to resolve items 2 and 3 above and then move on to consensus surrounding elements 2, 3 and 14 from the Guide.

Thank you for your continued support of the Capital Crossroads Local Government Collaborative.

The slides for this session are available on the Google Drive at

[https://drive.google.com/open?id=16WMjSHZ2EDFAB0QcnD\\_m682M6ltsXg1c](https://drive.google.com/open?id=16WMjSHZ2EDFAB0QcnD_m682M6ltsXg1c)

Links to videos of this session are available at

<https://drive.google.com/open?id=16C4KdWOqt2IynZDjUfjCTc7PNCw0dPNZr0jWx9yXZrg>

The meeting contained representation from:

Home Builder’s Association  
CDA Engineering  
Larson Engineering  
Foth Engineering  
Altoona  
Des Moines  
West Des Moines  
Waukee  
Windsor Heights  
Ankeny  
Johnston

Norwalk  
Pleasant Hill  
Polk County  
Hubbell Realty  
Urbandale  
RDG  
IDALS  
Altoona  
Polk SWCD  
DMAMPO  
ISWEP