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Introduction

The purpose of this report is to provide an overview of the activities, discussions, and recommendations of the Redevelopment and Drainage Task Force. The Redevelopment and Drainage Task Force, initiated pre-Hurricane Harvey by Chief Resilience Officer Stephen Costello, has worked to address three redevelopment issues: detention; fill; and encroachments in the city right-of-way. Task force membership is comprised of residents, city and county officials, and members of the engineering, architecture, development, real estate, construction, and green communities. Meetings were facilitated by Alan Witt, professor at the University of Houston, and Stephen Costello.

The stated goals of the task force are as follows:

➢ To ensure the City of Houston’s design standards are conducive to responsible development which does not negatively impact drainage
➢ To empower the City of Houston to effectively and consistently apply and enforce drainage-related development rules

Figure 1. Task Force Timeline

Detention

The first four meetings were dedicated to exploring the city’s detention requirements related to redevelopment. A brainstorming session took place at the kickoff meeting held October 11, 2017. Task force members were broken into six groups comprised of members from varying interests and asked, “What issues come to mind when considering the city’s detention criteria as promulgated in Chapter 9 of the City of Houston Department of Public Works and Engineering Infrastructure Design Manual (IDM)?”

Groups presented the following issues, comments, and ideas:
- Current calculations are flawed because they are not hydrology based; detention volume is currently only based on the change in impervious cover
- Use one standard for all development regardless of size
- When redeveloping a parcel, mitigate for more than just increase in impervious cover
- Increase standards – need safety net for overflow
- Incorporate effect of overland sheet flow into detention calculation
- Use impact fees to provide area-wide relief
- Review TP100/101 for possible options
- Enforce requirements for under 15,000 sq. ft.
- Redefine 100-year storm/update rainfall data
- Set detention criteria on a sliding scale by watershed; take into consideration historic flooding
- Have different requirements for infill vs. suburban development
- Impact of detention is determined in isolation
- Modify detention criteria to remedy past problems
- Focus detention in areas which need protection
- Focus on conveyance – better investment than “holding” rainfall volume
- Offer incentives – public/private partnerships for regional detention/leverage 380s
- Incorporate new water detention methods
- Allow developers to over-detain and sell excess volume
- Incentivize impervious area reductions through use of green storm water infrastructure/low-impact development and pier and beam construction
- Need certification process for maintenance of detention/enforce maintenance of detention
- Too many small ponds
- Address past detention violations
- Improve maintenance of storm sewers

At the second and third meetings, October 25, 2017, and November 8, 2017, members focused on: 1) detention rate, minimum parcel size, detention credit (grandfathering); 2) alternatives to detention; and 3) green infrastructure. Details of these discussions are shown below.

**Detention Rate, Minimum Parcel Size, Detention Credit**

- Require 0.5 acre-feet/acre for all sizes and all development
- No minimum parcel size
- For lots under 15,000 sq. ft., find way to allow for shared detention
- Consider varying detention amounts by watershed
- Use regional rather than lot-by-lot approach
- Phase out credit for existing development (grandfathering) over time
- Allow or disallow detention credits based on conveyance conditions, watershed location
- Consider allowing developers to sell detention credit in same hydraulic service area
- City and developers should share the cost of fixing inadequate infrastructure
• Need legal clarification on whether eliminating detention credit would be considered a taking
• Different areas have different needs; explore criteria as function of level of service
• Entire city system inadequate, so there is need for uniform criteria
• Consider public/private partnerships to develop detention on city-owned parks and other public lands

Alternatives to Detention

• Pay impact fee in lieu of detention if less than two-acres impervious or one-acre foot of detention
• Require lots under 15,000 sq. ft. to pay impact fee and avoid providing onsite detention
• Ensure impact fees are managed properly and with great transparency
• How to structure and spend fee in lieu of detention revenues is very important
• Must spend fees collected in same hydraulic service area

Green Infrastructure

• Allow reduced detention rate for sites that use green infrastructure (like Harris County)
• Offer more green infrastructure options
• Green strategies must be explicitly permitted
• Manage expectations associated with benefits of green infrastructure
• Require alternative retention methods such as green roofs or rain gardens
• Vary green infrastructure incentives based on location – urban vs. suburban

At the fourth meeting November 29, 2017, the goal was to come up with a set of recommendations related to the city’s detention criteria to advance to the mayor. The following recommendation options were presented. Task force members again broke into six groups to come up with consensus within each group. Groups were then asked to choose which of the following six recommendations they were in favor of advancing:

A. Require payment of a fee in lieu of detention for lot sizes under 15,000 sq. ft.

B. Provide detention credit for broad range of (green) low-impact development techniques (to mirror county criteria).

C. Maintain existing detention credit for existing impervious cover when redeveloping site. Require mitigating detention only for increased impervious cover and change in hydraulic efficiency, if applicable.

D. Eliminate detention credit for existing impervious cover when redeveloping site. Require mitigating detention for entire redeveloped site.

E. Provide 50% detention credit for existing impervious cover when redeveloping site. Require mitigating detention for increased impervious cover and 50% of existing impervious cover.
F. Maintain existing detention credit for existing impervious cover when redeveloping site. Impose higher detention rate standard (over-detain) for increased impervious cover.

Figure 2. Number of Groups in Favor of Each Recommendation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One group was in favor of advancing both D and E
One group had mixed consensus on which recommendation to advance – D, E, or F

Next, to address the recommendations that did not achieve overall consensus, individual task force members were asked to vote by placing a dot sticker on the recommendations (C, D, E, or F) he/she favored advancing.

Figure 3. Number of Individuals in Favor of Recommendations C-F

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Groups also put forth certain caveats associated with the recommendations. Below are the consensus detention recommendations with caveats:

- **Require payment of a fee in lieu of detention for lot sizes under 15,000 sq. ft.**
  
  **Caveats**
  
  1. Place collected funds in dedicated fund to be only used in specific service area where funds are collected (similar to park dedication fund)
  2. Ensure amounts collected are sufficient to be effective

- **Provide detention credit for broad range of (green) low-impact development techniques (to mirror county criteria)**
  
  **Caveat**
  
  1. Ensure proper inspection and maintenance of green infrastructure
Eliminate detention credit for existing impervious cover when redeveloping site. Require mitigating detention for entire redeveloped site. *(There was not a full consensus for this recommendation, but it received the vast majority of task force votes.)*

**Caveats**

1. Implement phasing strategy
2. Clearly define what constitutes redevelopment

At the fifth meeting held December 6, 2017, two additional detention-related recommendations were approved by task force members.

- Allow for the sale of excess detention capacity within the same hydraulic service area (detention volume banking)
- Encourage private sector involvement in creating regional detention in parks or other public lands

**Fill**

The topic of fill was introduced at the December 6, 2017, meeting. Discussions centered around requirements in the Section 9.02(C) of the IDM and the Houston Amendments to the 2012 International Building Code Section 106.3.

Task force members broke into six groups to discuss these focus questions: 1) What problems are brought forth by 9.02(C) and how should requirements be modified? 2) Should a grading permit be required for <50 cubic yards and should “engineered grading” be required for all lot sizes? 3) Should the city follow Harris County’s lead in disallowing fill to elevate structures in the 100-year floodplain?

Groups presented problems associated with the city’s requirement to move drainage from back of lot to front of lot. Members advocated for more flexibility to accommodate natural drainage patterns. Groups also debated the correct thresholds for requiring grading permits and “engineered grading.”

This discussion on fill continued at the sixth meeting held December 13, 2017. The group heard from homebuilders who described specific situations relating to fill requirements.

Task force members agreed to remove the one-acre threshold in 9.02(C) and clarify the section’s contradictory language and specify need for flexibility to accommodate natural drainage patterns.

Task force members also discussed changing the thresholds for grading permits and engineered grading. It was suggested “engineered grading” needed to be better defined in the section. Some offered the possibility of lowering the <50 cubic yard requirement for permitting and changing the requirement for engineered grading to 1000 or 2500 cubic yards (instead of 5000) or some percentage of total lot size. This matter was revisited at the task force meeting on January 24, 2018, and the majority of task members present voted by a show of hands to lower the threshold amount for engineered grading.
present for the vote, 15 voted to lower the threshold to 1000 cubic yards and nine voted to lower it to 2500 cubic yards.

To summarize, task force recommendations related to fill are:

➢ Remove the one-acre threshold in IDM Chapter 9 Section 9.02(C)
➢ Clarify contradictory language in IDM Chapter 9 Section 9.02(C) and specify need for flexibility to accommodate natural drainage patterns
➢ Clearly define “engineered grading” in Houston Amendments to the 2012 International Building Code Section 106.3
➢ Change threshold amount in Houston Amendments to the 2012 International Building Code Section 106.3 (no permit required for <50 cubic yards; engineered grading required for 1000 cubic yards)

Encroachments in City Right-of-Way

Also at the meeting held December 13, 2017, task force members were introduced to problems related to encroachments in the city’s right-of-way negatively affecting drainage flow. PWE staff presented current regulations and showed several photographs depicting examples of problems which occur when work (some permitted, most not permitted) is performed in the city’s right-of-way. Examples include filling in driveway culverts and paving over roadside ditches.

City ordinance 28-1 states it is unlawful for any person to throw or deposit in any ditch anything which will in any way obstruct the free flow of water. A large group discussion ensued regarding enforcement of this ordinance. Task members brought forth the following issues:

• Must have significant public education campaign to inform citizens of their responsibilities
• Need full understanding of legal ramifications if city takes back its right-of-way
• If permitted work, city should pay for removal; if unpermitted, property owner should pay
• The city’s neighborhood protection group is already in neighborhoods looking for code violations; this group should also identify drainage encroachments
• Need to establish policy and process to remove encroachments
• There will be public support for enforcing rules and removing obstructions post-Harvey if effort is initiated soon

Task force members were in favor of the following recommendations:

➢ Initiate a widespread public education campaign to inform citizens of their responsibilities regarding roadside drainage
➢ Fully enforce all applicable rules to re-establish drainage in the public right-of-way
Conclusion

At the final meeting held January 24, 2018, task force members reviewed each recommendation and discussed written comments submitted to date. Task force members were given the opportunity to express any concerns related to the recommendations. One recommendation related to fill was modified at this meeting.

Recommendations contained within this report are hereby submitted to Mayor Sylvester Turner for his consideration. It is important to note that while each recommendation did not receive unanimous support, the final recommendations are supported by the majority of members.

Through these proposed recommendations, the task force aims to achieve its goals and ensure city regulations are consistent with promoting better drainage in Houston. Any policy and regulation changes resulting from these recommendations will be carefully evaluated and implemented by officials in the Public Works and Engineering and Legal Departments in cooperation with City Council and outside stakeholders.

Chief Resilience Officer Stephen Costello gratefully acknowledges the participation and valuable input of each task force member.
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A. Task force membership list  
B. Final list of recommendations  
C. Comments on DRAFT Report  
D. Presentations
ATTACHMENT A
Task Force Membership
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acquaro</td>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>Community Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bell</td>
<td>Tomaro</td>
<td>Community Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blancett</td>
<td>Janet</td>
<td>Society of Asian Scientists and Engineers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bloom</td>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Houston Land/Water Sustainability Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blount</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>County Engineer, Harris County Public Infrastructure Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulloch</td>
<td>Kathie</td>
<td>Managing Engineer, Public Works and Engineering, City of Houston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burger</td>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>Community Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buscha</td>
<td>Tim</td>
<td>Association of Civil Engineering Companies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butler</td>
<td>Christon</td>
<td>Acting Deputy Director, Public Works and Engineering, City of Houston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calvert</td>
<td>Rogene</td>
<td>Blueprint Houston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clegg</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>American Institute of Architects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cole</td>
<td>Kevin</td>
<td>Greater 288 Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombo</td>
<td>Anthony</td>
<td>Houston Contractors Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costello</td>
<td>Steve</td>
<td>Chief Resilience Officer, Mayor's Office, City of Houston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dargan</td>
<td>Eric</td>
<td>Deputy Director, Chief Operating Officer, Public Works and Engineering, City of Houston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De La Pena</td>
<td>Jose</td>
<td>Society of Hispanic Professional Engineers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dishberger</td>
<td>Mike</td>
<td>Greater Houston Builders Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmondson</td>
<td>Becky</td>
<td>Community Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edwards</td>
<td>Keith</td>
<td>North Houston Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friedrichs</td>
<td>Edwin</td>
<td>Urban Land Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gant</td>
<td>Johnny</td>
<td>National Society of Black Engineers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grothues</td>
<td>Julie</td>
<td>Community Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haddock</td>
<td>Carol</td>
<td>Director, PWE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hendricks</td>
<td>Julie</td>
<td>Kirksey Architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hightower</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Houston Real Estate Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huffmaster</td>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Community Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jones</td>
<td>Randy</td>
<td>Community Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klein</td>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Community Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koehl</td>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Community Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lennard</td>
<td>Lee</td>
<td>West Houston Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menendez</td>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>Society of American Military Engineers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mengwasser</td>
<td>Drew</td>
<td>American Society of Landscape Architects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murray</td>
<td>Bridgette</td>
<td>Community Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nichols</td>
<td>Bruce</td>
<td>Community Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parker</td>
<td>Steve</td>
<td>Community Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinheiro</td>
<td>Rod</td>
<td>Assistant Director, Public Works and Engineering, City of Houston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poppe</td>
<td>Russ</td>
<td>Executive Director, Harris County Flood Control District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ritchie</td>
<td>Andrew</td>
<td>Houston Apartment Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roberson</td>
<td>Abbey</td>
<td>Texas Medical Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salazar</td>
<td>Andres</td>
<td>American Society of Civil Engineers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanders</td>
<td>Josh</td>
<td>Houstonians for Responsible Growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarman</td>
<td>Stan</td>
<td>Community Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walsh</td>
<td>Patrick</td>
<td>Director, Planning and Development, City of Houston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wicker</td>
<td>Madeline</td>
<td>Community Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wile</td>
<td>Randolph</td>
<td>Wile Interests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witt</td>
<td>Alan</td>
<td>Professor, University of Houston – Facilitator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolff</td>
<td>Ed</td>
<td>Houston Association of Realtors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zeve</td>
<td>Matt</td>
<td>Director of Operations, Harris County Flood Control District</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ATTACHMENT B
Final List of Recommendations
Detention Recommendations

➢ Require payment of a fee in lieu of detention for lot sizes under 15,000 sq. ft.
   
   Caveats
   • Place collected funds in dedicated fund to be only used in specific service area where funds are collected (similar to park dedication fund)
   • Ensure amounts collected are sufficient to be effective

➢ Provide detention credit for broad range of (green) low-impact development techniques (to mirror county criteria)
   
   Caveat
   • Ensure proper inspection and maintenance of green infrastructure

➢ Eliminate detention credit for existing impervious cover when redeveloping site. Require mitigating detention for entire redeveloped site.
   
   Caveats
   • Implement phasing strategy
   • Clearly define what constitutes redevelopment

➢ Allow for the sale of excess detention capacity within the same hydraulic service area (detention volume banking)

➢ Encourage private sector involvement in creating regional detention in parks or other public lands

Fill Recommendations

➢ Remove the one-acre threshold in IDM Chapter 9 Section 9.02(C)

➢ Clarify contradictory language in IDM Chapter 9 Section 9.02(C) and specify need for flexibility to accommodate natural drainage patterns

➢ Clearly define “engineered grading” in Houston Amendments to the 2012 International Building Code Section 106.3

➢ Change threshold amount in Houston Amendments to the 2012 International Building Code Section 106.3 (no permit required for <50 cubic yards; engineered grading required for 1000 cubic yards)

Encroachments in City Right-of-Way Recommendations

➢ Initiate a widespread public education campaign to inform citizens of their responsibilities regarding roadside drainage

➢ Fully enforce all applicable rules to re-establish drainage in the public right-of-way
ATTACHMENT C
Comments of DRAFT Report
Comments from Harris County Flood Control District representative:

Small sites

The methods for small redevelopment tracts would have these challenges:

- The impact fee option would have similar drawbacks as we have experienced. The time and effort managing the accounts would not seem to be cost effective. Also, providing mitigation in the same vicinity where the fees are collected is not always feasible.

- Requiring a standard detention basin for developments smaller than an acre would be problematic because the restrictor size would need to be smaller than a 6 inch diameter to be effective. Such small openings would be clogged most of the time.

Detention rate for redevelopment sites

Some of the proposals are based only on impervious cover. Runoff from a site can increase from regrading a site even if there is no increase (or even a decrease) in impervious cover.

Comments from Society of Asian Scientists and Engineers representative:

I propose the following addition to the Encroachments in City Right-of-Way section:

The city’s neighborhood protection group is already in neighborhoods looking for code violations; this group should also identify drainage encroachments. **Home Owners Associations (HOAs) within the City will be asked to include in their housing covenants keeping city ROW ditches that provide drainage immediately in front of a home owner’s property clear and free flowing.**

This requirement would be similar to covenants requiring home owners to limit the number of vehicles parked in public streets in front of their houses and other such interfaces between private property and public spaces. HOAs have the advantage of providing more frequent surveillance at the neighborhood level and already have established enforcement processes built into the housing covenants.

Comments from Houston Real Estate Council representative:

Introduction

Chapter 47 Article 14 of the Houston City Code establishes a Municipal Drainage Utility System and provides that the drainage service that the City provides is a public utility. The ordinance recognizes the existing conditions of impervious cover by charging a monthly utility fee, based on existing impervious cover, for draining into the City’s drainage system.

Upon redevelopment of a tract containing existing improvements, a property owner is given credit for the existing service capacity that water and waste water place upon the City’s systems, and for the existing impervious cover on the tract. The use of the credit recognizes the existing burden on the utility system for which the City is charging in the form of the “Drainage Charge” on the monthly Utility Bill. Credits for existing utility capacity are commonplace for redevelopment and should be continued.
Additional burden created by the redevelopment is accounted for by the impact fees and increased utility charges, determined by any increase in water and sewer capacity and any increase in impervious cover, as well as detention required under current regulations for any increase impervious cover.

Eliminating credit for the existing impervious cover does not reduce flooding. There are many factors that impact drainage such as inadequate conveyance systems and bayou capacity. Houston was mostly developed prior to the adoption in the early 1980’s of the flood plain regulations and the inadequacy of existing local drainage systems in the street will have a greater effect on flooding than the existence of the credit.

**Changes**

**Definitions**

- Project Development is the specific site described and depicted in the application for a building permit.
- New Development is the addition of new impervious cover on a Project Development on property that has not been covered by impervious cover within the past 5 years. In other words, “greenfield development”.
- Redevelopment is the addition of new impervious cover on a Project Development on property that had impervious cover within the past 5 years.

**Requirements**

- New Development will continue to be provided in accordance with the following current requirements:
  - Tracts ≤ 1.00 acre -- Detention for New Development will be provided at a rate of 0.20 acre-foot per acre of proposed impervious cover for the Project Development.
  - Tracts > 1.00 acre – Detention for New Development will be provided at a rate of 0.50 acre-foot per acre of proposed impervious cover for the Project Development.

- Redevelopment detention will be provided in accordance with the following:
  - The detention requirements for Redevelopment of new impervious cover (increase in cover over existing) are the same as for New Development.
  - For existing impervious cover that is being redeveloped, the detention requirement increases to 3,630 CF/Ac for the mitigation of change in hydraulic efficiency and require the payment of a fee that supports a dedicated regional (watershed service area) detention fund. (Such an impact fee will have to be determined per statutory requirements.)
  - A property owner may pay a fee of $XXXX per acre of existing impervious cover in lieu of detention otherwise required to mitigate any improved hydraulic efficiency.
  - For tracts less than 15,000 sq ft that are either a New Development or Redevelopment, the property owner may pay a fee of $XXXX per acre feet in lieu of providing on site detention of required detention. (Funds received from such fees would have to be dedicated to improving the storm water utility system in the immediate service area.)

Multiple, small detention ponds are inefficient, ineffective, ugly, health hazards and, overtime, are lost to poor maintenance/management and lack of adequate enforcement.
Small Detention

- Allow detention banking, both public and private.
- Allow private, defined drainage service area detention for phased developments.
- Honor prior agreements on public and private sub-regional detention and defined drainage service area detention.
- Allow private property owners to satisfy detention requirements by creating detention capacity in public lands, including parks.

Comments from Urban Land Institute representative:

GENERAL

Better planning results in more effective and efficient use of funds for drainage improvements. Planning is not as effective if it is performed in pieces. Plans that are developed at one time provide the best results. Houston should present a bold response to the flooding challenges it faces based on detailed analysis of the existing conditions and historical information, to develop a coordinated plan for the region.

Houston knows what to do. Houston needs to take a bold step and do it. To determine all flooding risks, the City of Houston needs a region-wide drainage study that includes not only bayous, but also tributaries and individual neighborhood drainage systems. This could be visionary for not only the Houston region, but for the whole country. Our risk of flooding is not only from Riverine Flooding but also from sheetflow and insufficient neighborhood drainage systems. Each area has unique characteristics that impact drainage, and therefore, one set of standard regulations for the city will not provide the correct answer for each neighborhood.

FILO

Fee in Lieu of (FILO) providing detention can be a good idea for smaller developments. However, FILO is a complicated issue that is governed by state statutes, and therefore, an in-depth legal analysis should be performed. The City of Houston should consider hiring outside legal counsel to assist in this analysis so stakeholders will see the outcome as being objective.

DETENTION BANK

Detention Banking can be complicated, and if pursued, should include an analysis of potential unintended consequences. Keeping accurate records can be difficult to manage if the detention facility’s ownership remains in the private sector. Issues associated with maintenance can also be a concern. If the facility is constructed by the private sector and given to the City of Houston to manage, this could possibly work similar to what is done in new subdivisions by Municipal Utility Districts. If the developer builds excess detention capacity, the City of Houston could reimburse them from money collected as new development in the area buys excess capacity from the detention bank. The City of Houston could even participate in sub-regional detention basins in joint projects with property owners. Selling ‘detention credits’ in the private market could be difficult for the City of Houston to track.
GRANDFATHERING

Any grandfathering proposal should be kept as simple as possible. Set some parameters such as requiring full detention if a renovation project costs more than 50% of the value of the existing development or if all of the site is redeveloped. Provisions will need to be made to track development so sites are not allowed to redevelop totally by doing the redevelopment 25% at a time. This issue is also governed by state statute and development of guidelines should include a thorough legal review.

Comments from Houston Land/Water Sustainability Forum representative:

It’s not obvious how we can incentivize green infrastructure without changing the current detention requirement to be “hydrology-based.” Hydrology-based means that the detention volume is based on the difference in the total runoff volume between the pre-development and post-development site, rather than the percentage change in imperviousness. Currently, permeable paving and green roofs and other methods that reduce the change in imperviousness are already incentivized, because they reduce the volume of required detention.

A hydrology-based green infrastructure “credit” will really only work if the default detention rate is high enough to make the green option reduce the required volume of detention in a meaningful way. Harris County rules start at 0.55 ac-ft/ac and, if technically based using hydrology, allow sites with green infrastructure to provide as low as 0.35 ac-ft/ac.

Harris County requires the pre- and post-hydrographs determined and the volume is the difference in runoff volume, with a 0.35 ac-ft/ac min. The reduced detention rate should be based on hydrology.

(Other edits and clarifying language offered by the Houston Land/Water Sustainability Forum representative were incorporated into the final report.)

Comments from a community representative:

Redevelopment and Drainage Task Force Recommendations

A great achievement of this task force is obtaining consensus on universal detention requirement and eliminating grandfathering of preexisting impervious surface. The 0.5 mitigation rate was a logical leap from 50% mitigation ignoring that the major event rainfall was not one foot but rather 13 inches. Not such an egregious difference, but if we take 16 inches as major event (100 year) rain fall standard then 0.5 represents 37.5% mitigation, a travesty. Therefore, I believe we should be stating 50% mitigation (0.5-acre ft. detention per acre foot of impervious per foot of rain). This allows detention standard to be set, and automatically scaled as rain fall data is adjusted based on climatic observations.

Alternatives to Detention

- Pay impact fee in lieu of detention if less than two-acre feet impervious or one-acre foot of detention
  This should be clarified to say that there should be a minimum size detention facility, ie one-acre foot (some said two to five was more practical)
• Provide detention credit for broad range of (green) low-impact development techniques (to mirror county criteria)

_Caveat_

Please note the Harris County credit is substantial and may exceed green infrastructure contributions depending on mitigation elements incorporated and their maintenance, and should be given detention mitigation credit to the extent mitigation is achieved.

IDM Chapter 9 section 2 Policy: The policy principles state when multiple criteria apply, the more stringent standard should be used yet individual articles often which criteria to use (County criteria will be used above certain development size or for discharge directly to county/HCFCD facility). The more stringent criteria should be used.

**On the point of fill**

The small group result was clear – reduce fill allowance to 1000 – 2500 cu yd for sealed engineered drainage report. Yet we had a different result with the group discussion format e – leave it be. I suggest we revisit this point on quantity for fill to require sealed engineering study before finalizing recommendations.

Our mandate was to make sure we are not allowing practices of the past to continue if they had an adverse impact on flooding. Seeing as all fill is basically negative detention if you are within the 500 yr flood plain, this is quite concerning.

I suggest at minimum the task force should revisit this issue on Wednesday. Seemed to me we were converging on 1000 yd as threshold on engineered drainage.

**Comments from American Institute of Architects Houston Chapter on Development and Drainage Task Force Recommendations, dated January 24, 2018**

**General Comments**

The purview of this task force was narrow, and limited to measures that will have only a small impact on flooding in the near future. Is the City undertaking a comprehensive study of the capacity problems with the current stormwater infrastructure, and which measures will be most effective in addressing them? AIA Houston would like to participate in future task forces addressing these issues.

New requirements should be graphically represented to better communicate the ideas behind them to the building industry and the public.

**Detention Requirements**

There should be an option for lots under 15,000 sf to implement appropriate engineered detention, particularly low impact development detention, instead of the fee. Since there are challenges in using impact fees to create added regional detention in areas where it is needed, this would have the positive effect of increasing capacity. It can also encourage positive stormwater practices on small lots.

Impact fees should be high enough to ensure that regional detention could realistically be built using those funds.
New policies for detaining water should be crafted in a way that encourages equitable transit-oriented developments. One possible consequence of more stringent detention requirements is to raise the cost of new developments. As a result, more development may take place outside of central areas that are served well by transit. While it may be reasonable for market-rate developments to factor in these costs, any policies around detention should incentivize the inclusion of affordable housing units near high-frequency transit (local buses, commuter buses, and rail). For example, developers of equitable transit-oriented development could receive credits, exemptions, or subsidies. Houston will be a more resilient city if low-income residents not only have access to affordable housing but access to affordable housing and transportation options. Houston should adopt a housing plan and make sure the flood management policies work in tandem with that plan.

**Encroachment**

The city should maintain open ditches to ensure proper functioning of the drainage system.

**Comments from The Society of American Military Engineers representative:**

The Society of American Military Engineers, Houston-Galveston Post appreciated being included in the City of Houston’s Redevelopment and Drainage Task Force overseen by the City’s Resilience Office.

The following is our input on the Revised Draft Report dated January 24, 2018.

- All grading, fill, and detention requirements for private development should be established by ordinance as adopted local amendment to building code. Houston to present has included key requirements only within the IDM, a non-codified publication with different purpose than regulation of private development. This has caused skepticism by both communities and developers regarding how serious the City is about such ‘rules’.
- Enforcement of encroachments is a matter of will and stewardship for the public infrastructure. Please note that while not popular, CenterPoint does a pretty good job of clearing tree growth that might impact its overhead lines. Their actions may generate some concern and criticism, even though effective in furthering resiliency of power distribution system. In not removing encroachments, Houston compromises the service level that the infrastructure could otherwise provide for all public users, reducing to the restricted capabilities caused by the encroachment and the benefitting party. A resilient city has a place for everything and everything is in its place—and there are places where things should not be, to include trees and encroaching features. Discussion here should be one of accountability, not policy.
- In general, the paper focuses on changing development controls, and does not include review of public drainage systems, capacity and functionality. Houston accomplishes drainage through a $100+ million/year drainage utility. Are there no improvements that could be made to how that utility provides drainage service throughout the City? How is HCFCD ‘best’ utilizing dedicated ad valorem taxes for drainage and flood mitigation across the county? If actual changes for flood mitigation are solely on the private side, engineers should at least provide better information to the public on the limits of service that they receive from public systems, so that citizens can make more informed decisions with regard to where and how to develop. This level of understanding would also benefit policy makers when considering the investment levels needed and the will of the public to fund.
- Public Engagement and Education is imperative for an understanding of the details and standards so that there is an equal starting point for discussion on policy. Drainage, as opposed to the other
public works services of water, wastewater, and paving, requires a greater extent of understanding in order to have substantive, collective progress in the public

Comments from the American Society of Civil Engineers representative:

The American Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE) appreciates the opportunity to participate in this task Force and supports policies that help reducing flooding and drainage problems in the City of Houston. ASCE offers the following comments:

1. Regarding Fee In Lieu of Payment (FILO), the approach is effective as long as the property paying the fee is inside the service area of a regional detention pond and detention is provided ahead of the development. Fees should be used for the construction and maintenance of detention ponds only. That ensures the added runoff is effectively mitigated.

2. Regarding the removal of credit for existing impervious cover and phasing out the grandfathering rule, the additional detention to be provided to mitigate existing impervious cover should be equitable to the size of new construction. As an example, a small improvement in a large developed parcel built a years ago should be required to mitigate the new construction plus a small cover proportional to the small project, not to the entire site. That results in a fair contribution of added detention.

3. Regarding parks and green spaces, their use for both recreation and storm water detention is a cost effective alternative in an urban environment where land availability is limited. We encourage the City to find creative ways for the mixed use of parks.

4. Last, we believe public outreach and education about the rationale of the adopted policy will be fundamental for a success of the program.

Please contact me with questions about these comments. Again, we appreciate the opportunity to participate and look forward to continuing working with the City.
ATTACHMENT D
Presentations
KICKOFF MEETING AGENDA

1. Welcome/goals, topics, and objectives of task force – Steve Costello
2. Introductions – all
3. Remarks by Mayor Turner
4. Description of existing detention criteria – Steve Costello
5. Facilitated discussion of major issues – Alan Witt/all
6. Solicit written feedback and recommendations – Alan Witt
7. Adjourn
TASK FORCE GOALS

➢ To ensure the City of Houston’s design standards are conducive to responsible development which does not negatively impact drainage
➢ To empower the City of Houston to effectively and consistently apply and enforce drainage-related development rules

TASK FORCE TOPICS

1. Detention
2. Fill
3. Unpermitted work in the city’s right-of-way which obstructs drainage flow
TASK FORCE OBJECTIVES

1. Dialogue
   - Give members the opportunity to fully express their views on the topics as well as hear and appreciate the views of others

2. Inform
   - Make sure participants have a comprehensive understanding of all issues associated with topics

3. Review
   - Review city's current detention and fill requirements and examine impacts

4. Explore
   - Explore pros/cons of changing the city's current detention and fill requirements

5. Identify
   - Identify ways city can better enforce its rules related to unpermitted work which obstructs drainage flow

6. Reach Consensus
   - Develop a broad set of recommendations related to the topics for city officials to consider adopting

DETENTION CRITERIA

COH Design Manual Chapter 9 Stormwater Design Requirements Section 9.05

(H)(1): The intention of stormwater detention is to mitigate the new development or redevelopment on an existing drainage system. Stormwater detention volume requirements are based on increased impervious cover and on existing impervious area that are redeveloped.


(H)(2)a: The use of on-site detention is required for all Developments within the City and for new or expanding utility districts within the City's ETJ. Detention may not be required if the City has developed detention capacity for a drainage watershed, and/or infrastructure improvements, to serve the drainage watershed in compliance with the requirements of this Chapter. Under these conditions, the City will consider a funding contribution in lieu of on-site detention volume constructed by the owner.

(H)(2)b: Stormwater detention requirements are invoked for redevelopments that change the quantity of impervious cover on the site or change the on-site (private) drainage system.
DETENTION CRITERIA

COH Design Manual Chapter 9 Stormwater Design Requirements Section 9.05

(H)(2)c: If New Development or Redevelopment drains directly into a channel maintained by HCFCD, then HCFCD requirements will govern. If New Development or Redevelopment drains directly to a roadside ditch, drainage ditch or storm sewer maintained by Harris County or TxDOT, then their respective criteria will govern.

(H)(2)d: If the drainage system outfalls directly into a channel maintained by HCFCD, and the requirements of HCFCD include payment of an impact fee, then no further impact fee will be required by the City.

(H)(2)e: A waiver of detention requirements may be requested if certain conditions are satisfied.


(H)(3)a: Detention volume for development areas is calculated on the basis of increases to the impervious cover associated with the project development and existing conditions at the site.

(H)(3)b: Single family residential (SFR) lots of 15,000 square feet in area or less: SFR lots are exempt from detention if proposed Impervious Cover is less than or equal to 65%. Detention volume of 0.20 acre feet per acre is required for Impervious Cover over 65%. Existing SFR lots of 15,000 square feet or less may be further subdivided and exempt from detention provided the proposed impervious cover remains less than or equal to 65%. If shared driveway is used, detention volume of 0.20 acre feet per acre is required.

(H)(3)b.1: Detention requirement = 0.2 acre feet per acre of increased impervious cover over 65% of the project area.

(H)(3)b.2: The area of the common or shared driveway, the access easement, access road, private alley or public alley must be included in the calculation of the project area.
DETENTION CRITERIA

COH Design Manual Chapter 9 Stormwater Design Requirements Section 9.05

(H)(3)c: Areas less than one acre and not subject to 9.05(H)(3)b: Detention volume will be required at 0.20 acre-feet per acre of increased impervious cover. Additionally, detention volume will be required to offset redevelopment of existing impervious areas.

(H)(3)d: Areas greater than one acre and less than or equal to 10 acres: Detention volume will be required at 0.50 acre-feet per acre of increased impervious cover. Additionally, detention volume will be required to offset redevelopment of existing impervious areas.

(H)(3)e: Areas between 10 acres and 50 acres: Detention volume will be required at 0.50 acre-feet per acre of increased impervious cover. Additionally, detention volume will be required to offset redevelopment of existing impervious areas.

(H)(3)f: Areas greater than 50 acres: Detention will be per the most current version of the Harris County Flood Control District Policy Criteria and Procedures Manual.

MEETING SCHEDULE

10/11/2017 Kickoff Meeting – Detention
10/25/2017 Detention
11/08/2017 Detention
11/29/2017 Fill
12/06/2017 Fill
12/13/2017 Drainage Obstructions
01/17/2017 Drainage Obstructions
01/24/2017 Wrap Up – Recommendations

All meetings held at 601 Sawyer, First Floor Conference Room, from 3:30 to 5:30 P.M.
FEEDBACK AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Questions?
Ideas?
Recommendations?
Feedback?
Things you'd like to know?
Send to Sallie Alcorn at
sallie.alcorn@houstontx.gov
832-393-1123
Slide 1

Slide 2

MEETING 2 AGENDA

1. Welcome - Witt
2. Introductions – first-time attendees
3. Meeting 1 issues overview – Costello
4. Introduce focus questions – Costello
5. Group discussion of focus questions - Witt/all
6. Present group results – group spokespeople
7. Wrap up – Costello/Witt
DETENTION ISSUES

Calculation
- Current calculations flawed because not hydrology based, only based on impervious cover
- One standard for all developments regardless of size
- When redeveloping a parcel, mitigate for more than just increase in impervious cover (possible takings issue)
- Increase standards, need safety net for overflow
- Incorporate effect of overland sheet flow into detention calculation
- Use impact fees to provide area-wide relief
- Review TP100/101 for possible部分内容
- Requirements for under 35,000 sq. ft.
- Redefine 100-year storm to incorporate runoff data
Location
- Set detention criteria on a sliding scale by watershed – take into consideration historic flooding
- Have different requirements for infill vs. suburban development
- Impact of detention is determined in isolation
- Modify detention criteria to remedy past problems
- Focus attention in areas which need protection
- Focus on conveyance – better investment than “holding” rainfall volume
Incentives
- Offer incentives – public/private partnerships for regional detention/leverage 385s
- Incorporate new water detention methods
- Allow developers to sell volume if demand beyond requirements
- Encourage decreases in impervious and use of green storm water infrastructure (macadam and beams vs. slab)
- There’s no incentive for developers to remove concrete
- Maintenance and Enforcement
  - Certification process for maintenance of detention/enforce maintenance of detention
  - Too many small ponds
  - Address past detention violations
  - Better maintenance of storm sewers

ADDITIONAL ISSUES
- Better maintenance of bayous
- Revisit Chapter 42 for more policing of development and densification
- Better coordination between agencies
- Form regional drainage system/multi-county drainage authority
- Plan to address fill and roadside ditches
- Educate public on rules and why the rules are in place
- Educate public on impervious and impact fee calculations
DETENTION FOCUS QUESTIONS

1. How would you modify detention criteria to consider hydrology, historic flooding, watershed, infill v suburban?

2. How would you modify detention criteria to mitigate for more than increase in impervious cover?

3. How would you modify detention criteria to incentivize green storm water infrastructure/low-impact development?

DETENTION CRITERIA

COH Design Manual Chapter 9 Stormwater Design Requirements Section 9.05

(H)(1): The intention of stormwater detention is to mitigate the new development or redevelopment on an existing drainage system. Stormwater detention volume requirements are based on increased impervious cover and on existing impervious area that are redeveloped.


(H)(2)a: The use of on-site detention is required for all Developments within the City and for new or expanding utility districts within the City's ETJ. Detention may not be required if the City has developed detention capacity for a drainage watershed, and/or infrastructure improvements, to serve the drainage watershed in compliance with the requirements of this Chapter. Under these conditions, the City will consider a funding contribution in lieu of on-site detention volume constructed by the owner.

(H)(2)b: Stormwater detention requirements are invoked for redevelopments that change the quantity of impervious cover on the site or change the on-site (private) drainage system.
DETENTION CRITERIA

COH Design Manual Chapter 9 Stormwater Design Requirements Section 9.05

(H)(2)c: If New Development or Redevelopment drains directly into a channel maintained by HCFCD, then HCFCD requirements will govern. If New Development or Redevelopment drains directly to a roadside ditch, drainage ditch or storm sewer maintained by Harris County or TxDOT, then their respective criteria will govern.

(H)(2)d: If the drainage system outfalls directly into a channel maintained by HCFCD, and the requirements of HCFCD include payment of an impact fee, then no further impact fee will be required by the City.

(H)(2)e: A waiver of detention requirements may be requested if certain conditions are satisfied.

---

DETECTION CRITERIA

COH Design Manual Chapter 9 Stormwater Design Requirements Section 9.05


(H)(3)a: Detention volume for development areas is calculated on the basis of increases to the impervious cover associated with the project development and existing conditions at the site.

(H)(3)b: Single family residential (SFR) lots of 15,000 square feet in area or less: SFR lots are exempt from detention if proposed Impervious Cover is less than or equal to 65%. Detention volume of 0.20 acre feet per acre is required for Impervious Cover over 65%. Existing SFR lots of 15,000 square feet or less may be further subdivided and exempt from detention provided the proposed impervious cover remains less than or equal to 65%. If shared driveway is used, detention volume of 0.20 acre feet per acre is required.

(H)(3)b.1: Detention requirement = 0.2 acre feet per acre of increased impervious cover over 65% of the project area.

(H)(3)b.2: The area of the common or shared driveway, the access easement, access road, private alley or public alley must be included in the calculation of the project area.
### DETENTION CRITERIA

**COH Design Manual Chapter 9 Stormwater Design Requirements Section 9.05**

*(H)(3)c:* Areas less than one acre and not subject to *(H)(3)b: Detention volume will be required at 0.20 acre-feet per acre of increased impervious cover. Additionally, detention volume will be required to offset redevelopment of existing impervious areas.

*(H)(3)d: Areas greater than one acre and less than or equal to 10 acres:* Detention volume will be required at 0.50 acre-feet per acre of increased impervious cover. Additionally, detention volume will be required to offset redevelopment of existing impervious areas.

*(H)(3)e: Areas between 10 acres and 50 acres:* Detention volume will be required at 0.50 acre-feet per acre of increased impervious cover. Additionally, detention volume will be required to offset redevelopment of existing impervious cover.

*(H)(3)f: Areas greater than 50 acres:* Detention will be per the most current version of the Harris County Flood Control District Policy Criteria and Procedures Manual.

### MEETING SCHEDULE

- **10/11/2017** Kickoff Meeting — Detention
- **10/25/2017** Detention
- **11/08/2017** Detention
- **11/29/2017** Fill
- **12/06/2017** Fill
- **12/13/2017** Drainage Obstructions
- **01/17/2017** Drainage Obstructions
- **01/24/2017** Wrap Up – Recommendations

All meetings held at 601 Sawyer, First Floor Conference Room, from 3:30 to 5:30 P.M.
FEEDBACK AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Questions?
Ideas?
Recommendations?
Feedback?
Things you’d like to know?
Send to Sallie Alcorn at
sallie.alcorn@houstontx.gov
832-393-1123
REDEVELOPMENT AND DRAINAGE TASK FORCE

MEETING 3 AGENDA

1. Welcome - Witt
2. Meeting 2 detention issues overview - Costello
3. Facilitated large-group discussion of detention issues – Costello/Witt/all
4. Finalize detention-related recommendations – Costello/Witt/all
5. Wrap up – Witt
Slide 3

1. Detention rate, minimum parcel size, grandfathering
2. Alternatives to detention
3. Green Infrastructure

DETENTION FOCUS ISSUES

Slide 4

Detention Issues

Detention Rate, Minimum Parcel Size, Grandfathering
- 0.5 for all sizes and all development
- No minimum parcel size, 0.5/0.65 rate
- For lots under 15,000 sq. ft., find way to allow for shared detention
- Consider varying detention amounts by watershed
- Use regional approach rather than lot-by-lot approach
- Phase out grandfathering (credit for existing development) over time
- Allow or disallow grandfathering based on conveyance conditions, watershed location
**Detention Issues**

**Alternatives to Detention**
- Pay impact fee in lieu of detention if less than 2-acre feet impervious or 1-acre foot of detention
- Require lots under 15,000 sq. ft. to pay impact fee
- Ensure impact fees are managed properly (similar to park dedication fund)

**Detention Issues**

**Green Infrastructure**
- Provide detention credit for green infrastructure at calculated detention rate
- Offer more green infrastructure options
- Green strategies must be explicitly permitted
- Manage expectations associated with benefits of green infrastructure
- Require alternative retention methods such as green roofs or rain gardens
- Vary green infrastructure incentives based on location - urban vs. suburban
Additional Recommendations

• City of Houston and Harris County work together to define quantitative low-impact development practices
• Expedite regional study for 13-county area
• Apply rules consistently across 4-county area
• Consider incentives for public/private partnership
• Educate the public on how the drainage system works and what citizens can do to help
• Establish clear ownership and maintenance responsibility of detention facilities
• Set up detention inspection program (every 3-5 years by COH inspector or annually certify by PE)
• Create drainage "TIRZs" to fund detention needs
• Establish better data management, citizen access to plans

Main Questions

1. 0.5 detention rate?
2. Minimum parcel size?
3. Phase out grandfathering? Duration?
4. Establish fee in lieu of detention?
5. Offer detention credits for green infrastructure?
6. Other?
MEETING SCHEDULE

10/11/2017 Kickoff Meeting—Detention
10/25/2017 Detention
11/08/2017 Detention
11/29/2017 Fill
12/06/2017 Fill
12/13/2017 Drainage Obstructions
01/17/2017 Drainage Obstructions
01/24/2017 Wrap Up – Recommendations

All meetings held at 601 Sawyer, First Floor Conference Room, from 3:30 to 5:30 P.M

FEEDBACK AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Questions?
Ideas?
Recommendations?
Feedback?
Things you’d like to know?
Send to Sallie Alcorn at sallie.alcorn@houstontx.gov
832-393-1123
MEETING 4 AGENDA

1. Welcome, Maps, Legal, Overview – Costello
2. Meeting Goal: Detention recommendation – Witt
3. Small group discussions (30 minutes)
4. Presentation of recommendations – group spokesperson
5. Large group discussion and votes – Witt/Costello/all
Meeting 1-3 Overview

Meeting 1
Small group brainstorming to come up with list of issues associated with the city’s detention criteria – issues centered on calculation, location, incentives, and maintenance.

Meeting 2
Small group discussions focused on how to modify existing criteria to address identified detention issues.

Meeting 3
Large group discussion of detention issues – considered rate, minimum parcel size, detention credit, alternatives to detention, and green infrastructure.

Meeting 3 Notes
Grandfathering – need legal clarification on whether getting rid of detention credit for existing impervious would be considered a taking
Could apply a new standard to increased impervious
Harris County rate .55 and credit for existing impervious - can go as low as .35 if use LID
If City knows where development will occur, it should upgrade the infrastructure there. City funding insufficient to fix infrastructure supporting existing impervious. Need developers to participate
Want to adopt new rules not to prevent development, but be transparent
Eliminate frog ponds
Main questions all linked together – changes need to address all four at once – rate, minimum parcel size, grandfathering, and fee in lieu of
Public/private partnership for growth - 10 acres/5 acre development new – give credit for public participation to offset
Share the cost of inadequate infrastructure
Goal is to do something to make it a better situation
Need to change what we do – formula only after grandfathering/fees
This is the group that must change things – don’t want to miss opportunity
Upgrades must be proportionate to the increased load to the system
Don’t want to study this for 2 years
If not a taking – phase out grandfathering over 2-5 years
If it is a taking – no change
<15,000 sq. ft. lot – fee in lieu of
Public says city too developer-friendly
Different areas have different needs – explore the criteria as a function of level of service
Entire system inadequate
How about development moratorium like what was done when sewer capacity insufficient?
Where do we have a 2-year drainage system and where do we not?
Identify what we do have and what we need – want overall maps of city showing level of service and who has flooded
Need debris pick up map to indicate flooded areas
About half of flooding occurs nowhere near a bayou
Detention depends on capacity of receiving system; assumes 2-year downstream capacity, if not, develop zones (like TIRZs)
Use different approach based on capacity downstream

Fee in lieu of – like park open space fee – how money used important/establish service areas for investment
How to structure and spend fee in lieu important
Drainage does not factor into siting decisions; rather, detention/drainage considerations affect cost and project feasibility
Underserved neighborhoods lack investment and infrastructure
Pendulum swings between science and politics
Get rid of minimum parcel sizes/ if < 15,000 sq. ft., pay fee
City is reactionary – needs to be proactive
Fee in lieu of must be transparent
Detention should be on public land (parks)
Developers want problems solved, but development community doesn’t want to pay for entire city’s costs
Encourage green infrastructure and incentives – offer more incentives like Harris County
MEETING GOAL

Detention Recommendations

➢ 1. Require payment of a fee in lieu of detention for lot sizes under 15,000 square feet.
➢ 2. Provide detention credit for broad range of (green) low-impact-development techniques (to mirror county criteria).

Recommendation Options
### Recommendation Options

- 3. Detention Credit options (four)
  - 3a. Maintain existing detention credit for existing impervious cover when redeveloping site. Require mitigating detention only for increased impervious cover and change in hydraulic efficiency, if applicable.
  - 3b. Eliminate detention credit for existing impervious cover when redeveloping site. Require mitigating detention for entire redeveloped site.
  - 3c. Provide 50% detention credit for existing impervious cover when redeveloping site. Require mitigating detention for increased impervious cover and 50% of existing impervious cover.
  - 3d. Maintain existing detention credit for existing impervious cover when redeveloping site. Impose higher detention rate standard (over-detain) for increased impervious cover.

### MEETING SCHEDULE

- 10/11/2017 Kickoff Meeting – Detention
- 10/25/2017 Detention
- 11/08/2017 Detention
- 11/29/2017 Detention
- 12/06/2017 Fill
- 12/13/2017 Drainage Obstructions
- 01/17/2017 Drainage Obstructions
- 01/24/2017 Wrap Up – Recommendations

All meetings held at 601 Sawyer, First Floor Conference Room, from 3:30 to 5:30 P.M
FEEDBACK AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Questions?
Ideas?
Recommendations?
Feedback?
Things you’d like to know?

Send to Sallie Alcorn at sallie.alcorn@houstontx.gov
832-393-1123
Meeting 5 – 12/06/2017
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REDEVELOPMENT AND DRAINAGE TASK FORCE

Stephen C. Costello
Chief Resilience Officer
City of Houston

Meeting 5 - December 6, 2017
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MEETING 5 AGENDA

1. Welcome – Witt
2. Overview of fill requirements, focus questions – Costello
3. Facilitated small group discussions – Witt/all
4. Presentation of recommendations – group spokespeople
5. Wrap up – Costello/Witt
City of Houston Department of Public Works and Engineering Infrastructure Design Manual

Section 9.02(C):
Proposed New Development or Redevelopment greater than 1 acre shall not alter existing overland flow patterns and shall not increase or redirect existing sheet flow to adjacent private or public property. Sheet flow from the developed property shall discharge only to the abutting public R.O.W. Where the existing sheet flow pattern is blocked by construction (i.e. raising the site elevation) of the Development, the sheet flow shall be re-routed within the developed property to return flow to original configuration or to the public R.O.W. Except under special circumstances dictated by natural drainage patterns, no sheet flow from the developed property will be allowed to drain onto adjacent private property.

Houston Amendments to the 2012 International Building Code:
Section E103.2(9.) and Section E106.3

Section E103.2(9.) states that a grading permit is not required: A fill less than 1 foot in depth and placed on natural terrain with a slope flatter than 1 unit vertical in 5 units horizontal (20% slope), or less than 3 feet in depth, not intended to support structures, that does not exceed 50 cubic yards on any one lot and does not obstruct a drainage course.

Section E106.3 states that: Grading in excess of 5000 cubic yards shall be performed in accordance with the approved grading plan prepared by a civil engineer and shall be designated as “engineered grading.” Grading involving less than 5000 cubic yards shall be designated “regular grading” unless the permittee chooses to have the grading performed as engineered grading or the building official determines that special conditions or unusual hazards exist, in which case grading shall conform to the requirements for engineered grading.
Fill Requirements

Harris County's proposed change to its floodplain management regulations – Section 4.05(b)(9):

No fill may be used to elevate structures in the 1 percent or 100-year floodplain. Structures may be constructed on an open foundation, such as piers, or on continuous foundation walls with properly sized and located openings. All foundations are required to be designed by a registered professional engineer. The drawings shall clearly show compliance with all provisions of these regulations. Fill may be used in coastal surge zones where floodplain fill mitigation is not an issue, however the standard for foundations remain the same.

FILL Focus Questions

What problems are brought forth by 9.02(C)? How should requirements be modified?

Should a grading permit be required for < 50 cubic yards?

Should “engineered grading” be required for all lot sizes?

Should city follow Harris County’s lead in disallowing fill to elevate structures in the 100-year floodplain?
MEETING SCHEDULE

10/11/2017 Kickoff Meeting — Detention
10/25/2017 Detention
11/08/2017 Detention
11/29/2017 Detention
12/06/2017 Fill
12/13/2017 Fill
01/17/2017 Drainage Obstructions
01/24/2017 Drainage Obstructions

All meetings held at 601 Sawyer, First Floor Conference Room, from 3:30 to 5:30 P.M.

FEEDBACK AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Questions?
Ideas?
Recommendations?
Feedback?
Things you’d like to know?

Send to Sallie Alcorn at sallie.alcorn@houstontx.gov
832-393-1123
MEETING 6 AGENDA

1. Welcome - Costello
2. Discussion and vote to determine fill consensus recommendations – Costello/all
3. Presentation on drainage obstructions/encroachments in city ROW – Rod Pinheiro, PWE
4. Enforcement issues – Costello/Pinheiro
5. Task force recommendation – Costello/all
6. Wrap up – Costello
City of Houston Department of Public Works and Engineering Infrastructure Design Manual
Section 9.02(C):
Proposed New Development or Redevelopment greater than 1 acre shall not alter existing overland flow patterns and shall not increase or redirect existing sheet flow to adjacent private or public property. Sheet flow from the developed property shall discharge only to the abutting public R.O.W. Where the existing sheet flow pattern is blocked by construction (i.e. raising the site elevation) of the Development, the sheet flow shall be re-routed within the developed property to return flow to original configuration or to the public R.O.W. Except under special circumstances dictated by natural drainage patterns, no sheet flow from the developed property will be allowed to drain onto adjacent private property.

➢ Remove >1-acre threshold?
➢ City should not mandate back to front drainage for every lot. Allow natural drainage patterns to remain.

Houston Amendments to the 2012 International Residential Code: Section E103.2(9.) and Section E106.3
Section E103.2(9.) states that a grading permit is not required: A fill less than 1 foot in depth and placed on natural terrain with a slope flatter than 1 unit vertical in 5 units horizontal (20% slope), or less than 3 feet in depth, not intended to support structures, that does not exceed 50 cubic yards on any one lot and does not obstruct a drainage course.
➢ Require grading permit for (what threshold)?

Section E106.3 states that: Grading in excess of 5000 cubic yards shall be performed in accordance with the approved grading plan prepared by a civil engineer and shall be designated as “engineered grading.” Grading involving less than 5000 cubic yards shall be designated “regular grading” unless the permittee chooses to have the grading performed as engineered grading or the building official determines that special conditions or unusual hazards exist, in which case grading shall conform to the requirements for engineered grading.
➢ Require permit for (what threshold)? Require engineered grading for (what threshold)?
Fill Requirements

*Harris County’s proposed change to its floodplain management regulations – Section 4.05(b)(9):*

No fill may be used to elevate structures in the 1 percent or 100-year floodplain. Structures may be constructed on an open foundation, such as piers, or on continuous foundation walls with properly sized and located openings. All foundations are required to be designed by a registered professional engineer. The drawings shall clearly show compliance with all provisions of these regulations. Fill may be used in coastal surge zones where floodplain fill mitigation is not an issue, however the standard for foundations remain the same.

➢ City should adopt same requirement for single lots in the 100-year floodplain.

Drainage Obstructions

*City of Houston Code of Ordinances, Section 28-1*

It shall be unlawful for any person to throw or deposit in any ditch anything which will in any way obstruct the free flow of water through the same.
It shall be the duty of every owner of real estate in the city, abutting on any public street in the city, in front of which real estate or along which street the city council may order the construction, reconstruction or repair, or bringing to grade of sidewalks, driveways, curbs or gutters, or any of them, to cause the same to be constructed, reconstructed or repaired or bring the same to grade, as the case may be, in accordance with the terms of such order, the specifications set out in this article and on the line and grade as established by the city engineer for the particular block, street or community in which the real estate may be situated. Such property owners shall cause to be constructed such improvements in front of their respective property after the giving of notice as prescribed in this article, within the time fixed by the city council. After the expiration of the time indicated in the notice to construct, reconstruct, repair or regrade, if the abutting owner shall not have built such improvements as ordered and indicated in the notice, then the city shall have the right to construct the same in accordance with the order for the same, and the standard specifications hereinafter set out, under the supervision of the city engineer, and may advertise for bids or may itself construct such improvements, at the expense of the abutting property owner, and may recover a personal judgment in any court having jurisdiction of the amount for the cost and expense in constructing, reconstructing, repairing or regrading such sidewalks, driveways, curbs and gutters, with ten percent additional for attorneys’ fees, and may, by ordinance, fix a lien on the property improved.

(b) Each additional parking space shall conform to the following requirements:
(1) The size and dimensions of the parking space shall be in conformance with the requirements of the Construction Code
(2) The parking space shall be placed within the boundaries of the subdivision plat, unless the parking space abuts:
   b. Culverts installed in accordance with the requirements of the design manual along an open ditch street adjacent to or within the subdivision plat boundary
Task Force Recommendation:

City should fully enforce all applicable rules related to re-establishing drainage in the public right-of-way.
Questions?
Ideas?
Recommendations?
Feedback?
Things you’d like to know?

Send to Sallie Alcorn at
sallie.alcorn@houstontx.gov
832-393-1123
City ROW Monitoring & Enforcement

Points for discussion:

PART A:
• We have an issue of authority or execution of authority when it comes to citations of violations in our right-of-way (ROW).
• The question is: How should we handle ROW violations and what is the best way for PWE or the City of Houston to address these issues as they occur?
  • Who has the authority to monitor and enforce?

PART B:
• Duties of abutting property owners
  • Can the City enforce property owners to fix issues?

PART C:
• Adopt a Ditch Program
PART “A”
Authority/Enforcement to issue notice to remove obstructions w/n City ROW

Chapter 28, Article I, Section 28-1 “Obstructing ditches”

It shall be unlawful for any person to throw or deposit in any ditch anything which will in any way obstruct the free flow of water through the same.
Roadside Ditch:

- Image 1
- Image 2
Center block retaining wall at the edge of the ditch in front of home

Sample of Encroachments
Slide 11

ROW with long run culvert - being used for business parking

Slide 12

Heights Area – Residential Parking Pads
PART “B”
Duties of abutting property owners

The concern relates to constituents requesting additional maintenance after desilting was performed to eliminate standing water. The standing water issue is mainly caused by: landscape features placed within ditch, culverts collapsed or not placed at the optimum elevation creating an off-set/uneven ditch flow line.

*Per City Code of Ordinance Section 40-84* it is the abutting property owner’s responsibility to construct, reconstruct or repair both the ditch culvert and driveway. Such repairs require all parties involved to coordinate with the City through the permitting system.
Section 40-84 - “Duties of abutting property owners”

It shall be the duty of every owner of real estate in the city, abutting on any public street in the city, in front of which real estate or along which street the city council may order the construction, reconstruction or repair, or bringing to grade of sidewalks, driveways, curbs or gutters, or any of them, to cause the same to be constructed, reconstructed or repaired or bring the same to grade, as the case may be, in accordance with the terms of such order, the specifications set out in this article and on the line and grade as established by the city engineer for the particular block, street or community in which the real estate may be situated. Such property owners shall cause to be constructed such improvements in front of their respective property after the giving of notice as prescribed in this article, within the time fixed by the city council. After the expiration of the time indicated in the notice to construct, reconstruct, repair or regrade, if the abutting owner shall not have built such improvements as ordered and indicated in the notice, then the city shall have the right to construct the same in accordance with the order for the same, and the standard specifications hereinafter set out, under the supervision of the city engineer, and may advertise for bids or may itself construct such improvements, at the expense of the abutting property owner, and may recover a personal judgment in any court having jurisdiction of the amount for the cost and expense in constructing, reconstructing, repairing or regrading such sidewalks, driveways, curbs and gutters, with ten percent additional for attorneys’ fees, and may, by ordinance, fix a lien on the property improved.

Collapsed long run culvert is causing water to sit stagnant in ditches
PART “X”

Urbanization Impacts to Roadside Ditches/Conveyance

Slide 18

Urbanization Impacts:

• Houston’s densification began in 1999. Before min. residential lots = 5,000 ft². After min. residential lots = 1,400 ft²

• Houston’s growth imposes greater demands on its Drainage.

• BEFORE 1999

• AFTER 1999
Slide 19

**SWMB Findings:**

“Moving the Flood”

Slide 20

**SWMB Findings:**

“Moving the Flood”
PART “C”
Adopt a Ditch Program

As a national award-winning Keep America Beautiful affiliate, Keep Houston Beautiful has worked with all segments of the community for more than 35 years to educate and empower individuals to take greater responsibility for beautifying and enhancing their environment. Each year, thousands more/control a cleaner and healthier city for all Houstonians.

Our mission is to engage individuals to take greater responsibility for their community environments.

Keep Houston Beautiful
300 Hitchcock, Ste. 250
Houston, TX 77009
Tel: 713.896.8685
Fax: 713.894.8689
www.houstonbeautiful.org
www.facebook.com/keephoustonbeautiful

Adopt-a-Ditch
Targeting tree planting along center-line ditches, Keep Houston Beautiful’s Adopt-a-Ditch tree program transforms public drainage channels into green, stormwater management/pleasant zones. A healthy tree canopy provides shade and reduces energy consumption while sequestering carbon dioxide and cleaning the air.
**Adopt-a-Ditch**

**What type of program is this?**

Adopt-a-Ditch is an initiative by the city of... programs. It is a... to create water quality... and education. The goal of this initiative is to improve water quality and educate the public... and maintain them... and health.

**What are the advantages?**

- Encourages neighborhood pride and... involvement.
- Enhances community... and natural areas.
- Provides... and... to... cleaning.
- Allows... to... in the... field.

- **How does it work?**

  Bypass... of stormwater... into the system... efficiency checks.
  - Encourages... and... during clean-up events.
  - Cutting... from... bags, and... in... during... events.
  - Completing... forms after... events.

**I Want to Adopt-a-Ditch!**

- **Organizations:**
- **Contact Name:**
- **E-mail:**
- **Phone:**
- **Estimated Number of Participants:**

---

**Storm Water Quality Education**

**Adopt-A-Ditch Project**
Storm Water Quality Education
Acres Homes Adopt-A-Ditch Project

BEFORE

AFTER
**Storm Water Quality Education**

South Park Adopt-A-Ditch Project

BEFORE

AFTER
Storm Water Quality Education
Almeda Plaza Adopt-A-Ditch Project

BEFORE

AFTER
MEETING 7 AGENDA

1. Welcome
2. Present revised DRAFT Report
3. Review comments received on DRAFT Report
4. Finalize recommendations
4. Wrap up
Detention Recommendations

➢ Require payment of a fee in lieu of for lot sizes under 15,000 feet
  Caveats: 1. Place collected funds in dedicated fund to be only used in specific service area where funds are collected (similar to park dedication fund)
  2. Ensure amounts collected are sufficient to be effective
➢ Provide detention credit for broad range of (green) low-impact development techniques (to mirror county criteria)
  Caveat: 1. Ensure proper inspection and maintenance of green infrastructure
➢ Eliminate detention credit for existing impervious cover when redeveloping site. Require mitigating detention for entire redeveloped site.
  Caveats: 1. Implement phasing strategy
  2. Clearly define what constitutes redevelopment
➢ Allow for the sale of excess detention capacity within the same hydraulic service area (detention volume banking)
➢ Encourage private sector involvement in creating regional detention in parks or other public lands

Fill Recommendations

➢ Remove the one-acre threshold in IDM Chapter 9 Section 9.02(c)
➢ Clarify contradictory language in IDM Chapter 9 Section 9.02(c) and specify need for flexibility to accommodate natural drainage patterns
➢ Clearly define “engineered grading” in Houston Amendments to the 2012 International Building Code Section 106.3
➢ Maintain threshold amounts in Houston Amendments to the 2012 International Building Code Section 106.3 (no permit required for <50 cubic yard; engineered grading required for 5000 cubic yards)
Encroachment Recommendation

➢ Initiate a widespread public education campaign to inform citizens of their responsibilities regarding roadside drainage
➢ Fully enforce all applicable rules to re-establish drainage in the public right-of-way

THANK YOU

Stephen C. Costello
Chief Resilience Officer
City of Houston