



**Town of Greenwich
Flood and Erosion Control Board
January 12, 2009 Workshop Minutes
3:00 pm – DPW Commissioner’s Office, Greenwich, Connecticut**

Those attending: Anthony M. Macleod (Chairman), Edward Schmeltz, Aubrey Mead, Jr., Len Van Houten, Amy Siebert, Dave Thompson, and Cindy Baumann, CDM.

A workshop was held to discuss a draft capital project prioritization approach to rate and rank possible stormwater management and drainage network improvements.

Based on December 2008 input, CDM presented a draft CIP Project Ranking Criteria and an example of how it might be applied using potential projects identified in the Strickland, Church Street, and draft Old Greenwich Stormwater Master Plans. The draft suggested first evaluating projects by certain global considerations:

- Floodplains: Evaluating if a project benefited parcels in FEMA delineated 100 year floodplain areas and considering putting such projects in a separate category to pursue federal funding. Such projects could still be evaluated with respect to all identified stormwater/drainage projects.
- Emergency Access: Determining if the project would improve emergency access under storm conditions and awarding points on that basis.
- Safety: Identifying if the project involves a safety issue such as a structural issue that must be addressed and awarding points on that basis.

The draft criteria includes land use density, acres impacted, percent undersized, environmental quality, parcels affected, operating budget, ownership, roadways flooded, and cost/acre/\$100K.

The group discussed several aspects of the draft:

- Emergency Access: The approach might want to take into account roadways by their classification – e.g. arterial, collector, local, etc. to help prioritize work. Should
- Technical versus cost factors: Consideration may be given to quantifying projects based on their technical factors, then applying operating and capital costs to the project, ultimately resulting in some form of cost / benefit ratio.
- Operating costs: Such costs may be isolated from other factors as typically costs will either remain the same or increase in virtually every project, rather than be reduced, given the drive to potentially expand / increase drainage networks and create flood control options.
- Capital costs / life cycle cost definition: We may want to include legal fees, right of way fees and other such costs to engineering and construction costs when determining project cost benefits.

- Ownership: The group discussed public versus private drainage networks and considered if this issue should be covered under the constructability factor – to get at construction issues associated with private property, private roads, easements, etc.
- Scoring: One potential option might be to take the project's total technical points and divide by project cost to obtain a final score to rank a given project.

DPW will discuss emergency access issues with Public Safety groups (Fire, Police, GEMS, etc.).

CDM was asked to edit the draft approach based on workshop comments for presentation at the next Board meeting.