









ENVIRONMENTAL & WATER RESOURCES INSTITUTE

## Cost of Maintaining Green Infrastructure

Edited by Jane Clary Holly Piza, P.E.

Sponsored by the Municipal Water Infrastructure Council Environmental and Water Resources Institute of the American Society of Civil Engineers





Published by the American Society of Civil Engineers

#### Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Names: Clary, Jane, editor. | Piza, Holly, editor.

Title: Cost of maintaining green infrastructure / edited by Jane Clary, Holly Piza, P.E.

- Description: Reston, Virginia : American Society of Civil Engineers, [2017] | Includes bibliographical references and index.
- Identifiers: LCCN 2017030566 | ISBN 9780784414897 (soft cover : alk. paper) | ISBN 9780784480960 (PDF) | ISBN 9780784480977 (ePub)
- Subjects: LCSH: Storm sewers-Maintenance and repair-Costs. | Urban runoff-Management-Costs. | Infrastructure (Economics)-Management.
- Classification: LCC TD665 .C68 2017 | DDC 628/.212-dc23 LC record available at https://lccn.loc.gov/2017030566

Published by American Society of Civil Engineers 1801 Alexander Bell Drive Reston, Virginia 20191-4382 www.asce.org/bookstore | ascelibrary.org

Any statements expressed in these materials are those of the individual authors and do not necessarily represent the views of ASCE, which takes no responsibility for any statement made herein. No reference made in this publication to any specific method, product, process, or service constitutes or implies an endorsement, recommendation, or warranty thereof by ASCE. The materials are for general information only and do not represent a standard of ASCE, nor are they intended as a reference in purchase specifications, contracts, regulations, statutes, or any other legal document. ASCE makes no representation or warranty of any kind, whether express or implied, concerning the accuracy, completeness, suitability, or utility of any information, apparatus, product, or process discussed in this publication, and assumes no liability therefor. The information contained in these materials should not be used without first securing competent advice with respect to its suitability for any general or specific application. Anyone utilizing such information assumes all liability arising from such use, including but not limited to infringement of any patent or patents.

ASCE and American Society of Civil Engineers—Registered in U.S. Patent and Trademark Office.

*Photocopies and permissions.* Permission to photocopy or reproduce material from ASCE publications can be requested by sending an e-mail to permissions@asce.org or by locating a title in the ASCE Library (http://ascelibrary.org) and using the "Permissions" link.

Errata: Errata, if any, can be found at https://doi.org/10.1061/9780784414897.

Copyright © 2017 by the American Society of Civil Engineers. All Rights Reserved. ISBN 978-0-7844-1489-7 (print) ISBN 978-0-7844-8096-0 (PDF) ISBN 978-0-7844-8097-7 (ePUB) Manufactured in the United States of America.

24 23 22 21 20 19 18 17 1 2 3 4 5

### Contents

Acknowledgmentsv					
1	ntroduction	<b></b> 1			
2	urvey Approach	3			
3	urvey Results for Communities Providing Maintenance         ost Data         .1 Overview of Findings         .2 Findings for Individual Data Providers         .3.2.1 Capitol Region Watershed District, MN         .3.2.2 Northeast Ohio Regional Sewer District         .3.2.3 Iowa Economic Development Authority         .3.2.4 City of Austin Watershed Protection Department         .3.2.5 Portland Bureau of Environmental Services         .3.2.6 Seattle Public Utilities         .3.2.7 Charlotte-Mecklenburg Stormwater Services         .3.2.8 City of Fort Collins, CO         .3.2.9 City of Lenexa, KS         .3.2.10 Urban Drainage and Flood Control District, Denver, CO	7 7 12 12 13 16 16 24 22 30 30			
4	<ul> <li>3.2.11 Proprietary Manufactured Devices</li> <li>otential Future Maintenance Cost Data Sources</li> <li>Philadelphia Water Department</li> <li>New York City Department of Environmental Protection</li> <li>San Francisco Public Utilities</li> <li>Southeast Metro Storm Sewer Authority, CO</li> <li>City of Lancaster, PA</li> <li>Milwaukee Metropolitan Sewerage District</li> <li>District of Columbia Water and Sewer Authority</li> <li>San Diego Transportation and Stormwater Department</li> <li>Atlanta Department of Watershed Management</li> <li>3 Rivers Wet Weather, Pennsylvania</li> <li>Washington State Department of Transportation</li> </ul>	. 36 . 37 . 38 . 40 . 41 . 41 . 43 . 43 . 43 . 43 . 44 . 44			
5	<ul> <li>I.S. Environmental Protection Agency Resources</li> <li>.1 EPA's 2013 Review of Green Infrastructure O&amp;M Practices</li> <li>.2 Summary of Green Infrastructure Cost Resources (EPA Website)</li> </ul>	• 45 . 45 51			

6	Cost	Estimating Tools and Resources Developed by Others	53		
	6.1	National Stormwater Calculator	53		
	6.2	University of Minnesota and Minnesota Department of			
		Transportation	56		
	6.3	University of New Hampshire Stormwater Center	57		
	6.4	WE&RF-AWWA-UKWIR 2005 BMPs/SUDS Whole-Life Costs	59		
	6.5	WE&RF's 2009 Whole-Life Cost Tool	64		
	6.6	National Cooperative Highway Research Program			
		Report 792	65		
	6.7	Urban Drainage and Flood Control District's			
		BMP-REALCOST Tool	67		
	6.8	North Carolina State University Biological and Agricultural			
		Engineering	68		
	6.9	Narayanan and Pitt and WinSLAMM	70		
_	_				
7	Reco	mmendations for Standardized Maintenance Cost			
	Repo	orting	71		
8	Cond	lusion	79		
•					
Ref	erenc	es	81		
۸n	oondi	y: BMP Cost Questions Focused on Green Infrastructure /			
Sm	all-Sc	ale Distributed Controls	85		
2					
Ind	Index				

## Acknowledgments

This research summary was prepared by the Municipal Water Infrastructure Committee (MWIC) of the Environmental and Water Resources Institute of the American Society of Civil Engineers with funding and support provided by the Urban Drainage and Flood Control District, a special district located in Denver and serving seven counties in Colorado.

#### **Committee Members, Contributors and Reviewers**

Holly Piza, P.E., Urban Drainage and Flood Control District (Committee Co-chair, Editor) Jane Clary, Wright Water Engineers (Editor) Elie Araj, P.E., D.WRE, Applied Sciences Kelly Behling, Wright Water Engineers Gerald Blackler, P.E., Enginuity Ted Cleveland, P.E., Ph.D., Texas Tech University Andrew Earles, P.E., Ph.D., Wright Water Engineers Ruth Hocker, P.E., City of Lancaster, PA Ken MacKenzie, P.E., Urban Drainage and Flood Control District Chris Olson, P.E., Ph.D., Colorado State University Linda Pechacek, P.E., D.WRE, LDP Consulting Charles Rowney, P.E., D.WRE, ACR Consulting Lee Sherman, City of Austin, TX Brian Van Weele, P.E., Parsons Brinckerhoff Ben Urbonas, P.E., D.WRE, Urban Watershed Research Institute

### **Data Providers/Information Sources**

Multiple municipalities provided cost data or references useful for development of this report. See Table 2-1 for a complete list of these contacts. MWIC appreciates the time and effort of the municipal staff who were willing to compile and share data for use in this report. MWIC would also like to acknowledge the following individuals who shared information used in this report:

Jason Berner, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Bethany Bezak, D.C. Water, Washington, D.C. Gerald Bright, Philadelphia Water Department, PA Brad Cox, Southeast Metro Stormwater Authority, CO Mark Doneux, Capitol Region Watershed District, MN Drena Donofrio, Seattle Public Utilities Andy Erickson, University of Minnesota Stormwater Center Jeff Geertz, Iowa Economic Development Authority Basil Hamden, City of Fort Collins, CO Ruth Hocker, City of Lancaster, PA Bill Hunt, North Carolina State University Steve Jadlocki, Charlotte-Mecklenburg Stormwater Services, NC Michelle Juon, Portland Bureau of Environment Services, OR James Lenhart, Contech Engineering Services Bill Lord, North Carolina State University Shane Ojar, New York City Department of Environmental Protection Holly Piza, Urban Drainage and Flood Control District, CO Kerry Rubin, AECOM, San Francisco Public Utilities, CA Matthew Scharver, Northeast Ohio Regional Sewer District Lee Sherman, City of Austin Watershed Department, TX Henry Stevens, Portland Bureau of Environment Services, OR Scott Struck, Geosyntec Consultants Tracy Tackett, Seattle Public Utilities

## CHAPTER 1 Introduction

Green infrastructure (GI), also known as green stormwater infrastructure (GSI), uses processes found in the natural environment to manage stormwater, with the end goal of reducing stormwater runoff volumes and corresponding pollutant loading from urban surfaces. These processes include storing, filtering, infiltrating, evaporating, and evapotranspiring stormwater while sequestering pollutants in the facility. Interactions among soil, vegetation, and water are key to managing stormwater with GI. GI practices can be implemented at a range of scales, such as regional (watershed scale), sub-regional (neighborhood scale), and widely distributed (smaller scale and single-lot scale). Distributed-scale GI practices have become more common, especially in high-density urban areas, where space is limited and the need for runoff volume reduction is great, such as in communities addressing combined sewer overflows (CSOs). Like traditional stormwater best management practices (BMPs) or control measures (SCMs), GI practices require maintenance to function effectively. Distributed GI practices have now been in place in some communities long enough to evaluate the comprehensive (whole-life) costs of implementation and maintenance.

In 2015, the Environmental and Water Resources Institute's (EWRI's) Municipal Water Infrastructure Council (MWIC) established two task committees to support municipalities implementing GI approaches. The committees are focused on these topics: (1) Comprehensive Costs of Implementing and Maintaining GI and (2) Sustaining Commitments to Municipal Stormwater System Infrastructure. This report has been completed to support the objectives of these two task committees. The primary focus of this report is compiling data to support whole-life cost estimates for a suite of small-scale distributed GI technologies, with particular emphasis on maintenance costs. The approach originally envisioned for this report involved contacting and surveying municipalities and organizations across the country regarding operation of their GI programs. Technologies of most interest included permeable pavements (parking lots, green streets, green alleys), infiltration/filtering technologies (rain gardens, street-side and bump-out planters, green gutters, tree trenches and pits, infiltration basins and trenches, media filters), and green building technologies (green roofs, green walls, planter boxes, disconnecting downspouts, rainwater harvesting). Information on more traditional technologies such as wetlands and detention ponds were also compiled when available. As part of this effort, information was pursued for the "hard costs"

(initial construction, operation and maintenance [O&M], and ultimate rehabilitation) and "soft costs" (planning, engineering, and administration) of small-scale distributed GI technologies.

During the course of the survey effort, it became apparent that GI maintenance cost data were relatively limited. Thus, two additional tasks were integrated into this report: a summary of currently available GI cost tools (Chapter 6) and recommendations for improved reporting of GI maintenance cost data (Chapter 7).

# CHAPTER 2 Survey Approach

The initial GI survey supporting this report focused on a list of national contacts identified by the MWIC GI task committees, with the list naturally expanding as the survey progressed. Prior to beginning the survey, a list of survey questions was developed to guide interviews with contacts, as summarized in the Appendix. When possible, this list of questions was sent to the contact point ahead of a scheduled phone conversation. Examples of information requested included GI program structure, types and frequency of maintenance activities, maintenance program costs, data tracking approach, and budgeting. Table 2-1 summarizes the contacts that were made and identifies whether GI cost data were provided or might be provided in the future as programs mature. Some communities did not respond or did not have data to share.

The highest-priority information requested was O&M data for GI. Survey discussions included questions about personnel that perform O&M (number of people, expertise, hours, pay rate); number, size, and age of facilities maintained; equipment use and cost; maintenance procedures (proactive, routine, and restorative); pretreatment practices (including street sweeping and other structural pretreatment); and any other costs outside of personnel and equipment. Other data of interest, although lower in priority, included other general stormwater program information such as annual budgets, stormwater master plans, software and other tools associated with stormwater needs assessment, training programs, and recommended design components to facilitate maintenance.

Although some municipalities were able to provide detailed maintenance cost information, most entities either had programs that were too new to be able to provide a useful data set or had programs that were so small that maintenance cost data for GI was rolled into a budget where it had not been tracked separately for each installation. In other cases, the local government may have had the information in some form, but did not have the resources to retrieve the requested information.