

Tina Motley-Pearson

June 30, 2010

Stormwater pollution is a common problem and municipalities need to be conscientious about what is flowing downstream.

There are technologies, like TRUE low impact development that would significantly benefit everyone. We need to keep the stormwater on site. Other states are requiring these technologies and seeing the benefits. The longer we wait to implement better development practices, the more expensive the clean up will be.

Putting off stage 2 allows Durham to continue developing the Falls lake water supply watershed at up to 70% impervious surface in highly erosive Triassic Basin soils. Durham consistently states that even if there was no growth in Durham's portion of the watershed, it would have pollution problems. Then Durham immediately states that they should wait numerous years to do stage 2, because the upper portion of Falls Lake might get better. How is the lake supposed to magically get better with few changes, more development, and Durham's admission that the upper part of the lake would have problems even if there was no development?

In the early 90's, Durham wanted weaker rules for Falls Lake so Durham could increase development. Raleigh was upset and there was quite a bit of controversy about development in the Falls Lake Watershed. The EMC was to address this in the early 1990's, however, they did not make any rules other than to recommend that the General Assembly should commission a study of Falls Lake.

The "Falls Lake Watershed Study" by the Cadmus Group in 1995 is that comprehensive report commissioned by the General Assembly and cost the taxpayers \$150,000. The nutrient problem in the section above I-85 was a common area of concern. This report articulates the concerns of increased development in the Falls Lake watershed, problems with Ellerbe Creek and

potential problems in the future. It was a conveniently forgotten report.

Durham's lobbyist, Steve Levitas, in charge of fighting the Falls Lake Rules was Deputy Secretary of DENR during this study, so he would have been aware of it.

Even before this study, Durham commissioned a study of the watersheds for their own water supplies. In 1989, Durham paid \$100,000 for a report called "Watershed Management Study: Lake Michie and Little River Reservoir Watersheds" (June 1989).

One of the issues this report addressed was how much impervious surface would cause degradation to the water. The report concluded that 6% impervious surface was the maximum amount of development that should be allowed to protect water quality.

Durham elected officials put this 6% limit for the entire watersheds for Lake Michie and Little River in their ordinances. This is proof that Durham's elected officials have known for many years that lakes need to be protected to ensure good water quality.

Durham's elected officials have known that one day, the citizens of Durham would have to pay for this clean-up. Durham's elected officials have intentionally neglected their responsibilities. And for the benefit of who? Not the citizens, not when we are talking billions of dollars for the clean-up of both Falls and Jordan Lakes.

And Durham is continuing this negligence, trying to push the clean-up into the future, 15 years down the road, when there will be even more developments to fix and at higher costs per

development.

The truth is Durham and Raleigh citizens have to pay the price for the short sighted politicians that have allowed bad development practices within their borders. The citizens of Durham will have increased stormwater fees and the citizens of Raleigh will have to pay hundreds of millions to upgrade their water treatment plant.

It is the politicians who are responsible for this mess. Every additional development using current practices is a stormwater I.O.U. from the citizens of Durham.

Clean up the entire lake.

1. Start now and finish the job within 25 years.
2. No delays along the way.
3. Keep stormwater on site by restoring natural hydrology.