

RETURN ON INVESTMENT: Online Tool Calculates The Benefits Of Green Infrastructure



21st Annual Public Works Roundup Kate Zielke, North Central Texas Council of Governments September 17, 2020

The challenge

66

We look at environmental programs as the right thing to do, but we look at them as a cost. How do we measure the return on investment of this work?

99

Goals for developing Economic & Environmental Benefits of Stewardship (EEBS) tool



Create a user-friendly, preliminary tool for decision-making and policy

Encourage infrastructure decision-makers to consider the benefits of incorporating environmental stewardship, including qualitative and quantitative benefits

Overcome the view that environmental stewardship is only a cost

Detention Ponds

EEBS!

Detention ponds capture and store stormwater in a pond year-round, or during/after a storm event. The stormwater is then released at a controlled rate and location. Depending on the type of pond, stormwater pollutants may be filtered, settled, infiltrated, or otherwise reduced before it is released.



EEBS was many steps in the making



Engaging stakeholders and experts

Stakeholder interviews

Tarrant Regional Water District Cities of Denton, Fort Worth, Cedar Hill Texas Parks & Wildlife Department NCTCOG

Project review committee

Texas Parks & Wildlife Department urban biologist City of Dallas Trinity Watershed Management NCTCOG National Environmental Policy Act practitioner

Consultant Highland Economics, LLC



Sample of stakeholder comments

Barriers to green infrastructure

City ordinances

Resistance to change may lead to belief that cost is higher

Lack of experience in implementing green infrastructure

Need for financial data

Metric that will most influence policy makers is money

Cost savings typically are not tracked for existing green infrastructure

Because of budgetary constraints, the bare minimum may be implemented

Need for public education

Education could lead the public to influence policy makers to support green infrastructure

The public likes the look of green infrastructure, and they like the environmental benefit once they are educated about this benefit

Need to include green infrastructure in planning phase

There is a need for a holistic, basin-wide vision in managing stormwater

We need to institutionalize the value of open space at the policy level

Push-back occurs after growth because people realize green space preservation was forgotten

Input from project review committee

Cleared up terminology discrepancies between city staff, NCTCOG staff, regulatory agencies

Provided feedback on impacts created by infrastructure, relevant green infrastructure to address impacts, and ecosystem services generated by green infrastructure

Discussed ecosystem services that ultimately the data and tool could not address, such as value of animal species, increase in neighboring property value

Economic data

Economic and Social Benefits of Mitigating Environmental Impacts of Transportation Projects

September 25, 2018

Prepared For:

North Central Texas Council of Governments Centerpoint II 616 Six Flags Drive Arlington, TX 76011

Prepared by:

Highland Economic, LLC 2344 NE 59th Ave Portland, OR 97213 503-954-1741



HIGHLAND ECONOMICS, LLC

Table 1-1: Quantified Costs: To		
Type of Environmental Impact	Quant	
Stormwater Runoff ¹	929,3	$\left \right $
Water Quality ²		
Sediment	900 - 1,	
Nitrogen	8.8 - 10	
Phosphorus	1.0 - 2	
Recreation ³	696 - 3,	
Urban Heat Island ⁴	4,98	
Habitat		
Wetland/Riparian	1	
Terrestrial Habitat	1	
Air Quality ⁵		
Particulate Matter	12.5 - 50.	9
Nitrogen Dioxide	4.5 - 12.5	5
- 14 1 - 1 - 1		

Table 1-3: Quantified Benefits: Tool Inputs on Economic Benefit

Environmental Benefit	Economic Value	Unit
Stormwater Management ¹	\$1,000 - \$1,100	\$ / Acre impervious / Year
Water Quality (Nitrogen) ²	\$1 - \$10	\$ / Pound
Water Quality (Phosphorus) ²	\$1 - \$10	\$ / Pound
Water Quality (TSS) ²	\$6	\$/Ton
Recreation ³	\$3 - \$25	Per Visit Benefit to Recreator
Energy Savings ⁴	\$0.1165	\$ / kWh
Aesthetics	\$300 - \$900	\$ / Street Tree / Year
Air Quality (PM10) 5	\$7.36 - \$19.85	\$ / Pound
Air Quality (NO₂) ⁵	\$4.59 - \$11.54	\$ / Pound
Air Quality (SO ₂) ⁵	\$3.67 - \$18.40	\$ / Pound
Habitat, Terrestrial	\$100 - \$750	\$ / Acre / Year
Habitat, Wetland/Riparian	\$500 - \$11,400	\$ / Acre / Year
Pavement Maintenance Costs	\$3.50 - \$17	\$ / Tree / Year

Note: Health benefits from air quality are included in the air quality values.

1/ Derived from the residential stormwater fees in Fort Worth and Dallas

2/ (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 2015; Natural Resource Conservation Service, US Department of Agriculture, 2010; Shaik, Helmers, & Langemeier, 2002)

3/ Sources: (Hansen, Mills, Stoll, Freeman, & Hankamer, 1990; Bergstrom & Cordell, 1991; Loomis, 2005). All values were adjusted for inflation to 2018 dollars using the Consumer Price Index.

4/ Based on the average marginal charge for electricity in Dallas in July 2018 (TexasElectricity Ratings.com, 2018) 5/ Derived from (Wang & Santini, 1995). The most recent data available were used for the Dallas metro area population and air pollutant concentrations. Values were adjusted to 2018 dollars using the Consumer Price Index.

Terrestrial Habitat	1	Acres Reduced Habitat / Acres Habitat Converted		
Quality ⁵				
Particulate Matter	12.5 - 50.9	Annual Pounds / Acre of Tree Canopy Removed / Year		
Nitrogen Dioxide	4.5 - 12.5	Annual Pounds / Acre of Tree Canopy Removed / Year		
Sulfur Dioxide	1.8 - 6.2	Annual Pounds / Acre of Tree Canopy Removed / Year		

1/ Source: Derived from rainfall in the Dallas/Fort Worth area from 2008 - 2017 (National Weather Service, 2018).
2/ Source: (Li, Barrett, Rammohan, Olivera, & Landphair, 2008). Ranges are similar to the pollutant loads found in other studies of urban runoff in North Central Texas (Banks, 2008; U.S. Geological Survey, 1998). Note that bacteria contamination is also a pollutant of concern in many area waterbodies, but is not related to transportation.

3/ Derived from (The Trust for Public Land, 2017; City of Plano, 2017; Dallas Park & Recreation, 2017; Dallas Park & Recreation, 2018)

Tool concept map



* If data was available

What are ecosystem services?

The services humans derive from the environment

- Food
- Flood control
- Recreation
- Many more...
- Public goods
- Value hard to quantify in decision making
- Protecting ecosystems and their services seen as a cost





Case studies

Green infrastructure

Open space

Pervious pavement Green Infrastructure in Grand Rapids, MI



North Central Texas Council of Governments



Green Infrastructure Net Economic Benefits in Grand Rapids, Michigan

Grand Rapids, Michigan Study

It is expected that there would be net benefits in Grand Rapids of implementing a variety of green infrastructure (GI) practices, including conserved natural areas, street tree planters, rain gardens, permeable asphalt, infiltration, and bioretention basins. A study by local researchers showed that each GI practice would provide a positive economic return when compared to conventional "gray" stormwater management infrastructure.¹

Net benefits were estimated to be positive over the life of the GI measure (measured as net present

Cities in North Central Texas

Key Program Benefits

- Green infrastructure mitigation measures are estimated to provide a higher net economic benefit than gray infrastructure.
 Specifically, the additional net benefits are:
 - Conserved natural areas: \$3.10/ft³
 - Street Trees: \$1.48/ft³
 - Rain gardens: \$1.12/ft³
 - Permeable asphalt: \$0.68/ft³

User guide

Video or PDF versions

Evaluate My Project

1. Draw Your Project Boundaries



Navigate to the location of your project by typing in an address, clicking and dragging on the map, and/or using the + and - tools.

Tool demo

Economic & Environmental Benefits of Stewardship

 \bigcirc

Evaluate My Project

Documentation

User Guide

Case Studies

Stewardship Information

User Guide

project evaluation tool.

Step by step guide for how to use the

Read User Guide

Data Report

About

Economic & Environmental Benefits of Stewardship

Project Evaluation Tool

The Economic & Environmental Benefits of Stewardship tool can estimate the return on investment of implementing environmental stewardship to reduce the environmental effects of transportation projects. The tool can educate decision-makers about the value of environmental stewardship.



Stewardship Information

Browse our library of stewardship options and download or print informational fliers.



Really excited about EEBS?

If you would like to promote EEBS, NCTCOG staff would be happy to speak at your event. We also can provide flyers to distribute or email.

Economic & Environmental Benefits of Stewardship Tool

The Economic & Environmental Benefits of Stewardship tool estimates the potential return on investment of implementing environmental stewardship to reduce the environmental effects created by transportation projects. The tool can educate decision makers about the financial value of environmental stewardship. Use the tool at **eebs.nctcog.org**.





Draw and describe project boundaries



Prioritize environmental effects



Select stewardship options



Compile report on benefits and costs

Regional Ecosystem Framework

> Environmental & Economic Benefits of Stewardship

Permittee Responsible Mitigation Database Environmental Matchmaking Tools

> Webinar September 30 1:30 p.m.

Learn about free tools to help identify your best stewardship options and mitigation locations for your transportation or development projects.

www.nctcog.org/envir/events

Contacts

EEBS content questions Kate Zielke, <u>kzielke@nctcog.org</u> Principal Transportation Planner NCTCOG Transportation Department

EEBS technical questions Brian Geck, <u>bgeck@nctcog.org</u> or <u>eebs@nctcog.org</u> Communications and Technology Supervisor NCTCOG Environment & Development Department