



## City and County of Honolulu Storm Water Utility Formation Stakeholder Advisory Group

March 30, 2020, 4:00-6:30 pm

### Webinar Meeting Summary

#### ATTENDEES

##### *Stakeholder Advisory Group Members*

American Council of Engineering Companies of Hawai'i (June Nakamura)  
AARP (Kealii Lopez)  
Building Owners and Managers Association (BOMA) Hawaii (Melissa Pavlicek)  
Hawai'i Appleseed Center for Legal and Economic Justice (Gavin Thornton)  
Hawai'i Association of Watershed Partnerships (Shelly Gustafson)  
Hawaii Reserves, Inc. (Jeff Tyau)  
Honolulu Board of Water Supply (Barry Usagawa)  
'Iolani School (Jaron Kawamura)  
Kamehameha Schools (Gary Evora)  
KUA (Wally Ito)  
NAIOP (Darian Chun)  
Neighborhood Board #4 (Sharon Schneider)  
Neighborhood Board #8 (Tim Streitz)  
Neighborhood Board #22 (Matthew Weyer)  
Neighborhood Board #25 (Bernie Marcos)  
Neighborhood Board #31 (Levani Lipton)  
O'ahu Resource Conservation and Development Council (Hannah Hubanks)  
Sustainable Coastlines (Rafael Bergstrom)  
The Nature Conservancy (Kim Hum)  
University of Hawaii (Roger Babcock)

##### *Public Agency Staff*

Randall Wakumoto (City and County of Honolulu Department of Facility Maintenance)  
Russell Leong (City and County of Honolulu Department of Facility Maintenance)  
Tonya Ketzka (City and County of Honolulu Department of Facility Maintenance)  
Lorna Aratani (City and County of Honolulu Office of Information Practices)

##### *Consultant Team*

Juli Beth (JB) Hinds (Birchline Planning LLC)  
Joan Isaacson (Kearns & West)  
Laurens van der Tak (Jacobs)  
Keith Bishton (Jacobs)  
Jessica Chiam (AECOM)  
Ming Ding (AECOM)  
Cami Kloster (G70)  
Janice Jensen (G70)  
Dana Butler (Hastings and Pleadwell)  
Taylor York (Kearns & West)

##### *Members of the Public*

Dana Okano (Hawaii Community Foundation)  
Christin Reynolds (One Water)  
Lauren Roth Venu (Roth Ecological Services)  
Malia Cox (Department of Hawaiian Home Lands Planning Office)  
Pearlyn Fukuba (Department of Hawaiian Home Lands Planning Office)  
Nancy McPherson (Department of Hawaiian Home Lands Planning Office)  
Andrew Choy (Department of Hawaiian Home Lands Planning Office)  
Unidentified / partial identified members of the public, ~5



## MEETING SUMMARY

### 1. Welcome and Introductions

Facilitator Joan Isaacson (Kearns & West) opened the meeting by showing the project video (see [StormWaterUtilityOahu.org](http://StormWaterUtilityOahu.org)). She then introduced Randall Wakumoto, Department of Facility Maintenance Storm Water Quality Branch Chief, who welcomed everyone to the meeting and expressed appreciation for the Stakeholder Advisory Group's continued commitment to the process and for their patience with the meeting rescheduling and the webinar format due to the COVID-19 situation.

### 2. Agenda Overview

The agenda for the evening was reviewed by Joan. Please see slides 5 to 11 of the presentation materials.

Two areas of focus for the meeting were 1) input received on the first round of community meetings and 2) the basic building blocks for the Storm Water Utility. Feedback was requested from the Stakeholder Advisory Group regarding: the number of tiers (4 or 8); thoughts on the Plan C budget; and ways to address the themes from the Round 1 community engagement. Joan also pointed out that a new date of August 24<sup>th</sup> was chosen for Stakeholder Advisory Group Meeting #7.

Joan reviewed the process for submitting questions and comments during the webinar and explained that the Tips for Productive Discussions are still useful in webinar meetings in order to maximize involvement and input. She also invited the Stakeholder Advisory Group members to email feedback to Randall until the end of the week (April 6<sup>th</sup>), and all input will be included in the meeting summary. During the meeting the chat function was used to provide feedback and ask questions. A brief demonstration was provided of the chat function.

### 3. Public Comment

Comments from the public will be included in the next meeting summary. Please see slides 5 to 11 of the presentation materials for this agenda item. Details for providing comments via email or US mail are listed on slide 13.

### 4. Sunshine Law Requirements

Lorna Aratani from the City's Office of Information Practices spoke briefly regarding the Sunshine Law. City ordinance requires that members of all boards and commissions take the Sunshine Law training course. While Sunshine Law requirements are currently suspended due to COVID-19 social distancing, boards, commissions and other groups like this one are encouraged to follow the intent of the law, including having time designated for comments at the beginning of the agenda.

The Office of Information Practices is taking questions via email currently, during the governor's suspension of the Sunshine Law.

### 5. New Binder Contents and Resources

Juli Beth (JB) Hinds (Birchline Planning) reviewed items that were emailed out and are posted on the [www.StormWaterUtilityOahu.org](http://www.StormWaterUtilityOahu.org) website. Please see slides 15 to 16 of the presentation slidedeck for this agenda item.



Emailed materials were:

- Chesapeake Bay fact sheet on federal facility responsibilities to pay duly adopted local storm water utility fees
- Press release regarding a court ruling that outlines why storm water fees were found to be a fee, rather than a tax, by the courts.
- Example of a City Council revenue bond resolution from the City and County of Honolulu for sewer bonds, provided as an example of a funding vehicle that could be used if a Storm Water Utility fee is adopted.
- United States versus City of Renton court decision, addressing the responsibility of federal facilities to pay duly adopted local storm water utility fees.
- Salt Lake City Public Utilities' annual report as an example of a customer-focused annual report on storm water services and other utility services.

Materials posted on the website were:

- A series of research journal studies and articles that document the impact of storm water on waterways and near-shore coastal resources, chiefly in Hawaii
- A Blueprint for Action Water Security for an Uncertain Future 2016-2018, report by the Fresh Water Initiative
- Looking Ahead: The Path to a Stormwater Utility for the City and County of Honolulu December 2017

If there is other information that would be useful to the Stakeholder Advisory Group, please let the project team know via Randall Wakumoto.

## Q&A/Discussion

*Please note: For all Q&A / Discussion sections, the notes with dashes (-) represent comments and questions from the Stakeholder Advisory Group and the notes with open points (o) represent the project team's responses.*

- How is a fee different from a tax?
  - o Taxes are general levies for variety of government purposes. A fee is an assessment that is earmarked for specific government purpose, is proportional to an impact (in this case impervious cover) and provides a specific service in return for payment of fees.

## 6. Community Engagement Updates and Key Input Themes

Joan gave an overview of the Round 1 community engagement process, which has been conducted and completed since the last Stakeholder Advisory Group meeting. Please see slides 17 to 29 of the presentation materials for community engagement update.

Eighteen community meetings were conducted across the islands. Meetings were scheduled to capture input that might vary by geography.

The first round of community meetings included repeated questions, comments, and ideas on these themes:

- Revenue neutrality/property tax reduction
- Assurances of program accountability and fund protection
- Credits and financial incentives – yes!
- Expectation for long-term planning & vision
- Fee adjustments for on-site storm water management



- Geographic investment in ALL O'ahu communities
- Address impacts to the elderly and low-income households, given Oahu's high cost of living

The elements that comprise a storm water utility are being refined based on community and Stakeholder Advisory Group input. The refined concepts will be shared with the public for additional feedback and then further refinement.

For Round 2 community engagement, meetings will likely be held as webinars. The focus will be to present draft core recommendations for the Storm Water Utility and solicit input and feedback that will be used to fine tune the recommendations. Another objective is to continue to increase the number and diversity of involved community members.

### Q&A/Discussion

- Will the invitation re: Community Outreach, be as rigorous re: the number of meetings? Did we collect contact information from attendees, and will those persons be re-invited in addition to others you hope to reach, expand, etc.?
  - o The project team has contact information for all attendees from the first round of outreach meetings and will be sending out announcements regarding the next round of meetings – as well as the community input summary from the first round of outreach.
- Community members are asking me how this stormwater utility will coordinate with DPP [Department of Planning and Permitting] with respect to development projects.
  - o The Storm Water Utility would fund some dedicated positions at DPP, which will be joint positions with both Department of Planning and Permitting and the Department of Facility Maintenance/Storm Water Utility.
- It was noted that the video does not emphasize that no decision has been made by City Council; however, this was stated at the community meetings. The video is not necessarily reflective of the full assessment process and it has a positive tone that may suggest to some people that the process has already been completed.

## 7. Refined Program Budget and Rate Structures

Laurens van der Tak (Jacobs) and JB presented information on how the program budget had been refined and implications for the rate structure. Please see slides 30 to 69 of the presentation materials for the refined program budget and rate structures.

### Rate Options

Laurens provided an overview of the differences between a 4-tier and 8-tier rate structures and the tradeoffs between complexity and equity (slides 30-34).

### Impact of Changing to a "Mid-Point" Multiplier

This discussion provided follow-up from the January Stakeholder Advisory Group meeting regarding multipliers for use in creating tiers. The tiers were reassessed using the mid-point of the multipliers (slides 35 to 41).



### Revised Program Budget: PLAN C & Revised Fee Scenario & Assumptions

A new program budget was presented and associated revised fee scenario and assumptions. The new budget, dubbed “Plan C,” is a hybrid of the Basic Compliance (Level of Service [LOS] 1) and Better Program (Level of Service [LOS] 2) budgets that were presented in December and January. The Plan C budget incorporates debt financing (slides 42 to 53).

During the first three years of Plan C, all scheduled capital projects are cash funded. Beginning in year 4, asset replacement projects are debt financed. Overall, the Plan C budget represents lower annual average total program costs than both the basic compliance and better programs previously evaluated. With debt financing, capital costs go down and operating expenses go up as proportions of the overall budget over time. This enables the City and County to address key operational challenges, notably stream channel cleaning and expanded drain line assessment, cleaning, and repair.

### Revised Fees per 1,000 SF Impervious Area & Customer Impact Examples

The revised fees per 1,000 SF of impervious area were calculated based on the Plan C budget, and examples were given for a variety of property types for both 4 and 8 tiers. Please see slides 54-69.

### Q&A/Discussion

- Please provide examples of the \$37 M of CIP [Capital Improvement Program] projects? There are many drain lines that are too small, only accommodating roughly a 15-year storm.
  - o Examples of CIP projects include erosional repair projects and municipal facility improvements. Please see the October Stakeholder Advisory Group meeting materials for more examples.
- How do these drain systems get upsized, through the SWU [Storm Water Utility] CIP or through City appropriations through DDC [Department of Design and Construction]?
  - o Today, this is a City/DDC responsibility. If, when and as the Storm Water Utility begins debt-funded asset replacement, the Storm Water Utility program would have the opportunity to begin addressing up-sizing of the system.
- You mentioned State Revolving Funds as another source of funding for projects. Have you already started this conversation with DOH [Department of Health] and EPA [Environmental Protection Agency]? How much can you count on this money?
  - o These conversations have begun and have been very productive. The State Revolving Fund is available for storm water projects, but it requires significant administration to manage. The Plan C program budget anticipates staffing positions that would be able to use and manage State Revolving Fund applications and processes that could fund a variety of beneficial projects.
- Did we address the issue of what the required fee would be once the debt service had to begin to be repaid?
  - o Once the backlog of CIP is addressed during the beginning of the storm water utility, the team’s projections anticipate that the annual average budget will begin to level off and remain the same, with adjustments for inflation. If the CIP backlog and other ‘one time’ issues such as eliminating illicit discharges are fully addressed, some areas of expenditure could perhaps go down.



- What is the outlook for the rates after year 6? Assuming that the rates remain constant over the first 6 years?
  - o With the projections, the year 7 is steady state at the level of average of the year 6. Overall start to have a smoother budget cycle. Barring some major change in the permitting process, the budget is not expected to increase substantially with respect to its content or overall level of cost beyond year 6.

## 8. Financial Incentives: Credit Policy and Program Options

Laurens presented different financial incentives that the storm water utility could adopt to encourage beneficial actions. Credits allow rate payers to reduce their bills, and reward actions that reduce the strain on Oahu's storm water system. Examples were provided of a sample of other municipalities and the various programs they provide. Please see slides 71 to 96 of the presentation materials for the financial incentives.

The options of rebates / grants (one-time payments) versus credits (ongoing reductions in fees) were compared before more details were discussed.

### Credit Eligibility

All properties must be eligible for credits in a storm water utility: If actions are taken on site to reduce the impact of impervious surface on the overall system, this must be credited in a consistent manner in the same way that energy conservation should lead to lower energy bills. Credits in a Storm Water Utility can be given for structural measures (such as bioretention, cisterns, rainwater harvesting, rain gardens, green roofs, vegetated swales, oil-water separators, sand filters) or non-structural measures (actions and operations that reduce storm water pollution or runoff) (please see slides 74-78).

### Credit Calculations

100% credits for a property are very rare in existing programs, as there are overall program costs that need to be covered through storm water fees. Credits for structural treatment and control typically are given based on the percentage of the impervious area on a site that is treated to a locally-adopted standard, such as the requirement to treat the first inch of runoff for the City & County Honolulu. Total credits are often capped at a percentage of the total fee. Maximum percent credits in comparable cities' programs range from roughly 40% of the bill to 70% of the bill. Examples were provided of how credits and credit maximums work for sites with multiple storm water treatment measures (slides 79 -84).

### Credit Manuals & Application Forms

Credit manuals provide the details of how property owners can obtain credits, and how much financial relief is offered for different actions. There may be separate manuals for residential properties versus for other non-residential land uses. Credits may have different durations of validity and are usually subject to verification of ongoing maintenance (slides 85-97).

### Q&A/Discussion

- Have all these credits been accounted for in the funding of the SW Utility program?
- In your rate calculations (\$/mo), what total % of credits did you assume?
  - o A 5% reduction in revenues from implementation of credit projects is planned, based on years of experiences in other municipalities. Rarely do credits result in a revenue decline of more than 2 to



4%, so this is a conservative assumption. Note that the 5% reduction is a reduction in total revenue, not in the number of participants.

- Will there be different credit amounts for different types of green infrastructure, for example a lawn vs a large tree (where they may cover the same area, but the lawn would not trap as much water as the tree)?
  - o Usually credit amounts are percentages and are based on how much of a 1" rainfall event over the site's impervious surface is being treated on site.
- What is the minimum [credit] if a subdivision already treats [runoff with] their [own on-site] stormwater devices?
  - o Storm water treatment usually provides a credit which is expressed as a percentage. Typical maximum credit levels are 50% and in some municipalities are up to 75%. Because of the need to cover overall program costs for the area served, most utilities do not provide 100% credit.
- How would the credit be calculated if a SWQ [storm water quality] device in a subdivision is calculated for all of the impervious area? Does each homeowner need to show the design engineers calculation for each home to receive the credit? I'm not sure I understand how an association would apply for the credit if each homeowner would be charged the fee. The credit should go to each homeowner from the fee.
  - o Who applies for which credit measure is flexible. Typically, where older types of measures (centralized facilities) are in place, the homeowners' association applies for the credit. The credit savings is then passed to the homeowners via a reduction in association-managed fees.
- Shouldn't the credit be for a lifetime as long as the Association is maintaining it?
  - o The length of time for the credit is finite because it needs to be maintained in order to be effective. So, if the storm water quality device is being maintained, the credit would be able to be renewed and would continue.
- We just recently calculated the Association maintenance fee and discovered the maintenance cost of the SWQ [Storm Water Quality] devices for our development is 33% of the monthly fee. It was also \$7100/unit to construct. Therefore, this fee is a large percentage for the homeowners to pay for an in this economic time this added cost is going to be hard for homeowners to pay for.
- What would be the way for property owners to have a dialogue with the Storm Water Utility?
  - o Any storm water utility has a substantial lead time from when the ordinance is passed until the first fee payment is due. During that time, all property owners would receive a notice of determination and could appeal the determination of how much impervious cover is on site.
  - o The final credit manual also would be developed during the first year.
  - o Also, for multi-tenant residences and businesses, who the bills will go to is determined during this period. Bills could be allocated to individual tenants or paid by an association. Usually associations receive notice and apply for the credit and then the fee is divided up among the homeowners.
- I am concerned about churches/non-taxed properties. They have no expense now. They can't get a tax credit. This will be painful for my church which already struggles with balancing revenues and expenses. If membership fees and donations stay constant, programs will have to be reduced/cut. Getting additional donations for stormwater fees instead of religious programs will seem to be challenging.
  - o Churches tend to be excellent candidates for credits and rebates. Churches in particular can benefit from participation in the non-structural credit options. For example, the City of Detroit, addressing



this concern specifically, came up with readily accessible ways to reduce the fees with credits for providing space for storm water educational programs.

## 9. Options for Addressing Other Key Community Input Themes

Joan provided notes on recommendation opportunities and process including the role of the Stakeholder Advisory Group. Please see slides 97 to 104 of the presentation materials for the financial incentives.

Joan reviewed the key community input from Round 1 of outreach and the objectives which were:

- Inform community members about storm water utilities – the “why, what, how, and when” – and options for Oahu.
- Share the project team’s research and analysis to date, including preliminary fee estimates, and the Core Values prepared with the Stakeholder Advisory Group.
- Solicit input from community members and other stakeholders on questions, ideas, concerns, and priorities for a potential storm water utility for Oahu.

Each community input theme was discussed along with potential responses in formulating the storm water utility.

### Q&A/Discussion

- Is the reduction of real estate [property] taxes even on the table? Currently, \$91M is taken from the general fund. If the stormwater utility is funded separately, will the tax for the general fund be reduced accordingly? Is this even on the table for consideration?
  - o Input about the importance of reduction in real estate taxes or another offset for current revenue was received at every community meeting and Stakeholder Advisory Group meeting. This feedback will be clearly communicated to City Council in the Storm Water Utility Formation study report. Ultimately it is up to City Council to make this decision.
- Being there are over 2000 SWUs [storm water utilities] across the country, haven't many of these questions already been addressed? Are we reinventing the wheel?
  - o Through the project team’s expertise, experiences across the country are being considered for O’ahu. While there are many commonalities in storm water utilities, there is not a one size fits all. Having these conversations is important to reflect local needs and finding the right answers for O’ahu. For example, there may be differences in complexity and equity, the extent of credit programs for seniors/low income.
- I am concerned about equity. There is an assumption being made that homeowners will be able to pay for and incorporate the features that will help mitigate stormwater runoff (rain gardens, bioswales, etc.). However, what about people who can’t afford these modifications but will still be required to pay the fee? They won’t be able to benefit from credits or incentives.
  - o This issue has been raised through the community meetings as well. One program option that can be recommended is to have a program that pays for credit projects to be completed for those who cannot afford to invest in the projects. This may be particularly targeted towards elders, especially in areas with rapidly increasing rents and property values.
- When will you submit the stakeholder committee report/recommendations to the city council?
  - o Per the project timeline, a report will go to City Council in July of 2020.



**10. Next Meeting Preview – May 18, 2020**

The next Stakeholder Advisory Group meeting will be held as the next round of community engagement is being launched. A more thoroughly developed program budget and credit proposal will be presented and discussed. The discussion will also be focused on matching core values and program needs and credits and incentives and how to ensure equity.

**11. Wrap-Up**

- Email additional input to Randall by Friday, April 3<sup>rd</sup>
- Watch for the complete Round 1 Input Summary
- Tell at least 100 people about the Round 2 community meetings!
- Attend one of the Round 2 community meetings
- Complete the 1-hour Sunshine Act webinar
- Continue to provide the team with feedback from your organization



## Post-Meeting Meeting Input from Stakeholder Advisory Group Members

Received 3/30/2020

I think the strategy of setting the effective date of the fee a year or two after the stormwater utility and enterprise fund is approved, is a good strategy.

Per your request for feedback:

4 or 8 Tiers: Seems like this is a balance between equity and simplicity. Mid-point multipliers are more equitable but harder to explain. If they don't understand it, will they believe it's more equitable? Anyways, 8 tiers are less expensive and more equitable than 4. So, 8...

The administrative work to slot parcels into tiers and applying the fee is an upfront effort, no matter the number of tiers. Once done, there's not much revisiting.

Since Plan C utilizes bond issuance, I support it because it lowers the unit rate per 1,000 sq. ft. by about \$3/k-sq.ft. per month. BWS financial policies target 50% cash and 50% bonds. Looks like there is a 60/40 split between operating and CIP, respectively. Good to establish a similar financial policy. It keeps rates lower...

Really like the Themes... My priority but they are all equally essential:

1. Revenue Neutrality/Property Tax Reduction. (no net increase, except for those exempt from property tax...)
2. Geographic Investment in ALL O'ahu Communities. (equity is important, all who pays benefits, although it will take time.)
3. Assurances of Program Accountability and Fund Protection. (both internal and external audits are standard and necessary) I would avoid any City Charter change because who knows how people will vote and it's all in how the language is drafted... Too much uncertainty and it would follow the negative view of HART and draw BWS into the swamp...
4. Address Impacts to the Elderly and Low-income Households, Given Oahu's High Cost of Living. (a greater % of old folks vote. A lifeline rate for elderly and fixed/low income folks really had a lot of support in our water rate revision. Equals less opposition.)
5. Expectation for Long-Term Planning & Vision... (incorporating the stormwater utility concepts and benefits into the East Honolulu Watershed Management Plan)

The Fee Adjustments for On-Site Storm Water Management theme seems to be already embedded in the credit's discussion.

Stakeholder feedback like surveys are excellent ways to leverage City Council if they are truly responsive to the community...

---



Received 3/31/2020

Implementation decisions and specific program actions by County agencies are **not** made by the City Council. The job of the Council is to make policy, the implementation of which is solely within the jurisdiction of the Executive branch of government. Council policy is expressed through authorization of plans and programs, usually by ordinance, and by funding and approving program budgets. County agencies are under the exclusive authority of the Mayor. To oversimplify, the Council makes policy while the Mayor implements such policy.

*Note: The language on slide #96 was modified after the meeting to address this comment.*

---

Received 3/31/2020

I have received no other comments from my other board members yet. But as I wrote to JB during the webinar, I support Plan C and I would support Option 1 for the rate schedule, i.e., having 8 tiers. I thought that Plan C captures the intent of meeting stormwater permit requirements and at the same time provides a good way ahead for implementing the capital improvements needed in our system. I like the 8 tier rate schedule method basically because it is the least cost to the customer, who is already faced with high taxes and fees from other utilities.

---

Received 3/31/2020

I have a few suggestions for organizations (I know outreach was mentioned in the meeting):

“Follow the drop” Lauren Roth Venu and the Citizen Forester with Smart Trees Pacific, which works with “mapping” trees and their water retention numbers.

---

Received 4/6/2020

*Neutrality/Property Tax reduction*

Maybe a partial reduction but I am concerned about how the taxes are calculated and may fluctuate. I don't know the best way to calculate this since a lot depends on the market and the budget. Would it be the theoretical budget for DFM's Storm Water work?

*Assurances of Program Accountability*

I am not familiar with the implications of each of the suggestions, but I think the funds should be protected from raids and there should be an annual audit/report for the public.

*Geographic Investment in ALL Oahu Communities*

Perhaps a discussion on priorities for our communities - Formula based funding provided to be spent by PPP is closest to what I perceive is fair.



*Fee Adjustments for On-Site Storm Water Management*

Of course web based or other materials for understanding and accessing credits. Perhaps a tax break for doing mitigation water flow project or using the grants. Community outreach for the rollout of the programs. I am not sure project credits should be forever. Would the mitigation be measured to determine the credit?

*Kupuna First!*

Yes, I think most important is Income -qualified relief.

Age is less important criteria. Grants and technical assistance for seniors and low income owner households property. What about renters? Would the fee be passed on to them? In the aforementioned case if the renter does not pay would the possibility of a lien help not to pass on the fee, especially to lower income renters?

*Four or Eight Tier Fees*

I am greatly influenced by the "Monster House" phenomenon. I would prefer slightly finer tiers to discourage huge houses on small lots - the paving of nearly the entire lot. There are numerous examples of situations, mainly the CPRs that may leave little room for mitigation of a significant amount of the runoff from their property.

---

Received 4/7/2020

I am submitting the following comments based upon the information presented to us to date and community comments that I have heard as part of attending community meetings in my district.

I am in support of the 8 tier fee system.

I have the following areas of concern of which I would like the opportunity to discuss these items with the Advisory Committee and ask for a vote on the following items.

1. Revenue Neutral

- a. Especially with the current Covid 19 Hawaii economic situation, this is not the time for additional fees in addition to the current taxation.
- b. Current City Property Tax paying Residential and Businesses are already paying for most of these services as part of the current property taxes. Since the City wants to be able to float bonds for longer term payment options, then the property taxes should be decreased to account for the new proposed Utility Fee.
  - i. ACTION ITEM, Estimate the property tax reduction amount that would approximately match the corresponding proposed utility fee for the various residential and commercial property tax rates and report this to the Citizens Advisory Committee.
- c. Allowances should be made for the elderly and fixed income qualified owners to pay a reasonable amount.



2. Rural vs Urban Equity

- a. Most of the items in the proposed Storm Water Utility Operating budget benefit the Urban areas. Rural paying properties may get little to no benefit from this fund. Unlike Sewer and Water utilities that have a clear one to one benefit vs charge ratio. Each Neighborhood board area should have 75% of the collected funds, from that district, used for that district. Neighborhood boards should have a say in the allocation and use of the funds for their districts.

3. Private Road Storm Water Fee Charge

- a. Not all private roads are equal. Many private roads are open and used for the public. The City and County will repave private roads the service more than 6 properties that meets certain established requirements. Since the City is proposing to not charge City and State roadways, private roadways that are open to the general public and meet the City and County repaving maintenance ordinance should not be charged the Utility Fee.

4. Private Storm Water Systems

- a. If an area is served by a private storm water system, then that area is already paying operating and CIP funds to maintain their private storm water system. The new City Storm Water Utility is not proposing to spend any funds to maintain private stormwater systems and thus those residences and businesses should NOT pay twice to storm water services, once to maintain their system and again to the City from which they will not receive any benefit or little benefit.