

**INCENTIVES WORKGROUP  
AGENDA  
AUGUST 6, 2009**

- I. INTRODUCTIONS – 5 minutes
- II. LINDA GORTON COMMENTS – 3 minutes
- III. ESTABLISH WORKGROUP DYNAMICS / ROLES – 20 minutes
- IV. REVIEW OF ORDINANCE (SECTION 14-410: INCENTIVES GRANT PROGRAM) – 15 minutes
- V. DISCUSS WORKGROUP GOALS / SCHEDULE – 30 minutes
- VI. FINALIZE WORKGROUP GOALS / SCHEDULE – 10 minutes

**Water Quality Management Fee  
Incentives Workgroup Meeting Notes  
August 6, 2009**

**Present**

Councilmember Tom Blues  
Councilmember Linda Gorton  
Susan Bush, Division of Environmental Policy  
John Cobb, RainScape  
Chad Harpole, Commerce Lexington  
Chris Howard, CARMAN  
Charles Martin, Division of Water Quality  
Julie Mantrom, Division of Water Quality  
Andrew Stoeckinger, Smith Management Group  
Amy Sohner, Bluegrass PRIDE  
Cheryl Taylor, Department of Environmental Quality  
Richard Walker, Tetra Tech

**Meeting Location**

Town Branch Wastewater Treatment Plant  
301 Lisle Industrial Ave., Lexington, KY

**Goal**

- The Incentive Workgroup set a goal of December 1, 2009, to have the Incentive Program developed—prior to collection of the Water Quality Management Fee in January 2010 by Kentucky American Water.

**Schedule**

- Meetings will be held the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> Friday of every month at 9:30 a.m. at the Town Branch Wastewater Treatment Plant, 301 Lisle Industrial Avenue, Lexington, Kentucky.
- Next Meeting will be Friday, September 11, 2009.

**Incentive Workgroup Dynamics/Roles**

Everyone interested in participating in the meeting discussion would be welcome as the Incentive Program is developed; however, the Workgroup agreed that a smaller group of voting members should be established to get the Incentive Program developed in the timeframe envisioned. A cross section of voting members was considered, and the Workgroup established the following list of voting member positions:

1. A representative of the Fayette Alliance
2. A representative of the Fayette County Neighborhood Council
3. A commercial developer
4. A representative of a major institution (i.e. church, hospital or non-profit)
5. A small business owner
6. A large business owner
7. A representative of Fayette County Schools
8. A representative from a major University (i.e. UK)
9. An LFUCG Councilmember

## **Discussion**

The Incentive Program budget proposed when the ordinance was adopted included \$1 million annually for the incentive program and \$200,000 annually for the neighborhood grant program.

- Since collection of the Water Quality Management Fee does not begin until the last half of FY 2010, there will not be the full level of funding available for the program the first year.
- It was agreed that even though the Incentive Program should be ready by the time fees are collected, it will take time for incentive applications to be received and reviewed—especially the first time through the process.
- Therefore, it might not be until late FY 2010 or even FY 2011 before any incentives funds are actually distributed.

The Workgroup considered the following:

- The Ordinance established an Incentive Program instead of a credit program to provide funds to encourage Class B properties to pursue new construction or special projects that reduces stormwater runoff, improves water quality or provides educational benefits.
- The Incentive Program was established for Class B property owners or neighborhood associations—not individuals.
- The Incentive Program could designate percentages of the incentive money be used for specific types of projects/initiatives, i.e. education, roof gardens, pavers, etc.
- The emphasis should be on examples from other communities of programs that have been successful.
- The Incentive Program should provide extra points for an application or target in some way projects that make improvements to watersheds with the most serious water quality problems.
  - This would include ranking watersheds so an Incentive Program applicant gets more points when a project is in watershed with the most serious water quality problems.
- Monitoring the incentives projects that are selected—during and after construction.
  - Possibly utilizing UK to help with this like they helped with the smoking ordinance.
- Emphasis on rewarding Best Management Practices and encouraging the use of creative ideas like the new pervious parking lot at Woodland Park.
  - This could include promoting efforts that overcome concerns about implementing new practices that are not proven.
  - Updating the Engineering Manuals or working with Engineering to provide information on “green” construction methods.

## **Next Meeting**

Charlie Martin and Richard Walker will bring a draft Incentive Program back to the Workgroup at the September 11<sup>th</sup> meeting.