

# **Water Quality Management Fee Incentives Workgroup Meeting Notes November 20, 2009**

## **Revised Schedule & Meeting Location**

**Next Meeting:** Thursday, December 3rd      **Future Meeting:** 9:30 a.m. on December 11<sup>th</sup>  
Town Branch Wastewater Treatment Plant      301 Lisle Industrial Ave., Lexington, KY

## **Water Quality Management Fee Incentive Workgroup Voting Members in Attendance**

Patrick Brewer, LexMark  
LFUCG Councilmember Linda Gorton  
Andy Haymaker, Representing Commercial Developers  
Sanford Levy, Small Business Owner Representative  
Emma Tibbs, Representing Fayette County Neighborhood Council  
Knox van Nagell, Fayette Alliance  
Bob Wiseman, University of Kentucky

## **Water Quality Management Fee Incentive Workgroup Voting Members Absent**

Kelly Breeding, Fayette County Schools

## **Others in Attendance**

John W. Bronaugh, Greater Lex. Apt. Assoc.  
John Cobb, RainScape  
John Steinmetz, Hazen & Sawyer  
Shane Tedder, University of Kentucky

## **Staff**

Charles Martin, Division of Water Quality  
Susan Plueger, Division of Water Quality  
Julie Mantrom, Division of Water Quality  
Jennifer Myatt, Division of Water Quality

## **Discussion**

The Water Quality Management Fee Incentive Workgroup approved the notes from the November 13<sup>th</sup> meeting. Susan Plueger went over the revisions made at the previous meeting to the **Project Guidelines**. Councilmember Linda Gorton asked if a timeline had been established yet for the grant process. Charlie Martin said that would be established after the incentive grant program had been developed and the Water Quality Fees Board appointed—although he expected the application process to begin early next year so grants could be awarded near the beginning of the next fiscal year, July 1, 2010.

## **Project Guidelines**

Patrick Brewer noted that the word “will” on page 3 under **2. Funding Amounts** had only been changed to “may” in the first sentence and not in the second sentence of the Application Packet. Susan Plueger said she just missed substituting the second “may” for “will” and agreed to make that change. Bob Wiseman mentioned he still had concerns with the rewording of **b.** under **4. Maintenance/Monitoring** on page 6 concerning access to a property for monitoring. Instead of substituting the term “access agreement” for the term “easement,” Mr. Wiseman suggested that a mutually acceptable agreement be negotiated up front outlining the timeframe and terms of access. The Workgroup asked Ms. Plueger to work on the wording of this section again.

The Workgroup then discussed **2. Funding Amounts** on page 5. Ms. Plueger had for Structural BMPs included the same wording as had been approved for education grants that to allow 100%

grants for project costs up to \$2,500. The Workgroup decided to delete 100% grants up to \$2,500 for Structural BMPs.

Also, in **2. Funding Amounts** on page 5, the Workgroup discussed at length removing the 50% match requirement. Mr. Martin explained he had included that for discussion because the strongest applicants were those that had “skin in the game.” Emma Tibbs noted that applicants had significant investment in the project since they owned the property/land for which they would be applying for a grant. Chair Andy Haymaker and Knox van Nagell reminded everyone that the goal of the fee was improved water quality, and questioned if the match requirement might eliminate a project that could have a profound impact on water quality. Mr. Wiseman mentioned that the match requirement could eliminate churches that might have trouble coming up with a 50% match.

It was suggested that providing a 50% match could make an applicant eligible for bonus points in scoring. Chair Haymaker and Mr. Brewer were concerned that might make the application process more subjective—which the Workgroup was trying to avoid, while keeping the application process as simple as possible. Sandy Levy suggested making percentage of investment in the project a tie breaker rather than bonus points to keep the scoring process as objective as possible. The Workgroup discussed several percentage scenarios but did not reach agreement. Ms. Plueger suggested for the next meeting she would develop some sample scoring worksheets that might help the Workgroup reach agreement on a match requirement.

### **Grant Award and Project Ranking Process**

Ms. Plueger then went over the **Grant Award and Project Ranking Process** she had developed. The Workgroup approved what Ms. Plueger had prepared, but with the following edits:

- Deleted the 8% requirement for small projects under Structural BMPs; therefore 80% of the funding is for Structural BMPs with no percentage set aside for small projects.
- Clarified the funding cycle was “fiscal” year.
- Changed the order for both Educational Programs and Structural BMPs to list Project Impact and/or Project Location/Impact first.
- Determined the weighted categories for Educational Programs would be:
  - **Program Impact** **50%**
  - **Target Audience** **30%**
  - **Program Success Measures** **10%**
  - **Program Sustainability** **10%**

### **Structural BMP Scoring Worksheet**

Ms. Plueger said she had taken to heart the Workgroup’s intent to keep the application process simple when she was preparing the Scoring Worksheets, and the Workgroup was pleased with the format. Ms. Plueger prepared a separate Scoring Worksheet for Educational and Structural BMP—which the Workgroup approved. The Workgroup began by reviewing the Structural BMP Scoring Worksheet. Each ranking criteria had 100 points—weighted per the Workgroup’s direction at the previous meeting. Other edits included:

For **1. Project Type**, the Workgroup changed 1c) dual water quality /quantity BMP from 15 to 20 points and changed 1g) future education opportunities from 15 to 10 points—while an education opportunity for Structural BMP is a plus, it is not a priority since there is a separate education grant.

For **2. Project Location/Impact** the Workgroup to avoid confusion deleted the reference to stormwater concerns under 2b) ii. The Workgroup also decided to flip the scoring so i. Developing or Redeveloping Class B parcel project would receive 5 points, and ii. Existing Class B parcel project would receive 10 points—as existing older structures that have been grandfathered in don't usually have an incentive to upgrade. Ms. Plueger agreed to further define developing and redeveloping as there was some confusion on use of those terms.

For **3. Project Design Innovation** the Workgroup approved what Ms. Plueger had proposed.

For **4. Project Success Measures** the Workgroup asked Ms. Plueger to further refine this section to determine if it is possible to find a way to definitively measure success.

For **5. Project Sustainability** the Workgroup approved what Ms. Plueger had proposed.

#### **Next Meeting**

The next meeting is scheduled for Thursday, December 3<sup>rd</sup> at 9:30 a.m.

The Workgroup agreed the goals for the next meeting included:

1. Reviewing the Education Scoring Worksheet.
2. Going over sample scoring worksheets Ms. Plueger would prepare:
  - a. to assist the Workgroup determine the match criteria, and
  - b. to refine **4. Project Success Measures** on the Structural BMP Worksheet.
3. Begin to discuss the actual application.

The Workgroup's goal is to wrap up details and finish the application so the final meeting will be December 11<sup>th</sup>.