



Southeast Metro Stormwater Authority Meeting Agenda Potential Credits

SEMSWA Board – Budget Subcommittee Meeting Notes Thursday, August 21, 2008

Present: Ron Weidmann (Board)
Linda Lehrer (Board)
Jim Dyer (Board)
Jacque Wedding-Scott (Board)
John McCarty
Dave Agee
Ashley Byerley
Lanae Raymond
Michelle Troy (AMEC)

Review of Potential Credits in AMEC Report dated June 11, 2008

1) General Information –

- A) Discussion of general information such as: Credit versus offset, purpose of credits, percentage of total revenue, and participation levels.
- B) System Development Fee Program – the SDF project is currently underway, initial proposed SDF for each basin are complete; however, cannot be presented to the Task Force until issues regarding Arapahoe County's and ACWWA's transfer of the MS4 permit are resolved. The Credit Study and the SDF Study are related to each other. The Credit Study does not address issues such as build in lieu of fees or reimbursement accounts for developers.
- C) The purpose of the Potential Credits report and the Budget Subcommittee meeting is to determine which credit options are promising for SEMSWA to look further into regarding the number and types of properties that qualify, the general criteria for credits, and the financial impact to SEMSWA of each credit.

2) Quality/ Quantity

- A) Recommended for further study.
- B) It is more difficult to determine the criteria for quality credits than for quantity credits.
- C) Credits would be given for criteria that exceed the standards, not meet the standards for regional facilities.
- D) A quantity credit promotes incentive for the developer to over-build.
- E) A quality or quantity credit would most likely apply for one-time offset for commercial properties.

3) Low Impact Development

- A) Not recommended for further study at this time.

- B) The criteria for defining what is LID and what would qualify for a credit is not yet established. Revisit as LID criteria become available.

4) NPDES Credit

- A) Not recommended as industrial permit holders would qualify.

5) Education Credit

- A) Not recommended at this time.
- B) The education program is a valuable program for SEMSWA, however, it is difficult to define for a credit.
- C) Wide spread participation across the school district is difficult, even though success has been achieved with individual teachers.
- D) It is difficult to ensure that the education activities are completed and are satisfactory.
- E) Schools have the opportunity to take advantage of another credit opportunity to reduce their fee.
- F) The school program is not the only educational effort that SEMSWA provides.

6) Low Density Single Family Residential Credit

- A) Recommended for further analysis.
- B) Mixed feelings on this one as the ones who benefit the most are likely middle or upper income who could also take advantage of other credits or methods to reduce their impervious area.
- C) A Low Density credit was originally included in the rate structure to increase equity.

7) Self- Maintenance

- A) Recommended for further analysis.
- B) The airport would qualify for this credit, at this time its unknown if any other properties would qualify.
- C) This credit requires the maintenance of facilities that SEMSWA would otherwise have to maintain (i.e. regional ponds).

8) Other

- A) Through the discussion it was determined that there are four major viewpoints that are the driving force behind each credit.
 - i) The credit would relieve pressure from the property owner
 - ii) The credit would save SEMSWA money
 - iii) The credit promotes good environmental practices
 - iv) The credit provides equity in the rate structure

9) Recommendation

- A) The following credit options will be analyzed in the next phase of this study:
 - i) Quality
 - ii) Quantity
 - iii) Self Maintenance
 - iv) Low Density Single Family Residential
- B) The following credit options are on the shelf and may be re-visited at a later time:
 - i) Low Impact Development
 - ii) Education