

## Meeting 4 - Task Force: Meeting Summary

3/10/2020

9:00 am

MSD Administrative Offices  
1801 Woodrow St. Cincinnati, OH 45205

**Overview:** The focus of this meeting is to review the draft Impervious Surface Fee Framework shared with the Task Force via email on February 7. The Framework discusses benefits of an “in-between” model to provide collaborative service delivery under a unified impervious area rate structure that would achieve the goal of holistic stormwater management services for the participating groups/agencies across Hamilton County. During this meeting, participants will share their reactions, feedback, and comments regarding the framework.

### Attendees:

- Karen Ball, Hamilton County  
([karen.ball@hamilton-co.org](mailto:karen.ball@hamilton-co.org))
- Joe Graf, Hamilton County  
([joe.graf@plantemor.com](mailto:joe.graf@plantemor.com))
- Mohammad Islam, Hamilton County P&D  
([mohammad.islam@hamilton-co.org](mailto:mohammad.islam@hamilton-co.org))
- Brian Wamsley, Hamilton County P&D  
([Brian.Wamsley@hamilton-co.org](mailto:Brian.Wamsley@hamilton-co.org))
- Charlie Anness, Hamilton County Prosecutor  
([Charles.Anness@hcpros.org](mailto:Charles.Anness@hcpros.org))
- Nancy Elwood, CDM Smith  
([ellwoodnk@cdmsmith.com](mailto:ellwoodnk@cdmsmith.com))
- Todd Long, Hamilton County Engineer/Stormwater District  
([todd.long@hamilton-co.org](mailto:todd.long@hamilton-co.org))
- Eric Saylor, Cincinnati SMU  
([eric.saylor@cincinnati-oh.gov](mailto:eric.saylor@cincinnati-oh.gov))
- Patrick Ross, City of Reading  
([pross@readingohio.org](mailto:pross@readingohio.org))
- Adam Lehman, Hamilton County Soil & Water  
([adam.lehman@hamilton-co.org](mailto:adam.lehman@hamilton-co.org))
- MaryLynn Loder, MSDGC  
([marylynn.lodor@cincinnati-oh.gov](mailto:marylynn.lodor@cincinnati-oh.gov))
- John Nelson, Hamilton County Soil & Water Conservation District  
([john.nelson@hamilton-co.org](mailto:john.nelson@hamilton-co.org))
- Keith Readling, Raftelis([kreadling@raftelis.com](mailto:kreadling@raftelis.com))
- Henrietta Locklear, Raftelis  
([hlocklear@raftelis.com](mailto:hlocklear@raftelis.com))
- Samantha Brown, Raftelis  
([sbrown@raftelis.com](mailto:sbrown@raftelis.com))

Meeting Item	Notes
Welcome	1. Karen welcomed the group & expressed appreciation for all the thoughtful feedback on the draft framework that has been provided thus far
Review Progress To-Date and Set-Up of Today's Discussion	1. Henrietta provided a review of the three prior meetings the task force has had to date and how the framework was drafted 2. The group discussed the importance of making sure the framework includes enough detail to sufficiently demonstrate the thought put into development. Make sure the final framework may be easily digested for all appropriate audiences <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ Once all feedback is incorporated into the framework, the next step of this</li></ul>

Meeting Item	Notes
	<p>process is to share with stakeholders and the community? We need to be mindful of the amount of detail that is incorporated in the document so we are properly prepared to share</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The goal should be to bring our ideas together in a collaborative fashion. We don't want perception that we are bringing preconceived ideas to the stakeholders, so there should be enough factual information based on technical details that allow the stakeholder to provide meaningful feedback on recommended direction and impacts of implementation</li> <li>○ The taskforce and stakeholder groups will be working in parallel tracks to inform each other's input and recommendations</li> </ul>
<p>Facilitated Open Discussion: Framework Review</p>	<p>Henrietta re-introduced and summarized the draft framework document with the group. The following input was provided to be taken into consideration in updating the draft. This input is in addition to the comments prepared by the Hamilton County Stormwater District and MSDGC prior to the meeting.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Background:</b> Those reviewing the document will be less familiar with the taskforce and issues than we are. We should be more explicit with naming the agencies participating in the taskforce, as well as those currently charging fees for impervious surface and/or stormwater management in the county <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Add footnote to list agencies across the county that are involved in the process</li> <li>○ Create an attachment or table to list all agencies that are currently charging a fee &amp; nature of the existing fee</li> <li>○ Go heavier on background: Make sure all the facts that are laid out are inarguable; but things that can be achieved thru multiple pathways, leave open for further discussion</li> <li>○ Use tables where possible</li> </ul> </li> <li>2. <b>Explicitly identify and define the project drivers in this document:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ County commissioners &amp; resolution <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Add the county resolution that establishes the taskforce as an appendix to the framework</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ I/I</li> <li>○ It is each agency's mission to deliver clean water and meet compliance requirements</li> <li>○ We have a fractured way of providing what is stormwater service county-wide; a better more comprehensive way of providing this is desired which provides a different path forward than what is currently being done. Provides a more comprehensive way to address stormwater <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Many agencies are collecting a fee for stormwater now, but it is fractured and the basis for the fees varies (ex: HCSW district collects annual, others collect monthly)</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ Need for quantity control</li> </ul> </li> <li>3. <b>Short-term vs. Long-term goals and implementation</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ It was suggested that we should explicitly describe short- and long-term goals</li> <li>○ The group has focused significant time on a comprehensive approach to improve effective service delivery and more unified policy countywide. The task</li> </ul> </li> </ol>

Meeting Item	Notes
	<p>force and stakeholder group should address what the Resolution requires while also being forward-looking enough to recognize long-term goals that will most benefit stakeholders</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Short-term: address resolution; modify MSD’s rate structure - Clearly define rate structure change for MSD and near-term changes</li> <li>○ Short-term: any stormwater fee established should be based on impervious surface; each agency can go to their base and begin asking for fee implementation</li> <li>○ Long-term: coordinated effort county wide stormwater management for various services directed or coordinated by one entity <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Incorporating the vision of the group and long-term goals helps demonstrate and communicate benefits of collaboration (cost, consistency, etc.) to county stakeholders. A short-term only focus may inhibit the overall vision and make it harder for stakeholders outside MSD’s service area and those without SSO/CSO issues to understand why an ISF is needed</li> <li>▪ We must get this messaging right: we must lock in communication for the short-term discussions and set the stage for a universal understanding of what the long-term will look like.</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ Establishing the foundation for long-term goals while also addressing short-term ordinance requirements is a strong approach for the June target date; we need to be mindful that June is a goal and we shouldn’t let the June date restrict progress</li> <li>○ Expand the discussion to explain that to meaningfully address stormwater, the group needs to contemplate long-term implementation beyond I/I</li> <li>○ The public should know the task forces thoughts and what is being contemplated <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Include logical first steps we can foresee</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ Anything we do must be accompanied by an incentive-based program – commissioners are intent on this even if not written within the resolution</li> </ul> <p>4. <b>Work to Date Section:</b> Expand on discussions to date and add discussion that more work is needed to really define level of service</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Explain that level of service is a complex issue to address</li> <li>○ Desired level of service varies based upon that audience that you are asking (homeowners, elected officials, etc.). But a defined level of service sets the direction for long-term strategy and program development</li> <li>○ Explain that stakeholder group will help define an appropriate target level of service</li> <li>○ Flood control will be a new service concept to many</li> <li>○ Include matrix developed during meeting 2 as an appendix</li> </ul> <p>5. <b>Context for Framework</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>Task Force Consensus: Level of service is not yet known, but any fee collected for stormwater should be based upon impervious surface</b></li> <li>○ Include discussion that the challenges we are currently facing didn’t just occur suddenly; current conditions have occurred through many, many years (over</li> </ul>

Meeting Item	Notes
	<p>the past 100+ years) we didn't get to this point overnight</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Rank the objectives and elements discussed in this section based on importance so we can discuss what needs to be addressed more short-term versus long-term</li> <li>○ Make sure frameworks doesn't imply that money will be taken from existing programs to address all the needs identified (ex: I/I dollars for consent decree won't be taken to address a different need) – we also may not need to charge more, we may just need to distribute the burden of cost differently (commercial vs residential) and an impervious-based fee will provide for this</li> </ul> <p>6. <b>Figure 1:</b> Should more detail be provided for each current bucket?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Next step: in order to get where we want to go, our level of service and costs need to be defined in much more detail</li> </ul> <p>7. <b>Vision Brainstorm:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Current rate structure is not fair and equitable as it is currently collected; residential customers are carrying largest part of burden of costs</li> <li>○ Move forward with an impervious surface fee</li> <li>○ Common rate structure across multiple organizations</li> <li>○ Long-term: one entity will collect an impervious surface fee for the entire county</li> </ul>
Overview of Stakeholder Engagement	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The first stakeholder meeting will be held March 24; this will strictly be an introductory meeting to introduce the group</li> <li>2. The idea of sending the stakeholders questions or introductory information to prep before the meeting was discussed. If anything is to be sent, this material will need to be developed.</li> <li>3. The task force would like to see the list of stakeholders invited</li> </ol>
Wrap-Up & Next Steps	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Raftelis will update the draft framework to reflect today's discussion</li> <li>2. Raftelis will provide a sample of what a defined level of service looks like</li> <li>3. Raftelis will schedule one-on-one meetings with participating agencies to discuss agency-specific program details</li> <li>4. Stakeholder Group list to be sent to agency group members</li> <li>5. Karen will schedule the next task force meeting, likely in a month</li> </ol>