

**Summary of Comments and Questions  
Presented at March 24, 2004 Public Forum  
on the Establishment of a Town Stormwater Management Utility**

The following are comments and questions presented at the March 24, 2004 Public Forum on the establishment of a local stormwater utility, with staff comments and responses where applicable:

1. *A Council Member asked what the recommended annual \$50,000 emergency reserve fund was intended for.*

Comment: The purpose of the emergency fund is for extraordinary and/or unexpected drainage maintenance/repair/replacement projects that require immediate attention. An example is the Piney Mountain Road culvert replacement following its unexpected failure in July, 2000.

2. *A Council Member asked how the fee was calculated, and stated that this would be an additional monthly cost to the Town's property owners.*

Comment: The fee that would be charged to a given property is based on the number of Equivalent Rate Units (ERUs) or portion thereof on the property. For the program currently under consideration by the Council, one ERU is equivalent to 2000 square feet of impervious surface area. A property with 200-2000 square feet of impervious surface area would be charged a fee for one ERU. A property with 2001-4000 square feet of impervious surface area would be charged for two ERUs, and so on with no cap on the number of ERUs per property. The number of ERUs multiplied by the monthly fee per ERU multiplied by twelve months would yield the annual utility fee assessed to the property owner.

3. *A Council Member asked how many ERU's would be assessed to a parcel with 5000 square feet of impervious surface area?*

Comment: A parcel with 5000 square feet of impervious surface would be assessed fees for three ERUs.

4. *A Council Member asked why the fee rate for the Manager's recommended program was higher than the fee rate for the Policy Review Committee's recommended program in the rate analysis summary table?*

Comment: The 12 cent fee rate differential between the Committee's program and the Manager's program results from the differences in the number of ERUs included in the modeling analyses for each program. The Committee's program fee rate started from a larger base number of ERUs that included the University properties and Town rights-of-way. The base number of ERUs for the Manager's program did not include the University properties or Town rights-of-way. Iterative modeling was necessary to remove first the Town roadway ERUs, and then both the roadway and the University property ERUs from the Committee's fee rate calculation. The modeling iterations necessary to compare the two programs that are based on different numbers of ERUs resulted in the slight fee rate differential.