

Online Survey Responses

1. Do you support the draft rate structure?

6 support rate structure, 4 do not support rate structure, 4 need more information

2. I support the rate structure because:

- a. Respondent 1: It's based on a well done study and gone through an appropriate process.
- b. Respondent 2: \$75/year seems reasonable if it will ensure my property is not flooded again. non-residential tiers make sense to adequately assess a businesses impact based on its stormwater impact.
- c. Respondent 3: All residents participate in the program. Residential fees are fixed and are the same city-wide.
- d. Respondent 4: I need more information regarding the rate structure, but obviously, this needs to be funded somehow as Carrboro does not 'perk' or drain all that effectively.
- e. Respondent 5: In principle, I do support this initiative, but my vote is a qualified yes. Responsible resource management is of course in our collective best interest. Not to mention the right thing to do. In practice, I have a specific concern I'd like to discuss. I have spent half an hour skimming the materials available, but have yet to find either the map resulting from the scientific survey or one indicating the distribution of ERU by parcel - either of which would have allowed me to preliminarily address my concern autonomously. I can drop by the town hall for a brief discussion.
- f. Respondent 6: Town needs to support a program for addressing stormwater regulations and mitigating stormwater problems that contribute to property damage, stream degradation, and pollution.
- g. Respondent 7: We need to invest in stormwater infrastructure improvements in Carrboro - that is obvious. Support for the rate structure/format is based on the fact that rates are tied to impervious surface area. I would support credits/fee reduction for those properties mitigating their impact. I tentatively support the specific dollar rates proposed based on trust that the statement "The draft rate structure is based on: Carrboro's Town Code, which provides the legal structure; anticipated expenses for the utility; a GIS study of impervious surfaces in Carrboro; and experience from other North Carolina jurisdictions that have implemented utilities. " is accurate.
- h. Respondent 8: Rephrasing more specifically: I very much support the existence of a dedicated revenue stream that is tied to the underlying driver of stormwater runoff (that is, impervious surface area). That said, without really analyzing the Rate Structure Study, I have no idea whether the actual proposed rates are too high, too low, or just right like Goldilocks. But given the Chapel Hill and Hillsborough comparable examples, it's good to get started on the effort.

3. I do not support the rate structure because:

- a. Respondent 1: Rate must consider BOTH permeable and impermeable surface of a property. 3,000 sq ft on a quarter-acre should pay more than the same 3,000 sq ft on a full acre.
- b. Respondent 2: The residential rate is just one number for all houses (\$75) but not all houses are equal. My house, at 1400 sq. ft. should not have to pay the same as a 4000+ sq ft McMansion. Could there be some broad scaling done for residential as is done for commercial?

- c. Respondent 3:
 - i. Cost of surveying all of the impervious in carrboro? Is a GIS study accurate?
 - ii. If owner A has 5+ ERU's but live at the lowest point in carrboro then he/she could be paying more than Owner B living at the highest point with just 1 ERU. But owner A has no impact on fellow carrboro neighbors whereas Owner B does have an impact. Likely there will be situations all over town like this and it could end up being Regressive taxation (see #3 below).
 - iii. A poor resident might have a lot of impervious. In other words Impervious quantity does not equal wealth or fancy digs. Imagine an 1 story ranch house with a shed and a long driveway. This property might be old and low value AND might be in a flood zone. Compare this hypothetical property with a new 2 or 3 story \$800k property with relatively low impervious ratio and sits on high ground. In this scenario the poor resident pays a lot more than the person who can afford it.
 - iv. For these reasons I think rate structure should be tied to either property value or make it a flat rate per acre.
 - v. In general... I don't support new taxation for this utility because it should already be included in what we pay for Public Works. Carrboro taxes are very high please keep that in mind.
 - vi. Public Works has really nice trucks and equipment and manpower and maybe their budget should be looked at to compensate for capital improvements to town drainage.
- d. Respondent 4: Not sure how funds will be used and don't have enough information. Credit for improvements invested already.
- e. Respondent 5: Large residences with paved driveways have a lot more impermeable surface than small residences with gravel driveways.

4. I'd like to see the following changes to the rate structure:

- a. Respondent 1: Some homeowners have permeable—not impermeable—surfaces on their property. There ought to be financial incentives (or discounts on the rate structure) for green driveways and other features that reduce stormwater runoff.
- b. Respondent 2: Some consideration could be given for people who currently receive reduced property taxes. It seems that NC regulations will not permit this, however. Perhaps fund surplus (over a certain level) could be used to do this. The Utility fund should be separate and not used to offset other capital needs. Multi-year surplus (above a certain level) could be re-distributed proportional to amount paid in fees.
- c. Respondent 3: Include BOTH the permeable and impermeable surface of the property in the assessment -- don't incentivize tiny houses on micro-lots!
- d. Respondent 4: More tiers for residences with small homes paying less.

5. Contact info:

- a. kurt.stolka@gmail.com
- b. John Parker, no need to contact me
- c. Susan Deupree, 102E Laurel Ave
- d. Marywinne Sherwood, 101Circadian Way, Chapel Hill, NC (located in Carrboro).
- e. Luke and Claire Mongoven 1020 W Main St. 919-270-9837. mongoven@gmail.com
- f. Reed Palmer, 408 Broad Street

Other Input Received

From: David Andrews

Sent: Friday, April 27, 2018 1:45 PM

To: Tamara S; boa

Cc: Joe Guckavan; Randy Dodd

Subject: RE: Stormwater Utility ProjectHi Tamara,

That is something that we plan to do and thank you for the suggestion!

David

From: Tamara S [tamarab.sanders@gmail.com]

Sent: Friday, April 27, 2018 11:54 AM

To: boa

Subject: Stormwater Utility Project

Good morning alderfolk!

I was unable to attend either Stormwater Utility Project input sessions.

Several years back, I worked with the county's Division of Soil and Water Conservation to set up a cost/share rainwater harvesting system. I am now set up with a total of 1600 gallons in three different cisterns, the plumbing and a pump to irrigate my ~1600 sq ft. garden. This setup was no small investment.

I'd like to see these investments for storm water mitigation by residents and businesses help offset that property's fees for this proposed utility.

Thanks and happy Friday!

Tamara Sanders

708 Davie Rd.