The meeting began at 4:33 p.m. Minutes from the previous meeting were distributed to the attendees with instruction to email George Heiner with any suggested edits and corrections.

**Overview of PowerPoint presentation (George Heiner)**

**Task Force Goals**

- Develop a suite of recommendations that will inform decision making
- Identify near-term strategies to support effort
- Identify long-term strategies and approaches
- Identify areas requiring additional investigation for County Staff

**Key Questions**

- How & where could residents connect?
- How to finance?
- What policies are needed to develop a successful program?

**Meetings**

- February 21, 2017: Introduction and Background Discussion
- March 21, 2017: Working Groups and Key Questions
- April 18, 2017: Current County Procedures & Case Studies
- May 16, 2017: Policy Topics and OSDS Management Strategies
- June 20, 2017: Working Group Updates
- July 25, 2017: Working Group Discussion and Summary
- March 27, 2018: Report Review & Close-out Meeting
Draft Task Force Report

- Draft Report distributed week of March 19
- Intent was to summarize input from the large group meetings and the separate working group meetings
- Plan to review, discuss and clarify key points
- Report Structure
  I. Background & Mission
  II. Task Force Members
  III. Meetings
  IV. Task Force Discussions
  V. Recommendations Summary
     A. Task Force Overall Guidance
     B. Land Use Working Group
     C. Fiscal Working Group
     D. Policy Working Group
  VI. Future OSDS Efforts

General Commentary

- 21 total guidance and recommendations identified.
- Compiled from meeting minutes and recollections of the discussions during different meetings.
- Grouping between “Task Force” and individual working groups was general.
- Part A (“Task Force”) recommendations were typically areas where there appeared to be general agreement during meetings, or where several separate working groups were providing similar recommendations.

Discussion

- Will review the main point for each of the 21 items.
- Please feel free to comment, clarify, or question any of the points.
- Intent is to have an interactive session and consolidate the consensus opinions where possible.
- Recommendations can be moved between groupings in the final report.

Overall Guidance & Recommendations

1. New Septic Connection Process – Develop new connection process that enables the County to have a more active role in identifying potential projects and determining project boundaries.
2. Prioritization System – Develop a ranking and prioritization system that can be used to identify projects and schedules.
3. Long Term Funding Commitments – Secure long-term commitment from MDE for BRF funding; determine requirements and obligations for obtaining funds.
4. Public Outreach and Education – Develop a robust public relations and outreach program. Engage and educate the public about the need for the program and the benefits of the improvements.
5. Revenue Approaches – The Task for does not recommend pursuing a separate, designated fee (similar to the stormwater fee) at this time.
6. **Cost Sharing & Subsidies** – The Task Force recommends sharing costs amongst stakeholders including County, State, individual homeowners, and other stakeholders. The benefits of improved surface water quality are experienced by the broader community.

7. **Financing Timelines** – Consider extending financing timelines. Given that the public sewer connection is essentially permanent, extension of the payment terms appears reasonable since future property owners will have the benefit of the connection.

8. **Examine Alternatives to Centralized Public Sewer** – Explores decentralized options such as BAT systems and small cluster treatment systems to minimized capital expenditures.

9. **Maintain Consistency with Smart Growth Policies** – Implementation should be done in a manner consistent with General Development Plan and Water and Sewer Master Plan Policies.

10. **Consider Impacts Related to Infill Development** – General number of available infill lot relatively small.

11. **Transferable Development Rights** – Task Force does not recommend pursuing a program relying on Transferable Development Rights (TDRs) at this time.

**Fiscal Working Group**

12. **Explore “Banking System” for Development Credits** – Examine alternatives for developing “banking” credit system that could be transferable across projects. *A working group should include OPZ, I&P, DPW, MBIA, environmental groups and other interested stakeholders to discuss the concept further.*

13. **Development Project Budget** – Develop a program budget for future years aligned with program priorities.

14. **Focus on Most Cost Effective Locations** – Where these locations are not critical to the development of other infrastructure, DPW should look for other ways to substitute these locations with more cost effective approaches.

**Policy Working Group**

15. **Develop Incentive System** – Develop methods to incentivize the retirement of traditional septic systems in the priority areas.

16. **Determine Public Interest/Valuation of Sewer** – Determine what cost communities may be willing to support when considering a potential project.

17. **Participation Requirement** – No consensus regarding mandatory vs non-mandatory approaches. Generally, if public funds are covering a large share of the cost, then a more mandatory approach may be acceptable.

18. **Early Hook-up Incentives** – Incentives to hook up to public sewer should include giving discounts for residents that complete connections quickly.

19. **Ownership Transfers** – Connect a particular element of the program to the sale of the home, such as connection cost or hook-up requirement.

20. **Alternative Financing Rates** – Consider modifying the finance rate from 8% to a different rate, such as prime +2 at the time of the petitioner vote.

21. **Pollutant Impact Fee** – Consider use of an impact fee tied to nitrogen load. The fee could be used to subsidize projects and provide an incentive for high impact locations to either connect to public sewer or upgrade existing systems.

**Guidance & Recommendations**

- Any missing or additional recommendations?
WIP Program Update

- Wastewater Sector
  - Current Enhanced Nutrient Removal (ENR) projects will meet treatment plant allocations
- Stormwater Sector
  - Urban Stormwater to be reduced by 32%
- Septic Sector
  - Septic System loads to be reduced by 46% by 2025
- County continuing to make progress on reductions in the wastewater, stormwater and point-source sectors
- Stormwater
  - Over $250 Million programmed in CIP to complete stormwater upgrades
  - On target to nearly meet 20% impervious area reduction by 2019 (end of current permit cycle)
  - Will need more funding and program efficiencies to meet TMDL by 2025
- Wastewater
  - All enhanced nutrient removal (ENR) treatment plant upgrades are operational as of 2017; Mayo WRF off-line in 2017
  - Treatment plant performance has been significantly improved and is below nutrient allocations

WRF Discharges: Major AA County Facilities

- Overall average discharge in 2017 approximately 3.6 mg/L
- Cumulative Flow from major facilities approximately 29 million gallons per day
- Overall 38% of WRF load allocation unused

Three WIP Components: Successful treatment plant performance can carry a greater share of the burden in the near term

- Current Plan (Based on 4MG/L TN)
  - Reduce WRF by 214,000 lbs
  - Reduce stormwater loads by 207,000 lbs
  - Reduce septic loads by 237,000 lbs

OR

- Alternative Plan (Based on 2.5MG/L TN)
  - Reduce WRF by 464,000 lbs
  - Reduce stormwater loads by 112,000 lbs
  - Reduce septic loads by 112,000 lbs

New Concepts & Approaches

- Septic Connection Alternatives
  - Examining small “minor” treatment facilities for opportunities
  - Studying cluster treatment alternatives
  - Studying water reuse options
  - Smaller Cost Reductions
• Reclaimed Water Aquifer Recharge
  o Significant Potential to Reduce Pollutant Load (Complement Septic System Conversion)
  o Groundwater Recharge – Water Supply Sustainability
  o More centralized / less disruptive
  o Larger Cost Reductions

• Looking for opportunities to –
  o Reduce program costs – by substituting the least cost effective septic connection locations with more cost effective approaches
  o Minimize disruptions – to neighborhoods by reducing the overall number of projects
  o Reduced future O&M Costs – by minimizing the overall increase in assets
  o Allow a new septic connection program to be developed and implemented building upon the efforts of this task force

Upcoming OSDS Efforts

• DPW working on procurement of an OSDS Conversion Program Manager
• Program Manager needs to have expertise in the following minimum areas:
  o Engineering & Construction
  o Financial Planning
  o Public & Environmental Policy
  o Public Relations
  o Program Management

During and following the presentations, the following revisions and corrections were discussed.

• Item 2, related to prioritizing projects, should include the hierarchy discussed by the fiscal working group.
• Item 11, related to Transferable Development Rights, was generally agreed upon and could be moved to Category “A”.
• Item 12, related to a credit banking system, was part of the Land Use Working Group discussions and not the Fiscal Working Group.
• Item 14, related to focusing on cost effective locations, should be reworded to include critical area and failing systems.
• Item 16, related to determining the public valuation, should mention a connection to the public education component. In addition, consideration should be given to communities that are willing to contribute more.
• Item 21, related to the pollutant impact fee, was clarified as applying to new construction.
• The chart presenting WRF discharges has an error in the projected loading for 2018 and 2019 that requires correction.
• A brief explanation and summary of the Fiscal Working Group’s Analysis should be provided as an appendix.
• Additional background discussion of the earlier 2008 OSDS study should be included since this information was relied upon by Task Force Members.

Mr. Heiner indicated that he would attempt to make the corrections and revisions to the slides and report within the next two weeks. The final versions will be posted on the Task Force website and distributed.
Handouts –

1. Agenda

The meeting was adjourned at 5:55 p.m.