

TO:

Michael Adams, City of Sweet Home

FROM:

Paul L. Matthews

Kerstin S. Rock

DATE:

November 17, 2004

SUBJECT:

Sewer SDC Methodology

PROJECT: P162.041.SD

Introduction

Like many municipal sewer utilities in Oregon, the City of Sweet Home (City) is faced with increasing costs for the expansion of its sewer system's capacity to serve growth. To mitigate this cost of growth in its sewer system, the City has historically assessed system development charges (SDCs) to new customers. As part of its routine business practices, the City has engaged Integrated Utilities Group, Inc. (IUG) to review its SDCs to ensure these charges are:

- Fair and Equitable, and
- Avoid subsidizing either growth or existing customers.

The assessment of SDCs in Oregon is governed by state law. Among other requirements, Oregon Revised Statutes (ORS) 223.304 requires that "...the methodology supporting the system development charge shall be available at least 60 days prior to the first hearing." This memorandum presents the proposed SDC methodology for the City.

SDC Methodology

The proposed SDC methodology is based on historical investments by the City and future capital improvements as identified by City staff based on the City's December 2002 Sanitary Sewer Master Plan developed by Brown and Caldwell and City staff's knowledge of the system. This methodology employs cost indices as allowed by ORS 223.3042 to account for future inflation.

¹ See Oregon Revised Statutes (ORS) 223.297 to 223.314.

² ORS 223.304 states in part: "A change in the amount of a reimbursement fee or an improvement fee is not a modification of the system development charge if the change in the amount is based on the periodic application of an adopted specific cost index or on a modification to any of the factors related to rate that are incorporated in the established methodology."

Page 2 November 17, 2004

Reimbursement Fee

The reimbursement fee is based on the capacity buy-in approach, and requires three steps:

- 1. Fixed asset valuation,
- 2. Capacity definition, and
- 3. Assessment schedule development.

The following is a description of each step.

Fixed Asset Valuation

Under the proposed methodology, the value of the City's fixed assets is based on the replacement cost new less depreciation (RCNLD) estimates developed by the City based on insurance coverage estimates and Linn County's land and property values. In addition to the City's fixed assets, the valuation also includes \$772,826 of cash provided by existing customers.

The City's system is designed to meet the needs of its customers and provide safe and reliable sewer service throughout its service area. The system consists of individual components that serve specific functions. To estimate the value of assets related to each function, the RCNLD of each asset is allocated to one or more of four functions. The City's functions are:

- 1. Collection System
- 2. Interceptor System
- 3. Treatment Plant
- 4. Exclude from SDC

Assets captured under the *Collection System* function are typically contributed by developers and thus are excluded from the calculation of the reimbursement fee. To explicitly show the amount of excluded assets, the assets initially assigned to this function were reassigned to the *Excluded from SDC* function. Table 1 summarizes the asset values attributed to each function. Based on the analysis, the total value of the City's system for fiscal year (FY) 2004 including a credit for existing debt⁵ is \$25.31 million. Of the total value, \$18.26 million are excluded from the SDC because these assets are considered to have been contributed or to be obsolete. Thus, for the purpose of establishing a reimbursement fee, the City's remaining sewer system is valued as \$7.05 million.

⁵ The outstanding debt was estimated to be \$434,369 for the 1993 OEDD Promissory Note and \$150,953 for the DEQ Promissory Note. The total net value of the system was therefore calculated by reducing the total system value of \$25.9 million by the amount of outstanding debt.

Page 3 November 17, 2004

Capacity Definition

The next step in determining the reimbursement fee under the capacity buy-in approach is to define the system capacity. Specifically, under the capacity buy-in approach the system capacity is based on the unused capacity of the system for each function identified above. The City provided data used for this analysis.

Table 2 lists the current capacities of each function. Table 3 estimates the amount of capacity in the existing system that is available for growth. Underlying the numbers shown in this table is the assumption that one equivalent dwelling unit (EDU) contributes 3,354 cubic feet of sewer flow per month or 110.2 cubic feet per day. This estimate is based on the City's historical average wet weather flows during FY2004. Using this assumption and the capacities for each function summarized in Table 3, the number of EDUs that can be served by each function are calculated. Subtracting the number of EDUs currently served by the utility generates the number of EDUs available for growth. A description of how the number of EDUs currently served by the City is estimated follows below.

Assessment Schedule Development

Table 4 provides an inventory of the number of EDUs by meter size. The number of EDUs is based on the analysis of the City's water system. The equivalency factors are calculated based on the average daily water use of a single-family residential meter with a 3/4-inch meter.

Analysis of the City's historical water consumption records for FY2002 and FY2003 indicated that the number of observations underlying the equivalency factors for meters greater than 1½-inch were too few for the data to be reliable. The proposed methodology augments the City's historical data for meters above 1½-inch in size by equivalency factors developed from data of the Tualatin Valley Water District (TVWD). Although a different agency, comparison of the data for the utilities showed little variation in the consumption of meters up to $1\frac{1}{2}$ -inch. The proposed equivalency schedule is presented in Table 4.

Based on the number of meters served by the City in July 2004 and the equivalency schedule presented in Table 4, the total number of EDUs served by the City is 3,638.

Fee Calculation

The total costs to be recovered from the reimbursement fee are based on the percentage of remaining capacities by functions calculated in Table 3 and the total system asset values shown in Table 1. Table 5 presents the total reimbursement amount by function. The total amount attributable to the reimbursement fee is \$4,783,849. Table 6 calculates the reimbursement fee per EDU for each of the functions. The total reimbursement fee per EDU is \$624.

Page 4 November 17, 2004

Improvement Fee

A review of the City's sewer capital improvement program (CIP) indicated that none of the proposed projects are growth related. Therefore, the City's SDC only contains a reimbursement fee SDC.

Recommendations

As shown in Tables 6 the total reimbursement fee is calculated to be \$624 per EDU. Table 7 presents the resulting schedule of SDCs by meter size.

Table 1: Net Fixed Asset Valuation	Asset Valuation
Description	FY 2004 Assets
Collection System	80
Interceptor System	4,906,955
Treatment Plant	2,147,056
Exclude from SDC	18,263,872
Total	\$25,317,883

1 aute 4. 5y	Table 4. System Component Capacitics	pacitics
System Component	Capacities	Units
Collection System	0.0	NA
Interceptor System	12.3	MGD
Treatment Plant	0.9	MGD
Exclude from SDC	0.0	NA

		Table 3: Used ar	ble 3: Used and Unused Capacities of Existing System	ties of Existing Sy	stem		
	Requirements per				Used Capacity	Used Capacity Unused Capacity	Remaining
System Component	EDUs	Units	Unit Conversion	Unit Conversion EDUs Available	(EDUs)	(EDUs)	Capacity
Collection System	110.2	Cubic Feet per Day	133,690	0	3,638	0	%00.0
Interceptor System	110.2	Cubic Feet per Day	133,690	14,916	3,638	11,278	75.61%
Treatment Plant	110.2	Cubic Feet per Day	133,690	7,276	3,638	3,638	20.00%
Exclude from SDC	0.0	NA	133,690	0	3,638	0	0.00%

L	able 4: Inventory o	Table 4: Inventory of EDUs for FY2004	
	Number of		
Meter Size	Meters	Equivalency Factor	EDUs
3/4-Inch	2,283	1.00	2,283
1-Inch	73	2.12	155
1 1/2-Inch	38	96.7	302
2-Inch	. 21	15.13	318
3-Inch	2	28.03	56
4-Inch	7	45.34	317
6-Inch	1	73.83	74
8-Inch		132.78	133
Total	2,426		3,638

Table 5: Calcu	Table 5: Calculation of Reimbursement Totals	rsement Totals
	Capacity	
	Available for	
System Component	Growth	Reimbursement Total
Collection System	%00.0	0\$
Interceptor System	75.61%	3,710,234
Treatment Plant	20.00%	1,073,615
Exclude from SDC	0.00%	0

Total		\$4,783,849

Table 6: Reimbursement Fee per EDUs	ent Fee per EDUs
	Proposed
	Reimbursement
System Component	SDC
Collection System	\$0
Interceptor System	329
Treatment Plant	295
Exclude from SDC	0
Total	\$624

	Table 7: Proposed SDC by Meter Size	DC by Meter Size	
Meter Size	Reimbursement	Improvement	Total
3/4-Inch	\$624	\$0	\$624
1-Inch	1,322	0	1,322
1 1/2-Inch	4,965	0	4,965
2-Inch	9,439	0	9,439
3-Inch	17,494	0	17,494
4-Inch	28,295	0	28,295
6-Inch	46,074	0	46,074
8-Inch	82,862	0	82,862