

Beaufort County Stormwater Management Utility Board (SWMU Board)
Meeting Minutes

July 15, 2015 at 1:30 p.m. in Beaufort Industrial Village Building #3 Conference Room

Board Members

Present

Allyn Schneider
Don Smith
Marc Feinberg
Larry Meisner

Absent

William Bruggeman
James Fargher
Patrick Mitchell

Ex-Officio Members

Present

Andy Kinghorn
Jeremy Ritchie
Van Willis

Absent

Scott Liggett

Beaufort County Staff

Eric Larson
Eddie Bellamy
Carolyn Wallace
Danny Polk
Kevin Pitts
Patricia Wilson
Seth Stanbery
Ezekiel Miller
Tom Keaveny
Allison Coppage
Alan Eisenman

Visitors

Jennifer Fitts, Raftelis Financial Consultants, Inc.
Keith Readling, Raftelis Financial Consultants, Inc.
Anthony Maglione, Applied Technology Mgt.
Robert Wilkinson, Shell Point Neighborhood Ass.
Denise Parsick, Bft. Conservation District
Bryan McIlwee, Town of Hilton Head Island
Kristina Wetzel, Citizen of Port Royal
Kathy Todd, City of Beaufort
Alice Howard, County Council
Reed Armstrong, Coastal Conservation League
Paul Moore, Ward Edwards
Yvette Williams, Citizen Sheldon District
Tom Zinn, Buckwalter Commercial
Suzanne Larson, L.I.T.
Lamar Taylor, City of Beaufort

1. Meeting called to order – Don Smith

- A. Agenda –Approved
- B. May 20, 2015 Minutes - Approved.

2. Introductions – Completed.

3. Public Comment(s) – None.

4. Unfinished Business – (Rate Study Backup) (Power Point Presentation Backup)

- A. **Rate Study Final Report** – Keith Readling, Raftelis Financial and Eric Larson, P.E.
Mr. Keith Readling represented Applied Management Technology and Raftelis Financial Consultants presented the final rate study results on modeling the six options presented at the previous Stormwater Management Utility Board Meeting. The rate study recommendation to the county and the municipalities is option E. For the unincorporated Beaufort County, this option includes two debt

issuances of \$5M in 2017 and \$5M in 2019 (a suggested benefit being that it allows future residence to contribute toward funding). Fees to fund the county wide infrastructure operation and maintenance will be generated from 80% of Impervious Area (IA) and 20% of Gross Area (GA). Parcels within the municipalities will also receive a separate Countywide Infrastructure Maintenance. The cost varies based on the amount of county-maintained infrastructure within the individual municipalities. The Gross Area has a declining block structure. There is a \$10.00 fee for the first two acres. The next two to ten acres have a \$5.00 fee. The next ninety acres have a \$4.00 fee and the next one hundred or more acres have a \$3.00 fee. The \$3.18 Single Family Unit (SFU) charge for the stormwater management will apply to the municipalities for this upcoming fiscal year due to the prior agreements and transition to per account basis in the future. Option E also has a fixed charge of \$12.00 to cover increased administrative costs for implementing new stormwater regulations. For the county, the \$3.18/ SFU charge will be deducted from the \$12.00 fixed cost. An example of a typical home on an acre lot would be: \$12.00 fixed charge plus \$65.00 for Impervious Area (IA) charge and \$10.00 for Gross Area (GA) charge equaling \$87.00. This is an increase from the average \$50.00 fee, but the increase is less compared to the other options necessary to support revenue requirements.

Ms. Alice Howard and Mr. Andy Kinghorn questioned credits for tidal acreage or improvements such as raingardens. Mr. Eric Larson explained that the Gross Area would still be charged, but if documentation supported credit requirements then the credit would be deducted. Mr. Larson also stated that changes to the credit policy are being proposed to improve the credit process. Mr. Larson clarified for Mr. Larry Meisner that county-wide infrastructure consists of roads, pipes, ditches, outfalls, etc. Mr. Jeremy Ritchie commented about the higher rate fee for the Town of Bluffton due to the significant amount of infrastructure compared to the lower number of billable units. Mr. Reading said that annexation by municipalities is easily modified in the rate structure model when questioned by Ms. Howard. When Mr. Reading was questioned by Ms. Kathy Todd about presenting the rate study results to the municipalities once all their data was included in the model, he said the scope included one more interaction with the towns and the city to make sure the capital and the model are correct, but not to make presentations to the elected officials. (NOTE: after the meeting Mr. Reading said a presentation to the municipalities would be included.)

Mr. Larry Meisner made a motion to accept the rate study with the recommended option E and the rates as identified in the rate study. The motion was seconded by Mr. Allyn Schneider.

5. New Business –

A. Stormwater Management Utility Budget – Eric Larson, P.E. ([please see attachment](#))

Mr. Eric Larson explained changes to the Stormwater Management Utility budget once the new rate structure and rate increase is adopted by County Council. Changes from the previous Fiscal Year 2016 budget reflect Zero in the Reserve Utilization of Stormwater Utility Revenues. The previous amount was \$1.9 million borrowed from the reserve. Increased revenues from the SWU Fees offset the need for using reserve funds. The cost share for the Management Plan update needs to be reallocated to cost share not CWI fees. The rate study model will be corrected to reflect that change and the municipalities are aware of this discrepancy. The budget reflects rolled over project expenditures that were forecasted as zero but delays in the projects meant that they needed to be included in this budget and the rate study model reflects differently due to this rollover.

Mr. Larson replied to a question from Mr. Don Smith about the Management Plan expenditure by stating that the plan has to be updated to correspond both to the MS4 requirements and to realign the capital expenditures with the watershed needs in the county. Four firms will give oral presentations in August for the contract to update the Management Plan and the Stormwater Implementation Committee will make the selection.

B. Revised Ordinance Presentation– Eric Larson, P.E. ([please see attachment](#))

Mr. Eric Larson said Mr. Tom Keaveny and Ms. Allison Coppage (Beaufort County Attorneys) are updating the ordinance to match the rate study language for option E, refining definitions and updating other administrative items. Mr. Andy Kinghorn questioned how changes in the CWI fee would affect the ordinance. Mr. Larson stated that the ordinance will reference the rate study tables and indices to provide for changes in the CWI. After five years, the ordinance will have to be updated as well as the rate study. If significant changes occur, both the rate study and the ordinance will have to be evaluated on an annual basis. Mr. Meisner suggested using general language instead of specific language and dates to extend the life period of the ordinance. Ms. Allison Coppage stated that due to *Equal dignity* the language needed to be more specific and comparable to the rate study even if it required a revision in the near future. Discrepancies between the rate study and the ordinance were discussed and Mr. Larson said corrections would be completed before the ordinance went to County Council.

Mr. Schneider amended the motion previously brought to the floor by Mr. Meisner. The board voted and unanimously passed the following motions:

1. Motion to accept the rate study with the recommended option E and the rates as identified in the rate study.
2. Motion to recommend the revised Stormwater Management Utility Budget for Fiscal Year 2016.
3. Motion to acknowledge the draft ordinance and agree with the changes in the ordinance to be brought before County Council.

6. Public Comment(s) –

A. Ms. Yvette Williams from the Sheldon District disagrees with the rate increase. Ms. Williams feels that residence in her district do not have a major impact on stormwater issues and she does not feel she is receiving stormwater services.

B. Mr. Tom Zinn (a developer with the Town of Bluffton) commented that construction work in the right-of-way should consider future implications and recovery costs outside of the right-of-way. An example is Highway 170 and Buckwalter Parkway where the plans called for 5 pipes which were downgraded to 1 pipe for compatibility purposes. Mr. Zinn feels stormwater recovery costs should be included in the construction costs to avoid future drainage issues in outlying areas.

7. Next Meeting Agenda – Approved ([Please see attachment](#))

9. Meeting Adjourned.

Beaufort County Stormwater Rate Study
(Including the Towns of Hilton Head Island, Bluffton, and
Port Royal, the City of Beaufort, and the Unincorporated
Beaufort County)
DRAFT Report
July 10, 2015

Prepared by Applied Technology & Management

Assistance from Raftelis Financial Consultants



Contents

Executive Summary.....	1
Background	3
Jurisdictional Cooperation	3
Utility background.....	4
Current Stormwater Utility Structure	5
Rate Structure	5
Business Processes.....	6
Rates	6
Stormwater Programs.....	7
Beaufort County.....	7
City of Beaufort.....	7
Town of Port Royal.....	8
Town of Hilton Head Island.....	8
Town of Bluffton	9
Rate Study Approach	9
Goals	9
Modeling.....	9
Data update	10
Rate Components	10
Fixed Costs	10
Variable Costs: Impervious Surfaces Area and Gross Parcel Area	10
Cost Allocability.....	11
Jurisdictional Infrastructure O&M.....	11
Jurisdiction Capital Projects.....	11
Debt.....	11
Countywide Infrastructure O&M.....	12
Utility Administration	12
MS4 Compliance.....	13
Individual Efforts	13
Cooperative Efforts	13
Modeled Options	13
Elements of Six Rate Structure Options.....	13

Options..... 14

 Alternative Cost Sharing Approach 14

Modified Rate Structure 15

 Fee Structure..... 15

 Bill Class..... 15

 Rate Structure Design 16

 Impervious Area Units..... 16

 Gross Area Blocks..... 16

 Exempt Properties and Special Cases 16

 Credit..... 16

Rate Study Results 16

 Beaufort County..... 16

 City, Towns..... 17

 General Impacts of Rate Structure Changes..... 18

Needed Ordinance Revisions 18

 County..... 18

 Other jurisdictions 19

 Interlocal Agreements..... 19

Ongoing Billing Data Maintenance 19

Appendix A – Beaufort County Recommended Rates (Options A-F)..... 1

Appendix B – City of Beaufort Example Rates (Options A-F)..... 7

Appendix C – Town of Port Royal Example Rates (Options A-F)..... 11

Appendix D – Town of Bluffton Example Rates (Options A-F)..... 15

Appendix E – Town of Hilton Head Island Example Rates (Options A-F)..... 2

Executive Summary

Beaufort County, in cooperation with the City of Beaufort, and the Towns of Bluffton, Hilton Head Island, and Port Royal retained Applied Technologies and Management (ATM) and its sub-consultant, Raftelis Financial Consultants to perform a rate study for the five stormwater utilities operated by the respective jurisdictions.

The County is facing a declining rate base driven by annexations, steeply mounting costs for maintaining countywide drainage infrastructure and complying with new MS4 requirements, and in need of continued capital project construction. The municipalities also face challenges which vary by jurisdiction from regulatory compliance under MS4 permits, to unmet capital project needs, to needs specifically within the Town of Hilton Head Island to increase operation and maintenance funding for aging infrastructure recently taken over by the Town.

The rate analyses performed in support of this rate study included six options for each jurisdiction. The options vary the rate metrics (impervious area, fixed charges per ratepayer, gross area), vary the way that shared costs are allocated between jurisdictions (by impervious area or by account), accommodate the existing administrative charges paid by each jurisdiction to the County (currently at \$3.18 per SFU), accommodate the existing payments made by municipalities to the County for varying levels of water quality monitoring and public outreach, and accommodate a new charge by the County to each municipality for that municipality's proportionate share of the entire County's drainage infrastructure to be maintained by the County. The detailed description of the six options is as follows:

Modeled Rate Structure Option	Overall Rate Structure	Debt Financing for Some Capital	Partial Tax Funding	Method for Allocating Administrative Costs	Method for Allocating County-wide Infrastructure Maintenance Costs	Method for Re-allocating Costs from One Jurisdiction to another	Minimum Charge	Simplified Residential Rates
A	Impervious Area	No	Optional at Jurisdiction's Choice	Impervious Area SFU's	None	Optional at Jurisdiction's Choice	No	Yes
B	Impervious Area	Yes	Optional at Jurisdiction's Choice	Impervious Area SFU's	None	Optional at Jurisdiction's Choice	No	Yes
C	Impervious and Gross Area at 80/20 or 90/10	No	Optional at Jurisdiction's Choice	Per Account	Impervious and Gross Area	Optional at Jurisdiction's Choice	Yes	Yes
D	Impervious and Gross Area at 80/20 or 90/10	No	Optional at Jurisdiction's Choice	Impervious and Gross Area	Impervious and Gross Area	Optional at Jurisdiction's Choice	Yes	Yes
E	Impervious and Gross Area at 80/20 or 90/10	Yes	Optional at Jurisdiction's Choice	Per Account	Impervious and Gross Area	Optional at Jurisdiction's Choice	Yes	Yes
F	Impervious and Gross Area at 80/20 or 90/10	Yes	Optional at Jurisdiction's Choice	Impervious and Gross Area	Impervious and Gross Area	Optional at Jurisdiction's Choice	Yes	Yes

In these evaluations, simplified residential rates means a series of flat rate charges for impervious area (three) similar to how the rate structure works now.

The recommended rate structure option from these evaluations is Option E. In this option jurisdictions can use debt financing for large capital projects, would share administrative costs allocated on a per-account basis, and would all pay for their proportionate share of countywide infrastructure costs

allocated across impervious and gross area. This option results in the most affordable rates for the County over the coming five years, and is likely to do so for the municipalities as well.

However, rate modeling done to date has been less detailed for the municipalities than it has for the County. This is because the County seeks to make rate structure changes immediately while the municipalities expect to not make immediate changes. Also, the budget and capital planning data available for the municipalities has varied in level of detail and in some cases no capital project planning data was available. Additional efforts between the consultants and the municipalities will complete this process and in this draft report any rates offered as examples for the municipalities should be taken as illustrative and not in any way as recommendations.

For the County, the existing rates are \$50 per SFU per year. Continuing with the current rate structure and without proportionate share funding from the municipalities for countywide infrastructure operation and maintenance, these rates would need to escalate over the coming five years to \$120 per SFU per year by FY 2019-2020. This is a 140% increase.

Under the recommended option E, the rate structure will change to one with a fixed charge per account, plus a variable charge for impervious area and another variable charge for gross lot area. For a “tier 2” (average house) residence in the County on a lot smaller than 2 acres, the existing charge is \$50 per SFU per year. Under option E this charge would escalate to \$87 per year by FY 2019-2020. This is a 74% increase. While still large, it is much more reasonable than the “stay the course” option.

The County is responsible for funding 76.4% of all countywide infrastructure (CWI) operation and maintenance under the CWI allocation used. This is \$44.34 of the total \$87.00 annual charge for an average house on a lot smaller than 2 acres. The four municipalities are responsible for the remaining CWI funding, with the allocation based on the amount of infrastructure to be maintained that falls within each jurisdiction. For this fiscal year their CWI funding on an SFU basis is:

City of Beaufort	\$9.31 per SFU
Town of Port Royal	\$5.82 per SFU
Town of Bluffton	\$30.49 per SFU
Town of Hilton Head Island	\$8.86 per SFU

Background

The Southern Coast of South Carolina has long been a desirable tourist destination and sought after place to live, in no small part due to the natural beauty surrounding the areas waterways. In recent years, Beaufort County has declared its intention to be a regional leader in environmental quality initiatives in order to promote this existing advantage. An important subset of environmental quality, especially in this region, is the effective management of stormwater runoff. Because the County is right on the coast, and is crossed by large water bodies otherwise, the imperative to manage stormwater runoff has immediate implications on water quality in the region, rather than somewhere downstream. Beaufort County and its underlying jurisdictions – the City of Beaufort, the Town of Port Royal, Town of Hilton Head Island, and Town of Bluffton – take this charge seriously, and have over time developed individual and cooperative programs to manage the public safety and water quality concerns related to stormwater runoff.

As these programs have matured over time, they have become more costly, and several jurisdictions now find themselves with just enough revenue to cover operating costs, without much to invest in needed capital improvement projects. The jurisdictions are interested in revising rates and exploring other financial tools to support program initiatives, especially capital spending, and have engaged Applied Technology & Management (ATM) and subcontractor Raftelis Financial Consultants (RFC) to conduct a rate structure analysis and rate study. This report summarizes the results of that effort.

Jurisdictional Cooperation

Although historically each jurisdiction has managed stormwater concerns indirectly through individual development standards and environmental ordinances, the group has been working together for many years to manage storm drainage and ensure an improved standard of living for residents of the County. This relationship has become more explicit over time, through the development of interlocal agreements and memoranda of understanding, and through a closer working relationship among staff of each local government.

The most outstanding example of cooperation relates to the administration of the five separate utilities. Since 2001, when the utilities went into effect, the County has provided administrative services, including billing, billing data maintenance, and customer service, in exchange for a small portion of the fee revenues for each underlying jurisdiction.

The County has historically been a significant service provider for drainage maintenance activities to each of the underlying jurisdictions, offering a menu of drainage infrastructure cleaning, maintenance, and repair activities at hourly rates. The patchwork nature of the jurisdictional boundaries lends itself to a cooperative approach to these activities whenever possible to maximize efficiencies in equipment and staff time.

Three of the five jurisdictions participating in the regional stormwater utility has recently submitted a notice of intent to be permitted as a municipal separate storm sewer system (MS4) and regulated under a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) MS4 permit. Permits are anticipated in September 2015. These permits will require strict management of activities that impact the quality of stormwater runoff, such as construction and industrial activities, as well as significant goals of public education and outreach in order to bolster the general public's ability to and interest in managing stormwater runoff responsibly.

Under the new permits, the jurisdictions will be required to perform maintenance activities on existing stormwater drainage infrastructure (as is done now), monitor water quality at outfalls, inspect facilities and infrastructure, and provide education and outreach to citizens. The costs for these activities can be limited if they are performed in coordination between jurisdictions, either across the entire county or in more geographically distinct regions (such as North or South of the Broad River).

Utility background

Each of the five jurisdictions has a separate stormwater utility, established by separate ordinance, allowing the jurisdiction to collect revenues dedicated to stormwater management activities. As mentioned above, each jurisdiction cooperates in the administration of the utility by funding a portion of the County staff and material costs, effectively creating a regional utility.

At the inception of the regional utility in 2001, each property was charged a stormwater fee (conveyed on the annual tax bill) based on the size of the property and a runoff factor associated with that type of property. At this time, all five jurisdictions were charging the same rate, such that a similar property in any jurisdiction would pay the same annual fee. By 2005, the County had access to aerial photography that allowed for a more reliable approach to fee calculation. Rather than use tabular property characteristics to develop the fee for an individual property, the fee could be calculated based on one characteristic that was deemed an important cost driver: impervious surface area. Some elements of the previous rate structure remained intact, but for developed properties, the utility replaced their existing rate structure with one based on impervious surface area as measured from aerial photography.

At its core, this is an industry standard approach to calculating stormwater fees. However, the data available to the County in 2005 were already several years out of date and of relatively poor quality (see Figure 1 below). In recent years, the County has been able to obtain much higher quality imagery on an annual basis and has been updating its impervious area measurements, the foundational billing data, as properties change.



Figure 1. Comparison of 2002 and 2015 Aerial Photography

Current Stormwater Utility Structure

Rate Structure

As defined by the ordinances passed in 2005, the jurisdictions share a rate structure, though each is allowed to charge rates necessary to generate the revenue needed within each individual jurisdiction. The current rate structure has three distinct parts: residential properties, nonresidential properties, and vacant lands. Because the stormwater fee is conveyed on the tax bill and the data should be related, every property falls into one of these three categories depending on its classification in the tax system. Generally, the basis for the rate is the amount of runoff a property generates, whether that be the result of impervious area or some other driver.

At the time of the last rate base and rate structure analysis, the median impervious surface area on single family residential properties was 4,906 square feet. This became the base unit (single family unit or SFU) for measuring impervious area on other types of properties as well. For property types within the tax system that have **residential** classifications, each equates to a distinct SFU equivalency factor in three “tiers.” Residential property with less than 2,520 square feet of impervious area is tier 1. Tier 3 is residential property with more than 7,266 square feet of impervious area, and all residential property between these two impervious measures is tier 2. The tier equivalent SFU factor is multiplied by the per SFU rate for encompassing jurisdiction results in the rate. This concept is called simplified residential rates and is recommended in the newly modeled rate structures described in this study. The residential property types and SFU equivalencies are as follows:

Property Type	Equivalent SFUs
<i>Tier 1 Single Family Unit ($\leq 2,521$ square feet)</i>	0.50
<i>Tier 2 Single Family Unit (2,522 to 7,265 square feet)</i>	1.00
<i>Tier 3 Single Family Unit ($\geq 7,266$ square feet)</i>	1.50
<i>Mobile Home</i>	0.36
<i>Apartment</i>	0.39
<i>Townhouse</i>	0.60
<i>Condominium</i>	0.27

Where a single property includes multiple residential units, the equivalent SFU is per unit, such that an apartment complex property with 100 units would be charged for 0.39 (SFUs per unit) times 100 (number of units) times the rate to calculate the final fee.

Nonresidential properties represent the simplest of area of the current rate structure. For every property not classified as residential or vacant in the tax system, the stormwater fee is calculated based on the amount of impervious surface area on that property. This amount, divided by the 4,906 square foot SFU and multiplied by the per SFU rate, results in the final fee. There is no rounding or other manipulation of data.

Finally, **vacant** lands are presumed to have no impervious area, and are therefore not charged on that basis. They do still have an impact on the stormwater system, however, and should be responsible for a portion of the costs. At present, the rate structure allows for 'runoff factors' to be applied to vacant lands, with different factors used depending on a matrix of classification including whether a property is classified as agriculture, forestry, disturbed, or undisturbed.

Business Processes

In addition to the documented rate structure, there exist a number of business processes that have been developed over time to facilitate utility administration. Most of these processes are in line with the current ordinance but some have evolved to address data collection and maintenance difficulties that emerged from the existing rate structure. These include:

- the treatment of golf courses and parks as vacant land when in fact they may have a good deal of impervious area
- treatment of multi-use parcels (such as house and forested area on the same lot) as separate parcels with summed fees
- granting stormwater best management practices credit by overriding a property's fee to 1 SFU

During the course of these studies, the ATM team worked to identify any divergent business processes and compute updated metrics for the affected properties.

Rates

With the same rate structure in place since 2005, each jurisdiction has experienced increased revenue requirements and subsequently higher rates. Beaufort County altered the rate only once, while the Town of Hilton Head Island has had much more variation in its rate over time. See Table 1 for a detailed account of each jurisdiction's rate per SFU over time.

Table 1. Stormwater Fee Rates over Time

	2005- 2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012- 2014
Beaufort County	\$ 44.43	\$ 44.43	\$ 50.00	\$ 50.00	\$ 50.00	\$ 50.00	\$ 50.00
City of Beaufort	\$ 44.43	\$ 44.43	\$ 44.43	\$ 44.43	\$ 105.00	\$ 105.00	\$ 105.00
Town of Port Royal	\$ 44.43	\$ 44.43	\$ 50.00	\$ 50.00	\$ 50.00	\$ 50.00	\$ 50.00
Town of Bluffton	\$ 49.00	\$ 49.00	\$ 98.00	\$ 98.00	\$ 98.00	\$ 98.00	\$ 98.00
Town of Hilton Head Island	\$ 44.43	\$ 50.76	\$ 50.76	\$ 83.23	\$ 108.70	\$ 108.70	\$ 108.70

Stormwater Programs

Beaufort County

Beaufort County's stormwater program serves as the backbone for the programs in the other jurisdictions. The County has historically been financially responsible for maintenance and repair on countywide infrastructure on and off County road rights of way, even within the municipal boundaries of underlying jurisdictions.

More recently, the County has become unable to adequately provide stormwater services throughout the entirety of the unincorporated county with the available funds. That is, maintenance activities in parts of the county, especially those pockets within other jurisdictions, have been neglected in favor of addressing needs that could be met more economically. The City and Towns have not been receiving the stormwater management services they have come to expect from the County, those the County also endeavors to provide, because of funding shortfalls.

The County is in a unique position in that its unincorporated area or its stormwater revenue base, is shrinking due to annexation, while its costs are still increasing. A notable portion of these costs are associated with managing water quality and drainage in rapidly growing regions just outside the underlying jurisdictional boundaries. Historically, some of these areas have been annexed into the adjacent Town or City yet the County continues to provide stormwater services.

There are a number of capital projects that have been identified by the County for completion in the next several years. While these are currently in unincorporated areas, they are either near to or surrounded by the municipalities such that the benefit is conferred well beyond the unincorporated region.

For these reasons and the new requirements soon to be imposed by the MS4 permit, the County has rapidly increasing costs paired with a declining revenue base. In recognition of this, the County was facing an enormous rate increase. Rather than simply adjust the rates in the unincorporated region, the County initiated a dialog with the City and Towns to discuss the growing countywide infrastructure operation and maintenance needs. The jurisdictions began exploring a more collaborative and equitable approach to sharing the costs (and receiving the benefits) of these services.

City of Beaufort

The City of Beaufort is the oldest, most densely built out of the jurisdictions. While the incorporated area is small, there is an extensive amount of old, buried infrastructure throughout the City, much of

which is estimated at over 100 years old. The City has been conducting an inventory of its drainage infrastructure and has identified approximately \$3 million in capital need, but the true need, not yet fully quantified, is likely much higher. The City may be interested in issuing debt to fund a capital program, but is likely to do so with general obligation bonds (for which the City itself is responsible) rather than revenue bonds (for which the utility is solely responsible).

An MS4 permit for the City is imminent, and it anticipates that the illicit discharge detection and elimination requirement of the permit will be costly as the aged infrastructure and unknown construction are likely to have a higher proportion of illicit connections.

The City is working, along with the other jurisdictions, on developing level and extent of service documentation to further define the parameters of its program going forward.

Town of Port Royal

The Town of Port Royal, just north of the Broad River, features widely varied development patterns, from the old town center to an expansive naval base, historic residential neighborhoods and recent development. Still, there is limited Town-maintained stormwater infrastructure. The primary piece of stormwater infrastructure is a regional BMP designed and constructed several years ago, which now requires regular maintenance. The BMP manages much of the stormwater runoff from the Town as well as from areas beyond its boundary.

At the outset of this project, the Town identified little pressing capital need, but increasing operating costs and a dwindling fund balance.

Town of Hilton Head Island

The Town of Hilton Head Island is contained on the County's largest, southern-most island. The Town is unique in its numerous planned unit developments, nearly all of which include individual and separate stormwater drainage systems. Upon development, the individual systems, associated BMPs, and their maintenance are the responsibility of the homeowners association or developer. Over time, however, the Town has taken over BMPs in the 10 largest residential developments. Many other, smaller, developments are interested in having the Town take over maintenance of their infrastructure and BMPs as well, so the Town is working toward a revised definition of its own level and extent of service that may accommodate these citizen requests.

Being the most secluded of the jurisdictions, Hilton Head Island has a particular difficulty receiving infrastructure maintenance services from the County. County staff and equipment are positioned at the other end of the county, making trips to the island inefficient and ineffectual. The Town is open to other arrangements that could result in quicker and less costly service provision.

The Town's pattern of BMP takeover is causing its basic cost picture to change over time. With a new permit for its MS4, the Town will face steeply rising costs as it complies with stringent monitoring, maintenance, and reporting requirements. These, paired with the difficulties associated with receiving services from the County, have been the impetus for a desire to develop a more comprehensive program, potentially one with dedicated equipment and staff.

Town of Bluffton

The Town of Bluffton has a stable stormwater management program funded by a moderate fee. The Town has a small set of equipment and staff available for maintenance work but relies on the County to provide drainage maintenance services outside the jurisdictional boundary. In Bluffton's case, the Town's municipal area has numerous unincorporated pockets, a circumstance which muddies the distinction between the County's responsibility and the Town's. This circumstance also makes it highly inefficient to work on individual sections of a continuous drainage system. Both parties would likely benefit from a thoughtful, well-executed drainage maintenance arrangement.

The Town is also anticipating MS4 permitting in September of this year. The permit will require additional monitoring, maintenance, and reporting efforts, and may require the Town to invest in additional equipment, hire additional staff, or make other arrangements to collaborate with the other newly permitted jurisdictions.

The Town is anticipating a small debt issuance in the coming years to fund identified capital projects.

Rate Study Approach

The ATM team was contracted to assist Beaufort County Stormwater (County) with a detailed stormwater utility rate study. For the unincorporated County and each of the four municipalities, the team conducted a full accounting of planned stormwater program costs over the next five years, which are expected to increase driven by the combination of existing operations and maintenance activities, a significant capital project backlog, and emerging NPDES compliance needs. The rate study was performed concurrent with the budgeting process for the fiscal year that began July 1, 2015, and resulted in the development and consideration of a number of rate structure options, described below.

Goals

The primary goal of the rate study was to model financially sufficient scenarios to support the jurisdictions' current and future stormwater programs. This included the following supporting objectives:

1. Determine the current and future (from MS4 compliance, jurisdictional growth, etc.) revenue requirements of each program;
2. Determine the most fair and reasonable way to recover revenues while balancing data maintenance efforts;
3. Facilitate future program visioning; and
4. Account for potential future collaboration and shared costs.

Through numerous meetings, extensive model development and refinement, and collaborative review of the results, the team and the project remained accountable to these goals throughout the process.

Modeling

The primary deliverable from the rate study is a model that was developed to compare and contrast different financial scenarios for each of the jurisdictions. The model balances revenue requirements with funding from the stormwater fee and other possible sources. On the revenue requirements side, for each jurisdiction the ATM team considered existing revenue requirements, future MS4 permit related

expenses, and capital needs. Revenue was modeled as the resulting revenue from several different rate structures as well as supplemental resources from bond issuances or other sources. With that basic structure in place, the model was refined to allow for allocation of costs across jurisdictions and rate components (see below for more information) in order to optimize rate equity.

The finalized model will be made available to each jurisdiction for ongoing use as a financial planning tool.

Data update

Much of the impervious area data originally developed for the 2005 rate study was created using low-quality 2002 aerial imagery. With the possible shift in rates and rate structure, it was critical to have improved source data. As a part of the rate study, the ATM team conducted a targeted review update (where needed) of approximately 5,000 parcel polygons within the GIS and across all of the jurisdictions in order to update the rate base.

At the conclusion of the effort, RFC reviewed and updated the impervious features as necessary on 5,937 parcel polygons, deriving the features using the newest available imagery from 2013.

Rate Components

Fixed Costs

Many costs associated with the administration of the utility have little to do with specific characteristics of the land. Rather, they represent a public service to which each property owner (account holder) has equal access. Billing and collections, data management and updating, programming, and customer support may fall within this category. These costs, then, are distributed evenly to each account holder by being allocable to a fixed charge per parcel.

Variable Costs: Impervious Surfaces Area and Gross Parcel Area

Impervious area is the area of land covered by a hard surface through which rainwater cannot pass, such as building footprints and parking lots. The amount of impervious area on a parcel is most directly related to the quantity of stormwater to be handled by the system. For bare soil and vegetated ground cover, some water will infiltrate into the ground—even during heavy rain—rather than run across the surface. For impervious surfaces, on the other hand, water cannot infiltrate into the ground. For that reason, impervious surface causes the peak discharge volume of runoff from a parcel of land to be higher than it would otherwise. Regardless of how the land is managed, runoff tends to gather nutrients and other potential pollutants. Because virtually none of this runoff (and the pollutants it carries) soaks into the ground, runoff from impervious area carries a greater volume of harmful materials toward receiving waterbodies than pervious area.

One unique aspect of the stormwater utilities in these jurisdictions is the wide variety of land use represented within each jurisdiction. Gross area is included as a component of the stormwater fee to capture the costs not solely related to impervious area runoff. As opposed to impervious area, gross land area contributes proportionately more to the nutrients and pollutants that stormwater runoff may pick up and less to the sheer volume of runoff to be managed. As discussed, pervious land can absorb some of the water that falls on it, so it does not contribute as much to runoff. However, pervious land still contributes pesticides, fertilizers, leaves, and other undesirable materials to the runoff that does

occur. As such, stormwater costs related to water quality and quantity (most O&M costs) are allocable in some portion to gross land area.

In the costs described below, allocability to impervious area and gross area represents a relationship between a particular cost and the demand for that cost caused by a higher volume of stormwater (including higher levels of pollution) to be managed. An impervious and gross area rate structure allocates some cost to each of the two variables, in this case either allocating 80% or 90% of the variable costs to impervious area, and the remaining costs to gross area. The gross area units would include a declining block, such that large properties have more units of gross area than small properties, but the increase in units of gross area as overall parcel size increase are blunted by the declining block.

Cost Allocability

The proposed rate structures take into account a number of costs that vary by:

- Who provides the service,
- Who receives the service, and
- What drives the cost of the service (the existence of an account, impervious area or gross area)

This section describes the different elements of the jurisdictions' and utility's program costs and how they may be accommodated in the rate structures. The resulting modeled rates for each jurisdiction take into account the distribution of costs across all jurisdictions based on the chosen allocation scheme, and the particular rate base of that jurisdiction.

Jurisdictional Infrastructure O&M

Each of the five jurisdictions maintains its own stormwater drainage infrastructure and funds those costs from utility revenue. These costs are driven by impervious area and gross area in the jurisdiction, which contribute to stormwater runoff and nutrient loading. As such, the impervious and/or gross area component of the fee will include these costs. Revenue from this fee component would be returned to the service provider, the individual jurisdiction.

Jurisdiction Capital Projects

Each of the five jurisdictions has an independent capital plan, and can determine whether bond funding or pay as you go funding (or paying with available unencumbered funds) is appropriate. Capital financing has been "pay-as-you-go" for most jurisdictions. An alternative is for jurisdictions to borrow money to build capital projects and pay this back over time. This option is described in the definitions as debt.

The cost drivers for capital projects are similar to those for regular O&M, and are allocable to impervious and gross area within a jurisdiction. Debt service (in the case of bond funding) or cash contributions to capital projects are included in the impervious and/or gross area components of a fee. Revenue from this fee component would be returned to the service provider, the individual jurisdiction.

Debt

For many of the jurisdictions, capital needs greatly outpace the funds available through fee revenue. Issuing debt in the form of revenue bonds is a viable alternative to fund these projects, and in some cases may be the most appropriate option. Debt financing is appropriate for large physical assets with long expected lives, generally constructed improvements. Most notable, debt service creates a

mechanism for future ratepayers to help fund the infrastructure from which they still benefit. The exceptional environmental quality found in this region is one of the primary reasons people choose to live and work here, and at its most basic, every investment made in capital projects supports that fundamental tenet. Through debt funding of capital projects, ratepayers of the future can pay back into the program that promotes this high quality of life.

Revenue bonding will not affect a jurisdiction's existing covenants or caps. With revenue bonds, the jurisdiction's stormwater utility will be solely responsible for servicing that debt, and there is no risk to the greater entity.

Countywide Infrastructure O&M

The County maintains some larger drainage infrastructure within each of the four municipalities in addition to drainage infrastructure within the unincorporated area. County-wide infrastructure (defined as pipes and open ditches both in and out of rights of way that are owned or maintained by the County) maintenance costs have not been allocated to any ratepayers outside the unincorporated County to date. That is, revenue from fees charged to property owners in the unincorporated County have been funding infrastructure maintenance, repair, and replacement activities throughout all five jurisdictions. Currently, these activities have been limited in the incorporated areas because funding levels, supported by the unincorporated ratepayers only, are insufficient. The modified rate structure will share the County's costs for Countywide infrastructure maintenance across all the unincorporated and incorporated areas of the County based on linear feet of pipes and open ditches in each jurisdiction.

The cost drivers for operation and maintenance of county infrastructure are similar to those for jurisdictional infrastructure. These costs may be recovered through an impervious and/or gross area fee component, the revenue from which supports County efforts. Revenue from this fee component would be returned to the service provider, the County.

A detailed analysis of the proportions of this County-wide infrastructure was prepared in 2015 by the County, and was used as the basis for the cost allocations to unincorporated areas of the County and to the municipalities. This inventory was conducted in GIS data layers and was made available to all jurisdictions by the County as part of this study. The analysis shows the proportions to be:

Unincorporated County	76.4%
City of Beaufort	3.4%
Town of Port Royal	1.0%
Town of Bluffton	11.1%
Town of Hilton Head Island	8.1%

Utility Administration

The County administers the cooperative utility for each of the five jurisdictions. Currently administrative fees are allocated across the impervious area rate base such that properties with a large number of SFUs of impervious area pay more in administrative fees than those with fewer SFUs.

Costs for this effort may be allocable to either the number of parcels or accounts for which data must be maintained, customer service must be provided, etc. These costs may instead be recovered via a fixed charge component charged to all utility customers. Alternatively, costs could be allocable to the

impervious and/or gross area fee component if they are more closely related to the effort of maintaining the geospatial data or researching and addressing detailed questions from large, complex customers. Revenue from this fee component would be returned to the service provider, the County.

MS4 Compliance

The County, the Town of Hilton Head, and the Town of Bluffton will be subject to MS4 permit requirements beginning in late 2015. Some program elements are fulfilled by each individual jurisdiction while others are provided cooperatively. Any existing interlocal agreements and Memoranda of Understanding (MOU) may need to be revised if an alternate structure is chosen.

Individual Efforts

Other MS4 permit compliance activities will be done separately by each jurisdiction, and provided only to that jurisdiction. These costs are allocable to the impervious and/or gross area fee component and revenue from this fee component would be returned to the service provider, the individual jurisdiction.

Cooperative Efforts

Monitoring

The County currently provides monitoring efforts in some jurisdictions (specifically North of the Broad). This relationship could be expanded to other jurisdictions if desired. These costs would be driven by the number of accounts and would be included in the fixed charge component of the fee, only in the jurisdictions where the County provides this monitoring service. Revenue from this fee component would be returned to the service provider, the County.

Public Education/Outreach

Currently, the jurisdictions participate in a cooperative public education and outreach scheme. Rather than implement separate agreements between each jurisdiction, this cost can be considered a per account cost and included in the fixed charge component of the fee, applicable to everyone in the County. Revenue from this fee component would be returned to the service provider, the County.

Modeled Options

Elements of Six Rate Structure Options

Simplified residential rate: Charge one of a series of flat rates, based on SFUs, to different classes of residential properties. This is how residential rates work in the current rate structure.

Continued application of the agricultural use policy: Properties legally under certain agricultural uses have limits placed on their stormwater fees by state law. The rate structure options will continue to follow this approach.

Updated source data: RFC reviewed and updated as necessary 5,937 parcel polygons with the newest available imagery from 2013. The results of this update were used to model both the modified rate structure options and the current rate structure options, which make use of the newly measured impervious features.

Minimum charge: A minimum charge is a rate structure feature whereby once the amount a property owes in annual stormwater fees is computed it is compared to the minimum charge and if less, the minimum charge is applied to the property. The minimum charge is set to reflect the minimum amount

of demand a property can actually place on the jurisdiction providing service. The minimum charge is represented as a fixed fee component and is charged to every property.

Options

- A. Current rate structure with updated source data; current approach for administrative fees based on impervious area units; compliance with current rate ordinance; pay-as-you-go capital financing
- B. Current rate structure with updated source data; current approach for administrative fees based on impervious area units; compliance with current rate ordinance; debt financing for some capital projects
- C. Modified rate structure based on impervious and gross area; continued use of simplified residential rates; continued application of agricultural use policy; County-wide administrative costs allocated to per-account basis; County-wide infrastructure maintenance costs allocated to impervious and gross area based on infrastructure miles per jurisdiction or other intra-jurisdictional allocation model; pay-as-you-go capital financing
- D. Modified rate structure based on impervious and gross area; continued use of simplified residential rates; continued application of agricultural use policy; County-wide administrative costs allocated to impervious and gross area; County-wide infrastructure maintenance costs allocated to impervious and gross area based on infrastructure miles per jurisdiction or other intra-jurisdictional allocation model; pay-as-you-go capital financing
- E. Modified rate structure based on impervious and gross area at 80/20 or 90/10 allocation; continued use of simplified residential rates; continued application of agricultural use policy; County-wide administrative costs allocated to per account basis; County-wide infrastructure maintenance costs allocated to impervious and gross area based on infrastructure miles per jurisdiction or other intra-jurisdictional allocation model; debt for some capital financing
- F. Modified rate structure based on impervious and gross area at 80/20 or 90/10 allocation; continued use of simplified residential rates; continued application of agricultural use policy; County-wide administrative costs allocated to impervious and gross area; County-wide infrastructure maintenance costs allocated to impervious and gross area based on infrastructure miles per jurisdiction or other intra-jurisdictional allocation model; debt for some capital financing

Alternative Cost Sharing Approach

As an alternative to the modeled countywide infrastructure charge, each underlying jurisdiction can work individually with the County to establish a level of service and cost for providing that service within the jurisdiction. Each jurisdiction is entitled to convey that fee to its customers in any reasonable manner, but must remit the appropriate amount to the County to receive the agreed upon services.

Table 2. Modeled Rate Structure Options

	<i>Overall Rate Structure</i>	<i>Debt Financing for Some Capital?</i>	<i>Method for Allocating Admin & Reg Costs</i>	<i>Method for Allocating CWI O&M Costs</i>	<i>Simplified Residential Rates</i>	<i>Alternative Cost Sharing Approach</i>
A	Current (Imp Area)	No	SFUs	Optional	Yes	Optional
B	Current (Imp Area)	Yes	SFUs	Optional	Yes	Optional
C	Impervious & Gross Area	No	Per account	Impervious & Gross Area	Yes	Optional
D	Impervious & Gross Area	No	Impervious & Gross Area	Impervious & Gross Area	Yes	Optional
E	Impervious & Gross Area	Yes	Per account	Impervious & Gross Area	Yes	Optional
F	Impervious & Gross Area	Yes	Impervious & Gross Area	Impervious & Gross Area	Yes	Optional

Modified Rate Structure

ATM modeled four of the six options based on a modified rate structure design that relies more heavily on measured impervious area data but retains the basic backbone of the existing rate structure.

Fee Structure

The recommended fee includes three components: a fixed component to convey costs allocable by account, and two variable components: one based on gross area and one based on impervious area, to convey the costs that vary by property characteristic. With the exception of those explicitly exempt, every real property (which in some cases does not include land on the ground) has a stormwater fee calculated for it.

Bill Class

Every taxed property falls into one of several bill classes, which determine fee calculation for that property. Residential properties are treated in a similar manner as they are currently, with SFU equivalents to represent the impervious area on each type of residential property. Gross area and fixed fee components are added to this portion of the residential fee. Vacant property is not charged for any impervious area, measured or assumed. It is, however, charged for the gross land area of the parcel and the fixed component of the fee, as described below. Agricultural properties in the County are excluded from any fee changes by State law, and as such represent their own category of properties for which the current fee is carried forward. Exempt parcels are not charged any portion of the fee. Finally, all other properties are considered non-residential, non-vacant properties (herein called “commercial”), which are charged a per unit rate for impervious area, along with a fixed fee and gross area charge.

Rate Structure Design

Impervious Area Units

The existing impervious area unit of 4906 has been retained for maximum equity between residential and commercial bill classes in impervious area charge. Residential properties are charged for impervious area based on the factors existing in the current rates structure. Commercial properties are charged per 4,906 square feet unit, or part thereof, of impervious area. Under the modified rate structure design, 80% of variable costs are funded through gross area charges.

Gross Area Blocks

A gross area fee component is included for all properties that have a real parcel and parcel area found in GIS. The gross area charge is calculated in equivalent units as follows:

- Every property is charged \$X for the first 2 acres of gross area. This means that every property getting a gross area fee is charged at least \$X.
- For every acre above 2 acres, and up to 10 acres, the property is charged $.5 * \$X$ per acre.
- For every acre above 10 acres, and up to 100 acres, the property is charged $.4 * \$X$ per acre.
- For every acre above 100 acres, the property is charged $.3 * \$X$ per acre.

This declining block structure maintains the important rate base of large properties. Under the modified rate structure design, 20% of variable costs are funded through gross area charges.

Exempt Properties and Special Cases

The modified rate structure design mirrors the current rate structure in exempt properties. Roads, railroads, private roads, and boat slip properties are exempt from stormwater fees. As described above, vacant (undeveloped) parcels are not exempt from the entire fee, but are not charged for the impervious area fee component.

Credit

For properties receiving credit for BMPs, that credit can be carried forward in this modified rate structure.

Rate Study Results

ATM developed a spreadsheet-based rate model tool to model the way the individual jurisdiction and Countywide costs impact rates in each jurisdiction. The comprehensive model can be manipulated to calculate rates for each of the six options described above, as well as allow for manual override of the calculated rates to predict the revenue generation and sufficiency of a particular rate structure and rate choice.

Beaufort County

For the unincorporated County, Option E (see appendix A) results in rates for a fixed charge, an impervious area charge, and a gross area charge. This option would raise the annual charge for an average single family home on a 1 acre lot from the current \$50 per year to \$87 per year and the rate could be held stable for at least five years. All other options for the County result in less favorable rates. The fee charged to an average house on a one acre parcel in Beaufort County under the current rates and the six options modeled as part of this rate study are as follows:

	Fiscal Year				
	2015-2016	2016-2017	2017-2018	2018-2019	2019-2020
Option A	\$100	\$100	\$100	\$110	\$120
Option B	\$95	\$95	\$95	\$95	\$95
Option C	\$87	\$99	\$99	\$99	\$101
Option D	\$90	\$100	\$100	\$100	\$107
Option E	\$87	\$87	\$87	\$87	\$87
Option F	\$90	\$90	\$90	\$90	\$92

Therefore, ATM recommends rate structure option E for the County, under which administrative and regulatory compliance charges are allocated on a per account basis, infrastructure O&M costs are allocated based on the impervious and gross area, and two bond sales of \$5,000,000 occur in FY 2017 and FY2019. Because the underlying jurisdictions are unlikely to adopt a rate structure change in the coming fiscal year, the existing \$3.18 per (paid) SFU administrative charge that has already been negotiated is retained.

The County is responsible for funding 76.4% of all countywide infrastructure (CWI) operation and maintenance under the CWI allocation used. This is \$44.34 of the total \$87.00 annual charge for an average house on a lot smaller than 2 acres. The four municipalities are responsible for the remaining CWI funding, with the allocation based on the amount of infrastructure to be maintained that falls within each jurisdiction, as described previously. For the 2015-16 fiscal year their CWI funding on an SFU basis is:

City of Beaufort	\$9.31 per SFU
Town of Port Royal	\$5.82 per SFU
Town of Bluffton	\$30.49 per SFU
Town of Hilton Head Island	\$8.86 per SFU

City, Towns

Because the City and Towns are not expected to change their rate structures this year, the financial planning for the municipalities was not constrained to the same timeline, and efforts to refine the rate model are ongoing. Draft rates for each of the municipalities have been produced for at least some of the six rate structure options but they should be viewed as examples rather than recommendations, and will likely be revised in the coming months. Because the timing of major costs, particularly capital expenses, can be so critical to rates, opportunities for each jurisdiction to work with the model are necessary and have not happened. Similarly, some jurisdictions have not provided any planned capital projects or costs and so the model is not yet capable of modeling debt options. Options where a reasonable model run cannot yet be created were not modeled.

Following a consensus on program and financial planning, final recommended rates can be developed with each municipality. Example model runs and the rates they use are provided in Appendix B (City of Beaufort), Appendix C (Town of Port Royal), Appendix D (Town of Bluffton), and Appendix E (Town of Hilton Head Island). As mentioned previously, these are illustrative only.

In general, the ATM team recommends rate structure options C or E for the jurisdictions, depending on the evolving capital needs of the programs. The team understands that this change is unlikely to happen in the coming year, so the recommendation extends to the following year if the current rate structure is

retained for this year. In future years, the County may need to charge a higher administrative fee to jurisdictions that do not adopt the rate structure of the group, as additional administrative effort will be spent managing a rate structure and supporting customer service needs in ways different than and in some cases separate from the regional utility.

The model provided as part of this rate study will assist the jurisdictions in fine-tuning program and capital expenses in the future to develop the most suitable set of rates over time.

General Impacts of Rate Structure Changes

The recommended rate structure (Option E if capital intensive, Option C if not) incorporates a fixed charge per account (parcel), plus two variable charges: one for impervious area on the parcel and one for gross parcel area. It also continues the practice of using simplified residential rates for residential properties of varying types from single family detached through condominium units. Because the current billing practices for large undeveloped tracts include an impervious area estimation process while the new rates structures do not charge an impervious area fee if there is no impervious area present, the impervious charges may be divergent between the rate structures. However, the introduction of a gross area charge in the new rate structure modeled largely mimics the fee outcomes.

Using three rate metrics (fixed, impervious area, gross area) allows the fee to have components that relate to cost causation most directly and is generally preferred in utility ratemaking. For example, some administrative costs for billing and collections efforts relate much more to the existence of a bill than to the size of the bill. Paying these costs from an impervious area rate shifts costs to large ratepayers while paying these costs from a fixed charge, as recommended, allocates the costs more equally across all ratepayers.

Needed Ordinance Revisions

County

If a new rate structure is adopted, significant revisions to the County's stormwater utility fee ordinance will be needed. While the revisions are outside the ATM team's scope of work, the team has identified the following categories to focus on:

1. The definitions for residential dwelling classifications and nonresidential properties will need to be revised according to the new rate structure, which does not strictly classify properties according to their land use code in the County tax data.
2. In the definitions and general funding policy section, the rate structure and fee calculation description will need to be updated (refer to Rate Structure Design section above).
3. The stormwater service fee rates for other jurisdictions should be removed and replaced with language that says the County will convey the fees for all jurisdictions until each has transitioned to the revised rate structure. The ordinance should state that the same rate structure will apply for all jurisdictions and should describe how the County will maintain stormwater billing data and conduct other administrative tasks. Once a jurisdiction has transitioned to the new rate structure, the jurisdiction should revise its own ordinance on stormwater service fee rates and execution of utility authority.
4. References to findings from the 2005 rate study should be eliminated or updated to reflect the current findings.

- References to the stormwater utility's responsibilities and how it is managed will need to be revised to take into account the multijurisdictional nature of the utility and any changes to the way funding (especially for countywide drainage infrastructure) occurs. The revisions can be based on current interlocal governmental agreements with the City and Towns.

Other jurisdictions

Following the County ordinance revision and adoption of the revised rate structure, each underlying jurisdiction should revise its ordinance accordingly and mirror the County's language on the rate structure.

Interlocal Agreements

After each jurisdiction transitions to the revised rate structure, the references to interlocal agreements on administrative fees in the County ordinance can be replaced with details on the actual fee component.

Ongoing Billing Data Maintenance

Data maintenance processes for stormwater utility fee billing are crucial to enabling accurate and timely reporting and customer service. Parcel data from the five jurisdictions should be integrated and kept as current as possible for use in determining properties that are billable for the stormwater fee. A GIS layer representing impervious surfaces should be updated regularly in response to development, demolition, and recognition of incorrect data. Other County data sources such as building permit applications and changes in improvement values can also be utilized as triggers to begin or update stormwater billing.

The ATM team will provide technical guidance on data maintenance in a separate memorandum that will go into detail on digitization and GIS processes, triggers for new or changed development, and other processes for keeping stormwater billing data current.

Appendix A – Beaufort County Recommended Rates (Options A-F)

**Beaufort County
Summary Sheet**

Sheet Name: BC-A
Option: A

	FY 2015-2016 Current RS	FY 2016-2017 Current RS	FY 2017-2018 Current RS	FY 2018-2019 Current RS	FY 2019-2020 Current RS
Rate Base					
1.00% Accounts	65,314	65,967	66,627	67,293	67,966
-0.50% Billable IA Units	54,388	54,116	53,845	53,576	53,308
-1.00% Billable Equivalent GA Units	104,545	103,500	102,465	101,440	100,426
Costs					
Administration (50250012)	\$ 360,495	\$ 363,725	\$ 368,737	\$ 373,179	\$ 379,546
County Portion: Administration	\$ 169,198	\$ 170,714	\$ 173,066	\$ 175,151	\$ 178,139
Regulatory Compliance (50250013)	\$ 620,242	\$ 687,847	\$ 635,754	\$ 669,218	\$ 695,872
County Portion: Regulatory Compliance	\$ 555,853	\$ 623,693	\$ 574,254	\$ 610,371	\$ 637,025
County-Wide Infrastructure O&M (50250011)	\$ 3,492,833	\$ 3,407,621	\$ 3,428,602	\$ 3,520,449	\$ 3,552,600
Capital Purchases & Projects	\$ 1,335,790	\$ 2,079,320	\$ 1,662,460	\$ 1,585,000	\$ 3,194,460
Total County Costs (excl. debt service)	\$ 5,809,361	\$ 6,538,513	\$ 6,095,553	\$ 6,147,846	\$ 7,822,478
Total County Costs excl. Shared Services Payable by Others (excl. debt service)	\$ 5,553,674	\$ 6,281,348	\$ 5,838,382	\$ 5,890,971	\$ 7,562,224
Debt Service					
Annual Debt Service	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Coverage Goal	1.30	1.30	1.30	1.30	1.30
Actual Coverage					
Current RS Fee Alternative					
Impervious Area Units	60,927	60,622	60,319	60,017	59,717
Fee	\$ 100.00	\$ 100.00	\$ 100.00	\$ 110.00	\$ 120.00
Countywide Infrastructure Charge	\$ 43.79	\$ 42.93	\$ 43.42	\$ 44.80	\$ 45.44
Override Countywide Infrastructure Charge	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Anticipated Unincorporated County Fee Billings	\$ 6,092,675	\$ 6,062,211	\$ 6,031,900	\$ 6,601,915	\$ 7,166,079
Collection Factor	94%	94%	94%	94%	94%
Revenues					
Anticipated Unincorp County Fee Revenue	\$ 5,727,114	\$ 5,698,479	\$ 5,669,986	\$ 6,205,800	\$ 6,736,114
Anticipated Revenue from other Jurisdictions	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Administrative Fee	\$ 191,297	\$ 193,011	\$ 195,671	\$ 198,028	\$ 201,407
Regulatory Compliance	\$ 64,390	\$ 64,154	\$ 61,500	\$ 58,847	\$ 58,847
Bond Issuance Proceeds	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Fund Balance					
FY Beginning Fund Balance	\$ -	\$ 429,127	\$ 103,423	\$ 192,199	\$ 763,903
Total Costs	\$ 5,553,674	\$ 6,281,348	\$ 5,838,382	\$ 5,890,971	\$ 7,562,224
Total Revenues	\$ 5,982,801	\$ 5,955,643	\$ 5,927,158	\$ 6,462,675	\$ 6,996,368
Surplus (Deficit)	\$ 429,127	\$ (325,705)	\$ 88,776	\$ 571,704	\$ (565,857)
FY End Fund Balance	\$ 429,127	\$ 103,423	\$ 192,199	\$ 763,903	\$ 198,047

**Beaufort County
Summary Sheet**

Sheet Name: **BC-B**
Option: **B**

	FY 2015-2016 Current RS	FY 2016-2017 Current RS	FY 2017-2018 Current RS	FY 2018-2019 Current RS	FY 2019-2020 Current RS
Rate Base					
1.00% Accounts	65,314	65,967	66,627	67,293	67,966
-0.50% Billable IA Units	54,388	54,116	53,845	53,576	53,308
-1.00% Billable Equivalent GA Units	104,545	103,500	102,465	101,440	100,426
Costs					
Administration (50250012)	\$ 360,495	\$ 363,725	\$ 368,737	\$ 373,179	\$ 379,546
County Portion: Administration	\$ 169,198	\$ 170,714	\$ 173,066	\$ 175,151	\$ 178,139
Regulatory Compliance (50250013)	\$ 620,242	\$ 687,847	\$ 635,754	\$ 669,218	\$ 695,872
County Portion: Regulatory Compliance	\$ 555,853	\$ 623,693	\$ 574,254	\$ 610,371	\$ 637,025
County-Wide Infrastructure O&M (50250011)	\$ 3,492,833	\$ 3,407,621	\$ 3,428,602	\$ 3,520,449	\$ 3,552,600
Capital Purchases & Projects	\$ 1,335,790	\$ 2,079,320	\$ 1,662,460	\$ 1,585,000	\$ 3,194,460
Total County Costs (excl. debt service)	\$ 5,809,361	\$ 6,538,513	\$ 6,095,553	\$ 6,147,846	\$ 7,822,478
Total County Costs excl. Shared Services Payable by Others (excl. debt service)	\$ 5,553,674	\$ 6,281,348	\$ 5,838,382	\$ 5,890,971	\$ 7,562,224
Debt Service					
Annual Debt Service	\$ -	\$ 146,185	\$ 292,371	\$ 438,556	\$ 584,741
Coverage Goal	1.30	1.30	1.30	1.30	1.30
Actual Coverage		13.79	6.91	4.30	3.09
Current RS Fee Alternative					
Impervious Area Units	60,927	60,622	60,319	60,017	59,717
Fee	\$ 95.00	\$ 95.00	\$ 95.00	\$ 95.00	\$ 95.00
Countywide Infrastructure Charge	\$ 43.79	\$ 42.93	\$ 43.42	\$ 44.80	\$ 45.44
Override Countywide Infrastructure Charge	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Anticipated Unincorporated County Fee Billings	\$ 5,788,041	\$ 5,759,101	\$ 5,730,305	\$ 5,701,654	\$ 5,673,146
Collection Factor	94%	94%	94%	94%	94%
Revenues					
Anticipated Unincorp County Fee Revenue	\$ 5,440,759	\$ 5,413,555	\$ 5,386,487	\$ 5,359,555	\$ 5,332,757
Anticipated Revenue from other Jurisdictions	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Administrative Fee	\$ 191,297	\$ 193,011	\$ 195,671	\$ 198,028	\$ 201,407
Regulatory Compliance	\$ 64,390	\$ 64,154	\$ 61,500	\$ 58,847	\$ 58,847
Bond Issuance Proceeds	\$ -	\$ 5,000,000	\$ -	\$ 5,000,000	\$ -
Fund Balance					
FY Beginning Fund Balance	\$ -	\$ 142,772	\$ 4,385,958	\$ 3,898,864	\$ 8,185,767
Total Costs	\$ 5,553,674	\$ 6,427,533	\$ 6,130,752	\$ 6,329,527	\$ 8,146,966
Total Revenues	\$ 5,696,446	\$ 10,670,719	\$ 5,643,658	\$ 10,616,430	\$ 5,593,011
Surplus (Deficit)	\$ 142,772	\$ 4,243,186	\$ (487,094)	\$ 4,286,903	\$ (2,553,955)
FY End Fund Balance	\$ 142,772	\$ 4,385,958	\$ 3,898,864	\$ 8,185,767	\$ 5,631,812

Beaufort County and Municipalities Stormwater Rate Study DRAFT Report

July 10, 2015

Beaufort County
Summary Sheet

Sheet Name: BC-C
Option: C

	FY 2015-2016 Revised RS	FY 2016-2017 Revised RS	FY 2017-2018 Revised RS	FY 2018-2019 Revised RS	FY 2019-2020 Revised RS
Rate Base					
1.00% Accounts	65,314	65,967	66,627	67,293	67,966
-0.50% Billable IA Units	54,388	54,116	53,845	53,576	53,308
-1.00% Billable Equivalent GA Units	104,545	103,500	102,465	101,440	100,426
Costs					
Administration (50250012)	\$ 360,495	\$ 363,725	\$ 368,737	\$ 373,179	\$ 379,546
County Portion: Administration	\$ 187,106	\$ 188,782	\$ 191,384	\$ 193,689	\$ 196,994
Regulatory Compliance (50250013)	\$ 620,242	\$ 687,847	\$ 635,754	\$ 669,218	\$ 695,872
County Portion: Regulatory Compliance	\$ 572,294	\$ 639,616	\$ 589,928	\$ 625,797	\$ 652,451
County-Wide Infrastructure O&M (50250011)	\$ 3,492,833	\$ 3,407,621	\$ 3,428,602	\$ 3,520,449	\$ 3,552,600
County Portion: County-Wide Infrastructure	\$ 2,667,868	\$ 2,602,782	\$ 2,618,807	\$ 2,688,961	\$ 2,713,518
Capital Purchases & Projects	\$ 1,335,790	\$ 2,079,320	\$ 1,662,460	\$ 1,585,000	\$ 3,194,460
	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Total County Costs (excl. debt service)	\$ 5,809,361	\$ 6,538,513	\$ 6,095,553	\$ 6,147,846	\$ 7,822,478
Total County Costs excl. Shared Services Payable by Others (excl. debt service)	\$ 4,763,057	\$ 5,510,500	\$ 5,062,579	\$ 5,093,447	\$ 6,757,423
Debt Service					
Annual Debt Service	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Coverage Goal	1.30	1.30	1.30	1.30	1.30
Actual Coverage					
Revised RS Stormwater Fee					
Fixed Cost per Account, Calc	\$ 11.63	\$ 13.19	\$ 12.41	\$ 12.92	\$ 13.30
Fixed Cost per Account, admin portion:	\$ 2.86	\$ 3.49	\$ 3.55	\$ 3.62	\$ 3.70
Fixed Cost per Account, regulatory compliance portion:	\$ 8.76	\$ 9.70	\$ 8.85	\$ 9.30	\$ 9.60
Fixed Cost per Account, CWI portion:	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Fixed Cost Collection Rate	91%	92%	94%	94%	94%
Fixed Cost per Account, Override	\$ 12.00	\$ 14.00	\$ 14.00	\$ 14.00	\$ 14.00
Variable Costs, IA Proportion	80%	80%	80%	80%	80%
Variable Costs, GA Proportion	20%	20%	20%	20%	20%
Variable Costs, IA Unit Fee Calc	\$ 58.90	\$ 69.22	\$ 63.61	\$ 63.82	\$ 88.67
Variable Costs, IA Unit Fee, administrative portion:	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Variable Costs, IA Unit Fee, reg compliance portion:	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Variable Costs, IA Unit Fee, CWI portion:	\$ 39.24	\$ 38.48	\$ 38.91	\$ 40.15	\$ 40.72
Variable Costs, IA Unit Fee, Other County costs portion:	\$ 19.65	\$ 30.74	\$ 24.70	\$ 23.67	\$ 47.94
IA Collection Rate	91%	92%	94%	94%	94%
Variable Costs, IA Unit Fee Override	\$ 65.00	\$ 75.00	\$ 75.00	\$ 75.00	\$ 75.00
Variable Costs, GA Unit Fee Calc	\$ 7.66	\$ 9.05	\$ 8.36	\$ 8.43	\$ 11.77
Variable Costs, GA Unit Fee, administrative portion:	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Variable Costs, GA Unit Fee, reg compliance portion:	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Variable Costs, GA Unit Fee, CWI portion:	\$ 5.10	\$ 5.03	\$ 5.11	\$ 5.30	\$ 5.40
Variable Costs, GA Unit Fee, Other County costs portion:	\$ 2.56	\$ 4.02	\$ 3.24	\$ 3.13	\$ 6.36
GA Collection Rate	91%	92%	94%	94%	94%
Variable Costs, GA Unit Fee Override	\$ 10.00	\$ 10.00	\$ 10.00	\$ 10.00	\$ 12.00
Anticipated Unincorp County Fee Billings	\$ 5,364,442	\$ 6,017,238	\$ 5,995,803	\$ 5,974,702	\$ 6,154,736
Revenues					
Anticipated Unincorp County Fee Revenue	\$ 4,881,642	\$ 5,535,859	\$ 5,636,055	\$ 5,616,220	\$ 5,785,452
Anticipated Revenue from other Jurisdictions	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Administrative Fee	\$ 173,390	\$ 174,943	\$ 177,354	\$ 179,490	\$ 182,552
Regulatory Compliance	\$ 47,948	\$ 48,230	\$ 45,825	\$ 43,421	\$ 43,421
Countywide Infrastructure Maintenance	\$ 824,966	\$ 804,840	\$ 809,795	\$ 831,488	\$ 839,082
Bond Issuance Proceeds	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Fund Balance					
FY Beginning Fund Balance	\$ -	\$ 118,585	\$ 143,944	\$ 717,420	\$ 1,240,193
Total Costs	\$ 5,809,361	\$ 6,538,513	\$ 6,095,553	\$ 6,147,846	\$ 7,822,478
Total Revenues	\$ 5,927,945	\$ 6,563,872	\$ 6,669,029	\$ 6,670,619	\$ 6,850,507
Surplus (Deficit)	\$ 118,585	\$ 25,359	\$ 573,476	\$ 522,773	\$ (971,971)
FY End Fund Balance	\$ 118,585	\$ 143,944	\$ 717,420	\$ 1,240,193	\$ 268,222

**Beaufort County
Summary Sheet**

Sheet Name: **BC-D**
Option: **D**

	FY 2015-2016 Revised RS	FY 2016-2017 Revised RS	FY 2017-2018 Revised RS	FY 2018-2019 Revised RS	FY 2019-2020 Revised RS
Rate Base					
1.00% Accounts	65,314	65,967	66,627	67,293	67,966
-0.50% Billable IA Units	54,388	54,116	53,845	53,576	53,308
-1.00% Billable Equivalent GA Units	104,545	103,500	102,465	101,440	100,426
Costs					
Administration (50250012)	\$ 360,495	\$ 363,725	\$ 368,737	\$ 373,179	\$ 379,546
County Portion: Administration	\$ 169,198	\$ 170,714	\$ 173,066	\$ 175,151	\$ 178,139
Regulatory Compliance (50250013)	\$ 620,242	\$ 687,847	\$ 635,754	\$ 669,218	\$ 695,872
County Portion: Regulatory Compliance	\$ 555,853	\$ 623,693	\$ 574,254	\$ 610,371	\$ 637,025
County-Wide Infrastructure O&M (50250011)	\$ 3,492,833	\$ 3,407,621	\$ 3,428,602	\$ 3,520,449	\$ 3,552,600
County Portion: County-Wide Infrastructure	\$ 2,667,868	\$ 2,602,782	\$ 2,618,807	\$ 2,688,961	\$ 2,713,518
Capital Purchases & Projects	\$ 1,335,790	\$ 2,079,320	\$ 1,662,460	\$ 1,585,000	\$ 3,194,460
	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Total County Costs (excl. debt service)	\$ 5,809,361	\$ 6,538,513	\$ 6,095,553	\$ 6,147,846	\$ 7,822,478
Total County Costs excl. Shared Services Payable by Others (excl. debt service)	\$ 4,728,708	\$ 5,476,509	\$ 5,028,587	\$ 5,059,483	\$ 6,723,142
Debt Service					
Annual Debt Service	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Coverage Goal	1.30	1.30	1.30	1.30	1.30
Actual Coverage					
Revised RS Stormwater Fee					
Fixed Cost per Account, Calc	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Fixed Cost per Account, admin portion:	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Fixed Cost per Account, regulatory compliance portion:	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Fixed Cost per Account, CWI portion:	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Fixed Cost Collection Rate	91%	92%	94%	94%	94%
Fixed Cost per Account, Override	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Variable Costs, IA Proportion	80%	80%	80%	80%	80%
Variable Costs, GA Proportion	20%	20%	20%	20%	20%
Variable Costs, IA Unit Fee Calc	\$ 69.56	\$ 80.96	\$ 74.72	\$ 75.55	\$ 100.90
Variable Costs, IA Unit Fee, administrative portion:	\$ 2.49	\$ 2.52	\$ 2.57	\$ 2.62	\$ 2.67
Variable Costs, IA Unit Fee, reg compliance portion:	\$ 8.18	\$ 9.22	\$ 8.53	\$ 9.11	\$ 9.56
Variable Costs, IA Unit Fee, CWI portion:	\$ 39.24	\$ 38.48	\$ 38.91	\$ 40.15	\$ 40.72
Variable Costs, IA Unit Fee, Other County costs portion:	\$ 19.65	\$ 30.74	\$ 24.70	\$ 23.67	\$ 47.94
IA Collection Rate	91%	92%	94%	94%	94%
Variable Costs, IA Unit Fee Override	\$ 80.00	\$ 90.00	\$ 90.00	\$ 90.00	\$ 95.00
Variable Costs, GA Unit Fee Calc	\$ 9.05	\$ 10.59	\$ 9.82	\$ 9.98	\$ 13.39
Variable Costs, GA Unit Fee, administrative portion:	\$ 0.32	\$ 0.33	\$ 0.34	\$ 0.35	\$ 0.35
Variable Costs, GA Unit Fee, reg compliance portion:	\$ 1.06	\$ 1.21	\$ 1.12	\$ 1.20	\$ 1.27
Variable Costs, GA Unit Fee, CWI portion:	\$ 5.10	\$ 5.03	\$ 5.11	\$ 5.30	\$ 5.40
Variable Costs, GA Unit Fee, Other County costs portion:	\$ 2.56	\$ 4.02	\$ 3.24	\$ 3.13	\$ 6.36
GA Collection Rate	91%	92%	94%	94%	94%
Variable Costs, GA Unit Fee Override	\$ 10.00	\$ 10.00	\$ 10.00	\$ 10.00	\$ 12.00
Anticipated Unincorp County Fee Billings	\$ 5,396,494	\$ 5,905,440	\$ 5,870,700	\$ 5,836,240	\$ 6,269,372
Revenues					
Anticipated Unincorp County Fee Revenue	\$ 4,910,810	\$ 5,433,005	\$ 5,518,458	\$ 5,486,066	\$ 5,893,210
Anticipated Revenue from other Jurisdictions	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Administrative Fee	\$ 191,297	\$ 193,011	\$ 195,671	\$ 198,028	\$ 201,407
Regulatory Compliance	\$ 64,390	\$ 64,154	\$ 61,500	\$ 58,847	\$ 58,847
Countywide Infrastructure Maintenance	\$ 824,966	\$ 804,840	\$ 809,795	\$ 831,488	\$ 839,082
Bond Issuance Proceeds	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Fund Balance					
FY Beginning Fund Balance	\$ -	\$ 182,102	\$ 138,598	\$ 628,469	\$ 1,055,052
Total Costs	\$ 5,809,361	\$ 6,538,513	\$ 6,095,553	\$ 6,147,846	\$ 7,822,478
Total Revenues	\$ 5,991,462	\$ 6,495,009	\$ 6,585,424	\$ 6,574,429	\$ 6,992,545
Surplus (Deficit)	\$ 182,102	\$ (43,504)	\$ 489,871	\$ 426,583	\$ (829,933)
FY End Fund Balance	\$ 182,102	\$ 138,598	\$ 628,469	\$ 1,055,052	\$ 225,119

Beaufort County and Municipalities Stormwater Rate Study DRAFT Report

July 10, 2015

**Beaufort County
Summary Sheet**

Sheet Name: **BC-E**
Option: **E**

	FY 2015-2016 Revised RS	FY 2016-2017 Revised RS	FY 2017-2018 Revised RS	FY 2018-2019 Revised RS	FY 2019-2020 Revised RS
Rate Base					
1.00% Accounts	65,314	65,967	66,627	67,293	67,966
-0.50% Billable IA Units	54,388	54,116	53,845	53,576	53,308
-1.00% Billable Equivalent GA Units	104,545	103,500	102,465	101,440	100,426
Costs					
Administration (50250012)	\$ 360,495	\$ 363,725	\$ 368,737	\$ 373,179	\$ 379,546
County Portion: Administration	\$ 187,106	\$ 188,782	\$ 191,384	\$ 193,689	\$ 196,994
Regulatory Compliance (50250013)	\$ 620,242	\$ 687,847	\$ 635,754	\$ 669,218	\$ 695,872
County Portion: Regulatory Compliance	\$ 572,294	\$ 639,616	\$ 589,928	\$ 625,797	\$ 652,451
County-Wide Infrastructure O&M (50250011)	\$ 3,492,833	\$ 3,407,621	\$ 3,428,602	\$ 3,520,449	\$ 3,552,600
County Portion: County-Wide Infrastructure	\$ 2,667,868	\$ 2,602,782	\$ 2,618,807	\$ 2,688,961	\$ 2,713,518
Capital Purchases & Projects	\$ 1,335,790	\$ 2,079,320	\$ 1,662,460	\$ 1,585,000	\$ 3,194,460
	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Total County Costs (excl. debt service)	\$ 5,809,361	\$ 6,538,513	\$ 6,095,553	\$ 6,147,846	\$ 7,822,478
Total County Costs excl. Shared Services Payable by Others (excl. debt service)	\$ 4,763,057	\$ 5,510,500	\$ 5,062,579	\$ 5,093,447	\$ 6,757,423
Debt Service					
Annual Debt Service	\$ -	\$ 146,185	\$ 292,371	\$ 438,556	\$ 584,741
Coverage Goal	1.30	1.30	1.30	1.30	1.30
Actual Coverage		10.16	5.49	3.37	2.40
Revised RS Stormwater Fee					
Fixed Cost per Account, Calc	\$ 11.63	\$ 13.19	\$ 12.41	\$ 12.92	\$ 13.30
Fixed Cost per Account, admin portion:	\$ 2.86	\$ 3.49	\$ 3.55	\$ 3.62	\$ 3.70
Fixed Cost per Account, regulatory compliance portion:	\$ 8.76	\$ 9.70	\$ 8.85	\$ 9.30	\$ 9.60
Fixed Cost per Account, CWI portion:	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Fixed Cost Collection Rate	91%	92%	94%	94%	94%
Fixed Cost per Account, Override	\$ 12.00	\$ 12.00	\$ 12.00	\$ 12.00	\$ 12.00
Variable Costs, IA Proportion	80%	80%	80%	80%	80%
Variable Costs, GA Proportion	20%	20%	20%	20%	20%
Variable Costs, IA Unit Fee Calc	\$ 58.90	\$ 71.38	\$ 67.96	\$ 70.37	\$ 97.44
Variable Costs, IA Unit Fee, administrative portion:	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Variable Costs, IA Unit Fee, reg compliance portion:	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Variable Costs, IA Unit Fee, CWI portion:	\$ 39.24	\$ 38.48	\$ 38.91	\$ 40.15	\$ 40.72
Variable Costs, IA Unit Fee, Other County costs portion:	\$ 19.65	\$ 32.90	\$ 29.04	\$ 30.22	\$ 56.71
IA Collection Rate	91%	92%	94%	94%	94%
Variable Costs, IA Unit Fee Override	\$ 65.00	\$ 65.00	\$ 65.00	\$ 65.00	\$ 65.00
Variable Costs, GA Unit Fee Calc	\$ 7.66	\$ 9.34	\$ 8.93	\$ 9.30	\$ 12.94
Variable Costs, GA Unit Fee, administrative portion:	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Variable Costs, GA Unit Fee, reg compliance portion:	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Variable Costs, GA Unit Fee, CWI portion:	\$ 5.10	\$ 5.03	\$ 5.11	\$ 5.30	\$ 5.40
Variable Costs, GA Unit Fee, Other County costs portion:	\$ 2.56	\$ 4.30	\$ 3.82	\$ 3.99	\$ 7.53
GA Collection Rate	91%	92%	94%	94%	94%
Variable Costs, GA Unit Fee Override	\$ 10.00	\$ 10.00	\$ 10.00	\$ 10.00	\$ 10.00
Anticipated Unincorp County Fee Billings	\$ 5,364,442	\$ 5,344,144	\$ 5,324,099	\$ 5,304,356	\$ 5,284,872
Revenues					
Anticipated Unincorp County Fee Revenue	\$ 4,881,642	\$ 4,916,612	\$ 5,004,653	\$ 4,986,095	\$ 4,967,780
Anticipated Revenue from other Jurisdictions	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Administrative Fee	\$ 173,390	\$ 174,943	\$ 177,354	\$ 179,490	\$ 182,552
Regulatory Compliance	\$ 47,948	\$ 48,230	\$ 45,825	\$ 43,421	\$ 43,421
Countywide Infrastructure Maintenance	\$ 824,966	\$ 804,840	\$ 809,795	\$ 831,488	\$ 839,082
Bond Issuance Proceeds	\$ -	\$ 5,000,000	\$ -	\$ 5,000,000	\$ -
Fund Balance					
FY Beginning Fund Balance	\$ -	\$ 118,585	\$ 4,378,512	\$ 4,028,216	\$ 8,482,308
Total Costs	\$ 5,809,361	\$ 6,684,698	\$ 6,387,923	\$ 6,586,402	\$ 8,407,219
Total Revenues	\$ 5,927,945	\$ 10,944,625	\$ 6,037,627	\$ 11,040,494	\$ 6,032,835
Surplus (Deficit)	\$ 118,585	\$ 4,259,927	\$ (350,296)	\$ 4,454,092	\$ (2,374,385)
FY End Fund Balance	\$ 118,585	\$ 4,378,512	\$ 4,028,216	\$ 8,482,308	\$ 6,107,923

Beaufort County and Municipalities Stormwater Rate Study DRAFT Report

July 10, 2015

**Beaufort County
Summary Sheet**

Sheet Name: BC-F
Option: F

	FY 2015-2016 Revised RS	FY 2016-2017 Revised RS	FY 2017-2018 Revised RS	FY 2018-2019 Revised RS	FY 2019-2020 Revised RS
Rate Base					
1.00% Accounts	65,314	65,967	66,627	67,293	67,966
-0.50% Billable IA Units	54,388	54,116	53,845	53,576	53,308
-1.00% Billable Equivalent GA Units	104,545	103,500	102,465	101,440	100,426
Costs					
Administration (50250012)	\$ 360,495	\$ 363,725	\$ 368,737	\$ 373,179	\$ 379,546
County Portion: Administration	\$ 169,198	\$ 170,714	\$ 173,066	\$ 175,151	\$ 178,139
Regulatory Compliance (50250013)	\$ 620,242	\$ 687,847	\$ 635,754	\$ 669,218	\$ 695,872
County Portion: Regulatory Compliance	\$ 555,853	\$ 623,693	\$ 574,254	\$ 610,371	\$ 637,025
County-Wide Infrastructure O&M (50250011)	\$ 3,492,833	\$ 3,407,621	\$ 3,428,602	\$ 3,520,449	\$ 3,552,600
County Portion: County-Wide Infrastructure	\$ 2,667,868	\$ 2,602,782	\$ 2,618,807	\$ 2,688,961	\$ 2,713,518
Capital Purchases & Projects	\$ 1,335,790	\$ 2,079,320	\$ 1,662,460	\$ 1,585,000	\$ 3,194,460
	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Total County Costs (excl. debt service)	\$ 5,809,361	\$ 6,538,513	\$ 6,095,553	\$ 6,147,846	\$ 7,822,478
Total County Costs excl. Shared Services Payable by Others (excl. debt service)	\$ 4,728,708	\$ 5,476,509	\$ 5,028,587	\$ 5,059,483	\$ 6,723,142
Debt Service					
Annual Debt Service	\$ -	\$ 146,185	\$ 292,371	\$ 438,556	\$ 584,741
Coverage Goal	1.30	1.30	1.30	1.30	1.30
Actual Coverage		10.52	5.63	3.44	2.76
Revised RS Stormwater Fee					
Fixed Cost per Account, Calc	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Fixed Cost per Account, admin portion:	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Fixed Cost per Account, regulatory compliance portion:	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Fixed Cost per Account, CWI portion:	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Fixed Cost Collection Rate	91%	92%	94%	94%	94%
Fixed Cost per Account, Override	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Variable Costs, IA Proportion	80%	80%	80%	80%	80%
Variable Costs, GA Proportion	20%	20%	20%	20%	20%
Variable Costs, IA Unit Fee Calc	\$ 69.56	\$ 83.13	\$ 79.06	\$ 82.10	\$ 109.68
Variable Costs, IA Unit Fee, administrative portion:	\$ 2.49	\$ 2.52	\$ 2.57	\$ 2.62	\$ 2.67
Variable Costs, IA Unit Fee, reg compliance portion:	\$ 8.18	\$ 9.22	\$ 8.53	\$ 9.11	\$ 9.56
Variable Costs, IA Unit Fee, CWI portion:	\$ 39.24	\$ 38.48	\$ 38.91	\$ 40.15	\$ 40.72
Variable Costs, IA Unit Fee, Other County costs portion:	\$ 19.65	\$ 32.90	\$ 29.04	\$ 30.22	\$ 56.71
IA Collection Rate	91%	92%	94%	94%	94%
Variable Costs, IA Unit Fee Override	\$ 80.00	\$ 80.00	\$ 80.00	\$ 80.00	\$ 80.00
Variable Costs, GA Unit Fee Calc	\$ 9.05	\$ 10.87	\$ 10.39	\$ 10.84	\$ 14.56
Variable Costs, GA Unit Fee, administrative portion:	\$ 0.32	\$ 0.33	\$ 0.34	\$ 0.35	\$ 0.35
Variable Costs, GA Unit Fee, reg compliance portion:	\$ 1.06	\$ 1.21	\$ 1.12	\$ 1.20	\$ 1.27
Variable Costs, GA Unit Fee, CWI portion:	\$ 5.10	\$ 5.03	\$ 5.11	\$ 5.30	\$ 5.40
Variable Costs, GA Unit Fee, Other County costs portion:	\$ 2.56	\$ 4.30	\$ 3.82	\$ 3.99	\$ 7.53
GA Collection Rate	91%	92%	94%	94%	94%
Variable Costs, GA Unit Fee Override	\$ 10.00	\$ 10.00	\$ 10.00	\$ 10.00	\$ 12.00
Anticipated Unincorp County Fee Billings	\$ 5,396,494	\$ 5,364,280	\$ 5,332,250	\$ 5,300,480	\$ 5,469,752
Revenues					
Anticipated Unincorp County Fee Revenue	\$ 4,910,810	\$ 4,935,138	\$ 5,012,315	\$ 4,982,451	\$ 5,141,567
Anticipated Revenue from other Jurisdictions	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Administrative Fee	\$ 191,297	\$ 193,011	\$ 195,671	\$ 198,028	\$ 201,407
Regulatory Compliance	\$ 64,390	\$ 64,154	\$ 61,500	\$ 58,847	\$ 58,847
Countywide Infrastructure Maintenance	\$ 824,966	\$ 804,840	\$ 809,795	\$ 831,488	\$ 839,082
Bond Issuance Proceeds	\$ -	\$ 5,000,000	\$ -	\$ 5,000,000	\$ -
Fund Balance					
FY Beginning Fund Balance	\$ -	\$ 182,102	\$ 4,494,545	\$ 4,185,903	\$ 8,670,316
Total Costs	\$ 5,809,361	\$ 6,684,698	\$ 6,387,923	\$ 6,586,402	\$ 8,407,219
Total Revenues	\$ 5,991,462	\$ 10,997,142	\$ 6,079,281	\$ 11,070,814	\$ 6,240,902
Surplus (Deficit)	\$ 182,102	\$ 4,312,444	\$ (308,642)	\$ 4,484,413	\$ (2,166,317)
FY End Fund Balance	\$ 182,102	\$ 4,494,545	\$ 4,185,903	\$ 8,670,316	\$ 6,503,999

Appendix B – City of Beaufort Example Rates (Options A-F)

City of Beaufort Summary Sheet

Option A

	FY 2015-2016 Current RS	FY 2016-2017 Current RS	FY 2017-2018 Current RS	FY 2018-2019 Current RS	FY 2019-2020 Current RS
Rate Base					
0.75% Accounts	6,431	6,479	6,528	6,577	6,626
1.25% Billable IA Units	12,726	12,885	13,046	13,209	13,374
1.25% Billable Equivalent GA Units	9,747	9,869	9,992	10,117	10,243
Costs					
Stormwater O&M	\$ 376,438	\$ 385,849	\$ 395,495	\$ 405,382	\$ 415,517
Shared County Services					
City Portion: Administration	\$ 26,220	\$ 31,857	\$ 32,255	\$ 32,658	\$ 33,067
City Portion: Monitoring & Outreach	\$ 25,882	\$ 25,235	\$ 24,686	\$ 24,137	\$ 24,137
City Portion: County-Wide Infrastructure O&M (CWI)	\$ 118,124	\$ 115,242	\$ 115,952	\$ 119,058	\$ 120,145
Capital Purchases & Projects	\$ 3,631	\$ 3,722	\$ 3,815	\$ 3,910	\$ 4,008
Total City Costs (excl. debt service)	\$ 380,069	\$ 389,570	\$ 399,309	\$ 409,292	\$ 419,525
Total City Costs payable to County for Shared Services	\$ 170,226	\$ 172,335	\$ 172,893	\$ 175,853	\$ 177,349
Debt Service					
Annual Debt Service	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Coverage Goal	1.30	1.30	1.30	1.30	1.30
Actual Coverage					
Current RS Fee Alternative					
Impervious Area Units	12,685	12,844	13,004	13,167	13,331
Fee	\$ 50.00	\$ 55.00	\$ 60.00	\$ 60.00	\$ 60.00
Countywide Infrastructure Charge	\$ 9.31	\$ 8.97	\$ 8.92	\$ 9.04	\$ 9.01
Override Countywide Infrastructure Charge	\$ 9.31	\$ 8.97	\$ 8.92	\$ 9.04	\$ 9.01
Anticipated City Fee Billings	\$ 752,345	\$ 821,600	\$ 896,241	\$ 909,024	\$ 919,987
Collection Factor	65%	65%	65%	65%	65%
Administrative Fee per Paid Unit	\$ 3.18	\$ 3.82	\$ 3.82	\$ 3.82	\$ 3.82
Revenues					
Anticipated City Fee Revenue	\$ 489,024	\$ 534,040	\$ 582,556	\$ 590,865	\$ 597,991
Anticipated funds remitted to County for Utility Admin	\$ (26,220)	\$ (31,857)	\$ (32,255)	\$ (32,658)	\$ (33,067)
Anticipated funds remitted to County for Monitoring & Outreach	\$ (25,882)	\$ (25,235)	\$ (24,686)	\$ (24,137)	\$ (24,137)
Anticipated funds remitted to County for CWI	\$ (118,124)	\$ (115,242)	\$ (115,952)	\$ (119,058)	\$ (120,145)
Anticipated Remaining City Fee Revenue	\$ 318,799	\$ 361,706	\$ 409,663	\$ 415,012	\$ 420,642
Bond Issuance Proceeds	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Fund Balance					
FY Beginning Fund Balance	\$ 450,749	\$ 389,479	\$ 361,614	\$ 371,968	\$ 377,688
Total Costs	\$ 380,069	\$ 389,570	\$ 399,309	\$ 409,292	\$ 419,525
Total Revenues	\$ 318,799	\$ 361,706	\$ 409,663	\$ 415,012	\$ 420,642
Surplus (Deficit)	\$ (61,270)	\$ (27,865)	\$ 10,354	\$ 5,720	\$ 1,118
FY End Fund Balance	\$ 389,479	\$ 361,614	\$ 371,968	\$ 377,688	\$ 378,805

City of Beaufort - Option B

No model run - City Capital Projects not identified

Beaufort County and Municipalities Stormwater Rate Study DRAFT Report
 City of Beaufort
 Summary Sheet

July 10, 2015

Option C

	FY 2015-2016 Revised RS	FY 2016-2017 Revised RS	FY 2017-2018 Revised RS	FY 2018-2019 Revised RS	FY 2019-2020 Revised RS
Rate Base					
0.75% Accounts	6,431	6,479	6,528	6,577	6,626
1.25% Billable IA Units	12,726	12,885	13,046	13,209	13,374
1.25% Billable Equivalent GA Units	9,747	9,869	9,992	10,117	10,243
Costs					
Stormwater O&M	\$ 376,438	\$ 385,849	\$ 395,495	\$ 405,382	\$ 415,517
Shared County Services					
City Portion: Administration	\$ 18,423	\$ 18,588	\$ 18,844	\$ 19,071	\$ 19,397
City Portion: Monitoring & Outreach	\$ 12,510	\$ 12,187	\$ 11,931	\$ 11,676	\$ 11,676
City Portion: County-Wide Infrastructure O&M (CWI)	\$ 118,124	\$ 115,242	\$ 115,952	\$ 119,058	\$ 120,145
Capital Purchases & Projects	\$ 3,631	\$ 3,722	\$ 3,815	\$ 3,910	\$ 4,008
Total City Costs (excl. debt service)	\$ 380,069	\$ 389,570	\$ 399,309	\$ 409,292	\$ 419,525
Total City Costs payable to County for Shared Services	\$ 149,057	\$ 146,017	\$ 146,727	\$ 149,805	\$ 151,218
Debt Service					
Annual Debt Service	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Coverage Goal	1.30	1.30	1.30	1.30	1.30
Actual Coverage					
Revised RS Stormwater Fee					
Fixed Cost per Account, Calc	\$ 4.81	\$ 4.75	\$ 4.72	\$ 4.68	\$ 4.69
Fixed Cost per Account, administrative portion:	\$ 2.86	\$ 2.87	\$ 2.89	\$ 2.90	\$ 2.93
Fixed Cost per Account, monitoring & outreach portion:	\$ 1.95	\$ 1.88	\$ 1.83	\$ 1.78	\$ 1.76
Fixed Cost per Account, CWI portion:	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Fixed Cost Collection Rate	90%	90%	90%	90%	90%
Fixed Cost per Account, Override	\$ 5.00	\$ 5.00	\$ 5.00	\$ 5.00	\$ 5.00
Variable Costs, IA Proportion	80%	80%	80%	80%	80%
Variable Costs, GA Proportion	20%	20%	20%	20%	20%
Variable Costs, IA Unit Fee Calc	\$ 31.32	\$ 31.35	\$ 31.60	\$ 32.00	\$ 32.29
Variable Costs, IA Unit Fee, administrative portion:	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Variable Costs, IA Unit Fee, monitoring & outreach portion:	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Variable Costs, IA Unit Fee, CWI portion:	\$ 7.43	\$ 7.16	\$ 7.11	\$ 7.21	\$ 7.19
Variable Costs, IA Unit Fee, City costs portion:	\$ 23.89	\$ 24.19	\$ 24.49	\$ 24.79	\$ 25.09
IA Collection Rate	62%	63%	64%	65%	65%
Variable Costs, IA Unit Fee Override	\$ 50.00	\$ 55.00	\$ 55.00	\$ 60.00	\$ 60.00
Variable Costs, GA Unit Fee Calc	\$ 10.23	\$ 10.24	\$ 10.32	\$ 10.45	\$ 10.54
Variable Costs, GA Unit Fee, administrative portion:	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Variable Costs, GA Unit Fee, monitoring & outreach portion:	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Variable Costs, GA Unit Fee, CWI portion:	\$ 2.42	\$ 2.34	\$ 2.32	\$ 2.35	\$ 2.35
Variable Costs, GA Unit Fee, City costs portion:	\$ 7.80	\$ 7.89	\$ 7.99	\$ 8.09	\$ 8.19
GA Collection Rate	62%	63%	64%	65%	65%
Variable Costs, GA Unit Fee Override	\$ 12.00	\$ 12.00	\$ 12.00	\$ 12.00	\$ 12.00
Anticipated City Fee Billings	\$ 785,435	\$ 859,498	\$ 870,074	\$ 946,829	\$ 958,486
Per Account Fees Paid to City	\$ 0.19	\$ 0.25	\$ 0.28	\$ 0.32	\$ 0.31
Per Impervious Area Unit Fees Paid to City	\$ 42.57	\$ 47.84	\$ 47.89	\$ 52.79	\$ 52.81
Per Gross Area Unit Fees Paid to City	\$ 9.58	\$ 9.66	\$ 9.68	\$ 9.65	\$ 9.65
Per Account Fees Paid to County	\$ 4.81	\$ 4.75	\$ 4.72	\$ 4.68	\$ 4.69
Per Impervious Area Unit Fees Paid to County	\$ 7.43	\$ 7.16	\$ 7.11	\$ 7.21	\$ 7.19
Per Gross Area Unit Fees Paid to County	\$ 2.42	\$ 2.34	\$ 2.32	\$ 2.35	\$ 2.35
Revenues					
Anticipated City Fee Revenue	\$ 495,973	\$ 550,230	\$ 565,334	\$ 623,660	\$ 631,298
Anticipated funds remitted to County for Utility Admin	\$ (18,423)	\$ (18,588)	\$ (18,844)	\$ (19,071)	\$ (19,397)
Anticipated funds remitted to County for Monitoring & Outreach	\$ (12,510)	\$ (12,187)	\$ (11,931)	\$ (11,676)	\$ (11,676)
Anticipated funds remitted to County for CWI	\$ (118,124)	\$ (115,242)	\$ (115,952)	\$ (119,058)	\$ (120,145)
Anticipated Remaining City Fee Revenue	\$ 346,916	\$ 404,213	\$ 418,607	\$ 473,855	\$ 480,081
Bond Issuance Proceeds	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Fund Balance					
FY Beginning Fund Balance	\$ 450,749	\$ 417,597	\$ 432,240	\$ 451,537	\$ 516,100
Total Costs	\$ 380,069	\$ 389,570	\$ 399,309	\$ 409,292	\$ 419,525
Total Revenues	\$ 346,916	\$ 404,213	\$ 418,607	\$ 473,855	\$ 480,081
Surplus (Deficit)	\$ (33,152)	\$ 14,643	\$ 19,297	\$ 64,563	\$ 60,556
FY End Fund Balance	\$ 417,597	\$ 432,240	\$ 451,537	\$ 516,100	\$ 576,656

Beaufort County and Municipalities Stormwater Rate Study DRAFT Report

July 10, 2015

City of Beaufort
Summary Sheet

Option D

	FY 2015-2016 Revised RS	FY 2016-2017 Revised RS	FY 2017-2018 Revised RS	FY 2018-2019 Revised RS	FY 2019-2020 Revised RS
Rate Base					
0.75% Accounts	6,431	6,479	6,528	6,577	6,626
1.25% Billable IA Units	12,726	12,885	13,046	13,209	13,374
1.25% Billable Equivalent GA Units	9,747	9,869	9,992	10,117	10,243
Costs					
Stormwater O&M	\$ 376,438	\$ 385,849	\$ 395,495	\$ 405,382	\$ 415,517
Shared County Services					
City Portion: Administration	\$ 39,591	\$ 39,946	\$ 40,496	\$ 40,984	\$ 41,683
City Portion: Monitoring & Outreach	\$ 25,882	\$ 25,235	\$ 24,686	\$ 24,137	\$ 24,137
City Portion: County-Wide Infrastructure O&M (CWI)	\$ 118,124	\$ 115,242	\$ 115,952	\$ 119,058	\$ 120,145
Capital Purchases & Projects	\$ 3,631	\$ 3,722	\$ 3,815	\$ 3,910	\$ 4,008
Total City Costs (excl. debt service)	\$ 380,069	\$ 389,570	\$ 399,309	\$ 409,292	\$ 419,525
Total City Costs payable to County for Shared Services	\$ 183,597	\$ 180,423	\$ 181,134	\$ 184,179	\$ 185,965
Debt Service					
Annual Debt Service	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Coverage Goal	1.30	1.30	1.30	1.30	1.30
Actual Coverage					
Revised RS Stormwater Fee					
Fixed Cost per Account, Calc	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Fixed Cost per Account, administrative portion:	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Fixed Cost per Account, monitoring & outreach portion:	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Fixed Cost per Account, CWI portion:	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Fixed Cost Collection Rate	90%	90%	90%	90%	90%
Fixed Cost per Account, Override	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Variable Costs, IA Proportion	80%	80%	80%	80%	80%
Variable Costs, GA Proportion	20%	20%	20%	20%	20%
Variable Costs, IA Unit Fee Calc	\$ 35.44	\$ 35.39	\$ 35.60	\$ 35.95	\$ 36.22
Variable Costs, IA Unit Fee, administrative portion:	\$ 2.49	\$ 2.48	\$ 2.48	\$ 2.48	\$ 2.49
Variable Costs, IA Unit Fee, monitoring & outreach portion:	\$ 1.63	\$ 1.57	\$ 1.51	\$ 1.46	\$ 1.44
Variable Costs, IA Unit Fee, CWI portion:	\$ 7.43	\$ 7.16	\$ 7.11	\$ 7.21	\$ 7.19
Variable Costs, IA Unit Fee, City costs portion:	\$ 23.89	\$ 24.19	\$ 24.49	\$ 24.79	\$ 25.09
IA Collection Rate	62%	63%	64%	65%	65%
Variable Costs, IA Unit Fee Override	\$ 55.00	\$ 55.00	\$ 55.00	\$ 60.00	\$ 60.00
Variable Costs, GA Unit Fee Calc	\$ 11.57	\$ 11.56	\$ 11.62	\$ 11.74	\$ 11.83
Variable Costs, GA Unit Fee, administrative portion:	\$ 0.81	\$ 0.81	\$ 0.81	\$ 0.81	\$ 0.81
Variable Costs, GA Unit Fee, monitoring & outreach portion:	\$ 0.53	\$ 0.51	\$ 0.49	\$ 0.48	\$ 0.47
Variable Costs, GA Unit Fee, CWI portion:	\$ 2.42	\$ 2.34	\$ 2.32	\$ 2.35	\$ 2.35
Variable Costs, GA Unit Fee, City costs portion:	\$ 7.80	\$ 7.89	\$ 7.99	\$ 8.09	\$ 8.19
GA Collection Rate	62%	63%	64%	65%	65%
Variable Costs, GA Unit Fee Override	\$ 12.00	\$ 12.00	\$ 12.00	\$ 12.00	\$ 12.00
Anticipated City Fee Billings	\$ 816,912	\$ 827,103	\$ 837,434	\$ 913,944	\$ 925,356
Per Account Fees Paid to City	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Per Impervious Area Unit Fees Paid to City	\$ 43.46	\$ 43.80	\$ 43.89	\$ 48.85	\$ 48.88
Per Gross Area Unit Fees Paid to City	\$ 8.23	\$ 8.34	\$ 8.37	\$ 8.36	\$ 8.37
Per Account Fees Paid to County	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Per Impervious Area Unit Fees Paid to County	\$ 11.54	\$ 11.20	\$ 11.11	\$ 11.15	\$ 11.12
Per Gross Area Unit Fees Paid to County	\$ 3.77	\$ 3.66	\$ 3.63	\$ 3.64	\$ 3.63
Revenues					
Anticipated City Fee Revenue	\$ 506,485	\$ 521,075	\$ 535,958	\$ 594,064	\$ 601,481
Anticipated funds remitted to County for Utility Admin	\$ (39,591)	\$ (39,946)	\$ (40,496)	\$ (40,984)	\$ (41,683)
Anticipated funds remitted to County for Monitoring & Outreach	\$ (25,882)	\$ (25,235)	\$ (24,686)	\$ (24,137)	\$ (24,137)
Anticipated funds remitted to County for CWI	\$ (118,124)	\$ (115,242)	\$ (115,952)	\$ (119,058)	\$ (120,145)
Anticipated Remaining City Fee Revenue	\$ 322,889	\$ 340,652	\$ 354,824	\$ 409,885	\$ 415,516
Bond Issuance Proceeds	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Fund Balance					
FY Beginning Fund Balance	\$ 450,749	\$ 393,569	\$ 344,650	\$ 300,165	\$ 300,757
Total Costs	\$ 380,069	\$ 389,570	\$ 399,309	\$ 409,292	\$ 419,525
Total Revenues	\$ 322,889	\$ 340,652	\$ 354,824	\$ 409,885	\$ 415,516
Surplus (Deficit)	\$ (57,180)	\$ (48,918)	\$ (44,486)	\$ 592	\$ (4,009)
FY End Fund Balance	\$ 393,569	\$ 344,650	\$ 300,165	\$ 300,757	\$ 296,748

City of Beaufort - Option E

No model run due to no CIP data yet

City of Beaufort - Option F

No model run due to no CIP data yet

DRAFT

Appendix C – Town of Port Royal Example Rates (Options A-F)

Town of Port Royal Summary Sheet

Option A

	FY 2015-2016 Current RS	FY 2016-2017 Current RS	FY 2017-2018 Current RS	FY 2018-2019 Current RS	FY 2019-2020 Current RS
Rate Base					
0.75% Accounts	3,850	3,879	3,908	3,937	3,967
1.25% Billable IA Units	6,330	6,409	6,489	6,570	6,652
1.25% Billable Equivalent GA Units	6,328	6,408	6,488	6,569	6,651
Costs					
Stormwater O&M	\$ 225,497	\$ 368,870	\$ 400,727	\$ 408,742	\$ 416,917
Shared County Services					
Town Portion: Administration	\$ 10,554	\$ 12,824	\$ 12,984	\$ 13,146	\$ 13,311
Town Portion: Monitoring & Outreach	\$ 12,873	\$ 12,552	\$ 12,279	\$ 12,006	\$ 12,006
Town Portion: County-Wide Infrastructure O&M	\$ 37,169	\$ 36,263	\$ 36,486	\$ 37,463	\$ 37,805
Capital Purchases & Projects	\$ 100,000	\$ 24,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Total Town Costs (excl. debt service)	\$ 325,497	\$ 392,870	\$ 400,727	\$ 408,742	\$ 416,917
Total Town Costs payable to County for Shared Services	\$ 60,597	\$ 61,638	\$ 61,749	\$ 62,615	\$ 63,122
Debt Service					
Annual Debt Service	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Coverage Goal	1.30	1.30	1.30	1.30	1.30
Actual Coverage					
Current RS Fee Alternative					
Impervious Area Units	6,383	6,462	6,543	6,625	6,708
Fee	\$ 90.00	\$ 120.00	\$ 120.00	\$ 130.00	\$ 130.00
Countywide Infrastructure Charge	\$ 5.82	\$ 5.61	\$ 5.58	\$ 5.65	\$ 5.64
Override Countywide Infrastructure Charge	\$ 5.82	\$ 5.61	\$ 5.58	\$ 5.65	\$ 5.64
Anticipated Town Fee Billings	\$ 611,590	\$ 811,752	\$ 821,703	\$ 898,689	\$ 909,855
Collection Factor	52%	52%	52%	52%	52%
Administrative Fee per Paid Unit	\$ 3.18	\$ 3.82	\$ 3.82	\$ 3.82	\$ 3.82
Revenues					
Anticipated Town Fee Revenue	\$ 318,027	\$ 422,111	\$ 427,286	\$ 467,318	\$ 473,125
Anticipated funds remitted to County for Utility Admin	\$ (10,554)	\$ (12,824)	\$ (12,984)	\$ (13,146)	\$ (13,311)
Anticipated funds remitted to County for Regulatory Compliance	\$ (12,873)	\$ (12,552)	\$ (12,279)	\$ (12,006)	\$ (12,006)
Anticipated funds remitted to County for CWI	\$ (37,169)	\$ (36,263)	\$ (36,486)	\$ (37,463)	\$ (37,805)
Anticipated Remaining Town Fee Revenue	\$ 257,430	\$ 360,473	\$ 365,537	\$ 404,703	\$ 410,003
Bond Issuance Proceeds	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Fund Balance					
FY Beginning Fund Balance	\$ 171,713	\$ 103,646	\$ 71,249	\$ 36,058	\$ 32,019
Total Costs	\$ 325,497	\$ 392,870	\$ 400,727	\$ 408,742	\$ 416,917
Total Revenues	\$ 257,430	\$ 360,473	\$ 365,537	\$ 404,703	\$ 410,003
Surplus (Deficit)	\$ (68,067)	\$ (32,397)	\$ (35,190)	\$ (4,039)	\$ (6,914)
FY End Fund Balance	\$ 103,646	\$ 71,249	\$ 36,058	\$ 32,019	\$ 25,106

Town of Port Royal - Option B

Capital needs not likely to suggest traditional debt option

Beaufort County and Municipalities Stormwater Rate Study DRAFT Report

July 10, 2015

Town of Port Royal
Summary Sheet

Option C

	FY 2015-2016 Revised RS	FY 2016-2017 Revised RS	FY 2017-2018 Revised RS	FY 2018-2019 Revised RS	FY 2019-2020 Revised RS
Rate Base					
0.75% Accounts	3,850	3,879	3,908	3,937	3,967
1.25% Billable IA Units	6,330	6,409	6,489	6,570	6,652
1.25% Billable Equivalent GA Units	6,328	6,408	6,488	6,569	6,651
Costs					
Stormwater O&M	\$ 225,497	\$ 368,870	\$ 400,727	\$ 408,742	\$ 416,917
Shared County Services					
Town Portion: Administration	\$ 11,029	\$ 11,128	\$ 11,281	\$ 11,417	\$ 11,612
Town Portion: Monitoring & Outreach	\$ 7,489	\$ 7,296	\$ 7,143	\$ 6,990	\$ 6,990
Town Portion: County-Wide Infrastructure O&M	\$ 37,169	\$ 36,263	\$ 36,486	\$ 37,463	\$ 37,805
Capital Purchases & Projects	\$ 100,000	\$ 24,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Total Town Costs (excl. debt service)	\$ 325,497	\$ 392,870	\$ 400,727	\$ 408,742	\$ 416,917
Total Town Costs payable to County for Shared Services	\$ 55,688	\$ 54,686	\$ 54,910	\$ 55,870	\$ 56,407
Debt Service					
Annual Debt Service	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Coverage Goal	1.30	1.30	1.30	1.30	1.30
Actual Coverage					
Revised RS Stormwater Fee					
Fixed Cost per Account, Calc	\$ 4.81	\$ 4.75	\$ 4.72	\$ 4.68	\$ 4.69
Fixed Cost per Account, administrative portion:	\$ 2.86	\$ 2.87	\$ 2.89	\$ 2.90	\$ 2.93
Fixed Cost per Account, monitoring & outreach portion:	\$ 1.95	\$ 1.88	\$ 1.83	\$ 1.78	\$ 1.76
Fixed Cost per Account, CWI portion:	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Fixed Cost Collection Rate	90%	90%	90%	90%	90%
Fixed Cost per Account, Override	\$ 5.00	\$ 5.00	\$ 5.00	\$ 5.00	\$ 5.00
Variable Costs, IA Proportion	80%	80%	80%	80%	80%
Variable Costs, GA Proportion	20%	20%	20%	20%	20%
Variable Costs, IA Unit Fee Calc	\$ 45.84	\$ 53.57	\$ 53.91	\$ 54.34	\$ 54.69
Variable Costs, IA Unit Fee, administrative portion:	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Variable Costs, IA Unit Fee, monitoring & outreach portion:	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Variable Costs, IA Unit Fee, CWI portion:	\$ 4.70	\$ 4.53	\$ 4.50	\$ 4.56	\$ 4.55
Variable Costs, IA Unit Fee, Town costs portion:	\$ 41.14	\$ 49.04	\$ 49.40	\$ 49.77	\$ 50.14
IA Collection Rate	50%	50%	50%	51%	52%
Variable Costs, IA Unit Fee Override	\$ 90.00	\$ 100.00	\$ 110.00	\$ 120.00	\$ 130.00
Variable Costs, GA Unit Fee Calc	\$ 11.47	\$ 13.40	\$ 13.48	\$ 13.59	\$ 13.68
Variable Costs, GA Unit Fee, administrative portion:	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Variable Costs, GA Unit Fee, monitoring & outreach portion:	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Variable Costs, GA Unit Fee, CWI portion:	\$ 1.17	\$ 1.13	\$ 1.12	\$ 1.14	\$ 1.14
Variable Costs, GA Unit Fee, Town costs portion:	\$ 10.29	\$ 12.26	\$ 12.35	\$ 12.44	\$ 12.54
GA Collection Rate	50%	50%	50%	51%	52%
Variable Costs, GA Unit Fee Override	\$ 12.00	\$ 14.00	\$ 14.00	\$ 14.00	\$ 14.00
Anticipated Town Fee Billings	\$ 664,891	\$ 750,007	\$ 824,162	\$ 900,051	\$ 977,709
Per Account Fees Paid to Town	\$ 0.19	\$ 0.25	\$ 0.28	\$ 0.32	\$ 0.31
Per Impervious Area Unit Fees Paid to Town	\$ 85.30	\$ 95.47	\$ 105.50	\$ 115.44	\$ 125.45
Per Gross Area Unit Fees Paid to Town	\$ 10.83	\$ 12.87	\$ 12.88	\$ 12.86	\$ 12.86
Per Account Fees Paid to County	\$ 4.81	\$ 4.75	\$ 4.72	\$ 4.68	\$ 4.69
Per Impervious Area Unit Fees Paid to County	\$ 4.70	\$ 4.53	\$ 4.50	\$ 4.56	\$ 4.55
Per Gross Area Unit Fees Paid to County	\$ 1.17	\$ 1.13	\$ 1.12	\$ 1.14	\$ 1.14
Revenues					
Anticipated Town Fee Revenue	\$ 340,145	\$ 382,762	\$ 419,897	\$ 466,703	\$ 515,946
Anticipated funds remitted to County for Utility Admin	\$ (11,029)	\$ (11,128)	\$ (11,281)	\$ (11,417)	\$ (11,612)
Anticipated funds remitted to County for Monitoring & Outreach	\$ (7,489)	\$ (7,296)	\$ (7,143)	\$ (6,990)	\$ (6,990)
Anticipated funds remitted to County for CWI	\$ (37,169)	\$ (36,263)	\$ (36,486)	\$ (37,463)	\$ (37,805)
Anticipated Remaining Town Fee Revenue	\$ 284,458	\$ 328,075	\$ 364,987	\$ 410,833	\$ 459,539
Bond Issuance Proceeds	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Fund Balance					
FY Beginning Fund Balance	\$ 171,713	\$ 130,674	\$ 65,879	\$ 30,138	\$ 32,229
Total Costs	\$ 325,497	\$ 392,870	\$ 400,727	\$ 408,742	\$ 416,917
Total Revenues	\$ 284,458	\$ 328,075	\$ 364,987	\$ 410,833	\$ 459,539
Surplus (Deficit)	\$ (41,039)	\$ (64,795)	\$ (35,740)	\$ 2,091	\$ 42,622
FY End Fund Balance	\$ 130,674	\$ 65,879	\$ 30,138	\$ 32,229	\$ 74,851

Beaufort County and Municipalities Stormwater Rate Study DRAFT Report

July 10, 2015

Town of Port Royal

Option D

Summary Sheet

	FY 2015-2016 Revised RS	FY 2016-2017 Revised RS	FY 2017-2018 Revised RS	FY 2018-2019 Revised RS	FY 2019-2020 Revised RS
Rate Base					
0.75% Accounts	3,850	3,879	3,908	3,937	3,967
1.25% Billable IA Units	6,330	6,409	6,489	6,570	6,652
1.25% Billable Equivalent GA Units	6,328	6,408	6,488	6,569	6,651
Costs					
Stormwater O&M	\$ 225,497	\$ 368,870	\$ 400,727	\$ 408,742	\$ 416,917
Shared County Services					
Town Portion: Administration	\$ 19,692	\$ 19,869	\$ 20,142	\$ 20,385	\$ 20,733
Town Portion: Monitoring & Outreach	\$ 12,873	\$ 12,552	\$ 12,279	\$ 12,006	\$ 12,006
Town Portion: County-Wide Infrastructure O&M	\$ 37,169	\$ 36,263	\$ 36,486	\$ 37,463	\$ 37,805
Capital Purchases & Projects	\$ 100,000	\$ 24,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Total Town Costs (excl. debt service)	\$ 325,497	\$ 392,870	\$ 400,727	\$ 408,742	\$ 416,917
Total Town Costs payable to County for Shared Services	\$ 69,735	\$ 68,683	\$ 68,907	\$ 69,854	\$ 70,544
Debt Service					
Annual Debt Service	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Coverage Goal	1.30	1.30	1.30	1.30	1.30
Actual Coverage					
Revised RS Stormwater Fee					
Fixed Cost per Account, Calc	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Fixed Cost per Account, administrative portion:	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Fixed Cost per Account, monitoring & outreach portion:	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Fixed Cost per Account, CWI portion:	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Fixed Cost Collection Rate	90%	90%	90%	90%	90%
Fixed Cost per Account, Override	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Variable Costs, IA Proportion	80%	80%	80%	80%	80%
Variable Costs, GA Proportion	20%	20%	20%	20%	20%
Variable Costs, IA Unit Fee Calc	\$ 49.96	\$ 57.62	\$ 57.90	\$ 58.28	\$ 58.63
Variable Costs, IA Unit Fee, administrative portion:	\$ 2.49	\$ 2.48	\$ 2.48	\$ 2.48	\$ 2.49
Variable Costs, IA Unit Fee, monitoring & outreach portion:	\$ 1.63	\$ 1.57	\$ 1.51	\$ 1.46	\$ 1.44
Variable Costs, IA Unit Fee, CWI portion:	\$ 4.70	\$ 4.53	\$ 4.50	\$ 4.56	\$ 4.55
Variable Costs, IA Unit Fee, Town costs portion:	\$ 41.14	\$ 49.04	\$ 49.40	\$ 49.77	\$ 50.14
IA Collection Rate	50%	50%	50%	51%	52%
Variable Costs, IA Unit Fee Override	\$ 80.00	\$ 110.00	\$ 130.00	\$ 130.00	\$ 140.00
Variable Costs, GA Unit Fee Calc	\$ 12.50	\$ 14.41	\$ 14.48	\$ 14.58	\$ 14.66
Variable Costs, GA Unit Fee, administrative portion:	\$ 0.62	\$ 0.62	\$ 0.62	\$ 0.62	\$ 0.62
Variable Costs, GA Unit Fee, monitoring & outreach portion:	\$ 0.41	\$ 0.39	\$ 0.38	\$ 0.37	\$ 0.36
Variable Costs, GA Unit Fee, CWI portion:	\$ 1.17	\$ 1.13	\$ 1.12	\$ 1.14	\$ 1.14
Variable Costs, GA Unit Fee, Town costs portion:	\$ 10.29	\$ 12.26	\$ 12.35	\$ 12.44	\$ 12.54
GA Collection Rate	50%	50%	50%	51%	52%
Variable Costs, GA Unit Fee Override	\$ 14.00	\$ 16.00	\$ 16.00	\$ 16.00	\$ 16.00
Anticipated Town Fee Billings	\$ 594,998	\$ 807,518	\$ 947,378	\$ 959,204	\$ 1,037,696
Per Account Fees Paid to Town	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Per Impervious Area Unit Fees Paid to Town	\$ 71.19	\$ 101.43	\$ 121.50	\$ 121.49	\$ 131.52
Per Gross Area Unit Fees Paid to Town	\$ 11.80	\$ 13.86	\$ 13.88	\$ 13.87	\$ 13.88
Per Account Fees Paid to County	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Per Impervious Area Unit Fees Paid to County	\$ 8.81	\$ 8.57	\$ 8.50	\$ 8.51	\$ 8.48
Per Gross Area Unit Fees Paid to County	\$ 2.20	\$ 2.14	\$ 2.12	\$ 2.13	\$ 2.12
Revenues					
Anticipated Town Fee Revenue	\$ 297,499	\$ 403,759	\$ 473,689	\$ 489,194	\$ 539,602
Anticipated funds remitted to County for Utility Admin	\$ (19,692)	\$ (19,869)	\$ (20,142)	\$ (20,385)	\$ (20,733)
Anticipated funds remitted to County for Regulatory Compliance	\$ (12,873)	\$ (12,552)	\$ (12,279)	\$ (12,006)	\$ (12,006)
Anticipated funds remitted to County for CWI	\$ (37,169)	\$ (36,263)	\$ (36,486)	\$ (37,463)	\$ (37,805)
Anticipated Remaining Town Fee Revenue	\$ 227,764	\$ 335,076	\$ 404,782	\$ 419,340	\$ 469,058
Bond Issuance Proceeds	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Fund Balance					
FY Beginning Fund Balance	\$ 171,713	\$ 73,980	\$ 16,185	\$ 20,240	\$ 30,838
Total Costs	\$ 325,497	\$ 392,870	\$ 400,727	\$ 408,742	\$ 416,917
Total Revenues	\$ 227,764	\$ 335,076	\$ 404,782	\$ 419,340	\$ 469,058
Surplus (Deficit)	\$ (97,733)	\$ (57,794)	\$ 4,055	\$ 10,598	\$ 52,141
FY End Fund Balance	\$ 73,980	\$ 16,185	\$ 20,240	\$ 30,838	\$ 82,979

Town of Port Royal - Option E

No model run - need to have CIP planning discussion

Town of Port Royal - Option F

No model run - need to have CIP planning discussion

DRAFT

Appendix D – Town of Bluffton Example Rates (Options A-F)

Town of Bluffton Summary Sheet

Option A

	FY 2015-2016 Current RS	FY 2016-2017 Current RS	FY 2017-2018 Current RS	FY 2018-2019 Current RS	FY 2019-2020 Current RS
Rate Base					
0.75% Accounts	11,265	11,349	11,434	11,520	11,606
1.25% Billable IA Units	10,317	10,446	10,577	10,709	10,843
1.25% Billable Equivalent GA Units	20,471	20,727	20,986	21,248	21,514
Costs					
Stormwater O&M	\$ 1,292,640	\$ 1,329,919	\$ 1,423,541	\$ 1,468,747	\$ 1,526,476
Shared County Services					
Town Portion: Administration & Regulatory Compliance	\$ 39,925	\$ 48,509	\$ 49,116	\$ 49,729	\$ 50,351
Town Portion: Monitoring & Outreach	\$ 6,232	\$ 6,410	\$ 5,965	\$ 5,520	\$ 5,520
Town Portion: County-Wide Infrastructure O&M	\$ 386,627	\$ 377,195	\$ 379,517	\$ 389,684	\$ 393,243
Capital Purchases & Projects	\$ 358,925	\$ 722,245	\$ 565,000	\$ 480,000	\$ 150,000
Total Town Costs (excl. debt service)	\$ 1,651,565	\$ 2,052,165	\$ 1,988,541	\$ 1,948,747	\$ 1,676,476
Total Town Costs payable to County for Shared Services	\$ 432,784	\$ 432,114	\$ 434,597	\$ 444,933	\$ 449,113
Debt Service					
Annual Debt Service	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Coverage Goal	1.30	1.30	1.30	1.30	1.30
Actual Coverage					
Current RS Fee Alternative					
Impervious Area Units	12,682	12,840	13,001	13,163	13,328
Fee	\$ 140.00	\$ 170.00	\$ 170.00	\$ 170.00	\$ 170.00
Countywide Infrastructure Charge	\$ 30.49	\$ 29.38	\$ 29.19	\$ 29.60	\$ 29.50
Override Countywide Infrastructure Charge	\$ 30.49	\$ 29.38	\$ 29.19	\$ 29.60	\$ 29.50
Anticipated Town Fee Billings	\$ 2,162,141	\$ 2,560,128	\$ 2,589,659	\$ 2,627,427	\$ 2,658,937
Collection Factor	99%	99%	99%	99%	99%
Administrative Fee per Paid Unit	\$ 3.18	\$ 3.82	\$ 3.82	\$ 3.82	\$ 3.82
Revenues					
Anticipated Town Fee Revenue	\$ 2,140,519	\$ 2,534,527	\$ 2,563,763	\$ 2,601,153	\$ 2,632,348
Anticipated funds remitted to County for Utility Admin	\$ (39,925)	\$ (48,509)	\$ (49,116)	\$ (49,729)	\$ (50,351)
Anticipated funds remitted to County for Regulatory Com	\$ (6,232)	\$ (6,410)	\$ (5,965)	\$ (5,520)	\$ (5,520)
Anticipated funds remitted to County for CWI	\$ (386,627)	\$ (377,195)	\$ (379,517)	\$ (389,684)	\$ (393,243)
Anticipated Remaining Town Fee Revenue	\$ 1,707,735	\$ 2,102,413	\$ 2,129,165	\$ 2,156,220	\$ 2,183,234
Bond Issuance Proceeds	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Fund Balance					
FY Beginning Fund Balance	\$ -	\$ 56,170	\$ 106,419	\$ 247,043	\$ 454,516
Total Costs	\$ 1,651,565	\$ 2,052,165	\$ 1,988,541	\$ 1,948,747	\$ 1,676,476
Total Revenues	\$ 1,707,735	\$ 2,102,413	\$ 2,129,165	\$ 2,156,220	\$ 2,183,234
Surplus (Deficit)	\$ 56,170	\$ 50,248	\$ 140,624	\$ 207,473	\$ 506,758
FY End Fund Balance	\$ 56,170	\$ 106,419	\$ 247,043	\$ 454,516	\$ 961,274

Town of Bluffton - Option B

No model run - debt options not fully fleshed out

Beaufort County and Municipalities Stormwater Rate Study DRAFT Report

July 10, 2015

Town of Bluffton
Summary Sheet

Option C

	FY 2015-2016 Revised RS	FY 2016-2017 Revised RS	FY 2017-2018 Revised RS	FY 2018-2019 Revised RS	FY 2019-2020 Revised RS
Rate Base					
0.75% Accounts	11,265	11,349	11,434	11,520	11,606
1.25% Billable IA Units	10,317	10,446	10,577	10,709	10,843
1.25% Billable Equivalent GA Units	20,471	20,727	20,986	21,248	21,514
Costs					
Stormwater O&M	\$ 1,292,640	\$ 1,329,919	\$ 1,423,541	\$ 1,468,747	\$ 1,526,476
Shared County Services					
Town Portion: Administration & Regulatory Compliance	\$ 32,271	\$ 32,560	\$ 33,009	\$ 33,406	\$ 33,976
Town Portion: Monitoring & Outreach	\$ 6,266	\$ 6,445	\$ 5,998	\$ 5,550	\$ 5,550
Town Portion: County-Wide Infrastructure O&M	\$ 386,627	\$ 377,195	\$ 379,517	\$ 389,684	\$ 393,243
Capital Purchases & Projects	\$ 358,925	\$ 722,245	\$ 565,000	\$ 480,000	\$ 150,000
Total Town Costs (excl. debt service)	\$ 1,651,565	\$ 2,052,165	\$ 1,988,541	\$ 1,948,747	\$ 1,676,476
Total Town Costs payable to County for Shared Services	\$ 425,164	\$ 416,200	\$ 418,523	\$ 428,640	\$ 432,769
Debt Service					
Annual Debt Service	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Coverage Goal	1.30	1.30	1.30	1.30	1.30
Actual Coverage					
Revised RS Stormwater Fee					
Fixed Cost per Account, Calc	\$ 3.43	\$ 3.44	\$ 3.42	\$ 3.39	\$ 3.41
Fixed Cost per Account, administrative portion:	\$ 2.86	\$ 2.87	\$ 2.89	\$ 2.90	\$ 2.93
Fixed Cost per Account, monitoring & outreach portion:	\$ 0.56	\$ 0.57	\$ 0.52	\$ 0.48	\$ 0.48
Fixed Cost per Account, CWI portion:	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Fixed Cost Collection Rate	96%	97%	98%	99%	99%
Fixed Cost per Account, Override	\$ 4.00	\$ 4.00	\$ 4.00	\$ 4.00	\$ 4.00
Variable Costs, IA Proportion	80%	80%	80%	80%	80%
Variable Costs, GA Proportion	20%	20%	20%	20%	20%
Variable Costs, IA Unit Fee Calc	\$ 158.05	\$ 186.06	\$ 179.11	\$ 174.69	\$ 152.71
Variable Costs, IA Unit Fee, administrative portion:	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Variable Costs, IA Unit Fee, monitoring & outreach portion:	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Variable Costs, IA Unit Fee, CWI portion:	\$ 29.98	\$ 28.89	\$ 28.71	\$ 29.11	\$ 29.01
Variable Costs, IA Unit Fee, Town costs portion:	\$ 128.07	\$ 157.16	\$ 150.40	\$ 145.58	\$ 123.69
IA Collection Rate	96%	97%	98%	99%	99%
Variable Costs, IA Unit Fee Override	\$ 180.00	\$ 180.00	\$ 180.00	\$ 180.00	\$ 180.00
Variable Costs, GA Unit Fee Calc	\$ 19.92	\$ 23.45	\$ 22.57	\$ 22.02	\$ 19.25
Variable Costs, GA Unit Fee, administrative portion:	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Variable Costs, GA Unit Fee, monitoring & outreach portion:	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Variable Costs, GA Unit Fee, CWI portion:	\$ 3.78	\$ 3.64	\$ 3.62	\$ 3.67	\$ 3.66
Variable Costs, GA Unit Fee, Town costs portion:	\$ 16.14	\$ 19.80	\$ 18.95	\$ 18.34	\$ 15.58
GA Collection Rate	96%	97%	98%	99%	99%
Variable Costs, GA Unit Fee Override	\$ 25.00	\$ 25.00	\$ 25.00	\$ 25.00	\$ 25.00
Anticipated Town Fee Billings	\$ 2,413,844	\$ 2,443,851	\$ 2,474,246	\$ 2,504,900	\$ 2,536,014
Per Account Fees Paid to Town	\$ 0.57	\$ 0.56	\$ 0.58	\$ 0.61	\$ 0.59
Per Impervious Area Unit Fees Paid to Town	\$ 150.02	\$ 151.11	\$ 151.29	\$ 150.89	\$ 150.99
Per Gross Area Unit Fees Paid to Town	\$ 21.22	\$ 21.36	\$ 21.38	\$ 21.33	\$ 21.34
Per Account Fees Paid to County	\$ 3.43	\$ 3.44	\$ 3.42	\$ 3.39	\$ 3.41
Per Impervious Area Unit Fees Paid to County	\$ 29.98	\$ 28.89	\$ 28.71	\$ 29.11	\$ 29.01
Per Gross Area Unit Fees Paid to County	\$ 3.78	\$ 3.64	\$ 3.62	\$ 3.67	\$ 3.66
Revenues					
Anticipated Town Fee Revenue	\$ 2,317,290	\$ 2,370,535	\$ 2,424,761	\$ 2,479,851	\$ 2,510,654
Anticipated funds remitted to County for Utility Admin	\$ (32,271)	\$ (32,560)	\$ (33,009)	\$ (33,406)	\$ (33,976)
Anticipated funds remitted to County for Monitoring & Outreach	\$ (6,266)	\$ (6,445)	\$ (5,998)	\$ (5,550)	\$ (5,550)
Anticipated funds remitted to County for CWI	\$ (386,627)	\$ (377,195)	\$ (379,517)	\$ (389,684)	\$ (393,243)
Anticipated Remaining Town Fee Revenue	\$ 1,892,126	\$ 1,954,335	\$ 2,006,238	\$ 2,051,211	\$ 2,077,885
Bond Issuance Proceeds	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Fund Balance					
FY Beginning Fund Balance	\$ -	\$ 240,561	\$ 142,732	\$ 160,428	\$ 262,892
Total Costs	\$ 1,651,565	\$ 2,052,165	\$ 1,988,541	\$ 1,948,747	\$ 1,676,476
Total Revenues	\$ 1,892,126	\$ 1,954,335	\$ 2,006,238	\$ 2,051,211	\$ 2,077,885
Surplus (Deficit)	\$ 240,561	\$ (97,829)	\$ 17,696	\$ 102,464	\$ 401,408
FY End Fund Balance	\$ 240,561	\$ 142,732	\$ 160,428	\$ 262,892	\$ 664,300

Beaufort County and Municipalities Stormwater Rate Study DRAFT Report

July 10, 2015

Town of Bluffton
Summary Sheet

Option D

	FY 2015-2016 Revised RS	FY 2016-2017 Revised RS	FY 2017-2018 Revised RS	FY 2018-2019 Revised RS	FY 2019-2020 Revised RS
Rate Base					
0.75% Accounts	11,265	11,349	11,434	11,520	11,606
1.25% Billable IA Units	10,317	10,446	10,577	10,709	10,843
1.25% Billable Equivalent GA Units	20,471	20,727	20,986	21,248	21,514
Costs					
Stormwater O&M	\$ 1,292,640	\$ 1,329,919	\$ 1,423,541	\$ 1,468,747	\$ 1,526,476
Shared County Services					
Town Portion: Administration & Regulatory Compliance	\$ 32,095	\$ 32,382	\$ 32,828	\$ 33,224	\$ 33,791
Town Portion: Monitoring & Outreach	\$ 6,232	\$ 6,410	\$ 5,965	\$ 5,520	\$ 5,520
Town Portion: County-Wide Infrastructure O&M	\$ 386,627	\$ 377,195	\$ 379,517	\$ 389,684	\$ 393,243
Capital Purchases & Projects	\$ 358,925	\$ 722,245	\$ 565,000	\$ 480,000	\$ 150,000
Total Town Costs (excl. debt service)	\$ 1,651,565	\$ 2,052,165	\$ 1,988,541	\$ 1,948,747	\$ 1,676,476
Total Town Costs payable to County for Shared Services	\$ 424,954	\$ 415,987	\$ 418,310	\$ 428,427	\$ 432,553
Debt Service					
Annual Debt Service	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Coverage Goal	1.30	1.30	1.30	1.30	1.30
Actual Coverage					
Revised RS Stormwater Fee					
Fixed Cost per Account, Calc	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Fixed Cost per Account, administrative portion:	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Fixed Cost per Account, monitoring & outreach portion:	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Fixed Cost per Account, CWI portion:	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Fixed Cost Collection Rate	96%	97%	98%	99%	99%
Fixed Cost per Account, Override	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Variable Costs, IA Proportion	80%	80%	80%	80%	80%
Variable Costs, GA Proportion	20%	20%	20%	20%	20%
Variable Costs, IA Unit Fee Calc	\$ 161.03	\$ 189.03	\$ 182.05	\$ 177.59	\$ 155.61
Variable Costs, IA Unit Fee, administrative portion:	\$ 2.49	\$ 2.48	\$ 2.48	\$ 2.48	\$ 2.49
Variable Costs, IA Unit Fee, monitoring & outreach portion:	\$ 0.48	\$ 0.49	\$ 0.45	\$ 0.41	\$ 0.41
Variable Costs, IA Unit Fee, CWI portion:	\$ 29.98	\$ 28.89	\$ 28.71	\$ 29.11	\$ 29.01
Variable Costs, IA Unit Fee, Town costs portion:	\$ 128.07	\$ 157.16	\$ 150.40	\$ 145.58	\$ 123.69
IA Collection Rate	96%	97%	98%	99%	99%
Variable Costs, IA Unit Fee Override	\$ 180.00	\$ 180.00	\$ 180.00	\$ 180.00	\$ 180.00
Variable Costs, GA Unit Fee Calc	\$ 20.29	\$ 23.82	\$ 22.94	\$ 22.38	\$ 19.61
Variable Costs, GA Unit Fee, administrative portion:	\$ 0.31	\$ 0.31	\$ 0.31	\$ 0.31	\$ 0.31
Variable Costs, GA Unit Fee, monitoring & outreach portion:	\$ 0.06	\$ 0.06	\$ 0.06	\$ 0.05	\$ 0.05
Variable Costs, GA Unit Fee, CWI portion:	\$ 3.78	\$ 3.64	\$ 3.62	\$ 3.67	\$ 3.66
Variable Costs, GA Unit Fee, Town costs portion:	\$ 16.14	\$ 19.80	\$ 18.95	\$ 18.34	\$ 15.58
GA Collection Rate	96%	97%	98%	99%	99%
Variable Costs, GA Unit Fee Override	\$ 25.00	\$ 25.00	\$ 25.00	\$ 25.00	\$ 25.00
Anticipated Town Fee Billings	\$ 2,368,784	\$ 2,398,455	\$ 2,428,510	\$ 2,458,820	\$ 2,489,590
Per Account Fees Paid to Town	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Per Impervious Area Unit Fees Paid to Town	\$ 147.05	\$ 148.14	\$ 148.36	\$ 147.99	\$ 148.09
Per Gross Area Unit Fees Paid to Town	\$ 20.85	\$ 20.99	\$ 21.01	\$ 20.97	\$ 20.98
Per Account Fees Paid to County	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Per Impervious Area Unit Fees Paid to County	\$ 32.95	\$ 31.86	\$ 31.64	\$ 32.01	\$ 31.91
Per Gross Area Unit Fees Paid to County	\$ 4.15	\$ 4.01	\$ 3.99	\$ 4.03	\$ 4.02
Revenues					
Anticipated Town Fee Revenue	\$ 2,274,032	\$ 2,326,501	\$ 2,379,940	\$ 2,434,232	\$ 2,464,694
Anticipated funds remitted to County for Utility Administration	\$ (32,095)	\$ (32,382)	\$ (32,828)	\$ (33,224)	\$ (33,791)
Anticipated funds remitted to County for Monitoring & Outreach	\$ (6,232)	\$ (6,410)	\$ (5,965)	\$ (5,520)	\$ (5,520)
Anticipated funds remitted to County for CWI	\$ (386,627)	\$ (377,195)	\$ (379,517)	\$ (389,684)	\$ (393,243)
Anticipated Remaining Town Fee Revenue	\$ 1,849,079	\$ 1,910,514	\$ 1,961,629	\$ 2,005,804	\$ 2,032,141
Bond Issuance Proceeds	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Fund Balance					
FY Beginning Fund Balance	\$ -	\$ 197,514	\$ 55,863	\$ 28,952	\$ 86,009
Total Costs	\$ 1,651,565	\$ 2,052,165	\$ 1,988,541	\$ 1,948,747	\$ 1,676,476
Total Revenues	\$ 1,849,079	\$ 1,910,514	\$ 1,961,629	\$ 2,005,804	\$ 2,032,141
Surplus (Deficit)	\$ 197,514	\$ (141,650)	\$ (26,912)	\$ 57,057	\$ 355,665
FY End Fund Balance	\$ 197,514	\$ 55,863	\$ 28,952	\$ 86,009	\$ 441,674

Town of Bluffton - Option E

No model run as yet - need to look at timing of planned CIP and consider temporal shift

Town of Bluffton - Option F

No model run as yet - need to look at timing of planned CIP and consider temporal shift

DRAFT

Appendix E – Town of Hilton Head Island Example Rates (Options A-F)

**Town of Hilton Head Island
Summary Sheet**

Option A

	FY 2015-2016 Current RS	FY 2016-2017 Current RS	FY 2017-2018 Current RS	FY 2018-2019 Current RS	FY 2019-2020 Current RS
Rate Base					
0.75% Accounts	38,980	39,272	39,567	39,864	40,163
1.25% Billable IA Units	32,119	32,520	32,927	33,339	33,756
1.25% Billable Equivalent GA Units	24,614	24,921	25,233	25,548	25,867
Costs					
Stormwater O&M	\$ 3,525,628	\$ 3,613,769	\$ 3,704,113	\$ 3,796,716	\$ 3,891,634
Shared County Services					
Town Portion: Administration	\$ 100,540	\$ 122,157	\$ 123,684	\$ 125,230	\$ 126,795
Town Portion: Monitoring & Outreach	\$ 19,402	\$ 19,956	\$ 18,571	\$ 17,185	\$ 17,185
Town Portion: County-Wide Infrastructure O&M	\$ 283,045	\$ 276,140	\$ 277,840	\$ 285,283	\$ 287,889
Capital Purchases & Projects	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Total Town Costs (excl. debt service)	\$ 3,525,628	\$ 3,613,769	\$ 3,704,113	\$ 3,796,716	\$ 3,891,634
Total Town Costs payable to County for Shared Services	\$ 402,988	\$ 418,253	\$ 420,094	\$ 427,697	\$ 431,868
Debt Service					
Annual Debt Service (Existing & Potential New)	\$ 1,175,675	\$ 1,205,067	\$ 1,235,194	\$ 1,266,073	\$ 1,297,725
Current RS Fee Alternative					
Impervious Area Units	31,936	32,335	32,739	33,148	33,563
Fee	\$ 160.00	\$ 160.00	\$ 160.00	\$ 160.00	\$ 160.00
Countywide Infrastructure Charge	\$ 8.86	\$ 8.54	\$ 8.49	\$ 8.61	\$ 8.58
Override Countywide Infrastructure Charge	\$ 8.86	\$ 8.54	\$ 8.49	\$ 8.61	\$ 8.58
Anticipated Town Fee Billings	\$ 5,392,684	\$ 5,449,745	\$ 5,516,230	\$ 5,589,161	\$ 5,658,018
Collection Factor	99%	99%	99%	99%	99%
Administrative Fee per Paid Unit	\$ 3.18	\$ 3.82	\$ 3.82	\$ 3.82	\$ 3.82
Revenues					
Anticipated Town Fee Revenue	\$ 5,338,757	\$ 5,395,248	\$ 5,461,068	\$ 5,533,269	\$ 5,601,438
Anticipated funds remitted to County for Utility Admin	\$ (100,540)	\$ (122,157)	\$ (123,684)	\$ (125,230)	\$ (126,795)
Anticipated funds remitted to County for Regulatory Compliance	\$ (19,402)	\$ (19,956)	\$ (18,571)	\$ (17,185)	\$ (17,185)
Anticipated funds remitted to County for CWI	\$ (283,045)	\$ (276,140)	\$ (277,840)	\$ (285,283)	\$ (287,889)
Anticipated Remaining Town Fee Revenue	\$ 4,935,769	\$ 4,976,995	\$ 5,040,974	\$ 5,105,572	\$ 5,169,570
Bond Issuance Proceeds	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Fund Balance					
FY Beginning Fund Balance	\$ -	\$ 234,467	\$ 392,626	\$ 494,293	\$ 537,076
Total Costs	\$ 4,701,303	\$ 4,818,835	\$ 4,939,306	\$ 5,062,789	\$ 5,189,359
Total Revenues	\$ 4,935,769	\$ 4,976,995	\$ 5,040,974	\$ 5,105,572	\$ 5,169,570
Surplus (Deficit)	\$ 234,467	\$ 158,159	\$ 101,667	\$ 42,783	\$ (19,789)
FY End Fund Balance	\$ 234,467	\$ 392,626	\$ 494,293	\$ 537,076	\$ 517,287

Town of Hilton Head Island - Option B
No model run - no new CIP identified

**Town of Hilton Head Island
Summary Sheet**

Option C

	FY 2015-2016 Revised RS	FY 2016-2017 Revised RS	FY 2017-2018 Revised RS	FY 2018-2019 Revised RS	FY 2019-2020 Revised RS
Rate Base					
0.75% Accounts	38,980	39,272	39,567	39,864	40,163
1.25% Billable IA Units	32,119	32,520	32,927	33,339	33,756
1.25% Billable Equivalent GA Units	24,614	24,921	25,233	25,548	25,867
Costs					
Stormwater O&M	\$ 3,525,628	\$ 3,613,769	\$ 3,704,113	\$ 3,796,716	\$ 3,891,634
Shared County Services					
Town Portion: Administration	\$ 111,666	\$ 112,667	\$ 114,220	\$ 115,595	\$ 117,568
Town Portion: Monitoring & Outreach	\$ 21,683	\$ 22,303	\$ 20,754	\$ 19,205	\$ 19,205
Town Portion: County-Wide Infrastructure O&M	\$ 283,045	\$ 276,140	\$ 277,840	\$ 285,283	\$ 287,889
Capital Purchases & Projects	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Total Town Costs (excl. debt service)	\$ 3,525,628	\$ 3,613,769	\$ 3,704,113	\$ 3,796,716	\$ 3,891,634
Total Town Costs payable to County for Shared Services	\$ 416,395	\$ 411,109	\$ 412,813	\$ 420,084	\$ 424,661
Debt Service					
Annual Debt Service (Existing)	\$ 1,175,675	\$ 1,205,067	\$ 1,235,194	\$ 1,266,073	\$ 1,297,725
Revised RS Stormwater Fee					
Fixed Cost per Account, Calc	\$ 3.43	\$ 3.44	\$ 3.42	\$ 3.39	\$ 3.41
Fixed Cost per Account, administrative portion:	\$ 2.86	\$ 2.87	\$ 2.89	\$ 2.90	\$ 2.93
Fixed Cost per Account, monitoring & outreach portion:	\$ 0.56	\$ 0.57	\$ 0.52	\$ 0.48	\$ 0.48
Fixed Cost per Account, CWI portion:	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Fixed Cost Collection Rate	96%	97%	98%	99%	99%
Fixed Cost per Account, Override	\$ 4.00	\$ 4.00	\$ 4.00	\$ 4.00	\$ 4.00
Variable Costs, IA Proportion	80%	80%	80%	80%	80%
Variable Costs, GA Proportion	20%	20%	20%	20%	20%
Variable Costs, IA Unit Fee Calc	\$ 124.15	\$ 125.34	\$ 126.76	\$ 128.34	\$ 129.81
Variable Costs, IA Unit Fee, administrative portion:	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Variable Costs, IA Unit Fee, monitoring & outreach portion:	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Variable Costs, IA Unit Fee, CWI portion:	\$ 7.05	\$ 6.79	\$ 6.75	\$ 6.85	\$ 6.82
Variable Costs, IA Unit Fee, Town costs portion:	\$ 117.10	\$ 118.54	\$ 120.01	\$ 121.49	\$ 122.99
IA Collection Rate	96%	97%	98%	99%	99%
Variable Costs, IA Unit Fee Override	\$ 130.00	\$ 130.00	\$ 130.00	\$ 130.00	\$ 130.00
Variable Costs, GA Unit Fee Calc	\$ 40.51	\$ 40.89	\$ 41.36	\$ 41.87	\$ 42.35
Variable Costs, GA Unit Fee, administrative portion:	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Variable Costs, GA Unit Fee, monitoring & outreach portion:	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Variable Costs, GA Unit Fee, CWI portion:	\$ 2.30	\$ 2.22	\$ 2.20	\$ 2.23	\$ 2.23
Variable Costs, GA Unit Fee, Town costs portion:	\$ 38.20	\$ 38.67	\$ 39.15	\$ 39.63	\$ 40.12
GA Collection Rate	96%	97%	98%	99%	99%
Variable Costs, GA Unit Fee Override	\$ 45.00	\$ 45.00	\$ 45.00	\$ 45.00	\$ 45.00
Anticipated Town Fee Billings	\$ 5,438,966	\$ 5,506,133	\$ 5,574,263	\$ 5,643,186	\$ 5,712,947
Per Account Fees Paid to Town	\$ 0.57	\$ 0.56	\$ 0.58	\$ 0.61	\$ 0.59
Per Impervious Area Unit Fees Paid to Town	\$ 122.95	\$ 123.21	\$ 123.25	\$ 123.15	\$ 123.18
Per Gross Area Unit Fees Paid to Town	\$ 42.70	\$ 42.78	\$ 42.80	\$ 42.77	\$ 42.77
Per Account Fees Paid to County	\$ 3.43	\$ 3.44	\$ 3.42	\$ 3.39	\$ 3.41
Per Impervious Area Unit Fees Paid to County	\$ 7.05	\$ 6.79	\$ 6.75	\$ 6.85	\$ 6.82
Per Gross Area Unit Fees Paid to County	\$ 2.30	\$ 2.22	\$ 2.20	\$ 2.23	\$ 2.23
Revenues					
Anticipated Town Fee Revenue	\$ 5,221,407	\$ 5,340,949	\$ 5,462,778	\$ 5,586,754	\$ 5,655,818
Anticipated funds remitted to County for Utility Admin	\$ (111,666)	\$ (112,667)	\$ (114,220)	\$ (115,595)	\$ (117,568)
Anticipated funds remitted to County for Monitoring & Outreach	\$ (21,683)	\$ (22,303)	\$ (20,754)	\$ (19,205)	\$ (19,205)
Anticipated funds remitted to County for CWI	\$ (283,045)	\$ (276,140)	\$ (277,840)	\$ (285,283)	\$ (287,889)
Anticipated Remaining Town Fee Revenue	\$ 4,805,012	\$ 4,929,840	\$ 5,049,964	\$ 5,166,671	\$ 5,231,156
Bond Issuance Proceeds	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Fund Balance					
FY Beginning Fund Balance	\$ -	\$ 103,709	\$ 214,713	\$ 325,371	\$ 429,253
Total Costs	\$ 4,701,303	\$ 4,818,835	\$ 4,939,306	\$ 5,062,789	\$ 5,189,359
Total Revenues	\$ 4,805,012	\$ 4,929,840	\$ 5,049,964	\$ 5,166,671	\$ 5,231,156
Surplus (Deficit)	\$ 103,709	\$ 111,004	\$ 110,658	\$ 103,882	\$ 41,798
FY End Fund Balance	\$ 103,709	\$ 214,713	\$ 325,371	\$ 429,253	\$ 471,051

Beaufort County and Municipalities Stormwater Rate Study DRAFT Report

July 10, 2015

Town of Hilton Head Island
Summary Sheet

Option D

	FY 2015-2016 Revised RS	FY 2016-2017 Revised RS	FY 2017-2018 Revised RS	FY 2018-2019 Revised RS	FY 2019-2020 Revised RS
Rate Base					
0.75% Accounts	38,980	39,272	39,567	39,864	40,163
1.25% Billable IA Units	32,119	32,520	32,927	33,339	33,756
1.25% Billable Equivalent GA Units	24,614	24,921	25,233	25,548	25,867
Costs					
Stormwater O&M	\$ 3,525,628	\$ 3,613,769	\$ 3,704,113	\$ 3,796,716	\$ 3,891,634
Shared County Services					
Town Portion: Administration	\$ 99,919	\$ 100,815	\$ 102,204	\$ 103,435	\$ 105,200
Town Portion: Monitoring & Outreach	\$ 19,402	\$ 19,956	\$ 18,571	\$ 17,185	\$ 17,185
Town Portion: County-Wide Infrastructure O&M	\$ 283,045	\$ 276,140	\$ 277,840	\$ 285,283	\$ 287,889
Capital Purchases & Projects	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Total Town Costs (excl. debt service)	\$ 3,525,628	\$ 3,613,769	\$ 3,704,113	\$ 3,796,716	\$ 3,891,634
Total Town Costs payable to County for Shared Services	\$ 402,367	\$ 396,911	\$ 398,615	\$ 405,903	\$ 410,273
Debt Service					
Annual Debt Service (Existing)	\$ 1,175,675	\$ 1,205,067	\$ 1,235,194	\$ 1,266,073	\$ 1,297,725
Revised RS Stormwater Fee					
Fixed Cost per Account, Calc	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Fixed Cost per Account, administrative portion:	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Fixed Cost per Account, monitoring & outreach portion:	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Fixed Cost per Account, CWI portion:	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Fixed Cost Collection Rate	96%	97%	98%	99%	99%
Fixed Cost per Account, Override	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Variable Costs, IA Proportion	80%	80%	80%	80%	80%
Variable Costs, GA Proportion	20%	20%	20%	20%	20%
Variable Costs, IA Unit Fee Calc	\$ 127.13	\$ 128.31	\$ 129.70	\$ 131.23	\$ 132.71
Variable Costs, IA Unit Fee, administrative portion:	\$ 2.49	\$ 2.48	\$ 2.48	\$ 2.48	\$ 2.49
Variable Costs, IA Unit Fee, monitoring & outreach portion:	\$ 0.48	\$ 0.49	\$ 0.45	\$ 0.41	\$ 0.41
Variable Costs, IA Unit Fee, CWI portion:	\$ 7.05	\$ 6.79	\$ 6.75	\$ 6.85	\$ 6.82
Variable Costs, IA Unit Fee, Town costs portion:	\$ 117.10	\$ 118.54	\$ 120.01	\$ 121.49	\$ 122.99
IA Collection Rate	96%	97%	98%	99%	99%
Variable Costs, IA Unit Fee Override	\$ 135.00	\$ 135.00	\$ 135.00	\$ 135.00	\$ 135.00
Variable Costs, GA Unit Fee Calc	\$ 41.48	\$ 41.86	\$ 42.31	\$ 42.82	\$ 43.30
Variable Costs, GA Unit Fee, administrative portion:	\$ 0.81	\$ 0.81	\$ 0.81	\$ 0.81	\$ 0.81
Variable Costs, GA Unit Fee, monitoring & outreach portion:	\$ 0.16	\$ 0.16	\$ 0.15	\$ 0.13	\$ 0.13
Variable Costs, GA Unit Fee, CWI portion:	\$ 2.30	\$ 2.22	\$ 2.20	\$ 2.23	\$ 2.23
Variable Costs, GA Unit Fee, Town costs portion:	\$ 38.20	\$ 38.67	\$ 39.15	\$ 39.63	\$ 40.12
GA Collection Rate	96%	97%	98%	99%	99%
Variable Costs, GA Unit Fee Override	\$ 45.00	\$ 45.00	\$ 45.00	\$ 45.00	\$ 45.00
Anticipated Town Fee Billings	\$ 5,443,639	\$ 5,511,645	\$ 5,580,630	\$ 5,650,425	\$ 5,721,075
Per Account Fees Paid to Town	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Per Impervious Area Unit Fees Paid to Town	\$ 124.98	\$ 125.24	\$ 125.32	\$ 125.26	\$ 125.28
Per Gross Area Unit Fees Paid to Town	\$ 41.73	\$ 41.81	\$ 41.84	\$ 41.82	\$ 41.83
Per Account Fees Paid to County	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Per Impervious Area Unit Fees Paid to County	\$ 10.02	\$ 9.76	\$ 9.68	\$ 9.74	\$ 9.72
Per Gross Area Unit Fees Paid to County	\$ 3.27	\$ 3.19	\$ 3.16	\$ 3.18	\$ 3.17
Revenues					
Anticipated Town Fee Revenue	\$ 5,225,894	\$ 5,346,296	\$ 5,469,017	\$ 5,593,921	\$ 5,663,864
Anticipated funds remitted to County for Utility Admin	\$ (99,919)	\$ (100,815)	\$ (102,204)	\$ (103,435)	\$ (105,200)
Anticipated funds remitted to County for Monitoring & Outreach	\$ (19,402)	\$ (19,956)	\$ (18,571)	\$ (17,185)	\$ (17,185)
Anticipated funds remitted to County for CWI	\$ (283,045)	\$ (276,140)	\$ (277,840)	\$ (285,283)	\$ (287,889)
Anticipated Remaining Town Fee Revenue	\$ 4,823,527	\$ 4,949,385	\$ 5,070,403	\$ 5,188,018	\$ 5,253,591
Bond Issuance Proceeds	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Fund Balance					
FY Beginning Fund Balance	\$ -	\$ 122,224	\$ 252,773	\$ 383,869	\$ 509,098
Total Costs	\$ 4,701,303	\$ 4,818,835	\$ 4,939,306	\$ 5,062,789	\$ 5,189,359
Total Revenues	\$ 4,823,527	\$ 4,949,385	\$ 5,070,403	\$ 5,188,018	\$ 5,253,591
Surplus (Deficit)	\$ 122,224	\$ 130,549	\$ 131,096	\$ 125,229	\$ 64,232
FY End Fund Balance	\$ 122,224	\$ 252,773	\$ 383,869	\$ 509,098	\$ 573,331

Town of Hilton Head Island - Option E

No model run - no CIP identified

Town of Hilton Head Island - Option F

No model run - no CIP identified

DRAFT

STORMWATER UTILITY RATE STUDY

Presentation of Draft Findings

STORMWATER UTILITY RATE STUDY

- Original contract – Unincorporated County
- Additional contract – City and three towns
- Additional effort to update impervious features on about 5,000 parcel polygons across all jurisdictions

STORMWATER UTILITY RATE STUDY

- February – April: program planning and cost evaluation
- May – June: Data update for impervious features
- June – July: Draft rate structures and rates

* Program planning efforts focused more on unincorporated County.

STORMWATER UTILITY RATE STUDY

- Major Issues for County:
 - Countywide infrastructure O&M costs increasing and currently no funding from municipalities
 - County rate base decreasing
 - MS4 compliance costs increasing
 - Capital needs expanding
 - Rates held constant since 2008 while costs rose and inflation continued

STORMWATER UTILITY RATE STUDY

- Major Issues for City and Towns:
 - Failing infrastructure and lack of data about the infrastructure (Beaufort)
 - MS4 compliance costs increasing (Bluffton, HHI)
 - O&M needs expanding for older infrastructure that the Town has agreed to maintain (HHI)
 - Increasing O&M needs and shrinking fund balance (PR)

STORMWATER UTILITY RATE STUDY

SIX OPTIONS FOR RATE STRUCTURE

Modeled Rate Structure Option	Overall Rate Structure	Debt Financing for Some Capital	Partial Tax Funding	Method for Allocating Administrative Costs	Method for Allocating County-wide Infrastructure Maintenance Costs	Method for Re-allocating Costs from One Jurisdiction to another	Minimum Charge	Simplified Residential Rates
A	Impervious Area	No	Optional at Jurisdiction's Choice	Impervious Area SFU's	None	Optional at Jurisdiction's Choice	No	Yes
B	Impervious Area	Yes	Optional at Jurisdiction's Choice	Impervious Area SFU's	None	Optional at Jurisdiction's Choice	No	Yes
C	Impervious and Gross Area at 80/20 or 90/10	No	Optional at Jurisdiction's Choice	Per Account	Impervious and Gross Area	Optional at Jurisdiction's Choice	Yes	Yes
D	Impervious and Gross Area at 80/20 or 90/10	No	Optional at Jurisdiction's Choice	Impervious and Gross Area	Impervious and Gross Area	Optional at Jurisdiction's Choice	Yes	Yes
E	Impervious and Gross Area at 80/20 or 90/10	Yes	Optional at Jurisdiction's Choice	Per Account	Impervious and Gross Area	Optional at Jurisdiction's Choice	Yes	Yes
F	Impervious and Gross Area at 80/20 or 90/10	Yes	Optional at Jurisdiction's Choice	Impervious and Gross Area	Impervious and Gross Area	Optional at Jurisdiction's Choice	Yes	Yes

STORMWATER UTILITY RATE STUDY

SIX OPTIONS FOR RATE STRUCTURE

Modeled Rate Structure Option	Overall Rate Structure	Debt Financing for Some Capital	Partial Tax Funding	Method for Allocating Administrative Costs	Method for Allocating County-wide Infrastructure Maintenance Costs	Method for Re-allocating Costs from One Jurisdiction to another	Minimum Charge	Simplified Residential Rates
A	Impervious Area	No	Optional at Jurisdiction's Choice	Impervious Area SFU's	None	Optional at Jurisdiction's Choice	No	Yes
B	Impervious Area	Yes	Optional at Jurisdiction's Choice	Impervious Area SFU's	None	Optional at Jurisdiction's Choice	No	Yes
C	Impervious and Gross Area at 80/20 or 90/10	No	Optional at Jurisdiction's Choice	Per Account	Impervious and Gross Area	Optional at Jurisdiction's Choice	Yes	Yes
D	Impervious and Gross Area at 80/20 or 90/10	No	Optional at Jurisdiction's Choice	Impervious and Gross Area	Impervious and Gross Area	Optional at Jurisdiction's Choice	Yes	Yes
E	Impervious and Gross Area at 80/20 or 90/10	Yes	Optional at Jurisdiction's Choice	Per Account	Impervious and Gross Area	Optional at Jurisdiction's Choice	Yes	Yes
F	Impervious and Gross Area at 80/20 or 90/10	Yes	Optional at Jurisdiction's Choice	Impervious and Gross Area	Impervious and Gross Area	Optional at Jurisdiction's Choice	Yes	Yes

STORMWATER UTILITY RATE STUDY

- Administration costs - \$3.18 per SFU this year, transitioning to per account in out years
- Borrow funds to finance capital projects (\$5M in 2017, \$5M in 2019)
- 80/20 Impervious and Gross area revenues for variable portion
- Countywide Infrastructure allocable to Impervious and Gross area

STORMWATER UTILITY RATE STUDY

Advantages of this rate structure:

- Consistent with already established administration costs of \$3.18 per SFU this year, and flexible for changing the methodology later
- Borrowing funds to finance capital projects (\$5M in 2017, \$5M in 2019) blunts rate increase and allows future residents to help pay for the programs and infrastructure they will use
- Allocates some costs to gross land area
- Establishes an allocation method for countywide infrastructure O&M

STORMWATER UTILITY RATE STUDY

- Countywide Infrastructure costs - about \$3.5M
- Allocation of CWI costs based on infrastructure distribution throughout County:

Unincorporated County	76.4%
City of Beaufort	3.4%
Town of Port Royal	1.0%
Town of Bluffton	11.1%
Town of Hilton Head Island	8.1%

STORMWATER UTILITY RATE STUDY

- Countywide Infrastructure costs - about \$3.5M
- Allocation of CWI costs based on infrastructure distribution throughout County (see percentages).
Current per SFU rates required to generate CWI monies are as follows:

Unincorporated County	\$44.34 per SFU
City of Beaufort	\$9.31 per SFU
Town of Port Royal	\$5.82 per SFU
Town of Bluffton	\$30.49 per SFU
Town of Hilton Head Island	\$8.86 per SFU

STORMWATER UTILITY RATE STUDY

- OPTION E -- Unincorporated County rates recommended (draft) in study:
 - Fixed charge per year: \$12.00 per parcel/account
 - Impervious charge: \$65.00 per Unit
 - Gross area charge: \$10.00 per Unit, declining blocks

STORMWATER UTILITY RATE STUDY

How Option E Compares -- Unincorporated County rates recommended (draft) in study:

Typical home on 1 acre lot

- Current charge: \$50 per year
- Option E charge: \$87 per year
- Option A charge: \$100 per year (\$120 per year by 2019)

STORMWATER UTILITY RATE STUDY

Declining block rates for gross area charges in the recommended unincorporated County rate structure:

- First 2 acres: \$10.00 per year
- Next 8 acres: \$5.00 per acre per year
- Next 90 acres: \$4.00 per acre per year
- All acres > 100: \$3.00 per acre per year

**Beaufort County Stormwater Utility
Revised Budget for FY2016**

Unaudited Projected Revenue

	FY2015 Requested Board Budget	FY2016 Requested Board Budget
Revenue		
Admin SWU Fees	313,460	357,244
<i>Unincorp/CWI SWU Fees</i>	2,766,881	5,522,753
Total Revenue from SWU Fees	3,080,341	5,879,997
Reimbursable Projects	2,500	2,500
Interest	2,955	2,771
Cost-Share for Joint Efforts	41,689	36,942
Reserve Utilization		
Capital Improvement Fund	767,500	434,079
Stormwater Utility	351,091	0
Projected Revenue Total	4,246,076	6,356,289

\$3.18/SFU

-3.5% from FY15 to FY16

\$2,500-SCDOT or BCSD

Notes:
*Reimbursement ck for \$38,566 from Carolina Clear to be applied to PE/PO contract.
**Cost-Share total in the model is \$47,948

Town of Port Royal (ToPR)

\$7,590 - WQ Monitoring \$60K NoBR
\$630 - PE/O cost-share \$60K C/W
\$13,961 - SMP Update cost share \$475K C/W

City of Beaufort (CoB)

\$18,685 - WQ Monitoring \$60K NoBR
\$1,545 - PE/O cost-share \$60K C/W
\$34,251 - SMP Update cost share \$475K C/W

Town of Hilton Head Island (ToHHI)

\$6,282 - PE/O cost-share \$60K C/W
\$139,243 - SMP Update cost share \$475K C/W

Town of Bluffton (ToB)

\$2,210 - PE/O cost-share \$60K C/W
\$48,954 - SMP Update cost share \$475K C/W

Lowest in FY15 (Nov 14) **Most Recent (Mar 15)**
Unres Net Assets-\$678K Unres Net Assets-\$1.4M
Cash Balance-(\$178K) Cash Balance-\$2.76M

Efforts (Expenditures)

Administration	313,460	360,495
Utility Activities		
UA/Control Reg	216,956	-
UA/WQ Monitoring	120,000	-
UA/Annual Maintenance	2,736,160	2,908,833
UA/Public Information/Outreach	50,000	-
UA/Drainage Enhancement	7,000	39,000
UA/Additional Studies	35,000	545,000
Utility Activities Subtotal	3,165,116	3,492,833
Regulation		
UA/Control Reg		445,242
UA/WQ Monitoring		105,000
UA/Public Information/Outreach		70,000
Regulation Subtotal	-	620,242
Reserve Utilization		
Capital Improvement Fund		
Admin Parking Lot Retrofit	327,169	-
Hwy 278 Retrofit	207,722	183,215
Okatie West/SC 170 Retrofit	100,000	315,000
Battery Creek Upper Retrofit	132,609	117,604
Buckingham Plantation	-	400,000
Brewer Memorial Demo Pond	-	9,500
Reserve Utilization Subtotal	767,500	1,025,319
Utility Operating Fund		
Surplus (Deficit)	-	857,399
Efforts Total	4,246,076	6,356,289

Personnel

Director of EE (SW Mngr) - .8 FTE
GIS&MS4 Data Mngr - 1.0 FTE
SW Bus Mngr - 1.0 FTE
Fiscal Tech - .1 FTE
SW Admin Tech - .5 FTE

Personnel

New Infrastructure Inspection Tech - 1.0 FTE
\$30K - O&M's Professional Services
\$21K - Survey
\$5K - Engineering Services
\$2K - Easement Appraisal Services
\$2K - Wetland Delineation/Restoration
\$0 - Inventory Secondary SW System (Staff)

\$39K - PSMS Enhancements

\$25K - Sawmill (Forby)
\$14K - Contingency

\$545K - Additional Studies

\$475K - Update to the SMMP
\$30K - Credits/Incentives Analysis
\$30K - Rate Study Phase II
\$10K - Contingency

Personnel

Superintendent - 1.0 FTE
Inspector - 1.0 FTE
Fiscal Tech - .1 FTE
Admin Tech - .5 FTE
New MS4 Coord - 1.0 FTE

\$70K - SW Control Regulations'

Professional Services
\$25K - IDDE (Ord/Plan)
\$25K - Construction (Ord/Manual)
\$20K - Post Construction WQ (Ord. review/manual review)

\$105K - WQ Monitoring

\$100K - USCB WQ Lab
\$5K - Gel Engineering
(Purchase of monitoring equip reflected in Capital Assets)

\$70K - Public Edu/Info

\$60K - MCM 1&2 Contract
\$10K - Website Development

carolynw:

Construction delayed

carolynw:

Construction delayed

\$573,290 - UA

\$314,460 - Replace (2) dump trucks
\$54K - Replace (2) 4x4 pickup trucks (intermediate)
\$32K - Add (1) pickup truck (Infr Inspection Tech)
\$5,830 - Radio (Infr Inspection Tech)
\$85K - Trailer Mounted Camera
\$32K Vac Truck Overhaul
\$50K - Land Acquisition (Condemnation)
\$38K - Regulatory Section
\$31K - Add (1) pickup truck (MS4 Coord)
\$7K - WagTech Kit

SWM - \$5,826

UA - \$231,980

Reg - \$10,675

Change in Capital Assets On Balance Sheet

	FY2015	FY2016
Capital Assets Additions	165,561	611,290
Depreciation	(182,523)	(248,481)
	(16,962)	362,809

**AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND THE STORMWATER MANAGEMENT UTILITY ORDINANCE AS ADOPTED
AUGUST 22, 2005 TO PROVIDE FOR AMENDMENT OF THE RATE STRUCTURE, ADJUST UTILITY RATES,
AND TO MODIFY CERTAIN TERMS TO ACCURATELY REFLECT ADMINISTRATION STRUCTURE**

WHEREAS, Act 283 of 1975, The Home Rule Act, vested Beaufort County Council with the independent authority to control all acts and powers of local governmental authority that are not expressly prohibited by South Carolina law; and

WHEREAS, Chapter 99, Article II, "Stormwater Management Utility" was adopted on August 27, 2001 and was modified by ordinance on August 22, 2005; and

WHEREAS, Stormwater Management Utility was established for the purpose of managing, acquiring, constructing, protecting, operating, maintaining, enhancing, controlling, and regulating the use of stormwater drainage systems in the county;

WHEREAS, to meet the increasing demands on the Stormwater Management Utility in the areas of federally mandated municipal Separate Stormsewer Systems (MS4) permitting, capital project needs, and cost of service of operations and maintenance, as well as an evolving understanding of the impacts of the urban environment on water quality, the Stormwater Management Utility finds it necessary to amend the structure in which rates are determined and adjust the rates charged to the citizens of Beaufort County to meet said demands in a fair and equitable manner; and

WHEREAS, the administrative structure of the Stormwater Management Utility needs to be amended to reflect the organization of the current administration; and

WHEREAS, Beaufort County Council believes to best provide for the health, safety, and welfare of its citizens it is appropriate to amend Chapter 99, Article II of the Beaufort County Code and to provide for additional terms to said Article; and

WHEREAS, text that is underscored shall be added text and text ~~lined through~~ shall be deleted text; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED BY BEAUFORT COUNTY COUNCIL, that Chapter 99, Article II of the Beaufort County Code is hereby amended and replaced with the following:

Chapter 99 - STORMWATER MANAGEMENT UTILITY

ARTICLE I. - IN GENERAL

Secs. 99-1—99-100. - Reserved.

ARTICLE II. - STORMWATER MANAGEMENT UTILITY

Sec. 99-101. - Findings of fact.

The County Council of Beaufort County, South Carolina, makes the following findings of fact:

- (a) The professional engineering and financial analyses conducted on behalf of and submitted to the county properly assesses and defines the stormwater management problems, needs, goals, program priorities, costs of service, need for interlocal cooperation, and funding opportunities of the county.
- (b) Given the problems, needs, goals, program priorities, costs of service, needs for interlocal cooperation, and funding opportunities identified in the professional engineering and financial analyses submitted to the county, it is appropriate to authorize the establishment of a separate enterprise accounting unit which shall be dedicated specifically to the management, construction, maintenance, protection, control, regulation, use, and enhancement of stormwater systems and programs in Beaufort County in concert with other water resource management programs.
- (c) Stormwater management is applicable and needed throughout the unincorporated portions of Beaufort County, but interlocal cooperation between the county and the incorporated cities and towns within the county is also essential to the efficient provision of stormwater programs, services, systems, and facilities. Intense urban development in some portions of the county has radically altered the natural hydrology of the area and the hydraulics of stormwater systems, with many natural elements having been replaced or augmented by man-made facilities. Other areas of the county remain very rural in character, with natural stormwater systems predominating except along roads where ditches and culverts have been installed. As a result, the specific program, service, system, and facility demands differ from area to area in the county. While the county manages, operates, and improves stormwater programs, services, systems and facilities in the rural as well as urban areas, the need for improved stormwater management is greatest in the urban areas and nearby, including areas within incorporated cities and towns. Therefore, a stormwater utility service area subject to stormwater service fees should encompass, in so far as possible through interlocal agreements, the entirety of Beaufort County and the stormwater management utility service fee rate structure should reflect the amount of impervious area on individual properties and the runoff impact from water quantity and water quality.
- (d) The stormwater needs in Beaufort County include but are not limited to protecting the public health, safety, and welfare. Provision of stormwater management programs, services, systems, and facilities therefore renders and/or results in both service and benefit to individual properties, property owners, citizens, and residents of the county and to properties, property owners, citizens, and residents of the county concurrently in a variety of ways as identified in the professional engineering and financial analyses.
- (e) The service and benefit rendered or resulting from the provision of stormwater management programs, services, systems, and facilities may differ over time depending on many factors and considerations, including but not limited to location, demands and impacts imposed on the stormwater programs, systems, and facilities, and risk exposure. It is not practical to allocate the cost of the county's stormwater management programs, services, systems, and facilities in direct and precise relationship to the services or benefits rendered to or received by individual properties or persons over a brief span of time, but it is both practical and equitable to allocate the cost of stormwater management among properties and persons in proportion to the long-term demands they impose on the county's stormwater programs, services, systems, and facilities which render or result in services and benefits.
- (f) Beaufort County presently owns and operates stormwater management systems and facilities that have been developed, installed, and acquired through various mechanisms over many years. The future usefulness and value of the existing stormwater systems and facilities owned and operated by Beaufort County, and of future additions and improvements thereto, rests on the ability of the county to effectively manage, construct, protect, operate, maintain, control, regulate, use, and enhance the stormwater systems and facilities in the county, in concert with the management of other water resources in the county and in cooperation with the incorporated cities and towns. In order to do so, the county must have adequate and stable funding for its stormwater management program operating and capital investment needs.

- (g) The county council finds, concludes, and determines that a stormwater management utility provides the most practical and appropriate means of properly delivering stormwater management services and benefits throughout the county, and the most equitable means to fund stormwater services in the county through stormwater service fees and other mechanisms as described in the professional engineering and financial analyses prepared for the county.
- (h) The county council finds, concludes, and determines that a schedule of stormwater utility service fees be levied upon and collected from the owners of all lots, parcels of real estate, and buildings that discharge stormwater or subsurface waters, directly or indirectly, to the county stormwater management system and that the proceeds of such charges so derived be used for the stormwater management system.
- (i) The county council finds that adjustments and credits against stormwater utility service fees are an appropriate means to grant properties providing stormwater management program services that would otherwise be provided by the county and will afford Beaufort County cost savings. These reductions will be developed by the ~~Beaufort County engineer~~ Stormwater Manager and will be reviewed on an annual basis to allow for any modifications to practices required by Beaufort County.

~~The county council finds that both the total gross area and impervious area on each property are the most important factors influencing the cost of stormwater management in Beaufort County and, the runoff impact from water quantity and water quality. In determining the basis for a stormwater management utility fee, the county council finds that it is appropriate to remove the amount of land area on each property that is designated as river or marsh as these areas are vital portions of the county's stormwater management program.~~

Sec. 99-102. - Establishment of a stormwater management utility and a utility enterprise fund.

There is hereby established within the ~~Public Works Department~~ Environmental Engineering Division of Beaufort County a stormwater management utility for the purpose of conducting the county's stormwater management program. The county administrator shall establish and maintain a stormwater management utility enterprise fund in the county budget and accounting system, which shall be and remain separate from other funds. All revenues of the utility shall be placed into the stormwater management utility enterprise fund and all expenses of the utility shall be paid from the fund, except that other revenues, receipts, and resources not accounted for in the stormwater management utility enterprise fund may be applied to stormwater management programs, services, systems, and facilities as deemed appropriate by the Beaufort County Council. The county administrator may designate within the stormwater management utility enterprise fund such sub-units as necessary for the purpose of accounting for the geographical generation of revenues and allocation of expenditures pursuant to interlocal governmental agreements with the cities and towns of Beaufort County.

Sec. 99-103. - Purpose and responsibility of the utility.

The Beaufort County Stormwater Management Utility is established for the purpose of managing, acquiring, constructing, protecting, operating, maintaining, enhancing, controlling, and regulating the use of stormwater drainage systems in the county. The utility shall, on behalf of the county and the citizens of the county: administer the stormwater management program; perform studies and analyses as required; collect service fees; system development fees, in-lieu of construction fees and other funding as allowed by law, and obtain and administer grants and loans as authorized by the county council; prepare capital improvement plans and designs; perform routine maintenance and remedial repair of the stormwater systems; acquire, construct, and improve stormwater systems; acquire necessary lands, easements, rights-of-way, rights-of-entry and use, and other means of access to properties to perform its duties; regulate the on-site control, conveyance, and discharge of stormwater from properties; obtain federal and state permits required to carry out its purpose; enter into operating agreements with other agencies; allocate funds pursuant to interlocal governmental agreements; educate and inform the public about stormwater management; and perform, without limitation except by law, any stormwater management

functions and activities necessary to ensure the public safety, protect private and public properties and habitat, and enhance the natural environment and waters of the county.

Sec. 99-104. - Limitation of scope of responsibility.

The purpose and responsibility of the stormwater management utility shall be limited by the following legal and practical considerations.

- (a) Beaufort County owns or has legal access for purposes of operation, maintenance, and improvement only to those stormwater systems and facilities which:
 - (1) Are located within public streets, other rights-of-way, and easements;
 - (2) Are subject to easements, rights-of-entry, rights-of-access, rights-of-use, or other permanent provisions for adequate access for operation, maintenance, monitoring, and/or improvement of systems and facilities; or
 - (3) Are located on public lands to which the county has adequate access for operation, maintenance, and/or improvement of systems and facilities.
- (b) Operation, maintenance, and/or improvement of stormwater systems and facilities which are located on private property or public property not owned by Beaufort County and for which there has been no public dedication of such systems and facilities for operation, maintenance, monitoring, and/or improvement of the systems and facilities shall be and remain the legal responsibility of the property owner, except as that responsibility may be otherwise affected by the laws of the State of South Carolina and the United States of America.
- (c) It is the express intent of this article to protect the public health, safety, and welfare of all properties and persons in general, but not to create any special duty or relationship with any individual person or to any specific property within or outside the boundaries of the county. Beaufort County expressly reserves the right to assert all available immunities and defenses in any action seeking to impose monetary damages upon the county, its officers, employees and agents arising out of any alleged failure or breach of duty or relationship as may now exist or hereafter be created.
- (d) To the extent any permit, plan approval, inspection or similar act is required by the county as a condition precedent to any activity or change upon property not owned by the county, pursuant to this or any other regulatory ordinance, regulation, or rule of the county or under federal or state law, the issuance of such permit, plan approval, or inspection shall not be deemed to constitute a warranty, express or implied, nor shall it afford the basis for any action, including any action based on failure to permit or negligent issuance of a permit, seeking the imposition of money damages against the county, its officers, employees, or agents.

Sec. 99-105. - Boundaries and jurisdiction.

The boundaries and jurisdiction of the stormwater management utility shall encompass all those portions of unincorporated Beaufort County, as they may exist from time to time and such additional areas lying inside the corporate limits of those cities and towns in Beaufort County as shall be subject to interlocal agreements for stormwater management as approved by county council and participating municipal councils.

Sec. 99-106. - Definitions.

Unless the context specifically indicates otherwise, the meaning of words and terms used in this article shall be as set forth in S.C. Code § 48-14-20, and 26 S.C. Code Regulation 72-301, mutatis mutandis.

Abatement. Any action deemed necessary by the county or its officers or agents to remedy, correct, control, or eliminate a condition within, associated with, or impacting a stormwater drainage system or the water quality of receiving waters shall be deemed an abatement action.

Adjustments. Adjustments shall mean a change in the amount of a stormwater service fee predicated upon the determination reached by the Beaufort County engineer Stormwater Manager and referenced to the Adjustments and Credit Manual.

Bill Class. Every taxed property falls into one of several bill classes. The bill class determines the fee calculation of that property.

Countywide Infrastructure Operation and Maintenance and Capital Projects. The County maintains some typically larger infrastructure within each of the four municipalities in addition to within the unincorporated area. The rate structure will allocate the costs for the County to maintain just the countywide drainage infrastructure across the entire rate base in all jurisdictions based on infrastructure linear feet per jurisdiction.

Customers of the stormwater management utility. Customers of the stormwater management utility shall be broadly defined to include all persons, properties, and entities served by and/or benefiting, directly and indirectly, from the utility's acquisition, management, construction, improvement, operation, maintenance, extension, and enhancement of the stormwater management programs, services, systems, and facilities in the county, and by its control and regulation of public and private stormwater systems, facilities, and activities related thereto.

Developed land. Developed land shall mean property altered from its natural state by construction or installation of improvements such as buildings, structures, or other impervious surfaces, or by other alteration of the property that results in a meaningful change in the hydrology of the property during and following rainfall events.

Exemption. Exemption shall mean not applying to or removing the application of the stormwater management utility service fee from a property. No permanent exemption shall be granted based on taxable or non-taxable status or economic status of the property owner.

Fixed costs. Costs associated with the public service provided equally to each property owner. These costs include, but are not limited to the following: billing and collections, data management and updating, programming, and customer support.

Gross Area. Gross area is the acreage of a parcel as identified by the Beaufort County Assessor records.

Hydrologic response. The hydrologic response of a property is the manner whereby stormwater collects, remains, infiltrates, and is conveyed from a property. It is dependent on several factors including but not limited to the size and overall intensity of development of each property, its impervious area, shape, topographic, vegetative, and geologic conditions, antecedent moisture conditions, and groundwater conditions and the nature of precipitation events. Extremely large undeveloped properties naturally attenuate but do not eliminate entirely the discharge of stormwater during and following rainfall events.

Jurisdictional Infrastructure Operations, Maintenance and Capital Projects. Each of the five jurisdictions maintains its own stormwater drainage infrastructure and funds those costs from utility revenue. Revenue from this fee component will be returned to the service provider, the individual jurisdiction.

Impervious surfaces. Impervious surfaces shall be a consideration in the determination of the development intensity factor. Impervious surfaces are those areas that prevent or impede the infiltration of stormwater into the soil as it entered in natural conditions prior to development. Common impervious surfaces include, but are not limited to, rooftops, sidewalks, walkways, patio areas, driveways, parking lots, storage areas, compacted gravel and soil surfaces, awnings and other fabric or plastic coverings, and other surfaces that prevent or impede the natural infiltration of stormwater runoff that existed prior to development.

Minimum Charge. A charge that reflects the minimum amount of demand a property will place on the service provider.

MS4 Permit. Each jurisdiction within Beaufort County will be subject to the federally mandated MS4 permit requirements. Compliance requirements include, but are not limited to monitoring, plan review, inspections, outreach and public education,

Nonresidential properties. Properties developed for uses other than permanent residential dwelling units and designated by the assigned land use code in the Beaufort County tax data system.

Other developed lands. Other developed lands shall mean, but not be limited to, mobile home parks, commercial and office buildings, public buildings and structures, industrial and manufacturing buildings, storage buildings and storage areas covered with impervious surfaces, parking lots, parks, recreation properties, public and private schools and universities, research facilities and stations, hospitals and convalescent centers, airports, agricultural uses covered by impervious surfaces, water and wastewater treatment plants, and lands in other uses which alter the hydrology of the property from that which would exist in a natural state. Properties that are used for other than single family residential use shall be deemed other developed lands for the purpose of calculating stormwater service fees.

Residential dwelling classifications. The following categories will identify the appropriate dwelling unit classifications to be utilized in applying the stormwater utility fee structure to the designations contained in the Beaufort County tax data system:

Single-family

Apartments

Townhouses

Condominiums

Mobile Home

~~Mobile home parks~~

~~Mobile home lots~~

~~River areas. River areas shall be those areas of Beaufort County that have been delineated as rivers on the most current digital mapping on file in the Beaufort County Engineering Department. Where applicable, these areas shall be deducted from a property's total land area in determining its stormwater service fee.~~

Stormwater management programs, services, systems and facilities. Stormwater management programs, services, systems and facilities are those administrative, engineering, operational, regulatory, and capital improvement activities and functions performed in the course of managing the stormwater systems of the county, plus all other activities and functions necessary to support the provision of such programs and services. Stormwater management systems and facilities are those natural and man-made channels, swales, ditches, swamps, rivers, streams, creeks, branches, reservoirs, ponds, drainage ways, inlets, catch basins, pipes, head walls, storm sewers, lakes, and other physical works, properties, and improvements which transfer, control, convey or otherwise influence the movement of stormwater runoff and its discharge to and impact upon receiving waters.

Stormwater service fees. Stormwater service fees shall mean the service fee imposed pursuant to this article for the purpose of funding costs related to stormwater programs, services, systems, and facilities. These fees will be calculated based upon the ~~residential category for a parcel and/or the nonresidential parcel's impervious area, and/or the vacant/undeveloped land category.~~ impervious and gross area at an 80/20 allocation; storm water service fee categories; any State agricultural exemptions or caps; an account administrative fee, countywide jurisdiction operation maintenance and capital project fees; and jurisdictional operation, maintenance and capital project fee.

~~Stormwater service fee; s~~Single-family unit (SFU). The single-family unit shall be defined as the impervious area measurements obtained from a statistically representative sample of all detached single-family structures within Beaufort County. The representative value will be 4,906 square feet.

Stormwater service fee categories. The appropriate categories for determining SFUs will be as follows:

	SFU (SFUs equal)	Calculation
Tier 1 Single-family Unit (<=2,521 square feet)		Dwelling units x 0.5
Tier 2 Single-family Unit (2,522 to 7,265 square feet)		Dwelling units x 1
Tier 3 Single-family Unit (>=7,266 square feet)		Dwelling units x 1.5
Mobil Home		Dwelling units x 0.36
Apartments		Dwelling units x 0.39
Townhouses		Dwelling units x 0.60
Condominiums		Dwelling units x 0.27
Mobile home parks		Dwelling units x 0.36
Mobile home lots		Dwelling units x 0.59
Nonresidential Commercial		Impervious area ÷ 4,906 sq. ft.
Residential/nonresidential vacant		Parcel area × SFU corrected factor

~~Vacant/undeveloped land. All parcels containing no impervious area and not being defined as exempt will have the corrected SFUs calculated for the following property classification system (PCS) codes:~~

- ~~PCS-29~~
- ~~PCS-33~~
- ~~PCS-91~~
- ~~PCS-92~~

~~PCS-99~~

~~PCS-81~~

~~PCS-82~~

~~PCS-83~~

~~PCS-84~~

~~PCS-89~~

~~PCS-74~~

~~PCS-76~~

~~Appropriate residential PCS category~~

~~Variable Costs. An impervious and gross area rate structure that allocates some cost to each of the two variables based on the amount of impervious surface and gross area.~~

Sec. 99-107. - Requirements for on-site stormwater systems: enforcement, methods and inspections.

- (a) All property owners and developers of real property to be developed within the unincorporated portions of Beaufort County shall provide, manage, maintain, and operate on-site stormwater systems and facilities sufficient to collect, convey, detain, control, and discharge stormwater in a safe manner consistent with all county development regulations and the laws of the State of South Carolina and the United States of America, except in cases when the property is located within an incorporated city or town subject to an interlocal governmental agreement with the county for stormwater management and the city or town has regulations that are more stringent than the county, in which case the city's or town's development regulations shall apply. Any failure to meet this obligation shall constitute a nuisance and be subject to an abatement action filed by the county in a court of competent jurisdiction. In the event a public nuisance is found by the court to exist, which the owner fails to properly abate within such reasonable time as allowed by the court, the county may enter upon the property and cause such work as is reasonably necessary to be performed, with the actual cost thereof charged to the owner in the same manner as a stormwater service fee as provided for in this article.
- (b) In the event that the county shall file an action pursuant to subsection 99-107(a), from the date of filing such action the county shall have all rights of judgment and collection through a court of competent jurisdiction as may be perfected by action.
- (c) The county shall have the right, pursuant to the authority of this article, for its designated officers and employees to enter upon private property and public property owned by other than the county, upon reasonable notice to the owner thereof, to inspect the property and conduct surveys and engineering tests thereon in order to assure compliance with any order or judgment entered pursuant to this section.

Sec. 99-108. - General funding policy.

- (a) It shall be the policy of Beaufort County that funding for the stormwater management utility program, services, systems, and facilities shall be equitably derived through methods which have a demonstrable relationship to the varied demands and impacts imposed on the stormwater program, services, systems, and facilities by individual properties or persons and/or the level of service rendered by or resulting from the provision of stormwater programs, systems and facilities. Stormwater service fee rates shall be structured so as to be fair and reasonable, and the resultant service fees shall bear a substantial relationship to the cost of providing services and facilities throughout the county. Similarly situated properties shall be charged similar rentals, rates, fees, or

licenses. Service fee rates shall be structured to be consistent in their application and shall be coordinated with the use of any other funding methods employed for stormwater management within the county, whether wholly or partially within the unincorporated portions of the county or within the cities and towns. Plan review and inspection fees, special fees for services, fees in-lieu of regulatory requirements, impact fees, system development fees, special assessments, general obligation and revenue bonding, and other funding methods and mechanisms available to the county may be used in concert with stormwater service fees and shall be coordinated with such fees in their application to ensure a fair and reasonable service fee rate structure and overall allocation of the cost of services and facilities.

- (b) The cost of stormwater management programs, systems, and facilities subject to stormwater service fees may include operating, capital investment, and non-operating expenses, prudent operational and emergency reserve expenses, and stormwater quality as well as stormwater quantity management programs, needs, and requirements.
- (c) To the extent practicable, adjustments to the stormwater service fees will be calculated by the Beaufort County ~~engineer~~ Stormwater Manager in accordance with the standards and procedures adopted by the ~~engineer's~~ Stormwater Manger's office.
- (d) The stormwater service fee rate may be determined and modified from time to time by the Beaufort County Council so that the total revenue generated by said fees and any other sources of revenues or other resources allocated to stormwater management by the county council to the stormwater management utility shall be sufficient to meet the cost of stormwater management services, systems, and facilities, including, but not limited to, the payment of principle and interest on debt obligations, operating expense, capital outlays, nonoperating expense, provisions for prudent reserves, and other costs as deemed appropriate by the county council.

Beaufort County service fee rate will be based on impervious and gross area at an 80/20 allocation; storm water service fee categories; any State agricultural exemptions or caps; an account administrative fee, countywide jurisdiction operation maintenance and capital project fees; and jurisdictional operation, maintenance and capital project fee. The rates are set by the Beaufort County Stormwater Rate Study adopted July 2015.

Each municipal jurisdiction may have a different fee predicated upon the individual municipal jurisdiction's revenue needs. The following stormwater service fee rates shall apply: be adopted by the municipal jurisdictions and may be amended from time to time by the individual governing body.

<u>Jurisdiction</u>	<u>Annual Stormwater Service Fee (\$/SFU/year)</u>
<u>City of Beaufort</u>	<u>\$65.00</u>
<u>Town of Bluffton</u>	<u>-98.00</u>
<u>Town of Hilton Head Island</u>	<u>108.70</u>
<u>Town of Port Royal</u>	<u>-50.00</u>
<u>Unincorporated Beaufort County</u>	<u>-50.00</u>

Sec. 99-109. - Exemptions and credits applicable to stormwater service fees.

Except as provided in this section, no public or private property shall be exempt from stormwater utility service fees. No exemption, credit, offset, or other reduction in stormwater service fees shall be granted based on the age, tax, or economic status, race, or religion of the customer, or other condition unrelated to the stormwater management utility's cost of providing stormwater programs, services, systems, and facilities. A stormwater management utility service fee credit manual shall be prepared by the ~~county engineer~~ Stormwater Manager specifying the design and performance standards of on-site stormwater services, systems, facilities, and activities that qualify for application of a service fee credit, and how such credits shall be calculated.

(a) Credits. The following types of credits against stormwater service fees shall be available:

- (1) Freshwater wetlands. All properties except those classified as detached single-family dwelling units may receive a credit against the stormwater service fee applicable to the property based on granting and dedicating a perpetual conservation easement on those portions of the property that are classified as freshwater wetlands and as detailed in the stormwater management utility service fee credit manual. The conservation easement shall remove that portion of the subject property from any future development. ~~Once this credit has been granted to a particular property, that portion of the property will be treated similar to the river and marsh areas and shall be deducted from the property's total land area in computing its stormwater service fee. This credit shall remain in effect as long as the conditions of the conservation easement are met.~~
- (2) Those properties that apply for consideration of an adjustment shall satisfy the requirements established by the Beaufort County ~~engineer~~ Stormwater Manager and approved reduced stormwater service fee.

(b) Exemptions. The following exemptions from the stormwater service fees shall be allowed:

- (1) Improved public road rights-of-way that have been conveyed to and accepted for maintenance by the state department of transportation and are available for use in common for vehicular transportation by the general public.
- (2) Improved public road rights-of-way that have been conveyed to and accepted for maintenance by Beaufort County and are available for use in common for vehicular transportation by the general public.
- (3) Improved private roadways that are shown as a separate parcel of land on the most current Beaufort County tax maps and are used by more than one property owner to access their property.
- (4) Railroad tracks shall be exempt from stormwater service fees. However, railroad stations, maintenance buildings, or other developed land used for railroad purposes shall not be exempt from stormwater service fees.
- (5) Condominium boat slips shall be exempt from stormwater service fees.

Sec. 99-110. - Stormwater service fee billing, delinquencies and collections.

(a) Method of billing. A stormwater service fee bill may be attached as a separate line item to the county's property tax billing or may be sent through the United States mail or by alternative means, notifying the customer of the amount of the bill, the date the fee is due (January 15), and the date when past due (March 17 - see Title 12, Section 45-180 of the South Carolina State Code). The stormwater service fee bill may be billed and collected along with other fees, including but not limited to the Beaufort County property tax billing, other Beaufort County utility bills, or assessments as deemed most effective and efficient by the Beaufort County Council. Failure to receive a bill is not justification for non-payment. Regardless of the party to whom the bill is initially directed, the owner

of each parcel of land shall be ultimately obligated to pay such fees and any associated fines or penalties, including, but not limited to, interest on delinquent service fees. If a customer is under-billed or if no bill is sent for a particular property, Beaufort County may retroactively bill for a period of up to one-year, but shall not assess penalties for any delinquency during that previous unbilled period.

- (b) Declaration of delinquency. A stormwater service fee shall be declared delinquent if not paid within 60 days of the date of billing or upon the date (March 17) of delinquency of the annual property tax billing if the stormwater service fee is placed upon the annual property tax billing or enclosed with or attached to the annual property tax billing.

Sec. 99-111. - Appeals.

Any customer who believes the provisions of this article have been applied in error may appeal in the following manner and sequence.

- (a) An appeal of a stormwater service fee must be filed in writing with the Beaufort County ~~public works director~~ Stormwater Manager or his/her designee within 30 days of the fee being mailed or delivered to the property owner and stating the reasons for the appeal. In the case of stormwater service fee appeals, the appeal shall include a survey prepared by a registered land surveyor or professional engineer containing information on the impervious surface area and any other feature or conditions that influence the development of the property and its hydrologic response to rainfall events.
- (b) Using information provided by the appellant, the county ~~public works director~~ Stormwater Manager (or his or her designee) shall conduct a technical review of the conditions on the property and respond to the appeal in writing within 30 days. In response to an appeal, the county public works director may adjust the stormwater service fee applicable to the property in conformance with the general purposes and intent of this article.
- (c) A decision of the county ~~public works director~~ Stormwater Manager that is adverse to an appellant may be further appealed to the county administrator or his designee within 30 days of the adverse decision. The appellant, stating the grounds for further appeal, shall deliver notice of the appeal to the county administrator or his designee. The county administrator or his designee shall issue a written decision on the appeal within 30 days. All decisions by the county administrator or his designee shall be served on the customer personally or by registered or certified mail, sent to the billing address of the customer. All decisions of the county administrator or his designee shall be final.
- (d) The appeal process contained in this section shall be a condition precedent to an aggrieved customer seeking judicial relief. Any decisions of the county administrator or his designee may be reviewed upon application for writ of certiorari before a court of competent jurisdiction, filed within 30 days of the date of the service of the decision.

Sec. 99-112. - No suspension of due date.

No provision of this article allowing for an administrative appeal shall be deemed to suspend the due date of the service fee with payment in full. Any adjustment in the service fee for the person pursuing an appeal shall be made by refund of the amount due.

Sec. 99-113. - Enforcement and penalties.

Any person who violates any provision of this article may be subject to a civil penalty of not more than \$1,000.00, or such additional maximum amount as may become authorized by state law, provided the owner or other person deemed to be in violation has been notified of a violation. Notice shall be deemed achieved when sent by regular United States mail to the last known address reflected on the county tax records, or such other address as has been provided by the person to the county. Each day of a continuing violation may be deemed a separate violation. If payment is not received or equitable settlement reached within 30 days after demand for payment is made, a civil action may be filed on behalf

of the county in the circuit court to recover the full amount of the penalty. This provision on penalties shall be in addition to and not in lieu of other provisions on penalties, civil or criminal, remedies and enforcement that may otherwise apply.

Sec. 99-114. - Investment and reinvestment of funds and borrowing.

Funds generated for the stormwater management utility from service fees, fees, rentals, rates, bond issues, other borrowing, grants, loans, and other sources shall be utilized only for those purposes for which the utility has been established as specified in this article, including but not limited to: regulation; planning; acquisition of interests in land, including easements; design and construction of facilities; maintenance of the stormwater system; billing and administration; water quantity and water quality management, including monitoring, surveillance, private maintenance inspection, construction inspection; public information and education, and other activities which are reasonably required. such funds shall be invested and reinvested pursuant to the same procedures and practices established by Title 12, Section 45-70 of the South Carolina State Code for investment and reinvestment of funds. County council may use any form of borrowing authorized by the laws of the State of South Carolina to fund capital acquisitions or expenditures for the stormwater management utility. County council, in its discretion and pursuant to standard budgetary procedures, may supplement such funds with amounts from the general fund.

Sec. 99-115. - ~~Initial study priorities for~~ Responsibilities of the stormwater management utility.

~~During the first three-year period of t~~ The county stormwater management utility, ~~the utility~~ shall perform adequate studies throughout the area served by the utility to determine the following:

- (1) Baseline study of water quality in the receiving waters;
- (2) Identification of pollutants carried by stormwater runoff into the receiving waters;
- (3) Recommended mitigation efforts to address pollutants carried by stormwater runoff into the receiving waters;
- (4) Inventory of the existing drainage system;
- (5) Recommended maintenance practices and standards of the existing drainage system;
- (6) Identification of capital improvements to the system to include construction or installation of appropriate BMPs.
- (7) A five-year spending plan.
- (8) Ensure compliance with the federally mandated MS4 permit requirements
- (9) Efficient utility administration including but not limited to billing, collection, defining rate structures, data management and customer support.

~~The proposed five-year spending plan shall be appropriately revised to reflect this priority and timetable for completion.~~

Sec. 99-116. - Stormwater utility management board.

- (1) Purpose. In compliance with and under authority of Beaufort County Ordinance 2001/23, the Beaufort County Council hereby establishes the stormwater management utility board (hereinafter referred to as the "SWU board") to advise the council as follows:
 - (a) To determine appropriate levels of public stormwater management services for residential, commercial, industrial and governmental entities within Beaufort County;
 - (b) To recommend appropriate funding levels for provision of services in the aforementioned sectors;

- (c) To advise the staff of the stormwater management utility on master planning efforts and cost of service/rate studies; and
- (d) To support and promote sound stormwater management practices that mitigates non-point source pollution and enhances area drainage within Beaufort County.

Municipal councils are encouraged to organize similar boards to advise them on stormwater management programs and priorities within their boundaries.

In keeping with discussions held during the formation of the stormwater utility, it is anticipated that the municipalities will appoint staff professionals as their representative on the advisory board.

(2) Stormwater districts. Stormwater districts are hereby established as follows:

District 1 - City of Beaufort

District 2 - Town of Port Royal

District 3 - Town of Hilton Head Island

District 4 - Town of Bluffton

District 5 - Unincorporated Sheldon Township

District 6 - Unincorporated Port Royal Island

District 7 - Unincorporated Lady's Island

District 8 - Unincorporated St. Helena Island Islands East

District 9 - Unincorporated Bluffton Township and Daufuskie Island

(3) Membership.

- (a) The SWU board is formed in accordance with Beaufort County Ordinance 92-28 and shall consist of a total of seven voting representatives from each of the following districts as noted below:

No. of Reps.	Stormwater District	Area
1	5	Unincorporated Sheldon Township
1	6	Unincorporated Port Royal Island
1	7	Unincorporated Lady's Island
1	8	Unincorporated St. Helena Island Islands East
2	9	Unincorporated Bluffton Township and Daufuskie Island
1	—	"At large"

All members of the SWU board will be appointed by county council and shall be residents of those districts or "at large" members from unincorporated Beaufort County.

- (b) The SWU board shall also consist of one nonvoting (ex officio) representative from the following districts:

Stormwater District	Municipality
1	City of Beaufort
2	Town of Port Royal
3	Town of Hilton Head Island
4	Town of Bluffton

All ex officio members from municipalities shall be appointed by their respective municipal councils for four-year terms.

- (c) All citizen members shall be appointed for a term of four years. The terms shall be staggered with one or two members appointed each year.
- (d) While no other eligibility criteria is established, it is recommended that members possess experience in one or more of the following areas: Stormwater management (drainage and water quality) issues, strategic planning, budget and finance issues or established professional qualifications in engineering, construction, civil engineering, architectural experience, commercial contractor or similar professions.

(4) Officers.

- (a) Officers. Selection of officers and their duties as follows:

1. Chairperson and vice-chair. At an annual organizational meeting, the members of the SWU board shall elect a chairperson and vice-chairperson from among its members. The chair's and vice-chair's terms shall be for one year with eligibility for reelection. The chair shall be in charge of all procedures before the SWU board, may administer oaths, may compel the attendance of witnesses, and shall take such action as shall be necessary to preserve order and the integrity of all proceedings before the SWU board. In the absence of the chair, the vice-chair shall act as chairperson.
2. Secretary. The county professional staff member shall appoint a secretary for the SWU board. The secretary shall keep minutes of all proceedings. The minutes shall contain a summary of all proceedings before the SWU board, which include the vote of all members upon every question, and its recommendations, resolutions, findings and determinations, and shall be attested to by the secretary. The minutes shall be approved by a majority of the SWU board members voting. In addition, the secretary shall maintain a public record of SWU board meetings, hearings, proceedings, and correspondence.
3. Staff. The ~~public works director~~ Stormwater Manager shall be the SWU board's professional staff.

- (b) Quorum and voting. Four SWU board members shall constitute a quorum of the SWU board necessary to take action and transact business. All actions shall require a simple majority of the number of SWU board members present.
 - (c) Removal from office. The county council, by a simple majority vote, shall terminate the appointment of any member of the SWU board and appoint a new member for the following reasons:
 - 1. Absent from more than one-third of the SWU board meetings per annum, whether excused or unexcused;
 - 2. Is no longer a resident of the county;
 - 3. Is convicted of a felony; or
 - 4. Violated conflict of interest rules according to the county-adopted template ordinance.Moreover, a member shall be removed automatically for failing to attend any three consecutive regular meetings.
 - (d) Vacancy. Whenever a vacancy occurs on the SWU board, the county council shall appoint a new member within 60 days of the vacancy, subject to the provisions of this section. A new member shall serve out the former member's term.
 - (e) Compensation. The SWU board members shall serve without compensation, but may be reimbursed for such travel, mileage and/or per diem expenses as may be authorized by the SWU board-approved budget.
- (5) Responsibilities and duties.
- (a) Review and recommend to the county council for approval, a comprehensive Beaufort County Stormwater Management Master Plan and appropriate utility rate study which is in accordance with the South Carolina Stormwater Management and Sediment Reduction Act; and
 - (b) Review and comment to the county administrator on the annual stormwater management utility enterprise fund budget; and
 - (c) Cooperate with the South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control (DHEC), Office of Coastal Resource Management (OCRM), the Oversight Committee of the Special Area Management Plan (SAMP), the Beaufort County Clean Water Task Force as well as other public and private agencies having programs directed toward stormwater management programs; and
 - (d) Review and make recommendations concerning development of a multiyear stormwater management capital improvement project (CIP) plan; and
 - (e) Review and advise on proposed stormwater management plans and procurement procedures; and
 - (f) Provide review and recommendations on studies conducted and/or funded by the utility; and
 - (g) Review and advise on actions and programs to comply with regulatory requirements, including permits issued under the State of South Carolina National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) General Permit for Storm Water Discharges from Regulated Small Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems (MS4).
- (6) Meetings. Meetings of the SWU board shall be held as established by the SWU board on a monthly basis and a calendar will be prepared giving the date, time and location of such meetings. Additionally, meetings may be called by the chairperson or at the request of four SWU board members. The location of all SWU board meetings shall be held in a public building in a place accessible to the public. The following shall apply to the conduct of all meetings:

- (a) Meeting records. The SWU board shall keep a record of meetings, resolutions, findings, and determinations. The SWU board may provide for transcription of such hearings and proceedings, or portions of hearings and proceedings, as may be deemed necessary.
- (b) Open to public. All meetings and public hearings of the SWU board shall be open to the public.
- (c) Recommendations or decisions. All recommendations shall be by show of hands of all members present. A tie vote or failure to take action shall constitute a denial recommendation. All recommendations shall be accompanied by a written summary of the action and recommendations.
- (d) Notice and agenda. The SWU board must give written public notice of regular meetings at the beginning of each calendar year. The SWU board must post regular meeting agendas at the meeting place 24 hours before any meeting. Notices and agenda for call, special or rescheduled meetings must be posted at least 24 hours before such meetings. The SWU board must notify any persons, organizations and news media that request such notification of meetings.

[\(Ord. No. 2005/33, § 17, 8-22-2005; Ord. No. 2009/21, §§ I—VI, 5-26-2009\)](#)

DRAFT



BEAUFORT COUNTY
STORMWATER MANAGEMENT UTILITY BOARD
AGENDA

Wednesday, August 26, 2015

2:00 p.m.

Beaufort Industrial Village, Building 3 Conference Room 104
Industrial Village Road, Beaufort
843.255.2805

In accordance with South Carolina Code of Laws, 1976, as amended, Section 30-4-80(d), all local media was duly notified of the time, date, place and agenda of this meeting.

1. CALL TO ORDER – 2:00 p.m.
 - A. Approval of Agenda
 - B. Approval of Minutes – July 15, 2015 ([backup](#))
2. INTRODUCTIONS
3. PUBLIC COMMENT
4. REPORTS
 - A. Utility Update – Eric Larson, P.E. ([backup](#))
 - B. MS4 Update - Eric Larson, P.E. ([backup](#))
 - C. Monitoring Update – Eric Larson, P.E. ([backup](#))
 - D. Stormwater Implementation Committee Report – Eric Larson, P.E. ([backup](#))
 - E. Stormwater Related Projects – Eric Larson, P.E. ([backup](#))
 - F. Upcoming Professional Contracts Report – Eric Larson, P.E. ([backup](#))
 - G. Regional Coordination – Eric Larson, P.E. ([backup](#))
 - H. Financial Report ([backup](#))
 - I. Maintenance Projects Report – Eddie Bellamy ([backup](#))
5. UNFINISHED BUSINESS
 - A. Update on the Rate Study- Eric Larson ([backup](#))
6. NEW BUSINESS
 - A. Selection of Consultant for 2015 Stormwater Management Implementation Guide ([backup](#))
 - B. Public Education Briefing - Beaufort Soil and Water Conservation District ([backup](#))
 - C. Solid Waste and Recycling Board Letter for Stormwater Management Utility Board ([backup](#))
 - D. Oaktie West Pond Acceptance of Section 319 Grant ([backup](#))
7. PUBLIC COMMENT



8. EXECUTIVE SESSION

A. "Discussion of negotiations incident to proposed contractual arrangements and proposed sale or purchase of property, the receipt of legal advice where the legal advice relates to a pending, threatened, or potential claim or other matters covered by the attorney-client privilege, settlement of legal claims, or the position of the public agency in other adversary situations involving the assertion against the agency of a claim."

9. NEXT MEETING AGENDA

A. September 30, 2015 ([backup](#))

10. ADJOURNMENT

