

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

February 13, 2019 at 2:00 p.m. in Executive Conference Room, Administration Building, Beaufort County Government Robert Smalls Complex, 100 Ribaut Road, Beaufort, South Carolina

### Board Members

#### Present

Don Smith  
Marc Feinberg  
Allyn Schneider  
William Bruggeman  
Patrick Mitchell

#### Absent

James Fargher

### Ex-Officio Members

#### Present

Neil Desai  
Kim Jones  
Van Willis  
Scott Liggett

#### Absent

### Beaufort County Staff

Eric Larson  
Melissa Allen  
Patricia Wilson  
Carolyn Wallace

### Visitors

Dr. Alan Warren, USCB Lab  
Lamar Taylor, City of Beaufort  
Steve Andrews, Andrew's Engineering

### 1. Meeting called to order – Don Smith

#### A. Agenda – Approved with Addition

- Addition to New Business – (Item D - FY 2020 Budget)

#### B. December 12, 2018 Minutes – Approved.

### 2. Introductions – Completed.

### 3. Public Comment(s) – None.

### 4. Reports – Mr. Eric Larson and Mr. David Wilhelm provided a written report which is included in the posted agenda and can be accessed at:

<https://www.bcgov.net/departments/Administrative/beaufort-county-council/boards-and-commissions/council-appointed/board-list/stormwater-management-utility-board/agendas/2019/021319.pdf>

#### A. Utility Update – Eric Larson

In reference to item 2A (Regionalization) the baseline report has been completed. A meeting will take place later in the month [February] to compare and contrast jurisdictions. Currently seeking input from the development community. Mr. Billy Bruggeman asked if there is much response. Mr. Larson explained this is the second time that it was sent out (first time was before Christmas) and responses are going directly to Bill Hodgins. He noted the deadline for feedback is in a few days [February 15].

In reference to Board Appointments (Item 7), Mr. Larson indicated that County Council is considering a recommendation for the District 6 seat and introduced Neil Desai as the new Ex-Officio member for City of Beaufort.

**B. Monitoring Update** – Eric Larson

Please reference the report, no additional updates.

**C. Stormwater Implementation Committee (SWIC) Report** – Eric Larson

Please reference the report, no additional updates.

**D. Stormwater Related Projects** – Eric Larson

Items #1 (Evergreen Project) and #7 (Alljoy) will be discussed during New Business.

**E. Professional Contracts Report** – Eric Larson

Please reference the report, no additional updates.

**F. Regional Coordination** – Eric Larson

Item #5 will be discussed during the budget presentation (New Business – FY2020 Budget).

**G. Municipal Reports** – Eric Larson

Please reference the report, no additional updates.

**H. Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4 Update)** – Eric Larson

Mr. Larson shared the “That’s My Truck” coloring contest event video. In reference to item #7 (System Mapping), the County is nearly done with this effort and will be done by fall. Mapping affects the budget [operations and maintenance of systems]. The County will be partnering with the Town of Port Royal and City of Beaufort to map their systems.

Mr. Don Smith asked if this will help with flooding and flood insurance requirements. Mr. Larson commented that this would be the first step in doing a hydrology model, which will help define watersheds and conveyance and identify choke points.

In reference to #11, the MS4 Annual Report was submitted to DHEC which included updates to monitoring plan and management plan.

**I. Maintenance Projects Report** – Eric Larson

Mr. Larson pointed out the Huspah Court South project, which was done as concession to receive an easement. That was the effort to satisfy a need to acquire an easement to the marsh and even though the easement was “free,” that is what it cost [\$31,895.47].

Mr. Marc Feinberg commented about educating the public on who is responsible [to maintain ditches]. Ms. Kim Jones shared that the Town of Bluffton gets that question constantly, especially from private communities. Mr. Larson noted that the Clemson program does provide education and will go to neighborhood POA meetings and hand out a brochure. He explained that he just attended a neighborhood meeting on Saturday and the topic was ditch maintenance.

**5. Unfinished Business** –

**A. Voting for Stormwater Manager Utility Board Chairman and Vice Chairman** – A motion was made for William Bruggeman as the Chairman and Allyn Schneider for the Vice Chairman. The motion was approved 5/0.

## 6. New Business

**A. *Evergreen Project Award*** – Mr. Larson explained that interviews were held the first week of January and the recommendation is for Andrew’s Engineering to do the project. The project will be funded out of CIP funds and by a grant match. The recommendation will go to Natural Resources Committee next week and is for design services and construction administration.

A motion was made to recommend this [award the contract to Andrew’s Engineering]. The motion was approved 5/0.

**B. *Alljoy Regional Study*** – Mr. Larson explained that this would be a sub-watershed study in the Alljoy area, as there are concerns of localized flooding during rain events and also due to high tide. He commented that it is similar to the Mossy Oaks situation. This study would help identify choke points and he anticipates a solution will be a small stormwater pond with a pump station to a larger pond.

Discussion took place about the following topics:

- The process. It would include an engineering study, engineering, land acquisition and construction.
- How many calls the County has received regarding this issue. Mr. Larson explained the County has received several calls (it is a hot spot when it rains).
- If not Stormwater’s responsibility to fix then who? Mr. Larson commented it should be rephrased to say should stormwater (utility revenue) fund the project. The flooding and complexity, as well as costs are above and beyond anything in current budget. Land acquisition is what is inflating the cost. Encourage CC to find other ways to fund the project.
- Discussion for the need to be very specific when making a decision (if stormwater issue or flooding issue) of who should or how the project should be funded.
- As the Stormwater Manager, what is the opinion on this issue? Mr. Larson commented that something needs to be done, but being funded by the utility will have a large impact on the revenue and rates and that is what is concerning.
- Description of Alljoy Area. – It is unincorporated, fairly dense, several repetitive loss properties (1 approved FEMA grant for elevation), approximately 600 acres area with two outfalls that is tidally influenced and predominantly state roads.
- Discussion about the Master Plan and will this project (if approved) give rise to other similar issues where the County would have to compare priorities.
- The study would help identify when and why flooding happens, how often, and assist in making decisions on how to make forward (funding sources, etc).
- Discussion about Emergency Management (proactive steps) and Disaster Recovery roles (mitigation and buy out programs).
- Mr. Larson explained that all of the study and estimates so far has been done by him and are assumptions.
- Discussion about other conditions to consider such as sea level rise.
- How many homes are/would be affected? There are 27 homes that have been identified.
- How many complaints has the County received? There are three properties that are consistently reporting
- The need to identify all properties below FEMA flood level (elevation projects). Have to approach from a grant perspective.

- This proposal would allow the County to select a firm from concept to construction drawings. \$250,000 would be the cost for the whole thing, estimate it may be about \$100,000 to get conceptual out of the way, it will require a lot of field work and modeling.
- There was a push from County Council to look at the Alljoy area. Mr. Larson's recommended approach is to solve the problem and not put a band-aid on it as that will only push the problem from one place to another.
- What is the major factor here? If it is tide, how is that a stormwater "problem?" There is a conveyance problem, elevation problem, and it is mostly state ROW.
- The proposed fees assume that there is no other participation than the County.

A motion was made to proceed with the minimum study to define the problem. Discussion: Mr. Bruggeman commented the need to define if it is a tide problem or stormwater problem. Mr. Larson noted that funding a study doesn't mean the Utility will need to fund the entire project. Comments were made that if the County was to apply for a grant that a study would be needed. The motion was approved 5/0.

**C. Annual MS4 Report** – The annual report was submitted and the revised monitoring and management plans were included in it. All MCM components are implemented, the program is fully staffed and operational, all ordinances are in place and inspections are increasing in volume. Mr. Feinberg asked if the County receives feedback on the report. Mr. Larson and Ms. Jones responded that they don't [haven't in the past] receive any.

**D. FY 2020 Budget** – Mr. Larson provided two memos that were prepared for the SWIC members [per IGA]. One memo was a financial summary of the last complete year of billing (for the utility). The other memo was the projected management fees for TY19 and projected cost shares for FY20. [The memos are attached.](#)

Mr. Larson explained that he wanted to provide a preview of the budget as he is working to update the five year plan for the utility. This is being presented a year early, as the management plan is complete and the capital project list and funding needs have changed.

The significant changes to staff would be an additional Inspector (plan reviewer), Assistant Stormwater Manager, Assistant Superintendent (data manager for infrastructure operations and maintenance), and second vac-truck crew. Addition of a specialty piece of equipment, Grade-All, which is a truck with a backhoe. The goal is to become proactive instead of reactive.

CIP Projects currently underway are in either the design or construction phase. New projects are those that were identified or renewed in master plan, but have not been started (regional ponds stormwater ponds for water quality).

Additional CIP to consider are projects that weren't in the master plan, but have been brought up to look at. Graves/Pepper Hall numbers were estimated by researching similar subdivisions. Alljoy numbers are estimates of the cost to do the study, design a pond with a pump, as well as elevation/land acquisition. May River sanitary sewer extension estimates are based on an older BJWSA study.

The proposed draft budget shows the next five years. Debt service is for the \$5 million borrowed in 2017 with another borrow anticipated for 2022.

The proposed stormwater fees increased rate is to \$100 starting next fiscal year and an alternative to wait 2 years to increase fees and then increase it to \$109. The recommended proposal is \$100/year, starting next year.

Proposed stormwater fees to account for additional capital improvement projects added to the budget were shared, and there were four different scenarios. The scenarios show the County may need to potentially double stormwater fees or find other funding sources. Mr. Larson was asked to look at the costs and see if the utility could fund these projects (sanitary sewer).

Discussion took place about:

- BJWSA and how they own and maintain once it is built, but they do not fund extensions.
- The priorities of Capital Projects and explaining how their costs are broken out over several years by phases.
- Discussion about debt service.
- Question and discussion about percent of stormwater fee to taxes.
- Comment about providing better education to the citizens on what they stormwater fee is for.

[The draft budget presentation is attached.](#)

#### **7. Public Comment(s) –**

Mr. Marc Feinberg thanked Mr. Smith, as it is his last board meeting.

Mr. Scott Liggett also honored Mr. Smith by sharing that has served since its inception in 2001. He commented that Mr. Smith never lost sight of the core mission to provide advice to Council or committees and has worked hard to generate opinions or advice. He mentioned that great strides have been made in areas such as flood reduction, storm readiness, land acquisition, and public education. Mr. Liggett thanked Mr. Smith for his service as a member and Chairman of the board. He also presented the award for his service.

Mr. Smith commented that it has been rewarding and he is proud of what the utility has done over the years.

#### **8. Next Meeting Agenda – Approved with Addition.**

Addition to Unfinished Business – FY20 Budget

#### **9. Meeting Adjourned**



**BEAUFORT COUNTY STORMWATER UTILITY**  
**120 Shanklin Road**  
**Beaufort, South Carolina 29906**  
**Voice (843) 255-2805 Facsimile (843) 255-9436**



**MEMORANDUM**

**TO:** Stormwater Implementation Committee (SWIC) Members

**FROM:** Eric W. Larson, Beaufort County Stormwater Utility Manager

**SUBJECT:** FY 17-18 Stormwater Utility Financial Summary

**DATE:** February 13, 2019

The following analysis serves as the end of year financial report provided each year as required by IGA Section 5.04(e). Administration has issued the final, audited Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (CAFR) for fiscal year (FY) 18.

In Tax Year (TY) 2017, Beaufort County, the Town of Port Royal, and the City of Beaufort continued their method of billing to “option E” as defined in the 2015 Rate Study. The Town of Hilton Head Island switched to Option E as well. The Town of Bluffton elected to remain with the previous rate structure, option A. The 2015 Rate Study explains how GIS information for impervious area and parcel acreage is used to determine billable units, based on the standard of 4,906 sq. ft. per SFU or IA. SWU fees are determined by Utility staff and reported to the County Auditor’s office for inclusion in the annual property tax notice.

A spreadsheet is attached providing detailed information per account:

	TY 2017 Total Billed	TY 2017 Total Collected	TY 2017 Billed Units	TY 2017 Collected Units	Collection Rates	TY 2017 Mgt. fees paid
Port Royal	\$ 395,283	\$ 226,980	7,044 IA 3,882 Acct.	# 3,767 Acct.	57.4% 97.0%	\$19,099
Beaufort, City	\$ 1,277,268	\$ 880,964	13,548 IA 6,439 Acct.	# 6,428 Acct.	69.0% 99.8%	\$32,847
HHI	\$ 4,845,352	\$ 4,805,127	33,240 IA 38,193 Acct.	# 37,696 Acct.	99.2% 98.7%	\$153,800
Bluffton	\$ 1,427,856	\$ 1,406,853	14,570 SFU* 12,154 Acct.	14,356 SFU* 12,001 Acct.	98.5% 98.7%	\$41,918
Unincorp. BC	\$ 4,842,993	\$ 4,641,983	53,877 IA 64,516 Acct.	# 62,197 Acct.	95.8% 96.4%	\$732,456
Total	\$12,788,752	\$ 11,961,907				\$980,120

**In Arrears**

A spreadsheet is attached which provides a complete accounting of all accounts in arrears, including a summary of actions taken to attempt collection. The following table summarizes the total number of accounts and fees in arrears for each jurisdiction.

	Accounts in arrears	Fees in arrears
Port Royal	124	\$167,935.89
Beaufort, City	85	\$407,345.20
HHI	402	\$26,841.15
Bluffton	242	\$6,346.30
Unincorp. BC	2,232	\$144,050.74
Total	3,085	\$752,519.28

**Credits**

A spreadsheet is attached which provides a complete accounting of all accounts receiving credits on SWU fees. The following table summarizes the total number of accounts and amount of credits given for each jurisdiction.

	Accounts with credits	Credit Amount
Port Royal	0	\$0
Beaufort, City	1	\$1,379
HHI	2	\$58,533
Bluffton	2	\$2,733
Unincorp. BC	498	\$100,389
Total	503	\$163,034

**Adjustments**

A spreadsheet is attached which provides a complete accounting of all accounts receiving adjustments on SWU fees after the initial billing for TY 17. The following table summarizes the total number of accounts for each jurisdiction.

	Accounts with adjustments
Port Royal	8
Beaufort, City	1
HHI	98
Bluffton	3
Unincorp. BC	111
Total	221


END



**BEAUFORT COUNTY STORMWATER UTILITY**  
**120 Shanklin Road**  
**Beaufort, South Carolina 29906**  
**Voice (843) 255-2805 Facsimile (843) 255-9436**

**MEMORANDUM**

**TO:** Stormwater Implementation Committee (SWIC) Members

**FROM:** Eric W. Larson, Beaufort County Stormwater Utility Manager 

**SUBJECT:** FY 19-20 (TY 19) Utility Management Fee Proposed Budget and Rates

**DATE:** February 13, 2019

This is the third year for the revised annual management fee budget proposal format. If you desire, you can compare the two years by reviewing the fiscal year FY 18-19 tax year (TY 18) budget proposal. The updated rate model, attached by reference to this memo, is intended to replace this analysis by presenting previous year’s actual numbers and projecting the Management fee annually once the actuals are added to the spreadsheet. Please note only the billable units have been updated in the model; the individual City and Town budgets were not provided to the County and therefore the Summary Tabs for each jurisdiction will not be a valid representation of your revenue and expenses. Of significant note for TY 19 will be the anticipated change to Option E by the Town of Bluffton. This change redistributed the management fee and cost shares to all jurisdictions within the County.

The scope of services to be provided by the Utility are defined by the IGA, specifically Section 5.04. Those services have been provided by the County staff to the municipalities for many years and will continue in fiscal year (FY) 20.

The final but unaudited collections for TY 17 have been inputted into the model along with the final billed units for TY 18. With this information input in the model, the distribution of cost shares and “percent of the whole” has shifted to reflect the most equitable method of cost sharing going into FY 19/20.

	TY 2017 Total Billed	TY 2017 Total Collected	TY 2017 Billed_Units (actual)	TY 2017 Collected Units	Collection Rates
Port Royal	\$ 395,283	\$ 226,980	7,044 IA 3,882 Acct.	# 3,767 Acct.	57.4% 97.0%
Beaufort, City	\$ 1,277,268	\$ 880,964	13,548 IA 6,439 Acct.	# 6,428 Acct.	69.0% 99.8%
HHI	\$ 4,845,352	\$ 4,805,127	33,240 IA 38,193 Acct.	# 37,696 Acct.	99.2% 98.7%
Bluffton	\$ 1,427,856	\$ 1,406,853	14,570 SFU* 12,154 Acct.	14,356 SFU* 12,001 Acct.	98.5% 98.7%
Unincorp. BC	\$ 4,842,993	\$ 4,641,983	53,877 IA 64,516 Acct.	# 62,197 Acct.	95.8% 96.4%
Total	\$12,788,752	\$ 11,961,907			

\*Under Option A, the SFU are based on total dollar amount billed/collected divided by the SFU rate, not from the analysis of the Impervious Layer.

# Under Option E, our current accounting system and SWU fee reporting software will not easily determine the exact collected billable units for IA and GA. Much like Option A, a percentage based on dollar amounts collected is assumed for projection of collection rates for billable units for the upcoming year.



	Billable Unit in TY 2018 (actual)	Calculated Growth Rate (TY17 to TY18)	Billable Units for TY 2019	Distribution for FY 19/20 – B.C. only ^	Distribution for FY 19/20 – NoB only ^
Port Royal	3,838 Acct.	0.987%	3,794 Acct.	3.00%	5.07%
Beaufort, City	6,499 Acct.	1.009%	6,560 Acct.	5.18%	8.77%
HHI	38,255 Acct.	1.002%	38,317 Acct.	30.28%	N/A
Bluffton	12,782 Acct.	1.052%	13,442 Acct.	10.62%	N/A
Unincorp. BC	64,467 Acct.	0.999%	64,418 Acct.	50.92%	86.16%
Total			126,532 Acct.	100 %	100 %

^ Based on TY 2019 projected billable acct. units for all jurisdictions within Beaufort County only.

The following cost shares are proposed for FY 20:

- 1) Public Education and Outreach - \$90,000. This is a continuation of the MOA for PE/PO and our contract with Clemson University. Distribution will be by the FY 19/20 percentages. Those jurisdictions using the Option E rate structure will pay this cost share as part of the Management fee.
- 2) Water Quality Monitoring North of the Broad River – \$120,000. This cost share is only for the County, Port Royal, and City of Beaufort. This is a continuation of the MOA for monitoring and our contract with USCB Lab. Distribution will be by the FY 19/20 percentages. These jurisdictions are using the Option E rate structure and will pay this cost share as part of the Management fee.
- 3) Regional Stormwater Standards Development – \$179,554. There is regional effort to standardize development standards throughout Beaufort County and Jasper County. With the cooperation of all political entities involved, a consultant was hired to study our region and provide recommendation for guidelines in future development and redevelopment standards. The project will be complete in the fall of 2019. This cost will be shared with the counties of Beaufort and Jasper, the cities of Beaufort and Hardeeville, and the towns of Bluffton, Hardeeville, and Port Royal and the cost-share will be based on population. The cost-share for the participating jurisdictions using the Option E rate structure is being remitted through the FY 19 management fee. For all other partners involved, it is important to budget any unspent funds for FY 20 to pay remaining invoices after June 30, 2019. Town of Bluffton and Jasper County jurisdictions will be billed for the expenses.

Cost Shares	PE/PO	Monitoring	Regional Development (From FY 19)
Port Royal	\$2,700	\$6,084	\$13,669 *
Beaufort, City	\$4,662	\$10,524	\$14,374 *
HHI	\$27,252	N/A	N/A
Bluffton	\$9,558	N/A	\$20,203
Unincorp. BC	\$45,828	\$103,392	\$105,303*
Yemassee	N/A	N/A	N/A
Unincorp, Jasper	N/A	N/A	\$19,889
Hardeeville	N/A	N/A	\$6,116
Ridgeland	N/A	N/A	N/A
Total	\$90,000	\$120,000	\$179,554

\* collected in full in FY 19 via the Mgt. fee.

The proposed Management budget for FY 19-20 is \$444,291. The following is a breakdown summary of major budget categories:

- Salaries, Fringe, Training = \$407,389
- Capital Equipment, Depreciation, Insurance, Repairs = \$10,772
- Cost Shares = \$210,000 (not included in Management budget)
- Office Supplies, Operational Expenses = \$8,630
- Professional & Non-Prof. Services = \$5,000
- Aerial Photography (budgeted annually, expended every 2 years) = \$12,500

Based upon the number of billable units, distribution percentages, and the Management budget, the following Management fee per billable unit and total Management fee has been estimated.

Mgt. Fee	Billable Units For TY 2019	Rate <sup>(1)</sup>	Total Mgt. Budget	Total Mgt. Budget w/ PE/PO & Monitoring Cost Shares (\$)
Port Royal	3,794 Acct.	\$5.83 / Acct.	\$13,322	\$22,106
Beaufort, City	6,560 Acct.	\$5.83 / Acct.	\$23,034	\$38,220
HHI	38,317 Acct.	\$4.23 / Acct.	\$134,543	\$161,795
Bluffton	13,442 SFU	\$4.23 / Acct.	\$47,199	\$56,757
Unincorp. BC	64,418 Acct.	\$19.00 / Acct. <sup>(2)</sup>	\$226,193	\$375,413
<b>Total</b>			<b>\$444,291</b>	<b>\$654,291</b>

\$ - Note that due to the lack of rounding within the Excel Spreadsheet “rate model” these values do differ slightly (\$10 or less) from the model.

- <sup>(1)</sup> Without regional standards project cost share added
- <sup>(2)</sup> Beaufort County has elected to fund its Regulatory program on a per account basis, therefore, the cost share amounts do not change the account fixed fee being proposed like it does other jurisdictions.

**Per Section 4.01 of the IGA, prior to April 1, 2019, please submit in writing your jurisdiction’s approval of the Management fee for TY 19 within FY 19-20.**

END

The background of the slide is a light gray gradient with several realistic water droplets of various sizes scattered across it. The droplets have highlights and shadows, giving them a three-dimensional appearance. The main title is centered in a large, bold, black sans-serif font.

# STORMWATER 5 YEAR PLAN UPDATE

BEAUFORT COUNTY STORMWATER DEPARTMENT AND UTILITY  
MANAGEMENT BUDGET PROPOSAL

FY 2020 – FY 2025

# SIGNIFICANT CHANGES

- ADDITION OF AN ASSISTANT STORMWATER MANAGER
- ADDITION OF A PLAN REVIEWER / MS4 INSPECTOR
- ADDITION OF AN ASSISTANT SUPERINTENDENT
- ADDITION OF SECOND VAC TRUCK CREW
  - DECISION TO KEEP THE OLD VAC TRUCK,
  - HIRE A 2-MAN CREW, AND
  - EVENTUAL PURCHASE OF A SECOND NEW VAC TRUCK IN FY 2023
- GRAD-ALL PURCHASE
- WHY? – COMPLETION OF PRIMARY SW INVENTORY SHOWS DRAMATICALLY MORE INFRASTRUCTURE
- ADDITION OF NEW CIP PROJECTS FROM 2018 MASTERPLAN UPDATE

# CAPITAL PROJECTS CURRENTLY UNDERWAY

- BREWER MEMORIAL PARK - \$562,000
- FACTORY CREEK PHASE I – NO ADDITIONAL COSTS
- FACTORY CREEK PHASE II - NO ADDITIONAL COSTS
- SALT CREEK SOUTH - \$2.1 MIL.
- SHANKLIN ROAD (AKA ROSEIDA ROAD) - \$3.5 MIL.
- MOSSY OAKS TASK FORCE - \$220,000
- EVERGREEN REGIONAL POND & 319 GRANT - \$697,000

# NEW CAPITAL PROJECTS FROM 2018 MASTERPLAN

- CAMP ST. MARY REGIONAL POND - \$3.9 MIL.
- ROCK SPRINGS CREEK - \$431,000
- SAWMILL BRANCH REGIONAL - \$1.1 MIL.
- LUCY POINT CREEK REGIONAL - \$439,000
- ALBERGOTTI CREEK REGIONAL - \$602,000

# ADDITIONAL CIP TO CONSIDER

- GRAVES / PEPPER HALL COST SHARE OF SW DESIGN & CONSTRUCTION - \$1.7 MIL. (EST.)
- ALLJOY REGIONAL WATERSHED STUDY - \$950,000 (EST.)
- ACQUISITIONS AND/OR STRUCTURE ELEVATIONS - \$9.7 MIL. (EST.)
- MAY RIVER WATERSHED SANITARY SEWER EXTENSIONS
  - GAS. BLUFF / STONEY CREEK - \$8 MIL. (EST.)
  - CAHILL BRANCH - \$ 2 MIL. (EST.)
  - PRITCHARDVILLE - \$10.5 MIL. (EST.)
  - ALLJOY - \$12.5 MIL. (EST.)

# PROPOSED BUDGET - DRAFT

	FY 20	FY 21	FY 22	FY 23	FY 24
<b>Expenses</b>					
SWU Mgt.	\$ 444,291	\$ 450,414	\$ 459,302	\$ 469,484	\$ 480,185
SWU Reg.	\$ 1,057,436	\$ 1,006,642	\$ 1,002,025	\$ 945,839	\$ 1,009,402
SWU O&M	\$ 4,041,160	\$ 4,208,455	\$ 4,306,992	\$ 4,400,074	\$ 4,451,797
Capital Equipment	\$ 683,940	\$ 657,000	\$ 855,000	\$ 639,100	\$ 415,000
Capital Projects	\$ 1,916,638	\$ 2,958,871	\$ 2,074,528	\$ 2,084,984	\$ 1,806,369
Debt Service	\$ 188,268	\$ 188,268	\$ 393,277	\$ 536,522	\$ 533,581
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 8,331,733</b>	<b>\$ 9,469,650</b>	<b>\$ 9,091,125</b>	<b>\$ 9,076,003</b>	<b>\$ 8,696,333</b>
<b>Revenues</b>					
Beginning Balance	\$ 5,876,948	\$ 4,276,370	\$ 1,660,500	\$ 4,620,065	\$ 2,729,346
Reserve	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 1,000,000
SWU Fees (all)	\$ 5,731,155	\$ 5,853,779	\$ 6,050,690	\$ 6,185,283	\$ 6,327,545
Bonds			\$ 5,000,000		
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 12,608,103</b>	<b>\$ 11,130,150</b>	<b>\$ 13,711,190</b>	<b>\$ 11,805,348</b>	<b>\$ 10,056,890</b>
<b>Net</b>	<b>\$ 4,276,370</b>	<b>\$ 1,660,500</b>	<b>\$ 4,620,065</b>	<b>\$ 2,729,346</b>	<b>\$ 1,360,557</b>



# PROPOSED SWU FEE – DRAFT PREFERRED ALTERNATE

Budget Alt. #1	FY 20	FY 21	FY 22	FY 23	FY 24	
Admin.	\$ 19	\$ 19	\$ 19	\$ 19	\$ 19	
IA (1)	\$ 71	\$ 71	\$ 71	\$ 71	\$ 71	
GA (2)	\$ 10	\$ 10	\$ 10	\$ 10	\$ 10	
total (3)	\$ 100	\$ 100	\$ 100	\$ 100	\$ 100	\$ 500
Bond			\$ 5,000,000 (4)			\$ 5,000,000
(1) Based on 4,906 sq.ft. per billable unit			(4) Current CIP has an add. \$4.5mil in new projects			
(2) Based on a declining block method						
(3) Typical Tier II SFR on 2 acres or less						

# PROPOSED SWU FEE – DRAFT ALTERNATE #2

Budget Alt. #2	FY 20	FY 21	FY 22	FY 23	FY 24	
Admin.	\$ 12	\$ 12	\$ 19	\$ 19	\$ 19	
IA (1)	\$ 65	\$ 65	\$ 80	\$ 80	\$ 80	
GA (2)	\$ 10	\$ 10	\$ 10	\$ 10	\$ 10	
total (3)	\$ 87	\$ 87	\$ 109	\$ 109	\$ 109	\$ 501
Bond			\$ 5,000,000 (4)			\$ 5,000,000
(1) Based on 4,906 sq.ft. per billable unit			(4) Current CIP has an add. \$4.5mil in new projects			
(2) Based on a declining block method						
(3) Typical Tier II SFR on 2 acres or less						

# BUDGET WITH ADDITIONAL CIP ADDED (ALT 3A) (ASSUMES COST SHARES WITH OTHER JURISDICTIONS)

Budget Alt. #3a *	FY 20	FY 21	FY 22	FY 23	FY 24	
Admin.	\$ 20	\$ 20	\$ 20	\$ 20	\$ 20	
IA (1)	\$ 85	\$ 85	\$ 85	\$ 85	\$ 85	
GA (2)	\$ 20	\$ 20	\$ 20	\$ 20	\$ 20	
total (3)	\$ 125	\$ 125	\$ 125	\$ 125	\$ 125	\$ 625
Bond		\$ 2,000,000	\$ 4,000,000	\$ 7,000,000	\$ 8,000,000	\$ 21,000,000
(1) Based on 4,906 sq.ft. per billable unit						
(2) Based on a declining block method						
(3) Typical Tier II SFR on 2 acres or less						
* adds to CIP: Pepper Hall cost share, Alljoy Flood Control, 50% of May River San. Sewer projects						

# BUDGET WITH ADDITIONAL CIP ADDED (ALT 3B) (ASSUMES COST SHARES WITH OTHER JURISDICTIONS)

Budget Alt. #3b *	FY 20	FY 21	FY 22	FY 23	FY 24	
Admin.	\$ 12	\$ 19	\$ 19	\$ 19	\$ 20	
IA (1)	\$ 65	\$ 65	\$ 75	\$ 80	\$ 85	
GA (2)	\$ 10	\$ 10	\$ 15	\$ 20	\$ 20	
total (3)	\$ 87	\$ 94	\$ 109	\$ 119	\$ 125	\$ 534
Bond		\$ 6,000,000	\$ 6,000,000	\$ 7,000,000	\$ 7,000,000	\$ 26,000,000
(1) Based on 4,906 sq.ft. per billable unit						
(2) Based on a declining block method						
(3) Typical Tier II SFR on 2 acres or less						
* adds to CIP: Pepper Hall cost share, Alljoy Flood Control, 50% of May River San. Sewer projects						

# BUDGET WITH ADDITIONAL CIP ADDED (ALT 4A) (ASSUMES NO COST SHARES)

Budget Alt. #4a *	FY 20	FY 21	FY 22	FY 23	FY 24	
Admin.	\$ 20	\$ 20	\$ 20	\$ 20	\$ 20	
IA (1)	\$ 105	\$ 105	\$ 105	\$ 105	\$ 105	
GA (2)	\$ 25	\$ 25	\$ 25	\$ 25	\$ 25	
total (3)	\$ 150	\$ 150	\$ 150	\$ 150	\$ 150	\$ 750
Bond		\$ 2,000,000	\$ 5,000,000	\$10,000,000	\$13,000,000	\$ 30,000,000
(1) Based on 4,906 sq.ft. per billable unit						
(2) Based on a declining block method						
(3) Typical Tier II SFR on 2 acres or less						
* adds to CIP: Pepper Hall cost share, Alljoy Flood Control, 100% of May River San. Sewer projects						

# BUDGET WITH ADDITIONAL CIP ADDED (ALT 4B) (ASSUMES NO COST SHARES)

Budget Alt. #4b *	FY 20	FY 21	FY 22	FY 23	FY 24	
Admin.	\$ 12	\$ 19	\$ 19	\$ 19	\$ 20	
IA (1)	\$ 65	\$ 65	\$ 80	\$ 80	\$ 105	
GA (2)	\$ 10	\$ 10	\$ 20	\$ 20	\$ 25	
total (3)	\$ 87	\$ 94	\$ 119	\$ 119	\$ 150	\$ 569
Bond		\$ 10,000,000	\$ 10,000,000	\$ 11,000,000	\$ 12,000,000	\$ 43,000,000
(1) Based on 4,906 sq.ft. per billable unit						
(2) Based on a declining block method						
(3) Typical Tier II SFR on 2 acres or less						
* adds to CIP: Pepper Hall cost share, Alljoy Flood Control, 100% of May River San. Sewer projects						

# RECOMMENDATIONS

- ADOPT A RATE INCREASE IN FY 20 AND REMAIN LEVEL FOR 5 YEARS, OR
- DELAY RATE INCREASE AND RAMP FEE INCREASES OVER 5 YEARS

AND

- COMMIT TO ADDING SOME OR ALL OF THE ADDITIONAL CIP PROJECTS TO PLAN, OR
- RECOMMEND TO COUNTY COUNCIL TO SEEK OTHER FUNDING SOURCES FOR THESE PROJECTS