

Otter Rock Water District

LINCOLN COUNTY, OREGON

May 2018

WATER SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT CHARGE METHODOLOGY



EXPIRATION DATE: 06/30/18

Table of Contents

1.0 Executive Summary 4

 1.1 Background..... 4

 1.2 Overview of SDC Methodology..... 4

 1.2.1 Water System SDC 4

 1.2.2 Compliance Costs..... 5

 1.2.3 SDC Summary for all Infrastructure Sectors 6

 1.2.4 SDC Ordinance and Methodologies..... 6

2.0 Introduction to SDC Methodology 7

 2.1 Background..... 7

 2.2 Oregon SDC Law 7

 2.2.1 SDC Structure 7

 2.2.2 SDC Credits 9

 2.2.3 Update and Review Requirements 9

 2.2.4 Other SDC Statutory Provisions 10

 2.3 Capacity Replacement Protocol..... 10

 2.4 Public Education and Input to Methodology 11

 2.4.1 SDC Public Education..... 11

 2.5 Report Organization 11

3.0 Water System SDC Methodology..... 12

 3.1 Introduction 12

 3.2 Water System Overview and Background..... 12

 3.2.1 Overall Water System Description..... 12

 3.2.2 Population and Population Projections 13

 3.3 EDU Methodology and Projected Growth 14

 3.4 CIP Project Summary and Project Costs 15

 3.4.1 Master CIP List 15

 3.4.2 Need for Projects on List Not in Existing Planning Documents..... 16

 3.5 Determination of Project SDC Eligibility..... 16

 3.6 Reimbursement SDC 18

 3.7 Improvement SDC..... 18

 3.8 SDC Credits – Water System 19

 3.8.1 Improvement Offset Credit 19

 3.8.2 Financing Credit - Project Costs and Potential Loan Amounts..... 20

 3.8.3 Present Worth of User Rate Increase and SDC Credits 20

 3.9 Water System SDC Summary 21

 3.10 SDC Assessment Schedule for Residential and Non-Residential Customers 21

 3.10.1 Residential and Nonresidential Assessment Table 21

 3.11 Potential Appeal Process for Calculation of Water System EDU’s: 23

4.0 Compliance Costs 25

 4.1 Introduction 25

 4.2 Compliance Costs..... 25

 4.2.1 Auditing/Accounting Costs 25

 4.2.2 SDC Methodology and Administration..... 25

 4.2.3 Infrastructure Planning Efforts..... 26

 4.2.4 Total Estimated SDC Revenue..... 26

 4.2.5 Calculation of Compliance Expenses..... 27

 4.2.6 Summary of SDC Revenue and Calculation of Compliance Surcharge 27

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Copy of ORS 223.297 to 223.314 (System Development Charges)

Appendix B: EDU Worksheet

Appendix C: League of Oregon Cities, System Development Charges Survey, August 2016 – Water SDC

OTTER ROCK WATER DISTRICT SDC METHODOLOGY

*Section***1**

1.0 Executive Summary

1.1 Background

The Otter Rock Water District (ORWD or District) is located in Lincoln County, Oregon approximately 8 miles north of Newport. The District is located along US Highway 101. In 2017 Otter Rock took on the task of planning for water infrastructure improvements throughout the District using the services of Civil West Engineering. The first step was a new Water System Feasibility Study and Planning Support (Study) that was completed in January 2018. The Study contains a Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) and associated costs.

In January 2018, the ORWD voted to create a System Development Charge (SDC) program for the water system. ORWD retained Civil West Engineering to also perform this work and prepare SDC methodology for the water system.

This methodology was prepared to present and summarize the methods and systems that can be used to establish water SDCs for ORWD. This methodology will be able to give possible options for funding the CIP list found in the Study. The SDC methodologies and calculations presented herein are consistent with the framework set forth by the Oregon SDC legislation encapsulated within ORS 223.297 to ORS 223.314.

“The purpose of ORS 223.297 to 223.314 is to provide a uniform framework for the imposition of system development charges by local governments, to provide equitable funding for orderly growth and development in Oregon’s communities and to establish that the charges may be used only for capital improvements” (www.oregonlaws.org).

1.2 Overview of SDC Methodology

The water system was analyzed in this methodology and recommendations prepared for an appropriate and defensible SDC. A summary of that effort is provided below.

1.2.1 Water System SDC

The methodology utilized to establish a water system SDC is based on the 2018 Water System Feasibility Study and Planning Support (Study). The projects in the water system CIP have been carefully analyzed to determine what percentage of each project is dedicated to providing capacity for future growth. Based on the analysis, a total SDC eligible project cost has been established.

Population estimates and ORWD’s adopted growth rate were used to establish the projected or future Equivalent Dwelling Units (EDUs) that will require additional capacity in the system. The water system SDC was established by dividing the SDC eligible project costs by the total projected growth in the system, resulting in a maximum water system SDC.

Credits should be developed, as appropriate, to eliminate the potential for “double-dip” charges that could result from a new user paying both increased user fees in support of a loan to construct new facilities and paying SDC fees for the same facility.

A summary of the SDC methodology for the water system is provided below in Table 1.2.1. For detailed coverage of the water system SDC methodology, see Section 3 of this report.

Table 1.2.1 – Water System SDC Summary

SDC Component	SDC Amount
Reimbursement Fee Per Section 3.6	\$0
Improvement Fee Per Section 3.7	\$15,183
Subtotal of Water SDC Fees per EDU	\$15,183

1.2.2 Compliance Costs

Oregon law allows a utility service provider to use SDC revenues to pay for costs associated with complying with and administering SDC programs. While this is not a separate category, it is acceptable to assess a “compliance charge” when collecting SDC fees.

Acceptable compliance cost activities include accounting and auditing costs, SDC methodology updates and plans, master planning costs, CIP administration costs, and other costs that are determined to be necessary to support and properly manage an SDC program.

It was estimated that the District will face an annual compliance cost of around \$6,000 related to administration of the SDC programs and maintaining proper infrastructure planning. A summary of the estimated SDC compliance expenses is provided below in Table 1.2.2a.

Table 1.2.2a – SDC Compliance Expense Summary

Compliance Activity	Estimated Cost	SDC Eligibility (%)	Frequency (years)	Annual \$
General Accounting / Administration Costs				
Auditing / Accounting	\$2,000	100%	1	\$2,000
SDC Methodology Administration & Annual Adjustments	\$2,000	100%	1	\$2,000
SDC Methodology Update	\$6,000	100%	10	\$600
Water System Compliance Costs				
Water Master Planning	\$24,000	50%	10	\$1,200
Water Conservation and Management Planning	\$8,000	50%	20	\$200
Subtotal of Annual Costs	\$41,000			\$6,000

Collection of funds to pay for these annual SDC compliance costs should be in the form of a percentage surcharge on the SDC collected. Therefore, an estimate must be made of the revenue that the District is projecting to collect over the planning period. By using average growth rates over the planning period, Table 1.2.2b below summarizes the anticipated revenue expected from the water system SDC.

Table 1.2.2b – SDC Revenue Estimate Summary

Estimates of SDC Revenue	Added EDU's per year	SDC Charge per EDU	Annual Revenue
Estimated Annual Water SDC Revenue	1.31	\$15,183	\$19,918
Compliance Cost Charge (Annual Cost/Annual Revenue)			30.12%

Based on this analysis, it will require a surcharge of around 30% on the SDC to collect adequate funds to properly administer an SDC program for ORWD. Section 4.0 of this methodology includes information and details on the establishment of SDC compliance costs.

1.2.3 SDC Summary for all Infrastructure Sectors

Table 1.2.3 summarizes the maximum defensible SDC for the water system as developed within this methodology.

Table 1.2.3 – Summary of SDC

SDC Component	SDC Amount
Improvement Fee	\$15,183
Reimbursement Fee	\$0
Compliance Surcharge	\$230
Total Water SDC Charge per EDU	\$15,413

A total water system SDC in Otter Rock would be around \$15,413 for an average new residential dwelling. It should be reiterated that this total charge does not include any potential reductions for SDC credits that may be appropriate in Otter Rock, depending on how the District undertakes the various CIP projects in the future.

1.2.4 SDC Ordinance and Methodologies

The SDC program in the ORWD is to be established through the ordinance process. The ordinance will provide the legal clout necessary to govern the administration and operation of the program. The new ordinance must pass through the regular and required ordinance process before being adopted as law within the District.

In addition to a new ordinance, a new resolution will be established to set the particular charge and other details for each SDC infrastructure sector.

This approach will allow the District to easily update SDC charges on a regular basis by simply passing a new resolution. There will be no need to adjust the SDC ordinance in the future. Information on updating and adjusting SDCs is provided in Section 2 of this methodology.

2.0 Introduction to SDC Methodology

2.1 Background

The potable water system currently serves approximately 190 residents (147 residential connections and 7 commercial connections).

The Otter Rock Water District owns and maintains a public water infrastructure system that includes:

- A potable water system complete with spring (groundwater) water intake, storage reservoirs, and a distribution system to deliver water to the end users.

The purpose of this study is to develop and discuss the methodology used to create a water system SDC program.

2.2 Oregon SDC Law

The State of Oregon has established statutory law for the development, assessment, and administration of SDCs for local governments, utility districts, and similar agencies. Oregon Revised Statutes (ORS) 223.297 - 223.314 (found in Appendix A for convenience) authorizes local governments and service districts to assess SDCs for various infrastructure sectors including sewer, water, storm drainage, streets, and others.

In addition to specifying the infrastructure systems for which SDCs may be assessed, the SDC legislation provides guidelines on the calculation and modification of SDCs, accounting requirements to track SDC revenues, and the adoption of administrative review procedures. A summary of the statutory SDC provisions is provided below:

2.2.1 SDC Structure

SDCs are typically developed around two separate modes or philosophies of SDC logic. They are:

1. Reimbursement SDC
2. Improvement SDC

SDCs can also be assessed based on a combination of reimbursement and improvement charges. In addition to these charges, the statute allows agencies to recover administrative costs that are necessary to set up, comply with, and administer SDC programs. These costs will be referred to as compliance costs.

Reimbursement SDC. A reimbursement SDC is designed to recover capital costs for projects that have already been undertaken. Current legislation requires that the reimbursement SDC be established by an ordinance or resolution that sets forth the methodology used to calculate and assess the charge. The methodology must integrate a number of factors when determining an appropriate SDC cost including:

1. The cost of existing facilities when they were constructed or implemented
2. Remaining capacity available for growth or development use
3. Prior contributions from existing users
4. The value of unused capacity
5. Ratemaking principles employed to finance the capital improvements
6. Grants or other funding sources that must be subtracted from the eligible costs and

7. Other relevant factors

The objective of a reimbursement SDC is that future system users contribute an equitable portion of the capital costs of developing new facilities with excess capacity.

A typical example of how a reimbursement SDC could be utilized is with a recently upgraded or constructed sanitary sewer pump station. Sanitary sewer pump stations are required to be designed and constructed to handle a future (20 or 25 year) projected capacity. The additional cost required for the construction of a new pump station that can not only handle existing flows but future projected flows becomes the SDC eligible portion of the project cost.

For example, if a pump station was built five years ago, but has additional capacity available for future growth, the value of the remaining unused capacity of the station can be calculated and assessed as a reimbursement SDC eligible project cost to all new customers who wish to utilize some of the remaining capacity during the remainder of the design period (15 or 20 years, or whatever the case may be).

Improvement SDC. The improvement fee is designed to recover costs of planned capital improvements as they appear on an adopted capital improvement list or capital improvement plan (CIP). The improvement fee must also be specified in an ordinance or resolution and is subject to the following conditions:

1. The costs of projected capital improvements will increase the capacity of the system.
2. Projects must appear on an approved and adopted CIP list or be added to the list through development review and approval.
3. Projects must serve more than the development for which the SDC is being charged. Specifically, to be considered a qualified project:
 - a. the project is not located on or contiguous to property that is being developed, or
 - b. the project is located in whole or in part on or contiguous to property that is the subject of development approval and required to be built larger or with greater capacity than is necessary for the particular development project to which the improvement fee is related.

Revenues generated from improvement fees must be dedicated to capacity increasing capital improvements or the repayment of debt on such improvements. An increase in capacity is established if an improvement increases the level of service provided by existing facilities or provides new facilities. The portion of such improvements funded by improvement fees must be related to current or projected development.

Combined SDC. In most cases, growth needs due to development will be met through a combination of existing available capacity (reimbursement SDC) and future capacity enhancing improvements (improvement SDC). The sum of reimbursement and improvement SDC is commonly referred to as a combined SDC. However, when utilizing a combined SDC, the methodology must demonstrate that the charge is not based on providing the same capacity-increasing result due to both SDCs. In short, an agency cannot “double-dip” when using a combined SDC. This is usually accomplished by structuring the fee to reflect the weighted average cost of existing and new facilities.

Compliance Costs. Oregon law allows SDC revenue to be utilized by the assessing agency for costs incurred in an effort to comply, administer, study, and update an SDC program. Compliance costs include, but are not necessarily limited to:

1. Auditing and accounting costs
2. Master/Facilities Planning Costs and Planning Updates
3. SDC Methodology Development Costs and Updating of SDC Plans
4. Maintenance of a Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) list

Compliance costs are typically assessed based on a percentage of the overall or maximum anticipated or projected annual SDC revenue. These revenues must be used to maintain or administer an active SDC program. Compliance costs are discussed in Section 4.0.

2.2.2 SDC Credits

Oregon law requires that an SDC credit be provided against any assessed improvement fee for the construction of “qualified public improvements.” Qualified improvements, as discussed above, are improvements that are required as a condition of development approval, are included on the CIP list, and are either:

1. not located on or contiguous to the property being developed, or
2. located in whole or in part, on or contiguous to, property that is the subject of development approval and required to be built larger or with greater capacity than is necessary for the particular development project to which the improvement fee is related.

In simple terms and for example, if a new wastewater pump station appears on a CIP list and is required for a specific development to be undertaken, the owner of the development can construct the new pump station and receive an SDC credit for the SDC eligible portion of the project costs, assuming that the new station is needed to serve more customers than are represented by the development alone.

An additional credit must be included in the methodology for the present worth of financing payments that may occur in the future for an undertaken improvement. In short, new users cannot be required to pay SDCs for specific improvements as well as pay increased user rates to pay back loans that were required to construct the improvements. This form of “double-dipping” is overcome by establishing a credit based on the present worth of a potential increase in monthly user rates over a specified period of time.

2.2.3 Update and Review Requirements

SDC methodology is public information and must be made available for public review.

The SDC ordinance must include procedures and practices for not only the establishment but the modifying and updating of SDC fees. Public agencies must maintain a list of persons and organizations who have made a written request for notification prior to the adoption or amendment of any new or updated SDC fees.

However, changes to the SDC rates resulting from:

1. changes to costs in materials, labor, or real property as applied to projects in the required project list, or
2. application of a cost index that considers average change in costs of materials, labor, or real property and is published for purposes other than SDC rate setting (i.e. ENR Construction Cost Index)

are not considered “modifications” to the SDC. As such, the local agency is not required to adhere to the notification provisions.

If changes to the SDC methodology or assessment amounts do represent a modification, the notification provisions in the Oregon law require a 90-day written notice period prior to the first public hearing, with the new SDC methodology available for review at least 60 days prior to the public meeting.

2.2.4 Other SDC Statutory Provisions

Other provisions of the Oregon legislation require:

1. Development of a capital improvement program/plan (CIP) or comparable planning effort that lists the improvements that may be funded with improvement fee revenues and the estimated timing and cost of each improvement. (This is usually accomplished through a master planning effort.)
2. Deposit of SDC revenues into dedicated and individual accounts and the annual accounting of revenues and expenditures. The annual accounting effort must include a list detailing the amount spent on each project funded, in whole or in part, by SDC revenues, including costs attributed to complying with the SDC legislation.
3. Creation of an administrative appeals procedure, in accordance with the legislation, whereby a citizen or other interested party may challenge any expenditure of SDC revenues.
4. Preclusion against challenging the SDC methodology after 60 days from the enactment of or revision to the SDC ordinance or resolution.

The provisions of the legislation are invalidated if they are construed to impair the local government’s bond obligations or the ability of the local government to issue new bonds or other financing. Furthermore, the establishment or modification of an SDC or a project list is not a land use decision issue.

2.3 Capacity Replacement Protocol

It is common to have a system in place that allows a new land use or development to replace an existing land use and provide an adjustment to SDCs.

For example, if someone buys an older house, tears it down, and constructs a new residential home in its place, no new flows or demands are added to the system, and no new capacity is required to service the new residence. Therefore, it would be appropriate to waive SDC fees in this instance.

If someone tears down a number of old homes to build a new apartment complex, the project must be carefully considered, and an adjustment made, depending on how many new units there will be, how much more impervious surface, etc. compared to the previous land use.

Capacity replacement issues must be handled on a case by case basis and a process developed to allow a fair adjustment when existing capacity use is replaced with a similar land use.

2.4 Public Education and Input to Methodology

A successful SDC methodology update must incorporate a public education and public input component that effectively conveys information to interested and affected groups in the community and allows them a forum to ask questions, voice concerns, and seek resolutions.

2.4.1 SDC Public Education

Once underway with the SDC methodology creation process, a meeting with the District Commissioners was held to discuss various topics. A description of how SDCs are calculated was presented for review, input, and concurrence. Feedback was received to tailor the methodology for the needs and desires of the community.

2.5 Report Organization

The following sections comprise this Otter Rock Water District SDC Methodology Plan as presently constituted:

- **Section 1 – Executive Summary.** This section provides a brief overview and summary of the SDC Plan and is intended to provide the reader with the important facts and findings contained in the overall plan.
- **Section 2 – Introduction to SDC Methodology.** This section provides information on the legal and statutory background for the establishment of SDCs within the State of Oregon.
- **Section 3 – Water System SDC Methodology.** This section provides a detailed accounting of the water system SDC methodology.
- **Section 4 – Compliance Costs.** This section provides a detailed accounting and methodology for the establishment of a compliance cost for the maintenance of the SDC program.
- **Appendix.** The Appendix includes information that is referenced in this study but is not included in the referenced planning documents.

3.0 Water System SDC Methodology

3.1 Introduction

This section describes the methodology and SDC calculation for the potable water system for the Otter Rock Water District, Oregon. Included are descriptions of the existing and future demand requirements on the water system, existing and future equivalent dwelling units (EDU) for the calculation of SDCs, the projects and project costs developed to address deficiencies and satisfy future demand needs, and a calculation of the maximum justifiable SDC for the District (per equivalent dwelling unit).

3.2 Water System Overview and Background

The District's Water System Feasibility Study and Planning Support (January 2018, Civil West Engineering Services, Inc.) has been used to establish present and future water demand, system capacity, improvement project development, project costs, and other information that will be used in this methodology. This section will provide some basic background information about the system as constituted at the time this methodology was prepared.

3.2.1 Overall Water System Description

The water system in ORWD includes a number of separate elements to obtain and transmit water to individual customers. A brief overview of the different system elements is provided below.

Source. ORWD obtains all its potable water from three (3) springs to the northeast of the community along Otter Crest Loop. The springs are fed by percolating groundwater through Cape Foulweather geologic formations and into the springs. Springs #1 and #2 lie to the east of Otter Crest Loop and Spring #3 lies to the west of Otter Crest Loop. Concrete spring boxes serve to collect the groundwater for all three sources. Spring #3 relies on a pump to deliver water to the storage tanks and the other two springs rely on gravity to feed the water storage tanks. Spring #3 is only used during emergencies. Spring #1 is the main water supply during storms and Spring #2 is the main supply during dry periods.

It is recommended all three springs be rehabilitated.

Treatment. The spring sources are classified as groundwater sources by the Oregon Drinking Water Program (DWP) in accordance with Oregon Health Authority (OHA) regulations. Filtration of the source water is not required. For records since 1997, a total of 12 routine water samples tested positive for total coliform (TC+). Five of the positive results have occurred since November of 2015. There were no positive test results between May of 2001 and November of 2015. Virus treatment is unlikely since a positive fecal coliform test has never occurred.

The spring sources are a valuable resource to the community – they represent a self-sustaining, locally derived source of water that has historically not required any treatment prior to consumption. The distribution of the water is entirely driven by gravity feed, so in the case of an emergency loss of power, the community will still be able to have potable water.

The source of the Total Coliform (TC+) hits are unknown; failing infrastructure, however, may be the potential cause. The roof of the large rectangular tank, for example, was recently replaced in September

of 2016. Prior to replacement, potential sources of contaminants from surface water and animals living on or around the tank may have contributed to the TC+ hits. Likewise, positive hits from the other sample sites could have come from the hardware, not from the sources themselves. If the cause for the TC+ hits are not in the source groundwater, upgrades and rehabilitation efforts may resolve the water quality problems currently experienced in the system.

Distribution. The existing water distribution system extends throughout the community and provides potable water to the system rate payers. The existing system distribution piping consists of a mix of 6-inch, 4-inch, 2-inch, and 1½-inch AC and PVC piping. Most of the system is about 40 years old – well beyond the design life of the system. Due to numerous leaks in the system, the entire distribution system will need to be replaced with new pipe.

The average daily unit production for Otter Rock has risen in the past two years from 224 gallons per person per day (2014) to 283 gallons per person per day (2016), based on the master meter readings furnished by the Water District. Water use in America is documented by the U.S. Department of the Interior in the 2000 U.S. Geological Survey - Circular 1268. According to the study, the average annual per capita water consumption for Oregon is 187 gallons per capita per day (gpcd) including domestic, commercial, public use and loss. The difference between consumption and production is indicative of excessive leaks in the system. Leaks in the distribution piping and appurtenances have the potential to not only adversely affect water quality through the introduction of pathogens from surface water, but also contribute considerably to pressure losses throughout the system.

It is recommended that all distribution pipeline be replaced. It is also recommended that individual water meters be installed at each connection.

Storage. The water storage capacity of ORWD consists of a 30,000-gallon concrete cylindrical tank and a 300,000-gallon concrete rectangular tank. The large tank was installed in the 1970s. The small tank was installed some time before the large tank, possibly as far back as the 1930s when the original system was installed. The water is currently not filtered or treated; it is piped directly from the spring sources to the cylindrical tank, and then to the rectangular tank for eventual distribution to the community.

It is recommended that both tanks be replaced. It is also recommended that a booster pump station be installed to help increase system pressures for fire fighting purposes and residential usage.

3.2.2 Population and Population Projections

The current population in the ORWD service area is approximately 190 residents, half of which are half-time and half of which are full-time. Future development is limited due to topography of the area. The present population growth rate for Lincoln County, based on estimates from Portland State University's Population Research Center for 2014-2015, is approximately 0.7%, which was used in the 2018 Feasibility Study and therefore will be used for this study. Projected future water demand, therefore, is based on current water demand for the present population and projected population growth.

It is estimated that approximately 28 customers will be added to the District's distribution system by the end of the 20-year planning period. The population is projected to grow to approximately 218 by 2037 given a growth rate of 0.7% and a current population of 190. A more detailed discussion of residential and commercial customers follows in the next section.

3.3 **EDU Methodology and Projected Growth**

Local water system capacity is commonly defined using a system that seeks to reduce or convert all customer categories, including residential and non-residential categories, to a common denominator commonly referred to as an equivalent dwelling unit or EDU. An equivalent dwelling unit represents the demand or quantity of water required on a daily basis by an average residential customer within the system. The cumulative demand or impact on the system generated by all the users can therefore be expressed in terms of a multiple of EDUs.

An example of using the EDU method to describe non-residential water use follows:

A restaurant is a non-residential water customer that uses more water than a typical household. A review of the water records for a particular restaurant may show that, over a period of time (a typical yearly operation) that the restaurant used as much water as 14 average residential customers in the community. Therefore, it can be said that the restaurant's water use or water demands are equivalent to 14 residential dwellings. More simply, the restaurant is equal to 14 EDUs. This value can be used to calculate and compare the regular water use at the restaurant, or any non-residential customer, to the water use in the residential sector of the system.

In order to project future EDUs it is assumed that the EDU growth rate will equal the population growth rate. This logic assumes that all sectors in the community will grow at a rate similar to that of the residential population. Under this assumption, it is anticipated that, for example, commercial enterprises will expand in response to population growth and job creation to service a growing population.

Presently there are no individual water meters for the current 147 existing residential users. However, there are water meters for the seven (7) commercial users. The seven commercial connections and their base water usage allotment is:

1. MO's – 6500 gallons/month
2. Palmer – 6,500 gallons/month
3. Flying Dutchman Winery – 6,500 gallons/month
4. Post Office – 6,500 gallons/month
5. Oregon State Parks – 26,500 gallons/month
6. Chalet Condos – 26,500 gallons/month
7. Linker – 1,210 gallons/month

Commercial annual base usage is approximately 1,000,000 gallons per year. However, metered record information from the District indicates that the actual annual usage is nearly double the base.

To determine the amount of growth EDUs to plan for, the number of existing water system EDUs had to be established. According to the 2018 Feasibility Study and District meter recordings, the average daily water usage is approximately 33,994 gallons/day (approx. 12.4 million gallons (MG) per year). Based on this total usage and other information from the District, it was approximated that nearly 10.4MG is attributed to residential use and 2MG attributed to commercial. Table 3.3.1 summarizes a spreadsheet found in Appendix B (Worksheet No. B) showing the progression to determining current and future EDUs. It is projected that an additional 26 EDUs will be added to the water system over the planning period.

Table 3.3.1 – Population and EDU Current and Future

	Current 2016	Future*
Population	190	218
Connections / EDUs:		
Residential	147 / 147	168 / 168
Commercial	7 / 28	8 / 33
Total EDU's	175	201

*Future based on 0.7% growth rate

The average quantity of water distributed to a typical single-family dwelling unit is approximately 70,801 gallons per year. This volume sold per year becomes the basis for EDU calculations with 1 EDU = 70,801 gallons per year. Other users can then be described as an equivalent number of EDUs based on their relative water consumption. For example, a commercial business that had an average metered consumption of 141,602 gallons per year uses twice the amount of water as the typical single-family dwelling and can be considered 2 EDUs.

3.4 CIP Project Summary and Project Costs

An integral component in this water SDC methodology is the establishment of a Water System Capital Improvement list or CIP. Because there have not been any recent significant improvements, there are no past projects to list and therefore, there will not be any Reimbursement SDCs as defined in Section 2. Projects that remain to be completed will form the basis for Improvement SDCs.

3.4.1 Master CIP List

The CIP projects found in the 2018 Otter Rock Water District Water System Feasibility Study was used for this methodology. The following table outlines the recommended improvements, costs, and projected date of completion. The CIP Master List should be updated regularly as new needs or additional planning arise, resulting in new projects. Likewise, if it is determined that a particular project is no longer needed, it should be dropped from the CIP list.

Table 3.4.1 – Master Water System Improvement Project List (CIP)

Project No.	Project Description	Project Cost	Projected Build Date	Project Cost Date
1	Replace Existing Distribution System	\$2,227,000	2019	2018
2	Install Individual Water Meters	\$398,000	2019	2018
3	Rehabilitate All Three Springs	\$37,000	2019	2018
4	Replace Both Storage Tanks	\$372,000	2019	2018
5	Upgrade Tank Site Valving and Piping	236,000	2019	2018
6	Install Booster Pump Station	90,000	2019	2018
7	Project Interim Financing	150,000	2019	2018
	TOTAL	\$3,510,000		

The CIP project list above indicates the date when the original project cost estimate was prepared. Should improvements not be made within a reasonable period of time, the “Project Cost Date” will allow for future planning by using the appropriate Engineering News Record Index (ENR Index). In the future, costs on the CIP can be updated using the new ENR values as needed. The ENR Index value is updated monthly to adjust for inflation, material and labor costs, changes in the industry, and other factors that affect the cost of engineering and construction efforts.

3.4.2 Need for Projects on List Not in Existing Planning Documents

Due to the size of the Water District's system, the above CIP represents improvements to every water system component. As such, with the CIP improvements, it is expected there will be no more significant improvements necessary for many years. It is anticipated that if there are any additional capital improvements they would be into the future at least 20-years, or as otherwise dictated by development which is unknown and unexpected at the time of this report.

3.5 Determination of Project SDC Eligibility

The SDC methodology must include a discussion of the percentage of each project's cost that can be attributed as necessary for growth and, therefore, be considered SDC eligible. As discussed previously, SDCs must be based on a project's costs or the portion of a project's cost that is necessary to add system capacity in response to or in anticipation of growth.

When determining what percentage of a project should be considered SDC eligible, one must consider existing capacity needs versus future capacity needs. If a project is developed to provide a 50% increase in capacity to an element of the water treatment or distribution system, 50% of the project costs would be considered to be SDC eligible. If a project is developed to provide service to a new area not currently served by municipal water and where development is expected to occur, the project could be considered to be 100% SDC eligible.

Using this approach, all of the projects presented in Section 3.4 were reviewed to determine SDC eligibility. A brief description is provided below to illustrate the logic and approach taken to determining the eligibility of each project on the CIP list.

Project 1: Replace Existing Distribution System

For many of the capacity related projects, the ratio of the existing overall system capacity to future required capacity was utilized to determine the percentage of SDC eligibility that a project should be considered for. Specifically, the following calculation was utilized:

- (A) Existing system-wide capacity: ~ 33,994 gpd (2018 Feasibility Study)
- (B) Projected capacity need: ~ 38,989 gpd
- (C) Ratio of existing capacity to future needs = $A/B = \sim .872$
- (D) Rounded % of SDC eligibility = $1 - C = 1 - 0.875 \sim 12.80\%$

Therefore, for Project 1 and other projects in this methodology, we have established that the estimated percentage of SDC eligibility, based on capacity growth, is approximately **12.8%**.

Project 2: Install Individual Water Meters

This project is primarily required to help manage the water system. Water meters will allow the District to accurately and fairly bill the water customers according to an established user rate structure. No part of this project will increase capacity or address growth issues. Therefore, the project is not considered to be SDC eligible.

Project 3: Rehabilitate All Three Springs

This project will result in the rehabilitation of all new springs, necessary for current and future water users. Based on the methodology discussed under project No. 1, the SDC eligibility of this project will be attributed to the ratio of the existing system capacity to the future needs that are to be imposed by anticipated growth. Therefore, the SDC eligibility of this project shall be considered to be 12.8% of the project costs.

Project 4: Replace Both Storage Tanks

This project entails the replacement of two old tanks with new storage facilities. The tanks are over 47 years old and are showing obvious signs of degradation and are not built to current seismic design criteria. It was concluded that the District's current volume of 330,000 gallons is sufficient storage to provide anticipated demands through the next 20-years. Because there is a need for new storage facilities, the same volume will be constructed which includes growth. Therefore, as with the other capacity related projects, this project is considered to be 12.8% SDC eligible.

Project 5: Upgrade Tank Site Valving and Piping

This project is required to replace and upgrade the entire valving and distribution system around the tanks and springs. The existing pipe has capacity issues as well as maintenance issues. A simpler, more functional, and more robust system is needed. As with the other capacity related facilities, this project is considered to be 12.8% SDC eligible.

Project 6: Install Booster Pump Station

Most of the properties in Otter Rock currently have inadequate pressure from the gravity-fed system. To provide the required minimum of 20 psi residual pressure at the service connections, a small booster pump station is required at the tank site to serve the community. As with the other capacity related projects, this project is considered to be 12.8% SDC eligible.

Project 7: Project Interim Financing

This real cost to the overall improvement project needs to be taken into account. Based on the methodology discussed under project No. 1, the SDC eligibility of this cost will be attributed to the ratio of the existing system capacity to the future needs that are to be imposed by anticipated growth. Therefore, the SDC eligibility of this project cost shall be considered to be 12.8% of the project costs.

Table 3.5.1 below summarizes all of the projects on the CIP and lists the SDC eligibility and percentages for each project.

Table 3.5.1 – Water System Project SDC Eligibility Summary

Project No.	Project Description	Current Cost Estimate	Reimbursement SDC Eligible (Y/N)	Improvement SDC Eligible (Y/N)	% SDC Eligible	SDC Eligible Cost
1	Replace Existing Distribution System	\$2,227,000	N	Y	12.8%	\$285,056
2	Install Individual Water Meters	\$398,000	N	N	0%	\$0
3	Rehabilitate All Three Springs	\$37,000	N	Y	12.8%	\$4,736
4	Replace Both Storage Tanks	\$372,000	N	Y	12.8%	\$47,616
5	Upgrade Tank Site Valving and Piping	236,000	N	Y	12.8%	\$30,208
6	Install Booster Pump Station	90,000	N	Y	12.8%	\$11,520
7	Project Interim Financing	150,000	N	Y	12.8%	\$19,200
	TOTALS	\$3,510,000				\$398,336

3.6 Reimbursement SDC

As stated previously, Oregon Law includes provisions for a reimbursement SDC to be developed for projects that have been completed and have remaining capacity available to service growth. However, in the case of the ORWD, there have been no significant project that falls under this provision, therefore, the reimbursement component is zero.

3.7 Improvement SDC

Calculation of the improvement SDC is based upon the methodology and the establishment of the SDC eligible project costs as outlined in Section 3.5 above. The following table provides a summary of the total cost of SDC eligible projects on the CIP that have not yet been constructed.

Table 3.7.1 illustrates the calculation used to establish the improvement SDC for the ORWD water system.

Table 3.7.1 – ORWD Improvement SDC Summary – Water System

Project No.	Project Description	SDC Eligible Cost
1	Replace Existing Distribution System	\$285,056
2	Install Individual Water Meters	\$0
3	Rehabilitate All Three Springs	\$4,736
4	Replace Both Storage Tanks	\$47,616
5	Upgrade Tank Site Valving and Piping	\$30,208
6	Install Booster Pump Station	\$11,520
7	Project Interim Financing	\$19,200
	Total Improvement Eligible Costs (A)	\$398,336
	Total Growth EDU's per Section 3.3 (B)	26
	Maximum Improvement Water SDC (A/B)	\$15,183

Therefore, based on this methodology, the combined SDC, including improvement and reimbursement eligible projects, totals around \$15,183, not including adjustments for SDC credits or compliance costs.

3.8 SDC Credits – Water System

An analysis of potential SDC credits should be included as part of an SDC methodology. Credits may be appropriate to offset financing costs that will be paid by all system customers including new customers. Credits are also appropriate for developers who construct or otherwise provide improvements to the system that are part of the current CIP project list. A brief description of a few potential SDC credit scenarios is provided below.

3.8.1 Improvement Offset Credit

In the case of a developer completing some or all of a CIP project, the credit provided should be equal to the value of the improvement made, though the credit cannot exceed the amount of SDC that the developer would have been required to pay.

For example: Assume that a developer undertakes a subdivision that would require him to pay \$200,000 in SDC fees for the water system. This same developer elects to construct a new waterline to service his development. As the waterline is part of the District's water system CIP, the developer's efforts make him eligible to receive an SDC credit for the improvements that he completed. If we assume the project cost to install the waterline is around \$300,000, the developer is only eligible to receive SDC credits up to the \$200,000 that he would have paid into SDCs.

It should be noted that determination of improvements offset credits can require some judgment as development situations can vary. The District should maintain an open policy when working with developers to identify a fair and reasonable offset credit when it applies.

It should also be reiterated that offset credits are not available for improvements undertaken by the developer that do not appear on the District's CIP and are not part of the SDC methodology.

3.8.2 Financing Credit - Project Costs and Potential Loan Amounts

Financing credits should be applied to SDCs so that new users who are assessed an SDC do not end up paying twice due to new debt loads incurred by the District to undertake improvements or portions of improvements intended to increase system capacity. As growth-related debt service may be repaid with SDC revenue, it is critical that the users who have paid SDCs receive an appropriate credit for the present value of rate increases that will likely be imposed for the purposes of paying back debt.

Establishing a precise financing credit for ORWD is difficult as it is not currently known to what level the District will elect to undertake projects, how those projects will be funded, or what percentage of the project funding will require a rate increase.

3.8.3 Present Worth of User Rate Increase and SDC Credits

It would be appropriate to provide a credit to new customers to offset the “double-dip” effects of paying an increased rate to payback a loan supporting the SDC eligible portion of a project in addition to paying the SDC itself. The following example will illustrate:

Assume the District undertakes a \$1,000,000 project to construct a new facility. It is determined that the project is 50% SDC eligible and the other half of the project will be paid through a loan. The terms of the loan are as follows:

Term: 20 years (240 months)

Rate: 5%

Principal: \$1,000,000 with \$500,000 being SDC eligible

Number of EDU's setting rate of payback: Existing customer base or 160 EDU's

Assuming the District obtains the \$1,000,000 loan, a monthly rate increase of around \$41.80 per EDU would be required. Approximately \$20.90 of that increase would be to cover the SDC eligible portion of the project. New customers would be charged an SDC to pay for their share of the SDC eligible portion of the project.

To avoid charging a rate increase in addition to an SDC, a present worth analysis of the \$20.90 portion of the rate increase should be completed and a credit established. The amount of the credit will vary depending on the period of time in the planning period that the new customer joins the system and begins paying the higher rates. A range of potential credits for this example scenario is discussed below:

- 1. A new customer joins the system early in the planning period and has nearly 20 years of increased rate payments in front of them. In this case, the present worth of a \$20.90 per month rate increase over 20 years (at 5% interest) is around \$3,125.*
- 2. A new customer joins the system in the middle of the planning period with only 10 years of increased payments in front of them. Under this scenario, the present worth of a \$20.90 rate increase over 10 years (at 5% interest) is around \$1,936.*
- 3. A new customer joins the system toward the end of the planning period with only 5 years remaining in the 20-year planning cycle. Under this scenario, the present worth of a \$20.90 rate increase over the remaining 5 years (at 5% interest) is around \$1,086.*

The amount of the credit that would be appropriate to offset the “double-dip” effect of a rate increase and an SDC charge varies with the following:

1. The amount of the loan and the resulting rate increase required to pay it back
2. The percentage of SDC eligibility for a specific project
3. The number of years remaining within the planning period or the remaining term left on the loan payback

Should the District elect to offer an SDC credit to offset a “double-dip” effect, a credit schedule should be established once a project is undertaken, a loan obtained, and a rate increase set to pay back the loan. A simple schedule can be established that varies based on years or months of time into the loan terms. When a new customer joins the system, the District can simply review the credit schedule for each affected project and total up each credit depending on the month that the new customer joins the system.

3.9 Water System SDC Summary

Section 3 has been developed to provide the Otter Rock Water District with the methodology needed to establish the maximum allowable SDC for the water system. The following table provides a summary of the information utilized to complete this analysis:

**Table 3.9.1 – Water System SDC
Summary per EDU (before compliance costs)**

SDC Component	SDC Amount
Reimbursement Fee Per Section 3.6	\$0
Improvement Fee Per Section 3.7	\$15,183
Subtotal of Water SDC Fees per EDU	\$15,183

Based on the summary in Table 3.9.1 the maximum defendable SDC for the water system is around \$15,183 per EDU *without the application of an SDC credit or SDC compliance costs* for new growth within the ORWD.

It should be reiterated that this calculation represents the maximum SDC that can be assessed and defended with proper methodology. The District has the autonomy to charge less than this amount if desired. However, if adequate SDC fees are not collected and projects must be undertaken to satisfy growth requirements, funds will have to be obtained from other sources such as from user rate increases.

3.10 SDC Assessment Schedule for Residential and Non-Residential Customers

The SDC established in Section 3.9 above is based on a cost per EDU or cost per single residential dwelling. For most non-residential developments, a plan review must be performed to determine the equivalent number of EDUs the development will require.

3.10.1 Residential and Nonresidential Assessment Table

The following tables should be used to assess water system SDCs for both residential and non-residential customers who wish to connect to the ORWD water system:

**Table 3.10.1 – Residential and Non-Residential Customers
Assessment Schedule for Water System SDCs**

Enterprise	Number of EDU's	Units
Apartments	0.75	per dwelling unit (EDU)
Apparel Store	0.2	per 1,000 ft ²
Athletic Club	0.3	per 1,000 ft ²
Auto Care	0.1	per service bay
Auto Parts Sales	0.2	per 1,000 ft ²
Auto Sales	0.2	per 1,000 ft ²
Bank, Drive-in	0.3	per 1,000 ft ²
Bank, Walk-in	0.3	per 1,000 ft ²
Building Material and Lumber Store	0.2	per 1,000 ft ²
Cab Company	0.2	per 1,000 ft ²
Car Wash, Automated	na	See meter sizing assessment in Table 3.10.2
Car Wash, Self Service	0.7	per stall
Cemetery	0.2	per 1,000 ft ²
Church	0.2	per 1,000 ft ²
Community/Junior College	1.0	Per 250 gross square ft ²
Convenience Market (Open 24 Hours)	0.2	per 1,000 ft ²
Convenience Market (Open 15-16 Hours)	0.2	per 1,000 ft ²
Convenience Market with Gasoline Pumps	0.2	per 1,000 ft ²
	0.1	per pump
Day Care	0.2	per student
Drinking Establishment	0.7	per 1,000 ft ²
Furniture Store	0.2	per 1,000 ft ²
Hardware/Paint	0.2	per 1,000 ft ²
Health/Fitness Club	0.3	per 1,000 ft ²
Hospital	1.0	See meter sizing assessment in Table 3.10.2
Industrial	1.0	See meter sizing assessment in Table 3.10.2
Library	0.2	per 1,000 ft ²
Lodge/Fraternal	0.3	per 1,000 ft ²
Manufacturing	0.2	per 1,000 ft ²
Medical/Dental Office	0.4	per 1,000 ft ²
Mini-warehouse Storage and warehouses	0.1	per 1,000 ft ²
Mobil Home Park	0.75	Per dwelling unit
Motel (not including laundry facilities or pools)	0.3	per room
Nursery Garden Center	0.2	per 1,000 ft ²
Nursing Home	0.3	per bed
Office Building	0.2	per 1,000 ft ²
Retail establishment, shopping center, grocery, etc.	0.2	per 1,000 ft ²
Post Office	0.2	per 1,000 ft ²
Quick Lubrication Vehicle Stop	0.1	per bay
Recreational Facility, Multipurpose	0.3	per 1,000 ft ²
Restaurant, any type	4	per 1,000 ft ²
Schools	1.4	Per 250 gross square ft ²
Service Station	0.1	per bay
Service Station w/Convenience Market	0.1	per pump

Enterprise	Number of EDU's	Units
	0.2	per 1,000 ft ²
Townhouse/Condo/Duplex	1	per unit
Single Family Detached Housing	1	per house
Pools and aquatic facilities	na	See meter sizing assessment in Table 3.10.2
Brewery	na	See meter sizing assessment in Table 3.10.2
Movie Theatre	0.3	per 100 seats
Commercial/Coin-Op Laundry	na	See meter sizing assessment in Table 3.10.2

When a specific land use is not included in Table 3.10.1 or if the table does not fit the application well, Table 3.10.2 can be used to convert the meter size of a new customer into an equivalent EDU amount. Staff should review the new customer's land use plans carefully to ensure that the proper meter size is being utilized by the new property.

Table 3.10.2 – Equivalency Table to Convert Meter Size To Equivalent Dwelling Units for Customers not Included in Table 3.10.1

Meter Size	Hydraulic Capacity Factor	No. of EDU's
3/4"	1	1.0
1"	1.67	1.7
1-1/2"	3.33	3.3
2"	5.33	5.3
3"	10.67	10.7
4"	16.67	16.7
6"	33.33	33.3
8"	53.33	53.3
10"	76.67	76.7

3.11 Potential Appeal Process for Calculation of Water System EDU's:

While Tables 3.10.1 and 3.10.2 include a wide assortment of residential and non-residential customer types and meter size estimates along with an estimate of the number of EDUs that should be associated with a new customer, you cannot address all potential customers through simple tables. Furthermore, in some cases, the assessment system may not fairly represent a new customer's actual impact on the water system. This is often the case in the commercial or industrial developments where water use varies greatly from one business to another. In these cases, the District may choose to allow for an appeal process so that new customers are assessed at a fair and reasonable rate.

The following discussion provides a sample appeal process which may be utilized in ORWD when it is deemed appropriate by the District:

A single EDU in ORWD is assumed to be a water demand of around 5,800 gallons per month on average. If a new customer disagrees with the assessment that is calculated using Table 3.10, they may be allowed to appeal the assessment and request a trial period to track water use and compare their own water consumption (and therefore their equivalent water demand) to the average District water usage per EDU. In these cases, water use should be monitored between the months of

November to April through the new customer's water bills. If time allows, a full year could be utilized to develop an average for the new customer. The average monthly water consumption of the new customer should be compared against the District's typical average. If this results in a lower EDU rating, an adjustment to the assessment could be made.

The District may wish to hold an SDC deposit during the appeal period. The amount of the deposit should be established by the District. A reasonable deposit amount equal to one-half (1/2) the amount estimated using Table 3.10 may be appropriate. Depending on the results of the winter water use, the new user may either receive a refund of some of the SDC payment or be required to pay additional SDC costs.

A specific example of the above appeal process follows:

A new restaurant wishes to open in ORWD. Through a plan review, it is determined that the restaurant has 2,000 square feet of floor space. Based on Table 3.10.1 the assessment to the restaurant would be for 8 EDUs.

The restaurant owner protests and appeals this calculation. They are assessed for 4 EDUs as a deposit and are allowed to track the water use during the winter months of their first year in operation. At the end of this period, they produce water bills showing that they used an average of 30,000 gallons per month. This equates to around 5 EDUs of water use.

The restaurant is charged for an additional 1 EDU's worth of water system SDC. Through the appeal process, the restaurant reduced the SDC assessment for water by a full 3 EDUs.

The inclusion of an appeal process will necessitate additional administration of individual customer SDC issues and may increase the costs associated with SDC compliance and administration. Appeals should only be considered for non-residential customers. However, as the majority of the growth in ORWD will be in the residential sector, the potential for appeals from the non-residential sector is limited.

With regard to the residential sector, it is recommended that the District seek to keep the assessment method as simple as possible. Each new home should be assessed on a single EDU basis with no adjustments to be made for square footage, fixture counts, or other more complex methods.

4.0 Compliance Costs

Section

4

4.1 Introduction

Oregon law includes provisions that allow SDC revenues to be used to offset costs incurred by local governments in complying with the provisions of SDC law, including expenses associated with developing SDC methodologies, master planning, administration and updating of CIP's, and other compliance related costs. The law requires annual accounting of SDC expenditures, including revenue collected and attributed to the costs of compliance. The expenses of this annual accounting process are also considered to be related to the costs of compliance and can, therefore, be paid for with SDC revenues.

4.2 Compliance Costs

Unlike reimbursement and improvement SDCs, compliance costs do not represent another category of system development charges. For the Otter Rock Water District, it is recommended that compliance costs be established as a "percentage" of the total SDCs that are likely to be assessed each year. The additional surcharge that is to be added to all SDCs will provide the funds necessary to administer each of the SDC programs and comply with current SDC laws and requirements.

The following sections provide a brief description of the components that will make up the compliance cost methodology.

4.2.1 Auditing/Accounting Costs

As mentioned previously, the District will be required to complete annual accounting and auditing of the implemented SDC program. The District must account for all revenues collected through SDC assessments, as well as all expenses and project costs that are fully or partially paid for with SDC funds, and all other debits or credits from the SDC funds.

For the purposes of this Study, it will be assumed that auditing and accounting expenses will not exceed \$2,000 per year.

4.2.2 SDC Methodology and Administration

It will be assumed that the District may have to perform regular updates of their SDC methodology due to the following:

1. Additions to the capital improvement plan (CIP)
2. To account for increases in project costs (inflation)
3. Adjustments for project financing specifics as projects develop (i.e. interest rates, grants, etc.)
4. Population or growth rate changes
5. Other issues that may change the SDC charge.

These updates may be required, to a greater or lesser extent, on an annual basis. It is also assumed that a full SDC methodology update will be required at least once each decade as planning efforts are updated. This major SDC methodology update may be required once every ten years and would ensure that the

District's SDC methodology meets all current legal requirements as well as being coordinated with updated planning efforts and CIPs.

While the cost of administering and updating the District's methodology may vary, it is recommended that the District plan on budgeting around \$2,000 per year for this purpose. This will include costs for consulting assistance as well as covering some of the administrative costs of District staff as they address SDC issues, determine assessments, track funds, and other administrative tasks each year.

4.2.3 Infrastructure Planning Efforts

Most master planning and facilities efforts include a planning period of 20 years. However, in many cases, planning is updated before the end of the planning period. Changes in community needs, development pressures, regulatory changes, or other issues often prompt planning to be updated or repeated on a more regular basis than the planning period suggests.

For the purposes of establishing compliance costs, it is recommended that water system planning be repeated on a schedule of at least once every 10 years. It may be that a major planning effort is required in year 1 and a less involved planning effort or update is appropriate for year 10. In any event, the District should be collecting revenues through the planning process that will allow them to update their planning documents as required.

It can be argued that 100 percent of the costs associated with planning should be considered SDC eligible. However, much of the efforts that go into infrastructure planning consist of assessing existing facilities, their capacities and condition, and the capabilities of the existing systems to provide service to existing and future customers. The planning efforts also include efforts to predict the infrastructure needs associated with growth and development. Therefore, the compliance cost associated with infrastructure planning should be shared in part by the SDC programs and in part by the existing users in the system.

For the purposes of this analysis, it is recommended that 50% of the recurring planning costs be considered attributable to growth and are therefore, considered to be SDC eligible. The individual costs of these planning efforts are estimated in Table 4.2.5.

4.2.4 Total Estimated SDC Revenue

As it is recommended that compliance costs should be charged as a percentage surcharge of SDC revenues, the amount of SDC revenue that is anticipated to be collected must be established.

For this calculation, we must make an assumption as to what the District will choose to charge for its SDC program. This may require adjustment once the final SDC charge is established. Once the annual compliance costs and annual revenue expected for SDCs are established, we can calculate the percentage surcharge that must be included to cover the annual compliance costs over and above the regular SDC revenues.

The growth component for each SDC program must be reviewed individually and an annual average growth unit established. For example, if it is determined that a water SDC program will add 60 new EDUs over 20 years, it should be assumed that the system will add an average of 3 EDUs each year to the system. Therefore, the compliance costs associated with the water SDC program should be paid as a percentage of the SDC revenues collected from the 3 new EDUs added to the system in any given year. A summary of this analysis is provided below in Table 4.2.5.

4.2.5 Calculation of Compliance Expenses

The following table illustrates and summarizes the estimated compliance costs that will be associated with the proper administration of an SDC program in the Otter Rock Water District. These expenses include annual costs for accounting and administration as well as longer term costs for planning efforts.

**Table 4.2.5 – Calculation of SDC Compliance Expenses
Otter Rock Water District SDC Program**

Compliance Activity	Estimated Cost	SDC Eligibility (%)	Frequency (years)	Annual \$
General Accounting / Administration Costs				
Auditing / Accounting	\$2,000	100%	1	\$2,000
SDC Methodology Administration & Annual Adjustments	\$2,000	100%	1	\$2,000
SDC Methodology Update	\$6,000	100%	10	\$600
Water System Compliance Costs				
Water Master Planning	\$24,000	50%	10	\$1,200
Water Conservation and Management Planning	\$8,000	50%	20	\$200
Subtotal of Annual Costs	\$42,000			\$6,000

Based on this analysis, it is estimated to require nearly \$6,000 per year to properly administer the entire SDC program in ORWD. This includes costs for planning as well as general administration.

4.2.6 Summary of SDC Revenue and Calculation of Compliance Surcharge

Within this methodology, an effort was made to establish the growth potential, over a 20-year planning period, for the water system. If we assume that growth occurs evenly over the planning period, we can assume a straight-line growth rate and determine the annual growth.

If we then multiply the average cost per EDU by the growth, we can calculate the estimated annual water system revenue. Table 4.2.6 below summarizes the estimated revenue expected.

**Table 4.2.6 – Calculation of Anticipated SDC Revenue
Otter Rock Water District SDC Program**

Estimates of SDC Revenue	Added EDU's per year	SDC Charge per EDU	Annual Revenue
Estimated Annual Water SDC Revenue	1.31	\$15,183	\$19,918
Compliance Cost Charge (Annual Cost/Annual Revenue)			30.12%

By dividing the calculated compliance costs in Table 4.2.5 by the total estimated annual revenue in Table 4.2.6, we can calculate an appropriate SDC surcharge that is required to administer the SDC program in ORWD.

Based on this analysis, it is recommended that compliance costs of approximately 30% of the SDC revenue be collected from this SDC program. On average, this surcharge should produce enough revenue annually to assist the District with the compliance and administration of the SDC program.

APPENDIX A

SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT CHARGES

ORS 2017 Edition

223.297 Policy. The purpose of ORS 223.297 to 223.314 is to provide a uniform framework for the imposition of system development charges by local governments, to provide equitable funding for orderly growth and development in Oregon's communities and to establish that the charges may be used only for capital improvements. [1989 c.449 §1; 1991 c.902 §25; 2003 c.765 §1; 2003 c.802 §17]

Note: 223.297 to 223.314 were added to and made a part of 223.205 to 223.295 by legislative action, but were not added to and made a part of the Bancroft Bonding Act. See section 10, chapter 449, Oregon Laws 1989.

223.299 Definitions for ORS 223.297 to 223.314. As used in ORS 223.297 to 223.314:

(1)(a) "Capital improvement" means facilities or assets used for the following:

- (A) Water supply, treatment and distribution;
- (B) Waste water collection, transmission, treatment and disposal;
- (C) Drainage and flood control;
- (D) Transportation; or
- (E) Parks and recreation.

(b) "Capital improvement" does not include costs of the operation or routine maintenance of capital improvements.

(2) "Improvement fee" means a fee for costs associated with capital improvements to be constructed.

(3) "Reimbursement fee" means a fee for costs associated with capital improvements already constructed, or under construction when the fee is established, for which the local government determines that capacity exists.

(4)(a) "System development charge" means a reimbursement fee, an improvement fee or a combination thereof assessed or collected at the time of increased usage of a capital improvement or issuance of a development permit, building permit or connection to the capital improvement. "System development charge" includes that portion of a sewer or water system connection charge that is greater than the amount necessary to reimburse the local government for its average cost of inspecting and installing connections with water and sewer facilities.

(b) "System development charge" does not include any fees assessed or collected as part of a local improvement district or a charge in lieu of a local improvement district assessment, or the cost of complying with requirements or conditions imposed upon a land use decision, expedited land division or limited land use decision. [1989 c.449 §2; 1991 c.817 §29; 1991 c.902 §26; 1995 c.595 §28; 2003 c.765 §2a; 2003 c.802 §18]

Note: See note under 223.297.

223.300 [Repealed by 1975 c.642 §26]

223.301 Certain system development charges and methodologies prohibited. (1) As used in this section, "employer" means any person who contracts to pay remuneration for, and secures the right to direct and control the services of, any person.

(2) A local government may not establish or impose a system development charge that requires an employer to pay a reimbursement fee or an improvement fee based on:

SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT CHARGES

ORS 2017 Edition

- (a) The number of individuals hired by the employer after a specified date; or
- (b) A methodology that assumes that costs are necessarily incurred for capital improvements when an employer hires an additional employee.
- (3) A methodology set forth in an ordinance or resolution that establishes an improvement fee or a reimbursement fee shall not include or incorporate any method or system under which the payment of the fee or the amount of the fee is determined by the number of employees of an employer without regard to new construction, new development or new use of an existing structure by the employer. [1999 c.1098 §2; 2003 c.802 §19]

Note: See note under 223.297.

223.302 System development charges; use of revenues; review procedures. (1) Local governments are authorized to establish system development charges, but the revenues produced therefrom must be expended only in accordance with ORS 223.297 to 223.314. If a local government expends revenues from system development charges in violation of the limitations described in ORS 223.307, the local government shall replace the misspent amount with moneys derived from sources other than system development charges. Replacement moneys must be deposited in a fund designated for the system development charge revenues not later than one year following a determination that the funds were misspent.

(2) Local governments shall adopt administrative review procedures by which any citizen or other interested person may challenge an expenditure of system development charge revenues. Such procedures shall provide that such a challenge must be filed within two years of the expenditure of the system development charge revenues. The decision of the local government shall be judicially reviewed only as provided in ORS 34.010 to 34.100.

(3)(a) A local government must advise a person who makes a written objection to the calculation of a system development charge of the right to petition for review pursuant to ORS 34.010 to 34.100.

(b) If a local government has adopted an administrative review procedure for objections to the calculation of a system development charge, the local government shall provide adequate notice regarding the procedure for review to a person who makes a written objection to the calculation of a system development charge. [1989 c.449 §3; 1991 c.902 §27; 2001 c.662 §2; 2003 c.765 §3; 2003 c.802 §20]

Note: See note under 223.297.

223.304 Determination of amount of system development charges; methodology; credit allowed against charge; limitation of action contesting methodology for imposing charge; notification request. (1)(a) Reimbursement fees must be established or modified by ordinance or resolution setting forth a methodology that is, when applicable, based on:

- (A) Ratemaking principles employed to finance publicly owned capital improvements;
 - (B) Prior contributions by existing users;
 - (C) Gifts or grants from federal or state government or private persons;
 - (D) The value of unused capacity available to future system users or the cost of the existing facilities; and
 - (E) Other relevant factors identified by the local government imposing the fee.
- (b) The methodology for establishing or modifying a reimbursement fee must:

SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT CHARGES

ORS 2017 Edition

(A) Promote the objective of future system users contributing no more than an equitable share to the cost of existing facilities.

(B) Be available for public inspection.

(2) Improvement fees must:

(a) Be established or modified by ordinance or resolution setting forth a methodology that is available for public inspection and demonstrates consideration of:

(A) The projected cost of the capital improvements identified in the plan and list adopted pursuant to ORS 223.309 that are needed to increase the capacity of the systems to which the fee is related; and

(B) The need for increased capacity in the system to which the fee is related that will be required to serve the demands placed on the system by future users.

(b) Be calculated to obtain the cost of capital improvements for the projected need for available system capacity for future users.

(3) A local government may establish and impose a system development charge that is a combination of a reimbursement fee and an improvement fee, if the methodology demonstrates that the charge is not based on providing the same system capacity.

(4) The ordinance or resolution that establishes or modifies an improvement fee shall also provide for a credit against such fee for the construction of a qualified public improvement. A “qualified public improvement” means a capital improvement that is required as a condition of development approval, identified in the plan and list adopted pursuant to ORS 223.309 and either:

(a) Not located on or contiguous to property that is the subject of development approval; or

(b) Located in whole or in part on or contiguous to property that is the subject of development approval and required to be built larger or with greater capacity than is necessary for the particular development project to which the improvement fee is related.

(5)(a) The credit provided for in subsection (4) of this section is only for the improvement fee charged for the type of improvement being constructed, and credit for qualified public improvements under subsection (4)(b) of this section may be granted only for the cost of that portion of such improvement that exceeds the local government’s minimum standard facility size or capacity needed to serve the particular development project or property. The applicant shall have the burden of demonstrating that a particular improvement qualifies for credit under subsection (4)(b) of this section.

(b) A local government may deny the credit provided for in subsection (4) of this section if the local government demonstrates:

(A) That the application does not meet the requirements of subsection (4) of this section; or

(B) By reference to the list adopted pursuant to ORS 223.309, that the improvement for which credit is sought was not included in the plan and list adopted pursuant to ORS 223.309.

(c) When the construction of a qualified public improvement gives rise to a credit amount greater than the improvement fee that would otherwise be levied against the project receiving development approval, the excess credit may be applied against improvement fees that accrue in subsequent phases of the original development project. This subsection does not prohibit a local government from providing a greater credit, or from establishing a system providing for the transferability of credits, or from providing a credit for a capital improvement not identified in the plan and list adopted pursuant to ORS 223.309, or from providing a share of the cost of such improvement by other means, if a local government so chooses.

SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT CHARGES

ORS 2017 Edition

(d) Credits must be used in the time specified in the ordinance but not later than 10 years from the date the credit is given.

(6) Any local government that proposes to establish or modify a system development charge shall maintain a list of persons who have made a written request for notification prior to adoption or amendment of a methodology for any system development charge.

(7)(a) Written notice must be mailed to persons on the list at least 90 days prior to the first hearing to establish or modify a system development charge, and the methodology supporting the system development charge must be available at least 60 days prior to the first hearing. The failure of a person on the list to receive a notice that was mailed does not invalidate the action of the local government. The local government may periodically delete names from the list, but at least 30 days prior to removing a name from the list shall notify the person whose name is to be deleted that a new written request for notification is required if the person wishes to remain on the notification list.

(b) Legal action intended to contest the methodology used for calculating a system development charge may not be filed after 60 days following adoption or modification of the system development charge ordinance or resolution by the local government. A person shall request judicial review of the methodology used for calculating a system development charge only as provided in ORS 34.010 to 34.100.

(8) A change in the amount of a reimbursement fee or an improvement fee is not a modification of the system development charge methodology if the change in amount is based on:

(a) A change in the cost of materials, labor or real property applied to projects or project capacity as set forth on the list adopted pursuant to ORS 223.309; or

(b) The periodic application of one or more specific cost indexes or other periodic data sources. A specific cost index or periodic data source must be:

(A) A relevant measurement of the average change in prices or costs over an identified time period for materials, labor, real property or a combination of the three;

(B) Published by a recognized organization or agency that produces the index or data source for reasons that are independent of the system development charge methodology; and

(C) Incorporated as part of the established methodology or identified and adopted in a separate ordinance, resolution or order. [1989 c.449 §4; 1991 c.902 §28; 1993 c.804 §20; 2001 c.662 §3; 2003 c.765 §§4a,5a; 2003 c.802 §21]

Note: See note under 223.297.

223.305 [Repealed by 1971 c.325 §1]

223.307 Authorized expenditure of system development charges. (1) Reimbursement fees may be spent only on capital improvements associated with the systems for which the fees are assessed including expenditures relating to repayment of indebtedness.

(2) Improvement fees may be spent only on capacity increasing capital improvements, including expenditures relating to repayment of debt for such improvements. An increase in system capacity may be established if a capital improvement increases the level of performance or service provided by existing facilities or provides new facilities. The portion of the improvements funded by improvement fees must be related to the need for increased capacity to provide service for future users.

SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT CHARGES

ORS 2017 Edition

(3) System development charges may not be expended for costs associated with the construction of administrative office facilities that are more than an incidental part of other capital improvements or for the expenses of the operation or maintenance of the facilities constructed with system development charge revenues.

(4) Any capital improvement being funded wholly or in part with system development charge revenues must be included in the plan and list adopted by a local government pursuant to ORS 223.309.

(5) Notwithstanding subsections (1) and (2) of this section, system development charge revenues may be expended on the costs of complying with the provisions of ORS 223.297 to 223.314, including the costs of developing system development charge methodologies and providing an annual accounting of system development charge expenditures. [1989 c.449 §5; 1991 c.902 §29; 2003 c.765 §6; 2003 c.802 §22]

Note: See note under 223.297.

223.309 Preparation of plan for capital improvements financed by system development charges; modification. (1) Prior to the establishment of a system development charge by ordinance or resolution, a local government shall prepare a capital improvement plan, public facilities plan, master plan or comparable plan that includes a list of the capital improvements that the local government intends to fund, in whole or in part, with revenues from an improvement fee and the estimated cost, timing and percentage of costs eligible to be funded with revenues from the improvement fee for each improvement.

(2) A local government that has prepared a plan and the list described in subsection (1) of this section may modify the plan and list at any time. If a system development charge will be increased by a proposed modification of the list to include a capacity increasing capital improvement, as described in ORS 223.307 (2):

(a) The local government shall provide, at least 30 days prior to the adoption of the modification, notice of the proposed modification to the persons who have requested written notice under ORS 223.304 (6).

(b) The local government shall hold a public hearing if the local government receives a written request for a hearing on the proposed modification within seven days of the date the proposed modification is scheduled for adoption.

(c) Notwithstanding ORS 294.160, a public hearing is not required if the local government does not receive a written request for a hearing.

(d) The decision of a local government to increase the system development charge by modifying the list may be judicially reviewed only as provided in ORS 34.010 to 34.100. [1989 c.449 §6; 1991 c.902 §30; 2001 c.662 §4; 2003 c.765 §7a; 2003 c.802 §23]

Note: See note under 223.297.

223.310 [Amended by 1957 c.397 §3; repealed by 1971 c.325 §1]

223.311 Deposit of system development charge revenues; annual accounting. (1) System development charge revenues must be deposited in accounts designated for such moneys. The local government shall provide an annual accounting, to be completed by January 1 of each year,

SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT CHARGES

ORS 2017 Edition

for system development charges showing the total amount of system development charge revenues collected for each system and the projects that were funded in the previous fiscal year.

(2) The local government shall include in the annual accounting:

(a) A list of the amount spent on each project funded, in whole or in part, with system development charge revenues; and

(b) The amount of revenue collected by the local government from system development charges and attributed to the costs of complying with the provisions of ORS 223.297 to 223.314, as described in ORS 223.307. [1989 c.449 §7; 1991 c.902 §31; 2001 c.662 §5; 2003 c.765 §8a; 2003 c.802 §24]

Note: See note under 223.297.

223.312 [1957 c.95 §4; repealed by 1971 c.325 §1]

223.313 Applicability of ORS 223.297 to 223.314. (1) ORS 223.297 to 223.314 shall apply only to system development charges in effect on or after July 1, 1991.

(2) The provisions of ORS 223.297 to 223.314 shall not be applicable if they are construed to impair bond obligations for which system development charges have been pledged or to impair the ability of local governments to issue new bonds or other financing as provided by law for improvements allowed under ORS 223.297 to 223.314. [1989 c.449 §8; 1991 c.902 §32; 2003 c.802 §25]

Note: See note under 223.297.

223.314 Establishment or modification of system development charge not a land use decision. The establishment, modification or implementation of a system development charge, or a plan or list adopted pursuant to ORS 223.309, or any modification of a plan or list, is not a land use decision pursuant to ORS chapters 195 and 197. [1989 c.449 §9; 2001 c.662 §6; 2003 c.765 §9]

Note: See note under 223.297.

APPENDIX B

Agency: Otter Rock Water District
Worksheet: EDU Worksheet
Worksheet No.: B

Table 1A: Water EDU Worksheet

(A)	Total residential connections in UGB	147
(B)	Total water sold to residential connections within Urban Growth Boundary (UGB)	10,407,810
(C)	Water use per residential EDU per year (B/A) in gal per year per EDU	70,801
(D)	System-wide water sales (inside and outside UGB) in gallons	12,407,810
(E)	System wide EDU count (D/C)	175
(F)	Persons per household per Census inside UGB	1.29
(H)	The estimated population within the UGB (FxA)	190
(I)	Average growth rate within the UGB for residential and nonresidential sectors	0.70%
(J)	Projected population within the UGB for 2026	218
(N)	Total water used inside UGB, gal	12,407,810
(O)	Total nonresidential EDU's inside UGB (N-B/C)	28
(P)	Total EDU's inside UGB (O+A)	175
(S)	Projected EDU's inside UGB (P projected at .7% for 20 yrs)	201
(T)	Projected EDU's outside UGB (R projected at .7%)	0
(U)	Total future EDU's (S+T)	201
(V)	Total Growth EDU's (U-E)	26

APPENDIX C

Water SDC

City	Total Annual Revenue (\$) - City Revenue - FY2013	Total Annual Revenue (\$) - City Revenue - FY2014	Total Annual Revenue (\$) - City Revenue - FY2015	Total Annual Revenue (\$) - Collected for Other Entity - FY2013	Total Annual Revenue (\$) - Collected for Other Entity - FY2014	Total Annual Revenue (\$) - Collected for Other Entity - FY2015	Total Annual Revenue (\$) - Collected for Other Entity - TEXT	Total Annual Revenue (\$) - Other Entities Collect in the City - FY2013	Total Annual Revenue (\$) - Other Entities Collect in the City - FY2014	Total Annual Revenue (\$) - Other Entities Collect in the City - FY2015	Total Annual Revenue (\$) - Other Entities Collect in the City - TEXT
Adams											
Albany	\$269,812	\$381,380	\$382,329								
Amity	\$13,080	\$0	\$18,062								
Antelope											
Bandon	\$58,138	\$44,142	\$109,681								
Banks	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Bay City	\$40,500	\$20,817	\$28,236								
Beaverton											
Boardman	\$1,088	\$304									
Brookings	\$33,289	\$25,823	\$12,358								
Carlton	\$46,681	\$61,371	\$150,238								
Cascade Locks	\$4,303	\$3,490	\$4,733								
Central Point	\$69,680	\$141,577	\$136,604	\$69,095	\$131,509	\$116,882	Medford Water Commission				
Clatskanie	\$0	\$6,000	\$0								
Coburg		\$6,920	\$61,907								
Coburg											
Columbia City	\$4,622	\$4,292	\$8,584								
Coos Bay											
Coquille	\$1,000	\$6,656	\$0								
Cornelius	\$11,175	\$8,940	\$79,615	\$1,603	\$12,420	\$35,651					
Corvallis	\$436,487	\$477,147	\$976,733								
Cottage Grove	\$153,968	\$146,702	\$69,279								
Creswell	\$55,286	\$64,633	\$116,482								
Culver											
Dallas	\$141,808	\$219,746	\$247,678								
Dayton	\$11,049	\$43,596	\$25,431								
Depoe Bay	\$20,660	\$42,064	\$70,122								
Detroit	\$18,223	\$4,225	\$5,295								
Drain	\$8,738	\$4,170	\$4,170								
Eagle Point											
Echo											
Enterprise											

City	Total Annual Revenue (\$) - City Revenue - FY2013	Total Annual Revenue (\$) - City Revenue - FY2014	Total Annual Revenue (\$) - City Revenue - FY2015	Total Annual Revenue (\$) - Collected for Other Entity - FY2013	Total Annual Revenue (\$) - Collected for Other Entity - FY2014	Total Annual Revenue (\$) - Collected for Other Entity - FY2015	Total Annual Revenue (\$) - Collected for Other Entity - TEXT	Total Annual Revenue (\$) - Other Entities Collect in the City - FY2013	Total Annual Revenue (\$) - Other Entities Collect in the City - FY2014	Total Annual Revenue (\$) - Other Entities Collect in the City - FY2015	Total Annual Revenue (\$) - Other Entities Collect in the City - TEXT
Estacada	\$14,946	\$63,776	\$217,726								
Falls City											
Forest Grove	\$775,172	\$694,903	\$376,591								
Gates											
Gearhart											
Gervais	\$13,878	\$6,939	\$2,313								
Gladstone											
Glendale	\$0	\$0	\$0								
Granite											
Grants Pass	\$253,102	\$277,656	\$373,850								
Gresham	\$230,446	\$300,196	\$624,183								
Halsey	\$538	\$2,423	\$4,845								
Happy Valley											
Heppner											
Hermiston	\$12,968	\$10,856	\$20,862								
Hillsboro	\$17,643,213	\$11,767,387	\$1,798,020		\$22,911	\$33,304					
Huntington											
Idanha											
Independence											
Irrigon	\$3,892	\$103,784	\$9,892								
Jefferson	\$6,345	\$5,139	\$1,269								
John Day	\$17,526	\$19,417	\$22,580.80								
Jordan Valley											
Joseph											
Keizer	\$23,155	\$51,963	\$105,561								
Klamath Falls	\$163,428	\$104,369	\$117,849	\$0	\$0	\$0					
La Pine	\$9,861	\$8,430	\$11,708								
Lafayette	\$41,041	\$69,255	\$67,716								
Lake Oswego	\$376,722	\$486,337	\$485,347								
Lakeside											
Lakeview											
Lebanon	\$35,671	\$49,753	\$52,593								
Lexington											
Lincoln City											
Long Creek											

City	Total Annual Revenue (\$) - City Revenue - FY2013	Total Annual Revenue (\$) - City Revenue - FY2014	Total Annual Revenue (\$) - City Revenue - FY2015	Total Annual Revenue (\$) - Collected for Other Entity - FY2013	Total Annual Revenue (\$) - Collected for Other Entity - FY2014	Total Annual Revenue (\$) - Collected for Other Entity - FY2015	Total Annual Revenue (\$) - Collected for Other Entity - TEXT	Total Annual Revenue (\$) - Other Entities Collect in the City - FY2013	Total Annual Revenue (\$) - Other Entities Collect in the City - FY2014	Total Annual Revenue (\$) - Other Entities Collect in the City - FY2015	Total Annual Revenue (\$) - Other Entities Collect in the City - TEXT
Lowell	\$24,749	\$27,522	\$16,074								
Madras	\$0	\$0	\$7,208								
Malin											
Maupin			\$1,000								
McMinnville											
Merrill											
Mill City	\$4,500	\$19,960	\$6,229								
Milwaukie	\$9,656	\$0	\$1,619								
Mitchell											
Monument											
Mosier											
Mt. Angel	\$2,338	\$11,690	\$23,371								
Myrtle Creek	\$43,799	\$31,285	\$37,542	\$0	\$0	\$0					
Myrtle Point											
Nehalem	\$8,095	\$27,795	\$30,505								
Newberg	\$29,607	\$524,533	\$347,783								
Newport	\$19,982	\$47,938	\$70,393								
North Bend											
North Plains	\$87,035	\$116,045	\$261,737								
North Powder											
Nyssa											
Oakland	\$4,786	\$7,179	\$9,572								
Oakridge											
Ontario											
Oregon City	\$898,988	\$544,905	\$441,916	\$426,245	\$239,444	\$194,063	South Fork Water Board				
Pendleton											
Phoenix	\$10,638	\$36,516	\$0	?	?	\$0	Medford Water District				
Pilot Rock											
Port Orford	\$7,309	\$0	\$16,408								
Portland	\$2,547,329	\$3,096,034	\$4,477,346								
Redmond	\$225,229	\$306,167	\$374,955								
Rivergrove											
Rogue River											
Salem	\$1,295,426	\$1,666,524	\$1,246,891								
Scappoose											

City	Total Annual Revenue (\$) - City Revenue - FY2013	Total Annual Revenue (\$) - City Revenue - FY2014	Total Annual Revenue (\$) - City Revenue - FY2015	Total Annual Revenue (\$) - Collected for Other Entity - FY2013	Total Annual Revenue (\$) - Collected for Other Entity - FY2014	Total Annual Revenue (\$) - Collected for Other Entity - FY2015	Total Annual Revenue (\$) - Collected for Other Entity - TEXT	Total Annual Revenue (\$) - Other Entities Collect in the City - FY2013	Total Annual Revenue (\$) - Other Entities Collect in the City - FY2014	Total Annual Revenue (\$) - Other Entities Collect in the City - FY2015	Total Annual Revenue (\$) - Other Entities Collect in the City - TEXT
Scotts Mills											
Seneca											
Shady Cove											
Sheridan											
Siletz	\$1,762	\$0	\$1,762								\$0
Silverton	\$56,619	\$227,656	\$349,048								
Sodaville	\$0	\$0	\$0								
Spray	\$38,085	\$26,988	\$41,265								
Springfield											
St. Helens	\$33,080	\$70,557	\$80,781								
St. Paul	\$0	\$8,500	\$8,500	\$0	\$0	\$0		\$0	\$0	\$0	
Stanfield	\$40,692	\$18,929	\$10,321								
Sublimity	\$4,740	\$4,740	\$7,110								
Sutherlin	\$38,430	\$12	\$31,728								
Sweet Home	\$8,505	\$20,943	\$1,500								
Tangent											
The Dalles	\$117,773	\$130,447	\$25,487								
Troutdale	\$4,977	\$5,380	\$8,474	\$0	\$0	\$0		\$0	\$0	\$0	
Turner	\$22,000	\$9,000	\$40,000								
Umatilla	\$3,767	\$21,606	\$6,854								
Union	\$8,500	\$7,000	\$7,800								
Veneta	\$40,677	\$119,561	\$74,207								
Waldport	\$12,916	\$23,212	\$15,234								
Warrenton											
Wasco	\$400	\$400	\$400								
Waterloo											
West Linn	\$356,432	\$402,150	\$131,811	\$116,934	\$136,915	\$54,368	South Fork Water Board				
Westfir	\$0	\$0	\$0								
Wilsonville	\$1,513,567	\$1,509,035	\$1,461,645								
Wood Village	\$3,764	\$0	\$16,530								
Yachats	\$13,659	\$15,003	\$26,531								
Yamhill	\$32,950	\$62,605	\$29,655								
Yoncalla											

City	Water SDC is charged for (Check all that Apply)-Residential Development	Water SDC is charged for (Check all that Apply)-Non-Residential Development	Water SDC is comprised of:-Improvement Fee	Water SDC is comprised of:-Reimbursement Fee	Water SDC is comprised of:-Other Fee (administration, land acquisition, etc.)	Water SDC is comprised of (Check all that Apply) :-Other Fee (administration, land acquisition, etc.)-TEXT	Example Residential-Improvement Fee	Example Residential-Reimbursement Fee	Example Residential-Other Fee 1	Example Residential-Other Fee 2
Adams										
Albany	X	X	X	X			\$2,125	\$356		
Amity	X	X	X	X			\$1,629	\$774		
Antelope										
Bandon	X	X	X	X			\$5,184	\$1,362		
Banks	X	X	X	X						
Bay City	X	X	X	X			\$4,622	\$2,477		
Beaverton										
Boardman	X	X		X	X		\$1,088	\$304		
Brookings	X	X	X	X			\$1,966	\$374		
Carlton	X	X	X	X	X	Compliance	\$1,900	\$4,611	\$132	
Cascade Locks	X	X	X		X	displacement/compound	\$922		\$724	
Central Point	X	X	X	X	X	Administration	\$1,058	\$444	\$50	
Clatskanie	X	X	X				\$1,250			
Coburg	X	X	X	X	X		\$2,577		\$129	
Coburg										
Columbia City	X	X	X	X			\$3,888	\$4,696		
Coos Bay										
Coquille	X	X	X	X	X	water meter size fee	\$1,427	\$1,901		
Cornelius	X	X	X				\$11,181			
Corvallis	X	X	X	X			\$913	\$375		
Cottage Grove	X	X	X	X	X	Administrative Cost Recovery	\$3,074	\$912	\$68	
Creswell	X	X	X	X			\$4,142	\$884		
Culver										
Dallas										
Dayton	X	X	X	X			\$3,029	\$1,213		
Depoe Bay	X	X	X	X			\$3,334	\$2,222		
Detroit	X	X	X		X	\$25 ADMIN FEE & 12% PER ANNUM FOR INSTALLMENT PLANS (COMBINED CHARGE ALL SDCs)	\$7,943			

City	Water SDC is charged for (Check all that Apply)-Residential Development	Water SDC is charged for (Check all that Apply)-Non-Residential Development	Water SDC is comprised of:-Improvement Fee	Water SDC is comprised of:-Reimbursement Fee	Water SDC is comprised of:-Other Fee (administration, land acquisition, etc.)	Water SDC is comprised of (Check all that Apply) :-Other Fee (administration, land acquisition, etc.)-TEXT	Example Residential-Improvement Fee	Example Residential-Reimbursement Fee	Example Residential-Other Fee 1	Example Residential-Other Fee 2
Drain	X	X	X	X			\$95	\$1,523	\$32	
Eagle Point										
Echo										
Enterprise										
Estacada	X	X	X	X			\$2,411	\$2,041		
Falls City										
Forest Grove	X	X	X	X	X	Administration	\$3,604	\$1,841	\$33	
Gates										
Gearhart										
Gervais	X	X	X				\$2,313			
Gladstone										
Glendale	X	X								
Granite										
Grants Pass	X	X	X	X	X	Administration	\$1,243	\$1,561	\$41	
Gresham	X	X	X	X			\$3,420	\$733		
Halsey	X	X		X				\$783		
Happy Valley										
Heppner										
Hermiston	X	X	X				\$282			
Hillsboro	X	X	X	X	X	administration = \$31	\$6,828	\$87	\$31	
Huntington										
Idanha										
Independence										
Irrigon	X	X	X				\$1,946			
Jefferson	X	X		X				\$1,206		
John Day	X	X	X	X			\$853	\$988		
Jordan Valley										
Joseph										
Keizer	X	X	X				\$1,000			
Klamath Falls	X	X	X	X	X		\$63	\$2,292	\$129	
La Pine	X	X	X				\$1,405			
Lafayette	X	X	X	X	X	Water hook-up, meter cost, and meter installation fee	\$2,386	\$179	\$328	
Lake Oswego	X	X	X	X	X	Administrative	\$5,750	\$1,080	\$474	
Lakeside										
Lakeview										

City	Water SDC is charged for (Check all that Apply)-Residential Development	Water SDC is charged for (Check all that Apply)-Non-Residential Development	Water SDC is comprised of:-Improvement Fee	Water SDC is comprised of:-Reimbursement Fee	Water SDC is comprised of:-Other Fee (administration, land acquisition, etc.)	Water SDC is comprised of (Check all that Apply) :-Other Fee (administration, land acquisition, etc.)-TEXT	Example Residential-Improvement Fee	Example Residential-Reimbursement Fee	Example Residential-Other Fee 1	Example Residential-Other Fee 2
Lebanon	X	X	X	X			\$2,246	\$13		
Lexington										
Lincoln City	X	X	X	X			\$545	\$1,431		
Long Creek										
Lowell	X	X	X	X	X	3% Administration	\$3,607	\$640	\$127	
Madras	X	X	X				\$832			
Malin										
Maupin	X	X	X				\$1,000			
McMinnville										
Merrill										
Mill City	X	X	X	X			\$2,250	\$2,250		
Milwaukie	X	X	X	X	X	Administration	\$754	\$907	\$127	
Mitchell										
Monument										
Mosier										
Mt. Angel	X	X	X	X	X	Administration Fee	\$1,480	\$2,178	\$73	
Myrtle Creek	X	X		X	X		\$5,742	\$575	\$0	\$0
Myrtle Point										
Nehalem	X	X	X	X			\$3,235	\$500		
Newberg	X	X	X	X			\$4,713	\$1,425		
Newport	X	X	X	X			\$2,336	\$77		
North Bend										
North Plains	X	X	X				\$4,936			
North Powder										
Nyssa										
Oakland	X	X		X	X	Meter fee	\$0	\$2,393	\$540	
Oakridge										
Ontario										
Oregon City	X	X	X	X			\$4,162	\$1,428	\$2,435	
Pendleton										
Phoenix	X	X	X	X	X	Admin Fee	\$3,407	\$62	\$132	
Pilot Rock										
Port Orford	X	X	X	X			\$8,421			
Portland	X	X		X				\$3,505		
Redmond	X	X	X	X			\$2,133	\$274		
Rivergrove										
Rogue River										

City	Water SDC is charged for (Check all that Apply)-Residential Development	Water SDC is charged for (Check all that Apply)-Non-Residential Development	Water SDC is comprised of:-Improvement Fee	Water SDC is comprised of:-Reimbursement Fee	Water SDC is comprised of:-Other Fee (administration, land acquisition, etc.)	Water SDC is comprised of (Check all that Apply) :-Other Fee (administration, land acquisition, etc.)-TEXT	Example Residential-Improvement Fee	Example Residential-Reimbursement Fee	Example Residential-Other Fee 1	Example Residential-Other Fee 2
Salem	X	X	X				\$3,253			
Scappoose										
Scotts Mills	X				X	New water system hook up			\$7,843	
Seneca										
Shady Cove										
Sheridan										
Siletz	X	X	X	X			\$800	\$962	\$0	\$0
Silverton	X	X	X	X			\$4,029	\$1,475		
Sodaville	X	X		X				\$2,000		
Spray	X	X		X			\$0	\$28	\$0	\$0
Springfield										
St. Helens	X	X	X	X			\$1,299	\$1,212		
St. Paul	X	X	X				\$8,500	\$0	\$0	\$0
Stanfield	X	X	X	X			\$2,453	\$214		
Sublimity	X		X		X					
Sutherlin	X	X	X				\$1,622	\$0	\$0	\$0
Sweet Home	X	X	X	X			\$478	\$737		
Tangent										
The Dalles	X	X	X				\$2,317	\$0	\$0	\$0
Troutdale	X	X	X				\$1,345	\$0	\$0	\$0
Turner	X	X	X	X			\$1,100	\$1,400		
Umatilla	X	X	X	X			\$500	\$529		
Union	X		X	X			\$572	\$672		
Veneta	X	X	X	X	X	4% admin Fee. SDC increases each year per CCI.	\$5,741	\$637		
Waldport	X	X	X	X			\$366	\$3,121		
Warrenton	X	X	X	X			\$1,100			
Wasco	X	X	X				\$400			
Waterloo										
West Linn	X	X	X	X	X	Administration	\$7,161	\$601	\$201	\$7,963
Westfir	X	X	X	X						
Wilsonville	X	X	X	X			\$5,384	\$54		
Wood Village	X	X	X	X			\$174	\$2,774		
Yachats	X	X	X	X	X	Admin	\$2,409	\$1,493	\$169	
Yamhill	X	X	X				\$3,295			
Yoncalla										

City	Please provide an average Water SDC for the above examples-Example Non-Residential-Improvement Fee	Please provide an average Water SDC for the above examples-Example Non-Residential-Reimbursement Fee	Please provide an average Water SDC for the above examples-Example Non-Residential-Other Fee 1	Please provide an average Water SDC for the above examples-Example Non-Residential-Other Fee 2	Please describe the basis of your fee (e.g. square footage) and any other calculation notes:	Is the adopted SDC charge less than the fee calculated using your methodology?	What year was the Water SDC fee last updated?	What year is the next planned Water SDC Update?
Adams								
Albany	\$11,325	\$1,897			Meter size	Yes	2016	2017
Amity	\$13,030	\$6,196				No	2015	2017
Antelope								
Bandon	\$27,474	\$7,220			Water meter size.	No	2004	2017
Banks						Unsure		
Bay City					Non-Residential SDCs would be charged on the projected number of EDU just as sewer SDC.	No	2016	
Beaverton								
Boardman	\$3,264	\$912			equivalent dwelling unit of 394 gallons/day	Yes	2000	
Brookings	\$10,419	\$1,983			Meter size	No	2015	
Carlton	\$1,900	\$4,611	\$132		na	Yes	2016	2017
Cascade Locks	\$4,918		\$1,790		The resolution is based on size of water meter.	Unsure	2004	
Central Point	\$4,232	\$1,776	\$211		Based on size of meter that is needed for the structure	No	2013	
Clatskanie	\$1,500					Unsure	2008	
Coburg	\$20,612		\$1,031		Residential and Non-residential based on meter size and number of meters.	Unsure	2003	
Coburg								
Columbia City	\$10,357	\$12,520			per water meter size	No	2008	
Coos Bay								
Coquille	\$10,535	\$14,034	\$17,639		1 equivalent dwelling unit = 149 gallons per day water consumption and water meter fee based on size of water meter	No	2012	2017
Cornelius	\$73,892				Residential – City of Cornelius Water SDC \$5,825 per ¾” meter plus collect \$5,356 per ¾” meter for City of Hillsboro / / Commercial - City of Cornelius Water SDC \$31,069 per 2” meter plus collect \$42,823 per 2” meter for City of Hillsboro /	No	2014	2019
Corvallis	\$3,653	\$1,501			Fixture units	No	2000	2018
Cottage Grove	\$12,297	\$3,648	\$257		Based on water fixture unit per Plumbing Code	No	2016	2017
Creswell	\$28,994	\$7,072			water meter size	Unsure	2014	2017
Culver								
Dallas								
Dayton	\$5,150	\$2,063			SDCs are based on water meter size.	Yes	2015	

City	Please provide an average Water SDC for the above examples-Example Non-Residential-Improvement Fee	Please provide an average Water SDC for the above examples-Example Non-Residential-Reimbursement Fee	Please provide an average Water SDC for the above examples-Example Non-Residential-Other Fee 1	Please provide an average Water SDC for the above examples-Example Non-Residential-Other Fee 2	Please describe the basis of your fee (e.g. square footage) and any other calculation notes:	Is the adopted SDC charge less than the fee calculated using your methodology?	What year was the Water SDC fee last updated?	What year is the next planned Water SDC Update?
Depoe Bay	\$26,670	\$17,778			fee is EDU based. One dwelling unit is one EDU. Commercial/Industrial is based on water meter/line size and EDU chart, ie; a 2 inch meter is 8 EDU	Unsure	2011	
Detroit	\$31,772				SINGLE-FAMILY DWELLINGS = 1 EDU / ALL OTHER = SQ FOOTAGE or PER ROOM or PER PUMP or PER SEATS (DEPENDING ON BUSINESS)	No	2006	2016
Drain	\$504	\$8,074	\$172				2011	
Eagle Point								
Echo								
Enterprise								
Estacada	\$17,138	\$14,513			based on water meter size	Yes	2015	206
Falls City								
Forest Grove	\$28,832	\$14,718	\$264		SDC charges for meters above 3/4" are based on the flow factor as compared to a 3/4" meter.	No	2016	2021
Gates								
Gearhart								
Gervais	\$2,313				Flat rate fee	No	2006	
Gladstone								
Glendale							2008	
Granite								
Grants Pass	\$9,947	\$12,493	\$336		Based on water meter size	No	2005	2017
Gresham	\$53,676	\$11,500			Water meter size.	No	2008	2016
Halsey		\$3,132			Calculated based on WSFUs -- Water Supply Fixture Units	Unsure	2010	2017
Happy Valley								
Heppner								
Hermiston	\$2,254				Water Meter Size	No	2009	
Hillsboro	\$54,619	\$700	\$31			Yes	2014	2018
Huntington								
Idanha								
Independence								
Irrigon	\$9,149				N/A	Yes	2006	
Jefferson						Unsure	2001	2016
John Day	\$8,189	\$9,485			ERUs for these items are calculated by estimating the water use and then dividing the water use by 200 gpd (single family home use). Single Family Home is 1.0 ERU. / / Office is based upon employees; One employee is 0.1 ERU.	No	2009	

City	Please provide an average Water SDC for the above examples-Example Non-Residential-Improvement Fee	Please provide an average Water SDC for the above examples-Example Non-Residential-Reimbursement Fee	Please provide an average Water SDC for the above examples-Example Non-Residential-Other Fee 1	Please provide an average Water SDC for the above examples-Example Non-Residential-Other Fee 2	Please describe the basis of your fee (e.g. square footage) and any other calculation notes:	Is the adopted SDC charge less than the fee calculated using your methodology?	What year was the Water SDC fee last updated?	What year is the next planned Water SDC Update?
Jordan Valley								
Joseph								
Keizer	\$5,000				Meter size	Yes	2016	2017
Klamath Falls	\$497	\$18,349	\$1,034	1850 meter installation fee	Based on meter size. In this case a residential meter size of 5/8". Non-residential rates depend on the size of the meter. For meters larger than 5/8" you start with the cost of that size meter and multiply by a weighting factor that has been adopted by the AWWA. This is accurate for meters up to 4". For meters larger than 4", the SDC is calculated based on the customers anticipated water usage.	Unsure	2014	
La Pine					We would need to know the number of public and private restrooms since our EDU schedule for this type of building is based on that criteria.	No	2001	2016
Lafayette	\$10,737	\$807	\$1,058		Residential per dwelling unit / Non-residential calculated by EDU	Unsure	2000	2017
Lake Oswego	\$30,701	\$5,768	\$2,531		Meter Size	No	2009	
Lakeside								
Lakeview								
Lebanon	\$17,970	\$103			SDCs are based on water meter size	No	2008	
Lexington								
Lincoln City	\$545	\$1,431			Example is for a 5/8" meter size	No	2016	
Long Creek								
Lowell	\$28,856	\$5,120	\$1,019		Single family residential units pay for 1 EDU. Commercial and Industrial developments are charged based on the flow factor equivalence as determined by the meter size: 0.75 inch (1.50 EDU), 1 inch (2.50 EDU), 1.50 inch (5.00 EDU), 2 inch (8.00 EDU), 3 inch (16 EDU).	Unsure	2015	2016
Madras	\$6,656				Fee is based on water meter size and amount of flow through the meter. A residential meter is one unit and a 2" water meter is 8 units. The base current fee is \$832 per unit. Therefore the non-residential use is 8 times \$832 or \$6,656.00	No	1991	2016
Malin								
Maupin	\$8,000				Meter Size	Yes	2010	
McMinnville								
Merrill								
Mill City	\$2,250	\$2,250			Water Meter Size / /	No	2008	
Milwaukie	\$4,023	\$4,838	\$679		Meter Size	No	2010	
Mitchell								

City	Please provide an average Water SDC for the above examples-Example Non-Residential-Improvement Fee	Please provide an average Water SDC for the above examples-Example Non-Residential-Reimbursement Fee	Please provide an average Water SDC for the above examples-Example Non-Residential-Other Fee 1	Please provide an average Water SDC for the above examples-Example Non-Residential-Other Fee 2	Please describe the basis of your fee (e.g. square footage) and any other calculation notes:	Is the adopted SDC charge less than the fee calculated using your methodology?	What year was the Water SDC fee last updated?	What year is the next planned Water SDC Update?
Monument								
Mosier								
Mt. Angel	\$7,888	\$11,609	\$389		All residential units are assigned one EDU per dwelling unit. Commercial and industrial developments are assessed proportionate SDC charges based on the capacity of water meter used to service the facility.	No	2016	
Myrtle Creek	\$45,936	\$4,120	\$0	\$0	water meter size	No	1998	
Myrtle Point								
Nehalem	\$3,235	\$500			Flat Rate	No	2010	2016
Newberg	\$24,979	\$7,553			Meter Size	Yes	2006	2016
Newport	\$9,343	\$309			City uses an Equivalent Dwelling Unit (EDU) methodology. Residential example is charge for 1 EDU. Non-residential charge is based on 4 EDU (i.e. .2 EDU per 1,000 sq. ft. of gross floor area).	No	2015	2017
North Bend								
North Plains	\$39,480					No	2015	
North Powder								
Nyssa								
Oakland	\$0	\$20,564	\$1,420			No	1997	
Oakridge								
Ontario								
Oregon City	\$22,201	\$7,619	\$12,986		Water Demand; Meter size	No	2016	2017
Pendleton								
Phoenix					Based on Water Meter Size.	Unsure		
Pilot Rock								
Port Orford	\$44,882				/ Meter Size	No	2015	2016
Portland		\$18,694			The Bureau's SDC is a reimbursement fee calculated in accordance with the language and intent of the Oregon state legislation as specified in ORS 223.297 to 223.314. The Portland Water Bureau's SDC adheres to the definition in ORS 223.299 (3) of a "Reimbursement fee means a fee for costs associated with capital improvements already constructed, or under construction when the fee is established, for which the local government determines that capacity exists." // The Bureau's buy-in SDC is essentially the "cost per equivalent meter unit" times the size of the meter (in equivalent units) added to the water system. Cost per equivalent meter unit is simply the net "value" of	No	2016	

City	Please provide an average Water SDC for the above examples-Example Non-Residential-Improvement Fee	Please provide an average Water SDC for the above examples-Example Non-Residential-Reimbursement Fee	Please provide an average Water SDC for the above examples-Example Non-Residential-Other Fee 1	Please provide an average Water SDC for the above examples-Example Non-Residential-Other Fee 2	Please describe the basis of your fee (e.g. square footage) and any other calculation notes:	Is the adopted SDC charge less than the fee calculated using your methodology?	What year was the Water SDC fee last updated?	What year is the next planned Water SDC Update?
					the water system divided by the total number of "equivalent meter units (5/8" meter = 1 equivalent meter unit)" served by the system. / The net value of the water system begins with the value of existing water facilities using estimated replacement cost, less accumulated depreciation (net replacement cost book value). Construction work in progress, current planned spending capital construction through year-end, and projected year-end fund cash balances, are added. Customer contributions and unpaid bond principal are deducted. The resulting total is the net "value" of the water system. / / The equivalent meter unit is a ratio based on the capacity of larger meters as compared to the capacity of a base meter such as a typical residential customer's 5/8" meter. /			
Redmond	\$17,064	\$2,192			Meter size.	Yes	2007	
Rivergrove								
Rogue River								
Salem	\$17,240				Water SDCs are charged by meter size - single family homes generally request a 3/4-inch meter, so the residential is based on that meter size. The non-residential example is based on a 2-inch meter, which is average for many commercial developments.	Unsure	2016	2017
Scappoose								
Scotts Mills					Fees are set. Based on a study done by Mid-Willamette Valley Council of Governments. Resolution was adopted in 2002.	No	2002	
Seneca								
Shady Cove								
Sheridan								
Siletz	\$800	\$962	\$0	\$0		Unsure	2006	
Silverton	\$21,475	\$7,862			Residential based on 3/4 inch water meter size. / Commercial based on 2 inch water meter size.	No	2013	
Sodaville		\$3,000			Depends on if it is on the Gravity or Pressurized system	Unsure	2015	2017
Spray	\$0	\$28	\$0	\$0	Monthly water charge is 28.00 a month unless they go over the amount. It the go over the allotted amount then they are charged an additional .50 cents per unit or 1.00. Whatever the units over.	Unsure		
Springfield								
St. Helens	\$6,131	\$5,721			Based on \$2,511 per ERU - \$1,299 Improvement Fee + \$1,212 Reimbursement Fee. Non-residential use, average daily water usage = 1,085 gpd / 230	No	2014	

City	Please provide an average Water SDC for the above examples-Example Non-Residential-Improvement Fee	Please provide an average Water SDC for the above examples-Example Non-Residential-Reimbursement Fee	Please provide an average Water SDC for the above examples-Example Non-Residential-Other Fee 1	Please provide an average Water SDC for the above examples-Example Non-Residential-Other Fee 2	Please describe the basis of your fee (e.g. square footage) and any other calculation notes:	Is the adopted SDC charge less than the fee calculated using your methodology?	What year was the Water SDC fee last updated?	What year is the next planned Water SDC Update?
					gallons per ERU = 4.72 ERU. 4.72 x \$1299 = 6,131.28 Improvement Fee; 4.72 x \$1,212 = 5,720.64 Reimbursement Fee			
St. Paul	\$8,500	\$0	\$0	\$0	Flat fee \$8500	Unsure	1998	
Stanfield	\$23,552	\$2,048			The fees for a single family home are the same regardless of the size of the home. An office building is charged based on the number of urinals or toilets. Since the number given only says "fixture units" I assumed that they are all toilets or urinals. This is obviously not true, but I had no other number to use. The improvement fee for an office building is \$32 per toilet/urinal and the reimbursement fee is \$368 per toilet/urinal.	Unsure	2016	
Sublimity					Water SDCs base rate is \$2370 per new residence	Unsure	1993	
Sutherlin	\$1,622	\$0	\$0	\$0		Yes	2011	
Sweet Home	\$7,232	\$11,142			Same as with Sewer - Water meter size per development requirement as defined by plumbing code.	No	2005	
Tangent								
The Dalles	\$16,219	\$0	\$0	\$0	Water meter size.	Yes	2006	
Troutdale	\$7,129	\$0	\$0	\$0	Hydraulic Equivalents	No	2012	2016
Turner	\$1,100	\$1,400			2015 master plan capacity calculations by EDU	No	2016	2017
Umatilla	\$1,333	\$1,411			meter size	No	1998	2018
Union						Yes	2006	
Veneta	\$14,353	\$1,594			SDC based on ERU. ERU = 432 GPD. / Reimbursement Fee = SDC eligible cost / expected growth (ERUs) / Improvement Fee = SDC eligible cost / expected growth / / Reimbursement Fee + Improvement Fee = SDC per ERU / /	No	2013	
Waldport	\$2,928	\$24,968			meter size	No	2015	2016
Warrenton	\$8,809				Meter Size	Yes	2013	
Wasco	\$400					Yes	1995	
Waterloo								
West Linn	\$57,288	\$4,808	\$1,608	\$63,704	Meter size	No	2008	2018
Westfir						Unsure	2007	
Wilsonville	\$41,269	\$417			Meter size	No	2000	2018
Wood Village	\$927	\$14,783			SDC calculations based on meter size.	No	2015	2016
Yachats					meter size	No	2016	2017
Yamhill	\$3,295					Unsure		2017
Yoncalla								