AGENDA
City of Brookings
Common Council Meeting
Brookings City Hall Council Chambers
898 Elk Drive, Brookings, Oregon 97415
Tuesday, May 26, 2009, 7:00 p.m.

I. **Call to Order**

II. **Pledge of Allegiance**

III. **Roll Call**

IV. **Public Hearings**

A. Continuation of the legislative public hearing in the matter of File # LDC-4-09, adding Chapter 17.94, to the Brookings Municipal Code. The public testimony portion of this hearing has been closed. *Planning Director; Advance Packet*

V. **Ordinances/Resolutions/Final Orders**

A. Ordinance 09-O-635, adding Chapter 17.94, Landscaping, Tree Preservation and Replacement to Title 17 of the Brookings Municipal Code. *Planning Director; Advance Packet*

B. Resolution 09-R-914, establishing methodologies for the System Development Charges for Water, Wastewater, Storm Drainage, Transportation and Parks Systems, and repealing Resolution 06-R-748. *Acting City Manager; pg. 5 (Resolution; pg. 67)*

VI. **Oral Requests and Communications from Audience** - Public Comments – limit to **5 minutes per person.** Turn in completed **public comment form** before start of meeting or to the City Manager's office during regular business hours. Obtain forms at City Hall or at www.brookings.or.us.

VII. **Consent Calendar**

A. Approval of Council Minutes for May 11, 2009. *Pg. 77*

B. Acceptance of Planning Commission Minutes for April 7 and May 5, 2009. *Pg. 79*

VIII. **Remarks from Mayor and Councilors**

A. Mayor

B. Councilors

IX. **Adjournment**

All public meetings are held in accessible locations. Auxiliary aids will be provided upon request with advance notification. Please contact 469-1102 if you have any questions regarding this notice.

May 2009

May 2009

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
					1	2
3	4	5	6	7	8	9
10	11	12	13	14	15	16
17	18	19	20	21	22	23
24	25	26	27	28	29	30
31						

June 2009

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
	1	2	3	4	5	6
7	8	9	10	11	12	13
14	15	16	17	18	19	20
21	22	23	24	25	26	27
28	29	30				

Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Sat/Sun
				May 1	2
					3
4	5	6	7	8	9
9:00am CC- VIPS/Volunteers in Police Service 4:00pm CC - Council Workshop 7:00pm FH-FireTng/ChShrp	FH - Fire Training 7:00pm CC - Planning Commission	8:00am CC-Staff/SRes 10:00am CC- Site Plan Com Mtg 1:00pm CC - LDC Meeting 3:00pm CC - Planning Staff 7:00pm FH-PoliceReserves	9:00am CC - HATSRP meeting 3:00pm CC SafetyComMtg		10:00am FH - Pistol Rifle Club
					10
11	12	13	14	15	16
8:00am 7:00pm FH-FireTng/ChShrp 7:00pm CC-Council Mtg	FH - Fire Training 10:00am CC - AFLAC 12:00pm FH - Stout Park Subcomm	10:00am CC- Site Plan Com Mtg 10:00am FH - Brookings Rural Fire Dept	9:00am CC-Crm Stoppers 1:00pm CC - Court 3:00pm CC Urban Renewal Advisory Committee	5:00pm CC - CPR	
					17
18	19	20	21	22	23
9:00am CC-VIPS/Volunteers in Police Service 7:00pm FH-FireTng/ChShrp	FH - Fire Training 1:30pm CC - LDC (Chambers) 7:00pm CC - Planning Comm (TENT)	8:00am CC-Staff/SRes 10:00am CC- Site Plan Com Mtg			
					24
25	26	27	28	29	30
MEMORIAL DAY 7:00pm FH-FireTng/ChShrp	FH - Fire Training 1:30pm CC - LDC (Chambers) 7:00pm CC-Council Mtg	10:00am CC- Site Plan Com Mtg 12:00pm CC - Stout Park Subcommittee	7:00pm CC-Parks & Rec		
					31

(3)

June 2009

June 2009

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
	1	2	3	4	5	6
7	8	9	10	11	12	13
14	15	16	17	18	19	20
21	22	23	24	25	26	27
28	29	30				

July 2009

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
			1	2	3	4
5	6	7	8	9	10	11
12	13	14	15	16	17	18
19	20	21	22	23	24	25
26	27	28	29	30	31	

Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Sat/Sun
June 1 9:00am CC- VIPS/Volunteers in Police Service 4:00pm CC - Council Workshop 7:00pm FH-FireTng/ChShrp	2 FH - Fire Training 1:30pm CC - LDC (Chambers) 7:00pm CC - Planning Commission	3 10:00am CC- Site Plan Com Mtg 7:00pm FH-PoliceReserves	4 3:00pm CC SafetyComMtg	5	6 7
8 7:00pm FH-FireTng/ChShrp 7:00pm CC-Council Mtg	9 FH - Fire Training 1:30pm CC - LDC (Chambers)	10 10:00am CC- Site Plan Com Mtg 10:00am FH - Brookings Rural Fire Dept 12:00pm CC - Stout Park Subcommittee 5:00pm CC - Victim's Impact	11 9:00am CC-Crm Stoppers 1:00pm CC - Court 3:00pm CC Urban Renewal Advisory Committee	12	13 10:00am FH - Parker 14
15 9:00am CC-VIPS/Volunteers in Police Service 7:00pm FH-FireTng/ChShrp	16 FH - Fire Training 1:30pm CC - LDC (Chambers) 7:00pm CC - Planning Comm (TENT)	17 10:00am CC- Site Plan Com Mtg	18 10:00am CC - AFLAC	19	20 21
22 7:00pm FH-FireTng/ChShrp 7:00pm CC-Council Mtg	23 FH - Fire Training 1:30pm CC - LDC (Chambers)	24 10:00am CC- Site Plan Com Mtg 12:00pm CC - Stout Park Subcommittee	25 7:00pm CC-Parks & Rec	26	27 28
29 7:00pm FH-FireTng/ChShrp	30 FH - Fire Training 1:30pm CC - LDC (Chambers)				

CITY OF BROOKINGS

COUNCIL AGENDA REPORT

Meeting Date: May 26, 2009

Originating Dept: City Manager

Signature (submitted by)

City Manager Approval

Subject: Updated System Development Charges

Recommended Action:
Adopt Resolution 09-R-914 establishing methodologies for System Development Charges for the Water System, Wastewater System, Storm Drainage System, Transportation system and Parks System, and Repealing Resolution 06-R-748.

Financial Impact:
Lowering the System Development Charges in water and wastewater will reduce available revenues for improvements and debt service in current economic conditions. However, based upon analysis of new infrastructure master plans, the recommended rates are the highest rates that can be justified.

Background/Discussion:
The City first established System Development Charges in 2003. The methodology used for calculating the fees was based upon system master plans which were in effect at that time. The City Council has adopted new master plans for water, wastewater and storm drain systems in 2007 and 2008. The City contracted with The Dyer Partnership to undertake a review of water, wastewater and storm drain System Development Charges.

During the course of this review, Dyer Partnership representatives and City Staff met with representatives of the real estate, business and construction community to obtain their comments and address their concerns.

A System Development Charges Update for Water, Wastewater and Storm Drainage was prepared by The Dyer Partnership and reviewed by the City Council at a workshop on November 3, 2008. Modifications were made as a result of those workshops. The new methodology was then available for public comments and Council consideration.

State Law requires that methodologies supporting System Development Charges be made available at least 60 days prior to public hearing. The Update was made available and legal notice made on December 10, 2008. The public hearing was held March 9, 2009. The System Development Charges Update was discussed again at City Council workshops on May 4, 2009 and May 11, 2009. No changes to the methodology were made subsequent to the public hearing.

If adopted, System Development Charges for water and wastewater will be reduced, while System Development Charges for storm drainage will increase. A chart showing the changes is attached.

The recommended System Development Charge rates are the highest rates that can be justified through analysis. The City could adopt lower rates.

Policy Considerations:
The enactment of System Development Charges by Oregon cities is a relatively new phenomenon, beginning in about 2000. The policy behind the enactment of SDCs is to have new development or expansion of existing uses pay for the cost of increasing capacity of basic infrastructure systems to serve increased demand, and to replace aging infrastructure which may not be capable of handling the impact of new demand.

The industry recommended "best practice" is to review System Development Charges every three years to assure consistency between capital improvement plan implementation and the revenue methodology.

Attachment(s):
- Resolution 09-R-914
- SDC Study by The Dyer Partnership

City of Brookings
Curry County, Oregon

SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT CHARGES UPDATE FOR WATER, WASTEWATER AND STORM DRAINAGE

FINAL MAY 19, 2009

The Dyer Partnership
Engineers & Planners, Inc.

1330 Teakwood Avenue
Coos Bay, Oregon 97420
(541) 269-0732 ▫ Fax (541) 269-2044
www.dyerpart.com

Project No. 145.03

City of Brookings

Curry County, Oregon

System Development Charges

Update for Water, Wastewater and Storm Drainage

Final May 19, 2009

Project No.145.03

The Dyer Partnership
Engineers & Planners, Inc.

1330 Teakwood Avenue
Coos Bay, Oregon 97420
(541) 269-0732 Fax (541) 269-2044
www.dyerpart.com

Table of Contents

SECTION 4 – STORM DRAINAGE

SECTION 5 – SUMMARY

LIST OF TABLES

Section

1

Introduction

Section

1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Planning Needs & Objectives

The City of Brookings continues to experience significant growth. New homes and commercial facilities proposed in the Brookings Urban Growth Boundary will place additional demands upon the existing infrastructure and require the construction of new municipal infrastructure to support this development.

Since the System Development Charge (SDC) Program, using the current methodology went into effect in 2005, new Master Plans for Water, Wastewater and Storm Drainage have been completed. It is therefore appropriate that the SDC program be updated in these three (3) areas to make adjustments for update EDU counts and updated projections of growth and well as the revised Capital Improvement Plans presented in the new Master Plan Reports.

This report addresses only three (3) of the five (5) systems or service areas of municipal infrastructure, for which provision is made under state law, to recover or provide for these costs associated with these services for new development. Transportation and Parks SDCs are not amended in this study. Note that infrastructure expansion costs required for additional administration, police, fire, schools and social services is not currently allowed to be charged to new development under the existing SDC ordinances. The areas of city services for which Systems Development Charges (SDCs) are allowed are for water, wastewater, drainage, transportation and recreation facilities.

The SDC is a one-time charge to new development (homes, commercial facilities or industrial facilities), which are constructed in the Brooking service area and benefit from the municipal systems provided for them. The updated study period will be for ten (10) years (year 2008 to 2018).

1.2 Purpose of System Development Charges

The citizens of the community have contributed money through taxes and user fees to construct those elements which make living in the City possible. These elements include streets; water treatment, storage and distribution systems; wastewater collection, pumping and treatment systems; storm water drainage systems and parks. It is only fair that new development reimburse the existing owners for the portions of existing infrastructure prepared in anticipation of the new arrivals. This charge is known as a reimbursement fee. New growth should also pay for the costs of proposed infrastructure that would not be required except for the needs of growth. This charge is known as an improvement fee.

These two elements - Reimbursement Fees and Improvement Fees, are the basis of System Development Charges (SDCs). The intention is that neither existing users nor new users subsidize the other, but rather that each pays their fair share. According to ORS 223.307 as amended by Senate Bill 939, authorized expenditure of system development charges are as follows:

"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" and;

"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 the need for increased capacity to provide service for future users."

1.3 Oregon Systems Development Charges Act

Critical concepts of the Systems Development Charges (SDCs) regulations are addressed in this section. Oregon Revised Statutes (ORS) Sections 223.297 to 223.314, which establishes Oregon law regarding SDCs and 2003 Regular Session Senate Bill 939 which amends the ORS provide the basis for the recommended methodology.

As noted above, there are restrictions on the expenditure of fees collected under the Oregon Systems Development Charges Act. The purpose of the regulations is to provide a uniform framework for the imposition of system development charges by governmental units for specified purposes and to establish that the charges may be used only for capital improvements. This includes land and right-of-way necessary for the improvement.

Under current definitions, "Capital Improvement" means planning, design, inspection, administration of construction and construction or repair costs, but not operations or routine maintenance costs for the following five Eligible City Services (ECSs):

- Water supply, treatment and distribution (Updated in this Study)
- Wastewater collection, transmission, treatment and disposal (Updated in this Study)
- Drainage and flood control (Updated in this Study)
- Transportation (SDC Study for 2005 remains in effect)
- Parks and recreation (SDC Study for 2005 remains in effect)

Not included with SDCs are connection or hook-up fees, which reimburse the City for its average cost of inspecting and installing connections for water and wastewater service. The City may (and should) collect these in addition to SDCs.

SDCs may not include any fees assessed or collected as part of a local improvement district. For businesses, SDCs may not be based on the number of employees hired without regard to actual usage.

The City must set forth a written methodology in the form of an Ordinance or Resolution for both reimbursement and/or improvement fee portions of the SDC. Support documents, such as this report, must be available for public inspection.

The reimbursement portion of the fee must not require future system users to contribute more than an equitable share to the cost of existing facilities. The method must consider the cost of the existing facilities, prior contributions by existing users, gifts or grants from federal or state government or private persons, the value of unused capacity available to future system users, rate-making principles employed to finance publicly owned capital improvements and other relevant factors identified by the local government imposing the fee.

The improvement portion of the fee must consider the cost of projected capital improvements needed to increase the capacity of the systems to which the fee is related and be calculated to obtain the cost of capital improvements for the projected need for available system capacity for future users.

The improvement fee must provide for a credit for the construction of a capital improvement that is required as a condition of development approval; identified in a Master Plan; is either not located on or contiguous to property that is the subject of development approval; or is built larger or with greater capacity than is necessary for the particular development project to which the improvement fee is related. The capital improvement must be of the same type as the SDC credited and the applicant must demonstrate that a particular improvement qualifies for credit. If the credit is greater than the SDC, then the credit may be used for the applicant's future developments up to a period of 10 years.

The City must 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 and mail them information 90 days prior to the first hearing.

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

System development charge revenues shall be deposited in accounts designated for such moneys. The governmental unit shall provide an annual accounting, to be completed by January 1 of each year, 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. The governmental unit shall include in the annual accounting, a list of the amount spent on each project funded, in whole or in part, with system development charge revenues.

1.4 Scope of Study

This study will set forth an updated methodology and recommended SDC fees for the following Eligible City Services (ESCs):

- Water supply, treatment and distribution
- Wastewater collection, transmission, treatment and disposal
- Drainage and flood control

This study, for each Updated SDC, includes EDU assessment tables, methodology development, and recommended charges for each service EDU. Water is addressed in Section 2; Wastewater in Section 3 and Drainage in Section 4. The SDC for each updated service will include a reimbursement and an improvement portion. This study concludes with a summary and chart representing all five services. The method of system development charge assessment is included in Section 5.

1.4.1. Reimbursement Fee Method

Based on an inventory of the existing capital improvements, a present day replacement value for each infrastructure element is determined. The age and service life of each element is determined or estimated. Then a depreciated value to the present time is calculated for that class of infrastructure with grant funding percentages excluded.

Next, the portion of each element which is available for new customers is determined. This portion is referred to as excess capacity. Finally, that portion of the excess capacity, depreciated value, existing capital improvements which are already "paid for" by the existing customers is determined. This is referred to as the equity portion. This "paid for" portion represents the "equity" of the system for which the new customers must purchase their share from the existing system customers, who in fact are the owners. Because new customers will pay for a portion of existing system elements currently being financed through the debt service portion of user fees and/or through property taxes, it is desirable that they not be charged for currently financed improvements. However, in the case where new improvements have recently been constructed, it may be appropriate that new users provide a portion of debt service payment as long as they are not also charged for the inventory value of the financed assets.

That portion of the non-grant funded, "paid for" and depreciated infrastructure which represents excess capacity (in excess of the present customer's demand) is the reimbursement or "buy in" portion of the SDCs.

Asset values are typically determined by one of two methods. Both methods estimate a life expectancy for the item under consideration. One method uses the actual cash cost of the item at the time of installation and depreciates it annually by straight line method in proportion to the estimated life of the asset to arrive at the value. This is a cash cost method. The other method uses the current replacement cost and depreciates it based on the age of the asset with respect to its estimated life to arrive at the current value. This is the current value

method. The current value method accounts for inflation, is more equitable and is the preferred method within this study.

As an example, consider the purchase of a home build in 1970, well maintained, with a 100-year life expectancy and originally sold for $30,000. Based on a cash cost method, the home would be worth only $20,100 today. Assume that the current replacement cost of such a home was today $130,000. Using this figure and depreciating for 33 years of a 100-year life expectancy would provide a value of $87,100 which would be more likely to represent a correct market value.

1.4.2 Improvement Fee

A Capital Improvements Plan (CIP) for each ECS is the basis of the improvement fee portion of the SDC. It must be determined which elements or portions of elements are strictly for replacement of existing capacity and which are for new service by providing additional capacity. SDC eligible costs are estimated as percentages of each Capital Improvement Plan line item for each ECS (i.e. water, wastewater, transportation, drainage, parks). A capital improvement plan for each ECS has been developed as part of this study. SDC eligible portions are also estimated as a part of this study. This was accomplished by determining proposed capital improvements presented in existing Master Plan, Facility Plan and other report documents and in consultation with the City Staff and City Council.

Information is presented in a tabular fashion for each ECS regarding each appropriate class of new customer including existing and projected EDUs for that ECS.

1.4.3 Assessment Method

All single family dwellings will be assessed SDCs based on 1 EDU per area of service. This is recommended as a matter of practicality. However, different types of new non-residential customers have unique demands for each service in terms of equivalent dwelling units (EDUs). For example, a medical clinic, per 1000 square feet, is projected to have a ¾" water meter which is the same as a new home (1 water EDU). Wastewater demand per 1000 square feet would be estimated as 1.12 EDU or 12% more than a typical home. Storm drainage is calculated in terms of actual impervious area related to 2500 square feet, which is the typical single-family home impervious area. For a new clinic located on a 10,000 square feet lot with all of it paved for parking or occupied with buildings and sidewalks, there would be 4 drainage EDUs assessed.

1.5 Previous Studies and Information

The following studies, reports and other sources of information have been used in the compilation of the System Development Charge Study:

- City of Brookings, System Development Charges – January 2005 – The Dyer Partnership, Inc.

- City of Brookings, Water System Master Plan Update and Adopted Water Conservation Management Plan - October 2007 (Final) - HGE, Inc.
- City of Brookings, Wastewater Facilities Plan – March 10, 2008 (Final) - HGE, Inc.
- Storm and Surface Water Facilities Plan for Brookings – Harbor Area – October, 2007 (Final) – HGE, Inc.
- Lone Ranch Wastewater & Water Improvements Off-Site Cost Sharing Documents (Draft) – March 2008
- Lone Ranch Infrastructure Financing Agreement (Draft 3)
- Water and Wastewater Billing and Usage Data provided by City Staff.
- Utility Debt Analysis extract provided by City Staff from latest audit.
- GASB 34 Implementation Documents - September 2002 - Resource Assistance for Rural Environments (RARE) by.Jeremy McVetty.
- Engineering News Record, Construction Cost Index History, McGraw Hill Co.
- 72nd Oregon Legislative Assembly - 2003 Regular Session - Senate Bill 939
- Oregon Revised Statutes 223.297 to 223.314

1.6 Authorization

The City of Brookings contracted with The Dyer Partnership, Engineers & Planners, Inc. on April 4th, 2008 to prepare the System Development Charge Study.

1.7 Acknowledgments

This plan is the result of contribution made by a number of individuals and agencies. We wish to acknowledge the efforts of Gary Milliman, City Manager; Patti Dunn, Administrative Services Director; John Cowan, Public Works Director; LauraLee Gray, Building Inspector/Official; Vicki Merrilland, Accounts Specialist and the other staff members of the City of Brookings.

Water Supply, Treatment & Distribution

Section

2

WATER SUPPLY, TREATMENT & DISTRIBUTION

Section 2

2.1 General

Brookings's water system infrastructure consists of land, buildings, structures, electro-mechanical equipment, electronic and mechanical instrumentation, piping, valves and tankage. Only capital improvement items will be considered eligible for existing excess capacity reimbursement or for planned improvement fee collection to increase capacity.

Recall from Section 1 that the System Development Charges (SDCs) consist of two parts: Reimbursement fees and Improvements fees. Reimbursement fees are based upon the value of the remaining capacity of existing facilities for new customers. Improvement fees are based upon planned improvements to increase capacity for new customers within the study period, which is ten years in this case. The sums for the two types of eligible fees (reimbursement or improvement) within each service (water, sewer, parks, drainage, transportation) are divided by the projected number of new customer EDUs (new projected demands in multiplies of what a typical single family home would use) for the study period (next ten years). In this manner the SDC charge per EDU for each service is calculated.

For the purposes of this study, vehicles and tools associated with operations and maintenance have not been included as eligible SDCs.

2.2 Projected EDUs and Services

In order to establish SDCs, it is necessary to determine both the current number of Equivalent Dwelling Units (EDUs) and the projected future number of EDUs. The total value of eligible reimbursement and improvement items are divided by the projected new EDUs to calculate the per EDU system development charge (SDC). These EDU projections were developed based on information provided in Table 4-1 of the Water System Master Plan Update and Adopted Water Conservation Management Plan prepared October 2007. The projections are shown below in Table 2.2.1. The projection indicate that there are estimated to be 1,979 water EDU's added during the ten year study period between 2008 and 2018. There are currently estimated to be 6,742 water EDU's. Therefore, by 2018 there are estimated to be a total of 8,721 water EDU's. New water EDU's will comprise 22.69% of water EDU's during the study period.

Table 2.2.1 Water EDU and Service Population Projections 2008

Demand per Account Unit			
	Res.	Com./Ind.	Spec. Use
GPD	162.1	835.4	91.8
% of Total	71.1%	28.0%	1.0%

Account Units (Assuming 3% Res. Growth - 1.5% Commercial /Industrial/Spec. Use Growth)				
Year	Res.	Com./Ind.	Spec. Use	Total
2006	4219	322	104	4645
2008	4891	347	112	5350
2013	5669	374	121	6164
2018	6572	403	130	7105

Number of EDUs (Assuming 3% Res. Growth 1.5% Public & Ind Growth)				
Year	Res.	Com./Ind.	Spec. Use	Total
2006	4219	1660	59	5937
2008	4891	1788	63	6742
2013	5669	1926	68	7664
2018	6572	2075	74	8721
Projected New EDU's 2008 to 2018 = 1979 22.7% of 2018 EDU's				

2.3 Reimbursement Fee Methodology Development

2.3.1 Inventory and Depreciated Value

An inventory of the Brookings water system's existing capital improvements and assets considered eligible for reimbursement is presented in this section. The principal source of pipe information for assets obtained prior to 2002 was obtained from the previous SDC report prepared in January 2005. The principal source of information for that report was Brookings's GASB 34 Implementation Documents by RARE report dated September 2002. Water pipe information was listed on pages 39 through 46. Facilities information was listed on page 63. Updated Water Facilities information identified as missing in the GASB 34 document on page 79 was obtained from the Brookings staff in 2004. Values were estimated for Pump Station #2 intake and Dodge Pump Stations #1 and 2 all constructed in 1985. The cost of the water treatment plant constructed in 1975 was unknown, but not particularly relevant to this study since it has reached the end of its service life.

Information for water assets obtained by the City since the previous report was obtained from City staff.

The assets noted above do not include tools, lab equipment and other items, which are considered expendable and associated more appropriately with operations and maintenance such as vehicles.

A tabulation of water pipe assets is presented on the next page as Table 2.3.1.1, Water Pipe Assets Current Value. A tabulation of water plant, reservoir, intake and pump station assets is presented below as Table 2.3.1.2, Water Facilities Assets Current Value

The tabulation of assets for water pipe includes date of acquisition, historic cost, ENR construction year index, ratio of ENR factor based on the recent value of 8112 (April '08), calculated replacement cost and age of asset. All water pipe is assumed to have a service life of 60 years. The depreciated value based on replacement cost is then computed. This value represents the "fair market" cost of the pipe. The tabulation of assets for water facilities includes all of the above information as well as a description of the asset and estimated useful service life

The derived asset valuations are generally based upon the original or estimated original cash cost of the item updated to reflect its current replacement cost and then depreciated. The intention of this SDC is determine the current value of the SDC eligible infrastructure item. As noted in Section 1, items valued simply at original cost and then depreciated do not correctly reflect the actual value of the item.

The value of land purchased for storage sites, intake structures and treatment plant is SDC reimbursement eligible. However, land associated with right of way for water lines was typically donated and therefore not eligible for SDC reimbursement. While land values for right of way, streets, storm drainage, sidewalks and some wastewater improvements are listed in the GASB 34 Implementation Documents, land for the water treatment plant, storage tanks and pump stations is not listed. It is therefore assumed that each storage site consists of a 100 ft. x 100 ft. site and that each pump station consists of a 30 ft x 20 ft site. The treatment plant site is estimated to be approximately 340 ft. x 180 ft. in area. The GASB 34 documents provided guidance for the valuation of land at $2.77 per sq. ft for industrial land area as of the year 2001. The ENR ratio of (8112/6343) updates the value to $3.54 per sq. ft. However, the property owned for water infrastructure is piece meal and not readily available for other uses. It is therefore discounted by 50% and valued at $1.77 per sq./ft. for purposes of this study.

Table 2.3.1.1 Water Pipe Assets Current Value 2008

Date Acquired	Historic Cost	ENR Index	ENR Factor	Replace. Cost	Age	Deprec. Value
record 1973	$2,116,355	1895	0.23	$9,059,563	54	$905,956
1976	$43,868	2401	0.30	$148,212	32	$69,166
1977	$202,471	2576	0.32	$637,595	31	$308,171
1978	$28,711	2776	0.34	$83,899	30	$41,950
1979	$108,213	3003	0.37	$292,316	29	$151,030
1981	$21,054	3535	0.44	$48,314	27	$26,573
1982	$123,961	3825	0.47	$262,895	26	$148,974
1983	$18,215	4066	0.50	$36,340	25	$21,199
1985	$148,302	4195	0.52	$286,776	23	$176,845
1988	$1,035,272	4519	0.56	$1,858,404	20	$1,238,936
1989	$131,632	4615	0.57	$231,376	19	$158,107
1990	$617,699	4732	0.58	$1,058,913	18	$741,239
1991	$75,375	4835	0.60	$126,462	17	$90,631
1993	$264,769	5210	0.64	$412,247	15	$309,185
1994	$835,780	5408	0.67	$1,253,670	14	$961,147
1995	$43,956	5471	0.67	$65,175	13	$51,054
1997	$8,964	5826	0.72	$12,481	11	$10,193
1998	$35,115	5920	0.73	$48,117	10	$40,098
2000	$84,511	6221	0.77	$110,200	8	$95,507
2001	$71,448	6343	0.78	$91,374	7	$80,714
2003	$30,528	6694	0.83	$36,995	5	$33,912
2004	$638,598	7109	0.88	$728,697	4	$680,117
2007	$207,900	7966	0.98	$211,710	1	$208,182
2008	$870,000	8090	1.00	$872,366	0	$872,366
Total	$7,762,697			$17,974,095		$7,421,248

Table 2.3.1.2 Water Facilities Assets Current Value 2008

Description	Date Acq.	Hist. Cost	ENR Index	ENR factor	Replace. Cost	Age	Ser. Life	Deprec. Value
WTP C. Control	1993	$84,864	5210	1.557	$132,134	15	20	$33,033
WTP Roofing	1997	$30,408	5826	1.392	$42,339	11	15	$11,291
PS # 2 (new) intake	1985	$4,000	4195	1.934	$7,735	23	20	$0
PS Dodge #1	1985	$4,000	4195	1.934	$7,735	23	20	$0
PS Dodge #2	1985	$4,000	4195	1.934	$7,735	23	20	$0
PS Mont. Dr. #1	1992	$5,476	4985	1.627	$8,911	16	20	$1,782
PS Mont. Dr. #2	1992	$4,711	4985	1.627	$7,666	16	20	$1,533
PS Mont. Dr. #3	1992	$4,711	4985	1.627	$7,666	16	20	$1,533
PS Pac View	1985	$4,000	4195	1.934	$7,735	23	20	$0
WTP orig.	1975	unknown	2212	3.667	NA	33	25	$0
Filter Expansion	1991	$482,600	4835	1.678	$809,690	17	25	$259,101
3 WT pumps	1992	$25,000	4985	1.627	$40,682	16	12	$0
Chlorine. Fac.(Intake)	1992	$12,000	4985	1.627	$19,527	16	15	$0
WTP New Pump	1994	$12,000	5408	1.500	$18,000	14	12	$0
Generator	2007	$150,000	7966	1.018	$152,749	1	12	$140,020
Totals		$827,770			$1,270,305			$448,293

Table 2.3.1.3 Water System Land Current Value 2008

Pump Station	Area S.F.	Value
East Harris	600	$1,062
Dodge 1	600	$1,062
Dodge 2	600	$1,062
1.5 MG Res. PS	600	$1,062
Pacific View	600	$1,062
Mtn. Drive 1	600	$1,062
Mtn. Drive 2	600	$1,062
Mtn. Drive 3	600	$1,062
Storage Facility	**Area S.F.**	**Value**
East Harris	10000	$17,700
1.5 MG Res.	10000	$17,700
Old County (Concrete)	10000	$17,700
Pacific View	10000	$17,700
Tidewater	10000	$17,700
Mtn. Drive 1	10000	$17,700
Mtn. Drive 2	10000	$17,700
Mtn. Drive 3	10000	$17,700
Mtn. Drive 4	10000	$17,700
Plant and Intake	**Area S.F.**	**Value**
Plant Site	61200	$108,324
Intake Site	900	$1,593
Totals	156900	$277,713

2.3.2 Grant Funding Portion

As previously discussed, those portions of the water infrastructure, which were paid for by Federal or State funds through grants are not eligible for system development charge reimbursement. Grant funding amounts are unknown. Water construction projects have historically been grant funded at 25% or less of project costs; the remainder being loan funded. Therefore, for purposes of this report all water infrastructure will be assumed to have been grant funded in the amount of 25%.

2.3.3 Capacity Remaining

Distribution System. Parts of the existing piping are not adequate in size to provide fire flows to portions of the existing community. However, combined with a number of new pipe installations proposed in the future, the existing piping network will provide necessary distribution for both existing and new customers. Because much of the anticipated growth will occur in areas not yet developed or served with existing water lines, it is estimated that only 40% of the existing distribution system should be considered available for future customers. Of this portion, 22.7% of the distribution demand in the next 10 year period is anticipated to be from new customers. The capacity remaining share is then computed as (40% x 22.7%) = 9.08% eligible for SDC reimbursement.

Plant and Raw Water System. The plant and elements of the raw water pump systems; piping and equipment associated with are near their capacity. To provide water for all projected growth in the next 10-year period will generally require that all phase 1 projects (as identified in the Water Master Plan) be constructed. Those portions of the plant which are new have the same capacity as computed for the pump stations following.

Pump Stations
It is assumed that the pump stations will continue to provide service to both existing and new customers during the study period. There are 6,742 current water EDUs with 1,979 additional EDUs projected by the year 2018 totaling 8,721 EDUs. For any assets, which have remaining capacity during the study for new users as well as the existing users, the percentage "share" for new users is 22.7% of the value. This portion should be considered potentially eligible for SDC reimbursement.

Land.
Potential SDC eligible share is computed in the same manner as in the proceeding paragraph and will be 22.7% of the value.

Water Storage System. The water storage reservoirs in Brookings have 1.86 million gallons of storage capacity. As indicated in Table 9.1 of the Water Master Plan, about 3.1 million gallons are currently recommended. The City is in the process of providing this additional storage but no SDC eligible reserve capacity remains at the present time.

2.3.4 Loans

There are three outstanding debts. The DEQ state Revolving Loan (SRF) which was for replacement of the sewer plant, a 1998 series bond and a 2003 series bond. Both the 1998 and 2003 bonds refinanced earlier issuances. The 1998 bonds refinanced a Bancroft Bond and is associated with local improvement district improvements in the Dawson Tract area of the City. Therefore, this loan is not relevant to the SDC computation process. The DEQ loan will be addressed in the wastewater SDC section of this report. The only outstanding loan associated with water improvements is therefore the 2003 series bond. The treatment of this loan is addressed below in Section 2.3.5.

2.3.5 Equity Portion

The equity portion of the existing water system consists of the depreciated and non-grant funded, SDC eligible infrastructure value which represents excess capacity available for new customers and which is not currently being financed. This amount is divided by the number of anticipated EDUs, which will be added to the system during the study period. The result is the reimbursement portion of the SDC.

In October of 2003, the City of Brookings issued an advance refunding loan in the amount of $3,190,000. This loan refinanced and consolidated earlier issues. Of this amount, 80% or $2,552,000 was specifically identified for wastewater systems. This 80% portion is being repaid by sewer fees.

The purpose of 20% or $638,000 of this loan is not specifically identified, but according to the previous SDC study, principal remaining to be paid for water system improvements was $ 504,788 at that time. This 20% portion of the loan is being repaid with property taxes. Because of concerns regarding assessments of double payment (i.e., property tax and SDCs), no portion of the water debt service will be assessed for water SDCs. Only the inventory for which the City has paid equity will be considered for SDC reimbursement.

For purposes of this study, the portion of this loan associated with water improvements is calculated as $504,788/ $3,190,000 = 15.8%. A principal amount of $1,730,000 currently remains. The water improvements share is computed as 15.8% x $1,730,000 = $273,340.

The type of water improvements for which these loans were made is not specified in information provided by the City. Therefore, the amount of financed portion value of $273,340 will be proportionally subtracted from all categories of remaining non-grant value water infrastructure in Table 2.3.6.1 following.

2.3.6 Calculation of Water SDC Reimbursement Fee

Table 2.3.6.1 titled Water SDC Reimbursement Portion Determination presents the calculations required to compute the reimbursement portion of the water SDC. The reimbursement portion per EDU is computed by dividing the remaining capacity equity value by the projected 1,979 new EDUs anticipated in Brookings during the study period. The table includes the steps described in sub-section 2.3.1 through 2.3.5 above. The reimbursement amount per water EDU is calculated to be $304/ EDU.

Table 2.3.6.1 Water SDC Reimbursement Portion Determination

Description	Depreciated Current Value	Non-Grant Portion %	Remaining Non-Grant Value	Financed Portion Value	Remaining Equity Value	Capacity Eligible %	Remain. Capacity Value	Reimb. EDU
Distribution	$7,421,248	75	$5,565,936	$248,983	$5,316,953	9.08	$482,779	$244
Plant & Pumps	$448,293	75	$336,220	$15,040	$321,180	22.7	$72,908	$37
Storage	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	0	$0	$0
Land	$277,713	75	$208,285	$9,317	$198,967	22.7	$45,166	$23
Total	$8,147,254		$6,110,441	$273,340	$5,837,101		$600,853	$304

2.4 Improvement Fee Methodology Development

2.4.1 Capital Improvement Plan

The capital improvement plan is the basis of the improvement fee portion of the SDC and was developed in the recently completed Water Master Plan augmented by the Lone Ranch Wastewater & Water Off-Site Cost Sharing Documents – March 2008. The cost estimates presented include four components: construction cost, engineering cost, contingency, and legal and administrative costs.

Thirty-six recommended water system improvement projects have been developed based on Master Plan recommendations and the Lone Ranch Wastewater & Water Improvements Off-Site Cost Sharing Documents (LRD). The proposed projects are presented on the following page as Table 2.4.1 - Water Capital Improvement Plan and Water Cost Sharing Percentages and Totals from the LRD. These projects differ from the previous SDC capital improvement plan in that no improvements are proposed for the water treatment plant during the next 10 year period (See Water Master Plan Update Section 7.5).

The estimated project costs presented are based on current construction expenses. These projects were determined to be necessary for the next 10-year period to accommodate growth and to correct existing water system deficiencies.

2.4.2 System Development Charge Eligible Portion

Included in Table 2.4.2.1 for each capital improvement is a percentage estimated for each project presenting the portion, which will provide or support new service. This is the SDC eligible portion. Those portions of projects, which improve service to existing customers or are to be constructed to meet new regulatory requirements for existing customers, are ineligible. Most projects will provide both functions.

Regarding Distribution Projects: Distribution projects are identified as priority 1 or 2 in the Brookings Water Master Plan. As noted on page 10-7 of the Water Master Plan Update, "Priority 1 improvements are associated with removing the most serious hydraulic deficiencies and enhancing overall distribution system performance." And "Priority II improvements are primarily associated with improved hydraulic performance, especially under fire flow conditions, in the City's core areas. Generally, Priority II improvements enhance distribution system performance in specific areas"

Type A Projects: New customer EDUs will comprise 22.7% of the total system EDUs by the end of this next 10 year period, based on the current estimate of 6742 EDUs and 8721 EDUs by 2018. Capacity share for projects which benefit all customers equally will therefore be: [(8721-6742)/8721] = 22.7%. Some projects will reach 100% utilization within the10 year study period. Projects which benefit existing and new customers equally and will be fully utilized with the 10 year study period will be referred to as Type A projects. Priority I distribution project meet this criteria.

Type B Projects: Projects, which are primarily needed for future customers will generally not be fully utilized within the study period, but rather will be constructed with a capacity to at least 2030. The capacity eligibility will be 80%, but utilization within the study period will be: [(2018-2008)/(2030-2008)] = 45.5%. These will be referred to as Type B projects.

Type C Projects: The water storage projects which are currently being addressed by the City are designed to provide adequate storage for new customers and to provide recommended storage reserves for existing customers. The system currently needs 1.37 mg of additional storage to provide recommended reserves. 2.5 mg of new storage is proposed. New customers should be responsible for 1.13 mg (45.2%) of the 2.5 mg storage planned for construction during the study period. For purposes of this report, utilization will be assumed as 67%.

Type D Projects: Maintenance projects or those proposed to be constructed after 2018 are not SDC eligible.

Type E Projects: Priority II distribution projects are assumed to have a utilization similar to a Type B project of 45.56%. However, they will also serve existing customers. It is assumed that only 22.7% capacity of this type of project will be for the benefit of new customers.

Type F1 & F2 Projects: This refers to the Lone Ranch distribution projects. These projects are assumed to have utilization similar to a Type B project of 45.56%. However, the portion of the project constructed North of Carpenterville Road (F1) will be paid entirely by Lone Range and therefore have a 0% capacity share with regard to Brookings SDCs. The portion south of Carpenterville Road (F2) has a Brookings cost share of 50%. It is assumed that only 22.7% capacity of the City's share of this project will be for the benefit of other new customers, the new Borax development having paid 50%. The net SDC capacity factor will therefore be half of 22.7% or 11.3%.

The Water Capital Improvement projects are listed as Table 2.4.2.1 on the following page. Each project is identified with respect to Project Type, utilization availability, capacity availability, net SDC eligibility percentage and estimated SDC eligible cost.

System development charge eligible, improvement fee portion costs in the amount of $3,129,300 of capital improvement projects may be paid with funds collected for this purpose from new development. The fee for each new EDU should be established to collect the fee over a 10-year period.

Based on the projected growth rate for Brookings for the next 10 years, the City is expected to add 1979 water EDUs to the water system. Therefore, the EDU charge for improvement fee portion of the SDC can be no greater than ($3,163,187 / 1979) = $1,598 per EDU.

Table 2.4.2.1
Water Capital Improvement Projects & SDC Eligible Costs

Proj		Project	Proj.	Util.	Sty. Per.	Cap.	SDC	SDC
	Intake and Transmission Piping Improvement	**Total Cost**	**Type**	**Avail.**	**Cost**	**Avail.**	**Elig.**	**Cost**
1	4900' replace 12" AC with 16" DI	$689,000	A	100.0%	$689,000	22.7%	22.7%	$156,403
2	Replace 40 HP with 3-120 HP pumps	$310,000	B	45.5%	$140,909	80.0%	36.4%	$112,727
	Treated Water Pumping & Transmission							
3	Inline 125 booster pump	$160,000	A	100.0%	$160,000	22.7%	22.7%	$36,320
4	8050' 18" Dia. DI and 3-300 HP pumps	$1,925,000	B	45.5%	$875,000	80.0%	36.4%	$700,000
	New Storage Reservoirs							
5	1,600,000 gal base level	$2,400,000	C	67.0%	$1,608,000	45.2%	30.3%	$726,816
6	750,000 gal. 1st high level near Airport	$1,200,000	C	67.0%	$804,000	45.2%	30.3%	$363,408
7	150,000 gal. Near Tidewater Reservoir	$375,000	C	67.0%	$251,250	45.2%	30.3%	$113,565
	Restoration Improvements							
8	Old County clean exterior	$3,000	D	45.5%	$1,364	0.0%	0.0%	$0
9	Tidewater replace roof	$15,000	D	45.5%	$6,818	0.0%	0.0%	$0
10	Mountain Dr #2 exterior paint	$7,000	D	45.5%	$3,182	0.0%	0.0%	$0
11	Mountain Dr #3 exterior paint	$7,000	D	45.5%	$3,182	0.0%	0.0%	$0
	Booster Station Improvements							
12	Dodge #1 & #2 Station Improvements	$241,600	A	100.0%	$241,600	22.7%	22.7%	$54,843
	Distribution Improvements							
13	Ref 1 Mod*10"Ransom Ck Xing Hassett to Hampton	$665,500	A	100.0%	$665,500	22.7%	22.7%	$151,069
14	Ref 2 Mod*10" Upgrade S.ParkView and Gowman	$177,870	A	100.0%	$177,870	22.7%	22.7%	$40,376
15	Ref 3*Pine St. - Fern to Myrtle to Redwood 8" 2000 lf	$297,000	E	45.5%	$135,000	22.7%	10.3%	$30,645
16	Ref 4 Mod*Extension to 6"&8" lines served by E Harris P.S.	$160,930	A	100.0%	$160,930	22.7%	22.7%	$36,531
17	Ref 5*Dodge - Parkview to Hilltop - to airport Res 12" 2750'	$445,500	A	100.0%	$445,500	22.7%	22.7%	$101,129
18	Ref 6*North Bank - connect existing 10" lines 10" 700 lf	$107,700	A	100.0%	$107,700	22.7%	22.7%	$24,448
19	Ref 7*Dodge - replace 4" north of Hilltop 8" 1300 lf	$193,100	A	100.0%	$193,100	22.7%	22.7%	$43,834
20	Ref 9*PRVs Westwood Ln & Eastwood Ln. provide 2	$40,500	A	100.0%	$40,500	22.7%	22.7%	$9,194
21	Ref 10*Seventh - Ransom to Easy 8" 850 lf	$126,200	E	45.5%	$57,364	22.7%	10.3%	$13,022
22	Ref 11*Moore St, west end south to west end Hub St. 6" 250 lf	$33,800	E	45.5%	$15,364	22.7%	10.3%	$3,488
23	Ref 12*Mill Beach - Railroad - Allen -Wharf - Center 8" 2600 lf.	$386,100	E	45.5%	$175,500	22.7%	10.3%	$39,839
24	Ref 13*King St. south end - east to Wharf St. 6" 300 lf	$40,500	E	45.5%	$18,409	22.7%	10.3%	$4,179
25	Ref 14*Memory Ln. - Cove to Railroad St. 8" 3500 lf	$519,800	E	45.5%	$236,273	22.7%	10.3%	$53,634
26	Ref 16*Redwood St. - Fern - Myrtle - 101 8" 2600 lf	$386,100	A	100.0%	$386,100	22.7%	22.7%	$87,645
27	Ref 17*Alder - Redwood St. to US Hwy 101, 8" 250 lf	$37,100	E	45.5%	$16,864	22.7%	10.3%	$3,828
28	Ref 18*O. County Rd. Lundeen, Land , Fir,, N. Bank 10" 1850 lf	$284,700	E	45.5%	$129,409	22.7%	10.3%	$29,376
29	Ref 19*Wharf St - Spruce, Chetco, Mill Ave. 8" 300 lf	$44,600	E	45.5%	$20,273	22.7%	10.3%	$4,602
30	Ref 20*N. Hazel St - S.. Hazel St to Del Norte Land 8" 100 lf	$14,900	E	45.5%	$6,773	22.7%	10.3%	$1,537
31	Ref 21*Del Norte - Woodland Ct. 8" 1,450 lf	$215,300	A	100.0%	$215,300	22.7%	22.7%	$48,873
32	Ref 22*Railroad St. - Cove Rd to Woodland Ct. 8" 2,900 lf	$430,700	A	100.0%	$430,700	22.7%	22.7%	$97,769
33	Ref 23*Seacreast Ln. & Glenwood Dr. 16" 300'	$52,700	A	100.0%	$52,700	22.7%	22.7%	$11,963
34	Lone Ranch Dev. N. of Carpenderville Rd. 16" 7125" (Complete)	$255,065	F1	45.5%	$115,939	0.0%	0.0%	$0
35	Lone Ranch Dev. S. of Carpenderville Rd. 16" 7500', 12" 3950'	$1,209,545	F2	45.5%	$549,793	11.3%	5.1%	$62,127
	Project Total	$13,457,810						
	Water improvement SDC Eligible Total							$3,163,187
	SDC charge / EDU							$1,598

2.5 Maximum SDC Charges

2.5.1 Calculation of Total Water System Development Charge

The Water System Development Charge may be as high as the summation of the reimbursement portion and the improvement portions computed in the above sections. The summation is shown below in Table 2.5.1.1

Table 2.5.1.1 Maximum Water System Development Charges

SDC Component	Total Amount	Charge per EDU
Reimbursement	$600,853	$304
Improvement	$3,163,187	$1,598
Total	$3,764,040	$1,902

2.5.2 Assessment Table

A determination of the number of EDUs associated with each new service connection must be made in order to fairly charge new customer the appropriate SDC amount. In the case of single-family dwellings this will usually be simple. One new service connection equals one EDU. However, in the case of commercial or industrial customers, the assessment becomes more difficult. The intention is to estimate the amount of water usage, which will occur in terms of equivalent residential dwelling units. For water, a use of 162.1 gallons per service per day has been established as the average residential (EDU) demand rate on page 4-3 of the Water Master Plan Update.

A method commonly used to predict water consumption within ranges is to estimate EDUs based upon meter size installed for the new customer. Listed in Table 2.5.2.2 are meter sizes and hydraulic equivalent (HE) factors relating larger meters to typically installed 3/4" meters residential services. Note that a 1 1/2" meter which is typical for a commercial installation has an HE factor of 3.3. In several communities studied, the EDU ratio between residential customer water use and commercial use based on billing records is also approximately 3.3. A direct relationship between hydraulic equivalents and EDUs may be assumed. Therefore the installed meter size may be used as the basis of SDC charges for water customers. As developed in Table 2.5.1.1, $1,902 per EDU is recommended as the base water SDC. The recommended assessment method presented on the following page in Table 2.5.2.2 provides recommended SDC charges for new water customers based on installed meter size.

Table 2.5.2.1 Maximum Water SDC Charges

Meter Size	EDUs per Meter	Cost per Meter
3/4"	1	$1,902
1"	1.7	$3,233
1 1/2"	3.3	$6,276
2"	5.3	$10,080
3"	10	$19,018
4"	16.7	$31,760
6"	To be computed by City Staff based on analysis of projected water usage	
8"		

Note that the above meter size costs should be assessed for routine water service only. If meter size is installed for fire protection purposes, the equivalent meter size cost necessary to provide only routine water use should be assessed.

Wastewater Collection & Treatment

Section

3

WASTEWATER COLLECTION & TREATMENT

Section 3

3.1 General

Brookings' wastewater system infrastructure consists of land, buildings, structures, electro-mechanical equipment, electronic and mechanical instrumentation, sewers, piping, valves and tankage. Only those portions of existing capital improvement items which have excess capacity are eligible for reimbursement and only those portions proposed capital improvements which increase capacity are eligible for improvement fee collection.

Vehicles and tools associated with operations and maintenance have not been included as eligible System Development Charges (SDCs) since these are not considered capital improvements infrastructure items.

3.2 Projected EDUs and Services

In order to update the wastewater SDCs, it is necessary to determine both the current number of Wastewater Equivalent Dwelling Units (EDUs) and the projected future number of EDUs in the wastewater system for the new study period. The total costs of eligible reimbursement and improvement items are divided by the projected new EDUs to calculate the per EDU system development charge.

Current wastewater EDUs were determined based upon adjustments made to the information presented in Table 4-1 of the Water System Master Plan Update. The current Wastewater Master Plan does not present EDU information. Previous studies have indicated that wastewater contribution is approximately 80% of the metered water volume of 162.1 gallons per unit per day. A wastewater EDU gpd value will therefore be based upon 80% of a water EDU gpd value and have a value of 145.89 gallons per unit per day. The Wastewater Account and EDU projections, as determined from current account records and in proportion to the water billing records, are shown in Table 3.2.1 below.

The projection indicate that there are estimated to be 1,558 wastewater EDU's added during the ten year study period between 2008 and 2018. There are currently estimated to be 4,562wastewater EDU's. Therefore, by 2018 there are estimated to be a total of 6,120 water EDU's. New wastewater users will comprise 25.5% of wastewater EDU's during the study period.

Table 3.2.1 Wastewater EDU and Service Population Projections
2008
Demand per Account Unit

	Res.	Com./Indust.	Spec. Use
GPD	145.89	751.86	82.62
% of Total	71.1%	28.0%	1.0%

Account Units (Assuming 3% Res. Growth - 1.5% Commercial /Industrial/Spec. Use Growth)

Year	Res.	Com./Indust.	Spec. Use	Total
2008	3065	279	104	3448.0
2013	3553	323	112	3988.7
2018	4119	375	121	4614.8

Number of EDUs (Assuming 3% Res. 1.5% Public & Ind. Growth)

Year	Res.	Com./Indust.	Spec. Use	Total
2008	3065	1438	59	4561.8
2013	3553	1667	63	5283.5
2018	4119	1932	68	6119.8
Projected new ten year wastewater EDU's = 1558 25.5% of 2018 EDU's				

3.3 Reimbursement Fee Methodology Development

3.3.1 Inventory and Depreciated Value

An inventory of the Brookings wastewater system's existing capital improvements and assets considered eligible for reimbursement is presented in this section. The principal source of pipe information for assets obtained prior to 2002 was obtained from the previous SDC report prepared in January 2005. The principal source of information for that report was Brookings's GASB 34 Implementation Documents by RARE report dated September 2002. Sewer pipe information was listed on pages 47 through 52 of that report. Facilities information was obtained from page 61 through 63. The GASB 34 information referenced is included in Appendix C.

The assets noted above do not include tools, lab equipment and other items, which are considered expendable and associated more appropriately with operations and maintenance.

A tabulation of wastewater pipe assets is presented as Table 3.3.1.1, Sewer Assets Current Value. A tabulation of wastewater plant and pump station assets is presented as Table 3.3.1.2, Wastewater Treatment Assets Current Value. A tabulation of Wastewater Pump Station Assets Current Value is presented as Table 3.3.1.3

The tabulation of assets for sewer pipe includes date of acquisition, historic cost, ENR construction year index, ratio of ENR factor based on current value of 8112 (April '08), calculated replacement cost and age of asset. All sewer pipe is assumed to have a service life of 100 years. The depreciated value based on replacement cost is then computed. This value

represents the "fair market" cost of the pipe. The tabulations of assets for wastewater treatment and for pump station facilities include all of the above information as well as a description of the asset and estimated useful service life.

The asset valuations derived in the GASB 34 report are generally based upon the original or estimated original cash cost of the item after depreciation. However, the intention of this SDC is determine the current value of the SDC eligible infrastructure item. As noted in Section 1, items valued at original cost and then depreciated do not correctly reflect the actual value of the item. In addition, the original cost of wastewater items as listed in the GASB 34 report and constructed in 2001 do not match the final construction cost as reflected in City invoices. The correct invoice value rather than the GASB 34 value for the Buena Vista Pump Station was entered in Table 3.3.1.3. Within Table 3.3.1.2, the GASB34 line items do not correspond with the final construction invoice line items. To correct this problem, the GASB 34 inventory values were multiplied by a factor so that the sum of the 2001 wastewater plant improvements equals the actual wastewater plant invoiced total. Engineering associated with the 2001 wastewater capital improvements was also included as SDC eligible costs.

Land purchased for the treatment plant and pump stations is potentially SDC eligible. However, land associated with right of way for sewer lines was typically donated and therefore not eligible for SDC reimbursement. Original land costs for right of way, streets, storm drainage, sidewalks and some wastewater improvements are listed in the GASB 34 Implementation Documents, including land for the wastewater treatment plant and pump stations.

Table 3.3.1.1, Table 3.3.1.2 and Table 3.3.1.3 are shown on the following pages.

Table 3.3.1.1 Sewer Pipe Assets Current Value 2008

Date Acq.	Historic Cost	ENR Index	ENR Factor	Replace. Cost	Age	Depreciated Value
1951	$299,425	543	0.07	$4,473,178	57	$1,923,466
1952	$20,421	569	0.07	$291,134	56	$128,099
1953	$28,662	600	0.07	$387,510	55	$174,380
1959	$17,927	797	0.10	$182,464	49	$93,057
1961	$245,132	847	0.10	$2,347,710	47	$1,244,287
1964	$32,462	936	0.12	$281,337	44	$157,549
1966	$720	1019	0.13	$5,732	42	$3,324
1971	$48,309	1581	0.19	$247,870	37	$156,158
1972	$13,456	1753	0.22	$62,268	36	$39,851
1975	$76,152	2212	0.27	$279,270	33	$187,111
1976	$155,159	2401	0.30	$524,219	32	$356,469
1977	$246,060	2576	0.32	$774,860	31	$534,653
1978	$112,940	2776	0.34	$330,032	30	$231,023
1979	$462,860	3003	0.37	$1,250,323	29	$887,729
1981	$35,062	3535	0.44	$80,459	27	$58,735
1982	$57,525	3825	0.47	$121,998	26	$90,279
1983	$23,026	4066	0.50	$45,939	25	$34,454
1985	$194,306	4195	0.52	$375,735	23	$289,316
1988	$248,561	4519	0.56	$446,189	20	$356,951
1989	$662,548	4615	0.57	$1,164,591	19	$943,319
1990	$1,508,620	4732	0.58	$2,586,206	18	$2,120,689
1991	$304,088	4835	0.60	$510,189	17	$423,457
1993	$103,901	5210	0.64	$161,774	15	$137,508
1994	$437,162	5408	0.67	$655,743	14	$563,939
1995	$80,559	5471	0.67	$119,447	13	$103,919
1997	$16,244	5826	0.72	$22,618	11	$20,130
1998	$59,432	5920	0.73	$81,438	10	$73,294
2000	$302,257	6221	0.77	$394,134	8	$362,603
2001	$34,675	6343	0.78	$44,346	7	$41,241
2002	$41,093	6538	0.81	$50,986	6	$47,927
2003	$99,336	6694	0.83	$120,378	5	$114,360
2004	$1,258,474	7109	0.88	$1,436,031	4	$1,378,589
2005	$667,249	7446	0.92	$726,930	3	$705,123
	$7,893,803			$20,583,038		$13,982,988

Table 3.3.1.2 Wastewater Treatment Assets Current Value 2008

Description	Date Acq.	Hist. Cost	ENR Index	ENR factor	Replace. Cost	Age	Service Life	Deprec. Value
Grit Chambers - (2) - Bldg.	2001	$14,645	6343	1.279	$18,729	7	50	$16,107
Eff. Outfall Box - Bldg.	1991	$25,849	4835	1.678	$43,369	17	50	$28,623
WWTP metal frame - bldg.	2001	$28,567	6343	1.279	$36,534	7	50	$31,419
Trickling Filter P.S. - Bldg.	1991	$72,362	4835	1.678	$121,407	17	50	$80,128
Blowers - Bldg.	1991	$80,758	4835	1.678	$135,493	17	50	$89,425
WWTP - Lab - Bldg.	2001	$165,572	6343	1.279	$211,749	7	50	$182,104
Primary Clarifier #1 - Bldg.	1991	$207,440	4835	1.678	$348,036	17	50	$229,704
Solids Contact Chamber - Bldg.	2001	$194,501	6343	1.279	$248,745	7	50	$213,921
Primary Clarifier #2 - Bldg.	2001	$203,782	6343	1.279	$260,615	7	50	$224,129
Aeration Basin - Bldg.	1991	$241,678	4835	1.678	$405,479	17	50	$267,616
Trickling Filter #1. - Bldg.	1991	$247,500	4835	1.678	$415,247	17	50	$274,063
Operations - Bldg.	2001	$498,309	6343	1.279	$637,282	7	50	$548,063
UV System - Bldg.	2001	$1,205,748	6343	1.279	$1,542,019	7	50	$1,326,136
WWTP Digester Control - Bldg.	2001	$1,290,176	6343	1.279	$1,649,994	7	50	$1,418,995
Sludge Tank - Bldg.	2001	$1,408,401	6343	1.279	$1,801,190	7	50	$1,549,023
Secondary Clarifier - Bldg.	2001	$1,455,231	6343	1.279	$1,861,080	7	50	$1,600,529
WWTP Digester - Bldg.	2001	$1,486,658	6343	1.279	$1,901,272	7	50	$1,635,094
Screenings Compactor.	1993	$23,800	5210	1.557	$37,057	15	20	$9,264
Sewer Camera Transporter	1999	$9,146	6059	1.339	$12,245	9	20	$6,735
WW Trickling Filter	2001	$13,405	6343	1.279	$17,144	7	20	$11,144
Bio-solids Pump Trailer	1997	$29,462	5826	1.392	$41,022	11	20	$18,460
Grit Chambers - (2) - Equip.	2001	$28,962	6343	1.279	$37,039	7	30	$28,397
Blower Bldg. - Equip.	2001	$38,301	6343	1.279	$48,983	7	30	$37,554
Operations - Bldg. - Equip.	2001	$114,904	6343	1.279	$146,950	7	30	$112,662
WWTP Lab Building - Equip.	2001	$131,300	6343	1.279	$167,919	7	30	$128,738
Primary Clarifier #1 - Equip.	2001	$204,673	6343	1.279	$261,755	7	30	$200,679
Solids Contact Chamber - Equip.	2001	$318,593	6343	1.279	$407,445	7	30	$312,374
Primary Clarifier #1 - Equip.	2001	$423,745	6343	1.279	$541,924	7	30	$415,475
Trickling Filter #1. - Equip.	2001	$444,100	6343	1.279	$567,955	7	30	$435,432
Trickling Filter PS - Equip.	2001	$463,410	6343	1.279	$592,651	7	30	$454,365
Sewer Line - Land	1991	$770	4835	1.678	$1,292	17	na	$1,292
Sewer Line - Land	1991	$770	4835	1.678	$1,292	17	na	$1,292
Sewer Line - Land	1991	$770	4835	1.678	$1,292	17	na	$1,292
Wastewater Facility Land	1957	$118,336	724	11.204	$1,325,886	51	na	$1,325,886
Sludge Tank - Land	2000	$133,104	6221	1.304	$173,564	8	na	$173,564
Wastewater Facility - Parking	2000	$0	6221	1.304	$0	8	40	$0
Wastewater Facility - Landscape	2000	$0	6221	1.304	$0	8	50	$0
Eng. Sld Dis./Plnt Upgrade EMK	1997	$459,263	5826	1.392	$639,468	11	30	$404,996
Eng. Sld Dis./Plnt Upgrade B&C	1997	$81,435	5826	1.392	$113,388	11	30	$71,813
Eng. WW Dsn & Construct B&C	1998	$66,469	5920	1.370	$91,080	10	30	$60,720
Eng WW Sys. Eng. B&C	1998	$61,694	5920	1.370	$84,537	10	30	$56,358
Eng. Digester Improve. (Proj 1902)	1996	$121,800	5620	1.443	$175,808	12	30	$105,485
Totals		$12,115,390			$17,125,936			$14,089,056

Table 3.3.1.3 Wastewater Pump Stations Assets Current Value 2008

Description	Date Acq.	Hist. Cost	ENR Index	ENR factor	Replace. Cost	Age	Service Life	Deprec. Value
Lift Sta. - Constituion Way	na						25	
Lift Sta. - Beach Ave. - Equip.	na						25	
Lift Sta.- Macklyn Cove - Equip.	na						25	
Lift Sta. - The Cove - Equip.	na						25	
Lift Sta. - Land	1959	$160	797	10.178	$1,629	49	na	$1,629
Lift Sta. - Seacliff - Bldg.	1997	$0	5826	1.392	$0	11	25	$0
Lift Sta. - Dawson Tract #2 - Bldg.	1990	$4,572	4732	1.714	$7,838	18	25	$2,195
Lift Sta. - Beach Ave. - Bldg.	1991	$4,994	4835	1.678	$8,379	17	25	$2,681
Lift Sta. - Dawson Tract #3 - Bldg.	1990	$5,404	4732	1.714	$9,264	18	25	$2,594
Lift Sta. - Dawson Tract #5 - Bldg.	1990	$7,586	4732	1.714	$13,005	18	25	$3,641
Lift Sta. - Dawson Tract #1 - Bldg.	1990	$13,510	4732	1.714	$23,160	18	25	$6,485
Lift Sta. - Dawson Tract #4 - Bldg.	1990	$13,510	4732	1.714	$23,160	18	25	$6,485
Lift Sta. - Buena Vista Lp. - Bldg.	2001	$147,377	6343	1.279	$188,479	7	25	$135,705
Lift Sta. - Macklyn Cove - Bldg.	na						25	
Lift Sta. - The Cove - Bldg.	na						25	
Lift Sta. - Dawson Tract#2 - Equip.	1990	$14,922	4732	1.714	$25,581	18	25	$7,163
Lift Sta. - Dawson Tract#3 - Equip.	1990	$18,652	4732	1.714	$31,975	18	25	$8,953
Lift Sta.- Dawson Tract#5 - Equip.	1990	$18,652	4732	1.714	$31,975	18	25	$8,953
Lift Sta. - Mill Beach Rd. - Equip.	2001	$46,571	6343	1.279	$59,559	7	25	$42,883
Generator - Mill Beach	2008	$50,000	8090	1.003	$50,136	0	12	$50,136
Lift Sta. - Buena Vista Lp. - Equip.	2001	$30,247	6343	1.279	$38,683	7	25	$27,851
Eff. Outfall Box - Equip.	2001	$31,508	6343	1.279	$40,295	7	25	$29,013
Lift Sta. - Dawson Tract#1 - Equip.	1990	$59,688	4732	1.714	$102,322	18	25	$28,650
Lift Sta. - Dawson Tract#4 - Equip.	1990	$69,688	4732	1.714	$119,465	18	25	$33,450
Lift Sta. - Land	1990	$38,939	4732	1.714	$66,753	18	na	$66,753
Totals		$575,980			$841,656			$465,218

3.3.2 Grant Funding Portion

As previously discussed, those portions of the water infrastructure, which were paid for by Federal or State funds through grants are not eligible for system development charge reimbursement. Grant funding amounts are unknown. Brookings has received very little wastewater construction projects grant funding. It is believed that no more than 15% of project costs were grant funded, the remainder being loan funded. Therefore, for purposes of this report all wastewater infrastructure will be assumed to have been non-grant funded in the amount of 85%.

3.3.3 Capacity Remaining

Wastewater Plant. The plant, yard piping and associated equipment have capacity to provide wastewater service for all projected growth in the next 10 year period and beyond. There are 4,562 current wastewater EDUs with 1,558 additional projected by the year 2018

totaling 6,120 EDUs. Growth EDUs will therefore receive at least 25.5 % of the plant system value. At a minimum, this portion of the plant value should be considered capacity eligible for SDC reimbursement. However, improvements constructed during the last improvement phase in the years 2000-2001, were disproportionately sized based on growth needs with respect to replacement of existing obsolete or "worn out" system components. It is estimated that at least 36% of the expansion constructed during this period was for the benefit of future users. Therefore, improvements constructed during this latest phase and the debt service for them should be assessed at this rate rather than at the more conservative rate of 25.5%, which assumes an even distribution between existing users and future users.

Pump Stations. The wastewater pump stations are assumed to have a service life for the duration of this study period. All existing pump stations have adequate excess capacity in their service areas for the projected growth within the period of their remaining service lives. Therefore, the SDC capacity share of the pump stations is calculated as 36% for station improvements constructed during the years 2000-2001 or later and 25.5% for improvements prior to this.

Land. Wastewater system is for the plant site and pump station sites. Land SDC shares are computed in the same manner as the plant and pump stations and will be 25.5% of the land acquired prior to year 2000 and 36% for years after.

Collection System. The existing collection system will provide service for both existing and new customers. This will result in an SDC capacity share for new customers of 25.5% of the collection system constructed prior to year 2000 and 36% for the years after.

3.3.4 Loans

There are three outstanding wastewater debts, two of which are relevant to wastewater SDCs. The SDC-relevant loans are identified as the DEQ state Revolving Loan (SRF) for replacement of the sewer plant, and a 2003-series bond which refinanced earlier sewer bond issuances.

The 1998-series bond refinanced a Bancroft Bond and is associated with local improvement district improvements in the Dawson Tract area of the City. Therefore, this loan is not relevant to the SDC computation process. The DEQ loan and 2003-series bond are addressed below in Section 3.3.5.

3.3.5 Equity and Debt Service Portion

The method of determining equity portion for other areas of service in Brookings consists of calculating the depreciated and non-grant funded, SDC-eligible infrastructure value. This result represents the value of excess capacity available for new customers which has already been paid (i.e. - not currently being financed). This amount is divided by the number of anticipated EDUs which will be added during the study period, and the result is the reimbursement portion per EDU. However, in the case of Brookings wastewater, this results

in an inappropriately low reimbursement portion because the debt service is removed from SDC compensation and would be funded entirely from user fees.

The City of Brookings has a DEQ state Revolving Loan (SRF) wastewater improvement loan in the original amount of $13,100,000 issued in 2001 to be paid fully in fiscal year 2020/21. At this time $2,821,933 or 21.5% of the principle has been paid. This leaves $10,278,067 principal or 78.5% remaining to be paid. Total payments including interest remaining during the study period total $10,356,942. The loan was for the purpose of designing and upgrading the wastewater treatment plant.

In October of 2003, the City of Brookings issued an advance refunding loan in the amount of $3,190,000. This loan refinanced and consolidated earlier issues. Of this amount, 80% or $2,552,000 was specifically identified for wastewater systems according to the latest available audit report. This 80% portion is being repaid by sewer fees.

The purpose of 20% or $638,000 of the original loan is not specifically identified. This 20% portion of the loan is being repaid with property taxes. Because of concerns regarding assessments of double payment (i.e., property tax and SDCs), no portion of this remaining debt service will be assessed for water or wastewater SDCs.

At this time, $1,460,000 or 45.8% of the 2003 refunding loan principal has been paid leaving $1,730,000 or 54.2% remaining principal unpaid. The wastewater portions are therefore 80% of these values. For purposes of this study, the 80% portion of the advance refunding wastewater loan principal paid is $1,168,000 and the 80% portion of unpaid principal is $1,384,000. Total payments for the sewer portion only (80%) including interest remaining during the study period total $1,539,629

Under these circumstances, for wastewater, the debt reimbursement should be included as is permitted under ORS 223.307 and Senate Bill 939 with new users paying 25.5 % of the debt incurred prior to 2000 and 36% thereafter as explained in Section 3.3.3.

Equity percentage will be 21.5% for assets constructed with the DEQ wastewater plant loan and 45.8% for assets constructed with the 2003 refunding loan. All other assets will be valued at 100% equity. Based on scheduled debt service payments due within the study period, the debt service reimbursements portion of the SDC is computed as shown in Table 3.3.4.1 following:

Table 3.3.5.1 Sewer SDC Debt Service Reimb. Portion 2008

	Payment			
Date of	Amount Due	SDC	SDC	SDC per
Loan	In Sty. Per.	Share %	Eligible	EDU
2003 Refunding	$1,539,629	25.50%	$392,605	$252
2001 DEQ	$10,356,942	36.00%	$3,728,499	$2,393
Totals	$11,896,570		$4,121,104	$2,645

3.3.6 Calculation of Wastewater SDC Reimbursement Fee

Tables 3.3.5.1, 3.3.5.2 and 3.3.5.3 presented on the following pages, show the calculations required to compute the asset reimbursement portions of the wastewater SDC for sewers, wastewater plant and pump stations respectively.

Table 3.3.6.1 Sewer SDC Reimbursement Portion 2008

Date Acq.	Depreciated Value	Non-Grant %	Equity %	SDC Share	SDC Eligible
1951	$1,923,466	85%	100%	25.5%	$416,911
1952	$128,099	85%	100%	25.5%	$27,765
1953	$174,380	85%	100%	25.5%	$37,797
1959	$93,057	85%	100%	25.5%	$20,170
1961	$1,244,287	85%	100%	25.5%	$269,699
1964	$157,549	85%	100%	25.5%	$34,149
1966	$3,324	85%	100%	25.5%	$721
1971	$156,158	85%	100%	25.5%	$33,847
1972	$39,851	85%	100%	25.5%	$8,638
1975	$187,111	85%	100%	25.5%	$40,556
1976	$356,469	85%	100%	25.5%	$77,265
1977	$534,653	85%	100%	25.5%	$115,886
1978	$231,023	85%	100%	25.5%	$50,074
1979	$887,729	85%	100%	25.5%	$192,415
1981	$58,735	85%	100%	25.5%	$12,731
1982	$90,279	85%	100%	25.5%	$19,568
1983	$34,454	85%	100%	25.5%	$7,468
1985	$289,316	85%	100%	25.5%	$62,709
1988	$356,951	85%	100%	25.5%	$77,369
1989	$943,319	85%	100%	25.5%	$204,464
1990	$2,120,689	85%	46%	25.5%	$210,524
1991	$423,457	85%	100%	25.5%	$91,784
1993	$137,508	85%	100%	25.5%	$29,805
1994	$563,939	85%	100%	25.5%	$122,234
1995	$103,919	85%	100%	25.5%	$22,524
1997	$20,130	85%	100%	25.5%	$4,363
1998	$73,294	85%	100%	25.5%	$15,886
2000	$362,603	85%	22%	36.0%	$23,856
2001	$41,241	85%	100%	36.0%	$12,620
2002	$47,927	85%	100%	36.0%	$14,666
2003	$114,360	85%	100%	36.0%	$34,994
2004	$1,378,589	100%	100%	36.0%	$496,292
2005	$705,123	100%	100%	50.0%	$352,561
	$13,982,988				$3,142,312

Table 3.3.6.2 Wastewater Treatment SDC Reimbursement Portion 2008

Description	Date Acq.	Depreciated Value	Non-Grant %	Equity %	SDC Share %	SDC Eligible
Grit Chambers - (2) - Bldg.	2001	$16,107	100.00%	21.50%	36.00%	$1,247
Eff. Outfall Box - Bldg.	1991	$28,623	85.00%	45.80%	25.50%	$2,841
WWTP metal frame - bldg.	2001	$31,419	100.00%	21.50%	36.00%	$2,432
Trickling Filter P.S. - Bldg.	1991	$80,128	85.00%	33.76%	25.50%	$5,863
Blowers - Bldg.	1991	$89,425	85.00%	33.76%	25.50%	$6,544
WWTP - Lab - Bldg.	2001	$182,104	100.00%	21.50%	36.00%	$14,095
Primary Clarifier #1 - Bldg.	1991	$229,704	85.00%	45.80%	25.50%	$22,803
Solids Contact Chamber - Bldg.	2001	$213,921	100.00%	21.50%	36.00%	$16,557
Primary Clarifier #2 - Bldg.	2001	$224,129	100.00%	21.50%	36.00%	$17,348
Aeration Basin - Bldg.	1991	$267,616	85.00%	45.80%	25.50%	$26,567
Trickling Filter #1. - Bldg.	1991	$274,063	85.00%	45.80%	25.50%	$27,207
Operations - Bldg.	2001	$548,063	100.00%	21.50%	36.00%	$42,420
UV System - Bldg.	2001	$1,326,136	100.00%	21.50%	36.00%	$102,643
WWTP Digester Control - Bldg.	2001	$1,418,995	100.00%	21.50%	36.00%	$109,830
Sludge Tank - Bldg.	2001	$1,549,023	100.00%	21.50%	36.00%	$119,894
Secondary Clarifier - Bldg.	2001	$1,600,529	100.00%	21.50%	36.00%	$123,881
WWTP Digester - Bldg.	2001	$1,635,094	100.00%	21.50%	36.00%	$126,556
Screenings Compactor.	1993	$9,264	100.00%	100.00%	25.50%	$2,362
Sewer Camera Transporter	1999	$6,735	100.00%	100.00%	25.50%	$1,717
WW Trickling Filter	2001	$11,144	100.00%	21.50%	36.00%	$863
Bio-solids Pump Trailer	1997	$18,460	100.00%	100.00%	25.50%	$4,707
Grit Chambers - (2) - Equip.	2001	$28,397	100.00%	21.50%	36.00%	$2,198
Blower Bldg. - Equip.	2001	$37,554	100.00%	21.50%	36.00%	$2,907
Operations - Bldg. - Equip.	2001	$112,662	100.00%	21.50%	36.00%	$8,720
WWTP Lab Building - Equip.	2001	$128,738	100.00%	21.50%	36.00%	$9,964
Primary Clarifier #1 - Equip.	2001	$200,679	100.00%	21.50%	36.00%	$15,533
Solids Contact Chamber - Equip.	2001	$312,374	100.00%	21.50%	36.00%	$24,178
Primary Clarifier #1 - Equip.	2001	$415,475	100.00%	21.50%	36.00%	$32,158
Trickling Filter #1. - Equip.	2001	$435,432	100.00%	21.50%	36.00%	$33,702
Trickling Filter PS - Equip.	2001	$454,365	100.00%	21.50%	36.00%	$35,168
Sewer Line - Land	1991	$1,292	85.00%	45.80%	25.50%	$128
Sewer Line - Land	1991	$1,292	85.00%	45.80%	25.50%	$128
Sewer Line - Land	1991	$1,292	85.00%	45.80%	25.50%	$128
Wastewater Facility Land	1957	$1,325,886	85.00%	100.00%	25.50%	$287,386
Sludge Tank - Land	2000	$173,564	100.00%	100.00%	36.00%	$62,483
Wastewater Facility - Parking	2000	$0	100.00%	100.00%	36.00%	$0
Wastewater Facility - Landscape	2000	$0	100.00%	100.00%	36.00%	$0
Eng. Sld Dis./Plant Upgrade EMK	1997	$404,996	100.00%	100.00%	36.00%	$145,799
Eng. Sld Dis./Plant Upgrade B&C	1997	$71,813	100.00%	100.00%	36.00%	$25,853
Eng. WW Dsn & Construct B&C	1998	$60,720	100.00%	100.00%	36.00%	$21,859
Eng WW Sys. Eng. B&C	1998	$56,358	100.00%	100.00%	36.00%	$20,289
Eng. Digester Improve. (Proj 1902)	1996	$105,485	100.00%	100.00%	36.00%	$37,975
Totals		$14,089,056				$1,544,933

Table 3.3.6.3 Wastewater Pump Stations SDC Reimbursement Portion 2008

Description	Date Acq.	Depreciated Value	Non-Grant %	Equity %	SDC Share %	SDC Eligible
Lift Sta. - Constituion Way	na	$0	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	$0
Lift Sta. - Beach Ave. - Equip.	na	$0	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	$0
Lift Sta.- Macklyn Cove - Equip.	na	$0	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	$0
Lift Sta. - The Cove - Equip.	na	$0	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	$0
Lift Sta. - Land	1959	$1,629	85.00%	100.00%	25.50%	$353
Lift Sta. - Seacliff - Bldg.	1997	$0	85.00%	100.00%	25.50%	$0
Lift Sta. - Dawson Tract #2 - Bldg.	1990	$2,195	100.00%	45.80%	25.50%	$256
Lift Sta. - Beach Ave. - Bldg.	1991	$2,681	100.00%	100.00%	25.50%	$684
Lift Sta. - Dawson Tract #3 - Bldg.	1990	$2,594	100.00%	45.80%	25.50%	$303
Lift Sta. - Dawson Tract #5 - Bldg.	1990	$3,641	100.00%	45.80%	25.50%	$425
Lift Sta. - Dawson Tract #1 - Bldg.	1990	$6,485	100.00%	45.80%	25.50%	$757
Lift Sta. - Dawson Tract #4 - Bldg.	1990	$6,485	100.00%	45.80%	25.50%	$757
Lift Sta. - Buena Vista Lp. - Bldg.	2001	$135,705	100.00%	21.50%	36.00%	$10,504
Lift Sta. - Macklyn Cove - Bldg.	na	$0	0.00%	0.00%	25.50%	$0
Lift Sta. - The Cove - Bldg.	na	$0	0.00%	0.00%	25.50%	$0
Lift Sta. - Dawson Tract#2 - Equip.	1990	$7,163	100.00%	45.80%	25.50%	$837
Lift Sta. - Dawson Tract#3 - Equip.	1990	$8,953	100.00%	45.80%	25.50%	$1,046
Lift Sta.- Dawson Tract#5 - Equip.	1990	$8,953	100.00%	45.80%	25.50%	$1,046
Lift Sta. - Mill Beach Rd. - Equip.	2001	$42,883	100.00%	21.50%	36.00%	$3,319
Generator - Mill Beach	2008	$50,136	100.00%	21.50%	36.00%	$3,881
Lift Sta. - Buena Vista Lp. - Equip.	2001	$27,851	100.00%	21.50%	36.00%	$2,156
Eff. Outfall Box - Equip.	2001	$29,013	100.00%	21.50%	36.00%	$2,246
Lift Sta. - Dawson Tract#1 - Equip.	1990	$28,650	100.00%	45.80%	25.50%	$3,346
Lift Sta. - Dawson Tract#4 - Equip.	1990	$33,450	100.00%	45.80%	25.50%	$3,907
Lift Sta. - Land	1990	$66,753	100.00%	45.80%	25.50%	$7,796
Totals		$465,218				$43,617

The total reimbursement portion of the SDC is computed by adding the results of Tables 3.3.4.1, 3.3.5.1, 3.3.5.2 and 3.3.5.3. The result is computed in Table 3.3.5.4 Titled Wastewater SDC Reimbursement Portion Determination

Table 3.3.6.4 Wastewater SDC Reimb. Portion Determination 2008

Description	Current Value	SDC Eligible	SDC per EDU
Debt Service	$11,896,570	$4,121,104	$2,645
Sewers	$13,982,988	$3,142,312	$2,017
Wastewater Plant	$14,089,056	$1,544,933	$992
Pump Stations	$465,218	$43,617	$28
Total	$40,433,833	$8,851,966	$5,681

3.4 Improvement Fee Methodology Development

The capital improvement plan is the basis of the improvement fee portion of the wastewater SDC and was developed in the recently completed Wastewater System Master Plan. The cost estimates presented include four components: construction cost, engineering cost, contingency, and legal and administrative costs.

Recommended wastewater system improvement projects have been developed in Section 7 of the Wastewater Master Plan Update and listed on page 7-3 of that report. The estimated project costs presented in Table 3.4.1.1 following, are based on current construction expenses. These projects were determined to be necessary for the next 10-year period to accommodate growth and to correct existing system deficiencies. Descriptions and explanations for each project are included in Section 7 of the Wastewater Master Plan Update. In the table below, "City Eligible %" refers to the agreement with Lone Ranch as explained in the report "Lone Ranch Wastewater & Water Improvements Off-Site Cost Sharing Documents". "Capacity Eligible %" refers to the portion of the project available for and on behalf of future development. The "SDC Eligible %" is the product of these two previous factors.

Table 3.4.1
Brookings Wastewater CIP Projects with SDC Eligible Costs

Project Description	Total Cost	City Eligible %	Capacity Eligible %	SDC Eligible %	SDC Cost
Priority 1 Phase I - Proj I 27" grav. sew. 1790'	$1,142,800	77.0%	90.0%	69.3%	$791,960
Priority 1 Phase II - Proj G 24" grav. sew. 1220'	$634,100	50.0%	80.0%	40.0%	$253,640
Priority 1 Phase III - Proj C Taylor Creek P.S.	$600,000	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	$0
Priority 1 Phase III - Proj E 8" FM 5380'	$1,033,900	50.0%	80.0%	40.0%	$413,560
Priority 1Phase IV - Projects JKL 27"gs 1490', 30" grav. sew 1750', 39" grav. Sew. 500'	$2,376,600	77.0%	60.0%	46.2%	$1,097,989
Priority II Improvements Ref. 1-16, except Ref. 12	$2,829,900	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	$0
Priority II Improvements Ref. 12	$314,200	100.0%	80.0%	80.0%	$251,360
Priority III Ref. 17	$529,300	100.0%	50.0%	50.0%	$264,650
Priority III Ref. 18	$984,000	100.0%	70.0%	70.0%	$688,800
Dewatering Facility	$2,000,000	100.0%	25.5%	25.5%	$510,000
Total	$12,444,800				$4,271,960

System development charge eligible, improvement fee portion costs in the amount of $4,271,960 capital improvement projects may be paid with funds collected for this purpose from new development. The fee for each new EDU should be established to collect the fee over a 10-year period.

Based on the projected growth rate for Brookings for the next 10 years, the City is expected to add 1558 wastewater EDUs. Therefore, the EDU charge for improvement fee portion of the SDC can be no greater than ($4,271,960 / 1558 EDUs) = $ 2,742 per EDU.

3.5 Recommended Charges

3.5.1 Calculation of Total Wastewater System Development Charge

The Wastewater System Development charge may include the reimbursement portion and the improvement portions computed in this section as shown below in Table 3.5.1.1.

Table 3.5.1.1 Maximum Wastewater System Development Charges

SDC Component	Total Amount	Charge per EDU
Reimbursement	$8,851,966	$5,681
Improvement	$4,271,960	$2,742
Total	$13,123,926	$8,423

The method used to compute the reimbursement portion of the wastewater SDC for Brookings, which included payment for debt service as well as equity, will produce a high total SDC with respect to those charged by other similar communities.

3.5.2 Assessment Table

EDUs associated with each new service connection must be determined in order to charge new customer the appropriate SDC amount. A single - family dwelling equals one EDU. However, in the case of commercial or industrial customers, the assessment becomes more difficult. A contribution of 146 gallons per day as established in Section 3.2 represents one EDU.

Wastewater EDU/daily average flow contribution assessment tables have been prepared for schools, workplaces, camps, motels, hotels, marinas, health care facilities, restaurants, recreational facilities, churches, residential units and other commercial activities. These tables are widely available. A number of these tables were examined and a composite prepared for Brookings. As is typical for wastewater assessments, the independent variable is often based on the number of students, employees, seats or other criteria. While useful for determination of existing conditions, these criteria are not well suited for use in SDC determinations for future users.

Therefore, this composite EDU/daily average flow contribution assessment table was modified in terms of gross square footage, living units and beds. Conversion factors were determined. This was primarily accomplished from relating trip counts from the ITE Trip Count Manual for the same period of time where both gross area criteria and student, employee or seat factors were also listed for the same or similar facilities.
A modified wastewater EDU Assessment Table was prepared which used SDC appropriate criteria. The table was also streamlined to reduce ambiguity and to more closely reflect the

anticipated type of growth in Brookings. Listed below as Table 3.5.2.1 is the recommended basis of wastewater EDU assessments for new services.

Table 3.5.2.1 Wastewater EDU Assessments for New Services

	EDU	GPD
CAMPS, MOTELS, HOTELS AND MARINAS		
MARINAS, PER BOAT SLIP	0.11	16
MOTELS & HOTELS, PER ROOM	0.48	69
MOTELS & HOTELS WITH COOKING FACILITY, PER ROOM	0.57	84
RV PARK PER SPACE	0.67	98
SUMMER OR CHURCH TYPE CAMPS, PER BED	0.42	61
COMMERCIAL / GOVERNMENT		
APPRARAL STORE	0.10	15
AVIATION AIRPORT, GENERAL, PER BASED AIRCRAFT	0.20	29
AUTO SERVICE STATIONS, PER FUELING POSITION.	1.01	147
AUTO CARE CENTER PER 1000 SQ. FT.	0.15	22
AUTO SALES NEW/USED PER 1000 SQ. FT.	0.10	15
AUTO WASH STAFFED PER BAY	2.00	292
AUTO WASH SELF SERVICE PER BAY	1.75	255
BANK/ SAVINGS & LOAN PER 1000 SQ. FT.	0.10	15
ADDITIONAL PER DRIVE-IN WINDOW		
BEAUTY SALON, PER 1000 SQ. FT.	1.75	255
BARBER SHOP , PER 1000 SQ. FT.	0.90	131
NAIL SALON, PER 1000 SQ. FT,	0.90	131
TANNING SALON PER 1000 SQ. FT.	0.85	124
BLDG. MATERIAL/LUMBER/HARDWARE PER 1000 SQ. FT.	0.10	15
BOARDING KENNEL PER 1000 SQ. FT.	0.14	20
CONVENIENCE MARKET PER 1000 SQ. FT.	0.50	73
DISCOUNT STORE FREE STANDING PER 1000 SQ. FT.	0.10	15
DOG GROOMING PER 1000 SQ. FT.	2.30	336
GENERAL OFFICE PER 1000 SQ. FT.	0.07	10
GOVERNMENT OFFICE PER 1000 SQ. FT.	0.09	13
GROCERY STORE PER 1000 SQ. FT.	0.14	20
LAUNDROMATS, PER MACHINE	1.80	263
MANUFACTURING/FACTORY PER 1000 SQ. FT.	0.07	10
ADD FOR FACTORY (WITH SHOWERS) PER 1000 SQ. FT.	0.03	4
MINI-WAREHOUSE (STORAGE) PER 1000 SQ. FT.	0.03	4
NURSERY PER 1000 SQ. FT.	0.07	10
RETAIL / SHOP / STORE PER 1000 SQ. FT.	0.10	15
TRUCK / TRANSPORTION TERMINALS PER 1000 SQ. FT.	0.20	29
WAREHOUSING PER 1000 SQ. FT.	0.05	7

Table 3.5.2.1 (Cont) Wastewater EDU Assessments for New Services

	EDU	GPD
EDUCATION FACILITIES / SCHOOLS		
BOARDING SCHOOLS PER RESIDENTIAL UNIT	0.56	82
COMMUNITY COLLEGE PER 1000 SQ. FT.	0.40	58
DAY CARE CENTER (NO MEALS PREPARED) PER 1000 SQ. FT.	0.30	44
LIBRARY PER 1000 SQ. FT.	0.15	22
SCHOOL, NO CAFETERIA OR SHOWERS PER 1000 SQ. FT.	0.29	42
ADD FOR CAFETERIA PER 1000 SQ. FT. OF SCHOOL	0.09	13
ADD FOR SHOWERS PER 1000 SQ. FT. OF SCHOOL	0.06	8
HEALTH CARE FACILITIES		
CLINICS AND VETS., PER 1000 SQ. FT.	1.12	163
HOSPITALS PER BED	1.40	204
NURSING HOMES PER BED	0.84	123
PLACES OF WORSHIP		
TEMPLE/CHAPEL NO SCHOOL PER 1000 SQ. FT.	0.90	131
WORSHIP & SUNDAY (SABBATH) SCHOOL PER 1000 SQ. FT.	0.13	20
ADD WITH MEAL PREPERATION FAC. PER 1000 SQ. FT.	0.09	13
RESTAURANTS		
BARS, TAVERNS AND COCKTAIL LOUNGES PER 1000 SQ. FT.	1.85	270
FAST FOOD PER 1000 SQ. FT.	2.52	368
ADDITIONAL PER DRIVE-IN WINDOW	1.34	196
QUALITY RESTAURANT PER 1000 SQ. FT.	2.80	409
BAKERY PER 1000 SQ. FT.	1.70	248
DELI, SANDWICH SHOP PER 1000 SQ. FT.	1.65	241
COFFEE SHOP NO PREPARED MEALS PER 1000 SQ. FT.	1.25	182
COFFEE KIOSK PER 1000 SQ. FT.	1.10	160
RECREATIONAL FACILITIES		
AMUSEMENT ARCADE/CENTER PER 1000 SQ. FT.	0.50	73
BOWLING ALLEY PER LANE	0.15	22
GOLF COURSE PER HOLE	0.20	29
HEALTH OR COUNTRY CLUB PER 1000 SQ. FT.	0.48	70
HEALT CLUB, NO SHOWERS PER 1000 SQ. FT.	0.45	66
PARKS PER ACRE	0.09	13
RECREATIONAL COMMUNITY CENTER PER 1000 SQ. FT.	0.70	102
THEATERS, SPORTING EVENTS, PER 1000 SQ. FT.	0.30	44
RESIDENTIAL		
CONDO/ TOWNHOUSE PER HOUSING UNIT	0.90	131
ROOMING/BOARDING HOUSE PER ROOM UNIT	0.25	37
MUTI-FAMILY / APARTMENT PER HOUSING UNIT	0.90	131
VACATION RENTAL HOUSE PER HOUSING UNIT	0.75	109
SINGLE FAMILY DWELLING PER HOUSING UNIT	1.00	146

Storm Drainage

Section

4

STORM DRAINAGE

Section 4

4.1 General

Brookings' storm drainage system infrastructure consists of inlet and outlet drainage structures, piping and ditches. Only storm drainage piping as been inventoried. Drainage capital improvements will be considered SDC eligible to the extent that they provide existing excess capacity or for planned improvements to increase capacity.

Recall from Section 1 that the System Development Charges (SDCs) consist of two parts: Reimbursement fees and Improvements fees. Reimbursement fees are based upon the value of the remaining capacity of existing facilities for new customers. Improvement fees are based upon planned improvements to increase capacity for new customers within the study period, which is ten years in this case. The sums for the two types of eligible fees (reimbursement or improvement) within each service (water, sewer, parks, drainage, transportation) are divided by the projected number of new customer EDUs (new projected demands in multiplies of what a typical single family home would use) for the study period (next ten years). In this manner the SDC charge per EDU for each service is calculated.

Vehicles and tools associated with operations and maintenance have not been included as eligible System Development Charges (SDCs).

4.2 Projected Drainage Areas and EDUs

In order to establish storm drainage SDCs, it is necessary to determine an equitable basis to assess both the current and the projected future drainage service area users. The total cost of eligible reimbursement and improvement items will be divided by the projected new service drainage area users. Each new development will vary in size and the resulting storm drainage run-off amounts created will vary. Run-off is directly related to the impervious area created by new construction. Therefore, assessment for new development on the basis of new square footage constructed or paved is clearly the most rational method to calculate the system development charge.

The last formal study addressing storm drainage was tilted "Storm and Surface Water Facilities Plan for Brookings-Harbor Area", published October 2007. This study focused on the entire Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) of 33 square miles. Demographic information provided in this report was based on the 2000 census and is therefore no more current than the information previously used in the previous SDC report of January 2005. The 2007 Storm water Facilities Plan does not address development acreage type or amount projections in sufficient detail to make EDU predictions of purposes of drainage SDCs.

For purposes of SDC development, the concept of equivalent dwelling units for storm drainage cost assessment must be related to, the impervious surface methodology. Since new updated information is available regarding residential, commercial and industrial impervious areas, the assumptions used during in the previous SDC storm water methodology of January 2005 will be continued for this study.

The method assumes a typical residential unit (meaning a single family detached home) consists of a 10,000 square foot lot divided into impervious area (roof tops, driveways, shed, etc.) and non-impervious surface areas (lawns, gardens, etc.). The typical impervious area is assumed to be 2,500 SF of the 10,000 SF development. The value of 2,500 SF impervious area is the key parameter, representing one (1) EDU (25% impervious). A typical commercial development with parking was found in other South Coast Oregon communities to consist of 10,000 SF with 9,000 SF of impervious area (90% impervious). A typical industrial development with parking lot was determined to consist of a 20,000 SF lot with 15,000 SF of impervious area (75% impervious). The typical commercial establishment would average 3.6 EDUs (15.7 EDUs/acre) and the typical industrial facility would average 6.0 EDUs (13 EDU's/acre).

However, while it is acceptable to assume that a residential account is equal to one EDU, and to assume a typical value for industrial, commercial or institutional accounts for projection of total future EDU's, it would not be desirable or fair to assume a typical value for industrial, commercial or institutional fee assessments. Rather, for new development, each commercial, muti-family, commercial or institutional user should be assigned EDUs based upon plan review by the City.

Extrapolating the storm drainage residential EDU projections developed in the previous SDC report of January 2005 produces 2,990 dwelling units for the year 2008. For purposes of comparison, there are currently 2,696 inside city limit water accounts for a reported number of 3,241 units. A number of these residential water consumption units are for multi-family units. The estimate of 2,900 residential storm water EDUs for purposes of this SDC report therefore appears to be reasonable. Table 4.2.1 from the previous SDC study of 2005 will therefore be updated by extrapolation and projections continued from the years 2008 to 2018.

This annual growth rate in terms of land area for commercial and industrial land used in the previous SDC report was 0.833%. Residential housing growth was assumed to at an annual rate of 3%. This also appears to remain valid and will continue to be used for this update. The projections are made below in Table 4.2.1 will continue to be based on one EDU per dwelling unit, 15.7 EDUs per commercial acre and 13.0 EDUs per industrial acre as was the case in the previous SDC study. The projections indicate that between 2008 and 2018, there will be 1208 new storm drainage EDUs. New EDUs will comprise 16% of the 2018 storm water EDUs.

Table 4.2.1 Storm Drainage EDU Projections 2008

YEAR	RESID EDUs	DEV. COMM ACRES	COMM EDUs	DEV. INDUST. ACRES	INDUST. EDUs	TOTAL EDUs
1991	1906	128	2008	75	975	4890
2000	2356	138	2164	81	1051	5571
2004	2652	142	2237	84	1086	5975
2008	2990	147	2313	86	1123	6426
2013	3365	154	2410	90	1171	6946
2018	3901	160	2513	94	1220	7634

4.3 Reimbursement Fee Methodology Development

4.3.1 Inventory and Depreciated Value

An inventory of the Brookings storm drainage system's existing capital improvements and assets considered eligible for reimbursement is presented in this section. The principal source of information was Brookings's GASB 34 Implementation Documents by RARE, identified for sewers, on pages 38 and 53 through 55 of that report dated September 2002. Additional Facilities information was obtained from page 61 for storm drains on Fir St and Old County Road and Fern Street. The GASB 34 information referenced is included in Appendix D.

The assets noted above do not include tools, lab equipment and other items, which are considered expendable and associated more appropriately with operations and maintenance.

A tabulation of assets is presented below as Table 3.3.1.1, Storm Drain Assets Current Value. The tabulation of assets for storm drain pipe includes date of acquisition, historic cost, ENR construction year index, ratio of ENR factor based on current value of 8,112 (April '08), calculated replacement cost and age of asset. All storm drainpipe is assumed to have a service life of 50 years. The depreciated value based on replacement cost is then computed. This value represents the "fair market" cost of the pipe.

The asset valuations derived in the GASB 34 report are generally based upon the original or estimated original cash cost of the item after depreciation. However, the intention of this SDC is determine the current value of the SDC eligible infrastructure item. As noted in Section 1, items valued at original cost and then depreciated do not correctly reflect the actual value of the item.

Land associated with right of way for storm drain lines was typically donated and therefore not eligible for SDC reimbursement.

Table 4.3.1.1 Storm Drainage SDC Eligible Assets 2008

Date Acq.	Historic Cost	ENR Index	ENR Factor	Replace. Cost	Age	Depreciated Value
1951	$313,418	543	0.07	$4,682,222	57	$0
1953	$3,612	600	0.07	$48,834	55	$0
1962	$1,462	872	0.11	$13,601	46	$1,088
1964	$41,108	936	0.12	$356,269	44	$42,752
1971	$10,603	1581	0.19	$54,403	37	$14,145
1977	$104,139	2576	0.32	$327,941	31	$124,618
1978	$38,158	2776	0.34	$111,505	30	$44,602
1979	$88,629	3003	0.37	$239,413	29	$100,554
1980	$103,013	3237	0.40	$258,153	28	$113,587
1982	$362,464	3825	0.47	$768,708	26	$368,980
1989	$68,708	4615	0.57	$120,771	19	$74,878
1990	$24,142	4732	0.58	$41,386	18	$26,487
1991	$68,512	4835	0.60	$114,947	17	$75,865
1992	$256,511	4985	0.61	$417,416	16	$283,843
1993	$520,597	5210	0.64	$810,573	15	$567,401
1994	$73,994	5408	0.67	$110,991	14	$79,914
1995	$41,597	5471	0.67	$61,677	13	$45,641
1997	$14,844	5826	0.72	$20,668	11	$16,121
2000	$173,580	6221	0.77	$226,343	8	$190,128
2001	$92,166	6343	0.78	$117,870	7	$101,368
2002	$46,391	6538	0.81	$57,559	6	$50,652
2003	$0	6694	0.83	$0	5	$0
	$2,447,648			$8,961,252		$2,322,624

4.3.2 Grant Funding Portion

There are no known portions of the storm drainage infrastructure that were paid for by Federal or State funds through grants. Therefore, no grant funding percentage reductions are made in Table 4.3.5.1 and non-grant portion will be considered 100%.

4.3.3 Equity Portion

The equity portion of the storm drainage system consists of the depreciated and non-grant funded, SDC eligible infrastructure value which represents excess capacity available for new customers and which is not currently being financed. This amount is divided by the number of anticipated EDUs which will be added to the system during the study period. The result is the reimbursement portion of the storm drainage SDC.

There are no known outstanding loans for storm drainage. For purposes of this report, equity is considered to be 100%.

4.3.4 Capacity Remaining

The existing 6426 EDUs have an investment of $8,961,252 in publicly owned drainage systems in current replacement value at $1,395 per EDU. The 1208 new EDUs are projected to require $414,400 as their portion of public storm drainage improvements as determined in Table 4.4.1 latter in this report. This is a share of $343 per EDU, in current costs, required for expansion of the system so that the new users may be serviced by the existing drainage system. If the assumption is made that the incremental cost of drainage infrastructure per Brookings EDU is correctly $343, then existing users have provided the difference between $1,395 and $343 as additional capacity on behalf of future users. This hypothetical amount is $1,052 or 75.4% of the existing EDU infrastructure share value. The significant parameter developed in the above calculation is that 75.4% of the existing system is available and may be utilized by the new EDUs. This is the recommended capacity remaining percentage value for subsequent calculations.

4.3.5 Available Capacity Utilization

Even thought the capacity remaining for future users is calculated above to be 75.4% of the system, the users within the next 10 years are not expected to utilize this entire capacity. For purposes of this report it is assumed that the remaining capacity will contribute to service for approximately 30 more years. Therefore, the utilization for the new EDUs within this study period will be estimated as 33%.

4.3.6 Calculation of Storm Drainage SDC Reimbursement Fee

Table 4.3.6.1 titled Storm Drainage SDC Reimbursement Portion Determination presents the calculations required to compute the reimbursement portion of the storm drainage SDC. The reimbursement portion of the EDU is computed by dividing the remaining equity value by the projected 1208 new storm drain EDUs anticipated in Brookings during the study period. It includes the steps described in sub-section 4.3.1 through 4.3.5 above.

Table 4.3.6.1 Storm Drainage SDC Reimbursement Portion Determination

Description	Depreciated Current Value	Non-Grant & Equity %	Remaining Non-Grant Value	Capacity Eligible %	Remaining Capacity Value	Utilization Portion %	Remaining Eligible Value	Reimb. Portion per EDU
Storm Drain	$2,322,624	100	$2,322,624	75.41%	$1,751,508	33	$577,998	$478

4.4 Improvement Fee Methodology Development

The capital improvement plan is the basis of the improvement fee portion of the storm drainage SDC and was developed in the 2007 Storm Drain Master Plan. Most of the projects are largely for the repair of existing problems or correction of existing deficiencies. The cost estimates include construction cost, engineering cost, contingency, and legal and administrative costs. Descriptions and explanations for each project are included in Storm Drain Master Plan. The project costs are presented in Table 4.4.1 below along with their

estimated SDC eligibility and resulting SDC eligible costs. For projects which restore or correct deficiencies of capacity (which includes future capacity) and therefore benefits existing and future users equally, an allowance of 16% will be used. Projects which increase capacity will be assigned an allowance of twice this or 32%. The Old County Road extension project appears to be for the primary purpose of provided new service and will be assigned an allowance of 80%.

Table 4.4.1
Capital Improvement Projects with Storm Drainage SDC Eligible Costs

Proj. #	Priority	Sub Basin	Description	Total Cost	SDC Elig. %	SDC Cost
1	I	19.6	Upgrade near Lucky Lane - 250 LF	$84,000	16%	$13,440
2a	I	19.9	Upgrade - N. Edge of City Hall Park. Lot	$30,000	16%	$4,800
2b	I	19.9	36" Macklyn Crk line replace w/ 48"	$500,000	32%	$160,000
3	II	19.6	Cont. Proj 1 across Hwy 101 - Post 2016	$100,000	32%	$32,000
4	II	19.2	Cont. of Proj. 1 & 4 30" & 42" Upgrades	$403,000	32%	$128,960
5	II	19.1	Alpine St. replace 12" culvert	$1,000	16%	$160
6	II	19.1	Mill Beach Rd. replace 48"	$57,000	16%	$9,120
7	II	27	Old Country Rd. storm drain extension	$62,000	80%	$49,600
9	II	23.1	Willow & Railroad Sts. replace culvert	$6,000	16%	$960
10	II	23.1	Railroad & Oak Sts. Replace culvert	$46,000	16%	$7,360
	I	MacklyCk	Storm water detailed study	$50,000	16%	$8,000
			Totals	$1,339,000		$414,400

System development charge eligible, improvement fee portion costs in the amount of $414,400 of capital improvement projects may be paid with funds collected for this purpose from new development. The fee for each new EDU should be established to collect the fee over a 10-year period. Based on the projected growth rate for Brookings for the next 10 years, the City is expected to add 1208 storm drain EDUs. Therefore, the EDU charge for improvement fee portion of the SDC can be no greater than ($414,400 /1208) = $ 343 per EDU.

4.5 Recommended Charges

4.5.1 Calculation of Total Storm Drainage System Development Charge

The total Storm Drainage System Development charge consists of the summation of the reimbursement portion and the improvement portions and is shown below in Table 4.5.1.1.

Table 4.5.1.1 Maximum Storm Drainage System Development Charges

SDC Component	Total Amount	Charge per EDU
Reimbursement	$577,998	$478
Improvement	$414,400	$343
Total	**$992,398**	**$821**

4.5.2 Assessment Table

One new single-family dwelling development equals one storm drainage EDU. However, in the case of commercial or industrial customers including multi-family developments, the assessment intention is to estimate the amount of storm drainage contribution which will occur in terms of equivalent dwelling units. An impervious area of 2,500 square feet is recommended as representing one EDU. The impervious areas for new development includes driveways, parking areas, sidewalks, roofs and any asphalt or concrete paved areas. Pervious areas include lawns, unimproved areas and landscaped areas (if able to freely drain into ground). Gravel parking and drive areas should be considered to be 60% impervious. Compacted but non-surfaced dirt roadways should be considered 40% impervious. The determination of the various types of surface areas should be submitted by the developer and confirmed during plan review by the City. Listed below in Table 4.5.2.1 are the recommended storm drainage EDU assessment criteria for Brookings.

Table 4.5.2.1 Storm Drainage EDU Assessment Criteria for New Development

Assessment Item	Area SF	EDU
Single Family Dwelling	---	1.0
Commercial, Industrial, Institutional		
Impervious Areas, roofs, pavements, sidewalks, etc.	2500	1.0
Gravel Parking/Roadway/Storage	2500	0.6
Compacted Dirt Roadway/Parking/Storage	2500	0.4

Summary

Section

5

Section

5

SUMMARY

5.1 General

A single list of anticipated development types should be adopted for use in determining all services SDCs. The list of current types of users prepared for the transportation SDCs was used as the basis of the list preparation, having been determined by research of the specific commercial, institutional and industrial make up of Brookings.

For the assessment method to be equitable, unambiguous and consistent, it is desirable to have broad classifications to the maximum extent possible. This will reduce subjective classification. However, the list must not be so broad as to obscure significant differences between different types of users.

Criteria such as the number of employees, number of restaurant seats, number of students or number of meals served can be useful for determining existing conditions within a community. However, these methods are not desirable for cost assessment purposes because the above criteria may change with time and under or over estimate future service demands. In addition, the use of number of employees for assessment purposes is severely restricted under Oregon Statutes. A more desirable method will use facility gross square footage criteria or other readily determined and consistent factors such as number of drive-in windows or number of fueling stations.

5.2 Summary of Recommended SDCs

Listed below in Table 5.2.1 are the recommended SDC per EDU charges based on the modifications to water, wastewater and drainage SDCs and without changes for transportation and parks. Table 5.2.2 is the calculation work sheet for assessement.

Table 5.2.1 Summary of Maximum Allowable SDC Costs Per EDU*

Item	Reimbursement Portion	Improvement Portion	Total SDC	2% Charge	Total SDC
Water	$304	$1,598	$1,902	$38	$1,940
Wastewater	$5,681	$2,742	$8,423	$168	$8,592
Drainage	$478	$343	$821	$16	$838
Transportation	$238	$971	$1,209	$24	$1,233
Parks	$201	$1,150	$1,351	$27	$1,378
Total	$6,902	$6,804	$13,706	$274	$13,980

Table 5.2.1 Summary of Maximum Allowable SDC Costs Per EDU*

Item	Reimbursement Portion	Improvement Portion	Total SDC	2% Admin. Charge	Total SDC Charge
Water	$304	$1,598	$1,902	$38	$1,940
Wastewater	$5,681	$2,742	$8,423	$168	$8,592
Drainage	$478	$343	$821	$16	$838
Transportation	$238	$971	$1,209	$24	$1,233
Parks	$201	$1,150	$1,351	$27	$1,378
Total	$6,902	$6,804	$13,706	$274	$13,980

* EDU determination varies for each type of service

TABLE 5.2.2 - SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT CHARGE (SDC) CALCULATION SHEET FOR CITY OF BROOKINGS

DEVELOPMENT TYPE	WATER		WASTEWATER			STORM DRAINAGE		TRANSPORTATION			PARKS	TOTAL
	Meter Size Req'd.	Cost from Table W1	1,000 S.F. or Units	EDU Basis	Cost = EDU x $8,423	EDU from Table D1	Cost EDU x $821	1,000 S.F. or Units	EDU Basis	Cost = EDU x $1,209	$1,351 Dwelling	SDC COST
CAMPS, MOTELS, HOTELS AND MARINAS												
MARINAS, PER BOAT SLIP				0.11	$0		$0		0.30	$0		$0
MOTELS & HOTELS, PER ROOM				0.48	$0		$0		0.74	$0		$0
MOTELS & HOTELS WITH COOKING FACILITY, PER ROOM				0.57	$0		$0		0.74	$0		$0
RV PARK PER SPACE				0.67	$0		$0		0.78	$0		$0
SUMMER OR CHURCH TYPE CAMPS, PER BED				0.42	$0		$0		0.78	$0		$0
COMMERCIAL / GOVERNMENT *												
APPRARAL STORE				0.10	$0		$0		1.03	$0		$0
AVIATION AIRPORT, GENERAL, PER BASED AIRCRAFT				0.20	$0		$0		0.69	$0		$0
AUTO SERVICE STATIONS, PER FUELING POSITION.				1.01	$0		$0		4.44	$0		$0
AUTO CARE CENTER PER 1000 SQ. FT.				0.15	$0		$0		1.97	$0		$0
AUTO SALES NEW/USED PER 1000 SQ. FT.				0.10	$0		$0		1.22	$0		$0
AUTO WASH STAFFED PER BAY				2.00	$0		$0		2.22	$0		$0
AUTO WASH SELF SERVICE PER BAY				1.75	$0		$0		2.22	$0		$0
BANK/ SAVINGS & LOAN PER 1000 SQ. FT.				0.10	$0		$0		4.71	$0		$0
ADDITIONAL PER DRIVE-IN WINDOW									2.36	$0		$0
BEAUTY SALON, PER 1000 SQ. FT.				1.75	$0		$0		3.30	$0		$0
BARBER SHOP , PER 1000 SQ. FT.				0.90	$0		$0		3.30	$0		$0
NAIL SALON, PER 1000 SQ. FT,				0.90	$0		$0		3.30	$0		$0
TANNING SALON PER 1000 SQ. FT.				0.85	$0		$0		3.30	$0		$0
BLDG. MATERIAL/LUMBER/HARDWARE PER 1000 SQ. FT.				0.10	$0		$0		2.27	$0		$0
BOARDING KENNEL PER 1000 SQ. FT.				0.14	$0		$0		0.22	$0		$0
CONVENIENCE MARKET PER 1000 SQ. FT.				0.50	$0		$0		6.23	$0		$0
DISCOUNT STORE FREE STANDING PER 1000 SQ. FT.				0.10	$0		$0		4.40	$0		$0
DOG GROOMING PER 1000 SQ. FT.				2.30	$0		$0		3.30	$0		$0
GENERAL OFFICE PER 1000 SQ. FT.				0.07	$0		$0		1.01	$0		$0
GOVERNMENT OFFICE PER 1000 SQ. FT.				0.09	$0		$0		4.15	$0		$0
GROCERY STORE PER 1000 SQ. FT.				0.14	$0		$0		6.40	$0		$0
LAUNDROMATS, PER MACHINE				1.80	$0		$0		0.27	$0		$0
MANUFACTURING/FACTORY PER 1000 SQ. FT.				0.07	$0		$0		0.83	$0		$0
ADD FOR FACTORY (WITH SHOWERS) PER 1000 SQ. FT.				0.03	$0							$0
MINI-WAREHOUSE (STORAGE) PER 1000 SQ. FT.				0.03	$0		$0		0.21	$0		$0
NURSERY PER 1000 SQ. FT.				0.07	$0		$0		1.57	$0		$0
RETAIL / SHOP / STORE PER 1000 SQ. FT.				0.10	$0		$0		2.96	$0		$0
TRUCK / TRANSPORTION TERMINALS PER 1000 SQ. FT.				0.20	$0		$0		1.00	$0		$0
WAREHOUSING PER 1000 SQ. FT.				0.05	$0		$0		0.56	$0		$0
EDUCATION FACILITIES / SCHOOLS												
BOARDING SCHOOLS PER RESIDENTIAL UNIT				0.56	$0		$0		0.50	$0		$0
COMMUNITY COLLEGE PER 1000 SQ. FT.				0.40	$0		$0		0.71	$0		$0
DAY CARE CENTER (NO MEALS PREPARED) PER 1000 SQ. FT.				0.30	$0		$0		2.06	$0		$0
LIBRARY PER 1000 SQ. FT.				0.15	$0		$0		2.64	$0		$0
SCHOOL, NO CAFETERIA OR SHOWERS PER 1000 SQ. FT.				0.29	$0		$0		1.28	$0		$0
ADD FOR CAFETERIA PER 1000 SQ. FT. OF SCHOOL				0.09	$0							$0
ADD FOR SHOWERS PER 1000 SQ. FT. OF SCHOOL				0.06	$0							$0

TABLE 5.2.2 - SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT CHARGE (SDC) CALCULATION SHEET FOR CITY OF BROOKINGS (CONT.)

DEVELOPMENT TYPE	WATER		WASTEWATER			STORM DRAINAGE		TRANSPORTATION			PARKS	TOTAL
	Meter Size Req'd.	Cost from Table W1	1,000 S.F. or Units	EDU Basis	Cost = EDU x $8,423	EDU from Table D1	Cost EDU x $821	1,000 S.F. or Units	EDU Basis	Cost = EDU x $1,209	$1,351 Dwelling	SDC COST
HEALTH CARE FACILITIES												
CLINICS AND VETS., PER 1000 SQ. FT.				1.12	$0		$0		4.00	$0		$0
HOSPITALS PER BED				1.40	$0		$0		0.63	$0		$0
NURSING HOMES PER BED				0.84	$0		$0		0.28	$0		$0
PLACES OF WORSHIP												
TEMPLE/CHAPEL NO SCHOOL PER 1000 SQ. FT.				0.90	$0		$0		2.50	$0		$0
WORSHIP & SUNDAY (SABBATH) SCHOOL PER 1000 SQ. FT.				0.13	$0		$0		2.75	$0		$0
ADD WITH MEAL PREPERATION FAC. PER 1000 SQ. FT.				0.09	$0							$0
RESTAURANTS & FOOD SERVICE												
BARS, TAVERNS AND COCKTAIL LOUNGES PER 1000 SQ. FT.				1.85	$0		$0		6.00	$0		$0
FAST FOOD PER 1000 SQ. FT.				2.52	$0		$0		4.40	$0		$0
ADDITIONAL PER DRIVE-IN WINDOW				1.34	$0				3.51	$0		$0
QUALITY RESTAURANT PER 1000 SQ. FT.				2.80	$0		$0		3.21	$0		$0
BAKERY PER 1000 SQ. FT.				1.70	$0		$0		4.40	$0		$0
DELI, SANDWICH SHOP PER 1000 SQ. FT.				1.65	$0		$0		4.40	$0		$0
COFFEE SHOP NO PREPARED MEALS PER 1000 SQ. FT.				1.25	$0		$0		4.20	$0		$0
COFFEE KIOSK PER 1000 SQ. FT.				1.10	$0		$0		4.40	$0		$0
RECREATIONAL FACILITIES												
AMUSEMENT ARCADE/CENTER PER 1000 SQ. FT.				0.50	$0		$0		5.00	$0		$0
BOWLING ALLEY PER LANE				0.15	$0		$0		2.77	$0		$0
GOLF COURSE PER HOLE				0.20	$0		$0		3.13	$0		$0
HEALTH OR COUNTRY CLUB PER 1000 SQ. FT.				0.48	$0		$0		2.50	$0		$0
HEALTH CLUB, NO SHOWERS PER 1000 SQ. FT.				0.45	$0		$0		2.50	$0		$0
PARKS PER ACRE				0.09	$0		$0		1.99	$0		$0
RECREATIONAL COMMUNITY CENTER PER 1000 SQ. FT.				0.70	$0		$0		1.69	$0		$0
THEATERS, SPORTING EVENTS, PER 1000 SQ. FT.				0.30	$0		$0		4.44	$0		$0
RESIDENTIAL												
CONDO/ TOWNHOUSE PER HOUSING UNIT				0.90	$0		$0		0.91	$0	$1,351	$1,351
ROOMING/BOARDING HOUSE PER ROOM UNIT				0.25	$0		$0		0.50	$0	$676	$676
MUTI-FAMILY / APARTMENT PER HOUSING UNIT				0.90	$0		$0		0.70	$0	$1,351	$1,351
VACATION RENTAL HOUSE PER HOUSING UNIT				0.75	$0		$0		0.60	$0	$1,013	$1,013
SINGLE FAMILY DWELLING PER HOUSING UNIT				1.00	0		0		1	$0	$1,351	$1,351
EXAMPLE - SINGLE FAMILY DWELLING PER HOUSING UNIT	3/4"	$1,902	1	1.00	$8,423	1	$821	1	1.00	$1,209	$1,351	$13,706

(09)

* Includes only domestic wastewater. Process wastewater load must be detemined for each new manufacturing or process facility. Additional one (1) wastewater EDU per 256 gallons/day flow.

TABLE W1 WATER SDC COST		
Meter	EDU	SDC Cost
3/4"	1	$1,902
1"	1.7	$3,233
1 1/2"	3.3	$6,276
2"	5.3	$10,080
3"	10	$19,018
4"	16.7	$31,760
>4" determined by analysis		

TABLE D1 DRAINAGE EDU**			
Surface	Sq. Ft.		Net Eq. Imper. Area
Impervious		x 1.0	0
Gravel		x 0.6	0
Compacted Earth		x 0.4	0
Total			0

Divide Total Net Eq. Impervious area by 2,500 sf./EDU

Drainage EDU

** Single family dwellling = 1.0 EDU : Duplex = 1.5 EDU

5.3 Assessment Criteria

Guidance is provided below for use with Table 5.2.2 in terms of assessment of areas and determination of correct development types and criteria for purposes of SDC calculation.

The water SDC will be the easiest to determine as it is based upon the size of a water meter set for the development in question. Only one SDC assessment should be made per meter set.

Storm drainage SDC assessments should be automatically assigned as one (1) for single-family detached dwellings including mobile or modular homes and 1.5 for a duplex (0.75 per unit). All other development will require that site plans be reviewed and that sufficient detail be provided with respect to impervious and semi-pervious areas proposed.

Wastewater and Transportation SDCs require that the type of development be determined. Table 5.2.2 provides classifications based upon anticipated development in Brookings. Wastewater EDUs are based upon anticipated domestic sewage only. For wet production or process facilities, it will be necessary to estimate that amount of wastewater generated in addition to domestic sewage and assess this flow at a rate of one (1) wastewater EDU per 162.1 gallons per day.

Mixed use facilities are common. It will often be necessary to divide the facility's gross covered square footage in terms of various facility types. Common areas should be proportioned between assigned types.

Schools / Education Facilities
Schools should be assessed with respect to gross floor space area. This includes outbuilding space. If showers or cafeterias are present, they should be included at the rate of the entire school area, not just the floor space devoted to these functions.

Gymnasiums should be assessed separately as theaters/ sporting events facility. Outdoor stadiums should be assessed at 50% the rate of theaters/sporting events facility.

Education Facilities include art schools, martial arts studios, dance studios. Museums should be assessed at the library rate.

Camps, Motels, Hotels and Marinas
This category includes transient or temporary living facilities which do not generally see as great a consumption of water or sewage service usage as more permanent living facilities. The criteria are established for the maximum capacity of the facility rather than the occupied number or rooms, beds, slips, etc.

Commercial / Government

This category includes a wide variety of facilities. As noted above, the SDC charges as listed are for the sanitary and/or domestic use of sewage services only. At the time of assessement,

it is important to determine process water use for manufacturing or food processing with respect to wastewater production (with the exception of restaurants, laundromats, beauty salons and pet grooming facilities which are already adjusted to reflect higher sewage generation). The City should add wastewater EDUs at the rate of 1 wastewater EDU /145.9 gallons/day of projected process wastewater.

For mixed use facilities, it is appropriate to divide the facility into its various functions. For example a traveler's service facility might include a convenience store with a fast food restaurant, gas station, auto garage and a car wash. The SDC gas station fuel position assessement should exclude up to 20 square feet of facility floor space for each fueling position from other assessement. The car wash assessement should exclude 50 square feet of facility floor space as well as the wash bay areas from other assessments. A drive in window assessement should exclude 20 square feet of facility floor space from other assessments. Mixed-use facilities should include a proportionate amount of restroom, hallway, cashier, entrance space and other common use areas for each assessement type.

Health Care Facilities

These include medical clinics, doctors and other clinician's offices with examine rooms, veterinarian's offices, dentist's offices, and those portions of mortuary facilities devoted to body preparation. Hospitals and nursing homes should be assessed on the number of approved bed space, not on the basis of occupancy.

Places of Worship and Meeting Halls
These include churches, temples, synagogues, chapels, fraternal organization facilities, lecture and meeting halls and other facilities which are not routinely and continuously occupied such as those portions of mortuaries devoted to chapel services. Church schools and daycare programs which are routinely in session during the week should be assessed as schools, otherwise, Sunday school buildings should be included in the gross floor area of the sanctuary, meeting rooms and offices. Separate storage facilities should be assessed as mini-storage.

Restaurants
There are two broad categories of restaurants. A quality restaurant provides seated service and does not typically offer "to go" service. Service is by means of washable flat ware and orders are generally prepared as ordered. Fast food service is characterized by paper service, "to go" service and food items prepared or semi-prepared in advance of order.

Restaurants, especially the fast food variety, are typically heavy traffic generators. However, in the case of single or limited item service such as ice-cream or fountain service only or other kiosk type of services such as, keys, photo mat or coffee drive-in service it is recommended that the drive-in add-on assessement not be made for facilities with a total floor space of less than 600 square feet. The drive-in addition charge per window should be pro-rated between 601 and 1099 square feet. (0.2% of additional fee per drive-in window per square foot over 600 sf.) Those facilities smaller than 600 sf. should be assessed as fast food

restaurants or retail businesses as appropriate on a square footage basis only. Outdoor food service should be assessed at a rate of 50% the standard rate.

Recreational Facilities

Amusement arcade centers include video game parlors, in-door shooting ranges, pool halls and in-door paint-ball facilities. Those portions of the facility devoided to food service or bar service should be assessed separately. The food service gross area should include kitchen, pantry and table areas. In addition, each assessement type should include a proportionate amount of storage, restroom, hallway, cashier and entrance space.

In the case of golf courses, miniture golf should be assessed at the same rate as conventional golf courses per hole. Food service facilities should be assessed separately. Driving ranges should be assessed at a rate of 33% per hole cost per driving position.

Residential

The SDCs are based upon comparison with the City services typically required of a single family detached dwelling. In the case of storm drainage, it is recommended that 1 EDU be automatically assigned for each dwelling of this type and that for duplex dwellings, 0.75 EDUs be assigned for each dwelling unit. Modular or mobile homes anchored to the ground should be assessed at the same rates as conventional homes. All other types of development will require that the impervious areas be computed. Gravel surfaced areas should be assessed at 60% of the impervious areas (roofs, sidewalks, concrete or asphalt pavements, etc.). Compacted earth areas (material storage yards, occasional parking, etc.) should be assessed at 40% of impervious areas. Only natural or freely draining landscaped areas such as lawns, undeveloped woods or pasture should be classified as pervious without storm drainage assessement.

5.4 Rate Adjustments and Subsidies

As noted at the beginning of this study, new homes and commercial facilities in the Brookings Urban Growth Boundary place additional demands upon the existing infrastructure and require the construction of municipal infrastructure to support this development. The City should resist the temptation to adjust fees based on income tests, profitability, or other criteria not related to the actual impact of the proposed development. The State Attorney General's Office was contacted regarding this concept and was not comfortable with it for a number of reasons. To reduce fees in this manner is not consistent with principles of equality under law and will shift the burden of infrastructure development to others, including existing system users.

If the City desires to subsidize certain developments, it should do so by direct payment of the subsidized amount to the SDC funds from other funds specifically established for this purpose. This has been discussed in the case of Urban Renewal Funds which might be used to assist with the SDC payments for development within the downtown area. If the City so

wishes, there does not appear to be any reason from the standpoint of SDC regulations or practices which would disallow this.

5.5 Authority of City Manager to Determine Assessments

Brookings Resolution No. 06-R-748 (currently in effect) provides authority for the City Manager (and his delegated staff) to make determinations regarding assessment for new users within the guidelines established by the resolution. This is important since properly categorizing the various types of new development often requires judgments regarding actual impact produced by the development and will sometimes require that the new development be evaluated as a composite of several development types. Resolution No. 06-R-748 addresses these issues in Section 4.3 for water; Section 5.3 for Wastewater; Section 6.3 for Storm Drainage; Section 7.3 for Transportation and Section 8.3 for Parks.

The resolution discussed also provides a concise description of the methodology used in Brookings for the SDC program. If the modifications recommended by this updated report are accepted, a new resolution is required. A copy of the current resolution with recommended revision "mark ups" is included at the end of this report.

5.6 Conclusion

The next step for the City of Brookings, after acceptance of this study, is to update and adopt the resolution regarding the SDC methodology and costs. As noted previously, all interested parties must be provided notification of this process and allowed an opportunity to participate.

A final recommendation is made that the City Council continue the practice of using the cost index update mechanism in the ordinance. The recommended index is the Engineering News Record (ENR) Construction Price Index found at:

http://enr.construction.com/features/conEco/costIndexes/constIndexHist.asp

The base index should be established as 8112 for April 2008. This index should be used to automatically adjust the SDCs for each service area on a yearly basis. This will adjust for inflation (or deflation) and maintain the SDC with respect to actual construction costs in the future. The ENR index meets the requirements of SB 939 Section 4.

Updated SDC Resolution

RESOLUTION NO. 09-R-914

A RESOLUTION ESTABLISHING METHODOLOGIES FOR SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT CHARGES FOR THE WATER SYSTEM, WASTEWATER SYSTEM, STORM DRAINAGE SYSTEM, TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM AND PARKS SYSTEM; AND REPEALING RESOLUTION 06-R-748.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, by the City Council of the City of Brookings, pursuant to Ordinance No. 91-0-477:

Section 1. GENERAL BACKGROUND

The City of Brookings, Oregon had year 2004 estimated Equivalent Dwelling Units (EDUs) service area demands as follows:

Transportation System	15,619
Parks System	2,599

and had updated year 2008 estimated Equivalent Dwelling Units (EDUs) service area demands as follows:

Water System	6,742
Wastewater System	4,562
Storm Drainage System	6,426

The study period for System Development Charges (SDC) calculations for Transportation System and Parks Systems remains as ten years (2004-2014). The year 2014 EDU count is projected to be as follows:

Transportation System	20,991
Parks System	3,493

The study period for System Development Charges (SDC) calculations for Water, Wastewater and Storm Drainage System has been updated as ten years (2008-2018). The year 2018 EDU count is projected to be as follows:

Water System	8,721
Wastewater System	6,120
Storm Drainage System	7,634

Therefore, during the respective study periods, there are estimated to be the following additional system EDUs:

Water System	1,979
Wastewater System	1,558
Storm Drainage System	1,208
Transportation System	5,372
Parks System	894

Because of the City's long standing investment in the water, wastewater, storm drainage, transportation and parks systems, which provide various amounts of reserve capacity for future development, it is reasonable for the City to recuperate those reserve capacity costs as the capacity is utilized and to take these costs into account when calculating the reimbursement fee portion of the system development charge to be imposed upon new development.

In addition, it is reasonable that the portion of costs for water, wastewater, storm drainage, transportation and parks system capital improvements which will be necessary to provide service for new development should be taken into account by the City when calculating the improvement fee portion of the system development charge to be imposed upon new development.

Section 2. DESIGNATION OF CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

The capital improvement plan used in determining the improvement fee portion of the system development charges is comprised of the following documents. When there is conflicting information in the documents, unless the council directs otherwise, the document with the most recent date shall be used.

CITY OF BROOKINGS SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT CHARGES report of January 2006, by Dyer Partnership, hereafter referred to as the "SDC Report - 2006" .

CITY OF BROOKINGS SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT CHARGES UPDATE FOR WATER, WASTEWATER AND STORM DRINAGE report of May 19, 2009, by Dyer Partnership, hereafter referred to as the "SDC Report – 2009".

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS listed in the approved and projected budgets for the current fiscal year and following years.

Section 3. DETERMINATION OF SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT CHARGE

The total system development charge for a proposed development shall be determined by totaling the charge for each capital improvement system for which the council has determined a methodology and rate and adding an administrative fee of 2% and then deducting any credit.

If the system development charge is not paid at the time of issuance of the permit it may be paid in equal semi-annual installments of principle and interest over a period of not to exceed 10 years. The interest on the unpaid principle balance shall be 10% per annum. Such installment payments shall be secured by a lien against the property upon which the development occurred or by some other collateral acceptable to the City.

Section 4. WATER SYSTEM CHARGE

4.1 Reimbursement Fee Calculation

4.1.1 The reimbursement fee portion of the City's water system is based on the following estimated depreciated values as determined from the City's records of municipal assets and the "SDC Report –2009":

Distribution system	$ 7,421,248
Plant & Pump Stations	$ 448,293
Storage	$ 0
Land	$ 277,713
Total	$ 8,147,254

4.1.2 Remaining value after deduction of capacity already utilized by customers and portions paid by grant or gift or otherwise not eligible for reimbursement:

Distribution system	$ 482,779
Plant & Pump Stations	$ 72,908
Storage	$ 0
Land	$ 45,166
Total	$ 600,853

4.1.5 The reimbursement portion of the water System Development Charge is calculated by dividing the eligible reimbursement value by the study period (10 years) number of projected new EDUs as follows:

$600,853/ (1,979 EDUs) = $304/EDU

4.2 Improvement Fee Calculation

4.2.1 The improvement fee portion of the City's water system is based on the Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) as summarized in Table 2.4.2.1 of the "SDC Report –2009".

4.2.2 The values of the improvements listed in the water CIP total $13,457,810 of which $3,163,187 is estimated to be required to provide additional capacity necessary to serve future customers.

4.2.3 The improvement portion of the water System Development Charge is calculated by dividing the eligible improvement value by the study period (10 years) by the number of projected new EDUs as follows:

$3,163,187/ (1,979 EDUs) = $1,598/EDU

4.3 SDC Determination The City Manager shall determine the potential peak demand upon the water system for development in terms of Equivalent Dwelling Units (EDUs). A single EDU is defined as the demand placed on the water system by a ¾" water meter and is typical of a single family residential unit. The average water usage associated

with 1 EDU is 162 gallons per day. Meters or meter capacity installed only for fire fighting capacity shall not assessed SDCs and an adjustment shall be made based on the meter size required were fire fighting capacity not provided.. The City Manager shall determine the water EDUs for nonresidential development in accordance with the following schedule which is incorporated in Sub-Table W1 in TABLE 5.2.2 - SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT CHARGE (SDC) CALCULATION SHEET FOR CITY OF BROOKINGS as contained in the "SDC Report –2009":

Meter Size	EDUs per Meter	Cost per Meter
3/4"	1	$ 1,902
1"	1.7	$ 3,233
1 1/2"	3.3	$ 6,276
2"	5.3	$10,080
3"	10	$19,018
4"	16.7	$31,760
6"	To be computed by City Staff based on analysis of projected water usage	
8"		

4.4 Total water System Development Charge (SDC) per EDU: The total Water SDC per EDU shall be based upon the sum of the reimbursement ($304) and improvement ($1,598) portions per EDU which equals $1902 per EDU

Section 5. WASTEWATER SYSTEM CHARGE

5.1 Reimbursement Fee Calculation

5.1.1 The reimbursement fee portion of the City's wastewater system is based on the following estimated depreciated values and debts as determined from the City's records of municipal assets and the "SDC Report –2009":

Collection system	$ 13,982,988
Wastewater Treatment Plant	$ 14,089,056
Pump Stations	$ 465,218
Debt Service	$ 11,896,570
Total	$ 40,433,833

5.1.2 Remaining value after deduction of capacity already utilized by customers and portions paid by grant or gift or otherwise not eligible for reimbursement:

Collection system	$ 3,142,312
Wastewater Treatment Plant	$ 1,544,933
Pump Stations	$ 43,617
Debt Service	$ 4,121,104
Total	$ 8,851,966

5.1.5 The reimbursement portion of the wastewater System Development Charge is calculated by dividing the eligible reimbursement value by the study period (10 years) number of projected new EDUs as follows:

$ 8,851,966/ (1,558 EDUs) = $5,681/EDU

5.2 Improvement Fee Calculation

5.2.1 The improvement fee portion of the City's wastewater system is based on the Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) as summarized in Table 3.4.1~~-1~~ of the "SDC Report – 2009".

5.2.2 The values of the improvements listed in the wastewater CIP total $12,444,800, of which $4,271,960 is estimated to be required to provide additional capacity necessary to serve future customers.

5.2.3 The improvement portion of the Wastewater System Development Charge is calculated by dividing the eligible improvement value by the study period (10 years) by the number of projected new EDUs as follows:

$4,271,960/ (1,558 EDUs) = $2,742/EDU

5.3 SDC Assessment: The City Manager shall determine the daily demand upon the wastewater system for new development in terms of Equivalent Dwelling Units (EDUs). A single EDU is defined as the demand placed on the sanitary sewer system by a typical single family residential unit. The wastewater flow associated with 1 EDU is 146 gallons per day: The City Manager shall take into account:

5.3.1 The daily demand figures published by DEQ and other local government jurisdictions for the development or similar developments;

5.3.2 The SDC historically charged the same or similar development;

5.3.3 TABLE 5.2.2 - SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT CHARGE (SDC) CALCULATION SHEET FOR CITY OF BROOKINGS as contained in the "SDC Report –2009".

5.4 Total Wastewater System Development Charge (SDC) per EDU: The total Wastewater SDC per EDU shall be based upon the sum of the reimbursement ($ 5,681) and improvement ($ 2,742) portions per EDU which equals $ 8,423 per EDU.

Section 6. STORM DRAINAGE SYSTEM CHARGE

6.1 Reimbursement Fee Calculation

6.1.1 The reimbursement fee portion of the City's storm drainage system is based on the following estimated depreciated values and debts as determined from the City's records of municipal assets and the "SDC Report –2009":

Storm Drain	$2,322,624

6.1.2 Remaining value after deduction of capacity already utilized by customers and portions paid by grant or gift or otherwise not eligible for reimbursement:

Storm Drain	$577,998

6.1.5 The reimbursement portion of the Storm Drainage System Development Charge is calculated by dividing the eligible reimbursement value by the study period (10 years) number of projected new EDUs as follows:

$577,998/ (1,208 EDUs) = $478/EDU

6.2 Improvement Fee Calculation

6.2.1 The improvement fee portion of the City's storm drainage system is based on the Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) as summarized in Table 4.4.1~~.1~~ of the "SDC Report – 2009".

6.2.2 The values of the improvements listed in the storm drainage CIP total $1,339,000, of which $414,400 is estimated to be required to provide additional capacity necessary to serve future customers.

6.2.3 The improvement portion of the Storm Drainage System Development Charge is calculated by dividing the eligible improvement value by the study period (10 years) by the number of projected new EDUs as follows:

$414,400/ (1,208 EDUs) = $343/EDU

6.3 SDC Assessment The City Manager shall determine the potential peak demand upon the storm drainage system for development in terms of Equivalent Dwelling Units (EDUs). A single EDU is defined as the demand placed on the storm drainage system by an impervious area of 2,500 square feet and is typical of a single family residential unit. The City Manager shall determine the water EDUs for nonresidential development in accordance with the following schedule which is incorporated in Sub-Table D1 in TABLE 5.2.2 - SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT CHARGE (SDC) CALCULATION SHEET FOR CITY OF BROOKINGS as contained in the "SDC Report – 2009":

Assessment Item	Area SF	EDU
Single Family Dwelling	---	1.0
Commercial, Industrial, Institutional		
Impervious Areas, Roofs, Pavements, Sidewalks, Etc.	2500	1.0
Gravel Parking/Roadway/Storage	2500	0.6
Compacted Dirt Roadway/Parking/Storage	2500	0.4

6.4 Total Storm Drainage System Development Charge (SDC) per EDU: The total Storm Drainage SDC per EDU shall be based upon the sum of the reimbursement ($478)and improvement ($343) portions per EDU which equals $821 per EDU.

Section 7. TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM CHARGE

7.1 Reimbursement Fee Calculation

7.1.1 The reimbursement fee portion of the City's transportation system is based on the following estimated depreciated values and debts as determined from the City's records of municipal assets and the "SDC Report – 2006":

Roads	$ 3,230,594
Sidewalks	$ 1,242,139
Total	$ 4,472,733

7.1.2 Remaining value after deduction of capacity already utilized by customers and portions paid by grant or gift or otherwise not eligible for reimbursement:

Roads	$ 872,260
Sidewalks	$ 335,378
Total	$ 1,207,638

7.1.5 The reimbursement portion of the Transportation System Development Charge is calculated by dividing the eligible reimbursement value by the study period (10 years) number of projected new EDUs as follows:

$1,207,638/ (5,372 EDUs) = $225/EDU

7.2 Improvement Fee Calculation

7.2.1 The improvement fee portion of the City's transportation system is based on the Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) as summarized in Table 5.4.1 of the "SDC Report – 2006".

7.2.2 The values of the improvements listed in the transportation CIP total $11,101,375 of which $4,918,509 is estimated to be required to provide additional capacity necessary to serve future customers.

7.2.3 The improvement portion of the Transportation System Development Charge is calculated by dividing the eligible improvement value by the study period (10 years) by the number of projected new EDUs as follows:

$4,918,509/ (5,372 EDUs) = $916/EDU

7.3 SDC Assessment: The City Manager shall determine the daily demand upon the transportation system for new development in terms of Equivalent Dwelling Units (EDUs). A single EDU is defined as the demand placed on the transportation system by a typical single family residential unit. The transportation demand unit associated with 1 EDU is 0.9 trip ends per peak hour: The City Manager shall take into account:

7.3.1 The peak hour trip end figures published in Volumes 1 through 3 of Trip Generation, 7th Edition by the Institute of Transportation Engineers and as

published by other local government jurisdictions for the development or similar developments;

7.3.2 The SDC historically charged the same or similar development;

7.3.3 TABLE 7.2.2 - SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT CHARGE (SDC) CALCULATION SHEET FOR CITY OF BROOKINGS as contained in the "SDC Report – 2006".

7.4 Total Transportation System Development Charge (SDC) per EDU: The total transportation SDC per EDU shall be based upon the sum of the reimbursement ($ 225) and improvement ($ 916) portions per EDU which equals $ 1,141 per EDU.

Section 8. PARKS SYSTEM CHARGE

8.1 Reimbursement Fee Calculation

8.1.1 The reimbursement fee portion of the City's parks system is based on the following estimated depreciated values and debts as determined from the City's records of municipal assets and the "SDC Report – 2006":

Parks Assets	$706,019

8.1.2 Remaining value after deduction of capacity already utilized by customers and portions paid by grant or gift or otherwise not eligible for reimbursement:

Parks Assets	$169,444

8.1.5 The reimbursement portion of the Parks System Development Charge is calculated by dividing the eligible reimbursement value by the study period (10 years) number of projected new EDUs as follows:

$169,444/ (894 EDUs) = $190/EDU

8.2 Improvement Fee Calculation

8.2.1 The improvement fee portion of the City's parks system is based on the Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) as summarized in Table 6.4.1 of the "SDC Report – 2006".

8.2.2 The values of the improvements listed in the parks CIP total $16,568,130, of which $970,081 is estimated to be required to provide additional capacity necessary to serve future residents.

8.2.3 The improvement portion of the Parks System Development Charge is calculated by dividing the eligible improvement value by the study period (10 years) by the number of projected new EDUs as follows:

$970,081/ (894 EDUs) = $1,085/EDU

8.3 SDC Assessment The City Manager shall determine the demand upon the parks system for residential development in terms of Equivalent Dwelling Units (EDUs).

Nonresidential commercial development will not be assessed parks SDCs A single EDU is defined as the demand placed on the parks system by a single family residential unit. The City Manager shall determine the park EDUs for residential development in accordance with TABLE 7.2.2 - SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT CHARGE (SDC) CALCULATION SHEET FOR CITY OF BROOKINGS as contained in the "SDC Report – 2006":

8.4 Total Park System Development Charge (SDC) per EDU: The total Parks SDC per EDU shall be based upon the sum of the reimbursement ($190) and improvement ($1,085) portions per EDU which equals $1,275 per EDU.

Section 9. CREDITS

9.1 No credits shall be given to be applied to the system development charge imposed except:

9.1.1 As required by state law for a qualified public improvement; or

9.1.1 When the Council determines based upon clear and convincing evidence provided by the developer that the proposed development will not place on the capital improvement the level of demand projected by this resolution.

9.1.3 A full or partial credit may be given when the council determines the proposed development will make an identified, direct, substantial and sustained enhancement to the economic vitality of the city:

9.1.3.1 Which is not related to the construction of the development; and

9.1.3.2 Which would not have been realized but for the proposed development.

Before receiving the credit allowed by this paragraph 9.1.3, the developer shall enter into an agreement with the City which requires the payment of all or part of the SDC excused because of this paragraph 9.1.3 if the development, when constructed and operating, fails to perform as represented when the credit is granted.

9.2 Credits are not transferable from one development to another unless the development is being constructed in phases. Credits for one capital system of the system development charge may not be applied to the system development charge of another capital system.

9.3 If subsequent amendments to this Resolution delete or reduce a credit previously granted but not used, the amount of the credit given shall be set by the Resolution in affect at the time an applicant seeks to apply the credit to the system development charge being imposed.

Section 10. SDC COST ADJUSTMENTS

10.1 The SDC per EDU rate shall be increased or decreased annually at, July 1, in accordance with the ratio of the Engineering News Record (ENR) Construction Cost Index for the month of May of that year with respect to the May ENR index of the previous year. The cost adjustment calculation shall be as follows:

Adjusted SDC/EDU = [$SDC per "SDC Report – 2006 (or 2009 as appropriate)"/ EDU] x [Current Year May ENR Index/Prior Year May ENR Index]

10.2 In accordance with ORS 223.307 (2), the City Manager may update, at any time, the Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) and increase the SDC charge as based on the addition of projects after provision of 30 days notice to persons who have requested written notice under ORS 223.304 (6). A public hearing is not required to adopt the modification if a written notice requesting a hearing in not received within 7 days of the notice.

Section 11. REPEALER

The following resolution is hereby repealed:

RESOLUTION 06-R-748, Adopted January 23, 2006.

Adopted by the City Council of the City of Brookings, County of Curry, State of Oregon, this _____ day of _____, 2009, and made effective on July 1, 2009.

Attest:

_____
Mayor Larry Anderson

_____
City Recorder Joyce Heffington

MINUTES
City of Brookings
Common Council Meeting
Brookings City Hall Council Chambers
898 Elk Drive, Brookings, Oregon 97415
Monday, May 11, 2009

Council met for a Workshop in Council Chambers at 5:30pm, to continue its discussion on system development charges and wastewater rates. Present were the full Council, Acting City Manager Janell Howard, Building Official LauraLee Gray, Public Works Director John Cowan, and approximately 15 members of the public and participating agencies.

Call to Order
Mayor Anderson called the meeting to order at 7:00pm.

Roll Call
Council Present: Mayor Larry Anderson, Councilors Hedenskog, Gordon, and Pieper; a quorum present. Councilor Dave Kitchen was absent.

Staff Present: Acting City Manager Janell Howard, Planning Director Dianne Morris and City Recorder Joyce Heffington.

Other Present: Curry Coastal Pilot Reporter Arwyn Rice and approximately 3 public.

Ceremonies/Appointments/Announcements
Mayor Anderson proclaimed the week of May 18th, 2009 as Azalea Festival Week. Chamber of Commerce President, Les Cohen, accepted the award on behalf of the Chamber and members of the dozens of organizations who help make the festival possible.

Public Hearings/Ordinances
Mayor Anderson called the legislative public hearing to order at 7:05pm in the matter of File LDC-4-09, adding Chapter 17.94, Landscaping, Tree Preservation and Replacement, to Title 17, Land Development Code, of the Brookings Municipal Code, City initiated.

Hearing no declarations of exparte, personal conflict, or conflicts of interest, and no objections as to jurisdiction, Planning Director Morris reviewed the language for the proposed chapter.

Frank Burris, Oregon State University Extension, PO Box 488, Gold Beach, spoke in support of the chapter, generally stating that Brookings, in considering this chapter for adoption, was the "envy of the Valley."

The hearing was closed at 7:18pm and Council moved to deliberations.

Councilor Pieper expressed concern with the idea of forcing property owners to install root barriers and using System Development Charges as incentives. Pieper also generally stated that the language pertaining to tree retention was too vague; the ordinance should provide a list of prohibited trees; and if incentives were to be used, they should be on a graduated scale such that a larger reduction would be realized with the incorporation of a greater number of listed items.

Councilor Gordon generally expressed concern with the City regulating trees on private property.

Council Hedenskog generally stated that a list of acceptable trees and regulations regarding tree height should be incorporated and that root barriers be excluded from the language.

Mayor Anderson generally stated that the language being considered was a step toward fulfilling the goal of conserving the City's water supply as well as a starting point toward providing incentives to encourage downtown development.

Council directed staff to look at moving the tree section over to the incentive section, eliminating the root barrier section, checking with the Dyer Partnership regarding the legal defensibility of providing incentives and incorporating a sliding incentive scale based on the number of incentive options being addressed by a particular developer.

Councilor Hedenskog moved, a second followed and Council voted unanimously to continue LDC-4-09 to the next Council meeting [at 7:00pm, May 26, 2009].

Ordinance 09-O-635 was not considered.

Regular Agenda

Acting City Manager Howard reviewed the Parks and Recreation Commission proposal to increase group Municipal Pool rates.

Councilor Hedenskog generally stated that there should be a non-resident rate consistent with other pool fees.

Councilor Hedenskog moved, a second followed and Council voted unanimously to approve swimming pool groups rates as recommended by the Park and Recreation Commission with an alternate change that we have in-City rates as proposed and a 25% increase for out-of-City rates

Acting City Manager Howard reviewed the terms of the Lone Ranch Financing Agreement.

Mayor Anderson stated that the agreement represents "...an opportunity for the City not to put its citizens in debt for millions of dollars and an opportunity for Borax to put the money out and take the risk." Mayor Anderson also stated for the record that public input had been received from Pat Sherman on this item and would be incorporated into the record of the meeting.

Councilor Gordon moved, a second followed and Council voted unanimously to authorize the City Manager to execute the Lone Ranch Infrastructure Financing Agreement.

Consent Calendar

A. Approval of Council Minutes for April 27, 2009.
B. Acceptance of Parks and Recreation Minutes for March 26, 2009.
C. Approval of pay grade change for Lauri Ziemer from Grade 1 to Grade 6.

Councilor Hedenskog moved, a second followed and Council voted unanimously to approve the Consent Calendar as written.

Adjournment

Councilor Gordon moved, a second followed and Council voted unanimously by voice vote to adjourn at 8:02pm.

Respectfully submitted:

ATTESTED:
this _____ day of _____ 2009:

Larry Anderson, Mayor

Joyce Heffington, City Recorder

MINUTES
BROOKINGS PLANNING COMMISSION
April 7, 2009

The regular meeting of the Brookings Planning Commission was called to order by Chair Markham at 7:00 in the Council Chambers at the Brookings City Hall on the above date with the following Commission members and staff in attendance.

Commissioners Present:

Steve Bismarck	Hedda Markham
Ken Bryan	Cheryl McMahan
Randy Gorman	Gerry Wulkowicz
Kelly McClain	

Staff Present:
Planning Director Dianne Morris, Senior Planner Donna Colby-Hanks, Building Official Laura Lee Gray and Secretary Alex Carr-Frederick
Other: One participant, Applicant David Reid in the audience and no press

CHAIR ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Chair welcomed Gerald Wulkowicz and Kelly McClain recently appointed to the Planning Commission for two-year terms.

THE PLANNING COMMISSION TOOK THE FOLLOWING ACTION IN THE PUBLIC HEARINGS

The Chair announced at 7:06 pm that the public hearing regarding File No. **MP-1-06/SUB-1-09**, a request for a 3 lot subdivision, Applicant, David Reid of PO Box 6662 Brookings OR, was opened. No exparte contact, personal bias, personal interest, conflicts or objections were declared by the Commission. There was no challenge from the audience as to the jurisdiction of the Commission to hear these requests

Director Morris reviewed the staff report. This proposal first came before the Planning Commission (PC) in 2006. the preliminary approval received at the time expired prior to all conditions of approval being fulfilled. The Applicant was requestiong both preliminary and final approval at this time. Applicant, David Reid, PO Box 6662 Brookings OR, stated there were no changes from the 2006 proposal. The public portion of the hearing closed at 7:16 pm. With minimal discussion, Commissioner McMahan moved to grant preliminary approval to the 3 lot subdivision, requiring the creation of a private Street, Eden Lane. Commissioner Bryan seconded and the motion carried unanimously. A motion was then made by Commissioner Bismarck (Second: Commissioner Gorman) to give the final approval to the subdivision plan as all special conditions had been met and staff recommended approval. Motion carried unanimously.

The Chair opened the public legislative hearing regarding the City initiated amendments to the City's Comprehensive Plan and to Chapter 15.15 of the Brookings Municipal Code (BMC), Flood Damage Prevention, which involves remapping the City's flood plain as required by FEMA. No exparte contact, personal bias, personal interest, conflicts or objections were declared by the Commission. There was no challenge from the audience as to the jurisdiction of the Commission to hear these requests.

Building Official, Laura Lee Gray, reviewed the staff report. There were no changes to the Brookings map, although there were three verbiage changes. Chapter 15.15.240, Sections 3, 1&2 Minimum base elevation of manufactured dwellings now must be 18 inches above the flood plain as opposed to 12 inches. There are no manufactured homes within the City limits currently affected by this change. The second change involved BMC Chapter 15.15.260, Section 3 where language was added to regulate and permit stream restoration. Flood plain requirements historically have inhibited stream restoration, the new language addresses that problem. BMC Chapter 15.15.260, Section 4 addresses the placement of existing manufactured dwellings in the floodway. They are only allowed in specific situations. There are no manufactured dwellings within the City's designated flood way at this time. Commissioner Bryan wanted it clarified which portions of the City fell within the flood plain, there are a few areas on Bridge Street and on Beach Ave. out off of Dawson. Commissioner McMahan was confused by a formatting inconsistency regarding capitalization in the document. With Commissioner Bryan making a motion and Commissioner Gorman seconding it, the PC voted unanimously to make a recommendation to City Council to approve CP-1-09, revisions to the Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance with the capitalization revisions. The motion passed unanimously.

The Chair opened the public legislative hearing regarding File No. **LDC-5-09**, a proposed amendment to Chapter 17.28, Multiple-Family Residential (R-3) District of the BMC, City initiated at 7:30pm. The criteria used to decide this matter is found in Chapter 17.140 Amendments, of the BMC. No exparte contact, personal bias, personal interest, conflicts or objections were declared by the Commission. There was no challenge from the audience as to the jurisdiction of the Commission to hear these requests.
Sr. Planner Colby-Hanks reviewed the staff report. In the past, the City Council and Planning Commissions had allowed a change to the Commercial Zoning to allow for existing single family dwellings as an outright permitted use. This revision was inadvertently left out when the changes were made to the R-3 Zone. This revision would allow any pre-existing single family dwellings within the R-3 zone to site a garage, or accessory structures. There were no questions, no discussion. Commissioner Gordon made a motion, Chair Markham seconded that the PC make a recommendation to City Council for approval of File No. **LDC-5-09**. Motion passed unanimously.

The Chair opened the public legislative hearing at 7:32 pm in the matter of File No. **LDC-4-09** Chapter 17.94, Landscaping. This was a continuation of the discussion at the March meeting. No exparte contact, personal bias, personal interest, conflicts or objections were declared by the Commission. There was no challenge from the audience as to the jurisdiction of the Commission to hear these requests.
Director Morris provided a revised copy of the new ordinance with all suggested changes from the March PC meeting in bold and italicized letters. A recap of those changes is as follows: Chapter 17.94.030 Open Space Standards, added language: Any easement areas will be subtracted prior to calculating the 25% of the property stated above. Chapter 17.94.050 Recommendations with Incentives, added language: 10% is the reduction amount in the water component of the homeowners SDCs for implementing any of the following: if a home owner landscapes an additional 25% of their property using non-vegetation, pervious materials, if a home owner uses low impact storm drainage techniques such as 'rain gardens", swales, permeable paving, rain barrel, cistern or other method of reducing use of the City's storm drain system. Additionally, drip irrigation will not qualify commercial, multi-family or industrial

properties for this incentive. Commissioner Wulkowicz made several suggestions regarding the Chapters on trees, 17.94.060 Private Trees and 17.94.070 Tree Preservation or Replacement. Commissioner Wulkowicz explained that in his opinion root barriers were prohibitively expensive, and if the language was left as is, stating 'install a root barrier if a tree is planted within 20 feet of a property line' homeowners would simply not plant trees within 20 feet of their property line which could make for unattractive street views. It was decided that item 4 will read: install an approved root barrier if a tree is planted within 20 feet of a property line adjacent to an existing right of way. Commissioner Bryan moved to recommend approval of File No. **LDC-4-09** to City Council and Commissioner McMahan seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

The Chair opened the public legislative hearing in the matter of File No. **LDC-3-09** Chapter 17.140, Amendments. No exparte contact, personal bias, personal interest, conflicts or objections were declared by the Commission. There was no challenge from the audience as to the jurisdiction of the Commission to hear these requests.
Director Morris explained that the Amendment chapter was confusing as previously written so it has been completely rewritten and broken down into seven sections to help streamline amendment processes. The new sections are as follows: .020-Proposed Amendments; .030-Citizen Initiated Text Amendment; .040-Application for Comp. Plan/Zone Change; .050-Qualified Comp. Plan/Zone changes; .060-Action by the Planning Commission; .070-Action by the City Council. Chair Markham made a motion and Commissioner Bismarck seconded to approve the changes in File No. **LDC-3-09** and recommend to City Council that they approve, motion passed unanimously.

The Chair opened the public legislative hearing in the matter of File No. **LDC-2-09** Chapter 17.04, Development Permit Procedures. No exparte contact, personal bias, personal interest, conflicts or objections were declared by the Commission. There was no challenge from the audience as to the jurisdiction of the Commission to hear these requests.
Sr. Planner Colby-Hanks explained that the Chapter as currently written could allow for a permit to expire before it moved completely through the approval and appeal process. The new language corrects this problem. Commissioner Bryan moved and Commissioner Gorman seconded to recommend approval of **LDC-2-09** to City Council. Motion passed unanimously.

COUNTY REFERRALS

Three county referrals were discussed. The first involved a replacement staircase to the beach on Oceanview Drive. The City asked that the owner meet all State Park requirements and then recommended approval. The second item involved a partition of a mobile home park. No neighboring properties were affected by the partition, only owners within the existing park were affected so the City recommended approval.
The 3rd involved the Outreach Gospel Missions request to increase the number of people allowed to overnight (temporary residents) from 10 to 20. Staff recommended approval considering health department issues, sanitation and neighborhood concerns.

APPROVAL of MINUTES

By a 5-0 vote (motion: Commissioner McMahan Second Chair Markham) the PC approved the minutes of the March 3, 2009 PC meeting. Commissioners Wulkowicz and McClain abstained as they were not seated at the March meeting.

COMMENTS by the PLANNING STAFF

Director Morris passed around the Planning Departments rough drafts of citizen information brochures "How to Build a Rain Garden" and "Permeable, Plantable Pavement". The Planning Department hopes to have these ready for the public by late April.

Chetco Point Park parking lot will be re-paved with pervious pavement, pending the outcome of a public works grant application.

In a County referral involving riparian property on the North Bank Chetco Road, city staff recommended approval. The County Planning Commission denied it.

COMMISSIONERS COMMENTS

Commissioner Gorman asked Director Morris to contact the safety committee regarding the crosswalk in front of the movie theater. Commissioner Bismarck pointed out that there is no safe crossing of the 101 from 5th Street northward. Director Morris explained that ODOT refused an extra crosswalk further north on the grounds that it impedes the flow of traffic. Director Morris offered to get Commissioner Bismarck a contact number for ODOT.

ADJOURNMENT:

With no further business before the Planning Commission, the meeting closed at 8:22 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

_____

Hedda Markham, Chair
(approved at 5/5/2009 meeting)

MINUTES
BROOKINGS PLANNING COMMISSION
May 5, 2009

The regular meeting of the Brookings Planning Commission was called to order by Chair Markham at 7:00 in the Council Chambers at the Brookings City Hall on the above date with the following Commission members and staff in attendance.

Commissioners Present:

Steve Bismarck	Hedda Markham
Ken Bryan	Cheryl McMahan
Randy Gorman	Jerry Wulkowicz
Kelly McClain	

Staff Present:
Planning Director Dianne Morris, Senior Planner Donna Colby-Hanks, Public Works Inspector Richard Christensen and Secretary Alex Carr-Frederick
Other: no press

PLANNING DIRECTOR ANNOUNCEMENTS

Planning Director Morris updated the Planning Commission on City Manager, Gary Milliman's post-operative recuperation. She explained that Mr. Milliman may be sent home one day early from the hospital, and that staff was wishing him a speedy recovery but willing to be patient to make sure it was a complete one.

THE PLANNING COMMISSION TOOK THE FOLLOWING ACTION IN THE PUBLIC HEARINGS

The Chair announced at 7:04 pm that the public quasi-judicial hearing regarding File No. **M3-01-09**, a request for a partition to divide a .43 acre parcel zoned R-2 into three residential lots, Applicant, Shirley and James Hogben of PO Box 508 Brookings OR was opened. No exparte contact, personal bias, personal interest, conflicts or objections were declared by the Commission. There was no challenge from the audience as to the jurisdiction of the Commission to hear these requests.

Director Morris reviewed the staff report. The property in question is comprised of 629, 633 & 633 ½ Old County Road. Applicant, Shirley Hogben spoke on her own behalf, expressing that she believed this partition would represent the property's highest and best use. The public portion of the hearing regarding this file closed at 7:17 pm. With minimal discussion, a motion was then made by Commissioner Bismarck (Second: Commissioner McMahan) to give approve the partition plan. Motion carried unanimously. Commissioner Bryan then made a motion to approve the Final Order it was seconded by Commissioner Bismarck and passed unanimously.

The Chair opened the public quasi-judicial hearing at 7:21 for File No. **VAR-1-09** an application for a variance to setback requirements to allow for realignment of the Easy Street right-of-way east of the intersection with Fern Ave. in front of the schools property, City of Brookings/School District 17C Applicants.
Director Dianne Morris reviewed the staff report. Public Works Inspector, Richard Christensen explained that the City and School District were applying for a Safe Paths to School grant and competing against other small cities for these funds. The more complete the application, the

better the School Districts chance of being awarded the grant. Getting the variance to the setback requirements approved would go a long way towards making the sidewalks on Easy Street a reality. Neil Walker of 629 Easy Street spoke in favor of this application stating that he has been working on getting sidewalks installed in this area for going on 10 years. Chair Markham closed the public discussion at 7:30. With Commissioner Bryan making a motion and Commissioner Gorman seconding it, the PC voted unanimously to approve VAR-1-09. Commissioner Bryan then made a motion to approve the Final Order for VAR-1-09, seconded by Commissioner Bismarck. The motion passed unanimously.

The Chair opened the public legislative hearing regarding File No. **CUP-1-09**, a request for a Conditional Use Permit for a short term rental at 847 Chetco Point Terrace, a single family residence zoned R-2 (Two-Family Residential) within a gated community. There were approximately 5 members of the public present for this hearing. Chair Markham declared a personal bias and interest, and recused herself. Commissioner Bryan took over for her. There was no challenge from the audience as to the jurisdiction of the Commission to hear this request. Sr. Planner Donna Colby-Hanks reviewed the staff report. The representative, Rob Sammons, of PO Box 75, Brookings, OR spoke in support of the application. He explained that he managed other properties in town, has many of the Conditions of Approval already in place, and that he facilitated a meeting with all of the neighboring homeowners to hear their concerns. Rod Reiger of 840 Chetco Point Terrace, Brookings, OR spoke next in opposition to the application. He expressed that all of the other current homeowners, applicant excepted, opposed the application. He also expressed that the CC&R's of the gated community, Chetco Point Terrace, allow for the use of a home as a vacation rental. Michael Webster of 837 Chetco Point Terrace, Brookings OR spoke in opposition. He expressed concern regarding the street width and availability of parking. Jeff Jansen of 7246 Santa Maria Circle, Jordan, UT spoke in opposition. He expressed a concern over property values. Commissioner McClain asked if Mr. Jansen had read his CC&R's prior to purchasing the property. Commissioner Bismarck interjected that the only issue germane to the application was whether or not the City had jurisdiction over this particular piece of property and it's application for a short-term rental. Since the Brookings Municipal Code (BMC) does not preclude short term rentals in residentially zoned areas, the City does indeed have jurisdiction and must apply the standards contained with in the BMC equally for all citizens.
Andrew Young, the applicant, then spoke. Sr. Planner Colby-Hanks reiterated that the street is wide enough, according to City Code, to support the conditional use. She also stated that it is not the City's pervue to enforce CC&R's. Public discussion was closed at 8:25. Commissioner Gorman made a motion, Commissioner Bismarck seconded that the PC approve the application within File No. **CUP-1-09**. Motion passed 6-0, with Chair Markham abstaining. Commissioner Bismarck moved to approve the Final Order, Commissioner McMahan seconded, the motion passed 6-0, Chair Markham abstaining.

The Chair opened the public legislative hearing at 7:32 pm in the matter of File No. **LDC-8-09** Definitions of the BMC. This was a second continuation of the discussion begun at the March meeting regarding the keeping of miniature species as pets. No exparte contact, personal bias, personal interest, conflicts or objections were declared by the Commission. There was no challenge from the audience as to the jurisdiction of the Commission to hear these requests.
Sr. Planner Colby-Hanks provided a revised copy of the new definitions which was partially crafted by Commissioner Wulkowicz. The new definition reads: Section 17.08.120 – L Terms. "Livestock" means any domestic farm animal kept for sale or use. Keeping of livestock within

the City requires a Conditional Use Permit. And: 17.08.160-P Terms. "Pets" means dogs, cats, rabbits, domesticated miniature species, or ten (10) or less poultry. Pets are allowed as an accessory permitted use in any zone. Commissioner Bryan moved to recommend approval of File No. **LDC-8-09** to City Council and Commissioner Wulkowicz seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

APPROVAL of MINUTES

By a 7-0 vote (motion: Chair Markham, Second Commissioner Bismarck) the PC approved the minutes of the March 3, 2009 PC meeting.

COMMENTS by the PLANNING STAFF

Director Morris offered a quick preview of the June agenda and passed out a three page letter from Yvonne Maitland, representing the Harbor Action Committee. The document was regarding the Harbor Area Transportation System Refinement Plan meetings. Ms. Maitland felt that the Planning Commission in their capacity as the Committee for Citizen Involvement would benefit from the briefing. Director Morris provided contact information for ODOT in Coquille regarding the crosswalk in front of the movie theater. She also mentioned that Police Chief Chris Wallace is the head of the Safety Committee.

COMMISSIONERS COMMENTS

ADJOURNMENT:

With no further business before the Planning Commission, the meeting closed at 8:48 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

_____

Hedda Markham, Chair
(approved at 6/2/2009 meeting)

BUILDING DEPARTMENT ACTIVITIES SUMMARY

For the Month of: April 2009

No.	Building	Permit Fee	Plan Check Fee	Surcharge	SDC's	Value Current Month	No. to Date	Total to Date	No. Last Yr	Total Last Year
1	Single Family Dwelling	$543.00	$352.95	$65.16	$0.00	$143,095.37	3	$1,055,118.37	5	$1,613,696.00
2	Single Family Addition	$417.50	$271.38	$50.10	$0.00	$66,451.60	5	$152,727.60	7	$100,295.00
0	Single Family Garage-Carport	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0	$0.00	3	$65,515.00
0	Two Family Residential	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0	$0.00	0	$0.00
0	Multi-Family Residential Apts	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0	$0.00	0	$0.00
0	Commercial New	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0	$0.00	0	$0.00
2	Commercial Addition-Change	$233.00	$8.45	$27.96	$0.00	$35,990.50	3	$202,274.50	3	$563,771.00
0	Churches	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0	$0.00	0	$0.00
0	School Repair-Addition	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0	$0.00	0	$0.00
0	Building Removal	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	2	$0.00	0	$0.00
1	Misc.-Retaining Wall-Fence	$134.00	$87.43	$16.08	$0.00	$18,840.00	8	$133,125.00	1	$20,000.00
6	Total Building Permits	$1,327.50	$720.21	$159.30	$0.00	$264,377.47	21	$1,543,245.47	19	$2,363,277.00
0	Mechanical Permits	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	N/A	N/A		N/A		N/A
0	Plumbing Permits	$0.00	N/A	$0.00		N/A		N/A		N/A
0	Mfg Home Install - Permit Fee	$0.00	N/A	$0.00	N/A	N/A		N/A		N/A
0	Mfg Home Install - Administrative Fee	$0.00	N/A	$0.00	N/A	N/A		N/A		N/A
6	TOTAL PERMITS	$1,327.50	$720.21	$159.30	$0.00	$264,377.47	21	$1,543,245.47	19	$2,363,277.00
	Total Year to Date Calculated Fees									
	2006 YTD Calculated Fees									

City of Brookings Building Division Perr

For the month of: April 2009

Permit #	Name	Address	EDU	Description	Type	Units	Value	Permit Fee	Plan Check	Plumb Fee	Mech Fee	Sewer Fee	Water Service	Sys Dev Chg	Map and Tax Lot	
B-09-16	wooding	755 Elk Drive		CA	7	1	640.00	13.00	8.45						4113-06AD-01801	
B-09-15	COB	905 Wharf St		CA	7	1	35,350.50	220.00							4113-07A -00500	
B-09-18	Ray/Vartanian	1100 Coral Ct		SFD	1	1	143,095.37	543.00	352.95						4113-06BA-02200	
B-09-19	SWOCC	420 Alder		M	11	1	18,840.00	134.00	87.43						4113-05CB-09700	
B-09-20	Alander	270 N. Hazel St		SFA	2	1	35,466.00	220.00	143.00						4113-05CD-05900	
B-09-24	Nixon	109 Tanbark Rd		SFA	2	1	30,985.60	187.50	128.38						4113-07AA-00800	
				Per Data Base			264,377.47	1,327.50	720.21							
				Per Worksheet			264,377.47	1,327.50	720.21							

Permit #	Name	Address	EDU	Description	Type	Units	Value	Permit Fee	Plan Check	Plumb Fee	Mech Fee	Sewer Fee	Water Service	Sys Dev Fee	MH Permit	MH Admin
				Per Data Base												
				Per Worksheet												
				Total Building & Manufactured Home Permits			264,377.47	1,327.50	720.21							