RESOLUTION NO. 573

A RESOLUTION APPROVING A STORM WATER MASTER PLAN AND ESTABLISHING A METHODOLOGY FOR A STORM WATER SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT CHARGE.

WHEREAS, the Canby City Council has determined, by Ordinance No. 867, as amended by Ordinance No. 928, that a charge shall be imposed upon new development for acquiring funds for capital acquisition and improvements for storm water facilities; and

WHEREAS, said Ordinance No. 867, as amended by Ordinance No. 928, provides that a methodology and charges for capital acquisition and improvements be established by resolution; and

WHEREAS, Curran and McLeod, Inc., consulting engineers, have prepared a Storm Water Master Plan, and a methodology for calculation for a Storm Water Master Plan; and

WHEREAS, ORS 310.145 requires that a governing body, when adopting a new fee resolution imposing new rates, may include a provision classifying said fees as subject to or not subject to the limitations set in Section 11(b), Article XI of the Oregon Constitution; and

WHEREAS, the City Council has determined that the methodology and rates hereinafter specified and established are just, reasonable, and necessary; now therefore it is hereby

RESOLVED that the Storm Water Master Plan prepared by Curran-McLeod, Inc., Consulting Engineers is hereby adopted; and

RESOLVED that the following methodology for storm water development charges, dated September 1994, for the City of Canby, attached hereto as Exhibit "A", be adopted, effective immediately, and be it

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Canby City Council hereby classified the charges imposed herein as not being subject to the limitations imposed by Section 11(b), Article XI of the Oregon Constitution and that the City Recorder is hereby directed to publish notice in accordance with ORS 310.145.

ADOPTED by the Canby City Council on the 2nd day of November, 1994.

Scott Taylor, Mayor

ATTEST:

Marilyn K. Perkett, City Recorder

City of Canby
Storm Drainage Master Planning

UTILITY FEE AND SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT CHARGE METHODOLOGY

September, 1994

CURRAN-McLEOD, INC., Consulting Engineers
RAYMOND J. BARTLETT, Economic & Financial Analysis

CITY OF CANBY
STORM DRAINAGE MASTER PLANNING
UTILITY FEE AND SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT CHARGE METHODOLOGY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT COSTS 2

III. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE EXPENSE 4

IV. STORM DRAINAGE COST ALLOCATIONS 4

1. Utility Fee Calculations 5
2. System Development Charge Allocation 7

V. STORM DRAINAGE FUNDING ANALYSIS 10

VI. IMPLEMENTATION 14

List of Tables

Table II-1: Capital Cost/Benefit Allocation 3
Table IV-1: Annual Utility Expense Summary 5
Table IV-2: Existing Average Daily Trip Generation 6
Table IV-3: Utility Fee Per ADT 6
Table IV-4: Utility Fee Allocation 7
Table IV-5: SDC Expense Summary 7
Table IV-6: Future Daily Trip Generation Increase 8
Table IV-7: SDC Cost Per Trip Summary 9
Table IV-8: SDC Allocation 9
Table V-1: Storm Water Utility Fee Justification Matrix 14

CITY OF CANBY
STORM DRAINAGE MASTER PLANNING
UTILITY FEE AND SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT CHARGE METHODOLOGY

I. INTRODUCTION

The City of Canby is in the process of adopting a *Storm Drainage Master Plan*. The draft plan identifies improvements required over a twenty year planning period. These improvements provide storm drainage collection and disposal in accordance with anticipated federal regulations. This portion of the Master Planning Process provides an overview of costs and methodology for implementing fees and charges to cover the identified costs.

To account for the benefit to existing users and future development, this report has the dual purpose of establishing a methodology and allocation of monthly storm drainage utility fees and system development fees. The text is organized in the following outline:

- Identification of required Capital Improvement costs and allocation of benefits to existing and future development;
- Identification of annual Operating and Maintenance expenses benefitting existing development;
- Existing development annual Utility Fee Allocation;
- Future Development System Development Charges allocations; and,
- Storm Drainage Funding analysis.

The *Storm Drainage Master Plan* document contains the details of each capital improvement phase. This text also incorporates by reference the allocation methods contained within the draft *Transportation Master Plan* currently under consideration by the City of Canby.

II. CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT COSTS

The *Storm Drainage Master Plan* has identified the cost of system improvements required to resolve current deficiencies as well as to comply with anticipated future regulations. These capital costs are broken into three phases, as follows:

Phase I: Deficiency Resolution $ 662,000

This phase includes resolution of existing problems and establishes the groundwork for future phases. This phase collects the stormwater from areas along North Pine Street, Molalla Forest Road and Redwood Street which cannot be served by drywells. In addition, this phase includes purchase of land adjacent to the Wastewater Plant for a future storm water treatment facility.

The timeline for implementation of this phase is 1 to 5 years, prompted by the impact on development and the anticipated escalation of land costs.

Phase II: NPDES Permitting, Sedimentation and Monitoring $ 515,000

This is the first phase of compliance with anticipated surface water runoff regulations. This phase will secure NPDES permits for each discharge point into the Molalla River and Willamette River. The major expense of this phase is a regional treatment site east of the Wastewater Treatment Plant and a second facility adjacent to NW 3rd Avenue and the railroad, west of Baker Drive.

This initial phase of compliance is predicated upon continued use of drywells as a Best Management Practice (BMP). The treatment facilities include only the runoff that is collected and discharged to surface waters. This phase will result in construction or modifications to existing retention/detention facilities including:

A. Territorial road - WWTP Area

B. Downtown Trunk - 3rd and Baker Area

C. City Park Ponds

Additionally, a monitoring program will be initiated to include existing discharges in areas including North Birch Street, Maple Street, Molalla Forest Road south of town, Baker Street, Knights Bridge Road and Highway 99E. This regulatory phase is expected to be implemented within the next decade.

Phase III: Discontinue Drywell Disposal $ 9,750,000

The final phase of compliance is triggered by more stringent regulations governing subsurface disposal. This phase contains by far the major cost of storm water control due to the need to construct collection lines and treatment facilities to discontinue use of all drywells.

This phase of construction includes construction of all major trunk sewers in all basins of the Canby Urban Growth Boundary.

This step of increased regulation is not anticipated soon as this action would require a regulatory policy change on the acceptability of drywells as a Storm Drainage Management Practice.

Each phase of Capital Improvements has been estimated for its benefit to existing users and future users. This breakdown identifies the portion of capital cost from each phase that must be paid by utility fees versus those which must be paid by system development charges. The following table identifies the capital cost breakdowns:

TABLE II-1
CAPITAL COST/BENEFIT ALLOCATION

Project Phase	Total Cost*	Existing Users		Future Users	
		% Benefitted	Capital Cost	% Benefitted	Capital Cost
Phase I	$ 662,000	90%	$ 595,800	10%	$ 66,200
Phase II	$ 515,000	40%	$ 206,000	60%	$ 309,000
Phase III	$ 9,750,000	40%	$ 3,900,000	60%	$ 5,850,000

* 1994 Dollars

III. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE EXPENSE

Through discussions with City staff and evaluation of existing procedures, an annual operating and maintenance expense has been estimated. This operating expense will support annual cleaning of storm water collection sumps, 5 year frequency cleaning of storm water drywells, and a nominal amount of system improvement/replacement/ cleaning.

Annual costs are estimated at $35,380 including personnel, material and services cost.

IV. STORM DRAINAGE COST ALLOCATIONS

Total capital costs and annual operational costs are associated with benefits to both existing and future development. As a result, two fee systems are proposed. The charges associated with the benefits to existing improvements are identified as the Storm Water Utility Fee. The charges to future users associated with benefits to future improvements are identified as the Storm Water System Development Charge (SDC).

Equitable allocation of costs related to the storm water utility is complex due to the unique character of the area. Typically, the impermeable area of a site development generates the storm water runoff. In these cases, storm water utility fees are customarily based upon the effects of runoff from the impermeable area on the developed site.

In the Canby area, the soils are very permeable and able to assimilate nearly all runoff on-site, with minimal impact on public storm water facilities. Additionally, Canby ordinances prohibit the discharge of storm water from private properties onto the public right-of-way. As a result, the impermeable area of private properties has minimal impact on public storm water flow and cannot be adopted as the basis of allocation of cost.

The volume of runoff and cost of storm water improvements closely correlate with the development of the transportation system because the majority of stormwater results from street runoff. Similar to the transportation plan, the cost of storm water improvements should be allocated on the basis of average transportation trip generation. This would then allocate storm drainage control costs in proportion to the local impacts on the transportation network.

1. Utility Fee Calculations

The utility fee is comprised of the annual operating expense and annual debt service for the component of capital improvements related to existing development. The distribution of costs within the utility fee is based upon the average daily trips completed by existing development within the City. The following table summarizes capital costs and identifies annualized costs of improvements benefitting existing development which becomes the basis of the Storm Water Utility Fee.

TABLE IV-1
ANNUAL UTILITY EXPENSE SUMMARY

PHASE	CAPITAL COST **	ANNUAL EXPENSE *
Phase I	$ 595,800	$ 84,596
Phase II	$ 206,000	$ 29,249
Phase III	$ 3,900,000	$ 553,750
Operation & Maintenance	---	$ 35,380

* Based upon 15 year amortization at 6.75% in 1997 dollars including Bond issuance cost.
** 1994 Dollars

The City of Canby *Transportation Plan* has projected the trip generation data based upon the *Institute of Transportation Engineers, Trip Generation Manual* with adjustments for trip length and linked trip factors. The following table identifies the allocation of trips to each land use:

TABLE IV-2 EXISTING AVERAGE DAILY TRIP GENERATION				
Land Use	Number of Units	ITE Daily Trip Rate	Average Daily Traffic	% of Total
Residential:	[Dwelling Units]			
Single-Family	3,000	9.55	28,650	21.4
Multi-Family	1,000	6.28	6,280	4.7
Commercial:	[1000 SF Units]			
Downtown	1,110 (1)	36.75	40,792	30.4
Highway	1,098 (2)	36.75	40,351	30.1
Commercial/ Manufacturing:	163 (3)	29.05	4,735	3.5
Industrial	1,018 (3)	7.84	7,981	6.0
Public Schools	[Student] 4,523	1.18	5,337	4.0
TOTAL AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC			134,126	100%

(1) Downtown commercial estimated to develop to 75% lot coverage, gross acres.
(2) Highway commercial estimated to develop to 35% lot coverage, gross acres.
(3) Commercial/Manufacturing and Light Industrial are estimated to develop to 25% lot coverage, gross acres.

Upon determination of the annual utility expense and the existing trip generation figures, costs can be identified per trip. The following table gives the utility cost per trip for each phase of the Capital Improvement Plan and operation and maintenance cost.

TABLE IV-3 UTILITY FEE PER ADT		
EXPENSE ITEM	ANNUAL COST	ANNUAL COST PER EXISTING ADT
Operation & Maintenance	$ 35,380	$ 0.264
Phase I	$ 84,596	$ 0.631
Phase II	$ 29,249	$ 0.218
Phase III	$ 553,750	$ 4.129

Using the cost per trip data, and ITE Daily Trip Rates, utility fees can be quantified for each existing land use. The following table lists the required utility fee per land use. The allocations have been rounded for ease of application and to account for deviations from the estimates.

TABLE IV-4
UTILITY FEE ALLOCATION

Land Use	ITE Daily Trip Rate	Units of Measure	Annual Storm Drainage Utility Cost			
			O&M	Phase I	Phase II	Phase III
Residential:						
Single-Family	9.55	Dwelling	$ 2.50	$ 6.00	$ 2.10	$ 39.50
Multi-Family	6.28	Dwelling	$ 1.70	$ 4.00	$ 1.40	$ 26.00
Commercial:						
Downtown	36.75	1,000 SF	$ 9.70	$ 23.20	$ 8.00	$ 151.80
Highway	36.75	1,000 SF	$ 9.70	$ 23.20	$ 8.00	$ 151.80
Commercial/ Manufacturing	29.05	1,000 SF	$ 7.70	$ 18.40	$ 6.40	$ 120.00
Industrial	7.84	1,000 SF	$ 2.10	$ 5.00	$ 1.70	$ 32.40
Public Schools	1.18	Student	$ 0.30	$ 0.75	$ 0.25	$ 4.90

2. System Development Charge Allocation

Capitalized costs attributable to future users become the basis for the storm drainage utility System Development Charges (SDC). These costs are inventoried in the following table:

TABLE IV-5
SDC EXPENSE SUMMARY

PROJECT PHASE	CAPITAL COST *
Phase I	$ 66,200
Phase II	$ 309,000
Phase II	$ 5,850,000

*1994 Dollars

Based upon ultimate buildout of the Urban Growth Boundary, trip generation can be projected and used as a basis for allocating costs of improvements benefitting future users. This provides an equitable allocation proportional to the impact on transportation systems as the basis of the System Development Charges (SDC).

TABLE IV-6
FUTURE DAILY TRIP GENERATION INCREASE

Land Use	Number of Units	ITE Daily Trip Rate	Addnl. Average Daily Traffic	% of Total
Residential:	[Dwelling Units]			
Single-Family	3,220	9.55	30,750	19.3
Multi-Family	945	6.28	5,935	3.7
Commercial:	[1,000 SF Units]			
Downtown	784 (1)	36.75	28,815	18.1
Highway	564 (2)	36.75	20,730	13.0
Commercial/ Manufacturing:	1,252.3 (3)	29.05	36,380	22.9
Industrial	4,301 (3)	7.84	33,725	21.2
Public Schools	[Students] 2,400	1.18	2,830	1.8
FUTURE ADT INCREASE			159,165	100%

(1) Downtown commercial estimated to develop to 75% lot coverage, gross acres.
(2) Highway commercial estimated to develop to 35% lot coverage, gross acres.
(3) Commercial/Manufacturing and Light Industrial are estimated to develop to 25% lot coverage, gross acres.

Again, using the total System Development Charge cost summary and the future new average daily trip generation, the cost per trip can be quantified as shown in the following table.

TABLE IV-7
SDC COST PER TRIP SUMMARY

EXPENSE ITEM	CAPITAL COST	COST PER FUTURE ADT
Phase I	$ 66,200	$ 0.416
Phase II	$ 309,000	$ 1.94
Phase III	$ 5,850,000	$ 36.75

TABLE IV-8
SDC ALLOCATION

Land Use	ITE Daily Trip Rate	Units of Measure	SDC Charge		
			Phase I	Phase II	Phase III
Residential:					
Single-Family	9.55	Dwelling	$ 4.00	$ 18.50	$ 350
Multi-Family	6.28	Dwelling	$ 2.60	$ 12.20	$ 230
Commercial:					
Downtown	36.75	1,000 SF	$ 15.30	$ 71.30	$ 1,350
Highway	36.75	1,000 SF	$ 15.30	$ 71.30	$ 1,350
Commercial/ Manufacturing	29.05	1,000 SF	$ 12.00	$ 56.40	$ 1,070
Industrial	7.84	1,000 SF	$ 3.30	$ 15.20	$ 290
Public Schools	1.18	Students	$ 0.50	$ 71.30	$ 43.40

V. STORM DRAINAGE FUNDING ANALYSIS

In the planning process, we must consider all possible funding sources. Generally the possible sources are:

- taxes on property;
- user fees for use of the storm water system; and
- systems development charges (SDC) on development as it occurs.

Grants from the federal and state governments are not available specifically for storm water management. The sources with real possibilities include a property tax, a user fee, and a SDC. Of the three, a SDC is the source of revenue most equitable for capital improvements. This cannot be used for operating expenses.

Over the long run, most of the annual expenses will be for operations and not for capital. Therefore, a tax or a user fee should be developed to generate sufficient revenue to pay for the annual operating costs and for capital costs not recoverable from the SDC. The tax or fee should meet four basic criteria:

A. Sufficient Revenue: total annual revenues should cover total annual costs, including the annual cost of capital.

B. Legal: the funding sources should be as secure from litigation as possible.

C. Economically Justified: the sources of revenue (e.g., taxes, user fees, systems development charges) should be

   - equitable and economically efficient; and
   - the cost of collecting the revenue should be a small fraction of the amount of revenue actually collected.

D. Politically Acceptable: the funding sources should have popular support when considered with all other taxes, fees, and charges levied by the City on its citizens.

The first criterion is straightforward. If the tax or fee does not produce sufficient revenue it need not be considered further.

The second criterion is that the law must be met. Two recent events in Oregon affect the City's choice of revenue sources to fund the storm water system. The first event was passage of a constitutional change (Ballot Measure 5) that specifically defines the difference between a property tax, a user fee, and an incurred charge. The second event was a state Supreme Court decision in favor of the City of Roseburg's storm drainage fee. These two events affect the City's ability to assess taxes and user fees for storm water.

Given these events, Oregon law now distinguishes a tax from a user fee based on two critical factors (1) who is liable for payment and (2) if the fee is avoidable. It is a tax if the property owner is liable for payment and there is no legal or practical means of avoiding all or a part of the fee.

A tax and fee apply different notions of equity. A tax uses an ability-to-pay notion of equity. The higher the value of the property the greater is the amount of the tax (the tax rate is fixed). In this notion of equity, no relationship exists between the amount paid in taxes and the benefits received from public services purchased with tax revenues.

A fee applies a cost-of-service notion of equity. That is, there is a link between the amount of the fee and the service received.

The third criterion is that the fee or tax is economically justified. Also, the cost of collecting the tax or fee should be a small fraction of the total revenue (administrative efficiency).

Finally, the fourth criterion calls for political judgement. The new tax or fee should be appropriate to the other taxes and fees assessed by the City, and the new tax or fee should be easily understandable to those paying it. The public by-and-large should be cognizant of the tax or fee, and feel that the amount of the tax or fee is appropriate to the users of the revenue.

When applied to Canby's storm water system, these legal and economic concepts produce an array of choices about how to pay for the storm water system. The soils are very porous and consequently rain water that falls on private impervious surfaces (driveways, roof tops, patios) is absorbed by the adjacent unbuilt land area. In fact, Canby's development codes require each private land user to contain storm water on their property. And technically, users have not had trouble meeting this code. Consequently there is no direct link between the amount of impervious surface on a private land use and the amount of storm water going to the public storm water system.

Most of the storm water that must be controlled comes from public streets. Only an indirect link exists between private land uses and the storm water system. That is, private land users generate vehicle and foot traffic that use public streets and sidewalks which produce storm water runoff. Therefore private land users contribute to storm water runoff and consequently can be charged for it.

The basis used by the City of Roseburg, which went to the state Supreme Court to verify its legal ability to charge for the control of storm water runoff, uses the square feet of impervious surface on private property. In its opinion, the Supreme Court said that the fee is for use of the service, and that "*...the obligation to pay storm drainage fees arises when a person responsible uses storm drainage services.*" It goes on to say "*It is presumed that storm drainage services are used whenever there is an improved premises.*" In Roseburg, soils do not readily absorb rain water so that rain water actually flows from private property to the public storm drains. Because of Canby's porous soil, the direct link between improved premises with impervious surfaces and storm water runoff cannot be so clearly made. A fee based on the amount of impervious surfaces on the premises would not exactly meet the Roseburg-test established by the court. Also, it fails the economic notion of equity since the amount of impervious surface and traffic generated may not be closely correlated.

Given these legal and practical problems, we cannot develop a storm water fee that exactly meets the Roseburg-test. We have looked for other means, and found three options. Including the fee for impervious surfaces, the three possibilities are:

1. Adopt an incurred charge for use of the storm water system

   Pros: Since the fee will be a small amount (e.g., about $1.00 per month per residence) relative to other fees and charges and relative to the cost of litigation to stop the City from making the charge, no one may challenge the City.

   Cons: A cause-cost relationship between private land use and storm water runoff in only indirect. There is no sound technical data that specifically relates the private use of property to the amount of runoff from the property. Technically the only water that enters the storm water system is from public streets.

2. Adopt a transportation user fee that includes the costs associated with the storm water system.

Pros: Technically this method provides the best cause-cost relationship of all the options.

Equity based on cost-of-service is served best by this option.

Cons: This method relies on measurement of traffic generated by a particular land use. Cities have been using averages published by the Institute of Transportation Engineers. This may not satisfy Oregon's law requiring incurred fees to be avoidable by a specific property.

3. Charge for storm water as part of the sanitary sewer fee. Re-create the enterprise fund as a Storm Water and Sanitary Sewer fund.

Pros: Canby currently uses this method. The public works staff who clean and maintain the sanitary sewer collection system are the same people who clean and maintain the storm drainage system. They are paid from sewer fee revenues.

Both systems deal with wastewater, storm or sanitary. The water pollution concepts are similar for the two types of wastewater.

Other cities use this method. For example, City of Portland uses it, but the individual customers pay based on water consumption (for sanitary) and impervious area (for storm).

Cons: The notion of equity probably is compromised. Users would pay for storm water services in proportion to the amount of sewage produced.

This option may be politically unacceptable because over the past four years the City has increased rates to meet debt service on bonds issued to make capital improvements to the treatment plant.

To summarize, listed below is the criteria for each option, graded with an "O" for just meeting a particular criterion, a "-" when the criterion is poorly or not met, and a "+" when the criterion is more than met.

TABLE V-1
STORM WATER UTILITY FEE JUSTIFICATION MATRIX

	Storm Water Fee	Transportation Fee	Sewer Fee
Sufficient Revenue	+	+	+
Equitable (cost-of-service)	-	+	O
Cost to Collect	O	+	+
Legal	-	O	O
Political Acceptance	O	O	-

Our conclusion and recommendation is that the logical links are strongest between storm water and transportation, and that the costs of maintaining and improving the storm drainage system should be incorporated into the transportation utility fees and system development charges.

VI. IMPLEMENTATION

To pay for the proposed Phase I improvements, a portion of the monitoring required in Phase II, and for operation and maintenance in the next 10 years, the City will depend on two sources of annual income: a user fee and a systems development charge. The user fee will be collected monthly from users of the street and storm water system. The SDC will be collected once when the Transportation SDC is collected.

The **user fee** is based on total annual utility costs (i.e., operation and annual debt service) and on trip rates. As described above the rates are based on a total annual cost of $119,976 in fiscal 1995 (i.e., $ 35,380 for operations and maintenance, and $84,596 for Phase I debt service beginning in fiscal 1997). This cost escalates with inflation at the rates of 5.5% for labor and 4.5% for materials and services. Capital costs escalate at 5% per year.

The City's *Transportation Master Plan* provides the trip rates, which are summarized on the Rate Analysis Table following this section of the report (e.g., a single-family house generated 9.55 trips per day). The City generated a total of 134,126 trips per day for all types of developments. The fee per month is therefore, $0.07 per trip (e.g., $119,976 per year divided by 134,126 trips per day divided by 12 months)-[1]

At this $0.07 per trip per month and 9.55 trips per day, a single family household will be billed $0.71 per month. A downtown store with 1,000 square feet of building space and a trip generation rate of 36.75 per 1,000 SF of space; the monthly fee will be $2.74.

The **systems development charge** on new development will be $0.42 per trip generated. This fee is based on the Phase I capital costs. The City's *Transportation Master Plan* shows growth of 159,165 trips for the roadways designed. The capital costs of storm water control attributable to new development divided by the number of new trips results in $0.42 per trip. Using the same averages for trips per day by type of development, the SDC for a single family residence will be $4.00. For 1,000 square feet of downtown commercial space that generates 36.75 trips, the SDC will be $15.30.

The SDC revenues can be used only for capital purchases and debt service. The Cash Flow Table at the end of this section, shows the total annual costs and revenues. The SDC revenue is used for cash acquisitions of capital and for debt service on the revenue bonds issued to build the Phase I improvements and for monitoring. The Schedule of Capital Improvements Table shows the improvements and monitoring.

---

[1] - The annual operating costs used to calculate rates is part of a simultaneous set of equations that balances the budget over a 10 year period. The equations consider the escalating costs of labor, materials, and capital, and an increasing customer base, at 2% per year.

Cash Flow Forecast

	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
Cash flows from operations										
Service Revenues	129,536	132,126	134,769	137,464	140,214	143,018	145,878	148,796	159,212	178,317
Miscellaneous										
Total revenue	129,536	132,126	134,769	137,464	140,214	143,018	145,878	148,796	159,212	178,317
Personnel										
Wages & salaries	26,536	27,995	29,535	31,160	32,873	34,681	36,589	38,601	40,724	42,964
Taxes, insurance		-								
Total Personnel	26,536	27,995	29,535	31,160	32,873	34,681	36,589	38,601	40,724	42,964
Materials & Services	8,844	9,242	9,658	10,093	10,547	11,022	11,518	12,036	12,578	13,144
Total materials & Services	8,844	9,242	9,658	10,093	10,547	11,022	11,518	12,036	12,578	13,144
Net Cash from Operations	94,155	94,888	95,575	96,212	96,793	97,315	97,772	98,158	105,909	122,209
Cash flows from capital and related activities										
SDC revenues	2,724	2,856	2,997	3,147	3,309	3,483	3,669	3,870	4,087	4,320
Contributed capital										
Grants										
Bond Proceeds		0	792,059	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bond Costs		0	(39,603)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Debt Service			0	(85,596)	(85,596)	(85,596)	(85,596)	(85,596)	(85,596)	(85,596)
Capital Outlays		0								
Replacement	(8,640)									
Improvements		0	(752,456)	0	(12,763)	0	(14,071)	0	(15,513)	0
Net Cash from Capital Activities	(5,916)	2,856	2,997	(82,448)	(95,049)	(82,113)	(95,997)	(81,725)	(97,022)	(81,276)
Interest on investments	1,572	4,940	8,613	10,921	11,586	12,301	13,041	13,830	14,774	16,187
Net Increase (Decrease) in Cash & Investments	89,811	102,685	107,185	24,684	13,330	27,502	14,815	30,263	23,661	57,121
Cash & Investments, June 30	0	89,811	192,496	299,681	324,365	337,694	365,197	380,012	410,275	433,936
Cash & Investments, July 1	89,811	192,496	299,681	324,365	337,694	365,197	380,012	410,275	433,936	491,057
Bond Reserve			85,596	85,596	85,596	85,596	85,596	85,596	85,596	85,596
Available			214,085	238,769	252,099	279,601	294,416	324,679	348,340	405,461
Total			299,681	324,365	337,694	365,197	380,012	410,275	433,936	491,057
				1.25	1.27	1.28	1.29	1.31	1.41	1.62

Rate Analysis

	Trip Rate	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
Trips by Type of Development											
Single Residential		28,650	29,714	30,817	31,961	33,148	34,379	35,655	36,979	38,352	39,776
Multiple Residential		6,280	6,492	6,712	6,939	7,174	7,416	7,667	7,927	8,195	8,472
Commercial											
Downtown		40,792	41,897	43,031	44,196	45,393	46,622	47,885	49,182	50,513	51,881
Highway		40,351	41,196	42,059	42,940	43,839	44,758	45,695	46,652	47,629	48,627
Mixed		4,735	5,275	5,877	6,548	7,296	8,128	9,056	10,089	11,241	12,524
Industrial		7,981	8,669	9,416	10,228	11,109	12,067	13,107	14,237	15,464	16,797
Schools		5,337	5,452	5,569	5,689	5,811	5,936	6,064	6,194	6,327	6,463
Total		134,126	138,695	143,482	148,501	153,770	159,306	165,129	171,259	177,721	184,539
Total, w/o Schools		128,789	133,243	137,913	142,813	147,959	153,370	159,065	165,065	171,394	178,076
Average Monthly Cost/Trip											
Total Trips		$0.08	$0.08	$0.08	$0.08	$0.08	$0.07	$0.07	$0.07	$0.07	$0.08
Total Trips net of School		$0.08	$0.08	$0.08	$0.08	$0.08	$0.08	$0.08	$0.08	$0.08	$0.08
Option 1, Charge Schools, Monthly Cost by Type of Development											
Single Residential	9.55	0.77	0.76	0.75	0.74	0.73	0.71	0.70	0.69	0.71	0.77
Multiple Residential	6.28	0.51	0.50	0.49	0.48	0.48	0.47	0.46	0.45	0.47	0.51
Commercial											
Downtown	36.75	2.96	2.92	2.88	2.83	2.79	2.75	2.71	2.66	2.74	2.96
Highway	36.75	2.96	2.92	2.88	2.83	2.79	2.75	2.71	2.66	2.74	2.96
Mixed	29.05	2.34	2.31	2.27	2.24	2.21	2.17	2.14	2.10	2.17	2.34
Industrial	7.84	0.63	0.62	0.61	0.60	0.60	0.59	0.58	0.57	0.59	0.63
Schools	1.18	0.09	0.09	0.09	0.09	0.09	0.09	0.09	0.09	0.09	0.10
Option 2, Do Not Charge Schools											
Single Residential	9.55	0.80	0.79	0.78	0.77	0.75	0.74	0.73	0.72	0.74	0.80
Multiple Residential	6.28	0.53	0.52	0.51	0.50	0.50	0.49	0.48	0.47	0.49	0.52
Commercial											
Downtown	36.75	3.08	3.04	2.99	2.95	2.90	2.86	2.81	2.76	2.84	3.07
Highway	36.75	3.08	3.04	2.99	2.95	2.90	2.86	2.81	2.76	2.84	3.07
Mixed	29.05	2.43	2.40	2.37	2.33	2.29	2.26	2.22	2.18	2.25	2.42
Industrial	7.84	0.66	0.65	0.64	0.63	0.62	0.61	0.60	0.59	0.61	0.65

Forecast of Trips by Type of Development

	Trips at Buildout in UGB	Average Annual Growth Rat	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
Trips by Type of Development												
Single Residential	59,400	3.7%	28,650	29,714	30,817	31,961	33,148	34,379	35,655	36,979	38,352	39,776
Multiple Residential	12,215	3.4%	6,280	6,492	6,712	6,939	7,174	7,416	7,667	7,927	8,195	8,472
Commercial												
Downtown	69,607	2.7%	40,792	41,897	43,031	44,196	45,393	46,622	47,885	49,182	50,513	51,881
Highway	61,081	2.1%	40,351	41,196	42,059	42,940	43,839	44,758	45,695	46,652	47,629	48,627
Mixed	41,115	11.4%	4,735	5,275	5,877	6,548	7,296	8,128	9,056	10,089	11,241	12,524
Industrial	41,706	8.6%	7,981	8,669	9,416	10,228	11,109	12,067	13,107	14,237	15,464	16,797
Schools	8,167	2.1%	5,337	5,452	5,569	5,689	5,811	5,936	6,064	6,194	6,327	6,463
Total	293,291	4.0%	134,126	138,695	143,482	148,501	153,770	159,306	165,129	171,259	177,721	184,539
% Change				3.4%	3.5%	3.5%	3.5%	3.6%	3.7%	3.7%	3.8%	3.8%
Total, w/o Schools	285,124	4.1%	128,789	133,243	137,913	142,813	147,959	153,370	159,065	165,065	171,394	178,076
% Change				3.5%	3.5%	3.6%	3.6%	3.7%	3.7%	3.8%	3.8%	3.9%

CITY OF CANBY
STORM DRAINAGE UTILITY FEE ALLOCATION

Land Use	ITE Daily Trip Rate	Units of Measure	Annual Storm Drainage Utility Cost			
			O&M	Phase I	Phase II	Phase III
Residential:						
Single-Family	9.55	Dwelling	$ 2.50	$ 6.00	$ 2.10	$ 39.50
Multi-Family	6.28	Dwelling	$ 1.70	$ 4.00	$ 1.40	$ 25.00
Commercial:						
Downtown	36.75	1,000 SF	$ 9.70	$ 23.20	$ 8.00	$ 151.80
Highway	36.75	1,000 SF	$ 9.70	$ 23.20	$ 8.00	$ 151.80
Commercial/ Manufacturing	29.05	1,000 SF	$ 7.70	$ 18.40	$ 6.40	$ 120.00
Industrial	7.84	1,000 SF	$ 2.10	$ 5.00	$ 1.70	$ 32.40
Public Schools	1.18	Student	$ 0.30	$ 0.75	$ 0.25	$ 4.90

CITY OF CANBY
STORM DRAINAGE SDC ALLOCATION

Land Use	ITE Daily Trip Rate	Units of Measure	SDC Charge		
			Phase I	Phase II	Phase III
Residential:					
Single-Family	9.55	Dwelling	$ 4.00	$ 18.50	$ 350
Multi-Family	6.28	Dwelling	$ 2.60	$ 12.20	$ 230
Commercial:					
Downtown	36.75	1,000 SF	$ 15.30	$ 71.30	$ 1,350
Highway	36.75	1,000 SF	$ 15.30	$ 71.30	$ 1,350
Commercial/ Manufacturing	29.05	1,000 SF	$ 12.00	$ 56.40	$ 1,070
Industrial	7.84	1,000 SF	$ 3.30	$ 15.20	$ 290
Public Schools	1.18	Students	$ 0.50	$ 71.30	$ 43.40