

Rates 101 Presentation Columbia, MO

Stantec Financial Services

Agenda



Introduction to Stantec

Rate Study Process

- Revenue Sufficiency
- Cost of Service
- Rate Design
- Customer Impacts
- Project Timeline

400+ Combined years of experience

35+ Specialists in utility financial management

>375 Communities served



1.5K studies in the last 10 years

>550 Utilities in our benchmarking database

\$4B+ Debt supported in the past five years

A Rate Study is a Series of Connected Investigations





Revenue Requirements How much?

Typical Components of Utility Revenue Requirements



What is the cost to empty your trash and recycling bins?



Source: Fiscal Year 21 Budget

What is the cost to drain a tub?



Operations = \$11.4M

Capital = \$3.7M

Source: Fiscal Year 21 Budget

10-Year Financial Management Plan



\$1.0M

\$0.5M

\$0 0M

ANYTOWN, USA - SOLID WASTE



CALC SAVE CTRL LAST OVR

| | FY 2020 | FY 2021 | FY 2022 | FY 2023 | FY 2024 | FY 2025 | FY 2026 | FY 2027 | FY 2028 | FY 2029 | FY 2030 | FY 2025 | FY 2030 |
|--------------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Solid Waste Rate Plan | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 4.33% | 1.46% | 1.28% | 1.34% | 1.34% | 1.36% | 1.37% | 1.39% | 7.23% | 14.71% |
| Senior-Lien DSC | 3.04 | 3.24 | 2.87 | 2.98 | 2.95 | 2.98 | 3.03 | 3.09 | 3.15 | 3.21 | 3.27 | | |
| Total Single Family Bill | \$18.00 | \$18.00 | \$18.00 | \$18.78 | \$19.05 | \$19.30 | \$19.56 | \$19.82 | \$20.09 | \$20.36 | \$20.65 | | |



Current Plan

20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30

Revenues vs. Expenses - O&M Cash In Cash Out \$3.0M \$2.5M \$2.0M \$1.5M \$1.5M \$0.5M \$0.0M

CIP Funding



Expenses by Type





Utilities Face Steeper Cost Increases than Overall Inflation



Key items that will move the needle

Capital Investment Needs

Operating Cost Pressures

Recycling Market Conditions

Regulatory Environment



Cost of Service From Whom?

Deep Dive into Customer Data Example: Tonnage Collected by Customer Class



Deep Dive into Customer Data Example: Impervious Area for Stormwater





Allocate System Costs to Functions **Cost Causation Method**

FY 2022 Revenue Requirement



Less: Offsetting **Revenues from Miscellaneous** Charges



Measuring How Customers Use Services

| Customer Type | Collection | Materials Processing | Disposal | |
|-----------------------|------------------|-------------------------|------------------|--|
| Residential Refuse | | | | |
| Residential Recycling | | Tonnage | Tonnage | |
| Commercial Front Load | # of Pickups and | Containar Siza | Containar Siza | |
| Commercial Rear Load | Containers | Container Size | Container Size | |
| Commercial Roll Off | | Residential Bags | Residential Bags | |
| Commercial Recycling | | | | |





Miscellaneous Fee Calculation

Identify costs and activities for each service and populate in Stantec's cost template

Labor

- How much time does each role spend to perform this service?
- **Equipment/Vehicles**
 - What pieces of equipment or vehicles are utilized to perform the service?

Materials

What materials are used as part of this service?





Example Cost to Serve vs. Current Revenue





Rate Design How to Collect?

Rate Structure-Balancing Objectives



Elements of Solid Waste Rate Structures



Elements of Wastewater Rate Structures



Rate Comparisons are Rather Complex Typical Monthly Residential Solid Waste Bill Survey



Rate Comparisons are Rather Complex Typical Monthly Residential Sewer Bill Survey @ 5,000 gallons



Rate Comparisons are Rather Complex Typical Monthly Residential Stormwater Bill





Customer Impacts

Example Residential

| Inside City Single Family 3/4" Meter Monthly Water & Sewer Bill Calculations | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-------------------|---------------|------------------------|--------|-----------|-----------------------|----|---------------|--------------|
| Monthly | | | | | | | | | |
| <u>Use (Gal)</u> | <u>% of Bills</u> | <u>Agg. %</u> | <u>Current (FY 13)</u> | | <u>Pr</u> | <u>oposed (FY 14)</u> | | <u>\$ Chg</u> | <u>% Chg</u> |
| - | 9.7% | 9.7% | \$ | 22.16 | \$ | 22.01 | \$ | (0.15) | -0.7% |
| 1,000 | 5.7% | 15.4% | \$ | 29.03 | \$ | 28.79 | \$ | (0.24) | -0.8% |
| 2,000 | 9.4% | 24.7% | \$ | 35.90 | \$ | 35.57 | \$ | (0.33) | -0.9% |
| 3,000 | 11.6% | 36.3% | \$ | 42.77 | \$ | 42.35 | \$ | (0.42) | -1.0% |
| 4,000 | 11.9% | 48.2% | \$ | 49.64 | \$ | 49.13 | \$ | (0.51) | -1.0% |
| 5,000 | 10.3% | 58.5% | \$ | 56.51 | \$ | 56.44 | \$ | (0.07) | -0.1% |
| 6,000 | 8.2% | 66.7% | \$ | 63.89 | \$ | 63.75 | \$ | (0.14) | -0.2% |
| 7,000 | 6.2% | 72.9% | \$ | 71.27 | \$ | 71.06 | \$ | (0.21) | -0.3% |
| 8,000 | 4.8% | 77.7% | \$ | 78.65 | \$ | 78.37 | \$ | (0.28) | -0.4% |
| 9,000 | 3.6% | 81.3% | \$ | 86.03 | \$ | 86.45 | \$ | 0.42 | 0.5% |
| 10,000 | 2.7% | 84.0% | \$ | 93.41 | \$ | 94.53 | \$ | 1.12 | 1.2% |
| 11,000 | 2.3% | 86.3% | \$ | 100.79 | \$ | 102.61 | \$ | 1.82 | 1.8% |
| 12,000 | 1.8% | 88.2% | \$ | 108.17 | \$ | 110.69 | \$ | 2.52 | 2.3% |
| 13,000 | 1.4% | 89.6% | \$ | 115.55 | \$ | 120.14 | \$ | 4.59 | 4.0% |
| 14,000 | 1.2% | 90.8% | \$ | 122.93 | \$ | 129.59 | \$ | 6.66 | 5.4% |
| 15,000 | 1.1% | 91.9% | \$ | 130.31 | \$ | 139.04 | \$ | 8.73 | 6.7% |
| 16,000 | 0.9% | 92.8% | \$ | 133.27 | \$ | 148.49 | \$ | 15.22 | 11.4% |
| 17,000 | 0.8% | 93.5% | \$ | 136.23 | \$ | 157.94 | \$ | 21.71 | 15.9% |
| 18,000 | 0.6% | 94.2% | \$ | 139.19 | \$ | 167.39 | \$ | 28.20 | 20.3% |
| 19,000 | 0.6% | 94.8% | \$ | 142.15 | \$ | 176.84 | \$ | 34.69 | 24.4% |
| 20,000 | 0.5% | 95.2% | \$ | 145.11 | \$ | 186.29 | \$ | 41.18 | 28.4% |

Example Non Residential

| Industrial User Monthly Bill Impact Calculations | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|---|-------------------------|----------|-------------------------------------|----------|-------------------------------------|----|---------------|--------------|
| | | | | (F | Current Y 2013) | P (I | roposed TY 2014) | | | |
| <u>Customer</u> | <u>Services</u> | <u>Avg. Monthly</u> <u>Usage (Gal)</u> | <u>Meter</u> Size(s) | <u>C</u> | <u>Total</u> harges ¹ | <u>C</u> | <u>Total</u> harges ¹ | | <u>\$ Chg</u> | <u>% Chg</u> |
| Dart | WA/IW | 2,230,000/ 670,000 | 6" | \$ | 8,064 | \$ | 6,758 | \$ | (1,307) | -16.2% |
| Siemens | WA/IW | 180,000/ 960,000 | 1.5" | \$ | 15,206 | \$ | 22,243 | \$ | 7,037 | 46.3% |
| J. Hardie | WA/IW | 2,430,000/ 4,110,000 | 4",8" | \$ | 23,828 | \$ | 16,899 | \$ | (6,929) | -29.1% |
| Paradise | WA/IW | 80,000/ 2,920,000 | 2" | \$ | 18,591 | \$ | 18,511 | \$ | (80) | -0.4% |
| Sunshine | WA/IW | 5,340,000/ 4,400,000 | 2",8" | \$ | 43,073 | \$ | 43,224 | \$ | 151 | 0.4% |
| Total | | | | \$ | 108,761 | \$ | 107,634 | \$ | (1,127) | -1.0% |

1 - Includes water, wastewater, and high strength surcharges.

Example Residential

Customer with water, sewer, solid waste and stormwater service Two person household with indoor use 4,000 gallons per month



30

Example Residential

Customer with water, sewer, solid waste and stormwater service Two person household with indoor use 6,000 gallons per month



Example Commercial Rate Impacts by Container Size

| Container Type | Current Rate per Pickup | Calculated Rate per Pickup | \$ Change |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------|
| 2 Cubic Yard Dumpster | \$67.03 | \$69.04 | \$2.01 |
| 4 Cubic Yard Dumpster | \$74.81 | \$77.05 | \$2.25 |
| 6 Cubic Yard Dumpster | \$83.52 | \$86.03 | \$2.51 |
| 8 Cubic Yard Dumpster | \$93.62 | \$96.43 | \$2.81 |
| Roll-Off Container | \$295.05 per pull | \$295.05 per pull | \$0.00 per pull |



Rate Study Timeline

Key Meeting Dates

| Meeting Topic | Target Date |
|---|-------------------|
| Special Meeting: Rate Study 101 with FAAC | Monday March 29 🗸 |
| Public Meeting #1: Rate Study 101 | Tuesday April 20 |
| Revenue Sufficiency Working Sessions | April 26-30 |
| Cost of Service Working Sessions | June 7-11 |
| Rate Design Working Sessions | July 19-23 |
| Miscellaneous Fees & Connection Fees Working Sessions | July 26-30 |
| Public Meeting #2: Rate Study Results | Aug 30-Sept 3 |
| Council Work Session: Presentation of Results | October |



Project Team:

Andrew Burnham Project Director

Kyle Stevens Project Manager

Morgan Brosch Lead Analyst

Questions/Comments

