

CHAPTER 8

WASTEWATER FACILITIES FINANCING

8.1 INTRODUCTION

In establishing a financial strategy for the Sewer District, an analysis of the feasible funding sources is required by the State. As this analysis indicates, a number of different mechanisms are available to fund the construction and operation of the proposed facilities. A majority of these options support capital improvements, while some are focused on operation and maintenance needs.

Several funding sources are available to support the community/District in financing the recommended capital improvements. The purpose of the financial plan is to attempt to identify the best options among a variety of available funding sources. Some of the potential financing sources include: Federal and State grants and loans, sale of bonds, privatization, leasing capital reserves, contributions from development, and user rates and charges.

The following funding methods have been used in most Washington municipalities and special-purpose districts for operations and maintenance and capital improvements. These methods should be evaluated in the context of the District's specific requirements and financing policies. The following is a brief description of the options that may be considered.

8.2 FEDERAL AND STATE GRANTS AND LOANS

The Federal EPA and Washington State Department of Ecology have grant and loan programs available to assist municipalities and special-purpose districts with capital funds for water pollution control and sludge handling facilities. Grant programs are generally more attractive since repayment is not required. Qualifying for these funds, however, can be challenging, very competitive, and time consuming. Loan programs are generally easier to qualify for and require repayment of borrowed capital. Often the interest rates on the loans are far below the market rates. Some loans even provide zero-percent interest for periods less than five years. Many of the state and federal grant programs are directed towards self-sustaining revolving loan funds.

Public Works Trust Fund

The State's Public Works Trust Fund (PWTF) is a low-cost loan program that provides funds for the repair, replacement, rehabilitation, reconstruction, or improvement of eligible wastewater systems necessary to meet current standards for existing users. In order for the District to be eligible for this funding it must have a 0.25 percent excise tax and have an accepted capital facilities plan. PWTF loans are not available for growth-related projects which create more than 10 percent reserve capacity. Interest rates vary

from one to three percent, depending on the percentage of local funds committed to the project. A minimum of 10 percent local match is required. Normally, applications are due in April of the year preceding the proposed project.

State Revolving Fund

Another low-cost loan program is the State Revolving Fund (SRF) for the construction of water pollution control facilities. The SRF was created by the Federal Clean Water Act (CWA) of 1987 to assist public agencies in financing water pollution prevention projects. In Washington, the SRF is administered by DOE. The SRF has limited funds available on any given year. It allocates what monies it receives from state and federal seed money and loan repayments. Potential facilities (structures) and activities projects are classified according to priority. There are no predetermined percentages for allocating available funds to the different classes. Projects that are declared as public health emergencies will be funded automatically. The availability of funds is subject to Congressional appropriations in any given year.

The attractive aspects of SRF loans are that the District can get a large loan at low interest rate. The interest rate established for an average SRF loan is often about 50% of the interest rate of Washington general obligation bonds. The interest rate on an SRF loan usually ranges from 0 to 4.5%, depending on the repayment period. Loans may also be used to match grants from other state and federal agencies, including the Centennial Clean Water Fund (CCWF). Applications for SRF loans are linked to the CCWF program and must be submitted by May of the year preceding the proposed project.

Centennial Clean Water Fund

Washington Department of Ecology administers the Centennial Clean Water Fund (CCWF) grant and loan programs. The CCWF has historically been the largest state grant program. It provides grants and loans for planning, design, and construction of facilities and other activities related to water quality. During the 1990s, the focus and project eligibility of the CCWF program changed. The primary focus of the program is pollution prevention and funding projects with quantifiable water quality benefits. Recently, the majority of funding has been in the form of loans – similar to the SRF program. Loans are available for 10 percent reserve capacity, facility planning, and design projects. Sewer systems with approved comprehensive plans are eligible for CCWF funding. The CCWF funding cycle requires that applications be submitted in February of the year preceding the proposed project. All eligible CCWF applications are automatically eligible for the SRF loan program as well.

Community Development Block Grant

The Community Development Block Grant program (CDBG) offers grants to cities with populations fewer than 50,000 and rural counties with populations under 200,000. The program is designed to provide financial and technical assistance for public facilities,

economic development, housing, and other comprehensive projects that benefit low and moderate income households. The program must primarily benefit residential neighborhoods that are occupied by at least 51% low and moderate income households. The CDBG provides 100% grant funding up to \$500,000. Eligible projects include design, construction, or reconstruction of sewage collection and treatment facilities. Applications are usually due in early winter and funds are awarded the following May or June.

Farmers Home Administration

The Farmers Home Administration (FmHA) offers grants and loans to provide financial assistance for wastewater projects to residential communities with populations of 10,000 or less. The FmHA provides 75 percent base grants for areas with income levels less than 80% of the state median household income (MHI). FmHA loans are offered for up to 40 years at interest rates ranging from 5% to market rate. The debt service portion of the user charge must be equal to or greater than 1 percent of the District's MHI. Eligible projects include construction of wastewater systems (including engineering and legal costs). Applications are accepted throughout the year and grant funds are awarded as needed.

These and other grants or loans should be carefully considered by the community and District and pursued where potential funding appears promising. However, numerous applicants usually compete for a limited funding pool, making the grant and loan processes an uncertain and unreliable revenue source. Even when communities secure grants and loans for their programs, these sources rarely provide full funding of major capital improvement project. Therefore, these funding sources should be realistically considered as supplemental opportunities to the District's overall funding strategy.

8.3 DEBT FINANCING

The most significant benefit of using bonds to finance capital projects is that the costs of new facilities are paid for during the useful life of the facilities by the users of the infrastructure. Bonds have the advantage of being one of the most reliable sources of financing and of spreading cost of the capital facilities over a longer period of time. Two different types of bonds are generally available: general obligation (GO) bonds and revenue bonds.

Typically, general obligation bonds are less expensive than revenue bonds; however, the preparation of a tax assessment roll may offset the cost savings. General obligation bonds require the creation of an assessment roll, prior to bond sale, identifying property owners who will benefit from the additional service. General obligation bonds are generally more appropriate for financing new sewer systems such as Clinton. GO bonds are backed by the "full faith and credit of the District" and are paid for through property tax levies, and requires voter approval.

Revenue bond costs are recovered through rates or fees such as connection charges and latecomers assessments. The interest rate charged for these bonds is a function of the District's bond rating. Revenue bonds are typically backed by the revenues of a specific utility fund. This type of funding may also be established without voter approval. GO bonds are the less costly form of debt (excluding costs related to securing voter approval via a bond election) and are administratively easier to manage. Conversely, revenue bonds offer ease of administration, but are the more costly form of debt financing due to issuance costs and coverage requirements. Debt financing is geared toward supporting specific capital improvements and has been successfully employed by similar jurisdictions for wastewater facilities construction. Table 8-1 summarizes the advantages and disadvantages of conventional long-term financing methods.

TABLE 8-1: CONVENTIONAL LONG-TERM FINANCING METHODS

	Applicability	Implementation	Likelihood of Success	Key Points
CONVENTIONAL DEBT				
General Obligation Bonds	Capital only	Require public vote	Low	Would use debt capacity often earmarked for other priorities
Revenue Bonds	Capital only	Requires vote of legislative body	Medium	Must have revenue source to repay
Local Improvement District	Capital only	Require approval of area to benefit from improvement(s)	Medium	Assessments may be charged on both developed and undeveloped area to be served; increase in market value must result
Utility Rates	Operations & Capital	Requires an established utility -- new or existing	High	Can't charge undeveloped land; only customers pay
Capital Facilities Charges	Capital only	Requires an established utility -- new or existing	High	Revenue dependent on growth
SPECIAL PROGRAMS				
CCWF Grants	Capital only	Must show financial hardship to acquire grant	Low	Rates must be high to demonstrate financial hardship
CCWF Loans	Capital only	Competitive process	Medium	Good terms -- must have revenue source to repay
State Revolving Fund	Capital only	Competitive process	Medium	Good terms -- must have revenue source to repay
Public Works Trust Fund Loan	Capital only	Competitive process	Medium	Good terms -- must have revenue source to repay

8.4 PRIVATIZATION

Privatization is the transfer of facility ownership from the District to a private entity for a specified period of time. Privatization transfers the responsibility for financing, constructing, operating, and maintaining the system to that private entity in return for contract payments from the District. Advantages of privatization include construction savings due to a more timely procurement of equipment, fewer procedural and approval process requirements for private enterprises than with public agencies, reduced costs to resolve design/construction conflicts, less debt capacity encumbrances, the availability of alternative financing sources available to the private sector, and lower user costs resulting from depreciation and tax credits which can be taken by the owner. Tax credits are subject to legislative actions which are frequently changed from year to year.

On the other hand, disadvantages include the loss of control over costs and operations due to third-party involvement, negative aspects of a long-term contract and user fee obligations to guarantee capital payback, the complexity of the privatization agreements, and state regulatory constraints on long-term contractual commitments and rate/profit goals. In addition, public opinion is often against privatization because flat-rate fees suggest that some customers are not paying user rates commensurate with their actual use.

8.5 IN-LIEU-OF FEES

In areas with much growth potential, the presence of large land developers can provide another source of capital. Land developers often stand to profit significantly from the benefits of urban-level municipal services such as a sewer system. The presence of a community wastewater system enables property to be developed at significantly higher intensity since onsite septic systems are not required which occupy large areas. Costs for developing the new service can often be incorporated by the developer into the costs (and value) of the improved properties.

In-lieu-of fees can either be a regulatory requirement or a development option that enables a utility to offer developers the opportunity to construct on-site facilities in accordance with the District's design standards or pay a fee into a fund dedicated to the construction and maintenance of facilities serving multiple properties. This approach has the potential to generate dedicated revenues and to guide development patterns consistent with the District's Comprehensive Sewer Plan.

In-lieu-of construction fees guarantee new development's initial financing commitment in program development while enhancing the community's ability to construct and develop regional systems in the most strategic and economic manner. In-lieu-of construction fees also offer an alternative to uniform requirements for construction of on-site systems for each new development.

New customers would still be required to pay the standard user fee at the same rate as other customers. Following completion, ownership and responsibility for operation and maintenance of the collection and treatment system would be transferred to the District. The disadvantage of this source of funds is the loss of control during the design process and limited availability of large developers in some areas. Another shortcoming is that the customary fee for a single property or development is seldom large enough to fund the construction of a centralized wastewater facility. Therefore, either multiple developments must occur simultaneously in a given area to generate enough revenue to fund the construction of a regional facility, or the project must be initially funded from alternative sources. Many utilities have successfully used alternative funding sources such as service charge revenues, general fund borrowing, etc. on a short term basis to fund initial construction, and then repaid the indebtedness as the in-lieu-of fees are eventually collected.

8.6 IMPROVEMENT DISTRICTS AND SPECIAL ASSESSMENTS

Projects funded through special assessments must have a special identifiable benefit to the properties included in the assessment area, and charges for each parcel must be consistent with the relative benefit to each property. RCW 57.16.065 states that actual assessments to property owners must be less than the increased true and fair value the improvement adds to the property. In Washington, municipalities can attempt to establish a local improvement district (LID) or utility local improvement district (ULID). The use of these techniques involves an assessment against property owners within the identified district. In order to achieve this, a minimum percentage of property owners within the boundaries of the proposed district must agree to establishment of the improvement district. In water or sewer LIDs/ULIDs the benefit is normally determined through frontage along the improvement. This option is best for non-regional facilities that do not benefit the entire population. A benefit to this method of financing is that it does not usually impact the District's debt capacity or debt service coverage requirements since the repayment of the bond or loan is backed by property within the improvement boundary.

An alternative method for determining LID/ULID assessments, which is not possible at this stage, is to relate the LID/ULID assessments to district wide property improvements. Once property improvement values along with the total project cost have been determined it is possible to determine LID/ULID assessments by proportioning the individual assessments to each property by the same percentage that results from comparing the same property's individual improvements to the district wide property improvements.

8.7 CONNECTION CHARGES

Connection charges, capacity charges and facility development charges are some of the common names used to identify the charges assessed to new customers for service to recover the cost of the sewer facilities needed to meet the capacity requirements for

growth. The District currently uses this method for the water system. The connection charge is generally considered a one-time fee. Connection charges are considered to add equity to funding system improvements by requiring new customers to make up-front contributions so that rates from existing customers don't have to be increased to pay for expansion necessitated by new customers.

There are three main components of the connection charge, all of which are summarized as follows:

- General Facilities Charge – the owner's proportionate share of the cost of facilities of general benefit to the district or sub basin of the district. This includes but is not limited to existing and future treatment plants, pump stations, trunk lines, force mains, reservoirs, other structures and equipment, and other capitalized costs.
- Local Facilities Charge – the owner's proportionate share of facilities constructed by districts, U.L.I.D.s or others, not to be of general benefit to a district. This includes collection and distribution lines, and related costs that are specific to the property, and not considered being of general benefit to an entire district or sub basin of a district.
- Site Facilities Charge – the actual on site costs of physical connections from Local Facility to be borne by property owners. This includes but is not limited to internal and external permits, engineering, plan checks, inspections and legal fees together with reimbursement for overhead and any other costs directly attributable to a specific property.

There are various methods that can be employed in developing the connection charge and all are based on the following objectives:

- Financially stable – effective in recovering the costs of providing capacity.
- Practical – easy to understand, publicly acceptable, and feasible for the District to administer.
- Equitable – fair in apportioning the total cost of capacity among new customers.
- Legally justifiable – assure that the charges are defensible in a court of law.

The authority to impose charges for connecting to a wastewater system is provided in RCW Chapter 57.08.005(9). There is no single, established method for the determination of a connection charge that is either appropriate for all wastewater utilities or eminently fair to all new applicants for service. There are, however, three general methods currently employed by wastewater utilities to develop wastewater system connection charges. These methods are summarized as follows:

System Buy-In

This form of connection charge is designed to derive the average investment per connection. This method is employed using either historical (original) system cost or replacement cost. This method is most appropriate for those utilities with available capacity in the existing system. The steps to develop the system buy-in connection charges are as follows:

- a. Identify the net book value of the capital facilities adjusted to current value.
- b. Identify facilities funded from outstanding debt or developer contributions.
- c. Determine existing capacity of the wastewater system.
- d. Calculate the cost per capacity unit by dividing the cost of capital facilities less previously funded facilities by the capacity available.

Growth-Related Cost Allocation

Growth-related cost allocation is designed to accommodate growth either partially or entirely. This method differs from the system buy-in method in that only the cost of new facilities to accommodate growth (expansion CIP costs) are recovered over the capacity provided by these facilities. This method is more appropriate for those utilities that are adding capacity and do not have available capacity for new customers. The steps to develop the growth-related connection charge are as follows:

- a. Identify the CIP expansion costs
- b. Determine the capacity provided by the CIP expansion projects.
- c. Calculate the cost per capacity unit by dividing the CIP expansion costs by the capacity provided.
- d. Calculate the connection charge for the base charge by multiplying the cost per capacity unit by the estimated average ERU flow.

Marginal (Incremental) Cost Pricing

These connection charges are designed to derive the incremental cost of system expansion. This method is based on the sound economic principle that new applicants for service should be responsible for only those incremental costs which they cause to be incurred. Under this method, the connection charges are designed so that the wastewater user rates would not have to be increased over the planning period to pay for growth. However, this method is deficient in that the incremental costs associated with meeting the demand of future customers may vary significantly over time because the number of new customers fluctuates. The steps to develop the marginal cost pricing connection charges are as follows:

- a. Identify the current CIP expansion.
- b. Determine the number of units to be served from the current CIP.
- c. Calculate the cost per unit by dividing the CIP cost by the number of units.

- d. Calculate the connection charge for the base charge by multiplying the cost per unit by the estimated average ERU flow.

With regard to financial stability, the marginal cost method is the only method that will provide the annual revenue requirements for the capital costs while the system buy-in method and growth-related methods recover capital costs over the period in which system capacity is actually available. Therefore, in the short-term, under the system buy-in and growth-related methods, the annual cost may not be provided. However, if sufficient reserves exist, a mutual lending mechanism can be established with the operating fund for the years when there is a deficit or a surplus so that, in the long-term, the capital costs are recovered from new applicants for service. Financial stability is obviously desirable, but the equity achieved by recovering the costs over the period in which system capacity is provided, and not over an unrelated financing period, makes the system buy-in and growth-related methods more appropriate.

With regard to practicality, the growth-related and marginal cost methods would be easier for the District to administer and for customers to understand because they are simpler to calculate. With regard to equity, the growth-related and system buy-in methods would have a distinct advantage. Although the marginal cost method is, by definition, designed to recover the incremental costs of system expansion, it is not based on the capacity provided by these facilities and thus lacks the equity afforded by the other two methods.

With regard to legality, both the growth-related method and the marginal cost method clearly relate the cost of expansion facilities to the new customers and thus they are more likely to be upheld by the court system based on the rational nexus test. However, the potential annual fluctuations in the level of the marginal cost connection charges could make it harder to defend. If the system buy-in charges are designed to recover the current value of the system and proposed additions over the capacity provided, and if there is available capacity, the system buy-in method should also be adequately defensible.

8.8 LATECOMER CHARGES

A latecomer's charge is levied when new customers desire to connect to the wastewater system through facilities paid for by local District assessments, by developer extensions, or by the District in anticipation of increased demand. The latecomers charge represents the new customer's proportionate share towards payment of sewer facilities (other than major components of the system) paid for by others. The amount of a latecomers charge is generally that amount that is obtained when the number of equivalent units of the latecomers sewage is divided by the capacity of the wastewater facilities (in equivalent units). That ratio is then multiplied by the actual cost to construct the wastewater facilities.

8.9 USER FEES

User fees are required to cover the total annual costs connected with wastewater collection, treatment, disposal, sludge handling and other ongoing costs of providing the sewer services. Total annual costs also typically include reserve funds and debt service, which are undetermined at this time. For the purposes of this CSP, an approximation of user fees is offered and is expressed as a range of cost. A more comprehensive financial study and refined determination of user fees can be done later as part of the Capital Facilities Plan.

8.10 ESTIMATING DIRECT COSTS FOR ASSESSMENTS, CONNECTION CHARGES AND USER FEES

Direct Costs of a Wastewater System

The direct costs of a wastewater system will include

- a. General facilities; costs associated with building capital facilities
- b. Local facilities; costs associated with connecting a customer to a system
- c. Rates; costs associated with operation and maintenance and debt service

These categories of direct costs are applicable to Options 2 through 5, which would be public wastewater systems under the jurisdiction of CWD and as permitted by State statutes. The cost methodology discussed in this chapter is not applicable to Option 1.

The direct costs associated with building capital facilities are allocated in a pro-rata manner among property owners within the proposed service area by way of assessments per residential acre and per commercial acre of property. A critical assumption therefore in estimating assessments for any option will be the size of the proposed service area.

Connection fees and user fees are the results of allocating the costs of connection and the costs of operation and maintenance (and debt service) to the customer base. Therefore these fees will be a direct function of the number of customers actually connected. Relatively lower connection charges and user fees are realized with a large customer base due to economy-of-scale.

Detailed, itemized cost estimates have been developed for Options 2 through 5 that define the phased implementation of capital facilities as well as anticipated operations and maintenance costs over the service life of the facilities. A summary of the facility costs is presented in Appendix C.

Indirect Costs of a Wastewater System

Besides a clear understanding and definition of the assumptions chosen which underlie projections of direct costs of any option, it will also be important for the community to

fully understand the indirect costs of any option. Each of the wastewater options will have specific influences on Clinton's economy, quality of life and other factors. Some impacts may be considered a benefit and others may be considered a cost. Certain options would have more or less impacts than others on water use, population growth, density, and zoning, with their attendant benefits and costs. Identification of this community-level assessment of indirect benefits or costs is best explored through community-level discussions and is beyond the scope of this study.

8.11 ESTIMATED CONNECTION CHARGES

For the purposes of this study, an estimate of ULID assessments are calculated and expressed as cost per acre of property. The following is a summary based on the concept-level facilities defined for the initial 20 year period and tax role that would encompass only about 50% of the entire service area of 278 acres.

For the centralized wastewater treatment plant options (Options 3, 4 and 5), the assessment could range from \$99,000 to \$109,000 per commercial acre and from \$40,000 to \$44,000 per residential acre.

For de-centralized wastewater treatment option (Option 2), the assessment could range from \$99,000 to \$254,000 per commercial acre and from \$34,000 to \$85,000 per residential acre.

For the purposes of this study, connection charges are calculated and expressed for Rural Center (RC) property based on 50% of the maximum development potential which is multi-family residential or 12 ERU's per acre. The following is a summary of anticipated connection charges based on the concept-level facilities defined in this report:

For the centralized wastewater treatment plant options (Options 3, 4 and 5), the connection charge is about \$10,000 per ERU based on a pro-rata allocation for customer connections within the next 20 years (759 ERU's).

For de-centralized wastewater treatment option (Option 2), the connection charges could range from \$8,000 to \$21,000 depending upon the ratio of commercial to residential customers in the system area and is based on a pro-rata allocation for customer connections within the next 20 years (759 ERU's).

Refer to Table 8-2 for more information.

8.12 ESTIMATED USER FEES

The following is a summary of anticipated user fees based on the concept-level facilities defined in this report:

For the centralized wastewater treatment plant options (Options 3, 4 and 5), the user fees could range from \$14 to \$45 per month depending upon the number of customers connected. The lower value is attainable only if a large proportion of properties (700 ERUs) that can be served are actually connected and paying for the service. Conversely, if only a few customers (300 ERUs) are connected, they will be paying higher rates. The centralized treatment options may not be able to connect customers as quickly as the decentralized treatment option resulting in a smaller fraction of plant capacity being utilized and consequently causing higher user rates. Actual user fees will likely include some additional amounts for debt service and reserve funds.

For decentralized wastewater treatment plant options (Option 2), the user fees are expected to range from \$18 to \$66 per month. It is anticipated that the decentralized treatment option will have a high likelihood of quickly connecting a majority of the customers in their respective service areas, which results in lower monthly user rates. Actual user fees will likely include some additional amounts for debt service and reserve funds.

Refer to Table 8-2 for more information.

Table 8-2 Estimated Charges and Rates

	Comm ERUs		Resid ERUs		Brighton Beach		Columbia Beach		Hwy 525 Corridor		Total	
	Option 5, SBR, Marine Outfall	Option 4, SBR, Recim/Influse	Option 3, MBR, Recim/Influse	Option 2, MBR, Recim/Influse	Option 2, MBR, Recim/Influse	Option 2, MBR, Recim/Influse	Option 2, MBR, Recim/Influse	Option 2, MBR, Recim/Influse	Option 2, MBR, Recim/Influse	Option 2, MBR, Recim/Influse	Option 2, MBR, Recim/Influse	Option 2, MBR, Recim/Influse
Total Capital Cost	\$ 7,790,263	\$ 7,936,791	\$ 7,240,793	\$ 2,963,781	\$ 2,963,781	\$ 2,963,781	\$ 2,963,781	\$ 2,963,781	\$ 3,145,313	\$ 3,145,313	\$ 3,145,313	\$ 8,797,401
less: Grant Funding	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Net Capital Facility Cost	\$ 7,790,263	\$ 7,936,791	\$ 7,240,793	\$ 2,963,781	\$ 2,963,781	\$ 2,963,781	\$ 2,963,781	\$ 2,963,781	\$ 3,145,313	\$ 3,145,313	\$ 3,145,313	\$ 8,797,401
LID Assessment	\$ 107,193	\$ 109,210	\$ 99,633	\$ 141,132	\$ 141,132	\$ 141,132	\$ 141,132	\$ 141,132	\$ 254,013	\$ 254,013	\$ 254,013	\$ 339,089
per commercial acre	\$ 42,628	\$ 43,653	\$ 39,807	\$ 55,372	\$ 55,372	\$ 55,372	\$ 55,372	\$ 55,372	\$ 86,811	\$ 86,811	\$ 86,811	\$ 110,909
per residential acre	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
or...												
Connection Charge	\$ 25,968	\$ 26,456	\$ 24,136	\$ 29,255	\$ 29,255	\$ 29,255	\$ 29,255	\$ 29,255	\$ 53,554	\$ 53,554	\$ 53,554	\$ 29,325
per ERU @ 300 customers	\$ 11,129	\$ 11,239	\$ 10,344	\$ 12,382	\$ 12,382	\$ 12,382	\$ 12,382	\$ 12,382	\$ 23,952	\$ 23,952	\$ 23,952	\$ 11,568
per ERU @ 710 customers	\$ 10,264	\$ 10,457	\$ 9,540	\$ 11,181	\$ 11,181	\$ 11,181	\$ 11,181	\$ 11,181	\$ 21,168	\$ 21,168	\$ 21,168	\$ 11,291
per ERU @ 735 customers	\$ 139,691	\$ 163,239	\$ 123,814	\$ 50,784	\$ 50,784	\$ 50,784	\$ 50,784	\$ 50,784	\$ 39,968	\$ 39,968	\$ 39,968	\$ 166,613
Annual Operations	\$ 38,80	\$ 45,34	\$ 34,39	\$ 42,49	\$ 42,49	\$ 42,49	\$ 42,49	\$ 42,49	\$ 68,38	\$ 68,38	\$ 68,38	\$ 48,28
Monthly Utility Rate	\$ 16,134	\$ 19,267	\$ 14,746	\$ 17,99	\$ 17,99	\$ 17,99	\$ 17,99	\$ 17,99	\$ 28,53	\$ 28,53	\$ 28,53	\$ 20,16
per customer (2005, to 2010)	\$ 15,34	\$ 17,92	\$ 13,59	\$ 16,79	\$ 16,79	\$ 16,79	\$ 16,79	\$ 16,79	\$ 26,94	\$ 26,94	\$ 26,94	\$ 18,29
per customer (2025)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -

Service area =
 Commercial (RC) area =
 Residential area =
 Customer base in 2020 =
 Customer base in 2025 =

278 acres,
 110 acres,
 300 customers (ERUs),
 700 customers after 15 year (ERUs),
 739 total customers (ERUs)