



**Syracuse City**

---

# **Culinary Water Amended Impact Fee Analysis**

**May 23, 2019**

---

## Amended Impact Fee Analysis for Culinary Water

### Summary

This Amended Impact Fee Analysis (“IFA”) uses the information provided in Syracuse City’s (“City”) Culinary Water Master Plan and Impact Fee Facilities Plan (“IFFP”),<sup>1</sup> as well as memorandums from the City dated May 14, 2019, May 16, 2019 and May 22, 2019 to calculate the proportionate share for culinary water impact fees that the City can charge to new development.

### Service Area

Syracuse City forms one geographic service area that provides culinary water utility services to properties in the City. The City has 8,009 culinary water ERCs in 2017.<sup>2</sup> The City is projected to grow by 2,877 ERCs by 2026, to a total of 10,886 ERCs.

### Service Levels

The IFFP measures water demand using two different sets of criteria: 1) The Utah State Administrative Code (UAC) which publishes annual indoor demand in UAC R309-510. The average annual demand is 146,000 gallons per ERC; and 2) the Average Annual Observed Values in Syracuse. UAC standards would result in demand for 3,464 acre feet while the City’s actual usage results in demand for 1,451 acre feet. The IFFP concludes that “the observed values are approximately 42 percent of the State of Utah minimum required values. The observed values will be used as the level of service, so as to not over estimate the amount of water needed during demand projections.”<sup>3</sup>

### Water Sources/Supply

The vast majority of Syracuse’s water supply comes from the Weber Basin Water Conservancy District (WBWCD) with the balance being supplied by the City’s well. The IFFP concludes that “there is sufficient capacity to meet the level of service determined by current use. However, there is not sufficient capacity to meet the level of service of 800 gpd/ERC mandated by the State of Utah for peak day use.”

The City has a water supply of 4,506 acre feet. With daily demand of 1,503 acre-feet, the City currently has excess capacity of 3,003 acre feet. The IFFP concludes that the City’s water supply, well #3, and the contracted water from WBWCD, are sufficient to address future demand based on a level of service of 0.188 acre-feet/year/ERC or 61,161 gallons/year/ERC.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Syracuse City, *Culinary Water Master Plan and Impact Fee Facilities Plan*, J-U-B Engineers, Inc., January 2017.

<sup>2</sup> Syracuse City, *Culinary Water Master Plan and Impact Fee Facilities Plan*, J-U-B Engineers, Inc., January 2017, p. 4.

<sup>3</sup> Syracuse City, *Culinary Water Master Plan and Impact Fee Facilities Plan*, J-U-B Engineers, Inc., January 2017, p. 8.

<sup>4</sup> Syracuse City, *Water Master Plan and Impact Fee Facilities Plan*, J-U-B Engineers, Inc., January 2017, p. 28.

### *Water Rights*

The State Administrative Rules for drinking water systems require that each system provide a full year supply of water to meet the demands of its users. The IFFP concludes that, “there is sufficient capacity to meet the level of service determined by current use for the water rights.”<sup>5</sup>

The City currently has demand for 1,503 acre feet per year of water rights. Current capacity is 5,446, resulting in excess capacity water rights of 3,943 acre feet per year.

### *Water Storage*

The City currently uses two water storage tanks – the 2.0 M gallon Syracuse tank at Hill Air Force Base (HAFB) and the 1.0 M gallon Freeport Center tank. The existing storage capacity is 3.0 M gallons from these two tanks. In addition, the City has some shared water storage with Clearfield City, as the 2.0M gallon tank is connected to Clearfield’s 7.0 M gallon tank system. The IFFP concludes that Syracuse should plan on only using the 3.0 M gallons of storage currently owned by Syracuse and half of the 7.0 M gallon Clearfield tank system in the future.<sup>6</sup> The IFFP also concludes that storage is needed now in order for the City to continue to meet the level of service.

### *Water Distribution System*

The IFFP states that, “There is sufficient capacity based on pressure and flow to meet the level of service for the water distribution system.”<sup>7</sup> The IFFP further identifies excess capacity in the distribution system but states that “the cost of the excess capacity for 2016 is not included” as the City did not have the data of the costs of the excess capacity.<sup>8</sup>

### **Existing Deficiencies**

The IFFP states, “There are no deficiencies in the existing system based on the City’s level of service for water supply, water rights, water storage, and the water distribution system. Although, it is noted that the existing water storage demand is equal to the water storage supply.”<sup>9</sup>

### **Excess Capacity**

The IFFP states that the cost of the excess capacity is not included. “The City did not have the data (years of installation and year of installation construction costs) of the costs for the source, water rights, storage and distribution.”<sup>10</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup> Syracuse City, *Culinary Water Master Plan and Impact Fee Facilities Plan*, J-U-B Engineers, Inc., January 2017, p. 15.

<sup>6</sup> Syracuse City, *Culinary Water Master Plan and Impact Fee Facilities Plan*, J-U-B Engineers, Inc., January 2017, p. 16.

<sup>7</sup> Syracuse City, *Culinary Water Master Plan and Impact Fee Facilities Plan*, J-U-B Engineers, Inc., January 2017, p. 20.

<sup>8</sup> Syracuse City, *Culinary Water Master Plan and Impact Fee Facilities Plan*, J-U-B Engineers, Inc., January 2017, p. 36.

<sup>9</sup> Syracuse City, *Culinary Water Master Plan and Impact Fee Facilities Plan*, J-U-B Engineers, Inc., January 2017, p. 33.

<sup>10</sup> Syracuse City, *Culinary Water Master Plan and Impact Fee Facilities Plan*, J-U-B Engineers, Inc., January 2017, p. 36.

## New Construction

The following projects are necessitated by new development.

Table 1: New Construction Projects

Project #	Project Description	Project Cost
1	Water Storage Tank-2.0 Mgallons at Freeport (portion of shared total of 3.0 Mgallon tank)	\$3,630,000
2	Water Storage Tank-4.0 Mgallons at HAFB (portion of shared total)	\$7,260,000
	Land Cost for Water Storage Tank	\$290,000
3	Water Transmission Line (portion of shared total)	\$831,000
	Water Transmission Line to Connect Tank with Water System	\$586,200
4	Water Rights Charge Application to Add Points of Diversion	\$25,000
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>\$12,622,200</b>

Of this total project cost, it is estimated that approximately 34.6 percent of the storage and transmission line capacity (not including project #4 – water rights charge) will be used by new development between 2017 and 2026. Therefore, the total cost attributable to new development between 2017 and 2026 is \$4,357,099.

## Proportionate Share Analysis

The proportionate share analysis for culinary water impact fees is as follows:

Table 2: Proportionate Share Analysis

Summary per ERC	Amount
Excess Capacity (Buy-In)	\$0.00
New Construction	\$1,514.46
Consultant Fees	\$3.08
Fund Balance	(\$312.63)
<b>TOTAL GROSS IMPACT FEE</b>	<b>\$1,204.92</b>

**The maximum fee per ERC is \$1,204.92.** However, credits must be made if there is any outstanding debt for culinary water improvements. Based on information provided by the City, there are no outstanding bonds for culinary water improvements. Therefore, no credits need to be made against the maximum fee.

The maximum impact fees that can be charged, based on water meter size, are as follows:

TABLE 3: FEES BASED ON WATER METER SIZE

Water Meter Size	Operating Flow*	Ratio	Proposed Amended Fee	Current Fee
3/4"	30	1	\$1,204.92	\$805.29
1"	50	1.67	\$2,008.20	\$1,342.15
1 1/2"	100	3.33	\$4,016.39	\$2,684.30

Water Meter Size	Operating Flow*	Ratio	Proposed Amended Fee	Current Fee
2"	160	5.33	\$6,426.23	\$4,294.88
3"	320	10.67	\$12,852.46	\$8,589.77
4"	500	16.67	\$20,081.96	\$13,421.51
6"	1,000	33.33	\$40,163.92	\$26,843.02
8"	1,600	53.33	\$64,262.28	\$42,948.83

\*Syracuse City, *Culinary Water Master Plan and Impact Fee Facilities Plan*, p. 1

## Utah Code Legal Requirements

Utah law requires that communities prepare an Impact Fee Analysis (IFA) before enacting an impact fee. Utah law also requires that communities give notice of their intent to prepare and adopt an IFA. This IFA follows all legal requirements as outlined below. The City has retained Zions Public Finance, Inc. (ZPFI) to prepare this Impact Fee Analysis in accordance with legal requirements.

### Notice of Intent to Prepare Impact Fee Analysis

A local political subdivision must provide written notice of its intent to prepare an IFA before preparing the Plan (Utah Code §11-36a-503). This notice must be posted on the Utah Public Notice website. The City has complied with this noticing requirement for the IFA by posting notice on February 1, 2013. A copy of the notice is included in Appendix A.

### Preparation of Impact Fee Analysis

Utah Code requires that each local political subdivision, before imposing an impact fee, prepare an impact fee analysis. (Utah Code 11-36a-304).

Section 11-36a-304 of the Utah Code outlines the requirements of an impact fee analysis which is required to:

- (1) An impact fee analysis shall:
  - (a) identify the anticipated impact on or consumption of any existing capacity of a public facility by the anticipated development activity;
  - (b) identify the anticipated impact on system improvements required by the anticipated development activity to maintain the established level of service for each public facility;
  - (c) demonstrate how the anticipated impacts described in Subsections (1)(a) and (b) are reasonably related to the anticipated development activity;
  - (d) estimate the proportionate share of:
    - (i) the costs for existing capacity that will be recouped; and
    - (ii) the costs of impacts on system improvements that are reasonably related to the new development activity; and

- (e) identify how the impact fee was calculated.
- (2) In analyzing whether or not the proportionate share of the costs of public facilities are reasonably related to the new development activity, the local political subdivision or private entity, as the case may be, shall identify, if applicable:
- (a) the cost of each existing public facility that has excess capacity to serve the anticipated development resulting from the new development activity;
  - (b) the cost of system improvements for each public facility;
  - (c) other than impact fees, the manner of financing for each public facility, such as user charges, special assessments, bonded indebtedness, general taxes, or federal grants;
  - (d) the relative extent to which development activity will contribute to financing the excess capacity of and system improvements for each existing public facility, by such means as user charges, special assessments, or payment from the proceeds of general taxes;
  - (e) the relative extent to which development activity will contribute to the cost of existing public facilities and system improvements in the future;
  - (f) the extent to which the development activity is entitled to a credit against impact fees because the development activity will dedicate system improvements or public facilities that will offset the demand for system improvements, inside or outside the proposed development;
  - (g) extraordinary costs, if any, in servicing the newly-developed properties; and
  - (h) the time-price differential inherent in fair comparisons of amounts paid at different times.

### **Certification of Impact Fee Analysis**

Utah Code states that an Impact Fee Analysis shall include a written certification from the person or entity that prepares the Impact Fee Analysis. This certification is included at the conclusion of this analysis.

## Anticipated Impact on or Consumption of Any Existing Capacity of a Public Facility by the Anticipated Development Activity

*Utah Code 11-36a-304(1)(a)*

### Anticipated Development Activity

Impacts on culinary water facilities will come from both residential and nonresidential growth. Growth is projected in the IFFP as follows:

TABLE 4: ERC GROWTH

Year	Population <sup>1</sup>	Res. Growth Rate <sup>2</sup>	People/Res. Conn. <sup>3</sup>	Total Res. Conn.	C&I Growth Rate <sup>4</sup>	C&I ERC <sup>5</sup>	Total ERCs
2014	26,639	4.70%	3.83	6,964	1.49%	301	7,265
2015	27,881	3.27%	3.88	7,192	1.49%	305	7,497
2016	28,794	3.17%	3.88	7,420	1.49%	310	7,730
2017	29,707	4.10%	3.86	7,694	1.49%	315	8,009
2018	30,922	3.90%	3.86	8,009	1.49%	319	8,328
2019	32,137	3.80%	3.86	8,324	1.49%	324	8,648
2020	33,352	3.60%	3.86	8,638	1.49%	329	8,967
2021	34,567	3.50%	3.86	8,953	1.49%	334	9,287
2022	35,782	3.40%	3.86	9,268	1.49%	339	9,607
2023	36,997	3.30%	3.86	9,583	1.49%	344	9,926
2024	38,212	3.20%	3.86	9,897	1.49%	349	10,246
2025	39,427	3.10%	3.86	10,212	1.49%	354	10,566
2026	40,642	3.00%	3.86	10,527	1.49%	359	10,886
2027	41,857	2.90%	3.86	10,841	1.49%	365	11,206
2028	43,072	2.80%	3.86	11,156	1.49%	370	11,526
2029	44,287	2.70%	3.86	11,471	1.49%	376	11,847
2030	45,502	2.70%	3.86	11,786	1.49%	381	12,167
2031	46,717	2.60%	3.86	12,100	1.49%	387	12,487
2032	47,932	2.50%	3.86	12,415	1.49%	393	12,808
2033	49,147	2.50%	3.86	12,730	1.49%	399	13,128
2034	50,362	2.40%	3.86	13,044	1.49%	405	13,449
2035	51,577	2.40%	3.86	13,359	1.49%	411	13,770
2036	52,792	2.30%	3.86	13,674	1.49%	417	14,091
2037	54,007	2.20%	3.86	13,989	1.49%	423	14,411
<b>2038</b>	<b>55,222</b>	<b>2.20%</b>	<b>3.86</b>	<b>14,303</b>	<b>1.49%</b>	<b>429</b>	<b>14,732</b>

*Source: Syracuse City Culinary Water Master Plan and Impact Fee Facilities Plan, January 2017.*

## Demand Placed on Existing Facilities by New Development Activity

### Water Demand

The IFFP measures water demand using two different sets of criteria: 1) The Utah State Administrative Code (UAC) which publishes annual indoor demand in UAC R309-510. The average annual demand is 146,000 gallons per ERC; and 2) the Average Annual Observed Values in Syracuse. UAC standards would result in demand for 3,464 acre feet while the City's actual usage results in demand for 1,451 acre feet. The IFFP concludes that "the observed values are approximately 42 percent of the State of Utah minimum required values. The observed values will be used as the level of service, so as to not over estimate the amount of water needed during demand projections."<sup>11</sup> Therefore, there is substantial excess capacity that will serve growth for some time in the future.

TABLE 5: WATER DEMAND – CONSUMPTION OF EXCESS CAPACITY

Year	ERCs	Demand AF/yr (AF/yr)	Excess Capacity/Deficiency (AF/yrs)	Excess Capacity/Deficiency (%)
<b>Capacity</b>	24,005	4,506	-	-
<b>2016</b>	7,730	1,451	3,055	68
<b>2017</b>	8,009	1,503	3,003	67
<b>2026</b>	10,886	2,043	2,463	55
<b>Build-out/2038</b>	14,732	2,765	1,741	39

Because of the excess capacity available to new development, the IFFP does not contemplate any new projects for water source.

### Water Sources/Supply

The vast majority of Syracuse's current water supply comes from the Weber Basin Water Conservancy District (WBWCD) with the balance being supplied by the City's well. The level of service has been analyzed based on peak day demand and annual average demand. The level of service is based on the observed demands of 0.286 gpm/ERC for peak day and 0.188 AF/yr/ERC for average annual. The IFFP concludes, "There is sufficient capacity to meet the level of service determined by current use. However, there is not sufficient capacity to meet the level of service of 800 gpd/ERC mandated by the State of Utah for peak day use."<sup>12</sup>

The City has a water supply of 4,506 acre feet. With daily demand of 1,503 acre-feet, the City currently has excess capacity of 3,003 acre feet. The IFFP concludes that the City's water supply, well #3, and the contracted water from WBWCD, are sufficient to address future demand based on a level of service of 0.188 acre-feet/year/ERC or 61,161 gallons/year/ERC.<sup>13</sup>

<sup>11</sup> Syracuse City, *Culinary Water Master Plan and Impact Fee Facilities Plan*, J-U-B Engineers, Inc., January 2017, p. 8.

<sup>12</sup> Syracuse City, *Culinary Water Master Plan and Impact Fee Facilities Plan*, J-U-B Engineers, Inc., January 2017, p. 12.

<sup>13</sup> Syracuse City, *Water Master Plan and Impact Fee Facilities Plan*, J-U-B Engineers, Inc., January 2017, p. 28.



### *Water Rights*

The State Administrative Rules for drinking water systems require that each system provide a full year supply of water to meet the demands of its users. This includes a sufficient allocation of water rights. Typically, a system's water rights are analyzed for both peak day and average annual water available, and this approach has been used in the analysis of Syracuse City's water rights.

The City currently has demand for 1,503 acre feet per year of water rights. Current capacity is 5,446, resulting in excess capacity water rights of 3,943 acre feet per year. The IFFP concludes that, "there is sufficient capacity to meet the level of service determined by current use for the water rights."<sup>14</sup>

### *Storage*

The City currently uses two water storage tanks – the 2.0 M gallon Syracuse tank at Hill Air Force Base (HAFB) and the 1.0 M gallon Freeport Center tank. The existing storage capacity is 3.0 M gallons. The 1.0 M gallon reservoir is located directly to the east of the City on a property to the west of the Freeport Center. The 2.0 M gallon Syracuse tank is owned in conjunction with Clearfield City and is connected to Clearfield's 7.0 M gallon tank system. Syracuse City is allowed to use Clearfield's facilities for peaking. All of Syracuse City has secondary water available which reduces the demand for culinary water storage.

The need for water storage is based on three factors: 1) equalization (State of Utah minimum requirements to satisfy peak hour demands); 2) fire storage (State of Utah minimum fire flow is 1,000 gpm for 60 minutes; Syracuse City requirement is 2,000 gpm for 2 hours); and 3) emergency storage (to meet emergency demands in the event of some type of system failure).

The IFFP states that the level of service for water storage is based on the State's minimum requirements (equalization) and the City's requirements (fire and emergency). The IFFP concludes that Storage is needed now in order for the City to continue to meet the level of service.

### *Distribution*

More than 69 percent of the culinary water distribution system has been installed since the 1990s. The IFFP states that, "There is sufficient capacity based on pressure and flow to meet the level of service for the water distribution system."<sup>15</sup> The IFFP further identifies excess capacity in the distribution system but states that "the cost of the excess capacity for 2016 is not included" as the City did not have the data of the costs of the excess capacity.<sup>16</sup>

---

<sup>14</sup> Syracuse City, *Culinary Water Master Plan and Impact Fee Facilities Plan*, J-U-B Engineers, Inc., January 2017, p. 15.

<sup>15</sup> Syracuse City, *Culinary Water Master Plan and Impact Fee Facilities Plan*, J-U-B Engineers, Inc., January 2017, p. 36.

<sup>16</sup> Syracuse City, *Culinary Water Master Plan and Impact Fee Facilities Plan*, J-U-B Engineers, Inc., January 2017, p. 39.

## Identify the Anticipated Impact on System Improvements Required by the Anticipated Development Activity to Maintain the Established Level of Service for Each Public Facility and Demonstrate How the Anticipated Impacts are Reasonably Related to the New Development Activity

*Utah Code 11-36a-304(1)(b)(c)*

### *Water Sources/Water Rights*

The IFFP states that, “based upon current growth rates for Syracuse and the State’s guidelines for supply, the existing sources will be adequate for several more years.”<sup>17</sup> This assumes that the production of the existing well can be increased to allow the City to continue to use it for some peaking. The main source of supply will continue to be water from Weber Basin Water Conservancy District.

Based on information provided in the IFFP, total excess capacity in 2017 is 3,003 acre feet; this number will decrease to 2,463 acre feet by 2026<sup>18</sup> as excess capacity in the system is consumed. Therefore, the IFFP does not list any new projects for water supply.

The same situation is true for water rights. No new projects are listed in the IFFP because there are currently excess rights of 3,943 acre feet per year, declining to 3,403 acre feet per year by 2026.<sup>19</sup>

### *Water Storage*

Because the City is at capacity for water storage, new projects are needed to meet the demands of new development.<sup>20</sup>

TABLE 6: WATER STORAGE NEW CONSTRUCTION

Project #	Project Description	Construction Cost
1	Water Storage Tank-2.0 Mgallons at Freeport (2/3 portion of 3.0 Mgallons tank)	\$3,630,000
2	Water Storage Tank-4.0 Mgallons at HAFB (portion of shared total)	\$7,260,000
	Land Cost for Water Tanks	\$290,000

*Source:* Tank cost estimates are based on the low bidder of water tank estimates obtained by the City in May 2019.

Total costs for water storage projects to be constructed before 2026 total \$11,180,000. The total capacity of these tanks, and the proportionate share to be consumed by new development between 2017 and 2026 is calculated as follows:

TABLE 7: WATER STORAGE NEW CONSTRUCTION – PROPORTIONATE SHARE TO NEW DEVELOPMENT 2017-2026

Description	Amount
Current gallons needed	6,740,000

<sup>17</sup> Syracuse City, *Culinary Water Master Plan and Impact Fee Facilities Plan*, p. 22.

<sup>18</sup> Syracuse City, *Culinary Water Master Plan and Impact Fee Facilities Plan*, p. 24.

<sup>19</sup> Syracuse City, *Culinary Water Master Plan and Impact Fee Facilities Plan*, p. 26.

<sup>20</sup> Syracuse City, *Culinary Water Master Plan and Impact Fee Facilities Plan*, p. 39.

Description	Amount
Current ERCs	8,009
Gallons needed per ERC	841.55
New construction capacity	7,000,000
ERC growth, 2017-2026	2,877
Gallons required, 2017-2026	2,421,149
Percent of capacity consumed	34.59%
Total storage tank cost	\$11,180,000
<b>Capacity amount consumed by new development, 2017-2026</b>	<b>\$3,866,920</b>

### Water Distribution

New facilities are also needed to transmit the water from the new storage tanks to the main transmission system. Therefore, 35 percent of the cost of the transmission line has been allocated to new development between 2017-2026 – the same percentage as the storage tank allocation.<sup>21</sup>

TABLE 8: WATER DISTRIBUTION NEW CONSTRUCTION – PROPORTIONATE SHARE TO NEW DEVELOPMENT 2017-2026

Description	Amount
Transmission Lines	\$831,000
Transmission Line Connecting Tank to Water System	\$586,200
Percent of capacity consumed, 2017-2026	34.59%
<b>Cost to new development, 2017-2026</b>	<b>\$490,179</b>

## Proportionate Share Analysis

The proportionate share analysis is calculated by taking five components of the impact fees:

- 1) Buy-in to new development's proportionate share of the actual costs of existing, excess capacity;
- 2) Proportionate share of the cost of constructing new facilities;
- 3) Consultant costs associated with the culinary water impact fees;
- 4) Credits for the impact fee fund balance; and
- 5) Credits for future payments on outstanding bonds.

### Excess Capacity Calculation.

No calculation has been made for buy-in to excess capacity, although excess capacity exists, due to the statement in the Culinary Water Master Plan and IFFP that, "The cost of the excess capacity for 2016 is not included. The City did not have the data (years of installation and year of installation construction costs) of the costs for the source, water rights, storage and distribution."<sup>22</sup>

<sup>21</sup> Syracuse City, *Culinary Water Master Plan and Impact Fee Facilities Plan*, p. 39.

<sup>22</sup> Syracuse City, *Culinary Water Master Plan and Impact Fee Facilities Plan*, p. 36.

### **New Construction Calculation.**

The proportionate fee for the construction of new facilities is calculated by taking the cost attributable to new development between 2017 and 2026 (\$4,357,099) and dividing by the growth in ERCs over that same time period (2,877 ERCs).

TABLE 9: PROPORTIONATE SHARE CALCULATION FOR NEW FACILITIES

<b>New Construction</b>	<b>Amount</b>
Cost Attributable to New Development, 2017-2026	\$4,357,099
Growth in ERCs, 2017-2026	2,877
<b>Cost per ERC</b>	<b>\$1,514.46</b>

### **Consultant Costs.**

The costs incurred by the consultants in preparing the IFFP and IFA can be included as part of the impact fees calculation. These costs are shown below.

TABLE 10: PROPORTIONATE SHARE CALCULATION FOR CONSULTANT COSTS

<b>Description</b>	<b>Amount</b>
Consultant Costs	\$8,872
Growth in ERCs, 2017-2026	2,877
<b>Cost per ERC</b>	<b>\$3.08</b>

### **Impact Fee Fund Balance.**

The impact fee fund balance for culinary water, as of May 2019, is \$899,423. This fund balance can be used to offset some of the new construction costs as well as repay the General Fund for prior culinary water expenditures. When a fund balance exists, then a credit needs to be made against the impact fee to account for the impact fee fund balance.

TABLE 11: PROPORTIONATE SHARE CALCULATION FOR IMPACT FEE FUND BALANCE

<b>Description</b>	<b>Amount</b>
Impact Fee Fund Balance	\$899,423
Growth in ERCs, 2017-2026	2,877
<b>Credit per ERC</b>	<b>(\$312.63)</b>

### **Summary of Impact Fees**

The maximum gross impact fee that can be charged is \$1,204.92 per ERC.

TABLE 12: SUMMARY OF PROPORTIONATE SHARE CALCULATION

<b>Description</b>	<b>Amount</b>
Buy-In Cost	\$0.00
New Construction	\$1,514.46
Consultant Costs	\$3.08
Impact Fee Fund Balance Credit	(\$312.63)

Description	Amount
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$1,204.92</b>

Based on water meter size, and flow rates as provided in the City's Culinary Water Master Plan and IFFP, the following are the maximum fees that can be charged to various water meter sizes:

TABLE 13: MAXIMUM IMPACT FEE BY METER SIZE

Meter Size Adjustment	Maximum Operating Flow	Ratio	Proposed Amended Fee	Current Fee
3/4"	30	1	\$1,204.92	\$805.29
1"	50	1.67	\$2,008.20	\$1,342.15
1 1/2"	100	3.33	\$4,016.39	\$2,684.30
2"	160	5.33	\$6,426.23	\$4,294.88
3"	320	10.67	\$12,852.46	\$8,589.77
4"	500	16.67	\$20,081.96	\$13,421.51
6"	1,000	33.33	\$40,163.92	\$26,843.02
8"	1,600	53.33	\$64,262.28	\$42,948.83

### Calculation of Credits

The maximum gross fee per ERC is \$1,204.92. Because no culinary water bonds are outstanding, no credits need to be made against the gross fee.

## Certification

Zions Public Finance, Inc. certifies that the attached impact fee analysis:

1. Includes only the costs of public facilities that are:
  - a. allowed under the Impact Fees Act; and
  - b. actually incurred; or
  - c. projected to be incurred or encumbered within six years after the day on which each impact fee is paid;
  
2. Does not include:
  - a. costs of operation and maintenance of public facilities;
  - b. costs for qualifying public facilities that will raise the level of service for the facilities, through impact fees, above the level of service that is supported by existing residents; or
  - c. an expense for overhead, unless the expense is calculated pursuant to a methodology that is consistent with generally accepted cost accounting practices and the methodological standards set forth by the federal Office of Management and Budget for federal grant reimbursement;
  
3. Offsets costs with grants or other alternate sources of payment; and
  
4. Complies in each and every relevant respect with the Impact Fees Act.



## Appendix A - Notice of Intent to Amend Culinary Water Impact Fee Analysis