

**MEMORANDUM
DEPARTMENT OF FACILITY SERVICES
COUNTY OF PLACER**

To: **BOARD OF SUPERVISORS**

Date: **JULY 10, 2007**

From:  **JAMES DURFEE / WILL DICKINSON**

Subject: **SEWER AND WATER MAINTENANCE AND OPERATIONS FEE INCREASES**

ACTION REQUESTED/RECOMMENDATION:

1. Continue the Public Hearing originally opened on May 22, 2007, to receive comments concerning the proposed increases in sewer and water maintenance and operations (M&O) fees as shown in Attachment A.
2. Adopt the attached Ordinance adjusting M&O fees enumerated in Section 13.12.350 of the Placer County Code.
3. Adopt the attached Resolution confirming the County Service Area (CSA) Zone Report of charges for the Sunset, Sheridan, Blue Canyon, Applegate, Livoti and Dry Creek CSAs.
4. Make and incorporate in the record findings, pursuant to Section 21080(b)(8) of the Public Resource Code, that the higher fees are derived directly from the cost of providing service and are necessary to meet operating expenses and/or to obtain funds for capital projects necessary to maintain service in existing service areas (as more particularly described in Exhibits B, B-1, and B-2 of Attachment B, Attachment C, and Attachment D, which are each hereby incorporated by reference) and are therefore exempt from environmental review.
5. Direct staff to work through the affected Municipal Advisory Committees to develop a review committee to serve in an advisory capacity to review capital improvement plans.

BACKGROUND: On May 22, 2007, your Board conducted a Public Hearing to take public input and consider increases to the fees charged for the operation and maintenance of three Sewer Maintenance Districts and six CSAs that provide sewer services in various communities in unincorporated Placer County (the Sheridan CSA also provides water service.) Upon discussion, your Board continued the Hearing to July 10, and directed staff to develop further information concerning the cost of pending capital improvements and to allow for further public input. The entire staff report from May 22 is attached as Attachment B.

During the May 22 meeting, your Board posed questions concerning the proposed fees and their relationship to needed capital improvements. Specifically, your Board asked what percentages of the fees were projected to be used for operations versus capital projects, and also asked for capital plans that depict capital needs on a timeline basis. As shown in Attachment C, with the exception of SMD No. 1, the proposed increases only address operations. In SMD No. 1, of the proposed 14% increase, 12.3% is for operations, the remaining 1.7% is programmed for capital expenses. With this exception, the recommended adjustments cover operations deficiencies due to inflation and increased regulatory requirements.

Attachment D includes capital requirements for SMD No. 1, SMD No. 3, Applegate and Sheridan (these are the districts with extensive capital needs.) Capital requirements in each case are projected over a five-year horizon, coinciding with NPDES Permit requirements. Assessments for both SMD No. 1 and 3 include options for upgrades to existing facilities and for closing the existing treatment facilities and connecting to Lincoln and Roseville respectively. Separate analysis of options in both districts indicate that the regional options carry greater capital costs, but both are less expensive when analyzed over longer terms (25 to 30 years) accounting for operations costs and the cost of future upgrades and rehabilitations. Staff is aggressively working with the Placer Nevada Wastewater Authority to further evaluate these regional options, and will be returning to your Board for direction over the upcoming months.

During the May 22 meeting, your Board expressed an interest in developing a citizen's review committee to assist in evaluating capital needs, compliance strategies and costs. To take advantage of an existing structure and resource, staff recommends working through the affected Municipal Advisory Committees (Granite Bay, Horseshoe Bar, Weimar/Applegate/Colfax, North Auburn, and Sheridan) to create a committee comprised of either MAC members or citizens appointed by the respective MACs to work with staff on addressing these issues.

As a parallel issue, on June 12, your Board authorized loans from the CSA Revolving Fund to SMD 3 (\$210,000); Sheridan Sewer & Water (\$400,000); and Applegate Sewer (\$40,000.) These loans are specifically intended to assist the districts in addressing regulatory issues, and represent a significant contribution on the part of the County.

Subsequent to the May 22 meeting, letters announcing the continuance of the Public Hearing and inviting further comment were sent to each property owner paying M&O fees. These notices explained the increases and invited comments.

Based on the analysis conducted since the May 22 meeting, staff's recommendation is that your Board approved the fee adjustments as originally recommended.

ENVIRONMENTAL CLEARANCE: The proposed fee increases are considered exempt from environmental review, pursuant to Section 21080(b)(8) of the Public Resource Code, provided your Board adopts the recommended findings specified in under "Action Requested".

FISCAL IMPACT: The proposed fee increases range between 9% and 80% (4.5% to 40% per year) depending on the district. These changes are expected to result in increased annual revenue to the districts as follows:

District or CSA	2007/2008 Annual Revenue Increase	% Increase to Customer	Average Annual % Increase
SMD 1 (North Auburn Area)	\$ 773,690	14%	7%
SMD 2 (Granite Bay Area)	\$ 336,006	9%	4.5%
SMD 3 (Auburn Folsom Rd.)	\$ 177,920	33%	16.5%
STEP SYSTEMS	\$ 22,558	19%	9.5%
CSA 2 (Sunset)	\$ 64,708	20%	10%
CSA 6 (Sheridan-Sewer)	\$ 53,222	55%	27.5%
CSA 6 (Sheridan-Water)	\$ 15,552	25%	12.5%
CSA 23 (Blue Canyon)	\$ 4,800	80%	40%
CSA 24 (Applegate)	\$ 7,060	26%	13%
CSA 55 (Livoti)	\$ 16,048	20%	10%
CSA 173 (Dry Creek)	\$ 114,365	30%	15%

ATTACHMENTS: ATTACHMENT A: HISTORICAL AND PROPOSED SEWER MAINTENANCE AND OPERATIONS FEES (COST/MONTH)
 ATTACHMENT B: MAY 22 2007 STAFF REPORT
 ATTACHMENT C: SEWER FEE CAPITAL/OPERATIONS COMPARISON
 ATTACHMENT D: CAPITAL REQUIREMENTS PLANS
 ORDINANCE
 RESOLUTION

CC: COUNTY EXECUTIVE OFFICE

JD/WD:wd

t:\factsmemo2007710\SD sewer MO fee increase 200710.doc

ATTACHMENT A

HISTORICAL AND PROPOSED SEWER MAINTENANCE AND OPERATIONS FEES (COST/MONTH)

District	2003/04	2004/05	2005/06	2006/07	2007/08 Proposed	2008/09 Proposed
SMD 1 (N. Auburn)	\$51.50	\$53.00	\$54.60	\$59.51	\$67.84	\$67.84
SMD 2 (Granite Bay)	\$38.15	\$39.30	\$40.50	\$44.15	\$48.12	\$48.12
SMD 3 (Auburn Folsom Rd)	\$58.70	\$60.50	\$62.30	\$74.76	\$99.43	\$99.43
STEP Systems (add charge)	\$17.25	\$17.75	\$18.30	\$20.50	\$24.40	\$24.40
CSA 2A3 (Sunset)	\$20.50	\$20.50	\$20.50	\$24.60	\$29.52	\$29.52
CSA 6 (Sheridan Sewer)	\$31.70	\$32.65	\$33.60	\$33.60	\$52.08	\$52.08
CSA 6 (Sheridan Water)	\$20.35	\$21.00	\$21.60	\$21.60	\$27.00	\$27.00
CSA 23 (Blue Canyon)	\$14.00	\$15.00	\$16.00	\$20.00	\$36.00	\$36.00
CSA 24 (Applegate)	\$52.50	\$54.10	\$55.60	\$61.16	\$77.06	\$77.06
CSA 55 (Livoti)	\$25.50	\$26.25	\$27.05	\$29.21	\$35.05	\$35.05
CSA 173 (Dry Creek)	\$23.00	\$23.70	\$24.45	\$29.34	\$38.14	\$38.14

**MEMORANDUM
DEPARTMENT OF FACILITY SERVICES
COUNTY OF PLACER**

To: **BOARD OF SUPERVISORS**

Date: **MAY 22, 2007**

From: **JAMES DURFEE / WILL DICKINSON**

Subject: **SEWER AND WATER MAINTENANCE AND OPERATIONS FEE INCREASES**

ACTION REQUESTED/RECOMMENDATION:

1. Conduct a Public Hearing to receive comments concerning the proposed increases in sewer and water maintenance and operations (M&O) fees as shown in Exhibit A.
2. Adopt the attached Ordinance adjusting M&O fees enumerated in Section 13.12.350 of the Placer County Code.
3. Adopt the attached Resolution confirming the County Service Area (CSA) Zone Report of charges for the Sunset, Sheridan, Blue Canyon, Applegate, Livoti and Dry Creek CSAs.
4. Make a finding pursuant to Section 21080(b)(8) of the Public Resource Code, that the higher fees are derived directly from the cost of providing service and are necessary to meet operating expenses required for maintenance of service, and are therefore exempt from environmental review.

BACKGROUND: The County provides wastewater services in various communities through the operation of three Sewer Maintenance Districts and six CSAs. The Sheridan CSA also provides water service. With the exception of occasional grants from State and Federal agencies, the districts are funded solely through fees collected from their customers. M&O fees pay for ongoing maintenance, operation and construction of sewer pipes, lift stations and treatment plants. Connection fees pay for plant expansion or other major capital expenditures necessary to provide capacity for future connections. The recommended actions apply only to the M&O fees. Historical and proposed M&O fees are shown in Exhibit A. Justification for the increases is provided in Exhibit B. The proposed M&O fees would be maintained without further increase for two years.

As required by Proposition 218, a letter noticing this public hearing was mailed to each property owner paying M&O fees. These notices explained the increases and invited comments. Approximately 12,600 letters were mailed; as of May 4, 2007, staff had received questions or comments from forty-eight individuals. Twenty-four of these people expressed their objection to a fee increase. The comments received are summarized in Exhibit C. Staff also presented information concerning the increases at meetings of the North Auburn, Granite Bay, Meadow Vista, Weimar/Applegate/Colfax, Horseshoe Bar, Sheridan and West Placer Municipal Advisory Councils. This public hearing and the proposed increases were noticed in newspapers of general circulation as required by law.

ENVIRONMENTAL CLEARANCE: The proposed fee increases are considered exempt from environmental review, pursuant to Section 21080(b)(8) of the Public Resource Code, provided your Board adopts the recommended findings specified in under "Action Requested".

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SEWER M&O FEE INCREASES
MAY 22, 2007
PAGE 2

FISCAL IMPACT: The proposed fee increases range between 9% and 80% (4.5% to 40% per year) depending on the district. These changes are expected to result in increased annual revenue to the districts as follows:

District or CSA	2007/2008 Annual Revenue Increase	% Increase to Customer	Average Annual % Increase
SMD 1 (North Auburn Area)	\$ 773,690	14%	7%
SMD 2 (Granite Bay Area)	\$ 336,006	9%	4.5%
SMD 3 (Auburn Folsom Rd.)	\$ 177,920	33%	16.5%
STEP SYSTEMS	\$ 22,558	19%	9.5%
CSA 2 (Sunset)	\$ 64,708	20%	10%
CSA 6 (Sheridan-Sewer)	\$ 53,222	55%	27.5%
CSA 6 (Sheridan-Water)	\$ 15,552	25%	12.5%
CSA 23 (Blue Canyon)	\$ 4,800	80%	40%
CSA 24 (Applegate)	\$ 7,060	26%	13%
CSA 55 (Livoti)	\$ 16,048	20%	10%
CSA 173 (Dry Creek)	\$ 114,365	30%	15%

ATTACHMENTS: EXHIBIT A – HISTORICAL AND PROPOSED FEES
EXHIBIT B – JUSTIFICATION FOR FEE INCREASES
EXHIBIT B-1 – NEW EFFLUENT AND RECEIVING WATER STANDARDS
EXHIBIT B-2 – SUMMARY OF NEW COLLECTION SYSTEM REQUIREMENTS
EXHIBIT C – SUMMARY OF COMMENTS
ORDINANCE
RESOLUTION

CC: COUNTY EXECUTIVE OFFICE

JD/WD:wd

t:\fac\bsmemo2007\SD sewer MO fee increase 2007.doc

EXHIBIT A

**HISTORICAL AND PROPOSED SEWER MAINTENANCE AND
OPERATIONS FEES (COST/MONTH)**

District	2003/04	2004/05	2005/06	2006/07	2007/08 Proposed	2008/09 Proposed
SMD 1 (N. Auburn)	\$51.50	\$53.00	\$54.60	\$59.51	\$67.84	\$67.84
SMD 2 (Granite Bay)	\$38.15	\$39.30	\$40.50	\$44.15	\$48.12	\$48.12
SMD 3 (Auburn Folsom Rd)	\$58.70	\$60.50	\$62.30	\$74.76	\$99.43	\$99.43
STEP Systems (add charge)	\$17.25	\$17.75	\$18.30	\$20.50	\$24.40	\$24.40
CSA 2A3 (Sunset)	\$20.50	\$20.50	\$20.50	\$24.60	\$29.52	\$29.52
CSA 6 (Sheridan Sewer)	\$31.70	\$32.65	\$33.60	\$33.60	\$52.08	\$52.08
CSA 6 (Sheridan Water)	\$20.35	\$21.00	\$21.60	\$21.60	\$27.00	\$27.00
CSA 23 (Blue Canyon)	\$14.00	\$15.00	\$16.00	\$20.00	\$36.00	\$36.00
CSA 24 (Applegate)	\$52.50	\$54.10	\$55.60	\$61.16	\$77.06	\$77.06
CSA 55 (Livoti)	\$25.50	\$26.25	\$27.05	\$29.21	\$35.05	\$35.05
CSA 173 (Dry Creek)	\$23.00	\$23.70	\$24.45	\$29.34	\$38.14	\$38.14

EXHIBIT B

JUSTIFICATION FOR SEWER M&O FEE INCREASES

APPLICABLE TO ALL DISTRICTS:

1. Inflation in the cost of many essential products and services, such as fuel, chemicals and labor.
2. More stringent regulatory standards; in particular, very restrictive discharge requirements for treatment plants, and a completely new set of requirements for sewage collection systems. See Exhibit B-1 for a list of new effluent and receiving water standards for treatment plants and Exhibit B-2 for a summary of new collection system requirements. The City of Roseville will be passing on costs of upgrading their plants on an annual basis to customers in SMD 2 and the Dry Creek and Sunset sewer CSAs.
3. Many of our collection systems and treatment plants date back to the early 1960s. Leaky pipes allow excessive amounts of water into the system, which drives up the cost of treatment and can cause sewer overflows. These pipes must be identified and repaired or replaced. The treatment plants also have ever-increasing maintenance, rehabilitation and replacement needs.

SPECIFIC TO EACH DISTRICT:

Sewer Maintenance District 1 – The district has incurred significant new costs to comply with the requirements of its 2005 treatment plant permit. These costs include increased water testing, new monitoring equipment, preparation of an industrial pretreatment ordinance, operational changes to meet new treatment standards, and consulting engineer studies to determine design options for a major upgrade of the wastewater treatment plant. A major effort is underway to identify and repair leaking pipes. The Placer County Redevelopment Agency has granted the district \$2 million to replace the Auburn Ravine Lift Station and complete other necessary repairs.

Sewer Maintenance District 2 – Sewage is conveyed to treatment plants operated by the City of Roseville. The annual cost for treatment by the City of Roseville jumped from \$1.36 million in 2005-2006 to an expected \$2.16 million in 2007-2008, for a total increase of \$800,000 per year. Rate increases over the same time period would raise annual revenue by \$698,000.

Sewer Maintenance District 3 - Staff and consultants devoted many hours this year to negotiating a new permit for the SMD 3 wastewater treatment plant. The new permit has significantly more difficult testing and effluent standards, which will require either construction of a new wastewater treatment plant at SMD 3 or construction of a pipeline to the Roseville treatment plant. Federal EPA grant funds were used to conduct an engineering analysis of the pipeline option. Given the small size of the district, a very large rate increase is needed to offset the capital and operating cost increases needed to maintain compliance with new regulations.

CSA NO. 24 (Applegate) – Costs have exceeded revenues in this CSA for the last few years due to a regulatory prohibition on discharging effluent from the treatment ponds. Additional M&O revenues will help offset the cost of trucking wastewater from Applegate to SMD 1 until a direct pipeline to the SMD 1 collection system is complete. Federal EPA grant funds were used to begin an engineering and environmental analysis of pipeline routes.

CSA No. 55 (Livoti) – Sewage from the Livoti sewer CSA flows to a treatment plant in Sacramento County. Sacramento County raised their treatment fees by 8.5% last year and will likely raise rates again next year while we hold ours constant. This is a major cost factor for the very small CSA.

CSA NO. 23 (Blue Canyon) – Sewage from this area flows to a community leach field serving 26 customers. The CSA now has only \$8,000 in Reserves, which will not be sufficient to repair the system should it fail. The recommended rate increase should provide funding for a scheduled replacement of one half of the leachfield in 2010-2011.

CSA No. 173 (Dry Creek) - Sewage is conveyed to a treatment plant operated by the City of Roseville. Annual costs for treatment by the City of Roseville jumped from \$40,000 in 2005-2006 to an expected \$224,000 in 2007-2008, for a total increase of \$184,000 per year. Revenue over the same time period would increase by \$260,000 per year if the proposed rate increases are approved. The additional revenue is needed to pay for maintenance costs that will increase as the district's pipes and liftstation age and are used more heavily.

CSA No. 6 (Sheridan water) – The Sheridan water system is old and needs considerable maintenance. One pump was replaced last summer at a cost of approximately \$25,000. Another pump is scheduled for replacement during the upcoming fiscal year. The proposed rate increase will help pay for these, and future, capital projects.

CSA No. 6 (Sheridan sewer) – The Sheridan treatment ponds cannot meet current standards for discharge into surface water and were recently fined \$270,000 for past violations. In order to avoid future violations, your Board approved construction of a new pond to hold treated water until it can be used for irrigation. This project, which was completed last fall, cost over \$1,000,000 and was funded by loans from the County. The second phase of this compliance project is to expand the areas that are irrigated by treated wastewater. Approximately 85% of the irrigation project will be funded by grants from the State Water Resources Control Board. Completion of this project will also relieve the district from responsibility for paying the \$270,000 fine referenced above. Rate increases are needed to assist in repayment of approximately \$1.5 million in loans.

EXHIBIT B-1

SMD-1 WWTP NPDES Permit New Effluent and Receiving Water Limitations

Constituent	Limitation Change	1997 Permit Limitations	2005 Interim Limitations	2005 Final Limitations
Alachlor	New Limit	No Previous Limit	No Interim Limit	30-day Average - 2 µg/L
Aluminum	New Limit	No Previous Limit	No Interim Limit	30-day Average - 58 µg/L Daily Average - 160 µg/L
Ammonia	More Stringent	Receiving Water Limit: 0.025 mg/L in the Receiving Water	No Interim Limit	Floating Effluent Limits: 1-hour, 4-day and 30-day limits - 0.457 to 32.6 mg/L
Atrazine	New Limit	No Previous Limit	No Interim Limit	Instantaneous Max - 1.0 µg/L 1-hour Average - 0.02 mg/L 4-day Average - 0.01 mg/L
Chlorine Residual	More Stringent	Daily Maximum - 0.02 mg/L	No Interim Limit	30-day Average - 1.1 µg/L
Chloroform	New Limit	No Previous Limit	No Interim Limit	30-day Average - 50 µg/L
Manganese	New Limit	No Previous Limit	No Interim Limit	30-day Average - 0.00021 lbs/day
Mercury	New Limit	No Previous Limit	No Interim Limit	30-day Average - 5 µg/L
MTBE	New Limit	No Previous Limit	No Interim Limit	30-day Average - 10 mg/L
Nitrate plus Nitrate	New Limit	No Previous Limit	No Interim Limit	30-day Average - 1 mg/L
Nitrite	New Limit	No Previous Limit	No Interim Limit	30-day Average - 3 µg/L
PAEs	New Limit	No Previous Limit	No Interim Limit	30-day Average - 0.00 µg/L
Chlorinated Hydrocarbon Pesticides	New Limit	No Previous Limit	No Interim Limit	Instantaneous Max - 0.00 µg/L 30-day Average - 0.04 µg/L Daily Average - 0.12 µg/L
Tributyltin	New Limit	No Previous Limit	No Interim Limit	Daily Average - 2 NTU
Turbidity	More Stringent	Monthly Average - 2 NTU; Exceed 5 NTU more than 5% of 24-hour period	No Interim Limit	Exceed 5NTU more than 5% of 24-hour period Instantaneous Max - 10 NTU
Bis-(2ethylhexyl)phthalate	New Limit	No Previous Limit	Daily Max - 9.11 µg/L	30-day Average - 1.8 µg/L
Bromodichloromethane	New Limit	No Previous Limit	Daily Max - 5.48 µg/L	30-day Average - 0.56 µg/L Floating Limits:
Copper	New Limit	No Previous Limit	Daily Max - 6.33 µg/L	30-day Average - 2.3 to 27 µg/L Daily Max - 3.8 to 44 µg/L
Dioxins and Furans	New Limit	No Previous Limit	Daily Max - 10.36 x10 ⁻⁶ µg/L	30-day Average - 1.3 x10 ⁻⁶ µg/L Floating Limits:
Lead	New Limit	No Previous Limit	Daily Max - 4.25 µg/L	30-day Average - 0.54 to 16 µg/L Daily Max - 0.86 to 30 µg/L
PCBs	New Limit	No Previous Limit	Daily Max - 17.73 µg/L	30-day Average - 1.7 x10 ⁻⁴ µg/L Floating Limits:
Silver	New Limit	No Previous Limit	Daily Max - 3.14 µg/L	30-day Average - 0.13 to 15 µg/L Daily Max - 0.37 to 44 µg/L Floating Limits:
Zinc	New Limit	No Previous Limit	Daily Max - 60.72 µg/L	30-day Average - 26 to 270 µg/L Daily Max - 37 to 390 µg/L
Receiving Water				
pH	More Stringent	30-day Average - 6.5 to 8.5 30-day Ambient pH Change More than 0.5	No Interim Limit	Instantaneous - 6.5 to 8.5 30-day Ambient pH Change More than 0.5

EXHIBIT B-1/PAGE 2

SMD-1 WWTP NPDES Permit New Influent, Effluent and Receiving Water Monitoring Requirements

Constituent	Monitoring Change	1997 Permit Monitoring	2005 Final Monitoring
Influent			
BOD	More Frequent	Composite - 2/week	Composite - 5/week
TSS	More Frequent	Composite - 2/week	Composite - 5/week
Effluent			
Turbidity	More Frequent	Grab - 7/week	Continuous
Total Coliform Organisms	More Frequent	Grab - 5/week	Grab - 7/week
Total Ammonia	More Frequent	Grab - 1/week	Grab - 7/week
Nitrate plus Nitrite	New	No Previous Sampling	Grab - 7/week
Nitrite	New	No Previous Sampling	Grab - 7/week
Oil & Grease	New	No Previous Sampling	Grab - 1/quarter
Aluminum	New	No Previous Sampling	Composite - 1/quarter
Copper	New	No Previous Sampling	Composite - 1/quarter
Iron	New	No Previous Sampling	Composite - 1/quarter
Lead	New	No Previous Sampling	Composite - 1/quarter
Manganese	New	No Previous Sampling	Composite - 1/quarter
Mercury	New	No Previous Sampling	Composite - 1/quarter
Silver	New	No Previous Sampling	Composite - 1/quarter
Tributyltin	New	No Previous Sampling	Composite - 1/quarter
Zinc	New	No Previous Sampling	Composite - 1/quarter
Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate	New	No Previous Sampling	Grab - 1/quarter
Bromodichloromethane	New	No Previous Sampling	Grab - 1/quarter
Chlorinated Hydrocarbon Pesticides	New	No Previous Sampling	Grab - 1/quarter
Chloroform	New	No Previous Sampling	Grab - 1/quarter
MTBE	New	No Previous Sampling	Grab - 1/quarter
Alachlor	New	No Previous Sampling	Grab - 1/quarter
Atrazine	New	No Previous Sampling	Grab - 1/quarter
Dioxins and Furans	New	No Previous Sampling	Grab - 1/quarter
PAEs	New	No Previous Sampling	Grab - 1/quarter
PCBs (all Aroclors)	New	No Previous Sampling	Grab - 1/quarter
PCB Aroclor 1016	New	No Previous Sampling	Grab - 1/quarter
PCB Aroclor 1221	New	No Previous Sampling	Grab - 1/quarter
PCB Aroclor 1260	New	No Previous Sampling	Grab - 1/quarter
Priority Pollutants	New	No Previous Sampling	1/year
Receiving Water			
DO	More Frequent	R1, R2 - 2/week	R1, R2, R3, R4 - 7/week
pH	More Frequent	R1, R2 - 2/week	R1, R2, R3, R4 - 7/week
Turbidity	More Frequent	R1, R2 - 2/week	R1, R2, R3, R4 - 7/week
Temperature	More Frequent	R1, R2 - 2/week	R1, R2, R3, R4 - 7/week
Electrical Conductivity	More Frequent	R1, R2 - 2/week	R1, R2, R3, R4 - 7/week
Fecal Coliform	New	No Previous Sampling	R1, R2, R3, R4 - 7/week
Radionuclides	New	No Previous Sampling	R1, R2, R3, R4 - 7/week

SUMMARY OF NEW COLLECTION SYSTEM REQUIREMENTS

➤ **LEGAL AUTHORITY**

- Develop ordinances, services agreement and other authority to:
 - Prevent illicit discharges into sewer
 - Require sewers and services to be properly designed
 - Ensure access for maintenance by agency
 - Provide means for enforcement

➤ **OVERFLOW EMERGENCY RESPONSE PLAN**

- Provide notification procedures for the State, Health Agencies, OES, Regional Boards and water agencies
- Provide a program for appropriate response to all overflows
- Provide training of procedures for staff
- Ensure all reasonable steps are taken

➤ **OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE PLAN**

- Up to date mapping of sewer system
- A description of routine Preventive Maintenance activities
- A Short & Long Term Rehabilitation and Replacement Plan
- A training Plan for operations and maintenance personnel
- Sufficient rolling stock, equipment and parts inventories to complete the above

➤ **GREASE CONTROL PROGRAM**

- An implementation plan
- A disposal location
- Legal Authority
- Construction requirements
- Authority to inspect
- Maintenance procedures for sewers subject to FOG
- Development of Source Control measures

➤ **DESIGN STANDARDS**

- Development of Design, Construction and inspection and testing procedures for new and rehabilitated sewer systems.

➤ **SYSTEM CAPACITY ASSURANCE PLAN**

- Evaluate the capability of the existing sewer system to handle peak flows
- Develop a Capital Improvement Program that identified short and long term improvements needed to insure capacity is available. May include new pipes, inflow and infiltration reduction, increased pumping capacity and storage.

EXHIBIT C

**SUMMARY OF TELEPHONE COMMENTS
PROPOSED SEWER M&O FEE INCREASES**

SMD NO. 1	Number
Phone Calls	
General objection to rate increase	6
General questions about rate increase	9
Wanted to know number of EDUs being billed (commercial)	5
Confused why they received notice. Forgot they owned property in SMD No. 1	2
 SMD NO. 2	
Phone Calls	
General objection to rate increase	1
Confused why they received notice. Forgot they owned property in SMD No. 2	1
General questions	1
 SMD NO. 3	
Phone Calls	
General objection to rate increase	2
 CSA NO. 24 (Applegate)	
Phone Calls	
General objection to rate increase	1
 CSA No. 173 (Dry Creek)	
Phone Calls	
General objection to rate increase	1
 CSA No. 2A3 (Sunset-Whitney)	
Phone Calls	
General objection to rate increase	1
Wanted to know number of EDUs being billed (commercial)	2
General questions about rate increase	1
 CSA NO. 6 (SHERIDAN), CSA NO. 23 (Blue Canyon) AND CSA NO. 55 (LIVOTI)	
No telephone calls received	

**SUMMARY OF LETTERS RECEIVED
PROPOSED SEWER M&O FEE INCREASES**

District	Received From	Summary of Letter
SMD 1 (N. Auburn)	Mr. Donald Miller	No objection to rate increase
SMD 1 (N. Auburn)	T. Love	General comment
SMD 1 (N. Auburn)	Carole Yarmek	General comment
SMD 1 (N. Auburn)	Millie Livingston	Is on social security and believes new homeowners and developers need to pick up the slack. Requests repairs be done in stages and a reserve fund set up for added expenses.
SMD 1 (N. Auburn)	Therese Rockwell	Protests the proposed rate increase and believes 14% increase is excessive
SMD 1 (N. Auburn)	Paul Choller	Protests the proposed rate increase and thinks new homes should pay for "improvements"
SMD 1 (N. Auburn)	Al French	Protests the proposed rate increase. Questions whether new home construction is paying their share and believes ongoing maintenance and expansion can be managed more effectively.
SMD 1 (N. Auburn)	Mary Wells Griffin	Is on social security and thinks there should be a discount to seniors
SMD 1 (N. Auburn)	Rosemary Smith Headley	Does not approve of this raise in fees
SMD 1 (N. Auburn)	Henry and Magda Sanchez	Are on social security and strongly protest such a large increase in the sewer fees
SMD 2 (Granite Bay)	William and Julie Coyle	Objects to the sewer rate increase. Thinks there is too much bureaucracy and believes the County needs to do a better job with the money received.
SMD 2 (Granite Bay)	Treelake Village Homeowners Association	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Requests that the financial reserves for SMD 2 be used to suspend rate increases for a minimum of 2 years. 2. Requests establishment of an ongoing Advisory Council to provide oversight of basic budgeting and planning functions such as large capital and maintenance projects. 3. Requests the Board to examine a tiered rate system so that urban dwellers do not subsidize rural areas.
SMD 3 (Auburn Folsom Rd)	David and Barbara Ghinassi	Protests the 33% increase, but believes an equal fee increase for each connection in all sewer maintenance areas that lasts no longer than 2 years would be acceptable
CSA 2A3 (Sunset)	N/A	No Letters Received
CSA 6 (Sheridan Sewer)	N/A	No Letters Received

ATTACHMENT B

District	Received From	Summary of Letter
CSA 6 (Sheridan Water)	N/A	No Letters Received
CSA 23 (Blue Canyon)	N/A	No Letters Received
CSA 24 (Applegate)	N/A	No Letters Received
CSA 55 (Livoti)	B. Viley	Would like the Board to consider the feasibility of connecting the Livoti area to the City of Roseville as their fees are the lowest in the area
CSA 173 (Dry Creek)	Clinton Smith	Opposes the proposed fee increase. Thinks the budget might be balanced by cutting big labor union bosses power, less employees and other "fat".

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF PLACER, STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

**In the matter of: AN ORDINANCE AMENDING
SECTION 13.12.350 AND 13.12.380 OF CHAPTER 13
OF THE PLACER COUNTY CODE RELATING TO
CHARGES AND FEES FOR PLACER COUNTY
SEWER MAINTENANCE DISTRICTS AND
COUNTY SERVICE AREAS**

Ord. No. _____
First Reading _____

The following **Ordinance** was duly passed by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Placer at a regular meeting held, _____ by the following vote on roll call:

Ayes:

Noes:

Absent:

Signed and approved by me after its passage.

Chairman, Board of Supervisors

Attest:
Clerk of the Board

Ann Holman

THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF THE COUNTY OF PLACER, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, DOES HEREBY ORDAIN THAT:

Section 1: Section 13.12.350 of Chapter 13 of the Placer County Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

13.12.350 Fee schedules.

- A. Sewer Maintenance District No. 1. The following schedule of charges and fees shall apply to property within Placer County sewer maintenance district No. 1 and are based upon a flow rate of one equivalent dwelling unit (EDU). Calculation of a charge and fee for a use that is billed at a rate other than one equivalent dwelling unit shall be based upon the schedules set forth in subsections D E and F of Section 13.12.240.

Sewer service charge	= \$59.51 \$67.84 per month per EDU.
Annexation fee	= \$5,500.00 per acre.
Sewer connection fee	= \$7,170.00 per EDU.

- B. Sewer Maintenance District No. 2. The following schedule of charges and fees shall apply to property within Placer County sewer maintenance district No. 2 and are based upon a flow rate of one equivalent dwelling unit (EDU). Calculation of a charge and fee for a use that is billed at a rate other than one equivalent dwelling unit shall be based upon the schedule set forth in subsection H of Section 13.12.240.

Sewer service charge	= \$44.15 \$48.12 per month per EDU.
Annexation fee	= \$1,500.00 per acre.
Sewer connection fee	= \$7,190.00 per EDU.

- C. Sewer Maintenance District No. 3. The following schedule of charges and fees shall apply to property within Placer County sewer maintenance district No. 3 and are based upon a flow rate of one equivalent dwelling unit (EDU). Calculation of a charge and fee for a use that is billed at a rate other than one equivalent dwelling unit shall be based upon the schedule set forth in subsections D E and F of Section 13.12.240.

Sewer service charge	= \$74.76 \$99.43 per month per EDU.
Annexation fee	= \$3,850.00 per acre.
Sewer connection fee	= \$7,190.00 per EDU.

- D. County Service Area No. 28, Zone No. 2, A3 (Sunset). The following schedule of charges and fees shall apply to property within county service area No. 28, Zone 2, A3 and are based upon a flow rate of one equivalent dwelling unit (EDU). Calculation of a charge and fee for a use that is billed at a rate other than one equivalent dwelling unit shall be based upon the schedule set forth in subsection H of Section 13.12.240.

Sewer service charge	= \$24.60 \$29.52 per month per EDU.
Annexation fee	= \$168.00 per acre.
Sewer connection fee	= \$7,190.00 per EDU.

- E. County Service Area No. 28, Zone No. 6 (Sheridan). The following schedule of charges and fees shall apply to property within county service area No. 28, Zone 6 and are based upon a flow rate of one equivalent dwelling unit (EDU). Calculation of a charge and fee for a use that is billed at a rate other than one equivalent dwelling unit shall be based upon the schedule set forth in subsections D E and F of Section 13.12.240.

Sewer service charge	= \$33.60 \$52.08 per month per EDU.
Sewer connection fee	= \$1,700.00 per EDU.
Water service charge	= \$24.60 \$27.00 per month per EDU.

- F. County Service Area No. 28, Zone No. 23 (Blue Canyon). The following schedule of charges and fees shall apply to property within county service area No. 28, Zone 6 23 and are based upon a flow rate of one equivalent dwelling unit (EDU). Calculation

of a charge and fee for a use that is billed at a rate other than one equivalent dwelling unit shall be based upon the schedule set forth in subsections D E and H of Section 13.12.240.

Sewer service charge	= \$20.00 \$36.00 per month per EDU.
Sewer connection fee	= \$3,820.00 per EDU.

- G. County Service Area No. 28, Zone No. 24 (Applegate). The following schedule of charges and fees shall apply to property within county service area No. 28, Zone 24 and are based upon a flow rate of one equivalent dwelling unit (EDU). Calculation of a charge and fee for a use that is billed at a rate other than one equivalent dwelling unit shall be based upon the schedule set forth in subsection D E and F of Section 13.12.240.

Sewer service charge	= \$61.16 \$77.06 per month per EDU.
Sewer connection fee	= \$1,500.00 per EDU.

- H. County Service Area No. 28, Zone No. 55 (Livoti). The following schedule of charges and fees shall apply to property within county service area No. 28, Zone 55 and are based upon a flow rate of one equivalent dwelling unit (EDU). Calculation of a charge and fee for a use that is billed at a rate other than one equivalent dwelling unit shall be based upon the schedule set forth in subsection H of Section 13.12.240.

Sewer service charge	= \$29.24 \$35.05 per month per EDU.
Sewer connection fee	= \$9,600.00 per EDU.

- I. County Service Area No. 28, Zone No. 173 (Dry Creek Sewers). The following schedule of charges and fees shall apply to property within county service area No. 28, Zone No. 173 and are based upon a flow rate of one equivalent dwelling unit (EDU). Calculation of a charge and fee for a use that is billed at a rate other than one equivalent dwelling unit shall be based upon the schedule set forth in subsection (H) of Section 13.12.240.

Sewer service charge	= \$29.34 \$38.14 per month per EDU.
Sewer connection fee	= \$7,190.00 per EDU.

- J. Sewer connection fees charged pursuant to this section, as such fees may be changed from time to time, shall be reduced by two hundred dollars (\$200.00) per EDU effective November 8, 2011. The purpose of this reduction is to sunset the "shop fee" component of sewer connection fees enacted on September 9, 2003. (Ord. 5387-B § 1, 2005; Ord. 5353-B (part), 2005; Ord 5302-B § 1, 2004; Ord. 5258-B § 1, 2003; Ord. 5248-B § 1, 2003; Ord. 5157-B, 2002; Ord. 5156-B, 2002; Ord. 5120-B § 1, 2001; Ord. 5116-B § 1, 2001; Ord. 5059-B § 27, 2000; Ord. 4965-B § 1, 1999; prior code § 18.50)

13.12.380 Septic tank effluent pump--STEP fee schedule.

The following fees shall apply to all connections to county maintained STEP systems:

STEP Service Charge	= \$20.50 \$24.40 per month.
---------------------	--

The STEP service charge noted above shall be charged to a STEP connection user in addition to the standard sewer service charge for the district. (Ord. 5387-B § 4, 2005; Ord. 5248-B § 2, 2003; Ord. 5116-B § 2, 2001; Ord. 5059-B § 31, 2000)

24

**Before the Board of Supervisors
County of Placer, State of California**

**In the matter of: A RESOLUTION TO
CONFIRM THE COUNTY SERVICE AREA
FEE REPORT FOR 2007/2008 FOR CSA #28,
ZONES 2-A3, 6, 23, 24, 55 & 173**

Resol. No: _____

The following RESOLUTION was duly passed by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Placer at a regular meeting held _____, by the following vote on roll call:

Ayes:

Noes:

Absent:

Signed and approved by me after its passage.

Chairman, Board of Supervisors

Attest:

Clerk of said Board

WHEREAS, the County Service Area Fee Report for 2007/2008 has been prepared in accordance with Section 33.05 (b) of the Placer County Code, detailing the user fees necessary to provide the authorized sewer and/or water services for each parcel in County Service Area No. 28, Zone of Benefit Nos. 2-A3, 6, 23, 24, 55 and 173 (the Report), and said Report is available for public review at the Clerk of the Board's Office and the Department of Facility Services, and

WHEREAS, notice of adoption of the Maintenance and Operation (M&O) fees as set forth in the Report has been given as required by law,

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT HEREBY RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Placer, State of California, as follows:

1. That the revenues derived from the M&O fees as set forth in the Report do not exceed the funds required to provide the sewer and/or water services.
2. That the revenues derived from the M&O fees as set forth in the Report shall only be used for providing sewer and/or water services, the purpose for which the fee is being imposed.

Reso No. _____
Page 2

3. That the amount of the fee does not exceed the proportional cost of providing sewer service to the parcel.
4. That the sewer services being funded by the M&O fee are actually being used by, or are immediately available for use by, the owner of each parcel.
5. That the sewer services provide a special benefit to the parcels.
6. That the County Service Area Fee Report for 2007/2008 as on file with the Clerk of the Board is hereby confirmed and adopted, and the Board does hereby authorize collection of the M&O fees on the County property tax roll as allowed by law.

SEWER AND WATER M&O FEES
PROPOSED TWO-YEAR FEE INCREASE

	Revenue Increase Over Two Years	Increase needed for operations	Projected capital projects*	Projected spending on capital projects*	% Increase in fee needed to fund operations	Proposed fee % increase (two years)	Comments
SMD 1 (North Auburn Area)	\$1,547,380	\$ 1,355,380	\$ 500,000	\$ 500,000	12.3%	14%	Capital projects to be covered primarily by reserves.
SMD 2 (Granite Bay Area)**	\$672,012	\$672,012	\$ 91,000	\$ 91,000	9%	9%	Capital projects to be covered by reserves.
SMD 3 (Auburn Folsom Rd.)	\$355,840	\$355,840	\$ 2,385,600	\$ 2,385,600	33%	33%	Assumes \$2.5 million loan to cover capital costs and cancellation of \$227,000 of reserves.
STEP SYSTEMS	\$45,116	\$ 45,116	\$ -	\$ -	19%	19%	
CSA 2 (Sunset)**	\$129,416	\$129,416	\$ 290,000	\$ 290,000	20%	20%	Capital projects to be covered by reserves.
CSA 6 (Sheridan-Sewer)	\$106,444	\$106,444	\$ 150,000	\$ 150,000	55%	55%	Assumes \$504,000 loan to cover capital and operating costs.
CSA 6 (Sheridan-Water)	\$31,104	\$31,104	\$ 153,000	\$ 153,000	25%	25%	Assumes \$153,000 loan to cover capital costs.
CSA 23 (Blue Canyon)	\$9,600	\$ -	\$ 4,800	\$ 4,800	0%	80%	Capital project planned for 2010-11.
CSA 24 (Applegate)	\$14,120	\$14,120	\$ 3,000,000	\$ 3,000,000	26%	26%	Assumes \$3,600,000 loan to cover capital and operating costs, or grant funding.
CSA 55 (Livoti)	\$32,096	\$ 32,096	\$ -	\$ -	20%	20%	
CSA 173 (Dry Creek)**	\$228,730	\$228,730	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	30%	30%	Capital projects to be covered by reserves.

* excludes grant funded projects; includes contributions to reserves for future capital projects
 ** These districts send their sewage to Roseville treatment plants. Contributions to reserves are needed to pay for planned rehabilitation projects at the Roseville plants. This contribution was included in "Operations" to differentiate between capital projects undertaken by the County Service Area or district.

**CAPITAL REQUIREMENTS FOR MAJOR TREATMENT PLANT UPGRADES
SEWER MAINTENANCE DISTRICT 1**

	FY 07-08	FY 08-09	FY 09-10	FY 10-11	FY 11-12	FY 12-13	total
Option A - new treatment plant							
Improvements needed to meet 2010 state permit requirements:							
new treatment plant -----		500,000	500,000	80,000,000			81,000,000
Total Capital Requirements	-	500,000	500,000	80,000,000	-	-	81,000,000
Option B - pipeline to regional plant							
Improvements needed to meet 2010 state permit requirements:							
pipeline to regional plant -----			61,050,000				61,050,000
Lincoln treatment plant capacity -----				40,440,000			40,440,000
Total Capital Requirements	-	-	61,050,000	40,440,000	-	-	101,490,000

Notes:

- 1 - although Option B is more expensive in the short term, over a 30-year period it becomes more economical due to savings from permitting, plant upgrade and operating costs.
- 2 - Option A has more risk associated with unknown regulatory requirements.
- 3 - Potential funding sources for Option A include \$7 million in reserves, future connection fees, M&O fees, State Revolving Loan Funds and bonds.
- 4 - Potential funding sources for Option B include all of the above plus Federal grants for regionalization.

CAPITAL REQUIREMENTS FOR MAJOR TREATMENT PLANT UPGRADES
SEWER MAINTENANCE DISTRICT 3

Option A - new treatment plant	FY 07-08	FY 08-09	FY 09-10	FY 10-11	FY 11-12	FY 12-13	total
Improvements needed to meet turbidity and nitrate standards -----	75,000	840,000					915,000
Solids handling equipment -----	75,000	600,000					675,000
Improvements needed to meet other 2007 state permit requirements: new treatment plant -----		1,000,000	1,000,000	10,873,000			12,873,000
Total Capital Requirements	150,000	2,440,000	1,000,000	10,873,000			14,463,000

Option B - pipeline to regional plant	FY 07-08	FY 08-09	FY 09-10	FY 10-11	FY 11-12	FY 12-13	total
Improvements needed to meet turbidity and nitrate standards -----	75,000	840,000					915,000
Solids handling equipment -----	75,000	600,000					675,000
Improvements needed to meet other 2007 state permit requirements: pipeline to regional plant connection fees -----		795,600	4,110,600	1,181,899	7,288,378	6,106,479	19,482,956
Total Capital Requirements	150,000	2,235,600	4,110,600	1,181,899	7,288,378	9,571,479	24,537,956

Notes:

- 1 - although Option B is more expensive in the short term, over a 30-year period it becomes more economical due to savings from permitting, plant upgrade and operating costs.
- 2 - Option A has more risk associated with unknown regulatory requirements.
- 3 - Potential funding sources for Option A include \$227,000 in reserves, future connection fees (probably minimal), M&O fees, State Revolving Loan Funds and bonds.
- 4 - Potential funding sources for Option B include all of the above plus Federal grants for regionalization.
- 5 - The proposed 2007-2009 M&O fee increase for this district will not pay for any of the capital requirements. The entire increase is needed for maintenance and operation of the existing facilities, including compliance with new collection system permit requirements.

**CAPITAL REQUIREMENTS FOR MAJOR SEWER AND WATER PROJECTS
SHERIDAN**

	FY 07-08	FY 08-09	total
Sewer			
Phase I - new treated water storage pond (completed) -----	-	-	-
Phase II - additional spray fields -----	900,000		900,000
Total Capital Requirements			
Water			
pump replacement	35,000	20,000	55,000
water system improvements		50,000	50,000
upgrade water well alarm system	12,000		12,000
monitoring wells for ponds	36,000		36,000
Total Capital Requirements	83,000	70,000	153,000

Notes:

- 1 - Established sewer funding sources include Small Community Waste Water Grants, M&O fees, Cemex development agreement contributions and the CSA Revolving Loan Fund. Connection fees may also help support to the extent that new capacity is created and the moratorium on new connections is lifted.
- 2 - Established water system funding sources include M&O fees and the CSA Revolving Loan Fund.
- 3 - The proposed 2007-2009 55% sewer M&O fee increase for this district is devoted to operating costs.
- 4 - The proposed 2007-2009 25% water system M&O fee increase for this district is devoted to operating costs.

**CAPITAL REQUIREMENTS FOR TREATMENT PLANT CLOSURE
APPLEGATE**

	FY 08-09	FY 09-10	total
Phase I - connection of all services to tie-in point (complete)---	-	-	-
Phase II - lift station and force main to SMD 1 -----	2,000,000	2,000,000	4,000,000
Total Capital Requirements	2,000,000	2,000,000	4,000,000

Notes:

- 1 - Established funding sources include M&O fees, Federal EPA grant funds and the CSA Revolving Loan Fund.
- 2 - The proposed 2007-2009 26% sewer M&O fee increase for this district is devoted to operating costs.

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF PLACER, STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

**In the matter of: AN ORDINANCE AMENDING
SECTION 13.12.350 AND 13.12.380 OF CHAPTER 13
OF THE PLACER COUNTY CODE RELATING TO
CHARGES AND FEES FOR PLACER COUNTY
SEWER MAINTENANCE DISTRICTS AND
COUNTY SERVICE AREAS**

Ord. No. _____
First Reading _____

The following **Ordinance** was duly passed by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Placer at a regular meeting held, _____ by the following vote on roll call:

Ayes:

Noes:

Absent:

Signed and approved by me after its passage.

Chairman, Board of Supervisors

Attest:
Clerk of the Board

Ann Holman

THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF THE COUNTY OF PLACER, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, DOES HEREBY ORDAIN THAT:

Section 1: Section 13.12.350 of Chapter 13 of the Placer County Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

13.12.350 Fee schedules.

- A. Sewer Maintenance District No. 1. The following schedule of charges and fees shall apply to property within Placer County sewer maintenance district No. 1 and are based upon a flow rate of one equivalent dwelling unit (EDU). Calculation of a charge and fee for a use that is billed at a rate other than one equivalent dwelling unit shall be based upon the schedules set forth in subsections ~~D~~ E and F of Section 13.12.240.

Sewer service charge	= \$59.51 \$67.84 per month per EDU.
Annexation fee	= \$5,500.00 per acre.
Sewer connection fee	= \$7,170.00 per EDU.

- B. Sewer Maintenance District No. 2. The following schedule of charges and fees shall apply to property within Placer County sewer maintenance district No. 2 and are based upon a flow rate of one equivalent dwelling unit (EDU). Calculation of a charge and fee for a use that is billed at a rate other than one equivalent dwelling unit shall be based upon the schedule set forth in subsection H of Section 13.12.240.

Sewer service charge	= \$44.15 \$48.12 per month per EDU.
Annexation fee	= \$1,500.00 per acre.
Sewer connection fee	= \$7,190.00 per EDU.

- C. Sewer Maintenance District No. 3. The following schedule of charges and fees shall apply to property within Placer County sewer maintenance district No. 3 and are based upon a flow rate of one equivalent dwelling unit (EDU). Calculation of a charge and fee for a use that is billed at a rate other than one equivalent dwelling unit shall be based upon the schedule set forth in subsections ~~D~~ **E** and F of Section 13.12.240.

Sewer service charge	= \$74.76 \$99.43 per month per EDU.
Annexation fee	= \$3,850.00 per acre.
Sewer connection fee	= \$7,190.00 per EDU.

- D. County Service Area No. 28, Zone No. 2, A3 (Sunset). The following schedule of charges and fees shall apply to property within county service area No. 28, Zone 2, A3 and are based upon a flow rate of one equivalent dwelling unit (EDU). Calculation of a charge and fee for a use that is billed at a rate other than one equivalent dwelling unit shall be based upon the schedule set forth in subsection H of Section 13.12.240.

Sewer service charge	= \$24.60 \$29.52 per month per EDU.
Annexation fee	= \$168.00 per acre.
Sewer connection fee	= \$7,190.00 per EDU.

- E. County Service Area No. 28, Zone No. 6 (Sheridan). The following schedule of charges and fees shall apply to property within county service area No. 28, Zone 6 and are based upon a flow rate of one equivalent dwelling unit (EDU). Calculation of a charge and fee for a use that is billed at a rate other than one equivalent dwelling unit shall be based upon the schedule set forth in subsections ~~D~~ **E** and F of Section 13.12.240.

Sewer service charge	= \$33.60 \$52.08 per month per EDU.
Sewer connection fee	= \$1,700.00 per EDU.
Water service charge	= \$24.60 \$27.00 per month per EDU.

- F. County Service Area No. 28, Zone No. 23 (Blue Canyon). The following schedule of charges and fees shall apply to property within county service area No. 28, Zone ~~6~~ **23** and are based upon a flow rate of one equivalent dwelling unit (EDU). Calculation

of a charge and fee for a use that is billed at a rate other than one equivalent dwelling unit shall be based upon the schedule set forth in subsections ~~D~~ E and H of Section 13.12.240.

Sewer service charge	= \$20.00 \$36.00 per month per EDU.
Sewer connection fee	= \$3,820.00 per EDU.

- G. County Service Area No. 28, Zone No. 24 (Applegate). The following schedule of charges and fees shall apply to property within county service area No. 28, Zone 24 and are based upon a flow rate of one equivalent dwelling unit (EDU). Calculation of a charge and fee for a use that is billed at a rate other than one equivalent dwelling unit shall be based upon the schedule set forth in subsection ~~D~~ E and F of Section 13.12.240.

Sewer service charge	= \$61.46 \$77.06 per month per EDU.
Sewer connection fee	= \$1,500.00 per EDU.

- H. County Service Area No. 28, Zone No. 55 (Livoti). The following schedule of charges and fees shall apply to property within county service area No. 28, Zone 55 and are based upon a flow rate of one equivalent dwelling unit (EDU). Calculation of a charge and fee for a use that is billed at a rate other than one equivalent dwelling unit shall be based upon the schedule set forth in subsection H of Section 13.12.240.

Sewer service charge	= \$29.24 \$35.05 per month per EDU.
Sewer connection fee	= \$9,600.00 per EDU.

- I. County Service Area No. 28, Zone No. 173 (Dry Creek Sewers). The following schedule of charges and fees shall apply to property within county service area No. 28, Zone No. 173 and are based upon a flow rate of one equivalent dwelling unit (EDU). Calculation of a charge and fee for a use that is billed at a rate other than one equivalent dwelling unit shall be based upon the schedule set forth in subsection (H) of Section 13.12.240.

Sewer service charge	= \$29.34 \$38.14 per month per EDU.
Sewer connection fee	= \$7,190.00 per EDU.

- J. Sewer connection fees charged pursuant to this section, as such fees may be changed from time to time, shall be reduced by two hundred dollars (\$200.00) per EDU effective November 8, 2011. The purpose of this reduction is to sunset the "shop fee" component of sewer connection fees enacted on September 9, 2003. (Ord. 5387-B § 1, 2005; Ord. 5353-B (part), 2005; Ord 5302-B § 1, 2004; Ord. 5258-B § 1, 2003; Ord. 5248-B § 1, 2003; Ord. 5157-B, 2002; Ord. 5156-B, 2002; Ord. 5120-B § 1, 2001; Ord. 5116-B § 1, 2001; Ord. 5059-B § 27, 2000; Ord. 4965-B § 1, 1999; prior code § 18.50)

13.12.380 Septic tank effluent pump--STEP fee schedule.

The following fees shall apply to all connections to county maintained STEP systems:

STEP Service Charge	= \$20.50 \$24.40 per month.
---------------------	--

The STEP service charge noted in this section shall be charged to a STEP connection user in addition to the standard sewer service charge for the district. (Ord. 5387-B § 4, 2005; Ord. 5248-B § 2, 2003; Ord. 5116-B § 2, 2001; Ord. 5059-B § 31, 2000) *jt*

Before the Board of Supervisors County of Placer, State of California

In the matter of: A RESOLUTION TO
CONFIRM THE COUNTY SERVICE AREA
FEE REPORT FOR 2007/2008 FOR CSA #28,
ZONES 2-A3, 6, 23, 24, 55 & 173

Resol. No: _____

The following RESOLUTION was duly passed by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Placer at a regular meeting held _____, by the following vote on roll call:

Ayes:

Noes:

Absent:

Signed and approved by me after its passage.

Chairman, Board of Supervisors

Attest:

Clerk of said Board

WHEREAS, the County Service Area Fee Report for 2007/2008 has been prepared in accordance with Section 33.05 (b) of the Placer County Code, detailing the user fees necessary to provide the authorized sewer and/or water services for each parcel in County Service Area No. 28, Zone of Benefit Nos. 2-A3, 6, 23, 24, 55 and 173 (the Report), and said Report is available for public review at the Clerk of the Board's Office and the Department of Facility Services, and

WHEREAS, notice of adoption of the Maintenance and Operation (M&O) fees as set forth in the Report has been given as required by law,

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT HEREBY RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Placer, State of California, as follows:

1. That the revenues derived from the M&O fees as set forth in the Report do not exceed the funds required to provide the sewer and/or water services.
2. That the revenues derived from the M&O fees as set forth in the Report shall only be used for providing sewer and/or water services, the purpose for which the fee is being imposed.

3. That the amount of the fee does not exceed the proportional cost of providing sewer service to the parcel.
4. That the sewer services being funded by the M&O fee are actually being used by, or are immediately available for use by, the owner of each parcel.
5. That the sewer services provide a special benefit to the parcels.
6. That the County Service Area Fee Report for 2007/2008 as on file with the Clerk of the Board is hereby confirmed and adopted, and the Board does hereby authorize collection of the M&O fees on the County property tax roll as allowed by law.