



---

# SEWER PARTICIPATION CHARGE ANALYSIS

---

JANUARY 4, 2024

# ENABLING LEGISLATION

---



Proposition 26, State Constitution Article XIII A and Article XIII C

Exempts charges imposed for a specific benefit conferred directly to the payor which do not exceed the reasonable costs to the local government of conferring the benefit imposed (i.e. capacity fees for service).



Municipal Utility District Act of the State of California (MUD Act)

Enables the setting of fees and charges for service.



State of California Government Code §66013

Capacity fees must be based on the "reasonable cost" to accommodate additional demand from new development or the expansion of existing development.



South Placer Municipal Utility District Sewer Code, Chapter 2.03

Charges for the privilege of connecting to the District's wastewater system.

# SPECIAL DISTRICTS vs MUNICIPALITIES

The District relies solely upon capacity charges to recover the cost of extension or enlargements to their system.

Cities & Counties have the authority to establish their own regulations and guidelines for development projects, including sewer infrastructure.

Authority over land use and can mandate development to make certain improvements through Development Agreements (Plan Area Impact Fees or Developer Contributions).

Access to a broader range of revenue streams: sales, property, other local taxes, and other sources which can help subsidize the cost of sewer services and keep the fees comparatively lower.

For example, the City of Citrus Heights has a program in place to reduce sewer impact fees for certain projects using Community and Economic Development funds.



# LOCAL FEE COMPARISON

Agency	Local Capacity Fee (Collections)	Regional Capacity Fee (Treatment)	Total Sewer Capacity Fee
Folsom	1369	6479	7,848
Placer County Livoti	1656	6479	8,135
Placer County SMD 1	1271	7698	8,969
Roseville	456	9852	10,308
SASD	4067	6479	10,546
Roseville SBA#3	1147	9852	10,999
Lincoln	3332	7699	11,031
Placer County SMD 2, 3, Area 28 Sunset & Dry Creek	1468	9664	11,132
SPMUD	4915	9852	14,767
Roseville SBA#4	8159	9852	18,011



# CITY OF ROSEVILLE REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT EXACTION COMPARISON (APRIL 2021)

---

- Presents a comparative snapshot that examines Roseville's development exactions relative to surrounding jurisdictions.
  - To understand the exaction costs associated with development within the City of Roseville when compared to exactions for services and capital improvements associated with new development in other jurisdictions; and
  - To gauge Roseville's overall cost-competitiveness for development.

*Includes a comparison with the Northwest Rocklin (Whitney Oaks) development that is within the District's service area.*



Figure S1 - Cumulative Single Family Residential Exactions by Jurisdiction (Per-Unit)



Figure S2 - Cumulative Multi-Family Residential Exactions by Jurisdiction (Per-Unit)



Table 1 - Detailed Single Family Residential Exactions by Jurisdiction



City	Elk Grove Laguna Ridge	Elk Grove SEPA	Folsom Folsom Plan Area (1)	Lincoln S. of Auburn Ravine (2)	Unincorp. Placer Co. Placer Vineyards	Rancho Cordova Sunridge Park	Rocklin Northwest Rocklin	Roseville Fiddymnt Ranch	Roseville Wstprk Low D'sity	Roseville SVSP Low D'sity	Roseville Creekview Low D'sity	Roseville ARSP Low Density	Sacramento North Natomas	West Sacramento Southport
<b>Processing Fees</b>														
Processing Fees	\$3,000	\$3,000	\$2,400	\$5,200	\$3,900	\$3,300	\$5,100	\$2,800	\$2,800	\$2,800	\$2,800	\$2,800	\$5,400	\$4,100
Total	\$3,000	\$3,000	\$2,400	\$5,200	\$3,900	\$3,300	\$5,100	\$2,800	\$2,800	\$2,800	\$2,800	\$2,800	\$5,400	\$4,100
<b>Development Impact Fees</b>														
Drainage / Flood	\$3,681			\$1,060	\$212	\$3,681		\$536	\$536	\$536	\$536	\$536	\$4,620	\$8,842
Affordable Housing	\$5,203	\$5,203	\$5,500											\$683
Child Care														
Library														
Conservation													\$3,798	
Police														\$1,306
Public Facilities	\$4,664	\$4,664		\$8,164	\$4,255	\$4,109	\$4,187	\$3,343	\$3,343	\$3,343	\$3,343	\$3,343	\$385	\$1,724
Fire	\$2,208	\$2,208				\$1,356		\$1,283	\$1,283	\$1,283	\$1,283	\$1,283		\$1,331
Parks/Open Space			\$94	\$453			\$2,696	\$6,619	\$7,677	\$6,790	\$7,352	\$7,352	\$5,757	\$17,006
Roadway - City	\$11,323	\$11,323		\$3,636		\$2,038	\$3,774	\$5,314	\$2,595	\$4,931	\$7,411	\$5,226	\$1,864	\$14,966
Roadway - Regional	\$4,634	\$4,634	\$1,329	\$8,859	\$4,624	\$1,329	\$2,999	\$2,330	\$2,330	\$10,288	\$9,394	\$9,394	\$1,356	\$1,382
Sewer - City				\$6,444			\$268	\$382	\$382	\$382	\$382	\$382	\$178	\$6,553
Sewer - Regional	\$9,780	\$9,780	\$6,479		\$8,951	\$9,780	\$12,396	\$8,267	\$8,267	\$8,267	\$8,267	\$8,267	\$9,780	\$6,479
Transit			\$35			\$179								
Water	\$17,985	\$17,985	\$301	\$22,826	\$19,665	\$17,985	\$19,339	\$10,529	\$10,529	\$10,529	\$10,529	\$10,529	\$3,696	\$10,229
Other				\$2,316			\$2,957	\$2,316	\$2,316	\$2,316	\$2,316	\$2,316		\$4,407
Total	\$59,479	\$55,797	\$13,738	\$53,757	\$37,707	\$40,457	\$48,616	\$40,919	\$39,258	\$48,665	\$50,813	\$48,628	\$31,434	\$74,908
<b>Plan Area Impact Fees and Developer Contributions</b>														
Plan Area Impact Fees	\$20,328	\$25,114	\$65,916	\$0	\$34,535	\$23,957	\$4,445	\$9,275	\$5,970	\$23,692	\$1,923	\$2,001	\$10,361	\$0
Total	\$20,328	\$25,114	\$65,916	\$0	\$34,535	\$23,957	\$4,445	\$9,275	\$5,970	\$23,692	\$1,923	\$2,001	\$10,361	\$0
<b>School Impact Fees</b>														
School Impact Fees	\$13,948	\$13,948	\$18,694	\$11,374	\$10,120	\$13,684	\$10,476	\$21,763	\$21,763	\$28,868	\$27,156	\$27,443	\$10,032	\$8,976
Total	\$13,948	\$13,948	\$18,694	\$11,374	\$10,120	\$13,684	\$10,476	\$21,763	\$21,763	\$28,868	\$27,156	\$27,443	\$10,032	\$8,976
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$96,755</b>	<b>\$97,859</b>	<b>\$100,748</b>	<b>\$70,331</b>	<b>\$86,262</b>	<b>\$81,397</b>	<b>\$68,637</b>	<b>\$74,757</b>	<b>\$69,791</b>	<b>\$104,025</b>	<b>\$82,692</b>	<b>\$80,872</b>	<b>\$57,227</b>	<b>\$87,984</b>

Notes:  
 - Amounts shown are estimates and are intended to provide order of magnitude information rather than exact figures.  
 - Amounts are based on interpretation of agency published fee schedules and information developed as part of prior regional fee comparisons.  
 - Amounts exclude impact/developer/mitigation fees for solid waste and electric.  
 (1) Folsom Plan Area fees exclude Folsom Heights.  
 (2) Lincoln South of Auburn Ravine development assumes SPRTA Tier 2 fees apply.



Table 2 - Detailed Multi-Family Residential Exactions by Jurisdiction



City	Elk Grove Laguna Ridge	Elk Grove SEPA	Folsom Folsom Plan Area (1)	Lincoln S. of Auburn Ravine (2)	Unincorp. Placer Co. Placer Vineyards	Rancho Cordova Sunridge Park	Rocklin Northwest Rocklin	Roseville Fiddymont Ranch	Roseville Sierra Vista	Roseville Creekview	City of Sacramento North Natomas	West Sacramento Southport
<b>Processing Fees</b>												
Processing Fees	\$1,300	\$1,300	\$1,300	\$1,100	\$1,900	\$1,900	\$1,100	\$2,200	\$2,200	\$2,200	\$1,900	\$2,100
Total	\$1,300	\$1,300	\$1,300	\$1,100	\$1,900	\$1,900	\$1,100	\$2,200	\$2,200	\$2,200	\$1,900	\$2,100
<b>Development Impact Fees</b>												
Drainage / Flood	\$1,118			\$254	\$135	\$1,118		\$467	\$467	\$467	\$1,020	\$4,308
Affordable Housing	\$3,121	\$3,121										\$256
Child Care												
Library												
Conservation											\$886	
Police												\$1,029
Public Facilities	\$3,486	\$3,486		\$5,977	\$3,054	\$3,211	\$2,130	\$2,229	\$2,229	\$2,229	\$250	\$1,359
Fire	\$1,454	\$1,454				\$1,059					\$1,059	\$1,048
Parks/Open Space			\$94	\$323			\$2,217	\$5,446	\$4,829	\$6,388	\$2,440	\$13,945
Roadway - City	\$7,868	\$7,868		\$2,618		\$2,073	\$2,378	\$3,295	\$3,057	\$4,595	\$843	\$11,895
Roadway - Regional	\$2,981	\$2,981	\$930	\$5,492	\$2,839	\$930	\$1,859	\$1,445	\$6,379	\$5,824	\$930	\$1,222
Sewer - City				\$5,153			\$268	\$382	\$382	\$382		\$4,915
Sewer - Regional	\$5,849	\$5,849	\$4,859		\$8,525	\$5,849	\$12,396	\$8,267	\$8,267	\$8,267	\$4,859	\$4,859
Transit			\$25			\$363						
Water	\$13,489	\$13,489	\$100	\$9,134	\$8,062	\$13,489	\$8,101	\$4,379	\$4,379	\$4,379	\$2,351	\$6,055
County Impact / Other				\$1,688			\$2,154	\$1,688	\$1,688	\$1,688		\$3,267
Total	\$39,365	\$38,248	\$6,008	\$30,639	\$22,616	\$28,092	\$31,503	\$27,597	\$31,676	\$34,219	\$14,637	\$54,158
<b>Plan Area Impact Fees and Developer Contributions</b>												
Plan Area Impact Fees	\$13,734	\$18,083	\$42,347	\$0	\$23,662	\$17,868	\$2,657	\$7,655	\$14,468	\$1,453	\$6,779	\$0
Total	\$13,734	\$18,083	\$42,347	\$0	\$23,662	\$17,868	\$2,657	\$7,655	\$14,468	\$1,453	\$6,779	\$0
<b>School Impact Fees</b>												
School Impact Fees	\$5,389	\$5,389	\$6,112	\$4,395	\$3,910	\$5,287	\$4,468	\$8,992	\$11,116	\$9,338	\$3,876	\$3,468
Total	\$5,389	\$5,389	\$6,112	\$4,395	\$3,910	\$5,287	\$4,468	\$8,992	\$11,116	\$9,338	\$3,876	\$3,468
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$59,788</b>	<b>\$63,020</b>	<b>\$55,767</b>	<b>\$36,133</b>	<b>\$52,087</b>	<b>\$53,147</b>	<b>\$39,728</b>	<b>\$46,443</b>	<b>\$59,461</b>	<b>\$47,210</b>	<b>\$27,192</b>	<b>\$59,726</b>

Notes:

- Amounts shown are estimates and are intended to provide order of magnitude information rather than exact figures.
- Amounts are based on interpretation of agency published fee schedules and information developed as part of prior regional fee comparisons.
- Amounts exclude impact/developer/mitigation fees for solid waste and electric.
- (1) Folsom Plan Area fees exclude Folsom Heights.
- (2) Lincoln South of Auburn Ravine development assumes SPRTA Tier 2 fees apply.



# ADDITIONAL INFORMATION (NOT YET CONSIDERED)

---

- South Placer Wastewater Authority (SPWA) Capacity Fee & EDU analysis which is scheduled to be completed in Q1 of 2024.
- Sacramento Area Sewer District (SASD) Guidance Document to identify the proportion of each asset that benefits each user group.



## CONCLUSIONS

- The District's Local Participation Charge is calculated in accordance with all State and Local laws and regulations.
- The District's Local Participation Charge is based on the "reasonable cost" to accommodate additional demand from new development.
- When combining Development Impact Fees with Plan Area Impact Fees and Developer Contributions, the District has some of the lowest fees for SFR and MFR in the region, based on the City of Roseville's comparative analysis.
- It does not appear that the District's Local Participation Charge renders Rocklin at a competitive disadvantage to development in the region.



QUESTIONS???

---