History of the Water Treatment Plant and Costs

September 3, 2008
Information Only

- The City has a responsibility to provide the citizens with accurate and factual information
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Part I – Executive Summary

- Public Processes Occurred (City Council actions and Public Meetings)
- Grants were examined
- Rates are comparable to surrounding communities
- Enterprise Funds are able to repay debt
- Expenditures are within budget
- Bond Financing Sound
- Technology decisions logical
Part II Overview

- Why?
- How and What?
- When?
- Where?
Water Treatment Plant. Why?

- Clean Water Act (Treatment of Groundwater for Arsenic)
- Use of Surface Water Rights
- Alternative Water Systems (Lower Cost water for “Purple Pipe”, Construction, etc.)
Clean Water Act (Arsenic)

- Maximum Contaminant Level (MCL) of 10 parts per billion (ppb) for Arsenic instead of the old standard of 50 ppb
- Fernley groundwater contains more than 10 ppb
- Treatment required to continue serving customers
- Health and safety of customers #1 priority
- Failure to comply could result in civil and criminal penalties, for the City and individuals
Clean Water Act (Arsenic)

- UNFUNDED MANDATE
- EPA requires compliance but does not provide funding for compliance
- Applies to all water systems
Surface Water Rights

- Current service is 100% from groundwater rights
- Additional groundwater rights are not available
- Future treatment of surface water rights for potable and non-potable water is essential for the future growth of Fernley
Surface Water Rights

- The WTP is designed to initially treat groundwater.
- Raw water delivery systems can be “tapped” to provide non-potable water to the “Purple Pipe” system and for lower cost landscape water, construction water, or other non-potable uses.
- Foresight of these possibilities provides for future growth of our community.
How and What?

- The WTP will use flocculation/sedimentation with microfiltration to remove the arsenic from the water
- Best alternative for both ground and surface water
- Water lines will be constructed to get raw water to the plant
- Water lines will be constructed to deliver treated water to customer
When?

- Per Bilateral Compliance Agreement with the Nevada Department of Environmental Protection
  July 23, 2009
- City delayed compliance as long as possible to investigate and implement the proper technology
- Long series of milestones to get to this point
Major Milestones 2003

- Green Sand Filtration Pilot Plant (similar to Fallon)
- NV Board for Financing Water Projects Presentation ($19M on Priority List)
- 3-year extension of compliance date from 2006 to 2009
Major Milestones 2004

- City Council Water Workshop
- Continued Pilot Plant Operations
- Need for Water Master Plan Update identified
- Kurt Kramer, Public Works Director, retires
- Lowell Patton begins as Public Works Director
  12/1/2004
Major Milestones 2005

- City Council Water Workshop
- Diatomaceous Earth Filtration pilot testing
- CDM hired to prepare Preliminary Engineering Report
- WTP stakeholders group formed
- PW shop on Cottonwood-Site Constraints
- Water Master Plan Update adopted
Major Milestones 2006

- CDM recommends single treatment site versus multiple regional plants. Preferred alternative of flocculation/sedimentation with microfiltration selected
- Final Preliminary Engineering Report Completed
- Johnson Property identified
- CDM begins design
Major Milestones 2006 (con’t)

- Contract for Water and Sewer Rate Analysis issued to FCS Group
- Grant and loan financing investigated (CIP)
- Bond process started WTP and Sewer projects
- Water Workshop
- CDM plans 30% complete
- Regulatory agencies conceptually approve plans
- Grants (AB198, EDA, USDA, CDBG, EPA)
- Senator Ensign visit
Major Milestones 2007

- 75%, 90%, and Final Design complete
- Regulatory agencies review and approve
- $50M bond authorization and issuance (4.36%) for WTP and sewer projects (favorable bond rating)
- Design of water conveyance facilities begun
- Water and Sewer Rate study completed, business impact statement and new rates approved by City Council
- 7/2/2007 City Council presentation
Major Milestones 2007 (con’t)

- Bilateral compliance agreement extended to July 23, 2009
- WTP test well award to Humboldt Drilling
- WTP construction award to K G Walters
- Microfiltration award to Pall Corporation
- Construction Management award to CDM
- Design for change order for solids handling facility authorized by City Council (change of scope)
- Notice to Proceed delayed from 9-7-07 to 10-4-07
Major Milestones 2008

- Authorization of second $50 M in bonds, issuance of $32.6M (4.97%) (favorable bond rating)
- Conveyance system final design completed and contracts awarded (some still pending)
- Construction
- Operation and Maintenance Planning
Where?

- The treatment plant is located at the west end of Mesa Drive
- Associated piping projects at various locations
Part III – Enterprise Funds & Bonds

- Rates and Fees
- Bond Issues
- Grants and other Financing Sources
- Cash Flow Projections
- Financial Condition
Rates

- The Rate Resolution passed on June 20, 2007 contains four user fee increases effective July 1, 2007, 2008, 2009, and 2010
- Staff indicated that a rate analysis (for both user fees and connection fees) will occur annually during the budget process with either a formal study by outside consultants or through in-house estimates
**Excerpt from Rate Study**

- **Major cost drivers**
  - Additional treatment O&M costs
  - System reinvestment funding
  - Debt service not funded with connection charges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REVENUE REQUIREMENTS SUMMARY</th>
<th>FYE</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenues</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate Revenue (w/ existing rates)</td>
<td>$2,088,722</td>
<td>$2,297,594</td>
<td>$2,527,353</td>
<td>$2,780,088</td>
<td>$3,058,097</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Revenues</td>
<td>$704,651</td>
<td>$752,250</td>
<td>$803,924</td>
<td>$860,058</td>
<td>$921,078</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of Connection Charges for Debt Service</td>
<td>$180,925</td>
<td>$3,045,722</td>
<td>$3,480,641</td>
<td>$3,318,212</td>
<td>$2,807,717</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest Earnings</td>
<td>$10,350</td>
<td>$31,501</td>
<td>$29,868</td>
<td>$33,204</td>
<td>$29,534</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenues</strong></td>
<td>$2,984,647</td>
<td>$6,127,067</td>
<td>$6,841,786</td>
<td>$6,991,562</td>
<td>$6,816,427</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating &amp; Maintenance Expenses</td>
<td>$2,098,700</td>
<td>$2,215,915</td>
<td>$3,237,474</td>
<td>$4,270,112</td>
<td>$4,482,936</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Debt Service</td>
<td>$180,925</td>
<td>$178,050</td>
<td>$179,800</td>
<td>$187,775</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate-Funded System Reinvestment</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$569,996</td>
<td>$1,158,400</td>
<td>$2,025,435</td>
<td>$1,996,242</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenses</strong></td>
<td>$2,279,625</td>
<td>$7,330,291</td>
<td>$8,942,004</td>
<td>$10,849,653</td>
<td>$12,090,163</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Annual Surplus/(Deficiency)</strong></td>
<td>$705,022</td>
<td>$(1,203,224)</td>
<td>$(2,100,218)</td>
<td>$(3,858,090)</td>
<td>$(5,273,736)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Annual Rate Adjustment</strong></td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cumulative Rate Adjustment</strong></td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>87.50%</td>
<td>134.38%</td>
<td>181.25%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ending Fund Balance</strong></td>
<td>$1,050,022</td>
<td>$995,595</td>
<td>$1,106,811</td>
<td>$984,465</td>
<td>$1,105,381</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Days of O&amp;M:</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Target Balance [60 days]:</td>
<td>$344,992</td>
<td>$363,265</td>
<td>$532,188</td>
<td>$701,936</td>
<td>$736,921</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Water CIP used for Rate Study

- The Water CIP used to formulate the rate study contains the Water Treatment Plant as well as the associated conveyance projects.
- These projects have been in the CIP since 2006.
## Excerpt from CIP Rate Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Current Cost</th>
<th>FYE</th>
<th>% Upgrade / Expansion</th>
<th>% R&amp;R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ground/Surface Water Treatment Plant</td>
<td>$ 600,000</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground/Surface Water Treatment Plant</td>
<td>42,000,000</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piping Conveyance</td>
<td>23,000,000</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comparison of Rates

- Updated rate information comparing the City of Fernley to Dayton, Fallon, Churchill County and Truckee Meadows Water Authority (TMWA)
- Results show that the City of Fernley rates generally are still less than these entities
Fallon Service Area

- Fallon provides service within the City limits and the Fallon Naval Air Station
- Fallon area is 3.05 square miles
- Fallon population is approximately 8,473 as of July 2007
- Churchill County provides water and sewer services in the unincorporated areas
Dayton Service Area

- Lyon County Utilities provides services to Dayton, Mound House and other areas.
- Dayton area is 31.7 square miles
- Dayton population was 5,907 for the 2000 census
City of Fernley Service Area

- Fernley provides service within the City limits and to certain unincorporated areas within the City limits
- Fernley area is 160 square miles
- Fernley population is approximately 20,000 as of July 2007
¾” Residential Monthly Water Bill

- Fernley
- Dayton
- TMWA
- Fallon
- Churchill

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gallons</th>
<th>Fernley</th>
<th>Dayton</th>
<th>TMWA</th>
<th>Fallon</th>
<th>Churchill</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>$150</td>
<td>$150</td>
<td>$150</td>
<td>$150</td>
<td>$150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>$200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### ¾” Residential Monthly Water Bill

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gallons</th>
<th>Fernley</th>
<th>Dayton</th>
<th>Churchill</th>
<th>Fallon</th>
<th>TMWA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>$15.09</td>
<td>$20.54</td>
<td>$41.00</td>
<td>$38.91</td>
<td>$17.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>$29.93</td>
<td>$33.19</td>
<td>$61.00</td>
<td>$51.78</td>
<td>$35.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>$73.33</td>
<td>$83.79</td>
<td>$116.00</td>
<td>$80.38</td>
<td>$86.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>$272.83</td>
<td>$260.89</td>
<td>$296.00</td>
<td>$180.48</td>
<td>$289.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
$\frac{3}{4}''$ Residential Water+Sewer Bill
### ¾” Residential Water+Sewer Bill

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gallons</th>
<th>Fernley</th>
<th>Dayton</th>
<th>Churchill</th>
<th>Fallon</th>
<th>TMWA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>$35.43</td>
<td>$67.73</td>
<td>$86.00</td>
<td>$63.91</td>
<td>$44.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>$50.27</td>
<td>$80.38</td>
<td>$106.00</td>
<td>$76.78</td>
<td>$62.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>$93.67</td>
<td>$130.98</td>
<td>$161.00</td>
<td>$105.38</td>
<td>$113.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>$293.17</td>
<td>$308.08</td>
<td>$341.00</td>
<td>$205.48</td>
<td>$316.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Existing Revenue Distribution

- **Commercial:** 19.3%
- **Residential:**
  - Individually Metered: 73.8%
  - Master-Metered: 6.8%

### Cost of Service Revenue Distribution

- **Commercial:** 19.2%
- **Residential:**
  - Individually Metered: 76.6%
  - Master-Metered: 4.2%

### FYE 2008 Revenue and Cost of Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Customer Classes</th>
<th>FYE 2008 Revenue Under Existing Rates</th>
<th>FYE 2008 Revenues with Across-the-Board Increase</th>
<th>FYE 2008 Across the Board Increase/Decrease</th>
<th>FYE 2008 Cost of Service</th>
<th>FYE 2008 Cost of Service Increase/Decrease</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential: Individually Metered</td>
<td>$1,696,717</td>
<td>$2,545,075</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>$2,639,691</td>
<td>55.58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential: Master-Metered</td>
<td>$157,231</td>
<td>$235,847</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>$143,856</td>
<td>-8.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>$443,646</td>
<td>$665,469</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>$662,844</td>
<td>49.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,297,594</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,446,391</strong></td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td><strong>$3,446,391</strong></td>
<td><strong>50.00%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2” Commercial Monthly Water Bill
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# 2” Commercial Monthly Water Bill

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gallons</th>
<th>Fernley</th>
<th>Dayton</th>
<th>Churchill</th>
<th>Fallon</th>
<th>TMWA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>$ 74.90</td>
<td>$ 54.48</td>
<td>$ 72.15</td>
<td>$ 38.91</td>
<td>$ 24.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>$ 92.36</td>
<td>$ 67.13</td>
<td>$ 95.00</td>
<td>$ 51.78</td>
<td>$ 38.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>$ 131.16</td>
<td>$ 117.73</td>
<td>$ 150.00</td>
<td>$ 80.38</td>
<td>$ 70.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>$ 266.96</td>
<td>$ 294.83</td>
<td>$ 410.00</td>
<td>$ 180.48</td>
<td>$ 194.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2” Commercial Water+Sewer Bill
## 2” Commercial Water+Sewer Bill

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gallons</th>
<th>Fernley</th>
<th>Dayton</th>
<th>Churchill</th>
<th>Fallon</th>
<th>TMWA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>$138.71</td>
<td>$76.80</td>
<td>$117.15</td>
<td>$48.79</td>
<td>$56.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>$165.56</td>
<td>$120.41</td>
<td>$149.58</td>
<td>$92.28</td>
<td>$115.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>$225.16</td>
<td>$239.81</td>
<td>$284.60</td>
<td>$151.88</td>
<td>$247.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>$433.76</td>
<td>$657.71</td>
<td>$547.48</td>
<td>$360.48</td>
<td>$721.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2” Master Meter Monthly Water Bill

- Fernley
- Dayton
- TMWA
- Fallon
- Churchill

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gallons</th>
<th>$0</th>
<th>$50</th>
<th>$100</th>
<th>$150</th>
<th>$200</th>
<th>$250</th>
<th>$300</th>
<th>$350</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2” Master Meter Monthly Water Bill

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gallons</th>
<th>Fernley</th>
<th>Dayton</th>
<th>Churchill</th>
<th>Fallon</th>
<th>TMWA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>$ 57.05</td>
<td>$ 54.48</td>
<td>$ 72.00</td>
<td>$ 38.91</td>
<td>$ 24.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>$ 74.33</td>
<td>$ 67.13</td>
<td>$ 92.00</td>
<td>$ 51.78</td>
<td>$ 38.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>$ 112.73</td>
<td>$ 117.73</td>
<td>$ 147.00</td>
<td>$ 80.38</td>
<td>$ 70.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>$ 247.13</td>
<td>$ 294.83</td>
<td>$ 327.00</td>
<td>$ 180.48</td>
<td>$ 194.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Series 2007 $50M bond issue

- The Series 2007 $50M bond issue is designed for interest only payments until 2-1-09 (first principal payment 2-1-09)
- The favorable Moody’s bond rating of Aaa with an underlying rating of A3 resulted in very competitive rates on the bond sale
- Bonds are amortized over 30 years
Series 2007 $50M bond issue

- The 2007 Series Bond issue was allocated $5.5M (11%) to the Sewer Fund and $44.5M (89%) to the Water Fund.
- The $5.5 M in the Sewer Fund was earmarked for the East Lift Station and Sewer Interceptor Upgrade Project that allowed WalMart, Lowe’s etc to build.
- The $44.5 M in the Water Fund was earmarked for the Water Treatment Facility.
Series 2008 $32.6M bond issue

- The Series 2008 $32.6M bond issue is designed for interest only payments until 2-1-2010 (first principal payment 2-1-2010)
- The favorable Moody’s bond rating of Aaa with an underlying rating of A3 resulted in very competitive rates on the bond sale
- Bonds are amortized over 30 years
Series 2008 $32.6M bond issue

- The 2008 Series Bond issue was allocated $2.6M (8%) to the Sewer Fund and $30M (92%) to the Water Fund
- The $2.6 M in the Sewer Fund was earmarked for the Highway 50 Lift Station Project
- The $30 M in the Water Fund was earmarked for the Water Treatment Facility and associated projects
Interest Earned on Investments

- Initially, interest earned on invested bond proceeds exceeded interest expense accrued on the bonds.
- In other words, we made money on the bond issue that could be plowed back into the projects.
- Over about six months, $200,000 ahead.
Grants and other financing

- AB198 Grants (populations under 6,000)
- USDA Grant and Loans
- EDA Grants
- CDBG Grants

- SRF **NOT** a grant
Cash Flow Projections

- Assumptions:
  - Very low growth
  - Very low connection fee revenue
  - User fees increase /# of customers flat
  - Increased costs for O&M Treatment Plant
  - Deferral of Growth Related Projects
Lyon Co. Projected Population


55,000 65,000 75,000 85,000 95,000 105,000 115,000 200 200 201 201 201 201 201 202 202 202
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
<th>Change Previous Year</th>
<th>Percentage Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>55,903</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>57,655</td>
<td>1,752</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>60,018</td>
<td>2,363</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>61,536</td>
<td>1,518</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>62,986</td>
<td>1,450</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>64,543</td>
<td>1,557</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>66,139</td>
<td>1,596</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>67,900</td>
<td>1,761</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>69,806</td>
<td>1,905</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>71,857</td>
<td>2,051</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>74,091</td>
<td>2,235</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>76,532</td>
<td>2,441</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>79,174</td>
<td>2,641</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>82,764</td>
<td>3,590</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>86,172</td>
<td>3,408</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>89,408</td>
<td>3,236</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td>92,470</td>
<td>3,062</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2024</td>
<td>95,369</td>
<td>2,899</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>98,122</td>
<td>2,753</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2026</td>
<td>100,724</td>
<td>2,602</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2027</td>
<td>103,193</td>
<td>2,469</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2028</td>
<td>105,533</td>
<td>2,340</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CIP

- The Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) used as a basis for the rate analysis contains projects that can be deferred if growth does not occur
- Projects have, in fact, been deferred
The Sewer CIP contained an estimated $32,031,934 in projects over the five year study period of which approximately $22 M were deferred in response to the downturn in residential construction.

The Water CIP contained an estimated $101,730,967 in projects over the five year study period of which approximately $29 M were deferred.

Deferrals result in the “old way” of no connections until developers construct infrastructure and “buy” a portion of the existing system.
## Water Fund Cash Flow Projections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Beginning Cash Balance</strong></td>
<td>65,850,516</td>
<td>7,347,400</td>
<td>5,844,999</td>
<td>5,054,887</td>
<td>4,810,514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cash In:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Charges</td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
<td>6,250,000</td>
<td>6,875,000</td>
<td>7,562,500</td>
<td>8,318,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Contributions</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Proceeds</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Operating Revenues</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td>350,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest Received</td>
<td>1,317,010</td>
<td>293,896</td>
<td>292,250</td>
<td>252,744</td>
<td>240,526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal-Cash In</strong></td>
<td>7,367,010</td>
<td>6,993,896</td>
<td>7,617,250</td>
<td>8,265,244</td>
<td>9,009,276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cash Out:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O&amp;M</td>
<td>3,000,000</td>
<td>3,100,000</td>
<td>3,200,000</td>
<td>3,300,000</td>
<td>3,400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Repayment</td>
<td>4,060,126</td>
<td>4,896,297</td>
<td>4,707,363</td>
<td>4,709,617</td>
<td>4,709,971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Outlay</td>
<td>58,810,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Cash Out</strong></td>
<td>65,870,126</td>
<td>8,496,297</td>
<td>8,407,363</td>
<td>8,509,617</td>
<td>8,609,971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Change in Cash</strong></td>
<td>-58,503,116</td>
<td>-1,502,401</td>
<td>-790,113</td>
<td>-244,372</td>
<td>399,305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ending Cash Balance</strong></td>
<td>7,347,400</td>
<td>5,844,999</td>
<td>5,054,887</td>
<td>4,810,514</td>
<td>5,209,819</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Sewer Fund Cash Flow Projections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Beginning Cash Balance</strong></td>
<td>10,954,115</td>
<td>7,412,123</td>
<td>7,656,613</td>
<td>7,966,769</td>
<td>8,268,940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cash In:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Charges</td>
<td>1,875,500</td>
<td>1,931,765</td>
<td>1,989,718</td>
<td>2,049,409</td>
<td>2,110,892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Contributions</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Operating Revenues</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td>350,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest Received</td>
<td>219,082</td>
<td>296,485</td>
<td>382,831</td>
<td>398,338</td>
<td>413,447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal-Cash In</strong></td>
<td>2,694,582</td>
<td>2,828,250</td>
<td>2,972,549</td>
<td>3,047,748</td>
<td>3,124,339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cash Out:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O&amp;M</td>
<td>1,500,000</td>
<td>1,575,000</td>
<td>1,653,750</td>
<td>1,736,438</td>
<td>1,823,259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Repayment</td>
<td>436,575</td>
<td>508,759</td>
<td>508,643</td>
<td>509,139</td>
<td>509,248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Outlay</td>
<td>4,300,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Cash Out</strong></td>
<td>6,236,575</td>
<td>2,583,759</td>
<td>2,662,393</td>
<td>2,745,577</td>
<td>2,832,508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Change in Cash</td>
<td>-3,541,992</td>
<td>244,490</td>
<td>310,155</td>
<td>302,171</td>
<td>291,831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ending Cash Balance</strong></td>
<td>7,412,123</td>
<td>7,656,613</td>
<td>7,966,769</td>
<td>8,268,940</td>
<td>8,560,771</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Financial Condition

- The Enterprise Funds are in reasonably good financial condition, despite the recent economic downturn.
- In a worst case scenario, the funds will remain healthy over the next five years.
- Rates are low and will likely continue to increase each year but annual review can even out the increases and avoid large increases in a given year.
- The City is in a better position to qualify for grants for some projects over the next five years.
Part IV – Capital budget v actual

- Budget WTP $42M
  - K G Walters contract $39M
  - Pall Microfilter $5M
  - CDM $5M
- Associated Piping Projects
  - $23M
K G Walters Change Orders

Figure 1 Water Treatment Plant Change Order Summary

- All Other change Orders (1.3%) $15,754

Current Contract Amount
$39,199,188

Original Contract (Including Solids Handling) Amount $38,683,434
Part V - Summary

- Public Processes Occurred (City Council actions and Public Meetings)
- Grants were examined
- Rates are comparable to surrounding communities
- Enterprise Funds are able to repay debt
- Expenditures are within budget
- Bond Financing Sound
- Technology decisions logical
Other information

- Appendix A-Timeline
Appendix A-Timeline

- 8/20/2002 American Water Works Association Albuquerque Arsenic Removal Workshop
- 11/7/2002 Teleconference – Emerging Arsenic Treatment Technologies
- 1/24/2003 Environmental Technology Verification (ETV) process reviewed for Arsenic Treatment technologies
Appendix A Timeline (continued)

- 1/25/2003 Nevada Board for Financing Water Projects Arsenic Presentation
- 4/28/2003 Severn Trent pilot testing at Well #11
- 6/18/2003 Severn Trent – Evaluating Arsenic Removal Workshop
- 8/6/2003 City Council addresses request to State for 3-year compliance extension
Appendix A Timeline (continued)

- 10/15/2003 City Council addresses request to State for 3-year compliance extension (second time)
- 12/12/2003 Bilateral Compliance Agreement executed by State (including milestones)
- 1/3/2004 City Council Water Workshop – Need for Water Master Plan Update identified
Appendix A Timeline (continued)

- 9/15/2004  Kurt Kramer’s last City Council meeting as retiring Public Works Director
- 12/1/2004  Lowell Patton’s first City Council meeting as Public Works Director
- 1/5/2005  City Council ratifies (Mayor signs) the Bilateral Compliance Agreement
- 1/22/2005  City Council Water Workshop
Appendix A Timeline (continued)

- 3/16/2005  City Council allows EaglePicher to continue pilot testing at Well #4
- 6/10/2005  Public Works advertises Request for Qualifications (RFQ) for WTP planning and engineering services
- 7/14/2005  Public Works interviews prospective WTP consultants
Appendix A Timeline (continued)

- 9/7/2005  City Council awards contract to CDM for study of water treatment options and Preliminary Engineering Report
- 12/5/2005  Public Works identified WTP stakeholders group
- 12/16/2005 CDM identifies potential site constraints at the Public Works Shop on Cottonwood
Appendix A Timeline (continued)

- 12/16/2005  CDM provides Public Works with Process Alternatives and relative cost comparisons
- 12/16/2005  CDM provides Public Works with groundwater treatment types and possible central or regionally clustered locations
- 12/21/2005  City Council adopts 2005 Water Master Plan Update
Appendix A Timeline (continued)

- 1/1/2006  CDM recommends pursuit of a single Water Treatment Plant rather than multiple regional plants
- 1/20/2006  City Engineering reviews CDM’s draft Preliminary Engineering Report
Appendix A Timeline (continued)

- 2/3/2006  Public Works delivers memorandum with excerpts from draft Preliminary Engineering Report to Stakeholders Group. Group agrees that flocculation/sedimentation with microfiltration is preferred alternative

- 6/14/2006  CDM delivers Final Preliminary Engineering Report
Appendix A Timeline (continued)

- 6/21/2006  City Council addresses offer to acquire Johnson Property on west terminus of Mesa Drive
- 6/23/2006  Public Works considers alternate project delivery concepts (Design Build, Engineering Procurement Construction Management, etc.)
- 7/5/2006  City Council awards contract to FCS Group for Water and Sewer Rate Analysis
Appendix A Timeline (continued)

- 7/17/2006  NDEP receives a copy of the Preliminary Engineering Report
- 7/19/2006  City Council authorization to go to Lyon County Debt Management Commission for bonding
- 7/19/2006  City Council approves Indebtedness Report
Appendix A Timeline (continued)

- 7/20/2006  City Council Water Workshop – WTP update given
- 7/21/2006  City Council authorizes the purchase of the Johnson property
- 8/16/2006  City Council amends CDM contract to include 75% design of WTP
Appendix A Timeline (continued)

- 12/8/2006  CDM delivers 30% plans to the City. NDEP BSDW review and conceptually approve the project concept (as much as possible with 30% design set)

- 1/3/2007  City Council addresses impact of Well #13 pumping and awards design contract for Mesa Drive waterline.
Appendix A Timeline (continued)

- 1/20/2007  City Council Goals and Priorities Workshop – WTP identified as high priority
- 3/2/2007  CDM delivers 75% plans to City. State again reviews the plans and conceptually approves the project
- 3/7/2007  City Council adopts Bill #83 authorizing issuance of $50,000,000 bonds
Appendix A Timeline (continued)

- 3/7/2007  City Council authorizes bid advertisement of Mesa Drive waterline construction contract
- 3/21/2007  City Council amends CDM contract to include Final Design and Bid Support
- 4/4/2007  City Council awards contract to Fehr & Peers for traffic study for WTP
Appendix A Timeline (continued)

- 4/4/2007 City Council awards construction contract for Mesa Drive waterline
- 4/4/2007 City Council awards a contract to TRC to begin corridor mapping of water conveyance facilities for inbound and outbound water lines for WTP
Appendix A Timeline (continued)

- 4/12/2007  CDM delivers 90% plans to City. State again reviews and conceptually approves the project
- 4/18/2007  City Council directs staff to prepare a Business Impact Statement for amended water and sewer fee structure
- 4/25/2004  City Council Goals and Priorities Workshop – WTP High Priority
Appendix A Timeline (continued)

- 5/2/2007 City Council initial presentation of Water and Sewer Rates
- 5/31/2007 CDM delivers complete plans to the City and the project advertised for bid.
- 6/29/2007 Addendum #1 to the WTP plans delivered
Appendix A Timeline (continued)

- 7/2/2007  City Council WTP overview presentation
  - Information Only with separate presentation on status of grants and loan funding
- 7/11/2007  Extension of Bilateral Compliance Agreement to July 23, 2009
- 8/15/2007  City Council awards WTP test well drilling contract to Humboldt Drilling and Pump Co.
Appendix A Timeline (continued)

- 9/5/2007  City Council awards WTP construction contract to K G Walters
- 9/5/2007  City Council awards microfiltration membrane contract to Pall Corporation
- 10/3/2007  City Council awards Construction Management Contract to CDM
Appendix A Timeline (continued)

- 10/22/2007 City meets with Jim Johnson to discuss acquisition of additional 10’ of right of way at east end of Mesa Drive. City later recieves sales offer

- 10/29/2007 City meets with Daniel Hyde to discuss acquisition of additional 10’ of right of way at west end of Mesa Drive
Appendix A Timeline (continued)

- 11/7/2007  City Council addresses alternatives for WTP solids handling facilities
- 11/14/2007  City meets with Danny Lamb to discuss acquisition of existing easement as dedicated right of way at extreme west end of Mesa Drive.
- 11/19/2007  Staff presents timeline indicating actions to be taken for arsenic compliance