

# **STORMWATER QUALITY FUNDING INITIATIVE**

## **TASK 1 REPORT: CURRENT AND FUTURE PROGRAM COST ANALYSIS**

**Fabry/Konnan**

**October 17, 2013**



# Methods & Preliminary Results

- See draft report for details.
- Comparing expenditure values for different categories among cities very challenging.
- Agencies often reported that the types of data we were looking for are not tracked.

# Major Assumptions - Expenditures

- Existing expenditures consistent with compliance with permit.
- Street sweeping costs generally included.
- For agencies lacking overall expenditure data, extrapolated from agencies with data based on population.

# Major Assumptions – Revenue

- Use of general funds not included in total dedicated revenue.
- Entire Measure M allocation included as dedicated revenue unless indicated otherwise.
- No data on annual cost recovery so not included in total dedicated revenue.

# Major Assumptions – Future Trash Control

- Treatment of all currently untreated trash generation area by full-capture devices (conservative assumption).
- Assumed implementation over 10-year period to estimate annual costs.
- O&M costs increase each year as area treated increases. Used 5-year mean.
- BPJ - results are highly uncertain.

# Major Assumptions – Future PCBs/Hg Control

- **Developed plausible scenario of activities in well studied area:**
  - 1. Property ID and referral**
  - 2. Stormwater treatment retrofit**
  - 3. Enhanced street sweeping**
  - 4. Effectiveness monitoring**

# Major Assumptions – Future PCBs/Hg (cont.)

- Developed annual estimated cost and then scaled to all other old industrial areas in San Mateo County.
- GIS layer needs ground truthing and possibly refinement.
- BPJ - results are highly uncertain.

# Review/Feedback Focus

- Review all values for your agency, especially those highlighted in yellow and Measure M use for compliance.
- Any issues unique to your jurisdiction not addressed (e.g., SM County ASBS and FCD trash controls)?
- Do untreated trash generation and old industrial land use areas (acreage) seem reasonable?



# Next Steps

- **Living document – refine future costs as we learn more about anticipated requirements in next permit.**
- **Trash – may be able to refine as long-term plans are developed.**
- **PCBs - may be able to further narrow area of interest via GIS analysis.**
- **Integrate with Funding Initiative – Task 2 Report and Action Plan.**

# Questions



Agency	Population	Estimated Existing Annual Compliance Expenditures <sup>1</sup>	Population-Extrapolated Existing Annual Compliance Expenditures	Estimated Future Trash Control Annual Capital Costs	Estimated Future Trash Control Annual O&M Costs	Estimated Future PCB/Mercury Annual Control Costs	Estimated Annual Dedicated Revenue <sup>1</sup>	Projected Annual Shortfall
SMCWPPP	NA	\$ 2,752,320	NA	NA	NA	NA	\$ 2,220,000	\$ 532,320
Atherton	6,917	UA	\$ 92,090	\$ 47,345	\$ 14,784	\$ -	\$ 142,700	\$ 11,520
Belmont	26,031	UA	\$ 346,568	\$ 80,840	\$ 25,244	\$ -	\$ 512,300	\$ (59,649)
Brisbane	4,328	\$ 288,109	NA	\$ 143,407	\$ 44,781	\$ 290,918	\$ 148,442	\$ 618,774
Burlingame	29,009	\$ 453,460	NA	\$ 167,544	\$ 52,318	\$ 326,908	\$ 375,668	\$ 624,562
Colma	1,805	UA	\$ 24,031	\$ 54,906	\$ 17,145	\$ 13,496	\$ 75,000	\$ 34,579
Daly City	101,920	\$ 848,752	NA	\$ 467,147	\$ 145,875	\$ 80,977	\$ 837,507	\$ 705,244
East Palo Alto	28,366	UA	\$ 377,655	\$ 440,944	\$ 137,693	\$ 125,965	\$ 218,967	\$ 863,289
Foster City	30,790	UA	\$ 409,927	\$ 411,570	\$ 128,520	\$ 14,996	\$ 199,227	\$ 765,786
Half Moon Bay	11,415	UA	\$ 151,975	\$ 61,033	\$ 19,059	\$ 11,997	\$ 89,203	\$ 154,861
Hillsborough	10,927	UA	\$ 145,478	\$ 21,174	\$ 6,612	\$ 4,499	\$ 117,436	\$ 60,327
Menlo Park	32,319	UA	\$ 430,284	\$ 307,544	\$ 96,036	\$ 229,436	\$ 386,349	\$ 676,950
Millbrae	21,714	\$ 870,000	NA	\$ 120,815	\$ 37,727	\$ 31,491	\$ 330,932	\$ 729,101
Pacifica	37,526	UA	\$ 499,608	\$ 161,019	\$ 50,281	\$ 46,487	\$ 322,515	\$ 434,880
Portola Valley	4,391	UA	\$ 58,460	\$ 34,327	\$ 10,719	\$ 5,998	\$ 75,000	\$ 34,505
Redwood City	77,712	\$ 550,000	NA	\$ 807,367	\$ 252,114	\$ 431,879	\$ 280,747	\$ 1,760,613
San Bruno	41,842	\$ 587,760	NA	\$ 308,582	\$ 96,360	\$ 58,484	\$ 593,279	\$ 457,907
San Carlos	28,615	\$ 606,577	NA	\$ 170,884	\$ 53,362	\$ 451,373	\$ 479,861	\$ 802,335
San Mateo	97,966	\$ 741,051	NA	\$ 605,994	\$ 189,232	\$ 161,955	\$ 880,562	\$ 817,670
SSF	64,067	\$ 1,274,067	NA	\$ 737,898	\$ 105,868	\$ 1,304,634	\$ 1,074,858	\$ 2,347,608
Woodside	5,336	UA	\$ 71,042	\$ 11,172	\$ 230,422	\$ 26,992	\$ 75,000	\$ 264,628
SM County	61,706	UA	\$ 821,532	\$ 339,028	\$ 3,489	\$ 317,911	\$ 386,806	\$ 1,095,154
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>724,702</b>	<b>\$ 8,972,096</b>	<b>\$ 3,428,650</b>	<b>\$ 5,500,540</b>	<b>\$ 1,717,641</b>	<b>\$ 3,936,395</b>	<b>\$ 9,822,359</b>	<b>\$ 13,732,963</b>