Water Systems Management Council Workshop Presentation #4

Stormwater Funding Options

Nov 8, 2012



Purpose and Outcomes for Meeting

- To advance decisions related to managing storm water in order to proceed to implementation in Thornhill and City-wide.
- The following directions to staff are needed at this meeting:
 - Service Level
 - Implementation timeframe
 - Funding Options (# and type) for inclusion at public consultation
- Presentation today will outline information to assist in making those decisions.



Agenda

- Introduction
- Review Flood Control Strategy
- Review Funding Options
- Combination (Blended) Funding Options
- Key Decisions
- Next steps

Towards a Sustainable Community



Building Markham's Future Together

Introduction

- Purpose is to report back on Workshop #3 (May 15, 2012) discussions and to provide Council with a more in-depth review of flood control funding options.
- To seek support for proposed flood control strategy, and funding options to advance to public consultation.





Agenda

- Introduction
- Review Flood Control Strategy
- Review Funding Options
- Combination (Blended) Funding Options
- Key Decisions
- Next steps

Towards a Sustainable Community



Building Markham's Future Together

Flood Control Strategy

- City-wide implementation of flood control requires a strategy including:
 - level of service (affects total cost),
 - implementation timeframe (affects annual cost), and
 - funding option.
- Strategy presented in Workshop #3 included:
 - 5-year level of service for Don Mills Channel, 100-year level of service for West Thornhill, 100-year level of service for Town-wide storm sewers (\$155 M flood control funding gap (in 2012 dollars))
 - 30 year implementation timeframe (\$5 to 6 M annual funding gap)



Costs and Funding

Type of Work	Estimat	Funding Identified	
 1- Flood Control Allowances a) Don Mills Channel b) West Thornhill c) Town-wide 	5-year Protection \$42M \$17M \$33M	100-year Protection \$112M \$40M \$77M	\$0 \$4M – Gas Tax \$0
Total Flood Control	\$92M	\$229M	Total \$4M
	\$ 159 M Floo	nding Gap	

Building Markham's Future Together

Towards a Sustainable Community



Flood Strategy Implementation Time and Components

• 30-year strategy components

- Year 1-5 : continue West Thornhill design and construction; complete Don Mills Channel Class EA (define capital works) and continue channel maintenance; implement low-cost risk reduction measures City-wide; prioritize projects City-wide based on identified risk and cost-effectiveness of solutions.
- Year 6-10 : complete West Thornhill implementation; initiate Don Mills capital works; initiate other City-wide Class EAs on a priority basis; continue low-cost measures and prioritization of projects City-wide.
- —Year 11+ : complete Don Mills capital works, lower priority projects and Class EA study implementation; continue lowcost measures and prioritization of projects City-wide.

Building Markham's Future Together

Towards a Sustainable Community



Flood Strategy Implementation Time – Short Term Requirements

- Funding is required to support completion of West Thornhill Phase 1 works and remaining works
 - \$4M is capital project underway for design and construction in WT (supports works through 2013)
 - Further \$3M required to complete Phase 1 (\$7M total)





Cost Comparison

- Compared to other municipalities, a 30 year implementation for flood control results in costs per person or per year that are comparable or less than other Ontario municipalities.
- Using an annual funding gap for flood control implementation of \$5 – 6M (subject to inflation) is reasonable to assess impacts of funding options.
- Strategy and funding gap will be updated on a 5year cycle considering to update funding requirements based on completed Class EAs and cost updates and inflation.



Agenda

- Introduction
- Review Flood Control Strategy
- Review Funding Options
- Combination (Blended) Funding Options
- Key Decisions
- Next steps

Towards a Sustainable Community



Building Markham's Future Together

Funding Source Options

- #1 Stormwater Flat Fee per Water Account/Property
- #2 Water Rate Surcharge
- #3 Property Tax Rate Increase
- #4 Local Property Owners only A charge under Section 391 of the Municipal Act, 2001
- #5 Stormwater Utility Fees based on runoff potential considering hard surfaces on lots
- #6 Assistance by Provincial/Federal Funds e.g., Canada Gas Tax Fund

Towards a Sustainable Community

Feedback from Workshop #3 Discussions

• Effect of Improvements of Property Values

Appraisers suggested estimating market value adjustments for flood control in a high demand area like Thornhill would be difficult to isolate given all other factors (corner lot, double garage). However they would agree it does add value to property.

• Financing Duration Compared to Other Local Improvements

10-year period was assumed in Workshop #3. Some sanitary sewer projects have been financed over 15 years (e.g., Robinson Street Laneway, Milmar Court). Longer periods are added for consideration.

 Details on Contributing Properties Compared to Class EA Study Areas

Local charges would include properties that contribute runoff or are within the storm improvement areas, as opposed to properties within the Class EA boundaries.



Feedback from Workshop #3 Discussions

- 'Pros and Cons' of funding source options presented at Workshop #3 have been updated.
- Based on advice from the City solicitor, funding options on the basis of water consumption are not recommended (legal challenges for Option #2).
- A stormwater utility approach (Option #5) was not favoured in Workshop #3 feedback due to administrative efforts/resources (e.g., detailed measurement of impervious/paved areas).
- Combining Options: Request to have staff prepare other options which are a combination of a couple City-wide and local funding sources. A single City-wide source is efficient and Option #1 flat fee (or tiered fee) is recommended over Option #3 tax increase since it is more transparent, and can be made more equitable (relate costs to property size as opposed to assessed value).



Two categories of Funding Options:

1. City-wide Funding Options

2. Local Charges

Building Markham's Future Together

Towards a Sustainable Community



City-wide Funding Options

- Option #1 Flat Fee
 - Residential : in the range of \$3-4/month per water account or property
 - Non-residential : in the range of \$45-60/month per water account
 Or average \$ 25 / month per property (can vary by size)

Option #2 – Water Rate Surcharge – legal advice

- Residential : in the range of approximately \$3-4/month per water account
- Non-residential : ranges from \$25/month to \$1,000/month per water account

• Option #3 – Property Tax Rate Increase

- One time 4.41% increase, or phased in
- Residential : average \$3-4/month per property (can vary by CVA)
- Non-residential : varies according to current value assessment

Option #5 – Stormwater Utility

- Residential : average \$3-4 / month per property (can vary by size)
- Non-residential : varies with hard surfaces, averages 6 to 7 times

residential, on average \$ 25 / month per property

: example large properties, e.g., shopping centre \$1000/month, school \$500/month, church \$120/month

Option #6 – Canada Gas Tax Fund

— Portion of annual fund (\$2M) could be dedicated toward flood control

Building Markha

Option #4 –Local Charge 10 and 30 year financing timeframe

 Applies to properties in specific areas only (West Thornhill, Don Mills Channel and other areas), no charges outside these specific areas

Assumptions:

- Based on a 30 year implementation strategy
- Based on the estimated number of benefiting properties in the identified improvement areas
- Based on interest rate of 5%
- Estimated financial implications:
 - West Thornhill: 1 time payment of approximately \$5,400/property, or
 \$58/month/property for 10 years or \$27/month/property for 30 years
 - Don Mills Channel: 1 time payment of approximately \$114,000/property, or \$1,230/month/property for 10 years or \$619/month/property for 30 years
 - Other Specific Areas: 1 time payment of approximately \$6,000/property, or \$64/month/property for 10 years or \$32/month/property for 30 years

Building Markham's Future Together

Towards a Sustainable Community



Option #4 –Local Charge Contributing Properties

• Flood impacts and improvement areas can represent a portion of the Class EA study area. Local charge estimates distribute costs only to properties within or contributing flow to the storm improvement areas, for example:

West Thornhill:

Class EA Study Area – 8500 properties

Areas contributing flow to improvement areas - 6700 properties

Don Mills Channel:

Class EA Study Area – 1300 properties

Areas contributing flow to improvement areas - 368 properties



Towards a Sustainable Community

Building Markham's Future Together

Pre-1978 areas may require local charges



West Thornhill

Don Mills Channel

West Thornhill

Legend

Class EA Study Area (8500 properties)
Storm Improvement Areas (6700 properties
within or contributing flow to areas)
No Flow to Improvement Area (1800 properties)





Building Markham's Future



Option #4 –Local Charge Challenges Defining Contributing Properties

- Contributing Properties do not contribute runoff equally to the improvement areas and may contribute:
 - Sewer Flow Only
 - Sewer Flow and Overland Flow

- Overland Flow Only

- Sewer contribution areas can be estimated with some confidence but the extent of overland flow contributing areas can only be estimated.
- Where local charges are considered, the divide between contributing, non-contributing, and partially-contributing properties makes allocation of costs uncertain for hundreds of properties.
- It is not common practice to allocate stormwater costs to special areas in this manner (may require field verification, partial charges, and appeals process for disputed boundaries). No other Canadian examples.

Building Markham's Future Together

Towards a Sustainable Community



Other municipalities – funding

- #1: Stormwater Flat Fee Aurora, London, St.Thomas, Saskatoon, Calgary, St. Albert, Strathcona County/Alberta (certain neighbourhoods), Richmond, Surrey
- #2: Water/sewer rate surcharge– Toronto, Regina, Hamilton, Peterborough
- #3: Property Tax Rate Increase Hamilton, Peterborough, Stratford
- #4: Local Property Owners only A charge under Section 391 of the Municipal Act, 2001 – no known examples for flood control capital works
- #5: Stormwater Utility Kitchener, Waterloo, Edmonton, approximately 700 US municipalities
- #6: Assistance by Provincial/Federal Funds Stratford, Saskatoon



Funding Source Comparison

	Option	Pros	Cons
	#1: Flat Fee	Easy to implement, aligned with focus group on sharing costs. Transparent. Can administer through water bill or tax bill.	Flood control services already paid for in new areas.
	#2: Water Rate Surcharge	Easy to implement, aligned with focus group on sharing costs.	Relevant with combined sewers (not appropriate in Markham). Declining revenue with conservation. Legal issues relating flood costs to water use.
	#3: Property Tax Rate Increase	Easiest to implement, aligned with focus group on sharing costs, similar to non-flood stormwater funding.	Not apparent where funding goes (requires education on strategy and benefits). Relates flood control costs to property value Town-wide.
	#4: Local Property Owners Charge	Consistent with user pay principle.	Contrary to focus group opinion on sharing costs Town-wide. High local costs are a barrier to advancing projects. Complex implementation. Longer timelines.
	#5: Stormwater Utility	Aligned with focus group on sharing costs.	Extensive effort/resources required – separate calculation per property.
Bui	#6: Federal Assistance Gas Tax Fund	Consistent with previous funding for flood control.	Displaces funding for other programs.

.....

25

Agenda

- Introduction
- Review Flood Control Strategy
- Review Funding Options
- Combination (Blended) Funding Options
- Key Decisions
- Next steps



Combination of Options

- Funding can be distributed between sources:
 - -City-wide sources
 - o Option #1 Flat Fee per Water Account or Property
 - o Option #2 Water Rate Surcharge
 - o Option #3 Property Tax Rate Increase
 - o Option #5 Stormwater Utility
 - o Option #6 Canada Gas Tax Fund
 - -Local sources
 - o Option #4 Local Charge
- If a combination of City-wide and local sources is chosen, the percentage of the City-wide component can be related to the portion of City lands within the local remediation area (e.g., right of ways, parks).



Proportion of City Lands

• West Thornhill Study Area: 26% City-owned (white areas)



Proportion of City Lands

• Don Mills Channel Area: 18% City-owned (white areas)



Combination of Options

- The portion of City-wide funding can be related to the portion of City-owned land within current flood improvement study areas, for example:
 - West Thornhill Study Area: approximately 26 % Cityowned
 - Don Mills Channel Catchment: approximately 18 % City-owned
- It is suggested that the City wide component can be estimated to be approximately 25%. A higher City-wide component can be considered given community benefits including traffic safety (reduced roadway flooding) and environmental protection (reduced inflows to sanitary sewer causing spills to watercourses). These benefits could support a 50% City-wide component.

Building Markham's Future Together

Towards a Sustainable Community



Funding Options / Combinations - Residential

	Distribution of Fees		Estimated Fees per Year (average)				
Combin-			City-wide Properties		Local West Thornhill Properties		
ation	City-wide	Local	No Gas Tax Funding	With Gas Tax Offset	No Gas Tax Funding	With Gas Tax Offset	
A	100 %	0 %	\$48	\$36	\$48	\$36	
В	75 %	25 %	\$36	\$27	\$120	\$90	
С	50 %	50 %	\$24	\$18	\$190	\$140	
D	25 %	75 %	\$12	\$9	\$260	\$200	
E	0 %	100 %	\$0	\$0	\$330	\$250	
31						MARKHAM	

30 year financing of local fees. 30 year strategy for city-wide fees. \$2M Gas Tax/yr

Funding Options / Combinations - Commercial

Combin- ation	Distribution of Fees		Estimated Fees per Year (average)			
			City-wide Properties		Local Don Mills Channel Properties	
	City-wide	Local	No Gas Tax Funding	With Gas Tax Offset	No Gas Tax Funding	With Gas Tax Offset
A	100 %	0 %	\$560	\$420	\$560 (maximum \$560/yr)	\$420 (maximum \$420/yr)
В	75 %	25 %	\$420	\$320	\$2280 (maximum \$30,200/yr)	\$1690 (maximum \$27,000/yr)
С	50 %	50 %	\$280	\$210	\$4000 (maximum \$59,700/yr)	\$2960 (maximum \$47,300/yr)
D	25 %	75 %	\$140	\$105	\$5710 (maximum \$89,300/yr)	\$4230 (maximum \$67,600/yr)
Е	0 %	100 %	\$0	0	\$7430 (maximum \$119,000/yr)	\$5500 (maximum \$87,900/yr)

• 30 year financing of local fees. 30 year strategy for city-wide fees. Maximum local approximately 16 times average in Don Mills Channel Area. \$2M/yr Gas Tax/yr.



32

Funding Combination Comparison

	Combin	Distribution of Fees			
	-ation	City-wide	Local	Considerations	
	A	100 %	0 %	Previous flood control projects funded City-wide. Would support transition to City-wide funding of all stormwater management program costs over time. Administrative efficiency compared to local charges	
	В	75 %	25 %	Small proportion of local charge does not warrant the significant administrative efforts/contributing area issues	
	С	50 %	50 %	Expanded City benefits given traffic safety, and risk of sewage spills to watercourses (due to stormwater entering basements and floor drains)	
	D	25 %	75 %	City land represents 25% of drainage area and contributes a proportionate fee distributed City-wide	
B 33	E	0 %	100 %	Suitable if fees benefit only local basement flood risk reduction. Those contributing flow (but who are not flood prone) would also contribute fee.	

Agenda

- Introduction
- Review Flood Control Strategy
- Review Funding Options
- Combination (Blended) Funding Options
- Key Decisions
- Next steps

Towards a Sustainable Community



Building Markham's Future Together

Key Decisions

• Staff recommendations for Council in the following areas for their consideration and approval:

-Level of Service

- Implementation Time
- Funding Sources for Public Consultation



Key Decisions – Flood Strategy Level of Service

- Previous Decisions by Council 100 year level of service for West Thornhill
- Recommendations for consideration:
 - That the City's flood control strategy consider a 100-year level of service target for City-wide storm drainage systems, subject to technical feasibility and approval as part of future Class EA's.
 - 2)That the City's flood control strategy consider a 5-year level of service target for the Don Mills Channel drainage system based on its original design, subject to technical feasibility and approval as part of a future Class EA.
 - (Note: 100-year already approved for West Thornhill (approved Class EA), and watercourse systems are subject to special policies and floodplain management regulations)



Key Decisions – Flood Strategy Implementation Time

- Recommendations for consideration:
 - 3) That the City adopt a 30-year implementation timeframe for its flood control strategy
 - That the flood control strategy implement City-wide flood risk reduction projects, prioritized on the basis of identified risk and cost-effectiveness of solutions
 - 5) That the flood control strategy be updated on a 5-year cycle considering projects identified in completed technical studies and updated budget requirements



Key Decisions– Funding Source

Recommendation for consideration:

- 6) That staff consult the public on the following stormwater funding sources:
 - a) 100% City-wide fees,
 - b) 100% Local Charges, and
 - c) 75% Local Charges and 25% City-wide fee
- 7) That Canada Gas Tax Funding be considered to offset the cost of the above options
- 8) That staff report back following public consultation and recommend a funding option.



Next Steps

- Public consultation on the City's proposed Flood Control Strategy and Funding Source options (Citywide and local aspects)
- Staff report on the City's Flood Control Strategy and preferred Funding Source including feedback from public consultation
- Council decision
- Implementation of the strategy

