

SECTION 8: FINANCING AND IMPLEMENTATION

8.1 INTRODUCTION

Lack of adequate funding is a common frustration of all municipalities in dealing with drainage problems. Funding for maintenance and capital improvements of storm drainage systems is basic to its successful operation as an efficient conveyance of stormwater runoff. If funds are not made available to address existing problems, the risk of stormwater related damage becomes greater. Adequate funding of the capital improvement projects and completion of the projects recommended in this plan will greatly reduce the risk of major storm water related damage.

Grant funding is generally not available for funding stormwater related improvements; consequently, the “need” for any particular capital improvement is shaped in large part by the cost of the project and the willingness of the City to devote the funds, or to incur the debt, necessary to complete the project. Priority is generally given to those projects that address existing or incipient problems that can be honestly characterized as urgent. Remaining projects are typically undertaken in accordance with prevailing perceptions of need and affordability.

8.2 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

8.2.1 Improvement Priorities

Specific capital improvements are developed and presented in Section 7.1. The projects are summarized below according to relative priority.

Table 8.1 Storm Water Capital Improvement Summary

Project Number	Construction Total	Project Total
<i>Priority: Urgent</i>		
#10 (Gervais/3rd)	\$32,500	\$48,900
Subtotal	\$32,500	\$48,900

<i>Priority: Urgent/High</i>		
Hemlock St. ¹	\$39,900	\$53,800
Subtotal	\$39,900	\$53,800
<i>Priority: High</i>		
#8 (Rowe)	\$22,900	\$30,900
#13 (Alder)	\$33,400	\$45,100
#19 (Basin N5)	\$1,500	\$1,500
#24 (Hemlock)	\$6,200	\$8,400
Subtotal	\$64,000	\$85,900
<i>Priority: to be determined by City</i>		
#12, Alt.2 (Gervais Cr.)	\$327,400	\$452,000
#12, Alt.1 (Gervais Cr.)	\$546,000	\$747,000
Subtotal	\$327,400-\$546,000	\$452,000-\$747,000
<i>Priority: Medium</i>		
#3 (Pennsylvania)	\$61,400	\$82,900
#7 (3 rd , near Hall)	\$2,100	\$2,800
#14 (Gregory/2nd)	\$50,900	\$68,700
#15 (Gregory/1st)	\$41,000	\$55,400
#17 (Rector)	\$13,300	\$18,000
#23 (4 th)	\$70,400	\$95,000
Subtotal	\$239,100	\$322,800

¹ Hemlock St. project and costs include portions of other projects. Costs attributable to Hemlock St. stabilization independent of other projects are :\$22,500 (construction subtotal) and \$30,400 (project total). See discussion in Section 7.2.

<i>Priority: Low</i>		
#1 (Dichter)	\$18,500	\$29,000
#2 (Dichter/Penn.)	\$3,500	\$8,700
#4 (DuBois)	\$9,900	\$13,400
#5 (DuBois/2nd)	\$6,500	\$8,700
#6 (4 th near Vosburg)	\$2,500	\$7,400
#11 (Hwy 101/Hall)	\$21,900	\$32,700
#16 (Rector/1st)	\$7,100	\$9,600
#18 (Pine/2nd)	\$3,900	\$5,300
#20 (Spruce)	\$14,700	\$19,900
#21 (Hwy 101/Spruce)	\$48,000	\$66,800
#22 (4 th)	\$53,700	\$72,500
Subtotal	\$190,200	\$274,000
Total² (excluding project #12)	\$549,300	\$762,000
Project #12	\$327,400-\$546,000	\$452,000-\$747,000
Total (all projects)	\$876,700- \$1,095,300	\$1,214,000- \$1,509,000

8.2.2 Improvement Scheduling

Actual scheduling of improvements will be dependent on the City's perception of need relative to affordability. Projects should be pursued according to the following schedule:

² Total adjusted according to footnote #1 above.

<u>Priority</u>	<u>Timeline</u>
Urgent	As soon as possible
High	Within next 2 years
Medium	Within next 5 years
Low	Within next 20 years

The timeline is not intended to be an inflexible schedule, but rather a guide based on current perception of problem area and needs. Some low priority projects, because of perceived benefits relative to cost, may be constructed prior to higher priority projects. Also, street improvement projects should incorporate recommended storm drainage improvements regardless of priority classification because of the cost effectiveness of coordinated design and construction.

The relocation of Gervais Creek is a project that will require special consideration by the City because of the cost and complexity involved.

8.3 FINANCING

8.3.1 Local Funding Sources

General Obligation Boards. Financing of improvements by General Obligation (G.O.) Bonds is accomplished by the following procedures:

1. The Consulting Engineer prepares a detailed cost estimate to determine the total monies required for construction.
2. An election is held.
3. When voter approval is granted (by a majority of the registered voters), bonds are offered for sale. The money for detailed planning and construction is obtained prior to preparation of final engineering plans and the start of project construction unless interim financing has been developed.

G.O. bonds are backed by the full credit of the issuer and authorize the issuer to levy ad valorem taxes. The issuer can make the required payments on the bonds solely from the new tax levy or may instead use revenue from assessment, user charges, or some other source.

Oregon Revised Statutes limit the maximum term of G.O. bonds to 40 years for cities; a more common term is 15-20 years.

Revenue Bonds. A revenue bond is one that is payable solely from charges made for the services provided. Such bonds cannot be paid tax levies or special assessments, and their only security is the borrower's promise to operate in a way that will provide sufficient net revenue to meet the obligations of the bond issue. Revenue bonds are most commonly retired with revenue from user fees. To be applicable, the City would need to establish a storm water utility.

Successful issuance of revenue bonds depends on bond market evaluation of the dependability of the revenue pledged. Normally there are no legal limitations on the amount of revenue bonds to be issued, but excessive bond issue amounts are generally unattractive to bond buyers because they represent high investment risk. In rating revenue bonds, buyers consider the economic justification for the project, reputation of the borrower, methods for billing and collection, rate structures, and the degree to which forecasts of net revenues are realistic.

Improvement Bonds (Local Improvement District). Improvement bonds may be issued to assess certain portions of improvements directly against the parties being benefitted. An equitable means of distributing the assessed cost must be utilized so that all property, whether developed or undeveloped, receives the assessment on an equal basis. Cities are limited to improvement bonds not exceeding 3% of true cash value. For a particular improvement, all property within the assessment area is assessed on an equal basis, regardless of whether it is developed or undeveloped.

Improvement bond financing requires that an improvement district be formed, the boundaries be established, and the benefitted properties and property owners are determined. The engineer usually determines an approximate assessment based on a square-foot, a front-foot basis, or a combined basis. Property owners are then given an opportunity to remonstrate against the project. The assessment against the properties is usually not levied until the actual total cost of the project is determined. Since this determination is normally not possible until the project is completed, funds are not available from assessments for the purpose of making monthly payments to the contractor. Therefore, some method of interim financing must be arranged, or a pre-assessment program, based on the estimated total costs, must be adopted. It is common practice to issue warrants, which are paid when the project is completed, to cover debts.

The primary disadvantages to this source of revenue (improvement bonds) are described below:

1. The property to be assessed must have a true cash valuation at least equal to 50% of the total assessments to be levied. This may require a substantial cash payment by owners of undeveloped property.
2. An assessment district is very cumbersome and expensive when facilities for an entire community are contemplated.
3. The project is impacted by tax limitations because the improvement bonds are backed or guaranteed by the city's authority to raise revenue via taxation.

Serial Levies. Under Oregon Revised Statutes, if approved by the voters, the City can levy taxes for a fixed period of time to construct new facilities and maintain existing facilities. Generally, when a serial levy is presented to the voters, it is based upon a specific program and listing of planned improvements.

Sinking Funds. Sinking funds can be established by budget for a particular capital improvement need. Budgeted amounts, from each annual budget, are carried in a sinking fund until sufficient revenue is available for the needed project. Funds can also be developed with revenue derived from system development charges or serial levies.

Assessments. In some cases the beneficiary of a public works improvement can simply be assessed for the cost of the project. It is not uncommon for an industrial or commercial developer to provide up-front capital to pay for a community administered improvement which serves the development.

Storm Water Utility. See Section 8.3.2.

System Development Charges. See Section 8.3.3.

8.3.2 Storm Water Utility

A storm water utility, like a water or wastewater utility, provides a municipal service through the operation and maintenance of a public facility. Few communities currently have storm water utilities; however, they have increased in

recent years as communities try to address storm water management needs on something other than a crisis basis. Revenue derived from user fees can be used for maintenance or capital improvements and associated debt service.

A storm water utility can be established by ordinance. A second ordinance is also needed to establish the rate structure. Rates are typically based on square footage of impermeable surface (roofs, paving, etc.) associated with each property. While equitable, the methodology requires measurements, often scaled off recent aerial photographs, and computations, as well as suitable billing software and data entry. Computations are also updated periodically. To reduce the administrative work, simplifications can be introduced - such as a flat rate for residential customers and a variable rate, based on impermeable square footage for other customers. For a small, predominantly residential community, the most cost-effective rate methodology may be that of a flat rate per water or sewer connection. A flat rate would allow the City to simply add a line item and cost to the water or sewer utility billing. This eliminates the need for computations, special billing software, or modifications, periodic updates, separate billings, and related administrative costs.

The political realities of establishing a storm water utility are such that revenues generated are not likely to truly meet all the City's storm water related needs. Recent literature indicates that a monthly fee of \$3.00 per average residence appears to be an approximate limit of political palatability. For Wheeler, a \$3.00 per month storm water charge attached to the sewer billings (234 active connections³) would yield \$8,424.00 per year. Monies could be used to supplement and expand current public works efforts devoted to stormwater management. Monies could also be used for debt service repayment.

Dedicated efforts by the City to inform and involve the public will be needed to obtain support for the establishment of a storm water utility.

8.3.3 System Development Charges (SDCs)

System Development Charges (SDCs) can be charged to all users of transportation, water, sewer, storm drainage, and parks and recreation facilities. The fee is usually charged as each piece of property is developed in the future and goes into a capital construction fund to pay for improvements required by growth in the community. The Oregon System Development Charges Act, House Bill

³ Source: Nehalem Bay Wastewater Agency

3224, became effective in 1991. Legislation requires that capital improvement plans be developed, and that methodology used to compute SDCs be documented and reviewed by the community before SDCs can be charged.

The Oregon System Development Charges Act permits two types of charges: 1) a reimbursable fee, and 2) an improvement charge. A reimbursable fee is a charge for unused capacity in existing capital improvements. An improvement charge is a fee associated with capital improvements to be constructed. Improvement fees are generally more popular than reimbursement fees, due to the complexity of computing reimbursable fees for infrastructure constructed sometime in the past.

Wheeler does not currently have an SDC for storm water. The City's existing storm water infrastructure is in relatively poor-fair condition and generally does not meet capacity requirements for a 25-year storm event: a reimbursement SDC would not be appropriate initially. An improvement SDC could be developed and should be based on the identified capital improvements summarized in Section 8.2. A methodology for assessing the SDC is necessary. Typically these are based on a square footage (of impermeable surface) allowance and associated costs. From a standpoint of consistency, and ease of development, an SDC based on a fixed fee per new sewer (or water) connection would be compatible with the flat rate methodology recommended in Section 8.3.2.

Housing units have increased at rate exceeding that of population. Between 1990 and 2000, the number of housing units grew at 2.53% AAGR (Section 3.2.3). Assuming a growth rate of 2.5% AAGR for all sewer/water connections in the city yields 628 connections in year 2045 (234 current connections, 2.5% AAGR, 40 year growth⁴). Total CIP costs (Table 8.1) range from \$762,000-\$1,509,000 depending on whether Gervais Creek is relocated and which alternative is developed. Dividing the total CIP costs by 628 projected sewer/water connections yields an estimated improvement SDC of \$1,213 to \$2,403.

8.3.4 Funding Programs

General. There are relatively few state or federal funding programs that provide financial assistance for municipal storm water related improvements. Those that do typically have conditions which limit the eligibility of any given project. Funding programs and policies are constantly evolving and funding priorities are often adjusted according to program budget allocations and prevailing economic

⁴ Assume 40-year design life for culverts.

policies. In general, most storm water improvement projects that address simple hydraulic conveyance (pipes, intakes, culverts, etc.) do not qualify for grant or low interest loan funding.

Funding of some improvements may be possible by focusing on aspects of the projects that may be covered by some of the funding programs potentially available. Specifically, the Hemlock Street improvements (Section 7.2) and the replacement of the 48" culvert on Gervais Creek at 3rd Street (Project 310, Section 7.1.9) could qualify as municipal water projects since the urgency associated with projects is related to the damage that could occur to the City's water system if no action is taken. These projects should therefore be pursued as municipal water projects with the primary goal being the stabilization and protection of the municipal water infrastructure; the secondary goal is the provision of improved storm water infrastructure.

Specific Programs. This section is intended to provide a general overview of recently available programs. **Agency and program policies are continually evolving and specifics are likely to have changed since development of this section.**

Rural Development

The Water and Wastewater Disposal Grants and Loans program is under the administration of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Rural Development (RD), under the old guidelines of Farmers Home Administration (FmHA). The program is limited to rural communities which have a population of less than 10,000 people; community population must not be likely to decline in the foreseeable future. The City meets this criteria.

RD Grant Program. RD utilizes "MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME" (MHI) in their computations for determining eligibility. This allows for single-person households to count as family-type households.

RD is currently basing its grant and loan determination on 2000 census data. Availability of grants from the RD is dependent on the (MHI); projects are competitive with one another on the basis of community need:

Maximum grant availability based on MHI from 2000 census data is as follows:

Less than \$32,984 75% maximum grant

Between \$32,984 and \$41,230 Up to 45% maximum grant
Greater than \$41,230 Ineligible for grant

The City of Wheeler has a MHI (2000 Census) of \$31,161 that could potentially qualify it for maximum grant funding. RD has a limited amount of grant funding available at the state and federal levels and requirements of the Safe Drinking Water Act and Clean Water Act have dramatically increased the current number of applications from Oregon communities. RD also requires eligible communities to finance the project with loans up to the extent of the communities ability to pay; the grant is then available to cover the remainder. The actual formula to determine the maximum burden per household is quite complicated, and costs for commercial users are typically higher. RD determines the debt burden required in each case.

RD Loan Program. The City falls within the established criteria for loans. Please note that this is an excellent financial assistance program. Items which determine a borrower's eligibility are listed below.

- Unable to obtain needed funds from other sources at reasonable rates and terms.
- Have legal capacity to borrow and repay loans, to pledge security for loans, and to operate and maintain the facilities or services.
- Be financially sound and able to manage the facility effectively.
- Have a financially sound facility based on taxes, assessments, revenues, fees, or other satisfactory sources of income to pay all facility costs, including costs that pertain to operation and maintenance. Furthermore, it must be shown that debts will be retired and financial reserves maintained.

RD loans currently have a 4.5 % interest rate: The maximum term for all loans to cities is 40 years. However, no repayment period can exceed any local statutory limitation on obligations.

Funding for storm water improvements that only address hydraulic issues are likely to have a very low priority status with RD. Funding, if available, would likely be loan only. Projects related to municipal water or wastewater utilities, or projects that address water quality issues, could qualify for both grant and low

interest loan funding. Actual grant percentage will be determined by the agency; it is likely to be considerably less than the potential 75% maximum grant.

Community Development Block Grant Program

The State of Oregon Economic and Community Development Department administers the Community Development Block Grant (OCDBG) program. This program is funded by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. Funds allocated under the heading of this grant program are provided for projects designed specifically to improve the conditions of low and moderate income housing areas. The maximum grant for a project is \$750,000 which includes planning, engineering and construction.

To qualify for an OCDBG, the project must meet at least one of the following three national objectives of the federal OCDBG program. The primary national objective is one that limits OCDBG assistance to projects that principally benefit low and moderate income persons. OCDBG funds may be used to develop projects that are needed to benefit current residents, however, they must be built to include sufficient capacity for future development.

The current policy is that at least 51% of a city's population must have low and moderate incomes to be eligible. Grant awards will be based on the 2000 Census data or an OECDD recognized income survey. Wheeler's low to moderate percentage, based on OECDD information, is 45.3 %. At present, the City does not qualify for OCDBG Funding.

Safe Drinking Water Revolving Loan Fund

The Safe Drinking Water Revolving Loan Fund (SDWRLF) was created in 1996 by Congress to assist community and non-profit non-community drinking water system plan, design, and construct drinking water facilities needed to correct non-compliance with current or future drinking water standards. The program is administered by the Oregon Economic and Community Development and is funded by annual grants from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and 20% matching funds through a biennial appropriation from the Oregon State Legislature and/or through bond sales for dedicated project funds.

Highlights of the program include 1% financing (30 year term) for disadvantaged communities. A disadvantaged community is one whose average water cost for a residential customer is at least the state "average" and also meets two of the

following criteria:

- For water system only communities, there is a per capita water system debt of at least \$250. For communities, there is a per capita water system debt of at least \$250. For communities with both water and sewer systems, the combined water and sewer system must be at least \$500 per capita.
- At least 15% low and moderate income persons
- Documented financial burden due to a national or state declared disaster that occurred within the past two years.

Interested applicants submit an initial "Letter of Interest". Projects are then ranked by the Department of Human Services (DHS) and OECDD to form a Project Priority List. Projects are ranked based on existing or potential noncompliance with Safe Drinking Water Act (SDWA) provisions. This program is notable in providing ranking "points" for systems that may be close but not actually in violation of SDWA requirements. Top ranking applicants will be invited to submit a final application. The cut-off for any given year will vary according to the nature of competing projects and the availability of funds.

This is a potential source of funding for projects that involve the City's municipal water system.

DEQ Clean Water State Revolving Fund

The State Revolving Fund (SRF) loan program provides low-interest rate loans to public agencies for the planning, design and construction of water pollution control facilities, as well as for some publicly-owned estuary management and non-point source control projects. This funding program is administered by DEQ. Recent interest rates for 20 year loans are approximately 2.92 % plus an annual fee of 0.5 % of the unpaid balance. These interest rates are subject to change, but will remain below market rates. Priority is given to projects addressing documented water-quality problems and health hazards. SRF funds can also be used for interim financing. Interim financing loans are paid when long-term financing is completed. The interest rate is 1.12 % for interim financing.

To be eligible, a stormwater project would need to either reduce inflow/infiltration to a sanitary sewer system or address issues directly related to water quality.

There were no projects identified for Wheeler that appear to meet the criteria.

Oregon Department of Transportation, Transportation Enhancement Program

The Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) through the Transportation Enhancement Program provides funds for twelve “transportation enhancement activities” that were identified in the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21). Stormwater improvements are potentially covered under “landscaping and scenic beautification” or “environmental mitigation”. Environmental mitigation refers to control of highway runoff or for purposes of wildlife protection only. The projects must also be directly related to surface transportation.

Potential projects are ranked and selected through a competitive process. Successful applicants contribute a minimum of 10.27% matching funds with the balance provided by the agency as a “reimbursement” rather than a grant.

The only project in Wheeler that may be covered by this program is the Gervais Creek relocation if it is developed as a “landscape and scenic beautification project”.

Federal Emergency Management Agency

The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) has two programs that may be utilized for storm water projects that meet program criteria for eligibility. The two programs are:

Flood Mitigation Assistance (FMA) Grant Program. This program provides grant funding to States, Indian tribal governments, and communities for cost-effective approaches to reduce or eliminate the risk of flood damage to buildings insurable under the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP). The FMA program includes three types of grants: Planning, Project, and Technical Assistance (TA). Current program priority is for flood mitigation activities that reduce the number of repetitive losses for structures currently insured by NFIP; however, the agency may also fund projects associated with properties covered by NFIP whether or not they have experienced repetitive losses. (Repetitive loss properties are those that have experienced at least two NFIP claim

payments of over \$1,000 each within any 10-year rolling period.)

To be eligible, a project must, at a minimum, be:

- Cost effective.
- Cost beneficial to the National Flood Insurance Fund
- Technically feasible.
- Physically located in a participating NFIP community or must reduce future flood damages in an NFIP community.

A project must also conform with:

- The minimum standards of the NFIP Floodplain Management Regulations.
- The applicant's Flood Mitigation Plan.
- All applicable laws and regulations, such as Federal and State environmental standards or local building codes.

FEMA may contribute up to 75 percent of the total eligible costs. At least 25 percent of the total eligible costs must be provided by a non-Federal source. Of this 25 percent, no more than half can be provided as in-kind contributions from third parties. There are limits on the frequency of grants and the amount of funding that can be allocated to a State or community in any 5-year period.

Since Project Grant funding requires the applicant to have a Flood Mitigation Plan, either a Planning Grant or a TA Grant may be a necessary pre-requisite to develop the Flood Mitigation Plan (or information needed to develop a viable FMA application or project).

Since waterway channelization is listed as an ineligible activity, the relocation of Gervais Creek may not fall within project guidelines.

Pre-Disaster Mitigation (PDM) Grant Program. This program provides grant funding to States, Indian tribal governments, and communities for

hazard mitigation planning and the implementation of mitigation projects prior to a disaster event. The intent is to reduce the risk to populations and structures and to reduce the reliance on compensation or funding for actual disasters. Like the FMA program, the PDM program requires applicants to have a Flood Mitigation Plan. The program does provide funding for stormwater management projects to reduce or eliminate the long-term risk from flood hazards.

The program provides up to \$3,000,000 of federal money. Grant funding contributes up to 75% of funds needed; at least 25% of the funds needed must be provided as matching funds (with no other federal monies included). Small, impoverished communities may be eligible for up to 90% federal cost-share.

The PDM program does appear to be a viable approach for funding the Gervais Creek relocation project. Applications for 2006 funding are due by January 16, 2006. Should the City decide to pursue funding through FEMA, the City should verify its status with the NFIP and meet with FEMA officials to discuss the project and which FEMA program(s) are applicable - if any. The agency can provide guidance on the application process and may be able to provide sample applications for examples of the level of detail expected. If the City desires, a consultant can prepare the application. Costs for application preparation are likely to be \$5,000 to \$10,000 depending on the scope of work.

8.4 IMPLEMENTATION

8.4.1 Project Selection

The study includes numerous projects; however, only a few require immediate or near-term attention. Of these, the most important is the replacement of the 48" culvert on Gervais Creek at 3rd Street (see Project #10 in Section 7.1.9 for details) with a total project cost of \$48,900. The Hemlock Street stabilization project (see Section 7.2) is also very important, though complex because of potential geotechnical and groundwater factors. Cost for the surface water component is \$53,800; the geotechnical study is on the order of \$30,000. Costs for remedial and stabilization work arising out of the geotechnical study are unknown at this time - as are the costs for reconstructing the road surface. There is no assurance that the recommended surface water improvements alone will fully stabilize the

roadway; however, it does appear likely that further damage will occur on Hemlock if the surface water improvements are not constructed.

The Gervais Creek relocation project (Project #12 in Section 7.1.10) will require special consideration because of the high costs (\$452,000 - \$747,000) and complexity. Costs could escalate depending on requirements of the various agencies involved. If the City desires to proceed, a pre-design report is recommended (\$20,000).

Other projects can be implemented in accordance with project need and affordability. Obviously, projects that are not implemented cannot provide benefits; therefore, the City must understand that “in accordance with project need and affordability” refers to the political reality. The physical reality is that many of these projects are needed now based on the theoretical possibility of large rainfall events.

8.4.2 Financing

In general, financing options for storm water related projects are limited. Of the projects identified, the following may be eligible for grant and low interest loan funding:

RD loan/grant for municipal water improvement project

• Project #10 (Gervais at 3 rd Street)	\$48,900
• Hemlock Street (Section 7.2) surface water improvements	\$53,800
• <u>Hemlock Street geotechnical</u>	<u>\$30,000</u>
Total:	\$132,700

FEMA or ODOT

• <u>Gervais Creek relocation (Project #12)</u>	
Total:	\$452,000 - \$747,000

Other projects do not appear to be eligible for the grant/loan programs identified.

Funding options are limited to those identified in Section 8.3.1

It is recommended that the City develop SDCs for future storm water improvements (Section 8.3.3). Development of an SDC methodology by a consultant for storm water is likely to cost approximately \$3,000. SDC monies are not likely to accumulate at a rate that will allow significant, near-term construction of needed improvements.

It is also recommended that the City create a storm water utility (Section 8.3.2). Keeping the rate structure very simple (example: \$3.00 flat fee per sanitary sewer connection) can generate a reliable cash flow that can be used for debt service or maintenance activities. A \$3.00 per month storm water charge attached to the sewer billings (234 connections) would yield \$8,424.00 per year.

8.4.3 Ordinances

It is recommended that the City of Wheeler consider promulgation of an Erosion and Sediment Control (ESC) ordinance (see Section 7.4). Example ESC ordinances may be obtained from other municipalities with an existing ordinance or it can be provided by a professional consulting firm. Many Oregon cities have such ordinances currently in place. The League of Oregon Cities may be able to provide Wheeler a contact list.

To ensure that future development incorporates rational storm water planning and design, the City should consider development and adoption of storm drainage ordinances (see Section 7.6). Ordinances can be prepared by an engineering or planning consultant with final review and editing by an attorney.

Other storm water related ordinances that may be needed relate to the recommended SDC methodology and establishment of a storm water utility (see Section 8.4.2).

8.4.4 Maintenance

Maintenance activities should be conducted in accordance with the discussion in Section 7.5. To facilitate maintenance activities, it is recommended that the City purchase a backhoe. A good used backhoe will cost approximately \$30,000.

8.4.5 Public Information

Dissemination of information to the public regarding storm water issues in general (as well as for specific projects, policies, ordinances, etc.) is essential for community support of needed actions by the City. With regard to improved water quality, it is probably the most important action the City can take. Understanding the impact and transport of household chemicals and pet wastes can make a real and favorable impact on how people manage their house and yards. Public discussion can help stimulate interest in storm water related issues and water quality; this in turn can generate support for needed projects. Both Planning Commission meetings and City Council meetings can provide some information for projects and storm water related issues that have become sufficiently important for those bodies to discuss or consider.

Newspaper articles are a good way of getting general information to the public. Mailings may not be a good approach unless they are very well written, short (1 page), and formatted to catch someone's attention before its relegated to the "circular" file.

Public meetings, in general, are not well attended, even when advertised, unless people are responding to perceived direct impacts to their lives⁵. More targeted meetings, presentations, or discussions are likely to be better attended and received. Examples might include presentation to school classes, scouts, or various civic groups. Experts in various fields or representatives from various agencies may also be able to attend or even make the presentations themselves.

With regard to public information, the most difficult part is in determining who or how to implement it. One possibility is to form a committee within the Council or a citizen's committee with close ties to the Council or Planning Commission. The committee should consist of people interested in the topic and capable of researching the needed information, making contacts, and implementing specific approaches.

⁵ For example, the largest attendance at a Council meeting is likely to be at the next meeting after a storm water utility billing is sent out, rather than at the meetings leading up to the formation of a storm water utility.