



Los Angeles/Ventura Chapter

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Derek Leavitt, *Modative, Inc.*
President

Barry Altshuler, *Equity Residential*
Vice President

Neils Cotter, *Carmel Partners*
Vice President

Derek Fraychineaud, *CIM Group*
Vice President

Larry Hoffman, *Fassberg Contracting Corporation*
Vice President

Ken Kahan, *California Landmark*
Vice President

Dave Little, *Pardee Homes*
Vice President

Greg McWilliams, *FivePoint*
Vice President

Monica Mejia, *LINC Housing*
Vice President

Frank Su, *Toll Brothers*
Vice President

Tom Warren, *Holland Partners*
Vice President

Henrik Nazarian, *D & D Engineering, Inc.*
Secretary, Treasurer

Kevin Harbison, *Shea Homes*
Immediate Past-President

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Rocco Cordola, *Gothic Landscape*

Donna Deutchman, *Homes 4 Families*

George Dickerson, *All Promotions Etc.*

Richard Dunbar, *Oakridge Landscape, Inc.*

Tommy Eckes, *Richmond American Homes*

Joseph Fillippelli, *Wells Fargo*

Mike Frasco, *Bio Clean Environmental Services*

Amy Freilich, *Armbruster Goldsmith & Delvac LLP*

Laurel Gillette, *KTGY Architecture + Planning, Inc.*

Ellen Golla, *DB Companies*

Peter Gutierrez, *Latham & Watkins*

Andy Henderson, *The Henderson Law Firm*

Marc Huffman, *Brookfield Residential*

Krysti Irving, *Landscape Development, Inc.*

Karl Mallick, *David Evans & Associates,*

Bill McReynolds, *Warmington Group*

Greg Medeiros, *Tejon Ranch Company*

Monica Mejia, *LINC Housing*

Eileen Merino, *CDS Insurance*

Greg McWilliams, *Five Point*

Brian Murtaugh, *Loan Depot*

John Musella, *The Musella Group*

Rogelio Navar, *Fifteen Group*

Adam Ochs, *Reylen*

Scott Ouellette, *Williams Homes*

Erik Pfahler, *Borstein Enterprises*

Harriet Rapista, *Comstock Homes*

Darrell Simien, *Habitat for Humanity of Greater LA*

Sara Soudani, *Commonwealth Title Insurance*

Harriet Rapista, *Comstock Homes*

Alyssa Trebil, *DuctTesters, Inc.*

Brett Trebil, *Watt Communities*

Rich Villaseñor, *KB Home*

Christine Villegas, *Chelsea Investment Corp*

Rick White, *Larrabure Framing*

November 14, 2019

Dan Mortensen, Chair
B. J. Atkins
Ed Cooley
Robert DiPrimio
Maria Gutzeit
R. J. Kelly
Finance and Administration Committee
Santa Clarita Valley Water Agency
27234 Bouquet Canyon Road
Santa Clarita, CA 91350

Subject: Revised Facility Capacity Fee Rates

Dear Chair Mortensen and Committee Members,

We would first like to thank staff and acknowledge the robust communication and review process that has been undertaken to work toward a credible and defensible Facility Capacity Fee update. Based upon this process, many potential disputes have been eliminated. However, there are a couple of remaining items that prevent us from being able to support the staff recommended update. We have listed our specific areas of concern below where we feel there is a lack of information to properly establish the required nexus between the fee and the benefit provided to future growth.

Proposed Fees Not Equitable

Staff is proposing to use the 95th percentile value for calculated Facility Capacity Fees. We feel this is not equitable to future growth and would exceed the estimated reasonable cost of providing the service. Using the 95th percentile value assumes that 95% of the time the fee amounts would be over-collected and 5% of the time the fee amounts would be under-collected. This would also mean that existing users are shouldering 5% of the risk and future users are shouldering 95% of the risk.

We feel this is in violation of Government Code Section 66013 that requires local agencies to not impose fees for water connections or



Los Angeles/Ventura Chapter

capacity charges that exceed the estimated reasonable cost of providing the service for which the fee or charge is imposed.

Therefore, we recommend support of the ratepayer advocates approach of using the 50th percentile value which is mathematically considered the “most likely scenario”. This would be equitable to both future users and existing users since it would mean that 50% of the time the fee amounts would be over-collected and 50% of the time the fee amounts would be under-collected. This would place an equal risk level on both existing and future users.

Not Adequate Justification for Using Extremely High Confidence Interval

Existing Debt – There may be an attempt to justify a 95th percentile value by claiming that new users are responsible for an existing debt of more than \$300,000,000. To our knowledge there does not exist a summary of projects or any listing of actual facilities or rights which have been constructed or bought with this debt. Without a description of the facility or right acquired by the debt, we find no nexus between this debt and new users. This existing debt should not be considered as justification for an unequitable distribution to future users.

Over Inflation of Future Portion of the CIP - Facility Capacity Fees (FCFs) are likely already inflated because the future portion of the CIP is being funded exclusively with FCFs and credit is not given for property tax from undeveloped land or for homes built after the future/existing allocations were established. FCFs and associated interest are the only revenue sources to pay for future users’ share of debt from the Capital Improvement Program. All revenue from the 1% property tax fund is assigned to pay for the existing users’ portion of the CIP. Undeveloped land and subdivided, vacant lots pay into the 1% fund through property taxes. These revenues are used to pay the existing users’ portion of the CIP, not the future users’ portion.

Thank you for your consideration of these suggestions and comments. Should you have any questions, please contact me at (213) 797-5967 or at tpiasky@bialav.org.

Sincerely,

Tim Piasky
Chief Executive Officer
BIA-Los Angeles/Ventura

Sent via e-mail