## MEMORANDUM

DATE: October 13, 2020
To: Honorable Mayor \& City Council
CC: Dave Bennett, Director of Public Works/City Engineer; Mark Elliott, Police Chief; Mitzi Baker, Community Development Director; Deb Little, City Clerk; Michelle Mahowald, Communications \& Human Resources Director; Teresa Jensen, Director of Library and Information Technology Resources; Chris Hood, City Attorney
From: Ben Martig, City Administrator
RE: "Supplemental Agenda Background Memo" for October 13, 2020 No. 1.

## Summary Report:

The following is an update on agenda items as supplemental background agenda information made available for Tuesday, October 13, 2020.

## Item \#3 Review Franchise Fee Ordinance

Please see attached presentation that will be provided by staff this evening. City Administrator Martig will be presenting. Finance Director Brenda Angelstad and Doug Green, Director of Baker Tilly Municipal Advisors will be in attendance for additional information and questions.

Item \#5 Discussion of 2021-2022 Budget and including potential grants in accordance with the City Council grants policy.
Staff is working on additional information related to this agenda item. Some additional slides will be presented at the meeting.


## City of Northfield, Minnesota City Council Updates

Franchise Fee Review
October 13, 2020

## Goals and Outcomes for Work Session

I. Review legal opinion regarding franchise fee implementation
II. Updated Scenario: Flat Fee by broad customer classes
III. Potential inequities from a flat fee approach
IV. Potential Solution: Flat Fee based on more specific customer classes.
V. Background on options (previously pres ented)
VI. Obtain Council direction

## Legal Opinion on Franchise Fee Implementation

- Working assumption that the City had broad authority to impose franchise fee based on an implementation method of its choosing, i.e. flat monthly fee; \% of revenue; \% of usage, etc.
- The City obtained a legal opinion from Flaherty Hood P.A. that the existing franchise agreement from December 2012 stated that any future franchise fee:
"shall be a flat fee per customer based on metered service to retail customers within the City or on some other similar basis."
- Result is the City cannot impose a fee based on a percent of usage without the consent of Xcel Energy, which is unlikely.


## Updated Scenario: Flat Fee by broad customer classes

|  | Approx \# of Premises |  | Option 1 |  | Option 2 |  | Option 3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \% Equivalent |  | 3\% |  | 4\% |  | 5\% |  |
| Electric |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Residential | 6,527 | \$ | 2.50 | \$ | 3.25 | \$ | 4.00 |
| Small C\&l: Non-Demand | 485 | \$ | 3.00 | \$ | 4.00 | \$ | 5.00 |
| Small C\&l: Demand | 225 | \$ | 24.25 | \$ | 32.50 | \$ | 40.25 |
| Large C\&1 | 55 | \$ | 740.00 | \$ | 990.00 | \$ | 1,235.00 |
| Public Street Lighting | 11 | \$ | - | \$ |  | \$ | - |
| Municipal Pumping: Non-Demand | 1 | \$ | - | \$ |  | \$ | - |
| Municipal Pumping: Demand | 0 | \$ | - | \$ |  | \$ | - |
| Total | 7,304 | \$ | 724,000.00 | \$ | 960,000.00 | \$ | 1,193,000.00 |
| \% Equivalent |  | 3\% |  | 4\% |  | 5\% |  |
| Gas |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Residential | 5,265 | \$ | 1.25 | \$ | 1.75 | \$ | 2.25 |
| Commercial Firm: Non-Demand | 510 | \$ | 7.50 | \$ | 10.00 | \$ | 12.50 |
| Commercial Firm: Demand | 10 | \$ | 292.00 | \$ | 390.00 | \$ | 485.00 |
| Small Interruptible | 1 | \$ | 59.75 | \$ | 80.00 | \$ | 99.50 |
| Medium \& Large Interruptible | 1 | \$ | 1,126.00 | \$ | 1,500.00 | \$ | 1,880.00 |
| Firm Transportation | 0 | \$ | - | \$ |  | \$ | - |
| Interruptible Transportation | 0 | \$ | - | \$ |  | \$ | - |
| Total | 5,787 | \$ | 172,000.00 | \$ | 235,000.00 | \$ | 298,000.00 |

- Xcel's position is that fee must be based on customer classes shown in table.
- Updated scenario calculates flat fee based on a percent increase in average annual charge for each customer class.
- A 3.5\% electric increase and $5.0 \%$ gas increase $=\sim \$ 1.140$ million
- Residential customers'electric and gas bills increase $\$ 61.50$ annually.


## Potential Inequities in Flat Fee

- Each customer within same customer class pays same amount.
- Small inequities in residential but potential large inequities in commercial and industrial.
- Electric General Service (non-residential) definitions:
o Small Rate Classes - Less than or equal to 100 kW per day
o Large Rate Classes - Greater than 100 kW per day

| Example of Discrepency | Average Daily <br> Usage $(\mathrm{kWh})$ | Annual <br> Electric Bill | Annual <br> Franchise Fee (4\%)* | Percent of <br> Annual Bill |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Electric Large C\&I Customer Class |  |  |  |  |
| General Service Premise (Actual Data) | 450 kWh | $\$ 16,000$ | $\$ 11,880$ | $74.3 \%$ |
| Peak Control Premise (Actual Data) | $34,000 \mathrm{kWh}$ | $\$ 998,000$ | $\$ 11,880$ | $1.2 \%$ |
| Peak Control Premise (Actual Data) | $5,400 \mathrm{kWh}$ | $\$ 230,000$ | $\$ 11,880$ | $5.2 \%$ |
| *\$990 per month times 12 months |  |  |  |  |

- Gas Commercial Non-Demand definitions:
o Small Rate Classes - Less than 6,000 therms per year
o Large Rate Classes - Greater than 6,000 therms per year


## Additional background: Xcel categorizes and bills customers based on multiple criteria, including types of customer and usage



## Possible Alternative Solution: Flat Fee on More Specific Definitions of Customer Class - Electric

| ELECTRIC | Approx \# of <br> Premises | Monthly <br> Franchise Fee |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | ---: |
| Small C\&I: Non-Demand |  |  |  |
| Between $0-50 \mathrm{kWh}$ | $?$ | $\$$ | 2.50 |
| Between $50-100 \mathrm{kWh}$ | $\underline{?}$ | $\$$ | 3.50 |
| Total | 485 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Small C\&I: Non-Demand |  |  |  |
| Between $0-50 \mathrm{kWh}$ | $?$ | $\$$ | 20.00 |
| Between $50-100 \mathrm{kWh}$ | $\underline{?}$ | $\$$ | 30.00 |
| Total | 225 |  |  |
| Large C\&I |  |  |  |
| Between $100-500 \mathrm{kWh}$ | $?$ | $\$$ | 600.00 |
| Between $501-1,000 \mathrm{kWh}$ | $?$ | $\$$ | 750.00 |
| Greater than $1,000 \mathrm{kWh}$ | $\underline{?}$ | $\$$ | $1,000.00$ |
| Total | 55 |  |  |

- Electric General Service (non-residential) definitions:
- Small Rate Classes - Less than or equal to 100 kW per day
- Large Rate Classes - Greater than 100 kW per day
- Xcel's position is that fee must be based on customer classes and that any additional us age calculation would not be allowed


## Possible Alternative Solution: Flat Fee on More Specific Definitions of Customer Class - Gas

| GAS |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | ---: |
| Gas Commercial Firm: | Approx \# of <br> Premises | Monthly <br> Franchise Fee |  |
| Small Rate Class | $?$ | $\$$ | 5.00 |
| Large Rate Class | $\underline{?}$ | $\$$ | 10.00 |
| Total | 510 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Gas Commercial Firm: <br> Demand |  |  |  |
| Small Rate Class | $?$ | $\$$ | 275.00 |
| Large Rate Class | 10 | $\$$ | 325.00 |
| Total |  |  |  |

- Gas Commercial Non-Demand definitions:
- Small Rate Classes - Less than 6,000 therms per year
- Large Rate Classes - Greater than 6,000 therms per year
- Xcel's position is that fee must be based on customer classes and that any additional usage calculation would not be allowed


## Background on options (previously presented)

## Special Assessments

## Advantages:

- Common tool to fund and finance infrastructure improvements.
- Relationship between value received / cost of service and amount paid.
- Tax-exempt properties pay for improvements they benefit from.
- Reduces overall property tax rate.
- Can be used to cash flow projects, i.e. reduce size of bond issues.


## Dis advantages:

- Process is complex, long and expensive
- LMC Guide to Special Assessments is over 100 pages.
- No perfect method for assessing property.
- Special Benefits Test is difficult to prove at times.
- Time consuming to administer.
- Multiple deferral options can make revenue projections difficult.


## How do other cities fund street improvement projects?

- Special Assessments
o Percent ranges from 0\%(Minnetonka) to 100\% (Edina)
o No one method is the same
- Annual Levy for Mill and Overlay
o Only bond for full street reconstruction projects
- Infrastructure Replacement Reserve Fund (M.S. 471.572)
o Commonly referred to as a Permanent Improvement Replacement (PIR) fund
o Provides additionally flexibility by pooling funds
o Can be used to cash flow projects prior to bonding
- Assessment Funds
o Similar to a PIR Fund
o Monies used to pay cash for street projects, reducing borrowing amount
o Future assessments replenish the fund


## Comparable City Information

- Mix of franchise fee revenue uses.
- Majority still assess for improvement projects.
- Elk River eliminated assessments in 2013.
- Created a franchise fee rebate program to reimburse property owners with outstanding assessments.

|  | Annual Franchise <br> Fee Revenue | Receiving <br> Fund | Assess for <br> Street Projects |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Forest Lake | $\$ 730,000$ | Capital Projects | No |
| St Louis Park | $\$ 3,100,000$ | Pavement <br> Management Fund | No |
| Owatonna (1) | Unknown | General Fund | Yes |
| Elk River (2) | $\$ 1,400,000$ | Management Fund | No |
| New Brighton | $\$ 900,000$ | General Fund | Yes |
| Stillwater | $\$ 470,000$ | General Fund | Yes |
| South St Paul | $\$ 1,100,000$ | General Fund | Yes |
| Faribault | $\$ 761,000$ | GF, DSF, CIP | Yes |
| White Bear Lake | $\$ 309,000$ | General Fund | Yes |
| New Hope | GF \& Street Fund | No |  |

(1) Owatonna Public Utilities (OPU) does not charge the City for electric use. Amount equals approximately $4 \%$ of OPU electric revenues.
(2) 2013 rebate program for outstanding special assessments.

## Comparable Cities

- 9 of 13 comparable cities have franchise cities.
- 6 of 13 have franchise fee and assessments.
- All cities either collect franchise fees or assessments.

| City | Annual Franchise Fee Revenue | Receiving Fund | Assess for Street Projects |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West St. Paul | \$1,200,000 | Multiple | Yes |
| South St Paul | \$1,100,000 | General Fund | Yes |
| New Brighton | \$900,000 | General Fund | Yes |
| Faribault | \$761,000 | GF, DSF, CIP | Yes |
| Stillwater | \$470,000 | General Fund | Yes |
| White Bear Lake | \$309,000 | General Fund | Yes |
|  |  | Pavement Management |  |
| St Louis Park | \$3,100,000 | Fund | No |
|  |  | Pavement Management |  |
| Elk River | \$1,400,000 | Fund | No |
| New Hope | \$945,000 | GF \& Street Fund | No |
| Forest Lake | \$730,000 | Capital Projects | No |
| Hastings | No | N/A | Yes |
| Columbia Heights | No | N/A | Yes |
| Crystal | No | No | Yes |
| Owatonna (1) | Unknown | General Fund | Yes |
|  |  |  |  |
| (1) Owatonna Public Utilities (OPU) does not charge the City for electric use. Amount equals approximately $4 \%$ of OPU electric revenues. |  |  |  |

## Current Trend: Franchise Fees

## Advantages:

- Franchise fees are paid by all properties within the City, including tax-exempt properties.
- Divers ifies the City's revenue sources, potentially reducing reliance on property taxes, local government aid and assessments.
- Provides a reliable source of revenue.
- Easy for the City to administer and no administrative costs are charged by the utility companies.


## Dis advantages:

- A flat-rate franchise fee is the same for all residential homes, regardless of the value of their property or utility usage.
- Depending on various circumstances (type of business, utility us age, amount of fee, etc.), franchise fees can be a financial hardship on commercial businesses.
- Like property taxes, franchise fees may make a city less desirable than surrounding communities that do not impose franchise fees.


## Recommendations

- Use General Obligation Improvement Bonds for New Constructions if Authorized by Council Upon Request by Developer
- Use G.O. Street Reconstruction Plan Bonds for Reconstructions and Mill \& Overlay
- Property tax and franchise fees
- Use Tax Abatement Bonds or Cash for Sidewalks, Trails, Others
- Property Tax and/or franchise fees

| Authorized Uses | G.O. Improvement Bonds | $\begin{gathered} \text { G.O. Street } \\ \text { Reconstruction } \\ \text { Plan Bonds } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | G.O. <br> Abatement Bonds |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Repair \& Replace Utilities* |  |  |  |
| Water Lines | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ |
| Sanitary Sewer Lines | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ |
| Storm and Gutters | - | - | $\bullet$ |
| Repair \& Replace Streets |  |  |  |
| Reconstruct and Overlays | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ |
| Adding Turn Lanes | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ |
| Widening Streets | $\bullet$ |  | - |
| Installing New Streets | $\bullet$ |  | $\bullet$ |
| Installing New Curbs and Gutters | $\bullet$ |  | $\bullet$ |
| Improving Sidewalks | $\bullet$ |  | - |
| Exception: Public Safety Function |  | $\bullet$ |  |
| Payment \& Process |  |  |  |
| Payment Source | Min 20\% Assess | Any | Any |
| Council Approval - Ordering Imp. | 5/7 | N/A | N/A |
| Council Approval - Bonds | Majority | Two-Thirds | Majority |
| Subject to Reverse Referendum | No | Yes | No |
| Number of Public Hearings | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| Subject to Debt Limit | No | Yes | No |
| Timing of Process | Min 6 months | Approx 3 mo | Approx 3 mo |
| Cost of Process | 1\% of constr. | None | \$10K |
| *Cities can repair and replace utilities under the Street Reconstruction |  |  |  |
| Plan authority if it is in conjuntion with a street project. |  |  |  |

## Franchise Fee Implementation Options

## Four Implementation Options

1. Flat fee per utility account

- Example: $\$ 4$ per month

2. Percentage of consumption used by each utility account

- Example: $\$ 0.0050$ per KWh for electric and $\$ 0.040$ per therm for gas)

3. Percent of Revenue

- Example: 3.0\% of monthly bill

4. Hybrid of flat fee and percent of us age or revenue

- Example: Flat fee for residential and percentage of usage or revenue for commercial and industrial)


## Implementation Considerations

- Xcel Energy's policy is to only implement a flat fee structure.
- Flat rate structure provides stable revenue stream, rather than one based on consumption or revenue.
- Percentage fee structure provides a more equitable fee across all users as it ensures the largest users pay a proportionally higher fee.
- Under a flat rate structure, setting an increasing flat fee for the various customer classes would be a way to mitigate the inequities.
- Financial impact on companies and institutions within the City.


## Special Assessment Background and Considerations

- Approximately $\$ 2.6$ million principal outstanding (includes $\$ 1.3$ million for 2020 projects)
- Approximately 580 properties with assessments outstanding (includes 2020 projects)
- Average historical assessment revenue is approximately $\$ 500,000$
- Due to larger projects and inflation included in 2020-2024 CIP, future assessment revenue is expected to be approximately $\$ 970,000$ annually by 2025
- There is no legal authority to forgive outstanding assessments
- Potential Franchise Fee Rebate Program:
o Property owners with outstanding assessments are rebated franchise fees (annually)
o Estimated cost is $\$ 50,000$ annually beginning in 2022 and decreasing $\$ 5,000$ each year


## Franchise Fee Revenue Requirements

- Approximately \$1.2 million needed annually to be budget neutral
o Minimum staff recommended revenue to be generated to pursue this fee
o $100 \%$ of future annual special assessment revenue
o Franchise fee rebate program for existing property owners paying assessments
o Other lost revenue


## Options \& Policy Direction

Option 1: Replace special assessments with franchise fees

- Us ing flat fee as presented (modeled after 3.5\% electric and 5\% gas percentage)

Option 2: Replace special assessments with franchise fees plus added fees for climate goals

- Option 2a. Increase in franchise fee to generate $\$ 100,000$ extra.
- Us ing flat fee as presented (modeled after $4.0 \%$ electric and $5 \%$ gas percentage)
- Funds go to Climate Action Plan implementation or related Carbon Reduction Strategies
- Option 2b. Increase franchise fee to generate some other increment besides $\$ 100,000$
- Funds go to Climate Action Plan implementation or related Carbon Reduction Strategies

Option 3: Replace special assessments with franchise fees plus added fees for increasing streets and pedestrian trail improvements

- Option 2a. Increase in franchise fee to generate $\$ 100,000$ extra.
- Using flat fee as presented (modeled after $4.0 \%$ electric and $5 \%$ gas percentage)
- Funds go to toward expanding street reconstructions, pothole filling, sealcoating, trails and sidewalks, etc.
- Option 2b. Increase franchise fee to generate some other increment besides $\$ 100,000$
- Funds go to toward expanding street reconstructions, pothole filling, sealcoating, trails and sidewalks, etc.

Option 4: Do not pursue franchise fees and maintain assessment practice

## Assessments vs Franchise Fee: Impact on Residential Users

- Franchise fee approximately $10 \%$ of annual assessment cost, but ongoing.

OPTION 1

- Annual Average Franchise Fee Residential

Gas $\quad \$ 27.00$
Electric \$34.50
Total \$61.50

- Average Residential Special Assessment
$\$ 6,800$ (can be paid in entirety)
$\$ 680$ per year (10-years repayment option)
OPTION 2 OR 3 WITH ADDITIONAL \$100,000
- Annual Average Franchise Fee Residential

Gas $\quad \$ 27.00$
Electric $\$ 39.00$
Total \$66.00

- Average Residential Special Assessment
$\$ 6,800$ (can be paid in entirety)
$\$ 680$ per year (10-years repayment option)


## Assessments vs Franchise Fee: Impact on "most typical" commercial

- Franchise fee approximately $10 \%$ of annual assessment cost, but ongoing.

OPTION 1

- Annual Average Franchise Fee Residential

Gas $\quad \$ 150.00$
Electric \$ 42.00
Total $\$ 192.00$

- Average Residential Special Assessment
$\$ 6,800$ (can be paid in entirety)
\$680 per year (10-years repayment option)
OPTION 2 OR 3 WITH ADDITIONAL \$100,000
- Annual Average Franchise Fee Residential

Gas $\quad \$ 150.00$
Electric \$ 48.00
Total \$198.00

- Average Residential Special Assessment
\$6,800 (can be paid in entirety)
\$680 per year (10-years repayment option)


## Tentative Timelines

| October $13^{\text {th }}$ | Council Worksession |
| :--- | :--- |
| October $20^{\text {th }}$ | Review Ordinance <br> Call for Public Hearing |
| October $21^{\text {st }}-$ Nov. $17^{\text {th }}$ | Public Information on Ordinance Consideration |
| November $10^{\text {th }}$ | Public Hearing <br> First Reading Ordinance |
| November $17^{\text {th }}$ Second Reading of Ordinance |  |
| November $18^{\text {th }}$ | Notice to Xcel (90-day implementation) |
| 2021 | Revenue Commencement |

## Councilor Questions \& Discussion

A. Are you supportive to proceed with timeline including first ordinance consideration next Tuesday?
B. Thoughts on interest to pursue the alternative option related to proposing the modified flat fee to include fixed usage amounts for commercial/industrial?
C. Which of the options are of interest to you based on this update?

Option 1
Option 2
Option 3
Option 4

