



1. Did you attend the interested parties meeting or watch the video streaming of the meeting regarding the proposed water rates structure on Nov. 7?

39 responses




2. Do you expect to be impacted by either of the proposed water rates structures?

39 responses




3. Do you feel that water conservation is important for the City of Columbia?

39 responses



4. Do you support the consultant's proposed water rate structure plans?

39 responses



5. Do you have any comments or suggestions?

31 responses

Yes, I believe your rate schedule is WAY out of line. I am receiving a COLA adjustment of just less than 3% (I'm very fortunate); this plan calls for an increase of more than 13% over the next two years. It doesn't get better as the years progress. However, it is a way to pay for the immediate and long-term shortfall in costs to provide the utility. As long as Water and Light is audited successfully, I will deal with it. That is, until I move elsewhere.

Brown lawns for everyone! Multiple tier system is terrible, many high bills because I like my house to look nice. Your electric "tier" system feels like you just make the rates up on the fly to just get whatever you want. I feel taken advantage of.

The taxes are way too high in Columbia. These plans are supposed to be for water improvement but in addition to that increase, it is an additional 10% to the city by way of the PILOT fee. Either of these plans causes my City water, sewer and trash average monthly bill to be \$10-\$19 month higher than my average Boone electric and Ameren gas bills.

Rescind the Water Bond Election and start over!!

Unsure

Fixed rate the same for 14 or 15 ccf would be nice

I am a single elderly person who uses hardly any water in the winter. I try to responsibly water my lawn at a bare minimum to keep it alive by using a underground built in irrigation system. I feel I am penalized even though I try to water sensibly due to the large difference between my minimal water usage in the winter and the usage in the summer. It doesn't take much to have a high increase when you only use barely 1 ccf in the winter! The other issue I would like addressed is the extra costs that people who have irrigation systems already incur to water more sensibly than those who water with a hose and a fan sprinkler! I pay \$55 dollar a year to have my back flow tested due to city regulations. I also pay another \$115 dollars a year to have a service plan to maintain the sprinkler system. In addition to these expenses the city charges me another \$2.20 a month or \$26.40 a year for the (backflow devise charge, the backflow pilot fee and taxes). When those expenses were first added years ago I called about the expenses I was told that the additional money was needed for the office staff to be able to "file" the report to the Department of Natural Resources. When I called the DNR office and asked about that process they told me that the city does not file any such report with them!. That amount times all the customers with the back flow devise in the city would be way more than what is needed for any clerical person to file the reports once a year. I feel like there has not been any clarity or transparency on this issue and they were looking for ways to get more income and picked a target customer group to gain more income! When I first bought my house the city employees actually did the back flow checks for us so allot of expenses have already been shifted directly to we customers away from the city. I feel if you really want those with irrigation systems to function they should also offer a more affordable way for us to have a separate meter so we don't have to also pay sewer charges on water used for irrigation. I tried to do that recently when I redid my system and it was cost prohibitive and I got no support from the city. Do commercial enterprises buy their second meter to keep track of irrigation water used? I would told I would have to buy the meter! If some new rate structure is put in place that would charge those with irrigation systems even more than the additional costs of the \$26.40 a month should be dropped and provisions should be provided so that a meter can be used to keep track of irrigation water so that sewage is not added to the cost as well. I would also like to see water billed in increments of 1ccf. I have been gone before for almost a month and am still changed about the same rate for my water even when it was shut off to the house.

From what I understand, the third tier is being added to foster conservation. All tiers should have a financial incentive to conserve.

I feel the average CCF per household should be more than the under 1,000 CCFs I read in the literature. I am one in a household of two adults and, according to our recent bill, we use less than 3,000 CCFs at non-summer rate (for a monthly water total of \$24). We conserve water but at the new suggested summer rates the cost would go up more than \$150 for the month. That doesn't include any additional CCFs used for irrigation so it would increase even more than \$150. If new rates need to be implemented, they need to increase at much more gradual rate over a longer period of time for less rate shock.

I recognize that the water treatment facilities need to be improved and expanded. The bonds also need to be retired and that will necessarily affect rates. I merely caution that there needs to be a balance that encourages enough use to retire the bonds. Rates that are too punitive will cause us all to be very conservative and impact overall revenue.

I would like more information on how the outside city customer's rate at 1.33 times and water district rates at 1.157 times of inside city was figured.

I support a tiered structure. Use more, pay more.

I support the fixed rate plan because it encourages people to conserve water year-round. The WQA method actually encourages water waste during the winter because with higher winter usage, the summer value (170%) is more generous than it would be if water had been conserved in the winter.

I represent the Osage Group of the Sierra Club which supports the third tier winter averaging alternative. We think this will encourage water conservation, defer the need to expand the treatment plant, and not penalize larger households. I also support this as an individual homeowner.

I don't think I should pay more in the summer for the same amount of water as the winter. (Average winter use was 6 and average summer use was 5) and the charges were higher in the summer.

It looks like the focus is on conservation. I agree that we shouldn't have irrigation for a certain look of the buildings and their surroundings. I wonder if the water plant will still need to be fixed. As the city grows in populations, the water plant will need to be fixed and expanded. Will we be asked to pay for expansion of water plant that has been neglected. I wonder how the big businesses like that organic dairy processing will be paying. Will the commercial users have to pay more for their water? They will use lots of water. I assume Oscar Meyer plant also uses a ridiculous amount of water. What do they pay? All the handouts seem to focus on residential water tiers. Winter quarter average seems to favor residents that use about water throughout winter. It seems like if you use 10 CCF for average all year long it would be a bargain. Since my winter quarter average is low I would be penalized for using extra water in the summer. I do not irrigate on a regular daily or nightly in summer. This affects some citizens on fixed income terribly.

There are 20+ neighborhood associations- is there some way to rollout this information to these groups?

Very concerned about Aurora Dairy and how their usage will affect our water treatment system. All depends on their actual usage. Will it be within the 50 CCF high on your charts? Will it be 5000 or 500 CCF? We can't assess their impact without data. None of their usage should be at Tier 1.

Does the sewer fee move in lock step? What about a conservation discount in summer? I use 2 CCFs in winter but have a large garden in summer.

I would like to see the same rate applied for commercial and individual use. I would like there to be a rate break for community gardens. I would like there to be a penalty-fine for water wasters- those who water sidewalks and streets. Thank you for your conservation efforts!

More education on conservation ie Water Sense. Concern about non-profits like community garden programs. Impact on low income rental residents. Impact on seniors who may winter elsewhere and cannot use winter billing plan.

Ground cover not grass

Any effort to help consumers conserve is appreciated. We use 3 - 5 CCFs on average.

Build north of Columbia an additional treatment plant. Large usage customers need to pay more.

Give strong conservation incentives all year to all customers. Keep base rates low. Phase out support for irrigation; phase in individual responsibility.

I like aspects of both plans. From a conservation standpoint, I think the Fixed Charge Plan will have more impact. From a generating revenue to pay for future infrastructure, I like the Winter Average Plan. Either way, I support the change.

Need to evaluate my bill and usage and think about how to implement better irrigation usage in the summer to conserve. Summer is the problem.

If you use more you pay more. Cheaper in summer does not make sense if trying to encourage conservation year round.

As an association with lots of meters for common areas (pools, irrigation, etc.) our bill for this August vs next August (based on some use) represents a 98.7% increase. I appreciate the attempt to have little impact on residential users, however, many residents live in multifamily (condos, town homes, apts) and will have additional costs passed on through increased assessment on rent. We will (as an association board) likely begin looking at strategies to begin redesigning summer water usage. I assume others will do the same. This I felt putting this revenue model at risk since most of the revenue from this increase seems to come from peak summer users.

The winter 1/4 Plan is an incentive to waste water in the winter to achieve lower summer bills, whether the math works out or not. Make an exception for CCUA and other civic organizations. About time we charge people more for watering lawns in the summer!

Please consider a conservation credit.