Baseline Statistics & Demographics

State of the State
Missouri

- 68,886 = Land area in square miles
- 2,747 = Land area inside municipal limits in square miles
- 4% = Land area inside municipalities
- 96% = Land area outside of municipalities

- 5,998,900 = Population (2010 U.S. Census Data)
- 6,063,600 = Population (2014 U.S. Census QuickFact)
- 3,959,616 = Population of Missouri municipalities
- 65.3% = Municipal Population of Missouri
- 34.7% = Non-Municipal Population of Missouri
Missouri

- 974 = Number of communities
- 799 = Number of communities with population totals between 100 and 3,500 people
- 13 = Number of municipalities greater than 50,000 people
- $47,764 = Median Household Income (2010-2014 U.S. Census QuickFact)
MPUA’s Water and Sewer Rates Survey

State of the Rates
Rate Survey

- **2016** – MPUA “re-invigorates” the water and sewer rate survey. The 2016 completed survey is bigger than the past surveys of 2010, 2012, and 2014.

- For communities with a population greater than 100 people, the MPUA Rate Survey covers 838 of the 974 entities.
Rate Survey

- For communities with a population greater than 100 people, the MPUA Rate Survey covers 838 of the 974 entities.

- MPUA obtained rate data from 781 of the 838 eligible entities.

- A 93.2% coverage of municipal governments.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Size Grouping (Population)</th>
<th>Number of Communities in Size Group</th>
<th>Communities with Population Increase</th>
<th>Communities with Population Decrease</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100 - 999</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000 - 3,499</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,500 - 5,999</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6,000 - 9,999</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 - 49,999</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 50,000</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2016 Rate Survey Highlights

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Size Grouping (Population)</th>
<th>Number of Communities in Size Group</th>
<th>Communities with Population Decrease</th>
<th>Communities with Population Decrease (as a %)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100 - 999</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000 - 3,499</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,500 - 5,999</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6,000 - 9,999</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 - 49,999</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 50,000</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 2016 Rate Survey Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Size Grouping (Population)</th>
<th>Number of Communities in Size Group</th>
<th>Surveyed Communities in Size Group</th>
<th>Water Rates (as % of MHI)</th>
<th>Sewer Rates (as % of MHI)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100 - 999</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>1.40%</td>
<td>1.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000 - 3,499</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>1.30%</td>
<td>1.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,500 - 5,999</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1.09%</td>
<td>1.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6,000 - 9,999</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0.92%</td>
<td>0.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 - 49,999</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>0.82%</td>
<td>0.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 50,000</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.90%</td>
<td>1.17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Comparing 2016 & 2014 Rate Surveys

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Size Grouping (Population)</th>
<th>Number of Communities in Size Group</th>
<th>Water Rates (as % of MHI)</th>
<th>Sewer Rates (as % of MHI)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100 - 999</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>+ 0.08%</td>
<td>+ 0.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000 - 3,499</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>+ 0.14%</td>
<td>+ 0.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,500 - 5,999</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>- 0.10%</td>
<td>- 0.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6,000 - 9,999</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>+ 0.08%</td>
<td>+ 0.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 - 49,999</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>+ 0.07%</td>
<td>+ 0.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 50,000</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>+ 0.13%</td>
<td>+ 0.26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Comparing 2016 & 2012 Rate Surveys

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Size Grouping (Population)</th>
<th>Number of Communities in Size Group</th>
<th>Water Rates (as % of MHI)</th>
<th>Sewer Rates (as % of MHI)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100 - 999</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>+ 0.10%</td>
<td>+ 0.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000 - 3,499</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>+ 0.22%</td>
<td>+ 0.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,500 - 5,999</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>+ 0.22%</td>
<td>+ 0.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6,000 - 9,999</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>+ 0.11%</td>
<td>+ 0.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 - 49,999</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>+ 0.10%</td>
<td>+ 0.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 50,000</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>+ 0.19%</td>
<td>+ 0.38%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rate Survey Gives You Answers
So..... Let’s Look at Something Comparing 2014 and 2016 Rate Surveys

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Size Grouping (Population)</th>
<th>Number of Communities in Size Group</th>
<th>Surveyed Communities in Size Group</th>
<th>Water Rates (as % of MHI)</th>
<th>Sewer Rates (as % of MHI)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1,000 – 3,499</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>+ 0.14%</td>
<td>+ 0.01%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comparing Data from the 2014 and 2016 Surveys

- For the different community size grouping in both survey years:

  Did MHIs “plunge”?

  Or...

  Did communities really raise water and sewer rates between 2014 and 2016?
Comparing MHI Data

- Median Household Income: The “middle-most” income value. The 50th value out of 100 in ascending order.

- U.S. Census data is collected every 10 years. **Now, we are in the doldrums.**

- Decreases in MHIs could be indicative of “rising” utility bills as a percentage of MHI.
Why Should You Care About All This Missouri Water and Sewer Rate Information Anyway!
Comparing Rate Data

- For the 174 publically-served communities represented by the 1,000 to 3,500 size grouping in both survey years:
  - Water rates were **increased in 88 of 138** eligible entities between 2014 & 2016.
    - 64% of the total.
  - Wastewater rates were **increased in 114 of 170** eligible entities between 2014 & 2016.
    - 67% of the total.
Comparing Rate Data

- For the 60 publically-served communities represented by the 3,500 to 5,999 size grouping in both survey years:

  - Water rates were **increased in 31 of 43** eligible entities between 2014 & 2016.
    - 72% of the total.

  - Wastewater rates were **increased in 42 of 59** eligible entities between 2014 & 2016.
    - 71% of the total.
Comparing Rate Data

- For the 37 publically-served communities represented by the 6,000 to 9,999 size grouping in both survey years:
  - Water rates were increased in 11 of 20 eligible entities between 2014 & 2016.
    - 55% of the total.
  - Wastewater rates were increased in 26 of 36 eligible entities between 2014 & 2016.
    - 72% of the total.
Comparing Rate Data

- For the 65 publically-served communities represented by the 10,000 to 49,999 size grouping in both survey years:
  - Water rates were increased in 21 of 35 eligible entities between 2014 & 2016.
    - 60% of the total.
  - Wastewater rates were increased in 40 of 63 eligible entities between 2014 & 2016.
    - 63% of the total.
Comparing Rate Data

For the 13 communities who have publicly-owned and publicly-operated utilities serving greater than 50,000 people:

- Water rates were increased in 7 of 9 eligible entities between 2014 & 2016.

- Wastewater rates were increased in 10 of 13 eligible entities between 2014 & 2016.
DNR’s 2016 Technical, Managerial, & Financial Survey Potable Water Systems

State of the Potable Water Industry
Fresh information from last night.
State’s Capacity Survey

So far in 2016, 33% (541 of 1,641) of the public drinking water systems have responded to the State’s biennial Technical, Managerial, and Financial (TMF) Capacity Survey.
State’s’s Capacity Survey

- 33% of State’s’s drinking water systems responded.
  - (541 of 1,641)

- 13% of State’s’s drinking water system respondents were municipal entities (cities, towns, villages).
  - (217 of 1,641)
State’s Capacity Survey

- Of the 217 drinking water system respondents that are municipal entities:
  - 59 = Municipalities have water losses greater than 15%.
    - (27% of them)
  - 62 = Municipalities have not determined their water losses.
    - (29% of them)
State’s Capacity Survey

- Of the 217 drinking water system respondents that are municipalities:
  - 121 = Municipalities have water losses greater than 15% or do not know the extent of their losses.
  - That’s a whopping 56%.
State’s Capacity Survey

- Of the 217 municipalities responding to the survey, 17 have potable water losses greater than or equal to 30%.
  - 1 @ 85%
  - 2 @ 65%
  - 2 @ 60%
  - 1 @ 48%
  - 2 @ 40%
  - 2 @ 36%
  - 1 @ 35%
  - 2 @ 34%
  - 1 @ 32%
  - 3 @ 30%
It is always about the pipes.
ENVIRONMENTAL PUBLIC POLICY

ENVIRONMENTAL REGULATIONS

AFFORDABILITY AND CAPACITY
Thank You!

Konda Bentley
Phil Walsack

573-445-3279
kbentley@mpua.org
pwalsack@mpua.org