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**Call to Order**

Acting Chairperson Butani called the DC Retail Water and Sewer Rates Committee meeting to order at 9:36 a.m.

**FY 2017 & FY 2018 Rate Proposal (Attachment A)**

Mr. Hawkins briefed the Committee about the two non-joint resolutions presented for their recommendation to the full Board. He noted that although the final action may trigger further joint use action in the future, the Finance and Budget committee may revise the policy governing use of funds in the Rate Stabilization Fund (RSF).

Mr. Hawkins gave a brief overview of the proposed resolution “**Evaluate and Propose Recommendations for the Expansion of the Customer Assistance Program to Clean Rivers Impervious Area Charge (CRIAC); Review the Impact of CRIAC on Various Customer Segments; Focus Efforts on Employment Opportunities for District Residents Through Water Works Program; and Work to Reduce FY 2018 Rate Increase Below 5%”**. He stated that the resolution is the precursor and foundation upon which the Retail Water and Sewer Rates Committee will make a recommendation on the rates for FY 2017 & FY 2018.

Mr. Hawkins informed the committee that once the approved, 5% rate increase for FY 2017 & FY 2018 would essentially create a ceiling for the two year timeframe. He explained that if DC Water needed more revenue than the estimated revenue generated by the 5% rate increase in FY 2018, the entire rate setting process would have to be followed. However, if the Board decides to reduce the 5% rate increase for FY 2018, then DC Water would not have to go through the rate setting process again.

Mr. Hawkins referred the Committee to the four proposed actions below:

**NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT:**

1. The Board directs the General Manager to evaluate the Customer Assistance Program (CAP) and make a recommendation to the Retail Rates Committee regarding the expansion of CAP to include the Clean Rivers Impervious Area Charge (CRIAC) as soon as practicable after September 2016.
2. The Board directs the General Manager to conduct a review of the impact of the CRIAC on various customer segments including low-income customers who do not qualify for CAP, non-profit organizations and small business owners, and to report to the Retail Rates Committee on its preliminary findings and recommendations by December, 2016.
3. The Board directs the General Manager to undertake efforts to provide appropriate employment opportunities for District residents through the Water Works program and other opportunities.
4. The Board encourages the General Manager to work to reduce the FY2018 rate increase below the 5.0% that has been approved.

Mr. Hawkins informed the committee that for item #1 staff would evaluate the financial consequence of expanding the CAP discount to include the CRIAC for CAP customers in FY 2017, FY 2018 and the ten year financial plan. He noted that the total cost of the Clean Rivers project is not changing, but if the Authority decided to expand the discount to the CAP customers, that revenue would have to be made up from somewhere else. The questions arise as to how much is the expanded CAP discount and what are the projected increases in the CRIAC over the next ten years. Management plans to come back to the Retail Water & Sewer Rate Committee in September with a proposal. To cover the costs of the CRIAC discount to CAP customers the Authority would use projected savings, cash surplus, or in the very unlikely event of neither being available, as a last resort redeploy budgeted Pay-Go, which is called CFCI (Cash Financed Capital Improvement). Potentially the funds in RSF can also be used, but this would require modification of the RSF policy governing the use of funds in the RSF. On legal note, DC Water would not be able to readjust the IAC charge for other customers until FY2019 at the earliest since we will have adopted 2-year rate proposal (including the IAC) for FY2017 and FY2018, unless we went through another public notice period.

Management plans to report back to RRC in September with more detail. There are some practical steps that have to be undertaken and the CRIAC discount to CAP customers would come into effect later this year or early 2017.

Mr. Brown stated that the Committee has been working on the FY 2017 and FY 2018 rate increases since last fall. He added that $3.66 billion Capital Improvement Program (CIP) is funded through rate increases. In FY 2017, $472.2 million is projected to be spent on CIP to improve the water and sewer system and $320.5 million is projected to be spent to operate the facility. In FY 2017, debt service and CFCI are projected at $167 million and $24.0 million respectively. It is important to put in perspective what the Committee is striving to achieve: 1) to make sure to fund DC Water and affordability for all customers and; 2) to pay special attention to those with less means either through employment programs or through the water bill. The Committee has spent a lot of time focusing on the right issues and now has to make choices on how to handle the approximately $10 million net surplus.

Acting Chairperson Butani noted that it is not fair to give back surplus to one segment of customer class. The $10 million surplus has been taken from all rate payers and therefore, should go back to all rate payers. She added that the Committee is trying to achieve affordability across the board and there are customers who need more support than others and she supports them. However, there are non-profit organizations, churches, small businesses that are also suffering from increased rates. She said that she would support the net surplus going toward to all customers whether it is through decrease in rates, transfer to RSF or transfer to Pay-Go and that it was difficult for her to agree to give net surplus to one segment of customers when surplus funds were collected from all customers.

Ms. Boardman stated that she disagrees with providing the net surplus to all customers. She acknowledged her support for low-income CAP customers and suggested having a full review of the CAP program.

Acting Chairperson Butani agreed with Ms. Boardman to review the CAP program and look at the impact it has on all customer segments, but does not believe that the surplus funds taken from all rate payers deserve to go to one segment of the population rather than all the rate-payers.

Mr. Hawkins commented that it is possible to consider a way to do both elements. The cost to provide a CRIAC credit to the CAP customers is less than $1.0 million. The net surplus is $10.0 million and CRIAC credit to the CAP customers is a fraction of net surplus. The CRIAC is part of the bill that has grown the fastest. The rest of the net surplus could be evaluated on how it can be used. A variety of techniques have been discussed that would mean going to the Finance Committee and typically the decision will not be made until September. One solution is to use a portion of the net surplus to enhance the Pay-Go program for DC rate payers, which would spread the reduced level of borrowing cost over all rate payers equally.

Ms. Harvey stated that it is refreshing to see that the committee takes this issue seriously. She asked what is more impactful to the community: 1) a one-time rebate for every customer; or 2) a permanent discount to customers that need help. She added that Pepco/Exelon just provided a rebate of approximately $30 per customer.

Reverend Curry noted that the customers who live in Wards 7 & 8 in Northeast Washington are the lowest-income rate paying customers and really in need of assistance. While hearing the arguments with regard to equity, we are dealing with a situation where we are not beginning with a level playing field. One may consider the idea of equity in terms of balancing all of the rates but when someone is already struggling due to poverty, the one-time CRIAC reduction is no benefit. It is time to eliminate or deeply reduce the CRIAC for low-income residents. The General Manager spoke how to use the $10.0 million surplus to reduce the CRIAC for CAP customers and transfer the difference to Pay-Go to reduce borrowing cost for rate payers. He said that he was not in favor of those options but he was in favor of reductions for low-income residents. These are the residents that are going to use non-profits and small businesses and try to make a living. If a customer has to pay $20 dollars for the CRIAC and still have to deal with a bill beyond their ability to pay, a one-time CRIAC credit to CAP customers is not reasonable. Low-income residents and CAP customers would benefit the greatest from eliminating or lowering the CRIAC.

Mr. Hawkins emphasized that the proposal for the CRIAC credit will be permanent for CAP customers. The staff will evaluate the CAP proposal to understand the costs in the 10-year Financial Plan.

Mr. Gibbs stated that the excess revenues should go into Pay-Go because it reduces the rates for all rate payers. He said that he was on board with expanding the CAP program to include the CRIAC.

Mr. Brown stated that the resolution is worded the way it is because staff has to go through a process. Mr. Brown inquired if CRIA credit was an option, could this be done today. The CRIAC credit for CAP customers has to go through a separate rulemaking. If DC Water was going to reduce charges from what was published it could be done in the existing rulemaking. There is a separate section of the regulations that deals with CAP customers. It is this section that would have to be amended and that’s why a separate rulemaking is required. There are several ways to return funds to all customer categories: 1) Pay-Go; 2) buy down rates and; 3) one time CRIAC credit to CAP customers.

Mr. Brown, General Counsel informed the Committee on the process to amend the CAP regulation. He further stated that if there is change to an existing regulation like a rate, number and anything that appears in a particular table, an amendment would be required. It is different from a proposal considering as part of the ratemaking process.

Mr. Brown asked if it is correct that there is a separate section of CAP regulations and that is why a separate rulemaking is required.

Mr. Brown, General Counsel responded, “Yes”.

Acting Chairperson Butani commented that an evaluation is necessary. The staff need to look at the impact of CRIAC because it is going to become unbearable for all rate payers. She said that in the future the Committee could eliminate the CRIAC for CAP customers, but right now deal with surplus funds that were taken from rate payers in order to pay for operations. The committee is taking those funds and changing the course of what the Authority was supposed do with them. Ms. Butani stated that she was not against CRIAC credit for CAP customers, which cost approximately $1.0 million. Her biggest concern was that DC Water took rate payers monies for a specific purpose and that purpose was not needed and those funds need to go back to all rate payers. Historically, any surpluses have always gone back to all rate payers: 1) RSF; and 2) Pay-Go. To change that decision without the evaluation by management is not fair to all rate payers.

Acting Chairperson Butani asked Mr. Brown, General Counsel if it is allowed to allocate the surplus to CAP customer for a CRIAC credit.

Mr. Hawkins responded that the strength of the enterprise is what sets us apart from a lot of other regional organizations that have been failures. Even when there are broad agreements the management makes sure they know why they are doing it and follow the appropriate steps. In this case what management proposed is that the projected net surplus would either go to the RSF or in cash until this evaluation unfolds. In parallel of the evaluation the management will make recommendations about how the net surplus would be used to cover this extension and determine the appropriate steps to make sure that it is done properly so that all of DC Water’s policies are straight and in place. It is absolutely possible to do that on a fairly expedited basis in parallel evaluating the financial costs 1, 2 and 10 years out to extend the CRIAC credit to CAP customers. The slightly longer term issue is that the staff has not gone back to look at the CRIAC since it has been implemented in 2009. What are the consequences to various customer groups? That needs a deeper dive and staff does not have good numbers as yet. That is listed as the second point of the resolution. This is a far richer evaluation that is going to take time to sort out the various options.

Mr. Brown, General Counsel replied that there is no easy answer. DC Water’s rate system is set up with various customer classes like residential, multi-family and non-residential customer classes and all those decisions were made upon rational difference based upon evaluations. If there is a good reason that is justified by the facts, income, circumstances and the principles then you can treat different classes differently. He added that he wouldn’t counsel to do this in a less than prudent fashion.

Reverend Curry informed the Committee that they have a fiduciary responsibility and that they are going to do things in a prudent way. He said that this is what they go through and do an evaluation and then come back and have the same discussion again about changing number and tables. It actually starts to lengthen the time of the impact customers have to deal with the CRIAC. He added that he was not sure if they are going to meet the September deadline. He said that they need to be able to say roughly when this is going to occur. The question raised on the street is when are you going to do something and he cannot answer that question. He wants to be able to respond to those customers who are struggling and are on the margins and that something is coming and they have to find a way of touching our low-income residents as soon as possible.

Ms. Boardman stated that she supports relief for the CAP customers and shares the same concern about the wait on the CRIAC credit and the disproportionate impact on that community. She said that she also believed that they have a duty to act prudently with measure, responsibly and with all the data available. The Committee went to the same hearing and heard from rate payers the pain that these charges impose. Had the committee been inclined to sit back and not do anything, which would have been the end of the ratemaking process? However, Committee members have put pressure on the management to bring something back in September. In the interest of due diligence as our responsibility on this Board the resolution is worded appropriately and tempers the need that the committee sees to assist the low-income residents.

Reverend Curry mentioned that he suffers from the rate increases as a non-profit organization. Also houses of worship suffer from the rate increases. He further stated his uneasiness is not to the overall idea of making sure that the numbers work, but that they need to make sure that things are accomplished. If this is the case they have the will to make sure that they are really taking seriously the low-income residents, non-profits and small business owners then he would feel much better about what they are doing. If this is truly not the case and they have to hear later, he will be greatly disappointed. He said that he was asking a “will” question.

Acting Chairperson Butani stated that when management commits to provide information to the Board, it happens. At that point it is up to the Committee to take the information from the management and make proper decisions, which is the proper order of how things should be done. Because, what management may find is that they want to include certain small businesses or certain non-profits that currently, if they made the decision today, would not be included. But if given more time to evaluate the data then perhaps there will be an expansion.

Acting Chairperson Butani asked by what time the Committee makes the decision about the surplus funds.

Mr. Brown responded that the Committee can initiate this action today with regard to the CRIAC credit for CAP customers and implement the credit this Fall and take some action with regard to put additional funds in Pay-Go and reducing the growth of the rates to 4% for FY 2017 & FY 2018.

Mr. Brown inquired whether the Retail Water and Sewer Rate Committee can move forward with direction today to put $10 million of the projected net surplus in Pay-Go and implement a complete elimination of the CRIAC for CAP customers this Fall in a financially responsible manner.

Mr. Hawkins replied that the utilization net surplus is a decision that is taken by the Finance committee.

Mr. Brown inquired if the Committee can move forward today with the intent that it is this Committee’s recommendation for the Finance and Budget Committee’s approval that $10 million of District’s funds be placed in Pay-Go and if adopted could management eliminate the CRIAC for CAP customers. Is it possible to make this decision?

Mr. Hawkins responded that the Committee can make a recommendation today to the Finance Committee on two fronts: 1) the Finance Committee begin in parallel looking at the policy governing the RSF to evaluate modifying the policy so that funds in the RSF could be used to pay for the expansion of the CAP program for the CRIAC; 2) in parallel the committee could recommend to the Finance Committee to use the net surplus funds for Pay-Go. Both of these recommendations can go to the Finance Committee now rather than waiting until the evaluation is complete, but would not be triggered as steps until the surplus occurred.

Mr. Brown stated that based on the information today, he wants to make sure that management do not preclude one course by making a decision on the other.

Mr. Hawkins responded that the Retail Water and Sewer Rate Committee can forward those recommendations to the Finance and Budget Committee for review of RSF policy and the source of the expansion of the CAP. Should the projected surplus occur, it can be used for two purposes: 1) to cover the extension of the CRIAC discount to CAP customers; and 2) to expand the Pay-Go program to reduce costs to all retail customers.

Mr. Brown added that in addition to the two purposes stated by Mr. Hawkins, the net surplus would also be used for the purposes of: 1) buy-down the rates; and 2) one-time CRIAC credit.

Acting Chairperson Butani reiterated that a surplus taken from all ratepayers should not go towards one segment of the population.

Mr. Hawkins replied that the funds will have to come from somewhere and if it is not net surplus, it would come from general revenues that would have come from all ratepayers. It will be the ratepayer’s general fund that will support the extension of the credit. The advantage of doing it from the cash surplus rather than the existing revenues is that it places less pressure on the existing budget as opposed to surplus funds set aside.

Acting Chairperson Butani stated that the net surplus funds were already collected for a specific purpose and now they are changing the purpose for which they were collected. It is one thing to make a rule and change things going forward and it is another thing to collect money from people telling them that it is going to be used in a certain way and then changing that once you have their money.

Mr. Hawkins replied that he does not believe that it makes a difference to the customers. If the Board makes a decision to use revenue from all retail customers for the something, would a customer care whether DC Water used the revenue that was collected in October rather than in August. Mr. Hawkins stated that DC Water is always making decisions about how revenue is used.

Mr. Brown asked the management to revise the resolution in the section **“NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT”**, from:

“The Board directs the General Manager to evaluate the Customer Assistance Program (CAP) and make a recommendation to the Retail Rates Committee regarding the expansion of CAP to include the Clear Rivers Impervious Area Charge (CRIAC) as soon as practicable after September 2016”

to: “The Board directs the General Manager to evaluate the Customer Assistance Program (CAP) and make a recommendation to the Retail Rates Committee regarding the expansion of CAP to include the Clear Rivers Impervious Area Charge (CRIAC) as soon as practicable”

Mr. Hawkins replied, “Yes.”

Acting Chairperson Butani asked to correct the misspelled acronym in the resolution from CRAIC to CRIAC.

Mr. Hawkins replied that this has already been corrected.

Mr. Brown asked staff to check that the resolution’s third **“Whereas”** clause language that reflects the increases from FY 2016 to FY 2017 of 9.6% and from FY 2017 to FY 2018 of 13.2%.

Ms. Boardman asked for the staff to recirculate the final resolution to the Committee after the substantive additions are made to the final iteration. This resolution would be presented presuming the Committee have the consensus to make a recommendation for the July Board meeting. Acting Chairperson Butani responded in the affirmative.

Reverend Curry asked in the resolution section NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT, in the first paragraph that refers to practicable, what funds do we have after August to be available to fund this particular initiative.

Chairman Brown asked when the Finance committee approves the allocation of the net surplus. Mr. Hawkins responded that the management recommends in July and the Finance Committee approves in September.

Mr. Brown asked if this Committee needs to include any instructions and recommendations to the Finance Committee to reserve or hold the right to set aside funds. He stated that he is hearing from this Committee its intent to move forward with the reduction of the CRIAC for CAP customers.

Mr. Hawkins responded that in the resolution section “NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT,” add a numerical comment that the DC Retail Water and Sewer Rates Committee asked the Finance Committee to review the policy governing use of funds in RSF and evaluate the use of RSF to reduce, moderate or eliminate the impact of CRIAC fee increases on rate payers, particularly rate payers eligible for CAP.

Also, add a comment for Finance Committee to consider the RRC recommendations regarding the use of net surplus funds for FY2016 to: a) hold all or a portion of the funds in cash; or b) authorize use of all or a portion of the funds to lessen impacts of escalating CRIAC fees; or c) designate all or a portion of the funds to increase funding for PAYGO capital funding.

Mr. Brown, General Counsel replied that he supports those comments from Mr. Hawkins because, the Finance Committee has to review these policies and make sure that the timing works.

Mr. Brown stated that he concurred with Mr. Hawkins additional language.

Acting Chairperson Butani inquired about the resolution’s third “Whereas” clause language that reflects the increases from FY 2016 to FY 2017 and from FY 2017 to FY 2018.

Mr. Brown asked staff to check the resolution’s third “Whereas” clause language that reflects the increases from FY 2016 to FY 2017 of 9.6% and from FY 2017 to FY 2018 of 13.2%.

Acting Chairperson Butani asked Board Secretary Linda Manley to recirculate the revised resolution by email so that the Committee can agree to move the resolution to the Board.

Mr. Hawkins requested the Committee to recommend the resolution as they prescribed and send out a revised resolution to make sure it matched what they described. He asked if a recommendation on a resolution can be made through e-mail.

Mr. Brown, General Counsel replied that the RRC can express their will here and the draft resolution will follow.

Acting Chairperson Butani said that they need to move on to the second resolution for discussion.

Ms. Boardman inquired if the second resolution embodies what management recommendation was and that there is no change.

Mr. Hawkins replied, “correct.” This is the rates resolution for the 5% increase for FY 2017 & FY 2018.

Acting Chairperson Butani asked, if they approve this resolution, it does not take the rate decrease off the table.

Mr. Hawkins replied “yes.” Furthermore, this resolution is the structure of the memo used every year. This is duplicated each year and some years the management change the rate structure more dramatically. This describes the changes proposed for all the rates, charges and fees. The difference in the resolution is that it is a two year proposal rather than one year. The core is that it is a 5% water and sewer increase for FY 2017 & FY 2018 and with all charges included with a 5.1% and 6.2% increase respectively. The resolution the Committee just reviewed encourages the management to do everything they can to reduce the FY 2018 rate increase when they get to the point of understanding what their finances are for that year. At the moment the proposal is as described to the public and the Committee in the past.

Mr. Khalil confirmed the CRIAC increases of 9.6% for FY 2017 and 13.2% for FY 2018 and the total monthly bill increases including the CRIAC for FY2017 and FY2018 as 5.1% and 6.2% respectively. Mr. Khalil provided an overview of the recommended FY 2017 & FY 2018 rates, charges and fees.

Reverend Curry inquired if the rates will go into effect October 1st and if the current rates will increase.

Mr. Brown, General Counsel replied, “Yes.” The rates would increase when the regulations are final.

Mr. Hope replied that the rates will be effective upon publication in the DC register and effectively collected on October 1st.

Reverend Curry stated that as per previous discussion, there will be a rate increase after evaluation. After the rates are increased the Committee will begin to deal with the options to reduce the CAP customer bill, which is stated in the other resolution.

Mr. Hawkins replied, “Yes.”

Mr. Brown inquired if it is possible to not increase the CRIAC until November 2016.

Ms. Boardman replied that this cannot be done based on the rate proposal. The Committee is doing something that is innovative and new and is pushing the Board in this direction. Ms. Boardman asked management to seek a retroactive credit for CAP customers on the CRIAC.

Ms. Boardman inquired as to when the customers will receive the rate increase. Maybe the management can communicate to the D.C. residents what we are thinking, what we are doing and this is our timeframe.

Mr. Hawkins stated his expectation to communicate to customers using all of techniques as to what is coming, when they will see this and how it will affect the customers.

Ms. Boardman mentioned that the Committee does not want any misunderstanding about the approval from this committee for the rates to go forward. The next piece which is addressing the issues that are presented in the first resolution and the timing and appropriate communications.

Acting Chairperson Butani mentioned that the goal of the committee is to use these surplus funds and not have them sit in cash. One of the earlier proposals was to decrease the rates using these surplus funds. There is still $10 million of surplus funds and whether this committee should recommend those surplus funds go towards reducing the rates or be used as Pay-Go.

Mr. Brown stated that the Committee will make a recommendation for a rate increase for the next two years. If it is this Committee’s desire to make a reduction to the overall water and sewer rate, the time to do that is now. If it is to find other ways to allocate the money to Pay-Go then that is a decision the Committee can make in the future.

Ms. Boardman replied that she wanted to move forward with the rate increase that has been studied and evaluated and then take a deep drill down on want has been left over and how are they going to apply the surplus.

Mr. Madrid added that DC Water is a cost recovery institution. The rates were established to recover the costs. This year it appears as if we will have a surplus of $10.0 million but it is incidental based on revenue basis of $500.0 million. In terms of what normally occurs we would move to put the funds into Pay-Go largely because it is like buying your house for cash as opposed to borrowing. The funds are actually in lieu of debt and the service of the interest is actually a long term savings to the institution.

Mr. Gibbs stated when the Committee first setup the multiple customer classes, they had a very large non-residential class that included (government, businesses, and churches). At the time there was no way to parse out into some reasonable sorting where they can say this customer class deserves a break or that customer class should pay this amount of money. As they go forward, it is time to start thinking along those lines.

Mr. Hawkins stated that the management’s recommendation is that the Committee recommends the rates as identified in the resolution. The first resolution indicates that we would come back to this Committee over the course of FY 2016 & FY 2017 to determine whether or not there will be a reason to decrease the rates in FY 2018. The 5% rate increase in FY 2018 represents a ceiling but not a floor and we can come back to that point. Management will work with the Committee Chair and the Board Chair on adding a point to the first resolution asking the Finance Committee to make sure it builds into its policy the flexibility on how to use the projected surplus, how best to deploy the surplus, or in parallel deploy into Pay-Go and to possibly keep it in cash to buy down the rate increases.

Reverend Curry reiterated that they need to get in front of the curve on the communication to the customers.

Acting Chairperson Burtani asked if any Committee members disagree with moving forward with the rate proposal as presented. No Committee members disagreed. The Committee recommended to move the rate resolution to the Board. The Committee recommended to move the first resolution with the modifications discussed and with the understanding that it will be circulated back to the committee prior to going to the Board.

Mr. Gibbs mentioned that the Board has adopted a policy on setting rates that all of them could benefit from reviewing in a future meeting.

**Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 11:15 a.m.

**FOLLOW-UP ITEMS – DC Retail Water and Sewer Rates Committee Meeting (June 28, 2016)**

1. In the resolution section NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT, add a numerical comment that the DC Retail Water and Sewer Rates Committee asked the Finance Committee to evaluate the proper steps to take to make sure that an expansion of the CAP program could be financially undertaken with reserved cash or RSF. (Mr. Hawkins) Status: Complete
2. Communicate to our residents this is what we are thinking, this is what we are doing and this is our timeframe. (Ms. Boardman) Status: August/September.
3. Work with the committee chair and the Board chair on adding a point to the first resolution asking the Finance Committee to make sure it builds into its policy the flexibility on how to use the projected surplus, how best to deploy the surplus, or in parallel deploy into Pay-Go and to possibly keep it in cash to buy down the rates increases. (Mr. Hawkins) Status:
4. Board has adopted a policy on setting rates that we could all benefit reviewing in a future meeting. (Mr. Gibbs) Status: Add to Proposal FY 2017 Wokplan