

Summary Table of Input from Panel on All Action Plans and Proposed Reductions with SPU’s Decisions (5.17.17)

#	Action Plan Title	6-Year Cost	Panel Consensus	SPU Decision	Panel Rationale
1	Expand the Apprenticeship Program	\$1.6M O&M	Support	Fund	It is difficult to find qualified staff
2b	Opportunity Transportation Projects: Water	\$56.2M CIP	Support	Fund	The water infrastructure is most at risk in the road projects. Projects will promote seismic stability. Utility should carefully track actual SDOT schedule and not “over-fund” these projects ahead of time.
3	Expand Maintenance of the Water Distribution System	\$3.2M O&M	Support	Fund	Extends life of infrastructure
5	Increase Sewer Repairs	\$1.6M O&M \$5.7M CIP	Support	Fund	Highly efficient use of public dollars to maintain infrastructure
7	Sewer Rehabilitation	\$25.9M CIP	Support	Fund	Extends life of infrastructure
8	Pump station, force main and CSO outfall capital program	\$18.5M CIP	Support	Fund	Focuses on infrastructure at highest risk of failure and on ensuring code compliance
10a2	Facilities North Operations Center (NOC) Phase 1 (land acquisition, warehouse, equipment storage. Phase 2 & 3 is a building--\$26M est.)	\$21.5M CIP	Support	Fund	Improves resiliency, supports workforce and efficient use of staff time. Utility controls timing—consider possibility to shift timing for rate smoothing.
10a3	Facilities North Operations Center (NOC) Phase 2 (\$4.6M for planning & design, co-locating staff)	\$4.6M CIP	Support	Fund	Improves resiliency, supports workforce and efficient use of staff time. Current facility is very inadequate to serve its intended function
10b	Facilities South Operations Center	\$42.7M CIP	Support	Fund	Improves resiliency, increases efficient use of staff time
10c	Facilities – Cedar Falls Phase 2	<i>\$8.5M CIP</i>	Support reduced cost alternative	Fund reduced cost alternative	Staff indicate scheduling is better if the project is deferred by one year.
10d1, 10d3	Facilities – SMT Phase 1 and 2	<i>\$1.3M CIP (Phase 1)</i> <i>\$16.4M CIP (Phase 2)</i>	Support reduced cost alternatives 1 and 2	Fund reduced cost alternatives 1 and 2 – Develop a plan outlining an evaluation approach the decision criteria to be used.	If study is done of the efficacy of the move after phase 1 (cost savings, staff efficiency), then the Utility should proceed with phase 2. The Utility should study telework opportunities as part of phase 1.

#	Action Plan Title	6-Year Cost	Panel Consensus	SPU Decision	Panel Rationale
11	Expand Security Monitoring	<i>\$800K O&M</i>	Support reduced alternative	Fund reduced alternative	Meets the objective of the Action Item
12	Green Fleet Initiative	\$6.5M CIP	This is in fact a requirement for the Utility and should be in the baseline.	Fund – Keep as an action plan rather than putting in baseline.	This is a mayoral initiative that began with Mayor Nickels. The Utility really has no option but to fund it. It should be in the baseline. However, some on the Panel are concerns that the Utility doesn't have enough information to support the proposed investments as being appropriate as the technology in this area is changing quickly.
13	Improve Technology Services	<i>\$900K O&M</i>	Support reduced cost alternative	Fund reduced cost alternative	Meets the objective of the Action Item
New	GSI improvements in select urban centers	\$424K O&M \$20M CIP	No action—request additional information	Fund	Initial comments at Meeting 14 (to be discussed further on 5.17.17): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There has not been enough success on these projects to justify additional investment. This is not a mandate and simply exacerbates pressure on rates. • SPU should instead consider exploring how these types of projects could be privately funded, by allowing new developing to meet its onsite requirements in the street right of way, or other creative ways. • Ongoing maintenance of these projects has been higher than anticipated and was raised earlier by the Panel as a concern. There is also a liability concern with these projects. • Could this be deferred? Or could it replace the funding proposed for some other discretionary project? • <i>Puja and Noel will meet w/Mami to learn more.</i>
2a	Opportunity Transportation Projects: DWW	\$66.3M CIP	Do not fund	Do not fund	Staff described these as lower risk items. Sewer investments are being addressed under Item 2. Trenchless technology improvements may make it possible to reduce cost of these projects over time.
6	Sanitary Sewer Capacity	\$37.0M CIP	Do not fund	Do not fund	This is a companion to Potential Reductions Item 9—the Panel would not cut Item 9.
10d3	Facilities - SMT Phase 3	\$9.7M CIP	Do not fund	Do not fund	

	Proposed Reductions	Risk	Savings (\$M—6 yr total)	Panel Consensus	SPU Decision	Panel Rationale
O&M	Sewer Cleaning - Reduce sewer cleaning efforts; remove temporary employees.		(3.9)	Do not cut	Do not cut	SPU identified these items as having high risk to Utility operations.
CIP	Transportation Opportunity Projects - Reduce funding for Water transportation Move Seattle opportunity projects. (Action Plan #2b).		(28.1)	Do not cut	Do not cut	
CIP	Sanitary Sewer Capacity - Decrease investment in the sanitary sewer capacity program by assuming no new projects in construction earlier than 2020.		(25.6)	Do not cut	Do not cut	
O&M	Solid Waste Contracts Inflation - Reduce contractor inflation assumption from 2.75% to 2.5%.		(4.7)	Do not cut	Do not cut	
	Solid Waste Bill-in-Advance - Do not use cash to eliminate BIA.		0.0	Do not cut	Do not cut	
O&M	Risk Reserves - Reduce 2022-2023 risk reserve from 2% to 1.5% of O&M, not including debt service, taxes or solid waste contracts.		(5.8)	Do not cut	Do not cut	
O&M	Green Seattle Partnership - Eliminate SPU's contribution in the City's Public Private Partnership with Forterra on care for forested parks.		(0.6)	Do not cut	Do not cut	
O&M	Rodent Control - Reduce above-ground and below-ground rodent control by 50%.		(1.2)	Do not cut	Do not cut	
CIP	Culvert Program - Reduce the culvert program spending by delaying projects.		(10.1)	Defer / Do not include in Plan	Defer / Do not include in Plan	With change in law, Utility should take more time to explore best response before investing.
CIP	Stormwater Regulatory Placeholder - Remove a placeholder for anticipated regulations for stormwater infrastructure. (Action Plan #6).		(4.8)	Defer / Do not include in Plan	Defer / Do not include in Plan	Too speculative to include.
CIP	Transportation Opportunity Projects - Reduce funding for DWW transportation Move Seattle opportunity projects. (Action Plan #2a).		(66.3)	Defer / Do not include in Plan	Defer / Do not include in Plan	These pipes are deeper; failure/disruption risk lower. Defer due to rate concerns.
O&M	Pet Waste & Diaper Composting - Defer pet waste & diaper composting program until evaluation is complete		(7.6)	Defer / Do not include in Plan	Defer / Do not include in Plan	Seek less expensive and potentially unpopular means to secure increases in recycling