

RESULTS OF SPU CUSTOMER PANEL BALLOTING ON ACTION PLANS<sup>1</sup> -- April 2014

PART A: Action Plan Title <sup>2</sup>	2015-2020 O & M <sup>3</sup>	% of Total O&M <sup>4</sup>	2015-2020 CIP <sup>1</sup>	% of total CIP <sup>5</sup>	1. Support as Presented	2. Support with decrease \$	3. Support with increased \$	4. Support only if no net increase in \$--re-prioritize	5. Cannot opine w/o more	6. Do not support	7. This Action Plan a priority for me	Other Panel Member Comments/Concerns/Ideas  <i>Numbers correspond to comments associated with an "X" in the column with that same number.</i>
<b>FOCUS AREA: Environment &amp; Public Health</b>												
EPH-1 Climate Change Adaptation and Resiliency	\$1,720	3.5%	\$3,533	3.0%	xx	xxxx				x	x	6. Not identified as top priority by SPU. 2.,7. Assume cost sharing with wholesale water customers 2.To me this seems like a big investment in research on future scenarios. I support this work, but I think other objectives are more important.
EPH-2 Decentralized "Green" Systems	\$0	0%	\$0	0%	xxx	x		xxx				4. SPU agreed to absorb into baseline 1. Although this isn't at the top of my priority list it does support SPU's mission and vision and helps keep SPU forward looking. I think a lot of customers would support this work.
EPH-3. Energy management & Carbon Neutrality	\$1,500	3.1%	\$0	0%	xx	xx				xxx		6. SPU identified as a low/bottom priority 6. SPU owns carbon positive forests that provide an offset. It appears to me this work has been

<sup>1</sup> 7 of 9 Panel Members votes are included here: Bruce Lorig is out of town and did not submit a ballot; Suzie Burke's votes are included per discussion with Karen; Dave Layton decided to abstain from voting (see Part B).

<sup>2</sup> If all 27 action Plans are approved it would add 0.5% - 0.6% to the annual rate increases between 2015 and 2020—excluding any efficiencies from these plans.

<sup>3</sup> In Thousands of dollars, 2014 dollars – NOTE that employee costs (part of O&M) will be offset by "net zero FTE by 2020" in the efficiencies commitment. Action plan templates have details on O&M, employee and other costs.

<sup>4</sup> % of Total O & M Expenditures attributable to this Action Plan in 2015-2020 as % of all Action Plans listed in the table.

<sup>5</sup> % of Total CIP expenditures attributable to this Action Plan over 2015-2020 as a % of all Action Plans listed in the table

PART A: Action Plan Title <sup>2</sup>	2015-2020 O & M <sup>3</sup>	% of Total O&M <sup>4</sup>	2015-2020 CIP <sup>1</sup>	% of total CIP <sup>5</sup>	1. Support as Presented	2. Support with decrease \$	3. Support with increased \$	4. Support only if no net increase in \$--re-prioritize	5. Cannot opine w/o more	6. Do not support	7. This Action Plan a priority for me	Other Panel Member Comments/Concerns/Ideas  Numbers correspond to comments associated with an "X" in the column with that same number.
												ongoing. 2. This is not at the top of my list of SPU priorities but SPU prides itself on being environmental stewards and this is a good goal to work towards.
EPPH-4 Watershed roadways	\$732	1.5%	\$1,680	1.4%	xxxx x	x		x			X	2. This should be funded out of City of Seattle Budget. 1. Since this is an existing obligation, it should be in the baseline. Shared cost with wholesale water customers. 4. Ranked low by SPU but may have a legal and regulatory impact. 1. We have a legal obligation to do this.
EPH -5 Street Sweeping	\$3,991	8.1%	\$345	0.3%	xxx xx	x	x				X	1. Appears to be cost effective project. 1. Seattle lacks sufficient levels of street sweeping compared to many other cities. Edmonds removes over 400 tons annually. 1. This is a great bang for the buck. If it is still a good rate of return on investment for increasing street sweeping even more then I support it.
	\$7,943	16.2%	\$5,558	4.8%								
<b>FOCUS AREA: Operational Excellence</b>												
OE-1 Drainage & Wastewater Planning & Policies	\$5,280	10.8%	\$0	0%	xxxx xx	x					Xx	1. High priority item that SPU & HDR identified 1. Big investment, but seems like it will reduce headaches down the road.

<b>PART A:</b> <b>Action Plan Title<sup>2</sup></b>	2015-2020 O & M <sup>3</sup>	% of Total O&M <sup>4</sup>	2015-2020 CIP <sup>1</sup>	% of total CIP <sup>5</sup>	1.Support as Presented	2. Support with decrease \$	3. Support with increased \$	4. Support only if no net increase in \$--reprioritize	5. Cannot opine w/o more	6. Do not support	7. This Action Plan a priority for me	<b>Other Panel Member Comments/Concerns/Ideas</b>  <i>Numbers correspond to comments associated with an "X" in the column with that same number.</i>
OE-2 Accelerate Implementation of Broadview and South Park Projects	\$0	0%	\$20,000	17.2%	xxxx xxx						xxx	1.High priority item that SPU & HDR identified 1.This addresses providing equitable services to SPU customers.
OE-3 Sewer Inspection & Rehab	\$3,230	6.6%	\$64,350	52.2%	xxxx	xx	x				xx	1.High priority but would slow rate of increase by \$5M/year 1.Decreases liability 1.We don't want to risk losing what was negotiated with the EPA and the State Dept. of Ecology. Doing it sooner rather than later can reduce costs.
OE-4 Sewer Cleaning	\$8,592	17.5%	\$1,000	0.9%	xxxx x	xx					X	1. Important project but slow increase to match OE-3 effort 1.Decreases liability 1.This seems like a rather ambitious goal. If staff efficiency goals are met it will be a good use of funds to prevent future sewer overflows, etc.
OE-5 Technology Services	\$4,350	8.9%	\$0	0%	xxxx xxx						x	1.High priority item identified by SPU & HDR 1.This investment makes sense, but it seems like there's some overlap with the objective "Managing Data & Information."
OE-6 SPU Facilities management	\$1,410	2.9%	\$23,200	19.9%	xxxx x	xx					X	1.High priority but slow pace of increase 1.Regional facilities costs can be shared with wholesale water customers 1.this investment will save dollars in the long run.
OE-7 Managing Data	\$775	1.6%	\$0	0%	xxxx						XX	1. High priority item

PART A: Action Plan Title <sup>2</sup>	2015-2020 O & M <sup>3</sup>	% of Total O&M <sup>4</sup>	2015-2020 CIP <sup>1</sup>	% of total CIP <sup>5</sup>	1.Support as Presented	2. Support with decrease \$	3. Support with increased \$	4. Support only if no net increase in \$--re-prioritize	5. Cannot opine w/o more	6. Do not support	7. This Action Plan a priority for me	Other Panel Member Comments/Concerns/Ideas  <i>Numbers correspond to comments associated with an "X" in the column with that same number.</i>
& Information					xxx							1.I'm sure countless hours are currently lost without document management to share and access documents easily.
OE-8 Materials Management	\$960	2.0%	\$0	0%	xxxx x	x		x			X	2.Sometimes centralization leads to decreased timely availability of necessities 4.Not a priority but do if it can be absorbed in baseline 1.Makes sense to have better management of SPU's assets.
OE-9 Emergencies and Disasters	\$450	0.9%	\$0	0%	xxxx xx		x				Xxx	1.Safety is a priority 1.Adequate emergency preparedness & response is essential 1.This is a must. Not investing resources in this could lead to big consequences down the road.
OE-10 Seismic Vulnerability	\$900	1.8%	\$0	0%	xxxx xx			x			X	1.Important but find other ways to fund in baseline 1.some cost sharing with wholesale water customers 1.Considering the seismic activity of this region investing in this plan is a good idea because it's a likely scenario.
OE-11 Valves	\$2,400	4.9%	\$0	0%	xxxx xx			x			X	4.Lower priority – do if it can be absorbed in baseline 1.decreases liability. BMP in my opinion. 1.If 90% of large utility companies have proactive valve maintenance programs it's probably a good

PART A: Action Plan Title <sup>2</sup>	2015-2020 O & M <sup>3</sup>	% of Total O&M <sup>4</sup>	2015-2020 CIP <sup>1</sup>	% of total CIP <sup>5</sup>	1. Support as Presented	2. Support with decrease \$	3. Support with increased \$	4. Support only if no net increase in \$--reprioritize	5. Cannot opine w/o more	6. Do not support	7. This Action Plan a priority for me	Other Panel Member Comments/Concerns/Ideas  <i>Numbers correspond to comments associated with an "X" in the column with that same number.</i>
												indication that SPU should as well.
OE-12 System Development Charges	\$0	0%	\$0	0%	xxxx xx	x					X	1. Critically important 1. Would help with revenue increases 1. This objective would be good for development and seems fair. It's an innovative idea.
OEr-1 Billing Meters	\$1,644	3.3%	\$408	0.4%	xxxx xx					x	X	6. May pay for itself but does not seem to have much of a payback 1. Will be offset by increased revenue.
OEr-2 Revenue Recovery	\$0	0%	\$0	0%	xxxx xx		x				xxx	1. No impact to rates 1. It looks like the costs will be recovered and customers satisfaction (due to accurate bills) would go up. 1. This would help with predictability for customers. I think more revenue would be recovered if bills didn't get so out of hand before they were followed up with by SPU. It's also a fairness issue because currently overdue bills are followed up with in different ways.
Total for Op. Ex:	\$29,991	61.1%	\$108,958	93.5%								

<b>PART A:</b> <b>Action Plan Title<sup>2</sup></b>	2015-2020 O & M <sup>3</sup>	% of Total O&M <sup>4</sup>	2015-2020 CIP <sup>1</sup>	% of total CIP <sup>5</sup>	1.Support as Presented	2. Support with decrease \$	3. Support with increased \$	4. Support only if no net increase in \$--reprioritize	5. Cannot opine w/o more	6. Do not support	7. This Action Plan a priority for me	<b>Other Panel Member Comments/Concerns/Ideas</b>  <i>Numbers correspond to comments associated with an "X" in the column with that same number.</i>
<b>FOCUS AREA: Transform the Workforce</b>												
TW-1 HR Data and Performance Management	\$3,200	6.5%	\$0	0%	xxxx xx			x			xxx	1. Best thing SPU can do is transform its workforce 1. This seems like an HR "must."
TW-2 Employee Performance Management	\$700	1.4%	\$0	0%	xxxx xxx						xxxx	1. Best thing SPU can do is transform its workforce 1. This objective will have a high return on investment.
TW-3 Talent Management	\$1,300	2.6%	\$0	0%	xxxx xx		x				xxx	1. Best thing SPU can do is transform its workforce 3. With the current age of the workforce a lot of investment needs to be made soon into succession plans and recruiting young talent. I am supportive of increasing this strategic objective if necessary.
TW-4 Leadership Development	\$1,050	2.1%	\$0	0%	xxxx x	xx					xxx	1. Best thing SPU can do is transform its workforce 2. This seems to me like it should naturally be intertwined with the employee performance management, which may save some costs on logistics.
TW-5 Absence and Disability Management	\$2,100	4.3%	\$0	0%	xxxx xx			x			xxxx	1. Need to pay workers less if they are not at work 1. Best thing SPU can do is transform its workforce 1. Safety is #1. We will see happy, healthier employees and cost savings after the plan is implemented making this well worth it.
<b>Total for Transforming Workforce</b>	<b>\$8,530</b>	<b>17.4%</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>0%</b>								

<b>PART A:</b> <b>Action Plan Title<sup>2</sup></b>	2015-2020 O & M <sup>3</sup>	% of Total O&M <sup>4</sup>	2015-2020 CIP <sup>1</sup>	% of total CIP <sup>5</sup>	1.Support as Presented	2. Support with decrease \$	3. Support with increased \$	4. Support only if no net increase in \$--reprioritize	5. Cannot opine w/o more	6. Do not support	7. This Action Plan a priority for me	<b>Other Panel Member Comments/Concerns/Ideas</b>  <i>Numbers correspond to comments associated with an "X" in the column with that same number.</i>
<b>FOCUS AREA: Easy &amp; Engaged Customer Experience</b>												
CE-1 Service Equity	\$0	0%	\$0	0%	xxxx x				x	x	x	6.The City should pay for this and coordinate it with SCL, healthcare and other social education programs 1. No rate impact 5.References 1 FTE-- \$? 1.As a public entity this is a must
CE-2 Development Services	\$1,050	2.1%	\$2,000	1.7%	xxxx xx	x					x	1. High priority 2. It will be important to have a plan in place to evaluate cost savings and customer satisfaction.
CE-3 Web Presence	\$1,750	3.6%	\$0	0%	xxxx	xxx					x	1.High Priority 2.Will support if FTE support is temporary 1.This is worth the investment. It's the most important tool to connect to customers.
<b>Total for Customer Experience</b>	\$2,880	5.7%	\$2,000	1.7%								
<b>TOTAL ALL PROPOSED ACTION PLANS</b>	\$49,084	100%	\$116,516	100%								

**Part B. Other Ideas or Comments?** (add additional pages if needed)

<p><b>Row 1:</b> Additional Action Plans I would like to see considered (and why?)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A. Collect Garbage and recycling on one side of the street only (excluding arterial roadways). Alternate sides collected each year. Residents could take their toters across the street. Would save gas and personnel costs “2 less trucks.”</li> <li>B. HR/Organizational Structure Study- It appears that the organizational structure is overly complex and could be simplified. Efficiencies discovered should lead to long-term cost savings. A highly skilled consultant is required to lead this work.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Row 2:</b> Other Comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A. Mistake not to implement “one less truck.” Worth revisiting this at the city government level.</li> <li>B. SPU needs to develop metrics regarding the age of its infrastructure. As a rate payer we are constantly hearing that the infrastructure is old and needs repair. We must have measurable data that can show all rate payers that SPU is making gains on its aging infrastructure as the strategic plan unfolds. This will help with accountability.</li> <li>C. The Seattle City Utility tax rate has to be addressed by the Council if it is going to be taken seriously when it comes to rate affordability. High rates mean increased flow of dollars into the City general fund. The tax rate needs to be capped, or scaled back. It would help in transparency if the citizens of Seattle knew how much it took to run the City and its utility companies without comingling the issue. Our recommendation to the Council must include a statement on this issue.</li> <li>D. Dave Layton as decided to abstain from voting, noting, “while I generally support the larger dollar investment proposals, I am unclear why most of the smaller ones could not be included within the variability of baseline spending or reprioritization of the baseline, and feel I am not in a position to make a judgment as to which of these many smaller investments to support or oppose.”</li> <li>E. Suzie Burke discussed with Karen how she would vote before going on vacation; her “shadow vote” is in here accordingly.</li> <li>F. These objectives are advantageous, but if executed as planned it’s hard to say any of them are not worth pursuing. Given the customer feedback pulled together people are generally in favor of increasing the rates to gain additional efficiencies, quality of service, etc. SPU staff are the experts in the field and I trust their analysis of the objectives. I appreciate the countless hours of thought that went into these plans.</li> </ul>