| Item No./ Date | Member | Question | Answer | Date Answered |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PL-1 9/24/19 | Daniel Meza | Are there unique classes in the rate structure for churches, nonprofits or cemeteries? | No, there are not currently. | 10/11/19 |
| PL-2 9/24/19 | James Smyle | Also, in looking at the list of pricing objectives presented here (and in comparison to those listed in the AWWA manual), I would suggest that it be considered to remove "Economic Development". First, the concern should be that rates be fair and equitable. If fair and equitable rates would unnecessarily hinder "economic development", i.e., be non-competitive in comparison to similar markets, then there are likely to be broader issues to deal with that rate setting does not address (or which may pave over). Second, water rates would seem to be a very blunt instrument for incentivizing greater economic growth, once one moves beyond having reasonably competitive rates. Third, this runs the risk of implicitly establishing a principle that water rates for "economic development" may (or do) merit a subsidy as a "public good"... and going down that path would require great transparency and a compelling, prior, economic justification. If the members prefer to keep a reference to economic concerns, I would then suggest that | SAWS has not interpreted "Economic Development" to mean "Competitive Rates". We have implemented targeted lower rates for a major jobs creation project which we referred to as "Economic Development" rates. The last time we had such rates was to support a major new Toyota vehicle manufacturing plant built here about 13 years ago; those targeted lower rates were in effect for a limited time from 2006 to 2013. <br> While "Economic Development" was the number 6 pricing objective priority for both the RAC and the SAWS in the 2015 study, we do not have any targeted Economic Development rates currently. We recommend to the RAC that "Economic Development" stay on the pricing objectives list so the RAC members can prioritize it higher, lower, or not at all as they see fit. | 10/11/19 |


|  |  | "Competitive Rates" be substituted for "Economic Development". |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PL-3 9/24/19 | Daniel Meza | What rate structure/class is the City of San Antonio, Bexar County and other government or semi-governmental agencies under? What about military bases? | All are in the General Class. | 10/11/2019 |
| PL-4 9/24/19 | James Smyle | To what extent did the new tiered rates achieve the stated objectives, e.g., of sending price signals to residential water users that incentivized water use efficiency and/or water conservation? | Staff provided a presentation at the 10/29/19 meeting on this issue. | 10/29/2019 |
| PL-5 9/24/19 | James Smyle | How accurate/realistic were demand projections (water and EDUs) and what, if any, implications might this have for the assumptions to be made for current analysis? | Staff provided a presentation at the 10/29/19 meeting on this issue. | 10/29/2019 |
| PL-6 9/24/19 | James Smyle | Did the merging of all non-residential classes -- Commercial, Institutional, and Multi-family Residential classes -- into one "General" user class have the effect of obscuring a central rate setting principle that "one class should not subsidize another"? | Commercial, institutional and multi-family customers have always been in the General Class since SAWS was formed in 1992. | 10/11/2019 |
| PL-7 9/24/19 | James Smyle | Did the 2015 rate-change for the Water Supply Fee, which created tiered rates for the general class, in practice reflect the real cost of the water supplies it was supposed to support? | The Water Supply Fee was adopted by the SAWS Board and the City Council for the exclusive purpose of recovering the cost of developing non-Edwards Aquifer water supplies. The 2015 Rate Study recommendations made adjustments to the Water Supply Fee to ensure that that the rate structure continued to meet this requirement. | 10/11/2019 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { PL-8 } \\ & 9 / 24 / 19 \end{aligned}$ | James Smyle | Did the reclassification into the General Class have unintended outcomes as regards cost apportionment, for example, General Class usage increased slightly ( $3 \%$ to $4 \%$ ), while its share of Water Supply Fees dropped almost $15 \%$ ? | There was no reclassification of other customer groups into the General Class in 2015. Commercial, institutional and multi-family customers have always been in the General Class since SAWS was formed in 1992. | 10/11/2019 |
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| PL-9 9/24/19 | Joseph Yakubik | Does SAWS have the highest fixed rates in Texas? | See Attachment I | 10/11/2019 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { PL-10 } \\ 9 / 24 / 19 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Patrick Garcia | Please provide the history of SAWS rates and rate structures over the last 10 years. | See Attachment II | 10/11/2019 |
| $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline \text { PL-11 } \\ 9 / 24 / 19 \end{array}$ | Raine Tanner, Daniel Meza, Patrick Garcia | Please provide a summary of incidental fees that have accumulated, for example the Stormwater Fee, over the last ten years. | See Attachment II for SAWS rates and fees history. See Attachment III for Storm Water Fee history. | 10/11/2019 |
| $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { PL-12 } \\ 9 / 24 / 19 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Patricia Wallace | Please compare SAWS rates over the last 10 years to those of other cities. | See Attachment IV | 10/11/2019 |
| $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { PL-13 } \\ 9 / 24 / 19 \end{array}$ | Daniel Meza | Please provide affordability history, including what the discount has look like over time. | \$ee Attachment V | 10/11/2019 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { PL-14 } \\ & 9 / 24 / 19 \end{aligned}$ | Daniel Meza | Disclose what SAWS tests for when testing water quality; Describe water quality testing protocol at SAWS and prospects for possible third party verification of SAWS water quality testing; provide full RAC with website reference | See Attachment VI | 10/11/2019 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { PL-15 } \\ & 9 / 24 / 19 \end{aligned}$ | Raine Tanner | Who will pay the higher water rate (which customer) will pay the higher rate for the Vista Ridge water? How does SAWS determine who is going to pay that higher Vista Ridge water rate than the cheaper Edwards rate? SAWS should never be selling our water outside of its service area. | This will be addressed when we discuss cost of service and rate design. | 10/16/2019 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { PL-16 } \\ & 9 / 24 / 19 \end{aligned}$ | Stephen Lara | Discussion of the number of area entities having emergency interconnect contracts with SAWS. <br> Additional questions from Mr. Lara sent on October 10, 2019: <br> 1. How are these cities charged and how are the individual meters checked for billing? |  | 10/11/2019 |
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|  |  | 2. Can an overview of the agreement and the actual system be briefed at some point? <br> 3. Is there a tier system that regulates the pricing for high volume users? <br> 4. Is there a tier system that regulates more frequent users of the interconnect agreement? |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { PL-17 } \\ & 10 / 22 / 2019 \end{aligned}$ | James Smyle | Can the RAC process revisit the recently approved water supply impact fee? As has been stated in the last two RAC meetings, Vista Ridge water is "baseload" due to the take-or-pay nature of the contract. However, in setting the water supply impact fee, it was assumed that only $32.4 \%$ of the incremental water supply for new growth would come from Vista Ridge water and the remaining 67.6\% from Edwards Aquifer water supply. This assumption resulted in the water supply impact fee actually being reduced by some $3 \%$ to $\$ 2,706$ per EDU. As the information provided to the RAC has clarified that $100 \%$ of the incremental water supply will be Vista Ridge water, this implies that the actual water supply impact fee should be about $\$ 7,002$ (based upon the model used by the consultants, Carollo, in their report "Water and Wastewater Facilities LUAP, CIP, and Maximum Impact Fees"). If it cannot be revisited, would it be correct to say that the difference between the established fee of $\$ 2,706 /$ EDU versus the actual cost of $\$ 7,002 /$ EDU would leave a projected cost of almost $\$ 674$ million to be picked up by SAWS ratepayers? | See Attachment VIII | 10/25/2019 |


|  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { PL-18 } \\ & 10 / 22 / 2019 \end{aligned}$ | Joseph Yakubik | Mr. Yakubik had a question about a slide in a presentation that had been removed from the RAC web page. He asked for the presentation to be reposted. He then wished to reconcile a statement Gavino Ramos had made during his presentation in which he mentioned direct mail as having the best results and was the most cost effective method for outreaching to potential Affordability Discount Program participants with a slide in the deleted presentation which he remembered said "...a $\$ 0$ cost versus $\$ 3700$ cost to mail, or something like that..." | The deleted presentation has been reposted on the RAC web page. Gavino Ramos responded to Mr. Yakubik's question as follows: The slide Mr. Yakubik saw in the previously deleted presentation was regarding a very informal Survey Monkey survey SAWS did to assistance program participants. The bullet point he was referencing stated: <br> - This survey cost $\$ 0$ compared to mailing which would have cost us $\$ 2,935$ for printing and mailing cost <br> Had SAWS printed and mailed the surveys to the participants, the estimated cost would have been $\$ 2,935$. This was a survey, not a direct mail campaign aimed to increase participation in our UpLift programs | 11/5/2019 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { PL-19 } \\ & \text { 10/29/2019 } \end{aligned}$ | Frances Gonzalez | Did the 500 irrigation residential customer accounts become established in 2001 right after the establishment of the irrigation rate class, or did the number of such accounts increase over time? | At the time the Irrigation Class was established beginning in 2001 there were 220 residential irrigation accounts established. There are now 604 residential irrigation accounts. 141 of the accounts were established from 2002 to 2010 and 243 accounts have been established to date since the end of 2010 . | 11/8/2019 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { PL-20 } \\ & \text { 10/29/2019 } \end{aligned}$ | Patricia Wallace | What in your professional opinion is the rate structure used by another city that would be the best fit for SAWS? | This will be addressed during the rate design process as various rate structure options will be brought for review so the RAC can decide which structure is the best fit. | 11/8/2019 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { PL-21 } \\ & 11 / 5 / 2019 \end{aligned}$ | Joseph Yakubik | Please have the slides from both presentations available in RAC4, along with Doug Evanson's initial slides to the Board | Detailed bill comparisons with other utilities will be made during the rate design process | 11/8/2019 |
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|  |  | when he introduced the RAC process earlier <br> the year. I am interested in the bill <br> comparison slides. |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| PL-22 |  | I would also like to have a discussion about <br> price signals. Where are they, specifically, in <br> the current structure? Where were they <br> before? Does the emphasis on fees in SAWS <br> structure dilute the signal? Do other cities <br> structures have stronger signals? How are <br> they manifested in real-world bills, including <br> wastewater? Diagrams would help. I'll bring <br> mine. | The structure of current and alternative price <br> signals will be addressed during the rate design <br> process. | $11 / 8 / 2019$ |
| PL-23 | Joseph Yakubik |  |  |  |
| $11 / 1 / 2019$ | Joseph Yakubik | Also - I am ready for Raftelis and SAWS <br> staff to discuss the "Austin Model" about <br> rate objectives, as recommended by Berto <br> Guerra during the introduction to this <br> process. I think we should have a robust <br> discussion about how our neighbors to the <br> north were able to reduce rates by focusing <br> on affordability. What were their objectives, <br> how did they balance competing needs? | Alternative affordability-related rate structures <br> will be addressed during the rate design process. | $11 / 8 / 2019$ |
| PL-24 |  | The RAC needs to have actual numbers - <br> not percentages or medians or averages - for <br> each of the classes within the General Class. <br> Equally, to better understand Residential <br> usage, per capita data should be presented <br> along with "customer" data. Can SAWS <br> commit to presenting the RAC with this <br> detailed breakdown? | We hope to begin a discussion of "Rate Classes" <br> during the 10 Dec 2019 meeting. This will <br> include some data related to General Class, <br> including current subgroups. Additional data, <br> including residential per capita data, will be <br> provided during future cost of service and rate <br> design discussions. | $12 / 6 / 2019$ |


|  |  | translated into actual revenue requirement shortfalls and to what extent surpluses translated into bankable savings. Also, please explain what "Chilled Water" refers to in the footnote on that page. | of SAWS four currently existing business units. As shown on slide 17 of the 10 Dec 2019 presentation, this business unit provides cooling services to various downtown hotels, Convention Center, Alamodome and Port San Antonio tenants. As further discussed, this business unit is not part of this rates advisory process. |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { PL-26 } \\ & 11 / 12 / 2019 \end{aligned}$ | James Smyle | Slide 19 of the 29 Oct 2019 RAC presentation states that the current rate structure classes have been in place since 2001 and the "parking lot" matrix states that the "General Class", as currently defined, has been in place since SAWS's inception in 1992. Please confirm that, for the "General Class", this is correct. If not, please explain the historic differences in the "General Class" and what the justifications were for those changes. | The statements are correct. The General Class has always included multi-family, commercial and industrial customers since 1992. The slide is referring to the fact that SAWS has maintained four different classes of water customers since 2001: Residential, General, Wholesale and Irrigation. | 12/6/2019 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { PL-27 } \\ & 11 / 12 / 2019 \end{aligned}$ | James Smyle | Reference Slide 25 of the 29 Oct 2019 RAC presentation. Please explain why Residential contribution increased over 42\% while General Class and Irrigation Class contributions increased less than one-third of that ( $12 \%$ ). Also, for purposes of clarity, can we please not lump together "General Class" and "Irrigation Class"? It is important that we understand the details of each class. | The reason is directly attributable to the results of the prior Cost of Service and Rate Design Analysis completed in 2015 which found that the Residential Class was under-recovering its Water Supply cost of service and required a $15.79 \%$ rate increase while General and Irrigation class were both over-recovering their Water Supply cost of service and had an indicated rate reduction of more than $14 \%$. Please see in particular pages 33 and 34 of the attached 2015 rate study report (report is available at www.saws.org/RAC). We understand the request relating to the combination of General Class and Irrigation | 12/6/2019 |


|  |  |  | Class and will not group these classes in presentations or analysis going forward. |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { PL-28 } \\ & 11 / 12 / 2019 \end{aligned}$ | James Smyle | Reference Slides 21, 26 and 27 of the 29 Oct 2019 RAC presentation. Please explain why, when General Class usage increased and Residential Class usage decreased, that General Class contribution decreased while Residential Class contribution increased, and Residential Class rates escalated at a rate $70 \%$ greater than that of General Class. | As shown on Slide 26, the May 2015 Comprehensive Cost of Service and Rate Design Analysis found that the Residential Class should be paying $56.771 \%$ of all water related costs while in 2015 they were actually only paying $53.568 \%$ of such costs. Conversely, the rate study found that the General Class should be paying $31.393 \%$ of all water related costs while in 2015 , they were actually paying $36.689 \%$. As a result, the rate design adopted in 2015 and implemented effective in January 2016 resulted in additional revenue being generated from the Residential Class as compared to the General Class. This is why the effective level of rate increases experienced by the Residential Class since 2015 have exceeded those of the General Class. | 12/6/2019 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { PL-29 } \\ & 11 / 12 / 2019 \end{aligned}$ | James Smyle | Reference Slides 21, 26 and 27 of the 29 Oct 2019 RAC presentation. Please identify the problem or flaw that resulted in this outcome and provide suggestions as to how such an outcome can be avoided in the future, i.e., so that increased usage by a class is absorbed by that class, rather than by others. | As pointed out in PL-28 above, this result is a direct result of adhering to cost of service principles by rate class as opposed to any "problem or flaw". Increased usage by a class is and has been absorbed by that class, rather than by others, however, rate increases are attributable to and applied to all volumes of usage not just incremental usage. | 12/6/2019 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { PL-30 } \\ & 11 / 12 / 2019 \end{aligned}$ | James Smyle | Reference Slide 33 of the 29 Oct 2019 RAC presentation. Please define acronyms when first used. What is "ADP"? Also, please correct. Slide states that average bill declined, while presents data showing average use declining. | ADP means Affordability Discount Program and this should have been defined. The subtitle of the slide states that "Average Residential Water Use Per Bill Declined" which is consistent with the data presented on the slide. | 12/6/2019 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { PL-31 } \\ & 11 / 12 / 2019 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | James Smyle | Reference Slides 36 and 38 of the 29 Oct 2019 RAC presentation. Total increase in | The additional $\$ 43.7$ million of referenced revenue relates primarily to extensive | 12/6/2019 |


|  |  | wastewater was 1.85 billion gallons, from which $14.5 \%$ was contributed by Residential Class and $85.5 \%$ was contributed by General Class. To pay for this increase SAWS charged an additional $\$ 43.7$ million, of which almost half ( $49.7 \%$ ) was paid for by the Residential Class. Please explain why the Residential Class paid for almost onehalf the increase while actually only contributing only about one-seventh of the increased wastewater volumes. Also please note that the presentation of the Cost of Service for Wastewater appears misleading as seems to imply that the General Class absorbed a higher percentage of the costs overall, when it actually speaks to relative percentage increases. In contrast, according to the figures presented, the Residential Class absorbed $175 \%$ more of the cost than it should have, on a per unit volumetric charge basis. | improvements being made to our existing Wastewater infrastructure. As discussed above in PL-29, any rate increases are applied to all wastewater volumes not just the incremental volumes. You are correct in stating that of the additional $\$ 43.7$ million in wastewater charges (to the Residential and General Classes), "almost half was paid for by the Residential Class". However, you need to compare this level of revenue contribution to the total wastewater flow contribution (as opposed to incremental flow contribution). In total, the Residential Class accounted for more than $53.6 \%$ of wastewater flows in 2015 and still more than $51.8 \%$ in 2018. As a result, it is reasonable that "almost half" of any incremental revenue would have been paid for by the Residential Class and it is incorrect to assert that "Residential Class absorbed $175 \%$ more of the cost than it should have, on a per unit volumetric charge basis". |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { PL-32 } \\ & \text { 11/12/2019 } \end{aligned}$ | James Smyle | Reference Slide 39 of the 29 Oct 2019 RAC presentation. Please provide some insight into why certain key outcomes particularly, Cost of Service, Conservation, Affordability to Disadvantaged Customers, and Drought Management - were not fully achieved. | As there are a number of variables that impact each of the key outcomes it is very difficult to ever fully achieve all of the objectives. This is why such rate studies are conducted once every five years or so. During this rate study we hope to enhance our rate structure to better achieve the objectives determined to be the highest priorities of this committee. | 12/6/2019 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { PL-33 } \\ & 11 / 12 / 2019 \end{aligned}$ | James Smyle | Reference Slide 39 of the 29 Oct 2019 RAC presentation. Based upon accepted water utility good practices, what are the suggestions/recommendations that Raftelis would have for the RAC as to changes in the current rate structure so next one might do a better job of achieving these outcomes. | This will be explored during the rate design process of the study. | 12/6/2019 |

SAN ANTONIO WATER SYSTEM: RATE STUDY

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { PL-34 } \\ & 11 / 12 / 2019 \end{aligned}$ | James Smyle | As it is clearly too early in the process to ask the RAC make informed decisions on such a highly subjective subject matter, I would strongly urge that this upcoming exercise be defined as no more than a straw poll in order to have an idea of the RAC's preliminary views. | The ranking results will be presented at the December $10^{\text {th }}$ RAC meeting to solicit the RAC member's feedback on these results. Additionally, staff and the consultant have acknowledged that the results of the initial ranking process are subject to change later in the Rate Study Process. | 12/6/2019 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { PL-35 } \\ & 11 / 12 / 2019 \end{aligned}$ | James Smyle | Thank you for breaking out the "must haves", as it was confusing to have these up for discussion in the same manner that other priorities might be. I suggest that a further break out and expansion is needed on what are core principles of rate setting, as these should be considered and understood by the RAC before any discussion of "priorities", which is what the majority of the so-called "pricing objectives" are. I am referring to core principles that are articulated in the AWWA manual and which are critical context for the RAC to keep in mind while doing its job. These include such principles as "user pays" and "one user class should not subsidize another", which I understand as being the point of "Cost of Service Based Allocations" mentioned on Slide 44. As a principle for rate setting, including it in this list of priorities to be rank ordered is mixing apples and oranges. Another important core principle, not yet mentioned to the RAC is "growth is to pay for growth". There are others. I think it very important that the presentation be expanded to include a section on "rate setting principles and criteria" and that this be well presented and discussed prior to any efforts to solicit the RAC's preliminary views on "rate setting | While the RAC has provided their preliminary views on priorities, we will provide information during the cost of service and rate design process related to industry standards and principles. | 12/6/2019 |


|  |  | priorities". The most important step in <br> priority setting is first laying out objective <br> criteria by which those priorities will be <br> established. The "must haves" and <br> "established rate setting principles" (and <br> lessons learned from the 2015 RAC and <br> current industry best practice? Others?) <br> provide such objective criteria |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| PL-36 |  | Reference Slide 46 of the 29 Oct 2019 RAC <br> presentation. Conservation is not just <br> permanent reductions in use thru "increased <br> efficiency", it is "permanent reduction in <br> usage through reduced consumption, <br> increased efficiency and/or shifting to <br> sustainable alternatives, such as rainfall <br> collection." | Please refer to the Conservation pricing <br> objective definition agreed to by the RAC at the <br> November 12 meeting: "A pricing structure that <br> encourages reductions in discretionary water <br> usage and efficient use of water." | $12 / 6 / 2019$ |
| James Smyle |  |  |  |  |
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| Fixed Fee Proportion vs. Volumetric Charge Proportion |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Residential (5/8" Meter, 7,092 Gal. Water, 5,668 Gal. Sewer) - 2019 Rates |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Austin |  | Dallas |  | Houston* |  | SAWS |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Charge | \% | Charge | \% | Charge | \% |  |  |
| Water Fixed | \$ 7.25 | 13.9\% | \$ 5.33 |  |  |  | Charge | \% |
| Water Volumetric | 44.80 | 86.1\% | + 19.81 | 78.8\% | 41.40 | 0.0\% | \$ 13.02 | 35.3\% |
| Total Water | \$ 52.05 | 100.0\% | \$ 25.14 | 100.0\% | \$ 41.40 | 100.0\% | 23.91 | $64.7 \%$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ 36.93 | $100.0 \%$ |
| Sewer Fixed | \$ 10.30 | 18.0\% | \$ 4.78 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sewer Volumetric | + 47.01 | 82.0\% | $\begin{array}{r}1 \\ \hline\end{array}$ | 13.6\% | \$ 52. | 0.0\% | \$ 14.59 | 46.0\% |
| Total Sewer | \$ 57.31 | 100.0\% | \$ 35.16 | 100.0\% |  | 100.0\% | \$ 31.69 | 54.0\% |
|  |  |  |  |  | \$ 52.97 |  |  | 100.0\% |
| Total Fixed | \$ 17.55 | 16.0\% | \$ 10.11 | 16.8\% | 5 |  |  |  |
| Total Volumetric | 91.81 | 84.0\% | + 50.19 | 83.2\% |  | 0.0\% | \$ 27.61 | 40.2\% |
| Total Water/Sewer Charge | \$ 109.36 | 100.0\% | \$ 60.30 | 100.0\% | \$ 94.37 | $\frac{100.0 \%}{100.0 \%}$ | \$ 68.62 | 59.8\% |
|  |  |  |  |  | \$ 94.37 |  |  | 100.0\% |
| * Houston assesses residential sewer volumetric charges on full water consumption, not the winter average. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Commercial (2"Meter, 50,000 Gal. Water, 50,000 Gal. 5ewer) - 2019 Rates |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Austin |  | Dalias |  | Houston |  | SAWS |  |
|  | Charge | \% | Charge | \% |  |  |  |  |  |
| Water Fixed | \$ 83.40 |  | \$ 32.54 | 14.0\% | Charge | \% | Charge | \% |
| Water Volumetric | 293.00 | $\begin{aligned} & 22.2 \% \\ & 77.8 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\$ 32.54$ 199.30 | $14.0 \%$ $86.0 \%$ | \$ 12.71 | 5.3\% | \$ 96.79 | 31.9\% |
| Total Water | \$ 376.40 | 100.0\% | \$231.84 | 100.0\% | \$239.71 | $\frac{94.7 \%}{100.0 \%}$ | \$303.35 | 100.0\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sewer Fixed | \$ 10.30 | 2.2\% | \$ 28.50 | 12.2\% | \$ 12.84 | 3.8\% | \$ 36.31 | 15.2\% |
| Sewer Volumetric | 462.50 | 97.8\% | 205.50 | 87.8\% | 321.50 |  |  |  |
| Total Sewer |  |  |  |  |  | 96.2\% | 201.79 | 84.8\% |
|  | \$ 472.80 | 100.0\% | \$234.00 | 100.0\% | \$ 334.34 | 100.0\% | \$ 238.10 | 100.0\% |
| Total Fixed | \$ 93.70 | 110\% | \$ 61.04 | 13.1\% | \$ 25.55 | 4.5\% | \$ 133.10 | 24.6\% |
| Total Volumetric | 755.50 |  |  | 86.9\% | 548.50 |  |  |  |
| Total Water/Sewer Charge | \$849.20 | 89.0\% | $\begin{array}{r}404.80 \\ \hline \$ 465.84\end{array}$ |  |  | 95.5\% | 408.35 | 75.4\% |
|  |  |  | \$465.84 | 100.0\% | \$ 574.05 | 100.0\% | \$ 541.45 |  |




## Son Antenio Water System

Schedule to－Gencral Clas：Rales（Inside Ciry Limils）

| Water | 2018 |  |  | 2017 | 2016 |  | 2015 |  | Fiscal Yiear |  |  |  |  | 2012 | 2011 |  | 2019 |  | 2009 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2014 |  | 2013 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Scrice Alatablurs Charge by meter fere |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $3 / 8^{\prime \prime}$ | \＄ | 1380 | 5 |  | 123 月 | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $3 / 4{ }^{\prime \prime}$ |  | 1271 | 5 | 17.97 | 5 | 16.55 | 8 | 15.53 | 5 | 10.16 14.53 |  | 2.92 |  | 9.92 |  | 2.59 |  | 9.39 |  | 981 |
| $1{ }^{\prime \prime}$ | 5 | 3131 | 5 | 28．7－ | 5 | 26.46 | 5 | 21．04 | S | 17.33 73.24 | 5 | 14．18 | 5 | 14.18 |  | 13.71 | 5 | 13.71 |  | 1316 |
| $1-1 / 3^{\circ}$ | 5 | 6103 | 5 | 55.65 | 5 | 31.24 | 5 | 4605 | 5 | 45.03 | 5 | 23．63 | 5 | 31.65 | 5 | 21.93 | 5 | 21.93 | 5 | 10.21 |
| － | 5 | 2610 | 5 | 8788 | － | 0.92 | 8 | 73.74 | \＄ | 7118 | \＄ | 69.48 | 5 |  |  | ＋23） | \＄ | ＋2．50 |  | 3503 |
| ＋＂ | 5 | 179 n | 1 | 16119 | 5 | 150.27 | 5 | 136，\％ | \＄ | 132 2n | 5 | 132．04 |  | 129.14 | － | 67.30 | \＄ | 67.20 |  | 52 星 |
| 6 | 8 | 39700 | S | 270.74 | 5 | 249．30 | 5 | 237．28 | ） | 11938 | \＄ | 214.13 | 5 | 21＋13 | 8 | 12.806 | 5 | $12+80$ | 3 | 17623 |
| 8 | 5 | 59195 | 5 | 33961 | 5 | 176．88 | \＄ | ＋53，184 | 5 | ＋3732 | \％ | ＋3¢．月积 | 5 | 126．86 | \％ | ＋17 ${ }^{\text {2 }}$ | 5 | 207．093 | \＄ | 17640 |
| 10＂ | 5 | $2+55$ | 5 | 月n3．31 | \＄ | 794.02 | \＄ | 723．99 | 3 | 62883 | \＄ | 682．12 | 5 | 682.12 | 5 | 659.69 | \＄ | 639.69 | S | 35103 543 |
| 13＂ | 5 | 2.38880 | \＄ |  | 5 | 1，176．cy | 5 | 1，048198 | \＄ | 1，014．94 | \＄ | 979.93 | \＄ | 979.93 | \＄ | 297．71 | 5 | $9+7.71$ | 5 | 755．89 |
| Usage（mer 100 gulury |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ruse（a） | 5 | 01813 | \＄ | 0164 | 3 | 01514 | 5 | 0．1218 | 1 | 01176 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $100 \cdot 12.50$ af base | 5 | －1 3076 | 5 | 01892 | \＄ | 0.1742 | 5 | 0.1457 | \＄ | 01406 | 5 | 0．1372 | ＋ | 0．1148 | 5 |  | \＄ |  |  |  |
| 123－175＂of basc <br> Ovet 175＂oufbase | \＄ | 112766 | 5 | 03.467 | \＄ | $0 \times 272$ | 5 | 03012 | 5 | 01971 | 5 | 0.1224 | 5 | 0.1724 | S | 018， | ？ | ก．1．37 |  |  |
|  | \＄ | （）3158 | \＄ | 0 287\％ | \＄ | 01631 | 5 | 07201 | 1 | 0.2847 | 5 | 0.2818 | 5 | 0.1818 | 5 | 02723 | 5 | 0.2735 |  |  |
| Lisaga（mer $1000_{\text {gatimil }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Belurs base（b） |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 100 125\％wf base |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5 | ก．108\％ |
| 123 $1800^{\circ}$ of base |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5 | 0．1237 |
| 150 2000．uf base |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5 | 0.16 .33 |
| Orer 200\％of base |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \＄ | 02138 |
| Sewer |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bj mikirsave |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 ${ }^{\text {² }}$ | 5 | 13.5 | \＄ | 1298 | 5 | 12 y | 3 | 126 | 5 | 119.1 | 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $11^{\circ}$ | 5 | 1472 | 5 | $1+28$ | S | 1312 | 5 | 12.69 |  | 1103 | 1 | 11.47 | 5 | 9．R6 | 5 |  | 5 |  | 5 |  |
| 11／2＂ | 5 | 1帤斯 | \＄ | 149 | 5 | $13 \%$ | 5 | 12 c | 5 | 1193 | 5 | 11.47 | 5 |  | 5 | R．68 | \＄ | A．ch | 5 | 7.76 |
| 11／ | $\leqslant$ | 2353 | 5 | 2271 | 1 | 311 | 5 | 12 ll | 5 | 1193 | J | 11.42 | 5 | 9，呺 | 5 | R． 48 | 5 | 86 | 5 | 7．76 |
| J＂ | 5 | 3362 | 5 | 32.55 | 5 | 3473 | 5 | 12.19 | 5 | 1193 | 5 | 11.84 | 5 | 9．8． | \＄ | H．68 | 5 | 8．6月 | 5 | 7．76 |
| 4 ＂ | 5 | 6723 | 5 | $66^{69}$ | 5 | 6145 | 5 | 126） | 5 | 1193 | \＄ | 11.49 | 5 | 2．as | \＄ |  | 5 | A．cs | 5 | 7.76 |
| 6 | 5 | 101807 | 5 | 9731 |  | 9218 | 5 | 1209 | 5 | 1193 | 5 | 11.47 | 5 | 2.86 | \＄ | H． 68 | 5 | 166 | 5 | 7.74 |
| $8{ }^{\circ}$ | 5 | $\underline{20.07}$ |  | 1623 $7+95$ |  | 13363 | 5 | 1269 | 3 | 1193 | 5 | 11.47 | 5 | 2.86 | ， | 8.68 | 5 | 8 解 | ， | 7.76 |
| $10^{\prime \prime}$ | 5 | 403.38 |  | 37936 |  | $2+581$ | 5 | 126 | 5 | 1193 | \＄ | 11.42 | s | 9．月6 | 1 | 1．6． 6 | 5 | 8，68 | 5 | 7.76 |
| 12＂ | 5 | 33783 |  | 51914 |  |  |  | 1269 | \＄ | 1183 |  | $11 .+7$ | 5 | 2．86 | 1 | A． 68 | \＄ | B．6． | 5 | 7.76 |
| Ill pllanis un excess on ！＋ha | 5 | \｜387） 5 | 5 | 01717 s | S | いぶひ | 5 | 01145 | \＄ | 01163 | 5 | 03017 | 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  <br>  <br> c）Per 100 prothons Itscludes the fave 1.196 gitlung |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## San Anvanio Water System <br> Schedule 11-General Clast Rates (Ouuside Ciny Limits)



## San Amonio Water System

Schedule 12 - Whotesule Class Rates

| Water | 2018 |  | 2017 |  | 2016 |  | 2013 |  | 2017 |  | 2013 |  | 2012 |  | 2011 |  | 2010 |  | 2009 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Serice Aisulabitay Cliage by meter sute |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6 | 5 | 33670 | S | +8924 | 5 | 431130 | 5 | 39762 | 5 | 38380 | 5 | $37+67$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{m}^{\prime \prime}$ | 5 | 85715 | 5 | 78136 | 5 | 71548 | 5 | 43503 | 5 | 41290 | 3 | 37462 598 | 5 | 374.62 59820 | 5 |  |  |  | \$ | 357.24 |
| $110^{19}$ | 5 | 173097 | 5 | 1,129 14 | 5 | 1,103328 | 5 | 911 98 | 5 | 480 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 5 | 8983 8 | 5 | 39810 85924 | 5 | 57863 83097 | 5 | 57469 | S | 409.45 |
| 12" | 5 | 729215 | 5 | 2003 H5 | 5 | 1,9บ8 8界 | 5 | 1,703 33 | 5 | 1,6+4 1+ | 5 | 1,604 8 | 5 | 1,60t.82 | 5 | $\begin{array}{r} 83099 \\ 1,55 \geq 05 \end{array}$ | 5 | $\begin{array}{r} 83097 \\ 1,55905 \end{array}$ | 5 | $\begin{array}{r} 387.03 \\ 1,00+4 . t^{2} \end{array}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base (2) | 5 | 02021 | 5 | 0.1906 | 5 | 01735 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Over Rase | 5 | UG27+ | 5 | 05719 | \$ | 03266 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lsage (Aer $100 \mathrm{~g}_{\text {g }}$ (taxt) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base (a) |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5 | 01088 | 5 | [19 (1)N | 5 | 01035 | 5 | (1)1135 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 162.125" of base |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5 | O163n | 5 | 013 lıj | 5 | 01553 | 5 | O1555 | 5 | - 01504 | 5 | 01 mbl |  |  |
| 135.173'0 of bate |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5 | 02381 | 5 | 0 2Y0n | 5 | 0772 | 5 | 01245 | \$ | 02171 | 5 | U171 |  |  |
| Ores 175'0 of base |  |  |  |  |  |  | S | (13300 | 5 | 0325 | 5 | 03174 | 5 | 03174 | 5 | (1) 4ग\% | 5 | 03070 |  |  |
| Belusu base (b) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $101-12 j^{2}$, ul tase |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5 | 01025 |
| 125-150\% of base |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5 | $1) 1279$ |
| $150200^{\circ}$, uf base |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5 | 01700 |
| Orer $300 \%$ - of base |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5 | $027+6$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5 | 03175 |
| Sewer |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Service Atrultuity Charge | 5 | 314.88 | S | 3113.94 | \$ | 287.89 | 5 | 14912 | \$ | 14006 | 5 | 13491 | 5 | 1158 | 5 | 101930 | S | 1 fl 23 | 5 | 9111 |
| Usage (ar 1008 glase) | 5 | 0.4100 | S | 0.3966 | S | 03756 | \$ | $11.36+1$ | S | 03727 | 5 | 11399 | \$ | (1) 3 \% | S | 012421 | \$ | 13 H 91 | 5 | 1) 3230 |
|  approyed be the SAIV 9 thand of I rustecs. <br> (b) Hase was defined as 'wot of the pret kus year's average annual urage divuled by owelve. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |



[^0]
(o) Applics tu all billed putable water.
(b) Hase is defined as toif" of the prestrus year's average annual usare dividet by treche


 and pruizctrd putable water sates on pallems for the jear.
 intu ascount any cumulate defich or surplus in the recinety:

San Antonio Water Syatem
Schedule 15 - Recycled Witer Rates




Link to Matrix
STORM WATER UTLUTT FEE
RATE SCHEDULE










Link to Matrix

## San Ananalo Water Syatem

Schedrle 27 - Moathly Residential Service Churges for Ten Major Texas Cities - Wuter Unaudited

| CITY | 2018 | 2017 | 2016 | 2015 | 20.4 | 2013 | 2012 | 2011 | 2010 | 2000 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Arrungtun |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6000 Gallons | 53550 | \$24 211 | \$34 31 | 533411 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9x\% Callines | 53387 | 53257 | 53257 | \$2978 | 521.12 587.96 | 512.49 $\$ 2555$ | 51971 52555 | \$19.49 | 519.47 | 518980 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (now) Callons | 53702 | 53835 | 53835 | 53737 | 537.21 |  |  |  |  |  |
| reht Gallons | 568 34 | 57130 | 571131 | 56588 | 557200 | 529.74 551.74 | 52516 | 526.16 | 521.34 | 51918 |
| Coupus Chrisu' ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| cuNo Gallons | 544115 | 51257 | \$4237 | 53476 | \$4.76 |  |  |  |  |  |
| swed ciallons | 56893 | S66 29 | 56G 21 | 55578 | 555.78 | 532.25 551.79 | 531155 $\$ 4876$ | 529.97 54567 | 527 76 | 52554 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Gnu Galluns | 53077 | 52169 | 52135 | 521186 | $519 \mathrm{R7}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hew Gations | 51277 | \$3471 | 53416 | 53325 | 531.60) | 5351.70 | \$1858 | 517.62 | S16.72 | 51616 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 60000 Gallons | 52719 | 52521 | 52183 | \$21.62 | S17.84 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9000 Cisllms | 53382 | 53121 | 531.28 | 52842 | S24 10 | 524.10 |  | $51653$ |  |  |
| Fi Worth |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Gn00 Gailons | 54082 | 52939 | \$28.601 | \$2662 | S24 82 | 523.32 |  |  |  |  |
| SH0U Gallons | S4273 | \$41.14 | S4177 | 538.49 | S36 615 | \$334.55 | 52332 | 57213 | 522.25 | S21.73 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6x4t Gallions | 514411 | 53752 | 532 42 | 53197 | 5106 | 5.310 .26 |  |  |  |  |
| 5ix) Galliona | 551142 | 54903 | 547.42 | S 41676 | 5 H 7 74 | 544.27 | 537.78 54012 | 52531 | 5231,5 | \$21.91 |
| Lubbrek |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| GUOUU Galluns | 541 mb | St+56 | 544.56 | \$4518 | 54386 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2006 Gallums | SGE (n) | 558 Br 4 | 558fl | 56372 | \$5670 | \$57. 0 | 55701 | \$41012 <br> 519013 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| C0w0 Gallans | 52948 | 529 4h | 525.98 | \$2598 | 52541 | 523.10 |  |  |  |  |
| 200 Ciallons | 541117 | \$41007 | 53538 | 51538 | 53372 | \$30.60 |  |  | 52050 | \$19.35 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| GOVO Galluns | 5\%172 | S2965 | 527.09 | \$2350 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9000 Gallums | 54740 | \$44 37 | 51196 |  | $53316$ | $531.37$ | 52167 | 519.5 ${ }^{5}$ | \$1985 | \$23.11 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }^{2}$ Assumes Standand rares fir | all persulis in | 5 and pruar | neludes | Peply For | pros |  |  |  |  |  |

San Antonio Water System
Schedule 29 - Monthly Residential Service Charges for Ten Major Texas Citics - Wastewater
Unaudited

| CITY | 2018 | 2017 | 2016 | 2015 | 2014 | 2013 | 2012 | 2011 | 2010 | 2009 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Arington |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| GH0 Gallons | \$3802 | 53498 | 53156 | \$31.10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| goms Gallons | \$5056 | S47.52 | S42 69 | \$42.20 |  |  |  |  | \$26.89 | 52597 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| G4n Gallons | $\sin 6 i^{1}$ | 56.230 | 56230 | \$59,86 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| rumi Gallons | 50023 | 50335 | 54395 | \$89.68 | 53584 | 554.40 58122 | 55+313 | 55035 | S48.77 | S46 28 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6000 Gallons | 54560 | 56079 | 56079 | 5523 | 55233 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2000 Ciallons | $\operatorname{sen} 15$ | S80.8f | S80 86 | 569.48 | S62 48 | \$6.271 | 543 55 50 | S+3 31 | 54080 | 53595 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 600n Galluns | 53694 | 537.06 | 53656 | \$35.78 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9000 Galians | 55302 | 55320 | \$52 47 | 55138 | S+2.00 | \$33.81 | 511041 | 53170 | 52999 | 529 31 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (104) Callons | 52282 | 521.14 | 51973 | 51779 | 51648 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sthel Gallons | 53448 | \$28 23 | 52635 | 52377 | 52201 | 516.48 | 51568 52103 | 51522 | 51522 | 51523 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6000 Gallons | S3810 | - 53551 | 53442 | 53060 | 527.96 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fik) Gillons | $553 \%$ | 550115 | S484] | 54316 | 53939 |  |  |  | 52627 | 525.67 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Gine Galhots | 54239 | S 31.23 | S3\% ${ }^{\text {R }}$ | 53931 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2600 Gallons | S6753 | 56568 | 56135 | 56262 | $5599^{\circ}$ |  |  | 53178 | S29 u | \$2+ $8+4$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (akh) Ciallims | \$38.26 | \$35.12 | 53512 | 52\%76 | ST. 50 |  |  |  |  |  |
| ginki Getions | S4123) | 54.51 | 5453 | 536015 | $53+25$ |  | 5275 534 |  | \$24319 | 52210 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| covo ciallons | 54159 | 541.57 | 53v 23 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MMO Callons | 55813 | 558.13 | 55488 | \$5231 | S47 51 |  | 53354 | 53354 | \$3354 | \$33 54 |
| Sandatomo |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| G:NO) Gallons | 53078 | 529.71 | 52813 | 527.91 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Max) Gillions | $5+3.72$ | $5+2.20$ | 539 9 | Sin min | 51571 | 52.36 | 521710 529 | 51912 | 51210 | 51702 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 52602 | S? $\mathrm{c}_{100}$ | 523 20) |

Sustre Rased un raics pusted un unch respectine cif's website

## Link to Matrix

## ATTACHMENT V (PL-13)

## 2019

## 2019 Gross Annual Income Eligibilty Table

Eligibilty is based on Household Family Size and Income at or below 125\% Federal Assistance Guidline (updated 2-22-2019)

| Family Size | Affordability Program Discounts |  |  |  |  | Income above 12.5\% Poverty : |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Income at or below 25\% <br> Poverty * | Income at or below 50\% Poverty * | Income at or below 75\% <br> Poverty * | Incorre at or below 100\% Poverty * | Income at or below 125\% Poverty * |  |
| 1 | \$3,123 | \$6,245 | \$9,368 | \$12,490 | \$15,613 | \$15,614 |
| 2 | \$4,228 | \$8,455 | \$12,683 | \$16,910 | \$21,138 | \$21,139 |
| 3 | \$5,333 | \$10,665 | \$15,998 | \$21,330 | \$26,663 | \$26,664 |
| 4 | \$6,438 | \$12,875 | \$19,313 | \$25,750 | \$32,188 | \$32,189 |
| 5 | \$7,543 | \$15,085 | \$22,628 | \$30,170 | \$37,713 | \$37,714 |
| 6 | \$8,648 | \$17,295 | \$25,943 | \$34,590 | \$43,238 | \$43,239 |
| 7 | \$9,753 | \$19,505 | \$29,258 | \$39,010 | \$48,763 | \$48,764 |
| 8 | \$10,858 | \$21,715 | \$32,573 | \$43,430 | \$54,288 | \$54,289 |
| 9 | \$11,963 | \$23,025 | \$35,888 | \$47,850 | \$59,813 | \$59,814 |
| 10 | \$13,068 | \$26,135 | \$39,203 | \$52,270 | \$65,338 | \$65,339 |
| 11 | \$14,173 | \$28,345 | \$42,518 | \$56,690 | \$70,863 | \$70,864 |
| 12 | \$15,278 | \$30,555 | \$45,833 | \$61,110 | \$76,388 | \$76,389 |


| 2019 Discount is based on type of service | A, K, R | B, L, S | C, M, T | D, N, U | $z$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Water and Sewer Water only Sewer only | \$25.75 (A) | \$17.95 (B) | \$11.55 (C) | \$9.05 (D) | None |
|  | \$11.25 (K) | \$8.15 (L) | \$5.30 (M) | \$4.15 (N) | None |
|  | \$14.50 (R) | \$9.80 (S) | \$6.25 (T) | \$4.90 (U) | None |

[^1]
## 2018 Gross Annual Income Eligibility Table

Ellgibility is based on Household Family Size and Income at or below 125\% Federal Assistance Guidelines Updated $1 / 2618$

| Farmily Sizz | Affordability Program Discounts |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Income at or below 25\% Poverty | Incomes at or below $50 \%$ Poverty | Incomeat or below 75\% Poverty | Income at or below 100\% Poverty | Income at or below: 125\% Poverty | income above 125\% Poverty |
| 1 | \$3,035 | \$6,070 | \$9,105 | \$12,140 | \$15,175 | \$15,176 |
| 2 | \$4,115 | \$8,230 | \$12,345 | \$16,460 | \$20,575 | \$20,576 |
| 3 | \$5,195 | \$10,390 | \$15,585 | \$20,780 | \$25,975 | \$25,976 |
| 4 | \$6,275 | \$12,550 | \$18,825 | \$25,100 | \$31,375 | \$31,376 |
| 6 | \$7,355 | \$14,710 | \$22,065 | \$29,420 | \$36,775 | \$36,776 |
| 6 | \$8,435 | \$16,870 | \$25,305 | \$33,740 | \$42,175 | \$42,176 |
| 7 | \$9,515 | \$19,030 | \$28,545 | \$38,060 | \$47,575 | \$47,576 |
| 8 | \$10,595 | \$21,190 | \$31,785 | \$42,380 | \$52,975 | \$52,976 |
| 9 | \$11,675 | \$23,350 | \$35,025 | \$46,700 | \$58,375 | \$58,376 |
| 10 | \$12,755 | \$25,510 | \$38,265 | \$51,020 | \$63,775 | \$63,776 |
| 11 | \$13,835 | \$27,670 | \$41,505 | \$55,340 | \$69,175 | \$69,176 |
| 13 | \$14,915 | \$29,830 | \$44,745 | \$59,660 | \$74,575 | \$74,576 |
| 14 |  | \$31,990 | \$47,985 | \$63,980 | \$79,875 | \$79,976 |
|  | \$17,075 | \$34,150 | \$51,225 | \$68,300 | \$85,375 | \$85,376 |


| 2018 Discount is based on type of service | A, K, R | B, L, S | C, M, T | D, $\mathrm{N}, \mathrm{U}$ | 2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Water and Sewer | \$24.50 (A) | \$17.00 (B) | \$11.00 (C) | \$8.72 (D) | None |
| Water anly | \$11.25 (K) | \$8.00 (L) | \$5.20 (M) | \$4.10 (N) | None |
| Sewer ouly | \$13.25 (R) | \$9.00 (S) | \$5.80 (T) | \$4.62 (U) | None |

[^2]
## I Income Eligibility Table

Eligibility is based on Household Family Stze and Income at or below 125\% Federal Assistance Guidelines Updated 13017

| Affordability Prociram Discounts, |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Family Sizes | Incoutite at or befow $25 \%$ Poverty ${ }^{*}$ | Incomea at or below 50\% Puverty ${ }^{*}$ | lincome at ers below $75 \%$ Poverty | Hacome at or below $700 \%$ Poverty ${ }^{\circ}$ | Incorme at or below 125\% Poverty | Incomes aboves 125\% Poverty |
| 1 | \$3,015 | \$6,030 | \$9,045 | \$12,060 |  |  |
| 2 | \$4,060 | \$8,120 | \$12,180 | \$16,240 | \$15,075 | \$15,076 |
| 3 | \$5,105 | \$10,210 | \$15,315 | \$16,240 | \$20,300 | \$20,301 |
| 4 | \$6,150 | \$12,300 |  | \$20,420 | \$25,525 | \$25,526 |
| 5 | \$7,195 | \$14,390 | \$18,450 | \$24,600 | \$30,750 | \$30,751 |
| 6 | \$8,240 | \$16,480 |  | \$28,780 | \$35,975 | \$35,976 |
| 7 | \$9,285 | \$18,570 | \$24,720 | \$32,960 | \$41,200 | \$41,201 |
| 8 | \$10,330 | \$18,570 | \$27,855 | \$37,140 | \$46,425 | \$46,426 |
| 8 | \$11,375 |  | \$30,990 | \$41,320 | 551,650 | \$51,651 |
| 10 | \$12,420 | \$24,840 | \$34,125 | \$45,500 | \$56,875 | \$58,876 |
| 11 | \$13,465 | \$24,840 | \$37,260 | \$49,680 | S82,100 | \$62,101 |
| 12 | \$14,510 | \$26,930 | \$40,395 | \$53,860 | \$67,325 | \$67,326 |
| 13 | \$15,555 | \$29,020 <br> 31.110 | \$43,530 | \$58,040 | \$72,550 | \$72,551 |
| 14 |  | \$31,110 | \$46,665 | \$62,220 | \$77,775 | \$77,776 |
|  | \$16,600 | \$33,200 | \$49,800 | \$66,400 | \$83,000 | \$83,001 |


| 2017 Discount is based on type of service | A, K | B, L | C. M | D. N | 2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Water and Sewer | \$21.40 (A) | \$14.30 (B) | \$8.81 (C) | \$6.99 (D) | None |
| Water only | 59.32 (K) | \$6.26 (L) | \$4.32 (M) | \$3.73 (N) | None |

[^3]
## 2016

## 2016 Gross Annual Income Eligibility Table

Eliglbility is based on Household Family Size and Income at or below 125\% Federal Assistance Guidelines Updated 2/4/16 Affordathility Programn Discounts

| Family Sizez | or below $25 \%$ <br> Poverty - | Income at or below 50\% Poverty ${ }^{\circ}$ | Income at or below 75\% Poveriy | income at or below 100\% Poverty ${ }^{\text {. }}$ | liscome at or below 125\% Poverty ${ }^{-}$ | Incames above 125\% Poverty |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | \$2,970 | \$5,940 | \$8,910 | \$11,880 | \$14,850 | \$14,851 |
| 2 | \$4,005 | \$8,010 | \$12,015 | \$16,020 | \$20,025 | \$20,026 |
| 3 | \$5,040 | \$10,080 | \$15,120 | \$20,160 | \$25,200 | \$25,201 |
| 4 | \$6,075 | \$12,150 | \$18,225 | \$24,300 | \$30,375 | \$30,376 |
| 5 | \$7,110 | \$14.220 | \$21,330 | \$28,440 | \$35,550 | \$35,551 |
| 6 | \$8,145 | \$16,290 | \$24,435 | \$32,580 | \$40,725 | \$40.726 |
| 7 | \$9,183 | \$18,365 | \$27,548 | \$36,730 | \$45,913 | \$45.914 |
| 8 | \$10,223 | \$20,445 | \$30,668 | \$40,890 | \$51,113 | \$51,114 |
| 9 | \$11,263 | \$22,525 | \$33,788 | \$45,050 | \$56,313 | \$56,314 |
| 10 | \$12,303 | \$24,605 | \$36,908 | \$49,210 | \$61,513 | \$61.514 |
| 11 | \$13,343 | \$26,685 | \$40,028 | \$53,370 | \$66,713 | \$66,714 |
| 12 | \$14,383 | \$28,765 | \$43,148 | \$57.530 | \$71,913 | \$71,914 |
| 13 | \$15,423 | \$30,845 | \$46,268 | \$61,690 | \$77,113 | \$77,114 |
| 14 | \$16,463 | \$32,925 | \$49,388 | \$65,850 | \$82,313 | \$82,314 |
| 15 | \$17,503 | \$35,005 | \$52,508 | \$70,010 | \$87,513 | \$87,514 |


| 2016 Discount is based on type of service | A, K, R | B, L, S | C. M, T | $\mathbf{D}, \mathbf{N}, \mathrm{U}$ | 2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Water and Sewer | \$18.00 (A) | \$12.60 (B) | \$8.25 (C) | \$6.55 (D) | None |
| Water only | \$8.00 (K) | \$5.61 (L) | \$4.00 (M) | \$3.73 (N) | None |
| Sewer only | \$10.00 (R) | \$7.00 (S) | \$4.25 (T) | \$3.63 (U) | None |

*Poverty level figures based on U.S. Dept. of Health \& Human Services 2016 guidelines

2015
come Eligibility Table

Eliglbility is based on Househofd Family Size and Income at or below 125\% Federal Assistance Guidelines Updated 3/s/Is
Affordibility Program Discoumts

| Family Size | lncome at or below $25 \%$ Proverty. | Income at or below $50 \%$ Poverty. | Income at or below 75\% Poverty. | Income at or below 100\% Poverty - | Income at or helow $125 \%$ Poverty. | fricome above 125\% Poverty |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | \$2,943 | \$5,885 | \$8,828 | \$11,770 |  | \$14.713 |
| 2 | \$3,983 | \$7,965 | \$11,948 | \$15,930 | \$19,912 | \$19,913 |
| 3 | \$5,023 | \$10.455 | \$15,068 | \$20,090 | \$25,112 | \$25,113 |
| 4 | \$6,063 | \$12,125 | \$18,188 | \$24,250 | \$30,312 | \$30,313 |
| 5 | \$7,103 | \$14,205 | \$21,308 | \$28,410 | \$35,512 | \$35,513 |
| 6 | \$8,143 | \$16,285 | \$24,428 | \$32,570 | \$40,712 | \$40,713 |
| 7 | \$9,183 | \$18,366 | \$27,548 | \$36,730 | \$45,912 | \$45.913 |
| 8 | \$10,223 | \$20,445 | \$30,668 | \$40,890 | \$51,112 | \$51,113 |
| 9 | \$11,263 | \$22,525 | \$33,788 | \$45,050 | \$56,312 | \$56,313 |
| 10 | \$12,303 | \$24,605 | \$36,908 | \$49,210 | \$61,512 | \$61,513 |
| 11 | \$13,343 | \$26,685 | \$40,028 | \$53,370 | \$66,712 | \$66,713 |
| 12 | \$14,383 | \$28,765 | \$43,148 | \$57,530 | \$71,912 | \$71,913 |
| 13 | \$15,423 | \$30,845 | \$46,268 | \$61,690 | \$77,112 | \$77,113 |
| 14 | \$16,463 | \$32,925 | \$49,388 | \$65,850 | \$82,312 | \$82,313 |
| 15 | \$17,503 | \$35,005 | \$52,508 | \$70,010 | \$87,512 | \$87.513 |


| 2015 Discount is based on type of servica | A, K, R | B, L, S | C, M, T | D, N, U | z |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Water and Sewer | \$14.35 (A) | \$10.04 (B) | \$7.18 (C) | \$5.72 (D) | None |
| Water only | \$7.40 (K) | \$5.17 (L) | \$3.84 (M) | \$3.73 (N) | None |
| Sewer only | \$6.95 (R) | \$4.86 (S) | \$3.75 (T) | \$3.63 (U) | None |

- Poverty level figures based on U.S. Dept. of Health \& Human Services 2015 guidelines

Upotated 2/28/14

| Family Size | Income at or below 25\% Poverty * | Affordability Program Discounts |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Income at or below 50\% Poverty * | Income at or below 75\% Poverty * | Income at or below 100\% Poverty * | Income at or below 125\% Poverty * | Income above 125\% Poverty * |
| 1 | \$2,918 | \$5,835 | \$8,753 | \$11,670 | 88 | 89 |
| 2 | \$3,933 | \$7,865 | \$11,798 | \$15,730 | \$19,663 | \$19,664 |
| 3 | \$4,948 | \$9,895 | \$14,843 | \$19,790 | \$24,738 | \$24,739 |
| 4 | \$5,963 | \$11,925 | \$17,888 | \$23,850 | \$29,813 | \$29,814 |
| 5 | \$6,978 | \$13,955 | \$20,933 | \$27,910 | \$34,888 | \$34,889 |
| 6 | \$7,993 | \$15,985 | \$23,978 | \$31,970 | \$39,963 | \$39,964 |
| 7 | \$9,008 | \$18,015 | \$27,023 | \$36,030 | \$45,038 | \$45,039 |
| 8 | \$10,023 | \$20,045 | \$30,068 | \$40,090 | \$50,113 | \$50,114 |
| 9 | \$11,038 | \$22,075 | \$33,113 | \$44,150 | \$55,188 | \$55,189 |
| 10 | \$12,053 | \$24,105 | \$36,158 | \$48,210 | \$60,263 | \$60,264 |
| 11 | \$13,068 | \$26,135 | \$39,203 | \$52,270 | \$65,338 | \$65,339 |
| 12 | \$14,083 | \$28,165 | \$42,248 | \$56,330 | \$70,413 | \$70,414 |
| 13 | \$15,098 | \$30,195 | \$45,293 | \$60,390 | \$75,488 | \$75,489 |
| 14 | \$16,113 | \$32,225 | \$48,338 | \$64,450 | \$80,563 | \$80,564 |
| 15 | \$17,128 | \$34,255 | \$51,383 | \$68,510 | \$85,638 | \$85,639 |


| 2014 Discount | A, K, R | B, L, S | C, M, T | D, N, U | Z |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Water and Sewer | \$13.63 (A) | \$9.53 (B) | \$6.82 (C) | \$5.43 (D) | None |
| Water only | \$7.11 (K) | \$4.97 (L) | \$3.84 (M) | \$3.73 (N) | None |
| Sewer only | \$6.53 (R) | \$4.57 (S) | \$3.75 (T) | \$3.63 (U) | None |

* Poverty level figures based on U.S. Dept. of Health \& Human Services 2014

| Affordability Program Discounts at $125 \%$ Federal Poverty Level Annual Household Income |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Family Size | Income at or below 25\% Poverty * | Income at or below 50\% Poverty * | Income at or below 75\% Poverty * | Income at or below 100\% Poverty * | Income at or below 125\% Poverty * | Over Income above 125\% Poverty * |
| 1 | \$2,873 | \$5,745 | \$8,618 | \$11,490 |  |  |
| 2 | \$3,878 | \$7,755 | \$11,633 | \$15,510 | \$14,363 | $\frac{\$ 14,363}{\$ 19388}$ |
| 3 | \$4,883 | \$9,765 | \$14,648 | \$19,530 | \$19,388 | \$19,388 |
| 4 | \$5,888 | \$11,775 | \$17,663 | \$23,550 | \$24,413 | \$24,413 |
| 5 | \$6,893 | \$13,785 | \$20,678 | \$27,570 | \$34,463 | \$29,438 |
| 6 | \$7,898 | \$15,795 | \$23,693 | \$31,590 | \$34,403 | \$34,463 |
| 7 | \$8,903 | \$17,805 | \$26,708 | \$35,610 | \$44,513 | \$39,488 |
| 8 | \$9,908 | \$19,815 | \$29,723 | \$39,630 | \$49,538 | \$49,513 |
| 9 | \$10,913 | \$21,825 | \$32,738 | \$43,650 | \$54,563 | \$49,538 |
| 10 | \$11,918 | \$23,835 | \$35,753 | \$47,670 | \$59,588 | \$54,563 |
| 11 | \$12,923 | \$25,845 | \$38,768 | \$51,690 | \$64,613 | \$59,588 |
| 12 | \$13,928 | \$27,855 | \$41,783 | \$55,710 | \$69,638 | \$64,613 |
| 13 | \$14,933 | \$29,865 | \$44,798 | \$59,730 | \$74,663 | \$69,638 |
| 14 | \$15,938 | \$31,875 | \$47,813 | \$63,750 | \$74,663 | \$74,663 |
| 15 | \$16,943 | \$33,885 | \$50,828 | \$67,770 | \$ $\mathbf{\$ 8 , 6 8 8}$ | \$79,688 |
|  |  |  |  |  | \$04,713 | \$84,713 |
| 2013 Discount is based on the type of service provided |  | A, K, R | B, L, S | C, M, T | D, N, U | z |
| Water and Sewer |  | \$12.97 (A) | \$9.07 (B) | \$6.49 (C) | \$5.17 (D) | None |
| Water only |  | \$6.68 ( K ) | \$4.67 (L) | \$3.61 (M) | \$3.50 (N) | None |
| Sewer only |  | \$6.29 (R) | \$4.40 (S) | \$3.61 (T) | \$3.50 (U) | None |

## 2012

Federal Assistance Guidelines

| Family Size: | Affordability Program Discounts |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Incornas at or below 25\% <br> Poverty ${ }^{\text {. }}$ | Income at or below 50\% <br> Poverty ${ }^{\text {. }}$ | Incornes at or thelow 75\% <br> Poverty | Income at or below 100\% Poverty ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | Income at cir below 125\% Poverly | Incomes <br> aboves <br> 125\% <br> Foverty |
| 1 | \$2,722 | \$5,445 | \$8,168 | \$10,890 | \$13,613 | \$13,614 |
| 2 | \$3,677 | \$7,355 | \$11.033 | \$14,710 | \$18,388 | \$18,389 |
| 3 | \$4,632 | \$9,265 | \$13,898 | \$18,530 | \$23,163 | \$23,164 |
| 4 | \$5,587 | \$11,175 | \$16,763 | \$22,350 | \$27,938 | \$27,939 |
| 5 | \$6,542 | \$13,085 | \$19,628 | \$26,170 | \$32,713 | \$32,714 |
| 6 | \$7,497 | \$14,995 | \$22,493 | \$29,990 | \$37,488 | \$37,489 |
| 7 | \$8,452 | \$16,905 | \$25,358 | \$33,810 | \$42,263 | \$42,264 |
| 8 | \$9,407 | \$18,815 | \$28,223 | \$37,630 | \$47,038 | \$47,039 |
| 9 | \$10,362 | \$20,725 | \$31,088 | \$41,450 | \$51,813 | \$51,814 |
| 10 | \$11,317 | \$22,635 | \$33,953 | \$45,270 | \$56,588 | \$56,589 |
| 11 | \$12,272 | \$24,545 | \$36,818 | \$49,090 | \$61,363 | \$61,364 |
| 12 | \$13,227 | \$26,455 | \$39,683 | \$52,910 | \$68,138 | \$66,139 |
| 13 | \$14,182 | \$28,365 | \$42,548 | \$56,730 | \$70,913 | \$70,914 |
| 14 | \$15,137 | \$30,275 | \$45,413 | \$60,550 | \$75,688 | \$75,689 |
| 15 | \$16,092 | \$32,185 | \$48,278 | \$64,370 | \$80,463 | \$80,464 |
| 2012 Discount |  | A, K, R | B, L, S | C, M, T | D, N, U | $z$ |
| Water and Sewer |  | \$11.80 (A) | \$8.25 (B) | \$5.90 (C) | \$4.70 (D) | None |
| Water only |  | \$6.36 (K) | \$4.44 (L) | \$3.61 (M) | \$3.50 (N) | None |
| Sewer only |  | \$5.55 (R) | \$4.23 (S) | \$3.61 (T) | \$3.50 (U) | None |

## 2011

Federal Assistance Guidelines

| Family Size | Affordability ${ }^{\text {P }}$ rogram Discounts |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | income at or below $25 \%$ <br> Poverty ${ }^{\text {. }}$ | Income at or laelow 50\% <br> Poverty - | Income at or Dealow 75\% <br> Poverly ${ }^{-}$ | incomea at or beelow 100\% <br> Poverty ${ }^{\text {. }}$ | Incomeat at or bealey $125 \%$ Poverty ${ }^{\circ}$ | fincome <br> above <br> $125 \%$ <br> Poverty . |
| 1 | \$2,722 | \$5,445 | \$8,168 | \$10,890 | \$13,613 | \$13,614 |
| 2 | \$3,677 | \$7,355 | \$11,033 | \$14,710 | \$18,388 | \$18,389 |
| 3 | \$4,632 | \$9,265 | \$13,898 | \$18,530 | \$23,163 | \$23,164 |
| 4 | \$5,587 | \$11,175 | \$16,763 | \$22,350 | \$27,938 | \$27,939 |
| 5 | \$6,542 | \$13,085 | \$19,628 | \$26,170 | \$32,713 | \$32,714 |
| 6 | \$7,497 | \$14,995 | \$22,493 | \$29,980 | \$37,488 | \$37,489 |
| 7 | \$8,452 | \$16,905 | \$25,358 | \$33,810 | \$42,263 | \$42,264 |
| 8 | \$9,407 | \$18,815 | \$28,223 | \$37,630 | \$47,038 | \$47,039 |
| 9 | \$10,362 | \$20,725 | \$31,088 | \$41,450 | \$51,813 | \$51,814 |
| 10 | \$11,317 | \$22,635 | \$33,953 | \$45,270 | \$56,588 | \$56,589 |
| 11 | \$12,272 | \$24,545 | \$36,818 | \$49,090 | \$61,363 | \$61,364 |
| 12 | \$13,227 | \$26,455 | \$39,683 | \$52,910 | \$66,138 | \$66,139 |
| 13 | \$14,182 | \$28,365 | \$42,548 | \$56,730 | \$70,913 | \$70,914 |
| 14 | \$15,137 | \$30,275 | \$45,413 | \$60,550 | \$75,688 | \$75,689 |
| 15 | \$16,092 | \$32,185 | \$48,278 | \$64,370 | \$80,463 | \$80,464 |
| 2011 Discount |  | A, K, R | B, L, S | C, M, T | D, N, U | 2 |
| Water and Sewer |  | \$9.30 (A) | \$6.45 (B) | \$4.23 (C) | \$3.49 (D) | None |
| Water only |  | \$5.55 (K) | \$4.23 (L) | \$3.59 (M) | \$3.49 (N) | None |
| Sewer only |  | \$5.55 (R) | \$4.23 (S) | \$3.59 (7) | \$3.49 (U) | None |

- Poverty level figures based on US Dept of Health \& Human Services 2011 guidelines

| Family Size | Affordability Program Discounts |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Income at or below 25\% <br> Poverty * | Income at or below 50\% Poverty * | Income at or below 75\% <br> Poverty * | Income at or below 100\% Poverty * | Income at or below 125\% <br> Poverty * | Income above 125\% Poverty * |
| 1 | \$2,707 | \$5,415 | \$8,123 | \$10,830 | \$13,538 | \$13,539 |
| 2 | \$35,642 | \$7,285 | \$10,928 | \$14,570 | \$18,213 | \$18,214 |
| 3 | \$4,577 | \$9,155 | \$13,733 | \$18,310 | \$22,888 | \$22,889 |
| 4 | \$5,512 | \$11,025 | \$16,538 | \$22,050 | \$27,563 | \$27,564 |
| 6 | $\$ 6,447$ $\$ 7,382$ | \$12,895 | \$19,343 | \$25,790 | \$32,238 | \$32,239 |
| 7 | \$7,382 $\$ 8,317$ | \$14,765 $\$ 16,635$ | \$22,148 | \$29,530 | \$36,913 | \$36,914 |
| 8 | \$8,317 | \$16,635 | \$24,953 | \$33,270 | \$41,588 | \$41,589 |
| 9 | \$10,187 | \$18,505 | \$27,758 $\$ 30,563$ | \$37,010 | \$46,263 | \$46,264 |
| 10 | \$11,122 | \$22,245 | \$33,368 |  | \$50,938 | \$50,939 |
| 11 | \$12,057 | \$24,115 | \$36,173 | \$48,230 |  | \$55,614 |
| 12 | \$12,992 | \$25,985 | \$38,978 | \$48,230 | $\$ 60,288$ $\$ 64,963$ | \$60,289 |
| 13 | \$13,927 | \$27,855 | \$41,783 | \$55,710 | \$64,963 | \$64,964 |
| 14 | \$14,862 | \$29,725 | \$44,588 | \$59,450 | \$74,313 | $\$ 74,314$ |
| 15 | \$15,797 | \$31,595 | \$47,393 | \$63,190 | \$78,988 | \$78,989 |
| 2009 Discount |  | A, K, R | B, L, S | C, M, T |  |  |
| Water and Sewer |  | \$8.80 (A) | \$6.10 (B) | \$4.00 (C) | \$3.30 (D) | None |
| Water only |  | \$5.25 (K) | \$4.00 (L) | \$3.40 (M) | \$3.30 (N) | None |
| Sewer only |  | \$5.25 (R) | \$4.00 (S) | \$3.40 (T) | \$3.30 (U) | None |

Link to matrix

- ATTACHMENT VI (PL-14)


## Response to Mr. Mera's water quality questions.

SAWS works with several departments and entities to ensure the highest water quality for our customers, including numerous checks and balances that ensure accurate and transparent data is available to the public and regulators.

The SAWS Resource Protection and Compliance Department (RPC) is responsible for regulatory sampling requirements for SAWS Public Water Systems. RPC is responsible for collecting at least 490 bacteriological samples per month, 5880 samples per vear for the drinking water program. Samples are collected throughout the year and are spread throughout numerous locations in the system. A variety of analyses are performed either in the field, at the SAWS lab, or by third party contract laboratory. Besides the sampling performed by SAWS, the TCEQ hires a third-party sampler to take samples at all PWS wells, tanks and other infrastructure. Sampling occurs every quarter for all distribution and source points per TCEQ's schedule. Third party sampling is currently performed by TCEQ's contractor, Third Coast Environmental Services and sent to the Texas Department of Health for analysis. Every three years, TCEQ performs an extensive inspection of all of SAWS Production facility and a detailed review of all monitoring and testing that is required in what is called a Comprehensive Compliance Investigation.

As stated in the federal and state rules, SAWS must also comply with the Lead and Copper Rule. The purpose of this rule is to protect public health by minimizing lead and copper levels in drinking water for safe consumption, primarily by reducing water corrosivity. When a new water source or new treatment technique is added, testing is performed to ensure the changes do not impact the water source(s). In addition to customer sampling, SAWS staff collects approximately 125 samples a month from numerous SAWS water supply sources for this purpose. It is through this sampling that we look at various corrosivity indices for water to recommend operational adjustments to ensure that iron and other metals are not leached from the pipe. Indices were developed by third party consultants in the design phase, and as each water source was brought on line. For additional information regarding the lead and copper rule, visit www.epa.gov/dwreginfo/lead-and-copper-rule.

Over 90\% of the samples are received and analyzed by the SAWS Environmental Laboratory Services (ELS) Department which is an accredited laboratory and performs over 200,000 analyses per year in support of both wastewater and potable water. The other $10 \%$ of samples are sent to the contract laboratory, Pace Analytical, which has laboratories all over the country. Samples sent to Pace are generally tests that are not performed by SAWS or when sample workload is such that ELS staff is not able to complete testing in a timely manner.

As a part of the accreditation process the state, Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ) performs an audit of the SAWS laboratory every other year. In addition to the state audit, the laboratory is audited annually by a third-party contractor, Labtopia, Inc., who is responsible for ensuring the laboratory meets accreditation requirements. Attached are the Draft 2018 Laboratory Management Review Document and a list of tests performed. Additionally, the below websites may be of interest in answering questions regarding regulations that govern potable water.

## Consumer Confident Report: https://www.saws.org/vour-water/water-quality/

TCEQ regulations regarding Revised Total Coliform Rules, Lead/Copper Rule and Water Quality Parameter Rule: https://www.tceg.texas.gov/drinkingwater/pwss.htm)

Link to matrix

## SAN ANTONIO WATER SYSTEM LIST OF ANALYSES PERFORMED

| Matrix: Drinking water | Matrix: Non-Potable Water (Wastewater, Industrial Waste, etc) |
| :---: | :---: |
| Aluminum | Fats Oil and Grease Total Kjeldahi Nitrogen etc) |
| Antimony | Turbidity Phosphorus |
| Aresenic | Aluminum Biological Oxygen Demand |
| Barium | Antimony Carbonaceous Oxygen Demand |
| Beryllum | Aresenic Chemical Oxygen Demand |
| Cadmium | Barium Heterotrophic Plate Count |
| Calcium | Beryllium Biomonitoring |
| Chromium | Boron Radiological |
| Cobalt | Cadmium Ammonia |
| Copper | Cobalt $\quad \mathrm{pH}$ |
| Iron | Copper |
| Lead | Iron |
| Lithium | Lead |
| Magnesium | Lithium |
| Manganese | Magnesium |
| Mercury | Manganese |
| Molybdenum | Mercury |
| Nickel | Molybdenum |
| Potassium | Nickel |
| Selenium | Potassium |
| Silica as SiO2 | Selenium |
| Silver | Silica as SiO2 |
| Sodium | Silver |
| Strotium | Sodium |
| Thallium | Strotium |
| Uranium | Thallium |
| Vanadium | Uranium |
| Zinc | Vanadium |
| Mercury | Zinc |
| Chloride | Hexavalent Chromium |
| Fluoride | Bromide |
| Nitrate | Chloride |
| Nitrite | Fluoride |
| Sulfate | Nitrate |
| Total Hardness | Nitrite |
| Condivity | Sulfate |
| Total Dissolve Solids | Total Cyanide |
| Heterotrophic Place Count | Ammonia |
| Total Coliforms | Total Cyanide |
| Turbidity | Total Organic Carbon |
| Esherichia Coll | Total Phenolics |
| Alkalinity | Volatiles |
| Volatiles | Semi-Volatiles/Pesticides |
| Radiological | Esherichia Coli (enumeration) |
| Free Chlorine | Chlorophyll A |
| Temperature | Alkalinity as CaCO 3 |
| DH | Total Hardness as CaCO3 |
| Halo-acetic Acids | Conductivity |
| Semi-Volatiles/Pesticides | Total Solids |
|  | Total Dissovled Solids |
|  | Total Suspended Solids |
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## Preface

In accordance with the requirements of the 2009 TNI Standard we are pleased to submit the Annual Laboratory Management Review for the year ended December 31, 2018. We believe that the information in the report is accurate and that all disclosures are necessary to enable the reader to gain an understanding of the Environmental Laboratory's operational status. The Environmental Laboratory Services (ELS) Department management review process is performed annually in order to determine the suitability and effectiveness of the laboratory's quality management system. The review serves to identify any changes required to meet the needs of clients, and any action needed to ensure the continuation of services provided by ELS. The review shall include executive management, clients and staff members.

Items that shall be discussed during the review include:

- Review of the laboratory quality policy statement.
- The suitability of policies and procedures.
- Reports from managerial and supervisory personnel.
- Resources and staffing levels.
- Changes in volume and type of work.
- The outcome of recent internal audits.
- Non-conformances and corrective/preventive actions.
- Assessment by external organizations.
- Results of proficiency test studies.
- Customer feedback.


## Executive Summary

On February 13，1992，the City council determined that it was in the best interest of the citizens of San Antonio（the City）and the customers served by the water and wastewater systems to consolidate all water systems，agencies and activities into one institution．The final City Council approval for such consolidation was given on April 30， 1992 with the approval of Ordinance No． 75686 which provided for the consolidation of all city owned utilities related to water，including the water，wastewater，and the water reuse systems，into the San Antonio Water System．

SAWS includes all water resources，properties，facilities，and plants owned，operated and maintained by the City relating to supply，storage，treatment，transmission，and distribution of treated potable water；collection and treatment of wastewater；and distribution of recycled water．Additionally，SAWS owns and operates five thermal energy facilities providing chilled water services to governmental and private entities．In 2018，SAWs provided potable water service to over 502，000 customer connections which represents nearly all of the water utility customers in Bexar County while providing wastewater services to more than 449,000 customer connections representing 93\％of the wastewater customers in Bexar County not utilizing septic systems．

The management and control of SAWS has been vested in the San Antonio Water System Board of Trustees（＂the Board）．The Board consists of the Mayor（ex－Officio）and six trustees who are residents of the City of San Antonio or reside within the area serviced by SAWS．With the exception of the Mayor，all other trustees are appointed by the City Council for four－year staggered terms．The general operations of SAWS are under the supervision of the President／Chief Executive Officer who is employed by the Board．

The mission，vision and values of San Antonio Water System are as follows：
Mission
Sustainable Affordable Water Services

Vision
To be leaders in delivering responsible water services for life
Values
Excellence，Integrity and Respect

The operations of the Environmental Laboratory Services Department are critical for SAWS to accomplish its mission, vision and values. The mission of the ELS Department is to respond to the needs of SAWS operations by providing reliable, responsive, and accurate analytical services with a strong emphasis on data integrity. ELS maintains a broad scope of analytical expertise in order to provide full-service environmental testing for SAWS. This testing includes a variety of microbiological, inorganic, and organic chemical tests in support of water and wastewater services. The laboratory analyzes samples for monitoring compliance under several programs such as: Texas Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (TPDES) for wastewater, including pretreatment, industrial waste, and stormwater; Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Part 503 Rule for biosolids, Ground Water Rule (GWR) for groundwater and Revised Total Coliform Rule (RTCR) and Lead and Copper Rule for drinking water. ELS performs analysis to monitor process control for the water recycling centers as well as for water quality research projects undertaken by other SAWS departments. The laboratory may, at the direction of senior management, provide analytical support for research projects sponsored by other organizations.

ELS was originally accredited by the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ) under the National Environmental Laboratory Accreditation Program (NELAP) in 2008 to perform total coliform analysis. In 2012, TCEQ performed a comprehensive audit on the SAWS Pretreatment Program identifying a deficiency that the laboratory was not accredited for the analyses required by the program. In March 2013, the laboratory expanded its accreditation to a total of 174 analyses in potable and non-potable water matrices to address this deficiency. The laboratory's current scope of accreditation stands at 194 analytes.

An annual review of lab services is conducted in order to meet the 2009 NELAC Institute Standard. It also periodically evaluates the continuing suitability and effectiveness of the laboratory management system and testing activities, and provides recommendations for improvement.

In meeting the standard, ELS is aligned with SAWS value statement of excellence, integrity and respect through continuous improvement and development of staff, processes and procedures used to generate analytical results, as outlined in this document. The laboratory is located at 3610 Valley Road; San Antonio, TX 78221 and measures approximately 15,000 square feet, with 9,000 square feet dedicated to analytical work.

## Operational Review

## Organization

The Environmental Laboratory Service (ELS) Department provides full-service environmental testing that is accredited by The NELAC Institute (TNI) body for various types of water and wastewater analyses.

ELS is structuped with four sections: Login, General Chemistry, Microbiology, and Instrumentation. The Quality Assurance Officers oversees and manages the quality and defensibility of laboratory activities and data.


The three analytical Sections provide:

- Sample analysis to measure various constituents in water, wastewater, soils, and sludges, in support of the production, treatment, distribution and collection of the systems.
- Development and validation of sample preparation and testing methods
- Consult in special projects

The Log in Section provides support to the Analytical Sections by:

- Performing all tasks related to the receipt of samples
- Subcontracting of any work to other laboratories that is not performed by the ELS
- Distributing bottle sets to samplers for all projects.

From January through December 2018 the laboratory received 32,548 samples and performed 185,652analyses. The major workload for ELS can be divided into the following areas:

- Wastewater analyses accounts for $56.8 \%$ of the overall laboratory workload.
- Water analyses accounts for $\mathbf{4 3 . 2 \%}$ of the overall laboratory workload

Less than 6.6\% of the CY 2018 laboratory budget covered analytical costs for work subcontracted to outside laboratories.

As of December 31, 2018, the total number of positions budgeted was 20 Full Time Equivalents (FTE) and 1 intern position. Of the 20 FTE positions, 14 positions were responsible for ensuring that analyses are received, logged in, and analyzed on a daily basis. This staff is responsible for effectively maintaining equipment, documenting information in the Laboratory Information Management System (LIMS), and ensuring that all analyses are

## Staffing Performance


performed in accordance with quality assurance plan requirements. The remaining positions are assigned to the technical services team. The technical services team consists of management, quality control/quality assurance, data operations and statistics, and reporting administrative functions.

As the laboratory became fully staffed throughout 2018, the rate of test/analyst increased to $\mathbf{1 5 , 4 7 1}$. This increase was due to the copper/lead program and the implementation of the Vista Ridge project.

## Instrumentation

Throughout 2018 instrumentation/equipment was added and/or replaced within the laboratory. The major replacement was that of the Analytik Jena Inductively Coupled Plasma Mass Spectrophotometer (ICPMS) with a Thermo-Fisher Scientific ICPMS. The ICPMS is primarily used to analyze metals in drinking water. In addition, the laboratory purchased a Metrohm auto-titrator, replaced a Type I water purification system, and replaced an air incubator. The auto-titrator will be used to perform pH , total hardness, alkalinity, and conductivity analyses.

## Training

The work performed in the laboratory could not be accomplished without an effective training program. Currently the laboratory training program consists primarily of technical training on specific analytical methods and is provided in-house. Plans are in development to enhance the training program by creating a more comprehensive formal training curriculum. During 2018, staff received 1,161 training hours, down from 1,366 in 2017 (see appendix C).

To further enhance knowledge, skills and abilities, staff routinely participates in the following professional organizations:

- Alamo Laboratory Analysts' Chapter (ALAC)
- Association of Laboratory Managers (ALMA)
- The NELAC Institute (TNI)

Lab staff also attended the Environmental Trade Fair and the 2018 Public Drinking Water Conference sponsored by TCEQ the quarterly TCEQ Drinking Water and Water Quality Advisory Work Group (DWAWG and WQAWG) meetings, TNI Assessor training and webinars for the Revised Total Coliform Rule and Lead and Copper Rule.

These organizations provide opportunities to network with professional peers from a variety of environmental laboratories and to stay abreast of current issues related to water and wastewater.

In addition, staff were provided with internal training for safety and professional development sessions related to communication, leadership and conflict management.

During 2018, tours were given to more than 150 visitors to the ELS. Visitors included students and instructors. The tours demonstrate the breadth of testing performed in the fields of microbiology, general chemistry, metals and organics. In addition, staff participates in Confluence, an education conference for local high school students, to inspire students who will be the next generation of scientists and technicians in laboratories such as ELS.

## Performance

As part of monitoring activities within the laboratory and identifying areas of improvement, the following key performance indicators were monitored throughout the year:

- Quality
- Corrective and Preventive Action Reports/Business Process Improvements
- Standard Operating Procedures
- Internal/External Audits
- Proficiency Testing
- Customer Satisfaction
- Survey


## Quality

There are four main areas that are monitored within the quality assurance program: Corrective and Preventive Action Reports, Standard Operating Procedures, Internal/External Audits and Proficiency Testing.

## Corrective/Preventive Action Reports

The 2009 TNI standard emphasizes the need to monitor the implementation of corrective and preventive actions and verify their effectiveness. In order to better fulfill this requirement, the laboratory enhanced its procedures for monitoring the timeliness and efficacy of corrective/preventive actions. Therefore, the laboratory tracks the number of days it takes from the time a CAR is opened until a corrective plan is approved, from approval to implementation and from implementation to verification of effectiveness, from which the overall closure rate can be calculated. The average time to close a Corrective Action Report (CAR) was 190 days. It takes an average of 36 days to complete the root cause analysis which is a key step within the process. The root cause analysis leads to the recommended corrective action plan (RCAP). After the RCAP is
approved, the next phase is implementation. The time required to implement recommended corrective actions is highly dependent on the magnitude of the problem. This step takes an average of 110 days, and thus accounts for over half of the total time required to complete a CAR. The time from implementation of the corrective action plan until its effectiveness can be verified is the shortest phase of the process, 46 days on average, but the time required for individual CARs varies significantly, depending on how frequently the relevant processes are performed and the complexity of the corrective action plan.

Corrective Action Age Report


As part of its responsibilities as an accredited laboratory, SAWS ELS seeks to continuously improve its quality management system, business processes and customer service. The laboratory management team is asked to determine ways to provide costeffective solutions, meet customer needs and adapt to increasing regulatory requirements and complexity of work (such as lower detection limit requirements). As each area has been addressed, the laboratory continued to identify and implement processes to achieve further effectiveness within that function. This process includes the preventive actions that laboratory staff have submitted for consideration. Five preventive actions were implemented in 2018:

- Developed detailed technical instructions for preparing control cultures used in E. coli analysis.
- Demonstrated through comparison studies that one type of absorbent pad provided improved recovery of $E$. coli in the membrane filtration analytical method and implemented routine use of these absorbent pads.
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- Replaced the bottle in which the matrix standard for Chemical Oxygen Demand analysis was stored with a dark bottle to decrease the photosensitivity of the chemical solution, thus improving its stability.
- Revised the SOP and benchsheet for oil and grease method to include documentation of the time pans are placed in and taken out of the desiccator as part of the analytical process. This serves to improve the traceability of the analytical steps as required by the accreditation standard.
- Created a macro to improve the accuracy and efficiency of the data transfer process from the lon Chromatograph software to the LIMS, by eliminating a manual entry process.


## Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs)

Standard operating procedures are a combination of administrative and technical documents that the laboratory follows. During 2018, trend analysis was developed to assist in identifying bottlenecks in the process, and SOP status was reviewed during the monthly Key Performance Indicator (KPI) meetings. Based on these regular reviews, laboratory management could determine when staff members needed to be scheduled to work on updating procedures that were past due or scheduled for review and revision. As a result of this allocation of resources, 40 SOPs were revised in 2018, up from 26 in 2017, and the backlog of overdue SOPs was eliminated.


Internal/External Audits

The 2009 TNI accreditation standard requires the laboratory to perform internal audits. These audits must incorporate review of the analytical work being done as well as all other elements of the quality management system and assess compliance with the standard.

The consulting firm Labtopia, Inc. is under contract to provide audit services to the laboratory and performed an onsite assessment Nov. 5-8, 2018. There were eight individual findings, down from 13 in 2017, none of which were deemed by the assessor to be critical. A corrective action was issued for each finding to document the steps taken to correct the deficiency. Corrective action plans have been developed and approved for all of the findings; two of the CARs have been completed and closed out, three are pending verification of effectiveness, and three are in the process of being implemented. No external audit was performed in 2018.

## Proficiency Testing Program

It is essential that accurate and precise results be reported by ELS for decision-making in support of SAWS operations. Tracking performance is one of the ways in which the lab evaluates and documents the quality of the data that is generated. To ensure the quality of reported data, ELS demonstrates the accuracy and precision of its analyses by performing required quality control tests with each batch of samples. In addition to the use of routine quality control measures, the laboratory participates in Performance Evaluation studies twice a year. Because the laboratory is accredited through the National Environmental Laboratory Accreditation Program administered by Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ), it must meet the NELAP requirement to pass two of the last three single-blind, proficiency testing studies for each field of testing per year. Laboratories are considered proficient if the score is $80 \%$ or above. Over the past five years, ELS has achieved an average overall score of $96.1 \%$. During CY 2018, the overall passing rate was 94.5 percent.

|  |  | \# Analytes | \# Pass | \% | \# <br> Analytes | \#Pass | $\%$ | \# <br> Analytes | \# Pass |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | \%

## Customer Satisfaction

ELS recognizes its role as a provider of analytical support for the successful operation of various groups within SAWS. As such, the lab has continued to make every effort to be proactive in determining customers' needs. Utilizing Survey Monkey again in 2018, the lab sent out the survey to all data users within SAWS.

In 2017 the laboratory introduced the Laboratory Promoter Score which is modeled after the Net Promoter Score. The purpose is to provide an overall score that measures the laboratory customer satisfaction from year to year and to identify areas where trending indicates the laboratory is either exceeding or lacking in a particular area with customers. The model was adapted to suit the laboratory environment due to a lack of a similar performance indicator as an industry standard. In 2017 the results of the overall scoring suggest that the laboratory is consistent in delivering accurate, sound data in the requested turn-around timeframe. The laboratory scores dipped below $80 \%$ in the areas of data being in a manageable format, a basic understanding if the laboratory adds value to their department, and if the laboratory's accreditation adds credibility to SAWS. However, the survey also shows that in 2017 there was a 50\% decrease in participation than in previous years which is believed to be attributed to personnel changes, departures, or issues with the email messaging.

In 2018 there were only 4 customers who completed the survey which rendered the laboratory unable to calculate the LPS and compare data over the last 4 years. The following comments were made and these will be addressed throughout 2019:

- Technical assessment: The laboratory met and/or exceed expectations of the quality, scope of services, usefulness of report and analytical capabilities. However, 1 respondent with the following statement: Would like the LIMS (LIMSVIEWER) to be expanded so that all results for a particular company or report them all to the same spreadsheet rather than just one event at a time. Notification on when things like MDL or test methods change would also be helpful.
- Response: Staff will work with I:S. to determine if the LIMS Viewer can be expanded to meet the needs of the customer. This will be a 2020 initiative. Staff will seek clarification regarding the MDLs and changes occurring during the login process. Test methods are generally dictated by the customer or regulations.

Laboratory management reviews and shares these results with lab staff, discusses these concerns with senior management and implements changes if deemed necessary

## Challenges

The responsibilities of the laboratory expands outside of just receiving and testing analyses. This includes evaluating and purchasing equipment, complying with regulations, managing human resources, developing safety programs, resolving building
issues, and so on. Throughout 2018, the laboratory was faced with challenges related to the operations of the building, unexpected regulatory requirements and unplanned interruptions. Below outlines some of the challenges faced during 2018.

- Temperature fluctuations with the Biological Oxygen Demand Incubator room
- Replacement of both walk-in coolers
- Replacement of chillers
- Unplanned interruptions
- Implementation of Viacon Software System
- Replacement of chill water pumps.


# Appendix A <br> Value of Laboratory Services 2018 Analytical Cost 

| Value of service provided to all clients (including expedited costs) | \$4,001,504 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Total Number of Tests Performed | 185,652 |
| Value of service to Water Recycling Centers (WRCs) - |  |
| Process Control only |  |
| Standard rates >6 Days | \$160,714 |
| Premium rates (2x) 3-6 Days | \$495,258 |
| Premium rates $(3 x)<=2$ Days | \$1,688,874 |
| Total | \$2,344,846 |
| Total Number of Tests Performed for WRC's | 75,279 |
| Value of service for non-process control samples | \$1,656,658 |
| Total Number of Tests Performed for non-WRC | 110373 |
| Total Value of Analytical Services | \$4,001,504 |
| 2018 Lab Expenses | \$2,284,902 |
| Savings | \$1,716,602 |

## Appendix B Workload by Client and Department

| CHENT |  | mples |  |  | Aalyses* |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 |
| A5R | 457 | 326 | 169 | 3678 | 5240 | $\frac{2018}{3385}$ |
| CONSTR INSP | 0 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 6 |  |
| DOS_RIOS_WRC** | 10,407 | 10,585 | 10,499 | 38,354 | $\underline{6}$ | 6 |
| ENGINEERING | 672 | 631 | 656 |  | 38,715 | 38,189 |
| LEON CREEK WRC** | 3961 | 3884 | 3819 | 2059 | 1929 | 2344 |
| MEDIO CREEK WRC** | 2688 | 3166 | 3870 | 21,325 | 20,427 | 20,188 |
| RESOURCE PROT_COMP | 7947 | 8892 | 9781 | 4,726 | 13,681 | 16,113 |
| SALADO CREEK WRC** | 366 | 365 | 365 | 24,726 | 64,921 | 80,493 |
| SERVICE_CENTERS | 342 | 325 | 677 | 1014 | 2398 | 2400 |
| TRT_TECH SVCS | 283 | 259 | 200 | 3251 | 982 | 2682 |
| WATER RESOURCES | 44 | 44 | 23 | 2201 | 2718 | 2213 |
| LAB QUALITY |  |  |  | 2201 | 2192 | 1173 |
| ASSURANCE (PT) | 148 | 152 | 137 | 907 | 873 | 756 |
| DISTRICT SPECIAL PROJECT | 2520 | 2320 | 2332 | 9421 | 9940 | 14857 |
| Misc. | 0 | 1 | 17 | 0 | 43 | 852 |
| *Includes non-invoiceable analysis codes. |  | 30,953 | 32,548 | 142,902 | 164,065 | 185,652 |

** ind
**Includes special project samples that are not part of process control

|  |  | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { \% change, } \\ & 2016 \text { - } \\ & 2017 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { \% change, } \\ & \text { 2017-2018 } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Stitiples |  | 29,835 | 30,953 | 32,548 | 3.75\% | 5.15\% |
| $\text { Analyser }+Q C$ |  | 264,083 | 305,641 | 329,954 | 15.74\% | 7.95\% |
| a Analysas |  | 142,902 | 164,065 | 185,652 | 14.81\% | 13.16\% |
|  | Chemistry | 60,074 | 67,136 | 68,945 | 11.76\% | 2.69\% |
|  | Micrabiology | 59,099 | 56,298 | 65,388 | -4.74\% | 16.14\% |
|  | Metals | 17,690 | 32,470 | 41,134 | 83.55\% | 26.68\% |
|  | Organics | 6,039 | 8,061 | 10,185 | 33.48\% | 26.35\% |
| \% Analyors |  | 54.11\% | 53.68\% | 56.27\% |  |  |
| , Q6 |  | 45.89\% | 46.32\% | 43.73\% |  |  |


APPENDIX C
Training Data

Total Phosphorus, SM 4500-P B, F. New A Total Phosphorus, SM $4500-\mathrm{P}$ B, F. New Analyst
Anions by EPA Method 300 .
TKN, SM 4500 Norg B/4500 NH3 B.C, New TKN, SM 4500 Norg B/4500 NH3 B,C, New Analyst
Quality Manual, Refresher and Updates Data Entry and Verification, Refresher and Records Management, Refresher and Und Updates Laboratory Ethics and Data Integrity
Mercury by CVAA, EPA 245.1, Refresher and Updates Specific Gravity, New Analyst Data Integrity and Ethics Training (Lablopia) Matals by ICP-MS, EPA 200.8, Refresher and Updates
Metals by ICP. EPA 200.7, Refresher and Updates Metals by ICP, EPA 200.7, Refresher and Updates
Conductivity SM 2510B, Benchsheet Update Sample Handling SOP, Refresher and Update Introduction to Labworks + Analysis Codes (Train ICP-MS Verification Sheet - Liquids, Upatates
Calibration of Volumetric Dispensing Devices, New Analyst Mercury by CVAA, EPA 245.1, New Analyst pH SM $4500 \mathrm{H}+\mathrm{B} /$ SW846 9045D and Soluble Salts SW 846 9050A.
Benchsheet Update
Total and Bicarbonate Alkalinity, SM 2320B, New Analyst
Total Hardness by Titration, SM 2340C. New Analyst
Total Phosphorus, SM 4500-P B, F, Refresher and Updates
TKN, SM 4500 Norg B/4500 NH3 B,C, Refresher and Updates


## BOD/CBOD, SM 5210B, New Analyst



Conductivity SM 2510B, New Analyst
Total Cyanide, EPA Method 335.4, New Analyst
Hexavalent Chromium, SM21 3500-Cr B, New Analyst Support Equipment, Refresher and Updates

TCEQ Environmental Trade Fair
Ammonia, Gas Diffusion SFA, EPA 350.1. Refresher and Updates
Ion Chromatography Training
Colilert, Quanti-Tray, SM 9223B, Refresher and Updates
Volatiles in Drinking Water, EPA 524.2, Refresher and Updates Subcontracting, Refresher and Updates

Oil and Grease, EPA Method 1664A, New Analyst
Ammonia, Titration, Post Distillation SM 4500NH3 B,C, Refresher
and Updates
Chemicals and
Chemicals and Standards Traceability, Refresher and Updates
Subsampling, Refresher and Updates
Heterotrophic Plate Count, SM 9215B, New Analyst
Document Control, Refresher and Updates
Fecal Coliform by Membrane Filtration, SM 9222D, New Analyst Volatiles in Wastewater, EPA 624, Refresher and Updates Internal Audits and Manageresher and Updates Data Validation, Refreshar Data Validation, Refresher
Sample Handling SOP. Upd
Sample Handling SOP. Updates (for sample couriers only)
TCEQ Laboratory Stakeholders Meeting
Aug. 7-9, 2018
Aug. 21-23, 2018
Aug. 23-30, 2018
Aug. 23-30, 2018
Aug. 30-Sept. 24,
2018
September 4, 2018
September 6, 2018
Sept. 19-Oct. 25,
2018
September 11, 2018
Sept. 12-18, 2018
September 13. 2018
September 13, 2018
Sept. 13-28, 2018
Sept. 18-19, 2018
Sept. 19-20, 2018
Septermber 25, 2018
September 26, 2018
Oct. 1-4, 2018
October 3, 2018
October 4, 2018

$\begin{array}{r}7.5 \\ 8.0 \\ 2.5 \\ 0.5 \\ 8.0 \\ 1.0 \\ 5.0 \\ 2.5 \\ 2.5 \\ 28.0 \\ \\ \hline 1161\end{array}$ ツールNーー응응 Grand Total 2018


Total Coliform／E．Coli，SM 9223－97（Colilert－24），Refresher and
Updates
Opdates Oil and Grease，EPA Method 1664A，Returning Analyst Heterotrophic Plate Count，SM 9215B，Refresher and Up
Field Chlorine Benchshet Field Chlorine，Benchsheet Update Colilert，Quanti－Tray，SM 9223B，New Analyst Stock Culture Maintenance．Refresher and Updates
BOD／CBOD，SM 5210B，Troubleshooting Blank Issu COD SM 5220D，Refresher and Updates Turbidity，EPA Method 180．1．Nephelome Turbidity，EPA Method 180．1．Nephelometric，Refresher and Updates
Advanced Microsoft Word
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Link to matrix

## Response to Mr. Lara's Questions

1. How are these cities charged and how are the individual meters checked for billing?

- Rates. Customer shall be charged the highest bill calculated based on the metered usage on the interconnect line of the Customer applied to the Water Rates of the System and the Water Rates of the Customer, and
- Standby Charge. Customer shall be charged monthly for the ability of System to provide standby services at the System's meter fee rate on the interconnect meter. If water usage is metered for two consecutive months or for more than three months during a calendar year, then the System shall charge additional standby services of ten times the applicable meter fee rate or Monthly Service Availability Charge for each month of metered usage in the calendar year, and
- Time and Material Charges. Customer shall be charged monthly for all time and material charges incurred to service the interconnect infrastructure. Such billing shall detail the reason for the charges in addition to the time and unit costs.
- The meters will be turned on by SAWS staff at the time of activation as well as the entity staff will need to open receiving valves and check the entity's meter.

2. Can an overview of the agreement and the actual system be briefed at some point?

There is only one active agreement in effect today:

## Country Bend (Southwest Water Company) Interconnect Agreement

- Signed 03/30/2010 - 10 year contract
- Either party can cancel at any time by providing prior written notice
- SAWS can deny water if SAWS customers will be adversely impacted
- All emergency interconnections are charged the interconnect water service rate
- Use of interconnect is limited to conditions necessitated by mechanical failure and will be temporary
- Each activation of interconnect cannot exceed 30 days unless granted by SAWS with written request
- Interconnect water use is limited to domestic indoor use - no landscape watering
- Interconnect cannot be used to supplement water shortages due to declining supply or unwillingness to find new supplies or build redundant infrastructure
- If Country Bend can't meet customer demand, regular connection should be requested
- Regular connection will require engineering study
- Regular connection will require payment of impact fees

3. Is there a tier system that regulates the pricing for high volume users?

- No. There is no outdoor usage permitted. Only emergency water permitted to sustain human life.

4. Is there a tier system that regulates more frequent users of the interconnect agreement?

- No. Contractually you cannot be a frequent user. Frequent use would constitute a wholesale agreement. Each emergency interconnect activation is limited to 30 calendar
days.


## EMERGENCY INTERCONNECT AGREEMENT

This Emergency Interconnect Agreement (the "Agreement") is entered into on this $30^{\text {th }}$ day of Laway 20 T0 (the "Effective Date") by and between The San Antonio Water System ("SAWS") and SWWC Utilities, Inc., a Delaware corporation ("SWWC"), with respect to SAWS providing an emergency interconnect to SWWC under the following conditions:

1. The requesting purveyor agrees that SAWS has the obligation to first provide water service to its customers not located in the area to be served through the emergency interconnect. SAWS has the right to not sell water through the emergency interconnect if it has determined that first priority customers would be adversely impacted. The requesting purveyor understands and agrees that SAWS, in its sole discretion, may terminate the emergency interconnect at anytime and reject any future emergency interconnects.
2. All emergency interconnections shall be charged the interconnect water service rate and billed in accordance with City of San Antonio Ordinance \# 101684 and as may be amended from time to time. Impact fees will not be charged by SAWS for an emergency interconnect.
3. Physical connections to the SAWS system for the emergency interconnect shall be funded entirely by the requesting purveyor. SAWS must approve the engineering plans and inspect the construction of the connection prior to activating the emergency
interconnect.
4. Activation of the connection is temporary and shall be limited to conditions necessitated by mechanical failure.
a. The emergency connection shall not be used as the mechanism to delay repairs or modifications to the requesting purveyors system.
b. Activation of the connection shall be performed by SAWS staff.
5. Each activation of the emergency interconnect shall not exceed 30 days. If more than 30 days is needed to repair the mechanical failure with the system, the requesting ${ }^{\text {. }}$ purveyor shall submit a written request to SAWS. SAWS will then reassess the request to determine if adequate water supply is available for SAWS first priority customers and also for the emergency interconnect.
6. Water use by the requesting purveyor shall be limited to domestic indoor use - not for landscape watering.
7. The emergency interconnect is not intended to serve as a supplemental source due to declining water supply and cannot be used to avoid acquiring additional water supplies or to avoid building redundant infrastructure.
a. The emergency interconnect cannot be used to satisfy any redundancy or back-up infrastructure or water supply requirements, including, those that may be prescribed by TCEQ.
b. If the purveyor does not have an adequate water supply to meet customer demand, a regular connection should be requested.
c. A regular connection will require an engineering study to determine compatibility with the System's master plan, the availability of capacity and if additional facilities will be required.
d. A regular connection will require the payment of impact fees.
8. The term of this Agreement commences on the Effective Date and shall remain in full force and effect for a period of ten (10) years.
9. Either party may terminate this Agreement by providing prior written notice to the other with an immediate effective date.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, SAWS and SWWC have duly executed this Agreement as of the Effective Date.

SWWC UTITLIES, INC.



# an ordinance 101684 <br> AUTHORIZING THE ADDITION OF AN INTERCONNECT Water service rate to city code of san ANTONIO, TEXAS CBAPTER 34, TO BE CHARGED BY THE SAN ANTONIO WATER SYSTEM; AND AMENDING THE CITY CODE ACCORDINGLY. 

WHEREAS, Ordinance No. 75686, authorized and approved by the City Council of the City of San Antonio, Texas ("City Council") on April 30, 1992, requires that the San Antonio Water System Board of Trustees (the "Board") determine the rates, fees and charges for services rendered by the San Antonio Water System ("SAWS"); and

WHEREAS, the Board had determined that the rates and charges for water customers are in need of revision to establish a Water Service Interconnect Rate; and

WHEREAS, such revisions will require amendments and additions to certain sections of and accompanying schedules to Chapter 34 of the San Antonio City Code, which must be approved by the City Council of the City of San Antonio; and

WHEREAS, if authorized, the Water Service Interconnect Rate will provide a charge for unscheduled potable water delivered to water purveyors or entities that connect to SAWS system on a temporary or short-term basis; and

WHEREAS, connection to the system and the application of the proposed rate are intended only for the time needed by the customer to resolve or mitigate the situation that caused the customer to request a connection; and

WHEREAS, water purveyors and eatities outside of the SAWS system have and will continue to request connections to the system to receive potable water services on a shortterm, unscheduled basis and the purveyors then resell the water provided by SAWS to their customers; and

WHEREAS, supplying water under the Water Service Interconnect Rate is not intended to be an indefinite source of water to the customer and, therefore, the rate is structured to provide short tem temporary water service, yet encourage long term water service agreements which will help SAWS and the benefiting water purveyor to work together at providing the necessary water supply for the community in need; and

WHEREAS, customers who connect to the SAWS system under the Water Service Intercomect Rate shall pay for all services related to connecting into the infrastructure of the system, including capital and operational costs; and
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WHEREAS, in addition to providing short tenn relief and encouraging long term relationships, the proposed rate will ensure that the water purveyors purchasing water under this rate schedule will not profit when reselling the water to their own customers; and

Whereas, it is in the best interest of the City for the City Council to approve and adopt such rates and charges in order to continue to maintain it covenants and obligations; NOW THEREFORE:

## BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SAN

 ANTONIO:SECTION 1. The Water Service Interconnect Rate set forth in Attachment I to this Ordinance is authorized and approved.

SECTION 2. The rate shall be effective for all SAWS billings on and after January 1 , 2006.

SECTION 3. The City Code shall be amended in accordance with Attachment I to this Ordinance.

SECTION 4. This Ordinance shall be effective on and after the tenth day after passage.

PASSED AND APPROVED this $17^{\text {th }}$ day of November, 2005.


ATTEST:



APPROVED AS TO FORM:


## Attachment I

## ATTACHMENT I

## AMENDMENTS TO CEAPTER 34 OF THE SAN ANTONIO CITY CODE

The City Code of the City of San Antonio Chapter 34, Water and Sewers, Article II, Water Service and Rates, Section 34-122, Rate Schedules, is hereby amended by adding the language that is underlined (added) as set forth herein.

## Article II. Water Service and Rates

## Section 34-122.4. Water Service Interconnect Rate

Section 34-122.4.01 Definitions
For the purpose of this chapter the following terms, phrases, words, and their derivations shall have the meaning in this section.

Customers. The application of the water service interconnect rate shall apply to customers or entities that request to interconnect into the System to receive water services pn a temporary basis that: a) do not have a current contract for wholegale water service with the System at the point of service that is included in the request; and b) plan to resell the water provided by the Systam to its own customers. The System shall have the discretion to determine whether or not a particular request for temporary water service qualifies as either a wholesale water service request or a request for temporary water service under this temporary interconmection rate. In malang such a determination, the System may consider whether or not the requirements for servics included in the request are within the System's long-term capabilities and consistent with the Systern's master
plan.

Water Rates of the Sustem. The water rates shall be herein defined as those water rates and charges in effect for residential customers as defined under Chapter 34 Article. II and amended from time to time. The water rates shall include but not be limited to the Water Supply Fee, all applicable water rates, 昭d Edwards Aquifer Authority Fees,
Wrater Rates of the Customer. The water rates shall be herein defined as those water rates and charges in effect for residential customers of the Customer at the time of the billing of the water service interconnect rate by the System. The water rates shall include but not be limited to all applicable water rates, surcharges, and charges for the procurement of existing or additional water sources.

## Section 34-122.4.02 Application of Water Service Interconnect Rate

a) Billing of Customer. Tha System shall bill Customer in accordance with the provisions in Chapter 34. Article II.
b) Sustems'Right to Sell Water. System has an obligation to serve its customers who are not under the water service intercomect rate. System shall have the right not to sall to Customer in any event that it deems necessary to preserve the capacity to serve customers who are not under the water service interconnect rate. When possible. System shall
notify Customer in advance that it will not be able serve Customer under the interconnect arrangament for a designated time period.
c) Required Documentation. Customer shall provide to System on a monthly basis its monthly forecast for the next twelve-month time period of water usage neads required of the interconnection infrastructure. The forecast documentation is necessary for System to determine its bbility to service Customer under the water service interoomect rate.

Customer shall also provide to System on a monfhly basis its current rate sohedules then in effect for its residential customers, including all applicable charges and faes that would be charged to its residential customers for that month If billing to Customer is not according to the applicable rate schedules then in effect at time of billing, System reserves the right to bill Customer on the applicable rates for all usage that was applied to the incorrect rate schedules.
d) Sustem's Ability to Provide Standby Semices, System recognizes that the interconnect services are necessary to provide services that are on a standby basis and the rate should incorporate a provision for the standby service.
e) Payment for the Interconnection Infrastructure. Customer shall pay for all services related to connecting into the infrastructure of the System, to include capital and operations costs. Customer shall pey for the pipeline costs in arivance of receiving water services from System. In the event System must inour operations costs to service the interconnect infastructure, System shall bill Custorner the current costs of time and materials.

1) Assignment of Water under Water Service Intercannect Rate. Water service provided to Customer through the interconnect line is intended for the use of the Customer on a temporary or emergency basis. Customer shall not assimn the provisions of the water service to other water purveyors.

Section 34-122.4.03 Water Service Interconnect Rate
The Water Service Interconnect Rate is hereby established and is applicable to the use of potable
water.

Customer shall be charged on a monthly basis for the preceding monthly metered usage based on the following calculations:
a) Rates. Customer shall be charged the highest bill calculated based on the meterad usage on the interconnect line of the Customer applied to the Water Rates of the System and the Water Rates of the Customer, and
b) Standby Charge. Customer shall be charged monthly for the ability of System to provide standby servicas at the System's mater fee rate on the interconnect meter. If water usage is metered for two consecutive months or for more than three months during a calendar year, then the System shall charge additional standby services of ten times the applicable meter fee rate or Monthly Service Availability Charge for each month of metered usage in the calendar year, and
c) Time and Material Chorges. Customer shall be charged monthly for all time and material charges incurred to service the ioterconnect infrastructure. Such billing shall detail the reason for the charges in addition to the time and unit costs.

## ATTACHMENT VIII (PL-17)

## Response to Mr. Smyle: (PL-17)

No, making recommendations concerning impact fees is beyond the legal scope of the RAC. The RAC is charged under the bylaws with making recommendations regarding the structures for water, sewer and recycled water rates. State law requires that a Capital Improvement Advisory Committee (CIAC) directly appointed by the City Council oversee the Impact Fee revision process.

The process of determining the maximum impact fee that can be charged is set forth in Chapter 395 of the Texas Local Government Code. The calculation of the maximum Water Supply impact fee is documented in the "Water and Wastewater Facilities LUAP, CIP and Maximum Impact Fees" (see Table 1.4 .2 on page 9 ). The maximum fee was calculated by taking the cost associated with capacity available from existing water supplies and adding the cost associated with any additional capacity necessary from new projects (i.e. Vista Ridge) to meet the demands from growth during the next ten years (the period allowed by law.) The Vista Ridge water supply is expected to meet projected growth for much longer than just the next ten years. Approximately, two-thirds of the capacity provided by the Vista Ridge project will support growth beyond the next ten years.

As with any SAWS infrastructure project necessary to meet the demands of future growth, the cost associated to the capacity of that project that pertains to growth beyond the ten year impact fee study period is borne by all ratepayers. However, this excess capacity will be included in the calculation of future impact fees. SAWS updates its impact fees every five years as proscribed by law. These future updates will allocate Vista Ridge costs to the projected growth occurring during each successive ten year periods until the total capacity provided by the project is exhausted, thereby recovering additional portions of the Vista Ridge costs in years beyond this first ten year period.

The "Water and Wastewater Facilities LUAP, CIP and Maximum Impact Fees" report provides more details related to the impact fee calculations and can be found at:

[^4]SAWS staff is happy to meet with you outside the RAC meetings to further discuss the impact fee calculations.

## ATTACHMENT IX (PL-25)

# San Antonio Water System <br> SCHEDULE OF REVENUES AND THEIR DISPOSITION COMPARED TO ANNUAL BUDGET (amounts in thousands) <br> For the year ended December 31, 2018 

| SOURCES OF FUNDS | Actual |  | Annual Budget |  | Variance |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| OPERATING REVENUES |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Water delivery system | S | 218,399 | s | 219,825 | S | $(1,426)$ |
| Water supply system |  | 202,674 |  | 211,626 |  | (8,952) |
| Wastewater system |  | 259,124 |  | 253,40 |  | 5,684 |
| Chilled water system |  | 10,849 |  | 10,327 |  | 522 |
| Total operating revenues |  | 691,046 |  | 695,218 |  | (4,172) |
| NONOPERATING REVENUES |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Interest earned and miscellaneous |  | 21, +11 |  | 11,350 |  | 10,061 |
| Orher financing sources (draw on equity) |  | 1,400 |  | 1,400 |  | . |
| Total nonoperating revenues |  | 22,811 |  | 12,750 |  | 10,061 |
| CAPITAL CONTRIBUTIONS |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Capital Recovery lices |  | 79,794 |  | 72,877 |  | 6,917 |
| Contributions in . Cd of Construction |  | 6,435 |  | . |  | 6,435 |
| Total capital contributions |  | 86,229 |  | 72,877 |  | 13,352 |
| TOTAL SOURCES OF FUNDS | S | 800,086 | S | 780,8+5 | S | 19,241 |
| USES OF FUNDS |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Salaries and fringe bencfits | S | 157,375 | s | 158,729 | S | 1,354 |
| Contractual services |  | 171,031 |  | 181,53 + |  |  |
| Materials and supplies |  | 23,485 |  | 23,538 |  | 53 |
| Orher charges |  | 9,956 |  | 10,048 |  | 92 |
| 1.ess: Costs capitalized to Construction in Progress |  | (31,612) |  | $(33,997)$ |  | $(2,385)$ |
| Total operation and maintenance |  | 330,235 |  | 339,852 |  | 9,617 |
| OPERATING RESERVE REQUIREMENT |  | 2,499 |  | 1,277 |  | $(1,223)$ |
| DEBT REQUIREMENTS |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Interest costs |  | 113,105 |  | 134,630 |  | 21,525 |
| Retirement of bonds |  | 90,146 |  | 99,2+2 |  | 9,096 |
| Other Debt Expense |  | 1,957 |  | 2.363 |  | 406 |
| Total debt requirements |  | 205,208 |  | 236,235 |  | 31,027 |
| TRANSFER TO THE CITY'S GENERAL FUND |  | 18,287 |  | 18,103 |  | (18+) |
| AMOUNT AVAILABLE FOR TRANSFER TO |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| THE RENEWAL AND REPLACEMENT FUND: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CAPITAL CONTRIBUTIONS |  | 86,229 |  | 74,002 |  | $(12,227)$ |
| GENERAL |  | 157,628 |  | 111,376 |  | (46, 25, ${ }^{\text {) }}$ |
| Total amount available for Renewal and Replacement Funds |  | 243,857 |  | 185,378 |  | (58,479) |
| TOTAL USES OF FUNDS | S | 800,086 | S | 780,845 | S | (19,2+1) |

The accompanying notes to the supplemental schedules is an integral part of this schedule.

# San Antonio Water System <br> SCHEDULE OF REVENUES AND THEIR DISPOSITION COMPARED TO ANNUAL BUDGET 

(amounts in thousands)
For the year ended December 31, 2017


The accompanying notes to the supplemental schedules is an integral part of this schedule.

# San Antonio Water System <br> SCHEDULE OF REVENUES AND THEIR DISPOSITION COMPARED TO ANNUAL BUDGET <br> (amounts in thousands) 

For the year ended December 31, 2016


The accompanying notes to the supplemental schedules is an integral part of this schedule.

# San Antonio Water System <br> SCHEDULE OF REVENUES AND THEIR DISPOSITION <br> COMPARED TO ANNUAL BUDGET <br> (amounts in thousands) <br> For the year ended December 31, 2015 

|  | Actual |  | Annual Budget |  | Variance |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SOURCES OF FUNDS |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| OPERATING REVENUES |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| W'ater delivery system | \$ | 123,895 | \$ | 131,026 | \$ | $(7,131)$ |
| Water supply system |  | 142,950 |  | 157,369 |  | $(14,419)$ |
| Wastewater System |  | 213,833 |  | 221,024 |  | $(7,191)$ |
| Chilled water and steam system |  | 11,102 |  | 10,236 |  | 866 |
| Total operating revenues |  | 491,780 |  | 519,655 |  | $(27,875)$ |
| NONOPERATING REVENUES |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Interest earned and miscellaneous |  | 6,097 |  | 5,420 |  | 677 |
| Other financing sources (draw on equity) |  | 1,400 |  | 1,400 |  | - |
| Total nonoperating revenues |  | 7,497 |  | 6,820 |  | 677 |
| CAPITAL CONTRIBUTIONS |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Capital Recovery Fees |  | 56,153 |  | 46,403 |  | 9,750 |
| Grant Revenue |  |  |  | . |  | . |
| Total capital contributions |  | 56,153 |  | 46,403 |  | 9,750 |
| TOTAL SOURCES OF FUNDS | \$ | 555,430 | \$ | 572,878 | \$ | $(17,4+8)$ |
| USES OF FUNDS |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Salaries and fringe benefits | 5 | 123,562 | \$ | 126,751 | \$ | 3,189 |
| Contractual services |  | 132,510 |  | 145,168 |  | 12,658 |
| Materials and supplies |  | 21,158 |  | 19,648 |  | $(1,510)$ |
| Other charges |  | 7,2+3 |  | 10,382 |  | 3,139 |
| Less: Costs capitalized to Construction in Progress |  | $(32,8+3)$ |  | $(36,165)$ |  | $(3,322)$ |
| Total operation and maintenance |  | 251,630 |  | 265,78t |  | 14,15+ |
| OPERATING RESERVE REQUIREMENT |  | 912 |  | 1,893 |  | 981 |
| DEBT REQUIREMENTS |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Interest costs |  | 100,513 |  | 110,937 |  | 10,424 |
| Retirement of bonds |  | 72,399 |  | 74,833 |  | 2,434 |
| Other Debt Expense |  | 1,906 |  | 2,577 |  | 671 |
| Total debt requirements |  | 174,818 |  | 188,347 |  | 13,529 |
| TRANSFER TO THE CITY'S GENERAL FUND |  | 12,683 |  | 13,275 |  | 592 |
| AMOUNT AVAILABLE FOR TRANSFER TO |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| THE RENEWAL AND REPLACEMENT FUND: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CAPITAL CONTRIBUTIONS |  | 56,153 |  | 46,403 |  | $(9,750)$ |
| GENERAL |  | 59,23 + |  | 57,176 |  | $(2,058)$ |
| Total amount available for Renewal and Replacement Funds |  | 115,387 |  | 103,579 |  | $(11,808)$ |
| TOTAL USES OF FUNDS | \$ | 555,430 | \$ | 572,878 | \$ | 17,448 |

The accompanying notes to the supplemental schedules is an integral part of this schedule.
San Antonio Water System - District Special Project
SCHEDULE OF SOURCES AND USES OF FUNDS
Twelve months ended December 2015



SOURCES OF FUNDS

## OPERATING REVENUES

EAATCEQ Passthrough Fees
Metered Water - Water Delivery
Water Supply Fee
Miscellaneous Fees
Less: Uncollectible Accounts

NON-OPERATING REVENUES
Interest earned
Total non-operating revenues
CAPITAL CONTRIBUTIONS
Capital Recovery and Service Extension Fees
TOTAL SOURCES OF FUNDS
USES OF FUNDS
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE Salaries and fringe benefits
Contractual services
Other charges
Capitalized cost
OPERATING RESERVE REQUIREMENT
DEBT REQUIREMENTS
Revenue Bonds:
evenue Bonds.
Interest costs
Retirement of bonds
Flexible Rate Note interes
Other Debt Expense
AMOUNT AVAILABLE FOR R\&R FUNDS: GENERAL
Total amount available for $R \& R$ Funds
TOTAL USES OF FUNDS

# San Antonio Water System <br> SCHEDULE OF REVENUES AND THEIR DISPOSITION COMPARED TO ANNUAL BUDGET <br> (amounts in thousands) 

For the year ended December 31, 2014


The accompanying notes to the supplemental schedules is an integral part of this schedule.



[^0]:    

[^1]:    2019 guidelines.

[^2]:    "Poverty level figures based on U.S. Depl. of Health \& Human Services

[^3]:    *Poverty haval higuras based on U S Dapl. of Heakh \& Human Services 2017 guidalines

[^4]:    https://apps.saws.org/business center/developer/impactfees/docs/20190410/SAWS\%202019\%20W W W\%201mpact\%20Fee\%20Rpt 062019.pdf

