

Water System Communication

Glenn Barnes

Environmental Finance Center

The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill 919-962-2789

glennbarnes@sog.unc.edu

Session Overview

- Explore ways that boards communicate with customers
- Discuss strategies to improve board and staff communication

Communicating with Customers

Rates are the primary way that we as water systems "communicate" with our customers

Here's a question we hear often...



It depends...



Rate Setting Objectives





Mission Statements

Do you have a mission statement? Do you know what it is?



What makes a good mission statement?





NASA

To improve life here,
to extend life to there,
to find life beyond.

" mission is to organize the world's information and make it universally accessible and useful"





To refresh the world
To inspire moments of optimism and happiness

To create value and make a difference



Water Mission Statements



We provide a safe, reliable, high-quality water supply with superior service and value.

Water Mission Statements

CITY OF LONGVIEW

The Water Utilities Department will develop and maintain a competent team of professionals who strive continuously to improve the level of service to our customers through accurate utility billing, increased technological enhancements, and a greater emphasis on customer solutions, while planning for future needs of a growing and diverse community.

Water Mission Statements



To assure responsive customers service; provide reliable, high quality, affordable and sustainable water supply, wastewater collection and treatment and reuse systems; and support a healthy, environmentally sustainable and economically-viable community.

Do Mission Statements Matter?

- Everyone needs to know where the organization is headed & everyone needs to be on the same page
- Some goals are contradictory; which one matters most?

 Board needs to provide support for the things it cares about



Board/Staff Communication





Communicating a Rate Case: 2014 Survey on Water system Rate Communication





Are rates getting approved?



n=1,330

What was approved versus what was requested?

n=804



*Summary Statistics

But did they ask for enough?

In your professional opinion, which statement below best describes the water rate increase that was proposed to the local government governing body for approval?

n=1,349 Beyond what is needed in coming year to help avoid another rate increase for a few years

Provided revenues to maintain a strong fiscal condition and meet most capital needs

Sufficient to address basic utility/department obligations, but not most capital needs

Below what was needed to maintain basic operating needs







Some Key Factors

- Trust
- Information conveyed
- Public Involvement

Trust (Working Relationship)

 According to elected officials, more frequent communication and effective communication are directly related to a good working relationship

Trust (Working Relationship)

Administrative officers with better working relationships with the governing board were:

- More likely to request higher rate increases
- More likely to request full-cost-recovery rate increases

The full governing body typically meets with staff once a year or less



Information Provided to Governing Boards

		Utility Interviewed									
Description		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1. How much the average bill would change		\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark	✓	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark	✓
2. How changing circumstances affects finances		\checkmark	✓	✓	✓	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark	✓	
3. Anticipated capital expenses		\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark	✓	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark	✓
4. The financial condition of the water utility		\checkmark	✓	\checkmark	✓	\checkmark		\checkmark	\checkmark	✓	\checkmark
5. The physical condition of the water	⁻ utility	\checkmark				\checkmark			\checkmark	\checkmark	
6. How proposed rates compare to c	ustomer incomes	\checkmark							\checkmark		\checkmark
7. Comparisons of rates with other ut	ilities	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark		\checkmark	\checkmark		
8. Bond covenants		\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark			\checkmark	\checkmark	
9. Multiple rate scenarios					\checkmark			\checkmark			\checkmark
10. Projected impact of rate adjustments on demand								\checkmark		\checkmark	
11. Previous history of water rate adju	stments	\checkmark	\checkmark			\checkmark				\checkmark	
12. Rate adjustments needed in the ne	ext few years	\checkmark	\checkmark			\checkmark		\checkmark		\checkmark	\checkmark
13. Comparisons of rate adjustments	with other services	\checkmark			\checkmark			\checkmark			
14. Initiatives that improve efficiency					\checkmark			\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark
15. Customer satisfaction surveys						\checkmark			\checkmark		\checkmark

Information Provided to Governing Boards

		Utility Interviewed								
Description	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1. How much the average bill would change		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
2. How changing circumstances affects finances		\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark	
3. Anticipated capital expenses		\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark
4. The financial condition of the water utility		\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark		\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark
5. The physical condition of the water utility					\checkmark			\checkmark	\checkmark	
6. How proposed rates compare to customer incomes								\checkmark		\checkmark
7. Comparisons of rates with other utilities		\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark		\checkmark	\checkmark		
8. Bond covenants	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark			\checkmark	\checkmark	
9. Multiple rate scenarios				\checkmark			\checkmark			\checkmark
10. Projected impact of rate adjustments on demand							\checkmark		\checkmark	
11. Previous history of water rate adjustments		\checkmark			\checkmark				\checkmark	
Rate adjustments needed in the next few years		\checkmark			\checkmark		\checkmark		\checkmark	\checkmark
13. Comparisons of rate adjustments with other services				\checkmark			\checkmark			
Initiatives that improve efficiency				\checkmark			\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark
15. Customer satisfaction surveys					\checkmark			\checkmark		\checkmark

Highlighted were reported by Governing Boards as most helpful.

Public Involvement

The more the public was involved, the more likely the rate adjustment was approved (p<0.01)





Public Involvement



When the public was involved, the system was 20% more likely to request a higher rate increase

Board & Staff Communication

Glenn Barnes Environmental Finance Center The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill 919-962-2789 glennbarnes@sog.unc.edu