

Report of the Mayor's Blue Ribbon Panel

Restructuring the Pittsburgh Water and Sewer Authority

December 28, 2017

Members of the Blue Ribbon Panel:

Independent Members

Fred Brown, President and CEO
Homewood Children's Village

Jared Cohon, President Emeritus and University Professor of Civil and Environmental
Engineering and Engineering and Public Policy
Carnegie Mellon University

Michelle Naccarati-Chapkis, Executive Director
Women for a Healthy Environment

Mark Stulga, Vice President, Commercial and Industrial Lending
WesBanco Bank

Alex Thomson, President and Chair of the Business Law Practice Group,
Houston Harbaugh, P.C.

Members who are Employees of the City of Pittsburgh

Kevin Acklin, Chief of Staff
Office of the Mayor

Jennifer Presutti, Director
Office of Management and Budget

Lourdes Sanchez-Ridge
Solicitor

Highlights of the Blue Ribbon Panel's Recommendations

The Pittsburgh Water and Sewer Authority (PWSA) should not be privatized at this time, nor should the ownership of the system be transferred from the City. PWSA should remain a municipal authority but it must be thoroughly reorganized to make it independent of elective politics and accountable to and trusted by the public.

This reorganization should be accomplished by March 31, 2018 through a contract between the City and PWSA.

The reorganization should be made permanent by amending the Municipal Authorities Act.

PWSA has made significant progress in recent months. PWSA, working with its new Board of Directors, must continue to pursue aggressively its transformation into a high-functioning, customer-oriented organization and its plan to repair and replace the existing water supply infrastructure.

INTRODUCTION

Water is, of course, essential; no species can live without it. But, for humans, water also carries cultural and social significance, no doubt in part because of its necessity. In Pittsburgh, water is wrapped up in our very identity. We are the City of Three Rivers. We are the City of Bridges (spanning those rivers). Pittsburgh is the city at the head of the Ohio.

Although few Pittsburghers realize it, our region is blessed with a water supply which is judged to be the most reliably available in the country, an enormous advantage in the competition with other cities for prized employers, talented workers and students. At the same time, however, the infrastructure we use to make our plentiful water drinkable and to deliver it to those who need it is badly dilapidated. And the organization we've created to manage it—the Pittsburgh Water and Sewer Authority—is struggling to overcome the burden of its poor management of the past. It has lost the trust of the public that it serves, and it has become a leading risk factor for the future of Pittsburgh's economic development.

Our water system's non-compliance with limits on lead in drinking water, multiple boil water advisories, several water main breaks and widespread errors in billing, have brought unprecedented public attention to PWSA. Collectively, these system failures and deficiencies have created a sense of crisis, and this is a crisis we must not waste. We must summon the political will to (i) make long-overdue changes in the way PWSA is governed and operates and (ii) invest in our water and sewer infrastructure.

CONTEXT, TERMS OF REFERENCE AND PROCESS

In recognition of the severe challenges faced by the Pittsburgh Water and Sewer Authority, the City of Pittsburgh decided to pursue a possible restructuring of the Authority. The City's Office of Management and Budget, on behalf of the Office of the Mayor, sought proposals from qualified consulting groups to provide advice and recommendations. In March, 2017, the Mayor appointed the Blue Ribbon Panel (BRP) to advise the City on the selection of a consultant and to review and render judgments about the consultant's recommendations.

The Selection of IMG

The BRP held two meetings by conference call in March, 2017 to learn about the context and expectations for the consulting engagement and to discuss the selection process.

On March 31, 2017, the Panel met in a public session at which four consulting groups, selected by the City from 18 proposals, made presentations and answered the Panel's questions. The BRP met via conference call on April 13 to discuss the members' evaluations of the four finalists. Based on that feedback, the City selected Infrastructure Management Group (IMG) and its partners to conduct the restructuring study.

The Evaluation Phase

IMG performed its work from May to November, 2017. The BRP was not involved in IMG's work, but it received status presentations from IMG in public meetings on August 28 and September 12, at which BRP members asked several questions and heard public comments, and a final presentation on November 8, also in a public meeting. Several BRP members also participated in a public workshop held by IMG on November 2.

In addition to its public meetings with IMG, the BRP held lengthy private meetings on October 17 (with IMG), November 8, 21, and 27 and on December 11. These private meetings were the primary mechanism through which the BRP explored the nature of PWSA's problems, digested information from IMG, PWSA and other sources, evaluated the options and reached its conclusions and recommendations.

The BRP made extensive use of email to exchange information and comment on drafts of this report. Individual members and subsets of the BRP met and talked with several stakeholders and experts (See the sources of information section below.)

The Independence of the BRP

The BRP and the Mayor's office recognized that it was essential that the BRP be independent of the City and PWSA. Thus, after the initial selection phase, the BRP members who are City employees (Acklin, Presutti and Sanchez-Ridge) stopped attending meetings of the BRP. Furthermore, they did not have input to or review drafts of this report.

The Mayor also appointed a panel of advisors to the BRP (see Appendix A). Some or all of the advisors attended the BRP's public meetings and the private meeting on November 8. None of the advisors attended the subsequent private meetings and, thus, were not directly involved in the BRP's evaluations or conclusions, or in the drafting of this report. However, their inputs early in the process and their written assessments were very valuable.

This report was produced by the independent members of the BRP and represents the opinions of only those members.

Sources of Information

The BRP used a wide range of sources, both written and oral, to inform its work. Of course, IMG's presentations and reports, especially its "Task 5 report," were the centerpiece and driver of the Panel's work, and PWSA provided very extensive information, much of it generated by requests from the BRP. These and many other sources are detailed in Appendix B.

We call out here two sources which were particularly important in informing the Panel's conclusions and recommendations. A report by Howard Neukrug, Patrick Cairo and Satya Rhodes-Conway provided (as of late November 2017) a timely, independent assessment of the PWSA by a team of very experienced

and knowledgeable water utility experts. A series of meetings with, and a memorandum from Carolyn Duronio from Reed Smith, facilitated by the Allegheny Conference on Community Development, provided valuable background and context for the Panel's recommendations on governance.

EVALUATING THE OPTIONS

IMG identified seven options for restructuring PWSA (see Section V of the "Task 5 Report"). Based on its evaluation of the options using ten criteria (Section VI of the "Task 5 Report"), IMG recommended restructuring the PWSA based on "three pillars" (Section VII of the "Task 5 Report").

- Governance: Transfer the ownership of the infrastructure and PWSA's governance and rate-setting responsibilities to a new "Pittsburgh Public Infrastructure Trust."
- Operations: Operational reform featured in a contract among the new Public Trust, PWSA and an infrastructure management partner (described next).
- Infrastructure: Enter into a long-term asset management lease assignment with a private partner

The BRP analyzed and discussed these recommendations in great detail, but, rather than restrict our attention to IMG's recommendations, we decided to consider the full suite of options and to evaluate them with criteria that were a modification of IMG's. This approach made for a more robust set of conclusions and recommendations.

The Options

The BRP considered the options for restructuring PWSA listed in Table 1. These are similar to IMG's options, but there are differences, starting with their "Baseline (Status Quo) Path" which the BRP eliminated. Doing nothing is simply not an option.

The BRP's exploration of the Public Trust idea (option 1a), led to the suggestion that there may be easier ways to accomplish the key governance changes, which led to our development, and ultimately recommendation, of option 1b. The other options differ in minor ways from IMG's, e.g., treating non-water utilities as distinct from water utilities in option 6.

The Criteria

IMG identified the ten criteria listed in Table 2. This is a valuable set of criteria, derived from the IMG team's engagement with the public. However, there are important considerations that are not captured as clearly and explicitly as they should be.

The BRP believes that, after public health and safety, there are four criteria of overarching importance:

- Independence from political control
- Public accountability
- Public trust
- Durability

IMG's criteria list captures accountability (but curiously combines it with public health and safety—see criterion 2) and durability, while independence and public trust are not explicitly included.

The BRP did not conduct a quantitative analysis of the options and their performance on the criteria. Rather, we asked ourselves whether the options differed in terms of specific individual criteria. In other words, would environmental protection and compliance be better or worse if, say, PWSA were reorganized as a public trust or owned by a private utility? The answer to this is “no, in general,” i.e. the environmental performance of either option could be good or bad, depending on execution, not on organizational structure. This is generally the case for the first seven criteria in Table 2. One could counter-argue, for example, that a publicly-owned utility will be more responsive to, say, ratepayer impact than a privately-owned operation. That may be true, but the BRP felt that the key distinction in this case, would be in public accountability—which is why we treated it as a separate criterion—not ratepayer impact per se.

This reasoning led to the modified list of criteria shown in Table 3. We call them “distinguishing criteria” because these are the criteria on which the various options differ from each other. This does not mean that other criteria, like public health and safety, are unimportant; it only means that every option before us could do well (or poorly) in terms of public health and safety. Indeed, one of our recommendations is that, no matter which option is pursued, it be made very clear, through contracts, bylaws, or statute, that public health and safety are of paramount importance and are the core of the water system operations and mission.

The first four criteria in Table 3 have already been discussed. Employee recruitment and retention, our fifth criterion, are crucial for the future of PWSA. We adopted this as a criterion, incorporating bargaining unit protection (IMG criterion #5), as well as training and skills development, residency requirement and compensation. We included efficiency (#6) in order to capture the expected benefit of options that include private sector providers. Implementability (#7) is a combination of IMG's criteria 8 and 9 in Table 2 and has legal, financial and political dimensions.

Table 1. The Restructuring Options Considered by the
Blue Ribbon Panel

1. Governance Change
 - a. Public Trust
 - b. Modifications to current authority
2. Internal Improvement with City Oversight
3. Long-term Operations and Maintenance Contract with a private company
4. Infrastructure-only Lease Concession
5. Full Service Lease Concession
6. Transfer ownership to a PUC-regulated, investor-owned, private utility
 - a. Non-water
 - b. Water

Table 2. IMG's Criteria (from "Task 5 Report," pp. 31-33)

1. Ratepayer Impact
2. Public Health and Safety and Public Accountability
3. Performance Impact Guarantee
4. Environmental Protection and Compliance
5. Labor and Bargaining Unit Protections
6. Green Infrastructure Guarantee
7. Low-Income Household Protection
8. Legal and Financial Feasibility
9. Ease and Speed of Implementation
10. Durability of Change

Table 3. The Blue Ribbon Panel's Distinguishing Criteria

1. Independence
2. Public accountability
3. Public confidence
4. Durability
5. Employee retention and recruitment
6. Efficiency
7. Implementability

Using the criteria in Table 3, the BRP then considered each option and determined on which criteria that option was strongest and on which it was weakest. A summary of our assessment is shown in Table 4. Both options 1a and b stand out in terms of independence, accountability, public confidence and durability. We believe that maintaining the PWSA, but with significant governance changes (1b) would be easier to implement than the public trust (1a). This is discussed more fully in the next section.

All of the alternatives that include some degree of privatization were judged to be weak in terms of accountability and the public's confidence in them. These options would also be difficult or impossible to implement politically, and they have uncertain implications for employees.

This, then was the basis for our conclusions and recommendations, presented in the next section.

Table 4. The Blue Ribbon Panel's Evaluation of the Options in Terms of the Distinguishing Criteria

	1 Independence	2 Accountable	3 Confidence	4 Durable	5 Employees	6 Efficient	7 Implementable
1.a. Public Trust	*	*	*	*			X
b. Modified Authority	*	*	*	*			?
2. Internal Improvement	X	X	X	X			*
3. O&M Contract	X	X	X	*	?	*	* (Fast) X (Political)
4. Infrastructure-only Lease		?	X		?	*	* ? (Political)
5. Full Lease		X	X	*	?	*	X (Political)
6.a. Non-water Utility		X	X	*	?	*	X (Political)
b. Water Utility		X	X	*	?	*	X (Political)

* = Stronger

X = Weaker

? = Not Sure

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

While PWSA has made important progress in recent months, changes in governance, organizational competence and culture should be pursued with urgency.

There are many useful ideas in the IMG report, and the Blue Ribbon Panel endorses the overall thrust of them, but the panel has some important refinements for some of IMG's specific recommendations and has reservations about others. We have organized our recommendations by following IMG's "three pillars."

I. Governance

The BRP believes that this is the most important change to be made to position PWSA for success both in the short term and the long term.

PWSA must be politically independent in order for the authority to properly focus on strategic and operational plans that result in delivery of clean and affordable water to the residents of the City of Pittsburgh. PWSA's governance must be changed in a way that makes PWSA independent of elective politics while ensuring its public accountability, trust and transparency, as well as the durability and sustainability of management and operational changes.

IMG recommended that a "public trust" be created to accomplish this, but the BRP believes that these governance goals can be attained more quickly and effectively by preserving PWSA as an authority under the Municipal Authorities Act (MAA). The BRP recommends the creation of an independent Board of Nominators (BON) that will be initiated through mayoral appointments, but would be self-perpetuating after its initiation. The mayor will appoint the initial BON from a list of nominees submitted by the BRP. The BON would consist of five members (with staggered terms) who are well regarded for their competence, experience, and demonstrated community engagement, and who reflect the diversity of the city and be geographically representative of the city. The BON will be charged with electing PWSA's Board of Directors (BOD), and evaluating its performance, ultimately ensuring the success of the PWSA.

The BOD will be charged with oversight of PWSA including public health and safety, fiscal management, efficiency and productivity, and continuation of affordable rates. The BRP recommends that the BOD consist of nine, independent members, all of whom must live within the PWSA water service area. BOD members will also be known for their competence and experience and, as a group, reflect the City's diversity. In addition, the BRP recommends that the BON assure that the BOD include areas of expertise relevant to the operations and management of the PWSA. These may include, but not be limited to, the following areas: financial, legal, engineering, public utility management, and human resources/management.

To ensure that the BOD operates in the best interests of PWSA, the directors' performance will be evaluated by the BON on an annual basis, utilizing a set of defined performance metrics, as well as a Board of Directors survey. The BOD will elect its officers (Chair, Vice Chair, Secretary and Treasurer) on an annual basis. Further, the BON and BOD will hold an annual joint meeting to address BOD performance, as well as PWSA's goals and priorities for the upcoming year.

Short-Term Strategy: Creation of a contract between the City of Pittsburgh and Pittsburgh Water and Sewer Authority (PWSA) that creates a new governance framework for PWSA.

To effect these governance changes as quickly as possible, the BRP recommends the creation of a contract between the City and PWSA. This contract will set forth the guiding principles and framework of governance as outlined above. The BRP recommends that an independent legal counsel be engaged to draft this contract, which will be effective by March 31, 2018. The BRP also recommends that the Blue Ribbon Panel be continued and that it be included in the contract negotiations.

The contract will create the BON, identify its members, restrict the Mayor and City Council from future control of BOD appointments, and define the process by which the BOD is appointed and the structure within which it operates (terms, frequency of meetings, etc.). Among the provisions of the contract, the characteristics and qualifications of both BON and BOD members will be included.

Long-Term Strategy: Amend the Municipal Authorities Act and PWSA Enabling Legislation and Organization Documents.

A contract is not the best vehicle to provide confidence that the governance changes will be permanent. In parallel with the contract development, the independent legal counsel will draft amendments to the MAA and PWSA's enabling legislation and organization documents to permanently implement the governance changes. These amendments should then be aggressively pursued at the City and State level with the expectation of full approval in 2018.

II. Operations

PWSA has made significant improvements in every aspect of its operations during the last several months—improvements that one outside expert characterized as “extraordinary”. The BRP agrees that there has been significant progress, based on its own review of the PWSA's plans and data on benchmarks provided by PWSA management. Yet, there is much more to be done, which is one of the major reasons for the proposed governance changes. In addition, the current, improved state of PWSA has been described as “fragile” by the same experts who give the current management high marks. Thus, it is important that the momentum of change and improvement be maintained and that remaining deficiencies in operations receive urgent attention.

PWSA must fix its system by pursuing an infrastructure repair and replacement program, which is discussed in the next section. At the same time, it must do the best it can with the system as it exists. This means bringing competence and ingenuity to the constant commitment of delivering safe drinking water every day. This also means rebuilding the public trust that it has lost, and that will require much better communication and transparency, as well as becoming an organization with a culture of customer service.

The current BOD, even while the new BOD is being created, should support PWSA management in making continued and rapid progress in: recruiting, retention and training of staff, including the removal of the city residency requirement and recalibration of salary levels to be market competitive;

continuation of the work that has established national benchmarks for operations, including significantly upgraded monitoring and data collection; and, implementation of the capital improvement plan.

Based on the Blue Ribbon Panel's review of the numerous reports and studies that assessed PWSA, including audits by the City Controller and the State Auditor General, as well as the BRP's discussions with various stakeholders, the Panel believes several specific actions should be taken to improve PWSA as soon as possible. In recommending these actions, the BRP recognizes that many of the things we think should change have a long history and that some of these changes will have a negative effect on some constituencies. Nevertheless, it is time that we all realize that these historical arrangements have had, and will continue to have, significant deleterious effects on PWSA unless we change them. The Blue Ribbon Panel therefore recommends the following actions be implemented as soon as possible:

1. Eliminate the Subsidy for Pennsylvania American Water Company. PWSA currently pays PA American Water a subsidy for Pittsburgh residents who are PA American Water customers based on the difference between PA American Water rates and PWSA rates. The BRP does not believe this subsidy makes economic or business sense especially given the condition of PWSA versus PA American Water. Further, this subsidy disguises what PA American Water actually charges its city resident customers for water. This change will result in immediate financial benefit to PWSA of several million dollars. In addition, it would make PA American Water more accountable to its customers for the rates it charges.

2. Cease the Subsidy of the City Under the Cooperation Agreement. PWSA is paying approximately \$7.1 million dollars per year to the City for services from the City. However, the City does not provide services valued at close to this payment. This "subsidy" should be eliminated and PWSA should only pay the City for services that it desires at a mutually agreed to fair market value rate. Likewise, the City should pay the PWSA for any goods and services provided by PWSA to the City.

3. Cease the Free Water Subsidy. PWSA provides free water to the City and certain related parties (i.e. Pittsburgh Zoo and PPG Aquarium, Phipps Conservatory and Botanical Gardens, The National Aviary and Schenley Golf Course). These users should be treated no differently from any other PWSA customer. All users should be metered and charged. Achieving this would also provide better information on water lost from the system.

4. Eliminate the Domicile Policy. The City residency requirement for PWSA needs to be eliminated. The pool of qualified talent willing to work for PWSA is already narrowed because of PWSA's troubles.

5. Transfer ALCOSAN Billing and Collections to ALCOSAN. Currently PWSA is required to perform ALCOSAN's billing of ALCOSAN's city and certain non-city residents (this includes PA American Water customers). ALCOSAN charges (and receives) full payment from the PWSA; however, the PWSA bears the full risk of non-payment by ALCOSAN customers. This billing arrangement was established at a time when ALCOSAN was in the early stages of its operations. The justifications for this arrangement no longer exist. ALCOSAN certainly has the operational, financial and management capabilities to bill its own customers and bear the risk of its customers' nonpayment. Similar to the elimination of the PA American Water subsidy, this change would not only assist PWSA financially, but would also make ALCOSAN more accountable to its customers for the rates it charges.

6. Implement a Stormwater Fee. PWSA must make a significant investment (over \$1B) to comply with the Federal consent decree associated with combined sewer overflow issues. Currently,

sewage and stormwater conveyance is billed based on water usage. A stormwater fee would assess a charge based on the amount of stormwater runoff a property creates and therefore align the cost to fix the issue to the source of the problem -- those properties that are generating significant stormwater overflow (i.e., large commercial properties, parking lots and other large impervious surfaces v. individual rate payers).

7. Cease Subsidies of Development Projects. PWSA is often asked to subsidize certain key development projects by providing water and sewer infrastructure that should be paid for by the developer. This should cease immediately. PWSA should be run as a utility, not an economic development agency.

Action steps 1-3 can be accomplished immediately by PWSA, the Mayor and City Council by an amendment to the Cooperation Agreement and repeal of related City ordinances. Action step 4 can be accomplished immediately by a resolution of PWSA's Board of Directors. Action step 5 can be implemented by a change to the Agreement between PWSA and ALCOSAN. Action Step 6 requires PWSA to amend its organizational documents to specifically provide for management of stormwater. PWSA has already developed a detailed stormwater plan. The Mayor in cooperation with PWSA should immediately establish a task force to finalize and implement the PWSA stormwater plan. PWSA's Board should then implement the stormwater fee. Action step 7 can be implemented by the PWSA Board's refusal to authorize any further subsidy for development projects.

III. Infrastructure

There is general agreement that the PWSA system has very large capital needs, and that these needs must be prioritized and addressed with a sense of urgency. Indeed, PWSA has developed a capital improvement plan which it is pursuing. IMG has recommended entering into an agreement with a private entity for the purposes of pursuing this or a revised plan. The BRP does not reject this idea, but it notes two important observations made by the Mayors Innovation Project: such an arrangement, while used in several non-water infrastructure systems, has been pursued rarely, if at all, for water systems; and, water systems, unlike other infrastructure, has an operational character that is closely tied to the infrastructure. Thus, the BRP believes that creating a separate entity or agreement for infrastructure would be risky.

PWSA should continue to pursue aggressively its risk-based capital improvement program. When the governance changes are implemented, the new BOD should consider IMG's proposal and other alternatives, taking into account all of the benefits, costs and risks.

In addition, The Mayor and the region's Harrisburg delegation should explore an immediate amendment to the state's Separations Act to permit PWSA to use more efficient and timely methods to implement its capital projects such as "design/build". The BRP expects that such a change would be supported by other municipalities in the State that are facing similar infrastructure challenges. The scope and urgency of PWSA's capital improvement program requires the use of innovative approaches and should not be handcuffed by a 100+ year old public bidding statute.

PWSA's implementation of its infrastructure plan is obviously connected to the Authority's financial situation and its ability to access capital. PWSA currently has about \$600 million of senior lien debt and some challenges as it develops strategies for refinancing, as some of that debt has significant defeasance fees that would make it expensive. Despite those legacy issues, in the last several weeks PWSA successfully refinanced \$380 million of that debt in two tranches. The first tranche, which was for \$163 million with an average duration of 12 years, was rated A/A2 by the rating agencies at an all-in cost of 2.4%. This is a very good rating and it bodes well for the future. The second tranche included \$218 million of variable-rate debt (based on the SIFMA index) that had interest rate swaps that synthetically fixed the rate at 4.04%. PWSA was able to refinance that debt at substantial cost savings. These developments are a reason for optimism about the future as the PWSA codifies and seeks to implement its broader capital plan.

It is important to keep in mind that the success of any infrastructure plan is intimately tied to people, processes and governance. Essential elements of a successful capital improvement program include: a well developed and competent organization that can interface effectively with all stake holders, good governance, effective and stable leadership, and organizational competence and expertise. These non-infrastructure elements are weighed heavily in the assessment of capital plans by Wall Street, bond holders, debt owners and rating agencies. PWSA must embrace all of these elements in order to implement an effective and robust capital program.

Broadly speaking, PWSA is on a good track for its capital plan and achieving its short-term goals. However, long-term success will require the continued transformation of the organization, and achieving that requires a fundamental change in governance.

OTHER ISSUES

Research: Innovation and continuous improvement are important for every organization, but especially one trying to make the most of a struggling system. PWSA should consider establishing a small research division or group(s) within existing divisions.

Regionalization: Political boundaries and subdivisions do not match the natural boundaries of watersheds and river basins. Regions that understand this and have created oversight and management bodies that overcome this mismatch are much better positioned to achieve efficient and effective water management. Southwest Pennsylvania is not such a region; in fact, we are likely the most fragmented region in the U.S. in terms of water management. This is a problem for Southwest Pennsylvania, and it costs us dearly.

PWSA must "get its house in order," but, once it does, opportunities for regional coordination and cooperation should be pursued. In addition, the potential for such regional cooperation should be a consideration in any change in PWSA's organization and enabling legislation.

Appendix A. Advisors to the Blue Ribbon Panel

Deborah Gross
Councilwoman and Member of the PWSA Board

Michael Lamb
City Controller

David Lassman, Distinguished Service Professor
Carnegie Mellon University

David Miller, Professor of Public and International Affairs
University of Pittsburgh

Alex Sciulli
Engineering Consultant

Sylvia Wilson, Member, Pittsburgh Board of Education
Chair of the ALCOSAN Board

Appendix B. Sources of Information

1. IMG reports and presentations
 - Presentation to the BRP on 8/28/17
 - Briefing Book on PWSA Restructuring Options, 8/28/17
 - An Overview of Citizens Energy Group (Indianapolis)
 - Presented by Daniel Evans on 9/12/17
 - Executive Summary of PWSA Options, Asset Management, Capital Programming and Legal Assessments, presentation on 10/17/17 with supporting documents from IMG (capital investment, asset assessment and operations), Grant Thornton (financials, internal controls and IT) and West Group (existing agreements and applicable laws)
 - Briefing to the BRP on the PWSA Restructuring Options Assessment, 11/8/17
 - Task 5 Report: Restructuring Options and Recommendations, 11/27/17
2. PWSA
 - Presentation to the BRP on 11/21/17 by
 - Robert Weimar, Interim Executive Director
 - Kent Lindsay, CFO
 - Mark Nowak, Solicitor
 - Seth Garrison, Consultant
 - Debbie Lestitian, Chair of PWSA Board, accompanied by other PWSA Board members
 - “Focusing on the Future: PWSA’s Roadmap for Success”, November, 2017
 - Executive Director’s Report, November 2017, Performance Metrics, 12/15/17
 - Audited Financial Statements for 2015 and 2016
3. Audits
 - Performance Audit, City Controller, February, 2017
 - Performance Audit: Governance, Pennsylvania Auditor General, November, 2017
 - Comprehensive Performance Evaluation for the Aspinwall Water Filtration Plant, DEP and EPA, September 18-22, 2017
4. Mayors Innovation Project—Howard Neukrug, Patrick Cairo and Satya Rhodes-Conway “Review and Comments on PWSA Restructuring,” December 8, 2017
 - Some BRP members also had phone meetings with this group.
5. Carolyn Duronio (Reed Smith), facilitated by the Allegheny Conference on Community Development, telephone meetings and a memorandum, re “Governance Proposal for PWSA,” dated December 8, 2017

6. Stakeholders Workshop organized by IMG and its partners on November 2, 2017
7. Our Water Campaign—meetings with individual BRP members