

**CITY OF SEATTLE**  
**RESOLUTION 31549**

1  
2  
3 A RESOLUTION relating to the City Light Department; stating the intent of the Seattle City  
4 Council to review City Light’s rate structure and examine the possibility of developing a  
5 rate design that merges residential and general service classes for City Light customers  
6 within the City of Seattle .

7 WHEREAS, Washington State has the most regressive tax system in the country, meaning poor  
8 and low-wage residents pay a significantly higher portion of their income in taxes than  
9 wealthy residents; and

10 WHEREAS, nationwide, poor and working people in the United States pay more in taxes than  
11 they receive in services; and

12 WHEREAS, in 2013 Seattle apartment rents rose higher than anywhere in the nation; and

13 WHEREAS, in Seattle is becoming an increasingly unaffordable city for poor and working  
14 people; and

15 WHEREAS, on average, around the world and throughout history, working people already face  
16 substantial economic hardship because they are paid less in wages than the value of their  
17 work; and

18 WHEREAS, the 2015-2020 strategic plan of Seattle Public Utilities also projects significant rate  
19 increases each of the next 6 years; and

20 WHEREAS, the cost allocation model the City of Seattle uses to design electricity rates across  
21 classes leads to residential Seattle City Light customers being charged significantly more  
22 for electricity on average than high capacity customers; and

23 WHEREAS, in 2013 the average energy cost for residential customers was \$0.0841 per kWh  
24 while the average energy cost for high capacity customers was \$0.0547 per kWh; and

25 WHEREAS, combining Seattle City Light customers into a single rate class would even the  
26 average rates, and would reduce the energy rates for residential customers; NOW,  
27 THEREFORE,

**BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SEATTLE, THAT:**

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27

Section 1. During the first quarter of 2015, the Seattle City Council intends to review Seattle City Light’s customer class design and cost allocation among those classes with a view to lowering the costs to Seattle City Light’s non-business customers beginning in 2016. The review will include consideration of merging the residential and general service classes for all customers within the City of Seattle.

Adopted by the City Council the \_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2014, and signed by me in open session in authentication of its adoption this \_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2014.

\_\_\_\_\_  
President \_\_\_\_\_ of the City Council

Filed by me this \_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2014.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Monica Martinez Simmons, City Clerk

(Seal)

**FISCAL NOTE FOR NON-CAPITAL PROJECTS**

<b>Department:</b>	<b>Contact Person/Phone:</b>	<b>CBO Analyst/Phone:</b>
LEG	Ted Virdone 206-684-8016	

**Legislation Title:**

A RESOLUTION relating to the City Light Department; stating the intent of the Seattle City Council to review City Light’s rate structure and examine the possibility of developing a rate design that merges residential and general service classes for City Light customers within the City of Seattle.

**Summary of the Legislation:**

This resolution relates to the City Light Department; stating the intent of the Seattle City Council to review City Light’s rate structure and examine the possibility of developing a rate design that merges residential and general service classes for City Light customers within the City of Seattle.

**Background:**

Cost allocation divides Seattle City Light’s revenue requirements across customer classes. As a result, energy rates are different for customers in different classes, with residential customers paying the most per kilowatt-hour. This resolution relates to the City Light Department; stating the intent of the Seattle City Council to review City Light’s rate structure and examine the possibility of developing a rate design that merges residential and general service classes for City Light customers within the City of Seattle.

Please check one of the following:

**This legislation does not have any financial implications.**  
 (Please skip to “Other Implications” section at the end of the document and answer questions a-h. Earlier sections that are left blank should be deleted. Please delete the instructions provided in parentheses at the end of each question.)

**This legislation has financial implications.**  
 (If the legislation has direct fiscal impacts (e.g., appropriations, revenue, positions), fill out the relevant sections below. If the financial implications are indirect or longer-term, describe them in narrative in the “Other Implications” Section. Please delete the instructions provided in parentheses at the end of each title and question.)

**Appropriations:**

(This table should reflect appropriations that are a direct result of this legislation. In the event that the project/programs associated with this ordinance had, or will have, appropriations in other legislation please provide details in the Appropriation Notes section below. If the appropriation is not supported by revenue/reimbursements, please confirm that there is available fund balance to cover this appropriation in the note section.)

Fund Name and Number	Department	Budget Control Level*	2013 Appropriation	2014 Anticipated Appropriation

<b>TOTAL</b>				
--------------	--	--	--	--

*\*See budget book to obtain the appropriate Budget Control Level for your department.*

Appropriations Notes:

**Anticipated Revenue/Reimbursement Resulting from this Legislation:**

(This table should reflect revenues/reimbursements that are a direct result of this legislation. In the event that the issues/projects associated with this ordinance/resolution have revenues or reimbursements that were, or will be, received because of previous or future legislation or budget actions, please provide details in the Notes section below the table.)

Fund Name and Number	Department	Revenue Source	2013 Revenue	2014 Revenue
<b>TOTAL</b>				

Revenue/Reimbursement Notes:

**Total Regular Positions Created, Modified, or Abrogated through this Legislation, Including FTE Impact:**

(This table should only reflect the actual number of positions affected by this legislation. In the event that positions have been, or will be, created as a result of other legislation, please provide details in the Notes section below the table.)

Position Title and Department	Position # for Existing Positions	Fund Name & #	PT/FT	2013 Positions	2013 FTE	2014 Positions*	2014 FTE*
<b>TOTAL</b>							

*\* 2014 positions and FTE are total 2014 position changes resulting from this legislation, not incremental changes. Therefore, under 2014, please be sure to include any continuing positions from 2013.*

Position Notes:

**Do positions sunset in the future?**

(If yes, identify sunset date)

**Spending/Cash Flow:**

(This table should be completed only in those cases where part or all of the funds authorized by this legislation will be spent in a different year than when they were appropriated (e.g., as in the case of certain grants and capital projects). Details surrounding spending that will occur in future years should be provided in the Notes section below the table.)

Fund Name & #	Department	Budget Control	2013	2014 Anticipated
---------------	------------	----------------	------	------------------

		Level*	Expenditures	Expenditures
<b>TOTAL</b>				

\* See budget book to obtain the appropriate Budget Control Level for your department.

Spending/Cash Flow Notes:

**Other Implications:**

- a) **Does the legislation have indirect financial implications, or long-term implications?**  
 (If yes, explain them here.)  
 No
  
- b) **What is the financial cost of not implementing the legislation?**  
 (Estimate the costs to the City of not implementing the legislation, including estimated costs to maintain or expand an existing facility or the cost avoidance due to replacement of an existing facility, potential conflicts with regulatory requirements, or other potential costs.)  
 None
  
- c) **Does this legislation affect any departments besides the originating department?**  
 (If so, please list the affected department(s), the nature of the impact (financial, operational, etc), and indicate which staff members in the other department(s) are aware of the proposed legislation.)  
 No
  
- d) **What are the possible alternatives to the legislation that could achieve the same or similar objectives?** (Include any potential alternatives to the proposed legislation, such as reducing fee-supported activities, identifying outside funding sources for fee-supported activities, etc.)  
 None
  
- e) **Is a public hearing required for this legislation?**  
 (If yes, what public hearing(s) have been held to date, and/or what public hearing(s) are planned for the future?)  
 No
  
- f) **Is publication of notice with *The Daily Journal of Commerce* and/or *The Seattle Times* required for this legislation?**  
 (For example, legislation related to sale of surplus property, condemnation, or certain capital projects with private partners may require publication of notice. If you aren't sure, please check with your lawyer. If publication of notice is required, describe any steps taken to comply with that requirement.)  
 None
  
- g) **Does this legislation affect a piece of property?**  
 (If yes, and if a map or other visual representation of the property is not already included as an exhibit or attachment to the legislation itself, then you must include a map and/or other visual representation of the property and its location as an attachment to the fiscal note. Place a note on the map attached to the fiscal note that indicates the map is intended for illustrative or informational purposes only and is not intended to modify anything in the legislation.)  
 No
  
- h) **Other Issues:**

**List attachments to the fiscal note below:**