

---

**From:** Daddow, Robert [daddowr@oakgov.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, February 12, 2015 4:47 PM  
**To:** Baird, Richard (GOV)  
**Subject:** RE: Flint

FYI — instead of going to Sue M. I thought I'd go directly to folk who might provide a sensitivity analysis of sorts on the Flint return to DWSD matter.

---

**From:** Robert Daddow [<mailto:daddowr@oakgov.com>]  
**Sent:** Thursday, February 12, 2015 4:45 PM  
**To:** Bart Foster [REDACTED]; Nicolette Bateson ([bateson@dwsd.org](mailto:bateson@dwsd.org))  
**Subject:** Flint

Nikki / Bart — don't need a hard and fast number on this. However, it would seem to me that in a fixed cost system such as water, if Flint were to be hooked up again at the \$847K / month cited in Ms. McCormick's January 12<sup>th</sup> memorandum and after the release of the rates yesterday, bringing Flint back would — on a marginal cost basis — serve to mitigate the wholesale (suburban) customer rate increase of 11.1% cited in yesterday's presentation. Without going into a whole lot of detailed calculations (unless necessary), what would the impact of the inclusion of Flint starting say on July 1, 2015 (hypothetical date) be on the rate increase presently now in the public? A revised increase of what — 10.6% - looking for a high level sensitivity analysis here. Can you help? RJD