



January 29, 2020

The Honorable Richard Neal  
Chairman  
Committee on Ways and Means  
U.S. House of Representatives  
Washington, D.C. 20515

The Honorable Kevin Brady  
Ranking Member  
Committee on Ways and Means  
U.S. House of Representatives  
Washington, D.C. 20515

**RE: Statement for the record of the House Ways and Means Committee hearing on “Paving the Way for Funding and Financing Infrastructure Investments.”**

Dear Chairman Neal and Ranking Member Brady:

The Association of Metropolitan Water Agencies (AMWA) appreciates the opportunity to submit this statement for the record of the committee’s hearing on “Paving the Way for Funding and Financing Infrastructure Investments.” Our statement will briefly discuss the importance of both maintaining tax-exempt municipal bond interest and reinstating the ability of communities to advance refund outstanding municipal bond debt.

AMWA is an organization of the nation’s largest publicly owned drinking water systems, and our members deliver clean and safe water to more than 155 million Americans from coast to coast. The challenges associated with building and maintaining the infrastructure necessary to accomplish this task are well known, so it is vital that Congress do its part to preserve proven mechanisms that help communities of all sizes affordably finance projects that enable the treatment and delivery of quality drinking water.

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency estimates that the nation’s drinking water and wastewater systems need nearly \$750 billion over the next 20 years for infrastructure improvements necessary just to maintain their current levels of service. But this sum does not factor in additional costs that communities may face, such as expensive undertakings to remove lead service lines or install new treatment technologies to counter new classes of emerging contaminants. Fortunately, in recent decades Congress has authorized a number of dedicated programs to help communities and their water systems pay for needed infrastructure upgrades. These include USDA rural grant programs, low-interest loans through EPA’s Drinking Water and Clean Water State Revolving Funds, and direct low-cost financing through the Water Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act, or WIFIA. However, despite the billions of dollars provided to date, these aid programs cover only a fraction of annual water infrastructure spending carried out by communities large and small.

**BOARD OF DIRECTORS**

**PRESIDENT**

Steve Schneider  
Saint Paul Regional Water  
Services

Jerry Brown  
Contra Costa Water District

Shane Chapman  
Metropolitan Water District of  
Southern California

Rudolph Chow  
Baltimore City Department of  
Public Works

**VICE PRESIDENT**

Angela Licata  
New York City Department of  
Environmental Protection

Robert L. Davis  
Cleveland Department of Public  
Utilities

Yvonne Forrest  
Houston Public Utilities  
Division

Kevin Gertig  
Fort Collins Utilities

**TREASURER**

John Entsminger  
Las Vegas Valley Water  
District

Richard Harasick  
Los Angeles Department of  
Water and Power

Julia J. Hunt  
Trinity River Authority of Texas

Robert Hunter  
Municipal Water District of  
Orange County

**SECRETARY**

Kathryn Sorensen  
Phoenix Water Services

Carrie Lewis  
Portland Water District

James S. Lochhead  
Denver Water

Ron Lovan  
Northern Kentucky Water  
District

**CHIEF EXECUTIVE  
OFFICER**

Diane VanDe Hei

Sue McCormick  
Great Lakes Water Authority

Charles M. Murray  
Fairfax Water

John P. Sullivan, Jr.  
Boston Water and Sewer  
Commission

Jeffrey Szabo  
Suffolk County Water Authority

Douglas Yoder  
Miami-Dade Water and Sewer  
Department

In fact, local water system ratepayers directly cover roughly 95 percent of water and sewer infrastructure development, rehabilitation, and operating costs. Put another way, local water rates directly pay for the vast majority of water infrastructure investments carried out each year, without grant or loan assistance from the federal government. The federal government has, however, built incentives into the tax code, in the form of tax-exempt municipal bonds, to help communities finance these investments as cost-effectively as possible. As the committee considers how to best promote affordable infrastructure investment, it must be sure to maintain this valuable and proven mechanism.

Tax-exempt municipal bonds have been enshrined in federal law since the establishment of the tax code in 1913 and are communities' primary mechanism for financing water infrastructure projects. These bonds are an attractive financing tool for community water systems because interest earned by bond holders is exempt from federal income tax. This makes investors willing to accept lower interest rates, translating into lower financing costs for the water systems that issue the bonds. Ultimately, this means that fewer ratepayer dollars are necessary to finance a given water infrastructure project – increasing local affordability and flexibility.

In 2016, communities nationwide issued nearly \$38 billion in tax-exempt municipal bonds to pay for water, sewer, and sanitation infrastructure projects. Had the interest on these bonds not been exempt from federal taxation, their total debt service costs would have gone up by approximately \$16 billion over the bond repayment periods – an increase of 25 percent. These higher financing costs would have effectively imposed a new tax on municipalities and their water system ratepayers.

While tax-exempt municipal bonds have a long history in the tax code, AMWA and other water sector stakeholders were concerned to see numerous proposals discussed during formulation of the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act of 2017 that would have capped or eliminated this critical financing tool. We were pleased that the final enacted legislation ultimately left tax-exempt municipal bonds in place, but it is important for the committee to know that any future attempt to streamline the tax code by eliminating tax-exempt municipal bond interest would, if passed, significantly increase the cost of vital water infrastructure projects in virtually every state and community in the nation.

Congress did approve, as part of the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act of 2017, a provision that eliminated the ability of communities to advance-refund municipal bonds. Previously, the tax code gave communities a one-time opportunity to refinance (or advance refund) outstanding municipal bond debt to take advantage of falling interest rates, thus reducing financing costs ultimately borne by their local ratepayers. Between 2013 and 2017 the advance refunding of municipal securities saved taxpayers nationwide roughly \$12 billion in financing costs, but the option for communities to achieve similar savings in the future was abolished by the 2017 tax reform law.

In May of 2019 a bipartisan group of representatives introduced H.R. 2772, legislation that would reinstate the ability of communities to advance refund tax-exempt municipal bonds. Along with the preservation of tax-exempt municipal bond interest, AMWA believes this proposal should be part of any tax package that aims to facilitate infrastructure financing.

The Honorable Richard Neal  
The Honorable Kevin Brady  
January 29, 2020  
Page 3 of 3

Again, AMWA appreciates the opportunity to submit this statement for the record of the Ways and Means Committee's hearing on "Paving the Way for Funding and Financing Infrastructure Investments." Our nation's water and wastewater infrastructure is critical to public health and economic vitality, and helping communities and their water system ratepayers efficiently finance infrastructure projects is an essential role of the federal government. AMWA trusts the committee will continue to preserve tax-exempt municipal bond interest, and we urge the reinstatement of the ability to advance refund these bonds.

Thank you again for organizing this hearing, and please do not hesitate to contact AMWA with any questions you may have.

Sincerely,



Diane VanDe Hei  
Chief Executive Officer