

# Bond Case Briefs

*Municipal Finance Law Since 1971*

---

## Senators Call for Tax Relief for Water Conservation Rebates.

Washington—Senators Dianne Feinstein (D-Calif.), Patty Murray (D-Wash.) and Michael Bennet (D-Colo.) today called on Treasury Secretary Jack Lew to confirm tax relief for individuals who receive water conservation and storm water management rebates that also result in energy conservation. These rebates have been treated as income but should qualify under an existing exemption in the tax code for energy conservation measures.

The senators wrote: **“There are many challenges impacting our nation’s water supplies, and it is imperative to maintain the effectiveness of incentives for residents to participate in water efficiency and storm water management programs. We would like to request that you clarify that in cases where a public utility can attest to energy savings from water conservation and storm water management measures, such rebates issued by a public utility can be excluded from gross income under Section 136. This is in line with the process many utilities already follow for energy conservation measures.”**

The full text of the letter follows:

December 20, 2016

The Honorable Secretary Jacob J. Lew  
Department of Treasury  
1500 Pennsylvania Avenue NW  
Washington, DC 20220

Dear Secretary Lew:

We are writing to follow up on our May 26, 2016, correspondence to request that the Department of the Treasury consider additional information in determining whether water conservation rebates and storm water management rebates, including the installation of green infrastructure, could be excluded from residents’ taxable income. Since our initial correspondence to you, we have received additional information showing significant, measurable energy savings that result from water conservation. Given the compelling data we have received, we now have reason to believe that water conservation rebates should be considered exempt from inclusion in gross income under 26 U.S.C. § 136 (Section 136), which provides such an exemption for energy conservation measures.

We have attached a letter from the Director of the Center for Water-Energy Efficiency at the University of California, Davis, which details the Center’s findings that water conservation in California in Summer 2015 resulted in energy savings equivalent to those of energy efficiency programs. Notably, their research found that water conservation-related greenhouse gas savings over the Summer of 2015 were equivalent to taking about 50,000 cars off the road for a year. Additionally, The Los Angeles Department of Water and Power has estimated total energy savings of approximately 24,400 MWh for fiscal year 2015/16 from the residential and commercial indoor and outdoor water conservation rebates that it provides. These figures are even higher after including energy savings from hot water heating and other customer end uses. In Colorado, water utilities

have also been working to implement conservation programs that have the benefit of saving water and electricity or natural gas, including residential shower head exchange programs. Similar conservation measures are underway at urban utilities throughout the country, including in Arizona, Nevada, and Washington.

Section 136 was added in 1992, when there was a clear line between energy and water conservation. Today, that distinction is largely gone and the nexus between saving water and saving energy has been established. Commissioner Lopez of the Bureau of Reclamation has stated, “[W]ater and energy efficiency are intrinsically linked. When we conserve water, we conserve the energy it takes to move it.” Water conservation also results in other energy savings, including reductions in energy use for heating and for treatment. We believe the federal agencies involved in energy and water conservation and the Department of the Treasury currently have the authority to interpret Section 136 more broadly.

It appears that many, if not all, water conservation rebates result in per capita energy savings. The same is true of rebates designed to collect, treat, and use storm water or reduce storm water inflows into combined sewers. There are many challenges impacting our nation’s water supplies, and it is imperative to maintain the effectiveness of incentives for residents to participate in water efficiency and storm water management programs. We would like to request that you clarify that in cases where a public utility can attest to energy savings from water conservation and storm water management measures, such rebates issued by a public utility can be excluded from gross income under Section 136. This is in line with the process many utilities already follow for energy conservation measures.

We look forward to working with you to ensure the success of water conservation and water quality efforts in our states.

Sincerely,

Dianne Feinstein  
U.S. Senator

Patty Murray  
U.S. Senator

Michael Bennet  
U.S. Senator