



Matthew T. Brown, Interim CEO and General Manager

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA WATER AND SEWER AUTHORITY | 1385 CANAL STREET, SE | WASHINGTON, DC 20003

July 22, 2026

The Honorable John Joyce
Chairman
Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations
Committee on Energy and Commerce
U.S. House of Representatives
Washington, D.C. 20515

Dear Chairman Joyce:

Thank you for your letter dated July 8, 2026, requesting information from the District of Columbia Water and Sewer Authority (“DC Water”) regarding the Potomac Interceptor. DC Water appreciates the opportunity to respond to your inquiry and remains committed to working collaboratively with the United States House of Representatives Committee on Energy and Commerce Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations (“Committee”). DC Water values its ongoing relationship with the Committee and welcomes continued engagement and open communication on matters of shared importance.

As you may be aware, the DC Water Board of Directors recently appointed me, Matthew Brown, as Interim Chief Executive Officer and General Manager. I have assumed leadership responsibilities during this transitional period and remain committed to ensuring DC Water’s continued transparency, accountability, and cooperation with the Committee.

As drafted, certain questions in the Subcommittee’s inquiry (Questions 5-7) are directed specifically to Mr. David Gadis, who is no longer the CEO and General Manager of DC Water. These questions ask Mr. Gadis to provide information that is within his personal knowledge. While DC Water is committed to providing information available through its institutional knowledge, records, and current personnel, we respectfully note, consistent with the advice of counsel, that questions concerning Mr. Gadis’ individual decisions, communications, or personal assessments during his tenure may be more appropriately addressed directly to him. Should the Subcommittee wish to contact Mr. Gadis, DC Water is prepared to provide his contact information upon request.

DC Water remains committed to working cooperatively with the Committee to address its questions and provide complete, accurate, and responsive information to the extent available. We value the constructive relationship that has been established with the Committee and remain dedicated to supporting the Committee’s oversight responsibilities.

Below are DC Water’s responses to the questions directed to the Authority that could be addressed based on available institutional knowledge and records, specifically Questions 1-4.

- 1. During the hearing, you committed to providing the Committee with a list of locations for three projects that were prioritized for repair after surveys of the full Potomac Interceptor pipe were completed. As you described during your testimony, these projects were prioritized after the January 19, 2026, collapse occurred. In a recent community meeting on June 11, 2026, DC Water officials noted that there are four locations that have been identified. Then, in a follow up document you sent to the Subcommittee on June 16, 2026, you stated that there are five sections that require urgent repair.¹ What is the total number of**

locations that have been identified as needing to be prioritized for repair since the January collapse? Please provide a list of all the locations.

- a. Please provide the Committee with additional details and any related documentation for each of these projects that are being prioritized, including:**
 - i. Why these areas of the Potomac Interceptor are being prioritized, including when assessments of these sections were conducted and what they revealed that made DC Water prioritize these sections for repair, whether the location a factor, etc.;**
 - ii. When these areas of the Potomac Interceptor were first identified as sections that need repair;**
 - iii. What changed post January 19, 2026, collapse that made these sections of the Potomac Interceptor a high priority for repair; and**
 - iv. When these projects are scheduled or expected to begin and be completed.**

DC Water Response: DC Water indicated it was performing internal inspections of the entire Potomac Interceptor (PI) following the break that occurred near Manhole (MH) 17. Internal inspections are being conducted using closed circuit television (CCTV) and multi-sensor (MSI) inspections. MSI inspections use sonar below the sewage level in the pipe and laser above the sewage level. MSI inspections allow contractors to compare the pipe's estimated current inside diameter with the diameter shown on the original construction drawings, thereby estimating pipe-wall loss caused by corrosion.

Once the results of the inspections are received, the data is reviewed to identify whether there are conditions that warrant near-term attention. Since submittal and review of the data is received on a rolling basis as information comes in, the number of projects has been updated over time as the data is obtained and reviewed. The list of current priority projects is as follows:

Row	Area	Project	Planned Rehabilitation	Date Identified	Estimated Completion Year	Status
1	Muddy Creek / Pennyfield Loc (Montgomery County, MD)	MH* 410-411	Sliplining	April 2026	2026	In construction
2	Broad Run (Loudoun County, VA)	MH 72-73.81	Cured in place pipe (CIPP)	May 2026	2026	In construction
3	Dulles Airport (Loudoun County, VA)	MH 82-83	Cured in place pipe (CIPP)	May 2026	2026	In construction
4	DC Line (Montgomery County, MD)	MH 1.6 - 4252	Sliplining	March 2026	2026	In construction
5	Difficult Run (Fairfax County, VA)	MH208.2 to MH209	To be determined	June 2026	2027	Planning/procurement
6	DC Line (Montgomery County, MD)	MH1.6 to 6	To be determined	March 2026	2029	Planning/procurement
7	Northeastern (Fairfax and Loudoun County, VA)	MH31.5 - 40	To be determined	March 2026	2029	Planning/procurement

*MH means Manhole

The projects were selected and prioritized based on the CCTV and MSI inspection results, together with information regarding pipe location and installation conditions. These data were used to identify pipe sections requiring priority rehabilitation. The inspections were conducted from February through May 2026. The table provides the date each project was identified, its estimated completion year, and its current status.

The projects listed in rows 6 and 7 are substantial construction efforts on lengths of pipe of 1.6 miles and 3.2 miles, respectively. The projects are scheduled to begin in 2027, with work being performed sequentially considering multiple factors such as pipe condition, access points and construction practicality. In addition, bypass pumping will be on site and used as needed to maintain flow while these sections of the pipeline are being rehabilitated.

2. What was the internal risk score or assessment assigned to the section of the Potomac Interceptor that collapsed as of the most recent assessment before the January 19 collapse, and how did that compare to other sections currently in the active rehabilitation queue?

a. How does DC Water determine the sequencing of rehabilitation work? Is it based solely on the risk score, or are there other factors associated with that decision?

DC Water Response: Prior to the January 19, 2026 break, DC Water’s capital improvement program (CIP) reflected its assessment of rehabilitation needs based on risk assessments, engineering judgment, construction practicality and other factors. The table on the following page identifies the CIP projects before the break at Manhole 17 and shows where there is overlap with the projects identified in the response to Question 1 (currently active rehabilitation queue).

Differences between the projects in the CIP before the Jan 19, 2026, break and the currently active rehab queue are due to several factors. One factor is the increased consideration of the data provided by newer technology inspections using MSI techniques. Another is that the currently active rehabilitation queue is not a complete CIP. Instead, it represents a snapshot based on the rolling assessment of inspection data. Revisions to the CIP are being developed based on the updated inspection of the entire PI.

Note that DC Water is reviewing inspection data on a rolling basis and, in addition to identifying and implementing priority projects, is reviewing and updating its CIP based on the inspection result. This process may result in definition of projects and updates to project scopes, schedules and prioritization.

Project in CIP Before Jan 19, 2026 Break	Overlap with Currently Active Rehabilitation Queue
PI-01 Rock Run (Lock 10 / Cabin John)	MH15-MH20 (permanent repair at MH17 break site and rehab of remaining pipe between MH15 and MH20)
PI-02 Broad Run / Fairfax Cured in Place Pipe	MH72 to MH73.8 and MH82-MH83
PI-03 NOVA Parks	MH31.5 to MH40
PI-04 Cabin John / MH 4252	MH1.6 to MH4252 and MH6 to MH1.6
PI-05, Broad Run Tunnel	See Note 1
PI-06 MD Tunnel	See Note 1
PI-07 Seneca/Watts Branch	Includes MH410/411
PI-08 Maryland Tunnel to Lock 10	See Note 1

Note 1: Prioritization and configuration of these projects are being evaluated as part of updates to the CIP

DC Water does not sequence rehabilitation work based solely on a risk score. Risk assessments are used to identify and prioritize assets for further evaluation; however, rehabilitation sequencing also considers condition assessment results, defect severity, rehabilitation urgency, constructability, permitting requirements, operational impacts, coordination needs, available funding, and opportunities to efficiently package work into implementable projects. For the Potomac Interceptor, detailed engineering analyses and condition assessment data are evaluated together with risk information, and engineering judgment is applied to determine the appropriate timing and sequencing of rehabilitation activities.

- 3. Has DC Water ever received conflicting reports on sections of the Potomac Interceptor, where one assessment said a section of the Potomac Interceptor was stable while another assessment indicated that the same section was in immediate need of repair?**
- a. If so, please provide details on those assessments, including what section of the Potomac Interceptor was being assessed, who conducted these assessments, when the assessments were conducted, and what the discrepancies were.**
 - b. What efforts did DC Water undertake to address these discrepancies? For example, did DC Water have additional assessments conducted?**

DC Water Response: DC Water is pleased to consistently cooperate with the Committee throughout its review of this matter. To date, DC Water has produced approximately 42,000 pages of records, including numerous inspection reports, condition assessments, and related materials concerning the Potomac Interceptor. The pre-collapse assessments reflect CCTV inspections and other inspection methodologies to identify the condition of the Potomac Interceptor, all of which informed rehabilitation planning and prioritization. As DC Water’s testimony indicated, specifically at the collapsed site, progress on rehabilitating critical segments was constrained by the federal permitting process required including NEPA and related National Park Service reviews. Following the collapse, forensic excavation revealed previously unknown exterior conditions adjacent to the infrastructure—including boulders whose load may have contributed additional stress—that could not have been detected through internal CCTV or other in-pipe inspection technologies. Accordingly, references to individual reports should be considered in the context of the full inspection and engineering record, as isolated excerpts may not accurately reflect the overall condition assessment process or the limitations of the technologies available at the time.

Generally, the interpretation of inspection reports is a matter of engineering judgment. The characterization of condition assessment results as “conflicting” may not accurately reflect the nature of infrastructure assessments. Consistent with industry practice and NASSCO methodologies, inspection findings are subject to inherent uncertainty and are intended to inform—not conclusively predict—asset performance or risk of failure. As additional condition assessment data and engineering analyses become available, interpretations of asset condition and rehabilitation priorities may be refined. Accordingly, differences between assessments often reflect new information, different inspection methodologies, or updated engineering evaluations rather than contradictory conclusions. DC Water evaluates such information and conducts additional inspections or analyses when warranted to support rehabilitation decisions.

- 4. Have any changes to DC Water’s inspection protocols, internal risk escalation procedures, and emergency preparedness plans been implemented since the Potomac Interceptor collapse on January 19, 2026? If so, what changes have been made?**

DC Water Response: In addition to CCTV, DC Water is performing MSI inspections on each section of the PI. MSI inspections use sonar below the sewage level in the pipe and laser above the sewage level. The MSI inspections allow estimating the inside diameter of the pipe compared to the record drawings at time of construction. This can

be used to estimate loss of pipe wall due to corrosion. Additional focus is being given to these inspections going forward to assess pipe condition. Since the January 19, 2026 collapse, DC Water has enhanced its risk-escalation and emergency preparedness processes by increasing executive-level review of significant inspection findings and data gaps, strengthening cross-functional risk evaluation and decision-making protocols, and updating emergency response, resource mobilization, and interagency coordination procedures to improve readiness for potential infrastructure failures.

Because previously unknown boulders outside the collapsed pipe segment exacerbated the post-collapse overflow, we are reviewing the geotechnical investigations conducted during the original design to identify other pipe sections where rock excavation likely occurred. In addition, we are testing ground penetrating radar at pilot sites to determine if this technology may be used to identify where boulders from rock excavations or uncontrolled backfill may exist over the pipeline.

Drone flights have also been used to survey the pipe alignment to identify critical areas and develop base mapping for rehabilitation projects. Further, DC Water is updating its overall emergency response planning for the PI based on the response to the Manhole 17 break.

Thank you for your continued partnership and engagement. Should you require any additional information or clarification, please do not hesitate to contact me at Matthew.Brown@dcwater.com.

Sincerely,

Matthew T. Brown
Interim Chief Executive Officer & General Manager
DC Water