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Dedicating more lands to preservation…

An aging, diversifying population…

Growing more sustainably…
Forty Years in San Diego

Sources: Caltrans photo archives (1966 and 1993); SANDAG Smart Growth Photo Gallery (2008)
2050 California Forecast

- 50 Million By 2050 (13 Million New Residents)
- San Diego is 2nd Most Populous County
- Majority of Growth in Southern California

Population, Jobs, and Housing

2010 - 2050
973,000 more people
489,000 more jobs
333,000 more housing units

Population
Jobs
Housing

973,000 more people
489,000 more jobs
333,000 more housing units

Population: 4,068,759
Jobs: 1,911,404
Housing: 1,491,804
Forecast process and new models

- Historical data
- Current demographics
- National forecast
- Demographic trends
- Expert review

Regionwide Forecast

- Current Estimates: Jobs, Housing, Population
- Local Plans/Policies
- Market Conditions
- Local Review

Subregional Forecast

Detailed Demographic Forecast

Transportation Model
Series 13 Subregional Forecast: Land Use Inputs

- Updated General Plans
  - Chula Vista (SP)
  - Escondido
  - Imperial Beach
  - National City
  - San Diego
  - San Marcos (SP)
  - Vista
  - County

- Site Specific Projects

- Sufficient Housing Lands
Land Use Inputs

- Existing Plans and Policies
- Reviewed ~350k Parcels
- ~65K Parcel Updates
- Updated Constraints

Online Comments = 2,322
Projected Open Space 2020 (Series 9)

Series 9 (2020): 846,086 acres
Existing Open Space 2013

Series 9 (2020): 846,086 acres
Conserved Lands (2013): 1,267,642 acres
Open space will increase by 30%

(based on MHCP & MSCP plans)
Series 13 Subregional Forecast: Housing Trends

2010-2050 Housing Units Growth, Region Total by Jurisdiction

- San Diego 53%
- Unincorporated 17%

Jurisdictions:
- Chula Vista 9%
- Vista 3%
- San Marcos 3%
- National City 3%
- Escondido 2%
- La Mesa 2%
- Oceanside 2%
- Carlsbad 2%
- El Cajon 1%
- Santee 1%
- Encinitas 1%
- Lemon Grove 1%
- Imperial Beach
- Poway
- Solana Beach
- Coronado
- Del Mar

Housing Trends:
- 2010
- 2020
- 2035
- 2050
Series 13 Subregional Forecast
Housing Growth

- 87% of growth in 1/2 mile to transit

Housing Growth
(n = 333,728)

- Single Family 18%
- Multi Family 82%
Series 13 Subregional Forecast: Jobs Trends

2010-2050 Jobs Growth, Region Total by Jurisdiction

- San Diego: 50%
- Unincorporated: 10%
- Chula Vista: 10%
- Carlsbad: 6%
- Vista: 3%
- National City: 3%
- Oceanside: 3%
- El Cajon: 2%
- La Mesa: 2%
- Escondido: 2%
- Poway: 1%
- Santee: 1%
- Encinitas: 1%
- Lemon Grove: 1%
- Solana Beach: 1%
- Imperial Beach: 1%
- Coronado: 1%
- Del Mar: 1%

2010-2050 Jobs Growth:
- San Diego: 50%
- Unincorporated: 10%
- Chula Vista: 10%
- Carlsbad: 6%
- Vista: 3%
- National City: 3%
- Oceanside: 3%
- El Cajon: 2%
- La Mesa: 2%
- Escondido: 2%
- Poway: 1%
- Santee: 1%
- Encinitas: 1%
- Lemon Grove: 1%
- Solana Beach: 1%
- Imperial Beach: 1%
- Coronado: 1%
- Del Mar: 1%

- 2050
- 2035
- 2020
- 2010
Series 13 Subregional Forecast
Job Growth

- 79% of growth in 1/2 mile to transit

Total Jobs, by Industry • 2050 • 2010

- Professional Business Services
- Government
- Leisure / Hospitality
- Education / Health
- Military
- Construction
Population, Jobs, and Housing

2010 - 2050
- 973,000 more people
- 489,000 more jobs
- 333,000 more housing units

973,000 more people
489,000 more jobs
333,000 more housing units
Presented by: Ken Weinberg, Director of Water Resources
Dave Chamberlain, Principal Engineer
Development of Draft Master Plan Documents

- Supply/Demand Analysis and Scenario Planning
- Evaluation Thresholds and Decision Metrics
- Baseline System Performance
- Storage Utilization Analysis
- New Supply and Conveyance Options (Long-Term)
- Recommended System Improvements (Near-Term)
- Project Costs, Supply/Conveyance Cost Comparisons
- Overview of CEQA Process (Supplemental PEIR)
- Consider Approval/Selection of Recommended Projects
- Review Specific Project Cost Estimates
- In-line Hydroelectric Opportunities
Master Plan Evaluation of In–Line Hydroelectric Opportunities

- What is in–line hydroelectric generation?
  - Uses available flow and pressure in a conveyance system to produce clean renewable energy
  - Recently approved changes to FERC licensing requirements encourages in–line hydro development

- Why evaluate hydroelectric generation in Master Plan?
  - Is compatible with water operations
  - Provides a potential new revenue stream
  - May support energy management goals
Key In-Line Hydro Siting Issues

- Significant available differential pressure
- Relatively constant annual flow rate
- Site availability adjacent to aqueduct system
- Close proximity to power grid
- No impact to aqueduct operations or member agency systems
Aqueduct System Potential Development Opportunities

- **Existing Water Authority owned hydro facilities**
  - 4.5 MW in-line Rancho Peñasquitos Hydroelectric Facility
  - 40 MW Lake Hodges Pumped Storage Project

- **New opportunities include existing/proposed service connections and control structures**

Existing hydro project – ✭
Potential hydro – ★
In-Line Hydro Generation

- Total new power development potential is approx. 10 MW
  - Size range is 50 kW to 2,000 kW

- Best candidate sites appear to offer reasonable payback potential of 10 years or less
  - Considers capital/operating costs, energy price paid by SDG&E for renewable projects ($0.10898/kWh)
Master Plan Conclusions

- Potential exists to develop new in-line hydroelectric generation with favorable economic benefits
- Further screening of best candidate sites needs to be conducted
  - Confirm economic benefits, compatibility with aqueduct operations, site issues, and permitting requirements
- Ensure consistency with SDCWA energy management policies
**2013 Master Plan Schedule**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>August 22, 2013</td>
<td><strong>Water Planning Committee</strong> – Board review of potential in-line hydroelectric opportunities and project specific cost estimates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 12, 2013</td>
<td><strong>Special Water Planning Committee</strong> – Workshop on outcomes of the Climate Action Plan (CAP) and review SPEIR content.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 26, 2013</td>
<td><strong>Water Planning Committee</strong> – Review elements of the draft Master Plan, CAP, and SPEIR prior to public review release.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September/October 2013</td>
<td><strong>Technical Advisory Committee</strong> – Review technical elements of the Master Plan and CAP prior to public review release.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2013</td>
<td><strong>Public Release/Review</strong> - Draft SPEIR, CAP, and Draft Master Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 14, 2013</td>
<td><strong>Special Water Planning Committee</strong> - Public Hearing on Draft SPEIR, CAP and Draft Master Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 27, 2014</td>
<td><strong>Regular Board Meeting</strong> - Certification of Final SPEIR and approval of CAP and Final Master Plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Bay–Delta Conservation Plan: Review Update

Imported Water Committee
August 22, 2013
Today’s Agenda

- What’s new?
- Review approach
- What is BDCP?
- Issues the Water Authority’s evaluation will focus on to provide comment letter through environmental review process
- Preliminary analysis
- Next step
August 15 Announcement

- DWR announced several changes to the proposed BDCP water conveyance system in an effort to address Delta landowner concerns. Among the changes are:
  - Shortening the main conveyance tunnels from 35 miles to 30 miles
  - Shrinking the new forebay from 750 acres to 40 acres
  - Realigning a segment of the twin tunnels several miles to the east to lands owned by a private non-profit group

- Public review drafts of the BDCP and the EIR/EIS are still expected to be released in October
BDCP Document Review

- BDCP is a permitting process supported by detailed planning and environmental documents
  - ADEIR & BDCP ~ 25,000 pages; public drafts to be issued in October will be voluminous

- BDCP Planning Documents
  - Support NCCP/HCP
  - Supporting scientific, economic, financial information
  - Non-CEQA/NEPA required analyses

- DEIR/EIS
  - Required for NCCP/HCP approval and permitting
Water Authority’s BDCP Review and Analysis

- Limited resources and time require a high level review
  - Perspective of a recipient and purchaser Delta exports
- Which Delta fix proposal most consistent with:
  - Board’s Bay–Delta Policy Principles
  - Reliability goals in the Water Authority’s 2010 UWMP

- Deliverables:
  - Comment letter through BDCP environmental review process
  - Assessment of project financing and impact on rates
  - Cost benefit assessment for Board review
# Summary of Options to be Evaluated

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>North Delta Conveyance Capacity</th>
<th>Additional Supply Element</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BDCP Administrative Draft EIR/EIS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferred</td>
<td>9,000 cfs</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Action</td>
<td>Current Operations</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Concepts</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRDC Portfolio</td>
<td>3,000 cfs+</td>
<td>Local Projects &amp; Storage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delta Vision BDCP Plus</td>
<td>6,000 cfs</td>
<td>Local Projects &amp; Storage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Two-Step Analytical Approach

1. Utilize BDCP data for conveyance capacities and other in-Delta features assessment for all options, including those proposed in BDCP Plus and NRDC alternatives
   • BDCP analyzes 3,000 and 6,000 cfs capacities
   • BDCP identifies restoration efforts associated with smaller conveyance capacities
   • BDCP Economics Benefits Analysis has financial and economic data for smaller capacity conveyance capital and operating costs
Two-Step Analytical Approach (Continued)

2. Assess the risk, financing, cost, benefit, and need for additional information for out-of-Delta features proposed in NRDC/BDCP Plus
   - Value of additional storage to increase exports
   - Value of additional local supply projects
   - Comparison to BDCP Preferred and No Action
   - Affect on San Diego regional reliability and rates
   - Both quantitative and qualitative risks will be presented

   Both analyses will support overall evaluation of alternatives and provide basis of comment letters
BDCP
Environmental Review
What is the BDCP?

- Comprehensive conservation strategy for Sacramento–San Joaquin River Delta
- 22 Conservation Measures (CMs)
  - CM 1: water conveyance facilities and operations
  - CM 2–22: restore, protect and conserve ecosystem
- Allows issuance of Endangered Species Act permits for 50-year term
  - Natural Communities Conservation Plan (state)
  - Habitat Conservation Plan (federal)
- BDCP is the “project” for environmental review
Environmental Review Process

- Required for any discretionary governmental action that may affect the environment
  - Approve or carry out a project
  - Authorize funding for a project
  - Grant a permit for project

- Disclose environmental effects to decision makers and the public
  - Identify ways to avoid or reduce effects
  - Identify feasible alternatives and mitigation measures
  - Specify reasons for the action
  - Enhance public participation
Environmental Review Process

- EIR/EIS is a joint CEQA (state) and NEPA (federal) document
  - Common practice to issue a combined EIR/EIS
  - Regulations require very similar analyses
  - For high level review no material differences
- Review the environmental effects of proposed project and a reasonable range of alternatives
- Lead agency for EIR is DWR
- Co–lead agencies for EIS are USBR, NMFS, and USFWS
EIR/EIS describes the BCDP project in the context of a “purpose and need”, as well as a “statement of objectives”

"DWR’s fundamental purpose in proposing the BDCP is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations."
Environmental Review Process

BDCP components address:

- Delta ecosystem health and productivity
  - Species/habitat decline
- Water supply reliability
  - Reduced volume and timing
  - Seismic and climate change
- Delta hydrology and water quality
  - Salinity, nutrients, PCBs, metals, and pesticides
NEW NORTH DELTA CONVEYANCE
DIVERSION STRUCTURE

Seawater

Salmon

Smelt

SOUTH DELTA PUMPS

DELTA MENDOTA CANAL
CALIFORNIA AQUEDUCT
HETCH HETCHY AQUEDUCT

MOKELUMNE AQUEDUCT
Fixing the Delta is about finding a Delicate Balance

- Water Exports
- Species protection and recovery
- Water Quality
- In-delta uses
  - Agriculture
  - Commercial Fishing
  - Recreation
- Requires complex integrated operations
Alternatives Development

- Started with 4 conservation strategy options
  - Existing thru-delta conveyance and opportunistic operations with possible new storage
  - Thru-delta conveyance with San Joaquin River isolation
  - Dual conveyance (new north delta diversion and existing south delta pumps)
  - Isolated conveyance around the delta
- Scoping resulted in 15 conveyance alternatives
- Applied 6 different operating scenarios
  - Varied amount of flow annually and seasonally
  - Varied salinity
  - In-delta consumptive use
  - Effects of climate change
- Resulted in 21 potential alternatives ranging from 3,000 to 15,000 cfs of north delta intake capacity
Screening of Potential 21 Alternatives

- **First Level Criteria**
  - Conservation and management of covered species
  - Protect, restore, and enhance natural communities/ecosystems
  - Restore and protect SWP and CVP water reliability

- **Second and Third Level Criteria**
  - Avoid or substantially lessen significant environmental effects
  - Technical and economic feasibility or practicability
  - Violate federal or state statutes or regulations
  - Balance relevant economic, environmental, social, and technological factors

15 EIR/EIS Alternatives
What does EIR/EIS analyze?

- Assessed environmental impacts of alternatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Water Supply</th>
<th>Agriculture</th>
<th>Noise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Surface Water</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>Hazards/Hazardous Materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groundwater</td>
<td>Socioeconomics</td>
<td>Public Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Quality</td>
<td>Aesthetics/Visual</td>
<td>Minerals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geology/Seismicity</td>
<td>Cultural</td>
<td>Paleontology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soils</td>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>Environmental Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish/Aquatic Biology</td>
<td>Public Services/Utilities</td>
<td>Climate Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrestrial Biology</td>
<td>Energy</td>
<td>Growth Inducement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use</td>
<td>Air Quality/Greenhouse Gas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What should Water Authority focus on?
- Alternatives (operating scenarios and yield)
- Water quality
- Species recovery goals
- Habitat mitigation
Habitat Restoration & Species Recovery

- HCP/NCCP Conservation Stds
  - More than just fully mitigating impacts to avoid further decline
  - Must contribute to recovery
    “...when the decline of a species is stopped or reversed, or threats to its survival neutralized so that its long-term survival in the wild can be ensured, and it can be removed from the list of threatened and endangered species.”

- BDCP covers 57 species and their habitats
## Habitat Conservation Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Year 1–5</th>
<th>Year 6–10</th>
<th>Year 11–40</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROTECTION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquisition</td>
<td>10,010</td>
<td>11,385</td>
<td>41,560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RESTORATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tidal Wetland</td>
<td>8,150</td>
<td>8,150</td>
<td>48,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floodplain</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Channel Margin (miles)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riparian Wetland</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>4,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grassland</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vernal Pool/Alkali Wetland</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non–tidal marsh</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>19,539</td>
<td>20,914</td>
<td>106,161</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Grand Total: 146,614 acres
Conservation Measure Uncertainty

- Unknown if habitat restoration will be successful
- Concerns about impacts to upstream storage and other beneficial uses
- Disagreement regarding minimum outflows for longfin and delta smelt
- BDCP incorporates a “decision tree” that uses future additional scientific information to determine flow requirements in 2025
- Once flows initially fixed, any further changes only via adaptive management
Adaptive Management

- Integrated process to evaluate project design, effectiveness and modification
- Data from monitoring, combined with new science, is applied to conservation strategy
- Information from project success/failure used to modify or develop new approaches
- Includes Changed Circumstances

Could require future structural or operating criteria changes that increase or decrease project cost and water availability
Assumptions and Baselines

- CEQA & NEPA require a “baseline” condition as a starting point to determine environmental impacts
  - Baseline usually reflects existing conditions at the time of the EIR/EIS with minor modifications for expected changes

- Recent case law has allowed the use of a projected future baseline
  - Based on substantial evidence
  - QSA Program EIR trial court decision
  - Recent California Supreme Court decision
Assumptions and Baselines

- Different assumptions and baselines were used in the EIR/EIS and BDCP
  - Baseline is important in determining mitigation, cost/benefit and a “yes/no” decision on project

- EIR/EIS alternatives evaluated from a perspective of avoiding or substantially lessening impacts to the whole “environment”, including humans.
  - Broad evaluation, all issue areas
  - Used a “snapshot” baseline of existing conditions with near term changes

- HCP/NCCP alternatives evaluated from a perspective of avoiding or lessening “take” of covered fish and wildlife
  - Narrow evaluation, biology only
  - Used baseline with forecasted future restrictions
Preliminary Analysis
On May 29, the BDCP economic benefit analysis was released for public review.

Economic benefit analysis assesses the value of the BDCP preferred alternative on:
- Water shortage avoidance
- Water quality improvement
- Seismic risk reduction

Water Authority staff will review the overall financing plans, funding sources, and the cost–benefit analysis of the BDCP alternatives.
Preliminary Demand Analysis

- Demand assumptions influence BDCP economic benefit analysis
- Unclear what demand assumptions were used for economic benefit analysis
- Staff to clarify demand assumptions
  - Recently, DWR now representing demand to reflect updated SCAG projection and Carlsbad Desalination
- BDCP EIR/EIS Growth Inducement Chapter reviewed water contractor profiles, including MWD
  - Relied on MWD’s 2010 RUWMP for demand profile
  - In 2010, GHA (retained by Water Authority) conducted an analysis and showed MWD’s RUWMP under-reported 312 taf of planned local projects that are shown in MWD MA UWMPs combined
Preliminary Water Supply Yield Analysis

- Dual facilities used for all three conveyance alternatives: continued reliance on existing thru-Delta system

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capacity (cfs)</th>
<th>Isolated Facility Exports</th>
<th>South Delta Exports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Initial items staff plans to evaluate:
  - Operating Scenarios associated with Alternatives
  - “Decision Tree” process
  - Frequency of north intake used
  - Benefit of additional storage
State and federal regulations for HCP/NCCP require assurance of “adequate funding” by the conservation plan applicant.

- Chapter 8 of the BDCP is intended to provide details of the funding strategy to satisfy the “adequate funding” requirement.

Chapter 8 currently notes:

- “It is important to note that this chapter is not a financing plan for the state or federal water contractors or any other party... This chapter provides an overview of potential funding sources that are likely to be available to support the implementation of the BDCP”

- “Details of the financing and repayment described in this section from the Authorized Entities and other sources are still being determined...”
How will BDCP be Financed?

- Based on BDCP’s Financing Chapter 8, who will bear the capital costs and debt obligations?
  - Unknown. Current Draft BDCP (page 8–80) says:
    - “Details of the financing… are still being determined through on-going discussion between the state and federal governments and between the government, the state and federal water contractors and other interests.”

Source: BDCP Web site fact sheet Estimated Funding to Implement the BDCP
Specific Financing Issues Already Raised by the Water Authority

- The Water Authority has identified three specific substantive issue areas that are lacking necessary discussion within Chapter 8
  - Lack of enforceable financial commitments by contractors’ member agencies or units
  - Lack of analysis regarding the effects of “step up” provisions
  - Lack of legal analysis examining the feasibility and appropriateness of using property taxes as additional back-up security for project debt

- These issues were raised repeatedly in Finance Workgroup meetings and conveyed in August 28, 2012 and July 30, 2013 correspondence to Dr. Jerry Meral
Next Steps
Next Steps

- Water Authority staff is continuing its multidisciplinary evaluation and analysis of the four Delta fix options.
- On September 12, a special Board meeting will feature presentations by Dr. Meral and a panel on economic benefit analysis of BDCP, including Dr. Sunding.
- Water Authority staff will continue to develop technical analysis, including responses to policy questions, for the September 26 Board meeting.
- May modify the review schedule if EIR/EIS release date is changed.
## BDCP Alternatives Review & Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting</th>
<th>Imported Water Committee/Board Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7/25/2013</td>
<td>Provide input on scope of proposed Water Authority analysis of BDCP alternatives; Provide input on policy questions to be addressed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/8/2013 Special Meeting</td>
<td>Overview of Bay-Delta and proposals for Delta fix, including description of alternatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/22/2013</td>
<td>Review of technical analysis – demand assumptions; alternative project yield assumptions; projected costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/12/2013 Special Meeting</td>
<td>BDCP economic study on cost–benefit of BDCP preferred alternative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/26/2013</td>
<td>Review of technical analysis (cont.), including responses to policy questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/10/2013 Special Meeting</td>
<td>Summary of technical analysis: Comparison of alternatives with Delta Policy Principles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/24/2013</td>
<td>Information: Identify areas of concern; potential CEQA–NEPA comment letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/21/2013</td>
<td>Action: EIR/EIS comment letter; consider adopting position on BDCP alternative(s)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# BDCP Alternatives Review & Analysis  
(Alternative Schedule)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting Date</th>
<th>Important Water Committee/Board Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7/25/2013</td>
<td>Provide input on scope of proposed Water Authority analysis of BDCP alternatives; provide input on policy questions to be addressed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/8/2013 Special Meeting</td>
<td>Overview of Bay-Delta and proposals for Delta fix, including description of alternatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/22/2013</td>
<td>Review of technical analysis – demand assumptions; alternative project yield assumptions; projected costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/12/2013 Special Meeting</td>
<td>BDCP economic study on cost–benefit of BDCP preferred alternative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/26/2013</td>
<td>Review of technical analysis (cont.), including responses to policy questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/24/2013</td>
<td>Summary of technical analysis: Comparison of alternatives with Delta Policy Principles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/14/2013 Special Meeting</td>
<td>Information: Identify areas of concern; potential CEQA–NEPA comment letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/9/2014 Special Meeting</td>
<td>Action: EIR/EIS comment letter; consider adopting position on BDCP alternative(s)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Colorado River Salinity Control Update

Imported Water Committee
August 22, 2013
Colorado River has relatively high salinity

Excess salinity causes ~$375 million/year in economic damage

High salinity can create environmental impacts
Colorado River Basin Salinity 2009

*Flow volume and salinity concentration data represent calendar year 2009.
*River segment widths correspond to annual flow volume in acre-feet per year.
*River segment colors correspond to annual average salinity concentrations.
*Flow volumes recorded at USGS gaging stations. Salinity concentration and load values computed by USGS.
Colorado River Salinity

Influencing Factors:
- Stream flow
- Reservoir storage
- Water resource development
- Climate
- Natural runoff
- Salinity control projects

Sources of Salinity

- Natural Sources 47%
- Irrigation 37%
- Reservoir Evaporation 12%
- M&I Use 4%
Salinity Control Program

- Colorado River Salinity Control Act of 1974
- Colorado River Salinity Control Forum
- States, Reclamation, Dept of Agriculture, Bureau of Land Management
- Set standards for salt levels on the river, including deliveries to Mexico
Salinity Control Projects

- Current reduction is 1.2 million tons/year
- Goal: Remove 1.85 million tons/year by 2030
  - Need additional projects to remove 650,000 tons of salt
- Projects intercept and dispose of salts, or improve irrigation practices
- Projects in Colorado, New Mexico, Arizona, and Utah

The Paradox Valley Brine Injection Facility in Colorado removes up to 128,000 tons of salt annually.
Salinity Control Project Funding

- Cost-share and run by states and local agencies
- BOR Basin-Wide Program – $7M in grant funds, mostly for ag improvements
- USDA – funding for on-farm irrigation projects
- More funding is needed, Forum is working with Congress to ensure continued funding
Recent Forum Discussions

- Addressing Budget Shortfalls
  - Analyzing short term options and long term solution
- Triennial Review
  - Currently drafting the 2014 Review
- Paradox Valley Unit Upgrade
  - January earthquake – reduced operations to 90% capacity- Looking at options
Major Salinity Control Project Locations

Yuma Desalting Plant

Paradox Valley Project
Deliveries to Mexico

- Minute 242: Salinity standards
- Minute 316: Env. releases into the Santa Clara Wetlands and monitoring program for YDP Pilot Run
Yuma Desalting Plant

- Completed in 1992
- Plant currently not operational
- 100 TAF flows bypassed annually to meet on-river salinity limits
Yuma Desalting Plant

- Pilot Run in 2010
  - Ran plant at 1/3 capacity for 1 year
  - Resulted in 30 TAF treated and delivered to Mexico
  - That amount did not need to be released from Lake Mead
YDP Long Term Operation

- Pilot Run part of long-term operation analysis
- Also conducting research and evaluating renewable energy options
- Ultimately, come up with a plan to best utilize the YDP to supplement Colorado River supplies
Current Situation

Colorado River

- Imperial Dam
- YDP
- MOD (from Wellton-Mohawk)
- MODE (to Cienega)
- Mexico
DWP Alternative

- Imperial Dam
  - MOD (from Wellton-Mohawk)
  - Colorado River
    - YDP
      - MODE (to Cienega)
      - Mexico
        - 242 Well Field

CAP
CENTRAL ARIZONA PROJECT
Salinity of San Diego Supply

- Water Authority goal to maintain salinity no greater than 500 mg/L
- Salinity depends on the mix of SWP and CR water
- Current salinity levels are averaging 420 mg/L
MWD Rate Litigation Overview
Imported Water Committee
August 22, 2013

Dennis Cushman, Assistant General Manager
Metropolitan Water District Sales 1990

Water Authority ~30%

2.5 Million Acre-Feet
By the 1990s, Water Authority had grown to become MWD’s largest member agency, buying ~30% of MWD’s water and providing largest share of all MWD revenues.

Water Authority purchasing twice the amount of water than its Preferential Right to MWD’s water.

- San Diego’s economy and quality of life for its residents were at significant risk during times of water shortage.
  - More than half of the water purchased annually by the Water Authority could be claimed by other MWD member agencies.
  - The Water Authority had nearly all of its “eggs” in one “basket”: MWD.
1990–91: Bottom of the Basket Falls Out

State to Shut Off Water Delivery to Southland

By VIRGINIA ELLIS and TED ROHRICH TIMES STAFF WRITERS

SACRAMENTO — Gov. Pete Wilson on Monday announced new and unprecedented cutbacks of state water deliveries so drastic that Southern California will be cut off from this traditional source of water by mid-March. Wilson said that heightened drought conditions had forced the state to notify cities and industry.

Limits on tap water use urged by staff

By Steve LaRue Self Water

The staff of the San Diego County Water Authority (CWA) will continue to recommend a blanket ban of tap water on private lawns and golf course roughs and fairways despite intense opposition by landscaping contractors and others at a hearing last week.

50% Water-Delivery Cut Will Be Blow to San Diego

■ Drought: Metropolitan Water District directors also vote a 90% cut in allocation for agricultural users.

Water Dependence Bodes a Dry San Diego Future

S.D. Faces 31% Cut in Imported Water Supply

By JENIFER WARREN TIMES STAFF WRITER

Faced with record-low rainfall and no prospects for relief, the Metropolitan Water District declared a water emergency on Tuesday and cut by 31% the amount of water it delivers to 27 agencies from Ventura to San Diego.

Grim water outlook is getting even worse

L.A. Ready to Battle San Diego Over Water

■ Conservation: DWP officials weigh legal action as southern neighbor refuses to impose rationing.

State Water Project cuts off water to farms; urban slash expected

Water: Authority to Vote Today on Mandatory Restrictions
MWD Shortage Allocations 1990–1992
Stages of MWD’s Interim Interruptible Conservation Program (Shortage Allocation Plan)

31% Shortage for 13 months

- Stage 1: Nov. 20, 1990
- Stage 2: Dec. 11, 1990
- Stage 3: Jan. 5, 1991
- Stage 5: Feb. 12, 1991
- Added Stage 6: March 4, 1991
- Stage 5: April 9, 1991
- Stage 1: April 1, 1992
MWD Drought Deliveries: Water Authority Down, LADWP Up
Retail Impact of Stage VI MWD Shortages (1990–1992 Drought)

Community’s Response:

“Never Again!”

“No More Water Shortages!”
Increasing San Diego County's Water Supply Reliability through Supply Diversification

1991
- 26 TAF (5%)
- 552 TAF (95%)
Total = 578 TAF

2012
- 274 TAF (45%)
- 80 TAF (11%) Imperial Irrigation District Transfer
- 70 TAF (11%) Metropolitan Water District
- 24 TAF (4%) All American & Coachella Canal Lining
- 18 TAF (3%) Recycled Water
- 61 TAF (10%) Groundwater
- 85 TAF (14%) Local Surface Water
Total = 612 TAF

2020
- 231 TAF (30%)
- 103 TAF (13%) Imperial Irrigation District Transfer
- 80 TAF (10%) Metropolitan Water District
- 44 TAF (6%) All American & Coachella Canal Lining
- 27 TAF (4%) Recycled Water
- 48 TAF (6%) Groundwater
- 56 TAF (7%) Local Surface Water
- 190 TAF (24%) Seawater Desalination
Total = 779 TAF

TAF=Thousand Acre-Feet
Cornerstone of Diversification Plan: 2003 Water Conservation & Transfer Agreements

- Water Authority secures new, more reliable Colorado River supplies
  - Imperial Irrigation District transfer
    - 200,000 AF/year for 45 to 75 years
  - Canal-lining projects
    - 80,000 AF/year for 110 years
- Key to diversification strategy
  - Provides 180,000 acre-feet in 2013
- By 2021, 34% of region’s supply
Diversification Improves Reliability; Reduces Purchases from MWD

- 1990: 672,801 acre-feet purchased from MWD
- 2012: 274,000 acre-feet
  
  59% less than 1990

- 2020: 231,000 acre-feet
  
  66% less than 1990
MWD Concocts Rate Structure to Preserve Revenues from Cash Cow

- MWD had lost its surplus Colorado River water — 662,000 acre-feet annually — but maintained monopoly control over conveyance facilities.
- Water transfers required a transportation rate from MWD to move the Water Authority’s independent Colorado River supplies to San Diego.
- To keep its cash cow, MWD developed a new rate structure that misallocated most of MWD’s State Water Project supply costs and all of its local supply subsidy costs to its transportation rate.
MWD’s Rate Structure Misallocates its Supply Costs to the Transportation Charge

< 2003

Uniform Water Rate

MWD Must Disaggregate Its Costs

Water Supply Costs

2003>

MWD System Costs

New Rate Structure Misallocates Water Supply Costs to Transportation Charge

Water Supply Rate

System Access Rate

Power Rate

Water Stewardship Rate

Charged for Transportation

Charged for Purchase of MWD Water
A Lawful MWD Rate Structure

- Water Supply Rate
- System Access Rate
- Power Rate

Charged for Transportation

Charged for Purchase of MWD Water

Water Supply Costs
MWD System Costs
## Supply vs. Wheeling Increases Since 2003

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Tier 1 Supply</th>
<th>Tier 2 Supply</th>
<th>Water Stewardship Rate</th>
<th>Wheeling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>$73</td>
<td>$154</td>
<td>$23</td>
<td>$253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>$73</td>
<td>$154</td>
<td>$30</td>
<td>$253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>$73</td>
<td>$154</td>
<td>$25</td>
<td>$258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>$73</td>
<td>$169</td>
<td>$25</td>
<td>$258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>$73</td>
<td>$171</td>
<td>$25</td>
<td>$258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>$73</td>
<td>$171</td>
<td>$25</td>
<td>$278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>$109</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$25</td>
<td>$278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>$170</td>
<td>$280</td>
<td>$41</td>
<td>$314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>$155</td>
<td>$280</td>
<td>$41</td>
<td>$372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$164</td>
<td>$290</td>
<td>$43</td>
<td>$396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$140</td>
<td>$290</td>
<td>$41</td>
<td>$453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$148</td>
<td>$290</td>
<td>$41</td>
<td>$445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘03–’14</td>
<td>+$75</td>
<td>+$136</td>
<td>+$18</td>
<td>+$192/AF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Water Authority barred from suing under 5-year Time-out

2010 Case

2012 Case
## Supply vs. Wheeling Increases Since 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Tier 1 Supply</th>
<th>Wheeling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>$170</td>
<td>$314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>$155</td>
<td>$372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$164</td>
<td>$396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$140</td>
<td>$453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$148</td>
<td>$445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘10–’14</td>
<td>$-22</td>
<td>$+131/AF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2010 Case

2012 Case
What’s wrong with MWD rates?

- Supply costs misallocated to transportation rate
  - ~80% of MWD’s State Water Project supply costs misallocated through the System Access Rate and System Power Rate onto its transportation rate
    - CY 2012 SWP costs: $556 million
  - 100% of local water supply development funding (recycling, desalination and conservation) misallocated through the Water Stewardship Rate onto the transportation rate
    - Significant financial impacts to Water Authority

- Costs to meet member agencies’ dry-year peaking are not properly captured nor allocated
  - Agencies that are not causing the costs are burdened with the costs
The amount of money at stake in the Water Authority’s rate lawsuit vs. MWD (over 45 years):

$1.3 billion to $2.1 billion

2013 Impact: $57 million taken out of San Diego’s economy
Efforts to Resolve Rate Dispute

- Water Authority attempted to negotiate a cooperative agreement with MWD for several years
- MWD refused to acknowledge value of Colorado River Quantification Settlement Agreement water
- Water Authority objected
  - Opposed rate structure adoption in 2001
  - Protested State Water Project cost misallocation in 2003
  - Advocated changes throughout protracted Long Range Finance Plan process 2007–2012
    - 2012: MWD abandoned development of LRFP
  - Participated in Cost of Service review process in 2009
  - Provided expert reports and other testimony to MWD’s board during public hearings in 2010 and 2012
- MWD Board ignored Water Authority’s information and request for lawful rates
Why Didn’t the Other MWD Member Agencies Agree with San Diego?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Undercharge</th>
<th>Overcharge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$1.3</td>
<td>City of Anaheim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0.5</td>
<td>City of Beverly Hills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0.7</td>
<td>City of Burbank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$4.6</td>
<td>Calleguas MWD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2.3</td>
<td>Central Basin MWD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0.1</td>
<td>City of Compton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$4.0</td>
<td>Eastern MWD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0.4</td>
<td>Foothill MWD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0.5</td>
<td>City of Fullerton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0.8</td>
<td>City of Glendale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$3.5</td>
<td>Inland Empire Utilities Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1.0</td>
<td>Las Virgenes MWD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1.6</td>
<td>City of Long Beach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$9.4</td>
<td>City of Los Angeles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$11.4</td>
<td>MWD of Orange County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0.8</td>
<td>City of Pasadena</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>San Diego County Water Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>City of San Fernando</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>City of San Marino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0.8</td>
<td>City of Santa Ana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0.3</td>
<td>City of Santa Monica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2.8</td>
<td>Three Valleys MWD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0.7</td>
<td>City of Torrance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1.1</td>
<td>Upper San Gabriel MWD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$5.1</td>
<td>West Basin MWD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$3.4</td>
<td>Western MWD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2013 Gross Impact of Misallocated Rates on MWD Member Agencies ($ in millions)
Water Authority Files Suit

- Water Authority Board voted unanimously to file lawsuit June 11, 2010 challenging MWD’s 2011 and 2012 rates
  - MWD misallocates unrelated water supply costs onto its transportation charge in violation of state law, California Constitution and industry standards
- Despite public position of desiring to “get the case heard,” MWD employs delay tactics
  - Frivolous motions, series of demurrers
- Because of MWD’s court delays, Water Authority Board voted unanimously to file lawsuit June 8, 2012 challenging MWD’s 2013 and 2014 rates
  - MWD spent most of 2012–13 fighting discovery
Support for Water Authority’s Rate Challenge
(As of 08/19/2013)

- 22nd District Agricultural Association
- Associated General Contractors of America, San Diego Chapter
- BIOCOM
- CONNECT
- San Diego Regional Chamber of Commerce
- San Diego Regional Economic Development Corporation
- The Strategic Roundtable
- Downtown San Diego Partnership
- San Diego County Taxpayers Association
- League of California Cities, San Diego County Division
- San Diego County Apartment Association
- Asian Business Association
- East County Economic Development Corporation
- Building Owners & Managers Association
- Engineering and General Contractors Association
- Fallbrook Chamber of Commerce
- San Diego County Hispanic Chamber of Commerce
- NAIOP Commercial Real Estate Development Association
- National City Chamber of Commerce
- San Diego North Chamber of Commerce
- San Ysidro Chamber of Commerce
- Lakeside Chamber of Commerce
- Santee Chamber of Commerce
- Old Town Chamber of Commerce

- San Diego County Board of Supervisors
- City of San Diego
- City of Del Mar
- City of Escondido
- City of Imperial Beach
- City of Lemon Grove
- City of National City
- City of Oceanside
- City of Poway
- City of Solana Beach
- Carlsbad MWD
- Fallbrook PUD
- Helix Water District
- Lakeside Water District
- Olivenhain MWD
- Otay Water District
- Padre Dam MWD
- Rainbow MWD
- Ramona MWD
- San Dieguito Water District
- Santa Fe Irrigation District
- South Bay Irrigation District
- Sweetwater Authority
- Vallecitos Water District
- Valley Center MWD
- Yuima MWD
Energy Subcommittee

A subcommittee to the Engineering and Operations Committee:

- Director Brady
- Director Miller
- Director Murtland
- Director Pocklington
- Director Tu
- Director Wornham
- Director Verbeke

Purpose: Develop an energy policy that would act as a guideline for future Water Authority activities.
Relationship between Energy Plan and other documents

- Energy Audit (Complete)
- Energy Management Policy
- Climate Action Plan (CAP)
- Facilities Master Plan (FMP) Update
Energy Management Policy Summary

- **Background:** Water Authority is a small user of energy, but recognizes that the water/energy nexus is of increasing importance.
- **Purpose:** Provides direction on future projects and programs generally as well as guidance to staff on their day-to-day activities.
- **Policy Sections**
  - Purchasing
  - Facilities Maintenance and Operation
  - Energy Reliance and Independence
  - Funding
  - Innovation
  - Energy Contracting
  - Interagency Cooperation
  - Legislation, Design and Construction
  - Public Education
  - Program Management
Construction Contract for Pipeline 3 Relining Sweetwater to Lower Otay Reservoir

Engineering & Operations Committee Meeting

August 22, 2013

Nicola Kavanagh
Pipeline 3 Relining, R0211/R0212 Sweetwater to Lower Otay Reservoir

San Diego County Water Authority
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

PIPELINE 3 RELINING, R0211/R0212 SWEETWATER TO LOWER OTAY RESERVOIR

FIGURE 1
## Bid Summary

**ADVERTISED BID RANGE $36M - $44M**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>GENERAL CONTRACTOR</th>
<th>BID AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>L.H. Woods &amp; Sons, Inc.</td>
<td>$25,387,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Oscar Renda Contracting, Inc.</td>
<td>$29,994,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Kiewit Infrastructure West Co.</td>
<td>$30,997,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>J.F. Shea Construction, Inc.</td>
<td>$31,226,279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Mladen Buntich Construction Co., Inc.</td>
<td>$34,989,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Ranger Pipelines, Inc.</td>
<td>$36,011,565</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recommendation

Authorize the General Manager to award a construction contract to L.H. Woods & Sons, Inc. in the amount of $25,387,000 for the Pipeline 3 Relining Sweetwater to Lower Otay project.
Sustainable Landscapes
Program Implementation Update

Legislation, Conservation and Outreach Committee
August 22, 2013

Carlos Michelon
Principal Water Resources Specialist
Oct. 2, 2012

Changing landscape

Different weather conditions dictate new solutions to challenges facing utility managers, consultants

Unlike traditional stormwater infrastructure, which uses pipes to remove rainwater, green infrastructure uses vegetation and soil to manage rainwater where it falls.

weather treatment solutions.

OCT. 2: Extreme weather calls for extreme planning, and a changing climate is changing assumptions about managing water.

Other Links

WEFTEC 2012 Technical Program
Build your own WEFTEC Planner
WEFTEC.org
EPA's Green Project Reserve
Confronting Climate Change (NACWA)
Philadelphia's Program for CSO Control
NYC Green Infrastructure Plan

Other Special Editions

Rulindo Challenge
Sustainable Landscapes Program (SLP)

- Designed to reduce:
  - Water waste
  - Pollutant infiltration into waterways

- Based on updated landscape standards consistent with:
  - Model Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance
  - Municipal Storm Water Permit
Proposition 84, Round 1 - Timeline

- 2007 – Board adopted San Diego IRWM Plan
- 2010 – Board authorized DWR grant application
- 2011 – Awarded Sustainable Landscapes Program grant
- 2012 – Executed DWR grant agreement
Multiple Benefits

- Water use reduction
- Green waste reduction
- Labor reductions associated with maintenance
- Carbon dioxide emissions reduction
- Water quality improvements
Consistent with Water Use Efficiency Policy Principles

- Leverages grant funding to offset ratepayer investments
- Pursues collaborative partnerships
- Helps offset demand for imported water
- Encourages market transformation and behavioral changes
- Leads to sustainable, long-term water use efficiency
## Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prop 84 IRWM Grant</td>
<td>$1,050,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined Local Match</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Program Budget</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,400,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Local Project Participants

Local Match Contributions ($350,000)

San Diego County Water Authority: $57,500
AMERICAN WATER: $25,000
City of San Diego: $77,250
SURFRIDER FOUNDATION: $64,000
ASSOCIATION OF COMPOST PRODUCERS: $25,250
County of San Diego: $86,000
Center for Sustainable Energy: $15,000
Scope of Work

- Landscape guidelines & specifications (integrates water efficiency & watershed protection)
- Education & training
- Technical assistance
- Retrofit incentives
- Landscape materials
- Outreach & stakeholder involvement
Examples of Planned Work Products

Updated Guidebook

A Homeowner’s Guide to a WaterSmart Landscape

Community Education
Examples of Planned Work Products

Industry Training
Next Steps

• 2013 – Execute Local Project Participants Implementation Agreement

• 2013 through 2016 – Program implementation
Legislative Update

Legislation, Conservation, & Outreach Committee
August 22, 2013
Statewide Water Action Plan

- ACWA leading process in conjunction with DWR to develop a “Statewide Water Action Plan for the Governor and the State of California”

- Plan is intended to outline “guiding principles and identify a suite of statewide actions that will, if implemented together, serve as a sustainable path forward for California”

- Effort involves a variety of stakeholder interests from Sacramento Valley, Bay Area, Delta, San Joaquin Valley, and southern California – including Water Authority

- Proposes 14 different statewide actions to be implemented as a comprehensive package
Seven bills remain active during the 2013 Legislative Session on which the Water Authority Board has taken a position:

- **AB 71** (Perez) – Salton Sea Restoration – S
- **AB 115** (Perea) – Safe Drinking Water SRF – S
- **AB 145** (Perea) – SWRCB: Drinking Water – O/A
- **AB 763** (Buchanan) – Aquatic Invasive Plants – S
- **AB 803** (Gomez) – Recycled Water – S
- **SB 322** (Hueso) – Water Recycling – S
- **SB 436** (Jackson) – CEQA Notices – O/A