Authorize Issuance of Extendable Commercial Paper

Administrative and Finance Committee
April 24, 2014

David Shank, Financial Planning Manager
Background

Adopted the Updated Statement of Debt Management Policy

Oct 13

Adopted an updated Variable Rate Debt Management Strategy

Nov 13

RENEW

Dec 13

PRIOR ACTION

TECP Series 5

Jan 14

TODAYS ACTION

REPLACE

Feb 14

Citi TECP Series 6 with Series 1 Extendable Commercial Paper (ECP)

Mar 14

- US Bank - Issuing and Paying Agent (IPA)

PRIOR ACTION

Wells Fargo

Completed

REPLACE

Bayerische TECP Series 1 w/ TECP Series 8 (maintain service providers)

Completed

Bank of Tokyo-Mitsubishi UFJ
Recommendation

- Adopt Resolution 2014–___ authorizing the issuance and sale of short-term revenue certificates and authorizing and approving certain actions in connection therewith.
Status of Special Agricultural Water Rate and Recent Agricultural Stakeholders’ Meeting

Administrative and Finance Committee
April 24, 2014

Presented by Tim Bombardier
Senior Water Resources Specialist
Agenda

- Background on Transitional Special Agricultural Water Rate (TSAWR)

- TSAWR CY 2014 Regional Cost Benefit

- Recent Meeting with Agricultural Stakeholders
TSAWR Background

- October 23, 2008, Water Authority Board approved two-year transitional SAWR (TSAWR) program
  - Only customers opting out of MWD’s Interim Agricultural Water Program
  - Termination date December 31, 2010
- October 2008 approval authorized formation of a SAWR Board Workgroup
  - Evaluate a range of options for the SAWR
TSAWR Background (cont.)

- Customers pay less in exchange for reduced level of service during shortages

- Pay MWD M&I supply rate
  - QSA supplies excluded

- Deliveries exempt from member agency storage charge calculation
  - Cut twice the rate of M&I in an emergency
  - No carryover storage service
March 22, 2010 Board Action

1. Two-year extension to the TSAWR to Dec. 31, 2012
2. Revised SAWR program beginning January 1, 2013
3. Comprehensive review of SAWR program prior to January 1, 2016
4. Staff meet annually with agricultural community and member agencies
April 26, 2012 Board Action

1. Second two-year extension to Dec 31, 2014
2. Revised SAWR start date of January 1, 2015
### TSAWR CY 2014 Regional Cost Benefit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Benefit</th>
<th>CY 2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supply Rate Differential</td>
<td>$139/AF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Storage Charge Exemption*</td>
<td>$144/AF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$283/AF</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Fixed charge converted to $/AF using regional M&I sales forecast. Actual cost benefit from storage charge exemption will vary by member agency.

Member agency projected participation for CY 2014 approximately 38,000 AF
Agriculture Stakeholders’ Meeting
February 12, 2014

- Voice concerns over terminating supply component
  - Water supply conditions
  - Inability to absorb price increases
- Request made to continue TSAWR program
  - Received letters conveying concerns and requesting continuation of TSAWR
Top Findings from Public Records Act Lawsuit Against Eastern Municipal Water District

Imported Water Committee
April 24, 2014

Dennis Cushman, Assistant General Manager
Public Records Act Request

- In fall 2012, Water Authority learned that Eastern Municipal Water District hired public relations firm California Strategies to conduct public relations program in San Diego County
  - Water Authority suspected work being conducted on behalf of MWD
- October 31, 2012: Requested documents relating to contract with California Strategies
- Eastern required filing a Public Records Act request
- Due to Eastern’s unresponsiveness, Water Authority forced to sue on Jan. 22, 2013
## 18 Months to Obtain Documents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Pages Released</th>
<th>Running Total</th>
<th>EMWD Claims Production Complete?</th>
<th>Production Complete?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 19, 2012</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. 21, 2012</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>In Progress</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan. 7, 2013</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 27, 2013</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. 20, 2013</td>
<td>1,033</td>
<td>1,136</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 11, 2014</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,139</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
First Key Finding

1. Claims of Attorney–Client and Attorney Work Product privilege were meritless
   - California Strategies work was public relations, not “litigation defense strategies
   - No party to the agreement is a licensed attorney
   - Eastern’s general counsel was not even copied on email communications until after Water Authority filed Public Records Act requests
Judge Chalfant on Eastern’s Claims of Privilege

- **Judge Chalfant:**
  - “There is no doubt in my mind that the petitioner's insistence that the production was inadequate has led to the production of additional documentation….”
  - “They are going to get attorney’s fees. I mean, I am willing to listen to your argument against attorney’s fees, but all they have to be is the motivating force in getting you to produce these documents. You took a privilege stance before.”

- **Ms. Carson:** “Your Honor, our client based their initial assertion of privilege on pending litigation –”

- **Judge Chalfant:** “Forget the privilege.”
Second Key Finding

2. Metropolitan Water District General Manager Jeff Kightlinger participated in meetings, teleconferences and briefings during the development of the “Ascertainment Study” and the Phase II MWD Public and Governmental Relations Plan

“It was very well received by Jeff and the other key member agency General Managers and we will continue to work with MWD on urging its implementation. Great job!” – Paul Jones, Dec. 28, 2012 email to California Strategies
Third Key Finding

3. The “MWD Member Agency Managers Workgroup” – aka “Anti–San Diego Coalition” and “Secret Society” – participated in discussions and briefings from the beginning

“Could you please give me an ETA on the scope of work? I have a coordination meeting with other MWD agencies on Friday and would tentatively like to take the item to our Board in closed session next Wednesday.” – Paul Jones, May 15, 2012 email to California Strategies
Fourth Key Finding

4. Former MWD General Manager Ron Gastelum participated in the development of the campaign from its inception

“On the budget for the new (MWD) office, I cannot stress enough the value of having discretionary funds available for business meals (within reason), and contributions to local organizations and programs... The senior executive (should) volunteer to serve on various boards and committees.... Contributing money to other causes may be tricky, but not necessarily if done in modest amounts.” – Ron Gastelum email, Dec. 7, 2012
Fifth Key Finding

5. Parties were concerned over the level of detail in the California Strategies scope of work, and the scope changed multiple times

“As promised here is a draft letter proposal for your review. After MUCH discussion it is thought to be better for the San Diego crew if it was sufficiently general in nature.” – California Strategies May 16, 2012 email to Jones

“I know there is reluctance to put specifics in writing given sensitivities….” – California Strategies May 23, 2012 email to Jones

“I plan to put the item on closed session (potential litigation) and present the proposed contract …. What I need is the following... a handout that you can provide at the meeting (and we can collect when you’re done) on the actual scope items....” – May 23, 2012 email response from Jones
Court Case Outcome

- April 11, 2014: Eastern made final document production – 18 months after initial request
- April 15, 2014: Los Angeles Superior Court Judge James Chalfant approved order declaring the Water Authority the prevailing party in the litigation and its entitlement to attorneys’ fees and costs
- April 18, 2014: Eastern agreed to Water Authority demands for attorneys’ fees and costs of $95,808.
  - Stipulation filed with the court April 22, 2014
  - Judge Chalfant expected to incorporate fee stipulation into final judgment
Summary

- A significant and expensive PR campaign is being conducted in our region by MWD and supported by some of their member agencies.
- Campaign purpose is to discredit the Water Authority and undermine the community’s support for the rate lawsuit and Authority’s advocacy positions at MWD.
- PR Plan Strategy: Buy friends and influence people.
- Irony: 25 cents of every dollar spent on this campaign is coming from our region.
Salton Sea Update: Mitigation and Restoration

Imported Water Committee
April 24, 2014

Dan Denham, Colorado River Program Director
525 Square Mile Ecosystem
$2.5 Billion Farming Economy
A Declining Resource
### Salton Sea Mitigation Water Schedule

#### SCHEDULE FOR PAYMENT TO IID FOR MITIGATION WATER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Mitigation Water</th>
<th>Mitigation Payments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>$454,335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>$933,658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>$1,439,001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>$1,971,431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>$2,532,056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>$2,601,688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>$3,207,881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>$3,845,447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>$4,515,654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>$5,219,814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td>$8,343,002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>90,000</td>
<td>$11,021,702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>110,000</td>
<td>$13,841,421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>130,000</td>
<td>$16,807,889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>$19,927,045</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Present Value of Payments: $50 million
- Interest rate: 6% per Exhibit A of Environmental Cost Sharing Agreement

$62 M Planned Through CY 2017

$35 M Spent Through CY 2013
Salton Sea Mitigation Funding

(nominal dollars)

Future Funding $296M
- Committed $52M
- Unallocated $27M

Mitigation Water* $28M
- Habitat/Wildlife Studies $12M
- Managed Marsh $6M
- Air Quality $3M
- Other $3M

Water Authority, IID, CVWD: $375 Million

State of California: Any expenses beyond $375 Million

*Does not include ~$7M payment to IID for Salton Sea storage water.
Current and Projected QSA Mitigation

**Mitigation**
Activities that reduce the impact of an action*

**Restoration**
Actions that bring back something that previously existed*

Air Quality Emissions

Modeled Windblown Dust PM-10 Emissions

Annual PM-10 Emissions (Tons per Day)
- 0-2
- 3-8
- 9-18
- 19-32
- 33-44
- 45-57
- 58-73
- 74-90
- 91-110
- 111-151

PM-10 Emissions (Tons/Day)
- Fugitive Windblown Dust
- Unpaved Roads
- Farming
- Construction and Demolition
- Paved Roads
- Other Sources
- On and Off Road Motor Vehicles

Legend:
- Current Sources (2010)
- Exposed Playa from QSA Sources (2047)
- Exposed Playa from Non-QSA Sources (2047)
Salton Sea Restoration Funding
(nominal dollars)

Funds Needed $8.8B

Salton Sea Restoration Fund $136M

Prop 84 $47M
Prop 50 $22M
QSA Parties $67M

Water Authority, IID, CVWD: $67 Million

State of California: $8.9 Billion Preferred Alternative
Renewable Energy Initiative
Incremental Approach
Vallecitos Direct Connection to Desalination Pipeline

Engineering & Operations Committee
April 24, 2014
Carlsbad Desalination Projects

TWIN OAKS VALLEY WATER TREATMENT PLANT DESALINATION MODIFICATIONS (K0306)

PIPELINE 3 DESALINATION RELINING SAN MARCOS TO TWIN OAKS (K0304) (27,100 FEET)

DESALINATION PRODUCT WATER CONVEYANCE PIPELINE (K0303) (10 MILES, 54-INCH PIPE)

SAN MARCOS VENT DESALINATION MODIFICATIONS (K0305)

LEGEND
- Desalination Plant
- Desalination Pipeline
- Water Authority Pipeline
- Pipeline 3 Relining
- Portal Location
- Portal Staging Area
Desalination Flow Control/Interconnect Facilities

- Existing Vallecitos 9 Flow Control Facility
- New Vallecitos 9 Pipeline
- New Vallecitos Desalination Connection
- Pipeline 3 Connection
- Pipeline 4 Connection
- End of Pipeline 3 Relining Station 2910+92

Legend:
- Isolation Valve
- San Diego County Water Authority Pipeline
- Pipeline 3 Relining
- Desalination Pipeline
- Existing Structure
- New Structure
Staff Recommendation

- Authorize the General Manager to execute an agreement with Vallecitos Water District for reimbursable costs related to the design and construction of new facilities to accommodate future treated water purchases from the Carlsbad Desalination Project.

- Increase the FY 2014/2015 Capital Improvement Program appropriation and lifetime budget for the Carlsbad Desalination Project by $220,000 for reimbursable costs related to future contract purchases of treated water from the Carlsbad Desalination Project.
State Water Project Table A Allocation

- CY 2014 Table A allocation increased to 5% on April 18
  - February and March storms modestly increased SWP reservoir storage
- DWR encouraging collaboration among SWP contractors
  - Implement extraordinary one-year transfers or multi-year exchange agreements with other agencies
- Drought Operations Plan and Operational Forecast
  - Joint USBR and DWR plan on SWP and CVP operations
  - Addresses health and safety needs, salinity control in the Delta, and fish and wildlife protection
Statewide Snowpack Conditions

- April 1st Conditions: 32% of normal statewide
  - DWR’s 4th Manual Snow Survey
  - Date of typical maximum accumulation for the season

- April 23rd Conditions: 17% of normal statewide
  - Warm and dry conditions causing early snowmelt

*Forecasted water year runoff as of April 1, 2014
Reservoir Conditions - San Luis

San Luis Levels: Various Past Water Years and Current Water Year, Ending At Midnight April 22, 2014

San Luis Conditions
(as of Midnight - April 22, 2014)

Current Level: 951,817 AF
47% (Total Capacity)  52% (Historical Avg.)

Total Reservoir Capacity: 2,041,000 AF

Upper Colorado River Basin Supply Conditions

- Long-term drought on the basin, but WY 2014 is normal
- 44% chance of shortage declaration in 2016
  - Would affect Nevada and Arizona before California, although MWD’s ability to take Lake Mead reserves would be restricted

*US Bureau of Reclamation WY 2014 forecast made on April 2, 2014
Fiscal Year Potable Water Use in Water Authority Service Area

July – April of FY 2014 is 4% more than in FY 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ave Daily Max Temp (° F)</th>
<th>Rainfall Lindbergh Field</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 2013: Dec – April was 0.8°F cooler than normal</td>
<td>FY 2013: Dec – Apr: 63% of normal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2014: Dec – April 20 was 4.0°F warmer than normal</td>
<td>FY 2014: Dec – Apr 20: 38% of normal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: April 2014 water use is estimated
Conclusion

- Ongoing extreme drought conditions in California
- Upper Colorado River Basin conditions are normal
- MWD projects significant storage utilization in 2014
  - Detailed report expected in May on MWD’s projected storage utilization
- Above average temperatures forecasted into the summer
  - Over 50% chance of El Niño developing in summer

Temperature Outlook
Valid May - July 2014

A = Above Average
B = Below Average
EC = Equal Chances

Made on April 17, 2014 by the Climate Prediction Center
Mitigated Negative Declaration for the Proposed Pipelines 3, 4 and 5 Relining Project - San Luis Rey River

Water Planning Committee
April 24, 2014

Presented by Mark Tegio, Senior Water Resources Specialist
Agenda

- Project Location
- Project Components/Objectives
- Environmental Impacts
- Administrative Actions
- Required Actions/Permits
Project Location
Project Components/Objectives

- Rehabilitate pipelines to ensure a safe and reliable water supply for our region’s future
- Must be done prior to widening and realignment of State Route 76
- Reline 475-foot segment of Pipeline 3 and 3,400-foot segments of Pipeline 4 & 5
  - Excavation of 5 access portals
  - Additional access at existing structures
Components (cont.)

Removing Existing Section of Pipe from the Portal
Components (cont.)

Securing Steel Liner to Cart
Components (cont.)

Installing Steel Liner
Components (cont.)
Components (cont.)

Completed Mortar Lining
Components (cont.)

Installing Steel Pipe, Portal Closure
Components (cont.)
Environmental Impacts

Biological Resources: Potential impact to: arroyo toad, southwestern willow flycatcher, coastal California gnatcatcher, least Bell’s vireo, southern California rufous-crowned sparrow, and mountain lion.

Direct temporary impact to Diegan coastal sage scrub.

Noise: Potential noise impact affecting least Bell’s vireo.

Traffic: Temporary traffic impact on roadway segment currently operating at level of service (LOS) F
Mitigation: Pre-activity surveys for target species.

Trapping and exclusionary fencing, and monitoring program for arroyo toad.

Reduce construction noise levels by installing noise control barriers, employing noise attenuation devices and modifications to equipment, limiting hours of operation; or using a combination of these measures.

Revegetate diegan coastal sage scrub in accordance with Water Authority’s NCCP/HCP permit.

Provide appropriate signage and flagging in both directions on SR 76, to warn traffic of the approaching construction site and potential for truck traffic.
Administrative Actions

March 26, 2014

Notice of Completion sent to State Clearinghouse

Draft MND distributed for public review/comment

Public Notice of Intent posted at County, published in San Diego Union-Tribune, and mailed to property owners

Public comment period begins
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>April 24, 2014</td>
<td>Public Hearing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public comment period ends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 22, 2014</td>
<td>Anticipated date for presenting Final MND and MMRP to Board of Directors for Consideration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Required Actions/Permits

• **Water Authority Board of Directors**
  • Adopt MND, Mitigation Monitoring & Reporting Plan, and approve project

• **County of San Diego**
  • Construction Access/Right of Entry

• **Caltrans**
  • Traffic Control Permit(s)

• **Regional Water Quality Control Board**
  • Construction Stormwater Permit
Approve Proposed Amendment to Sponsored Legislation – AB 2067 (Weber)

Legislation, Conservation & Outreach Committee
April 24, 2014
AB 2067 (Weber)

- Simplifies demand management measure reporting in UWMPs consistent with consensus recommendations from DWR’s Independent Technical Panel
  - 13–0 vote in Assembly Water, Parks, and Wildlife
  - 17–0 vote in Assembly Appropriations
  - Pending action on Assembly Floor
Water community interests have requested the Water Authority’s consideration of amendments to AB 2067:

- Extend the deadline for submittal of 2015 UWMPs to July 1, 2016 to accommodate 20x2020 water use efficiency information
- Extend the deadline for submittal of 2020 UWMPs to July 1, 2021 to accommodate 2020 Census data
Staff Recommendation

- Approve the proposed amendments to the Water Authority’s sponsored legislation – AB 2067 (Weber)

- **Next steps:** Staff will confer with Assemblymember Weber regarding the proposed amendments
ABOUT THE POLL

- 1,000 San Diego County adults between March 7 & 25, 2014.
- Telephone (N=500) and online (N=500) consolidated into single data set (N=1,000). A separate sample of cell phone contacts was also included in the telephone component.
- Overall margin of error equivalent to ± 3.1%, 19 times out of 20.
Public Interest in Water Issues
Top-of-Mind County Issues

“What do you feel is the most important issue facing San Diego County residents today?”

- Poor economy/unemployment: 22%
- Water supply/drought: 16%
- Affordable housing: 6%
- Crime/safety: 5%
- Cost of living: 5%
- City politics: 5%
- Infrastructure: 5%
- Education: 4%
- City financial problems: 3%
- Immigration/border issues: 3%
- Other: 17%
- ( Unsure): 9%
Importance of Reliable Water Supply

84%: Essential for a healthy economy

82%: Needed for good quality of life

70%: Feel current supply is reliable, but only 48% trust long-term supply
The Drought
Drought Awareness and Response

Nearly 7-in-10 aware of current drought

71% report taking action to save more water at home
Specific Water-Reducing Actions

“What specifically have you done?”

- Total Unaided Mentions -

Limit shower time/take baths: 35%
Reduce water usage/more aware: 32%
Cut back watering garden/lawn: 31%
Turn tap off when brushing teeth, etc.: 16%
Run laundry/dishwasher fully loaded: 13%
Drought-tolerant plants: 9%
Recommended Water Agency Actions If Drought Continues

“If dry conditions continue, what should local water agencies do to respond?”

- Total Mentions -

Mandatory conservation - 39%
Voluntary conservation - 28%
Encourage/promote/use recycled water - 16%
Increase seawater desalination - 15%
Increase water transfers - 15%
Views on Water Costs
Water Costs

56% feel water is good value

Most perceive higher value for other compared utilities

About three in ten feel cost of water is appropriate. 53% feel it’s too high
Support for Additional Investments

Higher costs to enhance environmental activities?

45% support, 23% oppose

Increases in rates necessary for enhanced supply reliability?

33% agree, 34% disagree
The Bay-Delta
Most agree that the Bay-Delta is an important water source for San Diego County (58%) and that this source is facing ecological challenges (57%).
“Some people feel San Diego County ratepayers should pay more to improve water supply reliability in the Bay-Delta. Others prefer focusing investments on developing more locally controlled water resources. Which approach do you prefer?”

- Prefer Bay-Delta Investments: 4% Strongly, 6% Moderately, 10% Overall
- Prefer Local Investments: 38% Strongly, 19% Moderately, 57% Overall
- Support Both: 13%
- Support Neither: 2%
- (Depends/Unsure): 18%

Most Prefer Water Investments Close to Home
Water Conservation
San Diego County residents exceed the national average on a range of household conservation practices including:

- Wait until full load: 82% (SD County) vs 78% (USA)
- Quickly repair leaky toilets/faucets: 81% (SD County) vs 74% (USA)
- Water garden early morning/late evening: 70% (SD County) vs 55% (USA)
- Avoid running tap: 69% (SD County) vs 52% (USA)
- Install water-efficient fixtures: 50% (SD County) vs 36% (USA)
- Limit shower time: 41% (SD County) vs 32% (USA)

*Source: Probe Research Syndicated Study: A Clear Perspective of Americans and their Drinking Water, January 2012
Public Demand for Selected Water Conservation Programs/Assistance

“What kind of water-use efficiency programs or assistance, if any, are you looking for?”

- Total Aided Mentions -

- Rebates for water-saving appliances/fixtures: 40%
- Discounts on water-efficient plants: 32%
- Rebates for water-saving landscaping/irrigation: 30%
- How-to guides: 28%
- WaterSmart landscape classes: 19%
- Indoor/outdoor water audits: 18%
- Other: 5%
- (Unsure): 34%
Majority Say They Can Save More

Despite these strong attitudinal and behavioral commitments to water conservation, a majority (53%) feel they could be doing more to conserve water on the home front...

especially younger citizens.

However, 25 percent felt there was nothing they could do to save more water.
Many Younger Residents on Conservation Sidelines

“People have different views and behaviors when it comes to San Diego County’s water supplies. *I could do more to conserve water at my home.*”

![Bar chart showing age distribution of agreement with water conservation statement.]
Household Water Conservation Practices by Age

“Can you tell me whether or not you personally do any of the following things to conserve water in your household?”

- Wait until full load
  - 18-34: 75%
  - 35-54: 86%
  - 55+: 85%

- Quickly repair leaky toilets/faucets
  - 18-34: 67%
  - 35-54: 86%
  - 55+: 89%

- Water garden early morning/late evening
  - 18-34: 56%
  - 35-54: 71%
  - 55+: 83%

- Check for leaks in irrigation
  - 18-34: 36%
  - 35-54: 56%
  - 55+: 71%

- Install water-efficient fixtures
  - 18-34: 31%
  - 35-54: 53%
  - 55+: 66%

- Limit shower time
  - 18-34: 29%
  - 35-54: 36%
  - 55+: 59%
Business Plan
Goals
79% support supply diversification strategy, significant increase from 2012 (57%)

45% familiar with regional reliability enhancement efforts
Water Use Efficiency as Civic Duty

“It is my civic responsibility to use water efficiently.”

- 82% Agree
- 22% Moderately Agree
- 60% Strongly Agree
- 5% Disagree
- 3% Moderately Disagree
- 13% Neutral/Unsure
Questions?

Contact:

Scott MacKay
1-877-538-5545
scott@probe-research.com
Drought Response/Conservation Outreach

Legislation, Conservation and Outreach Committee
April 24, 2014
Supported by the San Diego County Water Authority and its 24 member agencies.
Launch

April 29 media event

First phase May-Sept

Ads, partnerships and outreach
Hub for drought response

- Supply conditions
- Water agency actions
- Conservation information
- Water supply reliability efforts
Advertising

TV
- News partnerships
- Weather promotions
- “When in Drought Wednesdays”

Online news
- Banner ads on top sites
Advertising

Radio
- Traffic tags
- On-air promotion
- Event tie-ins

Google adwords
- Key online search terms
Partnerships

Restaurants

Craft brewers

High-traffic destinations
Community Outreach

Community & business groups

Elected officials

Schools

Garden and landscape events
Young Adults

Poll: Potential for more conservation

- Breweries
- Radio events
- Social media
Collaboration/Evaluation

- Joint Public Information Council
- Materials for member agencies
- Review tactics, messaging