Work Plan for Preparation of the Water Authority’s 2015 Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP)
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Preparation of the Water Authority’s 2015 UWMP

- Update required by law every 5 years
- Purpose and importance has grown since first required 30 years ago
- Identifies the projected water resources mix for the San Diego region
- Foundational document for other Water Authority planning efforts
  - Facilities master plan, long-range finance plan and integrated regional water management plan
- Coordination with member agencies critical element
Land–Use and Water Supply Coordination in the San Diego Region

Cities/County General Plans

SANDAG’s Regional Growth Forecast

Projected Water Demands

Urban Water Management Plan

SANDAG Regional Plan

Water Assessment (SB 610) Written Verification (SB 221)

Cities/County Plans & Policies
Urban Water Management Plan
Six Main Elements

Demand Forecast
- Econometric Model utilizing SANDAG Regional Growth Forecast

Water-Use Efficiency
- Include passive and active savings
- Ensure retail compliance with SBX7-7

Water Supplies
- Water Authority and member agency supplies

Water Resource Mix
- Resource mix to meet demands in normal and dry water years

Scenario Planning
- Process to manage supply uncertainties associated with resource mix

Shortage Planning
- Contingency analysis to address shortages due to drought, catastrophe or other event
Determining Projected Demands with Conservation Savings *(Illustrative Purposes)*
Supply projects categorized into three groups

Critical to identify “verifiable” supplies
- Utilized in compliance reports for laws linking land-use approval and supply availability (SB 610/221)
- Projects included in Water Reliability Assessment

Identification of “additional planned” projects provides for comprehensive long-term reliability planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Category</th>
<th>General Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Verifiable</td>
<td>Adequate documentation on implementation: CEQA certification, permits satisfied, contracts executed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Planned</td>
<td>Actively being pursued and planning effort currently being funded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conceptual</td>
<td>Project in conceptual, pre-feasibility phase</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Developing the Regional Water Resources Mix to Meet Demands *(Illustrative Purposes)*

Projected Demands w/ Conservation

- MWD
- Water Authority CDP
- Water Authority QSA Supplies
- Member Agency Supplies
Major Steps in Scenario Planning Process

Projected Resources Mix
- Develop in coordination with member agencies

Uncertainty Scenarios
- Based on critical uncertainties
- Risk assessment of resources mix
- Identify “supply gap”

Potential Strategies
- Qualitative and quantitative
- Manage uncertainties
- Fill potential “supply gap”

Key Tracking Metrics
- Metrics to track implementation of resource mix and potential need for strategies
- Avoid over investment
Consistency between UWMPs
Accurately Document Regional Supply Availability

Member Agency UWMPs = Water Authority UWMP
# 2015 Urban Water Management Plan

**Tentative Timeline: Major Actions and Member Agency Input**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jul 15, 2015</td>
<td>Member Agency coordination meeting for 2015 UWMP <em>(focus on data needs for plan preparation)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug 27, 2015</td>
<td>Staff report to SDCWA Board on preparation of 2015 UWMP <em>(overview of requirements, approach and schedule)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 10, 2015</td>
<td>Staff report to SDCWA Board on major elements of 2015 UWMP <em>(preliminary demand forecast, projected conservation and proposed supply mix)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 2015</td>
<td>Draft 2015 UWMP distributed to member agencies for review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 2016</td>
<td>Public Review Draft 2015 UWMP distributed to Board and public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb – Mar 2016</td>
<td>2015 UWMP stakeholder education and outreach effort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 28, 2016</td>
<td>Public hearing on Draft 2015 UWMP <em>(SDCWA Board meeting)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 26, 2016</td>
<td>SDCWA Board considers approval of 2015 UWMP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun 2016</td>
<td>2015 UWMP submitted to DWR <em>(submittal deadline July 1, 2016)</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Update on Supply Conditions and Drought Response Activities

El Niño growing
Although the trend could change in coming months, warming waters in the Pacific Ocean could bring soaking winter storms – as they did in the 1997-98 rainy season.

June 1997

June 2015

Warm water mass

Source: NASA; Jet Propulsion Laboratory

BAY AREA NEWS GROUP
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August 2015 - El Niño Advisory

- Issued when El Niño conditions are observed and expected to continue
- +90% chance El Niño will continue through winter
- 85% chance it will last into early spring

August 2014 - El Niño Watch

- Issued when conditions are favorable for development of El Niño
- Chance of El Niño had decreased to about 65% for fall and winter
NOAA Multi-Variate El Niño Index

Source: Mike Dettinger, USGS/SIO
National Weather Service Outlook
September – November 2015

Precipitation Outlook

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

Made February 19, 2015

Temperature Outlook

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

Made August 20, 2015
State Water Project
Lake Oroville Storage


Current Year
31% Capacity

Last Year

Record Low

(as of August 24, 2015)
San Luis Reservoir Storage

Current Year 20% Capacity

Last Year

(as of August 24, 2015)

San Luis Reservoir Storage

Total Reservoir Capacity: 2,041,000 AF

403,942 AF


403,942 AF
SWRCB Emergency Regulation
Updated Member Agency Conservation Standards*

*Based on R-GPCD data current as of 6/11/15
### SWRCB Emergency Regulation
**Member Agency Conservation – June 2015**

- **Conservation standard**
- **Conservation achieved toward designated standard**
- **Percent achieved above conservation standard**
- **Percent below below conservation standard**

*Based on R-GPCD data current as of 6/11/15*

Source: SWRCB Conservation Reporting Data
Total Potable M&I Water Use
State Emergency Regulation Reporting Months

Cumulative June - July 2015 is **29%** lower than 2013

Source: Member Agency monthly water use reporting to the Water Authority
Average Daily Maximum Temperature at Lindbergh Field – Departure from Normal (°F)

SWRCB Emergency Regulation Reporting Months

- June
- July
- August
- September
- October
- November
- December
- January
- February

Months in 2013

2015 - 2016

Hotter

Cooler
Timeline of Key Supply Events Leading up to FY 2016 Allocations

• April 2015 –
  • MWD implements Water Supply Allocation Plan, cutting back its supplies 15% for fiscal year 2016
  • Staff coordinates with member agency managers to prepare draft member agency supply allocations

• May 2015 –
  • Board authorizes Stage 3 (Mandatory Cutbacks) of the Water Shortage and Drought Response Plan
  • Board approves member agency M&I and TSAWR supply allocations
Monthly M&I Tracking Targets and Estimated Monthly M&I Deliveries (AF)
Cumulative M&I Tracking Targets and Estimated Cumulative M&I Deliveries (AF)
FY 2016 MWD Allocation and Water Authority Delivery of MWD Supplies (AF)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2016 MWD Allocation</th>
<th>Cumulative MWD Deliveries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>308,610</td>
<td>39,568</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- FY 2016 MWD Allocation
- Cumulative MWD Deliveries
Modification to Yuima Municipal Water District’s Fiscal Year 2016 Municipal and Industrial Supply Allocation

Water Planning Committee
August 27, 2015

Presentation by:
Dana Friehauf, Water Resources Manager
Agenda

1. Water Shortage and Drought Response Plan (WSDRP) Loss of Local Supply Adjustment
2. Board procedures for handling modifications
3. Yuima MWD allocation modification request
4. Staff analysis
5. Member Agency Managers’ recommendation
Purpose of Loss of Local Supply Adjustment
WSDRP Allocation Methodology

- Member agencies have invested heavily in local supplies, thereby reducing reliance on Water Authority supplies.

- Adjustment developed to recognize benefit and not penalize agencies for diminished supplies.

- Calculated as difference between average base year local supply and projected allocation year local supply use.
  - Difference is reduced by Water Authority cutback percent from MWD (e.g., 15%).
Board Procedures for Handling Supply Allocation Modifications

Is Water Authority Board Approval Required?

- Request for modification that totals more than 10% of requesting agency’s allocation or greater than 500 AF must be approved by the Board.

- Other minor modification requests may be approved by General Manager after consultation with Member Agency Managers.
Board Procedures for Handling Supply Allocation Modifications (Cont.)

1. Member Agency Provides Written Request
2. GM Provides Written Response within 30 Days
3. Member Agency Managers Review Request & Response
   - Approve
   - Deny
4. Board Consideration
   - Board Procedure
5. Member Agency can Appeal to Board
Yuima MWD Allocation Modification Request

- Groundwater wells within Yuima MWD service area experiencing a drop in yield due to drought
  - Yuima MWD and private wells

- Well owners requesting deliveries from Yuima to offset loss

- Historically private groundwater supplies are not accounted for in Yuima MWD’s local supplies
  - Not in base year demands or estimated FY 2016 local supply figure

- Yuima MWD is requesting modification to their M&I allocation to increase Loss of Local Supply Adjustment
  - Losses associated with both Yuima MWD groundwater supplies and private wells
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Base Year FY 13 &amp; 14 Well Yield (AF)</th>
<th>Estimated Allocation Year Yield (AF)</th>
<th>Loss of Groundwater Supply (AF)</th>
<th>Loss of Local Supply Adjustment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YMWD Wells (current)</td>
<td>999</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>649</td>
<td>552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requested Loss of Local Supply Adjustment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YMWD Wells (revised)</td>
<td>999</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>736</td>
<td>626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rincon Oaks MWS</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rancho Estates MWC</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rancho Pauma MWC</td>
<td>2,950</td>
<td>1,805</td>
<td>1,145</td>
<td>973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lazy H MWC</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pauma Ridge MWC</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YMWD Improvement District A</td>
<td>2,780</td>
<td>2,049</td>
<td>731</td>
<td>621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra del Oro Farms</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>8,575</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,950</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,625</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,081</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requested Modification to Loss of Local Supply Adjustment:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,529</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Staff Analysis

### WSDRP compared to Yuima MWD Request

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WSDRP Member Agency Supply Loss</th>
<th>Yuima MWD Request Loss of Local Supply</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yuima MWD Supply</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member agency local supply?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment made in local supply?</td>
<td>Yes, ratepayers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local supply within Water Authority service area?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continued...
## Staff Analysis (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WSDRP Member Agency Supply Loss</th>
<th>Yuima MWD Request Loss of Local Supply</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yuima MWD Supply</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce reliance on Water Authority supplies?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member agency provide well yield data?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do property owners pay Water Authority charges? (Taxes, Standby Charge, Capacity Charge and IAC)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusion Staff Analysis

• Support Yuima MWD’s modification request for FY 2016 allocation period
  1. Investment in local groundwater supplies has reduced demands on Water Authority
  2. Yuima MWD can provide adequate data on well yields
  3. Property owners have been paying Water Authority charges associated with receiving service

• Approval of modification results in other member agencies’ allocations reduced about 0.5% on average

• Work with member agency managers to develop a formal policy for Board consideration by early 2016
Member Agency Managers’ Recommendation

Approve a modification to Yuima Municipal Water District’s fiscal year 2016 municipal and industrial supply allocation to provide an additional 2,529 acre-feet under the loss of local supply adjustment.
Metropolitan Water District’s Integrated Resource Plan 2015 Update

Imported Water Committee
August 27, 2015
Integrated Resource Plan (IRP) History

1990
1993: MWD initiates first IRP process

1995
Jan. 1996: MWD adopts first IRP

2000
Nov. 2001: MWD launches first update

2005
June 2008: MWD begins 2010 IRP Update

2010
July 2004: MWD adopts 2004 Updated IRP

Oct. 2010: MWD adopts 2010 Updated IRP

2015
Key Changes Over Time

- **IRP Goal evolution**
  - 1996 IRP: “reliable & affordable water supply” to meet demands in 98 out of 100 years
  - 2004 Update: “provide 100% reliability”
  - 2010 Update: meet retail level demands under “all foreseeable hydrologic conditions”

- **IRP Strategy Development**
  - 1996 IRP: “Preferred Resource Mix” (core supplies)
  - 2004 Update: 500,000 AF of planning “buffer” supplies introduced (in addition to core supplies)
  - 2010 Update: Implement “Uncertainty Buffer,” introduced “Foundational Actions” (in addition to core supplies)
Water Authority’s Past Concerns

- Lack of analysis and data
  - Over development of supplies
- Failure to analyze member agencies willingness-to-pay
- Lack of financial mechanisms to cover costs
  - Risk of stranding assets
- Expanded role of MWD beyond imported water supplier
- Local supply development accountability
2015 IRP Update

- Condensed timeline
  - Initiated update in March 2015
  - Board adoption of final report scheduled for December 2015

- Bifurcated process
  - Technical workgroup – update demand & supply forecasts
  - IRP Committee – policy discussions
Draft Results of Existing Supplies’ ability to meet Projected Demands

**Summary of Shortage Probability**

"Do Nothing" Case Draft Water Balance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Shortage</th>
<th>No Shortage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2035</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2040</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2010 IRP Goals

Summary of Shortage Probability
IRP Approach Draft Water Balance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Shortage</th>
<th>No Shortage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2035</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2040</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MWD’s Observations

- “Significant resource investments” are needed to achieve 2010 IRP Targets
- Existing supplies need to be maintained
  - Colorado River Aqueduct
  - Local supply production
- Potential changes
  - Adjust targets to:
    - address shorter term imbalances
    - ensure sufficient storage
  - Ensure adequate supply buffer
  - Implementation approaches and policy to ensure development
Key Policy Issues

- Supply and Demand forecast – changed circumstances
- Reliability goal
- Drivers for various supply needs
  - Growth
  - Dry year peaking
  - Replenishment needs
  - Member agencies’ local supply development objectives
  - “Insurance” needs
Key Policy Issues (cont.)

- Fiscal considerations
  - Cost of service/ long range finance plan
  - Investments and willingness to pay
- MWD and member agency roles
  - Shared responsibilities
  - Accountability
- Climate change
MWD’s 1994 Blue Ribbon Task Force highlighted issues raised by the Water Authority and its Delegates

The Task Force was troubled to learn, for example, that some of the member agencies most strongly supporting big-ticket projects like the Barassie diversion included the provision in their price agreements that price reductions were based on the willingness of MWD customers to pay for such services. Member agencies may want, for example, the insurance provided by major investments to increase MWD standby capacity, but if forced to commit funds for such capabilities, they may actually prefer far lower levels of protection than a hypothetically "costless" water supply guarantee.

Demand for water may invalidate the justification for some capital program expenditures. Reliability, cost and demand are all interdependent and should be treated that way in the IRP and rate structure reform processes.
Next Steps

- The 2015 IRP process still ongoing
- Staff will continue to participate in technical workgroup
- Delegates will engage in policy discussions through the IRP Committee
- As needed, Delegates and staff will report back to the Imported Water Committee
Advertisement for Bids for Miramar Pump Station Rehabilitation

Engineering & Operations Committee Meeting
August 27, 2015

Nicola Kavanagh, Senior Engineer
EXISTING WATER AUTHORITY MIRAMAR PUMP STATION

METER VAULT

PROJECT:

MIRAMAR PUMP STATION REHABILITATION PROJECT

San Diego County Water Authority
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM
Schedule and Construction Cost Estimate

Award Contract: Fall 2015
Construction: Fall 2015 to Winter 2015

Construction Cost Estimate: $4.5 to $5.5 million
Construction Contract for the Nob Hill Improvements Project

Engineering & Operations Committee Meeting

August 27, 2015

Brent Fountain, Senior Engineer
- Pipeline
- Tunnel
- Connections
- Access Road
Bid Summary

Advertised Bid Range: $11.6M to $12.8M

<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>$  9,987,970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>James W. Fowler Co.</td>
<td>$12,300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Quest Civil Constructors, Inc.</td>
<td>$12,896,896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>USS Cal Builders, Inc.</td>
<td>$13,164,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recommendation

Authorize the General Manager to award a construction contract to L.H. Woods and Sons, Inc. in the amount of $9,987,970 for the Nob Hill Improvements project.
Standard Community Presentation

Three key components:
- Water Authority overview – our diversification story
- Drought response
- MWD rate litigation

Can be tailored:
- Components can be added or deleted

Updated monthly and as needed

Available to all board members
- Download from Water Authority cloud site
  - Instructions in LCO packet
How San Diego Prepared for this Drought...
...and the Next One, and the Next One

[Organization’s Name]
[Date]

[Presenter’s Name & Title]
Sacramento River Runoff is the sum of Sacramento River flow at Bend Bridge, Feather River inflow to Lake Oroville, Yuba River flow at Smartville, and American River inflow to Folsom.

Source: DWR

Droughts are Common in California
Sacramento River Unimpaired Runoff through 2015

Source: DWR

Sacramento River Runoff is the sum of Sacramento River flow at Bend Bridge, Feather River inflow to Lake Oroville, Yuba River flow at Smartville, and American River inflow to Folsom.
Climate Matters: San Diego Receives Little Rainfall

Average Annual Precipitation in the Southwest

San Diego: 9.1”*

*10-year average, 2005–2014
Temperature Matters

Departure from Normal Monthly Temperature at Lindbergh Field
19 of Last 20 Months Hotter than Normal

[Bar graph showing temperature deviations for each month from 2013 to 2015, with most months showing a hotter deviation than normal.]
San Diego County Has Very Little Groundwater

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Area Basins</th>
<th>Available Groundwater Basin Storage Space (AF)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northwest MWD Service Area Basins</td>
<td>945,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Fernando Valley Basins</td>
<td>505,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA County Coastal Plain Basins</td>
<td>450,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Gabriel Valley Basins</td>
<td>245,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange County Basins</td>
<td>135,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inland Empire Basins</td>
<td>439,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastside MWD Service Area Basins</td>
<td>500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego County Basins</td>
<td>19,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The reduction in potable per capita water use since 1990 offsets the need for over 300,000 acre-feet per year within the region.
Increasing San Diego County's Water Supply Reliability through Supply Diversification

### 1991
- **Total = 578 TAF**
  - Metropolitan Water District: 550 TAF (95%)
  - Imperial Irrigation District Transfer: 28 TAF (5%)

### 2015
- **Total = 534 TAF**
  - Metropolitan Water District: 304 TAF (57%)
  - Imperial Irrigation District Transfer: 80 TAF (15%)
  - All American & Coachella Canal Lining: 27 TAF (5%)
  - Local Surface Water: 18 TAF (3%)
  - Recycled Water: 5 TAF (1%)
  - Groundwater: 100 TAF (19%)
  - Seawater Desalination: 20 TAF (4%)

### Estimated 2020
- **Total = 587 TAF**
  - Metropolitan Water District: 150 TAF (26%)
  - Imperial Irrigation District Transfer: 80 TAF (14%)
  - All American & Coachella Canal Lining: 27 TAF (5%)
  - Local Surface Water: 48 TAF (8%)
  - Recycled Water: 44 TAF (7%)
  - Groundwater: 48 TAF (8%)
  - Seawater Desalination: 10 TAF (2%)

### Projected 2035
- **Total = 680 TAF**
  - Metropolitan Water District: 120 TAF (18%)
  - Imperial Irrigation District Transfer: 50 TAF (7%)
  - All American & Coachella Canal Lining: 50 TAF (7%)
  - Local Surface Water: 100 TAF (15%)
  - Recycled Water: 180 TAF (27%)
  - Groundwater: 30 TAF (4%)
  - Seawater Desalination: 20 TAF (3%)
  - Potable Reuse (Includes conceptual and planned projects): 100 TAF (15%)

TAF = Thousand Acre-Feet
Water Authority Can Meet 99% of Projected Demands in FY 2016, Even with 15% MWD Shortage Allocation

- Estimated FY 2016 Potable M&I Demand ~ 523 TAF *
- MWD Initial Allocation M&I 274 TAF
- Water Authority CDP 39 TAF
- Long-Term Colorado River Transfers 180 TAF
- Local Supplies 25 TAF

- Based on actual FY 2014, escalated at 1/2% per year.
- MWD supply allocation in effect 7/1/15 through June 30, 2016.
Total Potable M&I Water Use: SWRCB Emergency Regulation Reporting Months

Potable M&I Use (AF)

- 26%
- 30%

Months in 2013

2015 - 2016
San Diego County: 1990 vs. 2015

Potable water use (thousand acre-feet)
- 1990: 641
- 2015: 507

Population (millions)
- 1990: 2.4
- 2015: 3.2

Potable gallons per capita daily use
- 1990: 235
- 2015: 143

Cost of water per acre-foot (full service treated water rate)
- 1990: $114*
- 2015: $218

Jobs (millions)
- 1990: .97
- 2015: 1.3

Gross Domestic Product (billions)
- 1990: $505*
- 2015: $1365

* 2015 dollars
Drought Response Communications & Outreach Update

Legislation, Conservation and Outreach Committee
August 27, 2015

Denise Vedder, Public Affairs Senior Manager
Tenille Otero, Public Affairs Representative
Executing strategy to refine messages based on focus group research
- TV
- Radio
- Digital/Online
- Outdoor

Evaluating results and will make adjustments for Sept./Oct. if warranted
Community Partnerships

- San Diego Unified School District
  - Co-branded landscape signs
- U.S. Postal Service
  - Yard signs
- San Diego County Apartment Association
  - Yard signs, tip magnets

Pardon our Brown Lawns
We’re Doing Our Part to Save Water!

Save every day, every way.

whenindrought.org
New Conservation Tools in Development

- Online landscape education for homeowners
  - Approx. 2 hours of brief video lessons + material
- Water-efficient training for landscape professionals
  - Content adaptation under way
- Launch dates this fall
When in Drought, Report Waste App

- Regional water waste app
  - App has launched!
  - iPhone and Android devices
- Features:
  - Report water waste.
  - Learn about water-use restrictions and conservation programs.
  - Discover tips for reducing indoor and outdoor water use.
  - Learn about statewide and local drought conditions.
  - Connect to the Water Authority’s social media platforms.
How to Use the App

Select "Create a Request"

Create media
How to Use the App

Address entered automatically or or manually

Select a Report Type

First time entering report, enter name and email

Enter description
How to Use the App

Click submit. Request/report will display status.

Success message

App tracks reports of water waste.
How to Download

- Download app to smartphone or tablet by visiting whenindrought.org OR:

  - Android Google Play:  

  - iPhone iTunes:  

Instructions on how to use the app are available at whenindrought.org  
Click on the smartphone image at the top of the page.
Small Contractor Outreach and Opportunities Program Review

Legislation, Conservation and Outreach Committee
August 27, 2015

Teresa Penunuri, Public Affairs Supervisor
SCOOP: The Basics

- **Goal:** Increase the bidding opportunities for small businesses in public contracting bids.
  - Communicate and provide opportunities
  - Track and report small-business participation

- **Current annual goal:** 30%
Established in 1992
- Directors Johnson and Rogers
- Emerging Business Enterprise Program
- Focused on minority-owned, women-owned and veteran-owned businesses
- Help small, local businesses

Proposition 209 – 1996
- Prohibited discrimination in public employment, public education or public contracting
- Ad Hoc Committee established to study impacts
- SCOOP Committee established in 2002
Legal Requirements

- SCOOP is outreach-based
- Board policy, not a legal requirement
- Cannot discriminate against or provide preferential treatment to any individual or group on the basis of race, sex, color, ethnicity, or national origin
Program Components

- Outreach
  - Paths to Partnerships (PAC assistance)
  - Sheltered Market Program (est. 2013)

- Education/Training
  - In-person and online

- Technical Assistance
  - Mentor-Protégé Program (City of San Diego, AGC)

- SCOOP Committee
Benefits

- Small businesses
  - Have access to contracts they may have considered outside of their means
  - Technical assistance
  - Exposure to large primes and public agencies

- Water Authority and ratepayers
  - Raise awareness of projects
    - High-quality response
    - Increased bid accuracy
    - Better cost
What types of opportunities?

- Past: Large-scale construction

- Current: Professional services
  - Continuing services
  - Using in-house expertise to augment outside consultants
Historical CIP Expenditures (in millions)

CIP Expenditures (in millions)

2011 - CIP spending starts to ramp down

- Program right-sized
  - Focus on ongoing core needs
  - Efficient delivery of training
Historical SCOOP Goals

- 2004 – Goal established: 21%
- 2005 – 23%
- 2007 – 25%
- 2013 – 30%
## Fiscal Year 2015

**Results Through Third Quarter**
**(July 1, 2014 – March 31, 2015)**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total contracts</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small business awards</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount awarded to small</td>
<td>$39,496,251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>businesses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Business Percentage</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>