

MEETING OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE  
MUNICIPAL WATER DISTRICT OF ORANGE COUNTY

Jointly with the

**PLANNING & OPERATIONS COMMITTEE**

January 3, 2017, 8:30 a.m.

MWDOC Conference Room 101

**P&O Committee:**

Director L. Dick, Chair

Director J. Finnegan

Vacant

Staff: R. Hunter, K. Seckel, J. Berg,  
H. De La Torre, K. Davanaugh

Ex Officio Member: W. Osborne

---

MWDOC Committee meetings are noticed and held as joint meetings of the Committee and the entire Board of Directors and all members of the Board of Directors may attend and participate in the discussion. Each Committee has designated Committee members, and other members of the Board are designated alternate committee members. If less than a quorum of the full Board is in attendance, the Board meeting will be adjourned for lack of a quorum and the meeting will proceed as a meeting of the Committee with those Committee members and alternate members in attendance acting as the Committee.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS** - Public comments on agenda items and items under the jurisdiction of the Committee should be made at this time.

**ITEMS RECEIVED TOO LATE TO BE AGENDIZED** - Determine there is a need to take immediate action on item(s) and that the need for action came to the attention of the District subsequent to the posting of the Agenda. (Requires a unanimous vote of the Committee)

**ITEMS DISTRIBUTED TO THE BOARD LESS THAN 72 HOURS PRIOR TO MEETING --**  
Pursuant to Government Code section 54957.5, non-exempt public records that relate to open session agenda items and are distributed to a majority of the Board less than seventy-two (72) hours prior to the meeting will be available for public inspection in the lobby of the District's business office located at 18700 Ward Street, Fountain Valley, California 92708, during regular business hours. When practical, these public records will also be made available on the District's Internet Web site, accessible at <http://www.mwdoc.com>.

**DISCUSSION**

1. OVERVIEW AND PROCESS FOR LOCAL RESOURCES PROGRAM (LRP)  
PROJECTS WITHIN THE MWDOC SERVICE AREA
2. CONSIDER ADOPTION OF A JOINT RESOLUTION WITH OCWD REGARDING  
THE POSEIDON HUNTINGTON BEACH PROJECT

**INFORMATION ITEMS** (The following items are for informational purposes only – background information is included in the packet. Discussion is not necessary unless a Director requests.)

3. OC FLOOD CONTROL DISTRICT PROPOSAL ON ENCROACHMENT PERMITS  
(oral report)
4. STATUS REPORTS
  - a. Ongoing MWDOC Reliability and Engineering/Planning Projects
  - b. WEROC
  - c. Water Use Efficiency Projects
  - d. Water Use Efficiency Programs Savings and Implementation Report
5. REVIEW OF ISSUES RELATED TO CONSTRUCTION PROGRAMS, WATER USE EFFICIENCY, FACILITY AND EQUIPMENT MAINTENANCE, WATER STORAGE, WATER QUALITY, CONJUNCTIVE USE PROGRAMS, EDUCATION, DISTRICT FACILITIES, and MEMBER-AGENCY RELATIONS

## **ADJOURNMENT**

**NOTE:** At the discretion of the Committee, all items appearing on this agenda, whether or not expressly listed for action, may be deliberated, and may be subject to action by the Committee. On those items designated for Board action, the Committee reviews the items and makes a recommendation for final action to the full Board of Directors; final action will be taken by the Board of Directors. Agendas for Committee and Board meetings may be obtained from the District Secretary. Members of the public are advised that the Board consideration process includes consideration of each agenda item by one or more Committees indicated on the Board Action Sheet. Attendance at Committee meetings and the Board meeting considering an item consequently is advised.

Accommodations for the Disabled. Any person may make a request for a disability-related modification or accommodation needed for that person to be able to participate in the public meeting by telephoning Maribeth Goldsby, District Secretary, at (714) 963-3058, or writing to Municipal Water District of Orange County at P.O. Box 20895, Fountain Valley, CA 92728. Requests must specify the nature of the disability and the type of accommodation requested. A telephone number or other contact information should be included so that District staff may discuss appropriate arrangements. Persons requesting a disability-related accommodation should make the request with adequate time before the meeting for the District to provide the requested accommodation.





Item No. 1

## DISCUSSION ITEM

January 3, 2017

**TO:** Planning & Operations Committee  
(Directors Dick, Finnegan, Vacant)

**FROM:** Robert Hunter  
General Manager

Staff Contact: Harvey De La Torre  
Melissa Baum-Haley  
Keith Lyon

**SUBJECT:** Overview and Process for Local Resources Program (LRP) Projects  
within the MWDOC Service Area

### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

---

Staff recommends the Planning & Operations Committee review and discuss

### **COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION**

---

Committee recommends (To be determined at Committee Meeting)

### **SUMMARY**

---

The Metropolitan Water District of Southern California's (MET) Local Resources Program (LRP) provides funding to encourage the development of local resource projects, such as water recycling, groundwater recovery, and seawater desalination. The objective of the program is to help develop supplies that replace an existing demand (or prevents a new demand) on MET's imported water deliveries either through direct replacement of potable water or increased regional groundwater production.

A retail water agency within the MWDOC service area can only apply for MET's LRP financial incentives through its MET member agency - MWDOC. MWDOC staff offers assistance to local agencies to discuss potential projects that might qualify under MET's program. The current process includes application preparation and submittal by the agency to MWDOC and MET staff, review and approval of the LRP agreement by MWDOC Board and the local agency, followed by MET Board review and approval. Once the project is approved by MET and MWDOC, a monthly certification and annual reconciliation occurs to verify accurate production to properly determine the financial incentive.

Budgeted (Y/N): N	Budgeted amount: None	Core _X_	Choice __
Action item amount: N/A	Line item:		
<b>Fiscal Impact (explain if unbudgeted):</b>			

The purpose of this Board item is to describe the evolution of MET's LRP, its current program, including the three different financial incentive structures, performance provisions, and the application approval process. Additionally, in response to a MWDOC Board inquiry, MWDOC staff has recommended a modification to its LRP application process that seeks Board review of eligible projects earlier in the process so the Board is better informed of proposed local resource projects within the District's service area seeking LRP incentives.

## **DETAILED REPORT**

---

### **Program Evolution**

In 1982, MET established the Local Projects Program (LPP) to provide assistance to develop local supplies with a focus on recycled water projects. Within the LPP, MET's financial incentive was a fixed rate of \$154 per acre-foot (AF) of production.

In 1991, MET added the Groundwater Recovery Program (GRP), which was designed to improve water supply reliability through the recovery of otherwise unusable groundwater that was degraded by minerals and other contaminants, and provided access to the storage assets of the degraded groundwater. Within the GRP, MET's financial incentive was based on the project's actual unit production cost that was greater than MET's treated full service rate, on a sliding scale from \$0 to \$250 per AF.

Based on their similar objectives, in 1995 the LPP and GRP were combined into one MET program - Local Resources Program (LRP). As a result, member agencies were given the option to convert LPP agreements to the GRP-type incentive terms (sliding scale) or continue with the fixed incentive.

From 1998 through 2007, the LRP application process utilized a competitive approach, whereby potential local projects were evaluated by a panel based on criteria adopted by the MET Board. Within the LRP competitive process, as part of the application package, agencies specified their LRP financial incentive request within a range from \$0 to \$250 per AF with lower requests ranking higher.

The competitive process application was replaced with updated LRP principles in 2007, allowing for an open application process and eliminating the competitive process. The LRP was further revised in 2014, with a choice of three different financial incentive structures and the addition of ocean desalination projects. Below is a detail description of the current LRP.

### **Current LRP Incentives and Program Provisions**

The 2014 revisions extended the LRP to include ocean desalination projects as well as recycled water<sup>1</sup> and groundwater recovery projects. Continuing from previous versions of the program, project production must still replace an existing demand or prevent a new demand on MET's imported water deliveries.

---

<sup>1</sup> Recycled water use costs for on-site retrofit now qualify as a project cost to determine an agency's LRP incentive amount.

Within the revised LRP, financial incentives are based on the local agency's choice between three different incentive payment structures:

1. Sliding scale from \$0 to \$340 per AF for 25 years
2. Sliding scale from \$0 to \$475 per AF for 15 years (with a 25-year term)
3. Fixed up to \$304 per AF for 25 years

Under the sliding scale incentive payment structures (payment structures 1 and 2), MET's financial incentive provided to the local agency is calculated annually based on the agency's actual unit cost of production that is greater than MET's LRP Rate (which is equivalent to the treated full service rate), and subject to the maximum incentive rate threshold.

Furthermore, under incentive payment structure 2, project production must continue during years 16 thru 25, even though no MET incentives are provided.

Additionally, the following project performance provisions are included within each LRP agreement:

- o Must start construction within two years after agreement execution, or the agreement may be terminated
- o Must start project operation within four years after agreement execution, or the agreement may be terminated
- o Must produce at least 50% of agreement annual Ultimate Yield by seven years after Agreement execution, or Ultimate Yield may be reduced by production shortfall
- o Must produce at least 75% of agreement annual Ultimate Yield by eleven years after Agreement execution, or Ultimate Yield may be reduced by production shortfall
- o After 11 years after agreement execution, must produce at least 75% of agreement annual Ultimate Yield once during every four years until agreement termination

### **LRP Application Process and Board Approval**

The current process includes application preparation and submittal by the agency to MWDOC and MET staff, review and approval of the LRP agreement by MWDOC Board and the local agency, followed by MET Board review and approval. Below is a more detail description of the normal sequence for the MWDOC LRP application approval process:

#### **Project Development**

When a local agency considers development of a new or expanded local resource project, financial feasibility of the project often depends on whether or not it qualifies for LRP funds. Therefore, during project development, MWDOC and the agency's staff meet to discuss the potential project and LRP eligibility.

At the onset of discussions with the agency, MWDOC staff informs MET staff of potential future LRP projects. (In fact, member agencies are encouraged by MET staff to inform them of new local resource projects so MET can maintain a current inventory list of local resource projects.) In some occasions, subsequent meetings may be scheduled if there are complex questions regarding the project's qualification. Such meetings with local agencies and/or MET are described in the monthly MWDOC General Manager's Report.

### **Application Development and Submittal**

When the local agency is ready, MWDOC staff provide MET's LRP Application Guidelines<sup>2</sup>, and previously submitted LRP Applications as examples to help the local agency prepare their LRP Application. Some agencies develop the LRP Application in-house, while others contract the work to consultants.

Once the agency completes their LRP Application, it is submitted to MWDOC as a draft. MWDOC staff reviews the draft application for completeness and makes suggestions for improvement, where needed. An agency's final LRP Application is then re-submitted to MWDOC, whereby MWDOC submits the LRP Application to MET. Included in this application is a letter signed by MWDOC's General Manager officially submitting an LRP application and seeking an LRP incentive for the proposed local resource project. Submittal of all MWDOC LRP Application are reported in the monthly MWDOC General Manager's Report.

### **MET Staff Application Review**

Upon receiving an LRP Application, MET staff provides notification of receipt of the Application to MWDOC and the local agency. MET staff then proceeds to review the application for completeness, and requests any additional documents (e.g. permits, environmental documents) or meetings, if needed. It is important to note, that during this review process there is much collaboration with between MWDOC, the local agency and MET staff to ensure the application is completed. Once the application is deemed complete following completion of all permits, including CEQA, MET staff moves forward with its recommendation for approval to the MET Board. However, it is carefully explained to the local agency that any LRP Application submitted does not signify or guarantee funding approval by MET. All LRP agreements are subject to MWDOC and MET Board approval.

### **MWDOC Board Review and Approval**

Before the project can be considered by MET's Board of Directors, an LRP agreement is developed for MWDOC and the local agency review and approval. This is the official review of the LRP Project by the MWDOC Board. The entire LRP application along with the Agreement is distributed for the Board review and approval.

### **MET Board Review and Approval**

If MET staff determines that the Project qualifies within MET's LRP criteria and all required documents, including the LRP agreement, have been provided to MET, MET staff recommends approval to its Board.

### **List of MWDOC LRP Projects**

Since the program's inception, MWDOC has had a number of local resource projects in the program. A matrix of past, current, and pending LRP projects within the MWDOC service area are listed in the table below. This list of projects by MWDOC member agency includes year the LRP agreement was executed, eligible incentive (\$/AF) amount, the Ultimate Yield

---

<sup>2</sup> MET's LRP application can be found at:

[http://www.mwdh2o.com/PDF\\_About\\_Your\\_Water/2.4.3.1\\_Local\\_Resources\\_Program\\_Application.pdf](http://www.mwdh2o.com/PDF_About_Your_Water/2.4.3.1_Local_Resources_Program_Application.pdf)

project production amount (AFY), average production amount during active years, and fiscal year 2015-16 production amount, if the project is still active.

### **Modification to the MWDOC Review Process**

This past November, the MWDOC Board approved two LRP agreements for submittal to the MET Board. During the Board's review it was suggested that the current LRP application process be modified to include the MWDOC Board's review and input of eligible LRP projects earlier in the review process. Therefore, MWDOC staff recommends that the Board, in addition to the General Manager reports, receive an information item at the Planning and Operation Committee on the project during the time the LRP Application is being reviewed by MWDOC staff; rather than towards the end when the LRP agreement is being considered for Board approval. This will provide the Board with a better understanding of the pending LRP projects, its proposed production amounts, timeframe, as well as challenges, if any, to better assist in its approval at the MET Board.

**Matrix of past and current LRP projects with MWDOC Service Area**

Agency	Project Name	Agreement		MET Incentive		Production (AFY)	
		Year Executed	Status	(\$/AF)	Ultimate Yield	Average Yield	Fiscal Yr. 2015-16
EL Toro Water District	Recycled Water System Expansion	2012	Active	\$0-\$250/AF	1,175	309	542
	Recycled Water System Exp, Phase II	2016	New	\$0-\$475/AF	350	-	-
Irvine Ranch Water District	Irvine Ranch Reclamation Project	1986	Expired	\$154/AF	10,000	8,827	-
	Irvine Desalter	1993	Active	\$0-\$250/AF	6,700	3,229	3,644
Moulton Niguel Water District	Reclamation Expansion	2005	Active	\$117/AF	8,500	6,632	7,977
	Wells 21/22 Desalter	2011	Active	\$0-\$250/AF	6,400	3,013	1,539
Mesa Water District	Colored Groundwater Treatment Project	1999	Active	\$115-\$169/AF	9,947	3,731	3,792
Moulton Niguel Water District	Water Reclamation System	2006 <sup>[a]</sup>	Active	\$154/AF	9,276	5,206	5,396
Orange County Water District	Green Acres Reclamation Project	1999 <sup>[a]</sup>	Active	\$0-\$250/AF	2,800	1,714	2,480
	Groundwater Replenishment System	2004	Active	\$121/AF	72,000	56,426	70,000
San Clemente	Water Reclamation Project	1990	Expired	\$154/AF	500	286	-
	Water Reclamation Expansion Project	2012	Active	\$0-\$250/AF	1,000	155	292
San Juan Capistrano	San Juan Basin Desalter	1998	Active	\$0-\$250/AF	4,800	2,574	1,183
	Capistrano Valley Non-Domestic Water Supply Expansion	2000	Inactive <sup>[b]</sup>	\$150/AF	1,617	0	-
Santa Margarita Water District	Water Reclamation Expansion Project	1987	Expired	\$154/AF	3,600	1,681	-
	Non-domestic Water System, Ladera Ranch/Talaga Valley	2000	Active	\$114/AF	2,772	2,283	2,521
South Coast Water District	Lake Mission Viejo Advanced Purification Water Treatment Facilities	2016	New	\$0-\$475/AF	300	-	-
	Capo Beach Desalter	1998	Inactive <sup>[b]</sup>	\$0-\$250/AF	1,300	654	-
Trabuco Canyon Water District	Trabuco Canyon Reclamation Project	1989	Active	\$154/AF	800	263	137
Tustin	Tustin Desalter	1992	Active	\$0-\$250/AF	3,271	1,867	1,227
<b>Potential Future Projects</b>		N/A	N/A	\$0-\$475/AF	Pending	-	-
Orange County Water District	Huntington Beach Desalination Project						

[a] These projects had earlier agreements that were amended.

[b] Inactive status defines the project as not currently producing.





## **Item No. 2**

## **DISCUSSION ITEM**

January 3, 2017

**TO:** **Planning & Operations Committee**  
(Directors Dick, Finnegan)

## **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

It is recommended that the Committee receives and files the report and provides direction to staff.

## **COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION**

Committee recommends (To be determined at Committee Meeting)

## **DETAILED REPORT**

MWDOC's Executive Committee met on December 20 to discuss whether or not to adopt a joint resolution with OCWD regarding working together "for the common purpose of purchasing, distributing and integrating drinking water from the proposed Huntington Beach Desalination Project." A wide-ranging discussion occurred and the following points were made during the discussion:

- Some Directors supported the concept of adopting a joint resolution with OCWD while others did not see the need for such a resolution. It was noted the staff from the two agencies were already working cooperatively. Some thought the joint resolution would send an appropriate message regarding moving the project forward. Others were concerned about the implications in the existing wording about MWDOC's role in financing such a project as the MWDOC Board of Directors has not voted a resolution of support of the project.

Budgeted (Y/N): n/a	Budgeted amount: n/a	Core ✓	Choice __
Action item amount: n/a	Line item:		
<b>Fiscal Impact (explain if unbudgeted):</b>			

- Some voiced support for the Project as being in Orange County's future while others were not ready to make such a commitment.
- Other issues brought up during the discussion included:
  - We should not wait on the WaterFix and a belief that we need ocean desalination even if the WaterFix proceeds was expressed.
  - It was noted that many versions of how to integrate the water into the Orange County system were under consideration. OCWD indicated the need to know more precisely if MWDOC had an interest in moving any of the water to South County or whether OCWD would just proceed on their own and this is one of the main reasons for the Resolution to work together to clarify all of the possible integration options.
  - OCWD indicated that the Poseidon Project would help with overall reliability to South Orange County and would open up possibilities with moving emergency water to South Orange County including potentially moving groundwater to South Orange County. It was suggested that MWDOC take the primary role in this transaction with the potential for a MWDOC storage account in the groundwater basin.
  - There are many technical, engineering, and financial decisions that need to be resolved. Water quality, stranded assets, integration operations and CEQA coverage of all scenarios were discussed.
  - Some suggested the project would NOT result in stranding any of MET's assets while others pointed to a direct offset of MET water being treated at the Diemer Plant from implantation of the project.
  - It was noted that obtaining MET's LRP contribution in the amount of about \$400 million was needed or the project would not move forward. A new concept was put forth indicating OCWD's suggestion that MET retain 50% ownership in the project at the end of the Agreement. Input suggested that getting MET's LRP contribution to this project would not be an easy task.
  - The resolution was also an opportunity for the two Boards to work together on emergency supplies for South Orange County (really for all of Orange County). Having emergency supplies is very important for Orange County in the event of natural disasters.
  - CEQA issues are being studied right now and the process needs to include any possible delivery options to eliminate having to re-do CEQA at a later date.
  - Seeking Federal and State funds could reduce the overall costs of the project to OC ratepayers.
  - It was noted that we already have a resolution on working together with OCWD and that resolution provides sufficient flexibility for the two agencies to work on any reliability items.

- Some questioned the ultimate cost of the project and whether it is really a good investment while others noted the value of having water during water shortage events as being extremely valuable. Others noted the costs would only go up in the future so an investment sooner than later would be appropriate.
- OCWD noted that the intent of the resolution was to use the collective efforts of the two agencies to put the project forth to get an up or down vote.
- IRWD noted that those agencies electing to participate who benefit from the project should be the ones to pay for the project.
- It was noted that many projects are on the horizon, the California WaterFix, Eco-Restore, Carson, Poseidon, SARRCUP, Groundwater Storage, Emergency Supplies to South County – and there have been no formal positions by the Board, except just recently for the WaterFix and Eco-Restore.

### **Recommendation from the Executive Committee Discussions**

It was recommended that MWDOC staff put forth a summary report of the Executive Committee discussions for consideration at the January 3, 2017 Planning & Operations Committee that would include:

1. Bring back the Resolution with any wording changes suggested by Directors for discussion among the MWDOC Board. The General Manager will coordinate the inclusion of Directors' suggested changes to the resolution.
2. Schedule a joint discussion with OCWD for the Joint Committee to be held on January 25.
3. Target February as the time for consideration by both Boards for the Joint Resolution.
4. Consider whether to form an Ad Hoc Committee between the two Boards.
5. Direct the MWDOC staff to prepare technical analyses of the proposed options and issues, increase joint analyses with OCWD staff on the project, and provide the MWDOC Board of Directors with the results and conclusions of such efforts.
6. Consider whether to re-start the MWDOC Poseidon Working Group to help work through the technical, legal, and financial issues, especially to ensure that the CEQA document considers all options for integration of the water into the Orange County system.
7. The overall goal of the efforts would be to develop all of the necessary information to bring the Poseidon Project forward for an up or down vote by the two Boards.

### **Staff Observations**

MWDOC staff believes that the staff and Board from both MWDOC and OCWD should work together in a cooperative manner, and also with the member agencies, to fully evaluate the options, costs and implications of the Poseidon Project. Staff does not believe a resolution

is needed to bring these efforts to fruition - a simple directive is sufficient. Staff is also of the belief that much misinformation exists about what benefits the Poseidon Project will or won't bring to Orange County and when and under what conditions it may be needed from a reliability standpoint. Part of the future efforts should be for staff from the two agencies to work together to fully quantify the costs, benefits and implications of the Poseidon Project and how the water systems in Orange County will work to efficiently integrate local Santa Ana River supplies, MET supplies, Carson supplies and Poseidon supplies into the resources mix. It would be appropriate for the two staff to develop a work plan to outline the efforts needed to complete the various evaluations.

### **Attachment**

Attached is the original version of the proposed resolution as discussed at the MWDOC Executive Committee with the paragraphs numbered to facilitate reference and discussion. Staff will provide a revised document with suggested edits from the MWDOC Directors prior to the P&O meeting.

### **Suggested Technical Corrections**

MWDOC staff has identified the following factual and phrasing issues with the proposed resolution discussed at the Executive Committee meeting. Observations are listed by paragraph number.

(3) MWDOC provides water to 2.2 million people in Orange County. The total population of Orange County is 3.1 million people.

(6) The paragraph would more accurately read as "WHEREAS, MWDOC's Final 2015 Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP) Section 7.3 "Planned Water Supply Projects and Programs" identifies the proposed 50 MGD Huntington Beach Desalination Project as one of several potential future water supply projects that could improve water supply and system reliability, meet projected demands, as well as reduce the County's demand on imported water; and"

(7) This paragraph is factually correct but it should be noted that the demand for imported water in the 2015 UWMP is projected to decrease by approximately 18,000 acre-feet per year by the year 2040 under these conditions.

(9) MWD has not "endorsed" the Poseidon project. This paragraph could more accurately read as "WHEREAS, MWD listed the proposed Huntington Beach Desalination Project as one of several possible projects in MWD's 2015 Integrated Water Resources Plan (IRP) which also identified the need for 238,000 – 438,000 acre-feet from local supplies by 2040; and"

(13) There are two factual errors in this paragraph. The sentence "This policy goal can only be achieved through the development of new supplies that are locally controlled by the district..." is not factually correct as this is not the "only" way this goal can be achieved. In addition, it is not OCWD's policy to "reduce" the BPP if the overdraft reaches 350,000. It is OCWD's policy to "consider" reducing the overdraft at both 300,000 and 350,000 acre-feet. However, the consideration of reducing the BPP has also included discussions of increasing the BPP.

**JOINT RESOLUTION OF THE  
MUNICIPAL WATER DISTRICT OF ORANGE COUNTY  
BOARD OF DIRECTORS  
AND OF THE  
ORANGE COUNTY WATER DISTRICT BOARD OF DIRECTORS  
TO SUPPORT THE DISTRIBUTION AND INTEGRATION OF DRINKING WATER FROM THE  
HUNTINGTON BEACH DESALINATION PROJECT**

- (1) WHEREAS, the Municipal Water District of Orange County (MWDOC) is a member agency of the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California (MWD); and
- (2) WHEREAS, the Orange County Water District (OCWD) is a special district created by the California State Legislature in 1933; and
- (3) WHEREAS, MWDOC and OCWD jointly serve millions of consumers in Orange County, CA, with MWDOC providing water for 3.1 million people and OCWD providing water for 2.4 million people; and,
- (4) WHEREAS, MWDOC and OCWD share 19 water agency members in north and central Orange County, with MWDOC serving an additional 9 water agency members in south Orange County; and
- (5) WHEREAS, in August of 2016, the Board of Directors of MWDOC and the Board of Directors of OCWD jointly resolved that both districts shall work together for the common purpose of sourcing, treating and transmitting safe, reliable, high-quality, affordable water supplies throughout Orange County;
- (6) WHEREAS, MWDOC's Urban Water Management Plan ("UWMP") 2015 Update Section 7.3-4 "Planned Water Supply Projects and Programs" identifies the proposed 50 MGD Huntington Beach Desalination Project as a planned future water supply project that could meet projected demands as well as reduce the County's demand on imported water; and
- (7) WHEREAS, MWDOC's UWMP 2015 Update finds that under normal conditions total direct and indirect water demands are projected to increase to 515,425 by the year 2040 with Orange County still relying on imported water for over 200,000 acre feet per year without the development of new supplies; and
- (8) WHEREAS, MWDOC's Orange County Water Reliability study found that without the California WaterFix and without any new water supply projects, Orange County would have shortages in 8 out of 10 years; even with the completion of the California WaterFix, additional water supply projects by MWD, MWD-member agencies projects or projects

developed within Orange County are needed for Orange County to be fully reliable out to the year 2040; and

- (9) WHEREAS, MWD endorsed the proposed Huntington Beach Desalination Project, and MWD's Integrated Water Resources Plan (IRP) 2015 update identifies the need for 238,000 - 438,000 acre-feet from the local supplies by 2040; and
- (10) WHEREAS, in October 2013, Orange County's MWD-member agencies; MWDOC and the Cities of Santa Ana, Fullerton and Anaheim, jointly submitted an application to MWD for Local Resource Program funding for the Huntington Beach Desalination Project; and
- (11) WHEREAS, the OCWD Long-Term Facilities Plan 2014 Update identifies the Huntington Beach desalination facility as a priority project and the single largest source of new, local drinking water supply available to the County; and
- (12) WHEREAS, OCWD's Groundwater Management Plan 2015 Update identifies the proposed Huntington Beach Desalination Project as providing the District with up to 56,000 acre feet per year (50 MGD) of new supply prior to 2020; and
- (13) WHEREAS, in January 2013, OCWD's Board of Directors adopted a policy to maintain a 75% Basin Pumping Percentage (BPP). This policy goal can only be achieved through the development of new supplies that are locally controlled by the district to ensure that the higher BPP is sustainable over time. It is the District's policy to reduce the BPP if the cumulative groundwater basin overdraft reaches 350,000 acre feet. Today the District's groundwater basin is 75% depleted and the cumulative overdraft stands at 370,000; and
- (14) WHEREAS, on May 15, 2013, OCWD's Board of Directors resolved that it is the policy of the district to consider and develop a variety of new, local water resources – including seawater desalination – to ensure sufficient water supplies are always available to the residents and businesses in the service territory; and
- (15) WHEREAS, on March 17, 2010 the OCWD signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with Poseidon Resources for the consideration of the purchase of water from the proposed desalination Project. On July 24, 2013, the District's Board of Directors voted to evaluate the financial feasibility of purchasing the full 56,000 acre feet per year capacity of drinking water that will be produced by Poseidon's proposed Project, and on May 14, 2015 the District's board of directors voted to approve a Water Reliability Agreement Term Sheet for the purchase of 50 million gallons per day of drinking water from the proposed project; and
- (16) WHEREAS, the proposed Huntington Beach Desalination Project with a locally controlled, drought-proof, high-quality supply of drinking water that will reduce the need to import water and provide flexibility in how OCWD manages the groundwater basin.

- (17) WHEREAS, the proposed Huntington Beach Desalination Project has a certified Environmental Impact Report and all of its local permits from the City of Huntington Beach, and discretionary approvals from the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board and California State Lands Commission; and
- (18) WHEREAS, the proposed Huntington Beach Desalination Project is in the final phase of permitting. Poseidon Resources anticipates receiving the necessary permit amendments and new permit approvals during 2017; and
- (19) NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT HEREBY JOINTLY RESOLVED by the Board of Directors of MWDOC and the Board of Directors of OCWD that both districts shall work together for the common purpose of purchasing, distributing and integrating drinking water from the proposed Huntington Beach Desalination Project so that all of Orange County reasonably shares in the new water supply reliability benefits.
- (20) BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, DETERMINED, AND ORDERED AS FOLLOWS:
- (21) Section 1. The Board of Directors of MWDOC and OCWD shall collaborate in support of the successful permitting and development of the distribution system and institutional arrangements necessary to share the water supply reliability benefits from the Huntington Beach Desalination Project throughout Orange County.
- (22) Section 2. The Board of Directors of MWDOC and OCWD shall convene a combined agency desalination ad hoc committee that will ensure the timely fulfillment of this resolution.
- (23) Section 3: The Board of Directors of MWDOC and OCWD shall jointly engage with MWD regarding the LRP application and MWD's participation in the proposed Huntington Beach Desalination Project.
- (24) Section 4. The MWDOC Secretary and OCWD Secretary will transmit a certified copy of this resolution to members of both agencies.
- (25) Said Resolution was ADOPTED, SIGNED and APPROVED this xx day of October, 2016 by the following roll call vote.

AYES:

NOES:

- (26) I HEREBY CERTIFY the forgoing is a full, true and correct copy of Resolution NO. xxxx adopted by the Board of Directors of xxxx at its meeting held on October, xx, 2016.



**Status of Ongoing MWDOC Reliability and Engineering and Planning Projects**

**December 20, 2016**

Description	Lead Agency	Status % Complete	Scheduled Completion Date	Comments
<b>Baker Treatment Plant or Expansion of Baker Water Treatment Plant</b>	IRWD, MNWD, SMWD, ETWD Trabuco CWD		On line date is January 2017	The plant is scheduled to go on line to begin the 10-day performance test on January 4.
<b>Doheny Desalination Project</b>	South Coast Water District, Laguna Beach CWD			South Coast Water District is continuing to move the project forward and to look for potential partners and grant funding as they initiate the CEQA process.  MWDOC is in the process of awarding a contract for the decommissioning and removal of the test facilities at Doheny State Park. The construction is scheduled to begin the first week in January and be completed in about a month.
<b>Poseidon Resources Ocean Desalination Project in Huntington Beach</b>				OCWD is currently working on preparation of the CEQA documentation for the Poseidon Project. Work continues on the project integration into the water supplies for OC. Poseidon is continuing to work on permitting issues which are estimated to be completed by the end of 2017.
<b>Orange County Reliability Study</b>				Staff is completing the publishing of the study. Upcoming presentations are scheduled for OCB/C and the City of San Juan Capistrano.

Description	Lead Agency	Status % Complete	Scheduled Completion Date	Comments
<b>OC-28 Flow Metering Issue with MET</b>				MWDOC and OCWD are awaiting MET's analysis of the flow test to examine the metering issue from last summer.
<b>Service Connection CM-1 Cost Issues with MET</b>				<p>Since September, Kevin, Karl, and Keith have coordinated between MET, Newport Beach and Laguna Beach CWD for periodic "flushing" of the last stretch of the Orange County Feeder every week or two prior to the water quality getting too bad for delivery.</p> <p>Discussions have been initiated with MET on the design and costs of a bypass flow control structure that would allow LBCWD to take low flows of water from MET concurrently with taking flows from the City of Newport Beach. However, the costs of making changes at the CM-1 meter location could reach as high as \$150k to \$200k. Based on the recent discussions with MET, Laguna Beach CWD and Newport Beach are studying another alternative.</p> <p>In addition, LBCWD has had to take one of their reservoirs out of operation which has resulted in an inability to flush the line until the reservoir is put back into operations. The reservoir is being inspected for structural issues as pieces of concrete were noticed within the reservoir.</p>
<b>Other Meetings/Work</b>				

Description	Lead Agency	Status % Complete	Scheduled Completion Date	Comments
				<p>Karl Seckel, Heather Baez and John Lewis have continued to pursue opposition to the terms and conditions proposed by the OC Flood Control District for NEW encroachment permits for crossing of Flood Control property. Flood control is proposing a fee based on current market real estate values, a 7% return and 35 year agreements. This is one of a number of County Initiatives to raise revenue.</p> <p>On November 22, the item was continued by the Board of Supervisors to January 10, 2017. It has been reported that an internal Task Force at the County has been established to conduct further work; this may result in the January 10 item being pulled from the agenda. Staff will continue to work on this issue.</p>

Charles Busslinger attended the December meeting of the SJBA. The following chart on groundwater storage was shared at the meeting.

The following table shows the time-history of the spring and fall estimations of groundwater in storage for the period of fall 2012\* through fall 2016.

Calendar Year	Spring		Fall	
	Groundwater in Storage (af)	Percentage of Total Capacity	Groundwater in Storage (af)	Percentage of Total Capacity
2012			28,297	68%
2013	28,540	69%	25,855	62%
2014	26,269	63%	24,864	60%
2015	26,555	64%	27,623	67%
2016	29,380	71%	28,327	68%

\* The first storage estimation was performed in spring of 2013, which included an analysis of fall 2012 storage.

**Adaptive Pumping Management.** The Board adopted the 2016 Adaptive Pumping Management (APM) plan to manage groundwater pumping to ensure compliance with the water rights permits held by the SJBA and the South Coast Water District (SCWD), and the private agreements that settled their protests on each other's applications to appropriate water.

Based on the technical work performed in support of the development of the APM plan, the following additional pumping limitations apply with regards to the pumping allocation:

- If storage is less than 33,000 acre□feet (af), the pumping allocation is zero af.
- The SJBA's 80 percent of the pumping allocation can only be produced from the City's five GWRP wells in the Alipaz well field (Kinoshita, SJBA-2, SJBA-4, CVWD-1, and Dance Hall) to ensure that water levels required to

		<p>support riparian vegetation are maintained.</p> <p>The Spring estimation of storage was less than 30,000 af and pumping was halted. The recent Fall estimation was even lower than Spring meaning that the pumping allocation continues to be zero.</p>
		<p>Wildermuth Environmental created a plot showing the relationship between rainfall and groundwater basin recharge based upon historical data. The data indicates that 10 to 16 inches of rainfall are needed this year for pumping to restart in the basin. (The 24 year average is about 9 inches per year [if 4 wet years of data are excluded which skew the average])</p>
		<p>Karl Seckel, Kevin Hostert and Melissa Baum-Haley attended the MET Manager's meeting where presentations or discussions occurred on the SWRCB Regulations, the Little Hoover Commission (awaiting the final report), quagga mussels in the West Branch, and an update on the California WaterFix Cost Allocations (very preliminary info). It was also announced by Chief of Operations Jim Green that a workgroup would be organized in 2017 on flow metering issues to consider using meter technology beyond a 10:1 turndown and to discuss other changes that might be required in the administrative code to deal with these issues. MWDOC volunteered to be part of the workgroup due to the number of agencies looking for additional flexibility in metering ranges. On the quagga mussel issue, MET is expanding the facilities to be inspected for evidence of infestations. The findings to date indicate only a small number of the quaggas in the West Branch facilities, with none discovered alive. MET will also conduct enhanced inspections of the East Branch facilities. The State Project water does not have a high enough calcium content to allow the mussels to thrive, but the concerns with infestation are still valid.</p>

			in MWDOC's PAL Committee in January.
			Karl Seckel attended the Santiago Aqueduct Commission in December. The contract between the Commission and IRWD for the O&M of the Baker Pipeline was renewed. It was reported that the relation of about 3,000 feet of the Baker Pipeline by the Irvine Company had been delayed. It was also reported that the NEW Baker Treatment Plant would undergo a 5-day preliminary test in December and would begin the 10-day acceptance testing in January.
			Karl Seckel attended the IRWD Board meeting where staff reviewed with the Board the results of the IRWD Reliability Study. IRWD and MWDOC coordinated their reliability studies, but IRWD's went into more detail on emergency outage impacts to IRWD and the potential use of their Strand Ranch Banking Program to meet shortages within the IRWD service area. The IRWD analysis indicates a very high degree of reliability for IRWD based on being able to pull "extraordinary" supplies from their Strand Ranch Project.

**Status of Ongoing WEROC Projects**  
**December 2016**

Description	Comments
<b>Coordination with Member Agencies</b>	Four fuel trailers were delivered to El Toro Water District, Irvine Water District, East Orange County Water District and South Coast Water District. Kelly Hubbard coordinated with the DMV registration company and the fuel trailer company to ensure exempt license plates. Two trailers will be picked up after the New Year, thus completing the current order; staff is still hoping for funding for two additional trailers.
<b>Coordination with the County of Orange</b>	Kelly attended the December Orange County Emergency Management Organization (OCEMO) meeting. The meeting included the annual holiday luncheon and awards. Kelly was honored with OCEMO Helping Hands award for her work on Water and Commodity Point of Distribution Plans.
<b>Coordination with Outside Agencies</b>	Kelly participated in the California Water and Water Agency Response Network (CalWARN) State Steering Committee conference call. The group is working on updating the CalWARN website to be more efficient for adding additional agencies to the agreement and the website. These updates should make it easier for agencies to find contacts and resources during an emergency response.
<b>WEROC Emergency Operations Center (EOC) Readiness</b>	Kelly participated in the California Office of Emergency Services (Cal OES) Southern Region EOC Point of Distribution (POD) tabletop. This was a small tabletop with just their staff and I. The discussion was regarding on how what the CalOES region offices would be involved in a major POD response.
<b>Filling of WEROC Vacancies</b>	Staff participated in the November MARS successfully.  Colin Eckerle, WEROC/Engineering Intern, and Kelly met with the staff of the Center for Demographic Research (CDR) to review an update of the WEROC maps and atlases. The maps were last updated in 2005/2006 and require updates. The project will take several months to review the maps, update and review before reproduction. The MWDOC engineering staff also met to discuss the maps and ensure that all updates needed will be included.  Quite a bit of time was spent in December in interviews for a part-time administrative position that will be shared between Administration and WEROC and in conducting interviews for the WEROC Programs Coordinator position. The administrative assistant was hired and an offer was made for the Coordinator position.

## Status of Water Use Efficiency Projects

January 2017

Description	Lead Agency	Status % Complete	Scheduled Completion or Renewal Date	Comments
<b>Smart Timer Rebate Program</b>	MWDSC	Ongoing	Ongoing	For November 2016, 164 residential and 93 commercial smart timers were installed in Orange County.  For program water savings and implementation information, see MWDOC Water Use Efficiency Program Savings and Implementation Report.
<b>Rotating Nozzles Rebate Program</b>	MWDSC	Ongoing	Ongoing	For November 2016, 1,850 rotating nozzles were installed in Orange County.  For program savings and implementation information, please see MWDOC Water Use Efficiency Program Savings and Implementation Report.
<b>Water Smart Landscape Program</b>	MWDOC	On-going	On hold pending evaluation and RFP process	This Program is currently on hold while a Process and Impact Evaluation is conducted. Once the Evaluation is complete, the results will be used to make refinements to the Program.  For program savings and implementation information, please see MWDOC Water Use Efficiency Program Savings and Implementation Report.
<b>SoCal Water\$mart Residential Indoor Rebate Program</b>	MWDSC	On-going	On-going	In November 2016, 400 high efficiency clothes washers and 108 premium high efficiency toilets were installed through this program.  For program savings and implementation information, please see MWDOC Water Use Efficiency Program Savings and Implementation Report.

<b>SoCal Water\$mart Commercial Rebate Program</b>	MWDS/C	On-going	On-going	In November 2016, 70 premium high efficiency toilets and 270 multi-family high efficiency toilets were installed through this program.
<b>Industrial Process Water Use Reduction Program</b>	MWDOC	95%	September 2016	For program savings and implementation information, please see MWDOC Water Use Efficiency Program Savings and Implementation Report.
<b>Turf Removal Program</b>	MWDOC	On-going	On-going	A total of 41 Focused Surveys and 19 Comprehensive Surveys have been completed or are in progress. To date, 15 companies have signed Incentive Agreements. Updated discharger lists have been obtained, and outreach is continuing to sites with feasible water savings potential. As a result of this program, 359 AFY of water savings is being achieved.
<b>California Sprinkler Adjustment Notification System – Base Irrigation Schedule Calculator</b>	MWDOC	On-going	On-going	In November 2016, 30 rebates were paid, representing \$110,111.60 in rebates paid this month in Orange County. To date, the Turf Removal Program has removed approximately 20.5 million square feet of turf.
				For program savings and implementation information, please see MWDOC Water Use Efficiency Program Savings and Implementation Report.

<b>California Sprinkler Adjustment Notification System – Base Irrigation Schedule Calculator (cont.)</b>			customers. Several other agencies are considering access to the CSANS to administer their own messages to their customers: City of Brea, Mesa Water District, City of San Juan Capistrano, and Laguna Beach County WD. MWDOC will continue to work with these agencies to transition administration of CSANS to them. All other agencies are currently receiving educational messages administered by MWDOC.
<b>Spray to Drip Conversion Program</b>	MWDOC	75%	October 2017
			This is a pilot program designed to test the efficacy of replacing conventional spray heads in shrub beds with low-volume, low-precipitation drip technology. Through a rebate program format, residential and commercial sites will be encouraged to convert their existing spray nozzles to drip.
			To date, 193 residential sites and 52 commercial sites have completed spray to drip conversion projects.
<b>MWDOC Conservation Meeting</b>	MWDOC	On-going	Monthly
<b>Metropolitan Conservation Meeting</b>	MWDSC	On-going	Monthly

This month's meeting was held on December 1, 2016 at the City of Newport Beach. The next meeting will be on February 2, 2017 at County of Orange Public Works.
This month's meeting was held on December 15, 2016. The next meeting will be January 19, 2017 at Metropolitan.

# Orange County Water Use Efficiency Programs Savings and Implementation Report

## Retrofits and Acre-Feet Water Savings for Program Activity

Program	Program Start Date	Retrofits Installed in	Month Indicated		Current Fiscal Year		Overall Program		Cumulative Water Savings[4]
			Interventions	Water Savings	Interventions	Water Savings	Interventions	Annual Water Savings[4]	
High Efficiency Clothes Washer Program	2001	November-16	400	1.15	1,746	15.07	110,529	3,813	23,758
Smart Timer Program - Irrigation Timers	2004	November-16	257	5.74	1,122	254.30	18,604	7,044	38,116
Rotating Nozzles Rebate Program	2007	November-16	1,850	7.40	26,449	105.75	547,807	2,697	11,129
SoCal Water\$mart Commercial Plumbing Fixture Rebate Program	2002	November-16	340	0.77	7,837	67.73	78,119	3,518	39,200
Water Smart Landscape Program[1]	1997	November-15	12,677	904.62	12,677	3,615.21	12,677	10,621	72,668
Industrial Process Water Use Reduction Program	2006	November-16	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	15	359
Turf Removal Program[3]	2010	November-16	92,237	1.08	473,142	780	20,499,811	2,871	7,202
High Efficiency Toilet (HET) Program	2005	November-16	108	0.38	763	32.45	59,348	2,194	14,144
Home Water Certification Program	2013	November-15	0	0.000	53	0.251	312	7,339	15,266
Synthetic Turf Rebate Program	2007						685,438	96	469
Ultra-Low-Flush-Toilet Programs [2]	1992						363,926	13,452	162,561
Home Water Surveys [2]	1995						11,867	160	1,708
Showerhead Replacements [2]	1991						270,604	1,667	19,083
<b>Total Water Savings All Programs</b>			<b>921</b>	<b>523,789</b>	<b>4,871</b>	<b>22,659.057</b>	<b>48,499</b>	<b>391,974</b>	

[1] Water Smart Landscape Program participation is based on the number of water meters receiving monthly Irrigation Performance Reports.

[2] Cumulative Water Savings Program To Date totals are from a previous Water Use Efficiency Program Effort.

[3] Turf Removal Interventions are listed as square feet.

[4] Cumulative & annual water savings represents both active program savings and passive savings that continues to be realized due to plumbing code changes over time.

# HIGH EFFICIENCY CLOTHES WASHERS INSTALLED BY AGENCY

through MWDOC and Local Agency Conservation Programs

Agency	FY 08/09	FY 09/10	FY 10/11	FY 11/12	FY 12/13	FY 13/14	FY 14/15	FY 15/16	FY 16/17	Total	Current FY Water Savings Ac/Ft (Cumulative)	Cumulative Water Savings across all Fiscal Years	15 yr. Lifecycle Savings Ac/Ft
Brea	156	42	186	144	93	115	114	76	20	1,830	0.16	397.01	947
Buena Park	146	59	230	145	105	91	76	19	1,483	0.14	306.52	767	
East Orange CWD RZ	17	3	23	10	10	8	8	-	189	0.00	43.34	98	
El Toro WD	130	32	162	112	134	121	111	65	16	1,490	0.14	309.74	771
Fountain Valley	243	72	289	158	115	102	110	76	31	2,366	0.31	531.74	1,224
Garden Grove	332	101	481	236	190	162	165	251	59	3,495	0.48	744.13	1,808
Golden State W/C	447	168	583	485	265	283	359	260	70	4,947	0.63	1,051.36	2,560
Huntington Beach	751	211	963	582	334	295	319	225	67	8,133	0.56	1,865.66	4,208
Irvine Ranch WD	1,844	1,394	2,621	2,170	1,763	1,664	1,882	1,521	592	23,885	5.17	4,873.35	12,359
La Habra	83	22	179	128	82	114	87	66	21	1,295	0.15	268.03	670
La Palma	51	25	76	46	34	25	34	29	5	453	0.04	92.65	234
Laguna Beach CWD	77	27	96	57	38	37	39	32	2	915	0.02	204.32	473
Mesa Water	246	73	232	176	114	86	89	113	44	2,482	0.34	567.82	1,284
Moulton Niguel WD	742	250	1,127	679	442	421	790	688	267	9,613	2.32	1,963.28	4,974
Newport Beach	259	57	197	142	116	92	95	66	30	2,593	0.24	608.88	1,342
Orange	403	111	349	262	218	163	160	124	31	3,849	0.27	886.25	1,992
Orange Park Acres	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	12	0.00	3.42	6
San Juan Capistrano	127	43	190	110	76	73	92	63	20	1,446	0.13	310.84	748
San Clemente	278	63	333	206	140	94	141	75	29	2,579	0.24	563.72	1,334
Santa Margarita WD	740	257	1,105	679	553	662	792	466	159	9,308	1.42	1,923.80	4,816
Seal Beach	57	7	81	51	31	29	38	23	1	594	0.00	129.33	307
Serrano WD	23	7	21	20	13	10	26	8	7	353	0.06	81.03	183
South Coast WD	148	43	183	112	89	79	68	43	20	1,560	0.16	338.17	807
Trabuco Canyon WD	62	28	82	62	30	45	47	34	9	779	0.08	167.51	403
Tustin	144	45	174	97	78	59	80	66	24	1,592	0.23	357.77	824
Westminster	233	74	329	208	121	82	109	149	45	2,547	0.39	552.31	1,318
Yorba Linda	367	117	394	273	181	167	156	123	26	3,722	0.23	850.69	1,926
<b>Orange County Totals</b>	<b>8,106</b>	<b>3,331</b>	<b>10,686</b>	<b>7,350</b>	<b>5,365</b>	<b>5,094</b>	<b>6,002</b>	<b>4,726</b>	<b>1,614</b>	<b>93,510</b>	<b>13.91</b>	<b>19,992.68</b>	<b>18,066</b>
<b>Ashheim</b>	<b>781</b>	<b>860</b>	<b>910</b>	<b>477</b>	<b>331</b>	<b>285</b>	<b>295</b>	<b>266</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>10,537</b>	<b>0.60</b>	<b>2,372.72</b>	<b>5,452</b>
<b>Fullerton</b>	<b>330</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>397</b>	<b>270</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>186</b>	<b>211</b>	<b>165</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>3,629</b>	<b>0.33</b>	<b>725.62</b>	<b>1,878</b>
<b>Santa Ana</b>	<b>257</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>355</b>	<b>190</b>	<b>163</b>	<b>131</b>	<b>132</b>	<b>259</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>2,853</b>	<b>0.22</b>	<b>667.43</b>	<b>1,476</b>
<b>Non-MWDOC Totals</b>	<b>1,368</b>	<b>1,016</b>	<b>1,662</b>	<b>937</b>	<b>694</b>	<b>602</b>	<b>638</b>	<b>690</b>	<b>132</b>	<b>17,019</b>	<b>1.16</b>	<b>3,765.78</b>	<b>3,288</b>
<b>Orange County Totals</b>	<b>9,474</b>	<b>4,347</b>	<b>12,348</b>	<b>8,287</b>	<b>6,059</b>	<b>5,696</b>	<b>6,640</b>	<b>5,416</b>	<b>1,746</b>	<b>110,529</b>	<b>15.07</b>	<b>23,758.46</b>	<b>21,354</b>

**SMART TIMERS INSTALLED BY AGENCY**  
through MWDOC and Local Agency Conservation Programs

Agency	FY 09/10			FY 10/11			FY 11/12			FY 12/13			FY 13/14			FY 14/15			FY 15/16			FY 16/17			Total Program			Cumulative Water Savings across all Fiscal Years							
	Res	Comm	Res	Comm	Res	Comm	Res	Comm	Res	Comm	Res	Comm	Res	Comm	Res	Comm	Res	Comm	Res	Comm	Res	Comm	Res	Comm	Res	Comm	Res	Comm							
Brea	0	0	2	0	8	0	9	8	4	0	43	6	20	4	18	0	118	0	76	0	118	0	76	0	76	0	457	457	458,21						
Buena Park	0	0	0	0	4	19	3	0	0	0	4	10	7	4	3	5	24	39	39	39	39	39	39	39	39	39	39	39	39	39	116,12				
East Orange CWD RZ	0	0	1	0	5	0	2	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	15	0	15	0	15	0	15	0	6,82				
El Toro WD	2	18	5	5	26	2	7	2	11	0	8	9	9	17	12	3	94	350	350	350	350	350	350	350	350	350	350	350	350	350	350	2,22,63			
Fountain Valley	0	6	2	2	8	2	3	4	0	7	10	13	1	17	9	75	37	37	37	37	37	37	37	37	37	37	37	37	37	37	144,54				
Garden Grove	6	0	5	4	7	0	5	2	9	0	10	14	13	11	8	0	81	38	38	38	38	38	38	38	38	38	38	38	38	38	38	141,62			
Golden State WC	9	22	7	4	13	3	9	49	9	25	39	12	35	16	22	34	191	189	189	189	189	189	189	189	189	189	189	189	189	189	189	668,43			
Huntington Beach	6	27	6	36	15	4	18	33	20	35	19	2	42	12	44	26	228	200	200	200	200	200	200	200	200	200	200	200	200	200	200	82,03			
Irvine Ranch WD	14	145	28	153	267	71	414	135	71	59	67	310	239	207	133	100	1,558	1,966	1,966	1,966	1,966	1,966	1,966	1,966	1,966	1,966	1,966	1,966	1,966	1,966	1,966	9,468,90			
La Habra	0	21	0	0	3	0	4	7	2	0	4	7	3	1	2	7	26	44	44	44	44	44	44	44	44	44	44	44	44	44	44	17,130			
La Palma	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	2	0	2	0	0	3	2	0	0	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	4,12			
Laguna Beach CWD	2	14	4	1	109	2	76	2	71	0	86	0	86	1	3	0	473	20	19,45	20	19,45	20	19,45	20	19,45	20	19,45	20	19,45	20	19,45	20	58,82		
Mesa Water	13	7	22	21	0	10	2	15	2	17	28	36	12	17	0	186	113	113	113	113	113	113	113	113	113	113	113	113	113	113	58,82				
Moulton Niguel WD	17	162	36	60	179	31	51	74	40	45	46	95	163	100	109	33	787	705	705	705	705	705	705	705	705	705	705	705	705	705	705	2,922,70			
Newport Beach	7	58	6	0	275	12	242	26	168	75	11	9	28	43	19	10	1,027	407	407	407	407	407	407	407	407	407	407	407	407	407	407	407	2,290,12		
Orange	2	13	5	8	25	0	20	24	13	9	18	31	51	13	27	1	243	156	156	156	156	156	156	156	156	156	156	156	156	156	156	156	795,11		
San Juan Capistrano	7	49	13	1	103	2	14	18	6	11	6	19	20	8	10	0	210	117	117	117	117	117	117	117	117	117	117	117	117	117	117	541,95			
San Clemente	13	209	46	11	212	17	26	7	28	2	28	24	26	3	19	6	1,033	367	367	367	367	367	367	367	367	367	367	367	367	367	367	367	2,349,52		
Santa Margarita WD	10	152	61	53	262	7	53	171	64	93	53	321	189	136	206	54	1,034	1,205	1,205	1,205	1,205	1,205	1,205	1,205	1,205	1,205	1,205	1,205	1,205	1,205	1,205	1,205	4,522,66		
Santiago CWD	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0,00				
Seal Beach	0	1	0	0	0	3	1	0	1	36	1	12	2	2,446	2	4	7	2,502	3,435,01	3,435,01	3,435,01	3,435,01	3,435,01	3,435,01	3,435,01	3,435,01	3,435,01	3,435,01	3,435,01	3,435,01	3,435,01	3,435,01	3,435,01	3,435,01	3,435,01
Serrano WD	11	0	4	0	3	0	1	0	0	0	4	0	11	2	3	0	37	2	10,81	2	10,81	2	10,81	2	10,81	2	10,81	2	10,81	2	10,81	2	10,81		
South Coast WD	3	10	13	3	78	10	13	16	8	4	104	73	9	11	1	0	0	272	212	212	212	212	212	212	212	212	212	212	212	212	212	212	212	99,177	
Trabuco Canyon WD	2	0	2	10	12	0	6	0	2	0	6	1	16	50	5	0	95	154	154	154	154	154	154	154	154	154	154	154	154	154	154	154	83,743		
Tustin	10	14	10	0	11	0	8	4	9	1	18	14	33	8	13	1	123	58	58	58	58	58	58	58	58	58	58	58	58	58	58	58	26,287		
Westminster	3	0	1	2	0	1	1	2	0	13	17	7	1	7	7	1	55	39	39	39	39	39	39	39	39	39	39	39	39	39	39	160,53			
Yorba Linda	5	21	25	0	22	0	20	0	12	5	32	2	61	27	35	1	301	113	113	113	113	113	113	113	113	113	113	113	113	113	113	113	638,76		
<b>MWDOC Totals</b>	<b>142</b>	<b>949</b>	<b>289</b>	<b>374</b>	<b>1,671</b>	<b>185</b>	<b>1,017</b>	<b>583</b>	<b>571</b>	<b>402</b>	<b>648</b>	<b>1,026</b>	<b>1,123</b>	<b>3,136</b>	<b>736</b>	<b>301</b>	<b>8,302</b>	<b>9,111</b>	<b>9,111</b>	<b>9,111</b>	<b>9,111</b>	<b>9,111</b>	<b>9,111</b>	<b>9,111</b>	<b>9,111</b>	<b>34,765,23</b>									

Anaheim	5	46	12	11	23	60	19	10	9	26	7	52	30	34	41	10	198	457	457	457	457	457	457	457	457	457	457	457	457	457	457	457	2,285,08	
Fullerton	2	39	9	33	22	51	9	29	8	40	26	32	12	20	6	166	198	198	198	198	198	198	198	198	198	198	198	198	198	198	198	788,21		
Santa Ana	1	8	8	0	6	5	8	19	7	8	27	9	27	22	26	6	2	73	99	99	99	99	99	99	99	99	99	99	99	99	99	99	99	277,88
<b>Non-MWDOC Totals</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>116</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>105</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>437</b>	<b>754</b>	<b>3,351,17</b>															

Orange County Totals    150    1,042    318    418    1,722    301    1,053    641    595    436    704    1,131    1,207    3,208    803    319    8,739    9,865    38,116

**ROTATING NOZZLES INSTALLED BY AGENCY**  
**through MWDOC and Local Agency Conservation Programs**

Agency	FY 11/12			FY 12/13			FY 13/14			FY 14/15			FY 15/16			FY 16/17			Total Program			Cumulative Water Savings across all Fiscal Years
	Small	Large	Comm.	Small	Large	Comm.	Small	Large	Comm.	Small	Large	Comm.	Small	Large	Comm.	Small	Large	Comm.	Comm.	Comm.	Comm.	
Brea	130	0	65	120	0	84	0	157	45	0	74	2,484	0	0	0	0	0	572	2,749	0	32,68	
Buena Park	32	0	65	0	53	0	0	248	0	0	45	98	0	0	0	0	0	509	173	2,535	43,42	
East Orange	340	0	55	0	30	0	0	221	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	751	0	0	10,83	
El Toro	357	76	23	6,281	0	56	3,288	0	1,741	28,714	0	730	4,457	0	55	242	0	3,369	46,222	890	820,63	
Fountain Valley	108	0	35	0	0	0	0	107	0	0	0	222	0	0	0	0	0	710	0	0	10,22	
Garden Grove	119	0	95	0	0	80	0	0	88	50	0	110	0	0	55	98	0	933	299	0	19,72	
Golden State	294	0	257	2,595	0	192	0	0	583	1,741	0	1,088	0	0	0	176	4,701	0	3,417	10,009	0	152,29
Huntington Beach	458	0	270	0	120	0	0	798	1,419	0	1,345	2,836	0	149	1,465	0	3,797	10,629	2,681	730,51		
Irvine Ranch	1,715	4,255	0	25,018	1,014	0	11,010	4,257	0	1,421	632	0	1,939	5,047	0	287	4,672	0	47,089	89,722	2,004	2,900,68
La Habra	33	90	0	0	0	15	0	0	109	338	0	300	0	0	0	0	0	481	1,236	900	221,65	
La Palma	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56	505	0	4,65	
Laguna Beach	763	0	3,596	0	0	2,948	878	0	2,879	1,971	0	1,390	0	0	0	0	0	12,139	2,896	0	224,61	
Mesa Water	297	277	0	270	0	0	361	0	0	229	0	0	166	0	0	70	0	0	0	1,987	385	343
Moulton Niguel	1,225	0	512	1,385	0	361	227	0	1,596	4,587	0	5,492	1,441	0	76	5,609	0	11,797	20,252	2,945	1,016,16	
Newport Beach	640	3,273	0	25,365	50	0	19,349	6,835	0	460	3,857	0	348	670	0	0	0	0	46,678	21,413	0	1,178,02
Orange	343	0	0	264	0	0	245	120	0	304	688	0	631	91	0	0	0	3,170	1,072	0	69,27	
San Clemente	4,266	117	1,343	631	172	0	415	5,074	0	326	0	0	426	0	0	0	0	9,989	7,538	1,343	415,75	
San Juan Capistrano	949	0	684	30	0	370	0	0	495	737	0	310	593	0	75	0	0	5,495	8,729	0	236,54	
Santa Margarita	4,817	0	983	0	0	389	0	0	1,207	1,513	0	1,820	837	0	15	0	0	16,165	6,921	611	450,11	
Seal Beach	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	5,261	0	0	2,300	0	0	0	0	155	7,852	0	90,55	
Serrano	58	0	0	190	0	0	105	0	0	377	0	0	635	0	0	0	0	3,405	0	0	55,23	
South Coast	688	359	0	435	0	70	0	0	4,993	13,777	0	1,421	2,889	0	16	0	0	8,130	18,870	0	233,31	
Trabuco Canyon	379	0	34	0	0	0	0	0	56	0	0	130	0	0	0	0	0	2,086	791	0	53,52	
Tustin	476	1,013	0	378	0	0	329	0	0	408	0	0	317	386	0	65	0	0	3,371	1,399	0	69,73
Westminster	26	0	0	15	0	0	0	0	0	54	0	0	73	0	0	105	0	0	464	0	0	6,53
Yorba Linda	559	0	730	0	0	40	90	0	921	0	0	1,715	0	0	213	0	0	6,081	4,359	500	278,38	
<b>MWDOC Totals</b>	<b>19,072</b>	<b>9,460</b>	<b>1,343</b>	<b>59,970</b>	<b>11,647</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>36,622</b>	<b>21,669</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>19,818</b>	<b>65,250</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>20,833</b>	<b>24,634</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1,357</b>	<b>16,787</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>192,796</b>	<b>264,021</b>	<b>14,752</b>	<b>10,027,17</b>

Anaheim	742	38,554	0	459	813	0	338	0	0	498	712	0	794	5,221	0	147	3,953	0	4,020	49,799	105	630,16
Fullerton	409	0	119	0	0	107	0	0	684	1,196	0	521	7,015	0	65	3,034	0	2,910	11,309	1,484	336,40	
Santa Ana	22	65	0	99	0	0	86	2,533	0	310	0	0	1,420	0	0	1,106	0	859	5,752	0	85,35	
<b>Non-MWDOC Totals</b>	<b>1,173</b>	<b>38,619</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>677</b>	<b>813</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1,492</b>	<b>1,908</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1,315</b>	<b>13,656</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>212</b>	<b>8,093</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>7,789</b>	<b>66,860</b>	<b>1,539</b>	<b>1,101,91</b>			
Orange County Totals	20,245	48,079	1,343	60,647	12,460	0	37,153	24,202	0	21,310	67,158	0	22,198	38,290	0	1,569	24,880	0	200,585	330,881	16,341	11,129,08

**SOCAL WATER\$MART COMMERCIAL PLUMBING FIXTURES REBATE PROGRAM<sup>[1]</sup>**  
**INSTALLED BY AGENCY**  
through MWDOC and Local Agency Conservation Programs

Agency	FY 07/08	FY 08/09	FY 09/10	FY 10/11	FY 11/12	FY 12/13	FY 13/14	FY 14/15	FY 15/16	FY 16/17	FY Totals	Cumulative Water Savings across all Fiscal Years
Brea	27	113	24	4	1	234	0	10	91	0	631	394
Buena Park	153	432	122	379	290	5	23	56	591	0	2,356	1,070
East Orange CWD RZ	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
El Toro WD	0	92	143	1	137	0	212	6	268	25	1,052	586
Fountain Valley	17	35	0	2	314	0	0	1	249	0	872	584
Garden Grove	5	298	130	22	0	4	1	167	676	310	2,351	1,480
Golden State WC	46	414	55	68	135	0	1	0	1,008	53	2,865	1,896
Huntington Beach	48	104	126	96	156	104	144	7	783	0	2,313	1,541
Irvine Ranch WD	121	789	2,703	1,002	646	1,090	451	725	11,100	3,701	25,609	7,281
La Habra	191	75	53	4	0	0	0	0	340	0	883	544
La Palma	0	140	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	446	612	100
Laguna Beach CWD	20	137	189	0	0	0	27	0	0	0	446	312
Mesa Water	141	543	219	669	41	6	0	79	661	763	4,235	2,068
Moulton Niguel WD	9	69	151	6	0	0	0	3	413	0	986	811
Newport Beach	98	27	245	425	35	0	0	566	0	0	1,834	1,279
Orange	18	374	67	1	73	1	271	81	275	1,535	3,714	1,769
San Juan Capistrano	2	1	1	0	0	0	14	0	0	0	260	397
San Clemente	2	18	43	0	19	0	0	1	0	0	432	381
Santa Margarita WD	6	23	11	0	0	0	0	2	90	0	207	206
Santiago CWD	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sea Beach	1	2	124	0	0	0	0	0	0	184	538	427
Serrano WD	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
South Coast WD	9	114	56	422	84	148	0	382	0	0	1,320	509
Trabuco Canyon WD	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Tustin	115	145	25	230	0	0	0	75	358	0	1,190	814
Westminster	40	161	16	63	35	1	28	0	146	79	1,040	995
Yorba Linda	10	24	8	30	0	1	0	0	226	0	511	555
<b>MWDOC Totals</b>	<b>1,079</b>	<b>4,134</b>	<b>4,537</b>	<b>3,424</b>	<b>1,986</b>	<b>1,594</b>	<b>1,172</b>	<b>2,161</b>	<b>17,275</b>	<b>7,096</b>	<b>56,278</b>	<b>26,014</b>
<b>Orange County Totals</b>	<b>2,471</b>	<b>8,826</b>	<b>5,876</b>	<b>3,531</b>	<b>2,026</b>	<b>1,869</b>	<b>1,531</b>	<b>2,807</b>	<b>22,116</b>	<b>7,837</b>	<b>78,119</b>	<b>39,200</b>

[1] Retrofit devices include ULF Toilets and Urinals, High Efficiency Toilets and Urinals, Multi-Family and Multi-Family and Multi-Family and Multi-Family HETs, Zero Water Urinals, High Efficiency Clothes Washers, Cooling Tower Conductivity Controllers, pH Cooling Tower Conductivity Controllers, Flush Valve Retrofit Kits, Pre-rinse Spray heads, Hospital X-Ray Processor Recirculating Systems, Steam Sterilizer, Food Steamers, Water Pressurized Brooms, Laminar Flow Restrictors, and Ice Making Machines.

**Water Smart Landscape Program**  
**Total Number of Meters**  
**in Program by Agency**

Agency							Overall Water Savings To Date (AF)			
	FY 07-08	FY 08-09	FY 09-10	FY 10-11	FY 11-12	FY 12-13	FY 13-14	FY 14-15	FY 15-16	FY 16-17
Brea	0	0	0	0	22	22	22	22	22	0
Buena Park	0	0	17	103	101	101	101	101	101	64.37
East Orange CWD RZ	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	462.69
El Toro WD	352	384	371	820	810	812	812	812	812	0.00
Fountain Valley	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4,856.93
Garden Grove	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00
Golden State WC	14	34	32	34	32	32	32	32	32	0.00
Huntington Beach	0	0	31	33	31	31	31	31	31	200.59
Irvine Ranch WD	708	1,008	6,297	6,347	6,368	6,795	6,797	6,769	6,780	148.43
Laguna Beach CWD	0	57	141	143	141	124	124	124	124	38,304.89
La Habra	0	23	22	24	22	22	22	22	22	733.07
La Palma	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	136.72
Mesa Water	165	286	285	288	450	504	511	514	515	0.00
Moulton Niguel WD	180	473	571	595	643	640	675	673	661	2,943.57
Newport Beach	58	142	171	191	226	262	300	300	300	4,120.71
Orange	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,501.19
San Clemente	227	233	247	271	269	269	299	299	407	0.00
San Juan Capistrano	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2,368.77
Santa Margarita WD	945	1,571	1,666	1,746	1,962	1,956	2,274	2,386	2,386	0.00
Seal Beach	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00
Serrano WD	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00
South Coast WD	62	117	108	110	118	118	118	164	164	829.91
Trabuco Canyon WD	12	49	48	62	60	60	60	60	60	350.52
Tustin	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00
Westminster	10	18	18	20	18	18	18	18	18	116.46
Yorba Linda WD	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00
<b>MWDOC Totals</b>	<b>2,733</b>	<b>4,395</b>	<b>10,025</b>	<b>10,787</b>	<b>11,273</b>	<b>11,766</b>	<b>12,196</b>	<b>12,435</b>	<b>12,487</b>	<b>71,316.9</b>
Anaheim	0	0	142	146	144	190	190	190	190	1,351.53
Fullerton	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00
Santa Ana	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00
<b>Non-MWDOC Totals</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>142</b>	<b>146</b>	<b>144</b>	<b>190</b>	<b>190</b>	<b>190</b>	<b>190</b>	<b>1,351.53</b>
<b>Orange Co. Totals</b>	<b>2,733</b>	<b>4,395</b>	<b>10,167</b>	<b>10,933</b>	<b>11,417</b>	<b>11,956</b>	<b>12,386</b>	<b>12,625</b>	<b>12,677</b>	<b>72,668.45</b>

# INDUSTRIAL PROCESS WATER USE REDUCTION PROGRAM

## Number of Process Changes by Agency

Agency	FY 09/10	FY 10/11	FY 11/12	FY 12/13	FY 13/14	FY 14/15	FY 15/16	FY 16/17	Overall Program Interventions	Annual Water Savings[1]	Cumulative Water Savings across all Fiscal Years[1]
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Brea	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Buena Park	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	54	428
East Orange	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
El Toro	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Fountain Valley	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Garden Grove	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Golden State	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	26
Huntington Beach	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	3	127	382
Irvine Ranch	2	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	6	98	480
La Habra	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
La Palma	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Laguna Beach	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mesa Water	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Moulton Niguel	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Newport Beach	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	21	42
Orange	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	45	383
San Juan Capistrano	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
San Clemente	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Santa Margarita	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Seal Beach	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Serrano	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
South Coast	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Trabuco Canyon	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Tustin	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Westminster	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Yorba Linda	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>MWDOC Totals</b>		2	1	3	1	2	1	0	14	348	1741
Anaheim	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Fullerton	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Santa Ana	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	11	180
<b>OC Totals</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>359</b>	<b>1921</b>	

[1] Acre feet of savings determined during a one year monitoring period.  
If monitoring data is not available, the savings estimated in agreement is used.

**TURF REMOVAL BY AGENCY<sup>[1]</sup>**  
through MWDOC and Local Agency Conservation Programs

Agency	FY 11/12			FY 12/13			FY 13/14			FY 14/15			FY 15/16			FY 16/17			Total Program			Cumulative Water Savings across all Fiscal Years
	Res	Comm.	Res	Comm.	Res	Comm.	Res	Comm.	Res	Comm.	Res	Comm.	Res	Comm.	Res	Comm.	Res	Comm.	Res	Comm.		
Brea	3,397	9,466	7,605	0	5,697	0	71,981	30,617	118,930	404,411	3,556	0	211,166	444,494	0	209,44	-	-	-	-	-	
Buena Park	0	0	0	0	0	0	11,670	1,626	77,127	16,490	3,741	0	92,538	18,116	0	32,32	-	-	-	-		
East Orange	0	0	0	0	1,964	0	18,312	0	27,844	0	0	0	48,120	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16,59	
El Toro	4,723	0	4,680	72,718	4,582	0	27,046	221,612	63,546	162,548	2,852	23,019	107,429	479,897	0	232,07	-	-	-	-	-	
Fountain Valley	1,300	0	682	7,524	4,252	0	45,583	5,279	65,232	0	418	0	117,467	12,803	0	48,30	-	-	-	-	-	
Garden Grove	14,013	0	4,534	0	8,274	0	67,701	22,000	177,408	49,226	11,504	0	283,434	117,403	0	167,57	-	-	-	-	-	
Golden State	42,593	30,973	31,813	3,200	32,725	8,424	164,507	190,738	310,264	112,937	0	0	581,902	346,272	0	377,04	-	-	-	-	-	
Huntington Beach	27,630	48,838	9,219	12,437	20,642	0	165,600	58,942	305,420	270,303	8,057	21,534	537,369	415,705	0	354,96	-	-	-	-	-	
Irvine Ranch	6,450	1,666	32,884	32,384	36,584	76,400	234,905	317,999	782,844	2,675,629	86,480	38,722	1,185,570	3,155,594	0	1,351,72	-	-	-	-	-	
La Habra	0	8,262	0	0	0	0	14,014	1,818	49,691	72,164	0	0	63,705	90,019	0	55,33	-	-	-	-	-	
La Palma	0	0	0	0	0	0	4,884	0	10,257	59,760	0	0	15,141	59,760	0	21,66	-	-	-	-	-	
Laguna Beach	2,533	0	2,664	1,712	4,586	226	13,647	46,850	47,614	0	0	0	72,022	48,788	0	47,58	-	-	-	-	-	
Mesa Water	6,777	0	10,667	0	22,246	0	131,675	33,620	220,815	106,896	3,006	42,848	395,186	183,364	0	193,22	-	-	-	-	-	
Moulton Niguel	4,483	26,927	11,538	84,123	14,739	40,741	314,250	1,612,845	889,748	1,059,279	107,274	0	1,342,988	2,840,054	0	1,511,26	-	-	-	-	-	
Newport Beach	3,454	0	3,548	2,346	894	0	33,995	65,277	76,675	375,404	953	0	119,519	443,021	0	175,93	-	-	-	-	-	
Orange	12,971	0	15,951	8,723	11,244	0	120,093	281,402	289,990	106,487	1,271	2,366	451,520	398,978	0	314,61	-	-	-	-	-	
San Clemente	21,502	0	16,062	13,165	18,471	13,908	90,349	1,137	215,249	438,963	3,228	0	364,861	467,173	0	278,70	-	-	-	-	-	
San Juan Capistrano	22,656	103,692	29,544	27,156	12,106	0	101,195	32,366	197,290	143,315	2,624	40,748	365,415	347,277	0	310,13	-	-	-	-	-	
Santa Margarita	1,964	11,400	10,151	11,600	17,778	48,180	211,198	514,198	534,048	550,420	8,822	25,912	788,444	1,167,271	0	686,40	-	-	-	-	-	
Seal Beach	0	0	3,611	0	0	0	15,178	504	17,349	15,911	0	0	36,138	16,415	0	18,43	-	-	-	-	-	
Serrano	0	0	0	0	2,971	0	41,247	0	127,877	4,403	0	0	172,095	4,403	0	56,02	-	-	-	-	-	
South Coast	6,806	0	9,429	4,395	15,162	116,719	84,282	191,853	181,102	128,290	3,312	0	300,093	457,581	0	308,31	-	-	-	-	-	
Trabuco Canyon	272	0	1,542	22,440	2,651	0	14,771	0	42,510	88,272	0	0	61,746	110,712	0	61,32	-	-	-	-	-	
Tustin	0	0	9,980	0	1,410	0	71,285	14,137	232,697	33,362	9,043	0	324,415	47,499	0	119,41	-	-	-	-	-	
Westminster	0	0	0	0	0	0	14,040	34,631	71,833	23,902	5,894	0	91,767	58,533	0	48,07	-	-	-	-	-	
Yorba Linda	0	0	0	0	0	0	112,136	12,702	360,279	116,985	15,958	0	499,722	129,687	0	199,42	-	-	-	-	-	
<b>MWDOC Totals</b>	<b>183,524</b>	<b>241,224</b>	<b>216,104</b>	<b>303,923</b>	<b>238,978</b>	<b>304,998</b>	<b>2,195,544</b>	<b>3,692,153</b>	<b>5,493,639</b>	<b>7,015,357</b>	<b>277,993</b>	<b>195,149</b>	<b>8,629,772</b>	<b>11,860,825</b>	<b>7,196,41</b>	<b>7,202</b>						

Anaheim	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-
Fullerton	0	0	0	0	0	0	9,214	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9,214	5,16
Santa Ana	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-
<b>Non-MWDOC Totals</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>9,214</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>9,214</b>	<b>5,16</b>											

Installed device numbers are listed as square feet

## HIGH EFFICIENCY TOILETS (HETs) INSTALLED BY AGENCY

through MWDOC and Local Agency Conservation Programs

Agency	FY05-06	FY 06-07	FY 07-08	FY 08-09	FY 09-10	FY 10-11	FY 11-12	FY 12-13	FY 13-14	FY 14-15	FY 15-16	FY 16-17	Total	Cumulative Water Savings across all Fiscal Years
Brea	0	2	7	43	48	8	0	0	38	146	154	0	446	77.33
Buena Park	0	1	2	124	176	7	0	0	96	153	112	3	674	156.36
East Orange CWD RZ	0	0	10	12	1	0	0	0	13	26	24	0	86	16.77
El Toro WD	0	392	18	75	38	18	0	133	218	869	264	10	2,035	437.46
Fountain Valley	0	69	21	262	54	17	0	0	41	132	220	3	819	207.73
Golden Grove	0	14	39	443	181	24	0	0	63	350	363	2	1,479	348.01
Golden State WC	2	16	36	444	716	37	80	2	142	794	512	5	2,756	638.90
Huntington Beach	2	13	59	607	159	76	0	0	163	1,190	628	2	2,859	574.72
Irvine Ranch WD	29	1,055	826	5,088	2,114	325	0	1,449	810	1,777	2,798	478	16,749	4,557.31
Laguna Beach CWD	0	2	17	91	28	11	0	0	45	112	81	-1	386	84.65
La Habra	0	3	18	296	34	20	0	0	37	94	83	2	587	165.43
La Palma	0	1	10	36	26	13	0	0	21	59	52	0	218	46.77
Mesa Water	0	247	19	736	131	7	0	0	147	162	162	2	1,613	511.90
Moulton Niguel WD	0	20	104	447	188	46	0	0	400	2,497	1,939	35	5,676	855.99
Newport Beach	0	5	19	163	54	13	0	0	49	168	243	4	718	145.76
Orange	1	20	62	423	79	40	0	1	142	978	416	8	2,170	422.10
San Juan Capistrano	0	10	7	76	39	11	0	0	35	140	202	0	520	94.35
San Clemente	0	7	22	202	66	21	0	0	72	225	246	11	872	181.13
Santa Margarita WD	0	5	14	304	151	44	0	0	528	997	1,152	104	3,299	508.92
Seal Beach	0	678	8	21	12	1	0	2	17	50	69	-1	857	348.77
Serrano WD	2	0	1	13	5	0	0	0	2	40	55	3	121	18.39
South Coast WD	2	2	29	102	41	12	23	64	102	398	235	6	1,016	178.83
Trabuco Canyon WD	0	0	4	23	0	0	0	0	10	108	169	1	338	48.26
Tustin	0	186	28	387	479	17	0	0	64	132	201	13	1,507	460.79
Westminster	0	17	25	541	167	23	0	0	35	161	359	2	1,330	346.69
Yorba Linda WD	0	14	89	323	96	18	0	0	40	280	379	6	1,245	281.27
<b>MWDOC Totals</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>2,779</b>	<b>1,494</b>	<b>11,282</b>	<b>5,106</b>	<b>809</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>1,651</b>	<b>3,330</b>	<b>12,038</b>	<b>11,118</b>	<b>698</b>	<b>50,446</b>	<b>11,714.60</b>
Anaheim	0	255	78	2,771	619	114	0	0	156	1,188	614	37	5,832	1,690.74
Fullerton	0	4	28	286	60	23	0	0	61	293	286	11	1,052	223.22
Santa Ana	0	11	25	925	89	23	0	0	33	602	293	17	2,018	515.39
<b>Non-MWDOC Totals</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>270</b>	<b>131</b>	<b>3,982</b>	<b>768</b>	<b>160</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>250</b>	<b>2,083</b>	<b>1,193</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>8,902</b>	<b>2,429.36</b>
<b>Orange County Totals</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>3,049</b>	<b>1,625</b>	<b>15,264</b>	<b>5,874</b>	<b>969</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>1,651</b>	<b>3,580</b>	<b>14,121</b>	<b>12,311</b>	<b>763</b>	<b>59,348</b>	<b>14,143.95</b>

**HOME WATER SURVEYS PERFORMED BY AGENCY**  
 through MWDOC and Local Agency Conservation Programs

Agency	FY 13/14		FY 14/15		FY 15/16		Total Surveys	Cert Homes	Total Surveys	Cert Homes	Cumulative Water Savings
	Surveys	Cert Homes	Surveys	Cert Homes	Surveys	Cert Homes					
Brea	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0.16
Buena Park	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0.05
East Orange	19	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	20	0	1.39
El Toro	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0.14
Fountain Valley	3	0	4	0	1	0	0	0	8	0	0.42
Garden Grove	0	0	6	0	1	0	0	0	7	0	0.31
Golden State	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00
Huntington Beach	2	0	5	0	2	0	0	0	9	0	0.42
Irvine Ranch	1	0	3	0	6	0	0	0	10	0	0.35
La Habra	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0.05
La Palma	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00
Laguna Beach	4	0	8	0	1	0	0	0	13	0	0.68
Mesa Water	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00
Moulton Niguel	4	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	0.47
Newport Beach	2	0	8	0	6	0	0	0	16	0	0.66
Orange	2	0	18	0	1	0	0	0	21	0	1.01
San Clemente	15	0	13	0	0	0	0	0	28	0	1.67
San Juan Capistrano	4	0	13	0	2	0	0	0	19	0	0.94
Santa Margarita	15	0	40	1	14	0	0	0	69	1	3.27
Seal Beach	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	3	0	0.09
Serrano	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0.09
South Coast	6	0	4	0	1	0	0	0	11	0	0.64
Trabuco Canyon	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0.19
Tustin	0	0	10	0	5	0	0	0	15	0	0.59
Westminster	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00
Yorba Linda	0	0	13	0	10	0	0	0	23	0	0.85
<b>MWDOC Totals</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>164</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>294</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>294</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>14.44</b>
<b>Orange County Totals</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>181</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>312</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>312</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>15.266</b>
Anaheim	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00
Fullerton	0	0	17	0	1	0	0	0	18	0	0.82
Santa Ana	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00
<b>Non-MWDOC Totals</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.82</b>

**SYNTHETIC TURF INSTALLED BY AGENCY<sup>[1]</sup>**  
 through MWDOC and Local Agency Conservation Programs

Agency	FY 07/08			FY 08/09			FY 09/10			FY 10/11			Total Program		Cumulative Water Savings across all Fiscal Years
	Res	Comm.	Res	Comm.	Res	Comm.	Res	Comm.	Res	Comm.	Res	Comm.	Res	Comm.	
Brea	0	0	2,153	2,160	500	0	0	0	0	0	2,653	2,160	3,30	3,30	
Buena Park	0	0	1,566	5,850	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,566	5,850	5.19	5.19	
East Orange	0	0	0	983	0	0	0	0	0	0	983	0	0.55	0.55	
El Toro	3,183	0	2,974	0	3,308	0	895	0	0	0	10,360	0	6.98	6.98	
Fountain Valley	11,674	0	1,163	0	2,767	0	684	0	0	0	16,288	0	12.46	12.46	
Garden Grove	1,860	0	0	3,197	0	0	274	0	0	0	5,331	0	3.47	3.47	
Golden State	6,786	0	13,990	0	15,215	0	2,056	0	0	0	38,047	0	24.88	24.88	
Huntington Beach	15,192	591	12,512	0	4,343	1,504	0	0	0	0	32,047	2,095	25.29	25.29	
Irvine Ranch	11,009	876	13,669	0	2,585	0	0	0	0	0	27,263	876	21.00	21.00	
La Habra	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	-	
La Palma	429	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	429	0	0.36	0.36	
Laguna Beach	3,950	0	3,026	0	725	0	0	0	0	0	7,701	0	5.84	5.84	
Mesa Water	4,114	0	3,005	78,118	4,106	0	2,198	0	0	0	13,423	78,118	63.46	63.46	
Moulton Niguel	14,151	0	25,635	2,420	7,432	0	0	0	0	0	47,218	2,420	35.69	35.69	
Newport Beach	2,530	0	6,628	0	270	0	0	0	0	0	9,428	0	6.92	6.92	
Orange	4,169	0	7,191	0	635	0	0	0	0	0	11,995	0	8.89	8.89	
San Clemente	9,328	0	11,250	455	2,514	1,285	500	0	0	0	23,592	1,740	18.37	18.37	
San Juan Capistrano	0	0	7,297	639	2,730	0	4,607	0	0	0	14,634	639	9.02	9.02	
Santa Margarita	12,922	0	26,069	0	21,875	0	7,926	0	0	0	68,792	0	44.68	44.68	
Seal Beach	0	0	817	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	817	0	0.57	0.57	
Serrano	7,347	0	1,145	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8,492	0	6.97	6.97	
South Coast	2,311	0	6,316	0	17,200	0	1,044	0	0	0	26,871	0	16.43	16.43	
Trabuco Canyon	1,202	0	9,827	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11,029	0	7.89	7.89	
Tustin	6,123	0	4,717	0	2,190	0	0	0	0	0	13,030	0	9.67	9.67	
Westminster	2,748	16,566	8,215	0	890	0	0	0	0	0	11,853	16,566	22.47	22.47	
Yorba Linda	11,792	0	12,683	0	4,341	5,835	0	0	0	0	28,816	5,835	24.48	24.48	
<b>MWDOC Totals</b>	<b>132,820</b>	<b>18,033</b>	<b>181,848</b>	<b>89,642</b>	<b>97,806</b>	<b>8,624</b>	<b>20,184</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>432,658</b>	<b>116,299</b>	<b>384,83</b>				
<b>Orange County Totals</b>	<b>142,220</b>	<b>18,909</b>	<b>198,130</b>	<b>109,735</b>	<b>118,109</b>	<b>73,924</b>	<b>24,411</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>482,870</b>	<b>202,568</b>	<b>468,63</b>				

[1]Installed device numbers are calculated in square feet

**ULF TOILETS INSTALLED BY AGENCY**  
**through MWDOC and Local Agency Conservation Programs**

Agency	Previous Years	FY 95-96	FY 96-97	FY 97-98	FY 98-99	FY 99-00	FY 00-01	FY 01-02	FY 02-03	FY 03-04	FY 04-05	FY 05-06	FY 06-07	FY 07-08	FY 08-09	Total	Cumulative Water Savings across all Fiscal Years
Brea	378	189	299	299	122	144	867	585	341	401	26	48	17	4	0	3,720	1,692,64
Buena Park	361	147	331	802	520	469	524	1,229	2,325	1,522	50	40	18	9	0	8,347	3,498,37
East Orange CWD RZ	2	0	33	63	15	17	15	50	41	44	19	18	13	2	0	332	135,23
El Toro WD	1,169	511	678	889	711	171	310	564	472	324	176	205	61	40	0	6,281	3,091,16
Fountain Valley	638	454	635	858	1,289	2,355	1,697	1,406	1,400	802	176	111	58	32	0	11,911	5,383,10
Garden Grove	1,563	1,871	1,956	2,620	2,801	3,556	2,423	3,855	3,148	2,117	176	106	67	39	0	26,298	12,155,41
Golden State WC	3,535	1,396	3,141	1,113	3,024	2,957	1,379	2,143	3,222	1,870	167	116	501	43	0	24,607	11,731,47
Huntington Beach	3,963	1,779	2,600	2,522	2,319	3,492	3,281	2,698	3,752	1,901	367	308	143	121	0	29,246	13,854,70
Irvine Ranch WD	4,016	841	1,674	1,726	1,089	3,256	1,534	1,902	2,263	6,741	593	626	310	129	0	26,700	11,849,23
Laguna Beach CWD	283	93	118	74	149	306	220	85	271	118	32	26	29	6	0	1,810	845,69
La Habra	594	146	254	775	703	105	582	645	1,697	1,225	12	31	6	7	0	6,782	2,957,73
La Palma	65	180	222	125	44	132	518	173	343	193	31	27	20	17	0	2,090	927,52
Mesa Water	1,610	851	1,052	2,046	2,114	1,956	1,393	1,505	2,387	988	192	124	56	14	0	16,288	7,654,27
Moulton Niguel WD	744	309	761	698	523	475	716	891	728	684	410	381	187	100	0	7,607	3,371,14
Newport Beach	369	293	390	571	912	1,223	438	463	396	1,883	153	76	36	16	0	7,219	3,166,77
Orange	683	1,252	1,155	1,355	533	2,263	1,778	2,444	2,682	1,899	193	218	88	53	4	16,800	7,347,93
San Juan Capistrano	1,234	284	193	168	323	1,319	347	152	201	151	85	125	42	39	0	4,663	2,324,42
San Clemente	225	113	191	65	158	198	667	483	201	547	91	66	37	34	0	3,076	1,314,64
Santa Margarita WD	577	324	553	843	345	456	1,258	790	664	260	179	143	101	29	0	6,522	3,001,01
Seal Beach	74	66	312	609	47	155	132	81	134	729	29	10	6	12	0	2,396	1,073,80
Serrano WD	81	56	68	41	19	52	95	73	123	98	20	15	14	2	0	757	338,66
South Coast WD	110	176	177	114	182	133	358	191	469	88	72	32	22	0	2,305	990,05	
Trabuco Canyon WD	10	78	42	42	25	21	40	181	102	30	17	20	12	14	0	634	273,02
Justin	968	668	557	824	429	1,292	1,508	1,206	1,096	827	69	89	26	12	0	9,571	4,423,38
Westminster	747	493	969	1,056	2,336	2,291	2,304	1,523	2,492	1,118	145	105	70	24	0	15,683	7,064,28
Yorba Linda WD	257	309	417	457	404	1,400	2,759	1,690	1,155	627	158	136	81	41	0	7,891	3,409,49
<b>MWDOC Totals</b>	24,256	12,879	18,778	20,765	21,136	30,242	24,918	27,175	31,827	27,568	3,654	3,242	2,031	861	4	249,336	113,873,61

Anaheim	447	1,054	1,788	3,661	1,755	4,593	6,346	9,707	5,075	473	371	462	341	1	43,625	18,359,52	
Fullerton	1,453	1,143	694	1,193	1,364	2,138	1,926	2,130	2,213	1,749	172	44	23	2	16,321	7,435,23	
Santa Ana	1,111	1,964	1,205	2,729	2,088	8,788	5,614	10,822	10,716	9,164	279	134	25	5	0	54,644	22,887,95
<b>Non-MWDOC Totals</b>	3,011	4,161	3,687	7,553	5,207	18,477	12,133	19,298	22,636	15,988	924	582	531	369	3	114,590	48,682,70

Orange County Totals	27,267	17,040	22,465	28,348	26,343	48,719	37,051	46,473	54,463	43,556	4,578	3,824	2,562	1,230	7	363,926	162,561,30
----------------------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	-------	-------	-------	-------	---	---------	------------