WORKSHOP MEETING OF THE
BOARD OF DIRECTORS WITH MET DIRECTORS
MUNICIPAL WATER DISTRICT OF ORANGE COUNTY
18700 Ward Street, Board Room, Fountain Valley, California
September 2, 2015, 8:30 a.m.

Teleconference Site:
20989 Park Lane
Rollins, MT 59931
(406) 844-2282

(Members of the Public may attend and participate in the meeting at both locations.)

AGENDA

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

ROLL CALL

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION/COMMENTS
At this time members of the public will be given an opportunity to address the Board concerning items within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Board. Members of the public may also address the Board about a particular Agenda item at the time it is considered by the Board and before action is taken.

The Board requests, but does not require, that members of the public who want to address the Board complete a voluntary “Request to be Heard” form available from the Board Secretary prior to the meeting.

ITEMS RECEIVED TOO LATE TO BE AGENDIZED
Determine need and take action to agendize item(s), which arose subsequent to the posting of the Agenda. (ROLL CALL VOTE: Adoption of this recommendation requires a two-thirds vote of the Board members present or, if less than two-thirds of the Board members are present, a unanimous vote.)

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.

PRESENTATION/DISCUSSION/INFORMATION ITEMS

1. DISCUSSION WITH JEFF KIGHTLINGER REGARDING METROPOLITAN WATER DISTRICT ISSUES

   Recommendation: Review and discuss the information presented.

2. ORANGE COUNTY’S DROUGHT PERFORMANCE – JULY REPORT

   Recommendation: Review and discuss the information presented.
3. **STATUS ON METROPOLITAN’S 2015 INTEGRATED RESOURCES PLAN (IRP)**

   *Recommendation*: Review and discuss the information presented.

4. **MET ITEMS CRITICAL TO ORANGE COUNTY**

   a. MET’s Water Supply Conditions
   b. MET’s Finance and Rate Issues
   c. Colorado River Issues
   d. Bay Delta/State Water Project Issues
   e. MET’s Ocean Desalination Policy and Potential Participation by MET in the Doheny Desalination Project and in the Huntington Beach Ocean Desalination Project (Poseidon Desalination Project)
   f. Orange County Reliability Projects
   g. East Orange County Feeder No. 2

   *Recommendation*: Discuss and provide input on information relative to the MET items of critical interest to Orange County.

5. **OTHER INPUT OR QUESTIONS ON MET ISSUES FROM THE MEMBER AGENCIES**

6. **METROPOLITAN (MET) BOARD AND COMMITTEE AGENDA DISCUSSION ITEMS**

   a. Summary regarding August MET Board Meeting
   b. Review items of significance for MET Board and Committee Agendas

   *Recommendation*: Review and discuss the information presented.

**CLOSED SESSION ITEMS**

7. **CONFERENCE WITH LEGAL COUNSEL – EXISTING LITIGATION**

   Pursuant to Paragraph (1) of subdivision (d) of Government Code Section 54956.9. One Case: San Diego County Water Authority v. Metropolitan Water District of Southern California; all persons interested in the validity of the rates adopted by the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California on April 13, 2010, et al., former Los Angeles Superior Court, Case No. BS 126888, transferred on October 21, 2010, to San Francisco Superior Court, Case No. CPF-10-510830.

8. **CONFERENCE WITH LEGAL COUNSEL – EXISTING LITIGATION**

   Pursuant to Paragraph (1) of subdivision (d) of Government Code 54956.9. One Case: San Diego County Water Authority v. Metropolitan Water District of Southern California; all persons interested in the validity of the rates adopted by the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California on April 10, 2012 to be Effective January 1, 2013 and January 1, 2014; and Does 1-10, et al., former Los Angeles Superior Court, Case No. BS137830, transferred on August 23, 2012, to San Francisco Superior Court, Case No. CPF-12-512466.
9. CONFERENCE WITH LEGAL COUNSEL – EXISTING LITIGATION
Pursuant to Paragraph (1) of subdivision (d) of Government Code Section 54956.9. One Case: San Diego County Water Authority v. Metropolitan Water District of Southern California; all persons interested in the validity of the rates adopted by the Metropolitan Water of Southern California on April 8, 2014, et al., former Los Angeles Superior Court, Case No. BC547139, transferred on December 2, 2014, to San Francisco Superior Court, Case No. CPF-14-514004.

ADJOURNMENT

Note: 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.
DISCUSSION ITEM
September 2, 2015

TO: Board of Directors

FROM: Robert Hunter
General Manager

Staff Contact: Harvey De La Torre

SUBJECT: Presentation by Metropolitan Water District’s General Manager Jeff Kightlinger

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends the Board of Directors review and discuss this information

REPORT

MWDOC staff has invited Metropolitan’s General Manager Jeff Kightlinger to provide an update on the following issues:

- Status update on the Bay-Delta EIR/EIS and California WaterFix
- MET/San Diego lawsuit status and next steps
- Key issues for next year’s Biennial Budget
- Status of updating MET’s Integrated Resource Plan
- Key agenda items for September’s MET Board meeting
DISCUSSION ITEM
September 2, 2015

TO: Board of Directors
FROM: Robert Hunter
General Manager
Staff Contact: Harvey De La Torre

SUBJECT: ORANGE COUNTY’S DROUGHT PERFORMANCE - JULY REPORT

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends the Board of Directors review and discuss this information

BACKGROUND

Per Governor Brown’s Executive Order calling for statewide mandatory water reductions for all urban water retail agencies, MWDOC staff will provide monthly performance reports for Orange County.

Although each Orange County retail agency was assigned a conservation standard by the State Water Resource Control Board (State Board) that ranges between 8% and 36%, the aggregated water savings target among all of the retail agencies in Orange County is approximately 21.73%.

For the first month of the State Board’s mandatory reduction, Orange County retail water agencies reported a total water saving of 23.86% for the month of June 2015 (note this is compared to June 2013 water usage). This exceed our Orange County month conservation target of 21.73% by 2.13%. This was mainly due to exceptionally aggressive water conservation campaigns by the water agencies in Orange County and Metropolitan Water District.

Due to a recorded amount of rainfall for the month of July, as a result of remenants of Hurricane Delores, we anticipate total water savings to meet or exceed our monthly conservation target. Unfortunately, at the time of preparing this Board memo the State Board has not release its numbers. They expect to release the retail water usage at their Board meeting on September 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budgeted (Y/N): n/a</th>
<th>Budgeted amount: n/a</th>
<th>Core <em>X</em></th>
<th>Choice ___</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action item amount: n/a</td>
<td>Line item:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fiscal Impact (explain if unbudgeted):
# O.C. Conservation Saving Goals

## Orange County Average = 22%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anaheim</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>Huntington Beach</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>Santa Ana</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brea</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>IRWD</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>SMWD</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buena Park</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>La Habra</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>Seal Beach</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOCWD</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>La Palma</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>Serrano WD</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETWD</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>LBCWD</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>South Coast WD</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fountain Valley</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>Mesa Water</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>Trabuco Canyon</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fullerton</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>MNWD</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>Tustin</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garden Grove</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>Newport Beach</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>Westminster</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS–Cowan Heights</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>Yorba Linda</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS–Placentia</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>San Clemente</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS-West Orange</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>SJ Capistrano</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
O.C. Water Savings Reported to SWRCB

Average Monthly Water Savings for Orange County (2014-15 Vs CY 2013)

Orange County Savings Goal 22%

Mandatory Restrictions in Place

PENDING

24.51%

23.86%

8.83%

Percent of AF Savings
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OC Historical June Water Usage

Average = 56,000 AF
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OC Historical July Water Usage

Average = 64,323 AF
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47,243 AF
Next Month

- Report the O.C. water savings from the SWRCB for the month of July
- Show MWDOC’s imported water usage for the month of July compared to their MET Imported Allocation
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 during the 1997-98 rainy season. Forecasters predict there is a greater than 90 percent chance that El Niño will continue in the Northern Hemisphere this winter.

June 1997  

July 2015

Warm water mass

Source: NASA Jet Propulsion Laboratory  
BAY AREA NEWS GROUP

Potential impact of El Niño
What is El Niño

Warmer than usual surface temperatures in the equatorial waters of the Pacific
Increased Hurricane activity along the West Coast

Typically wet conditions in Southern California

Unknown whether it would bring additional snowpack in Northern California and Colorado River Basin

What impact will it have on us?
Comparing to the 1997 El Niño

Current Year Compared to Strongest El Niño on Record

- Very Strong El Niño
- Average Temperature

Departure from Normal °C

Jan  Feb  Mar  Apr  May  Jun  Jul  Aug  Sep  Oct  Nov  Dec

1997  2015
Comparing to the 1997 El Niño

Strongest El Niño on Record

November 1997

Departure of average ocean temperature (°F)

-9 | 0 | +9

July 2015
TO: Board of Directors

FROM: Robert Hunter
General Manager

Staff Contact: Karl Seckel
Harvey De La Torre

SUBJECT: Status on Metropolitan’s 2015 Integrated Resources Plan (IRP)

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends the Board of Directors review and discuss this information

REPORT

The attached presentation is an overview of Metropolitan’s 2015 Integrated Resources Plan (IRP) Preliminary Findings of their current outlook of water supplies and demands. It was presented to MWD’s IRP Board Committee on August 18 as a “First Step” in identifying the water supply reliability gaps using only existing supplies. In other words, it is what our total water supplies could cover over the next 25 years if we did nothing more; relying only on existing and under construction projects: no Delta Fix, no additional local resource projects, and no additional active conservation measures. At the end MET staff did add objectives from the 2010 IRP to examine what improvements occur.

MWD included each key water supply’s projections over the next 25 years based on using only existing and under construction projects, and what are the probability of a shortage occurring under expected demands. This gap analysis revealed that the “do nothing” approach is not sustainable and the shortage probability and size will increase over time due to further the dependence on storage to help meet demands.

To help meet this supply gap, MWD ran the shortage probability under the scenario of what if we develop all of our 2010 IRP Target, such as achieving the 20% reduction in GPCD as a region by 2020, develop 100 TAF of additional local resources, implement near and long term Delta improvement (including the California WaterFix), and develop Dry-Year supply programs to ensure a filled a Colorado River Aqueduct. The results show the development of all of the 2010 IRP supply targets would dramatically mitigate shortages and provide enough supplies to meet future demands.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budgeted (Y/N): n/a</th>
<th>Budgeted amount: n/a</th>
<th>Core <em>X</em></th>
<th>Choice ___</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action item amount: n/a</td>
<td>Line item:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal Impact (explain if unbudgeted):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
However, although these numbers/analysis are preliminary, MWDOC staff have the following observations/concerns:

- There is a need to review demand projections, in light of the recent Governor’s mandatory water restrictions, to determine the estimated demands over the short and long term?
- How much do we rely on the near and long term Delta improvements?
- Groundwater sustainability need to be carefully evaluated, so we may better understand the need for MWD water for the long term sustainability of groundwater basins.
- Developing and timing of Local Projects appear to critical to the supply need.
- We need to assess the storage space in both local basins and in MWD’s various storage accounts, as well as the amount needed to refill them to protect against future dry periods.
1. MET IRP Information is PRELIMINARY - MWDOC staff is still reviewing the info.

2. The level of demands and “demand rebound” is a significant issue.

3. Understanding the need for MET water for the long term sustainability of groundwater basin operations is essential.

4. Realizing “benefits” of the California Fix beginning as early as 2020 is essential along with a Plan “B” if it doesn’t happen.

5. A lot of storage space needs refilling.
Conservation Savings*
Projected on 1990 Base Year

*Does not include conservation from Price Effect

Does Not include Active Investments after 2015-16

Conservation Savings* (Thousand Acre-Feet)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2030</th>
<th>2035</th>
<th>2040</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>636</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>696</td>
<td>716</td>
<td>746</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Calendar Year

0 100 200 300 400 500 600 700 800

45 KAF of Conservation

Active
Code Based
System Loss

*Active Investments after 2015-16*
Where will demands go?
Retail Demands Post-Conservation

Historical and Projected

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Calendar Year</th>
<th>2020 (Min)</th>
<th>2025 (Min)</th>
<th>2030 (Min)</th>
<th>2035 (Min)</th>
<th>2040 (Min)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Avg</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>4.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>4.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Range of Total Retail Demands (Million Acre-Feet)

- Historical Production
- Draft Adjusted Forecast Range
- 2015 IRP Draft Adjusted Forecast

Calendar Year

Total Range of Local Supplies

2015 IRP Draft Forecast

Does Not include New Projects

Total Range of Local Supplies (Million Acre-Feet)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Avg</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>2.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>2.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>2.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2035</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>2.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2040</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>2.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CRA Base Supply Programs

2015 IRP Draft Forecast

Does Not include New Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total CRA Base Supplies (Million Acre-Feet)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2035</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2040</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Calendar Year

- Lower Colorado WSP
- Southern Nevada
- PVID Minimum
- Canal Lining MWD

Total CRA Base Supplies

Basic Apportionment with Adjustments

- Canal Lining SDCWA
- IID-MWD
- IID-SDCWA

Southern Nevada Canal Lining

New Projects

Does Not Include New Projects
### Total Range of SWP Supplies (Million Acre-Feet)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2030</th>
<th>2035</th>
<th>2040</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Min</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SWP Existing Conveyance Scenario**

**Draft Forecast Table A + Article 21**

![Graph showing the total range of SWP supplies over time](chart)

- **Million Acre-Feet**
- **Calendar Year**
- **2016**
- **2020**
- **2024**
- **2028**
- **2032**
- **2036**
- **2040**
SWP Yield to MET Under Different Scenarios

- Alt 4 A = California Fix = 1.16 MAF
- 2015 DCR ECHO = 837 TAF, 15 cm sea rise + 2008 Biop
- 2015 DCR ELT = 1.16 MAF, 15 cm sea rise
- 2015 DCR Base Case = 1.18 MAF, no climate

Graph showing the likelihood of exceeding various water yields (in million acre-feet) for different scenarios.
State & Federal Project Supplies
Average Annual (million AF/yr)

- **Existing**
  - 4.9 maf
  - SWP-CVP Exports (million AF)

- **Record of Decision**
  - Collaborative Adaptive Management

- **No New Facilities Scenario**
  - 3.6 maf

- **Cal Water Fix**
  - 5.3 maf
  - 4.7 maf

---

*SWP & CVP water supply analysis; Includes effect of climate change; Data from BDCP Draft EIR/S*

- 4.9 – 4.6 maf/yr. – BDCP Record of Decision, collaborative adaptive management, with climate change
- 3.6 – 3.4 maf/yr. – BDCP proposed regulations without northern intake (Existing Conditions High Outflow Scenario); BDCP Chapter 9
- 4.7 – 5.3 maf/yr. – Cal Water Fix Alternative 4a, range of SWP/CVP supply improvements
DISCUSSION ITEM
September 2, 2015

TO: Board of Directors & MWD Directors
FROM: Robert J. Hunter    Staff Contact: Harvey De La Torre
       General Manager

SUBJECT: MWD Items Critical To Orange County

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends the Board of Directors to review and discuss this information.

SUMMARY

This report provides a brief update on the current status of the following key MWD issues that may affect Orange County:

a) MWD’s Water Supply Conditions
b) MWD’s Finance and Rate Issues
c) Colorado River Issues
d) Bay Delta/State Water Project Issues
e) MWD’s Ocean Desalination Policy and Potential Participation by MWD in the Doheny Desalination Project and in the Huntington Beach Ocean Desalination Project (Poseidon Desalination Project)
f) Orange County Reliability Projects

g) East Orange County Feeder No. 2
ISSUE BRIEF # A

SUBJECT:  MWD’s Water Supply Conditions

RECENT ACTIVITY

Water Supply and Demand Balance for 2015
Prior to water supply allocations going into effect July 1, 2015, MET provided the following table showing expected total water supply and demand balance for calendar year 2015:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MET Water Supply and Demand Balance for CY 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total SWP Supplies (20% Table “A”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total CRA Supplies (Does not include ICS or exchanges)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Base Supplies Available for CY 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Demand &amp; Losses for CY 2015 (Under WSAP level 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shortfall in Supplies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draw from Dry-Year Storage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Transfer/Exchanges</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With imported demands and losses totaling 1.96 MAF for CY 2015 and base supplies from the CRA and SWP totaling 1.307 MAF, MET estimated the need to draw 489,000 AF of dry-year storage and bring in 165,000 AF from transfers and exchanges.

However, based on the recent reductions in retail water usage in July and August, as result of the Governor’s call for mandatory water use restrictions, MET demands are currently tracking 20% lower than expected. Moreover, although we are still early in the year, these lower than expected demands and the talk of a strong El Nino bring above average precipitation in the fall and winter may not only help MET make up this water supply shortfall this year but potentially create the opportunity to place water into storage.
SUBJECT: MWD’s Finance and Rate Issues

RECENT ACTIVITY

MWD Financial Report
At Metropolitan (MWD) August’s Finance and Insurance Committee, MWD staff report that this fiscal year’s first month water sales through the end of July totaled 158,700 Acre-Feet (AF); or 40,200 AF (20%) lower than budget estimates. It is estimated that is will lower projected sale revenues by as much as $34.5 million. These lower water sales are a result of the Governor’s mandatory conservation targets. Preliminary estimates for August are also trending to be rough 20% lower than budget estimates.
SUBJECT: Colorado River Issues

RECENT ACTIVITY

Metropolitan Issues Maximum PVID Fallowing Call

On July 31, Metropolitan issued the maximum fallowing call allowed under the terms of the Palo Verde Irrigation District (PVID)-Metropolitan land management and crop rotation program. That call will continue the fallowing of about 26,000 acres in the Palo Verde Valley, which represents about 29 percent of the Palo Verde Valley’s total irrigable acreage, and will generate about 130,000 acre-feet of water for Metropolitan during the contract year (August 1, 2016 through July 31, 2017). The fallowing call follows the maximum call that was made a year ago to increase fallowing on August 1, 2015. (Per the terms of the program, fallowing calls are made on July 31 of each year one year in advance of when fallowing occurs.) The 35-year program allows for a total of 10 maximum fallowing calls to be made; according to MWD, July’s call represents the sixth time the maximum fallowing call has been made in the program.

Metropolitan Finalized its Land Purchase in the Palo Verde Valley

MWD recently finalized negotiations of its purchase of 12,782 acres in the Palo Verde Valley from Verbena, LLC. Together with the approximately 8,000 acres of land MWD acquired from San Diego Gas & Electric Company in 2001, MWD now owns more than 20,000 acres in the Palo Verde Irrigation District, which represents about 20 percent of the total land in the lower Palo Verde Valley.

MWD staff will work with its Board to develop a land management plan early next year that will guide future actions regarding its lands. For the short term, MWD will work with the farmers currently irrigating the land until a longer-term plan for the land has been developed.

Wet Conditions Continue in the Colorado River Basin

Following a dry winter and spring, May, June, and July all saw well above average rainfall in the Upper Colorado River Basin, which significantly increased the projected inflow into Lake Powell this year. On May 1, 2015 the Lake Powell spring inflow projection was 3 million acre-feet, or 42 percent of average, and shortages on the Colorado River were anticipated as early as next year. Following three wet months, however, the final spring inflow total of 6.7 million acre-feet was more than double the May 2015 projection, ending up at 94 percent of average. With the increased water in Lake Powell and Lake Mead, the risk of shortages on the Colorado River has been pushed out at least two years. The improved hydrology has helped Metropolitan to implement interstate water supply programs in 2015, and will also provide additional water management opportunities over the next several years, if needed.
ISSUE BRIEF # D

SUBJECT: Bay Delta/State Water Project Issues

RECENT ACTIVITY

Bay Delta Conservation Plan

The Bay Delta Conservation Plan (BDCP)/"California WaterFix" Partially Recirculated Draft Environmental Impact Report/Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (RDEIR/SDEIS) was released to the public on July 10. The RDEIR/SDEIS was prepared by the lead agencies (California Department of Water Resources (DWR) and U.S. Bureau of Reclamation (USBR)) to provide the public and interested agencies an opportunity to review engineering refinements made to the water conveyance facilities; to introduce new sub-alternatives: Alternatives 4A (California WaterFix), 2D and 5A; to explore alternative regulatory permitting approaches; and to include updated environmental analyses that in part were conducted in response to issues raised in the more than 12,000 comments received on the December 2013 Public Draft BDCP EIR/EIS. Alternative 4A is the new Preferred Alternative, replacing Alternative 4 (the proposed BDCP). Alternative 4A includes the modified water conveyance design, habitat actions limited to mitigation of the conveyance only (approximately 15,600 acres), and embodies a new regulatory approach for gaining necessary authorizations under the California Endangered Species Act (CESA) and Federal Endangered Species Act (ESA). The public comment period started July 10, and due to the 60-day extension announced on July 22, concludes on October 30, 2015. Metropolitan staff is currently reviewing the revised environmental documents for consistency with their adopted Board policies and will be working jointly with other State Water Project (SWP)/Central Valley Project (CVP) public water agencies and the member agencies, including MWDOC to prepare comments.

State Water Resources Control Board

Due to dry conditions in the Delta, the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) has issued several curtailment notices directing water diverters in the Delta watershed to cease diversions. These curtailment notices were issued for all Term 91 and pre- and post-1914 water rights (on or after 1903) in the Sacramento-San Joaquin River watershed and Delta. On July 15, the SWRCB partially rescinded and reissued a water supply availability notice to more than 4,600 holders of over 9,300 junior and senior water rights to clarify that although previous notices were only advisory, diverting water where none is legally available could result in significant penalties. In response to a recent Sacramento Superior Court ruling, the re-issued notice clarifies the following: (1) based on supply and demand information available to the Board, water is unavailable to serve the priority of rights identified in the notices; (2) there is no order to stop taking water, but diversions when there is no available water for groups of diverters under their priority of rights are unauthorized and subject to enforcement; and (3) water right holders may voluntarily provide information about any domestic water system directives for consideration. The SWRCB emphasized that the recent court ruling explicitly upheld the SWRCB’s authority to enforce the Water
Code. Multiple cases challenging the curtailment notices were filed by senior water right holders in June and July raising issues that include due process, SWRCB jurisdiction and water availability.

Also the State Water Contractors (SWC) filed a complaint on June 16, 2015, requesting the SWRCB take action to protect SWP reservoir releases from unauthorized diversions of stored project water in the Delta. These unauthorized diversions by water diverters south of the San Joaquin River threaten to increase the burden on limited stored water supplies, affecting both the environment and other water users. The SWC is requesting that the SWRCB issue an order requiring diverters south of the San Joaquin River to stop unauthorized diversion of project storage water. Metropolitan staff met with SWRCB members, staff, and other interested parties regarding the complaint. Staff continues to prepare for future hearings and/or workshops with the SWRCB as well as possible lawsuits.
SUBJECT: MWD’s Ocean Desalination Policy and Potential Participation by MWD in the Doheny Desal Project (formerly South Orange Coastal Ocean Desalination Project) and in the Huntington Beach Ocean Desalination Project (Poseidon Desalination Project)

RECENT ACTIVITY

Doheny Desalination Project
Work continues under the MET Foundational Action Plan. The groundwater modeling reports on both the use of vertical extraction wells for the San Juan Basin Authority Project and the slant well intake for the Doheny Ocean desalination project are being issued and will be discussed at the September 8 San Juan Basin Authority meeting. The technical work will help to provide the understanding of how the projects can best be designed to work together. With the results starting to arrive, MWDOC is now working with NWRI to convene a Science Advisory Panel to review and comment on both the work being done by SJBA as well as the work being done by South Coast Water District and Laguna Beach County Water District. The panel is expected to convene in October or November and complete their report by the end of the year.

Huntington Beach Ocean Desalination Project (Poseidon Project)
OCWD has continued work on evaluating where the product water produced from the Poseidon Project would be utilized, either for the seawater barrier operations, injection or replenishment in the groundwater basin, for direct delivery to other agencies or some combination thereof. OCWD will be setting up a meeting with the South County Agencies to discuss potential delivery amounts from the Poseidon Project.
SUBJECT: Orange County Reliability Projects

RECENT ACTIVITY

Central Pool Augmentation Program

There are no updates to report.

Orange County Water Reliability Study

At the August meeting of the Workgroup, the topic centered on estimating future levels of demands in the County, taking into account where we are at today and projecting a continuing strong water use efficiency ethic. Quite a bit of the discussion centered on how much demands would “bounce back” following the drought we are in with numerous positions being expounded. It was suggested we look to the bounce back from other drought events in Southern California and also look to Australia for what they experienced following their millennial drought. The level of demands is critical to the study effort.

The Member Agencies also reviewed the Planning Scenarios being used for the GAP analysis and examined some of the modeling intricacies to focus on understanding how the model works to evaluate future demands and supplies from the various sources. Information from MET’s IRP was also discussed.

The group began discussing a three part roll-out of the work over September, October and November and the Phase 2 work that could begin as early as December. The initial phase of work was designed to estimate the supply GAPS and projects that could fill the supply GAPS, whether they be projects from MET or projects developed from within OC or by OC agencies. The Phase 2 work would allow additional work on alternatives by incorporating project portfolios into the model developed in Phase 1. The Phase 2 work would also provide additional information on the costs of alternatives. The schematic below provides an overview of the Phase 1 and 2 efforts.
Study Objective

Phase 1

- Estimate Supply & System GAP difference in projected demands and existing (planned) supplies
- Summarize New MET & OC Supply Projects & Policy Considerations

Phase 2

- Test New MET Options based on MET’s IRP
- Test New OC Options based on OC Reliability Study

Develop Portfolios of MET & OC Supply Options and develop information on:
- Reliability benefits (supply & system)
- Net present value (reflecting MET costs, local costs, costs of shortages)

This will not be done for only one set of planning assumptions, but rather a whole suite of planning scenarios
SUBJECT: East Orange County Feeder No. 2

RECENT ACTIVITY

Use of East Orange County Feeder No. 2 for Conveyance of Groundwater and Poseidon Water

Several discussions were held with MET, however, no NEW information came out of those discussions.
COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS

None (Agenda Item 5C)

FINANCE AND INSURANCE COMMITTEE

Adopted the resolution finding that continuing an Ad Valorem Property Tax rate at the rate levied for FY 2014/15 is essential to the fiscal integrity of the district and suspending the Ad Valorem Tax Rate restriction; and adopted the resolution levying taxes for the fiscal year Commencing July 1, 2015 and ending June 30, 2016 for the purposes of The Metropolitan Water District of Southern California maintaining the tax rate at .0035% of assessed valuation (exclusive of annexation levies), the same rate levied in FY 2014/15. (Agenda Item 5G-2)

ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS COMMITTEE

 Appropriated $17.7 million; awarded $10,267,000 contract to Kiewit Infrastructure West Co. for chemical feed upgrades at the F. E. Weymouth Water Treatment Plant; awarded $371,800 contract to O’Connell Engineering & Construction, Inc. for scrubber platform improvements; and authorized agreement with Lee & Ro, Inc. in an amount not to exceed $364,000. (Approps. 15392, 15472, & 15477) (Agenda Item 8-1)

 Appropriated $4.9 million; and awarded $2,998,000 contract to Kiewit Infrastructure West Co. for seismic retrofit of the Upper Feeder’s Santa Ana River Bridge. (Approp. 15441) (Agenda Item 8-2)

WATER PLANNING & STEWARDSHIP COMMITTEE

Authorized the General Manager to enter into an amendment to the 2007 California Agreement for the Creation and Delivery of Extraordinary Conservation Intentionally Created Surplus. (Agenda Item 8-3)

COMMUNICATIONS AND LEGISLATION COMMITTEE

Approved federal drought legislative priorities as set forth in the board letter with minor revisions to the language regarding (1) protection of local supplies, (2) emphasis on the use of sound and unbiased science, and (3) recognition that an adaptive management and collaborative science-based approach may promote both co-equal goals of protecting water supply and the environment, including measures under the state and federal Endangered Species Acts. (Agenda Item 8-4)

CONSENT CALENDAR

In other action, the Board:

 Appropriated $480,000; and awarded $345,305 contract to F. M. Thomas Air Conditioning, Inc. to replace the Administration Building HVAC system at the Skinner Water Treatment Plant. (Agenda Item 7-1)
Appropriated $1.24 million; and awarded $930,483 contract to Coleman Construction, Inc. for upgrades to the network rooms at Metropolitan’s Headquarters Building at Union Station. (Approp. 15487) (Agenda Item 7-2)

Adopted the resolution authorizing the Chair, in consultation with the Board and the General Manager as time permits, to cast, directly or by proxy, Metropolitan’s votes in Palo Verde Irrigation District elections. (Agenda Item 7-3)

OTHER MATTERS:

In other action, the Board:

Adopted resolution in support for the nomination of Kathleen Tiegs, a member of the board of directors of the Cucamonga Valley Water District, for the office of president of the Association of California Water Agencies. (Agenda Item 5E)

Adopted motion to adjourn the September Board meeting to September 22, 2015, due to the Labor Day holiday. (Committees to meet on September 21 and 22, 2015 and Executive Committee to meet on September 29, 2015). (Agenda Item 5F)

Discussed results of Department Head Performance Evaluations. (Agenda Item 10-1)

Discussed Department Head Salary Survey. (Agenda Item 10-2) (Postponed)

Discussed compensation recommendation for General Manager, General Counsel, General Auditor and Ethics Officer. (Agenda Item 10-3) (Postponed)

THIS INFORMATION SHOULD NOT BE CONSIDERED THE OFFICIAL MINUTES OF THE MEETING.

Board letters related to the items in this summary are generally posted in the Board Letter Archive approximately one week after the board meeting. In order to view them and their attachments, please copy and paste the following into your browser http://edmsidm.mwdh2o.com/idmweb/home.asp.