ELECTED OFFICIALS FORUM
Municipal Water District of Orange County
November 2, 2017

AGENDA
- California WaterFix
- Regional Water Supply & Storage
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California WaterFix

2 Main Tunnels
- 30 miles long
- 40’ diameter
- Up to 150’ Deep

North Tunnels
- 13.5 miles long
- 28’-40’ diameter

3 Intakes
- Sacramento River

New Pumping Plant
- SWP & CVP Service
Stormwater Capture
“Big Gulp & Little Sip”

To ensure adequate Delta flows for water quality and fish, Sacramento River exports are restricted based on many factors.

**Example Sacramento River Flows and North Delta Diversions**

**Wet Year Example**
- 64,000 cfs (Jan. 21, 2006)
- Maximum Diversion: 9,000 cfs

**9,000 CFS Diversion Cap**
A maximum possible diversion of 9,000 cfs is reached at river flows of 30.571 cfs under proposed operations.

**Dry Year Example**
- 6,400 cfs (Jan. 21, 2009)
- Maximum Diversion: 384 cfs

*Depending on water year type and fish presence
**9,000 cfs is the maximum diversion allowed, starting when the river is at 35,000 cfs.

Sacramento River Flows (CFS)

- 64,000
- 35,000
- 20,000
- 15,000
- 9,000
- 5,000

Maximum Diversions (CFS)

- Diverted: 9,000
- Diverted: 1,600 - 7,000
- Diverted: 900 - 3,000
- Diverted: 0 - 540
- No Diversion

Metropolitan Process

- **Metropolitan Staff Recommendation**
  - Authorize Participation
    - 25.9% of Total Project Cost ($4.4 billion)
  - Design & Construction JPA
  - Finance JPA

- **Board Vote Results**
  - Support – 69%
  - Oppose - 22%
  - Abstain – 8%

- **MWD White Papers**
  - Infrastructure
  - Operations
  - Finance
    - $2-3 per month (20-ys)
  - Q&A

- **Transparent Process**
  - Public Comment
  - Committee Meetings
  - Public Board Workshop
  - Board Meeting
**Cost Allocation**

- 250+ Users
- 29 Contractors

**State Water Project (SWP) & Central Valley Project (CVP)**

**SWP Infrastructure**
- 700 miles of canals, pipelines and tunnels spanning from Lake Oroville to Lake Perris in Riverside County
- 21 dams & reservoirs, 10 power plants with 2,991 MW capacity
- 4.23 million acre feet (MAF) contracted water
- Annual deliveries of 2.4 MAF
- 6.5 billion kilowatt hours of electricity (~2.3 million people)

**CVP Infrastructure**
- 400 miles, from the Cascade Mountains to the Tehachapi Mountains near Bakersfield
- 20 dams & reservoirs, 11 power plants, 500 miles of major canals
- 9.5 MAF contracted water
- Annual deliveries of 7 MAF
- 5.6 billion kilowatt hours of electricity (~2 million people)
State Water Project (SWP) vs Central Valley Project (CVP)

- **State Water Project (SWP)**
  - AF cost varies based on allocation – Fixed Payment
  - All pay share beneficiaries
  - 29 Contractors

- **Central Valley Project (CVP)**
  - Fixed AF cost of Water - Volumetric based water rate
  - Opt-in participants pay
  - 250+ Users
  - 270+ Contracts

State Water Contractor Support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Voted to Support CWF¹</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zone 7 Water Agency</td>
<td>Sep 20</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mojave Water Agency</td>
<td>Sep 28</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Gorgonio Pass Water Agency</td>
<td>Oct 2</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desert Water Agency</td>
<td>Oct 3</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Bernardino Valley MWD</td>
<td>Oct 3</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crestline-Lake Arrowhead WA</td>
<td>Oct 5</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coachella Valley Water District</td>
<td>Oct 10</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Water District</td>
<td>Oct 10</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castaic Lake Water Agency</td>
<td>Oct 11</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alameda County Water District</td>
<td>Oct 12</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kern County Water Agency</td>
<td>Oct 12</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara Valley Water District</td>
<td>Oct 17</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Many other State Water Project Contractors are not taking explicit action to their boards, but would anticipate cost responsibility under their existing SWP contract with the state, along with existing opportunities under the contract to manage their supply and costs through water transfers, banking, and exchanges.

+ 88% of share committed
CVP Subscription Issues

- Different Levels of Reliability (Priority System)
  1. San Joaquin River Exchange & Refuge Contract Users
  2. Municipal & Industrial Users
  3. Agricultural Users

- Different Supply Costs in Different Areas
  - A number of “Non-Reimbursable” Federal Expenditures
  - No interest payments on Reclamation Projects in the CVP
  - Results in low water supply ~$100-150/AF

- Impacts of Exempt Users on Cost Allocations
  - Exchange & Refuge Users
  - +50% cost shift of the Fix to remaining Contractors

- Lack of Leadership to bring all of the parties together
  - Bureau of Reclamation Confirmation
  - Friant Water Authority Board Resolution – Willingness to participate at apportioned share of benefits received

California WaterFix Issues

- One Tunnel vs. Two Tunnels
  - Big Gulp Consequences
  - Flow Reversal (15,000-9,000-4,500 cfs)
  - 3,000 cfs Proposal
  - Environmental Permitting Delay (Death?)

- Cost Allocation for Metropolitan
  - $2-$3/household/month @ 26% share
  - Desalination @ $5/household/month
    - Met could double it’s share (52%)

- Cost-effective Solution
  - 440 TAF Annually to MWD Service Area
Other Decisions & Next Steps

Next Steps:
- Continue discussions on mutually beneficial arrangements
- Negotiate with interested State Water Contractors on costs and benefits
- Develop terms that can enhance regional water supply benefits
- Potential future MWD Board actions
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Regional Water Supply

- Metropolitan Storage Levels
- Cyclic Storage & In Lieu Programs
- Oroville Progress & Impacts
- Winter Predictions

MWD Storage Levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Emergency Storage</th>
<th>Dry Year Storage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

End of Calendar Year

+ 1 MAF
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MWD Storage Levels

MWD Historical Demand VS Supplies

MWD Storage Levels

2017-18 In Lieu Operations

2017-18 In-Lieu Operations

2017-18 In Lieu Operations

2017-18 In-Lieu Operations
Oroville Spillway Update

Lake Oroville Spillway Timeline

- February 7th 2017 – DWR employees discover large area of concrete erosion.
- February 11th 2017 – Water elevation @ 901 Feet - Flow spilling via emergency spillway.
- February 12th 2017 – Erosion progressing faster than expected at the base of the emergency spillway. Flows in the main spillway increased to 100,000 CFS.
- February 20, 2017 – Lake elevation drops to 849 feet and crews begin to prep for repairs.
- May 19, 2017 – Main Spillway flow stopped. Spillway concrete demolition begins.
Oroville Spillway Update

May 26, 2017

October 30, 2017

Winter Predictions

Mike Halpert, Deputy Director
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
Climate Prediction Center

“There’s no way to say if you’ll be on the wet side or the dry side in California. Plan for it all.”
Lake Oroville Operations Plan

2017-2018

1,218 TAF
(34% capacity)
(57% normal)
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SDCWA v. MWDSC Lawsuits

Series of 5 Water Rate Lawsuits filed by the San Diego County Water Authority against the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California over 7 years

- Some Raise Different Legal Issues
- Schedules may differ
- Court venues may differ
- Progression in Courts differ

California Court System

Supreme Court

Appeals Court

Superior Court

Superior Court
**Series of Water Rate Lawsuits**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>SWP Transportation Costs, Prop 26, Stewardship Rate, Preferential Rights&lt;br&gt;Superior, Appeal, Supreme declined Review, Remanded to Superior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Same as 2010&lt;br&gt;Superior, Appeal, Supreme declined Review, Remanded to Superior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Same as 2010 &amp; 2012 Cases&lt;br&gt;Stayed Pending Appeal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Essentially Entire Rate Structure &amp; Process – Stewardship Rate Issue&lt;br&gt;Stayed Pending Appeal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Serial to 2016 - Update of the Capacity &amp; Readiness-to-Serve Charges&lt;br&gt;Stayed Pending Appeal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Rulings in 2010 & 2012 Lawsuits**

- **MWD Fact Sheet Handout (18 Key Rulings)**
  - Box Score: MWD = 7, SDCWA = 6, N/A = 5<br>- or – SDCWA = 9, MWD = 1
  - Not All Rulings Are Equal

- **Appellate Decision – “The central issue in dispute is one of cost allocation”**
  - Superior Court - SDCWA awarded $235 million (including interest)
  - Appeals Court – reduced award by at least $200 million
  - Remanded back to Superior Court
  - Question of Prevailing Party for Court & Attorney Fees

- **Rate Integrity Clause (i.e., LRP) & Stewardship Rate**
SDCWA v. MWDSC Lawsuits

Going Forward
- 2010-2012 Remand Proceedings
- 2014 Lawsuit
- 2016 & 2017 Lawsuit
- MWDOC’s Olive Branch Letter
- MWDOC & SDCWA
  - Correspondence
  - Initial Meeting
  - Settlement Discussions (?)
- 2018 Budget & Rates
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MWDOC Budget Process

- Schedule Changes
  - One month earlier
- CHOICE Budget Schedule
  - April Estimated
  - August Revised

Proposed Budget Process

- One Month Shift Earlier
- Deadlines for Estimates, Review, CHOICE Budget Commitments, Reconciliations
- Budget passed in April
- Revised CHOICE Budget in September
MWDOC Budget Process

- Schedule Changes
  - One month earlier
- CHOICE Budget Schedule
  - April Estimated
  - September Revised
- Reserve Balance Framework
  - Reserve Neutral Policy
- CalPERS Liability - $2.2 million
  - Funding policy & schedule
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Q&A