5750 Almaden Expressway, San Jose, CA 95118-3614 | (408) 265-2600 | www.valleywater.org

Santa Clara Valley Water District

March 30, 2017

MEETING NOTICE & REQUEST FOR RSVP

TO: SANTA CLARA VALLEY WATER COMMISSION

Municipality	Representative	Alternate
City of Campbell	Hon. Jeffrey Cristina	Hon. Susan M. Landry
City of Cupertino	Hon. Steven Scharf	Hon. Darcy Paul
City of Gilroy	Hon. Peter Leroe-Muñoz	Hon. Roland Velasco
City of Los Altos	Hon. Lynette Lee Eng	Hon. Mary Prochnow
Town of Los Altos Hills	Hon. Courtenay Corrigan	Vacant
Town of Los Gatos	Hon. Barbara Spector	Hon. Steve Leonardis
City of Milpitas	Hon. Garry Barbadillo	Nina Hawk
City of Monte Sereno	Hon. Evert Wolsheimer	Hon. Burton Craig
City of Morgan Hill	Hon. Rich Constantine	Hon. Larry Carr
City of Mountain View	Hon. Lisa Matichak	Hon. Lenny Siegel
City of Palo Alto	Hon. Adrian Fine	Hon. Tom DuBois
City of San Jose	Hon. Lan Diep	Kerrie Romanow
City of Santa Clara	Hon. Debi Davis	Hon. Patrick Kolstad
City of Saratoga	Hon. Rishi Kumar	Hon. Howard Miller
City of Sunnyvale	Hon. Nancy Smith	Hon. Larry Klein
Santa Clara County Board of Supervisors	Hon. Mike Wasserman	Hon. Cindy Chavez
Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District	Hon. Yoriko Kishimoto	Hon. Jed Cyr
Santa Clara County Open Space Authority	Hon. Mike Flaugher	Hon. Kalvin Gill

The regular meeting of the Santa Clara Valley Water Commission is scheduled to be held on Wednesday**, April 12, 2017, at 12:00 p.m.,** in the Headquarters Building Boardroom, located at the Santa Clara Valley Water District, 5700 Almaden Expressway, San Jose, California. Lunch will be provided.

Enclosed are the meeting agenda and corresponding materials. Please bring this packet with you to the meeting. Additional copies of this meeting packet are available on-line at http://www.valleywater.org/About/WaterCommission.aspx

A majority of the appointed membership is required to constitute a quorum, which is fifty percent plus one. A quorum for this meeting must be confirmed at least 48 hours prior to the scheduled meeting date or it will be canceled.

Further, a quorum must be present on the day of the scheduled meeting to call the meeting to order and take action on agenda items.
Members with two or more consecutive unexcused absences will be subject to rescinded membership.

Please confirm your attendance **no later than Monday, April 10, 2017; noon** by contacting Vicki Elam at 1-408-630-3056, or velam@valleywater.org.

Enclosures

Santa Clara Valley Water District - Headquarters Building, 5700 Almaden Expressway, San Jose, CA 95118



From Oakland:

- Take 880 South to 85 South
- Take 85 South to Almaden Expressway exit
- Turn left on Almaden Plaza Way
- Turn right (south) on Almaden Expressway
- At Via Monte (third traffic light), make a U-turn
- Proceed north on Almaden Expressway approximately 1,000 feet
- Turn right (east) into the campus entrance

From Morgan Hill/Gilroy:

- Take 101 North to 85 North
- Take 85 North to Almaden Expressway exit
- Turn left on Almaden Expressway
- Cross Blossom Hill Road
- At Via Monte (third traffic light), make a U-turn
- Proceed north on Almaden Expressway approximately 1,000 feet
- Turn right (east) into the campus entrance

From Sunnyvale:

- Take Highway 87 South to 85 North
- Take Highway 85 North to Almaden Expressway exit
- Turn left on Almaden Expressway
- At Via Monte (third traffic light), make a U-turn
- Proceed north on Almaden Expressway approximately 1,000 feet
- Turn right (east) into the campus entrance

From San Francisco:

- Take 280 South to Highway 85 South
- Take Highway 85 South to Almaden Expressway exit
- Turn left on Almaden Plaza Way
- Turn right (south) on Almaden Expressway
- At Via Monte (third traffic light), make a U-turn
- Proceed north on Almaden Expressway approximately 1,000 feet
- Turn right (east) into the campus entrance

From Downtown San Jose:

- Take Highway 87 - Guadalupe Expressway South
- Exit on Santa Teresa Blvd.
- Turn right on Blossom Hill Road
- Turn left at Almaden Expressway
- At Via Monte (first traffic light), make a U-turn
- Proceed north on Almaden Expressway approximately 1,000 feet
- Turn right (east) into the campus entrance

From Walnut Creek, Concord and East Bay areas:

- Take 680 South to 280 North
- Exit Highway 87-Guadalupe Expressway South
- Exit on Santa Teresa Blvd.
- Turn right on Blossom Hill Road
- Turn left at Almaden Expressway
- At Via Monte (third traffic light), make a U-turn
- Proceed north on Almaden Expressway approximately 1,000 feet
- Turn right (east) into the campus entrance

This Page Intentionally Left Blank

Santa Clara Valley Water District

Commission Officers
Hon. Yoriko Kishimoto, Chair
Hon. Rishi Kumar, Vice Chair

Board Representative
Barbara Keegan, Board Alternate
Richard P. Santos, Board Representative
John L. Varela, Board Representative

AGENDA

SANTA CLARA VALLEY WATER COMMISSION

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 12, 2017

12:00 p.m. – 2:00 p.m.

Santa Clara Valley Water District
Headquarters Building Boardroom
5700 Almaden Expressway
San Jose, CA 95118

Time Certain:
12:00 p.m.

1. Call to Order/Roll Call

2. Time Open for Public Comment on Any Item Not on Agenda
Comments should be limited to two minutes. If the Commission wishes to discuss a subject raised by the speaker, it can request placement on a future agenda.

3. Approval of Minutes
3.1 Approval of Minutes – January 25, 2017, meeting

4. Action Items
4.1 Review and Comment to the Board on the Fiscal Year 2017-18 Proposed Groundwater Production Charges (Darin Taylor)
Recommendation: Discuss and consider the attached proposed groundwater production charges and provide comment to the Board on policy implementation, as necessary.

4.2 Presentation on the 2017 Water Supply Master Plan Update (Tracy Hemmeter)
Recommendation: This is an information only item and no action is required.

4.3 Review Santa Clara Valley Water Commission Work Plan, the Outcomes of Board Action of Commission Requests and the Commission's Next Meeting Agenda (Commission Chair)
Recommendation: Review the Board-approved Commission work plan to guide the committee's discussions regarding policy alternatives and implications for Board deliberation.

5. Clerk Review and Clarification of Commission Requests to the Board
This is a review of the Commission*'s Requests, to the Board (from Item 4). The Commission may also request that the Board approve future agenda items for Commission discussion.*

6. **Reports**

Directors, Managers, and Commission members may make brief reports and/or announcements on their activities. Unless a subject is specifically listed on the agenda, the Report is for information only and not discussion or decision. Questions for clarification are permitted.

6.1 Director's Report
6.2 Manager's Report
6.3 Commission Member Reports

7. **Adjourn:** Adjourn to next regularly scheduled meeting on Wednesday, **July 26, 2017,** at 12:00 p.m., in the Headquarters Building Boardroom, 5700 Almaden Expressway, San Jose, CA 95118

All public records relating to an open session item on this agenda, which are not exempt from disclosure pursuant to the California Public Records Act, that are distributed to a majority of the legislative body will be available for public inspection at the Office of the Clerk of the Board at the Santa Clara Valley Water District Headquarter Building, 5700 Almaden Expressway, San Jose, CA., 95118, at the same time that the public records are distributed or made available to the legislative body.

The Santa Clara Valley Water District will make reasonable efforts to accommodate persons with disabilities wishing to attend commission meetings. Please advise the Clerk of the Board office of any special needs by calling 1-408-630-2277.

Santa Clara Valley Water Commission's Purpose and Duties

The Santa Clara Valley Water Commission of the Santa Clara Valley Water District is established to assist the Board of Directors (Board) with policies pertaining to water supply, flood protection and environmental stewardship in the areas of interest to Santa Clara County and the Towns and Cities therein.

The specific duties are:

- Prepare policy alternatives
- Provide comment on activities in the implementation of the District's mission
- Produce and present to the Board an Annual Accomplishments Report that provides a synopsis of the annual discussions and actions.

In carrying out these duties, Commission members bring to the District their respective expertise and the interests of the communities they represent. In addition, Commissioners may help the Board produce the link between the District and the public through information sharing to the communities they represent.

SANTA CLARA VALLEY WATER COMMISSION MEETING

DRAFT MINUTES

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 25, 2017
12:00 PM

(Paragraph numbers coincide with agenda item numbers)

A rescheduled meeting of the Santa Clara Valley Water Commission was held on January 25, 2017, in the Headquarters Building Boardroom, located at the Santa Clara Valley Water District, 5700 Almaden Expressway, San Jose, California.

1. CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

Vice Chair Hon. Yoriko Kishimoto called the meeting to order at 12:05 p.m.

Members in attendance were:

Municipality	Representative	Alternate
City of Campbell	Hon. Jeffrey Cristina	
City of Cupertino	Hon. Steve Schraf	
City of Gilroy	Hon. Peter Leroe-Muñoz	Hon. Roland Velasco
Town of Los Gatos	Hon. Barbara Spector	
City of Milpitas	Hon. Garry Barbadillo	
Town of Monte Sereno	Hon. Evert Wolsheimer	
City of Morgan Hill	Hon. Rich Constantine	
City of Mountain View	Hon. Lenny Siegel	
City of Palo Alto	Hon. Adrian Fine	
City of San José	Hon. Lan Diep*	
City of Santa Clara	Hon. Debi Davis	
City of Saratoga	Hon. Rishi Kumar	
City of Sunnyvale		John Stufflebean
County of Santa Clara	Hon. Mike Wasserman	
Santa Clara Open Space Authority	Hon. Mike Flaugher	
Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District	Hon. Yoriko Kishimoto	

Members not in attendance were:

Municipality	Representative	Alternate
City of Campbell		Hon. Susan M. Landry
City of Cupertino		Hon. Darcy Paul
City of Los Altos	Hon. Lynette Lee Eng	Hon. Mary Prochnow
Town of Los Gatos		Hon. Steve Leonardis
City of Milpitas		Nina Hawk
Town of Monte Sereno		Hon. Burton Craig
City of Morgan Hill		Hon. Larry Carr
City of Mountain View	Chris Clark	
City of Palo Alto		Hon. Tom DuBois
City of San José		Kerrie Romanow
City of Santa Clara		Hon. Patrick Kolstad
City of Saratoga		Hon. Howard Miller
County of Santa Clara		Hon. Cindy Chavez
Santa Clara Open Space Authority		Hon. Kalvin Gill
Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District		Hon. Jed Cyr

*Commission Members arrived as noted.

Board members in attendance were: Director Barbara Keegan and Director John Varela, Board Representatives and Director Gary Kremen, Board Alternate.

Staff members in attendance were: Glenna Brambill, Norma Camacho, Jerry De La Piedra, Jim Fiedler, Rachael Gibson, Garth Hall, and Darin Taylor.

2. TIME OPEN FOR PUBLIC COMMENT ON ANY ITEM NOT ON AGENDA

There was no one present who wished to speak.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

It was moved by Hon. Mike Wasserman, seconded by Hon. Debi Davis, and by majority vote carried, to approve the October 26, 2016, Santa Clara Valley Water Commission meeting minutes, as presented. There were five that abstained, Hon. Adrian Fine, Hon. Rishi Kumar, Hon. Peter Leroe-Muñoz, Hon. Lenny Siegel and Hon. Barbara Spector.

4. ELECTION OF CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR

It was moved by Hon. Rishi Kumar, seconded by Hon. Barbara Spector, and unanimously carried to elect Hon. Yoriko Kishimoto as the Chair for 2017.

It was moved by Hon. Lenny Siegel, seconded by Hon. Mike Wasserman, and by majority vote, to elect Hon. Rishi Kumar as the Vice Chair for 2017. One nay vote by Hon. Jeffrey Cristina.

5. ACTION ITEMS

5.1 REVIEW AND APPROVE 2016 ANNUAL ACCOMPLISHMENTS REPORT FOR PRESENTATION TO THE BOARD

Chair Hon. Yoriko Kishimoto and Ms. Glenna Brambill reviewed the materials as outlined in the agenda item.

It was moved by Hon. Peter Leroe-Muñoz, seconded by Hon. Mike Wasserman, and unanimously carried to approve the 2016 Annual Accomplishments Report for presentation to the Board.

*Hon. Lan Diep arrived at 12:18 p.m.

5.2 WATER SUPPLY UPDATE AND DROUGHT RESPONSE

Mr. Garth Hall and Mr. Jerry De La Piedra reviewed the materials as outlined in the agenda item.

Hon. Rishi Kumar, Hon. Mike Wasserman, Hon. Garry Barbadillo, Hon. Mike Flaugher, Hon. Yoriko Kishimoto, Hon. Rich Constantine, Hon. Lenny Siegel, spoke to this agenda item.

Mr. Jim Fiedler, Directors Barbara Keegan, Gary Kremen, John Varela and Mr. John Tang, of San Jose Water Company were available to answer questions.

No action was taken.

Mr. John Stufflebean left at 1:03 p.m. and did not return.

5.3 REVIEW AND COMMENT TO THE BOARD ON THE FISCAL YEAR 2018 PRELIMINARY GROUNDWATER PRODUCTION CHARGES

Mr. Darin Taylor reviewed the materials as outlined in the agenda item.

Hon. Rishi Kumar, Hon. Yoriko Kishimoto, and Hon. Garry Barbadillo, spoke to this agenda item.

Ms. Norma Camacho, Mr. Jim Fiedler and Director Gary Kremen were available to answer questions.

No action was taken.

Hon. Mike Wasserman left at 1:44 p.m. and did not return.

5.4. REVIEW SANTA CLARA VALLEY WATER COMMISSION WORK PLAN, THE OUTCOMES OF BOARD ACTION OF COMMISSION REQUESTS AND THE COMMISSION'S NEXT MEETING AGENDA

Ms. Glenna Brambill reviewed the material as outlined in the agenda item.

No action was taken.

6. **CLERK REVIEW AND CLARIFICATION OF COMMISSION REQUESTS TO THE BOARD**

Ms. Glenna Brambill reported there was one item for Board consideration.

The Committee approved the 2016 Annual Accomplishments Report for presentation to the Board.

7. REPORTS

7.1 Director's Report

Board Chair Director Barbara Keegan reported the following:

- Board Action
  - ❖ At the Board's January 24, 2017, meeting, Ms. Susan Stanton, was confirmed as the new Chief of Administration
- Water District News

7.2 Manager's Report

Interim CEO, Ms. Norma Camacho reported on the following item:

- Developing a water resources joint committee in south county to discuss current practices of groundwater management, recycled water opportunities policy discussions and homeless programs.

Hon. Rich Constantine left at 2:02 p.m. and did not return.

7.3 Commission Member Reports

None.

8. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Hon. Yoriko Kishimoto adjourned at 2:09 p.m. to the next regular meeting on Wednesday, April 12, 2017, at 12:00 p.m., in the Santa Clara Valley Water District Headquarters Boardroom.

Office of the Clerk of the Board

Approved:

Committee:	Water Commission
Meeting Date:	04/12/17
Agenda Item No.:	4.1
Unclassified Manager:	Jim Fiedler
Email:	jfiedler@valleywater.org
Est. Staff Time:	15 minutes

COMMITTEE AGENDA MEMO

SUBJECT: Review and Comment to the Board on the Fiscal Year 2017-18 Proposed Groundwater Production Charges

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

Provide comment to the Board in the implementation of the District's mission as it applies to staff's groundwater production charge recommendation for FY 2017–18.

SUMMARY:

This is an action item:

Staff proposes a 9.9% increase in the North County (Zone W-2) Municipal and Industrial groundwater production charge. The average household in Zone W-2 would experience an increase in their monthly bill of $3.65 or about 12 cents a day. With recent improvements in the state's water supply picture, our focus turns to driving progress on vital infrastructure upgrades and toward development of future drought-proof purified water supplies. Schedule extensions for the Anderson Dam Seismic Retrofit project and the Expedited Purified Water Program means that the maximum proposed groundwater production charge increase is lower than projected last year, however the District must continue investing significant capital dollars into repairing and rehabilitating the infrastructure required to deliver safe, reliable drinking water to Silicon Valley residents and businesses.

In the South County (Zone W-5), staff recommends a 6.4% increase in the M&I groundwater production charge. The average household in Zone W-5 would experience an increase in their monthly bill of $0.86 or about 3 cents per day. The proposed maximum groundwater production charge increase for FY 2017-18 will help drive progress on the Anderson Dam Seismic Retrofit project, which will help ensure public safety and bolster future water supply reliability. The Board is seeking input with regard to staff's groundwater production charge recommendation for FY 2017–18.

BACKGROUND:

Executive Limitation 7.4: A BAO shall "marshal for the Board as many staff and external points of view, issues and options as needed for fully informed Board choices."

ATTACHMENT(S):

None.

This Page Intentionally Left Blank

Committee:	Water Commission
Meeting Date:	04/12/17
Agenda Item No.:	4.2
Unclassified Manager:	Garth Hall
Email:	ghall@valleywater.org
Est. Staff Time:	10 minutes

COMMITTEE AGENDA MEMO

SUBJECT: Presentation on the 2017 Water Supply Master Plan Update

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

This is an information only item and no action is required.

SUMMARY:

The District is currently updating its Water Supply Master Plan. The Water Supply Master Plan is the District's strategy for providing a reliable and sustainable future water supply for Santa Clara County and ensuring new water supply investments are effective and efficient. To date, staff has updated the long-term water supply outlook, conducted a risk assessment, developed two scenarios against which portfolios of projects will be evaluated, identified costs and benefits of various projects, and convened an Expert Panel. This item summarizes the work that has been completed to date and presents next steps.

BACKGROUND:

Long-Term Water Supply Outlook

Since 2000, the average water supply for Santa Clara County has been 369,000 acre-feet per year (AFY) and the average water use has been 353,000 AFY. When supplies exceed demands, water is put into storage for use during times of shortage. During times of shortage, these storage supplies are used to meet demands and/or the District calls for short-term water use reductions. The District's current level of service goal is to develop supplies to meet 100 percent of demands in the Urban Water Management Plan in normal years and meet 90 percent of demands in drought years.

One of the first steps in water supply planning is to estimate future supplies and demands and the gaps that need to be filled. The baseline long-term water supply outlook assumes that retailer demands increase according to the projections in the retailers' 2015 Urban Water Management Plans, the Fisheries and Aquatic Habitat Collaborative Effort (FAHCE) flow and release requirements are implemented according to the FAHCE Settlement Agreement, future imported water deliveries are subject to the same operating requirements/regulations that are in place today, and that the District's 2012 Water Supply and Infrastructure Master Plan is fully implemented. The 2012 Water Supply and Infrastructure Master Plan includes completion of dam seismic retrofit projects before 2025, construction of 24,000 acre-feet per year (AFY) of potable reuse capacity by 2025, and 99,000 AFY of water conservation savings by 2030. Based on this baseline scenario, average supplies exceed average demands through 2040. However, modeling indicates the need to call for short-term water use reductions of up to 20 percent in nearly 15 percent of years. This equates to reducing countywide water use by up to 87,000 AFY every seven years, on average.

Risk Analysis

Understanding risks associated with the water supply outlook is another important step in water supply planning. Staff conducted a Strengths, Weakness, Opportunities, and Threats (SWOT) exercise in August 2016. A copy of the SWOT exercise results are in Attachment 1. The information was used to evaluate different risks to water supply reliability. Some of the key risks that were identified include changes in demands due to multiple factors; changes in supplies because of climate change; regulatory uncertainty related to the Delta, instream recharge operations, and potable reuse; development and land use (impacts can be both positive and negative); and funding. Overinvesting and investing too early were identified as risks to making effective and efficient investments in supply reliability. The two greatest vulnerabilities, or risks with the highest likelihood and consequence, are reductions in Delta-conveyed imported water supplies and uncertain demand projections.

Staff developed an alternative scenario, the "Trending" Scenario, that includes reduced imported water deliveries due to increased regulations in the Delta and a slower increase in demands based on updated regional growth projections. In this scenario, the District would need to call for water user reductions of up to 30 percent in nearly 25 percent of years. This equates to countywide water use reductions of up to 126,000 AFY every four years.

Water Supply Alternatives

The next step in the planning process involves the identification of projects and portfolios for filling the gap between the water supply outlook and the level of service goal. Staff has evaluated about 30 projects for their ability to meet the level of service goal and other objectives in the Baseline Scenario. The projects, which are summarized in Attachment 2, include:

- Water Conservation and Demand Management – Advanced metering infrastructure, gray water rebate program expansion, local land fallowing, model new development ordinance, rain barrel rebate program, and rain garden rebate program
- New or Expanded Storage – Sites Reservoir, Los Vaqueros Reservoir Expansion, groundwater banking, Anderson Reservoir Expansion, Pacheco Reservoir Expansion, Calero Reservoir Expansion, and Uvas Reservoir Expansion
- Additional Recharge Capacity in South County
- California WaterFix
- Raw Water Pipelines to Increase Operational Flexibility
- Morgan Hill Recycled Water
- Additional North County Potable Reuse
- Regional Desalination
- Stormwater Capture and Reuse – Centralized and Decentralized
- Transfers
- Imported Water Contract Purchase

Specific sites for agricultural land flooding for recharge were not identified, but would have similar benefits and costs as stormwater capture and reuse. Options for increasing San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) water deliveries to Santa Clara County is an on-going topic that is currently being evaluated through SFPUC's planning processes, the Bay Area Regional Reliability project, and potable reuse feasibilities studies. These processes have not yet identified specific options, but options will be evaluated as they are developed. Shallow groundwater reuse was re-evaluated, but was not carried forward due to concerns related to water quality, impacts on the environment, and infrastructure requirements. Del Valle Reservoir re-operations are being evaluated through a collaborative process with Alameda County Water District and Zone 7, but the benefits of such re-operations currently focus on short-term yields and water quality improvements. If a project is identified that would increase long-term water supply yields, staff will evaluate the project.

Staff will evaluate how different water supply portfolios, or combinations of projects, perform in meeting the reliability level of service goal under the Baseline Scenario as well as different risk scenarios such as the Trending Scenario.

It is likely that there will be a set of “no regrets” projects, such as cost-effective water conservation and demand management activities, that are appropriate regardless of the scenario. However, other projects may only be appropriate under certain scenarios or when combined with other projects. For instance, dry year transfers or options may make sense in the Baseline Scenario because Delta exports are subject to the same regulations as are currently in place and the District is currently able to obtain such transfers. However, in the Trending Scenario, where Delta exports are constrained, transfers would be less effective unless they were combined with another project.

Staff is currently evaluating portfolios with the following themes:

- Modular – Smaller projects and projects that can be phased in
- Low Risk – Projects that have more certainty for meeting yield, schedule, and cost assumptions
- Local Control – Local projects
- Low Cost – Lowest lifecycle cost projects
- Climate Change (Operational Flexibility) – Pipeline and storage projects
- Climate Change (Adaptation) – Projects that provide dry year supplies
- Local Storage – Local groundwater and surface water storage projects
- Statewide Storage – Out-of-County groundwater and surface water storage projects
- Securing Imports – California WaterFix

Next Steps

Staff is planning to present preliminary portfolio analysis results to the District Board in late April and to develop recommended portfolios for Board consideration in July 2017. After the Board selects a portfolio, staff will develop an implementation plan and complete the 2017 Water Supply Master Plan. The Water Supply Master Plan is scheduled for completion in December 2017.

Attachments

Attachment 1: SWOT Exercise Results
Attachment 2: Water Supply Projects

This Page Intentionally Left Blank

Santa Clara Valley Water District
Water Supply Master Plan
Strengths, Weakness, Opportunities, and Threats Analysis

	Strengths (Internal District)	Weaknesses (Internal District)	Opportunities (External)	Threats (External)
Groundwater	• Retailer systems/countywide pumping capacity is sufficient to meet minimum and average demands (infrastructure is available) • Several natural channels used for recharge are undergoing flood protection or erosion improvement projects • Size of the groundwater basin provides opportunity for soil aquifer treatment	• Potential for subsidence • Limited ability to manage groundwater pumping • Limited recharge capacity • Nitrate in Llagas/ South County • South county supplies less diverse than north county supplies • Need to better inform policy makers and leaders about the relationship between groundwater management and local/surface water supply and facilities	• Expand recharge • Add imported water pipeline to Church Ave ponds • Sustainable Groundwater Management Act • Sewer around San Pedro Ponds • Land use changes and policies that increase natural recharge • High quality stormwater infiltration	• Groundwater basin contamination (existing and potential) • Environmental flow regulations in natural channels may limit water supply/recharge operations • Land use changes that reduce natural recharge • Reduced natural recharge as a result of climate change • Major demand increase in groundwater dependent areas
Local Surface Water	• District's complex system and multiple sources allow for great operational flexibility in most areas • Multiple raw water sources are available to supply the water treatment plants (WTPs) and groundwater recharge operations	• Agreements with USACE for Downtown Guadalupe flood protection project requires District to maintain operations on Guadalupe, Almaden, and Calero • DSOD operating restrictions on several reservoirs • Several irrigators on raw water pipelines are not well documented or monitored, which leads to inefficient system operations • Several dam outlet structures may need rehab • Several dam hydraulic operating systems are in poor condition and at risk of failure • Specific facilities in notably poor condition include Vasona and Almaden-Calero Canals, Vasona Pumps, Church Diversion Dam • Special water quality related raw water blends to the treatment plants reduce amount of water that can go to recharge • Flood and erosion control projects could result in loss of recharge or include environmental requirements that limit the ability to manage the flows for water supply benefits.	• Expand existing in-county reservoirs • Connect local storage reservoirs to the raw water pipelines or improve operations to increase beneficial use of water (Uvas, Lexington) • Maximize use of Calero reservoir, as it can receive water from five sources • Implement new technologies to make system more efficient (automated valves, electronic data transfer, visual monitoring, etc.) • More off-stream recharge ponds and conveyance	• Reliability and cost of power or Federal regulations on GHG emissions could limit District operations • Additional regulatory constraints on using creeks for conveyance and recharge • Potential seismic and spillway and freeboard upgrades at several dams due to DSOD • Invasive species could degrade infrastructure • Reduced runoff from climate change • Increased evaporation of surface water and reservoirs from increased temp
Recycled and Purified Water	• Recycled water use at 5% • Silicon Valley Advanced Water Purification Center • Outreach efforts on recycled water • Long term agreements with San Jose	• Gilroy reclamation pipeline has had many leaks and needs replacement in 2038 or earlier • Need to define internal policies about District's role as sole wholesaler of purified water • Need to establish MOU's with partner agencies defining roles and responsibilities re: ownership and O&M of recycled water systems • Possible unknown water quality issues could affect ability to use • Required changes to current operations may have significant impacts	• Expansion of SCRWA system based on South County Recycled Water Master Plan • Potable reuse through integration of fully advanced treated water into District's water supply system • Partnerships on potable reuse • Partnerships on non-potable reuse	• Public perception about potable reuse, especially direct potable reuse • Ability to secure water for purification • Balancing non-potable and potable reuse • Energy requirements for purification • Availability of land for AWPF expansion Projects • Conflict/competition for recycled /purified water with other agencies/organizations • Direct potable reuse regulations still unavailable • Partnerships w/local wastewater treatment agencies that have inadequate Master Plans and investment analysis • Concentrate management for fully advanced treatment • Uncertainties and potential high cost
San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC)	• SFPUC Intertie is available for system outages • SFPUC system is resilient to earthquake as a result of the Water System Improvement project and 1 day outage level of service goal. Some retailers can rely on SFPUC as a backup to District TW outage		• West Pipeline extension or west side SFPUC connection • Individual supply guarantees • Water management agreement, exchange agreement, and/or incentives • Regional desal or other Bay Area Regional Reliability projects	• Climate change effects on supply and reduced deliveries • High cost of SFPUC water to retailers • High quality water is hard to replace with other supplies • Interruptible SFPUC contracts

	Strengths (Internal District)	Weaknesses (Internal District)	Opportunities (External)	Threats (External)
Delta-Conveyed Imported Water	• Relationships with current partners • Diversity of sources (transfer partners, contracts, etc) • Good quality in most years and main supply to drinking WTPs • Relationships with current partners	• Pacheco pump efficiency and San Felipe system capacity constraints can limit District capabilities to take max CVP contract allotment • Pacheco, Santa Clara and Santa Teresa Tunnels have leakage that may require repair • Semitropic accessibility is limited • Internal operational limitations/inefficiencies	• California WaterFix • Additional and improved groundwater banking opportunities, e.g., review Semitropic banking agreement and determine if it can be better used • Los Vaqueros expansion including Transfer-Bethany Pipeline • Sites Reservoir • Del Valle Reservoir • San Luis Reservoir LPIP, including reservoir expansion • Long-term transfer/option agreements • Purchase of permanent water rights • CPOU/Contract Amendment • Develop relationships with new partners • Improved agreements w/USBR for replacing failing infrastructure (PCCP) • Ensure Shasta and North of District water supply in San Luis Reservoir low point years	• Decreased availability of CVP and SWP sources due to environmental restrictions, drought, pumping constraints or infrastructure failure (seismic or age) • San Luis low point problem can limit District abilities to take CVP water • Uncertainty of water market (volatile costs) • Decreased availability of CVP and SWP supplies due to climate change • Reduced water quality due to climate change • SBA in requires substantial maintenance and PCCP pipe may be reaching end of life (Pacheco and SCC) • Cost overruns on Capital Projects and uncertainty and potential high cost of Delta improvements • Delta levee failure and natural disaster (including earthquakes)
Water Conservation	• District has successful water conservation programs	• Unpredictability of funding • Unpredictability/limited control (many users/people's efforts)	• Potential to decrease demands though land use policies that limit impervious surfaces, require recycled water use, increase on-site retention, and require demand management measures beyond code • Increase agricultural water conservation programs	• Increases in demands from climate change, population growth/housing development • Potential impact on meeting short term demand reduction needs
Treated Drinking Water	• East treated water system has redundant sources and a redundant delivery pipeline • Multiple raw water sources are available to supply the WTPs and groundwater recharge operations • Pipelines that have been inspected are in acceptable condition for their ages • Control systems reliability is being improved with completion of master plan and radio and microwave communications upgrades • Currently working on upgrading infrastructure and adding required service factor capacity at RWTP • Advanced treatment processes (Ozone) were added at STWTP and PWTP	• No redundancy in some parts of system, especially on the west side treated system • Most pipelines do not have cathodic protection. Also, the Pipeline Maintenance Plan is underfunded, and permit constraints for pipeline work is an issue • Need pre-stressed concrete cylinder pipe (PCCP) management program for all raw water • Line valves needed for isolation • Pipelines are vulnerable at creek crossings and road under crossings • Inherent seismic risk to PTWP • Water treatment complexities in severe shortages and drought	• Partnerships with SJWC on recycled water or Montevina WTP	• New potable water treatment regulations could impose new plant improvements including fluoridation and emerging contaminants • Deteriorating relationships with retailers and cities • Reduced source water quality due to contamination
Other Issues and Institutional	• Stockpile of pipeline repair materials available for emergency repairs • Most retailers have sufficient back up supplies for District treated water for short duration outages ~30 days • Asset Management Program • District is monitoring GHG reduction and energy efficiency strategies • The electrical system master plan is underway to streamline electrical improvements and improve energy efficiency throughout the District	• The Infrastructure Reliability Plan has not been fully implemented. • Pipeline stockpile security (threat of vandalism) • District customer service for well owners is not strong • Lack of resources • Overinvesting in costly new infrastructure, combined with lack of master planning and under-investing in existing assets	• Retailer exchanges or use of retailer systems to transfer water • Implement newly recommended IRP projects (SCVWD & retailer projects) • Continue to improve the asset management program that replaces and rehabs infrastructure at appropriate times	• Conflict or competition with other agencies • Funding risk & uncertainties and potential for overinvestment • Politics • Conflicts between recreation interests and District operations • Regulatory/environmental requirements; need to speak with one District voice • San Benito financial constraints may limit ability to cost share • SWRCB restricts or changes water rights (through FAHCE or other processes) to require more environmental water (affects local, but also imported) • Infrastructure failure taking 5-10 years to repair

Preliminary Project Analysis Results[1]

Project	Lifecycle Cost (2016$)	Average Annual Yield	Average Annual Drought Yield[2]	Cost/AF[3],[4]	Comments
Agricultural Land Flooding	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	Similar water supply benefits as Stormwater – Regional Basins.
Advanced Metering Infrastructure	$30 million	4,000	4,000	$500	
Anderson	$1,900 million	10,000	20,000	$10,000	
Butterfield Recharge	$30 million	TBD	TBD	TBD	
Calero Expansion	$510 million	3,000	5,000	$8,500	
Church Avenue Pipeline	$40 million	TBD	TBD	TBD	Similar water supply benefits as Butterfield Recharge.
Graywater Rebate Program Expansion	$1.5 million	100	100	$1,500	
Groundwater Banking	$90 million	500	2,000	$5,000	
Local Land Fallowing	$90 million	1,000	5,000	$2,500	7,400 AF savings in critical dry years
Los Vaqueros	$340 million	2,000	7,000	$9,500	
Model Ordinance	$1.4 million	5,000	5,000	$500	
Morgan Hill Recycled Water	$220 million	3,000	3,000	$1,500	
Pacheco Reservoir	$1,500 million	6,000	24,000	$11,000	
Potable Reuse – 6,000 AFY	$500 million	4,000	6,000	$3,500	
Potable Reuse – 11,000 AFY	$1,000 million	7,000	11,000	$3,500	
Potable Reuse – 15,000 AFY	$1,200 million	10,000	15,000	$3,500	
Regional Desal	$90 million	1,000	4,000	$4,000	5,600 AF in critical dry year yield

[1] All projects except the California WaterFix were analyzed against the Baseline Scenario.
[2] None of the individual projects reduced the maximum level of shortage (15 percent) compared to the Baseline Scenario. Staff are in the process of developing and evaluating portfolios that reduce the frequency and/or magnitude of shortages.
[3] The methodology for calculating cost per acre-foot has been updated from prior analyses, including the California WaterFix business case analyses presented in July 2016, based on input from the Expert Panel. Specifically, repair and replacement costs are included and the yield is discounted along with the costs.
[4] The cost per AF estimates are being provided at the Board's request. Staff and the Expert Panel recommend evaluating projects and portfolios based on their full range of benefits and avoid ranking projects based on cost per AF estimates.

Project	Lifecycle Cost (2016$)	Average Annual Yield	Average Annual Drought Yield[2]	Cost/AF[3],[4]	Comments
San Pedro Ponds	$40 million	1,000	500	$1,000	
Sites Reservoir	$230 million	16,000	40,000	$1,000	Sites Reservoir would provide additional imported water; current assumption is that it would not provide additional storage for District supplies
Stormwater – Regional Basins	$9 million to $60 million	100 to 1,000	100 to 1,000	$500 to $23,000	Range of cost and yield for three stormwater retention basins. Costs depend on whether additional land needs to be purchased. Yield depends on contributing watershed area (size, percent imperviousness, etc).
Stormwater – On-Site Capture	$20 million to $50 million	100 to 300	200 to 500	$3,500 to $20,000	Range of costs for rain gardens, cisterns, and rain barrels. Rain gardens would provide more yield at a lower cost.
Transfers	$250 million	2,000	8,000	$1,500	12,000 AF in critical dry years.
Uvas Pipeline	$80 million	1,000	200	$5,500	
Uvas Reservoir Expansion	$450 million	500	1,000	$46,000	
Water Rights Purchase	$800 million	12,000	5,000	$1,000	
California WaterFix	$1,800 million	30,000	18,000	$1,500	This project was only evaluated in the Trending Scenario, where there are additional regulatory constraints on Delta-conveyed imported water supplies. The yields would be less and the cost/AF would be higher in Baseline Scenario.

Committee:	Water Commission
Meeting Date:	04/12/17
Agenda Item No.:	4.3
Unclassified Manager:	Michele King
Email:	mking@valleywater.org
Est. Staff Time:	5 minutes

COMMITTEE AGENDA MEMO

SUBJECT: Review Santa Clara Valley Water Commission Work Plan, the Outcomes of Board Action of Commission Requests; and the Commission's Next Meeting Agenda.

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

Review the Board-approved Commission work plan to guide the commission's discussions regarding policy alternatives and implications for Board deliberation.

SUMMARY:

The attached Work Plan outlines the Board-approved topics for discussion to be able to prepare policy alternatives and implications for Board deliberation. The work plan is agendized at each meeting as accomplishments are updated and to review additional work plan assignments by the Board.

BACKGROUND:

Governance Process Policy-8:

The District Act provides for the creation of advisory boards, committees, or commissions by resolution to serve at the pleasure of the Board.

Accordingly, the Board has established Advisory Committees, which bring respective expertise and community interest, to advise the Board, when requested, in a capacity as defined: prepare Board policy alternatives and provide comment on activities in the implementation of the District's mission for Board consideration. In keeping with the Board's broader focus, Advisory Committees will not direct the implementation of District programs and projects, other than to receive information and provide comment.

Further, in accordance with Governance Process Policy-3, when requested by the Board, the Advisory Committees may help the Board produce the link between the District and the public through information sharing to the communities they represent.

ATTACHMENT(S):

Attachment 1: Santa Clara Valley Water Commission 2017 Work Plan
Attachment 2: Santa Clara Valley Water Commission April 2017 Draft Agenda

This Page Intentionally Left Blank

GP8. Accordingly, the Board has established Advisory Committees, which bring respective expertise and community interest, to advise the Board, when requested, in a capacity as defined: prepare Board policy alternatives and provide comment on activities in the implementation of the District's mission for Board consideration. In keeping with the Board's broader focus, Advisory Committees will not direct the implementation of District programs and projects, other than to receive information and provide comment.

The annual work plan establishes a framework for committee discussion and action during the annual meeting schedule. The committee work plan is a dynamic document, subject to change as external and internal issues impacting the District occur and are recommended for committee discussion. Subsequently, an annual committee accomplishments report is developed based on the work plan and presented to the District Board of Directors.

ITEM	WORK PLAN ITEM	MEETING	INTENDED OUTCOME(S) (Action or Information Only)	ACCOMPLISHMENT DATE AND OUTCOME
1	**Annual Accomplishments Report**	January 25	• Review and approve 2016 Accomplishments Report for presentation to the Board. ***(Action)*** • Submit requests to the Board, as appropriate.	**Accomplished January 25, 2017:** The Commission reviewed and approved the 2016 Accomplishments Report for presentation to the Board. *The Board received the 2016 Accomplishments report at their March 28, 2017, meeting.*
2	**Election of Chair and Vice Chair for 2017**	January 25	• Committee Elects Chair and Vice Chair for 2017. **(Action)**	**Accomplished January 25, 2017:** The Commission elected the 2017 Committee Chair and Vice-Chair, Hon. Yoriko Kishimoto and Hon. Rishi Kumar respectively.
3	**Review and Comment to the Board on the Fiscal Year 2018 Preliminary Groundwater Production Charges**	January 25	• Review and comment to the Board on the Fiscal Year 2018 Preliminary Groundwater Production Charges**.** ***(Action)*** • Submit requests to the Board, as appropriate.	**Accomplished January 25, 2017:** The Commission reviewed the Fiscal Year 2018 Preliminary Groundwater Production Charges and took no action.

Yellow = Update Since Last Meeting
Blue = Action taken by the Board of Directors

ITEM	WORK PLAN ITEM	MEETING	INTENDED OUTCOME(S) (Action or Information Only)	ACCOMPLISHMENT DATE AND OUTCOME
4	**Water Supply Update and Drought Response/Water Supply Master Plan**	January 25 April 12 October 25	• Receive update on water supply and drought respons ***(Action)*** • Provide comments to the Board, as necessary.	**Accomplished January 25, 2017:** The Commission received information on the water supply and drought response and took no action.
5	**Review of Santa Clara Valley Water Commission Work Plan, the Outcomes of Board Action of Commission Requests and the Commission's Next Meeting Agenda**	January 25 April 12 July 26 October 25	• Receive and review the 2016 Board-approved Committee work plan**.** ***(Action)*** • Submit requests to the Board, as appropriate.	**Accomplished January 25, 2017:** The Commission reviewed their work plan, the outcomes of board action of commission requests and the Commission's next meeting agenda and requested to move status of One Water Plan item from TBD to April 12th meeting. *Note: The update of the One Water Plan was moved to the July agenda as pertinent information was not available by the April 12, 2017, meeting.*
6	**Review and Comment to the Board on the Fiscal Year 2018 Proposed Groundwater Production Charges.**	April 12	• Review and comment to the Board on the Fiscal Year 2018 Proposed Groundwater Production Charges. ***(Action)*** • Provide comments to the Board, as necessary.	
7	**Safe, Clean Water and Natural Flood Protection Program Update**	July 26	• Receive an update on the Safe, Clean and Natural Flood Protection Program. *(Information)*	

ITEM	WORK PLAN ITEM	MEETING	INTENDED OUTCOME(S) (Action or Information Only)	ACCOMPLISHMENT DATE AND OUTCOME
8	**District's Communications Programs Update**	July 26	• Receive an update on the District's Communications Programs. *(Information)*	
9	**Status Report on the One Water Plan**	July 26	• Receive an update on the One Water Plan. ***(Information)***	
10	**Update on Joint Use of Trails**	July 26	• Receive an update on the joint use of trails. ***(Information)***	
11	**Discussion on the Riparian Corridor Ordinance, Encroachment Process**	TBD	• Discuss the Riparian Corridor Ordinance, Encroachment Process. ***(Action)*** • Provide comments to the Board, as necessary.	
12	**Climate Change Mitigation – Carbon Neutrality by 2020 Program Update**	TBD	• Receive information on climate change mitigation – carbon neutrality by 2020 program update. *(Action)* • Provide comments to the Board, as necessary.	

ITEM	WORK PLAN ITEM	MEETING	INTENDED OUTCOME(S) (Action or Information Only)	ACCOMPLISHMENT DATE AND OUTCOME
13	**Climate Change and Sea Level Rise Adaptation – Water Supply, Flood Protection, Ecosystems Protection**	TBD	• Receive information on climate change and sea level rise adaptation – water supply, flood protection, ecosystems protection. ***(Action)*** • Provide comments to the Board, as necessary.	
14	**Demand Management Strategies and Portfolio**	TBD	• Discussion on demand management strategies and portfolio. ***(Action)*** • Provide comments to the Board, as necessary.	
15	**Civic Engagement**	TBD	• Receive feedback from Commission per Transparency Audit). • Provide comments to the Board, as necessary.	
16	**Winter Preparedness Update**	TBD	• Receive information on the District's Winter Preparedness. *(Information)*	

Yellow = Update Since Last Meeting
Blue = Action taken by the Board of Directors

ITEM	WORK PLAN ITEM	MEETING	INTENDED OUTCOME(S) (Action or Information Only)	ACCOMPLISHMENT DATE AND OUTCOME
17	**Update on CA WaterFix**	TBD	• Receive an update on CA Waterfix ***(Information)***	
18	**Board Feedback on Safe, Clean Water and Natural Flood Protection Program**	TBD	• Discussion on the Board's feedback on the Safe, Clean Water and Natural Flood Protection Program. (Action) • Provide comments to the Board, as necessary.	

This Page Intentionally Left Blank

Santa Clara Valley Water District

Commission Officers
Hon. Yoriko Kishimoto, Chair
Hon. Rishi Kumar , Vice Chair

Board Representative
Barbara Keegan, Board Representative
Gary Kremen, Alternate
John L. Varela, Board Representative

DRAFT AGENDA

SANTA CLARA VALLEY WATER COMMISSION

WEDNESDAY, JULY 26, 2017

12:00 p.m. – 2:00 p.m.

Santa Clara Valley Water District
Headquarters Building Boardroom
5700 Almaden Expressway
San Jose, CA 95118

Time Certain:
12:00 p.m.

1. Call to Order/Roll Call

2. Time Open for Public Comment on Any Item Not on Agenda
Comments should be limited to two minutes. If the Commission wishes to discuss a subject raised by the speaker, it can request placement on a future agenda.

3. Approval of Minutes
3.1 Approval of Minutes – April 12, 2017, meeting

4. Action Items
4.1 Receive an Update on the District's Communication Programs (Marty Grimes)
Recommendation: This is an information item only and no action is required.

4.2 Status Report on the One Water Plan (Brian Mendenhall)
Recommendation: This is an information item only and no action is required.

4.3 Safe, Clean Water and Natural Flood Protection Program Update (Chris Elias)
Recommendation: This is an information item only and no action is required.

4.4 Update on Joint Use of Trails (Vincent Gin)
Recommendation: This is an information item only and no action is required.

4.5 Review Santa Clara Valley Water Commission Work Plan, the Outcomes of Board Action of Commission Requests and the Commission's Next Meeting Agenda (Commission Chair)
Recommendation: Review the Board-approved Commission work plan to guide the committee's discussions regarding policy alternatives and implications for Board deliberation.

5. Clerk Review and Clarification of Commission Requests to the Board
This is a review of the Commission*'s Requests, to the Board (from Item 4). The Commission may also request that the Board approve future agenda items for Commission discussion.*

6. **Reports**

Directors, Managers, and Commission members may make brief reports and/or announcements on their activities. Unless a subject is specifically listed on the agenda, the Report is for information only and not discussion or decision. Questions for clarification are permitted.

6.1 Director's Report
6.2 Manager's Report
6.3 Commission Member Reports

7. **Adjourn:** Adjourn to next regularly scheduled meeting at 12:00 p.m., **October 25, 2017,** in the Headquarters Building Boardroom, 5700 Almaden Expressway, San Jose, CA 95118

All public records relating to an open session item on this agenda, which are not exempt from disclosure pursuant to the California Public Records Act, that are distributed to a majority of the legislative body will be available for public inspection at the Office of the Clerk of the Board at the Santa Clara Valley Water District Headquarter Building, 5700 Almaden Expressway, San Jose, CA., 95118, at the same time that the public records are distributed or made available to the legislative body.

The Santa Clara Valley Water District will make reasonable efforts to accommodate persons with disabilities wishing to attend commission meetings. Please advise the Clerk of the Board office of any special needs by calling 1-408-630-2277.

Santa Clara Valley Water Commission's Purpose and Duties

The Santa Clara Valley Water Commission of the Santa Clara Valley Water District is established to assist the Board of Directors (Board) with policies pertaining to water supply, flood protection and environmental stewardship in the areas of interest to Santa Clara County and the Towns and Cities therein.

The specific duties are:

- Prepare policy alternatives
- Provide comment on activities in the implementation of the District's mission
- Produce and present to the Board an Annual Accomplishments Report that provides a synopsis of the annual discussions and actions.

In carrying out these duties, Commission members bring to the District their respective expertise and the interests of the communities they represent. In addition, Commissioners may help the Board produce the link between the District and the public through information sharing to the communities they represent.

Handouts

This Page Intentionally Left Blank

Santa Clara Valley Water District

File No.: 17-0169

Agenda Date: 4/11/2017
Item No.: 2.9.

BOARD AGENDA MEMORANDUM

SUBJECT:
Public Hearing - Annual Report on the Protection and Augmentation of Water Supplies - February 2017 and Recommended Groundwater Production and Other Water Charges for Fiscal Year 2017-2018 (FY 2017-18).

RECOMMENDATION:
A. Conduct a public hearing pursuant to Section 26.6 of the District Act to consider the District FY 2017-18 Annual Report on the Protection and Augmentation of Water Supplies, and direct staff to review such report with, and solicit comments from the District's advisory committees;
B. Hear public comments from groundwater producers and any interested persons regarding such report; and
C. Continue the public hearing regarding such report to the April 13, 2017 special meeting, at 7:00 pm.

SUMMARY:
Section 26.6 of the District Act requires a public hearing regarding the Protection and Augmentation of Water Supplies report be held on or before the fourth Tuesday of April. This public hearing is conducted to inform the community of the activities performed by the District to ensure reliable water supply and the recommended groundwater production and other water charges to pay for those activities. The hearing provides opportunity for any interested person to submit comments to the Board. This year's rate setting process includes a formal protest procedure consistent with Board Resolutions 12-10 and 12-11 (See attachments 3 and 4). If written protests are filed by a majority of well owners or surface water operators, the groundwater production charge or surface water charge, respectively, cannot be increased.

Since the publishing of the District's Annual Report on the Protection and Augmentation of Water Supplies (PAWS), which can be found at www.valleywater.org, staff has extended the schedule for the Expedited Purified Water Program. Consequently, the following staff proposed increases are lower than the proposed maximum groundwater production charges shown in the published annual PAWS report.

Staff proposes a 9.6% increase in the North County (Zone W-2) Municipal and Industrial groundwater production charge. Staff recommends maintaining the treated water surcharge at $100 per acre-foot and increasing the non-contract treated water surcharge to $100 per acre-foot. The average

household in Zone W-2 would experience an increase in their monthly bill of $3.55 or about 12 cents a day.

In the South County (Zone W-5), staff recommends a 6.4% increase in the M&I groundwater production charge. The average household in Zone W-5 would experience an increase in their monthly bill of $0.86 or about 3 cents per day.

The staff proposed increase to the agricultural groundwater production charge is 10.4% for both zones. An agricultural water user who pumps 2 acre-feet per acre per year would experience an increase of $0.25 per month per acre.

Staff recommends a 21.5% increase to the surface water master charge. This increase results in a 9.9% increase in the overall North County municipal and industrial surface water charge and 7.3% increase in the overall South County municipal and industrial surface water charge. The overall agricultural surface water charge in either zone would increase by 14.5%. Due to the continued severity of the drought, the water district suspended nearly all raw surface water deliveries in 2014. Many raw surface water users were forced to find an alternative source of water, primarily the groundwater basin. However, the district intends to reinstate untreated surface water users due to much improved water supply conditions.

For recycled water delivered in South County, staff recommends increasing the M&I charge by 6.7%. For agricultural recycled water, staff recommends a 3.2% increase. The increase maximizes cost recovery while concurrently providing an economic incentive to use recycled water. The pricing is consistent with the provisions of the “Wholesale-Retailer Agreement for Supply of Recycled Water Between Santa Clara Valley Water District and City of Gilroy.”

The increases in water charges are necessary to pay for critical investments in water supply infrastructure rehabilitation and upgrades, and the development of future drought-proof supplies, most notably purified water. Additionally, we are projecting lower water usage than pre-drought averages, which results in lower revenue.

Staff recommends setting the State Water Project Tax at $26 million for FY 2017-18. This translates to a property tax bill for the average single family residence of roughly $44.00 per year. The recommended SWP tax is consistent with past practice. If the recommended FY 2017-18 State Water Project Tax is not approved, the M&I groundwater production charge would need to be increased by an additional $148/AF in North County and $31/AF in South County. The open space credit would increase by roughly $755,000.

The District’s Annual Report on the Protection and Augmentation of Water Supplies, among other information, contains a financial analysis of the District’s water utility system and additional details about the above recommendations. This report can be found at www.valleywater.org

FINANCIAL IMPACT:
There is no financial impact associated with holding the hearing. If at a subsequent meeting, the Board approves the recommended groundwater production and other water charges or obtains

alternate funding mechanisms, the Water Utility should have sufficient funding for planned operations and capital improvement projects for fiscal year 2017-18.

CEQA:
The recommended action, the holding of a public hearing is not a project under CEQA. Further, establishment of groundwater production charges is not a project under CEQA. CEQA Guidelines Section 15273(a) reads as follows: CEQA does not apply to establishment or modification of charges by public agencies which the public agency finds are for the purpose of meeting operating expenses; purchasing or leasing supplies, equipment and materials; meeting financial reserve needs/requirements; and obtaining funds for capital projects needed to maintain service within existing service areas.

ATTACHMENTS:
Attachment 1: Staff Report
Attachment 2: PowerPoint
Attachment 3: Resolution No. 12-10
Attachment 4: Resolution No. 12-11

UNCLASSIFIED MANAGER:
Jim Fiedler, 408-630-2736

This Page Intentionally Left Blank

Page 4

Staff Report

In accordance with the District Act, District staff has prepared an annual report on the Protection and Augmentation of Water Supplies, which was filed with the Clerk of the Board on February 24, 2017.

The Report is the 46th annual report on the Santa Clara Valley Water District's (District) activities in the protection and augmentation of the water supplies. This Report is prepared in accordance with the requirements of the District Act, section 26.5. The Report provides information on water requirements and water supply availability, and financial analysis of the District's water utility system. The financial analysis includes future capital improvement and maintenance requirements, operating requirements, financing methods and staff's recommended groundwater production and other water charges by zone for fiscal year 2017–18.

The Rate Setting Process

According to Section 26.3 of the District Act, proceeds from groundwater production charges can be used for the following purposes:

1. Pay for construction, operation and maintenance of imported water facilities
2. Pay for imported water purchases
3. Pay for constructing, maintaining and operating facilities which will conserve or distribute water including facilities for groundwater recharge, surface distribution, and purification and treatment
4. Pay for debt incurred for purposes 1, 2 and 3.

This year, as in past years, staff has carefully evaluated the activities that can be paid for by groundwater production charges. The work of the district is divided into projects. Every project has a detailed description including objectives, milestones, and an estimate of resources needed to deliver the project. To ensure compliance with the District Act, each project manager must justify whether or not groundwater production charges can be used to pay for the activities associated with their project. The financial analysis presented in the annual report is based on these project plans.

Resolution 99-21 guides staff in the development of the overall pricing structure based on principles established in 1971. The general approach is to charge the recipients of the various benefits for the benefits received. More specifically, pricing is structured to manage surface water, groundwater supplies and recycled water conjunctively to prevent the over use or under use of the groundwater basin. Consequently, staff is very careful to recommend pricing for groundwater production charges, treated water charges, surface water charges and recycled water charges that work in concert to achieve the effective use of available resources.

This year's rate setting process is being conducted consistent with Board Resolutions 99-21, 12-10 and 12-11, as well as Proposition 218's requirements for property-related fees for water services. As in the past, the Board will continue to hold public hearings and seek input from its advisory committees and the public before rendering a final decision on groundwater production and other water charges for FY 2017–18.

Staff Recommendations

Exhibit 1 shows the proposed groundwater production charges and other charges for FY 2017–18. Since the publishing of the District's Annual Report on the Protection and Augmentation of Water Supplies (PAWS), staff has extended the schedule for the Expedited Purified Water Program. Consequently, the following staff proposed charges are lower than the proposed maximum charges shown in the published annual PAWS report.

Exhibit 1
Summary of Charges
(Dollars Per Acre Foot, $/AF)

	Dollars Per Acre Foot		
	FY 2015–16	FY 2016–17	Proposed FY 2017–18
Zone W-2 (North County)			
Basic User/Groundwater Production Charge			
Municipal & Industrial	894.00	1,072.00	1,175.00
Agricultural	21.36	23.59	25.09
Surface Water Charge			
Surface Water Master Charge	22.60	27.46	33.36
Total Surface Water, Municipal & Industrial*	916.60	1,099.46	1,208.36
Total Surface Water, Agricultural*	43.96	51.05	58.45
Treated Water Charges			
Contract Surcharge	100.00	100.00	100.00
Total Treated Water Contract Charge**	994.00	1,172.00	1,275.00
Non-Contract Surcharge	200.00	50.00	100.00
Total Treated Water Non-Contract Charge***	1,094.00	1,122.00	1,275.00
Zone W-5 (South County)			
Basic User/Groundwater Production Charge			
Municipal & Industrial	356.00	393.00	418.00
Agricultural	21.36	23.59	25.09
Surface Water Charge			
Surface Water Master Charge	22.60	27.46	33.36
Total Surface Water, Municipal & Industrial*	378.60	420.46	451.36
Total Surface Water, Agricultural*	43.96	51.05	58.45
Recycled Water Charges			
Municipal & Industrial	336.00	373.00	398.00
Agricultural	45.16	47.38	48.88

*Note: The total surface water charge is the sum of the basic user charge (which equals the groundwater production charge) plus the water master charge

**Note: The total treated water contract charge is the sum of the basic user charge (which equals the groundwater production charge) plus the contract surcharge

***Note: The total treated water non-contract charge is the sum of the basic user charge (which equals the groundwater production charge) plus the non-contract surcharge

The proposed increases in water charges are necessary to pay for critical investments in water supply infrastructure rehabilitation and upgrades, and the development of future drought-proof supplies, most notably purified water. Additionally, we are projecting lower water usage than pre-drought averages, which results in lower revenue.

Given the financial needs summarized above, staff proposes a 9.6% increase in the North County (Zone W-2) Municipal and Industrial groundwater production charge from $1,072/AF to $1,175/AF. Staff recommends maintaining the treated water surcharge at $100/AF, and increasing the non-contract treated water surcharge to $100/AF. The proposal equates to a monthly bill increase for the average household of $3.55 or about 12 cents a day.

In the South County (Zone W-5), staff proposes a 6.4% increase in the M&I groundwater production charge from $393/AF to $418/AF. The proposal equates to a monthly bill increase for the average household of $0.86 or about 3 cents per day.

Staff recommends a 6.4% increase in the agricultural groundwater production charge in both zones from $23.59/AF to $25.09/AF. The staff recommendation equates to a $0.25 increase per month per acre for an agricultural water user who pumps 2 acre-feet per acre per year.

Staff recommends a 21.5% increase to the surface water master charge from $27.46/AF to $33.36/AF to bring revenues in line with costs related to managing, operating and billing for surface water diversions. This increase results in a 9.9% increase in the overall North County municipal and industrial surface water charge and 7.3% increase in the overall South County municipal and industrial surface water charge. The overall agricultural surface water charge in either zone would increase by 14.5%. Due to the severity of the drought, the water district suspended nearly all raw surface water deliveries in 2014. Many raw surface water users were forced to find an alternative source of water, primarily the groundwater basin. However, the district intends to reinstate untreated surface water users due to much improved water supply conditions.

For recycled water, staff recommends increasing the M&I charge by 6.7% to $398/AF. For agricultural recycled water, staff recommends a 3.2% increase to $48.88/AF. The increase maximizes cost recovery while concurrently providing an economic incentive to use recycled water. This pricing is consistent with the provisions of the “Wholesale-Retailer Agreement for Supply of Recycled Water Between Santa Clara Valley Water District and City of Gilroy.”

Staff recommends setting the State Water Project Tax at $26 million for FY 2017–18. This translates to a property tax bill for the average single family residence of roughly $44.00 per year. The District incurs an annual indebtedness to the State of California pursuant to its Water Supply Contract dated November 20, 1961. Such indebtedness is proportional to the District’s allocation of water from the State Water Project and pays for construction, maintenance and operation of state water project infrastructure and facilities. Staff anticipates that the District’s contractual indebtedness to the State under the State Water Supply Contract for FY 2017–18 will be at least $28 million. Staff’s recommendation regarding the State Water Project tax is consistent with the District’s past practice and with the approach of other water districts and agencies that maintain State water supply contracts.

Projections

Exhibit 2 shows actual and projected District-managed water use. FY 2015–16 water usage came in at roughly 200,000 AF. For the current year, FY 2016–17, staff estimates that water usage will be approximately 205,000 AF or flat to the FY 2016-17 budget, and roughly a 28%

reduction versus calendar year 2013. For FY 2017–18, total District-managed water use is projected at 217,000 AF, which is a 6% increase relative to the FY 2016-17 estimated actual, and consistent with water usage patterns during the last drought that occurred between 2007 and 2011. The FY 2017-18 water usage estimate represents a 24 percent reduction relative to calendar year 2013. Water use is projected to ramp up to 253,000 AF by FY 2025-26.

Exhibit 2
District-managed Water Use Projection (1,000's AF)



Exhibit 3 shows key financial indicators with staff's recommendation projected to FY 2021-22. The debt service coverage ratio, which is a ratio of revenue less operations expenses divided by annual debt service, is targeted at 2.0 or better which helps to ensure financial stability and continued high credit ratings keeping cost to borrow low.

Exhibit 3
5 Year Charge and Financial Indicator Projection

Adjusted Proposal	2016–17	2017–18	2018–19	2019–20	2020–21	2021–22
No. County (W-2) M&I GWP charge ($/AF)	$1,072	$1,175	$1,288	$1,412	$1,547	$1,695
Y-Y Growth %	19.9%	9.6%	9.6%	9.6%	9.6%	9.6%
So. County (W-5) M&I GWP charge ($/AF)	$393	$418	$442	$467	$494	$522
Y-Y Growth %	10.4%	6.4%	5.7%	5.7%	5.8%	5.7%
Ag GWP charge ($/AF)	$23.59	$25.09	$26.53	$28.03	$29.65	$31.33
Y-Y Growth %	10.4%	6.4%	5.7%	5.7%	5.8%	5.7%
Operating & Capital Reserve	$51,025	$36,709	$46,179	$40,801	$48,018	$51,618
Supplemental Water Supply Reserve ($K)	$14,277	$14,677	$15,077	$15,477	$15,877	$16,277
Sr. Lien Debt Svc Cov Ratio (1.25 min)	1.89	2.14	2.52	2.59	2.36	2.26
South County (Deficit)/Reserves ($K)	$7,886	$7,214	$6,932	$7,893	$9,551	$10,968

A portion of the projected increases in the groundwater production charge are driven by the capital improvement program as shown in Exhibit 4. Over $2.3 billion in capital investments, primarily to repair and rehabilitate aging infrastructure, are planned for the next 10 years. FY 2017–18 operations and operating project costs are projected to decrease by 8.1% versus the FY 2016–17 adjusted budget, due primarily to reduced imported water costs. On a longer term basis, operating outlays are projected to increase an average of 4.5% per year for the next 10 years due to anticipated inflation, the California Water Fix, and new operations costs related to the expansion of purified water facilities. Debt service is projected to rise from $37.1 million in FY 2017–18 to $148.6 million in FY 2026–27 as a result of periodic debt issuances to fund the capital program.

Exhibit 4
Cost Projection by Cost Center ($M)



Exhibit 5 shows the groundwater production charge projection for the next 10 years and assumes a continuation of the level of service provided in FY 2016–17 and funding of the preliminary FY 2018-2027 Capital Improvement Program (CIP). Note that there are initiatives and potential uncertainties that could result in the identification of additional capital or operations projects that are not reflected in projection.

Exhibit 5
10 Year Groundwater Charge Projection



Exhibit 6 shows a comparison of the adjusted proposed groundwater production and treated water charges relative to the anticipated increases for the following similar agencies: Metropolitan Water District, Orange County Water District, San Diego County Water Authority, San Francisco PUC (Hetch Hetchy), and Zone 7 .

Exhibit 6
Anticipated FY 2017–18 Water Charge Increases for Similar Agencies

	% inc. '14 to '15	% inc. '15 to '16	% inc. '16 to '17	FY 17	Projection FY 18[3]
SCVWD North W-2 (Groundwater prdctn per AF)	10%	20%	20%	$1,072	9.6%
SCVWD North W-2 (Treated Water per AF)	9%	17%	18%	$1,172	8.8%
SCVWD South W-5 (Groundwater prdctn per AF)	5%	12%	10%	$393	6.4%
Metropolitan WD (Untreated Water per AF)[1]	-1%	1%	8%	$762	4.4%
Metropolitan WD (Treated Water per AF)[1]	3%	1%	2%	$1,075	3.8%
Orange County WD (Groundwater per AF)	7%	10%	25%	$402	TBD
San Diego County WA (Treated Water per AF)[1]	3%	6%	1%	$1,531	TBD
San Francisco PUC (Treated Water per AF)[2]	17%	25%	8%	$1,969	0.0%
Zone 7 (Treated Water per AF)[1]	3%	37%	15%	$1,575	-13.2%

1) MWD, SDCWA and Zone 7 rates based on calendar year (i.e. 2018 rate would be effective on 1/1/2018)
2) SFPUC rates include BAWSCA bond surcharge estimate of $183/AF
3) SCVWD FY 18 projection includes staff proposed adjustments to proposed maximum

Exhibit 7 shows a comparison of the average monthly bill for several of the District's retail customers (e.g. SJWC, City of Santa Clara, City of Morgan Hill, and City of Gilroy) relative to the District's perennial list of retail agency comparators across the state. SCVWD retailer rates shown include the SCVWD proposed adjusted increase for FY 2017-18. North County and South County well owner rates are also shown, which exclude pumping costs (e.g. electricity) and well maintenance costs.

Exhibit 7
Retail Agency Benchmarks



Cost of Service

The cost of service analyses for FY 2017–18 is shown in Exhibit 8 for North County and Exhibit 9 for South County. The exhibits are laid out in a format that follows six industry standard rate making steps.

1. Identify utility pricing objectives and constraints
2. Identify revenue requirements
3. Allocate costs to customer classes
4. Reduce costs by revenue offsets or non-rate related funding sources
5. Develop unit costs by customer class or net revenue requirements by customer class
6. Develop unit rates by customer class

Step 2 includes identifying and segregating Water Utility Fund costs from Watershed and Administrative Funds and allocating Water Utility costs between zones W-2 (North) and W-5 (South) according to benefit provided. Step 3 involves allocating costs by customer class either directly or based on water usage. Steps 4 and 5 result in unit costs by customer class after applying non-rate related offsets.

Step 6 includes two adjustments. The first adjustment is the application of fungible revenue, in this case 1% ad valorem property taxes, to offset the costs of agricultural water in accordance with Board Resolution 99-21. For FY 2017-18, staff is proposing a $1.6M transfer of 1% ad valorem property taxes from the General Fund and $1.6M from the Watershed Stream Stewardship Fund as sources for this adjustment also known as the “Open Space Credit.”

The second adjustment involves reallocating a portion of the cost of treated water (or recycled water in the case of South County) to groundwater and surface water users. Treated and recycled water offsets the need to pump groundwater and therefore increases the volume of stored groundwater and improves reliability. The reallocation of a portion of the treated water cost for example represents the value of treated water to groundwater and surface water users and facilitates a pricing structure that prevents the over use of the groundwater basin. Preventing over use not only preserves groundwater for use in times of drought, but also prevents land subsidence or sinking of the land, which can cause serious infrastructure issues.

Another aspect of the second adjustment is related to setting the basic user charge for surface water equal to the groundwater production charge. Surface water use is effectively in-lieu groundwater use permitted by the District to help preserve the groundwater basin. As such, the costs related to preserving the groundwater basin provide value to surface water users because it makes available District surface water, which otherwise would only be used for groundwater recharge. Similarly, the costs related to providing surface water benefit groundwater users because surface water usage helps preserve the groundwater basin. The second adjustment reallocates costs between surface water and groundwater customers in order to set the basic user charge for surface water equal to the groundwater production charge in recognition of this conjunctive use relationship, and in accordance with board policy. A 2015 study was conducted by Raftelis Financial Consultants, Inc (RFC) that confirms the reasonableness of such an adjustment. The report titled “Report Documenting the Reasonableness of the Conjunctive Use Benefit of Surface Water and Recycled Water to Groundwater Customers” documents the support and justification for the water district’s cost of service methodology and can be found on the District’s website.

Exhibit 8
Cost of Service North County Zone W-2 ($K)

	FY '18 Projection ($K)	Zone W-2					
		GW		TW	SW		Total W-2
		M&I	AG	M&I	M&I	Ag	
1	**Operating Outlays**						
2	Operations/Operating Projects	39,739	438	84,288	715	17	125,196
3	SWP Imported Water Costs	6,771	76	21,042	390	10	28,288
4	Debt Service	8,538	96	28,287	115	3	37,038
5	**Total Operating Outlays**	55,047	609	133,616	1,220	30	190,522
6							
7	**Capital & Transfers**						
8	Operating Transfers Out	3,286	37	5,939	85	2	9,349
9	Capital Outlays excl. carryforward	19,374	217	109,635	467	11	129,705
10	**Total Capital & Transfers**	22,661	254	115,574	552	13	139,054
11	**Total Annual Program Costs**	77,708	863	249,191	1,772	43	329,576
12							
13	**Revenue Requirement Offsets**						
14	Capital Cost Recovery	(1,730)	(19)	(3,127)	(45)	(1)	(4,923)
15	Debt Proceeds	(11,504)	(129)	(65,100)	(277)	(7)	(77,017)
16	Inter-governmental Services	(395)	(4)	(713)	(10)	(0)	(1,123)
17	SWP Property Tax	(5,565)	(62)	(18,490)	(315)	(8)	(24,440)
18	South County Deficit/Reserve	(87)	(1)	(157)	(2)	(0)	(248)
19	Interest Earnings	(254)	(3)	(460)	(7)	(0)	(723)
20	Inter-zone Interest	20	0	37	1	0	58
21	Capital Contributions	(945)	(11)	(1,708)	(24)	(1)	(2,688)
22	Other	(966)	(11)	(911)	(15)	(0)	(1,903)
23	Reserve Requirements	(4,539)	(21)	(24,765)	(109)	(1)	(29,435)
24	**Adjusted Revenue Requirement (FY 18)**	**51,744**	**602**	**133,797**	**968**	**25**	187,134
25	**Adjusted Revenue Requirement (FY 15 adj)**	12,633	56	4,657	158	84	17,587
26	**Total Adjusted Revenue Requirement**	**64,376**	**657**	**138,453**	**1,125**	**109**	204,721
27	Volume (KAF)	58.1	0.7	105.0	1.5	0.0	165.3
28							
29	Revenue Requirement per AF	$ 1,108	$ 1,012	$ 1,319	$ 750	$ 2,978	
30							
31	**Adjustments for Agricultural Preservation**						
32	Allocate WU 1% Ad Valorem Prop Tax	-	(641)	-	-	(107)	(748)
33	Transfer GF 1% Ad valorem Prop Tax	-	-	-	-	-	-
34	Transfer WS 1% Ad Valorem Prop Tax	-	-	-	-	-	-
35	Revenue Requirement per AF	$ 1,108.0	$ 25.1	$ 1,319	$ 750	$ 58.4	
36							
37	**Adjustments to Facilitate Conjunctive Use**						
38	Reallocate TW/SW/RW costs	3,891	-	(4,578)	687	-	(0)
39	Charge per AF	$ 1,175	$ 25.1	$ 1,275	$ 1,208	$ 58.4	
40	Total Revenue ($K)	$68,268	$16	$133,875	$1,813	$2	$203,974

Step 2- Identify revenue reqmnts

Step 3 - Allocate costs to customer classes

Step 4- Reduce costs by revenue offsets

Step 5 - Develop unit costs by customer class

Step 6 - Rate Design

Exhibit 9
Cost of Service South County Zone W-5 ($K)

	FY '18 Projection ($K)	Zone W-5						Total W-5
		GW		SW		RW		
		M&I	AG	M&I	AG	M&I	AG	
1	**Operating Outlays**							
2	Operations/Operating Projects	8,450	8,553	212	541	83	71	17,910
3	SWP Imported Water Costs	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
4	Debt Service	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
5	**Total Operating Outlays**	8,450	8,553	212	541	83	71	17,910
6								
7	**Capital & Transfers**							
8	Operating Transfers Out	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
9	Capital Outlays excl. carryforward	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
10	**Total Capital & Transfers**	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
11	**Total Annual Program Costs**	8,450	8,553	212	541	83	71	17,910
12								
13	**Revenue Requirement Offsets**							
14	Capital Cost Recovery	1,803	1,878	38	98	595	510	4,923
15	Debt Proceeds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
16	Inter-governmental Services	(67)	(69)	(1)	(4)	-	-	(141)
17	SWP Property Tax	(719)	(749)	(15)	(39)	(21)	(18)	(1,560)
18	South County Deficit/Reserve	(37)	269	(20)	14	15	6	248
19	Interest Earnings	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
20	Inter-zone Interest	(27)	(28)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(58)
21	Capital Contributions	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
22	Other	(65)	(68)	(1)	(2)	-	-	(136)
23	Reserve Requirements	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
24	**Adjusted Revenue Requirement (FY 18)**	**9,339**	**9,786**	**212**	**607**	**672**	**569**	21,185
25	**Adjusted Revenue Requirement (FY 15 adj)**	296	(764)	25	(177)	(8)	(291)	(918)
26	**Total Adjusted Revenue Requirement**	**9,635**	**9,023**	**237**	**430**	**664**	**278**	20,267
27	Volume (KAF)	24.0	25.0	0.5	1.3	0.7	0.6	52.1
28								
29	Revenue Requirement per AF	$ 401	$ 361	$ 474	$ 331	$ 949	$ 464	
30								
31	**Adjustments for Agricultural Preservation**							
32	Allocate WU 1% Ad Valorem Prop Tax	-	(5,761)	-	-	-	-	(5,761)
33	Transfer GF 1% Ad valorem Prop Tax	-	(1,626)	-	-	-	-	(1,626)
34	Transfer WS 1% Ad Valorem Prop Tax	-	(1,023)	-	(354)	-	(249)	(1,626)
35	Revenue Requirement per AF	$ 401	$ 24.5	$ 474	$ 58.4	$ 949	$ 48.9	
36								
37	**Adjustments to Facilitate Conjunctive Use**							
38	Reallocate TW/SW/RW costs	397	-	(11)	-	(386)	-	-
39	Charge per AF	$ 418	$ 24.5	$ 451	$ 58	$ 398	$ 48.9	
40	Total Revenue ($K)	$10,032	$613	$226	$76	$279	$29	$11,254

Step 2- Identify revenue reqmnts

Step 3 - Allocate costs to customer classes

Step 4- Reduce costs by revenue offsets

Step 5 - Develop unit costs by customer class

Step 6 - Rate Design

Open Space Credit

The District Act limits agricultural groundwater production charges to a maximum of 25 percent of the M&I groundwater production charges. Current board policy adds an "open space" credit to agricultural revenues. The purpose of the credit is to preserve the open space benefits provided by agricultural lands by keeping agricultural groundwater production charges low. To the extent that Proposition 218 applies to the groundwater production charge, it requires that costs to end users be proportional such that one class of users is not subsidizing another.

The recommended agricultural groundwater production charge for FY 2017–18 is $25.09 per acre foot, which is 6 percent of the proposed M&I groundwater production charge in South County. To comply with the current agricultural groundwater production charge setting policy, staff recommends the open space credit received by South County be $9.0 million in FY 2017-18 (funded by 1 percent ad valorem property taxes). This includes an adjustment that reconciles FY 2014–15 actuals against what was projected. The $9.0 million is comprised of a $4.4 million transfer from North County Water Utility 1% ad valorem property taxes, a $1.4 million contribution from South County Water Utility 1% ad valorem property taxes, a $1.6 million transfer of 1% ad valorem property taxes from the General Fund and $1.6 million from the Watershed Stream Stewardship Fund. As shown in Exhibit 10, the Open Space Credit is projected to grow to over $17.4 million by FY 2026-27.

Exhibit 10
Open Space Credit Trend



Hearings and Meetings Schedule

Exhibit 11 presents the schedule for the annual groundwater production charge setting process.

Exhibit 11
Hearings and Meetings Schedule – 2017

Date	Hearing/Meeting
December 13	Board Workshop: Planning for FY 18 Groundwater Production Charges
January 10	Board Meeting on Preliminary Groundwater Production Charge Analysis
February 24	Mail notice of public hearing and file PAWS report
March 15	Water Retailers Meeting
April 3	Agricultural Water Advisory Committee Meeting
April 4	Landscape Committee Meeting
April 11	Open Public Hearing
April 13	Continue Public Hearing in Morgan Hill (Informational Open House)
April 17	Environmental & Water Resources Committee
April 19	Water Commission Meeting
April 25	Conclude Public Hearing
May 9	Adopt Budget & Groundwater Production and Other Water Charges

Public Hearing

Groundwater Production & Other Water Charges

April 11, 2017

Santa Clara Valley Water District

Public Hearing has Three Specific Objectives

1. Present annual report on Santa Clara Valley Water District's activities and recommended groundwater production charges

2. Provide opportunity for any interested person to "…appear and submit evidence concerning the subject of the written report" to the Board of Directors

3. Determine and affix Groundwater Production and Other Water Charges for FY 2017-18

46th Annual Report Provides Information, Accountability



2017
Protection and Augmentation of Water Supplies Report

www.valleywater.org

A comprehensive, flexible water system serves 1.9 million people

- 10 Reservoirs
- 393 acres of recharge ponds
- 142 miles of pipelines
- 3 water treatment plants
- 1 water purification center
- 3 pump stations
- $7.1B system replacement value

Many activities ensure safe, reliable groundwater supplies

- Operate & maintain local reservoirs
- Purchase imported water
- Operate & maintain raw, treated & recycled water pipelines
- Plan & construct improvements to infrastructure
- Monitor & protect groundwater from pollutants

Topics For Today's Public Hearing

HANDOUT: AGENDA ITEM 4.1

- Rate Setting Process
- FY 18 financial analysis and projections
  - Water Usage
  - Cost Projection
  - Proposed Maximum Groundwater Production Charges & Staff Proposed Adjustments
  - Benchmarks
  - State Water Project Tax
- Schedule/Wrap up

Rate Setting Process

District Act Defines Uses for Groundwater Charges

- **District Act Section 26.3: Defines purposes of groundwater production charges that can be imposed on a zone of benefit**
  1. **Pay for construction, operation and maintenance of imported water facilities**
  2. **Pay for imported water purchases**
  3. **Pay for constructing, maintaining and operating facilities which will conserve or distribute water including facilities for groundwater recharge, surface distribution, and purification and treatment**
  4. **Pay for debt incurred for purposes 1, 2 and 3**

Pricing Policy helps Optimize Use of Water Resources

- **Resolution 99-21: Utility taxing and pricing policy guides staff in the development of the overall structure to charge recipients for the various direct and indirect benefits received**

- **Key concept – "water supplies are managed, through taxing and pricing, to obtain the effective utilization of the water resources of the District…"**

Objective: Maximize effective use of available resources

The Charge Setting Process is Consistent with Resolutions 12-10 and 12-11

HANDOUT: AGENDA ITEM 4.1

- Meets the procedural and substantive requirements for establishing property related fees
- Includes cost of service analysis by customer class
- Includes protest procedure as defined in Board Resolutions 12-10 & 12-11
  - Prior Year Results North County = <1.7% for GW, 0% for SW
  - Prior Year Results South County = <0.3% for GW, 0% for SW

The District follows best practice rate making steps



Step 6– Develop Unit Rates by Customer Class

Step 5 – Develop Unit Costs by Customer Class

Step 4 – Allocate Offsets to Customer Classes

Step 3 – Allocate Costs to Customer Classes

Step 2 - Identify Revenue Requirements

Step 1 - Identify Utility Pricing Objectives and Constraints

Pricing Objectives and Constraints

HANDOUT: AGENDA ITEM 4.1



Page 28

FY 18 Financial Analysis and Projections

Financial Analysis: FY 18 Key Assumptions

HANDOUT: AGENDA ITEM 4.1

California Water Fix (CWF):

- "Conveyance Pumping" Case included in Prelim Analysis
- State Water Project portion of CWF would be paid for by SWP tax in FY 19 & beyond
- Incremental SWP tax for average single family residence would be $13/yr by FY 27

Expedited Purified Water:

- Costs assume a Progressive Design Build (PDB) method
- Two year schedule extension versus January 2017 preliminary analysis

Recycled Water North County Partnership:

- FY 17 budget totals $3M
- No additional funding in FY 18 & beyond

Drought Reserve:

- $3M of seed funding allocated in FY 17, no further funding included in forecast

Salary Savings:

- Included in FY 18 ($1.5M)

District Managed Water Usage drives revenue projection



Adjusted Cost Projection

HANDOUT: AGENDA ITEM 4.1



Key Capital project funding FY 18 thru FY 27

- Expedited Purified Water Program ($966M)
- Rinconada Reliability Improvement ($174M)
- Anderson Dam Seismic Retrofit ($413M)
  - $67M (15% of total $445M project) to be reimbursed by Safe Clean Water Measure
- FAHCE Implementation Fund ($145M placeholder)
- Calero & Guadalupe Dams Seismic Retrofit ($133M)
- 10 Year Pipeline Rehabilitation ($97M)
- Almaden Dam Improvements ($47M)
- Vasona Pumping Plant Upgrade ($20M)

Some projects cannot be funded without higher future charges

HANDOUT: AGENDA ITEM 4.1

- Dam Seismic Stability at 2 Dams – Unfunded portion ($89.5M)
- SCADA Small Capital Improvements ($19.6M)
- South County Recycled Water Reservoir Expansion ($7.0M)
- Land Rights – South County Recycled Water Pipeline ($5.8M)
- Alamitos Diversion Dam Improvements ($3.2M)
- Coyote Diversion Dam Improvements (2.5M)

Financial Analysis: Implementation of CIP results in debt service increases



$37.0M in FY 2017-18

$148.6M in FY 2026-27

- **Debt service coverage ratio targeted at 2.0 helps ensure financial stability and high credit ratings**

Financial Analysis: Preliminary
Water Supply Investment Scenarios

HANDOUT: AGENDA ITEM 4.1



Notes:

- Water Supply alternative costs are based on staff estimates, and are subject to change
- CWF and Purified Water PDB track are included in the current projection

Page 36

Proposed Maximum Groundwater Production Charges & Staff Proposed Adjustments

FY 2018: North County Proposed Maximum Charges

HANDOUT: AGENDA ITEM 4-1

Staff proposed adjustments as of 3/15/17

9.6% ~~9.9%~~ *increase for M&I groundwater production*

8.8% ~~9.0%~~ *increase for contract treated water*

9.9% ~~10.2%~~ *increase for M&I surface water & 14.5% for Ag surface water*

6.4% increase for Ag groundwater production

	Dollars Per Acre Foot			
	FY 2015–16	FY 2016–17	Proposed Maximum FY 2017–18	
Zone W-2 (North County)				
Basic User/Groundwater Production Charge				
Municipal & Industrial	894.00	1,072.00	~~1,178.00~~	1,175.00
Agricultural	21.36	23.59	25.09	
Surface Water Charge				
Surface Water Master Charge	22.60	27.46	33.36	
Total Surface Water, Municipal & Industrial*	916.60	1,099.46	~~1,211.36~~	1,208.36
Total Surface Water, Agricultural*	43.96	51.05	58.45	
Treated Water Charges				
Contract Surcharge	100.00	100.00	100.00	
Total Treated Water Contract Charge**	994.00	1,172.00	~~1,278.00~~	1,275.00
Non-Contract Surcharge	200.00	50.00	~~50.00~~	100.00
Total Treated Water Non-Contract Charge***	1,094.00	1,122.00	~~1,228.00~~	1,275.00

*Note: The total surface water charge is the sum of the basic user charge (which equals the groundwater production charge) plus the water master charge

**Note: The total treated water contract charge is the sum of the basic user charge (which equals the groundwater production charge) plus the contract surcharge

***Note: The total treated water non-contract charge is the sum of the basic user charge (which equals the groundwater production charge) plus the non-contract surcharge

$3.55

~~$3.65~~ per month average household increase

Page 38

FY 2018: South County Proposed Maximum Charges

6.4% increase for M&I & Ag groundwater production
7.3% increase for M&I surface water & 14.5% for Ag surface water
6.7% increase for M&I recycled water & 3.2% for Ag recycled water

	Dollars Per Acre Foot		
	FY 2015–16	FY 2016–17	Proposed Maximum FY 2017–18
Zone W-5 (South County)			
Basic User/Groundwater Production Charge			
Municipal & Industrial	356.00	393.00	418.00
Agricultural	21.36	23.59	25.09
Surface Water Charge			
Surface Water Master Charge	22.60	27.46	33.36
Total Surface Water, Municipal & Industrial*	378.60	420.46	451.36
Total Surface Water, Agricultural*	43.96	51.05	58.45
Recycled Water Charges			
Municipal & Industrial	336.00	373.00	398.00
Agricultural	45.16	47.38	48.88

*Note: The total surface water charge is the sum of the basic user charge (which equals the groundwater production charge) plus the water master charge

**Note: The total treated water contract charge is the sum of the basic user charge (which equals the groundwater production charge) plus the contract surcharge

***Note: The total treated water non-contract charge is the sum of the basic user charge (which equals the groundwater production charge) plus the non-contract surcharge

$0.86 per month average household increase

Groundwater Production Charges Adjusted Projection

HANDOUT: AGENDA ITEM 4.1



Impact on Multi-Year Groundwater Production Charge Projection

Proposed Maximum

Proposed Maximum	2016–17	2017–18	2018–19	2019–20	2020–21	2021–22
No. County (W-2) M&I GWP charge ($/AF)	$1,072	$1,178	$1,306	$1,449	$1,607	$1,782
Y-Y Growth %	19.9%	9.9%	10.9%	10.9%	10.9%	10.9%
So. County (W-5) M&I GWP charge ($/AF)	$393	$418	$442	$467	$494	$522
Y-Y Growth %	10.4%	6.4%	5.7%	5.7%	5.8%	5.7%

Staff Proposed Adjustments

Adjusted Proposed Maximum	2016–17	2017–18	2018–19	2019–20	2020–21	2021–22
No. County (W-2) M&I GWP charge ($/AF)	$1,072	$1,175	$1,288	$1,412	$1,547	$1,695
Y-Y Growth %	19.9%	9.6%	9.6%	9.6%	9.6%	9.6%
So. County (W-5) M&I GWP charge ($/AF)	$393	$418	$442	$467	$494	$522
Y-Y Growth %	10.4%	6.4%	5.7%	5.7%	5.8%	5.7%

Note: Staff Proposed Adjustments reflect schedule extension for Expedited Purified Water Program

Benchmarks

Comparison of FY 17 proposed increase with similar agencies

	% inc. '14 to '15	% inc. '15 to '16	% inc. '16 to '17	FY 17	Projection FY 18[3]
SCVWD North W-2 (Groundwater prdctn per AF)	10%	20%	20%	$1,072	9.6%
SCVWD North W-2 (Treated Water per AF)	9%	17%	18%	$1,172	8.8%
SCVWD South W-5 (Groundwater prdctn per AF)	5%	12%	10%	$393	6.4%
Metropolitan WD (Untreated Water per AF)[1]	-1%	1%	8%	$762	4.4%
Metropolitan WD (Treated Water per AF)[1]	3%	1%	2%	$1,075	3.8%
Orange County WD (Groundwater per AF)	7%	10%	25%	$402	TBD
San Diego County WA (Treated Water per AF)[1]	3%	6%	1%	$1,531	TBD
San Francisco PUC (Treated Water per AF)[2]	17%	25%	8%	$1,969	0.0%
Zone 7 (Treated Water per AF)[1]	3%	37%	15%	$1,575	-13.2%

1) MWD, SDCWA and Zone 7 rates based on calendar year (i.e. 2018 rate would be effective on 1/1/2018)

2) SFPUC rates include BAWSCA bond surcharge estimate of $183/AF

3) SCVWD FY 18 projection includes staff proposed adjustments to proposed maximum

Retail Agency Benchmarks

HANDOUT: AGENDA ITEM 4.1



Notes:

- **SCVWD retailer rates shown include SCVWD proposed adjusted increase for FY 2017-18, but do not include increases that retailers may impose**
- **Well owner rates exclude pumping costs (e.g. electricity) and well maintenance costs**

State Water Project Tax Recommendation

- **Staff recommends decreasing the SWP tax from $33M to $26M**
- **The SWP tax bill for the average single family residence would increase from $55.00 to $44.00/year.**

Impact if SWP tax not approved:

- $148/AF in terms of North County M&I groundwater production charge
- $31/AF in terms of South County M&I groundwater production charge
- $755,000 in terms of Open space credit



Schedule & Wrap Up

HANDOUT: AGENDA ITEM 4.1

2017 schedule for hearings and meetings

✓	Dec 13	Board Workshop: Planning for FY 18 Groundwater Prod. Charges
✓	Jan 10	Board Meeting on Preliminary Groundwater Prod. Charge Analysis
✓	Feb 24	Mail notice of public hearing and file PAWS report
✓	March 15	Water Retailers Meeting
✓	April 3	Ag Water Advisory Committee
✓	April 4	Landscape Committee Meeting
	April 11	Open Public Hearing
	April 13	Continue Public Hearing in Morgan Hill (Informational Open House)
	April 17	Environmental & Water Resources Committee
	April 19	Water Commission Meeting
	April 25	Conclude Public Hearing
	May 9	Adopt budget & groundwater production and other water charges

Note: Protests may be submitted between the date the notice was mailed (February 24) and the conclusion of the hearing (April 25)

Feedback from Advisory Committees and Community

- Water Retailers
- Ag Advisory
- Landscape Committee
- Public Phone Calls

Summary and Next Steps

HANDOUT: AGENDA ITEM 4.1

Summary

- FY 18 increase driven by vital infrastructure rehabilitation, upgrades, and investments
- Staff proposed adjustments would reduce the FY 2017-18 groundwater production charge increase relative to the proposed maximum

Next Steps

- Obtain Feedback from Water Commission and Environmental & Water Resources Committee
- Continue Hearing to April 13 in Morgan Hill

RESOLUTION NO. 12-10

A RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF
THE SANTA CLARA VALLEY WATER DISTRICT ADOPTING PROCEDURES
FOR THE IMPOSITION OF SURFACE WATER CHARGES

WHEREAS, pursuant to Section 4 of the District Act, the purposes of the District Act are to authorize the District to provide comprehensive water management for all beneficial uses within Santa Clara County; and

WHEREAS, Section 5(5) of the District Act authorizes District to do any and every lawful act necessary to be done that sufficient water may be available for beneficial uses within Santa Clara County; and

WHEREAS, Section 5(12) authorizes the District to make contracts and do all acts necessary for the full exercise of all powers vested in the District; and

WHEREAS, Proposition 218, adopted on November 6, 1996, added Articles XIIIC and XIIID to the California Constitution which impose certain procedural and substantive requirements with respect to the imposition of certain new or increased fees and charges; and

WHEREAS, whether legally required or not, the District Board believes it to be in the best interest of the community to align its practices with respect to the imposition of surface water charges to mirror the majority protest requirements of Article XIII D, section 6 applicable to charges for water services to the extent possible; and

WHEREAS, the District Board believes it to be in the best interest of the community to record its decisions regarding implementation of the provisions relating to imposition of surface water charges and to provide the community with a guide to those decisions and how they have been made; and

NOW, THEREFORE, the Board of Directors of Santa Clara Valley Water District does hereby resolve as follows:

SECTION 1. Statement of Legislative Intent. It is the Board of Directors' intent in adopting this resolution, to adopt the notice, hearing, and majority protest procedure proceedings that are consistent, and in conformance with, Articles XIIIC and XIIID of the California Constitution and with the Proposition 218 Omnibus Implementation Act and the provisions of other statutes authorizing imposition of surface water charges. To the extent that these requirements are legally required to supercede the requirements set forth in the District Act, these provisions are intended to prevail.

SECTION 2. Definitions.

A. Record Owner. The District will provide the required notice to the Record Owner. "Record Owner" means the record owner of the property on which the surface water use-facility is present, and the tenant(s) who are District surface water permittees liable for the payment of the surface water charge.

B. **Charge Zone.** "Charge Zone" means the District zone (i.e. Zone W-2 or Zone W-5) that a surface water user's turnout is located, which is applicable in identifying the proposed surface water charge. Surface water users that receive surface water outside of either Zone W-2 or Zone W-5 are deemed to be located in the zone to which the surface water user's turnout is most nearly located.

SECTION 3. Surface Water Charge Proceeding. The following procedures will be used:

A. **Those Subject to the charge.** The Record Owners of the existing surface use-facilities.

B. **Amount of Charge.** A formula or schedule of charges by which the customer can easily calculate the potential surface water charge will be included in the notice. The surface water charge is comprised of a basic user charge and a surface water master charge. The surface water charge must comply with the following substantive requirements:

1. Revenues derived from the surface water charge will not be used for any purpose other than that for which the charge is imposed.

2. Revenues derived from the surface water charge will not exceed the direct and indirect costs required to provide the service.

3. The amount of the surface water charge must not exceed the proportional cost of the service attributable to the property.

4. No charge may be imposed for a service unless the service is actually used by, or immediately available to the property owner (or, if applicable, the tenant).

5. No charge can be imposed for general governmental services where the service is available to the public at large in substantially the same manner as it is to property owners.

C. **Notice.** The following guidelines apply to giving notice of the surface water charge.

1. Record Owner(s) of each parcel subject to the surface water charge, meaning any parcel with a surface water use-facility, will be determined from the last equalized property tax roll. If the property tax roll indicates more than one owner, each owner will be sent the notice. District surface water permittees liable for the payment of the surface water charge will also be provided with the notice.

2. The notice must be sent at least forty-five (45) days prior to the date set for the public hearing on the surface water charge.

3. Failure of any person to receive the notice will not invalidate the proceedings.

D. Surface Water Charge Protest. The following guidelines apply to the surface water charge protest procedure:

1. The notice will be mailed to all affected Record Owners at least forty-five (45) days prior to the date of the public hearing on the proposed surface water charge.

2. Written protests must be forwarded to the Clerk of the Board by mail or in person, sealed in an envelope which conceals the contents, with the property address or APN written on the outside of the envelope. To be counted, protests must be received no later than the date for return of protests stated on the notice, or the close of the public hearing, whichever is later.

3. A protest must be signed under penalty of perjury. For properties with more than one Record Owner, a protest from any one surface water user-facility will count as a protest for the property. No more than one protest will be counted for any given property.

4. Only protests with original signatures will be accepted. Photocopied signatures will not be accepted. Protests will not be accepted via e-mail. Protests must be submitted in sealed envelopes identifying the property on which the surface water user-facility is located, and include the legibly printed name of the signator. Protests not submitted as required by this Resolution will not be counted.

5. This proceeding is not an election.

6. Written Protests must remain sealed until the tabulation of protests commences at the conclusion of the public hearing. A written protest may be submitted or changed by the person who submitted the protest prior to the conclusion of the public testimony on the proposed charge at the public hearing.

7. Prior to the public hearing, neither the protest nor the envelope in which it is submitted will be treated as a public record, pursuant to the Government Code section 6254(c) and any other applicable law, in order to prevent potential unwarranted invasions of the submitter's privacy and to protect the integrity of the protest process.

E. Tabulating Protests. The following guidelines apply to tabulating protests:

1. It will be the responsibility of the Clerk of the Board to determine the validity of all protests. The Clerk will accept as valid all protests except those in the following categories:

   a. A photocopy which does not contain an original signature;
   b. An unsigned protest;
   c. A protest without a legible printed name;
   d. A protest which appears to be tampered with or otherwise invalid based upon its appearance or method of delivery or other circumstances;

e. A protest submitted to the District via e-mail;
f. A protest submitted in an envelope that does not have the address or APN written on the outside of the envelope;
g. A protest signed by someone other than the Record Owner for the APN.

The Clerk's decision, after consultation with the District Counsel, that a protest is invalid is final.

2. An impartial person, designated by the governing board, who does not have a vested interest in the outcome of the proposed charge will tabulate the written protests submitted, and not withdrawn. The impartial person may be a member of the Clerk of the Board Office.

3. A Record Owner who has submitted a protest may withdraw that protest at any time up until the conclusion of the final public hearing on the surface water charge.

4. A property owner's failure to receive notice of the surface water charge will not invalidate the proceedings conducted under this procedure.

F. Public Hearing.

1. At the public hearing, the District Board will hear and consider all public testimony regarding the proposed surface water charge and accept written protests until the close of the public hearing, which hearing may be continued from time to time.

2. The District Board may impose reasonable time limits on both the length of the entire hearing and the length of each speaker's testimony.

3. At the conclusion of the hearing, the Clerk of the Board, or other neutral person designated to do the tabulation will complete tabulation of the protests from Record Owners, including those received during public hearing.

4. If it is not possible to tabulate the protests on the same day as the public hearing, or if additional time is necessary for public testimony, the District Board may continue the public hearing to a later date to receive additional testimony, information or to finish tabulating the protests; or may close the public hearing and continue the item to a future meeting to finish tabulating the protests.

5. If according to the final tabulation of the protests from Record Owners, the number of protests submitted against the proposed surface water charge (or increase of the surface water charge) within a Charge Zone exceeds 50% plus one of either: (i) the identified number of parcels within that Charge Zone, or (ii) the identified number of owners and tenants who are subject to the surface water charge within that Charge Zone, then a "majority protest" exists and the District Board of Directors will not impose the surface water charge within that Charge Zone.

Resolution 12-10

A Resolution of the Board of Directors of the Santa Clara Valley Water District Adopting Procedures for the Imposition of Surface Water Charges

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Board of Directors of Santa Clara Valley Water District by the following vote on February 14, 2012.

AYES:	Directors	T. Estremera, D. Gage, J. Judge, P. Kwok, R. Santos, B. Schmidt, L. LeZotte
NOES:	Directors	None
ABSENT:	Directors	None
ABSTAIN:	Directors	None

SANTA CLARA VALLEY WATER DISTRICT

By: _____
LINDA J. LEZOTTE
Chair/Board of Directors

ATTEST: MICHELE L. KING, CMC

_____
Clerk/Board of Directors

RESOLUTION NO.12– 11

AN AMENDED AND RESTATED RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE SANTA CLARA VALLEY WATER DISTRICT ADOPTING PROCEDURES FOR THE IMPOSITION OF GROUNDWATER PRODUCTION CHARGES

WHEREAS, Section 26 of the District Act includes provisions relating to imposition and notice and opportunity to be heard on the imposition of groundwater production charges, including the opportunity to contest the imposition; and

WHEREAS, Section 26 of the District Act provides the purposes for which groundwater production charges can be collected as follows:

1. To pay for construction, operation and maintenance of imported water facilities;
2. To pay for imported water purchases;
3. To pay for construction, operation and maintenance of facilities to conserve or distribute water including facilities for groundwater recharge, surface distribution, and purification and treatment of water;
4. To pay for debt incurred for the above purposes.

WHEREAS, Proposition 218, adopted on November 6, 1996, added Articles XIIIC and XIIID to the California Constitution which impose certain procedural and substantive requirements with respect to the imposition of certain new or increased fees and charges; and

WHEREAS, whether the District's groundwater production charge is assessed upon a parcel of property or upon a person as an incident of property ownership such that it is subject to proposition 218 is a subject currently before the courts and has not yet been finally decided; and

WHEREAS, regardless of whether the District is legally required to or not, the District Board believes it to be in the best interest of the community to align its practices with respect to the imposition of groundwater production charges to mirror the majority protest requirements of Article XIII D section 6 applicable to charges for water to the extent possible; and

WHEREAS, some of the requirements of the majority protest procedure are unclear and require further judicial interpretation or legislative implementation; and WHEREAS, the District Board believes it to be in the best interest of the community to record its decisions regarding implementation of the provisions relating to imposition of groundwater production charges and to provide the community with a guide to those decisions and how they have been made;

NOW, THEREFORE, the Board of Directors of Santa Clara Valley Water District does hereby resolve as follows:

SECTION 1. Statement of Legislative Intent. It is the Board of Director's intent in adopting this amended and restated resolution, to adopt the notice, hearing, and majority protest procedure proceedings that are consistent, and in conformance with, Articles XIIIC and XIIID of the California Constitution and with the Proposition 218 Omnibus Implementation Act and the provisions of other statutes authorizing imposition of water charges. To the extent that these requirements are legally required to supercede the requirements set forth in the District Act, these provisions are intended to prevail.

SECTION 2. Definition of Record Owner. The District Act authorizes the groundwater production charge to be noticed and imposed on "owners or operators of water-producing facilities" which is not based on property ownership, while Article XIII D requires that notice be provided to the owner of a parcel whose name and address appears on the last equalized secured property tax assessment roll. In order to resolve the differences between these two approaches, the District will provide the required notice to the record owner of the property on which the water-producing facility is present, as well as to the owners or operators of water producing facilities (who are tenants of that real property directly liable to pay the groundwater production charge to the District).

SECTION 3. Groundwater Production Charge Proceeding. The following procedures will be used:

A. **Those Subject to the charge.** The Record Owners of existing water producing wells including water supply and extraction/environmental wells, whether currently active or not.

B. **Amount of Charge.** A formula or schedule of charges by which the customer can easily calculate the potential charge will be included in the notice. The charge must comply with the following substantive requirements:

1. Revenues derived from the charge will not be used for any purpose other than that for which the charge is imposed.

2. Revenues derived from the charge will not exceed the direct and indirect costs required to provide the service.

3. The amount of the charge must not exceed the proportional cost of the service attributable to the property.

4. No charge may be imposed for a service unless the service is actually used by, or immediately available to the owner.

5. No charge can be imposed for general governmental services where the service is available to the public at large in substantially the same manner as it is to property owners.

C. **Notice.** The following guidelines apply to giving notice of the groundwater production charge.

1. The record owner(s) of each parcel subject to the charge, meaning any parcel with a water-producing facility, will be determined from the last equalized property tax roll. If the property tax roll indicates more than one owner, each owner will be sent the notice. Where tenants are directly liable to pay the groundwater production charge to the District, they will also be provided with the notice.

2. The notice must be sent at least forty-five (45) days prior to the date set for the public hearing on the charge.

3. Failure of any person to receive notice will not invalidate the proceedings.

D. Groundwater Production Charge Protest. The following guidelines apply to the protest procedure:

1. The notice will be mailed to all affected Record Owners at least forty-five (45) days prior to the date of the public hearing on the proposed charge.

2. Written protests must be forwarded to the Clerk of the Board by mail or in person, sealed in an envelope which conceals the contents, with the property address or APN written on the outside of the envelope. To be counted, protests must be received no later than the date for return of protests stated on the notice, or the close of the public hearing, whichever is later.

3. A protest must be signed under penalty of perjury. For properties with more than one Record Owner, a protest from any one will count as a protest for the property. No more than one protest will be counted for any given property.

4. Only protests with original signatures will be accepted. Photocopied signatures will not be accepted. Protests will not be accepted via e-mail. Protests must be submitted in sealed envelopes identifying the property on which the well is located, and include the legibly printed name of the signator. Protests not submitted as required by this amended and restated esolution will not be counted.

5. This proceeding is not an election.

6. Written Protests must remain sealed until the tabulation of protests commences at the conclusion of the public hearing. A written protest may be submitted, or changed, or withdrawn by the person who submitted the protest prior to the conclusion of the public testimony on the proposed charge at the public hearing.

7. Prior to the public hearing, neither the protest nor the envelope in which it is submitted will be treated as a public record, pursuant to the Government Code section 6254(c) and any other applicable law, in order to prevent potential unwarranted invasions of the submitter's privacy and to protect the integrity of the protest process.

E. Tabulating Protests. The following guidelines apply to tabulating protests:

1. It will be the responsibility of the Clerk of the Board to determine the validity of all protests. The Clerk will accept as valid all protests except those in the following categories:

   a. A photocopy which does not contain an original signature;
   b. An unsigned protest;

c. A protest without a legible printed name;
d. A protest which appears to be tampered with or otherwise invalid based upon its appearance or method of delivery or other circumstances;
e. A protest submitted to the District via e-mail;
f. A protest submitted in an envelope that does not have the address or APN written on the outside of the envelope;
g. A protest signed by someone other than the Record Owner for the APN.

The Clerk's decision, after consultation with the District Counsel, that a protest is invalid is final.

2. An impartial person, designated by the governing board, who does not have a vested interest in the outcome of the proposed charge will tabulate the written protests submitted, and not withdrawn. The impartial person may be a member of the Clerk of the Board Office.

3. A Record Owner who has submitted a protest may withdraw the protest at any time up until the conclusion of the final public hearing on the charge.

4. A property owner's failure to receive notice of the charge will not invalidate the proceedings conducted under this procedure.

F. Public Hearing

1. At the public hearing, the District Board will hear and consider all public testimony regarding the proposed charge and accept written protests until the close of the public hearing, which hearing may be continued from time to time.

2. The District Board may impose reasonable time limits on both the length of the entire hearing and the length of each speaker's testimony.

3. At the conclusion of the hearing, the Clerk of the Board, or other neutral person designated to do the tabulation will complete tabulation of the protests from Record Owners, including those received during public hearing.

4. If it is not possible to tabulate the protests on the same day as the public hearing, or if additional time is necessary for public testimony, the District Board may continue the public hearing to a later date to receive additional testimony, information or to finish tabulating the protests; or may close the public hearing and continue the item to a future meeting to finish tabulating the protests.

5. If according to the final tabulation of the protests from Record Owners, the number of protests submitted against the proposed increase of the groundwater production charge within a groundwater production charge zone exceeds 50% plus one of either: (a) the identified number of parcels within that groundwater production charge zone, or (b) the identified number of owners and operators within that groundwater production charge zone who are subject to the increased groundwater production charge, then a "majority protest" exists and the District

Board of Directors will not impose any increase to the groundwater production charge within that groundwater production charge zone.

SECTION 4

Resolution No.11-03 adopted by the District on January 25, 2011 and Resolution No. 10-06 adopted by the District on January 26, 2010 are both hereby amended and restated in their entirety as set forth in this amended and restated resolution. This amended and restated resolution shall take effect immediately upon its adoption.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Board of Directors of Santa Clara Valley Water District by the following vote on February 14, 2012.

AYES:	Directors	T. Estremera, D. Gage, J. Judge, P. Kwok, R. Santos, B. Schmidt, L. LeZotte
NOES:	Directors	None
ABSENT:	Directors	None
ABSTAIN:	Directors	None

SANTA CLARA VALLEY WATER DISTRICT

By: _____
LINDA J. LEZOTTE
Chair/Board of Directors

ATTEST: MICHELE L. KING, CMC

_____
Clerk/Board of Directors

HANDOUT: AGENDA ITEM 4.1

FEBRUARY 2017

46th Annual Report

FY 2017-18

Protection and Augmentation of Water Supplies

Santa Clara Valley Water District

5750 Almaden Expressway, San Jose, CA 95118-3615 | (408) 265-2600 | www.valleywater.org

Santa Clara Valley Water District

Our mission is to provide Silicon Valley safe, clean water for a healthy life, environment, and economy.

February 24, 2017

Dear water district stakeholder:

The Santa Clara Valley Water District has released its 46th Annual Report on the Protection and Augmentation of Water Supplies, which documents the water district's efforts to ensure a reliable water supply to support a healthy life, environment and economy in Santa Clara County. The report presents the basis for the proposed maximum groundwater production charges for fiscal year (FY) 2017-18, and is posted on our website, www.valleywater.org.

The report is published and filed prior to the water district holding public hearings on the groundwater production charges. Groundwater replenished by the water district makes up, on average, two-thirds of the water used by residents, businesses and municipal and retail water providers countywide.

With revenue from groundwater production charges, the water district protects and augments water supplies for the health, welfare and safety of the community. The activities, programs and services undertaken with funding from groundwater production charges include:

Water supplies
- Operate and maintain local reservoirs to capture water and fill groundwater percolation ponds
- Purchase imported water and develop local water supplies to replenish the groundwater basin

Water quality
- Monitor and protect groundwater from pollutants and salt water intrusion
- Ensure proper construction and destruction of wells to prevent contaminants from infiltrating the groundwater basin

Infrastructure
- Plan and construct improvements to infrastructure such as dams, pipelines, ponds, drinking water and advanced purified water treatment plants, and pump stations
- Operate and maintain dams, pipelines, ponds, treatment plants and pumping stations to help sustain the groundwater aquifer

Groundwater basin storage levels have recovered significantly after several years of unprecedented drought. This is good news, in large part driven by the community's response to the Board's calls for conservation in conjunction with the district's diligent efforts. We appreciate that the community's efforts have helped Santa Clara County avoid the serious consequences of groundwater overdraft, land subsidence and saltwater intrusion.

However, drought conditions could return. Therefore we encourage the community to make conservation a way of life. Due to uncertainty over continued or potential reocurring drought conditions in the near term and to continue the momentum of the community's water savings practices, the water district's Board took action in January 2017 to continue the call for a countywide reduction of 20 percent, when compared to 2013 water use.

Throughout the historic drought, we have continued to focus on much needed investments. The upgrade of Rinconada Water Treatment Plant is well underway, which will extend the plant service life for the next 50 years. Much planning and design progress has been made towards the seismic retrofit of Anderson Dam, which will help ensure public safety. While the water district continues to strive for cost reductions and better utilization of the public's assets entrusted to us, we must align water charges with the costs to deliver the services the community relies on yearly. The proposed maximum charges will help drive progress on vital infrastructure upgrades—like those at Anderson Dam and Rinconada Water Treatment Plant and will aid the effort to expand purified water supplies, which will bolster future water supply reliability.

continued on next page...

The following represents the maximum proposed rate increases in its two groundwater zones for FY 2017-18:

North County Zone W-2 up to 9.9%, average household increase of $3.65 per month
South County Zone W-5 up to 6.4% average household increase of $0.86 per month
Surface water users in North County up to 10.2% average household increase of $3.85 per month
Surface water users in South County up to 7.3% average household increase of $1.06 per month
Ag groundwater users in either zone up to 6.4% or about $0.25 per month per acre
Ag surface water users in either zone up to 14.5% or about $1.23 per month per acre

I encourage you to learn more about these important groundwater issues. In addition to the information on our website at www.valleywater.org, the following opportunities are also available for you to gather information and provide input:

April 11, 2017
1 p.m.
- Board meeting
- Time certain

Public Hearing (opens)
Santa Clara Valley Water District Board Room
5700 Almaden Expwy., San Jose

April 13, 2017
- 6 p.m. open house
- 7 p.m. meeting

Public Hearing & Open House
Morgan Hill City Council Chambers
17555 Peak Avenue, Morgan Hill

April 25, 2017
6 p.m.
- Board meeting
- Time certain

Public Hearing (concludes)
Santa Clara Valley Water District Board Room
5700 Almaden Expwy., San Jose

If you have questions or concerns about groundwater, this year's charge-setting process, or how we can better serve you, please join us at an upcoming open house or public hearing, or visit our website, www.valleywater.org. You may also contact us directly by phone at (408) 265-2600, or email at clerkoftheboard@valleywater.org.

Sincerely,

James Fiedler

James M. Fiedler, P.E., D.WRE

Chief Operating Officer
Water Utility Enterprise

HANDOUT: AGENDA ITEM 4.1

46th Annual Report
Protection and Augumentation of Water Supplies
2017-2018

Sections

Prepared by:
Darin Taylor, Chief Financial Officer
Jennifer Abadilla, Senior Management Analyst
Michele Keefhaver, Senior Management Analyst

Under the Direction of:
Norma Camacho
Interim Chief Executive Officer
James Fiedler
Chief Operating Officer, Water Utility Enterprise
Susan Stanton
Chief Operating Officer, Administrative Services

Contributors:
Linda Arluck
Hossein Ashktorab
Aaron Baker
Erin Baker
Gerald De La Piedra
Vanessa De La Piedra
Hemang Desai
Garth Hall
Tracy Hemmeter
Dana Jacobson
Luis Jaimes
Cindy Kao
Bassam Kassab
Yaping Liu
James O'Brien
Katherine Oven
Melih Ozbilgin
Samina Shaikh
Sarah Young

Board of Directors:
John L. Varela – District 1, Chair
Richard P. Santos – District 3, Vice Chair
Barbara Keegan – District 2
Linda J. LeZotte – District 4
Nai Hsueh – District 5
Tony Estremera – District 6
Gary Kremen – District 7

Office of External Affairs
Local, State & Federal Government Relations
Rick Callender

Communications
Marty Grimes
Jose Villareal
Joy O. Lim
Ed Morales
Benjamin Apolo III
Sarah Khosla

Executive Summary

This is the 46th annual report on the Santa Clara Valley Water District's activities in the protection and augmentation of water supplies. This report is prepared in accordance with the requirements of the District Act, section 26.5.

Section 1
Provides information on the present water requirements and water supply availability;

Section 2
Addresses future water requirements and water supply availability;

Section 3
Discusses programs needed to sustain water supply reliability into the future;

Section 4
Provides the financial analysis of the water district's water utility system, including future capital improvement and maintenance requirements, operating requirements, financing methods and the proposed maximum groundwater production and other water charges by zone for fiscal year (FY) 2017-18.

For FY 2017-18, district staff is proposing up to a 9.9 percent increase in the municipal and industrial (M&I) groundwater production charge for the North County and up to a 6.4 percent increase for South County. For M&I surface water users the district staff is proposing up to a 10.2 percent increase for North County and up to 7.3 percent for South County. The district staff is proposing up to a 6.4 percent increase for agricultural groundwater users and up to 14.4 percent for agricultural surface water users in either zone. These increases are necessary to pay for critical investments that will help ensure reliable water supply.

What is being done to minimize the rate increase?

To minimize the FY 2017-18 rate increase the district:

- Board recently reviewed all capital projects to ensure only urgent and critical needs are funded.
- Is currently working on a refund of outstanding debt that will result in approximately $6 million (M) of present value savings.
- Continues to partner with other water purveyors to collectively buy electricity at a discount. Anticipated savings is $2M district-wide for FY 2017-18.
- Has opted out of full service maintenance contracts at the Silicon Valley Advanced Water Purification Center as internal staff ramp up knowledge and experience. Estimated savings is $20,000 per year.

We are currently projecting that water use will be 24 percent lower in FY 2017-18 than calendar year 2013. This results in lower revenues and puts upward pressure on water rates in the near term. However over the long term, reduced water use per capita will reduce the need for long term investments in accessing new supplies, which will minimize rate increases in the future.

What do Groundwater Production Charges pay for?

What you get	What we do
Benefits • Reliable, healthy and clean drinking water • Diverse water supply sources • Protected and sustained water resources • Maximized water conservation and recycling • Subsidence prevention	**Replenish the groundwater basin** • Operate and maintain local reservoirs to capture water and fill recharge ponds. • Purchase imported water. **Ensure safe drinking water** • Monitor and protect groundwater from pollutants. • Ensure proper construction and destruction of wells. **Construct, operate and maintain critical infrastructure** • Plan and construct improvements to infrastructure such as dams, pipelines, ponds, treatment plants and pump stations. • Operate and maintain pipelines and pumping plants to help sustain the groundwater aquifer.

Local water

A complex network of reservoirs, creeks and specialized ponds replenishes the groundwater basin. The same system is also used to transport imported water so that it, too, can be used to replenish the aquifer. It all works so well that "managed" recharge actually exceeds natural recharge in nearly all years. Water pumped from the groundwater basin through wells is used by private well owners, farmers and water retailers. Some water captured in reservoirs is processed at state-of-the art drinking water treatment plants. The treated water is sold to local water retailers, such as San Jose Water Company, who use their own distribution systems to serve customers.

Imported water

55% of the county's current water supply comes as snow or rain in the Sierra Nevada range of northern and eastern California, then as water in rivers that flow toward the Sacramento-San Joaquin River Delta. This "imported water" is brought into the county through the complex infrastructure of the State Water Project, the federal Central Valley Project and San Francisco's Hetch Hetchy system. Three drinking water treatment plants deliver imported water to customers, while the rest is used to replenish groundwater basins. Having treated imported water available to meet demands protects the groundwater basin from over pumping.

Recycled/Purified water

An important and growing source of water is recycled and purified water. Used primarily for irrigation by industry and agriculture, recycled water is wastewater that has been treated to meet strict standards set by the State Water Resources Control Board. Using recycled water helps conserve drinking water supplies, provides a dependable, drought-proof, locally controlled water supply, and reduces dependency on imported water and groundwater.

More than 20 years of water planning

Since the major drought in the late 1980's, the district made several critical investments including: 1) storing water in the Semitropic water bank in Kern County; 2) a series of recycled water expansion projects, and 3) enhancements to the conservation program. These investments paid off handsomely by helping to lessen the magnitude of the historic drought that we just experienced.



Over the years, the water district's water importation and groundwater management activities have stabilized groundwater levels and prevented land subsidence, or sinking.

Estimated 2016 total county water supply

The chart on page iv shows calendar year 2016 estimated total water supply for Santa Clara County. Water from our 10 local reservoirs and water imported from the federal Central Valley Project and State Water Project is:

- Used to replenish local groundwater basins, which are pumped for use by individual well owners, municipal and retail water providers
- Sent to the district's three drinking water treatment plants
- Supplied directly to water retailers
- Released to meet environmental needs and regulations

Non-district supplies in the county include rainfall recharge; water from San Francisco's Hetch Hetchy system; and private water rights. Note: stored groundwater is not included in the overall supply figure. For more detail on sources of supply, see Section 1.

Acre-foot (AF): About 326,000 gallons, the amount used by two families of five over one year.

Calendar Year 2016



[A] Includes net district and non-district surface water supplies and estimated rainfall recharge to groundwater basins.
[B] Includes municipal, industrial, agricultural and environmental uses.

WATER RATES

		Dollars Per Acre Foot of water		
	Basic User/Groundwater Production Charge	**FY 2015-16**	**FY 2016-17**	**Proposed Maximum FY 2017-18**
Zone W-2 (North County)	Municipal and Industrial	894.00	1,072.00	1,178.00
	Agricultural	21.36	23.59	25.09
	Surface Water Charge			
	Surface Water Master Charge	22.60	27.46	33.36
	Total Surface Water, Municipal and Industrial*	916.60	1,099.46	1,211.36
	Total Surface Water, Agricultural*	43.96	51.05	58.45
	Treated Water Charges			
	Contract Surcharge	100.00	100.00	100.00
	Total Treated Water Contract Charge**	994.00	1,172.00	1,278.00
	Non-Contract Surcharge	200.00	50.00	50.00
	Total Treated Water Non-Contract Charge***	1,094.00	1,122.00	1,228.00

	Basic User/Groundwater Production Charge	**FY 2015-16**	**FY 2016-17**	**Proposed Maximum FY 2017-18**
Zone W-5 (South County)	Municipal and Industrial	356.00	393.00	418.00
	Agricultural	21.36	23.59	25.09
	Surface Water Charge			
	Surface Water Master Charge	22.60	27.46	33.36
	Total Surface Water, Municipal and Industrial*	378.60	420.46	451.36
	Total Surface Water, Agricultural*	43.96	51.05	58.45
	Recycled Water Charges			
	Municipal and Industrial	336.00	373.00	398.00
	Agricultural	45.16	47.38	48.88

*Note: The total surface water charge is the sum of the basic user charge (which equals the groundwater production charge) plus the water master charge.

**Note: The total treated water contract charge is the sum of the basic user charge (which equals the groundwater production charge) plus the contract surcharge.

***Note: The total treated water non-contract charge is the sum of the basic user charge (which equals the groundwater production charge) plus the non-contract surcharge.

Water district staff is proposing groundwater production charge increases of up to 9.9 percent for North County Municipal and Industrial (M&I) well owners and up to 6.4 percent for South County. For agricultural groundwater users, the water district staff is proposing up to 6.4 percent increase in either zone. For surface water users, the water district staff is proposing increases up to 10.2 percent for North County M&I water users, up to 7.3 percent for South County M&I water users and up to 14.5 percent for agricultural surface water users. The increases are necessary to cover critical capital program needs, including dam seismic retrofits, water treatment plant upgrades and recycled water system expansion. The proposed maximum charges are shown in the right-hand column of the chart above.

1 2017 PAWS REPORT
Present Water Requirements and Water Supply Availability

1-1 WATER SUPPLY OVERVIEW

The mission of the Santa Clara Valley District (district) is to provide Silicon Valley safe, clean water for a healthy life, environment and economy. Accordingly, the district employs an integrated approach to manage a sustainable water supply through conjunctive management and use of surface water and groundwater resources and maximizing water use efficiency.

Water supply is comprised of "incoming" supplies from local and imported sources, as well as previously-stored supplies, referred to as carryover, withdrawn from in-county and/or out-of-county surface water and groundwater storage.

Local Supplies

Local groundwater resources make up the foundation of water supply in Santa Clara County, but they need to be augmented by the district's comprehensive water supply management activities to reliably meet the needs of county residents, businesses, agriculture and the environment. These activities include direct managed recharge and in-lieu groundwater recharge through the provision of treated surface water and untreated surface water, acquisition of supplemental water supplies, water conservation and recycling, and programs to protect, manage and sustain water resources.

Runoff from precipitation constitutes the bulk of the local water supplies and is captured in local reservoirs. The water is released for groundwater recharge, in-stream beneficial uses, local raw water customers, and treatment at the treatment plants. Some of the precipitation infiltrates and recharges the groundwater basins, although this natural recharge is insufficient to fully replenish groundwater pumped from the basins.

An additional local water supply is recycled water used for non-potable purposes. Use of recycled water offsets demand for potable water. Every gallon of recycled water used in this county saves an equal gallon of groundwater or treated drinking water.

Imported Supplies

The district's imported sources of supply originate from natural runoff and releases from statewide reservoirs and pumped out of the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta by the State Water Project (SWP) and the federal Central Valley Project (CVP). The district holds contracts with the State government for 100,000 acre-feet of supply from the SWP and federal government for 152,500 acre-feet of supply from the CVP, per year, respectively. Actual deliveries depend on the availability of water supplies after meeting regulations to protect the environment and Delta water quality. The imported water delivered by the SWP and CVP is sent to the district's three water treatment plants, used to supplement groundwater recharge, or stored in local and State reservoirs for use in subsequent years. The district also stores some of its imported water in the Semitropic Groundwater Bank in Kern County for withdrawal during dry periods. Treated imported water is sold to seven of the 13 water retailers located within Santa Clara County to offset groundwater pumping. The district may also augment its imported supplies by taking deliveries of available temporary flood flows from the Delta early in the

year, before imported water contract allocations and local hydrology are known. If water supplies are insufficient to meet needs, the district may also purchase transfer water or participate in exchanges to supplement supplies; both transfer and exchange supplies are conveyed to Santa Clara County from the Delta. Additionally, eight water retailers purchase water from the City and County of San Francisco that originates from the Tuolumne River watershed and watersheds in the Bay Area. Without all of these supplemental supplies, groundwater pumping would exceed sustainable groundwater extraction levels.

Conjunctive Water Management

Since the 1930s, the district's water supply strategy has been to coordinate the management and use of surface water and groundwater to maximize water supply reliability, which is known as conjunctive management. The Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA) was signed into State law in September 2014, with the intent of promoting the local, sustainable management of groundwater supplies. SGMA identifies the Santa Clara Valley District as one of fifteen exclusive groundwater management agencies within their jurisdictions. In May 2016, the district Board of Directors (Board) adopted a resolution to become the groundwater sustainability agency for the Santa Clara and Llagas subbasins. In November 2016, the Board adopted the 2016 Groundwater Management Plan (GWMP), which describes the district's conjunctive management activities, as well as groundwater sustainability goals, strategies, and related outcome measures. The GWMP was submitted to the California Department of Water Resources (DWR) in December 2016 as an alternative to a groundwater sustainability plan, in compliance with SGMA. The district will continue to sustainably manage the Santa Clara and Llagas subbasins according to the District Act and will fully comply with SGMA.

Key district conjunctive management efforts include using imported and local surface water to recharge the groundwater subbasins. The district also provides treated and raw surface water to customers, which offsets demands on the groundwater subbasins. Water conservation and recycled water use offset demands on both surface water and groundwater. All these activities help maintain a reliable water supply.

In 2016, the district managed recharge program was above normal, replenishing the groundwater basins with about 148,000 acre-feet of local and imported surface water. The largest source of in-lieu recharge was the distribution of treated water (98,000 acre-feet). The district saved an estimated 70,000 acre-feet of water through programs designed to reduce residential, commercial, and agricultural water use and make conservation a way of life in the county. A smaller, but important and growing source of in-lieu recharge is recycled water, which provided about 19,000 acre-feet of water for irrigation, industry, and agriculture in 2016. Using recycled water reduces dependency on groundwater and surface water, helps conserve drinking water supplies, and provides a locally-controlled, drought-proof supply. The district is partnering with local recycled water producers to further expand the use of recycled water.

Without the district's conjunctive use management programs (including managed and in-lieu recharge), groundwater levels would be considerably lower than they are today, reducing water supply reliability and increasing the risks of renewed land subsidence (sinking) and salt water intrusion. Water supplies are becoming increasingly constrained by challenges including uncertainty in surface water supplies, extended droughts, climate change, and increased water demands. Maintaining the district's conjunctive use management programs and expanding them as needed is critical to making the best use of local water resources and ensuring a reliable water supply both now and in the future.

Although the groundwater basins are the district's largest water storage facility, the limiting factor of providing a reliable water supply in drought periods is the overall capacity and capability to operate a conjunctive use management system of surface water and groundwater supplies. Most of the local reservoirs were sized for annual operations, storing water in winter for release to groundwater recharge in summer and fall. The exception is the Anderson-Coyote reservoir system, which provides valuable carryover of supplies from year to year and can serve as a backup supply source to the district's water treatment plants when imported water deliveries are curtailed. However, dam safety operating restrictions placed on Anderson, Coyote, Almaden, Calero and Guadalupe reservoirs have resulted in loss of over 46,000 AF or about a quarter of the total surface storage capacity (as shown in Table 1-1.1) as well as significant loss of water supply yield.

Table 1-1.1 Original and Restricted Capacities of Major District Reservoirs

Reservoir	Year Built	Reservoir Capacity (acre-feet)	Restricted Capacity (acre-feet)	Use
Almaden*	1935	1,586	1,472	Groundwater recharge, treated for drinking water
Anderson*,**	1950	90,373	61,810	Groundwater recharge, treated for drinking water
Calero*	1935	9,934	4,585	Groundwater recharge, treated for drinking water
Chesbro	1955	7,945	7,945	Groundwater recharge
Coyote*	1936	23,244	12,382	Groundwater recharge, treated for drinking water
Guadalupe*	1935	3,415	2,218	Groundwater recharge
Lexington	1952	19,044	19,044	Groundwater recharge
Stevens Creek	1935	3,138	3,138	Groundwater recharge
Uvas	1957	9,835	9,835	Groundwater recharge
Vasona	1935	495	495	Groundwater recharge
Total		**169,009**	**122,924**	

* Reservoirs with dam safety operating restrictions
** An interim reservoir restriction is under review.

As part of annual operations planning, the district routinely opts to carry over a portion of imported water supplies for future years. Even though the amount is often limited by state or federal project operations, it provides cost-effective insurance against a subsequent dry year. Additionally, the district has invested in a water banking program at the Semitropic Water Storage District which provides 350,000 acre-feet of out-of-county water storage capacity. Together with water transfers and exchanges, this additional storage helps the district manage uncertainty and variability in supply as each water year develops.

Managing a complex system of surface water and groundwater resources is further complicated by hydrologic uncertainties, regulatory restrictions and aging infrastructure, as discussed in the following sections of this report.

1-2 PRESENT WATER SUPPLY CONDITIONS

Precipitation

Locally, rainfall for the 2015–16 season at downtown San Jose was at 96 percent of average[1]. Total rainfall from July 2015 through June 2016 resulted in a below-average rainfall season, based on data going back to 1874.

The 2016–17[2] rainfall year began with a below-average December. Cumulative rainfall at the San Jose gauge from July 1, 2016 through December 31, 2016 was estimated to be 4.13 inches. Rainfall at the San Jose gauge in January 2017 totaled 5.28 inches, which is above average for that month. Cumulative local rainfall as of February 1, 2017 was 66 percent of seasonal average to date in San Jose and 113 percent in the Coyote watershed.

Statewide precipitation by December 31, 2016 was at 140 percent of seasonal average to date. As of January 31, 2017, statewide snow water equivalent was 30 inches and 177 percent of normal.

Imported Water Allocations

The Statewide drought continued for a fifth year in 2016, with limited but increasing water supplies available from both the SWP and CVP. The SWP allocation for 2016 was initially set at ten (10) percent in December 2015 and increased to a final allocation of sixty (60) percent by April 2016. The CVP agricultural allocation for water service contractors was set at five (5) percent, and the CVP M&I allocation finalized at 55 percent. Table 1-2.1 summarizes the year types and final allocations from the SWP and CVP to the district for the last five years.

The winter of 2016-2017 has been experiencing above average hydrology, but because the water year is starting with a large deficit in water supplies, initial allocations are expected to be low. In November 2016, Department of Water Resources (DWR) set the initial SWP allocation for 2017 at twenty (20) percent. Due to a series of storms, the state increased the 2017 SWP allocation to forty-

[1] Rainfall at San Jose (station 131) was approximately 13.8 inches or 96 percent of average for the rainfall season from July 1, 2015 to June 30, 2016.
[2] Precipitation data for rainfall year 2016-17 is provisional until verified by staff in Spring of 2017.

five (45) percent on December 21, 2016 and subsequently to 60% on January 18, 2017. The initial CVP allocation will not be available until after the writing of this report.

Table 1-2.1 Statewide Water Year Types and Final Imported Water Allocations

Water Year	Year Type		Final allocations to the district as % of contract amounts		
	Sacramento River	San Joaquin River	SWP	CVP	
				M&I	AG
2011-12	below normal	Dry	65%	75%	40%
2012-13	dry	Critical	35%	70%	20%
2013-14	critical	Critical	5%	50%	0%
2014-15	critical	Critical	20%	25%	0%
2015-16	below normal	Dry	60%	55%	5%

Water Banking

To provide reliability in future years, the district banks water in groundwater storage outside of the county. This involves conveyance of the district's state and/or federal water supplies to a banking partner, another district that operates a groundwater conjunctive use program. Storage in the bank occurs when water is physically delivered to ponds to soak into the aquifer, or when surface water deliveries are used by the banking partner in lieu of groundwater pumping ("in-lieu recharge"). Return of stored water is accomplished when the banking partner uses groundwater in place of surface supplies, or physically pumps groundwater into the surface conveyance system for use by the Department of Water Resources for the SWP. The district is then delivered imported water from the Delta that would have otherwise been delivered to the banking partner or to other SWP contractors. The district banks SWP and CVP water at the Semitropic Water Storage District in Kern County. Table 1-2.2 shows the annual changes and year-end balances for banked water during calendar years 2014 through 2015 and the estimated activity for 2016.

Table 1-2.2 District Water Banking for Calendar Years 2014 through 2016 (Acre-Feet)

Water Banking	Actual 2014	Actual 2015	Estimated 2016*
SEMITROPIC WATER STORAGE DISTRICT			
Beginning Balance (January 1)	262,665	227,550	181,669
District Deposit or Withdrawal	-35,115	-45,881	+8,671
TOTAL BANKED ENDING BALANCE (December 31)	**227,550**	**181,669**	**190,339**
** 2016 deposit quantity from Semitropic being finalized*			

The district has a contractual right to deliver or "put" up to 31,675 acre-feet of water to storage each year. In any given year, the district may be able to deliver more than 31,675 acre-feet by using the unused "put" capacity of other banking partners, including Semitropic. The maximum amount of water delivered to storage in a single year was 89,022 acre-feet in 2005. The district can withdraw or "take" up to 31,500 acre-feet at a minimum, or up to 78,050 acre-feet of water from storage in any given year, depending upon the SWP allocation. The higher the SWP water supply allocation, the greater the "take" capacity. The largest amount of water previously withdrawn by the district in a single year was 45,881 acre-feet in 2015. An estimated 8,671 acre feet were delivered to the bank in 2016.

Reservoir Storage

Reservoir storage volumes in Lake Oroville, Shasta Lake, and Folsom Lake began calendar year 2016 at 47, 50 and 50 percent of historic average beginning-of-year volumes, respectively. By the end of December 2016, those levels had increased to 91, 118 and 84 percent of average as northern California has received above average precipitation and runoff during the 2016-2017 water year. By January 31, 2017, the levels were at 123, 115 and 80 percent, respectively.

Locally, the 2016–17 water year[3] started with district reservoirs at low but recovering levels. October 1, 2016 total storage in these reservoirs was 81% of the 20-year average and 41% of capacity at the spillway crest.

Total storage in district reservoirs as of February 1, 2017 was 79 percent of capacity. However, because of storage restrictions in place for half of the district reservoirs, the combined storage was at 109 percent of restricted capacity. Outlets were being utilized at full capacity to bring down reservoir storage in a safe manner and in accordance with operating rules. Total storage at district reservoirs on that date was 144 percent of the 20 year average.

Groundwater Basins

While reservoirs are a visible indicator of our local water supply, the majority of our local reserves lie hidden beneath our feet in the groundwater aquifers. Because the groundwater basins can store two times more water than all the local surface water reservoirs combined, the district strives to

[3] Water year is the twelve month period between October 1 and September 30.

maintain adequate storage in the groundwater basins in wet and average years to ensure water supply reliability during dry periods such as the last several years.

Due to improved water supply conditions in 2016 and significant water use reduction by the community, groundwater levels improved at most wells throughout the county compared to 2015, including the three index wells used to indicate general groundwater trends and conditions (see locator map in Figure 1-2.1 and related hydrographs in Figures 1-2.2 through 1-2.4). This is due to lower than normal pumping (Table 1-3.1) and above-normal recharge, which increased by about 93,500 acre-feet (Table 1-3.2) from 2015 to 2016. In 2016, water levels remained well above thresholds established to prevent renewed land subsidence[4]. The district continues to closely monitor groundwater levels and land subsidence conditions.

Figure 1-2.1 Map of Index Well Locations



[4] To avoid additional permanent subsidence due to groundwater overdraft, the district has established water level thresholds at ten index wells throughout the Santa Clara Plain. A tolerable rate of 0.01 feet per year of land subsidence was applied to determine threshold groundwater levels for these wells. Threshold groundwater levels are the groundwater levels that must be maintained to ensure a low risk of unacceptable land subsidence.

Figure 1-2.2 Historical Santa Clara Plain Groundwater Elevations, Index Well 07S01W25L001



Figure 1-2.3 Historical Coyote Valley Groundwater Elevations, Index Well 09S02E02J002



Figure 1-2.4 Historical Llagas Subbasin Groundwater Elevations, Index Well 10S03E13D003



The estimated increase in groundwater storage in 2016 is about 72,000 AF as shown in Table 1-2.3. This is a notable improvement from 2015, when groundwater reserves were reduced by about 22,000 AF. The improvement can be attributed to continued, excellent water use reduction by the community, close cooperation with water retailers, and district efforts to secure supplemental water supplies. The district continues to closely track water supply conditions and modify operations accordingly. Monthly water supply conditions are summarized in the district's Water Tracker, which is available on the district website[5]. A more detailed evaluation of groundwater conditions will be presented in the district's annual groundwater report, which will be completed in June 2017 and will include reporting on outcome measures related to groundwater storage, levels, quality and subsidence.

Table 1-2.3 End-of-Year Groundwater Storage and Change in Storage

	Cumulative Groundwater Storage Estimates AF (acre feet)		
	End of Year 2015	End of Year 2016	Change in Storage AF
Santa Clara Subbasin, Santa Clara Plain	216,300	278,500	+62,200
Santa Clara Subbasin, Coyote Valley	600	1,200	+600
Llagas Subbasin	15,600	24,800	+9,200
Total	**232,500**	**304,500**	**+72,000**

Note: Groundwater storage estimates are based on accumulated groundwater storage since 1970, 1991, and 1990 for the Santa Clara Plain, Coyote Valley, and Llagas Subbasin, respectively. These estimates are refined as additional pumping and managed recharge data become available.

[5] The Water Tracker is available on the district website: http://www.valleywater.org/EkContent.aspx?id=7491&terms=water+tracker

Water Use Reduction

The district's Water Shortage Contingency Plan evaluates the water use reduction needed based on projected end of year groundwater storage as shown in Table 1-2.4. In 2014 the Santa Clara Valley District's Board of Directors (Board) approved a resolution setting a countywide water use reduction target equal to 20 percent of 2013 water use through December 31, 2014.

Due to the ongoing drought and the community not reaching the 20 percent target in 2014, groundwater storage at the beginning of 2015 was in the "Alert" stage of our Water Shortage Contingency Plan. On March 24, 2015, the Board adopted a resolution setting a water use reduction target of 30 percent for 2015. The Board-adopted resolution also included a restriction on outdoor watering of ornamental landscapes or lawns with potable water to no more than two days per week. This action was based on the district's Water Shortage Contingency Plan and the estimated 2015 water supply conditions that showed groundwater reserves reaching the Stage 4 ("Critical") level by the end of the calendar year if water use reduction measures were not implemented. The March resolution was set to expire on December 31, 2015. However due to the need for continued savings, the Board extended the 30 percent water use reduction target to June 30, 2016 on November 24, 2015. Based on improved conditions, on June 14, 2016, the Board approved a resolution to revise the call for water use reductions to 20 percent, and to increase the allowable days for outdoor irrigation from two to three days per week. On January 31, 2017 the Board approved a resolution to continue the call for water use reductions of 20 percent and the three day per week watering schedule, however the resolution removed the recommendation that retail water agencies, local municipalities, and the County of Santa Clara implement mandatory measures as needed to achieve the target.

The estimated end of 2016 storage of about 304,500 acre-feet falls into the "Normal" stage, the first stage in our five-stage Water Shortage Contingency Plan. (The five stages are shown in Table 1-2.4).

Table 1-2.4 Water Shortage Contingency Plan Action Levels

Stage	Title	Projected End-of-Year Groundwater Storage (Acre-Feet)	Suggested Short-Term Reduction in Water Use
1	Normal	Above 300,000	None
2	Alert	250,000 to 300,000	0 – 10%
3	Severe	200,000 to 250,000	10 – 20%
4	Critical	150,000 to 200,000	20 – 40%
5	Emergency	Less than 150,000	Up to 50%

Overview of District Drought Response

In February 2014, the district developed a strategic approach to respond to the drought and the Board's call for water use reductions. A cross-functional team from across the organization was convened and a Drought Response Strategy was formulated for implementation. The district's comprehensive drought response was implemented through fifteen strategies grouped into four general categories: (A) water supply and operations; (B) water use reduction; (C) drought response opportunities; and (D) administrative and financial management. Specific examples include:

- Secure Imported Water Supplies: Strategy included working with state and federal project operators (i.e. DWR and U.S. Bureau of Reclamation) and contractors of the SWP and CVP to secure the district's imported water allocations. It also included supporting initiatives to control Delta salinity; providing for return of water from the Semitropic Water Bank; determining the availability of supplemental water transfers and imported water carryover; and coordinating with San Francisco Public Utilities Commission on drought impacts to the Hetch-Hetchy Project.

- Manage surface water and groundwater supplies: To maximize water supply reliability and protect groundwater, this strategy optimized distribution of limited local and imported supplies, including deliveries to the three water treatment plants, operation of district reservoirs and the groundwater recharge system, and deliveries to untreated surface water users.

- Optimize treated water quality and availability: Strategy focused on optimizing treatment plant operations and source water supplies to meet drinking water quality and reliability objectives, in coordination with the district's retail treated water contractors. It included continuing to meet treated water quality objectives despite poorer water quality conditions in the Delta, and projected low storage levels in San Luis Reservoir that affected both the quality of this source of supply as well as the ability to pump water from the reservoir during the late summer and early fall months.

- Reduce 2016 water use by 20% compared to 2013 water use: Cumulative savings, as reported by the combined major water retailers, was 28 percent from January through December 2016 when compared to 2013 water use.

- Expedite purified water program development and implementation: Staff identified potential opportunities for additional recycled water projects to help alleviate water supply shortages assuming the current drought continues; pursuing regulatory proposals to provide for safe implementation of indirect and direct potable reuse projects; and completing the master planning of all recycled water efforts.

- Advance community knowledge, awareness, and understanding of the water supply system and services provided by the district: Strategy included efforts to expand outreach communication and engagement with general public and working even more closely with media to convey drought and water conservation messages.

- Secure Federal and State legislative support to offset drought impacts and accelerate conservation and recycling programs: Staff is tracking a number of State and federal legislative initiatives aimed at providing drought relief and funding to offset costs of drought response and accelerate water supply and water use efficiency projects.

The district also collaborated with water retailers, municipalities and the County to increase water conservation efforts and public outreach, and to implement other actions to reduce water use. Local water retailers responded to the district's call in various ways. Most retailers called for 20 percent reductions and activated or adopted water use restrictions, including a consistent three day per week watering restriction. Nearly every water retailer increased their outreach and education efforts.

1-3 PRESENT WATER USE AND WATER REQUIREMENTS

Due to the ongoing drought, in June 2016 the Board adopted a resolution calling for a 20 percent reduction in water use compared to 2013. The call for a 20 percent reduction was in place through January 31, 2017. Because of this call, water demands decreased by roughly 28% percent in 2016. Imported water allocations, transfers, exchanges, and groundwater banking brought approximately 167,570 acre-feet to meet 2016 demands.

To meet current and future demands, the district continues to implement its long-term water conservation program. With a target of saving nearly 100,000 acre-feet per year by 2030, the long-term program offers technical assistance and a variety of incentives that achieve sustainable water savings. The program saved approximately 70,000 acre-feet in calendar year 2016.

Table 1-3.1 shows unadjusted water use in Santa Clara County and Table 1-3.2 shows a breakdown of groundwater production and managed recharge by water charge zone. Table 1-3.3 shows a historical summary of surface water supply, use and distribution for the last three years.

Table 1-3.1 Water Use in Santa Clara County for Calendar Years 2014-2016

Historical Calendar Year Water Use	In Acre-feet*		
	Actual 2014	Preliminary 2015	Estimated 2016
Groundwater Pumped	169,400	116,000	110,800
Treated Water	91,500	94,500	97,900
Raw Surface Water Deliveries	2,600	1,200	1,000
SFPUC Supplies to Local Retailers[1]	47,600	42,400	43,200
San Jose Water Company Water Rights	1,300	4,800	7,600
Recycled Water	22,100	20,300	18,900
Total	**334,500**	**279,200**	**279,400**

[1] *San Francisco Public Utilities Commission supplies to 8 retailers and NASA-AMES*

* *All values are rounded to the nearest hundred*

Note: Stanford has historically utilized between 200-1000 Acre Feet/Year of its water rights. This is not reflected in the table above.

Table 1-3.2 Groundwater Production and Managed Recharge by Water Charge Zone

Charge Zone	Zone W-2					Zone W-5				
	Groundwater Production, acre-feet			Managed Recharge		Groundwater Production, acre-feet			Managed Recharge	
Calendar Year	Agricultural	Non Agricultural	Zone Total	Zone Total Recharge, acre-feet	Managed Recharge as % Production	Agricultural	Non-Agricultural	Zone Total	Zone Total Recharge, acre-feet	Managed Recharge as % Production
1997	1,910	118,550	120,460	78,040	65%	32,746	21,710	54,456	32,120	59%
1998	1,101	99,210	100,310	66,670	66%	25,861	20,009	45,870	26,130	57%
1999	1,087	106,403	107,490	80,900	75%	29,144	23,767	52,910	26,500	50%
2000	972	112,399	113,371	88,400	78%	26,920	24,537	51,457	30,200	59%
2001	752	114,606	115,358	84,620	73%	28,510	25,437	53,947	32,040	59%
2002	707	103,952	104,659	71,660	68%	27,537	23,787	51,324	35,300	69%
2003	447	96,208	96,656	74,200	77%	25,964	24,256	50,220	35,000	70%
2004	579	105,137	105,716	66,700	63%	27,634	25,533	53,167	31,000	58%
2005	826	86,640	87,467	69,200	79%	25,458	25,237	50,695	32,500	64%
2006	429	82,195	82,624	65,770	80%	24,420	28,616	53,036	30,440	57%
2007	1,087	108,748	109,835	58,000	53%	27,660	31,424	59,084	33,410	57%
2008	1,074	106,579	107,653	51,290	48%	28,183	33,520	61,703	36,100	59%
2009	608	97,242	26,700	63,000	236%	24,874	32,400	57,274	39,100	68%
2010	437	84,227	84,664	58,540	69%	22,616	29,459	52,075	42,210	81%
2011	298	70,989	71,287	54,820	77%	22,544	29,834	52,378	39,360	75%
2012	460	75,931	76,391	55,940	73%	25,010	30,847	55,857	40,790	73%
2013	562	94,731	95,293	59,600	63%	26,325	32,940	59,265	37,100	63%
2014	924	113,576	114,500	11,490	10%	26,018	28,852	54,870	15,010	27%
Prelim. 2015	600	65,300	65,900	28,300	43%	25,100	25,000	50,100	26,100	52%
Estim. 2016	300	57,500	57,800	101,100	175%	26,300	26,700	53,000	46,800	88%

Table 1-3.3 Historical Surface Water Supply, Use and Distribution for Three Previous Calendar Years

			Calendar Year, in Acre Feet		
			Actual 2014	Preliminary 2015	Estimated 2016
District Supplies					
Local Surface Water					
	Inflow	(net, minus evap)	26,520	21,730	102,020
	Surface Water Storage Releases (+) or additions to(-)		-11,050	+18,620	-25,240
Imported Water					
	Prior year carryover		31,230	45,080	52,270
	Delta flood flows		0	0	0
	State Water Project contract allocation		5,000	20,000	60,000
	San Felipe Division contract allocation[1.]		65,000	40,320	73,160
	Semitropic water bank withdrawals[2.]		35,120	45,880	0
	Water transfers and exchanges[2.]		17,930	20,050	34,410
	Returned to District from SFPUC via intertie		690	0	720
Total District Supplies:			**170,440**	**211,680**	**297,340**
Distribution of District Supplies					
	To groundwater recharge				
		Santa Clara Subbasin	11,490	28,300	101,090
		Coyote Subbasin	7,200	6,750	20,550
		Llagas Subbasin	7,810	19,310	26,290
	To treated water		91,460	94,490	97,850
	To surface water irrigation		2,560	1,220	970
	To environment		4,090	4,260	3,920
	To Semitropic water bank		0	0	8,670
	To imported water carryover				
		Used by District	45,080	52,270	37,370
		Returned to SWP/CVP	0	0	0
	To water transfers and exchanges		0	4,500	0
	Returned to SFPUC via intertie		750	580	630
Total Distribution of District Supplies:			**170,440**	**211,680**	**297,340**
Other Supplies					
San Jose Water Co. water rights[3.]			1,290	4,770	7,570
Recycled water (including District)			22,060	20,290	18,850
SFPUC deliveries to retailers			47,560	42,400	43,220
Total Other Surface Water Supplies			**70,910**	**67,460**	**69,640**
Total Managed Supplies:			**241,350**	**279,140**	**366,980**

Note: Numbers rounded to the nearest 10AF.

[1.] 2015 San Felipe Division Contract amount includes supply for public health and safety.

[2.] These values include supply secured in that year but may have been carried over to a future year.

[3.] Stanford has historically utilized between 200-1000 AFY of its water rights. This is not reflected in the table above.

2-1 OVERVIEW

As the water management agency and principal water wholesaler for Santa Clara County, the district is responsible for planning (in collaboration with San Francisco Public Utilities Commission [SFPUC] and local retailers) the water supply of the county to meet current and future demands.

Water supply reliability includes the availability of the water itself as well as the reliability and integrity of the infrastructure and systems that capture, store, transport, treat and distribute it. The district strives to meet water demand under all hydrologic conditions, including satisfying its treated water contracts for deliveries to the retail water suppliers. As the groundwater manager for the county, the district's goal is to protect and augment groundwater to ensure it is available both now and in the future.

Since water supplies available to the county are obtained from both local and imported sources, the district's water supply is a function of the amount of precipitation that falls both locally and in the watersheds of Northern California. The supply available is also a function of the facilities in place to manage the supply. Sources of water supply in northern Santa Clara County (North County) consist of locally developed and managed water, recycled water, water imported by the district via the SWP and the federal CVP, and supplies to some of the retail water suppliers from the SFPUC's regional water system (Hetch Hetchy and Bay Area watersheds). Southern Santa Clara County (South County including Coyote Valley and Llagas Subbasin) is supplied by locally developed and managed water, recycled water, and CVP water.

2-2 PROJECTED FUTURE WATER SUPPLY AVAILABILITY AND DEMAND

Near Term Water Supply Availability

District staff begins preparing the district's Annual Water Supply Operations and Contingency Strategy for the upcoming calendar year in the fall of each year. The strategy is composed of numerous operations and water supply management scenarios that account for the probable range of water supply conditions that the district can expect in the upcoming year. These variable conditions include precipitation, locally and in the Sierra, as well as imported supplies. Local precipitation and runoff impact our local reservoir storage, stream flow, and natural recharge of the groundwater basins. The quantity of precipitation in the Sierra and the timing of snowmelt impact the district's imported water supplies that are conveyed through the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta. Other factors that impact the district's water supply include: infrastructure and facility limitations; planned and unplanned facilities outages; contractual obligations; the ability to bring in banked district supplies from Semitropic Water Storage District; and regulatory, institutional, and legal constraints.

As described in Section 1 of the report, rainfall year 2016–17 began with a below average December in terms of local rainfall. However, above average precipitation has materialized in the month of January. The northern portion of California saw much more precipitation at the onset of the rainfall

year. The Northern Sierra 8-Station Precipitation Index total from the beginning of October through the end of January of 2017 was 53.2 inches, which is about 197 percent of the seasonal average to date and 106 percent of an average water year.

The California Department of Water Resources (DWR) announced an initial 2017 allocation of twenty (20) percent of contract amounts for the SWP supply and later increased it to forty-five (45) percent on December 21, 2016 and subsequently to sixty (60) percent on January 18, 2017. The United States Bureau of Reclamation (USBR) is expected to announce initial CVP allocations in mid or late February 2017. The initial allocations are subject to change as the water year progresses.

Local surface water supplies have been reduced because of the loss in district reservoir storage capacity due to regulatory restrictions to address seismic concerns. Regulatory restrictions at Anderson Reservoir, the largest district-owned surface reservoir, have resulted in the loss of about 30 percent of its original storage capacity.

Table 2-2.1 reflects the probable range of local and imported surface water supplies the district currently expects in calendar year 2017. In conjunction with surface water supplies, groundwater reserves are managed to supplement available supplies during dry periods and to ensure that there are adequate supplies to meet current and future demand. The strategy will be continuously updated throughout the year to account for operations to-date and real-time conditions.

Table 2-2.1 Projected Calendar Year 2017 - Range of Surface Water Supply

Projected Calendar Year 2017 Supply in Acre-Feet		
	Average Year	Dry Year
Imported Water[1]	160,800 – 194,800	136,300 – 166,300
Local Surface Water	54,300	44,700
Total	**215,100 – 249,100**	**181,100 – 211,000**

1. Imported Water Supplies are based on a range of SWP allocations provided during the January 18, 2017 Water Operations meeting. The average year projection assumes a 25% allocation for CVP agriculture (Ag) and 75% allocation for CVP municipal & industrial (M&I) while the dry year assumes a 10% allocation for CVP Ag and 60% for CVP M&I. Transfers, exchanges, banking, and carryover are not included as it is unknown at this point which of these supplies are needed for the upcoming year.

Long-Term Projected Demand and Water Supply

Water Demand

The Association of Bay Area Governments projected in 2013 that the population of the county will increase from about 1.9 million in 2015 to about 2.4 million by the year 2040. Jobs are projected to increase from about 1.0 million in 2015 to about 1.2 million in 2040. Even though per capita water use continues to decline, the district estimates that increases in population and jobs will result in an

increase in water demands from a current average of about 360,000 acre-feet to about 435,000 acre-feet in 2040. This demand projection takes into account implementation of planned water conservation programs.

Conservation

The district and most major retail water providers partner in regional implementation of a variety of water use efficiency programs to permanently reduce water use in the county. As shown in Figure 2-2.1, the year 2040 demand with currently planned conservation programs in place is projected to be approximately 435,000 acre-feet.

The long-term savings goal in the district Board-adopted 2012 Water Supply and Infrastructure Master Plan (Water Master Plan) is 99,000 acre-feet per year in water savings by 2030. Additionally, the Water Conservation Act of 2009 requires all retail water agencies in the state, with assistance from the water wholesalers, to reduce per capita water use 20 percent by 2020. To achieve these aggressive long-term goals, the district implements nearly 20 different ongoing water conservation programs that use a mix of incentives and rebates, free device installation, one-on-one home visits, site surveys, and educational outreach to reduce water consumption in homes, businesses and agriculture. These programs are designed to achieve sustainable, long-term water savings and are implemented regardless of water supply conditions.

Long-Term Projected Water Supply

Several sources of supply contribute to the district's ability to meet future demands, including local surface water and natural groundwater recharge, recycled water, supplies delivered to retailers by the SFPUC, and Delta-conveyed imported water supplies:

- Local Surface Water and Natural Groundwater Recharge

  Local surface water supplies are expected to increase over current levels after the district completes seismic retrofits on several dams so the dams can be operated at full capacity. In addition, the Water Master Plan calls for constructing and rehabilitating pipelines between reservoirs and groundwater recharge ponds and constructing new groundwater recharge ponds. These new and rehabilitated facilities will increase the district's ability to use local runoff to meet water demands. Natural groundwater recharge is not expected to change over the planning horizon.

- Recycled and Purified Water

  Recycled and purified water is a local, reliable source of supply that helps meet demands in normal years and in drought years. Recycled and purified water use is expected to increase in the long-term. The district's Urban Water Management Plan projects that approximately 33,500 acre-feet of year 2040 demands will be met with non-potable recycled water. In addition, the Water Master Plan includes developing another 20,000 acre-feet per year of advanced treated recycled water for potable reuse by 2030. Recent recycled water planning studies have also identified the potential to develop an additional 25,000 acre-feet per year of potable reuse above the 20,000 acre-feet per year identified in the Water Master Plan. The district is considering expediting and expanding the potable reuse program identified in the Water Master Plan as part of an Expedited Purified Water Program.

As part of the Program, several key decisions remain: 1) defining the specific projects that should be included; 2) determining whether to proceed with a progressive design build or public-private partnership program delivery mode; 3) finalize partnerships with other Bay Area water agencies; and 4) determining how to phase program implementation.

- San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC)

  SFPUC water supplies to common retailers reduce demands on district supplies in northern Santa Clara County. Most of the common retailers have supply guarantees from SFPUC that are not expected to change over time. However, two retailers (the City of San Jose and the City of Santa Clara) have interruptible contracts. San Francisco is scheduled to make a decision about whether to provide supply guarantees to these water retailers by 2018.

- Delta-Conveyed Imported Water

  The district holds contracts with the California Department of Water Resources and U.S. Bureau of Reclamation for up to 252,500 AF per year of supplies, with actual deliveries subject to availability of water supplies and satisfaction of regulatory constraints to protect fish, wildlife, and water quality in the Delta. These Delta-conveyed imported water deliveries from the SWP and CVP have been negatively impacted by significant restrictions on Delta pumping required by the biological opinions issued by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS, December 2008) and National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS, June 2009). Based on modeling projections provided by the California Department of Water Resources, future average imported water deliveries could decrease with additional regulatory restrictions and impacts from climate change, or could remain at about their current levels with potential for increasing if actions are taken to address challenges in the Delta. The State's EcoRestore Program and California Water Fix project are intended to improve both the Delta ecosystem and water conveyance through Delta, respectively, in an effort to stabilize and improve the reliability of Delta-conveyed supplies. The State of California released the final environmental documents for California WaterFix on December 22, 2016. The district will likely need to make decisions about participation in the project in 2017. Until there is more certainty associated with the status of Delta planning projects, the extent of additional regulatory restrictions, and impacts from climate change, the district is currently assuming that average imported water deliveries will remain constant over the planning horizon.

Figure 2-2.1 shows projected average supplies and demands through year 2040. The projection assumes existing supplies and infrastructure are maintained and that the Water Master Plan is fully implemented. In this case, average water supplies will be sufficient to meet future water demands.

Figure 2-2.1 Average Supply & Demand Comparison, Santa Clara County



Reserves

The Water Master Plan also evaluated water supply conditions during multiple dry-year periods (extended droughts). Santa Clara County, like the rest of California, experiences drastic changes in annual precipitation. The variation in precipitation, both locally and in the northern California watersheds, results in fluctuations in the amount of water supply available from year to year. In many years, annual supplies exceed demands, while in some years, demands can greatly exceed supplies. As part of its conjunctive management program, the district compensates for this supply variability by storing excess wet year supplies in the groundwater basin, local reservoirs, San Luis Reservoir, and Semitropic Groundwater Bank. The district draws on these reserve supplies during dry years to help meet demands. These reserves are generally sufficient to meet demands during a critical dry year and the first few years of an extended drought. Based on analyses being conducted as part of the 2017 Water Master Plan update, the district anticipates that supplies would be sufficient to meet at least 85 percent of demands during an extended drought with full implementation of the 2012 Water Master Plan water supply investments.

2-3 CONCLUSIONS, FINDINGS AND CHALLENGES TO FUTURE WATER SUPPLY AVAILABILITY

Future Water Supply Reliability

The district must make investments in securing existing water supplies and infrastructure, optimizing the use of existing supplies and infrastructure, and increasing recycling and conservation in order to provide a reliable future water supply. The Water Master Plan presents the district's strategy for developing the needed water supplies, providing a reliable water supply for Santa Clara County under normal and drought conditions and responding to future challenges and risks.

Future Challenges and Risks

Droughts

Droughts are the district's greatest water supply challenge. Single year droughts can impact the district's ability to maintain a groundwater recharge program. Multi-year droughts deplete reserves and can result in groundwater level declines and the risk of land subsidence. The district's conjunctive management program mitigates this risk, but needs to be supported with continued investments in the district's existing water supply system, increased water conservation, and the expansion of recycled water.

Delta-Conveyed Imported Water Supplies

The district's Delta-conveyed imported water supplies are at risk from increased regulatory restrictions, Delta levee failure, and climate change. To mitigate these risks and improve the reliability of its imported water supplies, the district participates with state and federal agencies, other water contractors, and environmental organizations in long-term planning efforts to improve Delta conveyance and ecosystem restoration. The goals of these planning efforts are to protect and restore both water supply reliability and the ecological health of the Delta. Water supply benefits generally fall into three categories: 1) reduced regulatory risk and improved long-term average water supply reliability (or avoided loss of long-term average water supply); 2) reduced risk of prolonged imported water supply interruption or curtailment due to seismic events, climate change, and sea level rise; and 3) improved quality of imported water conveyed through the Delta, and reduced salt loading to the groundwater basin. As noted above, the district will likely be making decisions about participation in the California WaterFix in 2017.

Climate Change

Potential impacts of climate change include decreases in imported water supplies as a result of reduced snow pack, a decrease in local surface water supplies as a result of reduced precipitation and shifts in the timing of runoff, more frequent and severe droughts, increases in seasonal irrigation demands, shifting in the timing of runoff, sea level rise, and changes in local and imported water quality. The district's water supply strategy is intended to adapt well to future climate change by managing demands, providing drought-proof supplies, and increasing system flexibility in managing supplies.

Other Risks and Uncertainties

Other risks and uncertainties to water supply include: fisheries protection measures, random occurrences of hazards and extreme events resulting in local and/or imported water outages, more stringent water quality standards, water quality contamination, SFPUC changes in contracts with local water retailers, and demand growth different than projected.

Investment Needs

The district manages and addresses risks and uncertainties by building and maintaining an integrated and diverse water supply system. The water supply system that exists today will continue to meet most of the county's future water needs and is the foundation of future water supply investments. Thus, securing existing water supplies and infrastructure is critical to water supply reliability. The district needs to continue to be vigilant in protecting the groundwater basins from overdraft and contamination, mitigating risks to imported and local supplies, expanding water conservation and recycling, and maintaining and replacing the aging water supply infrastructure. These infrastructure investment needs will be further discussed in Section 3 of this report.

The district is currently evaluating whether additional water supply investments, beyond those that are called for in the 2012 Water Master Plan and discussed in Section 3 are necessary to improve reliability during droughts and/or address future water supply challenges and risks. Some of the additional investments that are being evaluated as part of the 2017 Water Master Plan update are increased storage capacity in local and statewide reservoirs, additional groundwater banking, expanded recharge capacity, added stormwater capture and reuse, supplemental imported water supplies, further water conservation and demand management activities, and additional recycled water and potable reuse. The 2017 Water Master Plan is scheduled for completion by December 2017.

This page is left intentionally blank

3-1 ACTIVITIES TO PROTECT AND AUGMENT WATER SUPPLIES OF THE DISTRICT

Groundwater production charges and other water charges finance a program of activities to protect and augment water supplies of the district. The program is comprised of activities and service functions in the areas of operations, maintenance and construction, as illustrated in Table 3-1.1. These activities are designed to work together to meet district Board-adopted end goals and policies as well as to provide benefits to the community.

Table 3-1.1 Program Activities to Manage and Provide a Sustainable Water Supply

Activities to Protect & Augment Water Supplies		End Goals & Benefits
	Services and Functions	• Reliable, clean water supply for current and future generations • Delivery of reliable high quality drinking water • Sustainable water supply through integrated water management • Assets and resources managed for efficiency and reliability • Healthy, safe and enhanced quality of living in Santa Clara County
Operation	• Planning & development • Water purchases • Transmission • Treatment • Distribution • Storage • Groundwater recharge • Conservation & water recycling • Regulatory compliance and mitigation	
Maintenance	• Surface water & groundwater resources protection & management • Asset protection & management	
Construction	• Capital improvement • Infrastructure management	

Revenue from groundwater production charges and treated water charges constitute the majority of funds needed to finance the operations costs of the Water Utility. About a third of the operating budget[1] is needed for imported water purchases to augment local supplies. About a quarter of the operating budget is needed to provide treated water to augment groundwater supply in meeting water demand. The balance is used to provide program services including conjunctive management and protection of surface and groundwater resources, operation and maintenance of facilities, water conservation, planning and development of recycled water and other alternative sources of supply, as well as administrative and support services.

[1] The budget document is available on the district website: www.valleywater.org

District managed water use in FY 2015–16 is estimated at 199,000 acre-feet, which is significantly lower than the prior year actual of 236,000 acre-feet. The lower water usage was in large part due to the public's response to the Board's call for 30% water use reduction that was in place for most of FY 2015-16. The Board lowered its water use reduction target to 20% relative to calendar year 2013 for the period from June 2016 to January 2017. Accordingly, water usage for FY 2016-17 is anticipated to increase slightly to 205,000 acre-feet.

Due to improving water supply conditions and the public's response to the Board's call for conservation, the district operated an above normal groundwater recharge program in FY 2015-16 and is continuing to do so in FY 2016-17. The district was able to meet treated water demands with no water quality violations in FY 2015-16. On June 14, 2016, based on the Board's call for 20% reduction in water use, the district adjusted contracted water deliveries to 90% of the originally contracted amount. The Board continued the call for 20% reduction in water use on January 31, 2017. The adjusted treated water contracted deliveries will continue accordingly. Surface water deliveries have ceased for all but a few surface water users throughout 2015 and 2016, however the district intends to bring surface water users back on during 2017. Water conservation program services and outreach activities were significantly enhanced during FY 2014-15 and 2015-16 in response to the drought, but have been ratcheted back to more normal levels at a cost of roughly $6.5 million for FY 2016-17.

The asset management program and maintenance activities continued, including work at the district's water treatment plants, pipelines, and pump stations.

District staff have continued to evaluate the California WaterFix project, anticipating that if the district participates in the project, the reliability and water quality of its supplies conveyed through the Delta will improve. District staff are also supporting the state's EcoRestore program, which will contribute towards a sustainable Delta ecosystem.

3-2 FUTURE CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT, OPERATING AND MAINTENANCE REQUIREMENTS

For FY 2017–18, as well as the decades ahead, the highest priority work of the district's Water Utility is to implement a program of activities to ensure reliable water supplies both now and in the future, to protect local surface water and groundwater supplies, and to meet treated water quality standards. This program of operations, maintenance and capital improvement activities will require continued funding from groundwater production charges and other sources of revenue, as described in Section 4 of this report.

The proposed FY 2017–18 operations and capital programs, as shown in Tables 4-5.1 and 4-5.2, continue to emphasize activities to protect and maintain existing water supplies and assets, and to plan for uncertainties including hydrologic conditions and regulatory restrictions on imported and local supplies. The proposed programs, if funded accordingly, will enable the Water Utility to provide reliable water supplies in the next year as well as in the future. Specific details about the operations program can be found in "The 5-Year Water Utility Enterprise Operations Plan".[2]

[2] The 5-Year Water Utility Enterprise Operations Plan can be accessed at: www.valleywater.org/2017-18GroundwaterChargeProcess

The current capital program is composed of seismic retrofit, recycled water, and asset renewal and improvement projects. Maintaining existing assets provides the foundation for meeting current and future supply needs.

The seismic stability evaluations of Anderson, Almaden, Calero, Lenihan, Stevens Creek and Guadalupe Dams have been completed and the resulting CIP projects are planned and budgeted. The seismic stability evaluation for three remaining dams, Coyote, Chesbro and Uvas, was initiated in the fall of 2014; the findings may require seismic retrofit work at these locations in the future. In addition to seismic retrofit improvements at the above-listed dams, the conditions of the outlet system, and the adequacy of the spillway and freeboard are being evaluated, and will be incorporated into the retrofit work as appropriate. With operating restrictions on several district dams due to seismic deficiencies or questions about seismic adequacy, there may be impacts to current and future operating budgets, such as the need to purchase additional water because of an inability to capture and utilize local runoff or store imported water.

Additional future capital and operating improvements arise from Water Utility planning work. The district's 2012 Water Supply and Infrastructure Master Plan identifies a future water supply strategy that includes: 1) investing in existing supplies and infrastructure; 2) optimizing the use of existing supplies and infrastructure; and 3) increasing recycling and conservation. The current capital program supports this strategy as it is largely centered on protecting existing supplies and infrastructure. Operating budget impacts related to implementing this strategy are primarily related to planning for expansion of recycled water. Specific future capital projects related to this strategy include additional off-stream recharge, and new advanced recycled water treatment and distribution facilities.

Dam seismic retrofits and the Rinconada Water Treatment Plant facility renewals and reliability improvements are the largest of the projects in the current capital program. Some highlights of the proposed FY 2017–18 capital program are listed next.

Storage:

- Seismic retrofit of Anderson, Calero, and Guadalupe Dams
- Seismic evaluations of Coyote, Chesbro and Uvas Dams
- Rehabilitation of Almaden Dam outlet works

Transmission:

- Raw and treated water pipeline inspection and rehabilitation
- Main Avenue and Madrone Pipelines Restoration
- Vasona Pumping Plant Upgrades

Water Treatment Plants:

- Penitencia Water Treatment Plant Residuals Management
- Year 3 construction for a 5-year makeover of the Rinconada Water Treatment Plant processes to ensure plant reliability for the next 50 years; this will include the addition of fluoridation facilities.

Recycled and Purified Water:

- Complete development of the Expedited Purified Water Program and establish a schedule of Program implementation. The potential Program components include: 1) Ford Recharge Ponds Indirect Potable Reuse (IPR); 2) Mid-Basin Injection Wells IPR; 3) Los Gatos Recharge Ponds IPR; and 4) Westside Injection Wells IPR or Central Pipeline Direct Potable Reuse.
- Expansion of the recycled water pipeline system in Gilroy to increase usage by approximately 33% or from 2,000 to 3,000 acre-feet per year.

Detailed cost projections for the preliminary FY 2018–22 Capital Improvement Program (CIP) can be found in Section 4-5.

Another expected impact on future operating and capital budgets is the cost to meet requirements associated with the anticipated modified water rights order that will specify changes in operations and infrastructure improvements necessary to fulfill the Fisheries and Aquatic Habitat Collaborative Effort (FAHCE) Fish Habitat Restoration Plan.

The FAHCE Fish Habitat Restoration Plan arose from a water rights complaint together with the 1996 listing of steelhead trout as a threatened species under Federal Endangered Species Act (ESA)[3] by National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS). District staff continue to work diligently to resolve the water rights complaint.

Preparation of the FAHCE fish habitat restoration plan (FHRP) is an obligation of the district specified in the FAHCE Settlement Agreement and is required to resolve the 1996 water rights complaint. The FHRP and other elements of the FAHCE Settlement Agreement address and resolve issues raised in the complaint and arising under state and federal laws regarding the impacts of the operation and maintenance of the district's Water Utility Enterprise facilities in the Guadalupe River, Coyote Creek and Stevens Creek watersheds (Three Creeks). Because the FHRP will become a condition of the district's water right licenses that authorize diversions on the Three Creeks, the district will be unable to exercise these water right licenses unless it performs the related work. Hence, the FHRP is an unavoidable cost of distributing, recharging, and using water diverted from the Three Creeks into the district's groundwater zones and a cost of maintaining and operating related district's facilities. Moreover, those who rely directly and/or indirectly on groundwater supplies within the district's zones receive a benefit from the FHRP, without which the groundwater supplies in the district's groundwater zones would be significantly impacted.

[3] The Endangered Species Act (ESA) is a federal law to ensure the conservation of threatened and endangered plants and animals and the habitats in which they are found. The ESA prohibits "take" of listed species through direct harm or destruction or adverse modification of designated critical habitat of such species. In the 1982 ESA amendments, Congress authorized the federal ESA implementing agencies, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service, through the Secretary of the Interior, to issue permits for the "incidental take" of listed species before permittees could proceed with an activity that is legal in all other respects but would result in the incidental taking of a listed species. Prior to issuance of "take" permits, permit applicants are required to design, implement, and secure funding for a conservation plan that minimizes and mitigates harm to the impacted species during the proposed project. That plan is commonly called a Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). HCPs are legally binding agreements between the U.S. Secretary of the Interior or Commerce and the permit holder.

The California Endangered Species Act (CESA) is the state equivalent of the federal ESA. It states that all native species and habitats of fishes, amphibians, reptiles, birds, mammals, invertebrates, and plants threatened with extinction and those experiencing a significant decline which, if not halted, would lead to a threatened or endangered designation, will be protected or preserved. CESA also allows for take incidental to otherwise lawful development projects. The state Department of Fish and Game is the CESA implementing agency, authorized to issue permits and memorandum of understanding.

Resolution of the water rights complaint and implementation of the FAHCE settlement agreement will require a large financial commitment on the part of the district for construction, operation and maintenance of infrastructure that improve habitat for fish in creeks located in the Three Creeks. Costs have been estimated, but have not been completely integrated into the groundwater production charge projections, pending resolution of the water rights complaint following the completion of the FAHCE fish habitat restoration plan and Environmental Impact Report.

This page is left intentionally blank

4-1 INTRODUCTION

This section summarizes the maximum proposed charges for fiscal year (FY) 2017–18 and the multi-year financial analysis that serves as the foundation for those water charges in each zone. The major sources of revenue for the Water Utility are from the imposition of charges on groundwater production and from contracts for the sale of treated surface water produced by its three treatment plants. The district also receives revenue from surface water charges, recycled water charges, property tax, interest earnings, grants, capital reimbursements and other sources. The district assesses the need for groundwater production and other water charges annually and, in accordance with state law, prepares this report to describe the activities undertaken to provide a water supply, along with the associated capital, maintenance, and operating requirements.

The Rate Setting Process

According to Section 26.3 of the district's founding legislation (District Act), proceeds from groundwater production charges can be used for the following purposes:

1. Pay for construction, operation and maintenance of imported water facilities
2. Pay for imported water purchases
3. Pay for constructing, maintaining and operating facilities which will conserve or distribute water including facilities for groundwater recharge, surface distribution, and purification and treatment
4. Pay for debt incurred for purposes 1, 2 and 3

The work of the district is divided into projects. Every project has a detailed description including objectives, milestones, and an estimate of resources needed to deliver the project. To ensure compliance with the District Act, each project manager must justify whether or not groundwater production charges can be used to pay for the activities associated with their project. The financial analysis presented in this report is based on the financial forecasts for these vetted projects.

This year's groundwater production and surface water charge setting process will be conducted consistent with the District Act, Board Resolutions 99-21, 12-10 and 12-11[1], as well as Proposition 218's requirements for property-related fees for water services. The district maintains that the groundwater production and surface water charges are not legally subject to Proposition 218 requirements. Whether legally bound or not, the district is committed to a transparent water charge setting process.

The district has conducted a formal protest procedure of the proposed groundwater production charge increase for the past seven years and of surface water charges for the past five years. Last year, the results of the groundwater production charge protest procedure were that in the North County Zone W-2, no more than 1.7 percent of well operators or property owners protested the proposed groundwater production charges, while in the South County Zone W-5, no more than 0.3

[1] Resolutions 99-21, 12-10, and 12-11 can be found at http://www.valleywater.org/2017-18GroundwaterChargeProcess

percent of well operators or property owners protested. There were no protests by surface water account holders. FY 2017–18 will be the eighth year in which the process includes a formal protest procedure to allow well operators and property owners to decide whether the Board may authorize an increase to the existing groundwater production charges. It will be the sixth year that a protest procedure will be implemented for surface water users. As in the past, the Board will continue to hold public hearings and seek input from its advisory committees and the public before rendering a final decision on groundwater production and surface water charges for FY 2017–18.

In late 2009, the district engaged Raftelis Financial Consultants, Inc. (RFC) to review the district's cost of service and rate setting methodology used to calculate groundwater production charges for FY 2010–11. At that time, RFC had conducted over 600 rate and financial planning studies for water and wastewater utilities across the country. Specifically, RFC reviewed the cost of service and financial planning model developed by the district to calculate groundwater production charges for FY 2010–11. RFC reviewed the district's rate setting methodology for consistency with industry standards, best practices, and legal considerations such as Proposition 218, the District Act, and Resolution 99-21. The methodology used to calculate groundwater production charges for FY 2010–11 is detailed in RFC's report titled "Review of the Santa Clara Valley District's Cost of Service and Rate Setting Methodology for Setting FY 2011 Groundwater Production Charges"[2]. The report was completed in March 2010 and demonstrates that the district developed groundwater production charges and other charges consistent with cost of service principles and legal considerations including Proposition 218, the District Act, and Resolution 99-21. The district will use the same cost of service methodology for the FY 2017–18 rate setting process.

In 2010, the district engaged RFC and the water resources engineering firms of Hydrometrics Water Resources and Carollo Engineers to further analyze and quantify the conjunctive use benefit of treated water to groundwater and surface water customers. In addition, RFC analyzed the benefits of agricultural water usage to M&I users. The report titled "Report Documenting the Reasonableness of the Conjunctive Use Benefit of Treated Water to Groundwater and Surface Water Customers and the Benefit of Agricultural Customers to Municipal and Industrial Customers"[3] was completed in February 2011 and provides further support and justification for the district's cost of service methodology.

In 2014, the district engaged RFC once again to analyze and quantify the conjunctive use benefit of surface and recycled water to groundwater customers. The report titled "Report Documenting the Reasonableness of the Conjunctive Use Benefit of Surface Water and Recycled Water to Groundwater Customers"[4] was completed in February 2015 and provides further support and justification for the district's cost of service methodology.

Overview of Customer Classes and Charges

As the wholesale water provider for Santa Clara County, the district serves 4 customer classes including, groundwater users, treated water users, surface water users and recycled water users.

[2] The initial RFC report, dated March 5, 2010 can be found at http://www.valleywater.org/2017-18GroundwaterChargeProcess
[3] The second RFC report, dated February 17, 2011 can be found at http://www.valleywater.org/2017-18GroundwaterChargeProcess
[4] The third RFC report, dated February 27, 2015 can be found at http://www.valleywater.org/2017-18GroundwaterChargeProcess

Resolution 99-21 guides staff in the development of the overall pricing structure based on principles established in 1971. The general approach is to charge the recipients of the various benefits for the benefits received. More specifically, pricing is structured to manage surface water, groundwater supplies and recycled water conjunctively to prevent the over use or under use of the groundwater basin. Consequently, staff is very careful to recommend pricing for groundwater production charges, treated water charges, surface water charges and recycled water charges that work in concert to achieve the effective use of available resources (as supported by the 2010 RFC study).

Groundwater users pump water from the ground that is both naturally and artificially recharged into the groundwater basin. The groundwater production charge recoups the district's costs to protect and augment this source of water, as outlined in the District Act.

Treated water users are comprised of 7 retail water companies that take treated surface water from one of the district's 3 treatment plants and sell it to their end user customers. The water comes from locally captured runoff or water imported into the county. The district recoups the cost of providing treated water by charging users the basic user charge, which is set equivalent to the groundwater production charge, and a treated water surcharge. The provision of treated water helps preserve the groundwater basin and therefore benefits groundwater users. This fact provides the rationale for setting the basic user charge equal to the groundwater production charge in accordance with cost of service principles as justified by the 2011 RFC study. The treated water surcharge is set by Board policy at an amount that promotes the effective use of available water resources.

Surface water users are those users permitted by the district to tap raw district-managed surface water from creeks, streams or pipelines. To the extent the district releases stored water from its local reservoirs, the district considers this to be surface water, which is not subject to diversion by third parties. Local supplies and imported water are made available to district surface water permittees. Surface water users pay the basic user charge, which is set equivalent to the groundwater production charge, plus a surface water master charge. The basic user charge helps pay for the cost to manage and augment surface water supplies and is set equal to the groundwater production charge, as justified by the 2015 RFC study, because surface water is considered in-lieu groundwater usage. The surface water master charge pays for costs that are specific to surface water users only, including the work to operate surface water turnouts, and maintain surface water accounts.

Recycled water users are those users who take purified wastewater for irrigation purposes. Recycled water is an all-weather supply. Recycled water charges are established at rates that maximize cost recovery while providing an economic incentive to use recycled water. The provision of recycled water helps preserve the groundwater basin and therefore benefits groundwater users. Consequently, groundwater users pay for recycled water to the extent that recycled water charges do not achieve full cost recovery, as justified by the 2015 RFC study.

Agricultural water users are a subset of the groundwater, surface water and recycled water customer classes. Section 26.1 of the District Act defines agricultural water use as "water primarily used in the commercial production of agricultural crops or livestock." Agricultural charges are limited to a maximum of 25% of non-agricultural charges per the District Act. Board policy further limits agricultural charges to no more than 10% of non-agricultural charges in order to help preserve open space. Non-rate related revenue is used to offset lost agricultural water revenue for each customer class and is referred to as the Open Space Credit. Non-agricultural users (also referred to as Municipal and Industrial users) are a subset of all 4 customer classes and consist of all water use other

than agricultural. Non-agricultural water use charges are established for each customer class as described in the preceding paragraphs.

4-2 THE WATER CHARGE RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2017–18

Last year, FY 2016–17, the Board chose to increase groundwater production charges in both zones of benefit. In the North County Zone W-2, the Board adopted a groundwater production charge of $1,072 per acre-foot for non-agricultural water, $23.59 per acre-foot for agricultural water, and $1,172 per acre-foot for contract treated water. In the South County Zone W-5, the Board adopted a $393 per acre-foot groundwater production charge for non-agricultural water, and a $23.59 per acre-foot groundwater production charge for agricultural water.

Staff has developed a FY 2017-18 groundwater production charge scenario, which is lower than the prior year projection for North County due to a reduced cost forecast for imported water, and schedule extensions for the Anderson Dam Seismic Retrofit and the Expedited Purified Water Program. Cost projections for imported water from the Central Valley Project are lower by $4.5 million due to the phase out of higher drought rates. In addition, the cost projection for banked water is lower by $4.8 million due to the assumption that a banked water take is not necessary, and if so, would be paid for by the Supplemental Water Supply Reserve.

For South County, the FY 2017-18 groundwater production charge scenario is equal to or higher than the prior year projection due to the higher cost projection for the Anderson Dam Seismic Retrofit, as a more extensive embankment retrofit will be required to address all seismic stability issues and ensure public safety.

Staff is assuming a slight rebound in water usage for FY 2017–18 relative to the prior year projection that is in line with rebounds observed for previous droughts. For FY 2017–18 staff is assuming 217,000 AF of water use, up from 205,000 AF estimated for FY 2016-17. This represents a 6% increase year over year, but also represents a 24% reduction versus Calendar Year 2013. Lower water use relative to historical usage patterns translates to reduced revenue and therefore upward pressure on water rates.

The draft FY 2018–22 Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) totals $2.3 billion. Significant investments planned for FY 2017–18 include:

- $60 million for the Rinconada Water Treatment Plant Reliability Improvements
- $16 million for various pipeline rehabilitation projects
- $15 million for recycled water pipeline expansion in South County Zone W-5
- $10 million CVP capital payments, not CWF
- $9 million for Dam Seismic retrofits and improvements at Almaden, Guadalupe, and Calero Dams
- $9 million for Main & Madrone Pipelines Restore

Over the next 10 years, the draft FY 2017-18 CIP is higher than the prior year CIP driven by:

- A $245 million cost increase for the Anderson Dam Seismic Retrofit due to a more extensive embankment retrofit required than originally anticipated.

The district must continue investing significant capital dollars into repairing and rehabilitating the infrastructure required to deliver safe, reliable drinking water to Silicon Valley residents and businesses. The district is projecting rate increases over the next 10 years in order to significantly invest in several key areas:

- $1.4 billion over the next 10 years for repair, rehabilitation and seismic retrofitting of the system behind your water supply, including treatment plants, pipelines, pump stations, dams and recharge ponds.
- $113 million over the next 10 years to solve the statewide issue of the Bay Delta, where 40 percent of our water supply travels through. A catastrophic event in the Delta could interrupt this vital supply of water to Santa Clara County for up to two years or more.
- $917 million to develop new supplies that help ensure future sustainability. Recently completed planning efforts show that additional water supply investments will be needed in the future to accommodate and support the local economy and population.

The increase for FY 2017–18 will bring in revenue required to pay for rising operating costs, critical investments in the water supply infrastructure, and investments in future supplies. The effective management of the region's water supply system includes securing imported water supplies, storing surface water in local reservoirs, replenishment and protection of our groundwater basin, purification at local water treatment plants, testing for consistent water quality, transport and delivery of water to local water providers, and conservation programs.

To minimize the FY 2017–18 rate increase the district is currently working on a refund of outstanding debt that will result in approximately $6 million of present value savings. The district continues to partner with other water purveyors to collectively buy electricity at a discount, anticipating a savings of $2 million District-wide for FY 2017-18. The district has deployed new pump efficiency tools that help facilitate operating pumps in the most efficient range to reduce wear and tear and prolong life. A pump rebuild can cost $500,000. Finally, the district has begun to use electronic tools to help detect and locate leaks without having to dewater a pipeline, saving money and reducing the risk of catastrophic failure. Preventive maintenance is more cost effective than corrective repairs. Cost reduction opportunities are more difficult to come by given the cost saving achievements over the past few years.

Given the financial picture summarized above, staff proposes the following maximum water charges for FY 2017–18:

In the North County Zone W-2, staff proposes a maximum 9.9 percent increase, or $1,178 per acre-foot groundwater production charge for non-agricultural water; 6.4 percent increase, or $25.09 per acre-foot for agricultural water; 9.0 percent increase, or $1,278 per acre-foot for contract treated water; and 9.4 percent increase or, $1,228 per acre-foot for non-contract treated water. The average household would experience an increase in their monthly bill of $3.65 or about 12 cents a day.

In the South County Zone W-5, staff proposes a maximum 6.4 percent increase to both non-agricultural and agricultural water. This results in a $418 per acre-foot groundwater production

charge for non-agricultural water, and $25.09 per acre-foot groundwater production charge for agricultural water. The average household would experience an increase in their monthly bill of $0.86 or about 3 cents per day.

Staff recommends increasing the surface water master charge by 21.5 percent, from $27.46 per acre-foot to $33.36 per acre-foot, in order to bring revenues in closer alignment with the costs related to managing, operating and billing for surface water diversions.

For recycled water, staff recommends increasing the M&I charge by 6.7 percent to $398 per acre-foot. For agricultural recycled water, staff recommends a 3.2 percent increase to $48.88 per acre-foot. This increase maximizes cost recovery while concurrently providing an economic incentive to use recycled water.

Figure 4-2.1 illustrates the multi-year groundwater production charge projection. It reflects a range of potential groundwater production charges over the next ten years depending on the level of service to be provided. The high end of the range (line at the top of the shaded areas) represents the groundwater production charges required to fund all of the operations and capital projects identified by staff to meet the board's Ends Policies over the next few years. The potential impacts of not funding the high end of the range include increased risk of: (1) service interruptions; (2) higher corrective maintenance costs to repair facilities that have not been well maintained; and (3) reduced ability to respond to drought. While staff has identified as many projects as possible, there are initiatives and/or potential future uncertainties that could result in the identification of additional capital or operations projects that are not reflected in the high end of the range.

The lower end of the range (line at the bottom of the shaded areas) represents staff's proposed maximum groundwater production charges for FY 2017–18 and the corresponding future trajectory based on the assumption that operating services will either continue at or below the level budgeted in FY 2016–17.

Figure 4-2.1 Ten Year Projection



Table 4-2.1 shows groundwater production and other charges in fiscal years 2015–16 and 2016–17. The final column contains the proposed maximum water charges for FY 2017–18, which are in accordance with the pricing policy described in Resolution 99-21.

Table 4-2.1 Summary of Charges (Dollars Per Acre-Foot, $/AF)

	Dollars Per Acre Foot		
	FY 2015–16	FY 2016–17	Proposed Maximum FY 2017–18
Zone W-2 (North County)			
Basic User/Groundwater Production Charge			
Municipal & Industrial	894.00	1,072.00	1,178.00
Agricultural	21.36	23.59	25.09
Surface Water Charge			
Surface Water Master Charge	22.60	27.46	33.36
Total Surface Water, Municipal & Industrial*	916.60	1,099.46	1,211.36
Total Surface Water, Agricultural*	43.96	51.05	58.45
Treated Water Charges			
Contract Surcharge	100.00	100.00	100.00
Total Treated Water Contract Charge**	994.00	1,172.00	1,278.00
Non-Contract Surcharge	200.00	50.00	50.00
Total Treated Water Non-Contract Charge***	1,094.00	1,122.00	1,228.00
Zone W-5 (South County)			
Basic User/Groundwater Production Charge			
Municipal & Industrial	356.00	393.00	418.00
Agricultural	21.36	23.59	25.09
Surface Water Charge			
Surface Water Master Charge	22.60	27.46	33.36
Total Surface Water, Municipal & Industrial*	378.60	420.46	451.36
Total Surface Water, Agricultural*	43.96	51.05	58.45
Recycled Water Charges			
Municipal & Industrial	336.00	373.00	398.00
Agricultural	45.16	47.38	48.88

*Note: The total surface water charge is the sum of the basic user charge (which equals the groundwater production charge) plus the water master charge

**Note: The total treated water contract charge is the sum of the basic user charge (which equals the groundwater production charge) plus the contract surcharge

***Note: The total treated water non-contract charge is the sum of the basic user charge (which equals the groundwater production charge) plus the non-contract surcharge

Figure 4-2.2 illustrates historical and projected district water use, which is a key driver of the district's water revenue. Water usage in FY 2015–16 was estimated at approximately 199,000 AF, which is roughly 30,000 AF lower than budgeted and is roughly a 30% reduction versus Calendar Year 2013 of 286,000 AF. For the current year, FY 2016-17, staff estimates that water usage will be approximately 205,000 AF or flat to the FY 2016-17 budget and roughly a 28% reduction versus calendar year 2013. For FY 2017–18, staff assumed a water usage projection of 217,000 AF, which is 12,000 AF higher than the FY 2016–17 estimated actual, and represents a 24 percent reduction relative to Calendar Year 2013.

Figure 4-2.2 Historical and Projected District Water Use



4-3 FINANCIAL OVERVIEW OF THE DISTRICT

The district uses fund accounting to ensure and demonstrate compliance with finance-related legal requirements. Fund accounting allows government resources to be segregated and accounted for according to their intended purposes. Accounts related to activities of the Water Utility are segregated into the Water Utility Funds comprised of the Water Utility Enterprise Fund and the State Water Project (SWP) Fund. For the Water Utility Enterprise Fund, revenue accounts include groundwater production, treated water, property taxes, surface water, interest earnings, reimbursements, grants and other. Cost accounts include both direct and indirect or overhead costs associated with Water Utility projects and activities. The SWP Fund accounts specifically for SWP Tax

revenue and SWP contractual costs (Note that SWP Tax revenue can only be spent on SWP contractual costs). Table 4-3.1 shows an overview of the funds at the district including the Water Utility Funds and the estimated revenues, costs and reserves for FY 2017–18 for each fund. Throughout this report, the term "Water Utility" or "Water Utility Enterprise" refers to the combination of the Water Utility Enterprise Fund and the SWP Fund.

Table 4-3.1 FY 2017–18 Projected Funds Analysis

	Water Utility Funds				
	Water Utility	State Water	Safe, Clean Water	Watershed	Administration
(Millions $)	Enterprise Fund	Project Fund	Fund	Funds	Funds
Revenue	227.9	27.0	62.6	117.8	7.3
Interfund Transfer	(8.8)	2.7	9.6	(2.1)	(0.8)
Ops Costs	(143.5)	(27.9)	(17.3)	(51.1)	(69.7)
Debt Svc	(37.1)	-	(0.3)	(12.2)	(0.5)
Capital	(137.5)	-	(197.4)	(40.0)	(8.7)
Debt Proceeds	80.1	-	140.0	-	-
Intra-District Reimb.[1]	-	-	-	-	69.2
Balance	**(18.7)**	**1.8**	**(2.9)**	**12.4**	**(3.3)**
Reserves					
Restricted	43.6	-	50.3	-	-
Committed	33.6	-	-	37.3	12.6
Designated Liability	7.4	-	-	-	5.7
Total Reserves	**84.6**	**-**	**50.3**	**37.3**	**18.3**

Notes:

[1] Intra-District Reimbursements represent overhead costs that have been allocated to the Water Utility; Safe, Clean Water; and Watersheds (included in the operations and capital costs for those funds)

The Safe, Clean Water Fund accounts for a 15-year program that was approved by the voters in November, 2012 for the purpose of addressing several community priorities. These priorities include: securing a safe, reliable water supply; protecting our water system from earthquakes and natural disasters; preventing contaminants from entering the water supply; restoring habitat for fish, birds and wildlife and increasing open space; and enhancing flood protection. The primary source of revenue for this fund is a special parcel tax. This fund supports several projects that benefit not only the community at large but also the Water Utility including hazardous materials management, water conservation grants, rebates to remove excess nitrate from drinking water, and stormwater runoff management. Most notably this fund will contribute $66 million toward the Anderson Dam Seismic retrofit project in the form of a reimbursement to the Water Utility Enterprise Fund. It will also apportion some of the revenue towards the Treated Water Pipeline Reliability and Main/Madrone Avenues Pipeline Restoration projects. For more information on the Safe, Clean Water program please visit www.valleywater.org.

The Watershed Funds are a segregated grouping of funds with separate funding sources (including Benefit Assessments and 1 percent ad valorem property taxes) for the purpose of providing flood protection and watershed management.

The Administration Funds include the General Fund, Fleet Fund, Information Technology Fund, and Risk Fund to account for all revenues and expenditures necessary to carry out basic governmental activities of the district that are not accounted for through other funds. Administration Funds expenditures that are not offset by Administration Funds revenues are allocated to the Water Utility; Safe, Clean Water; and Watershed funds through an overhead rate at the project level.

4-4 WATER UTILITY FINANCES FOR FISCAL YEARS 2015–16 & 2016–17

Fiscal Year 2015– 16

Actual overall revenue for FY 2015–16 was $30.6 million less than the adopted budget of $225.0 million. The revenue shortfall was due primarily to lower groundwater water usage than budget, which comprised $21.8 million of the shortfall. In addition, capital reimbursement revenue was 7.9 million lower than budget, as roughly $6.2 million was received, but was booked to a deferred revenue account until it can be recognized.

Actual operations outlays came in at $178.1 million and were $31.8 million lower than the adopted budget. The savings were driven by $7.7 million lower debt service due to extending a planned debt issuance from early in FY 2015–16 to late in FY 2015–16, $20.3 million in unspent imported water cost budget, due to improved water supply conditions, and $1.6 million in unspent landscape rebate program budget, which will be carried over to the following year.

Unspent capital budget was carried forward to FY 2016–17 consistent with accounting practices.

Fiscal Year 2016– 17

Current estimates for FY 2016–17 show revenue trending on target to meet budgeted revenue of $232.5 million. Operations and capital costs are also trending to meet budget. Consequently, staff is anticipating that discretionary reserve levels will also meet budget at year end.

4-5 OVERVIEW OF OPERATING AND LONG-TERM CAPITAL PLANS

To develop a charge structure that will support planned work, staff analyzes the immediate needs of the district as well as anticipated requirements in the years to come.

Operating Outlays

Operations costs are projected to increase at an average of 4.5 percent per year over the next ten years. The increase is driven by anticipated inflation, cost increases associated with employee salaries and benefits, California Water Fix, efforts to develop new supplies that help ensure future sustainability and rising costs associated with regulatory requirements.

Table 4-5.1 shows the district's Water Utility operating program for FY 2015–16, FY 2016–17, and projected for FY 2017–18. Specific details about the programs and projects funded within the water utility can be found in "The 5-Year Water Utility Enterprise Operations Plan[5]." The Water Utility Enterprise strives to implement a program that ensures that treated water quality standards are met and that water supplies are reliable to meet current and future demand.

[5] The 5-year Water Utility Enterprise Operations Plan can be accessed at http://www.valleywater.org/2017-18GroundwaterChargeProcess

Table 4-5.1 Operating Budget Summary

		Thousands $			
Cost Center	Ends Policy	Actual FY 16	Adjusted FY 17	Projected FY 18	Description of Cost Centers and Activities
Source of Supply	E-2.1 Current and future water supply for municipalities, industries, agriculture and the environment is reliable	100,486	112,301	94,271	This cost center contains all the anticipated expenditures that relate to obtaining, producing, and protecting a water supply; including all conservation, reclamation, and importation costs. Activities include: groundwater level & quality monitoring; groundwater modeling; dams and reservoir operations & maintenance; imported water supply management; long-term Delta issues resolution; operations and maintenance of San Felipe Reaches 1-3, including mechanical and electrical; operations planning; water rights protection; Urban Water Management Plan; administration of recycled water agreements, technical studies; water conservation technical assistance, financial incentives, outreach and education; environmental planning & compliance; well permitting and destruction; Silicon Valley Advanced Water Purification Center operations and maintenance; and habitat conservation and mitigation commitments.
Raw Water Transmission & Distribution	E-2.2 Raw Water Transmission and Distribution Assets Are Managed to Ensure Efficiency and Reliability	11,246	13,969	13,110	This cost center contains all expenditures relating to the distribution of raw water. The distribution system consists of pipelines, canals, and percolation ponds and includes the use of creek systems. Activities include: operations and maintenance of recharge ponds, canals, pipelines & diversions including vegetation management; operations and maintenance of raw water distribution system, including mechanical and electrical; raw water corrosion control; environmental compliance support.
Water Treatment and Treated Water Transmission & Distribution	E-2.3 Reliable High Quality Water is Delivered	35,223	38,150	39,822	These cost centers contain all expenditures associated with the treatment of water at the Rinconada, Penitencia and Santa Teresa Water Treatment Plants, as well as those expenditures related to the distribution of treated water to retail customers and includes costs associated with the treated water reservoirs, pumping plants, pipelines, and turnouts. Activities include: operations and maintenance of 3 water treatment plants; Water District laboratory operations; water quality planning, testing, research, and reporting; operations and maintenance of treated water transmission and distribution system; and recycled water transmission and distribution general maintenance.
Administration & General	Support Services	18,022	22,068	24,193	This cost center contains all expenditures of an administrative nature which cannot be properly assigned to another of the other four cost centers. Activities include: asset protection evaluation and planning; integrated regional water management plan; water system computer modeling; urban runoff pollution prevention; general & division management; performance measures; financial support & water charge setting; customer relations; health and safety training; billing; data maintenance; auditing; meter reading, testing, repair, installation, backflow prevention; emergency services; warehouse and equipment services; real estate services; and ethics & diversity.
	Total Program Requirements	**164,976**	**186,489**	**171,395**	

Capital Improvements Plans

The district constructs, operates and maintains reservoirs, pipelines, recharge facilities, and water treatment plants that are needed to achieve the Board's Ends Policies. On an annual basis, the district conducts a process to plan for capital improvements and identify the resource needs and constraints to implement the projects. The result of this process is Board approval of a 5-Year Capital Improvement Program (CIP)[6].

Table 4-5.2 shows the capital projects identified in a preliminary version of the FY 2017–18 CIP and associated expenditures for the next ten fiscal years. The table shows funding $2.3 billion (inflated) worth of capital projects between FY 2017–18 and FY 2026–27. Roughly $921 million of that program is for recycled and purified water expansion, which will provide new drought-proof water supplies to help ensure future water supply reliability. The remaining portion of the capital program is primarily dedicated to asset management of Water Utility Enterprise facilities throughout the county. Staff continues to conduct a validation process as part of the district's Asset Management Program, to identify if there is a compelling business case for capital projects. All newly-proposed projects will undergo the validation process prior to being proposed for inclusion in the CIP.

The capital program, including debt proceeds and debt service flow through the North County Zone W-2 financial model. The North County Zone W-2 is reimbursed for all capital projects that benefit South County Zone W-5 via a capital cost recovery payment over a time period of 30 years, beginning when the project is completed.

[6] The latest CIP can be accessed at www.valleywater.org/CIP.aspx

Table 4-5.2 Capital Improvements Projects – Fiscal Years 2017–18 Through 2026–27

Water Utility CIP FY 2018-27 Sorted by Cost Center (Funded)	Planned Funding with Inflation (Thousands of Dollars)						
Name	FY18	FY19	FY20	FY21	FY22	FY 23-27	Total FY 18-27
SOURCE OF SUPPLY							
Dam Seismic Stability Evaluation*			422	468			890
South County Recycled Water Pipeline - Short-Term Implementation Phase 1B*	2,930	16					2,946
South County Recycled Water Pipeline - Short-Term Implementation Phase 2*		55	350				405
Central Valley Project Capital Payments*	9,715	10,057	10,411	10,777	11,156	61,950	114,066
Small Capital Improvements, San Felipe Reach 1*	586	844			94	5,160	6,684
Small Capital Improvements, San Felipe Reach 2*	48						48
Small Capital Improvements, San Felipe Reach 3*	45	335		726		9,048	10,154
Coyote Pumping Plant Warehouse*	3,323	54					3,377
Wolfe Road Recycled Water Facility	56						56
RWFE - Silicon Valley Adv Wtr Purification Center Expansion	8,629	13,772	44,886	77,293	77,517	105,615	327,712
RWFE - Purified Water Pipelines	6,658	7,679	33,451	53,627	55,071	88,538	245,024
Almaden Dam Improvements	520	541	562	538	27,590	17,184	46,935
Anderson Dam Seismic Retrofit (C1)*	7,979	3,452	147,292	83,915	107,297	63,341	413,276
Calero Dam Seismic Retrofit - Design & Constuct	435	15,032	46,749	5,877	1,533		69,626
Guadalupe Dam Seismic Retrofit - Design & Construct	375	8,893	21,037	21,159	6,000		57,464
Coyote Pumping Plant ASD Replacement		541	1,879	9,289	4,872		16,581
RWFE[1] - Future Recycled Water Projects					82,453	262,499	344,952
Source of Supply Subtotal	41,299	61,271	307,039	263,669	373,583	613,335	1,660,196
RAW WATER TRANSMISSION & DISTRIBUTION							
Pacheco/Santa Clara Conduit Right of Way Acquisition*	304	102					406
Penitencia Force Main Seismic Retrofit	64						64
Vasona Pumping Plant Upgrade	1,270	1,720	17,130	82			20,202
SCADA[2] Remote Architecture & Communications Upgrade*		382	180	936	852	3,909	6,259
Small Capital Improvements, Raw Water Transmission*	110		51		94	1,727	1,982
FAHCE[3] Stevens Creek Moffett Ave Fish Ladder - 90%	1,081	1,876					2,957
FAHCE[3] Stevens Creek Multi-Port Outlet at Dam - 90%	275	1,028					1,303
FAHCE[3] Implementation		4,739	4,379	14,691	14,690	106,609	145,108
Main & Madrone Pipelines Restoration (Xfer to Fund 26)*	9,349						9,349
Raw Water Transmission & Distribution Subtotal	12,453	9,846	21,740	15,709	15,636	112,245	187,630
ADMINISTRATION AND GENERAL							
Capital Warranty Services*	260	216	225	234	243	1,027	2,205
CIP Development & Administration*	774	764	794	826	859	4,838	8,855
Survey Management & Technical Support*	333	346	357	369	380	2,093	3,879
Technical Review Committee*	184	266	277	288	300	1,689	3,004
Capital Program Services Administration-WUE Only*	2,618	2,681	2,789	2,900	3,016	16,991	30,995
Capital Health & Safety Training-WUE Only*	125	103	107	111	115	650	1,211
Capital Training & Development-WUE Only*	503	304	316	329	342	1,927	3,721
Capital Program Services Administration-WSS Only*	2,465	2,601	2,680	2,804	2,885	16,088	29,523
Capital Health & Safety Training-WSS Only*	32	34	35	37	38	210	386
Capital Training & Development-WSS Only*	567	595	613	639	658	3,656	6,728
10-Year Pipeline Rehabilitation (FY 18-FY 27)*	15,965	20,157	11,474	4,502	8,231	36,899	97,228
WTP-WQL Network Equipment	1,301	555	198		103	6,241	8,398
Regionally Significant Habitat Land Acquisition		724	749	775	802	4,153	7,203
Winfield Capital Improvements (assume 24% WU)*		149					149
Headquarters Operations Building (assume 60% WU)*		147	1,085	4,876	3,999		10,108
Projected Carryforward*	4,675						4,675
Administration and General Subtotal	29,802	29,643	21,699	18,691	21,971	96,462	218,268

Table 4-5.2 Capital Improvements Projects – Fiscal Years 2017–18 Through 2026–27 (Continued)

Water Utility CIP FY 2018-27 Sorted by Cost Center (Funded)	Planned Funding with Inflation (Thousands of Dollars)						
Name	FY18	FY19	FY20	FY21	FY22	FY 23-27	Total FY 18-27
WATER TREATMENT							
Fluoridation at WTPs	32						32
RWTP[4] FRP Residuals Management Modifications	15,779	1,844	290				17,913
RWTP[4] Reliability Improvement	44,192	44,496	45,970	140			134,798
IRP2[5] WTP Ops Bldgs Seismic Retrofit	346						346
Small Capital Improvements, Water Treatment	2,132	6,444	7,565	7,875	3,950	10,159	38,125
PWTP[6] Residuals Management	676	1,406	7,597				9,679
Water Treatment Subtotal	63,157	54,190	61,422	8,015	3,950	10,159	200,893
TREATED WATER TRANSMISSION & DISTRIBUTION							
Penitencia Delivery Main Seismic Retrofit	34						34
Small Capital Improvements, Treated Water Transmission	58	81					139
Treated Water Transmission & Distribution Subtotal	92	81					173
TOTAL FUNDED	146,804	155,031	411,900	306,083	415,140	832,201	2,267,160

1. Recycled Water Facilities' Expansion
2. Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition
3. Fisheries and Aquatic Habitat Collaborative Effort
4. Rinconada Water Treatment Plant
5. Infrastructure Reliability Plan, Portfolio 2
6. Penitencia Water Treatment Plant

* The asterisked projects would benefit the South County, Zone W-5, and therefore would be funded in part of in whole by the South County.

Table 4-5.3 shows the lower priority or deferred capital projects that are not funded under the maximum proposed charges for FY 2017–18. The postponed capital projects total approximately $129 million (inflated) over the next ten years. A higher groundwater production charge projection would be necessary to fund these postponed capital projects.

Table 4-5.3 List of Capital Projects Postponed Indefinitely

	Proposed Funding in Raw Dollars						
Name	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Years 6-10	Total Yr 1-10
SOURCE OF SUPPLY							
SCADA[2] Small Capital Improvements - Source of Supply*	55	448	466	786	606	1,267	3,628
Dam Seismic Retrofit at 2 Dams (Chesbro & Uvas)*			17,900	17,900	17,900	35,800	89,500
Land Rights - South County Recycled Water Pipeline*		541	2,643	2,632			5,816
South County Recycled Water Reservoir Expansion*	1,000	1,500	2,000	1,500	1,000		7,000
Source of Supply Subtotal	1,055	2,489	23,009	22,818	19,506	37,067	105,944
RAW WATER TRANSMISSION & DISTRIBUTION							
Alamitos Diversion Dam Improvements	974	1,371					2,345
Coyote Diversion Dam Improvements	114	1,259	765				2,138
SCADA[2] Small Capital Improvements - Raw Water Trans & Dist*	61	499	519	875	675	1,411	4,040
Raw Water Transmission & Distribution Subtotal	1,149	3,129	1,284	875	675	1,411	8,523
WATER TREATMENT							
SCADA[2] Small Capital Improvements - Water Treatment	180	1,476	1,535	2,586	1,996	4,171	11,944
Water Treatment Subtotal	180	1,476	1,535	2,586	1,996	4,171	11,944
ADMINISTRATION AND GENERAL							
Fleet and Facility Annex Improvements (assume 60% WU)*	552	2,077	202				2,831
Administration and General Subtotal	552	2,077	202				2,831
TOTAL UNFUNDED	2,935	9,171	26,030	26,279	22,178	42,649	129,242

2. Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition

* The asterisked projects would benefit the South County, Zone W-5, and therefore would be funded in part or in whole by the South County.

4-6 FINANCES

Financing and Bond Rating

To fund the construction of new facilities, the district has historically relied on both pay-as-you-go financing as well as short-term and long-term debt financing. Water utility debt service will increase by roughly $10.5 million in FY 2017–18 due to a planned long-term debt issuance. Looking forward, capital improvement needs total nearly $2.3 billion (in inflated dollars) for the ten fiscal years 2017–18 through 2026–27. As shown in Figure 4-6.1, the district will see debt service rise from $37 million in FY 2017–18 to roughly $151.4 million in FY 2026–27 as a result of periodic debt issuances to fund capital projects. Total outstanding debt is shown in Figure 4-6.2 and is projected to increase from $593 million in FY 2017–18 to $1.8 billion in FY 2026–27. This outstanding debt could be significantly higher if all postponed capital projects were funded. Conversely, the debt could also be reduced if projects are reduced or further external funding is found.

Figure 4-6.1 Projected Debt Service



Figure 4-6.2 Projected Outstanding Debt



Current Water Utility senior lien debt issuances are rated Aa1 from Moody's, AA+ from Fitch, and AA- from Standard & Poor's. These ratings reflect the district's strong financial position and the highly rated creditworthiness of district issued securities. The ratings are among the highest for a water-related governmental entity in the state of California, which helps keep interest costs borne by the district at a minimum.

Water Utility Funds Projected Proforma

Table 4-6.1 shows the projected revenues, expenditures, and reserves over the next ten years for the Water Utility Funds. By financing with a combination of debt, current year revenue, and reserves, the district is able to achieve its capital investment plan. Under the maximum proposed projection, the financial model assumes that discretionary reserves (the operating and capital reserve plus the supplemental water supply reserve) are maintained at minimum per district policy. The minimum per policy for these reserves equates to having roughly 3 months worth of Water Utility operating outlays in the bank. These reserves serve several purposes including: 1) to meet cash flow needs; 2) provide emergency funding; and 3) to provide a funding source for future operating and capital needs. Last year, the Board established a Drought Contingency Reserve that would be built up in healthier rainfall and economic times. The purpose of this reserve is to offset costs that arise during a drought and minimize spikes in the rates. The financial model assumes no further funding for the Drought Contingency Reserve at this time given the current historic drought. The district's current reserve policy can be found within the Financial Summaries section of the FY 2016–17 Budget document.[7]

The financial model under the FY 2017–18 maximum proposed projection reflects a Senior/Parity Lien Debt Service Coverage Ratio ranging between 1.97 and 2.62 between FY 2017-18 and FY 2026–27. Targeting a ratio of 2.0 or better helps to ensure financial stability and continued high credit ratings.

[7] The FY 2016-17 Budget document is located at http://www.valleywater.org/About/Finance.aspx.

Table 4-6.1 Ten-Year Water Utility Plan – ($ in Thousands)

	Actual	Projected	Projected	Projected	Projected	Projected	Projected	Projected	Projected	Projected	Projected	Projected
	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25	2025-26	2026-27
Operating Revenues												
Groundwater Production Charges	$61,128	$76,847	$79,117	$91,466	$108,442	$137,612	$151,750	$167,951	$185,271	$200,020	$206,688	$213,592
Surface & Recycled Water Charges	$732	$2,218	$2,429	$2,656	$2,905	$3,180	$3,482	$3,816	$4,171	$4,476	$4,625	$4,780
Treated Water Charges	$89,375	$107,824	$134,190	$154,550	$177,790	$195,730	$215,625	$238,898	$263,835	$284,952	$294,218	$303,666
Other	$607	$660	$660	$660	$660	$660	$660	$660	$660	$660	$660	$660
Inter-governmental Services	$2,244	$2,768	$1,264	$1,136	$1,155	$1,170	$1,187	$1,208	$1,226	$1,246	$1,266	$1,292
Total Operating Revenue	**$154,086**	**$190,317**	**$217,660**	**$250,468**	**$290,952**	**$338,352**	**$372,704**	**$412,533**	**$455,163**	**$491,354**	**$507,457**	**$523,990**
Non-Operating Revenues												
Property Taxes	$30,535	$39,285	$32,505	$34,733	$36,968	$39,212	$42,465	$47,726	$49,996	$54,276	$59,566	$63,866
Interest	$2,527	$629	$698	$873	$1,208	$1,607	$1,986	$2,446	$3,115	$3,764	$5,766	$10,017
Capital Contributions	$3,177	$12,322	$2,688	$3,341	$359	$550	$2,084	$1,295	$187	$437	$291	$277
Semitropic Sales	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Other	$4,116	$1,377	$1,379	$1,386	$1,393	$1,400	$1,408	$1,416	$1,425	$1,434	$1,443	$1,453
Total Non-Operating Revenues	$40,355	$53,614	$37,270	$40,333	$39,928	$42,769	$47,943	$52,883	$54,723	$59,910	$67,066	$75,612
Total Revenue	**$194,441**	**$243,930**	**$254,930**	**$290,801**	**$330,880**	**$381,121**	**$420,647**	**$465,416**	**$509,886**	**$551,264**	**$574,523**	**$599,602**
	2.3%	25.5%	4.5%	14.1%	13.8%	15.2%	10.4%	10.6%	9.6%	8.1%	4.2%	4.4%
Operating Outlays												
Operations	$164,821	$186,431	$171,204	$179,866	$188,808	$195,289	$208,453	$221,397	$233,922	$260,436	$275,047	$285,398
Operating Projects	$156	$57	$190	$200	$207	$215	$222	$231	$238	$247	$256	$266
Debt Service	$13,162	$26,482	$37,083	$46,350	$62,000	$88,005	$106,802	$131,303	$149,949	$159,001	$152,073	$152,057
Total Operating Outlays	**$178,139**	**$212,971**	**$208,478**	**$226,416**	**$251,015**	**$283,508**	**$315,478**	**$352,930**	**$384,110**	**$419,684**	**$427,376**	**$437,722**
Operations + OP % Increase	6.7%	13.0%	-8.1%	5.1%	5.0%	3.4%	6.7%	6.2%	5.7%	11.3%	5.6%	3.8%
Operating Transfers In/(Out)	19,874	(1,324)	(6,096)	4,371	3,979	627	1,959	6,456	6,994	7,549	8,144	8,780
Debt Proceeds	139,973	123,585	80,135	91,327	340,283	210,589	309,145	235,109	165,495	(1)	0	1
Capital Outlay	(146,906)	(160,834)	(137,455)	(154,735)	(410,815)	(301,207)	(411,141)	(341,531)	(278,478)	(134,732)	(41,368)	(36,092)
Total Other Financing Sources/ (Uses)	12,941	(38,573)	(63,416)	(59,036)	(66,553)	(89,992)	(100,037)	(99,966)	(105,988)	(127,184)	(33,224)	(27,311)
Balance Available	**29,243**	**(7,613)**	**(16,963)**	**5,348**	**13,312**	**7,621**	**5,132**	**12,519**	**19,788**	**4,396**	**113,923**	**134,569**
Reserves:												
Restricted Reserves:												
WUE-Restricted Operating Reserve	$17,494	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
WUE - Rate Stablization Reserve	$2,082	$19,974	$21,082	$23,503	$27,118	$32,426	$36,970	$42,541	$47,004	$50,874	$50,822	$51,683
San Felipe Emergency Reserve	$2,876	$2,926	$2,976	$3,026	$3,076	$3,126	$3,176	$3,226	$3,276	$3,326	$3,376	$3,426
Revenue Bond Debt Service Reserve	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
State Water Project Tax Reserve	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Drought Contingency Reserve	$0	$3,000	$3,000	$3,000	$3,000	$3,000	$3,000	$3,000	$3,000	$3,000	$3,000	$3,000
Supplemental Water Supply Appropo.	$12,736	$14,277	$14,677	$15,077	$15,477	$15,877	$16,277	$16,677	$17,077	$17,477	$17,877	$18,277
SVAWPC Sinking Fund	$1,906	$1,906	$1,906	$1,906	$1,906	$1,906	$1,906	$1,906	$1,906	$1,906	$1,906	$1,906
State Revolving Fund	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Total Restricted	**$37,094**	**$42,083**	**$43,641**	**$46,512**	**$50,577**	**$56,336**	**$61,330**	**$67,351**	**$72,263**	**$76,583**	**$76,981**	**$78,292**
Committed Reserves:												
Floating Rate Debt Stabilization	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Designated for Operating and Capital	$35,432	$47,465	$33,619	$36,096	$45,343	$47,206	$47,344	$53,842	$68,718	$68,794	$182,319	$315,577
Currently Authorized Projects	$29,311	$4,675	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Total Designated Reserves	**$64,742**	**$52,140**	**$33,619**	**$36,096**	**$45,343**	**$47,206**	**$47,344**	**$53,842**	**$68,718**	**$68,794**	**$182,319**	**$315,577**
Designated Liability & Other:												
GO litigation liability	$7,386	$7,386	$7,386	$7,386	$7,386	$7,386	$7,386	$7,386	$7,386	$7,386	$7,386	$7,386
Total Designated Liability & Other	**$7,386**	**$7,386**	**$7,386**	**$7,386**	**$7,386**	**$7,386**	**$7,386**	**$7,386**	**$7,386**	**$7,386**	**$7,386**	**$7,386**
Total	**$109,222**	**$101,609**	**$84,646**	**$89,994**	**$103,307**	**$110,928**	**$116,060**	**$128,579**	**$148,367**	**$152,763**	**$266,686**	**$401,255**
Debt Service Coverage												
Senior Lien Debt Service Coverage	4.17	1.74	2.15	2.57	2.62	2.27	2.11	2.00	2.00	1.97	2.03	2.12

North County (Zone W-2) Finances

North County (Zone W-2) is generally defined as the portion of the county north of Metcalf Road. North County accounts for approximately 80 percent of district water consumption, but because of higher charges due to higher North County costs, about 95 percent of the Water Utility Enterprise's revenue. As shown at the beginning of the financial section in Table 4-2.1, the proposed maximum is $1,178 per acre-foot groundwater production charge for M&I or other non-agricultural water and a $1,278 per acre-foot charge for contract treated water for FY 2017–18. If adopted, there would be a 9.9 percent increase for groundwater production and 9.0 percent for contract treated water compared to FY 2016–17. The average household would experience an increase in their monthly bill of $3.65 or about 12 cents a day. Customers may also experience additional charge increases enacted by their retail water provider.

Staff propose a $1.50 per acre-foot or 6.4 percent increase to the North County agricultural groundwater production charge, which results in $25.09 per acre-foot in FY 2017–18, in concert with the South County agricultural groundwater production charge. The resulting agricultural groundwater production charge is 2.1 percent of the M&I groundwater production charge in North County.

Staff recommend maintaining the surcharge on treated water delivered under the contracts with retail agencies at $100 per acre-foot. As outlined in treated water contracts, the district has the discretion to make available treated water in excess of the retailers' basic contract amounts, so-called non-contract treated water, "… at such times and such prices as determined by the District." Staff recommend maintaining the non-contract surcharge at $50 per acre-foot for FY 2017–18 to encourage retail customers to take treated water in order to help the groundwater basin continue recovering from the drought.

It is recommended that the surface water master charge be increased from $27.46 per acre-foot to $33.36 per acre-foot in order to gradually bring revenues in line with costs related to managing, operating and billing for surface water diversions. The increases in the basic user charge and surface water master charge result in a total surface water charge for M&I water of $1,211.36 per acre-foot or a 10.2 percent increase. The total surface water charge for agricultural water would increase to $58.45 per acre-foot, which is a 14.5 percent increase, relative to FY 2016–17. Due to the severity of the drought, the district suspended almost all raw surface water deliveries in 2014. Many raw surface water users were forced to find an alternative source of water, primarily the groundwater basin. However, the District intends to reinstate untreated surface water users due to much improved water supply conditions.

To ease the burden on proposed groundwater production charge increases, staff recommends setting the SWP tax collection for FY 2017–18 at $26 million. The district incurs an annual indebtedness to the State of California pursuant to its Water Supply Contract dated November 20, 1961. Such indebtedness is proportional to the district's allocation of water from the SWP and pays for construction, maintenance and operation of SWP infrastructure and facilities. Staff anticipates that the district's contractual indebtedness to the State under the State Water Supply Contract for FY 2017–18 will be approximately $28 million. Not levying the SWP tax in FY 18 would result in revenue loss equivalent to $148 per AF in terms of the North County M&I groundwater production charge,

$31 per AF in terms of the South County M&I groundwater production charge, and $755,000 in terms of the Open Space Credit. (See Page 56 for further information on the Open Space Credit).

Table 4-6.2 shows the relationship between expenditures and the sources of revenue in North County Zone W-2. The maximum proposed groundwater production charges for FY 2017–18 are necessary to conduct "district activities in the protection and augmentation of the water supplies for users within a zone or zones of the district which are necessary for the public health, welfare, and safety of the people of this State" (District Act, Section 26.3).

Table 4-6.2 Fiscal Year 2017–18 North County Water Utility Water Program Requirements and Financing Sources

Center	Ends Policy	Projected ($K)	Description of Cost Center/Activities
Source of Supply	E-2.1 Current and future water supply for municipalities, industries, agriculture and the environment is reliable	84,179	This cost center contains all the anticipated expenditures that relate to obtaining, producing, and protecting a water supply; including all conservation, reclamation, and importation costs.
Raw Water Transmission & Distribution	E-2.2 Raw Water Transmission and Distribution Assets Are Managed to Ensure Efficiency and Reliability	9,682	This cost center contains all expenditures relating to the distribution of raw water. The distribution system consists of pipelines, canals, and percolation ponds and includes the use of creek systems.
Water Treatment and Treated Water Transmission & Distribution	E-2.3 Reliable High Quality Water is Delivered	39,566	These cost centers contain all expenditures associated with the treatment of water at the Rinconada, Penitencia and Santa Teresa Water Treatment Plants, as well as those expenditures related to the distribution of treated water to water utilities and includes costs associated with the treated water reservoirs, pumping plants, pipelines, and turnouts.
Administration & General	Support Services	20,058	This cost center contains all expenditures of an administrative nature which cannot be properly assigned to another of the other four cost centers. Work performed in this cost center cover items such as the collection of groundwater charges, financial and cash flow studies, annual reports, and general water management planning.
Capital & Other	Debt Service	37,083	Principal and Interest payments on outstanding debt
	Capital Improvements	146,804	Capital Improvement Program
	Open Space Credit	4,384	Help preserve the open space benefits provided by agricultural lands
	Adjustments		
	Adjust for FY 15 Actuals Versus Plan	17,587	
	Total Program Requirements	**359,343**	
	Financing Sources		
	Capital Cost recovery	4,502	
	Debt Proceeds	80,135	
	Interest & Other	6,997	
	Property Tax	29,609	
	Treated Water Sales	134,190	
	Surface Water Charges	1,819	
	Groundwater Production Charges	68,458	
	Capital Carryforward Reserves	4,675	
	Change in Reserves	28,957	
	Total Financing Sources	**359,342**	

Figure 4-6.3 and Table 4-6.3 show the cost of service analysis by customer class following six industry standard rate making steps:

1. Identify utility pricing objectives and constraints
2. Identify revenue requirements
3. Allocate costs to customer classes
4. Reduce costs by revenue offsets or non-rate related funding sources
5. Develop unit costs by customer class or net revenue requirements by customer class
6. Develop unit rates by customer class

Figure 4-6.3 Industry Standard Rate Making Steps



Water Utility pricing objectives and constraints are identified in Resolution 99-21, the District Act, Proposition 218, and existing contracts.

Line 11 in Table 4-6.3 represents rate making steps 2 and 3 summarizing the revenue requirements for North County Zone W-2 including operations costs, capital costs and debt service. Step 2 involves allocating water utility costs between zones W-2 (North County) and W-5 (South County) according to the benefits provided in each zone. Appendix B shows the percentage of operations costs allocated to the South County, along with a brief description of the basis of the allocation. Appendix C shows the percentage of capital and debt service costs allocated to South County along with a brief description of the basis of the allocations. Costs not allocated to the South County are allocated to the North County. Step 3 involves allocating costs directly to each customer class where possible, or allocating based on volume where the program services benefit multiple customer classes.

Line 29 in Table 4-6.3 represents rate making steps 4 and 5. It reflects the unit cost per acre-foot by customer class after applying non-rate related offsets to the revenue requirements. Offsets have

been allocated directly to each zone and customer class where possible, or allocated based on volume where the offset applies to multiple customer classes. FY 2017–18 unit costs include an adjustment for the reconciliation of FY 2014–15 actual costs and revenues against what should have been collected given actual costs.

Line 39 represents rate making step 6. There are two adjustments that have been made to achieve a pricing structure that meets the objectives of Resolution 99-21, namely a structure that facilitates managing surface water (SW) and groundwater (GW) supplies conjunctively to prevent the over use or under use of the groundwater basin. First, non-rate related revenues are offset against the cost of agricultural water. This is referred to as the "Open Space Credit." The purpose of the credit is to preserve the open space benefits provided by agricultural lands by keeping agricultural groundwater production charges low.

The second adjustment involves reallocating the cost of treated water to groundwater and surface water users based on proportional water usage. Importing water into the county for treatment and subsequent distribution to treated water (TW) users offsets the need to pump water from the ground. Without treated imported water supplies, the groundwater basin would become over drafted, which would also impact surface water users (who are permitted to take surface water in-lieu of pumping it from the ground). Consequently, the reallocation of treated water cost represents the value of treated water to groundwater and surface water users and facilitates a pricing structure that prevents the over use of the groundwater basin. The 2011 RFC report mentioned earlier in the section supports the reasonableness of such an adjustment.

Another aspect of the second adjustment is related to setting the basic user charge for surface water equal to the groundwater production charge. Surface water use is effectively in-lieu groundwater use permitted by the district to help preserve the groundwater basin. As such, the costs related to preserving the groundwater basin provide value to surface water users because it makes available district surface water, which otherwise would only be used for groundwater recharge. Similarly, the costs related to providing surface water benefit groundwater users because surface water usage helps preserve the groundwater basin. The second adjustment reallocates cost between surface water and groundwater customers in order to set the basic user charge for surface water equal to the groundwater production charge in recognition of this conjunctive use relationship, and in accordance with board policy. The 2015 RFC report mentioned earlier in the section supports the reasonableness of such an adjustment.

Table 4-6.3 Fiscal Year 2017–18 North County (Zone W-2) Cost of Service by Customer Class

	FY '18 Projection ($K)	Zone W-2					
		GW		TW	SW		Total W-2
		M&I	AG	M&I	M&I	Ag	
1	**Operating Outlays**						
2	Operations/Operating Projects	39,739	438	84,288	715	17	125,196
3	SWP Imported Water Costs	6,771	76	21,042	390	10	28,288
4	Debt Service	8,548	96	28,322	115	3	37,083
5	**Total Operating Outlays**	55,058	609	133,651	1,220	30	190,568
6							
7	**Capital & Transfers**						
8	Operating Transfers Out	3,286	37	5,939	85	2	9,349
9	Capital Outlays excl. carryforward	22,712	254	109,248	553	13	132,780
10	**Total Capital & Transfers**	25,998	291	115,187	638	16	142,129
11	**Total Annual Program Costs**	81,055	900	248,838	1,858	45	332,697
12							
13	**Revenue Requirement Offsets**						
14	Capital Cost Recovery	(1,583)	(18)	(2,860)	(41)	(1)	(4,502)
15	Debt Proceeds	(13,707)	(153)	(65,933)	(334)	(8)	(80,135)
16	Inter-governmental Services	(395)	(4)	(713)	(10)	(0)	(1,123)
17	SWP Property Tax	(5,565)	(62)	(18,490)	(315)	(8)	(24,440)
18	South County Deficit/Reserve	(236)	(3)	(427)	(6)	(0)	(673)
19	Interest Earnings	(246)	(3)	(444)	(6)	(0)	(698)
20	Inter-zone Interest	22	0	40	1	0	63
21	Capital Contributions	(945)	(11)	(1,708)	(24)	(1)	(2,688)
22	Other	(966)	(11)	(911)	(15)	(0)	(1,903)
23	Reserve Requirements	(5,116)	(24)	(23,692)	(125)	(1)	(28,957)
24	**Adjusted Revenue Requirement (FY 18)**	**52,320**	**612**	**133,700**	**982**	**26**	187,640
25	**Adjusted Revenue Requirement (FY 15 adj)**	12,633	56	4,657	158	84	17,587
26	**Total Adjusted Revenue Requirement**	**64,953**	**668**	**138,357**	**1,140**	**109**	205,227
27	Volume (KAF)	58.1	0.7	105.0	1.5	0.0	165.3
28							
29	Revenue Requirement per AF	$ 1,118	$ 1,028	$ 1,318	$ 760	$ 2,995	
30							
31	**Adjustments for Agricultural Preservation**						
32	Allocate WU 1% Ad Valorem Prop Tax	-	(652)	-	-	(107)	(759)
33	Transfer GF 1% Ad valorem Prop Tax	-	-	-	-	-	-
34	Transfer WS 1% Ad Valorem Prop Tax	-	-	-	-	-	-
35	Revenue Requirement per AF	$ 1,117.9	$ 25.1	$ 1,318	$ 760	$ 58.4	
36							
37	**Adjustments to Facilitate Conjunctive Use**						
38	Reallocate TW/SW/RW costs	3,489	-	(4,166)	677	-	0
39	Charge per AF	$ 1,178	$ 25.1	$ 1,278	$ 1,211	$ 58.4	
40	Total Revenue ($K)	$68,442	$16	$134,191	$1,817	$2	$204,468

Step 2- Identify revenue reqmnts

Step 3 - Allocate costs to customer classes

Step 4- Reduce costs by revenue offsets

Step 5 - Develop unit costs by customer class

Step 6 - Rate Design

South County (Zone W-5) Finances

South County (Zone W-5) is generally defined as the portion of Santa Clara County south of Metcalf Road, including Coyote Valley, Morgan Hill, San Martin, Gilroy and other unincorporated areas within the zone. Within the Water Utility Fund, district staff track revenue and costs associated with the South County Zone W-5 separately so that the groundwater production charge for services that benefit the South County Zone can be calculated.

Charges in the South County Zone W-5 are based on the costs of specific facilities, imported water costs, and operations costs related to managing a conjunctive use program, ensuring water quality, and measuring water supplies and usage. Historically, South County finances have been managed to maintain an approximate balance between cumulative revenues and costs. However, going forward, staff believe that maintaining a cumulative surplus or reserve balance would be prudent to provide a funding source for future costs.

For South County, the proposed maximum groundwater production charge is $418 per acre-foot for M&I water and $25.09 per acre-foot for agricultural water. The average household would experience an increase in their monthly bill of 86 cents per month or about 3 cents per day. Customers may also experience additional water charge increases enacted by their retail water provider.

It is recommended that the surface water master charge be increased from $27.46 per acre-foot to $33.36 per acre-foot in order to gradually bring revenues in line with costs related to managing, operating and billing for surface water diversions. The increases in the basic user charge and surface water master results in a total surface water charge for M&I water of $451.36 per acre-foot or a 7.3 percent increase. The total surface water charge for agricultural water would increase to $58.45 per acre-foot, which is a 14.5 percent increase, relative to FY 2016–17.

For recycled water, staff recommends increasing the M&I charge by 6.7 percent to $398 per acre-foot. For agricultural recycled water, staff recommends a 3.2 percent increase to $48.88 per acre-foot. This pricing is consistent with the provisions of the "Wholesale-Retailer Agreement for Supply of recycled Water Between Santa Clara Valley District and City of Gilroy.[8]" The increase maximizes cost recovery while concurrently providing an economic incentive to use recycled water.

On a year over year basis, costs are estimated to exceed revenues by approximately $0.3 million at the end of FY 2017–18. Figure 4-6.4 shows a cumulative revenue surplus projected in subsequent years which could help pay for potential dam seismic work at Uvas and Chesbro dams. The projection assumes an average increase of 5.8 percent in the M&I groundwater charge between FY 2017–18 and FY 2026–27. The average increase under the high end of the projected range shown in Figure 4-2.1 is 7.5 percent, over the same time frame.

[8] The Wholesale-Retailer Agreement for Supply of recycled Water Between Santa Clara Valley District and City of Gilroy can be accessed at http://www.valleywater.org/2017-18GroundwaterChargeProcess

Figure 4-6.4 South County Cumulative Revenue Surplus / Shortfall Projection ($/Thousands)



Open Space Credit

The District Act limits agricultural groundwater production charges to a maximum of 25 percent of the M&I groundwater production charges. Current Board policy adds an "open space" credit to agricultural revenues. The purpose of the credit is to help preserve the open space benefits provided by agricultural lands by keeping agricultural groundwater production charges low. To the extent that Proposition 218 applies to the groundwater production charge, it requires that costs to end users be proportional such that one class of users is not subsidizing another.

In 2013 and at the request of the Board, staff completed a study of the Board's Open Space Credit policy to address whether or not the property taxes used to support the Open Space Credit should be used to fund other important district activities, and whether increasing the agricultural groundwater production charges would affect the viability of the agricultural lands. Staff engaged a diverse group of stakeholders to gain insight on the impact of the current Open Space Credit policy on them and the impact of any potential changes to this policy. Staff convened a Working Group comprised of members representing agriculture, water retailers, the business community and the County of Santa Clara Land Planning. Staff solicited feedback from the Agricultural Advisory Committee, the Environmental Advisory Committee, Santa Clara County Farm Bureau, Water Commission, and farmers in North County and South. At the completion of the study in November 2013, the Board agreed with the Working Group recommendation and decided to maintain the Open Space Credit as is but agreed to have further discussions on the policy as necessary in the

future. The Board had further discussion in August 2016 and decided to maintain the Open Space Credit as is.

To comply with the current agricultural groundwater production charge setting policy, staff recommends the open space credit received by South County be $9.0 million in FY 2017–18 (funded by 1 percent ad valorem property taxes). This includes an adjustment that reconciles FY 2014–15 actuals against what was projected. The maximum proposed agricultural groundwater production charge for FY 2017–18 is $25.09 per acre foot, which is 6 percent of the proposed M&I groundwater production charge in South County.

Program Requirements and Financing Sources

Table 4-6.4 shows the relationship between expenditures and sources of revenue in South County for FY 2017–18. The specific operating costs allocated to South County can be found in Appendix B. Details on capital cost recovery can be found in Appendix C. The maximum groundwater production charges proposed for FY 2017–18 in South County Zone W-5 are necessary to conduct, "district activities in the protection and augmentation of the water supplies for users within a zone or zones of the district which are necessary for the public health, welfare, and safety of the people of this State" (District Act, Section 26.3).

Table 4-6.4 Fiscal Year 2017–18 South County Water Utility Program Requirements and Financing Sources

Cost Center	FY 18		
	Ends Policy	Projected ($K)	Description of Cost Center/Activities
Source of Supply	E-2.1 Current and future water supply for municipalities, industries, agriculture and the environment is reliable	10,092	This cost center contains all the anticipated expenditures that relate to obtaining, producing, and protecting a water supply; including all conservation, reclamation, and importation costs.
Raw Water Transmission & Distribution	E-2.2 Raw Water Transmission and Distribution Assets Are Managed to Ensure Efficiency and Reliability	3,428	This cost center contains all expenditures relating to the distribution of raw water. The distribution system consists of pipelines, canals, and percolation ponds and includes the use of creek systems.
Water Treatment and Treated Water Transmission & Distribution	E-2.3 Reliable High Quality Water is Delivered	256	These cost centers contain all expenditures associated with the treatment of water at the Rinconada, Penitencia and Santa Teresa Water Treatment Plants, as well as those expenditures related to the distribution of treated water to water utilities and includes costs associated with the treated water reservoirs, pumping plants, pipelines, and turnouts.
Administration & General	Support Services	4,135	This cost center contains all expenditures of an administrative nature which cannot be properly assigned to another of the other four cost centers. Work performed in this cost center cover items such as the collection of groundwater charges, financial and cash flow studies, annual reports, and general water management planning.
Capital & Other	Capital Cost Recovery	4,502	Annual payment for completed capital facilities and improvements
	Interest (Earned)/Due Utility Reserves	(63)	Based on cumulative revenue surplus at 3% interest rate
	Adjust for FY 15 Actuals Versus Plan	(918)	
	Total Program Requirements	21,431	
	Financing Sources		
	Open Space Credit	7,637	
	Property Tax & Other Revenue	3,199	
	Surface Water Charges	302	
	Recycled Water Charges	308	
	Groundwater Production Charges	10,659	
	Total Financing Sources	**22,104**	
	FY 18 Revenue Surplus/(Shortfall)	**673**	

Figure 4-6.3 and Table 4-6.5 show the cost of service analysis by customer class following the six industry standard rate making steps for South County Zone W-5:

1. Identify utility pricing objectives and constraints
2. Identify revenue requirements
3. Allocate costs to customer classes
4. Reduce costs by revenue offsets or non-rate related funding sources
5. Develop unit costs by customer class or net revenue requirements by customer class
6. Develop unit rates by customer class

Line 11 in Table 4-6.5 represents rate making steps 2 and 3 summarizing the revenue requirements for South County Zone W-5. Costs have been allocated directly to each customer class where possible, or allocated based on volume where the costs benefit multiple customer classes.

Line 29 in Table 4-6.5 represents rate making steps 4 and 5. It reflects the unit cost per acre-foot by customer class after applying non-rate related offsets to the revenue requirements. Offsets have been allocated directly to each customer class where possible, or allocated based on volume where the offset applies to multiple customer classes. FY 2017–18 unit costs include an adjustment for the reconciliation of FY 2014–15 actual costs and revenue against what should have been collected given actual costs.

Line 39 represents rate making step 6. There are two adjustments that have been made to achieve a pricing structure that meets the objectives of Resolution 99-21, namely a structure that facilitates managing surface water and groundwater supplies conjunctively to prevent the over use or under use of the groundwater basin. First, non-rate related revenues are offset against the cost of agricultural water. This is referred to as the "Open Space Credit". The purpose of the credit is to help preserve the open space benefits provided by agricultural lands by keeping agricultural groundwater production charges low.

The second adjustment involves reallocating the cost of recycled water (RW) to groundwater and surface water users. Without recycled water supplies, there would be additional demand on the groundwater basin and a higher risk of overdraft, which would also impact surface water users (who are permitted to take surface water in lieu of pumping it from the ground). Consequently, the reallocation of recycled water cost represents the value of recycled water to groundwater and surface water users and facilitates a pricing structure that helps prevent the over use of the groundwater basin.

Another aspect of the second adjustment is related to setting the basic user charge for surface water equal to the groundwater production charge. Surface water use is effectively in-lieu groundwater use permitted by the district to help preserve the groundwater basin. As such, the costs related to preserving the groundwater basin provide value to surface water users because it makes available district surface water which otherwise would only be used for groundwater recharge. Similarly, the costs related to providing surface water benefit groundwater users because surface water usage helps preserve the groundwater basin. The second adjustment reallocates cost between surface water and groundwater customers in order to set the basic user charge for surface water equal to the groundwater production charge in recognition of this conjunctive use relationship, and in accord with board policy. The 2015 RFC report mentioned earlier in the section supports the reasonableness of these recycled and surface water conjunctive use adjustments.

Table 4-6.5 Fiscal Year 2017–18 South County (Zone W-5) Cost of Service by Customer Class

	FY '18 Projection ($K)	Zone W-5						Total W-5
		GW		SW		RW		
		M&I	AG	M&I	AG	M&I	AG	
1	**Operating Outlays**							
2	Operations/Operating Projects	8,450	8,553	212	541	83	71	17,910
3	SWP Imported Water Costs	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
4	Debt Service	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
5	**Total Operating Outlays**	8,450	8,553	212	541	83	71	17,910
6	Step 2- Identify revenue reqmnts							
7	**Capital & Transfers**							
8	Operating Transfers Out	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
9	Capital Outlays excl. carryforward	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
10	**Total Capital & Transfers**	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
11	**Total Annual Program Costs**	8,450	8,553	212	541	83	71	17,910
12	Step 3 - Allocate costs to customer classes							
13	**Revenue Requirement Offsets**							
14	Capital Cost Recovery	1,605	1,672	33	87	595	510	4,502
15	Debt Proceeds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
16	Inter-governmental Services	(67)	(69)	(1)	(4)	-	-	(141)
17	SWP Property Tax	(719)	(749)	(15)	(39)	(21)	(18)	(1,560)
18	South County Deficit/Reserve	158	473	(16)	25	21	11	673
19	Interest Earnings	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
20	Inter-zone Interest	(29)	(30)	(1)	(2)	(1)	(1)	(63)
21	Capital Contributions	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
22	Other	(65)	(68)	(1)	(2)	-	-	(136)
23	Reserve Requirements	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
24	**Adjusted Revenue Requirement (FY 18)**	**9,334**	**9,781**	**212**	**607**	**678**	**574**	21,185
25	**Adjusted Revenue Requirement (FY 15 adj)**	296	(764)	25	(177)	(8)	(291)	(918)
	Step 4- Reduce costs by revenue offsets							
26	**Total Adjusted Revenue Requirement**	**9,630**	**9,017**	**237**	**430**	**670**	**283**	20,267
27	Volume (KAF)	24.0	25.0	0.5	1.3	0.7	0.6	52.1
28								
29	Revenue Requirement per AF	$ 401	$ 361	$ 474	$ 331	$ 957	$ 472	
30	Step 5 - Develop unit costs by customer class							
31	**Adjustments for Agricultural Preservation**							
32	Allocate WU 1% Ad Valorem Prop Tax	-	(5,746)	-	-	-	-	(5,746)
33	Transfer GF 1% Ad valorem Prop Tax	-	(1,626)	-	-	-	-	(1,626)
34	Transfer WS 1% Ad Valorem Prop Tax	-	(1,018)	-	(354)	-	(254)	(1,626)
35	Revenue Requirement per AF	$ 401	$ 25.1	$ 474	$ 58.4	$ 957	$ 48.9	
36	Step 6 - Rate Design							
37	**Adjustments to Facilitate Conjunctive Use**							
38	Reallocate TW/SW/RW costs	402	-	(11)	-	(391)	-	-
39	Charge per AF	$ 418	$ 25.1	$ 451	$ 58	$ 398	$ 48.9	
40	Total Revenue ($K)	$10,032	$627	$226	$76	$279	$29	$11,269

APPENDIX A

WATER UTILITY CHARGE COMPONENTS AND MAXIMUM PROPOSED CHARGES

Table A-1 Maximum Proposed Charge Components for Fiscal Year 2017–18

Component	Charge ($/AF)
Basic User, Zone W-2 (North County)	
Agricultural	25.09
M&I	1,178.00
Basic User, Zone W-5 (South County/Coyote Valley)	
Agricultural	25.09
M&I	418.00
Treated Water Surcharge	
Contract	100.00
Non-contract	50.00
Surface Water Charge	
Water Master	33.36

Table A-2 Maximum Proposed Charge Components for Fiscal Year 2017–18

Type of Charge	AG Water ($/AF)	M&I Water ($/AF)
Groundwater Production		
Zone W-2	$25.09	$1,178.00
Zone W-5	$25.09	$418.00
Surface Water[1]		
Other Zone W-5 Deliveries[2]	$58.45	$451.36
Other Zone W-2 Deliveries[3]	$58.45	$1,211.36
Minimum Charge Zone W-5[4]	$18.82	$313.50
Minimum Charge Zone W-2[5]	$18.82	$883.50
Treated Water		
Contract[6]	N/A	$1,278.00
Non-contract[7]	N/A	$1,228.00
Recycled Water		
Gilroy	$48.88	$398.00

[1] Surface water charge is the sum of the basic user charge plus the water master charge.
[2] Other Zone W-5 Deliveries = Basic User (AG or M&I @ $25.09/AF or $418.00/AF) + Water Master ($33.36/AF).
[3] Other Zone W-2 Deliveries = Basic User (AG or M&I @ $25.09/AF or $1,178.00/AF) + Water Master ($33.36/AF).
[4] Minimum Charge W-5 = 0.75 X Basic User W-5 (M&I @ $418./AF, AG @ $25.09/AF).
[5] Minimum Charge W-2 = 0.75 X Basic User W-2 (M&I @ $1,178.00/AF, AG @ $25.09/AF).
[6] Treated Water Charge is the sum of Basic User ($1,178.00/AF) and Treated Water Surcharge ($100.00/AF).
[7] The charge for non-contract deliveries is the sum of the basic user charge ($1,178.00/AF) and the treated water surcharge for non-contract water ($50.00/AF).

APPENDIX B

BASIS OF COST ALLOCATIONS BETWEEN NORTH AND SOUTH ZONES (IN THOUSANDS $)

Cost Center	Project #	Project Name	South County Allocation	South County Share	North County Share	Total FY 2018	Basis of Allocation
Source of Supply	91041012	Water Operations Planning	16.9%	89	439	528	Raw Water Deliveries
	91041018	Groundwater Management Program	42.4%	1,704	2,315	4,018	Groundwater Production Ratio
	91061012	Facilities Env Compliance	16.9%	6	31	37	Raw Water Deliveries
	91081007	Dam Safety Program	14.4%	243	1,442	1,685	Program Benefit Calculation
	91101004	Recycled Water Program	5.9%	402	6,414	6,817	Population
	91111001	Water Rights	16.9%	51	252	303	Raw Water Deliveries
	91131004	Imported Water Program	12.0%	905	6,640	7,545	Imported Water Ratio
	91131006	IW San Felipe Division Delvrs	19.7%	4,580	18,668	23,248	Program Benefit Calculation
	91131007	IW South Bay Aqueduct Delvrs	0.0%	-	2,992	2,992	No South County Benefit
	91131008	State Water Project Costs	0.0%	-	28,288	28,288	No South County Benefit
	91151001	Water Conservation Program	7.3%	385	4,895	5,281	Program Benefit Calculation
	91151011	Water Conservation Campaign	5.9%	14	222	236	Population
	91151012	Recycled/Purified Water Public Engagement	5.9%	37	595	633	Population
	91211004	San Felipe Reach 1 Operation	19.8%	117	472	589	CVP Imported Water Ratio
	91211005	SFD Reach 1 Administration	19.8%	2	8	9	CVP Imported Water Ratio
	91211084	San Felipe Reach1 Ctrl and Ele	19.8%	85	344	429	CVP Imported Water Ratio
	91211085	SF Reach 1-Engineering - Other	19.8%	33	134	167	CVP Imported Water Ratio
	91211099	San Felipe Reach 1 Gen Maint	19.8%	139	563	702	CVP Imported Water Ratio
	91221002	San Felipe Reach 2 Operation	19.8%	13	54	68	CVP Imported Water Ratio
	91221006	SF Reach 2-Engineering - Other	19.8%	39	160	199	CVP Imported Water Ratio
	91221099	San Felipe Reach 2 Gen Maint	19.8%	40	161	201	CVP Imported Water Ratio
	91231002	San Felipe Reach 3 Operation	19.8%	20	187	207	CVP Imported Water Ratio
	91231084	San Felipe Reach3 Ctrl and Ele	19.8%	39	359	398	CVP Imported Water Ratio
	91231085	SF Reach 3-Engineering - Other	19.8%	14	124	137	CVP Imported Water Ratio
	91231099	San Felipe Reach 3 Gen Maint	19.8%	120	688	808	CVP Imported Water Ratio
	91281007	SVAWPC Facility Operations	0.0%	-	2,697	2,697	No South County Benefit
	91281008	SVAWPC Facility Maintenance	0.0%	-	1,314	1,314	No South County Benefit
	91441003	Desalination	13.0%	3	21	24	M&I Water Usage Ratio
	91451002	Well Ordinance Program	20.7%	287	1,100	1,388	Well Permits and Inpections
	91451005	Source Water Quality Mgmt	13.0%	54	364	418	M&I Water Usage Ratio
	91451011	Invasive Mussel Prevention	16.9%	110	542	652	Raw Water Deliveries
	91761001	Local Res / Div Plan & Analysis	21.5%	259	944	1,203	Total Water Deliveries Ratio
	91761013	SCADA Systems Upgrades	19.8%	17	68	85	CVP Imported Water Ratio
	91761099	Dams / Reservoir Gen Maint	22.0%	395	1,399	1,794	Program Benefit Calculation
	60061007	WUE Drought Emergency Response	13.0%	87	585	672	M&I Water Usage Ratio
	91061007	Districtwide Salary Savings	13.0%	(199)	(1,301)	(1,500)	No South County Benefit
				10,092	**84,179**	**94,271**	

BASIS OF COST ALLOCATIONS BETWEEN NORTH AND SOUTH ZONES (IN THOUSANDS $) … CONTINUED

Cost Center	Project #	Project Name	South County Allocation	South County Share	North County Share	Total FY 2018	Basis of Allocation
Raw Water Transmission & Distribution	92041014	FAHCE/Three Creeks HCP Project	4.3%	89	1,983	2,072	Coyote Water Supply Ratio
	92061012	Facilities Env Compliance	16.9%	11	56	67	Raw Water Deliveries
	92261099	Vasona Pump Station Gen Main	0.0%	-	296	296	No South County Benefit
	92761001	Raw Water T and D Genrl Oper	16.9%	250	1,227	1,476	Raw Water Deliveries
	92761006	Rchrg / RW Field Fac Asset Mgt	42.1%	83	114	197	Groundwater Recharge Ratio
	92761007	Rchrg / RW Field Ops Pln& Anlys	42.1%	108	149	257	Groundwater Recharge Ratio
	92761008	Recycled Water T&D Genrl Maint	100.0%	93	-	93	Benefits only South County
	92761009	Recharge/RW Field Ops	42.1%	1,310	1,802	3,112	Program Benefit Calculation
	92761010	Rchrg / RW Field Fac Maint	42.1%	834	1,147	1,982	Groundwater Recharge Ratio
	92761012	Untreated Water Prog Plan&Analysis	51.3%	66	63	129	Untreated Water Deliveries Ratio
	92761013	SCADA Systems Upgrades	16.9%	8	41	49	Raw Water Deliveries
	92761082	Raw Water T&D Ctrl and Electr	16.9%	130	639	769	Raw Water Deliveries
	92761083	Raw Water T&D Eng Other	16.9%	75	370	446	Raw Water Deliveries
	92761085	Anderson Hydrelctrc Fclty Main	19.9%	27	108	135	Anderson Water Deliveries Ratio
	92761099	Raw Water T / D Gen Maint	16.9%	277	1,364	1,641	Raw Water Deliveries
	92781002	RW Corrosion Control	16.9%	66	323	389	Raw Water Deliveries
				3,428	**9,682**	**13,110**	
Water Treatment and Treated Water Transmission & Distribution	93061012	Facilities Env Compliance	0.0%	-	454	454	No South County Benefit
	93081008	W T General Water Quality	0.0%	-	2,047	2,047	No South County Benefit
	93081009	Water Treatment Plant Engineering	0.0%	-	567	567	No South County Benefit
	93231007	PWTP Landslide Monitoring	0.0%	-	151	151	No South County Benefit
	93231009	PWTP General Operations	0.0%	-	5,451	5,451	No South County Benefit
	93231099	Penitencia WTP General Maint	0.0%	-	2,464	2,464	No South County Benefit
	93281005	STWTP - General Operations	0.0%	-	4,828	4,828	No South County Benefit
	93281099	Santa Teresa WTP General Maint	0.0%	-	3,001	3,001	No South County Benefit
	93291012	RWTP General Operations	0.0%	-	7,963	7,963	No South County Benefit
	93291099	Rinconada WTP General Maint	0.0%	-	3,404	3,404	No South County Benefit
	93401002	Water District Laboratory	5.7%	256	4,237	4,493	Lab Analyses
	93761001	SF/SCVWD Intertie General Ops	0.0%	-	221	221	No South County Benefit
	93761004	Campbell Well Field Operations	0.0%	-	193	193	No South County Benefit
	93761005	Campbell Well Field Maintenance	0.0%	-	92	92	No South County Benefit
	93761006	Treated Water Ctrl & Elec Eng	0.0%	-	2,612	2,612	No South County Benefit
	93761013	SCADA Systems Upgrades	0.0%	-	143	143	No South County Benefit
	93761099	SF/SCVWD Intertie Gen Maint	0.0%	-	101	101	No South County Benefit
	94761005	TW T&D - Engineering - Other	0.0%	-	235	235	No South County Benefit
	94761013	SCADA Systems Upgrades	0.0%	-	27	27	No South County Benefit
	94761099	Treated Water T/D Gen Maint	0.0%	-	1,103	1,103	No South County Benefit
	94781001	Treated Water T/D Corrosion	0.0%	-	272	272	No South County Benefit
				256	**39,566**	**39,822**	

BASIS OF COST ALLOCATIONS BETWEEN NORTH AND SOUTH ZONES (IN THOUSANDS $) … CONTINUED

Cost Center	Project #	Project Name	South County Allocation	South County Share	North County Share	Total FY 2018	Basis of Allocation
Administration & General	95001090	Unscoped Projects-Budget Only	13.0%	46	305	350	M&I Water Usage Ratio
	95011003	WU Asset Protection Support	2.4%	14	581	596	Program Benefit Calculation
	95021008	Electrical Power Support	1.5%	4	259	263	Labor Hours
	95031002	Grants Management	14.0%	54	331	385	Program Benefit Calculation
	95041039	Integrated Regional Water Mgmt	13.0%	19	124	142	M&I Water Usage Ratio
	95041046	Survey Record Management	13.0%	10	65	75	M&I Water Usage Ratio
	95061007	WUE Asset Management Plng Prgm	4.5%	61	1,293	1,354	Program Benefit Calculation
	95061012	Rental Expense San Pedro,MH	100.0%	28	-	28	Benefits only South County
	95061027	Water Utility Health & Safety	13.0%	55	369	424	M&I Water Usage Ratio
	95061032	Water Utility Ops Safety Training	13.0%	68	453	520	M&I Water Usage Ratio
	95061037	WUE Training & Development	13.0%	137	920	1,057	M&I Water Usage Ratio
	95061038	WUE Administration	13.0%	973	6,511	7,484	M&I Water Usage Ratio
	95061043	WUE ER Response Plan & Implement	5.9%	15	242	257	Population
	95061045	AM Framework Implementation	4.5%	23	496	519	M&I Water Usage Ratio
	95061047	WUE Technical Training Program	13.0%	118	790	908	M&I Water Usage Ratio
	95061048	Climate Change Adaptation/Mtg.	13.0%	56	372	428	M&I Water Usage Ratio
	95071041	Welding Services	1.5%	7	463	469	Program Benefit Calculation
	95101003	W2 W5 Wtr Revenue Program	63.0%	930	546	1,476	Labor Hours
	95111003	Water Use Measurement	46.0%	823	966	1,789	Labor Hours
	95121003	Long Term Financial Planning	13.0%	72	479	550	M&I Water Usage Ratio
	95151002	Water Utility Customer Relations	5.9%	18	288	306	Population
	95741001	WUE Long-term Planning	13.0%	127	849	976	M&I Water Usage Ratio
	95741042	Water Resources EnvPlng & Permtg	18.0%	180	820	999	Program Benefit Calculation
	95761003	SCADA Network Administration	2.6%	9	327	336	Program Benefit Calculation
	95761071	Emergency Preparedness Prog	5.9%	53	841	894	Population
	95762011	Tree Maintenance Program	13.0%	25	166	190	M&I Water Usage Ratio
	95771011	InterAgency Urban Runoff Program	16.9%	73	361	434	Raw Water Deliveries
	95771031	HAZMAT Emergency Response	10.0%	11	100	111	Emergency Response Events
	95811043	Hydrologic Data Msrmt & Mgmt	17.0%	152	740	892	Stream Gauge location
	95811046	Warehouse Services	13.0%	86	579	665	M&I Water Usage Ratio
	95811049	X Valley Subsidence Survey	0.0%	-	130	130	No South County Benefit
	95811050	Benchmark Maintenance (Countywide)	23.3%	32	106	138	Benchmark Maintenance
	95811054	District Real Property Administration	0.0%	-	142	142	Program Benefit Calculation
		Adjustment for Anticipated Budget Changes	13.0%	(143)	(954)	(1,097)	M&I Water Usage Ratio
				4,135	**20,058**	**24,193**	
		TOTAL		17,911	153,484	171,395	

Note: Projects 91231002, 91231084, 912341085, and 91231099 have been adjusted for the Coyote Pumping Plant costs.

APPENDIX C

SOUTH COUNTY CAPITAL COST RECOVERY

(In Thousands $)						
Job Description	Total Project Cost	South County %	South County Cost	FY 18 Cost Recovery*	Year Cost Recovery is Complete	Basis of Allocation to the South
Uvas Dam & Reservoir	$ 1,124	100.0%	$ 1,124	$ 88	FY 22	Benefits only South County
San Pedro Recharge Facility	$ 1,882	100.0%	$ 1,882	$ 147	FY 22	Benefits only South County
San Pedro Recharge house	$ 700	100.0%	$ 700	$ 47	FY 31	Benefits only South County
Recycled Water Improvements I	$ 7,232	100.0%	$ 7,232	$ 481	FY 32	Benefits only South County
Recycled Water Improvements II	$ 118	100.0%	$ 118	$ 8	FY 33	Benefits only South County
Recycled Water Improvements III	$ 1,721	100.0%	$ 1,721	$ 115	FY 34	Benefits only South County
Water Banking Rights	$ 6,226	8.0%	$ 498	$ 33	FY 35	Total Imported Water Ratio
Dam Instrumentation	$ 6,243	21.0%	$ 1,311	$ 87	FY 41	Program benefit calculation
Geodetic Control Maintenance	$ 236	41.0%	$ 97	$ 6	FY 36	Survey Analysis
Dam Maintenance Mitigation	$ 244	22.0%	$ 54	$ 4	FY 45	Program benefit calculation
SC Recycled Water Masterplan - Immediate Term	$ 3,257	100.0%	$ 3,257	$ 216	FY 37	Benefits only South County
SC Recycled Water Masterplan - Short Term Implementation 1A	$ 4,314	100.0%	$ 4,314	$ 286	FY 42	Benefits only South County
Water Banking FY 06	$ 18,895	9.0%	$ 1,701	$ 113	FY 36	Total Imported Water Ratio
San Felipe Division Capital	$ 9,715	14.1%	$ 1,370	$ 1,370	N/A	Repayment Cost Distribution
Pacheco Conduit Inspection and Rehabilitation	$ 5,668	19.1%	$ 1,083	$ 68	FY 47	CVP Imported Water Ratio
Pacheco Pumping Plant Regulating Tank Recoating	$ 2,550	17.0%	$ 434	$ 29	FY 42	CVP Imported Water Ratio
San Felipe Communications Cable Replacement	$ 235	17.0%	$ 40	$ 3	FY 42	CVP Imported Water Ratio
Small Caps, San Felipe	$ 257	19.8%	$ 51	$ 51	N/A	CVP Imported Water Ratio
Santa Clara Tunnel Landslide	$ 4,509	15.1%	$ 681	$ 45	FY 39	CVP Imported Water Ratio
SC Tunnel Landslide Mitigation	$ 217	16.9%	$ 37	$ 2	FY 39	CVP Imported Water Ratio
Small Caps, San Felipe Reach 2	$ 48	19.8%	$ 10	$ 10	N/A	CVP Imported Water Ratio
Small Caps, San Felipe Reach 3	$ 45	19.8%	$ 9	$ 9	N/A	CVP Imported Water Ratio
Water Infrastructure Reliability Program	$ 2,134	1.5%	$ 32	$ 2	FY 36	Program benefit calculation
Water Infrastructure Baseline Improvement	$ 2,403	3.6%	$ 87	$ 6	FY 38	Spare pipe usage
Coyote Dam Control Building Improvement	$ 576	19.6%	$ 113	$ 7	FY 42	Anderson deliveries ratio
Pacheco Pumping Plant ASD Replacement	$ 19,169	18.6%	$ 3,565	$ 236	FY 45	CVP Imported Water Ratio
Radio Repeater Infill	$ 5	11.1%	$ 1	$ 0	FY 42	M&I Water Usage Ratio
Santa Clara Conduit Rehab	$ 1,814	17.0%	$ 308	$ 20	FY 42	CVP Imported Water Ratio
Raw Water Control System	$ 9,188	4.3%	$ 399	$ 26	FY 37	Program benefit calculation
Small Caps, Raw Water T&D	$ 110	16.9%	$ 19	$ 19	N/A	Raw Water Usage
Inf Reliability Master Plan	$ 2,066	12.3%	$ 254	$ 16	FY 46	M&I Water Usage Ratio
Water Protection	$ 11,387	2.3%	$ 261	$ 17	FY 45	Program benefit calculation
Microwave Telecommunications	$ 4,595	11.5%	$ 528	$ 35	FY 44	M&I Water Usage Ratio
Capital Warranty Services	$ 260	13.0%	$ 34	$ 34	FY 32	M&I Water Usage Ratio
5-year Pipeline Rehabilitation	$ 29,083	4.6%	$ 1,338	$ 84	FY 47	Program benefit calculation
Pipeline Hydraulic Reliability Upgrade	$ 335	2.3%	$ 8	$ 1	FY 45	Program benefit calculation
WTP_WQL Network Equipment	$ 1,301	13.0%	$ 169	$ 169	FY 47	M&I Water Usage Ratio
Corp Yard Relocation	$ 26	10.2%	$ 3	$ 0	FY 40	M&I Water Usage Ratio
Information Systems Management	$ 5,802	9.8%	$ 569	$ 38	FY 40	M&I Water Usage Ratio
Peoplesoft Upgrade	$ 78	9.8%	$ 8	$ 1	FY 39	M&I Water Usage Ratio
Peoplesoft System Upgrade & Expansion	$ 1,217	12.3%	$ 150	$ 9	FY 46	M&I Water Usage Ratio
Uvas Property Acquisition	$ 1,251	100.0%	$ 1,251	$ 79	FY 46	Benefits only South County
Capital Program Administration	$ 7,484	6.5%	$ 486	$ 486	N/A	Total Capital Cost Ratio
Grand Total	**$ 175,723**		**$ 37,302**	**$ 4,502**		

* Capital projects that benefit South County are paid for over the life of the project (typically 30 years) beginning when the project is completed

APPENDIX D
ACRONYMS

AF	Acre-Foot or Acre-Feet
AG	Agriculture
ASD	Adjustable Speed Drive
Board	Board of Directors
CESA	California Endangered Species Act
CIP	Capital Improvement Program
CVP	Central Valley Project
DWR	Department of Water Resources
ESA	Endangered Species Act
FAHCE	Fisheries and Aquatic Habitat Collaborative Effort
FHRP	FAHCE fish habitat restoration plan
FWS	Fish and Wildlife Service
FY	Fiscal Year
GW	Groundwater
GWMP	Groundwater Management Plan
HCP	Habitat Conservation Plan
IPR	Indirect Potable Reuse
Llagas Subbasin	Groundwater Subbasin as defined by DWR bulletin 118-2003 and as shown in map of Groundwater Subbasins, area south of Cochrane Road
Master Plan	Countywide Recycled and Purified Water Master Plan
M&I	Municipal and Industrial
NMFS	National Marine Fisheries Service
NWS	National Weather Service
North County	Northern Santa Clara County, north of Metcalf Road
Program	Potable Reuse Program
RFC	Raftelis Financial Consultants, Inc.
RW	Recycled Water
SCADA	Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition
SFPUC	San Francisco Public Utilities Commission
SGMA	Sustainable Groundwater Management Act
Santa Clara Subbasin	Groundwater Subbasin as defined by DWR bulletin 118-2003 and as shown in map of Groundwater Subbasins, area north of Cochrane Road and includes Coyote Valley
South County	Southern Santa Clara County, south of Metcalf Road
SVAWPC	Silicon Valley Advanced Water Purification Center
SW	Surface Water
SWP	State Water Project
SWRCB	State Water Resources Control Board
Three Creeks	Guadalupe River, Coyote Creek and Stevens Creek
TW	Treated Water
USBR	Unite States Bureau of Reclamation
Water District	Santa Clara Valley District
Water Master Plan	Water Supply and Infrastructure Master Plan
Zone W-2	Charge zone W-2, as defined by zone boundary in map of Water Utility Zones
Zone W-5	Charge zone W-5, as defined by zone boundary in map of Water Utility Zones

APPENDIX E
MAP

District map
Water Supply Distribution



Water Utility Zones in Santa Clara County

Groundwater Subbasins in Santa Clara County



Managed Recharge Facilities



Legend

- District Recharge Pond or Facility
- Instream Recharge
- District Reservoir
- Santa Clara Subbasin (DWR Basin 2-9.02)
- Santa Clara Plain Confined Area
- Santa Clara Plain Recharge Area
- Coyote Valley Recharge Area
- Approximate Extent Confined Area
- Llagas Confined Area
- Llagas Recharge Area
- Santa Clara County
- Llagas Subbasin (DWR Basin 3-3.01)



Santa Clara Valley Water District

Santa Clara Valley Water District
5750 Almaden Expressway, San Jose, CA 95118-3686
Phone: (408) 265-2600 Fax: (408) 266-0271
www.valleywater.org