

MEMORANDUM



RANCHO PALOS VERDES

TO: RANCHO PALOS VERDES CITY COUNCIL

FROM: DOUG WILLMORE, CITY MANAGER *DW (CB)*

DATE: APRIL 22, 2015

SUBJECT: ADMINISTRATIVE REPORT NO. 15-16

CITY MANAGER

- LA-RICS Update: On April 14th, the Board of Supervisors approved a scaled-down proposal for the wireless broadband (i.e., LTE) component of the LA-RICS system (see attached Board letter). The reduced project has eliminated LTE sites previously proposed at County Fire Station No. 83 in Miraleste Plaza and the County antenna farm on Crestridge Road, as well as at other County fire stations on the Peninsula. However, voice (i.e., LMR) sites are still being proposed at several locations, including the Coast Guard property at Upper Point Vicente.
- School District Legislation: Assemblymember David Hadley has introduced two (2) bills that could affect local school districts (see attached April 17th *Daily Breeze* editorial). AB 306 would allow the children of active-duty military families (such as Los Angeles Air Force Base personnel) to attend public schools in the district of their choice, while AB 803 would streamline the process for creating new, local school districts (see attached bills). If any councilmember desires the full City Council to take a formal position on either of these bills, please let Staff know so that they may be agendized at a future meeting.
- Drought Regulations: On April 18th, the State Water Resources Control Board (WRCB) issued a revised proposal and regulations to achieve Governor Brown's mandate for 25-percent statewide reductions in urban potable water consumption (see attachments from WRCB website). Under the new, 9-tiered proposal, the California Water Service Company's Palos Verdes district would be required to achieve a 36-percent reduction in consumption (a 1-percent increase from the 35 percent reduction under the original, 4-tiered WRCB proposal). WRCB is expected to take final action on these proposed regulations on May 5th or 6th.
- Staff held an informational Town Hall Meeting regarding the Anonymous Fraud, Waste, and Abuse Hotline on April 16th at Miraleste Intermediate School, unfortunately no residents attended the presentation.
- The Anonymous Fraud, Waste, and Abuse Hotline investigative RFPs were due today, 4/22/2015, and the implementation process continues, with anticipated launch in early May.

ADMINISTRATIVE REPORT

April 22, 2015

Page 2

- The recruitment for the Director of Finance position has closed. Staff continues the process, and anticipates the position being filled by the end of May.
- April 22, 2015 marks the first day of 2015 negotiations between the City and the Employee Association.
- Staff continues with the Associate Civil Engineer recruitment, which closes on May 4th.
- Within the next week, Staff will be opening the Recreation Specialist recruitments to the public for part-time staffing at Abalone Cove, Hesse Park Administration, and the School District / Sports areas.

FINANCE

- Good news! The City can pre-pay the FY15-16 payment for the unfunded employee pension liability and save money. The required FY15-16 payment is \$356,067. If we pay by August 1st, the payment is only \$343,422. That's a savings of \$12,645 or 3.6%!
- Utility User Tax (UUT) Claim Data Update: The City's Claim Administrator has provided refund claim data through April 17, 2015. As of this date, 3,909 physical claims and 987 online claims have been filed. Additional data to note:
 - ▶ The total Flat Refund amount that has been claimed so far is \$139,400.
 - ▶ The total Extrapolated Refund (Option 2) so far is approximately \$32,685 (avg. claim amount of \$46.10 x 709 claims)
 - ▶ The total Exact Refund (Option 3) amount so far is approximately \$2,985 (avg. claim amount of \$30.46 x 98 claims)

The deadline to submit a claim is August 5, 2015.

- UUT Deficiency Letter Update: The Claims Administrator will be sending out letters this week to claimants alerting them of an error or incomplete information (deficiency) identified on their claims. The claimant will be given 30 days to respond to the deficiency letter.

PUBLIC WORKS

- **Engineering:** Public Works staff met with the L.A. Sanitation District engineers to discuss land movement at the ski jump and the possible relocation of sewage lines to the north side of PV drive south.
- Public Works staff met with archery club representatives regarding land movement in the archery club area and what is needed to maintain the access road.
- **Maintenance Activities:** Responded to report of broken sewer line at 24 Narcissa. The break was in a private lateral line. Homeowner was advised to contact plumber.

ADMINISTRATIVE REPORT

April 22, 2015

Page 3

- Completed inventory of City facilities water fixtures. Data will be used to formulate recommendations for water conservation.
- Completed a one day trial with Eaglelift, Inc. for sidewalk lifting. The results were impressive. The cost is 50% -70% less when compared to sidewalk removal & replacement. (See attached photos)



BEFORE

AFTER

- Grinder pump overflowed at 1 Figtree. Our vendor responded, replaced a faulty switch, cleaned the sump and remediated the spill.
- Completed repainting of end walls in McTaggart Hall.
- Staff provided support for the shredding & e-waste collection event on Saturday, April 18th.
- Perform annual fire extinguisher and sprinkler system inspections.
- **Document shredding, Electronics Waste roundup** and mulch giveaway event was on Saturday 4/20/15 from 8 to 11 am. Over 485 cars brought paper and/or electronics for the event. Three shredding trucks were full after shredding 26,000 lbs. of paper on site. Old/obsolete electronics were and collected 46,000 lbs. of free mulch provided which were hauled away by residents. Next event in six months.



- **Solid Waste Education:** Waste Management and the City of Rancho Palos Verdes taught more than 200 students from Rancho Palos Verdes School District the anatomy of a landfill. Students learned the complicated components of a landfill and the importance of reducing, reusing and recycling.
- **Earth Day:** Staff will attend the Earth Day Fair on the PV Promenade on 4/22/15 and provide recycling and water conservation handouts.
- **Drought Response:** The City's website updated water conservation information, available rebates and giveaways. Links available to various agencies: California Department of Water Resources, California Water Service, West Basin Waster District, and South Bay Environmental Services Center (SBESC).

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

- The Trump organization submitted the results of the nesting survey for the waterfall removal project. City Staff forwarded this document to the California Department of Fish and Wildlife for approval. Upon approval by said agency, City Staff intends to issue the building permit so that they can begin the work with conditions to follow the recommendations of their biologist with regards to timing and monitoring.
- Draft PC Agenda
- Applications of Note

RECREATION & PARKS

- The Recreation and Parks Department coordinates maintenance requests for the Palos Verdes Nature Preserve per the City's management responsibilities. In the first quarter


ADMINISTRATIVE REPORT

April 22, 2015

Page 5

of 2015, the Public Works Department responded to approximately 40 maintenance requests including clearing graffiti, repairing trails, fence repair, installation of new signage, closing motorized vehicle access points, garbage and illegal dumping removal, and clearing illegally built structures. In addition, staff coordinated with rangers, Trump National Golf Club Staff, and Terranea staff for maintenance of Preserve areas.

- On April 16th, 33 children and 29 adults attended the 'Little Fish Tales by the Sea' enrichment program at PVIC. This monthly event is a partnership between the Department of Recreation and Parks and the PVL Young Readers Department.



- About 160 visitors came to the April 18th 'Meet the Goats' event at PVIC. This annual event is co-sponsored by the City and Fire Grazers, Inc. and is offered to provide a fun, hands-on event and raise awareness of the City's use of goats to clear brush and reduce fire hazards.



- The Recreation and Parks Department will have a booth at the April 22nd Earth Day Celebration from 3 pm to 6 pm at the Promenade on the Peninsula.

ADMINISTRATIVE REPORT

April 22, 2015

Page 6

- The Junior Ranger Program will meet at Abalone Cove Shoreline Park on April 25th for an MRCA Ranger-led hike to the tide pools.
- Founders Park is rented for a small wedding ceremony this Sunday.
- Hesse Park facilities are rented this week for ten indoor recreation classes, three outdoor recreation classes, two Peninsula Seniors activities, four non-profit group meetings, three outdoor sports league practices, and three private indoor events.
- Ladera Linda facilities are rented this week for six indoor recreation classes, and the Portuguese Bend Nursery School will hold its annual spring picnic this Sunday on the lower field.
- The PVIC Sunset Room is rented this week for one weekday evening non-profit event, and two weekend wedding receptions.
- Los Serenos Docents will lead two school groups on museum tours this week.
- Ryan Park facilities are rented this week for three indoor recreation classes, three outdoor recreation classes, one outdoor youth sports league practice, and one private indoor event.
- REACH, the City's Therapeutic Recreation Program, is offering two events this week. On Earth Day, April 22nd, participants will visit the Marine Mammal Care Center and learn about why record numbers of baby seals and other marine mammals are washing up on local beaches. Each REACH participant will bring a donation item to MMCC to assist with the care of the animals. On Saturday, April 25th, REACH participants will travel to Tanaka Farms in Irvine to enjoy a guided wagon ride around the farm and an opportunity to pick strawberries and learn about local farming.

CORRESPONDENCE AND INFORMATION RECEIVED (See Attachments)

- Calendars – Page 7
- Tentative Agendas – PAGE 10
- Channel 33 Programming Schedule – PAGE 17
- Channel 35 Programming Schedule – PAGE 18
- Crime Report – PAGE 19
- Community Development Draft Agenda –Page 22
- Community Development Applications of Note – Page 25
- Miscellaneous – Page 26

April 2015

Sun	Mon	Tue	Wed	Thu	Fri	Sat
			1	2	3	4 10:00 am—4:00 pm - Whale of a Day @ PVIC
5	6	7 7:00 pm—City Council Meeting @ Hesse Park	8 7:30 pm—Information on Utility Undergrounding Process From Public Works @ La Vista Verde HOA	9 8:00 am—SBCCOG Legislative Breakfast @ Torrance Facility (Knight) 6:00 pm—IMAC Meeting @ Hesse Park 7:00 pm—Storm Drain Oversight Committee Meeting @ City Hall Community Room	10	11 8:15 am—Hike With Councilman Campbell—Families Welcome Contact b.camp@cox.net for each month starting location 12:00 pm—Traffic Safety Committee Public Workshop: PVDS Traffic Study Report @ Ladera Linda Community Center
12 1:00 pm—3:00 pm—Volunteer Fair @ City Hall	13 12:00 pm—SBCCOG Steering Committee Meeting @ Torrance Facility (Knight)	14 7:00 pm—Planning Commission Meeting @ Hesse Park	15 12:00 pm—Mayor's Lunch @ The Depot (Knight) 1:30 pm—Sanitation District Meeting (Knight)	16 7:00 pm—Emergency Preparedness Committee Meeting—City Hall Community Room - CANCELLED	17	18 8:00 am—11:00 am—EDCO Shredding/E-waste Day @ City Hall Parking Lot 11:00 am—1:00 pm—Meet the Goats @ PVIC
19	20	21 7:00 pm—City Council Meeting @ Hesse Park	22 7:00 pm—Finance Advisory Committee Meeting @ City Hall Community Room	23 6:00 pm—SBCCOG Board Meeting @ Torrance Facility (Knight)	24 7:30 am—Mayor's Breakfast @ Coco's (Knight/Misetich)	25 9:00 am—3:00 pm—HHW/-Electronics Waste Roundup @ Maintenance Yard, City Hall
26	27 7:00 pm—Traffic Safety Committee @ City Hall Community Room	28 7:00 pm—Planning Commission Meeting @ Hesse Park	29 6:00 pm—Trails Network Plan Public Workshop #3 @ City Hall Community Room	30		

May 2015

Sun	Mon	Tue	Wed	Thu	Fri	Sat
					1	2 9:00 am—11:00 am— Community Leaders Meeting @ PVIC
3	4	5 7:00 pm—City Council Meeting @ Hesse Park	6 4:00 pm—5:30 pm— Peninsula Watershed Man- agement Group Workshop @ South Coast Botanical Gar- dens 6:00 pm—Quarterly Preserve Public Forum @ City Hall Community Room 7:00 pm—Sunnyside Ridge Trail Project @ Miraleste Intermediate School Library	7 7:00 pm—Storm Drain Over- sight Committee Meeting @ City Hall Community Room	8	9 8:15 am—Hike With Council- man Campbell—Families Wel- come Contact b.camp@cox.net for each month starting location
10	11	12 7:00 pm—Planning Commis- sion Meeting @ Hesse Park	13	14 8:00 am—Regional Law Committee Meeting @ RH City Hall (Brooks/Misetich) 6:00 pm—IMAC Meeting @ Hesse Park	15	16
				56th CCCA Annual Conference—Indian Wells / (Knight/Brooks/Misetich/Petru)		
17 56th CCCA Annual Conference—Indian Wells (Knight/Brooks/ Misetich/Petru) 11:00 am—3:00 pm— Pet Adoption Event @ Hesse Park—Upper Picnic Area	18	19 7:00 pm—City Council Meeting @ Hesse Park	20 12:00 pm—Mayor's Lunch @ The Depot (Knight) 1:30 pm—Sanitation District Meeting (Knight)	21 6:00 pm—8:00 pm—Pet Licensing/Vaccination/ Microchip @ Hesse Park (Upper Field area) 7:00 pm—Emergency Pre- paredness Committee Meet- ing—City Hall Community Room 7:00 pm—Storm Drain Over- sight Committee Meeting @ Hesse Park	22	23
24	25 Memorial Day Holiday—City Hall Closed	26 7:00 pm—Planning Commis- sion Meeting @ Hesse Park	27	28 7:00 pm—Oversight Commit- tee for the Water Quality & Flood Protection Program @ Community Room, City Hall	29 7:30 am—Mayor's Breakfast @ Coco's (Knight/Brooks)	30
31						

June 2015

Sun	Mon	Tue	Wed	Thu	Fri	Sat
	1	2 7:00 pm—City Council Meeting @ Hesse Park	3	4	5	6 10:00 am—10:00 pm—PV Street Fair @ Peninsula Center 11:30 am—Los Serenos Docent Appreciation Luncheon @ Ports o' Call Restaurant
7 10:00 am—9:00 pm—PV Street Fair @ Peninsula Center	8	9 7:00 pm—Planning Commission Meeting @ Hesse Park	10	11 6:00 pm—IMAC Meeting @ Hesse Park	12	13 8:15 am—Hike With Your Councilman—Families Welcome Contact b.camp@cox.net for each month starting location
14	15	16 7:00 pm—City Council Meeting @ Hesse Park	17 12:00 pm—Mayor's Lunch @ The Depot (Knight) 1:30 pm—Sanitation District Meeting (Knight)	18 7:00 pm—Emergency Preparedness Committee Workshop @ City Hall Community Room	19	20
21	22 7:00 pm—Traffic Safety Committee Meeting @ City Hall Community Room	23 7:00 pm—Planning Commission Meeting @ Hesse Park	24	25	26 7:30 am—Mayor's Breakfast @ Coco's (Knight/Campbell)	27 Movie in the Park—7:30 pm—Pre-show Activities 8:30 pm Showtime @ Eastview Park
28	29	30				

TENTATIVE AGENDAS*

*This list is a tool used by the City to plan and coordinate Council agendas. As a working document, items on this list are subject to frequent changes.

Note: Time Estimates include 45 minutes for the first section of the agenda (Mayor's Announcements, etc. through the Consent Calendar) and 15 minutes for the last section (Future Agenda Items through Adjournment).

April 27, 2015 (Monday) – Adj. Reg. Mtg./City Council Workshop – 5:00 P.M. Hesse Park/Fireside Room - (Time Est. – 4 hrs)

Regular Business

Invention of a Compelling Future

May 2, 2015 (Saturday) – Adj. Reg. Mtg./Community Leaders' Meeting – 9:00 A.M. – Pt. Vicente Interpretive Center (Time Est. – 2 hrs)

Regular Business

Community Leaders Meeting – Meet Our New City Manager

May 5, 2015 – (Time Est. – 6 hrs)

Adj. Reg. Mtg. – 6:00 P.M. – Interviews of EPC Applicants

Closed Session:

Mayor's Announcements: Building and Safety Month

City Manager Report:

New Business:

Consent

Adoption of Ordinance No. 566 – 5656 Crest Road

Adoption of Ordinance No. 567 – Petty Cash

Introduction of Ordinance - Rescinding the 3% UUT on Telecommunications

Citywide Landscaping and Lighting Maintenance District – Initiate Proceedings

Award Contract City Works - Computer Maintenance Management System

Letters in Opposition to Proposed LA-RICS Monopole at Upper Pt. Vicente

NOC for the John C. McTaggart Memorial Hall & Council Chambers Interior Improvements

Amendment Agmt All City Mgmt Services Inc Crossing Guard Services

Letter to State Controller's Office regarding Employee Compensation

Time Extension Request for Nantasket Residential Development

Public Hearings

Appeal of PC Approval of New SFR on Knoll View Drive (1 hr)

Abalone Cove Parking Fees (20 mins)

Regular Business

Appointment of Two Members to the Emergency Preparedness Committee (10 mins)
Information Technology Services Agreement (10 mins)
Reduction in Permit Fees to Encourage Water Conservation (10 mins)
Water Conservation Measures by the City (10 mins)
Budget Menu Exercise (3 hrs)

May 19, 2015 – (Time Est. – 4 hrs 55 mins)

Closed Session:

Study Session: Revisiting the Skateboard Ordinance

Mayor's Announcements: Public Works Week

City Manager Report:

New Business:

Consent

Adoption of Ordinance – Rescinding the 3% UUT on Telecommunications
Salary Resolution for Part-time GIS Coordinator
Second Admt. to Agmt. for Community Development Block Grant – Admin. Services
Extension of Contract - Mountains Recreation Conservation Authority
Award Contract to Strath Pump for Dewatering Wells
Bank of the West – Certificates of Deposit
Renewal of PV Net Annex Lease Agreement

Public Hearings

Film Permit Fee Increase (10 mins)
Gen Plan Amdmt & Zone Change - 10 Chaparral Lane (1 hr)

Regular Business

Approval of Final Proj. Design & Specs – Sunnyside Ridge Trail Improv. Project (30 mins)
Lower Hesse Park Improvements (30 mins)
Parks Master Plan Update (45 mins)
Introduction of Wireless Antenna Ordinance (30 mins)
Del Cerro Park Parking Plan (30 mins)

June 2, 2015 – (Time Est. – 4 hrs 30 mins)

Closed Session:

Mayor's Announcements:

City Manager Report:

New Business:

Consent

Border Issues Status Report

Contract Renewal for Geotechnical Consulting Services
Contract Renewal for View Restoration Mediator Professional Services
Contract Renewal for Consultant for Building and Safety Services
Contract Renewal for On-Call Biological and Arboricultural Consulting Services
Contract Renewal for View Restoration Arborist
Renewal Landscape Plan Review Consultant
Approve Deed Restrictions for Measure A Funded City Acquired Open Space Acquis.
Award Street Sweeping Contract
Adoption of Wireless Antenna Ordinance

Public Hearings

Draft Budget Review (30 mins)
Draft Five-Year Model (10 mins)
Draft CIP (20 mins)
Green Hills Memorial Park (1 hr 30 mins)

Regular Business

Western Avenue Design Guidelines (1 hr)

June 16, 2015 – (Time Est. – 5 hrs 15 mins)

Closed Session: Interviews of City Attorney Candidates

Study Session:

Mayor's Announcements: Recreation and Parks Month

City Manager Report: Announcement - 4th of July Celebration

New Business:

Consent

Award Park Landscaping Contract
Award Median Maintenance Contract
Tree Trimming Contract Amendment
Award Pavement Striping Maintenance Contract
Annual Investment Policy
Appropriations Limit
Notice and Call of General Municipal Election – November 2015
Approval of 2015 Work Plan – Emergency Preparedness Committee
Council Authorization to Submit Enhanced Watershed Management Plan
Canon Copier Maintenance Agreement Renewal

Public Hearings

Citywide Landscaping and Lighting Maintenance District (10 mins)
Abalone Cove Sewer Maintenance District – Engineer's Report (10 mins)
Rate Adjustment Request for EDCO (15 mins)
Rate Adjustment Request for UWS (5 mins)
Adoption of the Budget (15 mins)
Storm Drain User Fee (20 mins)

Regular Business

Peafowl Management Plan (2 hrs)
Proposed Revisions to the City's Street Tree Policy (30 mins)
Del Cerro Park Parking Plan (30 mins)

July 7, 2015 – (Time Est. – 3 hrs 5 mins)

Closed Session:

Mayor's Announcements:

City Manager Report:

New Business:

Consent

On-Call Services – Engineering Contracts
Award of Contract – City Attorney Services

Public Hearings

Outdoor Lighting Code Amendment (30 mins)
Congestion Management Plan Adoption (5 mins)

Regular Business

Arterial Walls Along Major Corridors (45 mins)
Lower Pt. Vicente – Amendment to Coastal Vision Plan (45 mins)

IA - Investment Policy (Consent)
Adoption of Budget

July 21, 2015 – (Time Est. – 3 hrs 30 mins)

Closed Session:

Study Session:

Mayor's Announcements:

City Manager Report:

New Business:

Consent

Public Hearings

St. John Fisher – Conditional Use Permit Revision Request (30 mins)
Channel View Court Neighborhood Request for Permit Parking (30 mins)
Appeal of Fence/Wall Permit Decisions-29023 Sprucegrove Drive (cont'd from 4/21/15) (1 hr)
Consideration of Amdmt. to the Moratorium Ord. to allow Non-Habitable Construction (30 mins)

Regular Business

August 4, 2015 – (Time Est. – 1 hr 10 mins)

Closed Session:

Study Session:

Mayor's Announcements:

City Manager Report:

New Business:

Consent

Public Hearings

Introduction of Ordinance - Organic Waste Recycling AB 1826 (10 mins)

Regular Business

August 18, 2015 – (Time Est. – 1 hr)

Closed Session:

Study Session:

Mayor's Announcements:

City Manager Report:

New Business:

Consent

Public Hearings

Regular Business

September 1, 2015 – (Time Est. – 1 hr)

Closed Session:

Study Session:

Mayor's Announcements:

City Manager Report:

New Business:

Consent

Continuing Appropriations and Year-End Budget Adjustments
Adoption of Ordinance - Organic Waste Recycling AB 1826

Public Hearings

Regular Business

September 15, 2015 – (Time Est. – 1 hr)

Closed Session:

Study Session:

Mayor's Announcements:

City Manager Report:

New Business:

Consent

Public Hearings

Regular Business

Future Agenda Items (Identified at Council Mtgs & pending receipt of memo from Councilmember)

July 15, 2014 – Wireless Antenna Master Plan (Campbell)

July 29, 2014 – Discussion of the roles, responsibilities and duties of the City Manager and the City Council (Campbell)

September 30, 2014 – Review of recent City Council Policy No. 47 and/or 48 regarding review of certain records and communications by Council Members (Campbell)

October 7, 2014 - Councilman Buscaino's letter regarding the Rancho LPG Tank Facility (Duhovic)

November 4, 2014 – Regulation of Ultra-Light Aircraft and Drone Flights Along the City's Coastline (Brooks)

December 16, 2014 – Revisit the PVPLC Management Agreement regarding Naming Opportunities (Duhovic); Current Council Ancillary Insurance Coverage (Campbell)

January 20, 2015 – Consider feasibility of a resident oversight committee of the Sheriff Department's Services (Campbell)

February 17, 2015 – Consideration of Passport Services through the City Clerk's Office (Misetich)

April 21, 2015 – City Partnership with traditional non-profit organizations in a non-monetary way (Campbell)

Future Agenda Items Agendized or Otherwise Being Addressed

April 15, 2014 - Revisiting the Skateboarding Ordinance (Brooks) [Agendized on Study Session of April 21, 2015; Agendized on May 19, 2015 Study Session]

October 7, 2014 - Process of responding to residents' emails sent to cc@rpv.com (Duhovic) [Staff currently addressing]

January 20, 2015 – Consideration of Renaming Shoreline Park (Duhovic) [Working with staff]

February 3, 2015 - Wireless Antenna Ordinance (Knight) [Agendized for May 19, 2015]

February 17, 2015 – Imposition of Penalties on SCE for Unplanned Outages Lasting Longer than 8 hours (Misetich) [Memo to be prepared by City Attorney Lynch]

March 3, 2015 – Annexation of the Navy Fuel Depot property into the City to utilize the space as open space area into perpetuity (Misetich) [City Attorney Lynch researching]

RPVtv Channel 33 Programming Schedule Guide Week of 04/22/15 - 04/28/15			
Wednesday, Thursday, Friday		Saturday, Sunday, Monday	Tuesday
Peninsula Fitness with DeDe Daniels	6:00 AM - 6:30 AM	Peninsula Fitness with DeDe Daniels	Peninsula Fitness with DeDe Daniels
Cardio Fitness Jazz	6:30 AM - 7:00 AM	Cardio Fitness Jazz	Cardio Fitness Jazz
Peninsula Beat 48: State Water Restriction, Montemalaga Elementary, RPV Volunteer Fair, PV Art Center John Elgin Wolf, Toberman House, Whale of a Day 2015	7:00 AM - 7:30 AM	Peninsula Beat 47: Trump PGA Announcement Whale of a Day, Paper Shredding, Peninsula High School Baseball, Rx For Life	Peninsula Beat 47: Trump PGA Announcement Whale of a Day, Paper Shredding, Peninsula High School Baseball, Rx For Life
L.A. County News	7:30 AM - 8:00 AM	L.A. County News	L.A. County News
Arm Chair Traveler: The Korean Bell in San Pedro	8:00 AM - 8:30 AM	RPV City Talk: RPV Mayor Jim Knight, April 2015	RPV City Talk: RPV Mayor Jim Knight, April 2015
Arm Chair Traveler	8:30 AM - 9:00 AM	RPV City Talk: RPV Mayor Jim Knight, April 2015	RPV City Talk: RPV Mayor Jim Knight, April 2015
Peninsula Beat 48: State Water Restriction, Montemalaga Elementary, RPV Volunteer Fair, PV Art Center John Elgin	09:00 AM - 9:30 AM	Peninsula Beat 48: State Water Restriction, Montemalaga Elementary, RPV Volunteer Fair, PV Art Center John Elgin	Peninsula Beat 48: State Water Restriction, Montemalaga Elementary, RPV Volunteer Fair, PV Art Center John Elgin
L.A. County News	9:30 AM - 10:00 AM	L.A. County News	L.A. County News
Arm Chair Traveler: The Korean Bell in San Pedro	10:00 AM -	RPV City Talk: RPV Mayor Jim Knight, April 2015	RPV City Talk: RPV Mayor Jim Knight, April 2015
Arm Chair Traveler	10:30 AM -	RPV City Talk: RPV Mayor Jim Knight, April 2015	RPV City Talk: RPV Mayor Jim Knight, April 2015
Peninsula Beat 48: State Water Restriction, Montemalaga Elementary, RPV Volunteer Fair, PV Art Center John Elgin	11:00 AM - 11:30 AM	Peninsula Beat 48: State Water Restriction, Montemalaga Elementary, RPV Volunteer Fair, PV Art Center John Elgin	Peninsula Beat 48: State Water Restriction, Montemalaga Elementary, RPV Volunteer Fair, PV Art Center John Elgin
L.A. County News	11:30 AM -	L.A. County News	L.A. County News
Peninsula Seniors: The Air War in China Hal Javitt	12:00 PM - 12:30PM	Peninsula Seniors: The Air War in China Hal Javitt	Peninsula Seniors: The Air War in China Hal Javitt
Peninsula Seniors (continued)	12:30 PM -	Peninsula Seniors (continued)	Peninsula Seniors (continued)
The Brigitte Schuegraf Elementary Choral Festival	1:00 PM - 1:30PM	The City of Rancho Palos Verdes City Council Meeting April 21st, 2015	The Brigitte Schuegraf Elementary Choral Festival
The Brigitte Schuegraf Elementary Choral Festival	1:30 PM - 2:00PM	The City of Rancho Palos Verdes City Council Meeting April 21st, 2015	The Brigitte Schuegraf Elementary Choral Festival
The Brigitte Schuegraf Elementary Choral Festival	2:00 PM - 2:30PM	The City of Rancho Palos Verdes City Council Meeting April 21st, 2015	The Brigitte Schuegraf Elementary Choral Festival
The Brigitte Schuegraf Elementary Choral Festival	2:30 PM - 3:00PM	The City of Rancho Palos Verdes City Council Meeting	The Brigitte Schuegraf Elementary Choral Festival
The Brigitte Schuegraf Elementary Choral Festival	3:00 PM - 3:30PM	The City of Rancho Palos Verdes City Council Meeting	The Brigitte Schuegraf Elementary Choral Festival
The Brigitte Schuegraf Elementary Choral Festival	3:30 PM - 4:00PM	The City of Rancho Palos Verdes City Council Meeting	The Brigitte Schuegraf Elementary Choral Festival
Peninsula Beat 48: State Water Restriction, Montemalaga Elementary, RPV Volunteer Fair, PV Art Center John Elgin Wolf, Toberman House, Whale of a Day 2015	4:00 PM - 4:30PM	The City of Rancho Palos Verdes City Council Meeting April 21st, 2015	RPV City Talk: RPV Mayor Jim Knight, April 2015
L.A. County News	4:30 PM - 5:00PM	The City of Rancho Palos Verdes City Council Meeting April 21st, 2015	RPV City Talk: RPV Mayor Jim Knight, April 2015
Peninsula Fitness with DeDe Daniels	5:00 PM - 5:30PM	Peninsula Fitness with DeDe Daniels	Peninsula Fitness with DeDe Daniels
Cardio Fitness Jazz	5:30 PM - 6:00PM	Cardio Fitness Jazz	Cardio Fitness Jazz
Peninsula Beat 48: State Water Restriction, Montemalaga Elementary, RPV Volunteer Fair, PV Art Center John Elgin Wolf, Toberman House, Whale of a Day 2015	6:00 PM - 6:30PM	Peninsula Beat 48: State Water Restriction, Montemalaga Elementary, RPV Volunteer Fair, PV Art Center John Elgin Wolf, Toberman House, Whale of a Day 2015	Peninsula Beat 48: State Water Restriction, Montemalaga Elementary, RPV Volunteer Fair, PV Art Center John Elgin Wolf, Toberman House, Whale of a Day 2015
L.A. County News	6:30 PM - 7:00PM	L.A. County News	L.A. County News
Peninsula Seniors Lecture Series: Greystone Mansion Concours d' Elegance 2014	7:00 PM - 7:30PM	Peninsula Seniors Lecture Series: Greystone Mansion Concours d' Elegance 2014	Peninsula Seniors Lecture Series: Greystone Mansion Concours d' Elegance 2014
Peninsula Seniors (continued)	7:30 PM - 8:00PM	Peninsula Seniors (continued)	Peninsula Seniors (continued)
Peninsula Beat 48: State Water Restriction, Montemalaga	8:00 PM - 8:30PM	Peninsula Beat 48: State Water Restriction, Montemalaga	Peninsula Beat 48: State Water Restriction, Montemalaga
L.A. County News	8:30 PM - 9:00PM	L.A. County News	L.A. County News
Arm Chair Traveler: The Korean Bell in San Pedro	9:00 PM - 9:30PM	RPV City Talk: RPV Mayor Jim Knight, April 2015	RPV City Talk: RPV Mayor Jim Knight, April 2015
Arm Chair Traveler	9:30 PM -	RPV City Talk: RPV Mayor Jim Knight, April 2015	RPV City Talk: RPV Mayor Jim Knight, April 2015
The City of Rancho Palos Verdes City Council Meeting April 21st, 2015	10:00 PM - 10:30PM	The City of Rancho Palos Verdes City Council Meeting April 21st, 2015	The City of Rancho Palos Verdes City Council Meeting April 21st, 2015
The City of Rancho Palos Verdes City Council Meeting	10:30 PM -	The City of Rancho Palos Verdes City Council Meeting	The City of Rancho Palos Verdes City Council Meeting
The City of Rancho Palos Verdes City Council Meeting	11:00 PM -	The City of Rancho Palos Verdes City Council Meeting	The City of Rancho Palos Verdes City Council Meeting
The City of Rancho Palos Verdes City Council Meeting	11:30 PM - 12:00	The City of Rancho Palos Verdes City Council Meeting	The City of Rancho Palos Verdes City Council Meeting
The City of Rancho Palos Verdes City Council Meeting	12:00 AM - 1:00	The City of Rancho Palos Verdes City Council Meeting	The City of Rancho Palos Verdes City Council Meeting
Community Announcements	1:00 AM - 6:00 AM	Community Announcements	Community Announcements



PVPTV35 Programming Schedule Guide
Week of 4/27/15 to 5/03/15

Monday, April 27

3:00PM

Palos Verdes Library Dist.

6:00PM

PVP Coordinating Council

7:00PM

PVPUSD Board Meeting

Tuesday , April 28

7:00PM

City of RHE City Council Meeting - Live (6 hour block)

Wednesday, April 29

7:30PM

City of PVE City Council Meeting, 4/28/15

Thursday, April 30

7:00PM

No Programming

Friday, May 01

6:00PM

PVP Land Conservancy Nature Walk

7:00PM

City of RHE City Council Meeting , 4/28/15

Saturday, May 02

10:00AM

City of PVE Planning Commission, 4/21/15

7:00PM

City of RPV Planning Commission , 4/28/15

Sunday, May 03

7:00PM

City of RHE City Council Meeting, 4/28/15

**LOS ANGELES COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT- LOMITA STATION
REPORTED CRIMES & ARRESTS BETWEEN 4/5/2015 - 4/11/2015**

LOMITA:

CRIME	FILE #	RD	DATE	TIME	LOCATION	METHOD OF ENTRY	LOSS	ADDITIONAL INFORMATION
PETTY THEFT	15-01298	1713	4/5/2015	1800-2000	2000 BLK 262ND ST	N/A	VEH EMBLEM	SUSPECT(S) UNKNOWN
PETTY THEFT (SHOPLIFTING)	15-01317	1714	4/6/2015	1430	1900 BLK PCH	OPEN FOR BUSINESS	HAIR PRODUCTS	SUSPECT1: F/M H/20's/511-600/270/BRO/BRO, SUSPECT2: FH/30's/504-505/180/BRO HAIR, SUSPECT3: FH/30's/504/505/140/BRO HAIR, & SUSPECT4: FW/50's/504/505/140
PETTY THEFT (SHOPLIFTING)	15-01350	1714	4/8/2015	1750	2100 BLK PCH	OPEN FOR BUSINESS	CLOCK	SUSPECT: FW/30's/505/110/BLOND
GRAND THEFT (AUTO)	15-01358	1713	4/9/2015	1200-1210	2400 BLK ESTERVIEW DR	N/A	2001 WHI 4DR TOYOTA RAV-4	SUSPECT ARRESTED
BURGLARY (VEHICLE)	15-01392	1710	4/10/2015-4/13/2015	1730-0830	1900 BLK LOMITA BL	DRIVER'S SIDE DOOR HANDLE PRIED	VEH RADIO	SUSPECT(S) UNKNOWN
ASSAULT WITH A DEADLY WEAPON	15-01383	1711	4/11/2015	1520	25000 BLK WALNUT ST	N/A	N/A	1 SUSPECT ARRESTED
ARRESTS: ADW-1, DRUGS-6, SUSPENDED LICENSE-1								

RANCHO PALOS VERDES:

CRIME	FILE #	RD	DATE	TIME	LOCATION	METHOD OF ENTRY	LOSS	ADDITIONAL INFORMATION
GRAND THEFT (AUTO)	15-01286	1743	4/2/2015-4/4/2015	1700-1700	30800 BLK CASILINA DR	N/A	2007 GRY TOYOTA PRIUS	SUSPECT(S) UNKNOWN. VEH RECOVERED.
BURGLARY (RESIDENTIAL)	15-01314	1744	4/6/2015	1000-1215	6200 BLK VIA SUBIDA	WINDOW SCREEN REMOVED	GUNS	SUSPECT(S) UNKNOWN
PETTY THEFT (BICYCLE)	15-01345	1736	4/7/2015-4/8/2015	1830-0830	6800 BLK LOS VERDES DR	LOCK CUT	BICYCLE	SUSPECT(S) UNKNOWN
PETTY THEFT (UNLOCKED VEHICLE)	15-01366	1746	4/7/2015-4/9/2015	0630-1700	1700 BLK OLDSTONE CT	UNLOCKED VEHICLE	MISC CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT AND TOOLS	SUSPECT(S) UNKNOWN
GRAND THEFT	15-01362	1735	4/8/2015-4/9/2015	1600-0900	6500 BLK OCEAN CREST DR	N/A	MISC TOOLS	SUSPECT(S) UNKNOWN
BURGLARY (RESIDENTIAL)	15-01349	1746	4/8/2015	0920-1530	2100 BLK GENERAL ST	DOUBLE PANE GLASS DOOR SHATTERED	ELECTRONICS	SUSPECT(S) UNKNOWN
GRAND THEFT (AUTO)	15-01352	1746	4/8/2015	1920	1800 BLK CADDINGTON DR	N/A	2013 WHI 4DR INFINIT G37	SUSPECT(S) UNKNOWN. VEH RECOVERED.
BURGLARY (VEHICLE)	15-01361	1742	4/9/2015	1400-1515	LA ROTONDA DR / PV DR SOUTH	WINDOW SHATTERED	PURSE, ELECTRONIC, U.S. CURRENCY	SUSPECT(S) UNKNOWN
BURGLARY (VEHICLE)	15-01363	1742	4/9/2015	1300-1515	LA ROTONDA DR / PV DR SOUTH	REAR WINDOW SHATTERED	BAGS, ELECTRONICS, MISC SKIN CARE PRODUCTS, WATCH	SUSPECT(S) UNKNOWN

BURGLARY (RESIDENTIAL)	15-01380	1744	4/10/2015-4/11/2015	1700-0800	31200 BLK GANADO DR	GARAGE FORCED OPEN	MISC TOOLS	SUSPECT(S) UNKNOWN
PETTY THEFT (UNLOCKED VEHICLE)	15-01368	1746	4/10/2015	0300	2000 BLK AVENIDA FELICIANO	UNLOCKED VEHICLE	U.S. CURRENCY	SUSPECT: MW/30's
GRAND THEFT (UNLOCKED VEHICLE)	15-01372	1746	4/9/2015	0000-0015	29600 BLK WESTERN AV	UNLOCKED VEHICLE	U.S. CURRENCY, SUNGLASSES, ELECTRONICS	1 SUSPECT ARRESTED
ARRESTS: GRAND THEFT-1								

ROLLING HILLS:

CRIME	FILE #	RD	DATE	TIME	LOCATION	METHOD OF ENTRY	LOSS	ADDITIONAL INFORMATION
NO CRIMES DURING THIS TIME								
NO ARRESTS DURING THIS TIME								

ROLLING HILLS ESTATES:

CRIME	FILE #	RD	DATE	TIME	LOCATION	METHOD OF ENTRY	LOSS	ADDITIONAL INFORMATION
BURGLARY (BUSINESS)	15-01300	1724	4/3/2015-4/5/2015	1530-2153	700 BLK SILVER SPURD RD	FRONT DOOR FORCED OPEN	ELECTRONICS, U.S. CURRENCY	SUSPECT(S) UNKNOWN
BURGLARY (BUSINESS)	15-01304	1724	4/3/2015-4/6/2015	1800-0715	700 BLK SILVER SPURD RD	FRONT DOOR PRIED	ELECTRONIC	SUSPECT(S) UNKNOWN
BURGLARY (BUSINESS)	15-01311	1724	4/3/2015-4/6/2015	1700-1200	700 BLK SILVER SPURD RD	INTERIOR DOOR PRIED	UNK AT TIME OF REPORT	SUSPECT(S) UNKNOWN
BURGLARY (BUSINESS)	15-01312	1724	4/3/2015-4/6/2015	1700-1200	700 BLK SILVER SPURD RD	MAIL SLOT	UNK AT TIME OF REPORT	SUSPECT(S) UNKNOWN
BURGLARY (BUSINESS)	15-01308	1724	4/4/2015-4/6/2015	1700-1000	900 BLK SILVER SPURD RD	NO SIGNS OF FORCED ENTRY	ELECTRONIC, CRYSTAL, U.S. CURRENCY	SUSPECT(S) UNKNOWN
BURGLARY (VEHICLE)	15-01313	1724	4/5/2015-4/6/2015	2030-0400	700 BLK SILVER SPURD RD	REAR WINDOW & DRIVER'S SIDE WINDOW SHATTERED	UNK AT TIME OF REPORT	SUSPECT(S) UNKNOWN
PETTY THEFT	15-01338	1724	4/6/2015	1400-1445	27100 BLK SILVER SPURD RD	UNSECURED LOCKER	WALLET, CDL, U.S. CURRENCY	SUSPECT(S) UNKNOWN
BURGLARY (COMMERCIAL)	15-01353	1724	4/8/2015	1930	500 BLK DEEP VALLEY DR	OPEN FOR BUSINESS	MULTIPLE PERFUMES	S1/MB/20-25/510/170/BLK/BRO & S2: MB/20-25/510-170/BLK/BRO
ARRESTS: DRUGS-1								

SAN PEDRO:

CRIME	FILE #	RD	DATE	TIME	LOCATION	METHOD OF ENTRY	LOSS	ADDITIONAL INFORMATION
GRAND THEFT (AUTO)	15-01274	1750	4/2/2015-4/3/2015	1000-2330	1100 BLK 7TH ST	N/A	1999 WHI DODGE 1500 VAN	SUSPECT(S) UNKNOWN. VEH RECOVERED.
NO CRIMES DURING THIS TIME								

PVP:

CRIME	FILE #	RD	DATE	TIME	LOCATION	METHOD OF ENTRY	LOSS	ADDITIONAL INFORMATION
NO CRIMES DURING THIS TIME								
NO ARRESTS DURING THIS TIME								



DRAFT AGENDA

**RANCHO PALOS VERDES PLANNING COMMISSION
TUESDAY, APRIL 28, 2015
FRED HESSE COMMUNITY PARK, 29301 HAWTHORNE BOULEVARD
REGULAR MEETING
7:00 PM**

SCHEDULING NOTES

REQUESTS TO SPEAK ON AN ITEM MUST BE SUBMITTED TO THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR PRIOR TO THE COMPLETION OF THE REMARKS OF THE FIRST SPEAKER ON THE ITEM. NO REQUEST FORMS WILL BE ACCEPTED AFTER THAT TIME.

PURSUANT TO ADOPTED PLANNING COMMISSION PROCEDURE, UNLESS THE PLANNING COMMISSION AGREES TO SUSPEND ITS RULES, NO NEW BUSINESS WILL BE HEARD AFTER 11:00 P.M. AND NO ITEM WILL BE HEARD PAST MIDNIGHT. ANY ITEMS NOT HEARD BECAUSE OF THE TIME LIMITS WILL BE AUTOMATICALLY CONTINUED TO THE NEXT COMMISSION AGENDA.

NEXT P.C. RESOLUTION NO. 2015-07

CALL TO ORDER:

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:

ROLL CALL:

APPROVAL OF AGENDA:

COMMUNICATIONS:

City Council Items:

Staff:

Commission:

COMMENTS FROM THE AUDIENCE (regarding non-agenda items):

CONSENT CALENDAR:

1. APPROVAL OF MARCH 23, 2015 MINUTES

CONTINUED BUSINESS:

2. OUTDOOR LIGHTING (CASE NO. ZON2014-00320): City (LM)

Request: A City Council initiated amendment to Chapter 17.56.030 (Outdoor Lighting for Residential Uses) and Chapter 17.56.040 (Outdoor Lighting for Non-residential Uses) of the Rancho Palos Verdes Zoning Code (Title 17) to improve the City's existing regulations for exterior lighting, including, but not limited to codifying the following changes: 1) Specifying that light fixtures are to be fully shielded so that the light source is not visible; and, 2) Establishing acceptable color temperatures for exterior lights; 3) Imposing restrictions on exterior light emissions based on lumens instead of wattage; and, 4) Addressing the glare of exterior lights to neighboring properties and vehicles in the public right-of-way.

Action Deadline:

Recommendation:

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

3. HEIGHT VARIATION (CASE NO. ZON2014-00493): 5287 Rolling Ridge Road (JC)

Request: To construct a new 1,682.5 square foot second-floor addition to an existing 2,281 square foot single-story residence on an 80,806 square foot lot. The height of the residence will measure 25'-10 1/2" in height as measured from the lowest finished grade adjacent to the structure (elev. 310.69') to the top of the highest roof ridgeline (elev. 336.54') of the addition. In addition, the applicant is requesting an interior remodel and a reconfiguration of the existing first floor and garage area.

Action Deadline:

Recommendation:

4. WESTERN AVE. GUIDELINE PLAN (TENATIVE): City (LM)

Request: A review of the Western Avenue Vision Plan design guidelines being prepared for the City of Rancho Palos in partnership with the City of Los Angeles to create an environment that invites mobility for various users and creates more inviting, business friendly destinations along Western Avenue.

Action Deadline:

Recommendation:

NEW BUSINESS:

NONE

ITEMS TO BE PLACED ON FUTURE AGENDAS:

5. PRE-AGENDA FOR THE MEETING ON MAY 12, 2015

ADJOURNMENT:



Applications of Note as of April 22, 2015

Case No.	Owner	Street Address	Project Description	Submitted
ZON2015-00199	JEFFREY TOM	57 SEA BREEZE AVE	Landscape Review	4/16/2015
<i>Landscape Plan Review</i>				
ZON2015-00200	GRAGG-RICKS TRUST	48 SEA BREEZE AVE	landscape plan	4/16/2015
<i>Landscape Plan Review</i>				
ZON2015-00203	LILI GU	3234 PARKHURST DR	Proposed 210 SF addition; interior remodel; one (N) detached gazebo; one (N) attached trellis.	4/20/2015
<i>Site Plan Review</i> <i>Foliage Analysis</i>				
ZON2015-00204	YANCHESON, MICHAEL G & CLAUDIA	9 FRUIT TREE RD	LME to construct a 52 SF mudroom onto the existing single family residence; remodel and reconfigure 1,050 SF on interior ground floor space.	4/21/2015
<i>Landslide Moratorium Exception</i>				

t:\Forms\Applications of Note.rpt



County of Los Angeles CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICE

Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration
500 West Temple Street, Room 713, Los Angeles, California 90012
(213) 974-1101
<http://ceo.lacounty.gov>

SACHI A. HAMAI
Interim Chief Executive Officer

April 14, 2015

The Honorable Board of Supervisors
County of Los Angeles
383 Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration
500 West Temple Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Dear Supervisors:

**REQUEST TO APPROVE THE LA-RICS AUTHORITY
CORRECTIVE ACTION PLAN
(ALL DISTRICTS)
(3 VOTES)**

SUBJECT

Recommendation for approval of Corrective Action Plan allowing for 29 County owned, operated, or controlled sites to be used as Long Term Evolution (LTE) telecommunications site as part of the Los Angeles Regional Interoperable Communications System (LA-RICS) Authority's LTE System.

IT IS RECOMMENDED THAT THE BOARD:

1. Approve the LA-RICS Authority's Corrective Action Plan (CAP) permitting construction of Long Term Evolution (LTE) infrastructure at a smaller number of County owned, operated, or controlled sites, as identified in the LA-RICS Authority's CAP; and authorize construction to begin or continue at those County owned, operated or controlled sites, as set forth in the LA-RICS Authority's CAP.

PURPOSE/JUSTIFICATION OF RECOMMENDED ACTION

The purpose of the recommended action is to allow for a smaller number of County owned, operated, and controlled sites be used as LTE telecommunications site as part of the LA-RICS LTE System. If the Board approves the CAP, it is agreeing to allow construction to proceed forward at the 29 Los Angeles County owned, operated, and controlled sites. Approval of the CAP by the Board will also allow for a condition to be met as set by the federal grantor, to allow for the current grant suspension to be lifted.

"To Enrich Lives Through Effective And Caring Service"

**Please Conserve Paper – This Document and Copies are Two-Sided
Intra-County Correspondence Sent Electronically Only**

Board of Supervisors
HILDA L. SOLIS
First District

MARK RIDLEY-THOMAS
Second District

SHEILA KUEHL
Third District

DON KNABE
Fourth District

MICHAEL D. ANTONOVICH
Fifth District

Implementation of Strategic Plan Goals

The proposed CAP supports the Countywide Strategic Plan Goal of Operational Effectiveness (Goal 1). If the CAP is approved by the Board and the grant suspension is lifted, the LA-RICS Authority will be in a position to develop a modern public safety communication system that will maximize the effectiveness of processes, structure, and operations to support the timely delivery of customer-oriented and efficient public services, particularly in the areas of public safety.

FISCAL IMPACT/FINANCING

Design, construction, equipment purchase and implementation of the LTE System is covered by the BTOP grant, including a 20% required match, made up of 10% in-kind match and 10% cash match paid for by the LA-RICS Authority.

FACTS AND PROVISIONS/LEGAL REQUIREMENTS

As your Board is aware, the National Telecommunications Information Administration (NTIA) issued a suspension notice to the LA-RICS Authority on April 3, 2015 suspending the BTOP grant for the LA-RICS LTE project. The suspension notice required that all LTE project work stop immediately, except for specified items called out in the letter. As part of that suspension notice, the NTIA also required a CAP be submitted on April 13, 2015, that contains a revised LTE deployment plan for consideration by NTIA. That revised deployment plan must also receive approval by the Board of Supervisors prior to NTIA's release of any BTOP suspension.

The revised LTE deployment plan now has, as its baseline plan, 49 sites, of which 46 are LTE sites and three (3) are microwave backhaul sites. Of the core 49 site baseline plan, 29 are Los Angeles County owned, operated, or controlled sites. No County fire stations have been included in the baseline plan. Of the 29 County owned, operated, or controlled sites, 20 are LA County Sheriff sites, 4 are County hospitals or rehabilitation facilities, 4 are existing ISD telecommunications sites, and the Fire Command and Control Facility (FCCF) is included as well. All 29 County owned, operated, or controlled sites are existing telecommunications transmitter sites. The remaining 20 sites of the 49 site baseline plan, are located in independent cities that have provided, or are in the process of providing, the LA-RICS Authority with site access agreements for those independent city sites.

LA-RICS staff will continue to conduct public outreach meetings, as requested by the Board at the March 24, 2015 Board meeting, including conducting regional outreach meetings. The public outreach will be tailored towards the remaining sites in the baseline plan.

The Honorable Board of Supervisors
April 14, 2015
Page 3

Given that the baseline plan includes County owned, operated, or controlled sites, the NTIA is requiring that the Board approve the CAP baseline plan, before it lifts any suspension of the BTOP grant for the LTE project. If the Board approves the CAP, it is agreeing to allow construction to proceed forward at the 29 Los Angeles County owned, operated, and controlled sites.

The CAP also provides for additional options, if feasible, to allow for 15 State of California sites to be used to locate temporary cell on wheels (COWS) to improve coverage within those locations. The LA-RICS Authority staff is currently working with State representatives on that effort. If those sites can be used to house COWS, coverage will be improved.


ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTATION

The LA-RICS Authority, as the lead agency, and the County, have already determined that design, construction, implementation, operation and maintenance of the LTE System at these sites, are statutorily exempt under Public Resources Code section 21080.25, the statutory CEQA exemption adopted specifically for LA-RICS. This action is within the scope of the original determinations.

IMPACT ON CURRENT SERVICES (OR PROJECTS)

There will be no compromise of public safety missions or disruption of vital, existing communication services.

Respectfully submitted,


Sachi A. Hamai
Interim Chief Executive Officer

SAH:JJ:GH
TM:cc

c: Executive Office, Board of Supervisors
County Counsel
Sheriff
Fire
Internal Services
LA-RICS

Why communities should be able to leave LAUSD and start new districts

By David Hadley

DailyBreeze.com

The political battles over California public education assume there must always be winners and losers. Public schools versus charters. Governmental oversight versus parental choice. Battle lines have hardened on these issues.

Those debates will continue, but let's not miss opportunities to pursue win-win education reforms that put our kids first. As a newly elected state assemblyman, my first actions include two bills that pass that test.

My personal experience and my district provide useful context for these bills. My wife Suzanne and I moved to the South Bay 19 years ago for the schools. Our four kids have all attended our local public schools. People from all over Southern California move to the South Bay because they want the best possible education for their children.

I ran for the Assembly to protect what is great about South Bay schools and to make California schools more like them.

The South Bay assembly district that I am proud to represent provides a unique vantage point from which to view the California education debates.

The western portion of the district consists of locally-controlled school districts: Palos Verdes, Torrance, Hermosa, Redondo Beach and Manhattan Beach. The schools in the eastern part of the district, including Gardena, Lomita and other Los Angeles communities, are in Los Angeles Unified School District.

The western portion is the ultimate educational win-win: union teachers in well-regarded public schools, high real estate values partly driven by educational excellence and many parents who can afford private schools but who choose public.

It is in the LAUSD portion of the district where the school debates are the most intense. This is where charter schools gain students and more affluent parents often choose private schools or move out of the school district.

The parents and residents of Gardena, Lomita and communities throughout California should have the same opportunity as other South Bay residents to control the educational destinies of their children if they choose.

However, current state law makes that virtually impossible. Torrance left LAUSD in 1947, but no jurisdiction has left since. I have introduced Assembly Bill 803 to streamline the process of creating new school districts.

My bill outlines an appropriate path to create a new district. The process starts with a petition signed by a city council majority or over 10 percent of a city or community's voters. It involves the development of a strategic plan that addresses transition issues, facilities, debts and collective bargaining agreements. It culminates in an up-or-down vote of the potential district's residents. My bill has the power to deliver true local control over K-12 education.

Advertisement

We have another educational win-win opportunity, one where we can do right by our military personnel and help safeguard the future of California's military bases. I introduced Assembly Bill 306 to allow active duty military families to send their kids to public school districts of their choice without a "veto" of the home school district.

AB 306 is good for everyone. Military personnel stationed at Los Angeles Air Force Base or other bases in California would not be limited to the public school district that serves on-base housing.

For that reason, AB 306 would also make LAAFB more attractive to the Pentagon and military families considering deployment to LAAFB – an important goal given that our military bases are always at risk in the next base closing commission or could lose functions and jobs to other bases in lower-cost areas.

A quality public education is the Constitutional right of every child in California. Empowering local communities and providing flexibility to our military families are two common-sense ways to help deliver on that promise.

AMENDED IN ASSEMBLY MARCH 26, 2015

CALIFORNIA LEGISLATURE—2015–16 REGULAR SESSION

ASSEMBLY BILL

No. 803

Introduced by Assembly Member Hadley

February 26, 2015

An act to ~~amend~~ *add* Section ~~47602~~ of 35721.7 to the Education Code, and Section 21080.18.5 to the Public Resources Code, relating to ~~charter schools~~. *school districts*.

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL'S DIGEST

AB 803, as amended, Hadley. ~~Charter schools~~. *School districts: reorganization.*

(1) Existing law specifies a process for the unification or reorganization of school districts. As part of that process, existing law requires a county committee on school district organization to hold a public hearing upon receipt of a petition signed by at least 10% of the qualified electors residing in any school district for consideration of unification or other reorganization of any area. Existing law also requires a county committee on school district organization to hold a public hearing upon receipt of a resolution approved by a majority of the members of specified local agencies for consideration of unification or other reorganization of any area. Following those public hearings, existing law requires the county committee on school district organization to grant or deny the petition or resolution proposal. If a county committee on school district organization approves a petition to transfer territory, existing law requires the county committee to notify the county superintendent of schools who, upon that notification, is required to call an election in the territory of the school district, as specified.

Notwithstanding those provisions, this bill would create a separate procedure for inhabited territory transfers within the boundaries of a single school district for the formation of a new school district within a single county. The bill would authorize a transfer to be initiated by a petition signed by 10% of the number of qualified electors who voted in the last gubernatorial election and who reside within the boundaries of the proposed district, or by resolution of a local agency, as defined, approved by a majority of its members.

The bill would require the county board of education to hold a public hearing on a petition upon receipt of that petition, and to grant or deny the petition following the hearing. The bill would also require the county board of education, upon receipt of a resolution proposal, to hold a public hearing on that proposal jointly with the local agency that initiated the proposed transfer, and would require the county board of education and the local agency to jointly grant or deny the proposal by majority vote of all members. By imposing additional duties on county boards of education, the bill would impose a state-mandated local program.

The bill would require a petition to identify the persons who will represent the proposed school district at those public hearings. The bill would also require the local agency to appoint persons to represent the proposed school district at those public hearings by a resolution.

The bill would require the county superintendent of schools to call an election of registered voters within the boundaries of the territory to be transferred, as specified, if a petition or proposal is granted. By imposing additional duties on county superintendents of schools, the bill would impose a state-mandated local program.

(2) The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) generally requires all state and local governmental lead agencies to prepare, or cause to be prepared by contract, and certify the completion of, an environmental impact report on any project that they propose to carry out or approve that may result in a significant effect on the environment, that is, a substantial, or potentially substantial, adverse change in the physical conditions that exist within the area that will be affected by the project.

This bill would provide that CEQA shall not apply to inhabited territory transfers within the boundaries of a single school district for the formation of a new school district within a single county where only existing facilities will be transferred.

(3) *The California Constitution requires the state to reimburse local agencies and school districts for certain costs mandated by the state. Statutory provisions establish procedures for making that reimbursement.*

This bill would provide that, if the Commission on State Mandates determines that the bill contains costs mandated by the state, reimbursement for those costs shall be made pursuant to these statutory provisions.

~~Under the Charter Schools Act of 1992, a maximum of 100 additional charter schools may be authorized to operate in the state each school year.~~

~~This bill would make nonsubstantive changes to these provisions, including deleting an obsolete provision relating to a Legislative Analyst's report.~~

Vote: majority. Appropriation: no. Fiscal committee: ~~no~~-yes.
State-mandated local program: ~~no~~-yes.

The people of the State of California do enact as follows:

1 SECTION 1. Section 35721.7 is added to the Education Code,
2 to read:
3 35721.7. (a) Notwithstanding any other law, the following
4 provisions apply to inhabited territory transfers within the
5 boundaries of a single school district for the formation of a new
6 school district within a single county:
7 (1) The transfer may be initiated by either of the following:
8 (A) A petition signed by at least 10 percent of the number of
9 qualified electors who voted in the last gubernatorial election and
10 who reside within the boundaries of the territory proposed to be
11 transferred. The petition shall identify persons who will represent
12 the proposed school district in public hearings.
13 (B) A resolution of a local agency approved by a majority of its
14 members. The local agency shall also appoint persons to represent
15 the proposed school district in public hearings by a resolution.
16 (2) Upon receipt of a petition specified in subparagraph (A) of
17 paragraph (1), the county board of education shall hold a public
18 hearing on the petition at a regular or special meeting. Following
19 the hearing, the county board of education shall grant or deny the
20 petition.

1 (3) Upon receipt of a resolution specified in subparagraph (B)
 2 of paragraph (1), the county board of education and the local
 3 agency that initiated the transfer proposal shall jointly hold a
 4 public hearing on the transfer proposal at a regular or special
 5 meeting. Following the hearing, the county board of education
 6 and the local agency that initiated the transfer proposal shall
 7 jointly grant or deny the transfer proposal by a majority vote of
 8 all members.

9 (4) If a petition or proposal is granted, the county superintendent
 10 of schools shall call an election of registered voters within the
 11 boundaries of the territory to be transferred to be conducted at
 12 the next election of any kind in accordance with either of the
 13 following:

14 (A) Section 1002 of the Elections Code and Part 4 (commencing
 15 with Section 5000) of Division 1 or Title 1.

16 (B) Division 4 (commencing with Section 4000) of the Elections
 17 Code.

18 (b) For purposes of this section, "local agency" means a city
 19 council, county board of supervisors, governing body of a special
 20 district, or local agency formation commission that has jurisdiction
 21 over all or a portion of the proposed school district.

22 SEC. 2. Section 21080.18.5 is added to the Public Resources
 23 Code, to read:

24 21080.18.5. This division shall not apply to inhabited territory
 25 transfers within the boundaries of a single school district for the
 26 formation of a new school district within a single county where
 27 only existing facilities will be transferred.

28 SEC. 3. If the Commission on State Mandates determines that
 29 this act contains costs mandated by the state, reimbursement to
 30 local agencies and school districts for those costs shall be made
 31 pursuant to Part 7 (commencing with Section 17500) of Division
 32 4 of Title 2 of the Government Code.

33 SECTION 1. Section 47602 of the Education Code is amended
 34 to read:

35 47602. (a) In the 1998-99 school year, the maximum total
 36 number of charter schools authorized to operate in this state shall
 37 be 250. In each successive school year thereafter, an additional
 38 100 charter schools are authorized to operate in this state each
 39 successive school year. For purposes of implementing this section,
 40 the state board shall assign a number to each charter petition that

1 ~~it grants pursuant to subdivision (j) of Section 47605 or Section~~
2 ~~47605.8 and to each charter notice it receives pursuant to this part,~~
3 ~~based on the chronological order in which the notice is received.~~
4 ~~The number assigned by the state board shall correspond to a single~~
5 ~~petition that identifies a charter school that will operate within the~~
6 ~~geographic and site limitations of this part. The state board shall~~
7 ~~develop a numbering system for charter schools that identifies~~
8 ~~each school associated with a charter and that operates within the~~
9 ~~existing limit on the number of charter schools that can be approved~~
10 ~~each year. For purposes of this section, sites that share educational~~
11 ~~programs and serve similar pupil populations may not be counted~~
12 ~~as separate schools. Sites that do not share a common educational~~
13 ~~program shall be considered separate schools for purposes of this~~
14 ~~section. The limits contained in this subdivision may not be waived~~
15 ~~by the state board pursuant to Section 33050 or any other law.~~
16 ~~(b) A charter shall not be granted under this part that authorizes~~
17 ~~the conversion of a private school to a charter school. A charter~~
18 ~~school shall not receive any public funds for a pupil if the pupil~~
19 ~~also attends a private school that charges the pupil's family for~~
20 ~~tuition. The state board shall adopt regulations to implement this~~
21 ~~section.~~

O

AMENDED IN ASSEMBLY MARCH 26, 2015

CALIFORNIA LEGISLATURE—2015–16 REGULAR SESSION

ASSEMBLY BILL

No. 306

Introduced by Assembly Member Hadley

February 12, 2015

An act to ~~amend Section 35700 of~~ add Article 7.5 (commencing with Section 48318) to Chapter 2 of Part 27 of Division 4 of Title 2 of the Education Code, relating to school districts.

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL'S DIGEST

AB 306, as amended, Hadley. ~~School districts: reorganization. Public schools: attendance alternatives: children of military personnel.~~

Existing law requires each person between 6 and 18 years of age, not otherwise exempt, to attend the public full-time day school in the district in which their parent or guardian is a resident. Existing law provides for attendance alternatives, authorizes the governing board of any school district to accept interdistrict transfers, and prescribes procedures for the acceptance and approval of applications for interdistrict transfers. Existing law further authorizes a school district of choice, as defined, to give priority of attendance to children of military personnel.

This bill would authorize a parent of a pupil enrolled in a school district of residence, as defined, to submit an application for the pupil to attend a school in any school district of choice, as defined, if the parent with whom the pupil resides is enlisted in the military and is on active military duty, as defined. The bill would require that an application requesting such a transfer to a school district of choice be submitted to the school district of choice before January 1 of the year preceding the school year for which a pupil is requesting the transfer,

except as provided, and would specify that the application may request enrollment of the pupil in a specific school or program within the school district of choice. The bill would require a school district of choice to establish a time period for resident pupil enrollment, in order to provide priority enrollment opportunities for pupils residing in the school district, and, after that time period has concluded, if space is available at a school in the school district of choice, to accept and approve transfer applications submitted pursuant to those provisions, in accordance with specified priorities. The bill would require a school district of choice that receives such an application for a transfer to allow the pupil to enroll in the school district of choice in the school year immediately following the approval of his or her application. The bill would authorize a school district of choice to adopt specific, written standards for the acceptance of applicants pursuant to those provisions. By imposing new duties on school districts with regard to the review and acceptance of requests for alternative school attendance by children of military personnel, the bill would impose a state-mandated local program.

The California Constitution requires the state to reimburse local agencies and school districts for certain costs mandated by the state. Statutory provisions establish procedures for making that reimbursement.

This bill would provide that, if the Commission on State Mandates determines that the bill contains costs mandated by the state, reimbursement for those costs shall be made pursuant to these statutory provisions.

~~Existing law requires that an action to reorganize one or more school districts be initiated upon the filing with the county superintendent of schools of a petition to reorganize one or more school districts if the petition is signed by any of 4 specified groups.~~

~~This bill would make nonsubstantive changes to that provision.~~

Vote: majority. Appropriation: no. Fiscal committee: ~~no~~-yes.
State-mandated local program: ~~no~~-yes.

The people of the State of California do enact as follows:

- 1 SECTION 1. Article 7.5 (commencing with Section 48318) is
- 2 added to Chapter 2 of Part 27 of Division 4 of Title 2 of the
- 3 Education Code, to read:

1 *Article 7.5. Attendance Alternatives for Children of Military*
2 *Personnel*

3
4 48318. For purposes of this article, the following definitions
5 apply:

6 (a) “Active military duty” means full-time military duty status
7 in the active uniformed service of the United States, including
8 members of the National Guard and the State Reserve on active
9 duty orders pursuant to Sections 1209 and 1211 of Title 10 of the
10 United States Code.

11 (b) “Parent” means the natural or adoptive parent or guardian
12 of a dependent child.

13 (c) “School district of choice” means a school district for which
14 an application for enrollment has been submitted by the parent of
15 a pupil requesting enrollment pursuant to Section 48318.1. A
16 school district of choice may include a school district in which the
17 parent of a pupil resides or a school district other than the school
18 district in which the parent of a pupil resides.

19 (d) “School district of residence” means the school district that
20 a pupil would be directed to attend, pursuant to this chapter.

21 48318.1. (a) A parent of a pupil enrolled in a school district
22 of residence may submit an application for the pupil to attend a
23 school in any school district of choice, if the parent with whom
24 the pupil resides is enlisted in the military and is on active military
25 duty.

26 (b) An application requesting a transfer pursuant to this article
27 shall be submitted by the parent of a pupil to the school district of
28 choice before January 1 of the school year preceding the school
29 year for which the pupil is requesting the transfer. However, this
30 deadline does not apply to an application requesting a transfer if
31 the parent with whom the pupil resides was relocated by the
32 military within 90 days before submitting the application. The
33 school district of choice may waive the deadline specified in this
34 subdivision.

35 (c) The application may request enrollment of the pupil in a
36 specific school or program within the school district of choice.

37 (d) A pupil may enroll in the school district of choice in the
38 school year immediately following the approval of his or her
39 application.

1 (e) In order to provide priority enrollment opportunities for
 2 pupils residing in the school district of choice, a school district of
 3 choice shall establish a period of time for resident pupil enrollment
 4 before accepting transfer applications pursuant to this article.
 5 After the period of time for resident pupil enrollment has
 6 concluded, if space is available at a school in the desired school
 7 district of choice, the school district of choice shall accept and
 8 approve a transfer application submitted pursuant to this article,
 9 in accordance with the following priorities:

10 (1) First priority for transfer shall be given to the siblings of
 11 pupils who already attend the desired school.

12 (2) After approving the applications for enrollment for siblings
 13 of pupils pursuant to the priority specified in paragraph (1), if the
 14 number of pupils who request a particular school exceeds the
 15 number of spaces at that school, a lottery shall be conducted to
 16 select pupils at random until all of the available spaces are filled.

17 48318.2. A school district of choice may adopt specific, written
 18 standards for acceptance of applicants pursuant to this article.
 19 The standards may include consideration of the capacity of a
 20 program, class, grade level, school facilities, and adverse financial
 21 impacts. However, these standards may not include consideration
 22 of a pupil's previous academic achievement, physical condition,
 23 proficiency in the English language, family income, or any of the
 24 individual characteristics set forth in Section 200.

25 SEC. 2. If the Commission on State Mandates determines that
 26 this act contains costs mandated by the state, reimbursement to
 27 local agencies and school districts for those costs shall be made
 28 pursuant to Part 7 (commencing with Section 17500) of Division
 29 4 of Title 2 of the Government Code.

30 SECTION 1.—Section 35700 of the Education Code is amended
 31 to read:

32 35700.—An action to reorganize one or more school districts is
 33 initiated upon the filing, with the county superintendent of schools,
 34 of a petition to reorganize one or more school districts signed by
 35 any of the following:

36 (a) At least 25 percent of the registered voters residing in the
 37 territory proposed to be reorganized if the territory is inhabited.
 38 Where the petition is to reorganize territory in two or more school
 39 districts, the petition shall be signed by at least 25 percent of the
 40 registered voters in that territory in each of those school districts.

1 ~~(b) A number of registered voters residing in the territory~~
2 ~~proposed to be reorganized, equal to at least 8 percent of the votes~~
3 ~~cast for all candidates for Governor at the last gubernatorial election~~
4 ~~in the territory proposed to be reorganized, where the affected~~
5 ~~territory consists of a single school district with over 200,000~~
6 ~~pupils in average daily attendance and the petition is to reorganize~~
7 ~~the school district into two or more school districts:~~

8 ~~(c) The owner of the property, provided that territory is~~
9 ~~uninhabited and the owner of the property has filed either a~~
10 ~~tentative subdivision map with the appropriate county or city~~
11 ~~agency or an application for any project, as defined in Section~~
12 ~~21065 of the Public Resources Code, with one or more local~~
13 ~~agencies:~~

14 ~~(d) A majority of the members of the governing boards of each~~
15 ~~of the school districts that would be affected by the proposed~~
16 ~~reorganization:~~

O



GENERAL INFORMATION

MANDATORY RESTRICTIONS TO ACHIEVE A 25% STATEWIDE REDUCTION IN POTABLE URBAN WATER USE

With California facing one of the most severe droughts on record, Governor Brown declared a drought State of Emergency in January 2014 and issued a series of Executive Orders in April and September 2014 and January 2015, that streamline the State's drought response and makes California more drought resilient for the future.

The April 2014 Executive Order asked the State Water Board to assess voluntary conservation levels for urban water agencies and granted authority to adopt emergency conservation regulations, which the Board did in July of 2014 and updated in March of 2015. With the lowest snowpack on record and a lack of sufficient conservation to deal with the continuing drought emergency, the Governor, on April 1, 2015, directed the State Water Board to implement mandatory water reductions in urban areas to reduce potable urban water usage by 25 percent statewide. He also directed that this regulation take into account the different levels of conservation already achieved by communities based upon their relative per capita water usage.

This savings amounts to approximately 1.3 million acre-feet of water over the next nine months, or nearly as much water as is currently in Lake Oroville. To achieve these savings, the State Water Board is expediting an emergency regulation to set usage targets for communities around the State.

The Board's task is to implement a regulation which is equitable, achievable, and enforceable for every urban water supplier in the state, and which can be implemented quickly given the state of the drought and the uncertainty of when it will end. To maximize input in a short amount of time, the Board began discussions with water suppliers, stakeholder groups, and others to solicit feedback on approach on the day that the Executive Order was issued.

On April 7, 2015, the Board released a draft framework and received more than 250 comments. Suggestions from the comments were incorporated into the draft regulation issued on April 17, 2015. The Board is soliciting additional comment on the draft regulation by April 22. The draft regulation will be further refined based on comments received and the Notice of Proposed Emergency Rulemaking and accompanying documents will be released on April 28th for public comment and consideration by the Board at its May 5-6, 2015 meeting.

Content of Emergency Regulation

This emergency regulation will address the following provisions of the April 1, 2015 Executive Order :

- Ordering Provision 2: Mandatory 25% reduction in potable urban water use with recognition of past conservation achievements;
- Ordering Provision 5: Reductions in potable water use at commercial, industrial and institutional properties;
- Ordering Provision 6: Prohibition on using potable water for irrigation of ornamental turf in street medians; and
- Ordering Provision 7: Prohibition on using potable water for irrigation outside of new home construction without drip or microspray systems.

This emergency regulation does not address rate structures and other pricing mechanisms required by Ordering Provision 8, which will be developed separately.

Schedule for Adoption and Implementation of the Emergency Regulation

Stakeholder comments on the proposed emergency regulation must be submitted by **Wednesday April 22, 2015**. Staff will use those comments to finalize the draft emergency regulation, which will be published on April 28, 2015, along with supporting documents. Final public comment on the emergency regulation can be made at the Board meeting on May 5, 2015. The specific prohibitions in the emergency regulation will take effect immediately upon approval by the Office of Administrative Law. Urban water suppliers will be expected to begin implementing measures to meet their mandatory reduction targets by June 1, 2015 to ensure maximum conservation during the summer months. The schedule is listed below.

- Notice announcing release of draft regulation for informal public comment April 17, 2015
- Deadline for comment on draft regulation April 22, 2015
- Formal Notice of Proposed Rulemaking and written comment period April 28, 2015
- Board hearing and adoption May 5-6, 2015
- Office of Administrative Law approval May 15, 2015
- Specific prohibitions become effective May 15, 2015
- First (June) report on water production and other conservation measures due July 15, 2015

How to Provide Input

Information including discussion drafts, draft regulations and related materials is available on the State Water Board's website at:

http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/drought/emergency_mandatory_regulations.shtml .

Written comment and questions can be sent to Jessica Bean at jessica.bean@waterboards.ca.gov .



Fact Sheet

DRAFT REGULATIONS IMPLEMENTING 25% CONSERVATION STANDARD

On April 1, 2015, Governor Jerry Brown issued the fourth in a series of Executive Orders on actions necessary to address California's severe drought conditions. With snowpack water content at a record low level of 5 percent of average for April 1st, major reservoir storage shrinking each day as a percentage of their daily average measured over the last several decades, and groundwater levels continuing to decline, urgent action is needed. The April 1 Executive Order requires, for the first time in the State's history, mandatory conservation of potable urban water use. Commercial agriculture in many parts of the State has already been notified of severe cutbacks in water supply contracted through the State and Federal Water Projects and is bracing for curtailments of surface water rights in the near-term. Conserving water more seriously now will forestall even more catastrophic impacts if it does not rain next year.

Early Input

To maximize input in a short amount of time, the State Water Board released a proposed regulatory framework for implementing the 25% conservation standard mandated by the Executive Order on April 7, 2015. This will result in water savings amounting to approximately 1.3 million acre-feet of water over the next nine months, or nearly as much water as is currently in Lake Oroville. Draft regulations are now available for informal public comment that consider and incorporate the input contained in over 250 comments submitted by water suppliers, local government, businesses, individuals, and non-governmental organizations. Key areas of comment focused on the methodology behind the assignment of conservation standards, the availability of exclusions or adjustments under defined conditions, how to approach the commercial, industrial and institutional (CII) sector, the requirements for smaller water suppliers, and the approach to enforcement.

What's Next

During this second informal comment period, we are soliciting feedback on the updated approach reflected in the draft regulation as well as comment on the specific regulatory language. Please submit comments by email to Jessica Bean at Jessica.Bean@waterboards.ca.gov by April 22, 2015. The draft regulation will be further refined based on comments received and the Notice of Proposed Emergency Rulemaking and accompanying revised regulatory language will be released on April 28th for public comment and consideration by the Board at its May 5-6, 2015 regular business meeting.



Draft Regulation - Key Provisions

Conservation Standard for Urban Water Suppliers

As drought conditions continue, all water suppliers will need to do more to meet the statewide 25% conservation standard. Many communities around the State have been conserving for years. Some of these communities have achieved remarkable results with residential water use now hovering around the statewide target for indoor water use, while others are using many times more. Everyone must do more, but the greatest opportunities to meet the statewide 25% conservation standard now exist in those areas with higher water use. Often, but not always, these water suppliers are located in areas where the majority of the water use is directed at outdoor irrigation due to lot size and other factors.

In response to comments and suggestions, the draft regulation assigns urban water suppliers to a tier of water reduction based upon three months of summer residential gallons-per-capita-per-day data (July-September). These three months reflect the amount of water used for summer outdoor irrigation, which provides the greatest opportunity for conservation savings.

The number of tiers has more than doubled, from the proposed regulatory framework, to more equitably allocate the conservation savings necessary to reach the statewide 25 percent reduction mandate. This updated approach lessens the disparities in reduction requirements between agencies that have similar levels of water consumption, but fall on different sides of dividing lines between tiers. Suppliers that were in the 35% reduction tier in the prior proposal may now be in the 32% or 28% tier if their summer 2014 R-GPCD was below 210. Adding additional tiers to the conservation framework also better reflects past conservation efforts because water suppliers that have reduced use prior to the drought will have a lower R-GPCD and lower conservation standard than water suppliers with similar climate and density factors where R-GPCD remains high.

Urban water suppliers (serving more than 3,000 customers or delivering more than 3,000 acre feet of water per year and accounting for more than 90% of urban water use) will be assigned a conservation standard, as shown in the following table:

Tier	R-GPCD Range		# of Suppliers in Range	Conservation Standard
	From	To		
1	reserved		0	4%
2	0	64.99	23	8%
3	65	79.99	21	12%
4	80	94.99	42	16%
5	95	109.99	41	20%
6	110	129.99	51	24%
7	130	169.99	73	28%
8	170	214.99	66	32%
9	215	612.00	94	36%

The Smith family of three learns that their water district must reduce water use by 12 percent. A manufacturing plant uses 20 percent of the water and cannot reduce its use. So, residents are told to reduce their use by 15 percent to meet the overall 12 percent target. The Smith family uses an average of 210 gallons per day (or about 70 gallons per person), 165 gallons for indoor use and 45 gallons for watering their small yard. To meet the 15% reduction requirement they must bring their total water use down to about 180 gallons per day. This is equivalent to about 60 gallons per person per day.

The Jones family of four learn that their water district must reduce water use by 32 percent. An oil refinery uses 10 percent of the district's water and cannot reduce its use. Their city also has many small businesses, and a golf course, which can reduce use by more than 10 percent. The residents must now reduce their use by 30 percent to meet the overall 32 percent target. The Jones family uses an average of 1,200 gallons per day (or about 300 gallons per person); 300 gallons for indoor use and 900 gallons outdoors, to irrigate a large yard that includes grass and fruit trees. To cut water use by 30 percent, the Jones' must cut their water use by 360 gallons per day to 840 gallons which is equivalent to 210 gallons per person per day.

The draft regulation describes two situations where water suppliers could request to modify their total water use or be placed into a lower conservation tier:

1. Urban water suppliers delivering more than 20 percent of their total water production to commercial agriculture may be allowed to modify the amount of water subject to their conservation standard. These suppliers must provide written certification to the Board to be able to subtract the water supplied to commercial agriculture from their total water production for baseline and conservation purposes.
2. Urban water suppliers that have a reserve supply of surface water that could last multiple years may be eligible for placement into lower conservation tier. Only suppliers meeting the eligibility criteria will be considered. These criteria relate to the source(s) of supply, precipitation amounts, and the number of years that those supplies could last.

There are no specific use reduction targets for commercial, industrial, and institutional users served by urban and all other water suppliers. Water suppliers will decide how to meet their conservation standard through reductions from both residential and non-residential users. Water suppliers are encouraged to look at their commercial, institutional and industrial properties that irrigate outdoor ornamental landscapes with potable water for potential conservation savings.

An open question is whether the draft regulation should allow multiple suppliers to join together to meet a collective conservation standard. In order to achieve a statewide 25% reduction in urban water use, the group as a whole would need to achieve the same amount of water savings as they would as individual suppliers. This approach could provide additional flexibility in achieving the conservation standard and allow for uniform messaging and implementation across contiguous service areas. There are many uncertainties, however, related to the appropriate geographic scope, group leadership, compliance assessment, accountability, and enforcement. Input is requested regarding how a collective approach could be administered that addresses these uncertainties and achieves the required reduction in water use.

Conservation Standard For All Other Water Suppliers

Under the current proposal, smaller water suppliers (serving fewer than 3,000 connections) will be required to achieve a 25% conservation standard or restrict outdoor irrigation to no more than two days per week. Commercial, industrial, and institutional users with independent supplies will also be required to reduce usage by 25% or restrict outdoor irrigation to no more than two days per week. These smaller urban suppliers serve less than 10% of Californians.

End-User Requirements

The new prohibitions in the Executive Order apply to all Californians and will take effect immediately upon approval of the regulation by the Office of Administrative Law. These include:

- Irrigation with potable water of ornamental turf on public street medians is prohibited; and
- Irrigation with potable water outside of newly constructed homes and buildings not delivered by drip or microspray is prohibited.

Commercial, industrial and institutional properties under Provision 5 of the Executive Order with an independent source of water supply (not served by a water supplier), are required under the draft regulation to either limit outdoor irrigation to two days per week or achieve a 25% reduction in water use. Often, these properties have large landscapes that would otherwise not be addressed by this regulation.

It will be very important as these provisions are implemented to ensure that existing trees remain healthy and do not present a public safety hazard. Guidance on the implementation of both prohibitions will be developed.

New Reporting Requirements

Total monthly water production and specific reporting on residential use and enforcement as laid out in the previously adopted emergency regulations will remain in effect. Because the conservation standard applies to total water production, the draft regulation expands the reporting to include information on water use in the commercial, industrial, and institutional sectors. Small water suppliers with fewer than 3,000 service connections will be required to submit a single report on December 15, 2015 that provides their water production from June-November 2015 and June-November 2013. In addition, they must report on the number of days per week outdoor irrigation is allowed.

Commercial, industrial, and institutional facilities with an independent source of supply (they are not served by a water supplier) will not be required to submit a report; however they should be prepared to demonstrate their compliance with the two day per week watering restriction or the 25% reduction in water use if requested to do so by the Board.


Compliance Assessment

In many communities around the state, over half (and up to 80 percent) of total residential water use is for outdoor irrigation during the summer months. With summer just around the corner, bringing with it the greatest opportunity for making substantial conservation gains, immediate action is essential. As a result, the Board will begin assessing compliance with the submittal of the June monthly report on July 15, 2015.

Commenters pointed out that a month-by-month comparison of the percentage reduction in water use is confusing to the public because of the potentially wide variation in results due to temperatures, precipitation, and other factors. Several comments suggested using a 12-month rolling average; however a cumulative approach will also eliminate the wide swings that can occur in a month-by-month comparison and give a more accurate sense of progress. Beyond June, the Board will track compliance on a cumulative basis. Cumulative tracking means that conservation savings will be added together from one month to the next and compared to the amount of water used during the same months in 2013. This tracking will look like the sample graph below.

Example Comparison of Monthly Savings and Cumulative or Running Savings

	2013 Water Use	2015 Water Use	Monthly savings	Cumulative or Running Savings
June	1000	800	20%	20%
July	1500	1050	30%	26%
August	1200	1020	15%	22%
September	900	825	8%	20%



Two additional tools are included in the draft regulation to both expedite the investigation of water suppliers not meeting their conservation standard and require the implementation of actions to correct this situation. A new informational order is proposed that water suppliers would be required to respond to or face immediate enforcement. The proposed conservation order can be used to direct specific actions to correct non-compliance. Both of these tools are tailored to the emergency circumstances that the State finds itself in as a result of continuing drought conditions. Violation of an information or conservation order carries a penalty of up to \$500 per day.

The Board will work with water suppliers along the way that are not meeting their targets to implement actions to get them back on track. These actions could include changes to rates and pricing, restrictions on outdoor irrigation, public outreach, rebates and audit programs, leak detection and repair, and other measures. The Board may use its enforcement tools to ensure that water suppliers are on track to meet their conservation standards at any point during the 270 days that the emergency regulation is in effect.

In Conclusion

The Board received many comments on how to incorporate factors correlated with water use, such as climate, density, past conservation achievements, growth, and others. Many of these factors are accounted for in the State's 20x2020 conservation approach adopted in 2009, and they are relevant to a longer-term conservation policy. While the draft regulation does not directly adjust the conservation standards based on climate or other factors, the increase in the number of tiers gives many communities in the hotter, inland areas a lower conservation standard than they would have otherwise been subject to.

There were also many comments that discussed how recycled water and other new sources of water supply should factor in to the conservation standard. Many suggested that potable recycled water supplies be excluded from the amount of water subject to the conservation standard and that a credit system be established to also recognize investments made in developing non-potable recycled water supplies (which are not included in Total Water Production). Both of these sources of supply add resiliency and are key to a more sustainable water future. These suggestions were not integrated into the draft regulations because while the State, our federal government partners and local governments have provided much needed capital to make these projects work; they are still sources of supply that need to be managed judiciously, especially in times of drought.

The staff appreciates the extensive input submitted from individuals, communities and organizations around the State. In particular, comments that targeted specific concerns and provided specific solutions were very well received. There has been a wealth of input on actions that are more appropriately dealt with over the longer term, not necessarily in this rulemaking. These suggestions will be considered as the Board moves forward in establishing permanent regulations for water usage, conservation, and reporting under Provision 9 of the Executive Order as well as additional temporary emergency regulations that may be needed if it does not rain significantly next winter.

PROPOSED TEXT OF EMERGENCY REGULATION

Article 22.5. Drought Emergency Water Conservation.

Sec. 863. Findings of Drought Emergency.

(a) The State Water Resources Control Board finds as follows:

(1) On January 17, 2014, the Governor issued a proclamation of a state of emergency under the California Emergency Services Act based on drought conditions;

(2) On April 25, 2014, the Governor issued a proclamation of a continued state of emergency under the California Emergency Services Act based on continued drought conditions;

(3) On April 1, 2015, the Governor issued an Executive Order that, in part, directs the State Board to impose restrictions on water suppliers to achieve a statewide 25 percent reduction in potable urban usage through February 28, 2016; require commercial, industrial, and institutional users to implement water efficiency measures; prohibit irrigation with potable water of ornamental turf in public street medians; and prohibit irrigation with potable water outside newly constructed homes and buildings that is not delivered by drip or microspray systems;

~~(34)~~ The drought conditions that formed the basis of the Governor's emergency proclamations continue to exist;

~~(45)~~ The present year is critically dry and has been immediately preceded by two or more consecutive below normal, dry, or critically dry years; and

~~(56)~~ The drought conditions will likely continue for the foreseeable future and additional action by both the State Water Resources Control Board and local water suppliers will likely be necessary to prevent waste and unreasonable use of water and to further promote conservation.

Authority: Section 1058.5, Water Code.

References: Sections 102, 104 and 105, Water Code.

Sec. 864. End-User Requirements in Promotion of Water Conservation.

(a) To prevent the waste and unreasonable use of water and to promote water conservation, each of the following actions is prohibited, except where necessary to address an immediate health and safety need or to comply with a term or condition in a permit issued by a state or federal agency:

(1) The application of potable water to outdoor landscapes in a manner that causes runoff such that water flows onto adjacent property, non-irrigated areas, private and public walkways, roadways, parking lots, or structures;

(2) The use of a hose that dispenses potable water to wash a motor vehicle, except where the hose is fitted with a shut-off nozzle or device attached to it that causes it to cease dispensing water immediately when not in use;

(3) The application of potable water to driveways and sidewalks; and

(4) The use of potable water in a fountain or other decorative water feature, except where the water is part of a recirculating system;

(5) The application of potable water to outdoor landscapes during and within 48 hours after measurable rainfall; ~~and~~

(6) The serving of drinking water other than upon request in eating or drinking establishments, including but not limited to restaurants, hotels, cafes, cafeterias, bars, or other public places where food or drink are served and/or purchased;

(7) The irrigation with potable water of ornamental turf on public street medians;
and

(8) The irrigation with potable water outside of newly constructed homes and buildings that is not delivered by drip or microspray systems.

(b) To promote water conservation, operators of hotels and motels shall provide guests with the option of choosing not to have towels and linens laundered daily. The hotel or motel shall prominently display notice of this option in each guestroom using clear and easily understood language.

(c) Immediately upon this subdivision taking effect, all commercial, industrial and institutional properties not served by a water supplier meeting the requirements of Water Code section 10617 or section 350 shall either:

(1) Limit outdoor irrigation of ornamental landscapes or turf with potable water to no more than two days per week; or

(2) Reduce potable water usage by 25 percent for the months of June 2015 through February 2016 as compared to the amount used for the same months in 2013.

~~(e)~~ The taking of any action prohibited in subdivision (a) or the failure to take any action required in subdivisions (b) or (c), in addition to any other applicable civil or criminal penalties, is an infraction, punishable by a fine of up to five hundred dollars (\$500) for each day in which the violation occurs.

Authority: Section 1058.5, Water Code.

References: Sections 102, 104, ~~and~~ 105, 350, and 10617, Water Code.

Sec. 865. Mandatory Actions by Water Suppliers.

(a) The term "urban water supplier," when used in this section, refers to a supplier that meets the definition set forth in Water Code section 10617, except it does not refer to suppliers when they are functioning solely in a wholesale capacity, but does apply to suppliers when they are functioning in a retail capacity.

~~(b)(1) To promote water conservation, each urban water supplier shall implement all requirements and actions of the stage of its water shortage contingency plan that imposes includes mandatory restrictions on the number of days that outdoor irrigation of ornamental landscapes or turf with potable water is allowed, or shall amend its water shortage contingency plan to include mandatory restrictions on the number of days that outdoor irrigation of ornamental landscapes or turf with potable water is allowed and implement these restrictions within forty five (45) days. Urban water suppliers with approved alternate plans as described in subdivision (b)(2) are exempted from this requirement.~~

~~(2) An urban water supplier may submit a request to the Executive Director for approval of an alternate plan that includes allocation based rate structures that satisfies the requirements of chapter 3.4 (commencing with section 370) of division 1 of the Water~~

~~Code, and the Executive Director may approve such an alternate plan upon determining that the rate structure, in conjunction with other measures, achieves a level of conservation that would be superior to that achieved by implementing limitations on outdoor irrigation of ornamental landscapes or turf with potable water by the persons it serves to no more than two days per week.~~

~~_____ (e) To promote water conservation, each urban water supplier that does not have a water shortage contingency plan that restricts the number of days that outdoor irrigation of ornamental landscapes and turf with potable water is allowed, or has been notified by the Department of Water Resources that its water shortage contingency plan does not meet the requirements of Water Code section 10632 shall, within forty five (45) days, limit outdoor irrigation of ornamental landscapes or turf with potable water by the persons it serves to no more than two days per week.~~

(db) In furtherance of the promotion of water conservation each urban water supplier shall:

(1) Provide prompt notice to a customer whenever the supplier obtains information that indicates that a leak may exist within the end-users exclusive control.

(2) Prepare and submit to the State Water Resources Control Board by the 15th of each month a monitoring report on forms provided by the Board. The monitoring report shall include the amount of potable water the urban water supplier produced, including water provided by a wholesaler, in the preceding calendar month and shall compare that amount to the amount produced in the same calendar month in 2013. The monitoring report shall specify the population served by the urban water supplier, the percentage of water produced that is used for the residential sector, descriptive statistics on water conservation compliance and enforcement efforts, ~~and~~ the number of days that outdoor irrigation is allowed, monthly commercial sector use, monthly industrial sector use, and monthly institutional sector use. The monitoring report shall also estimate the gallons of water per person per day used by the residential customers it serves.

(c)(1) To prevent the waste and unreasonable use of water and to meet the requirements of the Governor's April 1, 2015 Executive Order, each urban water supplier shall reduce its total potable water production by the percentage identified as its conservation standard in this subdivision. Each urban water supplier's conservation standard considers its service area's relative per capita water usage.

(2) Each urban water supplier whose source of supply does not include groundwater or water imported from outside the hydrologic region and that received average annual precipitation in 2014 may, notwithstanding its average July-September 2014 R-GPCD, submit for Executive Director approval a request to reduce its total water usage by 4 percent for each month as compared to the amount used in the same month in 2013. Any such request shall be accompanied by information showing that the supplier's sources of supply do not include groundwater or water imported from outside the hydrologic region and that the supplier's service area received average annual precipitation in 2014.

(3) Each urban water supplier whose average July-September 2014 R-GPCD was less than 65 shall reduce its total water usage by 8 percent for each month as compared to the amount used in the same month in 2013.

(4) Each urban water supplier whose average July-September 2014 R-GPCD was between 65 and 79.9 shall reduce its total water usage by 12 percent for each month as compared to the amount used in the same month in 2013.

(5) Each urban water supplier whose average July-September 2014 R-GPCD was between 80 and 94.9 shall reduce its total water usage by 16 percent for each month as compared to the amount used in the same month in 2013.

(6) Each urban water supplier whose average July-September 2014 R-GPCD was between 95 and 109.9 shall reduce its total water usage by 20 percent for each month as compared to the amount used in the same month in 2013.

(7) Each urban water supplier whose average July-September 2014 R-GPCD was between 110 and 129.9 shall reduce its total water usage by 24 percent for each month as compared to the amount used in the same month in 2013.

(8) Each urban water supplier whose average July-September 2014 R-GPCD was between 130 and 169.9 shall reduce its total water usage by 28 percent for each month as compared to the amount used in the same month in 2013.

(9) Each urban water supplier whose average July-September 2014 R-GPCD was between 170 and 214.9 shall reduce its total water usage by 32 percent for each month as compared to the amount used in the same month in 2013.

(10) Each urban water supplier whose average July-September 2014 R-GPCD was greater than 215 shall reduce its total water usage by 36 percent for each month as compared to the amount used in the same month in 2013.

(d)(1) Beginning June 1, 2015, each urban water supplier shall comply with the conservation standard specified subdivision (c).

(2) Compliance with the requirements of this subdivision shall be measured monthly and assessed on a cumulative basis.

(e) Each urban water supplier that serves 20 percent or more of its total production for commercial agricultural use meeting the definition of Government Code section 51201, subdivision (a) may subtract the amount of water supplied for commercial agricultural use from its water production total, provided that the supplier complies with the Agricultural Water Management Plan requirement of paragraph 12 of the April 1, 2015 Executive Order. Each urban water supplier that serves 20 percent or more of its total production for commercial agricultural use meeting the definition of Government Code section 51201, subdivision (a) shall certify that the agricultural uses it serves meet the definition of Government Code section 51201, subdivision (a), and shall report its total water production pursuant to subdivision (b)(2), identifying the total amount of water supplied for commercial agricultural use.

(e)(1) To prevent waste and unreasonable use of water and to promote water conservation, each distributor of a public water supply, as defined in Water Code section 350, that is not an urban water supplier shall, ~~within forty five (45) days,~~ take one or more of the following actions:

(+A) Limit outdoor irrigation of ornamental landscapes or turf with potable water by the persons it serves to no more than two days per week; or

(2B) Implement another mandatory conservation measure or measures intended to achieve a ~~20~~25 percent reduction in water consumption by the persons it serves relative to the amount consumed in 2013.

(2) Each distributor of a public water supply, as defined in Water Code section 350, that is not an urban water supplier shall submit a report by December 15, 2015, on a form provided by the Board, that includes:

(A) Total potable water production, by month, from June through November, 2015, and total potable water production, by month, for June through November 2013; or

(B) Confirmation that the distributor limited outdoor irrigation of ornamental landscapes or turf with potable water by the persons it serves to no more than two days per week.

Authority: Section 1058.5, Water Code.

References: Sections 102, 104, 105, 350, 1846, 10617 and 10632, Water Code.

Sec. 866. Additional Conservation Tools.

(a)(1) To prevent the waste and unreasonable use of water and to promote conservation, when a water supplier does not meet its conservation standard required by section 865 the Executive Director, or his designee, may issue conservation orders requiring additional actions by the supplier to come into compliance with its conservation standard.

(2) All conservation orders issued under this article shall be subject to reconsideration under article 2 (commencing with section 1122) of chapter 4 of part 1 of division 2 of the California Water Code.

(b) The Executive Director, or his designee, may issue an informational order requiring water suppliers, or commercial, industrial or institutional properties not served by a water supplier meeting the requirements of Water Code section 10617 or section 350, to submit additional information beyond that required to be reported pursuant to the other provisions of this article. The failure to provide the information requested within 30 days or any additional time extension granted is a violation subject to civil liability of up to \$500 per day for each day the violation continues pursuant to Water Code section 1846.

Authority: Section 1058.5, Water Code.

References: Sections 100, 102, 104, 105, 174, 186, 187, 275, 350, 1051, 1122, 1123, 1825, 1846, 10617 and 10632, Water Code.

(2) Each distributor of a public water supply, as defined in Water Code section 350, that is not an urban water supplier shall submit a report by December 15, 2015, on a form provided by the Board, that includes:

(A) Total potable water production, by month, from June through November, 2015, and total potable water production, by month, for June through November 2013; or

(B) Confirmation that the distributor limited outdoor irrigation of ornamental landscapes or turf with potable water by the persons it serves to no more than two days per week.

Authority: Section 1058.5, Water Code.

References: Sections 102, 104, 105, 350, 1846, 10617 and 10632, Water Code.

Sec. 866. Additional Conservation Tools.

(a)(1) To prevent the waste and unreasonable use of water and to promote conservation, when a water supplier does not meet its conservation standard required by section 865 the Executive Director, or his designee, may issue conservation orders requiring additional actions by the supplier to come into compliance with its conservation standard.

(2) All conservation orders issued under this article shall be subject to reconsideration under article 2 (commencing with section 1122) of chapter 4 of part 1 of division 2 of the California Water Code.

(b) The Executive Director, or his designee, may issue an informational order requiring water suppliers, or commercial, industrial or institutional properties not served by a water supplier meeting the requirements of Water Code section 10617 or section 350, to submit additional information beyond that required to be reported pursuant to the other provisions of this article. The failure to provide the information requested within 30 days or any additional time extension granted is a violation subject to civil liability of up to \$500 per day for each day the violation continues pursuant to Water Code section 1846.

Authority: Section 1058.5, Water Code.

References: Sections 100, 102, 104, 105, 174, 186, 187, 275, 350, 1051, 1122, 1123, 1825, 1846, 10617 and 10632, Water Code.

Urban Water Suppliers and Proposed Regulatory Framework Tiers to Achieve 25% Use Reduction (Provisional)

Supplier Name	Total Water Production (gallons)		Total Water Saved (Jun-14 - Feb-15, compared to 2013)	Percent Saved (Jun-14 - Feb-15, compared to 2013)	Jul-Sep 2014 R GPCD	Tier	Conservation Standard
	2013 (Jun - Feb)	2014/15 (Jun-14 - Feb-15)					
Arcata City of	499,104,000	495,047,000	4,057,000	1%	43.5	2	8%
San Francisco Public Utilities Commission	20,365,410,000	18,717,900,000	1,647,510,000	8%	45.4	2	8%
Santa Cruz City of	2,527,700,000	1,933,400,000	594,300,000	24%	47.3	2	8%
California Water Service Company South San Francisco	2,075,673,590	1,907,534,254	168,139,336	8%	48.8	2	8%
California-American Water Company Monterey District	2,903,844,543	2,590,336,368	313,508,175	11%	51.3	2	8%
California Water Service Company East Los Angeles	3,998,522,861	3,819,956,279	178,566,582	4%	51.4	2	8%
Vernon City of	1,907,061,769	1,788,380,162	118,681,607	6%	51.6	2	8%
California-American Water Company San Diego District	2,795,094,888	2,578,195,144	216,899,744	8%	51.9	2	8%
Cambria Community Services District	166,216,813	95,513,570	70,703,243	43%	54.4	2	8%
East Palo Alto, City of	409,886,088	454,911,335	-45,025,247	-11%	55.6	2	8%
Park Water Company	2,833,164,110	2,598,821,539	234,342,571	8%	55.6	2	8%
San Bruno City of	929,865,974	849,620,197	80,245,777	9%	55.7	2	8%
Golden State Water Company Bell-Bell Gardens	1,279,423,043	1,208,354,847	71,068,196	6%	58.4	2	8%
Daly City City of	1,888,066,301	1,622,632,784	265,433,517	14%	58.8	2	8%
North Coast County Water District	809,332,364	713,333,361	95,999,003	12%	59.5	2	8%
Westborough Water District	257,568,499	213,776,790	43,791,709	17%	59.5	2	8%
Coastside County Water District	565,550,000	524,430,000	41,120,000	7%	61.9	2	8%
Grover Beach City of	352,828,667	208,202,769	144,625,897	41%	62.1	2	8%
Hayward City of	4,474,967,937	3,957,222,483	517,745,455	12%	62.1	2	8%
Redwood City City of	2,525,846,774	2,179,170,327	346,676,447	14%	63.4	2	8%
Compton City of	1,858,895,919	1,837,323,747	21,572,172	1%	63.6	2	8%
Soquel Creek Water District	1,046,626,000	826,889,000	219,737,000	21%	64.3	2	8%
Seal Beach City of	905,215,264	856,337,550	48,877,714	5%	64.7	2	8%
Inglewood City of	2,457,964,645	2,284,776,001	173,188,643	7%	65.1	3	12%
Goleta Water District	3,523,431,480	3,053,227,871	470,203,609	13%	65.5	3	12%
Golden State Water Company Florence Graham	1,246,577,219	1,227,482,326	19,094,894	2%	66.5	3	12%
Oxnard City of	5,742,131,037	5,086,123,686	656,007,351	11%	66.6	3	12%
Paramount City of	1,628,999,712	1,623,382,034	5,617,679	0%	67.0	3	12%
Port Hueneme City of	500,546,894	456,100,759	44,446,135	9%	67.2	3	12%
California Water Service Company King City	428,820,478	403,729,918	25,090,560	6%	67.7	3	12%
Morro Bay City of	316,836,255	281,236,756	35,599,499	11%	70.0	3	12%
South Gate City of	2,066,696,383	2,017,629,675	49,066,708	2%	70.1	3	12%
Huntington Park City of	1,171,761,731	1,128,423,492	43,338,240	4%	71.3	3	12%
Estero Municipal Improvement District	1,137,677,797	1,077,438,670	60,239,127	5%	72.8	3	12%
Golden State Water Company Norwalk	1,214,317,928	1,131,519,080	82,798,848	7%	73.5	3	12%
Golden State Water Company Bay Point	512,238,443	452,672,802	59,565,641	12%	75.5	3	12%
Sweetwater Authority	5,185,495,337	4,886,767,783	298,727,554	6%	75.6	3	12%
City of Big Bear Lake, Dept of Water & Power	610,520,000	590,469,860	20,050,140	3%	75.8	3	12%
Marina Coast Water District	1,063,425,908	946,396,368	117,029,540	11%	75.9	3	12%

Urban Water Suppliers and Proposed Regulatory Framework Tiers to Achieve 25% Use Reduction (Provisional)

Supplier Name	Total Water Production (gallons)		Total Water Saved (Jun-14 - Feb-15, compared to 2013)	Percent Saved (Jun-14 - Feb-15, compared to 2013)	Jul-Sep 2014 R GPCD	Tier	Conservation Standard
	2013 (Jun - Feb)	2014/15 (Jun-14 - Feb-15)					
Lompoc City of	1,253,200,000	1,106,800,000	146,400,000	12%	76.6	3	12%
San Lorenzo Valley Water District	416,952,583	335,050,267	81,902,316	20%	77.9	3	12%
Golden State Water Company S San Gabriel	664,867,252	637,528,317	27,338,935	4%	77.9	3	12%
Santa Ana City of	9,729,076,397	9,323,684,636	405,391,760	4%	78.3	3	12%
McKinleyville Community Service District	344,448,000	300,869,000	43,579,000	13%	79.8	3	12%
Santa Fe Springs City of	1,526,056,730	1,408,567,739	117,488,991	8%	80.1	4	16%
Crestline Village Water District	185,010,871	167,499,027	17,511,844	9%	80.3	4	16%
Monterey Park City of	649,960,000	594,880,000	55,080,000	8%	80.4	4	16%
Montebello Land and Water Company	859,407,071	791,398,619	68,008,451	8%	80.5	4	16%
Santa Barbara City of	3,348,530,727	2,632,951,217	715,579,509	21%	80.9	4	16%
Rohnert Park City of	1,267,000,000	1,124,000,000	143,000,000	11%	81.0	4	16%
Valley County Water District	2,033,127,821	1,853,913,772	179,214,049	9%	81.6	4	16%
Golden State Water Company Southwest	7,303,405,789	6,894,299,322	409,106,467	6%	81.7	4	16%
San Diego City of	47,355,303,598	46,452,597,390	902,706,208	2%	82.0	4	16%
Mountain View City of	2,967,854,797	2,531,213,885	436,640,912	15%	82.5	4	16%
California Water Service Company Dominguez	8,444,765,582	8,077,205,172	367,560,410	4%	83.7	4	16%
Long Beach City of	14,658,100,592	13,842,168,619	815,931,973	6%	83.8	4	16%
Greenfield, City of	573,049,890	501,684,126	71,365,764	12%	83.8	4	16%
Dublin San Ramon Services District	2,779,417,000	1,959,505,000	819,912,000	29%	84.7	4	16%
San Luis Obispo City of	1,387,716,506	1,278,706,170	109,010,336	8%	85.0	4	16%
Sunnyvale City of	4,612,426,949	3,920,970,221	691,456,728	15%	85.2	4	16%
California Water Service Company Salinas District	4,612,101,098	4,065,974,106	546,126,992	12%	86.0	4	16%
Lynwood City of	1,264,349,156	1,237,371,916	26,977,240	2%	86.3	4	16%
Santa Rosa City of	5,454,466,874	4,447,473,373	1,006,993,501	18%	86.7	4	16%
Hawthorne City of	1,070,747,789	1,135,592,223	-64,844,434	-6%	86.7	4	16%
California Water Service Company Mid Peninsula	3,986,792,209	3,551,780,554	435,011,655	11%	87.4	4	16%
San Gabriel Valley Water Company	9,747,519,587	9,124,165,807	623,353,780	6%	88.3	4	16%
Alameda County Water District	10,539,100,000	8,458,900,000	2,080,200,000	20%	88.3	4	16%
Santa Clara City of	5,338,900,000	4,749,500,000	589,400,000	11%	88.3	4	16%
Menlo Park City of	1,058,240,665	769,095,397	289,145,268	27%	88.6	4	16%
Sweetwater Springs Water District	208,544,913	177,491,272	31,053,641	15%	88.7	4	16%
Millbrae City of	668,885,610	603,267,242	65,618,369	10%	89.2	4	16%
Golden State Water Company Artesia	1,402,138,690	1,348,796,812	53,341,879	4%	90.0	4	16%
Hi-Desert Water District	744,117,577	733,074,472	11,043,105	1%	90.3	4	16%
Burlingame City of	1,288,363,748	1,075,113,151	213,250,598	17%	90.4	4	16%
Los Angeles Department of Water and Power	139,452,680,105	130,343,503,463	9,109,176,642	7%	90.9	4	16%
Vallejo City of	4,410,308,000	4,020,375,000	389,933,000	9%	91.3	4	16%
San Buenaventura City of	4,446,346,994	3,813,888,925	632,458,069	14%	91.3	4	16%
Scotts Valley Water District	311,979,632	253,857,835	58,121,797	19%	91.6	4	16%

Urban Water Suppliers and Proposed Regulatory Framework Tiers to Achieve 25% Use Reduction (Provisional)

Supplier Name	Total Water Production (gallons)		Total Water Saved (Jun-14 - Feb-15, compared to 2013)	Percent Saved (Jun-14 - Feb-15, compared to 2013)	Jul-Sep 2014 R GPCD	Tier	Conservation Standard
	2013 (Jun - Feb)	2014/15 (Jun-14 - Feb-15)					
Irvine Ranch Water District	15,406,744,246	15,015,266,341	391,477,904	3%	91.7	4	16%
Otay Water District	8,209,272,756	7,888,634,952	320,637,804	4%	93.0	4	16%
Windsor, Town of	963,136,985	817,896,531	145,240,453	15%	93.0	4	16%
California Water Service Company Redwood Valley	108,182,674	82,440,411	25,742,263	24%	93.3	4	16%
American Canyon, City of	915,968,361	777,155,653	138,812,708	15%	93.5	4	16%
Lakewood City of	2,086,631,973	1,856,580,866	230,051,107	11%	93.9	4	16%
East Bay Municipal Utilities District	52,390,500,000	46,127,500,000	6,263,000,000	12%	94.2	4	16%
Crescent City City of	583,110,000	710,650,000	-127,540,000	-22%	94.5	4	16%
San Jose City of	5,294,000,000	4,707,000,000	587,000,000	11%	96.0	5	20%
Pomona City of	5,817,361,333	5,468,536,077	348,825,256	6%	96.1	5	20%
Bellflower-Somerset Mutual Water Company	1,350,031,789	1,268,477,694	81,554,095	6%	96.1	5	20%
California Water Service Company Hermosa/Redondo	2,984,799,071	2,983,495,666	1,303,406	0%	96.4	5	20%
Azusa City of	5,165,530,597	4,670,763,054	494,767,543	10%	97.3	5	20%
California Water Service Company Stockton	6,808,665,567	6,318,910,872	489,754,695	7%	97.6	5	20%
El Segundo City of	1,692,179,532	1,788,496,457	-96,316,925	-6%	97.9	5	20%
Carpinteria Valley Water District	1,160,826,158	1,028,941,051	131,885,107	11%	98.2	5	20%
Lomita City of	591,013,026	547,632,425	43,380,600	7%	98.3	5	20%
Norwalk City of	559,456,000	511,830,000	47,626,000	9%	98.7	5	20%
Moulton Niguel Water District	7,135,207,799	6,864,125,480	271,082,319	4%	99.1	5	20%
Rowland Water District	2,857,000,142	2,756,214,295	100,785,846	4%	99.3	5	20%
Livermore City of Division of Water Resources	1,642,615,000	1,199,514,000	443,101,000	27%	100.0	5	20%
Fountain Valley City of	2,438,968,604	2,305,516,153	133,452,452	5%	100.2	5	20%
Pittsburg City of	2,481,549,000	2,226,323,000	255,226,000	10%	100.3	5	20%
Watsonville City of	2,045,660,752	1,803,744,576	241,916,176	12%	100.3	5	20%
Lathrop, City of	1,149,290,000	990,960,000	158,330,000	14%	100.5	5	20%
El Monte City of	328,279,000	312,936,000	15,343,000	5%	100.6	5	20%
Mid-Peninsula Water District	823,925,361	712,822,442	111,102,919	13%	101.4	5	20%
San Gabriel County Water District	1,612,133,643	1,485,957,453	126,176,190	8%	102.9	5	20%
Helix Water District	8,454,736,636	8,067,103,778	387,632,858	5%	103.6	5	20%
Whittier City of	2,041,957,743	2,084,064,264	-42,106,521	-2%	104.2	5	20%
Great Oaks Water Company Incorporated	2,641,791,567	2,210,783,322	431,008,244	16%	104.2	5	20%
Hollister City of	832,612,930	742,476,980	90,135,950	11%	104.4	5	20%
Calexico City of	1,524,360,000	1,440,570,000	83,790,000	5%	104.6	5	20%
Oceanside City of	6,988,111,948	6,765,555,423	222,556,525	3%	105.3	5	20%
San Jose Water Company	36,046,000,000	31,608,300,000	4,437,700,000	12%	105.7	5	20%
Westminster City of	3,064,371,990	2,956,971,359	107,400,630	4%	105.9	5	20%
Escondido City of	4,625,134,351	4,059,907,513	565,226,838	12%	106.7	5	20%
Fairfield City of	5,435,000,000	4,853,000,000	582,000,000	11%	106.7	5	20%
Downey City of	4,090,256,554	3,834,059,128	256,197,426	6%	106.9	5	20%

Urban Water Suppliers and Proposed Regulatory Framework Tiers to Achieve 25% Use Reduction (Provisional)

Supplier Name	Total Water Production (gallons)		Total Water Saved (Jun-14 - Feb-15, compared to 2013)	Percent Saved (Jun-14 - Feb-15, compared to 2013)	Jul-Sep 2014 R GPCD	Tier	Conservation Standard
	2013 (Jun - Feb)	2014/15 (Jun-14 - Feb-15)					
Glendale City of	6,839,188,070	6,346,086,881	493,101,189	7%	107.1	5	20%
Marin Municipal Water District	7,006,662,670	5,966,662,221	1,040,000,448	15%	107.4	5	20%
Camarillo City of	2,747,943,839	2,399,416,293	348,527,546	13%	107.5	5	20%
California-American Water Company Sacramento District	8,801,191,649	7,285,565,423	1,515,626,225	17%	107.8	5	20%
Adelanto city of	1,091,834,544	993,603,394	98,231,150	9%	108.5	5	20%
Anaheim City of	16,337,538,847	15,992,788,037	344,750,810	2%	108.6	5	20%
Ukiah City of	678,601,000	551,722,000	126,879,000	19%	108.6	5	20%
Pico Rivera City of	1,267,056,981	1,099,162,034	167,894,948	13%	108.8	5	20%
Huntington Beach City of	7,506,541,568	7,116,888,432	389,653,136	5%	109.0	5	20%
Crescenta Valley Water District	1,200,433,997	1,043,760,838	156,673,159	13%	109.4	5	20%
Milpitas City of	2,719,687,979	2,424,775,231	294,912,748	11%	110.2	6	24%
Torrance City of	3,906,665,343	3,703,464,394	203,200,950	5%	111.0	6	24%
Vista Irrigation District	4,896,569,394	4,632,303,886	264,265,507	5%	111.1	6	24%
Martinez City of	1,027,679,751	871,695,210	155,984,540	15%	111.7	6	24%
Santa Monica City of	3,462,200,000	3,321,100,000	141,100,000	4%	111.7	6	24%
Perris, City of	437,809,090	430,597,020	7,212,070	2%	111.9	6	24%
Golden State Water Company Culver City	1,415,824,450	1,344,756,254	71,068,196	5%	113.1	6	24%
Lakeside Water District	1,064,566,388	977,942,044	86,624,343	8%	114.6	6	24%
Golden State Water Company S Arcadia	908,701,874	851,189,098	57,512,777	6%	116.0	6	24%
Vallecitos Water District	4,390,033,350	4,037,168,840	352,864,510	8%	116.1	6	24%
Soledad, City of	581,571,300	531,785,500	49,785,800	9%	116.7	6	24%
Manhattan Beach City of	1,219,661,891	1,153,188,200	66,473,691	5%	116.7	6	24%
Mesa Water District	4,434,609,825	4,283,056,327	151,553,499	3%	116.8	6	24%
Palo Alto City of	3,180,440,852	2,685,999,460	494,441,392	16%	116.8	6	24%
Gilroy City of	2,328,666,000	1,995,678,000	332,988,000	14%	117.6	6	24%
Humboldt Community Service District	610,120,000	573,669,000	36,451,000	6%	117.9	6	24%
Alhambra City of	2,575,148,433	2,329,573,763	245,574,669	10%	118.3	6	24%
Orchard Dale Water District	589,289,272	550,757,340	38,531,931	7%	118.7	6	24%
Buena Park City of	3,777,921,445	3,441,805,698	336,115,747	9%	118.9	6	24%
Pico Water District	1,029,001,320	960,057,631	68,943,690	7%	119.0	6	24%
Delano City of	2,386,120,000	2,229,650,000	156,470,000	7%	119.4	6	24%
El Centro City of	1,978,323,000	1,910,544,000	67,779,000	3%	119.5	6	24%
Woodland City of	2,938,159,020	2,454,292,204	483,866,816	16%	119.8	6	24%
Pleasanton City of	4,439,552,000	3,099,891,000	1,339,661,000	30%	119.8	6	24%
El Toro Water District	2,331,141,109	2,239,576,858	91,564,251	4%	119.9	6	24%
San Fernando City of	839,719,127	786,931,196	52,787,931	6%	120.3	6	24%
Suburban Water Systems San Jose Hills	7,160,122,399	6,833,016,444	327,105,955	5%	120.3	6	24%
Sunny Slope Water Company	1,052,785,122	950,022,234	102,762,888	10%	120.5	6	24%
California Water Service Company Livermore	2,781,467,781	1,909,163,511	872,304,270	31%	120.5	6	24%

Urban Water Suppliers and Proposed Regulatory Framework Tiers to Achieve 25% Use Reduction (Provisional)

Supplier Name	Total Water Production (gallons)		Total Water Saved (Jun-14 - Feb-15, compared to 2013)	Percent Saved (Jun-14 - Feb-15, compared to 2013)	Jul-Sep 2014 R- GPCD	Tier	Conservation Standard
	2013 (Jun - Feb)	2014/15 (Jun-14 - Feb-15)					
Laguna Beach County Water District	872,082,691	867,064,579	5,018,112	1%	121.0	6	24%
Fortuna City of	303,008,000	276,986,000	26,022,000	9%	121.2	6	24%
Golden State Water Company West Orange	4,000,477,969	3,830,090,258	170,387,711	4%	121.4	6	24%
Amador Water Agency	899,761,000	773,623,400	126,137,600	14%	121.6	6	24%
South Coast Water District	1,639,847,306	1,549,814,557	90,032,749	5%	121.7	6	24%
Napa City of	3,605,871,891	3,247,435,321	358,436,570	10%	124.1	6	24%
Alco Water Service	1,156,954,000	1,028,617,000	128,337,000	11%	124.2	6	24%
Coachella City of	1,395,900,000	1,294,010,000	101,890,000	7%	125.5	6	24%
California Water Service Company Marysville	575,127,769	496,597,575	78,530,194	14%	125.5	6	24%
Valley of the Moon Water District	800,300,880	646,691,259	153,609,621	19%	125.8	6	24%
Brea City of	2,826,761,129	2,727,376,444	99,384,685	4%	125.9	6	24%
Chino City of	3,332,449,959	3,123,999,542	208,450,416	6%	126.7	6	24%
Santa Margarita Water District	7,105,190,366	6,932,489,109	172,701,256	2%	126.8	6	24%
Reedley City of	1,302,000,000	1,109,000,000	193,000,000	15%	126.9	6	24%
Ontario City of	8,782,999,363	8,499,508,622	283,490,741	3%	126.9	6	24%
Valencia Water Company	7,817,224,611	6,780,899,767	1,036,324,844	13%	127.0	6	24%
Groveland Community Services District	127,297,632	96,625,396	30,672,236	24%	127.5	6	24%
Eureka City of	860,874,000	799,778,000	61,096,000	7%	128.0	6	24%
Petaluma City of	2,407,770,000	2,071,485,000	336,285,000	14%	129.0	6	24%
North Marin Water District	2,457,000,000	1,986,810,000	470,190,000	19%	129.1	6	24%
City of Newman Water Department	559,946,000	448,854,000	111,092,000	20%	129.2	6	24%
Tuolumne Utilities District	1,441,240,862	992,152,425	449,088,437	31%	129.3	6	24%
Monte Vista Water District	2,603,464,922	2,359,464,115	244,000,807	9%	130.3	7	28%
Twentynine Palms Water District	666,765,336	641,552,256	25,213,080	4%	130.6	7	28%
Eastern Municipal Water District	22,059,815,756	21,154,600,492	905,215,264	4%	130.7	7	28%
California Water Service Company Oroville	830,595,287	682,007,037	148,588,251	18%	131.6	7	28%
Healdsburg City of	540,150,000	446,810,000	93,340,000	17%	131.7	7	28%
Humboldt Bay Municipal Water District	146,056,000	148,820,000	-2,764,000	-2%	132.1	7	28%
Burbank City of	4,712,137,486	4,362,205,638	349,931,847	7%	132.2	7	28%
Arroyo Grande City of	776,210,684	654,635,517	121,575,167	16%	132.2	7	28%
Padre Dam Municipal Water District	2,952,148,758	2,752,858,026	199,290,733	7%	132.6	7	28%
San Juan Capistrano City of	2,040,416,466	1,962,283,810	78,132,655	4%	133.3	7	28%
Garden Grove City of	6,584,316,860	6,185,605,054	398,711,806	6%	133.6	7	28%
Del Oro Water Company	369,631,917	306,051,990	63,579,927	17%	134.3	7	28%
Tracy City of	4,529,625,694	3,497,663,768	1,031,961,925	23%	134.6	7	28%
Riverside City of	17,427,511,870	15,956,944,380	1,470,567,490	8%	135.3	7	28%
La Palma City of	545,401,972	497,342,471	48,059,501	9%	136.3	7	28%
Santa Maria City of	3,370,607,161	3,257,210,864	113,396,297	3%	136.6	7	28%
Lincoln Avenue Water Company	613,030,807	557,668,649	55,362,157	9%	137.2	7	28%

Urban Water Suppliers and Proposed Regulatory Framework Tiers to Achieve 25% Use Reduction (Provisional)

Supplier Name	Total Water Production (gallons)		Total Water Saved (Jun-14 - Feb-15, compared to 2013)	Percent Saved (Jun-14 - Feb-15, compared to 2013)	Jul-Sep 2014 R- GPCD	Tier	Conservation Standard
	2013 (Jun - Feb)	2014/15 (Jun-14 - Feb-15)					
La Habra City of Public Works	2,397,728,848	2,535,032,864	-137,304,016	-6%	137.5	7	28%
Golden State Water Company Placentia	1,868,334,327	1,778,757,770	89,576,557	5%	137.8	7	28%
Pasadena City of	8,349,297,631	7,614,975,148	734,322,483	9%	139.0	7	28%
Contra Costa Water District	8,855,338,380	7,547,370,752	1,307,967,628	15%	139.9	7	28%
Suburban Water Systems Whittier/La Mirada	5,584,910,982	5,234,793,399	350,117,583	6%	141.1	7	28%
Golden State Water Company Simi Valley	1,830,698,487	1,657,215,187	173,483,300	9%	141.5	7	28%
Lake Arrowhead Community Services District	440,648,885	386,238,213	54,410,671	12%	141.6	7	28%
Antioch City of	4,642,068,000	4,042,923,000	599,145,000	13%	141.9	7	28%
Big Bear City Community Services District	266,135,894	256,898,007	9,237,888	3%	142.4	7	28%
Sonoma City of	583,798,675	494,362,234	89,436,441	15%	142.5	7	28%
San Gabriel Valley Fontana Water Company	10,907,224,816	10,188,722,419	718,502,397	7%	142.9	7	28%
Tehachapi, City of	582,624,632	536,291,818	46,332,814	8%	143.8	7	28%
Davis City of	3,023,400,000	2,527,400,000	496,000,000	16%	143.9	7	28%
Benicia City of	1,543,102,018	1,217,315,761	325,786,257	21%	143.9	7	28%
California Water Service Company Dixon, City of	382,549,575	346,705,918	35,843,657	9%	144.3	7	28%
Suisun-Solano Water Authority	1,038,300,000	918,300,000	120,000,000	12%	144.5	7	28%
Sunnyslope County Water District	694,319,032	596,249,460	98,069,572	14%	144.6	7	28%
Roseville City of	8,448,024,096	6,930,859,852	1,517,164,244	18%	145.1	7	28%
Paso Robles City of	1,705,474,000	1,511,094,000	194,380,000	11%	146.0	7	28%
Sacramento City of	28,979,000,000	23,440,000,000	5,539,000,000	19%	146.4	7	28%
Walnut Valley Water District	5,119,451,770	4,877,344,159	242,107,610	5%	146.4	7	28%
Rialto City of	2,544,482,555	2,596,683,954	-52,201,399	-2%	146.9	7	28%
Diablo Water District	1,487,225,000	1,338,770,000	148,455,000	10%	147.7	7	28%
Patterson City of	1,040,156,104	948,595,320	91,560,784	9%	148.3	7	28%
San Dieguito Water District	1,583,703,106	1,621,176,020	-37,472,914	-2%	148.3	7	28%
Orange City of	7,732,617,288	7,437,395,896	295,221,393	4%	148.7	7	28%
California Water Service Company Kern River Valley	222,882,376	201,376,182	21,506,194	10%	148.9	7	28%
Fresno City of	36,603,191,424	30,513,707,650	6,089,483,774	17%	150.7	7	28%
Cerritos City of	2,219,233,953	1,991,297,621	227,936,332	10%	153.6	7	28%
Sanger City of	1,552,776,000	1,422,246,000	130,530,000	8%	153.6	7	28%
Monrovia City of	1,885,000,000	1,673,000,000	212,000,000	11%	154.6	7	28%
Covina City of	1,500,350,310	1,393,914,200	106,436,110	7%	154.7	7	28%
Lake Hemet Municipal Water District	2,880,852,466	2,579,961,258	300,891,208	10%	154.9	7	28%
Stockton City of	8,304,530,000	7,263,300,000	1,041,230,000	13%	155.0	7	28%
Ventura County Waterworks District No. 8	5,424,122,854	4,896,895,245	527,227,609	10%	156.1	7	28%
Tustin City of	2,984,049,613	2,895,189,929	88,859,684	3%	156.5	7	28%
California-American Water Company Los Angeles District	5,579,752,754	5,179,473,602	400,279,151	7%	156.8	7	28%
Fullerton City of	7,215,373,767	6,969,105,034	246,268,733	3%	157.4	7	28%
San Clemente City of	2,270,663,084	2,331,434,375	-60,771,291	-3%	157.7	7	28%

Urban Water Suppliers and Proposed Regulatory Framework Tiers to Achieve 25% Use Reduction (Provisional)

Supplier Name	Total Water Production (gallons)		Total Water Saved (Jun-14 - Feb-15, compared to 2013)	Percent Saved (Jun-14 - Feb-15, compared to 2013)	Jul-Sep 2014 R GPCD	Tier	Conservation Standard
	2013 (Jun - Feb)	2014/15 (Jun-14 - Feb-15)					
Chino Hills City of	3,952,965,804	3,587,674,904	365,290,900	9%	157.8	7	28%
Rubidoux Community Service District	1,400,190,000	1,335,510,000	64,680,000	5%	158.0	7	28%
Rosamond Community Service District	719,200,000	712,000,000	7,200,000	1%	158.3	7	28%
Santa Paula City of	1,218,270,506	1,081,725,724	136,544,782	11%	160.2	7	28%
North Tahoe Public Utility District	350,120,000	332,141,000	17,979,000	5%	161.3	7	28%
Atascadero Mutual Water Company	1,291,000,000	1,056,900,000	234,100,000	18%	163.0	7	28%
Thousand Oaks City of	3,106,634,920	2,792,709,655	313,925,265	10%	163.7	7	28%
Victorville Water District	4,985,852,685	4,486,322,447	499,530,238	10%	164.4	7	28%
Nipomo Community Services District	665,258,273	527,032,098	138,226,175	21%	165.4	7	28%
Fillmore City of	482,079,202	446,216,000	35,863,202	7%	165.6	7	28%
Ramona Municipal Water District	1,087,105,531	1,049,746,665	37,358,866	3%	165.9	7	28%
Golden State Water Company Barstow	1,595,531,512	1,445,509,515	150,021,997	9%	166.2	7	28%
El Dorado Irrigation District	10,044,044,386	7,600,810,386	2,443,234,000	24%	166.2	7	28%
Ceres City of	1,985,969,000	1,848,968,000	137,001,000	7%	166.3	7	28%
California Water Service Company Willows	364,301,895	318,682,696	45,619,200	13%	168.6	7	28%
East Valley Water District	5,405,695,956	4,782,879,831	622,816,125	12%	169.4	7	28%
Joshua Basin Water District	409,078,118	382,604,644	26,473,473	6%	169.6	7	28%
Newport Beach City of	4,220,349,478	3,924,557,845	295,791,633	7%	170.3	8	32%
South Pasadena City of	1,045,005,526	935,193,595	109,811,931	11%	171.1	8	32%
Imperial, City of	687,420,000	671,127,000	16,293,000	2%	171.9	8	32%
Ventura County Waterworks District No 1	2,688,665,294	2,241,890,403	446,774,892	17%	172.0	8	32%
Dinuba City of	1,126,830,000	977,550,000	149,280,000	13%	172.3	8	32%
Madera City of	2,268,235,000	2,115,715,000	152,520,000	7%	173.5	8	32%
California Water Service Company Los Altos/Suburban	3,714,706,268	3,136,645,836	578,060,431	16%	173.8	8	32%
Hesperia Water District City of	3,676,581,651	3,538,094,794	138,486,856	4%	174.6	8	32%
Castaic Lake Water Agency Santa Clarita Water Division	7,358,051,073	6,493,567,237	864,483,836	12%	174.8	8	32%
Brentwood City of	3,038,220,000	2,663,210,000	375,010,000	12%	174.8	8	32%
Arvin Community Services District	740,072,884	667,768,501	72,304,383	10%	175.3	8	32%
Palmdale Water District	5,291,175,472	5,010,063,446	281,112,026	5%	175.9	8	32%
San Jacinto City of	756,372,530	651,046,816	105,325,714	14%	176.1	8	32%
La Verne City of	2,094,159,141	1,955,656,970	138,502,171	7%	176.5	8	32%
Newhall County Water District	2,611,216,927	2,326,139,289	285,077,638	11%	178.3	8	32%
Rincon Del Diablo Municipal Water District	1,766,766,437	1,514,883,284	251,883,153	14%	179.2	8	32%
Mission Springs Water District	2,072,832,166	1,979,439,888	93,392,277	5%	179.4	8	32%
Brawley City of	1,842,390,000	1,088,690,000	753,700,000	41%	179.6	8	32%
Calaveras County Water District	1,468,843,000	1,200,100,000	268,743,000	18%	180.4	8	32%
Banning City of	2,219,758,574	2,058,002,667	161,755,907	7%	181.2	8	32%
Phelan Pinon Hills Community Services District	635,139,826	675,206,517	-40,066,691	-6%	181.6	8	32%
Porterville City of	3,123,277,400	2,849,237,200	274,040,200	9%	182.0	8	32%

Urban Water Suppliers and Proposed Regulatory Framework Tiers to Achieve 25% Use Reduction (Provisional)

Supplier Name	Total Water Production (gallons)		Total Water Saved (Jun-14 - Feb-15, compared to 2013)	Percent Saved (Jun-14 - Feb-15, compared to 2013)	Jul-Sep 2014 R GPCD	Tier	Conservation Standard
	2013 (Jun - Feb)	2014/15 (Jun-14 - Feb-15)					
Sacramento County Water Agency	9,991,675,171	8,451,666,395	1,540,008,776	15%	184.3	8	32%
California-American Water Ventura District	4,397,006,571	3,988,454,052	408,552,519	9%	184.6	8	32%
Blythe City of	806,370,000	811,680,000	-5,310,000	-1%	185.8	8	32%
Yreka, City of	593,290,000	519,800,000	73,490,000	12%	186.6	8	32%
Yuba City City of	4,215,490,000	3,629,080,000	586,410,000	14%	188.2	8	32%
Carlsbad Municipal Water District	4,342,002,850	4,259,269,173	82,733,677	2%	188.5	8	32%
California Water Service Company Selma	1,492,399,536	1,239,212,977	253,186,559	17%	189.2	8	32%
Western Municipal Water District of Riverside	5,887,379,311	5,683,989,367	203,389,944	3%	189.2	8	32%
West Kern Water District	4,045,106,581	3,679,048,346	366,058,235	9%	191.3	8	32%
Riverbank City of	860,786,846	737,503,990	123,282,856	14%	191.4	8	32%
Pismo Beach City of	434,216,578	359,495,587	74,720,991	17%	191.7	8	32%
California Water Service Company Visalia	8,033,215,230	7,144,292,537	888,922,693	11%	191.7	8	32%
Hemet City of	1,116,063,947	1,045,970,047	70,093,900	6%	192.6	8	32%
Hanford City of	3,229,776,700	2,793,029,816	436,746,884	14%	193.7	8	32%
Turlock City of	5,571,505,100	4,909,059,441	662,445,659	12%	194.0	8	32%
Corona City of	8,699,410,000	8,297,070,000	402,340,000	5%	194.3	8	32%
Trabuco Canyon Water District	764,121,596	767,705,962	-3,584,366	0%	194.9	8	32%
Triunfo Sanitation District / Oak Park Water Service	687,285,830	597,937,369	89,348,461	13%	195.7	8	32%
Lamont Public Utility District	993,121,000	914,688,000	78,433,000	8%	197.5	8	32%
California Water Service Company Bakersfield	18,863,864,960	16,841,305,153	2,022,559,807	11%	197.6	8	32%
Morgan Hill City of	2,262,311,000	1,786,089,000	476,222,000	21%	198.5	8	32%
Jurupa Community Service District	6,546,170,411	6,107,698,865	438,471,545	7%	198.6	8	32%
Lemoore City of	1,967,044,000	1,783,354,000	183,690,000	9%	198.9	8	32%
Cucamonga Valley Water District	12,916,078,335	12,778,430,872	137,647,463	1%	199.2	8	32%
Vacaville City of	4,536,829,418	3,868,833,993	667,995,425	15%	199.9	8	32%
Citrus Heights Water District	3,723,178,405	3,023,575,391	699,603,014	19%	201.4	8	32%
Poway City of	2,984,245,124	2,893,299,991	90,945,133	3%	201.7	8	32%
Livingston City of	1,870,481,000	1,810,513,000	59,968,000	3%	204.2	8	32%
Shasta Lake City of	309,004,338	258,461,000	50,543,338	16%	205.5	8	32%
Elsinore Valley Municipal Water District	6,567,437,756	6,285,445,931	281,991,825	4%	205.8	8	32%
Galt City of	1,302,667,000	1,052,546,000	250,121,000	19%	207.2	8	32%
Lee Lake Water District	760,491,304	738,717,756	21,773,548	3%	208.1	8	32%
Casitas Municipal Water District	777,155,653	678,096,820	99,058,834	13%	209.1	8	32%
Golden State Water Company Ojai	564,830,864	487,636,661	77,194,203	14%	209.2	8	32%
San Bernardino County Service Area 70	457,322,702	431,251,330	26,071,373	6%	209.8	8	32%
Golden State Water Company San Dimas	3,063,589,946	2,950,649,842	112,940,105	4%	209.9	8	32%
California Water Service Company Chico District	6,759,462,002	5,680,893,778	1,078,568,223	16%	210.4	8	32%
San Bernardino City of	11,535,034,614	10,722,937,586	812,097,028	7%	212.1	8	32%
West Valley Water District	5,029,549,361	4,747,557,536	281,991,825	6%	212.3	8	32%

Urban Water Suppliers and Proposed Regulatory Framework Tiers to Achieve 25% Use Reduction (Provisional)

Supplier Name	Total Water Production (gallons)		Total Water Saved (Jun-14 - Feb-15, compared to 2013)	Percent Saved (Jun-14 - Feb-15, compared to 2013)	Jul-Sep 2014 R GPCD	Tier	Conservation Standard
	2013 (Jun - Feb)	2014/15 (Jun-14 - Feb-15)					
Colton, City of	2,519,711,330	2,487,549,794	32,161,536	1%	213.1	8	32%
Manteca City of	3,844,580,000	3,212,645,000	631,935,000	16%	213.3	8	32%
Folsom City of	5,476,678,514	4,592,545,306	884,133,208	16%	213.7	8	32%
Sierra Madre City of	616,142,059	546,575,118	69,566,941	11%	214.2	8	32%
Tulare, City of	4,805,328,900	4,324,313,800	481,015,100	10%	214.8	8	32%
Indio City of	5,340,000,000	5,006,100,000	333,900,000	6%	215.6	9	36%
Apple Valley Ranchos Water Company	4,101,713,205	3,942,264,436	159,448,769	4%	215.7	9	36%
Oakdale City of	1,417,000,000	1,139,000,000	278,000,000	20%	215.9	9	36%
Fallbrook Public Utility District	3,340,661,415	3,012,268,347	328,393,068	10%	217.3	9	36%
Kerman, City of	880,465,000	769,624,000	110,841,000	13%	217.9	9	36%
Exeter City of	600,332,681	535,287,408	65,045,273	11%	218.8	9	36%
Georgetown Divide Public Utilities District	512,901,000	410,416,000	102,485,000	20%	219.4	9	36%
Yorba Linda Water District	5,380,523,933	5,128,021,662	252,502,271	5%	220.2	9	36%
Rubio Canyon Land and Water Association	561,116,157	508,002,375	53,113,783	9%	220.8	9	36%
Elk Grove Water Service	1,982,552,982	1,615,618,816	366,934,166	19%	221.6	9	36%
Sacramento Suburban Water District	9,630,759,000	8,318,514,000	1,312,245,000	14%	222.5	9	36%
Los Angeles County Public Works Waterworks District 40	12,870,711,018	11,980,791,220	889,919,798	7%	223.1	9	36%
Corcoran City of	1,162,447,000	950,206,000	212,241,000	18%	223.7	9	36%
Norco City of	2,009,949,357	1,856,691,656	153,257,702	8%	224.3	9	36%
Winton Water & Sanitary District	432,243,000	400,904,000	31,339,000	7%	228.9	9	36%
Montecito Water District	1,577,349,003	836,688,709	740,660,294	47%	228.9	9	36%
Camrosa Water District	2,469,015,365	2,141,221,863	327,793,502	13%	229.4	9	36%
Wasco City of	1,096,680,000	952,170,000	144,510,000	13%	231.1	9	36%
South Tahoe Public Utilities District	1,641,227,000	1,550,474,000	90,753,000	6%	231.5	9	36%
Upland City of	5,523,683,657	5,024,215,355	499,468,301	9%	234.9	9	36%
Clovis City of	6,737,008,000	6,080,852,000	656,156,000	10%	235.2	9	36%
Beverly Hills City of	2,984,049,613	2,900,957,499	83,092,114	3%	235.8	9	36%
Loma Linda City of *	1,379,990,569	1,323,839,525	56,151,044	4%	236.1	9	36%
Shafter City of	1,350,000,000	1,154,000,000	196,000,000	15%	236.5	9	36%
Fruitridge Vista Water Company	1,000,084,300	823,053,400	177,030,900	18%	238.3	9	36%
Glendora City of	3,108,798,089	3,089,127,284	19,670,805	1%	242.0	9	36%
Carmichael Water District	2,598,570,000	2,107,250,000	491,320,000	19%	242.5	9	36%
Placer County Water Agency	7,686,123,771	6,395,079,193	1,291,044,578	17%	242.5	9	36%
Golden State Water Company Orcutt	1,941,781,239	1,705,636,709	236,144,529	12%	242.8	9	36%
Rainbow Municipal Water District	3,976,593,060	3,760,749,074	215,843,985	5%	243.0	9	36%
Modesto, City of	15,589,770,183	13,698,086,925	1,891,683,258	12%	245.9	9	36%
Pinedale County Water District	267,792,348	224,289,932	43,502,416	16%	247.0	9	36%
Los Angeles County Public Works Waterworks District 29	2,383,427,229	2,356,081,777	27,345,452	1%	248.9	9	36%
Lincoln City of	2,592,190,000	2,158,050,000	434,140,000	17%	251.0	9	36%

Urban Water Suppliers and Proposed Regulatory Framework Tiers to Achieve 25% Use Reduction (Provisional)

Supplier Name	Total Water Production (gallons)		Total Water Saved (Jun-14 - Feb-15, compared to 2013)	Percent Saved (Jun-14 - Feb-15, compared to 2013)	Jul-Sep 2014 R- GPCD	Tier	Conservation Standard
	2013 (Jun - Feb)	2014/15 (Jun-14 - Feb-15)					
California Water Service Company Bear Gulch	3,623,142,017	3,228,861,790	394,280,227	11%	252.5	9	36%
Los Banos, City of	2,053,870,000	1,905,101,000	148,769,000	7%	253.0	9	36%
Redding City of	7,109,010,000	5,934,100,000	1,174,910,000	17%	253.7	9	36%
Riverside Highland Water Company	971,591,200	889,248,544	82,342,656	8%	253.9	9	36%
California Water Service Company Palos Verdes	5,184,622,055	4,979,661,507	204,960,548	4%	255.4	9	36%
Olivehurst Public Utility District	1,161,641,529	959,245,393	202,396,137	17%	256.0	9	36%
San Bernardino County Service Area 64	758,722,238	679,807,540	78,914,699	10%	257.5	9	36%
Mammoth Community Water District	499,483,000	447,407,000	52,076,000	10%	259.3	9	36%
Anderson, City of	572,342,000	498,676,000	73,666,000	13%	260.8	9	36%
Rio Vista, city of	641,312,000	606,333,000	34,979,000	5%	260.9	9	36%
Indian Wells Valley Water District	1,861,884,000	1,789,365,000	72,519,000	4%	263.5	9	36%
West Sacramento City of	3,567,747,274	2,941,460,832	626,286,443	18%	264.3	9	36%
Yucaipa Valley Water District	2,981,840,000	2,837,629,000	144,211,000	5%	265.0	9	36%
Paradise Irrigation District	1,721,400,000	1,355,900,000	365,500,000	21%	266.0	9	36%
Nevada Irrigation District	2,750,729,000	2,339,997,000	410,732,000	15%	267.7	9	36%
Beaumont-Cherry Valley Water District	3,172,199,486	3,139,252,648	32,946,838	1%	269.7	9	36%
Olivenhain Municipal Water District	5,326,497,766	5,149,755,952	176,741,814	3%	271.7	9	36%
East Niles Community Service District	2,504,168,216	2,213,508,744	290,659,473	12%	271.8	9	36%
Fair Oaks Water District	3,068,959,978	2,450,034,519	618,925,459	20%	274.1	9	36%
Discovery Bay Community Services District	986,000,000	808,000,000	178,000,000	18%	276.3	9	36%
East Orange County Water District	247,060,552	225,554,358	21,506,194	9%	277.6	9	36%
Rio Linda - Elverta Community Water District	770,017,391	629,595,315	140,422,076	18%	278.1	9	36%
Bakersfield City of	11,705,594,680	10,744,390,565	961,204,114	8%	279.9	9	36%
Truckee-Donner Public Utilities District	1,264,764,466	1,144,274,188	120,490,278	10%	282.0	9	36%
Lodi City of Public Works Department	3,904,230,000	3,932,720,000	-28,490,000	-1%	287.7	9	36%
Valley Center Municipal Water District	6,829,813,325	6,798,466,417	31,346,907	0%	291.2	9	36%
Tahoe City Public Utilities District	372,523,331	326,265,848	46,257,483	12%	292.6	9	36%
Red Bluff City of	904,393,249	764,891,212	139,502,037	15%	294.5	9	36%
California Water Service Company Antelope Valley	186,061,165	216,691,199	-30,630,034	-16%	296.6	9	36%
Golden State Water Company Claremont	2,873,781,490	2,604,204,605	269,576,886	9%	297.6	9	36%
Merced City of	6,872,130,000	6,271,910,000	600,220,000	9%	298.8	9	36%
Bakman Water Company	1,032,655,497	893,235,946	139,419,551	14%	302.2	9	36%
Las Virgenes Municipal Water District	5,714,163,209	5,470,784,778	243,378,431	4%	304.8	9	36%
Oildale Mutual Water Company	2,485,920,537	2,317,129,497	168,791,039	7%	306.4	9	36%
California City City of	1,192,746,563	1,264,824,899	-72,078,336	-6%	307.0	9	36%
Atwater City of	2,358,960,000	1,821,770,000	537,190,000	23%	308.0	9	36%
Golden State Water Company Cordova	4,051,962,495	3,483,514,680	568,447,814	14%	312.4	9	36%
Redlands City of	7,033,861,488	6,969,114,810	64,746,679	1%	313.2	9	36%
Ripon City of	1,431,002,833	1,223,409,134	207,593,699	15%	316.1	9	36%

Urban Water Suppliers and Proposed Regulatory Framework Tiers to Achieve 25% Use Reduction (Provisional)

Supplier Name	Total Water Production (gallons)		Total Water Saved (Jun-14 - Feb-15, compared to 2013)	Percent Saved (Jun-14 - Feb-15, compared to 2013)	Jul-Sep 2014 R- GPCD	Tier	Conservation Standard
	2013 (Jun - Feb)	2014/15 (Jun-14 - Feb-15)					
Arcadia City of	4,352,404,027	4,033,916,843	318,487,185	7%	318.5	9	36%
Hillsborough Town of	877,331,034	658,647,771	218,683,262	25%	324.5	9	36%
Madera County	891,468,716	660,496,910	230,971,806	26%	328.1	9	36%
Kingsburg, City of	1,009,319,000	825,793,000	183,526,000	18%	332.7	9	36%
California Water Service Company Westlake	2,085,449,133	1,928,388,745	157,060,388	8%	336.7	9	36%
Rancho California Water District	16,377,618,572	16,074,902,597	302,715,976	2%	349.1	9	36%
Linda County Water District	971,706,000	880,037,000	91,669,000	9%	349.1	9	36%
Orange Vale Water Company	1,274,470,101	1,008,190,832	266,279,269	21%	354.3	9	36%
Quartz Hill Water District	1,430,054,382	1,276,190,597	153,863,785	11%	364.9	9	36%
Susanville City of	560,250,000	602,070,000	-41,820,000	-7%	383.0	9	36%
Bella Vista Water District	3,596,422,200	1,864,847,717	1,731,574,483	48%	386.3	9	36%
Valley Water Company	999,093,060	898,861,161	100,231,899	10%	400.8	9	36%
Desert Water Agency	8,823,730,792	8,310,188,943	513,541,849	6%	416.0	9	36%
South Feather Water and Power Agency	1,435,400,000	1,292,100,000	143,300,000	10%	465.9	9	36%
Coachella Valley Water District	28,323,853,249	27,188,261,025	1,135,592,223	4%	475.1	9	36%
San Juan Water District	3,594,268,324	2,773,624,539	820,643,785	23%	484.3	9	36%
Vaughn Water Company	3,206,837,858	2,989,389,519	217,448,339	7%	507.0	9	36%
Serrano Water District	829,682,903	749,230,186	80,452,717	10%	539.0	9	36%
Golden State Water Company Cowan Heights	703,676,157	691,163,462	12,512,695	2%	572.4	9	36%
Santa Fe Irrigation District	2,820,156,121	2,869,480,251	-49,324,131	-2%	604.6	9	36%
Myoma Dunes Mutual Water Company	757,700,108	707,153,944	50,546,164	7%	612.5	9	36%