Appendix A

References

Appendix A - References

Association of Bay Area Governments. Projections 2005. (December 2004).

Contra Costa Water District. Emergency Operations Plan. (August 2001).

Contra Costa Water District. Future Water Supply Study Update. (December 2002).

Contra Costa Water District. Seismic Reliability Improvement Project. (1997).

Contra Costa Water District. Ten-Year Capital Improvement Program For Fiscal Years 2006 - 2015. (February 2005).

EDAW. Future Water Supply Study. (August 1996).

EDAW. Future Water Supply Implementation Draft Environmental Impact Report. (September 1998).

EDAW. Future Water Supply Implementation Final Environmental Impact Report. (February 1999).

United States Bureau of Reclamation. Central Valley Project M&I Water Shortage Policy. (Draft September 2001).

United States Bureau of Reclamation. Long-Term Renewal Contract Between the United States and Contra Costa Water District Providing For Water Service and For Facilities Repayment. (May 2005).

Appendix B

Letters to Municipal Customers and Service Area Communities

Mailing List for UWMP Notifications

Municipal Customers

Mr. Mike Yeraka
General Manager
Diablo Water District
2107 Main Street
Oakley, CA 94561

Mr. Phil Harrington, Director
City of Antioch
Public Works Department
212 H Street, P.O. Box 5007
Antioch, CA 94509

Mr. John Fuller
Director of Public Works
65 Civic Avenue
Pittsburg, CA 94565

Ms. Katherine Lawson
Golden State Water Company
3035 Prospect Park, Suite 60
Rancho Cordova, CA 95670

Mr. Richard Pearson
Director of Community Development
City of Martinez
525 Henrietta Street
Martinez, CA 94553

Wastewater Agencies

Ms. Ann Farrell
Director of Engineering
Central Contra Costa Sanitary District
5019 Imhoff Place
Martinez, CA 94553-4392

Mr. Greg Baatrup
Technical Services Manager
Delta Diablo Sanitation District
2500 Pittsburg-Antioch Highway
Antioch, CA 94509-13732

Mr. Dave Contreras
District Manager
Mt. View Sanitary District
P.O. Box 2757
Martinez CA, 94553

Mr. Tom Williams
General Manager
Ironhouse Sanitary District
450 Walnut Meadows Drive
Oakley, CA 94561

Cities and Communities

Mr. Dennis Barry
Director
Contra Costa County Community Development Dept.
651 Pine Street, 4th Floor, North Wing
Martinez, CA 94553

Mr. Jim Forsberg
Director of Planning & Economic Development
1950 Parkside Drive
Concord, CA 94519

Mr. Jeremy Graves
Director
Community Development Dept.
City of Clayton
6000 Heritage Trail
Clayton, CA 94517

Ms. Rebecca Willis
Director
Community Development Dept.
City of Oakley
P.O. Box 6
3633 Main Street
Oakley, CA 94561

Ms. Valerie Barone
Director
Community Development Dept.
City of Walnut Creek
1666 North Main Street
Walnut Creek, CA 94596

Mr. Steve Wallace
Director
Community Development Dept.
City of Pleasant Hill
100 Gregory Lane
Pleasant Hill, CA 94523

Mr. Richard Pearson
Director
Community Development Dept
City of Martinez
525 Henrietta Street
Martinez, CA 94553

Mr. Howard Sword
Director of Community Development
City of Brentwood
104 Oak Street
Brentwood, CA 94513

CONTRA COSTA
WATER DISTRICT

1331 Concord Avenue
P.O. Box H20
Concord, CA 94524
(925) 688-8000 FAX (925) 688-8122

June 1, 2005

Directors
Joseph L. Campbell
President

Elizabeth R. Anello
Vice President

Bette Boatmun
John A. Burgh
Karl L. Wandry

Walter J. Bishop
General Manager

Mr. Mike Yeraka
General Manager
Diablo Water District
2107 Main Street
Oakley, CA 94561

Subject: Urban Water Management Plan Update

Dear Mike:

The California Urban Water Management Planning Act (California Water Code Division 6, Part 2.6, Sections 10610 through 10656) requires that each urban water supplier, providing water for municipal purposes either directly or indirectly to more than 3,000 customers or supplying more than 3,000 acre-feet of water annually, shall prepare, update and adopt its urban water management plan (UWMP) at least once every five years. The next urban water management plan is due to the Department of Water Resources by December 31, 2005.

One requirement of the UWMP Act is that agencies that rely on a wholesale agency as a source of supply "shall provide the wholesale agency with water use projections from that agency for that source of water in five-year increments to 20 years or as far as data is available." Enclosed are the projected demands the District is currently assuming for the Diablo Water District. Please review the demand projections and provide any comments or updated information by July 1, 2005.

The District is preparing a summary of relevant data on the reliability of its supply to municipal customers during normal, dry, and multiple dry water years in support of the information required by UWMP Act and for use in our municipal customers' UWMPs. This information will be provided for your information in August 2005. A draft of the District's UWMP will be available for review in October 2005.

Please contact me at (925) 688-8312 or Jeff Quimby, Senior Engineer at (925) 688-8310 if you have any additional questions about the District's Urban Water Management Plan update or the enclosed material.

Sincerely,

Fran Garland
Principal Planner

Enclosure
File: Project #50533100

Contra Costa Water District
Draft Demand Projections for the 2005 Urban Water Management Plan Update
June 1, 2005

Demand Projections, Acre-Feet/year	2010	2015	2020	2025	2030
Diablo Water District	8,300	10,200	12,100	13,900	15,700

Please review the demand projections and send any comments or updated information by July 1, 2005 to:

Jeff Quimby
Contra Costa Water District
1331 Concord Avenue
Post Office Box H2O
Concord, CA 94524-2099

CONTRA COSTA
WATER DISTRICT

1331 Concord Avenue
P.O. Box H20
Concord, CA 94524
(925) 688-8000 FAX (925) 688-8122

September 1, 2005

Directors
Joseph L. Campbell
President

Elizabeth R. Anello
Vice President

Bette Boatmun
John A. Burgh
Karl L. Wandry

Walter J. Bishop
General Manager

Mr. Mike Yeraka
General Manager
Diablo Water District
2107 Main Street
Oakley, CA 94561

Subject: Urban Water Management Plan – Supply Reliability Analysis

Dear ~~Mr. Yeraka~~ mike:

The Contra Costa Water District (District) is currently preparing an update to its Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP). In conformance with California Water Code Division 5, Part 2.6, Section 10635, the District has prepared an assessment of its water supply reliability. This analysis is being provided to all wholesale municipal customers of the District for use in the preparation of their UWMPs.

Existing demand and demand projections for the District's service area in five-year increments over the next 25 years are shown in Table 1. The projections are consistent with the projections presented in the District's 2002 Future Water Supply Study (FWSS).

Table 2 presents the existing sources of supply and their expected availability under various supply conditions in five-year increments over the next 25 years. If your agency uses groundwater for municipal supply, we would appreciate data on your past 5 years of groundwater pumpage so we can update this overall supply analysis accordingly.

Table 3 shows the comparison between projected water supply and demand over the next 25 years. The water supply reliability goal approved by the District's Board of Directors is to meet at least 85 percent of demand in a second or third dry year and 100 percent of demand in other years. The remaining 15 percent would be met by a combination of short-term water purchases and a voluntary short-term conservation program.

Note that near-term demands can be met under all supply conditions. However, beginning in 2010, during the second and third years of a multi-year drought, short-term water purchases in conjunction with a request for up to a 5 and 15 percent, respectively, voluntary short-term conservation would be considered to meet

demands. The maximum amount of short-term conservation expected to be necessary is 15 percent of demand.

We will follow up this letter with a phone call to you within the next two weeks to discuss whether you might have any questions or concerns about this information; however, should you have any questions about the District's UWMP or the enclosed material prior to hearing from our office, please feel free to contact me at (925) 688-8312.

Sincerely,

Fran Garland
Principal Planner

Enclosures

File: Project #50533100

Table 1: Past, Current and Projected Water Demands

Water Use Sectors	2000 (actual) (af/yr)	2004 (actual) (af/yr)	2005 (af/yr)	2010 (af/yr)	2015 (af/yr)	2020 (af/yr)	2025 (af/yr)	2030 (af/yr)
Raw Water Service Area								
Municipal[a]	47,057	53,055	52,383	57,708	63,862	70,015	73,912	77,809
Major Industrial/Irrigation/Ag.[b]	34,836	42,537	53,507	72,177	72,177	72,177	72,177	72,177
Unincorporated Areas	233	251	259	284	305	326	349	371
Subtotal	82,126	95,843	106,148	130,169	136,344	142,518	146,438	150,357
Treated Water Service Area	41,098	43,446	46,434	51,769	54,162	56,555	57,795	59,034
Other Uses								
Other Unincorporated Areas	213	248	262	310	354	398	428	457
Conveyance Losses	10,225	12,500	12,500	12,500	12,500	12,500	12,500	12,500
TOTAL SERVICE AREA [c]	133,662	152,037	165,300	194,700	203,400	212,000	217,200	222,300

(a) Actuals include CCWD municipal sales, City of Antioch River diversions, and an estimate of 3,000 af/yr of groundwater use. Projected water demands have not been reduced by expected water conservation savings.
(b) Future projections of major industrial use include a placeholder amount for industrial customers currently using less than capacity.
(c) All projections have been rounded to the nearest hundred acre-foot/year.

Table 2: Projected Water Supply

Condition [a]	CVP (af/yr)	Industrial Diversions (af/yr)	Mallard Slough [b] (af/yr)	Antioch Diversions[c] (af/yr)	Ground-water [d] (af/yr)	ECCID Purchases (af/yr)	Recycled Water (af/yr)	Total Firm Supply (af/yr)	Conser-vation savings (af/yr)	Total Supply (af/yr)
2005										
Normal	174,100	10,000	3,100	6,700	3,000	5,700	7,500	210,100	1,900	212,000
Single-Year Drought	148,000	0	0	0	3,000	9,700	7,500	168,200	1,900	170,100
Multi-Year Drought (yr 1)	148,000	0	0	0	3,000	9,700	7,500	168,200	1,900	170,100
Multi-Year Drought (yr 2)	130,600	0	0	0	3,000	9,700	7,500	150,800	1,900	152,700
Multi-Year Drought (yr 3)	113,200	0	0	0	3,000	9,700	7,500	133,400	1,900	135,300
2010										
Normal	194,700	10,000	3,100	6,700	3,000	7,000	12,000	236,500	3,800	240,300
Single-Year Drought	165,500	0	0	0	3,000	11,000	12,000	191,500	3,800	195,300
Multi-Year Drought (yr 1)	165,500	0	0	0	3,000	11,000	12,000	191,500	3,800	195,300
Multi-Year Drought (yr 2)	146,000	0	0	0	3,000	11,000	12,000	172,000	3,800	175,800
Multi-Year Drought (yr 3)	126,600	0	0	0	3,000	11,000	12,000	152,600	3,800	156,400
2015										
Normal	195,000	10,000	3,100	6,700	3,000	8,200	12,000	238,000	6,200	244,200
Single-Year Drought	165,800	0	0	0	3,000	12,200	12,000	193,000	6,200	199,200
Multi-Year Drought (yr 1)	165,800	0	0	0	3,000	12,200	12,000	193,000	6,200	199,200
Multi-Year Drought (yr 2)	146,300	0	0	0	3,000	12,200	12,000	173,500	6,200	179,700
Multi-Year Drought (yr 3)	126,800	0	0	0	3,000	12,200	12,000	154,000	6,200	160,200
2020										
Normal	195,000	10,000	3,100	6,700	3,000	8,200	12,000	238,000	8,500	246,500
Single-Year Drought	165,800	0	0	0	3,000	12,200	12,000	193,000	8,500	201,500
Multi-Year Drought (yr 1)	165,800	0	0	0	3,000	12,200	12,000	193,000	8,500	201,500
Multi-Year Drought (yr 2)	146,300	0	0	0	3,000	12,200	12,000	173,500	8,500	182,000
Multi-Year Drought (yr 3)	126,800	0	0	0	3,000	12,200	12,000	154,000	8,500	162,500
2025										
Normal	195,000	10,000	3,100	6,700	3,000	8,200	12,000	238,000	11,100	249,100
Single-Year Drought	165,800	0	0	0	3,000	12,200	12,000	193,000	11,100	204,100
Multi-Year Drought (yr 1)	165,800	0	0	0	3,000	12,200	12,000	193,000	11,100	204,100
Multi-Year Drought (yr 2)	146,300	0	0	0	3,000	12,200	12,000	173,500	11,100	184,600
Multi-Year Drought (yr 3)	126,800	0	0	0	3,000	12,200	12,000	154,000	11,100	165,100
2030										
Normal	195,000	10,000	3,100	6,700	3,000	8,200	12,000	238,000	13,600	251,600
Single-Year Drought	165,800	0	0	0	3,000	12,200	12,000	193,000	13,600	206,600
Multi-Year Drought (yr 1)	165,800	0	0	0	3,000	12,200	12,000	193,000	13,600	206,600
Multi-Year Drought (yr 2)	146,300	0	0	0	3,000	12,200	12,000	173,500	13,600	187,100
Multi-Year Drought (yr 3)	126,800	0	0	0	3,000	12,200	12,000	154,000	13,600	167,600

a) 2005 UWMP: The CVP conditions used for supply planning are defined as follows: Normal is Adjusted Historical Use. **Single Year Drought and Multi-year drought (year 1) supply is 85 percent of Historical Use.** Multi-Year Drought (year 2) is 75 percent of Historical Use. Multi-Year Drought (year 3) is 65 percent of Historical Use.

b) Average annual diversion over 15 year period (1990 - 2004).

c) Average annual diversion over 6 year period since pumping plant improvements (1999 - 2004).

d) Groundwater represents production from Mallard Wells, Diablo Water District wells, and miscellaneous other wells in the District's service area.

Table 3: Projected Supply and Demand Comparison

Condition [a]	Demand (af/yr)	Available Supply (af/yr)	Supply Deficit (af/yr)	Planned Purchases [b] (af/yr)	Short-term Demand Management [c] (af/yr)
2005					
Normal	165,300	212,000	none	-	-
Single-Year Drought	165,300	170,100	none	-	-
Multi-Year Drought (yr 1)	165,300	170,100	none	-	-
Multi-Year Drought (yr 2)	165,300	152,700	12,600	-	-
Multi-Year Drought (yr 3)	165,300	135,300	30,000	-	-
2010					
Normal	194,700	240,300	none	-	-
Single-Year Drought	194,700	195,300	none	-	-
Multi-Year Drought (yr 1)	194,700	195,300	none	-	-
Multi-Year Drought (yr 2)	194,700	175,800	18,900	9,000	9,900
Multi-Year Drought (yr 3)	194,700	156,400	38,300	9,000	29,300
2015					
Normal	203,400	244,200	none	-	-
Single-Year Drought	203,400	199,200	4,200	5,000	-
Multi-Year Drought (yr 1)	203,400	199,200	4,200	5,000	-
Multi-Year Drought (yr 2)	203,400	179,700	23,700	13,000	10,700
Multi-Year Drought (yr 3)	203,400	160,200	43,200	13,000	30,200
2020					
Normal	212,000	246,500	none	-	-
Single-Year Drought	212,000	201,500	10,500	11,000	-
Multi-Year Drought (yr 1)	212,000	201,500	10,500	11,000	-
Multi-Year Drought (yr 2)	212,000	182,000	30,000	18,000	12,000
Multi-Year Drought (yr 3)	212,000	162,500	49,500	18,000	31,500
2025					
Normal	217,200	249,100	none	-	-
Single-Year Drought	217,200	204,100	13,100	14,000	-
Multi-Year Drought (yr 1)	217,200	204,100	13,100	14,000	-
Multi-Year Drought (yr 2)	217,200	184,600	32,600	19,500	13,100
Multi-Year Drought (yr 3)	217,200	165,100	52,100	19,500	32,600
2030					
Normal	222,300	251,600	none	-	-
Single-Year Drought	222,300	206,600	15,700	16,000	-
Multi-Year Drought (yr 1)	222,300	206,600	15,700	16,000	-
Multi-Year Drought (yr 2)	222,300	187,100	35,200	21,500	13,700
Multi-Year Drought (yr 3)	222,300	167,600	54,700	21,500	33,200

a) Single Year Drought and Multi-year drought (year 1) supply is 85 percent of Historical Use. Multi-Year Drought (year 2) is 75 percent of Historical Use. Multi-Year Drought (year 3) is 65 percent of Historical Use.

b) Planned purchases consistent with the District's Future Water Supply Implementation Program. The water supply reliability goal adopted by the Board of Directors is to meet at least 85 percent of demand in a 2nd or 3rd dry year and 100 percent of demand in other years.

c) Beginning in 2010, during the second and third years of a multi-year drought, short-term water purchases in conjunction with a request for up to a 5 and 15 percent, respectively, voluntary short-term conservation would be considered to meet demands.

CONTRA COSTA
WATER DISTRICT

1331 Concord Avenue
P.O. Box H20
Concord, CA 94524
(925) 688-8000 FAX (925) 688-8122

Directors
Joseph L. Campbell
President

Elizabeth R. Anello
Vice President

Bette Boatmun
John A. Burgh
Karl L. Wandry

Walter J. Bishop
General Manager

November 1, 2005

Mr. Mike Yeraka
General Manager
Diablo Water District
2107 Main Street
Oakley, CA 94561

Subject: Draft Urban Water Management Plan

Dear ~~Mr. Yeraka~~ Mike:

The Contra Costa Water District (District) is currently preparing an update to its Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP). In conformance with California Water Code Division 6, Part 2.6, Section 10621, the District is notifying interested parties of a public hearing on the draft plan and providing them copies of the draft plan for their review and comment. A copy of the draft plan is being provided to all wholesale municipal customers of the District and is available for public review.

Written comments should be addressed to me and are due by November 30, 2005. A public hearing on the draft plan will be held on Wednesday, December 7, 2005 at 6:30 pm in the Board Room of the District offices (located at 1331 Concord Ave., Concord). Please contact me at (925) 688-8312 or Jeff Quimby, Senior Engineer at (925) 688-8310 if you have any questions about the District's Urban Water Management Plan update.

Sincerely,

Fran Garland
Principal Planner

FG/rlr

Enclosure (1)

File: Project #505331

CONTRA COSTA
WATER DISTRICT

1331 Concord Avenue
P.O. Box H20
Concord, CA 94524
(925) 688-8000 FAX (925) 688-8122

May 31, 2005

Directors
Joseph L. Campbell
President

Elizabeth R. Anello
Vice President

Bette Boatmun
John A. Burgh
Karl L. Wandry

Walter J. Bishop
General Manager

Ms. Ann Farrell
Director of Engineering
Central Contra Costa Sanitary District
5019 Imhoff Place
Martinez, CA 94553-4392

Subject: Urban Water Management Plan Update

Existing state law requires each urban water supplier to prepare and adopt an urban water management plan at least once every 5 years. The Contra Costa Water District (District) is currently preparing an update to its Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP), which was last adopted in December 2000. A copy of the 2000 UWMP is available on the District's website (http://www.ccwater.com/publications/watersupply.asp). The UWMP documents the District's plans to ensure adequate water supplies to meet existing and future demands for water under a range of water supply conditions, including water shortages.

The UWMP will include a description of the wastewater collection and treatment systems in the District's service area, recycled water currently being used, quantification of the potential uses of recycled water, and the projected use of recycled water in the District's service area.

A draft of the District's UWMP will be provided to you for review in October 2005. The final UWMP will be submitted to the California Department of Water Resources by December 31, 2005.

Please contact me at (925) 688-8312 or Jeff Quimby, Senior Engineer at (925) 688-8310 if you have any questions about the District's Urban Water Management Plan update.

Sincerely,

Fran Garland
Principal Planner

File: Project #50533100

CONTRA COSTA
WATER DISTRICT

1331 Concord Avenue
P.O. Box H20
Concord, CA 94524
(925) 688-8000 FAX (925) 688-8122

Directors
Joseph L. Campbell
President

Elizabeth R. Anello
Vice President

Bette Boatmun
John A. Burgh
Karl L. Wandry

Walter J. Bishop
General Manager

November 1, 2005

Ms. Ann Farrell
Director of Engineering
Central Contra Costa Sanitary District
5019 Imhoff Place
Martinez, CA 94553-4392

Subject: Draft 2005 Urban Water Management Plan

Dear Ms. Farrell:

The Contra Costa Water District (District) is currently preparing an update to its Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP). In conformance with California Water Code Division 6, Part 2.6, Section 10621, the District is notifying interested parties of a public hearing on the draft plan and providing them copies of the draft plan for their review and comment. A copy of the draft plan is being provided to all wastewater agencies in the District's service area and is available for public review.

Written comments should be addressed to me and are due by November 30, 2005. A public hearing on the draft plan will be held on Wednesday, December 7, 2005 at 6:30 pm in the Board Room of the District offices (located at 1331 Concord Ave., Concord). Please contact me at (925) 688-8312 or Jeff Quimby, Senior Engineer at (925) 688-8310 if you have any questions about the District's Urban Water Management Plan update.

Sincerely,

Fran Garland
Principal Planner

FG/rlr

Enclosure (1)

File: Project #505331

CONTRA COSTA
WATER DISTRICT

1331 Concord Avenue
P.O. Box H20
Concord, CA 94524
(925) 688-8000 FAX (925) 688-8122

May 31, 2005

Directors
Joseph L. Campbell
President

Elizabeth R. Anello
Vice President

Bette Boatmun
John A. Burgh
Karl L. Wandry

Walter J. Bishop
General Manager

Mr. Dennis Barry
Director
Contra Costa County Community Development Dept.
651 Pine Street, 4th Floor, North Wing
Martinez, CA 94553

Subject: Urban Water Management Plan Update

Dear Mr. Barry:

Existing state law requires each urban water supplier to prepare and adopt an urban water management plan at least once every 5 years. The Contra Costa Water District (District) is currently preparing an update to its Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP), which was last adopted in December 2000. A copy of the 2000 UWMP is available at the District's website (http://www.ccwater.com/publications/watersupply.asp). The UWMP documents the District's plans to ensure adequate water supplies to meet existing and future demands for water under a range of water supply conditions, including water shortages.

In conformance with California Water Code Division 6, Part 2.6, Section 10621, the District is notifying any city or county within which the District provides water supplies that the UWMP is being reviewed and updated. A copy of the draft plan will be provided to all wholesale municipal customers of the District and city and county planning departments in October 2005. The final plan will be submitted to the California Department of Water Resources by December 31, 2005.

Please contact me at (925) 688-8312 or Jeff Quimby, Senior Engineer at (925) 688-8310 if you have any questions about the District's Urban Water Management Plan update.

Sincerely,

Fran Garland
Principal Planner

FG:JQ:fm

File: Project #50533100

CONTRA COSTA
WATER DISTRICT

1331 Concord Avenue
P.O. Box H20
Concord, CA 94524
(925) 688-8000 FAX (925) 688-8122

Directors
Joseph L. Campbell
President

Elizabeth R. Anello
Vice President

Bette Boatmun
John A. Burgh
Karl L. Wandry

Walter J. Bishop
General Manager

November 1, 2005

Mr. Dennis Barry
Director
Contra Costa County Community Development Department
651 Pine Street, 4th Floor, North Wing
Martinez, CA 94553

Subject: Draft Urban Water Management Plan

Dear Mr. Barry:

Existing state law requires each urban water supplier to prepare and adopt an urban water management plan at least once every 5 years. The Contra Costa Water District (District) is currently preparing an update to its Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP), which was last adopted in December 2000. The UWMP documents the District's plans to ensure adequate water supplies to meet existing and future water demands under a range of water supply conditions, including water shortages.

This update incorporates the recommendations of the District's Future Water Supply Study (FWSS, adopted August 1996 and December 2002) and the Future Water Supply Implementation Environmental Impact Report (FWSI EIR, certified February 1999). In conformance with California Water Code Division 6, Part 2.6, Section 10621, the District is notifying interested parties of a public hearing on the draft plan. A copy of the draft UWMP is available for review on the District's web-site (www.ccwater.com).

Written comments should be addressed to me and are due by November 30, 2005. A public hearing on the draft plan will be held on Wednesday, December 7, 2005 at 6:30 pm in the Board Room of the District offices (located at 1331 Concord Ave., Concord). Please contact me at (925) 688-8312 or Jeff Quimby, Senior Engineer at (925) 688-8310 if you have any questions about the District's Urban Water Management Plan update.

Sincerely,

Fran Garland
Principal Planner

FG/rlr-

File: Project #506331

Appendix C

California Urban Water Conservation Council Annual Reports

2003 CUWCC Retail Report

Water Supply & Reuse

Reporting Unit:
Contra Costa WD - Retail

Year:
2003

Water Supply Source Information

Supply Source Name	Quantity (AF) Supplied	Supply Type
USBR CVP @ Rock Slough	14620	Imported
USBR CVP @ Old River	54648	Imported
Mallard Slough	5352	Local Watershed
ECCID Water	7650	Local Watershed
LV Releases	36018	Local Watershed
Water Transfer	1337	Imported
Contra Loma Releases	-707	Imported

Total AF: 118918

Reported as of 10/1

Accounts & Water Use

Reporting Unit Name:
Contra Costa WD - Retail

Submitted to CUWCC
01/21/2004

Year:
2003

A. Service Area Population Information:

1. Total service area population 230000

B. Number of Accounts and Water Deliveries (AF)

Type	Metered		Unmetered	
	No. of Accounts	Water Deliveries (AF)	No. of Accounts	Water Deliveries (AF)
1. Single-Family	52177	20512	0	0
2. Multi-Family	2483	6004	0	0
3. Commercial	2689	4206	0	0
4. Industrial	6	133	0	0
5. Institutional	221	1131	0	0
6. Dedicated Irrigation	1277	4017	0	0
7. Recycled Water	0	0	0	0
8. Other	69	34352	465	1065
9. Unaccounted	NA	0	NA	0
Total	58922	70355	465	1065
	Metered		**Unmetered**	

Reported as of 10/1

BMP 01: Water Survey Programs for Single-Family and Multi-Family Residential Customers

Reporting Unit:	BMP Form Status:	Year:
Contra Costa WD - Retail	**100% Complete**	**2003**

A. Implementation

1. Based on your signed MOU date, 09/11/1991, your Agency STRATEGY DUE DATE is:	09/10/1993
2. Has your agency developed and implemented a targeting/ marketing strategy for SINGLE-FAMILY residential water use surveys?	yes
a. If YES, when was it implemented?	07/01/1988
3. Has your agency developed and implemented a targeting/ marketing strategy for MULTI-FAMILY residential water use surveys?	yes
a. If YES, when was it implemented?	07/01/1991

B. Water Survey Data

Survey Counts:	Single Family Accounts	Multi-Family Units
1. Number of surveys offered:	7014	9600
2. Number of surveys completed:	462	615
Indoor Survey:		
3. Check for leaks, including toilets, faucets and meter checks	yes	yes
4. Check showerhead flow rates, aerator flow rates, and offer to replace or recommend replacement, if necessary	yes	yes
5. Check toilet flow rates and offer to install or recommend installation of displacement device or direct customer to ULFT replacement program, as neccesary; replace leaking toilet flapper, as necessary	yes	yes
Outdoor Survey:		
6. Check irrigation system and timers	yes	yes
7. Review or develop customer irrigation schedule	yes	yes
8. Measure landscaped area (Recommended but not required for surveys)	no	yes
9. Measure total irrigable area (Recommended but not required for surveys)	no	yes
10. Which measurement method is typically used (Recommended but not required for surveys)		Image-Based
11. Were customers provided with information packets that included evaluation results and water savings recommendations?	yes	yes
12. Have the number of surveys offered and completed, survey results, and survey costs been tracked?	yes	yes
a. If yes, in what form are surveys tracked?		database
b. Describe how your agency tracks this information.		

MS Access

C. Water Survey Program Expenditures

	This Year	Next Year
1. Budgeted Expenditures	203897	0
2. Actual Expenditures	154573	

D. "At Least As Effective As"

1. Is your AGENCY implementing an "at least as effective as" variant of this BMP?	No
a. If YES, please explain in detail how your implementation of this BMP differs from Exhibit 1 and why you consider it to be "at least as effective as."	

E. Comments

Budget and expenditures include those for "Residential" Programs and 30% of "Administration" for Conservation. Budget for Retail Program activities assumes 70% of actual budget and expenditures. The other 30% is documented on the Wholesale Report.

Reported as of 10/1

BMP 02: Residential Plumbing Retrofit

Reporting Unit:	BMP Form Status:	Year:
Contra Costa WD - Retail	**100% Complete**	**2003**

A. Implementation

1. Is there an enforceable ordinance in effect in your service area requiring replacement of high-flow showerheads and other water use fixtures with their low-flow counterparts? — no

   a. If YES, list local jurisdictions in your service area and code or ordinance in each:

2. Has your agency satisfied the 75% saturation requirement for single-family housing units? — no
3. Estimated percent of single-family households with low-flow showerheads: — 70%
4. Has your agency satisfied the 75% saturation requirement for multi-family housing units? — no
5. Estimated percent of multi-family households with low-flow showerheads: — 70%
6. If YES to 2 OR 4 above, please describe how saturation was determined, including the dates and results of any survey research.

B. Low-Flow Device Distribution Information

1. Has your agency developed a targeting/ marketing strategy for distributing low-flow devices? — yes

   a. If YES, when did your agency begin implementing this strategy? — 07/01/1991

   b. Describe your targeting/ marketing strategy.

   Market to Single Family and Multi-Family residential properties built prior to 1992. Secondly, during residential conservation surveys, devices are tested and replaced as necessary.

Low-Flow Devices Distributed/ Installed	SF Accounts	MF Units
2. Number of low-flow showerheads distributed:	226	191
3. Number of toilet-displacement devices distributed:	0	0
4. Number of toilet flappers distributed:	86	69
5. Number of faucet aerators distributed:	120	936

6. Does your agency track the distribution and cost of low-flow devices? — yes

   a. If YES, in what format are low-flow devices tracked? — Database

   b. If yes, describe your tracking and distribution system :

   MS Access

C. Low-Flow Device Distribution Expenditures

	This Year	Next Year
1. Budgeted Expenditures	0	0

2. Actual Expenditures	0

D. "At Least As Effective As"

1. Is your AGENCY implementing an "at least as effective as" variant of this BMP? — No

   a. If YES, please explain in detail how your implementation of this BMP differs from Exhibit 1 and why you consider it to be "at least as effective as."

E. Comments

Budget included in BMP 1

Reported as of 10/1

BMP 03: System Water Audits, Leak Detection and Repair

Reporting Unit:	BMP Form Status:	Year:
Contra Costa WD - Retail	**100% Complete**	**2003**

A. Implementation

1. Has your agency completed a pre-screening system audit for this reporting year? yes
2. If YES, enter the values (AF/Year) used to calculate verifiable use as a percent of total production:
   - a. Determine metered sales (AF) 36298
   - b. Determine other system verifiable uses (AF) 83
   - c. Determine total supply into the system (AF) 40014
   - d. Using the numbers above, if (Metered Sales + Other Verifiable Uses) / Total Supply is < 0.9 then a full-scale system audit is required. 0.91
3. Does your agency keep necessary data on file to verify the values used to calculate verifiable uses as a percent of total production? yes
4. Did your agency complete a full-scale audit during this report year? no
5. Does your agency maintain in-house records of audit results or the completed AWWA audit worksheets for the completed audit? yes
6. Does your agency operate a system leak detection program? yes
   - a. If yes, describe the leak detection program:

     CCWD has a leak detection crew that has a goal of surveying approximately 160 miles of the treated water service area per year.

B. Survey Data

1. Total number of miles of distribution system line. 790
2. Number of miles of distribution system line surveyed. 12

C. System Audit / Leak Detection Program Expenditures

	This Year	Next Year
1. Budgeted Expenditures	29402	0
2. Actual Expenditures	29062	

D. "At Least As Effective As"

1. Is your AGENCY implementing an "at least as effective as" variant of this BMP? No
   - a. If YES, please explain in detail how your implementation of this BMP differs from Exhibit 1 and why you consider it to be "at least as effective as."

E. Comments

The budget and expendatures above reflect only those from the District's Leak Detection Unit. Expendatures for leak repair is included in the overall Opperations and Maintenance budget.

Reported as of 10/1

BMP 04: Metering with Commodity Rates for all New Connections and Retrofit of Existing

Reporting Unit:	BMP Form Status:	Year:
Contra Costa WD - Retail	**100% Complete**	**2003**

A. Implementation

1. Does your agency require meters for all new connections and bill by volume-of-use? yes
2. Does your agency have a program for retrofitting existing unmetered connections and bill by volume-of-use? yes
   - a. If YES, when was the plan to retrofit and bill by volume-of-use existing unmetered connections completed? 06/30/2000
   - b. Describe the program:

     The District has less than 450 Flat Rate customers(less than 1%) who recieive Raw water (untreated) via the Contra Costa canal. These customers are charged a flat rate for the raw water for irrigation purposes. Currently the Distirct is implementing a meter replacement program. Each connection is evaluated to determine the cost effectiveness of metering.
3. Number of previously unmetered accounts fitted with meters during report year. 6

B. Feasibility Study

1. Has your agency conducted a feasibility study to assess the merits of a program to provide incentives to switch mixed-use accounts to dedicated landscape meters? no
   - a. If YES, when was the feasibility study conducted? (mm/dd/yy)
   - b. Describe the feasibility study:
2. Number of CII accounts with mixed-use meters. 0
3. Number of CII accounts with mixed-use meters retrofitted with dedicated irrigation meters during reporting period. 0

C. Meter Retrofit Program Expenditures

	This Year	Next Year
1. Budgeted Expenditures	0	0
2. Actual Expenditures	0	

D. "At Least As Effective As"

1. Is your AGENCY implementing an "at least as effective as" variant of this BMP? No
   - a. If YES, please explain in detail how your implementation of this BMP differs from Exhibit 1 and why you consider it to be "at least as effective as."

E. Comments

Expendatures for this BMP are included in the O & M, Finance, and Conservation Budgets and can not be itemized.

Reported as of 10/1

BMP 05: Large Landscape Conservation Programs and Incentives

Reporting Unit: **Contra Costa WD - Retail** | BMP Form Status: **100% Complete** | Year: **2003**

A. Water Use Budgets

1. Number of Dedicated Irrigation Meter Accounts:	1239
2. Number of Dedicated Irrigation Meter Accounts with Water Budgets:	544
3. Budgeted Use for Irrigation Meter Accounts with Water Budgets (AF):	0
4. Actual Use for Irrigation Meter Accounts with Water Budgets (AF):	0
5. Does your agency provide water use notices to accounts with budgets each billing cycle?	no

B. Landscape Surveys

1. Has your agency developed a marketing / targeting strategy for landscape surveys?	yes
a. If YES, when did your agency begin implementing this strategy?	07/01/1990

b. Description of marketing / targeting strategy:

Contact top customers with water use over their water budget. Direct mail to top 25% of CII and MF Residential accounts. Also, marketing is done through property management and landscape management contacts.

2. Number of Surveys Offered.	1075
3. Number of Surveys Completed.	108
4. Indicate which of the following Landscape Elements are part of your survey:	
a. Irrigation System Check	yes
b. Distribution Uniformity Analysis	yes
c. Review / Develop Irrigation Schedules	yes
d. Measure Landscape Area	yes
e. Measure Total Irrigable Area	yes
f. Provide Customer Report / Information	yes
5. Do you track survey offers and results?	yes
6. Does your agency provide follow-up surveys for previously completed surveys?	yes

a. If YES, describe below:

Follow-up survyes are often requested by customers to get clarification regarding some aspect of the initial survey. Secondly, as landscape managers are replaced, cusotmers often ask us to conduct a follow-up survey with the new landscape manager.

C. Other BMP 5 Actions

1. An agency can provide mixed-use accounts with ETo-based landscape budgets in lieu of a large landscape survey program. Does your agency provide mixed-use accounts with landscape budgets?	no
2. Number of CII mixed-use accounts with landscape budgets.	0
3. Do you offer landscape irrigation training?	yes
4. Does your agency offer financial incentives to improve landscape water use efficiency?	yes

Type of Financial Incentive:	Budget (Dollars/ Year)	Number Awarded to Customers	Total Amount Awarded
a. Rebates	10000	5	5355
b. Loans	0	0	0
c. Grants	0	0	0

5. Do you provide landscape water use efficiency information to new customers and customers changing services?	No
a. If YES, describe below:	
6. Do you have irrigated landscaping at your facilities?	yes
a. If yes, is it water-efficient?	yes
b. If yes, does it have dedicated irrigation metering?	yes
7. Do you provide customer notices at the start of the irrigation season?	no
8. Do you provide customer notices at the end of the irrigation season?	yes

D. Landscape Conservation Program Expenditures

	This Year	Next Year
1. Budgeted Expenditures	102401	0
2. Actual Expenditures	113507	

E. "At Least As Effective As"

1. Is your AGENCY implementing an "at least as effective as" variant of this BMP?	No

a. If YES, please explain in detail how your implementation of this BMP differs from Exhibit 1 and why you consider it to be "at least as effective as."

F. Comments

Budget and expenditures include those for "Large Landscape" Programs and 20% of "Administration" for Conservation. Assumes 70% of actural budget and expenditures in this Retail report and 30% in the wholesale report.

Reported as of 10/1

BMP 06: High-Efficiency Washing Machine Rebate Programs

Reporting Unit:	BMP Form Status:	Year:
Contra Costa WD - Retail	**100% Complete**	**2003**

A. Implementation

1. Do any energy service providers or waste water utilities in your service area offer rebates for high-efficiency washers? yes

   a. If YES, describe the offerings and incentives as well as who the energy/waste water utility provider is.

   Pacific Gas and Electirc (PG&E) offers a $75 rebate for residential Energy Star rated clothes washers

2. Does your agency offer rebates for high-efficiency washers? yes
3. What is the level of the rebate? 100
4. Number of rebates awarded. 1137

B. Rebate Program Expenditures

	This Year	Next Year
1. Budgeted Expenditures	0	0
2. Actual Expenditures	109965	

C. "At Least As Effective As"

1. Is your AGENCY implementing an "at least as effective as" variant of this BMP? no

   a. If YES, please explain in detail how your implementation of this BMP differs from Exhibit 1 and why you consider it to be "at least as effective as."

D. Comments

Budget for this program is included in the District's Conservation Incentive Program which includes all rebates and replacement programs. Total budget is shown in the BMP 14 report. Expenditures in this report reflect 70% of the actual expenditures for BMP 6. The other 30% is listed in the Wholesale Report. CCWD was part of a Bay Area Regional Washer Rebate Program in FY 03.

Reported as of 10/1

BMP 07: Public Information Programs

Reporting Unit:	BMP Form Status:	Year:
Contra Costa WD - Retail	**100% Complete**	**2003**

A. Implementation

1. Does your agency maintain an active public information program to promote and educate customers about water conservation? yes

   a. If YES, describe the program and how it's organized.

   The Public Information and Conservation Department is responsible for implementing the Districts Public Information Program. This is carried out through a variety of program elements including: legislative affairs; employee communications; external communications with customers, key constituents, decision-makers, public organizations, the news media, and through an active water conservation program. The promotion of water conservation is made through a variety of methods such as direct mailing, paid advertising, bill inserts, the On Tap newsletter, brochures, water bill message, demonstration gardens, media events and an active speakers bureau. The public information program as well as the water conservation program are carried out thorough the entire District service area.

2. Indicate which and how many of the following activities are included in your public information program.

Public Information Program Activity	Yes/No	Number of Events
a. Paid Advertising	yes	24
b. Public Service Announcement	no	0
c. Bill Inserts / Newsletters / Brochures	yes	16
d. Bill showing water usage in comparison to previous year's usage	yes	
e. Demonstration Gardens	yes	2
f. Special Events, Media Events	yes	4
g. Speaker's Bureau	yes	65
h. Program to coordinate with other government agencies, industry and public interest groups and media	yes	

B. Conservation Information Program Expenditures

	This Year	Next Year
1. Budgeted Expenditures	51000	0
2. Actual Expenditures	52500	

C. "At Least As Effective As"

1. Is your AGENCY implementing an "at least as effective as" variant of this BMP? No

   a. If YES, please explain in detail how your implementation of this BMP differs from Exhibit 1 and why you consider it to be "at least as effective as."

D. Comments

Budget and expenditures reflect 50% of the actual. The other 50% is listed in the Wholesale Report

Reported as of 10/1

BMP 08: School Education Programs

Reporting Unit:	BMP Form Status:	Year:
Contra Costa WD - Retail	**100% Complete**	**2003**

A. Implementation

1.Has your agency implemented a school information program to promote water conservation? yes

2. Please provide information on your school programs (by grade level):

Grade	Are grade-appropriate materials distributed?	No. of class presentations	No. of students reached	No. of teachers' workshops
Grades K-3rd	yes	135	9450	4
Grades 4th-6th	yes	173	12110	7
Grades 7th-8th	yes	13	455	0
High School	no	5	140	0

3. Did your Agency's materials meet state education framework requirements? yes

4. When did your Agency begin implementing this program? 07/01/1980

B. School Education Program Expenditures

	This Year	Next Year
1. Budgeted Expenditures	89500	0
2. Actual Expenditures	90000	

C. "At Least As Effective As"

1. Is your AGENCY implementing an "at least as effective as" variant of this BMP? No

a. If YES, please explain in detail how your implementation of this BMP differs from Exhibit 1 and why you consider it to be "at least as effective as."

D. Comments

Note: The School Education Program is offered throughout the CCWD retail and wholesale service areas. Therefore, the activities reflect those of the entire program. The same data is submitted on the CCWD Retail Report. Budget and expenditures reflect 50% of the actual. The other 50% is listed in the wholesale Report.

Reported as of 10/1

BMP 09: Conservation Programs for CII Accounts

Reporting Unit:	BMP Form Status:	Year:
Contra Costa WD - Retail	**100% Complete**	**2003**

A. Implementation

1. Has your agency identified and ranked COMMERCIAL customers according to use?	yes
2. Has your agency identified and ranked INDUSTRIAL customers according to use?	yes
3. Has your agency identified and ranked INSTITUTIONAL customers according to use?	yes

Option A: CII Water Use Survey and Customer Incentives Program

4. Is your agency operating a CII water use survey and customer incentives program for the purpose of complying with BMP 9 under this option?	yes

CII Surveys	Commercial Accounts	Industrial Accounts	Institutional Accounts
a. Number of New Surveys Offered	400	0	60
b. Number of New Surveys Completed	105	0	6
c. Number of Site Follow-ups of Previous Surveys (within 1 yr)	12	0	4
d. Number of Phone Follow-ups of Previous Surveys (within 1 yr)	0	0	0

CII Survey Components	Commercial Accounts	Industrial Accounts	Institutional Accounts
e. Site Visit	yes	yes	yes
f. Evaluation of all water-using apparatus and processes	yes	yes	yes
g. Customer report identifying recommended efficiency measures, paybacks and agency incentives	yes	yes	yes

Agency CII Customer Incentives	Budget ($/Year)	No. Awarded to Customers	Total $ Amount Awarded
h. Rebates	10000	44	7100
i. Loans	0	0	0
j. Grants	0	0	0
k. Others	0	139	25020

Option B: CII Conservation Program Targets

5. Does your agency track CII program interventions and water savings for the purpose of complying with BMP 9 under this option?	no
6. Does your agency document and maintain records on how savings were realized and the method of calculation for estimated savings?	no
7. Estimated annual savings (AF/yr) from site-verified actions taken by agency since 1991.	0
8. Estimated annual savings (AF/yr) from non-site-verified actions taken by agency since 1991.	0

B. Conservation Program Expenditures for CII Accounts

	This Year	Next Year
1. Budgeted Expenditures	77447	0
2. Actual Expenditures	84382	

C. "At Least As Effective As"

1. Is your AGENCY implementing an "at least as effective as" variant of this BMP?	No

a. If YES, please explain in detail how your implementation of this BMP differs from Exhibit 1 and why you consider it to be "at least as effective as."

D. Comments

Budget includes the "CII" Program plus 20% of "Administration" for Conservation. Assumes 70% of actural budget in this Retail report and 30% in the wholesale report. Expenditures 100% of the "CII" program plus 20% of the "Administration" plus 100% of the expenditures for Pre-Rinse and Lite Wash Programs. Expenditures assumes 70% of these expenditures in this Retail report and 30% in the wholesale report.

Reported as of 10/1

BMP 09a: CII ULFT Water Savings

Reporting Unit:	BMP Form Status:	Year:
Contra Costa WD - Retail	**100% Complete**	**2003**

1. Did your agency implement a CII ULFT replacement program in the reporting year? If No, please explain why on Line B. 10. — Yes

A. Targeting and Marketing

1. What basis does your agency use to target customers for participation in this program? Check all that apply.
   - Consumption ranking
   - Potential savings
   - Oldest meter
   - CII Sector or subsector
   - CII ULFT Study subsector targeting

   a. Describe which method you found to be the most effective overall, and which was the most effective per dollar expended.

   Although it is difficult to separate out which tarketing was the most effective, targeting the customers with the highest consumption seemed to be the most effective.

2. How does your agency advertise this program? Check all that apply.
   - Direct letter
   - Bill insert
   - Bill message
   - Newsletter
   - Telephone
   - Web page
   - Trade publications
   - Trade shows and events

   a. Describe which method you found to be the most effective overall, and which was the most effective per dollar expended.

   Our marketing consisted of direct mailing to customers in several forms. This included direct mailing from the District and mailing through groups such as the Chambers of Commerce. Bill messages and bill inserts were inexpensive and resulted in modest participation. Direct mailing letters and fliers to customers was effective, but required significant mailing to produce enough participants.

B. Implementation

1. Does your agency keep and maintain customer participant information? (Read the Help information for a complete list of all the information for this BMP.) — Yes
2. Would your agency be willing to share this information if the CUWCC did a study to evaluate the program on behalf of your agency? — Yes
3. What is the total number of customer accounts participating in the program during the last year ? — 82

CII Subsector	Number of Toilets Replaced			
4.	Standard Gravity Tank	Air Assisted	Valve Floor Mount	Valve Wall Mount
a. Offices	211	60	0	51
b. Retail / Wholesale	20	0	0	0
c. Hotels	50	0	0	0
d. Health	80	0	0	0
e. Industrial	0	0	0	0
f. Schools: K to 12	35	0	0	15
g. Eating	31	0	0	0
h. Government	0	0	0	0
i. Churches	70	0	0	0
j. Other	8	0	0	0

5. Program design. — Rebate or voucher
6. Does your agency use outside services to implement this program? — No
   a. If yes, check all that apply.
7. Participant tracking and follow-up.
   - Letter
   - Site Visit
8. Based on your program experience, please rank on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being the least frequent cause and 5 being the most frequent cause, the following reasons why customers refused to participate in the program.

a. Disruption to business	4
b. Inadequate payback	3
c. Inadequate ULFT performance	4
d. Lack of funding	3
e. American's with Disabilities Act	2
f. Permitting	2
g. Other. Please describe in B. 9.	5

9. Please describe general program acceptance/resistance by customers, obstacles to implementation, and other isues affecting program implementation or effectiveness.

   9.Business sectors with the most conventional toilets including: office, health care and religious organizations participated in the program the most (72%). Conversely, business sectors with the fewest conventional toilets, restaurants, government and schools participated in the program the least (6%). Restaurants and retail/wholesale business sectors which have the highest water savings per ULFT installed were specifically and extensively marketed for program participation. However, these sectors did not participate in the program as much as office, health care and religious organizations. It may be that restaurants and retail/wholesale businesses are not as viable for ULFT replacements as office health care and religious organizations.

10. Please provide a general assessment of the program for this reporting year. Did your program achieve its objectives? Were your targeting and marketing approaches effective? Were program costs in line with expectations and budgeting?

   10. The program achieved its goals with the number of toilets

replaced in the program (1000 ULFTs in 18 months in the CCWD retail and wholesale areas). However, the program did not meet its goal for targeted business sector participation in the program including: restaurants and wholesale and retail sites with significant water savings (37-47 gallons) per ULFT installed. The result of the lack of participation by the restaurant and retail wholesale businesses was that the average water savings per ULFT installed was 22 gallons per unit rather than the projected 30 gallons per ULFT installed. Restaurants were marketed heavily, however, possibly due to a downward economy, preceived disruption to business or lack of interest, these sectors did not participate in the program in large numbers. The marketing reached the business sectors, and many were interested, but few actually completed the program. Program costs were greater than expected trying to continually get the targeted businesses sectors, restaurants, and retail-wholesale businesses to participate.

C. Conservation Program Expenditures for CII ULFT

1. CII ULFT Program: Annual Budget & Expenditure Data

	Budgeted	Actual Expenditure
a. Labor	0	89518
b. Materials	0	192835
c. Marketing & Advertising	0	0
d. Administration & Overhead	0	0
e. Outside Services	0	0
f. Total	0	282353

2. CII ULFT Program: Annual Cost Sharing

a. Wholesale agency contribution	0
b. State agency contribution	102054
c. Federal agency contribution	0
d. Other contribution	0
e. Total	102054

D. Comments

Program Budget is included in the overall Conservation Incentive Program Budget (see BMP 14). Expenditures include 100% of the CII ULFT Program labor and rebate costs. Marketing and advertising expendatures are included in the overal Conservation Incentive Program expendatures.

Reported as of 10/1

BMP 11: Conservation Pricing

Reporting Unit:	BMP Form Status:	Year:
Contra Costa WD - Retail	**100% Complete**	**2003**

A. Implementation

Rate Structure Data Volumetric Rates for Water Service by Customer Class

1. Residential	
a. Water Rate Structure	Uniform
b. Sewer Rate Structure	Service Not Provided
c. Total Revenue from Volumetric Rates	$25788000
d. Total Revenue from Non-Volumetric Charges, Fees and other Revenue Sources	$13233000
2. Commercial	
a. Water Rate Structure	Uniform
b. Sewer Rate Structure	Service Not Provided
c. Total Revenue from Volumetric Rates	$3962000
d. Total Revenue from Non-Volumetric Charges, Fees and other Revenue Sources	$1781000
3. Industrial	
a. Water Rate Structure	Uniform
b. Sewer Rate Structure	Service Not Provided
c. Total Revenue from Volumetric Rates	$136668
d. Total Revenue from Non-Volumetric Charges, Fees and other Revenue Sources	$22551
4. Institutional / Government	
a. Water Rate Structure	Uniform
b. Sewer Rate Structure	Service Not Provided
c. Total Revenue from Volumetric Rates	$1075269
d. Total Revenue from Non-Volumetric Charges, Fees and other Revenue Sources	$480911
5. Irrigation	
a. Water Rate Structure	Uniform
b. Sewer Rate Structure	Service Not Provided
c. Total Revenue from Volumetric Rates	$3916172
d. Total Revenue from Non-Volumetric Charges, Fees and other Revenue Sources	$1078086
6. Other	
a. Water Rate Structure	Uniform
b. Sewer Rate Structure	Service Not Provided
c. Total Revenue from Volumetric Rates	$16803883

d. Total Revenue from Non-Volumetric Charges, Fees and other Revenue Sources $415519

B. Conservation Pricing Program Expenditures

	This Year	Next Year
1. Budgeted Expenditures	0	0
2. Actual Expenditures	0	

C. "At Least As Effective As"

1. Is your AGENCY implementing an "at least as effective as" variant of this BMP? No

a. If YES, please explain in detail how your implementation of this BMP differs from Exhibit 1 and why you consider it to be "at least as effective as."

D. Comments

Other includes all non-municipal raw water customers such as: industrial, canal landscape and agg. Budget is included in the overall Finance Department budget.

Reported as of 10/1

BMP 12: Conservation Coordinator

Reporting Unit:	BMP Form Status:	Year:
Contra Costa WD - Retail	**100% Complete**	**2003**

A. Implementation

1. Does your Agency have a conservation coordinator? yes
2. Is this a full-time position? yes
3. If no, is the coordinator supplied by another agency with which you cooperate in a regional conservation program ?
4. Partner agency's name:
5. If your agency supplies the conservation coordinator:
   - a. What percent is this conservation coordinator's position? 100%
   - b. Coordinator's Name Chris Dundon
   - c. Coordinator's Title Water Conservation Supervisor
   - d. Coordinator's Experience and Number of Years 12 years
   - e. Date Coordinator's position was created (mm/dd/yyyy) 04/30/1991
6. Number of conservation staff, including Conservation Coordinator. 11

B. Conservation Staff Program Expenditures

	This Year	Next Year
1. Budgeted Expenditures	418513	0
2. Actual Expenditures	417647	

C. "At Least As Effective As"

1. Is your AGENCY implementing an "at least as effective as" variant of this BMP? no

a. If YES, please explain in detail how your implementation of this BMP differs from Exhibit 1 and why you consider it to be "at least as effective as."

D. Comments

Staff budget and expenditures includes full time and temporary water conservation staff. The figures do not include staff expenditures from other units such as public information, Opperations and Maintenance, and Finance which also contribute to BMP implementation. Budget and expenditures assume 70% of actual in this Retail report and 30% in the wholesale report.

Reported as of 10/1

BMP 13: Water Waste Prohibition

Reporting Unit:	BMP Form Status:	Year:
Contra Costa WD - Retail	**100% Complete**	**2003**

A. Requirements for Documenting BMP Implementation

1. Is a water waste prohibition ordinance in effect in your service area? yes

a. If YES, describe the ordinance:

CCWD Title 5: Water Supply and Rates, section 5.44.010 Prevention of Waste and section 5.44.020 Encouraged water use

2. Is a copy of the most current ordinance(s) on file with CUWCC? yes

a. List local jurisdictions in your service area in the first text box and water waste ordinance citations in each jurisdiction in the second text box:

Treatd Water Service Area: Concord, Clayton, Clyde, Pacheco and parts of Martinez, Walnut Creek and Pleasant Hill	CCWD Title 5: Water Supply and Rates, section 5.44.010 Prevention of Waste and section 5.44.020 Encouraged water use and Resolution 93-23

B. Implementation

1. Indicate which of the water uses listed below are prohibited by your agency or service area.

a. Gutter flooding	yes
b. Single-pass cooling systems for new connections	Yes
c. Non-recirculating systems in all new conveyor or car wash systems	yes
d. Non-recirculating systems in all new commercial laundry systems	Yes
e. Non-recirculating systems in all new decorative fountains	yes
f. Other, please name	Yes

2. Describe measures that prohibit water uses listed above:

CCWD Title 5: Water Supply and Rates, section 5.44.010 Prevention of Waste and section 5.44.020 Encouraged water use. Resolution No. 93-23 prohibits withink the area served by the District: The use of water in a decorative fountain or pool that does not recycle water; Washing paved or other hard-surfaced areas, including sidewalks, walkways, driveways, patios and parking areas; Outside watering that results in flooding or excessive runoff in a gutter, drain, patio, driveway, walkway or street; Flushing sewers or hydrants, or washing streets except for emergencies, protection of public health or safety, or essential operations; Using potable water for construction except if no other water supply is available; The use of nonrecirculating systems in all new conveyer car wash and commercial laundry systems; The use of single pass cooling systems in new construction; and The failure to repair a controllable leak of water.

Water Softeners:

3. Indicate which of the following measures your agency has supported in developing state law:

a. Allow the sale of more efficient, demand-initiated regenerating DIR models. Yes

b. Develop minimum appliance efficiency standards that:

i.) Increase the regeneration efficiency standard to at least 3,350 grains of hardness removed per pound of common salt used. Yes

ii.) Implement an identified maximum number of gallons discharged per gallon of soft water produced. Yes

c. Allow local agencies, including municipalities and special districts, to set more stringent standards and/or to ban on-site regeneration of water softeners if it is demonstrated and found by the agency governing board that there is an adverse effect on the reclaimed water or groundwater supply. Yes

4. Does your agency include water softener checks in home water audit programs? yes

5. Does your agency include information about DIR and exchange-type water softeners in educational efforts to encourage replacement of less efficient timer models? Yes

C. Water Waste Prohibition Program Expenditures

	This Year	Next Year
1. Budgeted Expenditures	0	0
2. Actual Expenditures	0	

D. "At Least As Effective As"

1. Is your AGENCY implementing an "at least as effective as" variant of this BMP? no

a. If YES, please explain in detail how your implementation of this BMP differs from Exhibit 1 and why you consider it to be "at least as effective as."

E. Comments

There is no specific budget line item for this BMP.

Reported as of 10/1

BMP 14: Residential ULFT Replacement Programs

Reporting Unit:	BMP Form Status:	Year:
Contra Costa WD - Retail	**100% Complete**	**2003**

A. Implementation

	Single-Family Accounts	Multi-Family Units
1. Does your Agency have program(s) for replacing high-water-using toilets with ultra-low flush toilets?	yes	yes

Number of Toilets Replaced by Agency Program During Report Year

Replacement Method	SF Accounts	MF Units
2. Rebate	549	26
3. Direct Install	0	0
4. CBO Distribution	0	441
5. Other	0	0
Total	**549**	**467**

6. Describe your agency's ULFT program for single-family residences.

$75 rebate for replacing non-ulft with a ulft.

7. Describe your agency's ULFT program for multi-family residences.

Voucher provided to MF customers to replace non-ULFT with ULFT. Voucher good for specific ULFT model from vendor contracted with CCWD.

8. Is a toilet retrofit on resale ordinance in effect for your service area? no

9. List local jurisdictions in your service area in the left box and ordinance citations in each jurisdiction in the right box:

B. Residential ULFT Program Expenditures

	This Year	Next Year
1. Budgeted Expenditures	382452	0
2. Actual Expenditures	124703	

C. "At Least As Effective As"

1. Is your AGENCY implementing an "at least as effective as" variant of this BMP? no

a. If YES, please explain in detail how your implementation of this BMP differs from Exhibit 1 and why you consider it to be "at least as effective as."

D. Comments

The budget includes the TOTAL budget for the Conservation Incentive Program plus 30% of the Administration budget and expenditures. 70% of the actual is included in this Retail report and 30% in the wholesale report. (note the Conservation Incentive Program includes all rebates and incentives offered by the District). Expenditures reflect Only those for Residential ULFT programs.

Reported as of 10/1

2003 CUWCC Wholesale Report

Water Supply & Reuse

Reporting Unit: **Contra Costa WD - Wholesale** Year: **2003**

Water Supply Source Information

Supply Source Name	Quantity (AF) Supplied	Supply Type
USBR CVP @ Rock Slough	14620	Imported
USBR CVP @ Old River	54648	Imported
Mallard Slough	5352	Local Watershed
ECCID Water	7650	Local Watershed
LV Releases	36018	Local Watershed
Water Tranfer	1337	Imported
Contra Loma Releases	-707	Imported

Total AF: 118918

Purchaser Information

Name of Agency	Quantity (AF) Supplied	Retailer or Wholesaler
Antioch (Raw)	13133	retail
Martinez (Raw)	5099	retail
Diablo Water District (Raw)	4962	retail
Pittsburg (Raw)	10121	retail
SCWC (Raw)	2629	retail
SCWC (Treated)	68	retail
Brentwood (Treated)	2755	retail

Total AF: 38767

Reported as of 10/1

BMP 03: System Water Audits, Leak Detection and Repair

Reporting Unit: **Contra Costa WD - Wholesale** BMP Form Status: **100% Complete** Year: **2003**

A. Implementation

1. Has your agency completed a pre-screening system audit for this reporting year? yes
2. If YES, enter the values (AF/Year) used to calculate verifiable use as a percent of total production:
   - a. Determine metered sales (AF) 114441
   - b. Determine other system verifiable uses (AF) 0
   - c. Determine total supply into the system (AF) 118884
   - d. Using the numbers above, if (Metered Sales + Other Verifiable Uses) / Total Supply is < 0.9 then a full-scale system audit is required. 0.96
3. Does your agency keep necessary data on file to verify the values used to calculate verifiable uses as a percent of total production? yes
4. Did your agency complete a full-scale audit during this report year? no
5. Does your agency maintain in-house records of audit results or the completed AWWA audit worksheets for the completed audit? yes
6. Does your agency operate a system leak detection program? yes
   - a. If yes, describe the leak detection program:

     The Contra Costa Canal is continously surveyed by water tendors and other maintenence personnel for leaks. Leaks are repaired as part of the District's Raw Water Facility Improvement Program.

B. Survey Data

1. Total number of miles of distribution system line. 48
2. Number of miles of distribution system line surveyed. 48

C. System Audit / Leak Detection Program Expenditures

	This Year	Next Year
1. Budgeted Expenditures	0	0
2. Actual Expenditures	0	

D. "At Least As Effective As"

1. Is your AGENCY implementing an "at least as effective as" variant of this BMP? No
   - a. If YES, please explain in detail how your implementation of this BMP differs from Exhibit 1 and why you consider it to be "at least as effective as."

E. Comments

Budget and expenditures are included in the overall Opperations and Maintenance budget.

Reported as of 10/1

BMP 07: Public Information Programs

Reporting Unit:	BMP Form Status:	Year:
Contra Costa WD - Wholesale	**100% Complete**	**2003**

A. Implementation

1. Does your agency maintain an active public information program to promote and educate customers about water conservation? yes

a. If YES, describe the program and how it's organized.

The Public Information and Conservation Department is responsible for implementing the Districts Public Information Program. This is carried out through a variety of program elements including: legislative affairs; employee communications; external communications with customers, key constituents, decision-makers, public organizations, the news media, and through an active water conservation program. The promotion of water conservation is made through a variety of methods such as direct mailing, paid advertising, bill inserts, the On Tap newsletter, brochures, water bill message, demonstration gardens, media events and an active speakers bureau. The public information program as well as the water conservation program is carried out thorough the entire District service area.

2. Indicate which and how many of the following activities are included in your public information program.

Public Information Program Activity	Yes/No	Number of Events
a. Paid Advertising	yes	24
b. Public Service Announcement	no	0
c. Bill Inserts / Newsletters / Brochures	yes	16
d. Bill showing water usage in comparison to previous year's usage	yes	
e. Demonstration Gardens	yes	2
f. Special Events, Media Events	yes	4
g. Speaker's Bureau	yes	65
h. Program to coordinate with other government agencies, industry and public interest groups and media	yes	

B. Conservation Information Program Expenditures

	This Year	Next Year
1. Budgeted Expenditures	51000	0
2. Actual Expenditures	52500	

C. "At Least As Effective As"

1. Is your AGENCY implementing an "at least as effective as" variant of this BMP? No

a. If YES, please explain in detail how your implementation of this BMP differs from Exhibit 1 and why you consider it to be "at least as effective as."

D. Comments

Activities are conducted in both the CCWD Retail Service Area and the Wholesale Service Area. Therefore, the activities listed are the same as in the Retail BMP 7 report. Budget and expenditures reflect 50% of the

actual. The other 50% is listed in the Retail Report.

Reported as of 10/1

BMP 08: School Education Programs

Reporting Unit: **Contra Costa WD - Wholesale** | BMP Form Status: **100% Complete** | Year: **2003**

A. Implementation

1.Has your agency implemented a school information program to promote water conservation? yes

2. Please provide information on your school programs (by grade level):

Grade	Are grade-appropriate materials distributed?	No. of class presentations	No. of students reached	No. of teachers' workshops
Grades K-3rd	yes	135	9450	4
Grades 4th-6th	yes	173	12110	7
Grades 7th-8th	yes	13	455	0
High School	no	5	140	0

3. Did your Agency's materials meet state education framework requirements? yes

4. When did your Agency begin implementing this program? 07/01/1980

B. School Education Program Expenditures

	This Year	Next Year
1. Budgeted Expenditures	89500	0
2. Actual Expenditures	90000	

C. "At Least As Effective As"

1. Is your AGENCY implementing an "at least as effective as" variant of this BMP? No

a. If YES, please explain in detail how your implementation of this BMP differs from Exhibit 1 and why you consider it to be "at least as effective as."

D. Comments

Note: The School Education Program is offered throughout the CCWD retail and wholesale service areas. Therefore, the activities reflect those of the entire program. The same data is submitted on the CCWD Retail Report. Budget and expenditures reflect 50% of the actual. The other 50% is listed in the Retail Report

Reported as of 10/1

BMP 10: Wholesale Agency Assistance Programs

Reporting Unit: **Contra Costa WD - Wholesale** | BMP Form Status: **100% Complete** | Year: **2003**

A. Implementation

1. Financial Support by BMP

BMP	Financial Incentives Offered?	Budgeted Amount	Amount Awarded	BMP	Financial Incentives Offered?	Budgeted Amount	Amount Awarded
1	yes	87384	66246	8	yes	89500	90000
2	yes	0	0	9	yes	33192	120603
3	No	0	0	10	yes	0	0
4	No	0	0	11	No	0	0
5	yes	43886	48646	12	yes	179363	178991
6	yes	0	47128	13	No		
7	yes	51000	52500	14	yes	163908	53444

2. Technical Support

a. Has your agency conducted or funded workshops addressing CUWCC procedures for calculating program savings, costs and cost-effectiveness? No

b. Has your agency conducted or funded workshops addressing retail agencies' BMP implementation reporting requirements? No

c. Has your agency conducted or funded workshops addressing:

1) ULFT replacement No

2) Residential retrofits yes

3) Commercial, industrial, and institutional surveys No

4) Residential and large turf irrigation yes

5) Conservation-related rates and pricing No

3. Staff Resources by BMP

Qualified Staff	No. FTE Staff	Qualified Staff	No. FTE Staff

BMP	Available for BMP?	Assigned to BMP	BMP	Available for BMP?	Assigned to BMP
1	yes	3	8	yes	2
2	yes	1	9	yes	1
3	No	0	10	yes	1
4	No	0	11	No	0
5	yes	1	12	yes	1
6	yes	1	13	No	0
7	yes	1	14	yes	1

4. Regional Programs by BMP

BMP	Implementation/ Management Program?	BMP	Implementation/ Management Program?
1	yes	8	yes
2	yes	9	yes
3	No	10	yes
4	No	11	No
5	yes	12	yes
6	yes	13	No
7	yes	14	yes

B. Wholesale Agency Assistance Program Expenditures

	This Year	Next Year
1. Budgeted Expenditures	468870	0
2. Actual Expenditures	478566	

C. "At Least As Effective As"

1. Is your AGENCY implementing an "at least as effective as" variant of this BMP? No

a. If YES, please explain in detail how your implementation of this BMP differs from Exhibit 1 and why you consider it to be "at least as effective as."

D. Comments

The Contra Costa Water District provides conservation services to individual customers in both the treated water service area (Retail) and the raw water service area (wholesale). Section B reflects an estimated 30% of the total Water Conservation budget and expenditures and 50% of the public information and school education budget and expenditures for bmp 7 and 8. This does not include the budget or expenditures for the Opperations and Maintenance Department which implement bmp 3 nor does it include the Finance department budget which implements bmp 11. Section A-1 reflects the following: BMP 1- 30% of Program budget and expenditures; BMP 2- included in BMP 1; BMP 5- 30% of Program budget and expenditures; BMP 6- budget is included in BMP 14 and expenditures are 30% of BMP 6 program expenditures; BMP 7- 50% of program budget and expenditures; BMP 8- 50% of program budget and expenditures; BMP 9- 30% of program budget and expenditures; BMP 10- included in each of the other individual BMPs; BMP 12- 30% of salaries and benefits of Conservation staff; BMP 14- 30% of COnservation Incentive Program Budget (all incentives and rebates) and 30% of Residential ULFT replacements expenditures budget is includes the material costs for rebates and distribution in the District wholesale area. NOte, other expenditures against this budget are shown in BMP 6, 9, and 14.

Reported as of 10/1

BMP 11: Conservation Pricing

Reporting Unit:	BMP Form Status:	Year:
Contra Costa WD - Wholesale	**100% Complete**	**2003**

A. Implementation

Rate Structure Data Volumetric Rates for Water Service by Customer Class

1. Residential	
a. Water Rate Structure	
b. Sewer Rate Structure	
c. Total Revenue from Volumetric Rates	$
d. Total Revenue from Non-Volumetric Charges, Fees and other Revenue Sources	$
2. Commercial	
a. Water Rate Structure	Service Not Provided
b. Sewer Rate Structure	Service Not Provided
c. Total Revenue from Volumetric Rates	$0
d. Total Revenue from Non-Volumetric Charges, Fees and other Revenue Sources	$0
3. Industrial	
a. Water Rate Structure	Service Not Provided
b. Sewer Rate Structure	Service Not Provided
c. Total Revenue from Volumetric Rates	$0
d. Total Revenue from Non-Volumetric Charges, Fees and other Revenue Sources	$0
4. Institutional / Government	
a. Water Rate Structure	Service Not Provided
b. Sewer Rate Structure	Service Not Provided
c. Total Revenue from Volumetric Rates	$0
d. Total Revenue from Non-Volumetric Charges, Fees and other Revenue Sources	$0
5. Irrigation	
a. Water Rate Structure	Service Not Provided
b. Sewer Rate Structure	Service Not Provided
c. Total Revenue from Volumetric Rates	$
d. Total Revenue from Non-Volumetric Charges, Fees and other Revenue Sources	$
6. Other	
a. Water Rate Structure	Service Not Provided
b. Sewer Rate Structure	Service Not Provided
c. Total Revenue from Volumetric Rates	$17781975

d. Total Revenue from Non-Volumetric Charges, Fees and other Revenue Sources	$0

B. Conservation Pricing Program Expenditures

	This Year	Next Year
1. Budgeted Expenditures	0	0
2. Actual Expenditures	0	

C. "At Least As Effective As"

1. Is your AGENCY implementing an "at least as effective as" variant of this BMP? No

a. If YES, please explain in detail how your implementation of this BMP differs from Exhibit 1 and why you consider it to be "at least as effective as."

D. Comments

Reported as of 10/1

BMP 12: Conservation Coordinator

Reporting Unit:	BMP Form Status:	Year:
Contra Costa WD - Wholesale	**100% Complete**	**2003**

A. Implementation

1. Does your Agency have a conservation coordinator? yes
2. Is this a full-time position? yes
3. If no, is the coordinator supplied by another agency with which you cooperate in a regional conservation program ?
4. Partner agency's name:
5. If your agency supplies the conservation coordinator:
   - a. What percent is this conservation coordinator's position? 100%
   - b. Coordinator's Name Chris Dundon
   - c. Coordinator's Title Water Conservation Supervisor
   - d. Coordinator's Experience and Number of Years 12
   - e. Date Coordinator's position was created (mm/dd/yyyy) 04/30/1991
6. Number of conservation staff, including Conservation Coordinator. 11

B. Conservation Staff Program Expenditures

	This Year	Next Year
1. Budgeted Expenditures	179363	0
2. Actual Expenditures	178991	

C. "At Least As Effective As"

1. Is your AGENCY implementing an "at least as effective as" variant of this BMP? no
   - a. If YES, please explain in detail how your implementation of this BMP differs from Exhibit 1 and why you consider it to be "at least as effective as."

D. Comments

Staff budget and expenditures includes full time and temporary water conservation staff. The figures do not include staff expenditures from other units such as public information, Opperations and Maintenance, and Finance which also contribute to BMP implementation. Budget and expendatures assume 30% of actual in this Wholesale report and 70% in the Retail Report.

Reported as of 10/1

2004 CUWCC Retail Report

Water Supply & Reuse

Reporting Unit: **Contra Costa WD - Retail**
Year: **2004**

Water Supply Source Information

Supply Source Name	Quantity (AF) Supplied	Supply Type
USBR CVP @ Rock Slough	21924	Imported
USBR CVP @ Old River	51486	Imported
Mallard Slough	2035	Local Watershed
LV Releases	29515	Local Watershed
ECCID Water	10580	Local Watershed
Water Transfer	4999	Imported
Contra Loma Release	1112	Imported

Total AF: 121651

Reported as of 10/1

Accounts & Water Use

Reporting Unit Name: **Contra Costa WD - Retail**
Submitted to CUWCC **12/15/2004**
Year: **2004**

A. Service Area Population Information:

1. Total service area population 245000

B. Number of Accounts and Water Deliveries (AF)

Type	Metered		Unmetered	
	No. of Accounts	Water Deliveries (AF)	No. of Accounts	Water Deliveries (AF)
1. Single-Family	52313	22435	0	0
2. Multi-Family	2482	6314	0	0
3. Commercial	2707	4377	0	0
4. Industrial	6	130	0	0
5. Institutional	218	1174	0	0
6. Dedicated Irrigation	1282	4638	0	0
7. Recycled Water	0	0	0	0
8. Other	72	33464	410	362
9. Unaccounted	NA	0	NA	0
Total	59080	72532	410	362
	Metered		**Unmetered**	

Reported as of 10/1

BMP 01: Water Survey Programs for Single-Family and Multi-Family Residential Customers

Reporting Unit:	BMP Form Status:	Year:
Contra Costa WD - Retail	**100% Complete**	**2004**

A. Implementation

1. Based on your signed MOU date, 09/11/1991, your Agency STRATEGY DUE DATE is:	09/10/1993
2. Has your agency developed and implemented a targeting/ marketing strategy for SINGLE-FAMILY residential water use surveys?	yes
a. If YES, when was it implemented?	07/01/2000
3. Has your agency developed and implemented a targeting/ marketing strategy for MULTI-FAMILY residential water use surveys?	yes
a. If YES, when was it implemented?	07/01/2000

B. Water Survey Data

Survey Counts:	Single Family Accounts	Multi-Family Units
1. Number of surveys offered:	6000	8000
2. Number of surveys completed:	652	402
Indoor Survey:		
3. Check for leaks, including toilets, faucets and meter checks	yes	yes
4. Check showerhead flow rates, aerator flow rates, and offer to replace or recommend replacement, if necessary	yes	yes
5. Check toilet flow rates and offer to install or recommend installation of displacement device or direct customer to ULFT replacement program, as neccesary; replace leaking toilet flapper, as necessary	yes	yes
Outdoor Survey:		
6. Check irrigation system and timers	yes	yes
7. Review or develop customer irrigation schedule	yes	yes
8. Measure landscaped area (Recommended but not required for surveys)	no	yes
9. Measure total irrigable area (Recommended but not required for surveys)	no	yes
10. Which measurement method is typically used (Recommended but not required for surveys)	Image-Based	
11. Were customers provided with information packets that included evaluation results and water savings recommendations?	yes	yes
12. Have the number of surveys offered and completed, survey results, and survey costs been tracked?	yes	yes
a. If yes, in what form are surveys tracked?	database	

b. Describe how your agency tracks this information.

MS Access

C. Water Survey Program Expenditures

	This Year	Next Year
1. Budgeted Expenditures	203188	0
2. Actual Expenditures	145307	

D. "At Least As Effective As"

1. Is your AGENCY implementing an "at least as effective as" variant of this BMP?	No

a. If YES, please explain in detail how your implementation of this BMP differs from Exhibit 1 and why you consider it to be "at least as effective as."

E. Comments

Budget and expenditures include those for Residential Programs and 20% of Administration for Conservation. Budget for Retail Report activities assumes 70% of actual budget and expenditures. The other 30% is documented on the Wholesale Report

Reported as of 10/1

BMP 02: Residential Plumbing Retrofit

Reporting Unit:	BMP Form Status:	Year:
Contra Costa WD - Retail	**100% Complete**	**2004**

A. Implementation

1. Is there an enforceable ordinance in effect in your service area requiring replacement of high-flow showerheads and other water use fixtures with their low-flow counterparts? no

   a. If YES, list local jurisdictions in your service area and code or ordinance in each:

2. Has your agency satisfied the 75% saturation requirement for single-family housing units? no
3. Estimated percent of single-family households with low-flow showerheads: 70%
4. Has your agency satisfied the 75% saturation requirement for multi-family housing units? no
5. Estimated percent of multi-family households with low-flow showerheads: 70%
6. If YES to 2 OR 4 above, please describe how saturation was determined, including the dates and results of any survey research.

B. Low-Flow Device Distribution Information

1. Has your agency developed a targeting/ marketing strategy for distributing low-flow devices? yes

   a. If YES, when did your agency begin implementing this strategy? 07/01/1991

   b. Describe your targeting/ marketing strategy.

   Primary marketing method is through the residential conservation surveys. Existing devices are tested and replaced as necessary. In addition, devices are given out at the District Center as requested.

Low-Flow Devices Distributed/ Installed	SF Accounts	MF Units
2. Number of low-flow showerheads distributed:	214	185
3. Number of toilet-displacement devices distributed:	0	0
4. Number of toilet flappers distributed:	47	7
5. Number of faucet aerators distributed:	101	524

6. Does your agency track the distribution and cost of low-flow devices? yes

   a. If YES, in what format are low-flow devices tracked? Database

   b. If yes, describe your tracking and distribution system :

   MS Access

C. Low-Flow Device Distribution Expenditures

	This Year	Next Year
1. Budgeted Expenditures	0	0
2. Actual Expenditures	0	

D. "At Least As Effective As"

1. Is your AGENCY implementing an "at least as effective as" variant of this BMP? No

   a. If YES, please explain in detail how your implementation of this BMP differs from Exhibit 1 and why you consider it to be "at least as effective as."

E. Comments

Budget included in BMP 1

Reported as of 10/1

BMP 03: System Water Audits, Leak Detection and Repair

Reporting Unit:	BMP Form Status:	Year:
Contra Costa WD - Retail	**100% Complete**	**2004**

A. Implementation

1. Has your agency completed a pre-screening system audit for this reporting year? — yes
2. If YES, enter the values (AF/Year) used to calculate verifiable use as a percent of total production:
   - a. Determine metered sales (AF) — 39191
   - b. Determine other system verifiable uses (AF) — 72
   - c. Determine total supply into the system (AF) — 42954
   - d. Using the numbers above, if (Metered Sales + Other Verifiable Uses) / Total Supply is < 0.9 then a full-scale system audit is required. — 0.91
3. Does your agency keep necessary data on file to verify the values used to calculate verifiable uses as a percent of total production? — yes
4. Did your agency complete a full-scale audit during this report year? — no
5. Does your agency maintain in-house records of audit results or the completed AWWA audit worksheets for the completed audit? — yes
6. Does your agency operate a system leak detection program? — yes
   - a. If yes, describe the leak detection program:

     CCWD has a leak detection crew that has a goal of surveying approximately 160 miles of the treated water service area per year.

B. Survey Data

1. Total number of miles of distribution system line. — 790
2. Number of miles of distribution system line surveyed. — 27

C. System Audit / Leak Detection Program Expenditures

	This Year	Next Year
1. Budgeted Expenditures	28532	0
2. Actual Expenditures	28532	

D. "At Least As Effective As"

1. Is your AGENCY implementing an "at least as effective as" variant of this BMP? — No
   - a. If YES, please explain in detail how your implementation of this BMP differs from Exhibit 1 and why you consider it to be "at least as effective as."

E. Comments

The budget above reflects only the District's O & M Leak Detection Program. Expenditures for this program are estimated, because they were accounted for in the overall O & M expenses. Additional expenditures for leak repair are not included but are included in the overall Opperations and Maintenance budget.

Reported as of 10/1

BMP 04: Metering with Commodity Rates for all New Connections and Retrofit of Existing

Reporting Unit:	BMP Form Status:	Year:
Contra Costa WD - Retail	**100% Complete**	**2004**

A. Implementation

1. Does your agency require meters for all new connections and bill by volume-of-use? — yes
2. Does your agency have a program for retrofitting existing unmetered connections and bill by volume-of-use? — yes
   - a. If YES, when was the plan to retrofit and bill by volume-of-use existing unmetered connections completed? — 06/30/2000
   - b. Describe the program:

     The District has less than 450 Flat Rate customers(less than 1%) who recieive Raw water (untreated) via the Contra Costa canal. These customers are charged a flat rate for the raw water for irrigation purposes. Currently the Distirct is implementing a meter replacement program. Each connection is evaluated to determine the cost effectiveness of metering.
3. Number of previously unmetered accounts fitted with meters during report year. — 4

B. Feasibility Study

1. Has your agency conducted a feasibility study to assess the merits of a program to provide incentives to switch mixed-use accounts to dedicated landscape meters? — no
   - a. If YES, when was the feasibility study conducted? (mm/dd/yy)
   - b. Describe the feasibility study:
2. Number of CII accounts with mixed-use meters. — 0
3. Number of CII accounts with mixed-use meters retrofitted with dedicated irrigation meters during reporting period. — 0

C. Meter Retrofit Program Expenditures

	This Year	Next Year
1. Budgeted Expenditures	0	0
2. Actual Expenditures	0	

D. "At Least As Effective As"

1. Is your AGENCY implementing an "at least as effective as" variant of this BMP? — No
   - a. If YES, please explain in detail how your implementation of this BMP differs from Exhibit 1 and why you consider it to be "at least as effective as."

E. Comments

Expenditures for this BMP are included in the O & M, Finance, and Conservation Budgets and can not be reasonably itemized.

Reported as of 10/1

BMP 05: Large Landscape Conservation Programs and Incentives

Reporting Unit:	BMP Form Status:	Year:
Contra Costa WD - Retail	**100% Complete**	**2004**

A. Water Use Budgets

1. Number of Dedicated Irrigation Meter Accounts:	1282
2. Number of Dedicated Irrigation Meter Accounts with Water Budgets:	626
3. Budgeted Use for Irrigation Meter Accounts with Water Budgets (AF):	0
4. Actual Use for Irrigation Meter Accounts with Water Budgets (AF):	0
5. Does your agency provide water use notices to accounts with budgets each billing cycle?	no

B. Landscape Surveys

1. Has your agency developed a marketing / targeting strategy for landscape surveys?	yes
a. If YES, when did your agency begin implementing this strategy?	07/01/1990

b. Description of marketing / targeting strategy:

Marketing for this program is done in several ways. For mixed use accounts, high summer vs. winter use is targeted. For dedicated accounts customers over their water budget are targeted. Also, marketing is done through property management and landscape management contacts.

2. Number of Surveys Offered.	700
3. Number of Surveys Completed.	109
4. Indicate which of the following Landscape Elements are part of your survey:	
a. Irrigation System Check	yes
b. Distribution Uniformity Analysis	yes
c. Review / Develop Irrigation Schedules	yes
d. Measure Landscape Area	yes
e. Measure Total Irrigable Area	yes
f. Provide Customer Report / Information	yes
5. Do you track survey offers and results?	yes
6. Does your agency provide follow-up surveys for previously completed surveys?	yes

a. If YES, describe below:

Follow-up surveys are often requested by customers to get clarification regarding some aspect of the initial survey. Secondly, as landscape managers are replaced, customers often ask us to conduct a follow-up survey with the new landscape manager.

C. Other BMP 5 Actions

1. An agency can provide mixed-use accounts with ETo-based landscape budgets in lieu of a large landscape survey program.	no

Does your agency provide mixed-use accounts with landscape budgets?	
2. Number of CII mixed-use accounts with landscape budgets.	0
3. Do you offer landscape irrigation training?	yes
4. Does your agency offer financial incentives to improve landscape water use efficiency?	yes

Type of Financial Incentive:	Budget (Dollars/ Year)	Number Awarded to Customers	Total Amount Awarded
a. Rebates	0	15	6572
b. Loans	0	0	0
c. Grants	0	0	0

5. Do you provide landscape water use efficiency information to new customers and customers changing services?	No
a. If YES, describe below:	
6. Do you have irrigated landscaping at your facilities?	yes
a. If yes, is it water-efficient?	yes
b. If yes, does it have dedicated irrigation metering?	yes
7. Do you provide customer notices at the start of the irrigation season?	no
8. Do you provide customer notices at the end of the irrigation season?	yes

D. Landscape Conservation Program Expenditures

	This Year	Next Year
1. Budgeted Expenditures	102669	0
2. Actual Expenditures	104104	

E. "At Least As Effective As"

1. Is your AGENCY implementing an "at least as effective as" variant of this BMP?	No

a. If YES, please explain in detail how your implementation of this BMP differs from Exhibit 1 and why you consider it to be "at least as effective as."

F. Comments

Budget and expenditures include those for Large Landscape Programs and 15% of Administration for Conservation. Budget for the Retail Report activities assumes 70% of actual budget and expenditures in this Retail report and 30% in the wholesale report. Budget for the irrigation incentives is include in the District's Conservation Program which includes all rebates and replacement programs. The budget is shown in the BMP 14 report.

Reported as of 10/1

BMP 06: High-Efficiency Washing Machine Rebate Programs

Reporting Unit:	BMP Form Status:	Year:
Contra Costa WD - Retail	**100% Complete**	**2004**

A. Implementation

1. Do any energy service providers or waste water utilities in your service area offer rebates for high-efficiency washers? yes

   a. If YES, describe the offerings and incentives as well as who the energy/waste water utility provider is.

   Pacific Gas and Electirc (PG&E) offered rebates during the year for Energy Star rated washers. However, the PG&E program was discontinued for a period during the FY.

2. Does your agency offer rebates for high-efficiency washers? yes
3. What is the level of the rebate? 50
4. Number of rebates awarded. 479

B. Rebate Program Expenditures

	This Year	Next Year
1. Budgeted Expenditures	0	0
2. Actual Expenditures	73692	

C. "At Least As Effective As"

1. Is your AGENCY implementing an "at least as effective as" variant of this BMP? no

   a. If YES, please explain in detail how your implementation of this BMP differs from Exhibit 1 and why you consider it to be "at least as effective as."

D. Comments

NOTE: the program was implemented for 6 months during the FY. Budget for this program is included in the District's overall Conservation Incentive Program, which includes all rebates and replacement programs. Total budget is shown in the BMP 14 report. Expenditures in this report reflect 70% of the actual expenditures for BMP 6. The other 30% is listed in the Wholesale Report

Reported as of 10/1

BMP 07: Public Information Programs

Reporting Unit:	BMP Form Status:	Year:
Contra Costa WD - Retail	**100% Complete**	**2004**

A. Implementation

1. Does your agency maintain an active public information program to promote and educate customers about water conservation? yes

   a. If YES, describe the program and how it's organized.

   The Public Information and Conservation Department is responsible for implementing the District's Public Information Program. This is carried out through a variety of program elements including: legislative affairs; employee communications; external communications with customers, key constituents, decision-makers, public organizations, the news media, and through an active water conservation program. The promotion of water conservation is made through a variety of methods such as direct mailing, paid advertising, bill inserts, the On Tap newsletter, brochures, water bill message, demonstration gardens, media events and an active speakers bureau. The public information program as well as the water conservation program are carried out through the entire District service area.

2. Indicate which and how many of the following activities are included in your public information program.

Public Information Program Activity	Yes/No	Number of Events
a. Paid Advertising	no	0
b. Public Service Announcement	no	0
c. Bill Inserts / Newsletters / Brochures	yes	11
d. Bill showing water usage in comparison to previous year's usage	yes	
e. Demonstration Gardens	yes	2
f. Special Events, Media Events	yes	3
g. Speaker's Bureau	yes	61
h. Program to coordinate with other government agencies, industry and public interest groups and media	yes	

B. Conservation Information Program Expenditures

	This Year	Next Year
1. Budgeted Expenditures	61400	0
2. Actual Expenditures	61400	

C. "At Least As Effective As"

1. Is your AGENCY implementing an "at least as effective as" variant of this BMP? No

   a. If YES, please explain in detail how your implementation of this BMP differs from Exhibit 1 and why you consider it to be "at least as effective as."

D. Comments

Budget only includes those costs for line items listed above. It does not reflect all staff time to implement. The public information program is implemented throughout the CCWD retail and wholesale service area.

Reported as of 10/1

BMP 08: School Education Programs

Reporting Unit:	BMP Form Status:	Year:
Contra Costa WD - Retail	**100% Complete**	**2004**

A. Implementation

1.Has your agency implemented a school information program to promote water conservation? yes

2. Please provide information on your school programs (by grade level):

Grade	Are grade-appropriate materials distributed?	No. of class presentations	No. of students reached	No. of teachers' workshops
Grades K-3rd	yes	135	9450	0
Grades 4th-6th	yes	283	19836	4
Grades 7th-8th	yes	13	455	0
High School	no	5	140	0

3. Did your Agency's materials meet state education framework requirements? yes

4. When did your Agency begin implementing this program? 07/01/1980

B. School Education Program Expenditures

	This Year	Next Year
1. Budgeted Expenditures	90000	0
2. Actual Expenditures	90000	

C. "At Least As Effective As"

1. Is your AGENCY implementing an "at least as effective as" variant of this BMP? No

a. If YES, please explain in detail how your implementation of this BMP differs from Exhibit 1 and why you consider it to be "at least as effective as."

D. Comments

Note: The School Education Program is offered throughout the CCWD retail and wholesale service areas.

Reported as of 10/1

BMP 09: Conservation Programs for CII Accounts

Reporting Unit:	BMP Form Status:	Year:
Contra Costa WD - Retail	**100% Complete**	**2004**

A. Implementation

1. Has your agency identified and ranked COMMERCIAL customers according to use?	yes
2. Has your agency identified and ranked INDUSTRIAL customers according to use?	yes
3. Has your agency identified and ranked INSTITUTIONAL customers according to use?	yes

Option A: CII Water Use Survey and Customer Incentives Program

4. Is your agency operating a CII water use survey and customer incentives program for the purpose of complying with BMP 9 under this option?	yes

CII Surveys	Commercial Accounts	Industrial Accounts	Institutional Accounts
a. Number of New Surveys Offered	300	0	50
b. Number of New Surveys Completed	72	0	2
c. Number of Site Follow-ups of Previous Surveys (within 1 yr)	10	0	0
d. Number of Phone Follow-ups of Previous Surveys (within 1 yr)	10	0	0

CII Survey Components	Commercial Accounts	Industrial Accounts	Institutional Accounts
e. Site Visit	yes	yes	yes
f. Evaluation of all water-using apparatus and processes	yes	yes	yes
g. Customer report identifying recommended efficiency measures, paybacks and agency incentives	yes	yes	yes

Agency CII Customer Incentives	Budget ($/Year)	No. Awarded to Customers	Total $ Amount Awarded
h. Rebates	0	151	45075
i. Loans	0	0	0
j. Grants	0	0	0
k. Others	0	42	7560

Option B: CII Conservation Program Targets

5. Does your agency track CII program interventions and water savings for the purpose of complying with BMP 9 under this option?	no
6. Does your agency document and maintain records on how savings were realized and the method of calculation for estimated savings?	no
7. Estimated annual savings (AF/yr) from site-verified actions taken by agency since 1991.	0
8. Estimated annual savings (AF/yr) from non-site-verified actions taken by agency since 1991.	0

B. Conservation Program Expenditures for CII Accounts

	This Year	Next Year
1. Budgeted Expenditures	73626	0
2. Actual Expenditures	118653	

C. "At Least As Effective As"

1. Is your AGENCY implementing an "at least as effective as" variant of this BMP?	No

a. If YES, please explain in detail how your implementation of this BMP differs from Exhibit 1 and why you consider it to be "at least as effective as."

D. Comments

Budget includes the CII Survey Program plus 15% of Administration for Conservation. Budget for the Retail Report Activities assumes 70% of actual budget in this retail report and 30% in the wholesale report. Expenditures in this report reflect 70% of the CII program, Pre-Rinse program, and Light Wash Program.

Reported as of 10/1

BMP 09a: CII ULFT Water Savings

Reporting Unit:	BMP Form Status:	Year:
Contra Costa WD - Retail	**100% Complete**	**2004**

1. Did your agency implement a CII ULFT replacement program in the reporting year? If No, please explain why on Line B. 10. — Yes

A. Targeting and Marketing

1. What basis does your agency use to target customers for participation in this program? Check all that apply.
   - Consumption ranking
   - Potential savings
   - Oldest meter
   - CII Sector or subsector
   - CII ULFT Study subsector targeting

   a. Describe which method you found to be the most effective overall, and which was the most effective per dollar expended.

   Repeated targeting seems to help. However, some customers will not participate regardless of the incentive.

2. How does your agency advertise this program? Check all that apply.
   - Direct letter
   - Bill insert
   - Bill message
   - Newsletter
   - Telephone
   - Web page
   - Trade publications
   - Trade shows and events

   a. Describe which method you found to be the most effective overall, and which was the most effective per dollar expended.

   Our marketing consisted of direct mailing to customers in several forms. This included direct mailing from the District and mailing through groups such as the Chambers of Commerce. Bill messages and bill inserts were inexpensive and resulted in modest participation. Direct mailing letters and fliers to customers was effective, but required significant mailing to produce enough participants. In addition, a considerable amount of follow-up calls are required to convince some customers to participate.

B. Implementation

1. Does your agency keep and maintain customer participant information? (Read the Help information for a complete list of all the information for this BMP.) — Yes
2. Would your agency be willing to share this information if the CUWCC did a study to evaluate the program on behalf of your agency? — Yes
3. What is the total number of customer accounts participating in the program during the last year ? — 34

CII Subsector	Number of Toilets Replaced			
4.	Standard Gravity Tank	Air Assisted	Valve Floor Mount	Valve Wall Mount
a. Offices	0	0	0	0
b. Retail / Wholesale	0	0	0	0
c. Hotels	0	0	0	0
d. Health	0	0	0	0
e. Industrial	0	0	0	0
f. Schools: K to 12	0	0	0	0
g. Eating	0	0	0	0
h. Government	0	0	0	0
i. Churches	0	0	0	0
j. Other	0	0	0	0

5. Program design. — Rebate or voucher

6. Does your agency use outside services to implement this program? — No

a. If yes, check all that apply.

7. Participant tracking and follow-up.
   - Letter
   - Site Visit

8. Based on your program experience, please rank on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being the least frequent cause and 5 being the most frequent cause, the following reasons why customers refused to participate in the program.

a. Disruption to business	4
b. Inadequate payback	3
c. Inadequate ULFT performance	4
d. Lack of funding	3
e. American's with Disabilities Act	2
f. Permitting	2
g. Other. Please describe in B. 9.	4

9. Please describe general program acceptance/resistance by customers, obstacles to implementation, and other isues affecting program implementation or effectiveness.

   9. The program offered a rebate of 100% of the material cost of the ULFT up to $150. This is less than the Grant-Funded FY03 program which offered up to $300. The program was marketed heavely, but resulted in considerably less participation than the FY03 program. A number of factors affect the customer reluctance to participate. These include: cost of installation, disruption to business, perception of poor performance, and others. For two years in a row the participation by Churches has been reasonably high. This may be because the estimated cost savings from the saved water is proportionally a bigger part of their overall operating budget.

10. Please provide a general assessment of the program for this reporting year. Did your program achieve its objectives? Were your targeting and marketing approaches effective? Were program costs in line with expectations and budgeting?

   A total of 132 CII ULFTs were installed through the program in the District whole service area (TWSA and RWSA). This did not meet

the goal of 150 to 200 for the year. The rebate was reduced because grant funding ended. This most likely had an effect on the participation level. However, many other reasons for reduced participation as listed in section 9 above more likely had a greater effect on paticipation levels. Also, as the program catches the 'low hanging fruit' the remaining customers will be more difficult to convince to participate.

C. Conservation Program Expenditures for CII ULFT

1. CII ULFT Program: Annual Budget & Expenditure Data

	Budgeted	Actual Expenditure
a. Labor	0	38389
b. Materials	0	12450
c. Marketing & Advertising	0	0
d. Administration & Overhead	0	0
e. Outside Services	0	0
f. Total	0	50839

2. CII ULFT Program: Annual Cost Sharing

a. Wholesale agency contribution	0
b. State agency contribution	0
c. Federal agency contribution	0
d. Other contribution	0
e. Total	0

D. Comments

Program Budget is included in the overall Conservation Incentive Program Budget (see BMP 14). Expenditures include 100% of the CII ULFT Program labor and rebate costs. Marketing and advertising expendatures are included in the overall Conservation Incentive Program expenditures.

Reported as of 10/1

BMP 11: Conservation Pricing

Reporting Unit: **Contra Costa WD - Retail**

BMP Form Status: **100% Complete**

Year: **2004**

A. Implementation

Rate Structure Data Volumetric Rates for Water Service by Customer Class

1. Residential	
a. Water Rate Structure	Uniform
b. Sewer Rate Structure	Service Not Provided
c. Total Revenue from Volumetric Rates	$26429454
d. Total Revenue from Non-Volumetric Charges, Fees and other Revenue Sources	$15287222
2. Commercial	
a. Water Rate Structure	Uniform
b. Sewer Rate Structure	Service Not Provided
c. Total Revenue from Volumetric Rates	$4032238
d. Total Revenue from Non-Volumetric Charges, Fees and other Revenue Sources	$1991979
3. Industrial	
a. Water Rate Structure	Uniform
b. Sewer Rate Structure	Service Not Provided
c. Total Revenue from Volumetric Rates	$116391
d. Total Revenue from Non-Volumetric Charges, Fees and other Revenue Sources	$32176
4. Institutional / Government	
a. Water Rate Structure	Uniform
b. Sewer Rate Structure	Service Not Provided
c. Total Revenue from Volumetric Rates	$1067813
d. Total Revenue from Non-Volumetric Charges, Fees and other Revenue Sources	$498074
5. Irrigation	
a. Water Rate Structure	Uniform
b. Sewer Rate Structure	Service Not Provided
c. Total Revenue from Volumetric Rates	$4224377
d. Total Revenue from Non-Volumetric Charges, Fees and other Revenue Sources	$1274799
6. Other	

a. Water Rate Structure	Uniform
b. Sewer Rate Structure	Service Not Provided
c. Total Revenue from Volumetric Rates	$16357341
d. Total Revenue from Non-Volumetric Charges, Fees and other Revenue Sources	$258601

B. Conservation Pricing Program Expenditures

	This Year	Next Year
1. Budgeted Expenditures	0	0
2. Actual Expenditures	0	

C. "At Least As Effective As"

1. Is your AGENCY implementing an "at least as effective as" variant of this BMP? No

a. If YES, please explain in detail how your implementation of this BMP differs from Exhibit 1 and why you consider it to be "at least as effective as."

D. Comments

Other(section 6 above) includes all non-municipal raw water customers such as: industrial, canal landscape and agg. Budget is included in the overall Finance Department budget.

Reported as of 10/1

BMP 12: Conservation Coordinator

Reporting Unit:	BMP Form Status:	Year:
Contra Costa WD - Retail	**100% Complete**	**2004**

A. Implementation

1. Does your Agency have a conservation coordinator? yes
2. Is this a full-time position? yes
3. If no, is the coordinator supplied by another agency with which you cooperate in a regional conservation program ?
4. Partner agency's name:
5. If your agency supplies the conservation coordinator:

a. What percent is this conservation coordinator's position?	100%
b. Coordinator's Name	Chris Dundon
c. Coordinator's Title	Water Conservation Supervisor
d. Coordinator's Experience and Number of Years	13 years
e. Date Coordinator's position was created (mm/dd/yyyy)	04/30/1991

6. Number of conservation staff, including Conservation Coordinator. 11

B. Conservation Staff Program Expenditures

	This Year	Next Year
1. Budgeted Expenditures	443050	0
2. Actual Expenditures	441326	

C. "At Least As Effective As"

1. Is your AGENCY implementing an "at least as effective as" variant of this BMP? no

a. If YES, please explain in detail how your implementation of this BMP differs from Exhibit 1 and why you consider it to be "at least as effective as."

D. Comments

Staff budget and expenditures includes full time and temporary water conservation staff. The figures do not include staff expenditures from other units such as public information, Operations and Maintenance, and Finance, who also contribute to BMP implementation. Budget and expenditures assume 70% of actual in this Retail report and 30% in the wholesale report.

Reported as of 10/1

BMP 13: Water Waste Prohibition

Reporting Unit:	BMP Form Status:	Year:
Contra Costa WD - Retail	**100% Complete**	**2004**

A. Requirements for Documenting BMP Implementation

1. Is a water waste prohibition ordinance in effect in your service area? yes

   a. If YES, describe the ordinance:

   CCWD Title 5: Water Supply and Rates, section 5.44.010 Prevention of Waste and section 5.44.020 Encouraged water use

2. Is a copy of the most current ordinance(s) on file with CUWCC? yes

   a. List local jurisdictions in your service area in the first text box and water waste ordinance citations in each jurisdiction in the second text box:

Retail Water Service provided to: Concord, Clayton, Clyde, Pacheco and parts of Martinez, Walnut Creek and Pleasant Hill	CCWD Title 5: Water Supply and Rates, section 5.44.010 Prevention of Waste and section 5.44.020 Encouraged water use and Resolution 93-23

B. Implementation

1. Indicate which of the water uses listed below are prohibited by your agency or service area.

   a. Gutter flooding yes

   b. Single-pass cooling systems for new connections Yes

   c. Non-recirculating systems in all new conveyor or car wash systems yes

   d. Non-recirculating systems in all new commercial laundry systems Yes

   e. Non-recirculating systems in all new decorative fountains yes

   f. Other, please name Yes

2. Describe measures that prohibit water uses listed above:

   CCWD Title 5: Water Supply and Rates, section 5.44.010 Prevention of Waste and section 5.44.020 Encouraged water use. Resolution No. 93-23 prohibits withink the area served by the District: The use of water in a decorative fountain or pool that does not recycle water; Washing paved or other hard-surfaced areas, including sidewalks, walkways, driveways, patios and parking areas; Outside watering that results in flooding or excessive runoff in a gutter, drain, patio, driveway, walkway or street; Flushing sewers or hydrants, or washing streets except for emergencies, protection of public health or safety, or essential operations; Using potable water for construction except if no other water supply is available; The use of nonrecirculating systems in all new conveyer car wash and commercial laundry systems; The use of single pass cooling systems in new construction; and The failure to repair a controllable leak of water.

Water Softeners:

3. Indicate which of the following measures your agency has supported in developing state law:

   a. Allow the sale of more efficient, demand-initiated

   regenerating DIR models. Yes

   b. Develop minimum appliance efficiency standards that:

      i.) Increase the regeneration efficiency standard to at least 3,350 grains of hardness removed per pound of common salt used. Yes

      ii.) Implement an identified maximum number of gallons discharged per gallon of soft water produced. Yes

   c. Allow local agencies, including municipalities and special districts, to set more stringent standards and/or to ban on-site regeneration of water softeners if it is demonstrated and found by the agency governing board that there is an adverse effect on the reclaimed water or groundwater supply. Yes

4. Does your agency include water softener checks in home water audit programs? yes

5. Does your agency include information about DIR and exchange-type water softeners in educational efforts to encourage replacement of less efficient timer models? Yes

C. Water Waste Prohibition Program Expenditures

	This Year	Next Year
1. Budgeted Expenditures	0	0
2. Actual Expenditures	0	

D. "At Least As Effective As"

1. Is your AGENCY implementing an "at least as effective as" variant of this BMP? no

   a. If YES, please explain in detail how your implementation of this BMP differs from Exhibit 1 and why you consider it to be "at least as effective as."

E. Comments

There is no specific budget line item for this BMP.

Reported as of 10/1

BMP 14: Residential ULFT Replacement Programs

Reporting Unit:	BMP Form Status:	Year:
Contra Costa WD - Retail	**100% Complete**	**2004**

A. Implementation

	Single-Family Accounts	Multi-Family Units
1. Does your Agency have program(s) for replacing high-water-using toilets with ultra-low flush toilets?	yes	yes

Number of Toilets Replaced by Agency Program During Report Year

Replacement Method	SF Accounts	MF Units
2. Rebate	103	16
3. Direct Install	0	0
4. CBO Distribution	910	302
5. Other	0	0
Total	**1013**	**318**

6. Describe your agency's ULFT program for single-family residences.

Rebate program was replaced with a Voucher/Distribution program for all residential (SF and MF). Program provides a high quality ULFT free to elegible customers.

7. Describe your agency's ULFT program for multi-family residences.

Distribution/ Voucher provided to MF customers to replace non-ULFT with ULFT. Voucher good for specific ULFT model from vendor contracted with CCWD.

8. Is a toilet retrofit on resale ordinance in effect for your service area? no

9. List local jurisdictions in your service area in the left box and ordinance citations in each jurisdiction in the right box:

B. Residential ULFT Program Expenditures

	This Year	Next Year
1. Budgeted Expenditures	412564	0
2. Actual Expenditures	22167	

C. "At Least As Effective As"

1. Is your AGENCY implementing an "at least as effective as" variant of this BMP? no

a. If YES, please explain in detail how your implementation of this BMP differs from Exhibit 1 and why you consider it to be "at least as effective as."

D. Comments

The budget includes the entire Conservation Incentive Program budget plus 50% of the Administration budget. The expenditures include only those for the ULFT programs. The other Conservation Incentives expenditures are shown in the appropriate BMP reports (bmp 5, 6, 9, 9A). Expenditures in this report reflect 70%of the actual. The other 30%

is listed in the Wholesale Report.

Reported as of 10/1

2004 CUWCC Wholesale Report

Water Supply & Reuse

Reporting Unit: **Contra Costa WD - Wholesale**
Year: **2004**

Water Supply Source Information

Supply Source Name	Quantity (AF) Supplied	Supply Type
USBR CVP @ Rock Slough	21924	Imported
USBR CVP @ Old River	51486	Imported
Mallard Slough	2035	Local Watershed
LV Releases	29515	Local Watershed
ECCID Water	10580	Local Watershed
Water Transfer	4999	Imported
Contra Loma Release	1112	Imported

Total AF: 121651

Purchaser Information

Name of Agency	Quantity (AF) Supplied	Retailer or Wholesaler
Antioch (Raw)	14162	retail
Martinez (Raw)	5696	retail
Diablo Water District (Raw)	11000	retail
Pittsburg (Raw)	10150	retail
SCWC (Raw)	2704	retail
SCWC (Treated)	57	retail
Brentwood (Treated)	4060	retail

Total AF: 47829

Reported as of 10/1

BMP 03: System Water Audits, Leak Detection and Repair

Reporting Unit: **Contra Costa WD - Wholesale**
BMP Form Status: **100% Complete**
Year: **2004**

A. Implementation

1. Has your agency completed a pre-screening system audit for this reporting year? — yes
2. If YES, enter the values (AF/Year) used to calculate verifiable use as a percent of total production:
   - a. Determine metered sales (AF) — 121087
   - b. Determine other system verifiable uses (AF) — 0
   - c. Determine total supply into the system (AF) — 121651
   - d. Using the numbers above, if (Metered Sales + Other Verifiable Uses) / Total Supply is < 0.9 then a full-scale system audit is required. — 1.00
3. Does your agency keep necessary data on file to verify the values used to calculate verifiable uses as a percent of total production? — yes
4. Did your agency complete a full-scale audit during this report year? — no
5. Does your agency maintain in-house records of audit results or the completed AWWA audit worksheets for the completed audit? — yes
6. Does your agency operate a system leak detection program? — yes
   - a. If yes, describe the leak detection program:

     The Contra Costa Canal is continously surveyed by water tendors and other maintenence personnel for leaks. Leaks are repaired as part of the District's Raw Water Facility Improvement Program.

B. Survey Data

1. Total number of miles of distribution system line. — 48
2. Number of miles of distribution system line surveyed. — 48

C. System Audit / Leak Detection Program Expenditures

	This Year	Next Year
1. Budgeted Expenditures	0	0
2. Actual Expenditures	0	

D. "At Least As Effective As"

1. Is your AGENCY implementing an "at least as effective as" variant of this BMP? — No
   - a. If YES, please explain in detail how your implementation of this BMP differs from Exhibit 1 and why you consider it to be "at least as effective as."

E. Comments

Budget and expenditures are included in the overall Opperations & Maintenance budget.

Reported as of 10/1

BMP 07: Public Information Programs

Reporting Unit:	BMP Form Status:	Year:
Contra Costa WD - Wholesale	**100% Complete**	**2004**

A. Implementation

1. Does your agency maintain an active public information program to promote and educate customers about water conservation? yes

a. If YES, describe the program and how it's organized.

The Public Information and Conservation Department is responsible for implementing the District's Public Information Program. This is carried out through a variety of program elements including: legislative affairs; employee communications; external communications with customers, key constituents, decision-makers, public organizations, the news media, and through an active water conservation program. The promotion of water conservation is made through a variety of methods such as direct mailing, paid advertising, bill inserts, the On Tap newsletter, brochures, water bill message, demonstration gardens, media events and an active speakers bureau. The public information program as well as the water conservation program is carried out through the entire District service area.

2. Indicate which and how many of the following activities are included in your public information program.

Public Information Program Activity	Yes/No	Number of Events
a. Paid Advertising	no	0
b. Public Service Announcement	no	0
c. Bill Inserts / Newsletters / Brochures	yes	11
d. Bill showing water usage in comparison to previous year's usage	yes	
e. Demonstration Gardens	yes	2
f. Special Events, Media Events	yes	3
g. Speaker's Bureau	yes	61
h. Program to coordinate with other government agencies, industry and public interest groups and media	yes	

B. Conservation Information Program Expenditures

	This Year	Next Year
1. Budgeted Expenditures	61400	0
2. Actual Expenditures	61400	

C. "At Least As Effective As"

1. Is your AGENCY implementing an "at least as effective as" variant of this BMP? No

a. If YES, please explain in detail how your implementation of this BMP differs from Exhibit 1 and why you consider it to be "at least as effective as."

D. Comments

Budget only includes those costs for line items listed above. It does not reflect the costs of staff time to implement. The program is implemented equally over the entire service area including both retail and wholesale

areas.

Reported as of 10/1

BMP 08: School Education Programs

Reporting Unit:	BMP Form Status:	Year:
Contra Costa WD - Wholesale	**100% Complete**	**2004**

A. Implementation

1.Has your agency implemented a school information program to promote water conservation? yes

2. Please provide information on your school programs (by grade level):

Grade	Are grade-appropriate materials distributed?	No. of class presentations	No. of students reached	No. of teachers' workshops
Grades K-3rd	yes	135	9450	0
Grades 4th-6th	yes	283	19836	4
Grades 7th-8th	yes	13	455	0
High School	no	5	140	0

3. Did your Agency's materials meet state education framework requirements? yes

4. When did your Agency begin implementing this program? 07/01/1980

B. School Education Program Expenditures

	This Year	Next Year
1. Budgeted Expenditures	90000	0
2. Actual Expenditures	90000	

C. "At Least As Effective As"

1. Is your AGENCY implementing an "at least as effective as" variant of this BMP? No

a. If YES, please explain in detail how your implementation of this BMP differs from Exhibit 1 and why you consider it to be "at least as effective as."

D. Comments

Note: The School Education Program is offered throughout the CCWD retail and wholesale service areas. Therefore, the activities reflect those of the entire program.

Reported as of 10/1

BMP 10: Wholesale Agency Assistance Programs

Reporting Unit:	BMP Form Status:	Year:
Contra Costa WD - Wholesale	**100% Complete**	**2004**

A. Implementation

1. Financial Support by BMP

BMP	Financial Incentives Offered?	Budgeted Amount	Amount Awarded	BMP	Financial Incentives Offered?	Budgeted Amount	Amount Awarded
1	yes	87081	62275	8	yes	90000	90000
2	yes	0	0	9	yes	31554	50851
3	No	0	0	10	yes	0	0
4	No	0	0	11	No	0	0
5	yes	44001	44616	12	yes	189878	189140
6	yes	0	31582	13	No	0	0
7	yes	61400	61400	14	yes	176813	95214

2. Technical Support

a. Has your agency conducted or funded workshops addressing CUWCC procedures for calculating program savings, costs and cost-effectiveness? No

b. Has your agency conducted or funded workshops addressing retail agencies' BMP implementation reporting requirements? No

c. Has your agency conducted or funded workshops addressing:

1) ULFT replacement No
2) Residential retrofits yes
3) Commercial, industrial, and institutional surveys No
4) Residential and large turf irrigation yes
5) Conservation-related rates and pricing No

3. Staff Resources by BMP

Qualified Staff	No. FTE Staff	Qualified Staff	No. FTE Staff

BMP	Available for BMP?	Assigned to BMP	BMP	Available for BMP?	Assigned to BMP
1	yes	3	8	yes	2
2	yes	1	9	yes	1
3	No		10	yes	1
4	No		11	No	0
5	yes	1	12	yes	1
6	yes	1	13	No	0
7	yes	1	14	yes	1

4. Regional Programs by BMP

BMP	Implementation/ Management Program?	BMP	Implementation/ Management Program?
1	yes	8	yes
2	yes	9	yes
3	No	10	yes
4	No	11	No
5	yes	12	yes
6	yes	13	No
7	yes	14	yes

B. Wholesale Agency Assistance Program Expenditures

	This Year	Next Year
1. Budgeted Expenditures	680000	0
2. Actual Expenditures	640000	

C. "At Least As Effective As"

1. Is your AGENCY implementing an "at least as effective as" variant of this BMP? No

a. If YES, please explain in detail how your implementation of this BMP differs from Exhibit 1 and why you consider it to be "at least as effective as."

D. Comments

The Contra Costa Water District provides conservation services to individual customers in both the treated water service area (Retail) and the raw water service area (wholesale). Section B reflects an estimated 30% of the total Water Conservation budget and expenditures and 100% of the public information and school education budget and expenditures for bmp 7 and 8, not including staff labor for BMP7. This does not include the budget or expenditures for the O&M Department which implements bmp 3 nor does it include the Finance department budget which implements bmp 11. Section A-1 reflects the following: BMP 1- 30% of Program budget and expenditures; BMP 2- included in BMP 1; BMP 5- 30% of Program budget and expenditures; BMP 6- budget is included in BMP 14 and expenditures are 30% of BMP 6 program expenditures; BMP 7- 100% of program budget and expenditures; BMP 8- 100% of program budget and expenditures; BMP 9- 30% of program budget and expenditures; BMP 10- included in each of the other individual BMPs; BMP 12- 30% of salaries and benefits of Conservation staff; BMP 14- NOTE, the BUDGET reflects 30% of Conservation Incentive Program budget, which includes ALL incentives and rebates such as ULFTs, Washers, CII devices, Irrigation rebates, etc. Expenditures reflect 30% of only the Residential ULFT replacements. The other expenditures are shown in the appropriate BMPs 1, 5, 6, 9, and 9A.

Reported as of 10/1

BMP 11: Conservation Pricing

Reporting Unit:	BMP Form Status:	Year:
Contra Costa WD - Wholesale	**100% Complete**	**2004**

A. Implementation

Rate Structure Data Volumetric Rates for Water Service by Customer Class

1. Residential

a. Water Rate Structure

b. Sewer Rate Structure

c. Total Revenue from Volumetric Rates $

d. Total Revenue from Non-Volumetric Charges, Fees and other Revenue Sources $

2. Commercial

a. Water Rate Structure

b. Sewer Rate Structure

c. Total Revenue from Volumetric Rates $

d. Total Revenue from Non-Volumetric Charges, Fees and other Revenue Sources $

3. Industrial

a. Water Rate Structure

b. Sewer Rate Structure

c. Total Revenue from Volumetric Rates $

d. Total Revenue from Non-Volumetric Charges, Fees and other Revenue Sources $

4. Institutional / Government

a. Water Rate Structure

b. Sewer Rate Structure

c. Total Revenue from Volumetric Rates $

d. Total Revenue from Non-Volumetric Charges, Fees and other Revenue Sources $

5. Irrigation

a. Water Rate Structure

b. Sewer Rate Structure

c. Total Revenue from Volumetric Rates $

d. Total Revenue from Non-Volumetric Charges, Fees and other Revenue Sources $

6. Other

a. Water Rate Structure Uniform

b. Sewer Rate Structure Service Not Provided

c. Total Revenue from Volumetric Rates $19843258

d. Total Revenue from Non-Volumetric Charges, Fees and other Revenue Sources $0

B. Conservation Pricing Program Expenditures

	This Year	Next Year
1. Budgeted Expenditures	0	0
2. Actual Expenditures	0	

C. "At Least As Effective As"

1. Is your AGENCY implementing an "at least as effective as" variant of this BMP? No

a. If YES, please explain in detail how your implementation of this BMP differs from Exhibit 1 and why you consider it to be "at least as effective as."

D. Comments

Income includes Wholesale Raw and Treated Wholesale.

Reported as of 10/1

BMP 12: Conservation Coordinator

Reporting Unit:	BMP Form Status:	Year:
Contra Costa WD - Wholesale	**100% Complete**	**2004**

A. Implementation

1. Does your Agency have a conservation coordinator? yes
2. Is this a full-time position? yes
3. If no, is the coordinator supplied by another agency with which you cooperate in a regional conservation program ?
4. Partner agency's name:
5. If your agency supplies the conservation coordinator:
   - a. What percent is this conservation coordinator's position? 100%
   - b. Coordinator's Name Chris Dundon
   - c. Coordinator's Title Water Conservation Supervisor
   - d. Coordinator's Experience and Number of Years 13
   - e. Date Coordinator's position was created (mm/dd/yyyy) 04/30/1991
6. Number of conservation staff, including Conservation Coordinator. 11

B. Conservation Staff Program Expenditures

	This Year	Next Year
1. Budgeted Expenditures	189878	0
2. Actual Expenditures	189140	

C. "At Least As Effective As"

1. Is your AGENCY implementing an "at least as effective as" variant of this BMP? no
   - a. If YES, please explain in detail how your implementation of this BMP differs from Exhibit 1 and why you consider it to be "at least as effective as."

D. Comments

Staff budget and expenditures includes full time and temporary water conservation staff. The figures do not include staff expenditures from other units such as public information, Opperations and Maintenance, and Finance which also contribute to BMP implementation. Budget and expendatures assume 30% of actual in this Wholesale report and 70% in the Retail Report.

Reported as of 10/1

Appendix D

Board Resolutions and Regulations

Appendix D - Board Resolutions and Regulations

This Appendix lists the Board resolutions and regulations pertaining to the Urban Water Management Plan and other District water conservation efforts. The resolutions are listed in Table D-1 and the regulations in Table D-2. The text of the resolution adopting the 2005 Urban Water Management Plan is included in this Appendix and follows Table D-2.

Table D-1 Resolutions Regarding the Urban Water Management Plan Update and Water Waste Prohibitions

Resolution Number	Title	Status
00-28	A Resolution of the Board of Directors of the Contra Costa Water District Authorizing Approval of the Urban Water Management Plan	Passed
95-60	A Resolution of the Board of Directors of the Contra Costa Water District Adopting the Urban Water Management Plan	Passed
95-57	A Resolution of the Board of Directors of the Contra Costa Water District Authorizing Execution of a Project Specific Agreement for the Zone 1 Recycled Water Project Between Central Contra Costa Sanitary District and Contra Costa Water District	Passed
93-23	A Resolution of the Board of Directors of the Contra Costa Water District Enacting Water Waste Prohibitions Within the Area Served by this District	Passed
92-02	A Resolution of the Board of Directors of the Contra Costa Water District Adopting the Urban Water Shortage Contingency Plan of Said District	Passed. Superceded by resolution to adopt the update of the 1995 Urban Water Management Plan.
91-60	A Resolution of the Board of Directors of the Contra Costa Water District Amending the Drought Emergency Regulations of the District	Passed on December 11, 1991. Amended section 1 of Resolution No. 91-11 regarding effective period of regulations.
91-31	A Resolution of the Board of Directors of the Contra Costa Water District Amending Drought Emergency Regulations	Passed on June 26, 1991. Repealed mandatory water reduction provisions passed with Resolution No. 91-11
91-11	A Resolution of the Board of Directors of the Contra Costa Water District Adopting Drought Emergency Regulations Restricting the Quantity and Use of Water Supplied by the District and Imposing Penalties for Non-Compliance	Passed on March 6, 1991
91-10	A Resolution of the Board of Directors of the Contra Costa Water District Declaring a Water Shortage Emergency Condition to Prevail Within the Area Served by the District	Passed in February 1991
91-01	A Resolution of the Board of Directors of the Contra Costa Water District Amending the Urban Water Management Plan of Said District and Directing the Implementation of the Plan	Passed on January 9, 1991
90-79	A Resolution of the Board of Directors of the Contra Costa Water District Declaring Certain Policies in Regard to Recycled Water	Passed on November 7, 1990

Table D-1 Resolutions Regarding the Urban Water Management Plan Update and Water Waste Prohibitions		
Resolution Number	**Title**	**Status**
90-59	A Resolution of the Board of Directors of the Contra Costa Water District Declaring the Urgent Need to Conserve Water and Challenging All Customers of the District to Improve Water Use Efficiency and to Avoid the Waste and Unnecessary Use of Water	Passed on July 11, 1990
90-44	A Resolution of the Board of Directors of the Contra Costa Water District Approving Revised Water Conservation Guidelines for New Developments and Urging Local Municipalities to Adopt Said Guidelines	Passed on May 16, 1990
88-25	A Resolution of the Board of Directors of the Contra Costa Water District Declaring the Need to Conserve Water and Urging the Raw Water Customers of the District to Improve Water Use Efficiency and to Avoid Waste and Unnecessary Use of Water	Passed on April 20, 1988
88-24	A Resolution of the Board of Directors of the Contra Costa Water District Declaring the Need to Conserve Water and Urging the Treated Water Customers of the District to Improve Water Use Efficiency and to Avoid Waste and Unnecessary Use of Water	Passed on April 20, 1988
85-31	A Resolution of the Board of Directors of the Contra Costa Water District Adopting Regulation No. 137, the Urban Water Management Plan of Contra Costa Water District	Passed on December 18, 1985
72-3	A Resolution of the Board of Directors of the Contra Costa Water District of Intent to Negotiate a Contract to Purchase Reclaimed Water	Passed on January 26, 1972
71-39	A Resolution of the Board of Directors of the Contra Costa Water District Declaring its Intention to Negotiate a Contract with Central Contra Costa Sanitary District for Reuse of Reclaimed Water	Passed on November 17, 1971

Table D-2 Regulations Regarding Water Conservation	
Chapter in District Regulations	**Title**
5.04	General Provisions
5.44	Water Conservation
7.20	Operating Plans

CERTIFIED A TRUE COPY OF THE ORIGINAL

Sharon L. Burris, District Secretary
Contra Costa Water District

RESOLUTION NO. 05-25

A RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE CONTRA COSTA WATER DISTRICT ADOPTING THE URBAN WATER MANAGEMENT PLAN

WHEREAS, the Urban Water Management Planning Act, which is codified at California Water Code Section 10610 et seq. (Chapter 1009, Statutes of 1983 and subsequent amendments thereto), requires that every urban water supplier which provides 3,000 acre-feet or more of water annually, or which directly or indirectly supplies water for municipal purposes to more than 3,000 customers, shall prepare an Urban Water Management Plan, the primary objective of which is to plan for the reliable delivery of urban water supplies and for the conservation and efficient use of water; and

WHEREAS, the Contra Costa Water District is an urban water supplier providing in excess of 3,000 acre-feet of water per year to over 3,000 treated water customer connections, and providing additional raw water at wholesale to municipal and industrial customers; and

WHEREAS, the Act requires that the Plan shall be periodically reviewed at least once every five years, and that the District shall make amendments or changes to its Plan which are indicated by the review; and

WHEREAS, the revised Plan must be adopted by December 31, 2005, after public review and a Public Hearing by the District, and after adoption by the District's Board of Directors, must be filed with the California Department of Water Resources; and

WHEREAS, the District has heretofore prepared, and commencing on October 31, 2005, circulated for public review, a Draft 2005 Urban Water Management Plan, in compliance with the requirements of the Act, and duly noticed a Public Hearing on said Draft Plan, and having conducted a Public Hearing before the Board of Directors in accordance with said notice on December 7, 2005, and no objections having been raised, said Draft Plan now may be finalized and adopted as prepared.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Directors of the Contra Costa Water District as follows:

1. The Board does hereby find, determine and declare that:

   a. The District has prepared said draft Urban Water Management Plan (Draft Plan), dated October 2005.

   b. A copy of the Draft Plan has been available for public inspection at the principal office of the District and on the District's website continuously since October 30, 2005.

   c. On December 7, 2005, this Board held a Public Hearing on the Draft Plan. Notice of the time and place of said Hearing was published in the Contra Costa Times, a newspaper of general circulation, on October 30, 2005 and November 6, 2005.

   d. The Board has considered public comment received and hereby approves and adopts the 2005 Urban Water Management Plan dated October 2005 prepared by the District.

2. The General Manager or his designee is hereby authorized and directed to submit three copies of the Plan to the California Department of Water Resources.

3. The General Manager shall from time to time submit to this Board recommended policies and actions to implement effective and equitable water conservation and allocation programs in accordance with the Plan.

* * * * * * * * * * * *

The foregoing Resolution was duly and regularly adopted at a regular meeting held on the 7th day of December 2005, by the Board of Directors of the Contra Costa Water District by the following vote of the Board.

AYES: Burgh, Anello, Campbell

NOES: None

ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: Boatmun, Wandry

Joseph L. Campbell, President

ATTEST:

Sharon L. Burris
District Secretary

Appendix E

Public Notices

CONTRA COSTA WATER DISTRICT
1331 Concord Avenue
PO Box H2O
Concord, CA 94524

NOTICE OF
PUBLIC HEARING

The Contra Costa Water District will hold a public hearing to accept comments on its draft 2005 URBAN WATER MANAGEMENT PLAN which was developed in compliance with the State of California's Urban Water Management Planning Act which is codified under the California Water Code Section 10610 et seq.

Date: Wednesday, December 7, 2005

Time: 6:30 PM

Place: Board Room
Contra Costa Water District
1331 Concord Avenue
Concord, California

A copy of the draft report is available for review on the District's web-site (www.ccwater.com) and at the District Office located at 1331 Concord Ave.
Legal CCT 4093
Publish October 30, November 6, 2005

Appendix F

Acronyms and Abbreviations

APPENDIX F. ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

ABAG	Association of Bay Area Governments
af/yr	acre-feet per year
BMP	Best Management Practice
BRAC	Base Realignment and Closure
CCCSD	Central Contra Costa Sanitary District
CCWD	Contra Costa Water District
CII	Commercial, Institutional and Industrial
CIMIS	California Irrigation Management Information System
CIP	Capital Improvement Program
CNWS	Concord Naval Weapons Station
CPA1	Conservation Program Alternative 1
CUWCC	California Urban water Conservation Council
CVP	Central Valley Project
DDSD	Delta Diablo Sanitation District
DEC	Delta Energy Center
DMM	Demand Management Measure
DWD	Diablo Water District
DWR	Department of Water Resources
ECCID	East Contra Costa Irrigation District
EOP	Emergency Operations Plan
Eto	Evapotranspiration
FWSS	Future Water Supply Study
gpcd	gallons per capita per day
gpf	gallons per flush
HET	High Efficiency Toilet
ISD	Ironhouse Sanitary District
LMEC	Los Medanos Energy Center
LVP	Los Vaqueros Project
MF	multi-family
mgd	million gallons per day
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
MPP	Multi-Purpose Pipeline
MVSD	Mountain View Sanitation District
M&I	Municipal and Industrial
RWSA	Raw Water Service Area
SRIP	Seismic Reliability Improvement Project
SWP	State Water Project
TWMP	Treated Water Master Plan
TWSA	Treated Water Service Area
UAW	Unaccounted for Water
ULFT	Ultra Low Flow Toilet
USBR	United States Bureau of Reclamation
UV	ultraviolet

Appendix G

Comments and Responses

Contra Costa Water District
Draft 2005 Urban Water Management Plan
Comments from Ironhouse Sanitary District

Comments are as follows:

Table 5-1:

- The RWQCB considers ISD to be reclaiming 100% of the effluent through irrigation of agricultural lands. ISD meets Title 22 criteria for irrigation of agricultural lands. ISD-1
- ISD does not have evaporation/percolation ponds. Evaporation does however occur from the treatment and storage ponds naturally.

Table 5-2:

- There is no footnote (d). If the bottom footnote referenced as (a) is actually (d) then refer to first comment above for Table 5-1. ISD-2

For reference I have attached ISD's comments to Diablo Water District's Draft Urban Water Management Plan.

CCWD Response
ISD-1: Text in Table 5-1 has been modified.
ISD-2: Text in Table 5-2 has been modified.