
APPENDIX G

Water Supply & Reuse

Reporting Unit:
City of San Diego

Year:
2003

Report Not Filed

Accounts & Water Use

Reporting Unit Name:
City of San Diego

Submitted to
CUWCC
12/01/2004

Year:
2003

A. Service Area Population Information:

1. Total service area population 1258716

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	214174	0	0	0
2. Multi-Family	28829	0	0	0
3. Commercial	20448	0	0	0
4. Industrial	679	0	0	0
5. Institutional	0	0	0	0
6. Dedicated Irrigation	6333	0	0	0
7. Recycled Water	294	0	0	0
8. Other	0	0	0	0
9. Unaccounted	NA	0	NA	0
Total	270757	0	0	0

Metered

Unmetered

Reported as of 10/

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

Reporting Unit: **City of San Diego** BMP Form Status: **100% Complete** Year: **2003**

A. Implementation

- | | |
|---|------------|
| 1. Based on your signed MOU date, 09/23/1991, your Agency STRATEGY DUE DATE is: | 09/22/1993 |
| 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? | 06/01/1992 |
| 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? | 06/01/1992 |

B. Water Survey Data

Survey Counts:	Single Family Accounts	Multi-Family Units
1. Number of surveys offered:	213601	29843
2. Number of surveys completed:	865	60

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 necessary; 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) | yes | yes |
| 9. Measure total irrigable area (Recommended but not required for surveys) | yes | yes |
| 10. Which measurement method is typically used (Recommended but not required for surveys) | | Other |
| 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. | | |

Oracle database. Totals for SF and MF are combined but can be broken out by classification for each type.

C. Water Survey Program Expenditures

	This Year	Next Year
1. Budgeted Expenditures	260732	325098
2. Actual Expenditures	167823	

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

Reported as of 10/

BMP 02: Residential Plumbing Retrofit

Reporting Unit:

BMP Form Status:

Year:

City of San Diego**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? yes

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

City of San Diego SDMC 147.04

2. Has your agency satisfied the 75% saturation requirement for single-family housing units? yes

3. Estimated percent of single-family households with low-flow showerheads: 83%

4. Has your agency satisfied the 75% saturation requirement for multi-family housing units? yes

5. Estimated percent of multi-family households with low-flow showerheads: 80%

6. If YES to 2 OR 4 above, please describe how saturation was determined, including the dates and results of any survey research.

a. On March 26, 1991, City Council approved Ordinance 17626, which requires installation of ULFT's in all new construction effective May 1, 1991. b. The City supported this legislation that was effective January 1, 1994. c. All 150,000 pre-1981 single-family households retrofitted in FY 91-93. Multi-family and Mobile Home retrofit program implemented in FY 93. In 1991, in association with CWA, showerheads were distributed to public facilities including the Navy and several universities.

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? 03/01/1991

b. Describe your targeting/ marketing strategy.

Many of the initial water conservation programs implemented by the City focused on reducing residential interior water usage. Residential customers were targeted because they account for 57 percent of annual water consumption in the City. In 1991-92 the majority of single-family households, multi-family units, and mobile homes in the City received retrofit kits. The City also promotes the installation of ultra-low flush toilets for permanent water savings, as well as water-efficient landscape and irrigation design to new homeowners. Residential Interior Plumbing Retrofit Program The Residential Interior Plumbing Retrofit Program (Residential Retrofit Program) retrofitted 147,000 pre-1981 single-family households within the City with water saving retrofit kits (low-flow showerheads, toilet tank displacement devices, and leak detection tablets). Using the deliver and canvass method, kit distribution was completed in three phases, from Spring of 1991 through the Fall of 1992. The Residential Retrofit Program's estimated water savings is 1.9 million gallons of water per day or 2,173 acre-feet per year. The City's cost per acre-foot saved to implement this program was \$75. City staff continue to issue retrofit equipment upon request to single-family households who did not participate in the program. Multi-Family Interior Plumbing Retrofit

Program The Multi-Family Interior Plumbing Retrofit Program (Multi-Family Retrofit Program) offered similar retrofit kits to the City's multi-family residential customers between July-November 1992. When the Program Office closed its doors, more than 100,000 pre-1981 multi-family residential units had been issued water saving retrofit kits using the depot style of distribution. The Multi-Family Retrofit Program's estimated water savings is 1.6 million gallons of water per day or 1,792 acre-feet* per year. The City's cost per acre-foot saved to implement this program was \$25. City staff continue to issue retrofit equipment to multi-family complexes that did not participate in the program when operational, but are now seeking the associated water savings.

Mobile Home Showerhead Retrofit Program utilized a direct installation approach when it distributed water-saving retrofit kits to approximately 1,250 mobile homes city-wide in June 1992. Along with the retrofit kits, field crews installed energy efficient compact fluorescent lightbulbs, courtesy of the San Diego Gas and Electric Company (SDG&E). The Mobile Home Showerhead Retrofit Program's estimated water savings is 19,649 gallons of water per day or 22 acre-feet* per year. The City's cost per acre-foot saved to implement this program was \$25. If requested, City staff will provide low-flow showerheads to mobile homes that have not participated in the program.

School Showerhead Program The School Showerhead Program was implemented during the 1993-94 school year, targeting children from Kindergarten through 6th Grade. The goal of this program was to increase children's awareness and understanding of residential water use through a simple self audit conducted in their home with the assistance of their parents. Using a cartoon map that acted as a guide through all water using appliances and fixtures found in a typical home, students and parents were given information on appropriate water conservation measures. The program taught school children to identify potential water conservation measures, and distributed low-flow showerheads and toilet displacement devices where needed. Participating students were given incentives including a colorful wristwatch, refrigerator magnets, pencils, and coupons from corporate sponsors such as El Pollo Loco and KidSoft. This program was implemented in conjunction with the MWD. The School Showerhead Program's estimated water savings is 48,500 gallons per day or 54 acre-feet* per year. The City's cost per acre-foot saved to implement this program is \$29.

Low-Flow Devices Distributed/ Installed	SF Accounts	MF Units
2. Number of low-flow showerheads distributed:	227	32
3. Number of toilet-displacement devices distributed:	956	249
4. Number of toilet flappers distributed:	0	0
5. Number of faucet aerators distributed:	35971	15013
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 :		

The city-wide implementation of water conservation programs designed to promote permanent water savings began in 1991. As each new program began, data was collected and tracked on five separate, stand-alone personal computers (PC's). Each PC constituted a distinct system containing unique program data. After two years of collecting and

entering program data, Water Conservation Program staff recognized the need to centralize and consolidate all information into an integrated and relational database linking all program and participant data. The Consolidated Water Conservation Database (CWCD) project began in 1993. The project team consisted of Water Conservation Program staff, and technical staff from the SDDPC. Project objectives included: (1) centralizing all water conservation program information and simplifying program participation validation; (2) identifying program effectiveness and water savings on both detail and program summary levels; (3) developing a means to identify target groups of customers for future current program participation; and, (4) maintaining the most current/accurate customer information. SDDPC developed a software application in a Windows environment to administer and report on the CWCD. The Windows application is used for program data maintenance, editing, participation validation, and program evaluation. The system runs on a Local Area Network (LAN) allowing staff members to access the CWCD from their personal computer. The CWCD has proven to be a positive business improvement for the Water Conservation Program through the consolidation of program and customer information. Improved practices include: validation of program participation, standardization of program data, integration of customer consumption information, actual water savings since program participation, automation of program participation requests, and an increase in staff efficiency and productivity.

C. Low-Flow Device Distribution Expenditures

	This Year	Next Year
1. Budgeted Expenditures	134780	157355
2. Actual Expenditures	147192	

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

Showerheads and faucet aerators continue to be distributed through community events, the ULFT incentive programs, and during field surveys.

Reported as of 10/

BMP 03: System Water Audits, Leak Detection and Repair

Reporting Unit:

BMP Form Status:

Year:

City of San Diego**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) 220178
 - b. Determine other system verifiable uses (AF) 4106
 - c. Determine total supply into the system (AF) 224424
 - 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:

Leak detection program is housed within Emergency Services Section.

B. Survey Data

1. Total number of miles of distribution system line. 3138
2. Number of miles of distribution system line surveyed. 0

C. System Audit / Leak Detection Program Expenditures

	This Year	Next Year
1. Budgeted Expenditures	1832842	1833472
2. Actual Expenditures	1847651	

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

B.2 Statistics not compiled by operations staff.

Reported as of 10/

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

Reporting Unit:

City of San Diego

BMP Form Status:

100% Complete

Year:

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? no

a. If YES, when was the plan to retrofit and bill by volume-of-use existing unmetered connections completed?

b. Describe the program:

All new accounts require meters.

3. Number of previously unmetered accounts fitted with meters during report year. 0

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:

Staffing unavailable for this. See below. Unknown number of mixed use meters.

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. 58

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

Number of mixed use meters is unknown. Mixed use commercial meters are retrofitted to dedicated irrigation meters when reclaimed water is provided. City Council Resolution R-296437 restricts staffing levels through FY2007, which hampers the Water Conservation Section's ability to perform and/or implement the switch of mixed use meters to dedicated potable water irrigation meters.

Reported as of 10/

BMP 05: Large Landscape Conservation Programs and Incentives

Reporting Unit: **City of San Diego** BMP Form Status: **100% Complete** Year: **2003**

A. Water Use Budgets

- | | |
|--|------|
| 1. Number of Dedicated Irrigation Meter Accounts: | 7605 |
| 2. Number of Dedicated Irrigation Meter Accounts with Water Budgets: | 115 |
| 3. Budgeted Use for Irrigation Meter Accounts with Water Budgets (AF): | 856 |
| 4. Actual Use for Irrigation Meter Accounts with Water Budgets (AF): | 1226 |
| 5. Does your agency provide water use notices to accounts with budgets each billing cycle? | yes |

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? | 06/01/1992 |
| b. Description of marketing / targeting strategy: | |
| Bill messages, direct mailers, phone solicitation. | |
| 2. Number of Surveys Offered. | 67 |
| 3. Number of Surveys Completed. | 42 |
| 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: | |
| Customers are eligible for annual follow-up surveys and on-going customer support. | |

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. | yes |
| Does your agency provide mixed-use accounts with landscape budgets? | |
| 2. Number of CII mixed-use accounts with landscape budgets. | 94 |
| 3. Do you offer landscape irrigation training? | yes |
| 4. Does your agency offer financial incentives to improve landscape water use efficiency? | no |

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

5. Do you provide landscape water use efficiency information to new customers and customers changing services? yes

a. If YES, describe below:

Bill messages are used to advertise our programs.

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? yes

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	528328	555021
2. Actual Expenditures	319516	

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

Reported as of 10/

BMP 06: High-Efficiency Washing Machine Rebate Programs

Reporting Unit:

City of San Diego

BMP Form Status:

100% Complete

Year:

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.

SDG&E at times offers \$75 rebates.

2. Does your agency offer rebates for high-efficiency washers? yes

3. What is the level of the rebate? 125

4. Number of rebates awarded. 3924

B. Rebate Program Expenditures

	This Year	Next Year
1. Budgeted Expenditures	233120	205934
2. Actual Expenditures	85148	

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 HEWs is for both Commercial and Residential.

Reported as of 10/

BMP 07: Public Information Programs

Reporting Unit:

City of San Diego

BMP Form Status:

100% Complete

Year:

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.

Public Education Central to the overall water conservation goal is an enhanced public education program. Public education promotes new plans as well as the existing foundation of conservation programs. The public can't cooperate without being informed, but they also must be convinced. The campaign is structured to reach schoolchildren as well as adults. Elementary students design the aforementioned posters promoting water conservation. Top entries receive prizes as well as extensive public recognition. Water Conservation staff members actively participate in community fairs, providing informational brochures on the various programs and promoting both simple and highly technical conservation measures. Additional components of this program include: updating and maintaining the Department's and Water Conservation web-site, providing more and better quality brochures and fact sheets that have a centralized theme for water conservation, advertising, working with local television and radio news stations, and coordinating with the CWA, MWD and other local agencies on regional water conservation efforts. In FY2003, the Section's focused on placing articles in community newsletters, participation in television news, and developing "month-to-month" water conservation tips, that can be given to all media formats.

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	1
b. Public Service Announcement	yes	8
c. Bill Inserts / Newsletters / Brochures	yes	260000
d. Bill showing water usage in comparison to previous year's usage	yes	
e. Demonstration Gardens	yes	5
f. Special Events, Media Events	yes	26
g. Speaker's Bureau	yes	4
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	320307	320307
2. Actual Expenditures	379010	

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/

BMP 08: School Education Programs

Reporting Unit:

BMP Form Status:

Year:

City of San Diego**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	46	10211	36
Grades 4th-6th	yes	284	17032	48
Grades 7th-8th	yes	0	0	0
High School	yes	0	0	0

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

4. When did your Agency begin implementing this program? 09/09/1990

B. School Education 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

This BMP is provided region-wide by the San Diego County Water Authority (SDCWA). The data is provided by the SDCWA and is approximate. The City also promotes an Annual Water Conservation Poster Contest.

Reported as of 10.

BMP 09: Conservation Programs for CII Accounts

Reporting Unit:

BMP Form Status:

Year:

City of San Diego**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	189	7	23
b. Number of New Surveys Completed	50	20	6
c. Number of Site Follow-ups of Previous Surveys (within 1 yr)	7	2	1
d. Number of Phone Follow-ups of Previous Surveys (within 1 yr)	3	2	1
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	0	0
i. Loans	0	0	0
j. Grants	0	0	0
k. Others	50000	417	37575

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? | yes |
| 7. Estimated annual savings (AF/yr) from site-verified actions taken by agency since 1991. | .79 |
| 8. Estimated annual savings (AF/yr) from non-site-verified actions taken by agency since 1991. | 2.26 |

B. Conservation Program Expenditures for CII Accounts

	This Year	Next Year
1. Budgeted Expenditures	113778	122002
2. Actual Expenditures	233226	

C. "At Least As Effective As"

- | | |
|---|----|
| 1. Is your AGENCY implementing an "at least as effective as" variant of this BMP? | No |
| <p>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."</p> | |

D. Comments

Reported as of 10/

BMP 09a: CII ULFT Water Savings

Reporting Unit:
City of San Diego

BMP Form Status:
100% Complete

Year:
2003

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

A. Targeting and Marketing

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

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

The City participates in the SDCWA's voucher program. SDCWA's response will answer this question in detail, however the City also has SDMC 147.04, the City's "Plumbing Retrofit Upon Change of Ownership"(Retrofit Upon Resale Ordinance). Potential savings appears to be the most effective. Numerous referrals received from our CII survey program.

2. How does your agency advertise this program? Check all that apply. Bill insert
Bill message
Newsletter
Telephone
Web page
Newspapers
Trade publications
Other print media
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.

SDCWA could answer this question more effectively. Bill inserts, brochures, community events and trade shows.

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 ? 136

4.	CII Subsector	Number of Toilets Replaced			
		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. Govern- ment	0	0	0	0
i. Churches	0	0	0	0
j. Other	0	0	0	0

5. Program design.

Rebate or voucher
Retrofit on resale

6. Does your agency use outside services to implement this program? Yes

a. If yes, check all that apply.

Consultant

7. Participant tracking and follow-up.

Telephone
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 5
- c. Inadequate ULFT performance 3
- d. Lack of funding 5
- e. American's with Disabilities Act 2
- f. Permitting 2
- g. Other. Please describe in B. 9.

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

Many businesses will not change out toilets unless the payback period is less than 1 year.

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?

See previous year's response.

C. Conservation Program Expenditures for CII ULFT

1. CII ULFT Program: Annual Budget & Expenditure Data

	Budgeted	Actual Expenditure
a. Labor	0	0
b. Materials	0	0
c. Marketing & Advertising	0	0

d. Administration & Overhead	41399.69	49952.5
e. Outside Services	0	0
f. Total	41399.69	49952.5

2. CII ULFT Program: Annual Cost Sharing

a. Wholesale agency contribution		92220
b. State agency contribution		0
c. Federal agency contribution		0
d. Other contribution		41399.69
e. Total		133619.69

D. Comments

Section C.2 This total represents the amount of funds available in our CII Voucher Incentive Program which besides ULFT's includes; CTCC's, Urinals, and HEW's. The contributing wholesale agencies are MWD and the SDCWA.

Reported as of 10/

BMP 11: Conservation Pricing

Reporting Unit:
City of San Diego

BMP Form
 Status:
100% Complete

Year:
2003

A. Implementation

Rate Structure Data Volumetric Rates for Water Service by Customer Class

1. Residential

a. Water Rate Structure	Increasing Block
b. Sewer Rate Structure	Increasing Block
c. Total Revenue from Volumetric Rates	\$0
d. Total Revenue from Non-Volumetric Charges, Fees and other Revenue Sources	\$0

2. Commercial

a. Water Rate Structure	Uniform
b. Sewer Rate Structure	Uniform
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	Uniform
b. Sewer Rate Structure	Uniform
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	Uniform
b. Sewer Rate Structure	Uniform
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	Uniform
b. Sewer Rate Structure	Uniform
c. Total Revenue from Volumetric Rates	\$0
d. Total Revenue from Non-Volumetric Charges, Fees and other Revenue Sources	\$0

6. Other

a. Water Rate Structure	Uniform
b. Sewer Rate Structure	Uniform
c. Total Revenue from Volumetric Rates	\$0

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."

There is no separate budget for this BMP.

D. Comments

Annual report still under review by City Auditor. Audited amounts not available at the time of the BMP submittal.

Reported as of 10/

BMP 12: Conservation Coordinator

Reporting Unit:

BMP Form Status:

Year:

City of San Diego**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 ? | | no |
| 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 | Luis Generoso | |
| c. Coordinator's Title | Recycling Program Manager | |
| d. Coordinator's Experience and Number of Years | 12.5 in Water Conservation | |
| e. Date Coordinator's position was created (mm/dd/yyyy) | 06/01/1991 | |
| 6. Number of conservation staff, including Conservation Coordinator. | 22 | |

B. Conservation Staff Program Expenditures

	This Year	Next Year
1. Budgeted Expenditures	1128995	1426671
2. Actual Expenditures	1287657	

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

Expenditures include salary and fringe.

Reported as of 10/

BMP 13: Water Waste Prohibition

Reporting Unit:

BMP Form Status:

Year:

City of San Diego**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:

See SDMC in previous year's submittal.

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:

San Diego.

Per SDMC.

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 no

c. Non-recirculating systems in all new conveyor or car wash systems no

d. Non-recirculating systems in all new commercial laundry systems no

e. Non-recirculating systems in all new decorative fountains no

f. Other, please name no

2. Describe measures that prohibit water uses listed above:

﻿Water Waste Investigations Water Conservation Program staff respond to water waste complaints generated by citizens throughout the Department's service area. Staff contact the property owner or manager and work to resolve all kinds of water waste concerns and their associated hazards. Water waste complaints can range drastically, yet a typical example would be a broken sprinkler head which is wasting 10 to 15 gallons per minute and flooding adjacent properties

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. no

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. no

ii.) Implement an identified maximum number of gallons discharged per gallon of soft water produced. no

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.

no

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

no

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

no

C. Water Waste Prohibition Program Expenditures

	This Year	Next Year
1. Budgeted Expenditures	205867	225382
2. Actual Expenditures	63248	

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

Reported as of 10/

BMP 14: Residential ULFT Replacement Programs

Reporting Unit: **City of San Diego** BMP Form Status: **100% Complete** Year: **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	0	0
3. Direct Install	0	0
4. CBO Distribution	0	0
5. Other	9365	6064
Total	9365	6064

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

The ULFT Toilet Voucher Program promotes the incentive-based upgrade of existing fixtures to water-efficient models. Customers receive vouchers that reduce the cost of water efficient toilets that replace existing ones using at least 3.5 gallons per flush. The voucher program is estimated to provide over 8 million gallons of water savings each day.

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

As previous.

8. Is a toilet retrofit on resale ordinance in effect for your service area? yes

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

San Diego No citations.

B. Residential ULFT Program Expenditures

	This Year	Next Year
1. Budgeted Expenditures	636401	691521
2. Actual Expenditures	405379	

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

ULFT programs for Residential and Commercial are combined budgetarily.

Reported as of 10/

Water Supply & Reuse

Reporting Unit:
City of San Diego

Year:
2004

Report Not Filed

Accounts & Water Use

Reporting Unit Name:
City of San Diego

Submitted to
CUWCC
12/01/2004

Year:
2004

A. Service Area Population Information:

1. Total service area population 1294032

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	216958	0	0	0
2. Multi-Family	29936	0	0	0
3. Commercial	20406	0	0	0
4. Industrial	554	0	0	0
5. Institutional	0	0	0	0
6. Dedicated Irrigation	6364	0	0	0
7. Recycled Water	318	0	0	0
8. Other	8538	0	0	0
9. Unaccounted	NA	0	NA	0
Total	283074	0	0	0

Metered

Unmetered

Reported as of 10/

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

Reporting Unit: **City of San Diego** BMP Form Status: **100% Complete** Year: **2004**

A. Implementation

- | | |
|--|------------|
| 1. Based on your signed MOU date, 09/23/1991, your Agency STRATEGY DUE DATE is: | 09/22/1993 |
| 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? | 06/01/1992 |
| 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? | 06/01/1992 |

B. Water Survey Data

Survey Counts:	Single Family Accounts	Multi-Family Units
1. Number of surveys offered:	213619	29847
2. Number of surveys completed:	1217	32

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 necessary; 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) | yes | yes |
| 9. Measure total irrigable area (Recommended but not required for surveys) | yes | yes |
| 10. Which measurement method is typically used (Recommended but not required for surveys) | | Other |
| 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. | | |

Oracle database. Totals for SF and MF are combined but can be broken out by classification for each type.

C. Water Survey Program Expenditures

	This Year	Next Year
1. Budgeted Expenditures	325098	325098
2. Actual Expenditures	207743	

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

Reported as of 10/

BMP 02: Residential Plumbing Retrofit

Reporting Unit: **City of San Diego** BMP Form Status: **100% Complete** Year: **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? yes
 - a. If YES, list local jurisdictions in your service area and code or ordinance in each:

City of San Diego SDMC 147.04
2. Has your agency satisfied the 75% saturation requirement for single-family housing units? yes
3. Estimated percent of single-family households with low-flow showerheads: 85%
4. Has your agency satisfied the 75% saturation requirement for multi-family housing units? yes
5. Estimated percent of multi-family households with low-flow showerheads: 82%
6. If YES to 2 OR 4 above, please describe how saturation was determined, including the dates and results of any survey research.

a. On March 26, 1991, City Council approved Ordinance 17626, which requires installation of ULFT's in all new construction effective May 1, 1991. b. The City supported this legislation that was effective January 1, 1994. c. All 150,000 pre-1981 single-family households retrofitted in FY 91-93. Multi-family and Mobile Home retrofit program implemented in FY 93. In 1991, in association with CWA, showerheads were distributed to public facilities including the Navy and several universities.

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? 03/01/1991
 - b. Describe your targeting/ marketing strategy.

Many of the initial water conservation programs implemented by the City focused on reducing residential interior water usage. Residential customers were targeted because they account for 57 percent of annual water consumption in the City. In 1991-92 the majority of single-family households, multi-family units, and mobile homes in the City received retrofit kits. The City also promotes the installation of ultra-low flush toilets for permanent water savings, as well as water-efficient landscape and irrigation design to new homeowners. Residential Interior Plumbing Retrofit Program The Residential Interior Plumbing Retrofit Program (Residential Retrofit Program) retrofitted 147,000 pre-1981 single-family households within the City with water saving retrofit kits (low-flow showerheads, toilet tank displacement devices, and leak detection tablets). Using the deliver and canvass method, kit distribution was completed in three phases, from Spring of 1991 through the Fall of 1992. The Residential Retrofit Program's estimated water savings is 1.9 million gallons of water per day or 2,173 acre-feet per year. The City's cost per acre-foot saved to implement this program was \$75. City staff continue to issue retrofit equipment upon request to single-family households who did not participate in the program. Multi-Family Interior Plumbing Retrofit

Program The Multi-Family Interior Plumbing Retrofit Program (Multi-Family Retrofit Program) offered similar retrofit kits to the City's multi-family residential customers between July-November 1992. When the Program Office closed its doors, more than 100,000 pre-1981 multi-family residential units had been issued water saving retrofit kits using the depot style of distribution. The Multi-Family Retrofit Program's estimated water savings is 1.6 million gallons of water per day or 1,792 acre-feet* per year. The City's cost per acre-foot saved to implement this program was \$25. City staff continue to issue retrofit equipment to multi-family complexes that did not participate in the program when operational, but are now seeking the associated water savings.

Mobile Home Showerhead Retrofit Program utilized a direct installation approach when it distributed water-saving retrofit kits to approximately 1,250 mobile homes city-wide in June 1992. Along with the retrofit kits, field crews installed energy efficient compact fluorescent lightbulbs, courtesy of the San Diego Gas and Electric Company (SDG&E). The Mobile Home Showerhead Retrofit Program's estimated water savings is 19,649 gallons of water per day or 22 acre-feet* per year. The City's cost per acre-foot saved to implement this program was \$25. If requested, City staff will provide low-flow showerheads to mobile homes that have not participated in the program.

School Showerhead Program The School Showerhead Program was implemented during the 1993-94 school year, targeting children from Kindergarten through 6th Grade. The goal of this program was to increase children's awareness and understanding of residential water use through a simple self audit conducted in their home with the assistance of their parents. Using a cartoon map that acted as a guide through all water using appliances and fixtures found in a typical home, students and parents were given information on appropriate water conservation measures. The program taught school children to identify potential water conservation measures, and distributed low-flow showerheads and toilet displacement devices where needed. Participating students were given incentives including a colorful wristwatch, refrigerator magnets, pencils, and coupons from corporate sponsors such as El Pollo Loco and KidSoft. This program was implemented in conjunction with the MWD. The School Showerhead Program's estimated water savings is 48,500 gallons per day or 54 acre-feet* per year. The City's cost per acre-foot saved to implement this program is \$29.

Low-Flow Devices Distributed/ Installed	SF Accounts	MF Units
2. Number of low-flow showerheads distributed:	351	35
3. Number of toilet-displacement devices distributed:	0	0
4. Number of toilet flappers distributed:	0	0
5. Number of faucet aerators distributed:	3672	97
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 :		

The city-wide implementation of water conservation programs designed to promote permanent water savings began in 1991. As each new program began, data was collected and tracked on five separate, stand-alone personal computers (PC's). Each PC constituted a distinct system containing unique program data. After two years of collecting and

entering program data, Water Conservation Program staff recognized the need to centralize and consolidate all information into an integrated and relational database linking all program and participant data. The Consolidated Water Conservation Database (CWCD) project began in 1993. The project team consisted of Water Conservation Program staff, and technical staff from the SDDPC. Project objectives included: (1) centralizing all water conservation program information and simplifying program participation validation; (2) identifying program effectiveness and water savings on both detail and program summary levels; (3) developing a means to identify target groups of customers for future current program participation; and, (4) maintaining the most current/accurate customer information. SDDPC developed a software application in a Windows environment to administer and report on the CWCD. The Windows application is used for program data maintenance, editing, participation validation, and program evaluation. The system runs on a Local Area Network (LAN) allowing staff members to access the CWCD from their personal computer. The CWCD has proven to be a positive business improvement for the Water Conservation Program through the consolidation of program and customer information. Improved practices include: validation of program participation, standardization of program data, integration of customer consumption information, actual water savings since program participation, automation of program participation requests, and an increase in staff efficiency and productivity.

C. Low-Flow Device Distribution Expenditures

	This Year	Next Year
1. Budgeted Expenditures	147192	147192
2. Actual Expenditures	128260	

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

Reported as of 10/

BMP 03: System Water Audits, Leak Detection and Repair

Reporting Unit:

BMP Form Status:

Year:

City of San Diego**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) 220178
 - b. Determine other system verifiable uses (AF) 4106
 - c. Determine total supply into the system (AF) 224424
 - 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:

Leak detection program is housed within Emergency Services Section.

B. Survey Data

1. Total number of miles of distribution system line. 3138
2. Number of miles of distribution system line surveyed. 0

C. System Audit / Leak Detection Program Expenditures

	This Year	Next Year
1. Budgeted Expenditures	1833472	1835742
2. Actual Expenditures	1850117	

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

B.2 Statistics not compiled by operations staff.

Reported as of 10/

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

Reporting Unit: **City of San Diego** BMP Form Status: **100% Complete** Year: **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? no
- a. If YES, when was the plan to retrofit and bill by volume-of-use existing unmetered connections completed?
- b. Describe the program:
- All new accounts require meters.
3. Number of previously unmetered accounts fitted with meters during report year. 0

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:
- Staffing unavailable for this. See below.
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. 24

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."

No budget for this.

E. Comments

Number of mixed use meters is unknown. Mixed use commercial meters are retrofitted to dedicated irrigation meters when reclaimed water is provided. City Council Resolution R-296437 restricts staffing levels through FY2007, which hampers the Water Conservation Section's ability to perform and/or implement the switch of mixed use meters to dedicated potable water irrigation meters.

Reported as of 10/

BMP 05: Large Landscape Conservation Programs and Incentives

Reporting Unit: **City of San Diego** BMP Form Status: **100% Complete** Year: **2004**

A. Water Use Budgets

- | | |
|--|------|
| 1. Number of Dedicated Irrigation Meter Accounts: | 7911 |
| 2. Number of Dedicated Irrigation Meter Accounts with Water Budgets: | 199 |
| 3. Budgeted Use for Irrigation Meter Accounts with Water Budgets (AF): | 1508 |
| 4. Actual Use for Irrigation Meter Accounts with Water Budgets (AF): | 2461 |
| 5. Does your agency provide water use notices to accounts with budgets each billing cycle? | yes |

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? | 07/01/2002 |
| b. Description of marketing / targeting strategy: | |
| Bill messages, direct mailers, phone solicitation. | |
| 2. Number of Surveys Offered. | 47 |
| 3. Number of Surveys Completed. | 37 |
| 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: | |
| Customers are eligible for annual follow-up surveys and on-going customer support. | |

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. | yes |
| Does your agency provide mixed-use accounts with landscape budgets? | |
| 2. Number of CII mixed-use accounts with landscape budgets. | 137 |
| 3. Do you offer landscape irrigation training? | yes |
| 4. Does your agency offer financial incentives to improve landscape water use efficiency? | no |

Type of Financial Incentive:	Budget (Dollars/Year)	Number Awarded to Customers	Total Amount Awarded
a. Rebates	0	0	0
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? yes

a. If YES, describe below:

Bill messages are used to advertise our programs.

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? yes

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	555021	555021
2. Actual Expenditures	329636	

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

Reported as of 10/

BMP 06: High-Efficiency Washing Machine Rebate Programs

Reporting Unit:

City of San Diego

BMP Form Status:

100% Complete

Year:

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.

SDG&E at times offers \$75 rebates.

2. Does your agency offer rebates for high-efficiency washers? yes

3. What is the level of the rebate? 125

4. Number of rebates awarded. 5268

B. Rebate Program Expenditures

	This Year	Next Year
1. Budgeted Expenditures	205934	205934
2. Actual Expenditures	35705	

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 HEWs is for both Commercial and Residential.

Reported as of 10/

BMP 07: Public Information Programs

Reporting Unit:
City of San Diego

BMP Form Status:
100% Complete

Year:
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.

Public Education Central to the overall water conservation goal is an enhanced public education program. Public education promotes new plans as well as the existing foundation of conservation programs. The public can't cooperate without being informed, but they also must be convinced. The campaign is structured to reach schoolchildren as well as adults. Elementary students design the aforementioned posters promoting water conservation. Top entries receive prizes as well as extensive public recognition. Water Conservation staff members actively participate in community fairs, providing informational brochures on the various programs and promoting both simple and highly technical conservation measures. Additional components of this program include: updating and maintaining the Department's and Water Conservation web-site, providing more and better quality brochures and fact sheets that have a centralized theme for water conservation, advertising, working with local television and radio news stations, and coordinating with the CWA, MWD and other local agencies on regional water conservation efforts. In FY2003, the Section's focused on placing articles in community newsletters, participation in television news, and developing "month-to-month" water conservation tips, that can be given to all media formats.

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	1
b. Public Service Announcement	yes	7
c. Bill Inserts / Newsletters / Brochures	yes	260000
d. Bill showing water usage in comparison to previous year's usage	yes	
e. Demonstration Gardens	yes	5
f. Special Events, Media Events	yes	20
g. Speaker's Bureau	yes	23
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	320307	320307
2. Actual Expenditures	379010	

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/

BMP 08: School Education Programs

Reporting Unit:
City of San Diego

BMP Form Status:
100% Complete

Year:
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	47	10117	33
Grades 4th-6th	yes	285	17037	15
Grades 7th-8th	yes	0	0	0
High School	yes	0	0	0

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

4. When did your Agency begin implementing this program? 09/09/1990

B. School Education 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

This BMP is provided region-wide by the San Diego County Water Authority (SDCWA). The data is provided by the SDCWA and is approximate. The City also promotes an Annual Water Conservation Poster Contest.

Reported as of 10.

BMP 09: Conservation Programs for CII Accounts

Reporting Unit:

BMP Form Status:

Year:

City of San Diego**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	172	25	19
b. Number of New Surveys Completed	39	15	11
c. Number of Site Follow-ups of Previous Surveys (within 1 yr)	5	2	2
d. Number of Phone Follow-ups of Previous Surveys (within 1 yr)	3	2	1
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	0	0
i. Loans	0	0	0
j. Grants	0	0	0
k. Others	50000	843	148693

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? yes
- 7. Estimated annual savings (AF/yr) from site-verified actions taken by agency since 1991. 1.03
- 8. Estimated annual savings (AF/yr) from non-site-verified actions taken by agency since 1991. 2.44

B. Conservation Program Expenditures for CII Accounts

	This Year	Next Year
1. Budgeted Expenditures	122002	122002
2. Actual Expenditures	281242	

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 CII vouchers is contained in the activity group as well.

Reported as of 10/

BMP 09a: CII ULFT Water Savings

Reporting Unit:
City of San Diego

BMP Form Status:
100% Complete

Year:
2004

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

A. Targeting and Marketing

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

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

The City participates in the SDCWA's voucher program. SDCWA's response will answer this question in detail, however the City also has SDMC 147.04, the City's "Plumbing Retrofit Upon Change of Ownership"(Retrofit Upon Resale Ordinance). Potential savings appears to be the most effective. Numerous referrals received from our CII survey program.

2. How does your agency advertise this program? Check all that apply. Bill insert
Bill message
Newsletter
Telephone
Web page
Newspapers
Trade publications
Other print media
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.

SDCWA could answer this question more effectively. Bill inserts, brochures, community events and trade shows.

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 ?

4.	CII Subsector	Number of Toilets Replaced			
		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. Govern- ment	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? Yes

a. If yes, check all that apply.

Consultant

7. Participant tracking and follow-up.

Letter
Telephone
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 5
- c. Inadequate ULFT performance 3
- d. Lack of funding 5
- e. American's with Disabilities Act 2
- f. Permitting 2
- g. Other. Please describe in B. 9.

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

Many businesses will not change out toilets unless the payback period is less than 1 year.

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?

See previous year's responses.

C. Conservation Program Expenditures for CII ULFT

1. CII ULFT Program: Annual Budget & Expenditure Data

	Budgeted	Actual Expenditure
a. Labor	0	0
b. Materials	0	0
c. Marketing & Advertising	0	0

d. Administration & Overhead	0	0
e. Outside Services	0	0
f. Total	0	0

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

See San Diego County Water Authority's response.

Reported as of 10/

BMP 11: Conservation Pricing

Reporting Unit:
City of San Diego

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	Increasing Block
b. Sewer Rate Structure	Increasing Block
c. Total Revenue from Volumetric Rates	\$0
d. Total Revenue from Non-Volumetric Charges, Fees and other Revenue Sources	\$0

2. Commercial

a. Water Rate Structure	Uniform
b. Sewer Rate Structure	Uniform
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	Uniform
b. Sewer Rate Structure	Uniform
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	Uniform
b. Sewer Rate Structure	Uniform
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	Uniform
b. Sewer Rate Structure	Uniform
c. Total Revenue from Volumetric Rates	\$0
d. Total Revenue from Non-Volumetric Charges, Fees and other Revenue Sources	\$0

6. Other

a. Water Rate Structure	Uniform
b. Sewer Rate Structure	Uniform
c. Total Revenue from Volumetric Rates	\$0

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."

There is no separate budget for this BMP.

D. Comments

Annual report with revenue still under review by City Auditor due to investigations. Audited amounts not available at the time of the BMP submittal.

Reported as of 10/

BMP 12: Conservation Coordinator

Reporting Unit:

BMP Form Status:

Year:

City of San Diego**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 ? | no |
| 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 | Luis Generoso |
| c. Coordinator's Title | Recycling Program Manager |
| d. Coordinator's Experience and Number of Years | 13.5 in Water Conservation |
| e. Date Coordinator's position was created (mm/dd/yyyy) | 06/01/1991 |
| 6. Number of conservation staff, including Conservation Coordinator. | 22 |

B. Conservation Staff Program Expenditures

	This Year	Next Year
1. Budgeted Expenditures	1426671	1426671
2. Actual Expenditures	1475425	

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

Expenditures include salary and fringe.

Reported as of 10/

BMP 13: Water Waste Prohibition

Reporting Unit:

BMP Form Status:

Year:

City of San Diego**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:

See SDMC in previous year's submittal.

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:

San Diego.

Per SDMC.

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 no

c. Non-recirculating systems in all new conveyor or car wash systems no

d. Non-recirculating systems in all new commercial laundry systems no

e. Non-recirculating systems in all new decorative fountains no

f. Other, please name no

2. Describe measures that prohibit water uses listed above:

﻿Water Waste Investigations Water Conservation Program staff respond to water waste complaints generated by citizens throughout the Department's service area. Staff contact the property owner or manager and work to resolve all kinds of water waste concerns and their associated hazards. Water waste complaints can range drastically, yet a typical example would be a broken sprinkler head which is wasting 10 to 15 gallons per minute and flooding adjacent properties

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. no

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. no

ii.) Implement an identified maximum number of gallons discharged per gallon of soft water produced. no

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.

no

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

no

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

no

C. Water Waste Prohibition Program Expenditures

	This Year	Next Year
1. Budgeted Expenditures	225382	225382
2. Actual Expenditures	67457	

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

Reported as of 10/

BMP 14: Residential ULFT Replacement Programs

Reporting Unit: **City of San Diego** BMP Form Status: **100% Complete** Year: **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	0	0
3. Direct Install	0	0
4. CBO Distribution	0	0
5. Other	7454	4663
<hr/>		
Total	7454	4663

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

The ULFT Toilet Voucher Program promotes the incentive-based upgrade of existing fixtures to water-efficient models. Customers receive vouchers that reduce the cost of water efficient toilets that replace existing ones using at least 3.5 gallons per flush. The voucher program is estimated to provide over 9 million gallons of water savings each day.

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

As previous.

8. Is a toilet retrofit on resale ordinance in effect for your service area? yes

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

San Diego No citations.

B. Residential ULFT Program Expenditures

	This Year	Next Year
1. Budgeted Expenditures	691521	691521
2. Actual Expenditures	524902	

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

ULFT programs for Residential and Commercial are combined budgetarily.

Reported as of 10/