

Appendix D

San Francisco's BMP Reports filed with the CUWCC

Retail Reports

- **Reporting Period 03-04 BMP Reports**
- **Reporting Period 01-02 BMP Reports**
- **Coverage Reports: Years 2000-2004**

Wholesaler Reports

- **Coverage Reports: Years 2000-2004**

BMP Retailer Reports

Reported as of 10/

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

Reporting Unit: **San Francisco PUC - Retail** Reporting Period: **03-04**

MOU Exhibit 1 Coverage Requirement

No exemption request filed
 Agency indicated "at least as effective as" implementation during report period? No

A Reporting Unit (RU) must meet three conditions to satisfy strict compliance for BMP 1.

- Condition 1: Adopt survey targeting and marketing strategy on time
- Condition 2: Offer surveys to 20% of SF accounts and 20% of MF units during report period
- Condition 3: Be on track to survey 15% of SF accounts and 15% of MF units within 10 years of implementation start date.

Test for Condition 1

San Francisco PUC - Retail to Implement Targeting/Marketing Program by:	1999		
		<u>Single-Family</u>	<u>Multi-Family</u>
Year San Francisco PUC - Retail Reported Implementing Targeting/Marketing Program:	1989	1995	
San Francisco PUC - Retail Met Targeting/Marketing Coverage Requirement:	YES	YES	

Test for Condition 2

			<u>Single-Family</u>	<u>Multi-Family</u>
Survey Program to Start by:	1998	Residential Survey Offers (%)	29.76%	6.40%
Reporting Period:	03-04	Survey Offers ≥ 20%	YES	NO

Test for Condition 3

	Completed Residential Surveys	
	<u>Single-Family</u>	<u>Multi-Family</u>
Total Completed Surveys 1999 - 2004:	27,564	33,237
Past Credit for Surveys Completed Prior to 1999 (Implementation of Reporting Database):	7,937	20,641
Total + Credit	35,501	53,878
Residential Accounts in Base Year	107,533	227,541

San Francisco PUC - Retail Survey Coverage as % of Base Year Residential Accounts	33.01%	23.68%
Coverage Requirement by Year 7 of Implementation per Exhibit 1	7.90%	7.90%
San Francisco PUC - Retail on Schedule to Meet 10-Year Coverage Requirement	YES	YES

BMP 1 COVERAGE STATUS SUMMARY:

Water supplier has not met one or more coverage requirements for this BMP.

Reported as of 10/

BMP 02 Coverage: Residential Plumbing Retrofit

Reporting Unit: **San Francisco PUC - Retail** Reporting Period: **03-04**

MOU Exhibit 1 Coverage Requirement

No exemption request filed

Agency indicated "at least as effective as" implementation during report period? **Yes**

An agency must meet one of three conditions to satisfy strict compliance for BMP 2.

Condition 1: The agency has demonstrated that 75% of SF accounts and 75% of MF units constructed prior to 1992 are fitted with low-flow showerheads.

Condition 2: An enforceable ordinance requiring the replacement of high-flow showerheads and other water use fixtures with their low-flow counterparts is in place for the agency's service area.

Condition 3: The agency has distributed or directly installed low-flow showerheads and other low-flow plumbing devices to not less than 10% of single-family accounts and 10% of multi-family units constructed prior to 1992 during the reporting period.

Test for Condition 1

Report Year	Report Period	Single-Family		Multi-Family	
		Reported Saturation	Saturation > 75%?	Reported Saturation	Saturation > 75%?
1999	99-00	91.00%	YES	91.00%	YES
2000	99-00	91.00%	YES	91.00%	YES
2001	01-02	90.00%	YES	90.00%	YES
2002	01-02	90.00%	YES	90.00%	YES
2003	03-04	90.00%	YES	90.00%	YES
2004	03-04	90.00%	YES	90.00%	YES

Test for Condition 2

Report Year	Report Period	San Francisco PUC - Retail has ordinance requiring showerhead retrofit?
1999	99-00	YES
2000	99-00	YES
2001	01-02	YES
2002	01-02	YES
2003	03-04	YES
2004	03-04	YES

Test for Condition 3

Reporting Period: 03-04

1992 SF Accounts	Num. Showerheads Distributed to SF Accounts	Single-Family Coverage Ratio	SF Coverage Ratio > 10%
105,382			NO
1992 MF Accounts	Num. Showerheads Distributed to MF Accounts	Multi-Family Coverage Ratio	MF Coverage Ratio > 10%

222,990

NO

BMP 2 COVERAGE STATUS SUMMARY:
Water supplier is meeting coverage requirements for this BMP.

Reported as of 10/

BMP 03 Coverage: System Water Audits, Leak Detection and Repair

Reporting Unit: **San Francisco PUC - Retail** Reporting Period: **03-04**

MOU Exhibit 1 Coverage Requirement

No exemption request filed

Agency indicated "at least as effective as" implementation during report period? **No**

An agency must meet one of two conditions to be in compliance with BMP 3:

Condition 1: Perform a prescreening audit. If the result is equal to or greater than 0.9 nothing more needs be done.

Condition 2: Perform a prescreening audit. If the result is less than 0.9, perform a full audit in accordance with AWWA's Manual of Water Supply Practices, Water Audits, and Leak Detection.

Test for Conditions 1 and 2

<u>Report Year</u>	<u>Report Period</u>	<u>Pre-Screen Completed</u>	<u>Pre-Screen Result</u>	<u>Full Audit Indicated</u>	<u>Full Audit Completed</u>
1999	99-00	YES	92.6%	No	NO
2000	99-00	YES	92.6%	No	NO
2001	01-02	NO	100.0%	No	NO
2002	01-02	NO			NO
2003	03-04	NO			NO
2004	03-04	NO			NO

BMP 3 COVERAGE STATUS SUMMARY:

Water supplier has not met one or more coverage requirements for this BMP.

Reported as of 10/

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

Reporting Unit: **San Francisco PUC - Retail** Reporting Period: **03-04**

MOU Exhibit 1 Coverage Requirement

No exemption request filed

Agency indicated "at least as effective as" implementation during report period? **Yes**

An agency must be on track to retrofit 100% of its unmetered accounts within 10 years to be in compliance with BMP 4.

Test for Compliance

Total Meter Retrofits Reported through 2004

No. of Unmetered Accounts in Base Year

Meter Retrofit Coverage as % of Base Year Unmetered Accounts

Coverage Requirement by Year 6 of Implementation per Exhibit 1 **42.0%**

RU on Schedule to meet 10 Year Coverage Requirement **YES**

BMP 4 COVERAGE STATUS SUMMARY:

Water supplier is meeting coverage requirements for this BMP.

Reported as of 10/

BMP 05 Coverage: Large Landscape Conservation Programs and Incentives

Reporting Unit: **San Francisco PUC - Retail** Reporting Period: **03-04**

MOU Exhibit 1 Coverage Requirement

No exemption request filed

Agency indicated "at least as effective as" implementation during report period? **Yes**

An agency must meet three conditions to comply with BMP 5.

Condition 1: Develop water budgets for 90% of its dedicated landscape meter accounts within four years of the date implementation is to start.

Condition 2: (a) Offer landscape surveys to at least 20% of its CII accounts with mixed use meters each report cycle and be on track to survey at least 15% of its CII accounts with mixed use meters within 10 years of the date implementation is to start OR (b) Implement a dedicated landscape meter retrofit program for CII accounts with mixed use meters or assign landscape budgets to mixed use meters.

Condition 3: Implement and maintain customer incentive program(s) for irrigation equipment retrofits.

Test for Condition 1

Year	Report Period	BMP 5 Implementation Year	No. of Irrigation Meter Accounts	No. of Irrigation Accounts with Budgets	Budget Coverage Ratio	90% Coverage Met by Year 4
1999	99-00	1	1,092			NA
2000	99-00	2	1,113	1,113	100.0%	NA
2001	01-02	3	1,113	1,113	100.0%	NA
2002	01-02	4	1,158	1,158	100.0%	Yes
2003	03-04	5	1,184	1,184	100.0%	Yes
2004	03-04	6	1,215	1,215	100.0%	Yes

Test for Condition 2a (survey offers)

Select Reporting Period: **03-04**
 Large Landscape Survey Offers as % of Mixed Use Meter CII Accounts
 Survey Offers Equal or Exceed 20% Coverage Requirement **NO**

Test for Condition 2a (surveys completed)

Total Completed Landscape Surveys Reported through Reporting Database **2,896**
 Credit for Surveys Completed Prior to Implementation of Reporting Database **269**
 Total + Credit **3,165**
 CII Accounts in Base Year **21,895**
 RU Survey Coverage as a % of Base Year CII Accounts **14.5%**
 Coverage Requirement by Year of Implementation per Exhibit 1 **6.3%**
 RU on Schedule to Meet 10 Year Coverage

Requirement

YES

Test for Condition 2b (mixed use budget or meter retrofit program)

Report Year	Report Period	BMP 5 Implementation Year	Agency has mix-use budget program	No. of mixed-use budgets
1999	99-00	1	YES	27
2000	99-00	2	YES	27
2001	01-02	3	YES	589
2002	01-02	4	YES	604
2003	03-04	5	YES	604
2004	03-04	6	YES	604

Report Year	Report Period	BMP 4 Implementation Year	No. of mixed use CII accounts	No. of mixed use CII accounts fitted with irrig. meters
1999	99-00	1	27	
2000	99-00	2	27	
2001	01-02	3	886	2
2002	01-02	4	886	2
2003	03-04	5	866	
2004	03-04	6	866	

Test for Condition 3

Report Year	Report Period	BMP 5 Implementation Year	RU offers financial incentives?	No. of Loans	Total Amt. Loans
1999	99-00	1	NO		
2000	99-00	2	NO		
2001	01-02	3	NO		
2002	01-02	4	NO		
2003	03-04	5	NO		
2004	03-04	6	NO		

Report Year	Report Period	No. of Grants	Total Amt. Grants	No. of rebates	Total Amt. Rebates
1999	99-00				
2000	99-00				
2001	01-02				
2002	01-02				
2003	03-04				
2004	03-04				

BMP 5 COVERAGE STATUS SUMMARY:

Water supplier has not met one or more coverage requirements for this BMP.

Reported as of 10/

BMP 06 Coverage: High-Efficiency Washing Machine Rebate Programs

Reporting Unit: **San Francisco PUC - Retail** Reporting Period: **03-04**

MOU Exhibit 1 Coverage Requirement

No exemption request filed

Agency indicated "at least as effective as" implementation during report period? **No**

An agency must meet one condition to comply with BMP 6.

Condition 1: Offer a cost-effective financial incentive for high-efficiency washers if one or more energy service providers in service area offer financial incentives for high-efficiency washers.

Test for Condition 1

Year	Report Period	BMP 6 Implementation Year	Rebate Offered by ESP?	Rebate Offered by RU?	Rebate Amount
1999	99-00	1	YES	YES	75.00
2000	99-00	2	YES	YES	75.00
2001	01-02	3	YES	YES	75.00
2002	01-02	4	YES	YES	75.00
2003	03-04	5	YES	YES	75.00
2004	03-04	6	YES	YES	75.00

Year	Report Period	BMP 6 Implementation Year	No. Rebates Awarded	Coverage Met?
1999	99-00	1	271	YES
2000	99-00	2	209	YES
2001	01-02	3	115	YES
2002	01-02	4	364	YES
2003	03-04	5	538	YES
2004	03-04	6	729	YES

BMP 6 COVERAGE STATUS SUMMARY:

Water supplier is meeting coverage requirements for this BMP.

Reported as of 10/

BMP 07 Coverage: Public Information Programs

Reporting Unit: **San Francisco PUC - Retail** Reporting Period: **03-04**

MOU Exhibit 1 Coverage Requirement

No exemption request filed

Agency indicated "at least as effective as" implementation during report period? **No**

An agency must meet one condition to comply with BMP 7.

Condition 1: Implement and maintain a public information program consistent with BMP 7's definition.

Test for Condition 1

Year	Report Period	BMP 7 Implementation Year	RU Has Public Information Program?
1999	99-00	2	YES
2000	99-00	3	YES
2001	01-02	4	YES
2002	01-02	5	YES
2003	03-04	6	YES
2004	03-04	7	YES

BMP 7 COVERAGE STATUS SUMMARY:

Water supplier is meeting coverage requirements for this BMP.

Reported as of 10/

BMP 08 Coverage: School Education Programs

Reporting Unit: **San Francisco PUC - Retail** Reporting Period: **03-04**

MOU Exhibit 1 Coverage Requirement

No exemption request filed

Agency indicated "at least as effective as" implementation during report period? **No**

An agency must meet one condition to comply with BMP 8.

Condition 1: Implement and maintain a school education program consistent with BMP 8's definition.

Test for Condition 1

Year	Report Period	BMP 8 Implementation Year	RU Has School Education Program?
1999	99-00	2	YES
2000	99-00	3	YES
2001	01-02	4	YES
2002	01-02	5	YES
2003	03-04	6	YES
2004	03-04	7	YES

BMP 8 COVERAGE STATUS SUMMARY:

Water supplier is meeting coverage requirements for this BMP.

Reported as of 10/

BMP 09 Coverage: Conservation Programs for CII Accounts

Reporting Unit: **San Francisco PUC - Retail** Reporting Period: **03-04**

MOU Exhibit 1 Coverage Requirement

No exemption request filed

Agency indicated "at least as effective as" implementation during report period? **No**

An agency must meet three conditions to comply with BMP 9.

Condition 1: Agency has identified and ranked by use commercial, industrial, and institutional accounts.

Condition 2(a): Agency is on track to survey 10% of commercial accounts, 10% of industrial accounts, and 10% of institutional accounts within 10 years of date implementation to commence.

OR

Condition 2(b): Agency is on track to reduce CII water use by an amount equal to 10% of baseline use within 10 years of date implementation to commence.

OR

Condition 2(c): Agency is on track to meet the combined target as described in Exhibit 1 BMP 9 documentation.

Test for Condition 1

Year	Report Period	BMP 9 Implementation Year	Ranked Com. Use	Ranked Ind. Use	Ranked Inst. Use
1999	99-00	1	YES	YES	YES
2000	99-00	2	YES	YES	YES
2001	01-02	3	YES	YES	YES
2002	01-02	4	YES	YES	YES
2003	03-04	5	YES	YES	YES
2004	03-04	6	YES	YES	YES

Test for Condition 2a

	Commercial	Industrial	Institutional
Total Completed Surveys Reported through 2004	969	2	791
Credit for Surveys Completed Prior to Implementation of Reporting Databases	10,926	147	50
Total + Credit	11,895	149	841
CII Accounts in Base Year	21,057	119	719
RU Survey Coverage as % of Base Year CII Accounts	56.5%	125.2%	117.0%
Coverage Requirement by Year 6 of Implementation per Exhibit 1	4.2%	4.2%	4.2%
RU on Schedule to Meet 10 Year Coverage Requirement	YES	YES	YES

Test for Condition 2a

Performance

Year	Report Period	BMP 9 Implementation Year	Performance Target Savings (AF/yr)	Performance Target Savings Coverage	Target Savings Coverage Requirement	Coverage Requirement Met
1999	99-00	1	259	0.8%	0.5%	YES
2000	99-00	2	264	0.9%	1.0%	NO
2001	01-02	3			1.7%	NO
2002	01-02	4			2.4%	NO
2003	03-04	5			3.3%	NO
2004	03-04	6			4.2%	NO

Test for Condition 2c

Total BMP 9 Surveys + Credit	12,885
BMP 9 Survey Coverage	58.8%
BMP 9 Performance Target Coverage	
BMP 9 Survey + Performance Target Coverage	58.8%
Combined Coverage Equals or Exceeds Coverage Requirement?	YES

BMP 9 COVERAGE STATUS SUMMARY:

Water supplier is meeting coverage requirements for this BMP.

Reported as of 10/

BMP 11 Coverage: Conservation Pricing

Reporting Unit:

San Francisco PUC - Retail

Reporting Period:

03-04

MOU Exhibit 1 Coverage Requirement

No exemption request filed

Agency indicated "at least as effective as" implementation during report period? **No**

An agency must meet one condition to comply with BMP 11.

Agency shall maintain rate structure consistent with BMP 11's definition of conservation pricing. Implementation methods shall be at least as effective as eliminating non-conserving pricing and adopting conserving pricing. For signatories supplying both water and sewer service, this BMP applies to pricing of both water and sewer service. Signatories that supply water but not sewer service shall make good faith efforts to work with sewer agencies so that those sewer agencies adopt conservation pricing for sewer service.

a) Non-conserving pricing provides no incentives to customers to reduce use. Such pricing is characterized by one or more of the following components: rates in which the unit price decreases as the quantity used increases (declining block rates); rates that involve charging customers a fixed amount per billing cycle regardless of the quantity used; pricing in which the typical bill is determined by high fixed charges and low commodity charges.

b) Conservation pricing provides incentives to customers to reduce average or peak use, or both. Such pricing includes: rates designed to recover the cost of providing service; and billing for water and sewer service based on metered water use. Conservation pricing is also characterized by one or more of the following components: rates in which the unit rate is constant regardless of the quantity used (uniform rates) or increases as the quantity used increases (increasing block rates); seasonal rates or excess-use surcharges to reduce peak demands during summer months; rates based upon the longrun marginal cost or the cost of adding the next unit of capacity to the system.

Test for Condition 1

Year	Report Period	RU Employed Non Conserving Rate Structure	RU Meets BMP 11 Coverage Requirement
1999	99-00	NO	YES
2000	99-00	NO	YES
2001	01-02	NO	YES
2002	01-02	NO	YES
2003	03-04	NO	YES
2004	03-04	NO	YES

BMP 11 COVERAGE STATUS SUMMARY:

Water supplier is meeting coverage requirements for this BMP.

Reported as of 10/

BMP 12 Coverage: Conservation Coordinator

Reporting Unit: **San Francisco PUC - Retail** Reporting Period: **03-04**

MOU Exhibit 1 Coverage Requirement

No exemption request filed

Agency indicated "at least as effective as" implementation during report period? **No**

Agency shall staff and maintain the position of conservation coordinator and provide support staff as necessary.

Test for Compliance

Report Year	Report Period	Conservation Coordinator Position Staffed?	Total Staff on Team (incl. CC)
1999	99-00	YES	5
2000	99-00	YES	5
2001	01-02	YES	5
2002	01-02	YES	5
2003	03-04	YES	5
2004	03-04	YES	5

BMP 12 COVERAGE STATUS SUMMARY:

Water supplier is meeting coverage requirements for this BMP.

Reported as of 10/

BMP 13 Coverage: Water Waste Prohibition

Reporting Unit: **San Francisco PUC - Retail** Reporting Period: **03-04**

MOU Exhibit 1 Coverage Requirement

No exemption request filed

Agency indicated "at least as effective as" implementation during report period? **No**

An agency must meet one condition to comply with BMP 13.

Implementation methods shall be enacting and enforcing measures prohibiting gutter flooding, single pass cooling systems in new connections, non-recirculating systems in all new conveyer car wash and commercial laundry systems, and non-recycling decorative water fountains.

Test for Condition 1

Agency or service area prohibits:

Year	Gutter Flooding	Single-Pass Cooling Systems	Single-Pass Car Wash	Single-Pass Laundry	Single-Pass Fountains	Other	RU has ordinance that meets coverage requirement
1999	yes	yes	yes	no	yes	yes	NO
2000	yes	yes	yes	no	yes	yes	NO
2001	yes	yes	yes	no	yes	yes	NO
2002	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	YES
2003	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	YES
2004	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	YES

BMP 13 COVERAGE STATUS SUMMARY:

Water supplier is meeting coverage requirements for this BMP.

Reported as of 10/

BMP 14 Coverage: Residential ULFT Replacement Programs

Reporting Unit: **San Francisco PUC - Retail**

MOU Exhibit 1 Coverage Requirement

A Reporting Unit (RU) must meet one of the following conditions to be in compliance with BMP 14.

Condition 1: Retrofit-on-resale (ROR) ordinance in effect in service area.

Condition 2: Water savings from toilet replacement programs equal to 90% of Exhibit 6 coverage requirement.

An agency with an exemption for BMP 14 is not required to meet one of the above conditions. This report treats an agency with missing base year data required to compute the Exhibit 6 coverage requirement as out of compliance with BMP 14.

Status: Water supplier has not met one or more coverage requirements for this BMP. as of 2004

Coverage Year	BMP 14 Data Submitted to CUWCC	Exemption Filed with CUWCC	ROR Ordinance in Effect	Exhibit 6 Coverage Req'mt (AF)	Toilet Replacement Program Water Savings* (AF)
1998	No			644.89	
1999	Yes	No	No	1848.53	481.95
2000	Yes	No	No	3533.90	1359.58
2001	Yes	No	No	5632.23	2383.03
2002	Yes	No	No	8082.17	3553.82
2003	Yes	No	No	10829.02	4840.91
2004	Yes	No	No	13824.12	6131.94
2005	No	No	No	17024.18	
2006	No	No	No	20390.80	
2007	No	No	No	23889.94	

*NOTE: Program water savings listed are net of the plumbing code. Savings are cumulative (not annual) between 1991 and the given year. Residential ULFT count data from unsubmitted forms are NOT included in the calculation.

BMP 14 COVERAGE STATUS SUMMARY:

Water supplier has not met one or more coverage requirements for this BMP.

BMP 14 Coverage: Residential ULFT Replacement Programs

Reporting Unit: **San Francisco PUC - Retail**

BMP 14 Coverage Calculation Detail: Retrofit on Resale (ROR) Ordinance Water Savings

	Single Family	Multi-Family
1992 Housing Stock		
Average rate of natural replacement (% of remaining stock)	.04	.04
Average rate of housing demolition (% of remaining stock)	.005	.005
Estimated Housing Units with 3.5+ gpf Toilets in 1997	86015.15	182009.43
Average resale rate	.0664	.0498
Average persons per unit		
Average toilets per unit		
Average savings per home (gpd; from Exhibit 6)	42.7	39.6

Single Family Housing Units

Coverage Year	Unretrofitted Houses	Houses Sold	Houses Unsold	Sold and Retrofitted	Sold and Already Retrofitted	Unsold and Retrofitted	Gross ROR Savings (AFY)	Nat'l Replacement Only Savings (AFY)	Net ROR Savings (AFY)
1998	77136.21	5682.85	79902.22	5682.85		3196.09	1350.80	1089.90	260.90
1999	69173.80	5654.43	79502.71	5096.24	558.20	2866.17	1731.58	1247.10	484.48
2000	62033.32	5626.16	79105.20	4570.17	1055.99	2570.31	2073.06	1398.04	675.02
2001	55629.91	5598.03	78709.67	4098.42	1499.61	2304.99	2379.29	1542.98	836.31
2002	49887.50	5570.04	78316.13	3675.36	1894.68	2067.06	2653.91	1682.15	971.76
2003	44737.85	5542.19	77924.54	3295.97	2246.22	1853.68	2900.18	1815.78	1084.40
2004	40119.77	5514.48	77534.92	2955.74	2558.74	1662.34	3121.03	1944.09	1176.94
2005	35978.40	5486.91	77147.25	2650.63	2836.27	1490.74	3319.09	2067.29	1251.79
2006	32264.52	5459.47	76761.51	2377.02	3082.45	1336.86	3496.69	2185.60	1311.10
2007	28934.00	5432.18	76377.70	2131.65	3300.52	1198.86	3655.97	2299.19	1356.78

Multi Family Housing Units

Coverage Year	Unretrofitted Houses	Houses Sold	Houses Unsold	Sold and Retrofitted	Sold and Already Retrofitted	Unsold and Retrofitted	Gross ROR Savings (AFY)	Nat'l Replacement Only Savings (AFY)	Net ROR Savings (AFY)
1998	166107.46	9018.75	172080.64	9018.75		6883.23	2522.80	2138.81	383.99
1999	151594.82	8973.66	171220.23	8230.79	742.87	6281.85	3166.45	2447.30	719.15
2000	138350.14	8928.79	170364.13	7511.68	1417.11	5733.01	3753.86	2743.51	1010.35
2001	126262.63	8884.14	169512.31	6855.39	2028.76	5232.12	4289.96	3027.94	1262.02
2002	115231.20	8839.72	168664.75	6256.44	2583.28	4775.00	4779.21	3301.04	1478.17
2003	105163.57	8795.52	167821.43	5709.82	3085.70	4357.81	5225.72	3563.27	1662.45
2004	95975.54	8751.55	166982.32	5210.96	3540.59	3977.07	5633.22	3815.07	1818.15
2005	87590.25	8707.79	166147.41	4755.68	3952.10	3629.60	6005.12	4056.85	1948.27
2006	79937.58	8664.25	165316.67	4340.18	4324.07	3312.48	6344.52	4289.00	2055.52

2007 72953.52 8620.93 164490.09 3960.99 4659.94 3023.08 6654.27 4511.91 2142.36

This page intentionally left blank

Reported as of 10/

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

Reporting Unit: **San Francisco PUC - Retail** Reporting Period: **01-02**

MOU Exhibit 1 Coverage Requirement

No exemption request filed
 Agency indicated "at least as effective as" implementation during report period? Yes

A Reporting Unit (RU) must meet three conditions to satisfy strict compliance for BMP 1.

- Condition 1: Adopt survey targeting and marketing strategy on time
- Condition 2: Offer surveys to 20% of SF accounts and 20% of MF units during report period
- Condition 3: Be on track to survey 15% of SF accounts and 15% of MF units within 10 years of implementation start date.

Test for Condition 1

San Francisco PUC - Retail to Implement Targeting/Marketing Program by:	1999		
		<u>Single-Family</u>	<u>Multi-Family</u>
Year San Francisco PUC - Retail Reported Implementing Targeting/Marketing Program:	1989	1995	
San Francisco PUC - Retail Met Targeting/Marketing Coverage Requirement:	YES	YES	

Test for Condition 2

			<u>Single-Family</u>	<u>Multi-Family</u>
Survey Program to Start by:	1998	Residential Survey Offers (%)	21.62%	20.91%
Reporting Period:	01-02	Survey Offers ≥ 20%	YES	YES

Test for Condition 3

	Completed Residential Surveys	
	<u>Single-Family</u>	<u>Multi-Family</u>
Total Completed Surveys 1999 - 2002:	24,512	31,816
Past Credit for Surveys Completed Prior to 1999 (Implementation of Reporting Database):	7,937	20,641
Total + Credit	32,449	52,457
Residential Accounts in Base Year	107,533	227,541

San Francisco PUC - Retail Survey Coverage as % of Base Year Residential Accounts	30.18%	23.05%
Coverage Requirement by Year 5 of Implementation per Exhibit 1	4.90%	4.90%
San Francisco PUC - Retail on Schedule to Meet 10-Year Coverage Requirement	YES	YES

BMP 1 COVERAGE STATUS SUMMARY:
Water supplier is meeting coverage requirements for this BMP.

Reported as of 10/

BMP 02 Coverage: Residential Plumbing Retrofit

Reporting Unit: **San Francisco PUC - Retail** Reporting Period: **01-02**

MOU Exhibit 1 Coverage Requirement

No exemption request filed

Agency indicated "at least as effective as" implementation during report period? **Yes**

An agency must meet one of three conditions to satisfy strict compliance for BMP 2.

Condition 1: The agency has demonstrated that 75% of SF accounts and 75% of MF units constructed prior to 1992 are fitted with low-flow showerheads.

Condition 2: An enforceable ordinance requiring the replacement of high-flow showerheads and other water use fixtures with their low-flow counterparts is in place for the agency's service area.

Condition 3: The agency has distributed or directly installed low-flow showerheads and other low-flow plumbing devices to not less than 10% of single-family accounts and 10% of multi-family units constructed prior to 1992 during the reporting period.

Test for Condition 1

Report Year	Report Period	Single-Family		Multi-Family	
		Reported Saturation	Saturation > 75%?	Reported Saturation	Saturation > 75%?
1999	99-00	91.00%	YES	91.00%	YES
2000	99-00	91.00%	YES	91.00%	YES
2001	01-02	90.00%	YES	90.00%	YES
2002	01-02	90.00%	YES	90.00%	YES
2003	03-04	90.00%	YES	90.00%	YES
2004	03-04	90.00%	YES	90.00%	YES

Test for Condition 2

Report Year	Report Period	San Francisco PUC - Retail has ordinance requiring showerhead retrofit?
1999	99-00	YES
2000	99-00	YES
2001	01-02	YES
2002	01-02	YES
2003	03-04	YES
2004	03-04	YES

Test for Condition 3

Reporting Period: 01-02

1992 SF Accounts	Num. Showerheads Distributed to SF Accounts	Single-Family Coverage Ratio	SF Coverage Ratio > 10%
105,382			NO
1992 MF Accounts	Num. Showerheads Distributed to MF Accounts	Multi-Family Coverage Ratio	MF Coverage Ratio > 10%

222,990

NO

BMP 2 COVERAGE STATUS SUMMARY:
Water supplier is meeting coverage requirements for this BMP.

Reported as of 10/

BMP 03 Coverage: System Water Audits, Leak Detection and Repair

Reporting Unit: **San Francisco PUC - Retail** Reporting Period: **01-02**

MOU Exhibit 1 Coverage Requirement

No exemption request filed

Agency indicated "at least as effective as" implementation during report period? **No**

An agency must meet one of two conditions to be in compliance with BMP 3:

Condition 1: Perform a prescreening audit. If the result is equal to or greater than 0.9 nothing more needs be done.

Condition 2: Perform a prescreening audit. If the result is less than 0.9, perform a full audit in accordance with AWWA's Manual of Water Supply Practices, Water Audits, and Leak Detection.

Test for Conditions 1 and 2

<u>Report Year</u>	<u>Report Period</u>	<u>Pre-Screen Completed</u>	<u>Pre-Screen Result</u>	<u>Full Audit Indicated</u>	<u>Full Audit Completed</u>
1999	99-00	YES	92.6%	No	NO
2000	99-00	YES	92.6%	No	NO
2001	01-02	NO	100.0%	No	NO
2002	01-02	NO			NO
2003	03-04	NO			NO
2004	03-04	NO			NO

BMP 3 COVERAGE STATUS SUMMARY:

Water supplier has not met one or more coverage requirements for this BMP.

Reported as of 10/

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

Reporting Unit: **San Francisco PUC - Retail** Reporting Period: **01-02**

MOU Exhibit 1 Coverage Requirement

No exemption request filed

Agency indicated "at least as effective as" implementation during report period? **Yes**

An agency must be on track to retrofit 100% of its unmetered accounts within 10 years to be in compliance with BMP 4.

Test for Compliance

Total Meter Retrofits Reported through 2002

No. of Unmetered Accounts in Base Year

Meter Retrofit Coverage as % of Base Year Unmetered Accounts

Coverage Requirement by Year 4 of Implementation per Exhibit 1 **24.0%**

RU on Schedule to meet 10 Year Coverage Requirement **YES**

BMP 4 COVERAGE STATUS SUMMARY:

Water supplier is meeting coverage requirements for this BMP.

Reported as of 10/

BMP 05 Coverage: Large Landscape Conservation Programs and Incentives

Reporting Unit: **San Francisco PUC - Retail** Reporting Period: **01-02**

MOU Exhibit 1 Coverage Requirement

No exemption request filed

Agency indicated "at least as effective as" implementation during report period? **Yes**

An agency must meet three conditions to comply with BMP 5.

Condition 1: Develop water budgets for 90% of its dedicated landscape meter accounts within four years of the date implementation is to start.

Condition 2: (a) Offer landscape surveys to at least 20% of its CII accounts with mixed use meters each report cycle and be on track to survey at least 15% of its CII accounts with mixed use meters within 10 years of the date implementation is to start OR (b) Implement a dedicated landscape meter retrofit program for CII accounts with mixed use meters or assign landscape budgets to mixed use meters.

Condition 3: Implement and maintain customer incentive program(s) for irrigation equipment retrofits.

Test for Condition 1

Year	Report Period	BMP 5 Implementation Year	No. of Irrigation Meter Accounts	No. of Irrigation Accounts with Budgets	Budget Coverage Ratio	90% Coverage Met by Year 4
1999	99-00	1	1,092			NA
2000	99-00	2	1,113	1,113	100.0%	NA
2001	01-02	3	1,113	1,113	100.0%	NA
2002	01-02	4	1,158	1,158	100.0%	Yes
2003	03-04	5	1,184	1,184	100.0%	Yes
2004	03-04	6	1,215	1,215	100.0%	Yes

Test for Condition 2a (survey offers)

Select Reporting Period: **01-02**
 Large Landscape Survey Offers as % of Mixed Use Meter CII Accounts **6.2%**
 Survey Offers Equal or Exceed 20% Coverage Requirement **NO**

Test for Condition 2a (surveys completed)

Total Completed Landscape Surveys Reported through Credit for Surveys Completed Prior to Implementation of Reporting Database **269**
 Total + Credit **269**
 CII Accounts in Base Year **21,895**
 RU Survey Coverage as a % of Base Year CII Accounts **1.2%**
 Coverage Requirement by Year of Implementation per Exhibit 1 **3.6%**
 RU on Schedule to Meet 10 Year Coverage

Requirement

NO

Test for Condition 2b (mixed use budget or meter retrofit program)

Report Year	Report Period	BMP 5 Implementation Year	Agency has mix-use budget program	No. of mixed-use budgets
1999	99-00	1	YES	27
2000	99-00	2	YES	27
2001	01-02	3	YES	589
2002	01-02	4	YES	604
2003	03-04	5	YES	604
2004	03-04	6	YES	604

Report Year	Report Period	BMP 4 Implementation Year	No. of mixed use CII accounts	No. of mixed use CII accounts fitted with irrig. meters
1999	99-00	1	27	
2000	99-00	2	27	
2001	01-02	3	886	2
2002	01-02	4	886	2
2003	03-04	5	866	
2004	03-04	6	866	

Test for Condition 3

Report Year	Report Period	BMP 5 Implementation Year	RU offers financial incentives?	No. of Loans	Total Amt. Loans
1999	99-00	1	NO		
2000	99-00	2	NO		
2001	01-02	3	NO		
2002	01-02	4	NO		
2003	03-04	5	NO		
2004	03-04	6	NO		

Report Year	Report Period	No. of Grants	Total Amt. Grants	No. of rebates	Total Amt. Rebates
1999	99-00				
2000	99-00				
2001	01-02				
2002	01-02				
2003	03-04				
2004	03-04				

BMP 5 COVERAGE STATUS SUMMARY:

Water supplier has not met one or more coverage requirements for this BMP.

Reported as of 10/

BMP 06 Coverage: High-Efficiency Washing Machine Rebate Programs

Reporting Unit: **San Francisco PUC - Retail** Reporting Period: **01-02**

MOU Exhibit 1 Coverage Requirement

No exemption request filed

Agency indicated "at least as effective as" implementation during report period? **No**

An agency must meet one condition to comply with BMP 6.

Condition 1: Offer a cost-effective financial incentive for high-efficiency washers if one or more energy service providers in service area offer financial incentives for high-efficiency washers.

Test for Condition 1

Year	Report Period	BMP 6 Implementation Year	Rebate Offered by ESP?	Rebate Offered by RU?	Rebate Amount
1999	99-00	1	YES	YES	75.00
2000	99-00	2	YES	YES	75.00
2001	01-02	3	YES	YES	75.00
2002	01-02	4	YES	YES	75.00
2003	03-04	5	YES	YES	75.00
2004	03-04	6	YES	YES	75.00

Year	Report Period	BMP 6 Implementation Year	No. Rebates Awarded	Coverage Met?
1999	99-00	1	271	YES
2000	99-00	2	209	YES
2001	01-02	3	115	YES
2002	01-02	4	364	YES
2003	03-04	5	538	YES
2004	03-04	6	729	YES

BMP 6 COVERAGE STATUS SUMMARY:

Water supplier is meeting coverage requirements for this BMP.

Reported as of 10/

BMP 07 Coverage: Public Information Programs

Reporting Unit: **San Francisco PUC - Retail** Reporting Period: **01-02**

MOU Exhibit 1 Coverage Requirement

No exemption request filed

Agency indicated "at least as effective as" implementation during report period? **No**

An agency must meet one condition to comply with BMP 7.

Condition 1: Implement and maintain a public information program consistent with BMP 7's definition.

Test for Condition 1

Year	Report Period	BMP 7 Implementation Year	RU Has Public Information Program?
1999	99-00	2	YES
2000	99-00	3	YES
2001	01-02	4	YES
2002	01-02	5	YES
2003	03-04	6	YES
2004	03-04	7	YES

BMP 7 COVERAGE STATUS SUMMARY:

Water supplier is meeting coverage requirements for this BMP.

Reported as of 10/

BMP 08 Coverage: School Education Programs

Reporting Unit: **San Francisco PUC - Retail** Reporting Period: **01-02**

MOU Exhibit 1 Coverage Requirement

No exemption request filed

Agency indicated "at least as effective as" implementation during report period? **No**

An agency must meet one condition to comply with BMP 8.

Condition 1: Implement and maintain a school education program consistent with BMP 8's definition.

Test for Condition 1

Year	Report Period	BMP 8 Implementation Year	RU Has School Education Program?
1999	99-00	2	YES
2000	99-00	3	YES
2001	01-02	4	YES
2002	01-02	5	YES
2003	03-04	6	YES
2004	03-04	7	YES

BMP 8 COVERAGE STATUS SUMMARY:

Water supplier is meeting coverage requirements for this BMP.

Reported as of 10/

BMP 09 Coverage: Conservation Programs for CII Accounts

Reporting Unit: **San Francisco PUC - Retail** Reporting Period: **01-02**

MOU Exhibit 1 Coverage Requirement

No exemption request filed

Agency indicated "at least as effective as" implementation during report period? **Yes**

An agency must meet three conditions to comply with BMP 9.

Condition 1: Agency has identified and ranked by use commercial, industrial, and institutional accounts.

Condition 2(a): Agency is on track to survey 10% of commercial accounts, 10% of industrial accounts, and 10% of institutional accounts within 10 years of date implementation to commence.

OR

Condition 2(b): Agency is on track to reduce CII water use by an amount equal to 10% of baseline use within 10 years of date implementation to commence.

OR

Condition 2(c): Agency is on track to meet the combined target as described in Exhibit 1 BMP 9 documentation.

Test for Condition 1

Year	Report Period	BMP 9 Implementation Year	Ranked Com. Use	Ranked Ind. Use	Ranked Inst. Use
1999	99-00	1	YES	YES	YES
2000	99-00	2	YES	YES	YES
2001	01-02	3	YES	YES	YES
2002	01-02	4	YES	YES	YES
2003	03-04	5	YES	YES	YES
2004	03-04	6	YES	YES	YES

Test for Condition 2a

	Commercial	Industrial	Institutional
Total Completed Surveys Reported through 2002			
Credit for Surveys Completed Prior to Implementation of Reporting Databases	10,926	147	50
Total + Credit	10,926	147	50
CII Accounts in Base Year	21,057	119	719
RU Survey Coverage as % of Base Year CII Accounts	51.9%	123.5%	7.0%
Coverage Requirement by Year 4 of Implementation per Exhibit 1	2.4%	2.4%	2.4%
RU on Schedule to Meet 10 Year Coverage Requirement	YES	YES	YES

Test for Condition 2a

Performance

Year	Report Period	BMP 9 Implementation Year	Performance Target Savings (AF/yr)	Performance Target Savings Coverage	Target Savings Coverage Requirement	Coverage Requirement Met
1999	99-00	1	259	0.8%	0.5%	YES
2000	99-00	2	264	0.9%	1.0%	NO
2001	01-02	3			1.7%	NO
2002	01-02	4			2.4%	NO
2003	03-04	5			3.3%	NO
2004	03-04	6			4.2%	NO

Test for Condition 2c

Total BMP 9 Surveys + Credit	11,123
BMP 9 Survey Coverage	50.8%
BMP 9 Performance Target Coverage	
BMP 9 Survey + Performance Target Coverage	50.8%
Combined Coverage Equals or Exceeds Coverage Requirement?	YES

BMP 9 COVERAGE STATUS SUMMARY:

Water supplier is meeting coverage requirements for this BMP.

Reported as of 10/

BMP 11 Coverage: Conservation Pricing

Reporting Unit:

San Francisco PUC - Retail

Reporting Period:

01-02

MOU Exhibit 1 Coverage Requirement

No exemption request filed

Agency indicated "at least as effective as" implementation during report period? **No**

An agency must meet one condition to comply with BMP 11.

Agency shall maintain rate structure consistent with BMP 11's definition of conservation pricing. Implementation methods shall be at least as effective as eliminating non-conserving pricing and adopting conserving pricing. For signatories supplying both water and sewer service, this BMP applies to pricing of both water and sewer service. Signatories that supply water but not sewer service shall make good faith efforts to work with sewer agencies so that those sewer agencies adopt conservation pricing for sewer service.

a) Non-conserving pricing provides no incentives to customers to reduce use. Such pricing is characterized by one or more of the following components: rates in which the unit price decreases as the quantity used increases (declining block rates); rates that involve charging customers a fixed amount per billing cycle regardless of the quantity used; pricing in which the typical bill is determined by high fixed charges and low commodity charges.

b) Conservation pricing provides incentives to customers to reduce average or peak use, or both. Such pricing includes: rates designed to recover the cost of providing service; and billing for water and sewer service based on metered water use. Conservation pricing is also characterized by one or more of the following components: rates in which the unit rate is constant regardless of the quantity used (uniform rates) or increases as the quantity used increases (increasing block rates); seasonal rates or excess-use surcharges to reduce peak demands during summer months; rates based upon the longrun marginal cost or the cost of adding the next unit of capacity to the system.

Test for Condition 1

Year	Report Period	RU Employed Non Conserving Rate Structure	RU Meets BMP 11 Coverage Requirement
1999	99-00	NO	YES
2000	99-00	NO	YES
2001	01-02	NO	YES
2002	01-02	NO	YES
2003	03-04	NO	YES
2004	03-04	NO	YES

BMP 11 COVERAGE STATUS SUMMARY:

Water supplier is meeting coverage requirements for this BMP.

Reported as of 10/

BMP 12 Coverage: Conservation Coordinator

Reporting Unit: **San Francisco PUC - Retail** Reporting Period: **01-02**

MOU Exhibit 1 Coverage Requirement

No exemption request filed

Agency indicated "at least as effective as" implementation during report period? **No**

Agency shall staff and maintain the position of conservation coordinator and provide support staff as necessary.

Test for Compliance

Report Year	Report Period	Conservation Coordinator Position Staffed?	Total Staff on Team (incl. CC)
1999	99-00	YES	5
2000	99-00	YES	5
2001	01-02	YES	5
2002	01-02	YES	5
2003	03-04	YES	5
2004	03-04	YES	5

BMP 12 COVERAGE STATUS SUMMARY:

Water supplier is meeting coverage requirements for this BMP.

Reported as of 10/

BMP 13 Coverage: Water Waste Prohibition

Reporting Unit: **San Francisco PUC - Retail** Reporting Period: **01-02**

MOU Exhibit 1 Coverage Requirement

No exemption request filed

Agency indicated "at least as effective as" implementation during report period? **Yes**

An agency must meet one condition to comply with BMP 13.

Implementation methods shall be enacting and enforcing measures prohibiting gutter flooding, single pass cooling systems in new connections, non-recirculating systems in all new conveyer car wash and commercial laundry systems, and non-recycling decorative water fountains.

Test for Condition 1

Agency or service area prohibits:

Year	Gutter Flooding	Single-Pass Cooling Systems	Single-Pass Car Wash	Single-Pass Laundry	Single-Pass Fountains	Other	RU has ordinance that meets coverage requirement
1999	yes	yes	yes	no	yes	yes	NO
2000	yes	yes	yes	no	yes	yes	NO
2001	yes	yes	yes	no	yes	yes	NO
2002	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	YES
2003	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	YES
2004	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	YES

BMP 13 COVERAGE STATUS SUMMARY:

Water supplier has not met one or more coverage requirements for this BMP.

Reported as of 10/

BMP 14 Coverage: Residential ULFT Replacement Programs

Reporting Unit: **San Francisco PUC - Retail**

MOU Exhibit 1 Coverage Requirement

A Reporting Unit (RU) must meet one of the following conditions to be in compliance with BMP 14.

Condition 1: Retrofit-on-resale (ROR) ordinance in effect in service area.

Condition 2: Water savings from toilet replacement programs equal to 90% of Exhibit 6 coverage requirement.

An agency with an exemption for BMP 14 is not required to meet one of the above conditions. This report treats an agency with missing base year data required to compute the Exhibit 6 coverage requirement as out of compliance with BMP 14.

Status: Water supplier has not met one or more coverage requirements for this BMP. as of 2004

Coverage Year	BMP 14 Data Submitted to CUWCC	Exemption Filed with CUWCC	ROR Ordinance in Effect	Exhibit 6 Coverage Req'tmt (AF)	Toilet Replacement Program Water Savings* (AF)
1998	No			644.89	
1999	Yes	No	No	1848.53	481.95
2000	Yes	No	No	3533.90	1359.58
2001	Yes	No	No	5632.23	2383.03
2002	Yes	No	No	8082.17	3553.82
2003	Yes	No	No	10829.02	4840.91
2004	Yes	No	No	13824.12	6131.94
2005	No	No	No	17024.18	
2006	No	No	No	20390.80	
2007	No	No	No	23889.94	

*NOTE: Program water savings listed are net of the plumbing code. Savings are cumulative (not annual) between 1991 and the given year. Residential ULFT count data from unsubmitted forms are NOT included in the calculation.

BMP 14 COVERAGE STATUS SUMMARY:

Water supplier has not met one or more coverage requirements for this BMP.

BMP 14 Coverage: Residential ULFT Replacement Programs

Reporting Unit: **San Francisco PUC - Retail**

BMP 14 Coverage Calculation Detail: Retrofit on Resale (ROR) Ordinance Water Savings

	Single Family	Multi-Family
1992 Housing Stock		
Average rate of natural replacement (% of remaining stock)	.04	.04
Average rate of housing demolition (% of remaining stock)	.005	.005
Estimated Housing Units with 3.5+ gpf Toilets in 1997	86015.15	182009.43
Average resale rate	.0664	.0498
Average persons per unit		
Average toilets per unit		
Average savings per home (gpd; from Exhibit 6)	42.7	39.6

Single Family Housing Units

Coverage Year	Unretrofitted Houses	Houses Sold	Houses Unsold	Sold and Retrofitted	Sold and Already Retrofitted	Unsold and Retrofitted	Gross ROR Savings (AFY)	Nat'l Replacement Only Savings (AFY)	Net ROR Savings (AFY)
1998	77136.21	5682.85	79902.22	5682.85		3196.09	1350.80	1089.90	260.90
1999	69173.80	5654.43	79502.71	5096.24	558.20	2866.17	1731.58	1247.10	484.48
2000	62033.32	5626.16	79105.20	4570.17	1055.99	2570.31	2073.06	1398.04	675.02
2001	55629.91	5598.03	78709.67	4098.42	1499.61	2304.99	2379.29	1542.98	836.31
2002	49887.50	5570.04	78316.13	3675.36	1894.68	2067.06	2653.91	1682.15	971.76
2003	44737.85	5542.19	77924.54	3295.97	2246.22	1853.68	2900.18	1815.78	1084.40
2004	40119.77	5514.48	77534.92	2955.74	2558.74	1662.34	3121.03	1944.09	1176.94
2005	35978.40	5486.91	77147.25	2650.63	2836.27	1490.74	3319.09	2067.29	1251.79
2006	32264.52	5459.47	76761.51	2377.02	3082.45	1336.86	3496.69	2185.60	1311.10
2007	28934.00	5432.18	76377.70	2131.65	3300.52	1198.86	3655.97	2299.19	1356.78

Multi Family Housing Units

Coverage Year	Unretrofitted Houses	Houses Sold	Houses Unsold	Sold and Retrofitted	Sold and Already Retrofitted	Unsold and Retrofitted	Gross ROR Savings (AFY)	Nat'l Replacement Only Savings (AFY)	Net ROR Savings (AFY)
1998	166107.46	9018.75	172080.64	9018.75		6883.23	2522.80	2138.81	383.99
1999	151594.82	8973.66	171220.23	8230.79	742.87	6281.85	3166.45	2447.30	719.15
2000	138350.14	8928.79	170364.13	7511.68	1417.11	5733.01	3753.86	2743.51	1010.35
2001	126262.63	8884.14	169512.31	6855.39	2028.76	5232.12	4289.96	3027.94	1262.02
2002	115231.20	8839.72	168664.75	6256.44	2583.28	4775.00	4779.21	3301.04	1478.17
2003	105163.57	8795.52	167821.43	5709.82	3085.70	4357.81	5225.72	3563.27	1662.45
2004	95975.54	8751.55	166982.32	5210.96	3540.59	3977.07	5633.22	3815.07	1818.15
2005	87590.25	8707.79	166147.41	4755.68	3952.10	3629.60	6005.12	4056.85	1948.27
2006	79937.58	8664.25	165316.67	4340.18	4324.07	3312.48	6344.52	4289.00	2055.52

2007 72953.52 8620.93 164490.09 3960.99 4659.94 3023.08 6654.27 4511.91 2142.36

This page intentionally left blank

Reported as of 10/

Water Supply & Reuse

Reporting Unit: **San Francisco PUC - Retail** Year: **2004**

Water Supply Source Information

Supply Source Name	Quantity (AF) Supplied	Supply Type
Hetch Hetchy/imported	84232	Imported
Recycled	0	Recycled
Groundwater	2774	Groundwater
Local	14864	Local Watershed

Total AF: 101870

Reported as of 10/

Accounts & Water Use

Reporting Unit Name: **San Francisco PUC - Retail** Submitted to: **CUWCC** Year: **2004**
 03/01/2005

A. Service Area Population Information:

1. Total service area population 792700

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	109121	21876	0	0
2. Multi-Family	38477	31908	0	0
3. Commercial	20931	23776	0	0
4. Industrial	108	321	0	0
5. Institutional	424	5433	0	0
6. Dedicated Irrigation	1209	3251	0	0
7. Recycled Water	0	0	0	0
8. Other	400	6008	0	0
9. Unaccounted	NA	9297	NA	0
Total	170670	101870	0	0
	Metered		Unmetered	

Reported as of 10/

Reported as of 10/

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

Reporting Unit: **San Francisco PUC - Retail** BMP Form Status: **100% Complete** Year: **2004**

A. Implementation

- 1. Based on your signed MOU date, 12/11/1991, your Agency STRATEGY DUE DATE is: 12/10/1993
- 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? 12/11/1991
- 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? 12/11/1991

B. Water Survey Data

Survey Counts:	Single Family Accounts	Multi-Family Units
1. Number of surveys offered:	18000	7000
2. Number of surveys completed:	1727	633

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 no
- 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) no no
- 10. Which measurement method is typically used (Recommended but not required for surveys) Odometer Wheel
- 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.

The billing system allows us to track number and type of inspection as well as relevant comments

C. Water Survey Program Expenditures

	This Year	Next Year
1. Budgeted Expenditures	195700	250000
2. Actual Expenditures	195700	

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."

The average single-family account only uses 10% of its water for outdoor irrigation. Most multifamily accounts do not have any outdoor water use due to the density of the City.

E. Comments

While we perform them as necessary, the SFPUC's residential audit program focuses heavily on indoor use. Landscape use is relatively low in San Francisco due to a variety of geographic reasons including climate and density. The staffing expenditures are somewhat estimated because we have two full time inspectors and one staff who deals about .50FTE with audit-related administration. Finally, program activity fell this year because of a fairly time consuming office move and an 8 month gap without a conservation administrator. The number of surveys offered value was estimated based on the response rate (usually about 10%), we did not collect the information at that time.

Reported as of 10/

BMP 02: Residential Plumbing Retrofit

Reporting Unit: **San Francisco PUC - Retail** 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 and County of San Francisco Ordinance 185-91 for Multifamily Ordinance 346-91 for Single-Family

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: **90%**

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: **90%**

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

The City and County of San Francisco requires that all owners of property in San Francisco must file a conservation affidavit testifying that low-flow showerheads have been installed in order to get the lower water rate. Subsequent inspections have found that this data is correct. Those who do not retrofit their homes, get a rate that is 75 cents per ccf higher than those who have retrofitted their homes. The number of accounts that have filed affidavits and have not filed affidavits are updated by our billing system on a monthly basis.

B. Low-Flow Device Distribution Information

1. Has your agency developed a targeting/ marketing strategy for distributing low-flow devices? **no**

a. If YES, when did your agency begin implementing this strategy?

b. Describe your targeting/ marketing strategy.

Those who have installed showerheads using not more than 2.5 gallons per minute and aerators with restrictors on their faucets get the rate of \$1.49 per ccf. Those who do not install low-flow showerheads and aerators with restrictors on their faucets get a rate of \$2.24 per ccf. We have found that this rate structure has motivated our retail customers to retrofit their homes and buildings. Also, the conservation inspectors distribute devices such as low flow showerheads and aerators during their walk-throughs as needed. Customers may also call and request these devices. Unfortunately, while we keep the devices stocked, we don't track their distribution.

Low-Flow Devices Distributed/ Installed	SF Accounts	MF Units
2. Number of low-flow showerheads distributed:	0	0
3. Number of toilet-displacement devices	0	0

distributed:

4. Number of toilet flappers distributed: 0 0

5. Number of faucet aerators distributed: 0 0

6. Does your agency track the distribution and cost of low-flow devices? **no**

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

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

The affidavits are recorded on the customer's electronic record on the SFPUC/SFWD's billing mainframe system. Also, a constant supply of devices is stocked in house for distribution.

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? **yes**

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."

We incentivize device replacement through our "conservation rate". Those who have installed showerheads using not more than 2.5 gallons per minute and aerators with restrictors on their faucets get the rate of \$1.49 per ccf. Those who do not install low-flow showerheads and aerators with restrictors on their faucets get a rate of \$2.24 per ccf. We have found that this rate structure has motivated our retail customers to retrofit their homes and buildings.

E. Comments

Reported as of 10/

BMP 03: System Water Audits, Leak Detection and Repair

Reporting Unit: **San Francisco PUC - Retail** BMP Form Status: **100% Complete** Year: **2004**

A. Implementation

- 1. Has your agency completed a pre-screening system audit for this reporting year? no
- 2. If YES, enter the values (AF/Year) used to calculate verifiable use as a percent of total production:
 - a. Determine metered sales (AF) 98619
 - b. Determine other system verifiable uses (AF) 0
 - c. Determine total supply into the system (AF) 0
 - d. Using the numbers above, if (Metered Sales + Other Verifiable Uses) / Total Supply is < 0.9 then a full-scale system audit is required. 0.00
- 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? no
- 6. Does your agency operate a system leak detection program? yes
 - a. If yes, describe the leak detection program:

The SFPUC investigates all leaks that are reported by the public. The gatemen are the first to follow up; if they are not able to fix or detect the leak, it goes to the leak locators at the Distribution Division. The Distribution Division investigates complaints about water leaking into meter vaults, basements and/or other areas.

B. Survey Data

- 1. Total number of miles of distribution system line. 1220
- 2. Number of miles of distribution system line surveyed. 0

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

ILI program begins in 2005-06

Reported as of 10/

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

Reporting Unit: **San Francisco PUC - Retail** 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:

This is not applicable. The City and County of San Francisco has been fully metered since 1916.
- 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:
- 2. Number of CII accounts with mixed-use meters. 866
- 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? yes
 - 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."

Because the mixed-use meters are charged for sewer at \$5.35 per ccf as opposed to irrigation meters which are not charged for sewer, the water consumption for irrigation meters are higher than mixed-use accounts in San Francisco.

E. Comments

Reported as of 10/

BMP 05: Large Landscape Conservation Programs and Incentives

Reporting Unit: **San Francisco PUC - Retail**
 BMP Form Status: **100% Complete**
 Year: **2004**

A. Water Use Budgets

- 1. Number of Dedicated Irrigation Meter Accounts: 1215
- 2. Number of Dedicated Irrigation Meter Accounts with Water Budgets: 1215
- 3. Budgeted Use for Irrigation Meter Accounts with Water Budgets (AF): 0
- 4. Actual Use for Irrigation Meter Accounts with Water Budgets (AF): 3251
- 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? 11/1/1986
 - b. Description of marketing / targeting strategy:

We write to each landscape account, offering them to do a free landscape audit. If we do not hear from them, we write to them again.

- 2. Number of Surveys Offered. 0
- 3. Number of Surveys Completed. 200
- 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 no
 - 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:

We offer surveys to all of our irrigation customers annually

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. 604

- 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
- b. Loans
- c. Grants

- 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? no
 - a. If yes, is it water-efficient?

b. If yes, does it have dedicated irrigation metering?

- 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	9565	9565
2. Actual Expenditures	9565	

E. "At Least As Effective As"

- 1. Is your AGENCY implementing an "at least as effective as" variant of this BMP? yes
 - 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."

Because 90% of SF's water is consumed indoors, all rebates are centered on reducing interior water use. Every facility requiring a new meter must submit landscape plans that get checked for planting type and irrigation efficiency.

F. Comments

Reported as of 10/

BMP 06: High-Efficiency Washing Machine Rebate Programs

Reporting Unit: **San Francisco PUC - Retail** 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.

PG&E is the local energy provider and they offer a rebate of about \$75 for a high efficiency washer. The SFPUC is the local wastewater provider.

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

3. What is the level of the rebate? 75

4. Number of rebates awarded. 729

B. Rebate Program Expenditures

	This Year	Next Year
1. Budgeted Expenditures	43000	88000
2. Actual Expenditures	67675	

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

Of the expenditures. 54,675 was spent on the actual rebates. Embedded in the expenditure value is .25FTE for one employee. I cannot be sure how the previous Conservation Coordinator calculated these expenses and whether computed and projected expenses reflected these staffing costs.

Reported as of 10/

BMP 07: Public Information Programs

Reporting Unit: **San Francisco PUC - Retail** 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.

The Conservation Section is in charge of promoting the toilet and washer rebate programs as well as the toilet sale program. The SFPUC's Communications Section is in charge of the SFPUC's web page, general brochures (such as those on general ways to reduce water use) and staffing tables at various events.

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	4
b. Public Service Announcement	yes	4
c. Bill Inserts / Newsletters / Brochures	yes	3
d. Bill showing water usage in comparison to previous year's usage	yes	
e. Demonstration Gardens	yes	1
f. Special Events, Media Events	yes	4
g. Speaker's Bureau	no	
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	74000	65000
2. Actual Expenditures	74000	

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

We cannot be sure how much was actually expensed towards public information programs because it is not a discrete budget line item that is expensed against and the program administrator is not longer at this position. The reduced budget for program expenditure is partly due to the fact that that materials reproduction was reallocated in-house at substantial cost savings.

Reported as of 10/

BMP 08: School Education Programs

Reporting Unit: **San Francisco PUC - Retail** 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	5	150	0
Grades 4th-6th	yes	75	4015	80
Grades 7th-8th	yes	0	1050	1
High School	yes	0	1100	0

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

4. When did your Agency begin implementing this program? 1/1/1986

B. School Education Program Expenditures

	This Year	Next Year
1. Budgeted Expenditures	24000	24000
2. Actual Expenditures	24000	

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

We have a variety of school programs including: water-wise poster and bumper sticker contest, coloring book, etc. Some were eliminated due to budget cuts. It's difficult to accurately track the activities from 2003-2004 because the program administrator has changed and there does not seem to be much in terms of accounting of activities. We assumed that activity had not changed from the previous years. The SFPUC is currently looking to develop a comprehensive education program, in collaboration with our Communication Department. In the meantime, in addition to the activities referred to above, we have funded a variety of school programs including \$20,000 to the SF Unified School District. We have also provided funding to a training program for local educators that includes a water conservation component.

Reported as of 10/

BMP 09: Conservation Programs for CII Accounts

Reporting Unit: **San Francisco PUC - Retail** BMP Form Status: **100% Complete** Year: **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	1030	0	60
b. Number of New Surveys Completed	103	0	6
c. Number of Site Follow-ups of Previous Surveys (within 1 yr)	44	0	0
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	0	0	0
i. Loans	0	0	0
j. Grants	0	0	0
k. Others	0	0	0

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	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."

The San Francisco Public Utilities Commission has made the decision that at this time it would only offer rebates to residential customers. The SFPUC did not offer any loans for retail customers during this period.

D. Comments

2004 was the first year that our rebate programs were extended to all customer classes. Previously they had been limited to residential customers, with only the ULFT program opened to restaurants in the past few years. The San Francisco Public Utilities Commission had made the decision that it would only offer rebates to residential customers. Regarding costs: The survey costs for CII cannot be separated from all other survey costs which are captured in BMP1. At the time, we did not track the number of audit offers mailed out. However, we do mail out offers to the top 20% of users in each customer class in rotating cycled. I estimated the offers as if we had a response rate of 10%. Finally, activity was low during this year for two reasons: a major office move and a staffing gap where for about 8 months there was no Conservation Coordinator.

Reported as of 10/

BMP 09a: CII ULFT Water Savings

Reporting Unit: **San Francisco PUC - Retail** BMP Form Status: **100% Complete** Year: **2004**

- 1. Did your agency implement a CII ULFT replacement program in the reporting year? No
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?

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.

We emphasize replacement of toilets with ultra low flow toilets through our audits, seminars for professional building managers. The Commission overseeing the SF Public Utilities Commission have not approved funding for commercial rebate programs. They have instead devoted their rebate funds to residential accounts. We also send out letters to the top 20% of users by customer class. We have found that when we tell the customer that they are in the high user group, in a formal way, they tend to respond.

- 2. How does your agency advertise this program? Check all that apply.

Newspapers

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

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 ? 17

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:	0	0	0	0

K to 12				
g. Eating	17	0	0	0
h. Government	0	0	0	0
i. Churches	0	0	0	0
j. Other	0	0	0	0

5. Program design.

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

a. If yes, check all that apply.

7. Participant tracking and follow-up.

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	3
b. Inadequate payback	1
c. Inadequate ULFT performance	4
d. Lack of funding	4
e. American's with Disabilities Act	1
f. Permitting	1
g. Other. Please describe in B. 9.	5

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

The Commission overseeing the SF Public Utilities Commission have not been approved funding for commercial rebate programs. They have instead devoted their rebate funds to residential accounts.

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?

2004 was the first year that our rebate programs were extended to all customer classes. Previously they had been limited to residential customers, with the ULFT rebates opened to restaurants in the past few years, although not directly marketed. For a combination of reasons, it seems that residential customers are easier to reach than CII users. Maybe because they are more likely to pay their utility bills. I believe that we may have to go more directly to the business associations (e.g. restaurant associations, etc). Also, we have to find a way to more effectively reach municipal accounts, office building, etc, where "no one" pays the bills. At this time, I do not feel that this qualifies us for implementing the BMP.

C. Conservation Program Expenditures for CII ULFT

1. CII ULFT Program: Annual Budget & Expenditure Data

Budgeted	Actual Expenditure
-----------------	-------------------------------

a. Labor	0	0
b. Materials	2040	2040
c. Marketing & Advertising	0	0
d. Administration & Overhead	0	0
e. Outside Services	0	0
f. Total	2040	2040

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

Reported as of 10/

BMP 11: Conservation Pricing

Reporting Unit: **San Francisco PUC - 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 Increasing Block
 b. Sewer Rate Structure Increasing Block
 c. Total Revenue from Volumetric Rates \$47404276
 d. Total Revenue from Non-Volumetric Charges, Fees and other Revenue Sources \$6464550

2. Commercial

a. Water Rate Structure Increasing Block
 b. Sewer Rate Structure Uniform
 c. Total Revenue from Volumetric Rates \$21822522
 d. Total Revenue from Non-Volumetric Charges, Fees and other Revenue Sources \$4714614

3. Industrial

a. Water Rate Structure Increasing Block
 b. Sewer Rate Structure Uniform
 c. Total Revenue from Volumetric Rates \$277606
 d. Total Revenue from Non-Volumetric Charges, Fees and other Revenue Sources \$47130

4. Institutional / Government

a. Water Rate Structure Uniform
 b. Sewer Rate Structure Uniform
 c. Total Revenue from Volumetric Rates \$1272259
 d. Total Revenue from Non-Volumetric Charges, Fees and other Revenue Sources \$171132

5. Irrigation

a. Water Rate Structure Uniform
 b. Sewer Rate Structure Service Not Provided
 c. Total Revenue from Volumetric Rates \$2167933
 d. Total Revenue from Non-Volumetric Charges, Fees and other Revenue Sources \$58032

6. Other

a. Water Rate Structure Increasing Block
 b. Sewer Rate Structure Service Not Provided
 c. Total Revenue from Volumetric Rates \$356956
 d. Total Revenue from Non-Volumetric Charges, Fees and other Revenue Sources \$94266

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

The total revenue from non-volumetric charges may be underestimated. Here they include only service charges, however there are additional miscellaneous charges that cannot be separated at this time. Also, that charge is an estimate based on one billing cycle. Only a fraction of municipal accounts pay for water, however they all pay sewer. BMP11 expenditures are incurred through the billing and IT groups, not directly through conservation.

Reported as of 10/

BMP 12: Conservation Coordinator

Reporting Unit: **San Francisco PUC - Retail** BMP Form Status: **100% Complete** Year: **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 Dana Haasz
 - c. Coordinator's Title Water Conservation Administrator
 - d. Coordinator's Experience and Number of Years 1 yr at SFPUC, 6 yrs in water conservation
 - e. Date Coordinator's position was created (mm/dd/yyyy) 11/22/1986
- 6. Number of conservation staff, including Conservation Coordinator. 5

B. Conservation Staff Program Expenditures

	This Year	Next Year
1. Budgeted Expenditures	445563	469752
2. Actual Expenditures	322972	

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

Actual expenditures are less than budgeted because for about 8 months of this FY, there was no conservation coordinator. The previous coordinator moved to another positions and the Conservation program was carried by the Customer Services manager and program staff in the interim. Salaries include benefits.

Reported as of 10/

BMP 13: Water Waste Prohibition

Reporting Unit: **San Francisco PUC - Retail** BMP Form Status: **100% Complete** Year: **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:

The ordinance is connected with the Rules and Regulations regarding water service. This allows the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission to not only turn off the customer's water when they have repeatedly violated the ordinance. But it also allows the SFPUC to charge a fine or rate surcharge in the event of water shortage.
- 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:

City and County of San Francisco	Rules and Regulations Regarding Water Service
----------------------------------	---

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
Serve water only upon request
- 2. Describe measures that prohibit water uses listed above:

On the first violation, we give them a written notice. On the second violation, they receive a letter from the Water Conservation Administrator. On the third violation, they get a choice of a training or a water reducer device on their service line. On the fourth violation, the meter is homed.

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 no

produced.
 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.

- 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	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

San Francisco has very soft water. So very few of our customers have soft water conditioners. The enforcement of the waste water ordinance is done by the SFPUC's Water Conservation's Field Service Inspectors. They do the enforcement along with the audits for BMP #1 and BMP #5.

Reported as of 10/

BMP 14: Residential ULFT Replacement Programs

Reporting Unit: **San Francisco PUC - Retail** 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	527	293
3. Direct Install	0	0
4. CBO Distribution	0	0
5. Other	503	291
Total	1030	584

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

In the fall, we offer a rebate of up to \$50 per toilet if the customer applies for the rebate PRIOR to purchasing the toilet. We also sell Universal Rundle Toilets for only \$10 at sales during the spring. The sales are open to single-family and multifamily customers who have already filed a conservation affidavit showing that they have already installed a low-flow showerhead and aerators with restrictors on all faucets. Restaurant owners are also eligible to purchase the toilets for only \$10 but few have opted to join this program. The sales are staffed by SFPUC staff as well as local youth groups who receive payment per number of toilets sold.

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

In the fall, we offer a rebate of up to \$50 per toilet (the cost of the toilet itself) if the customer applies for the rebate PRIOR to purchasing the toilet. We also sell Universal Rundle Toilets for only \$10 at sales during the spring. This is open to both single-family and multifamily customers who have already filed a conservation affidavit showing that they have already installed a low-flow showerhead and aerators with restrictors on all faucets. The sales are staffed by SFPUC staff as well as local youth groups who receive payment per number of toilets sold.

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	321000	160000
2. Actual Expenditures	321000	

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

Although a retrofit on resale ordinance does exist, it reflects outdated toilet standards of 3.5 gpf. We are currently in the process of updating the ordinance to reflect current standards. The actual expenditures are difficult to extrapolate due to a change in administration. The SFPUC spent about 96,840 on materials (toilets) and the rest was administration, marketing and labor. There was 1 toilet sale that year.

This page intentionally left blank

Reported as of 10/

Water Supply & Reuse

Reporting Unit: **San Francisco PUC - Retail** Year: **2003**

Water Supply Source Information

Supply Source Name	Quantity (AF) Supplied	Supply Type
Hetch Hetchy	81915	Imported
Groundwater	2774	Groundwater
Recycled	0	Recycled
Local	14455	Local Watershed

Total AF: 99144

Reported as of 10/

Accounts & Water Use

Reporting Unit Name: **San Francisco PUC - Retail** Submitted to: **CUWCC** Year: **2003**
 03/01/2005

A. Service Area Population Information:

1. Total service area population 789700

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	108951	21349	0	0
2. Multi-Family	38216	31687	0	0
3. Commercial	20949	22952	0	0
4. Industrial	110	395	0	0
5. Institutional	1660	5316	0	0
6. Dedicated Irrigation	1183	2919	0	0
7. Recycled Water	0	0	0	0
8. Other	414	5229	0	0
9. Unaccounted	NA	9297	NA	0
Total	171483	99144	0	0

Metered Unmetered

Reported as of 10/

Reported as of 10/

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

Reporting Unit: **San Francisco PUC - Retail** BMP Form Status: **100% Complete** Year: **2003**

A. Implementation

- 1. Based on your signed MOU date, 12/11/1991, your Agency STRATEGY DUE DATE is: 12/10/1993
- 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? 12/11/1991
- 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? 12/11/1991

B. Water Survey Data

Survey Counts:	Single Family Accounts	Multi-Family Units
1. Number of surveys offered:	14000	7566
2. Number of surveys completed:	1325	788

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 no
- 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) no no
- 10. Which measurement method is typically used (Recommended but not required for surveys) Odometer Wheel
- 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.

The billing system allows us to track number and type of inspection as well as relevant comments. While we track the number of surveys completed, we don't track the number offered.

C. Water Survey Program Expenditures

	This Year	Next Year
1. Budgeted Expenditures	195700	195700
2. Actual Expenditures	195700	

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."

The average single-family account only uses 10% of its water for outdoor irrigation. Most multifamily accounts do not have any outdoor water use due to the density of the City.

E. Comments

While we perform them as necessary, the SFPUC's residential audit program focuses heavily on indoor use. Landscape use is relatively low in San Francisco due to a variety of geographic reasons including climate and density. The staffing numbers are somewhat estimated. The SF surveys offered value was estimated based on the response rate (usually about 10%).

Reported as of 10/

BMP 02: Residential Plumbing Retrofit

Reporting Unit: **San Francisco PUC - Retail** BMP Form Status: **100% Complete** Year: **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 and County of San Francisco Ordinance 185-91 for Multifamily Ordinance 346-91 for Single-Family

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: 90%

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: 90%

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

The City and County of San Francisco requires that all owners of property in San Francisco must file a conservation affidavit testifying that low-flow showerheads have been installed in order to get a reduced water rate. Subsequent inspections have found that this data is correct. Those who do not retrofit their homes, pay 75 cents per ccf more than those who have retrofitted their homes. The number of accounts that have affidavits on file are updated by our billing system on a monthly basis.

B. Low-Flow Device Distribution Information

1. Has your agency developed a targeting/ marketing strategy for distributing low-flow devices? no

a. If YES, when did your agency begin implementing this strategy?

b. Describe your targeting/ marketing strategy.

Those who have installed showerheads using not more than 2.5 gallons per minute and aerators with restrictors on their faucets get the rate of \$1.49 per ccf. Those who do not install low-flow showerheads and aerators with restrictors on their faucets get a rate of \$2.24 per ccf. We have found that this rate structure has motivated our retail customers to retrofit their homes and buildings. Also, the conservation inspectors distribute devices such as low flow showerheads and aerators during their walk-throughs as needed. Customers may also call and request these devices. Unfortunately, while we keep the devices stocked, we don't track their distribution.

Low-Flow Devices Distributed/ Installed	SF Accounts	MF Units
---	-------------	----------

2. Number of low-flow showerheads distributed:	0	0
--	---	---

3. Number of toilet-displacement devices	0	0
--	---	---

distributed:

4. Number of toilet flappers distributed: 0 0

5. Number of faucet aerators distributed: 0 0

6. Does your agency track the distribution and cost of low-flow devices? no

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

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

The affidavits are recorded on the customer's electronic record on the SFPUC/SFWD's billing mainframe system. Also, a constant supply of devices is stocked in house for distribution.

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? yes

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."

We incentivize device replacement through our "conservation rate". Those who have installed showerheads using not more than 2.5 gallons per minute and aerators with restrictors on their faucets get the rate of \$1.49 per ccf. Those who do not install low-flow showerheads and aerators with restrictors on their faucets get a rate of \$2.24 per ccf. We have found that this rate structure has motivated our retail customers to retrofit their homes and buildings.

E. Comments

Reported as of 10/

BMP 03: System Water Audits, Leak Detection and Repair

Reporting Unit: **San Francisco PUC - Retail** BMP Form Status: **100% Complete** Year: **2003**

A. Implementation

- 1. Has your agency completed a pre-screening system audit for this reporting year? no
- 2. If YES, enter the values (AF/Year) used to calculate verifiable use as a percent of total production:
 - a. Determine metered sales (AF) 96225
 - b. Determine other system verifiable uses (AF) 0
 - c. Determine total supply into the system (AF) 0
 - d. Using the numbers above, if (Metered Sales + Other Verifiable Uses) / Total Supply is < 0.9 then a full-scale system audit is required. 0.00
- 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? no
- 6. Does your agency operate a system leak detection program? yes
 - a. If yes, describe the leak detection program:

The SFPUC investigates all leaks that are reported by the public. The gatemen are the first to follow up; if they are not able to fix or detect the leak, it goes to the leak locators at the Distribution Division. The Distribution Division investigates complaints about water leaking into meter vaults, basements and/or other areas.

B. Survey Data

- 1. Total number of miles of distribution system line. 1220
- 2. Number of miles of distribution system line surveyed. 0

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

Reported as of 10/

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

Reporting Unit: **San Francisco PUC - Retail** 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:

This is not applicable. The City and County of San Francisco has been fully metered since 1916.
- 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:
- 2. Number of CII accounts with mixed-use meters. 866
- 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? yes
 - 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."

Because the mixed-use meters are charged for sewer at \$5.35 per ccf as opposed to irrigation meters which are not charged for sewer, the water consumption for irrigation meters are higher than mixed-use accounts in San Francisco.

E. Comments

Reported as of 10/

BMP 05: Large Landscape Conservation Programs and Incentives

Reporting Unit: **San Francisco PUC - Retail**
 BMP Form Status: **100% Complete**
 Year: **2003**

A. Water Use Budgets

- 1. Number of Dedicated Irrigation Meter Accounts: 1184
- 2. Number of Dedicated Irrigation Meter Accounts with Water Budgets: 1184
- 3. Budgeted Use for Irrigation Meter Accounts with Water Budgets (AF): 0
- 4. Actual Use for Irrigation Meter Accounts with Water Budgets (AF): 2919
- 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? 11/1/1986
 - b. Description of marketing / targeting strategy:

We write to each landscape account, offering them to do a free landscape audit. If we do not hear from them, we write to them again.

- 2. Number of Surveys Offered. 0
- 3. Number of Surveys Completed. 300
- 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 no
 - 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:

We offer surveys to all of our irrigation customers annually.

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? yes
- 2. Number of CII mixed-use accounts with landscape budgets. 604
- 3. Do you offer landscape irrigation training? no

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
- b. Loans
- c. Grants

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? no

a. If yes, is it water-efficient?

b. If yes, does it have dedicated irrigation metering?

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	9565	9565
2. Actual Expenditures	9565	

E. "At Least As Effective As"

1. Is your AGENCY implementing an "at least as effective as" variant of this BMP? yes

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."

Because 90% of SF's water is consumed indoors, all rebates are centered on reducing interior water use. Every facility requiring a new meter must submit landscape plans that get checked for planting type and irrigation efficiency.

F. Comments

Reported as of 10/

BMP 06: High-Efficiency Washing Machine Rebate Programs

Reporting Unit: **San Francisco PUC - Retail** 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.

PG&E is the energy provider and they offer a rebate of about \$75 for a horizontal washer. The SFPUC is the local wastewater provider.
- 2. Does your agency offer rebates for high-efficiency washers? yes
- 3. What is the level of the rebate? 75
- 4. Number of rebates awarded. 538

B. Rebate Program Expenditures

	This Year	Next Year
1. Budgeted Expenditures	37500	43000
2. Actual Expenditures	53250	

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

Of the expenditures. 40,350 was spent on the actual rebates. Embedded in the expenditure value is .25FTE for one employee. I cannot be sure how the previous Conservation Coordinator calculated these expenses and whether computed and projected expenses reflected these staffing costs.

Reported as of 10/

BMP 07: Public Information Programs

Reporting Unit: **San Francisco PUC - Retail** 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.

The Conservation Section is in charge of promoting the toilet and washer rebate programs as well as the toilet sale program. The SFPUC's Communications Section is in charge of the SFPUC's web page, general brochures (such as those on general ways to reduce water use) and staffing tables at various events.

- 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	4
b. Public Service Announcement	yes	4
c. Bill Inserts / Newsletters / Brochures	yes	3
d. Bill showing water usage in comparison to previous year's usage	yes	
e. Demonstration Gardens	yes	1
f. Special Events, Media Events	yes	9
g. Speaker's Bureau	yes	1
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	45000	74000
2. Actual Expenditures	45000	

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

I cannot be sure how much was actually expensed towards public information programs because it is not a discrete budget line item that is expensed against and the program administrator is not longer at this position. Events consist of: local neighborhood fairs, tradeshows, environmental summit, contests, etc.

Reported as of 10/

BMP 08: School Education Programs

Reporting Unit: **San Francisco PUC - Retail** 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	5	150	0
Grades 4th-6th	yes	75	4015	80
Grades 7th-8th	yes	0	1050	1
High School	yes	0	1100	0

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

4. When did your Agency begin implementing this program? 1/1/1986

B. School Education Program Expenditures

	This Year	Next Year
1. Budgeted Expenditures	24000	24000
2. Actual Expenditures	24000	

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

We have a variety of school programs including: water-wise poster and bumper sticker contest, coloring book, etc. Some were eliminated due to budget cuts. It's difficult to accurately track the activities from 2003-2004 because the program administrator has changed and there does not seem to be much tracking. We assumed that activity had not changed from the previous year.

Reported as of 10/

BMP 09: Conservation Programs for CII Accounts

Reporting Unit: **San Francisco PUC - Retail** BMP Form Status: **100% Complete** Year: **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	4160	10	1670
b. Number of New Surveys Completed	416	1	167
c. Number of Site Follow-ups of Previous Surveys (within 1 yr)	59	0	0
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	0	0	0
i. Loans	0	0	0
j. Grants	0	0	0
k. Others	0	0	0

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

B. Conservation Program Expenditures for CII Accounts

	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."

The San Francisco Public Utilities Commission has made the decision that at this time it would only offer rebates to residential customers. The SFPUC did not offer any loans for retail customers during this period.

D. Comments

At the time, we did not track the number of audit offers mailed out. However, we do mail out offers to the top 20% of users in each customer class in rotating cycled. I estimated the offers as if we had a response rate of 10%

Reported as of 10/

BMP 09a: CII ULFT Water Savings

Reporting Unit: **San Francisco PUC - Retail** BMP Form Status: **100% Complete** Year: **2003**

- 1. Did your agency implement a CII ULFT replacement program in the reporting year? No
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?

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.

We emphasize replacement of toilets with ultra low flow toilets through our audits, seminars for professional building managers. The Commission overseeing the SF Public Utilities Commission have not approved funding for commercial rebate programs. They have instead devoted their rebate funds to residential accounts.

- 2. How does your agency advertise this program? 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.

We find that the highest response rate with commercial customers is with direct letters

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 ? 36

CII Subsector Number of Toilets Replaced

4.	Number of Toilets Replaced			
	Standard Gravity Tank	Air Assisted	Valve Floor Mount	Valve Wall Mount
a. Offices				
b. Retail / Wholesale				
c. Hotels				
d. Health				
e. Industrial				
f. Schools: K to 12				
g. Eating		36		

- h. Government
- i. Churches
- j. Other

5. Program design.

Direct installation with customer co-payment

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

a. If yes, check all that apply.

Community Based Organization

7. Participant tracking and follow-up.

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

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

The Commission overseeing the SF Public Utilities Commission have not been approved funding for commercial rebate programs. They have instead devoted their rebate funds to residential accounts.

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?

The Commission overseeing the SF Public Utilities Commission have not been supportive of commercial rebate programs. They have instead devoted their rebate funds to residential accounts.

C. Conservation Program Expenditures for CII ULFT

1. CII ULFT Program: Annual Budget & Expenditure Data

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

2. CII ULFT Program: Annual Cost Sharing

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

0

D. Comments

Reported as of 10/

BMP 11: Conservation Pricing

Reporting Unit: **San Francisco PUC - Retail**
 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 \$46692877
 d. Total Revenue from Non-Volumetric Charges, Fees and other Revenue Sources \$5749326

2. Commercial

a. Water Rate Structure Increasing Block
 b. Sewer Rate Structure Uniform
 c. Total Revenue from Volumetric Rates \$21353587
 d. Total Revenue from Non-Volumetric Charges, Fees and other Revenue Sources \$4257282

3. Industrial

a. Water Rate Structure Increasing Block
 b. Sewer Rate Structure Uniform
 c. Total Revenue from Volumetric Rates \$324671
 d. Total Revenue from Non-Volumetric Charges, Fees and other Revenue Sources \$40542

4. Institutional / Government

a. Water Rate Structure Uniform
 b. Sewer Rate Structure Uniform
 c. Total Revenue from Volumetric Rates \$1274165
 d. Total Revenue from Non-Volumetric Charges, Fees and other Revenue Sources \$171414

5. Irrigation

a. Water Rate Structure Uniform
 b. Sewer Rate Structure Service Not Provided
 c. Total Revenue from Volumetric Rates \$1894757
 d. Total Revenue from Non-Volumetric Charges, Fees and other Revenue Sources \$56784

6. Other

a. Water Rate Structure Increasing Block
 b. Sewer Rate Structure Service Not Provided
 c. Total Revenue from Volumetric Rates \$367782
 d. Total Revenue from Non-Volumetric Charges, Fees and other Revenue Sources \$72384

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

The total revenue from non-volumetric charges may be underestimated. Here they include only service charges, however there are additional miscellaneous charges that cannot be separated at this time. Also, that charge is an estimate based on one billing cycle. Only a fraction of municipal accounts pay for water, however they all pay sewer. BMP11 expenditures are incurred through the billing and IT groups, not directly through conservation.

Reported as of 10/

BMP 12: Conservation Coordinator

Reporting Unit: **San Francisco PUC - Retail** BMP Form Status: **100% Complete** Year: **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 Kimberley M. Knox
 - c. Coordinator's Title Water Conservation Administrator
 - d. Coordinator's Experience and Number of Years 17
 - e. Date Coordinator's position was created (mm/dd/yyyy) 11/22/1986
- 6. Number of conservation staff, including Conservation Coordinator. 5

B. Conservation Staff Program Expenditures

	This Year	Next Year
1. Budgeted Expenditures	452896	432079
2. Actual Expenditures	438069	

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 13: Water Waste Prohibition

Reporting Unit: **San Francisco PUC - Retail** BMP Form Status: **100% Complete** Year: **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:

The ordinance is connected with the Rules and Regulations regarding water service. This allows the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission to not only turn off the customer's water when they have repeatedly violated the ordinance. But it also allows the SFPUC to charge a fine or rate surcharge in the event of water shortage.
- 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:

City and County of San Francisco	Rules and Regulations Regarding Water Service
----------------------------------	---

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
Serve water only upon request
- 2. Describe measures that prohibit water uses listed above:

On the first violation, we give them a written notice. On the second violation, they receive a letter from the Water Conservation Administrator. On the third violation, they get a choice of a training or a water reducer device on their service line. On the fourth violation, the meter is homed.

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 no

produced.
 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.

4. Does your agency include water softener checks in home water audit programs? yes
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? yes
no

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? yes
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

San Francisco has very soft water. So very few of our customers have soft water conditioners. The enforcement of the waste water ordinance is done by the SFPUC's Water Conservation's Field Service Inspectors. They do the enforcement along with the audits for BMP #1 and BMP #5.

Reported as of 10/

BMP 14: Residential ULFT Replacement Programs

Reporting Unit: **San Francisco PUC - Retail** 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	289	991
3. Direct Install	0	0
4. CBO Distribution	0	0
5. Other	2114	1073
Total	2403	2064

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

We offer a rebate of up to \$50 per toilet if the customer applies for the rebate PRIOR to purchasing the toilet. We also sell Universal Rundle Toilets for only \$10 at sales during the spring. The sales are open to single-family and multifamily customers who have already filed a conservation affidavit showing that they have already installed a low-flow showerhead and aerators with restrictors on all faucets. Restaurant owners are also eligible to purchase the toilets for only \$10 but few have opted to join this program. The sales are staffed by SFPUC staff as well as local youth groups who receive payment per number of toilets sold.

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

In the fall, we offer a rebate of up to \$50 per toilet (the cost of the toilet itself) if the customer applies for the rebate PRIOR to purchasing the toilet. We also sell Universal Rundle Toilets for only \$10 at sales during the spring. This is open to both single-family and multifamily customers who have already filed a conservation affidavit showing that they have already installed a low-flow showerhead and aerators with restrictors on all faucets. The sales are staffed by SFPUC staff as well as local youth groups who receive payment per number of toilets sold.

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	446428	321000
2. Actual Expenditures	446428	

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

Although a retrofit on resale ordinance does exist, it reflects outdated toilet standards of 3.5 gpf and it is not tracked. The actual expenditures are difficult to extrapolate due to a change in administration. The SFPUC spent 223,350 on materials (toilets) and the rest was administration and labor. There were 3 toilet sales that year.

This page intentionally left blank

Reported as of 10/

Water Supply & Reuse

Reporting Unit:

San Francisco PUC - Retail

Year:

2002**Water Supply Source Information**

Supply Source Name	Quantity (AF) Supplied	Supply Type
Hetch Hetchy	61896	Imported
Local Watershed	26527	Local Watershed

Total AF: 88423

Reported as of 10/

Accounts & Water Use

Reporting Unit Name:

San Francisco PUC - Retail

Submitted to

CUWCC

Year:

2002**02/18/2003****A. Service Area Population Information:**

1. Total service area population 744956

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	108608	21271	0	0
2. Multi-Family	37784	31949	0	0
3. Commercial	21039	25657	0	0
4. Industrial	109	521	0	0
5. Institutional	1002	6099	0	0
6. Dedicated Irrigation	1194	2926	0	0
7. Recycled Water	0	0	0	0
8. Other	0	0	0	0
9. Unaccounted	NA	0	NA	863
Total	169736	88423	0	863
	Metered		Unmetered	

Reported as of 10/

Reported as of 10/

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

Reporting Unit: **San Francisco PUC - Retail** BMP Form Status: **100% Complete** Year: **2002**

A. Implementation

- 1. Based on your signed MOU date, 12/11/1991, your Agency STRATEGY DUE DATE is: 12/10/1993
- 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? 12/11/1991
- 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? 12/11/1991

B. Water Survey Data

Survey Counts:	Single Family Accounts	Multi-Family Units
1. Number of surveys offered:	6151	34566
2. Number of surveys completed:	5791	15870

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 no
- 7. Review or develop customer irrigation schedule yes no
- 8. Measure landscaped area (Recommended but not required for surveys) no no
- 9. Measure total irrigable area (Recommended but not required for surveys) no no
- 10. Which measurement method is typically used (Recommended but not required for surveys) Pacing
- 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.

SFPUC/SFWD's billing system allows specific fields to be evaluated.

C. Water Survey Program Expenditures

	This Year	Next Year
1. Budgeted Expenditures	190000	195700
2. Actual Expenditures	180218	

D. "At Least As Effective As"

- 1. Is your AGENCY implementing an "at least as effective as" variant of this BMP? yes
 - 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."

The average single-family account only uses 10% of its water for outdoor irrigation. Almost all multifamily accounts do not have any outdoor water use due to the high price of land in San Francisco.

E. Comments

Reported as of 10/

BMP 02: Residential Plumbing Retrofit

Reporting Unit: **San Francisco PUC - Retail** BMP Form Status: **100% Complete** Year: **2002**

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 and County of San Francisco Ordinance 185-91 for Multifamily Ordinance 346-91 for Single-Family

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: **90%**

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: **90%**

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

The City and County of San Francisco requires that all owners of property in San Francisco must file a conservation affidavit testifying that low-flow showerheads have been installed in order to get the lower water rate. Subsequent inspections have found that this data is correct. Those who do not retrofit their homes, get a rate that is 75 cents per ccf higher than those who have retrofitted their homes. The number of accounts that have filed affidavits and have not filed affidavits are updated by our billing system on a monthly basis.

B. Low-Flow Device Distribution Information

1. Has your agency developed a targeting/ marketing strategy for distributing low-flow devices? **no**

a. If YES, when did your agency begin implementing this strategy?

b. Describe your targeting/ marketing strategy.

Those who have installed showerheads using not more than 2.5 gallons per minute and aerators with restrictors on their faucets get the rate of \$1.49 per ccf. Those who do not install low-flow showerheads and aerators with restrictors on their faucets get a rate of \$2.24 per ccf. We have found that this rate structure has motivated our retail customers to retrofit their homes and buildings.

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

6. Does your agency track the distribution and cost of low-flow devices? **no**

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

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

The affidavits are recorded on the customer's electronic record on the SFPUC/SFWD's billing mainframe system.

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? **yes**

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."

Those who have installed showerheads using not more than 2.5 gallons per minute and aerators with restrictors on their faucets get the rate of \$1.49 per ccf. Those who do not install low-flow showerheads and aerators with restrictors on their faucets get a rate of \$2.24 per ccf. We have found that this rate structure has motivated our retail customers to retrofit their homes and buildings.

E. Comments

Reported as of 10/

BMP 03: System Water Audits, Leak Detection and Repair

Reporting Unit: **San Francisco PUC - Retail** BMP Form Status: **100% Complete** Year: **2002**

A. Implementation

- 1. Has your agency completed a pre-screening system audit for this reporting year? no
- 2. If YES, enter the values (AF/Year) used to calculate verifiable use as a percent of total production:
 - a. Determine metered sales (AF) 88423
 - b. Determine other system verifiable uses (AF)
 - c. Determine total supply into the system (AF)
 - d. Using the numbers above, if (Metered Sales + Other Verifiable Uses) / Total Supply is < 0.9 then a full-scale system audit is required. 0.00
- 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? no
- 6. Does your agency operate a system leak detection program? no
 - a. If yes, describe the leak detection program:

Unfortunately, our Distribution Division has discontinued our leak detection program. We only go out if there is complaints about water leaking into meter vaults, basements and/or other areas.

B. Survey Data

- 1. Total number of miles of distribution system line. 1250
- 2. Number of miles of distribution system line surveyed. 60

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

Reported as of 10/

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

Reporting Unit: **San Francisco PUC - Retail** BMP Form Status: **100% Complete** Year: **2002**

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:

The City and County of San Francisco has been fully metered since 1916.

- 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:

- 2. Number of CII accounts with mixed-use meters. 886
- 3. Number of CII accounts with mixed-use meters retrofitted with dedicated irrigation meters during reporting period. 2

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? yes
 - 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."

Because the mixed-use meters are charged for sewer at \$5.35 per ccf as opposed to irrigation meters which are not charged for sewer, the water consumption for irrigation meters are higher than mixed-use accounts in San Francisco.

E. Comments

Reported as of 10/

BMP 05: Large Landscape Conservation Programs and Incentives

Reporting Unit: **San Francisco PUC - Retail** BMP Form Status: **100% Complete** Year: **2002**

A. Water Use Budgets

- 1. Number of Dedicated Irrigation Meter Accounts: 1158
- 2. Number of Dedicated Irrigation Meter Accounts with Water Budgets: 1158
- 3. Budgeted Use for Irrigation Meter Accounts with Water Budgets (AF): 8137
- 4. Actual Use for Irrigation Meter Accounts with Water Budgets (AF): 2926
- 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? 11/1/1986
 - b. Description of marketing / targeting strategy:

We write to each landscape account, offering them to do a free landscape audit. If we do not hear from them, we write to them again.

- 2. Number of Surveys Offered. 237
- 3. Number of Surveys Completed. 237
- 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 no
 - 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:

Each year, we offer surveys to all of our irrigation customers.

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. 604

- 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? No

a. If YES, describe below:

Yes, all of the surveys are entered onto our mainframe system and each year, we get a report on how much water they used as opposed to their budget.

- 6. Do you have irrigated landscaping at your facilities? no
 - 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	9242	9565
2. Actual Expenditures	9242	

E. "At Least As Effective As"

- 1. Is your AGENCY implementing an "at least as effective as" variant of this BMP? yes
 - 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."

Because 90% of SF's water is consumed indoors, all rebates are centered on reducing interior water use.

F. Comments

There appears to be some sort of programming glitch. Even though we completed every box, it still show 97%. CUWCC was unable to help us locate the problem.

Reported as of 10/

BMP 06: High-Efficiency Washing Machine Rebate Programs

Reporting Unit: **San Francisco PUC - Retail** BMP Form Status: **100% Complete** Year: **2002**

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.

PG&E offer a rebate of \$75 for a horizontal washer.
- 2. Does your agency offer rebates for high-efficiency washers? yes
- 3. What is the level of the rebate? 75
- 4. Number of rebates awarded. 364

B. Rebate Program Expenditures

	This Year	Next Year
1. Budgeted Expenditures	37500	37500
2. Actual Expenditures	27300	

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

Since the cost of administration is absorbed into the costs of administering the toilet rebate program, the SFPUC does not work with the Bay Area utilities and PG&E in offering a rebate program. This saves us approximately \$60,000 per year.

Reported as of 10/

BMP 07: Public Information Programs

Reporting Unit: **San Francisco PUC - Retail** BMP Form Status: **100% Complete** Year: **2002**

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 Conservation Section is in charge of promoting the toilet and washer rebate programs as well as the toilet sale program. The SFPUC's Communications Section is in charge of the SFPUC's web page, general brochures (such as those on general ways to reduce water use) and staffing tables at various events.

- 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	4
b. Public Service Announcement	yes	4
c. Bill Inserts / Newsletters / Brochures	yes	3
d. Bill showing water usage in comparison to previous year's usage	yes	
e. Demonstration Gardens	yes	1
f. Special Events, Media Events	yes	3
g. Speaker's Bureau	no	
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	45000	45000
2. Actual Expenditures	45000	

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: **San Francisco PUC - Retail** BMP Form Status: **100% Complete** Year: **2002**

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	5	150	0
Grades 4th-6th	yes	75	4015	80
Grades 7th-8th	yes	0	1050	1
High School	yes	0	1100	0

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

4. When did your Agency begin implementing this program? 1/1/1986

B. School Education Program Expenditures

	This Year	Next Year
1. Budgeted Expenditures	24000	24000
2. Actual Expenditures	24000	

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 09: Conservation Programs for CII Accounts

Reporting Unit: **San Francisco PUC - Retail** BMP Form Status: **100% Complete** Year: **2002**

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	0	0	294
b. Number of New Surveys Completed	137	0	294
c. Number of Site Follow-ups of Previous Surveys (within 1 yr)	137	0	294
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	0	0	0
i. Loans	0	0	0
j. Grants	0	0	0
k. Others	0	0	0

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

B. Conservation Program Expenditures for CII Accounts

	This Year	Next Year
1. Budgeted Expenditures	92422	92422
2. Actual Expenditures	92422	

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."

The San Francisco Public Utilities Commission has made the decision that at this time it would only offer rebates to residential customers. The SFPUC does not offer any loans for retail customers.

D. Comments

Reported as of 10/

BMP 09a: CII ULFT Water Savings

Reporting Unit: **San Francisco PUC - Retail** BMP Form Status: **100% Complete** Year: **2002**

- 1. Did your agency implement a CII ULFT replacement program in the reporting year? No
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

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.

We emphasize replacement of toilets with ultra low flow toilets through our audits, seminars for professional building managers. The Commission overseeing the SF Public Utilities Commission have not approved funding for commercial rebate programs. They have instead devoted their rebate funds to residential accounts.

- 2. How does your agency advertise this program? Check all that apply. Direct letter
Web page

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

We find that the highest response rate with commercial customers is with direct letters.

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 ?

CII Subsector	Number of Toilets Replaced			
	Standard Gravity Tank	Air Assisted	Valve Floor Mount	Valve Wall Mount
4.				
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	4	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.

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.

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	5
b. Inadequate payback	4
c. Inadequate ULFT performance	4
d. Lack of funding	2
e. American's with Disabilities Act	3
f. Permitting	5

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.

The Commission overseeing the SF Public Utilities Commission have not been approved funding for commercial rebate programs. They have instead devoted their rebate funds to residential accounts.

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?

The Commission overseeing the SF Public Utilities Commission have not been supportive of commercial rebate programs. They have instead devoted their rebate funds to residential accounts.

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

We emphasize replacement of toilets with ultra low flow toilets through our audits, seminars for professional building managers. The Commission overseeing the SF Public Utilities Commission have not been supportive of commercial rebate programs. They have instead devoted their rebate funds to residential accounts.

Reported as of 10/

BMP 11: Conservation Pricing

Reporting Unit: **San Francisco PUC - Retail**
 BMP Form Status: **100% Complete**
 Year: **2002**

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	\$34159711
d. Total Revenue from Non-Volumetric Charges, Fees and other Revenue Sources	\$10211106

2. Commercial

a. Water Rate Structure	Increasing Block
b. Sewer Rate Structure	Uniform
c. Total Revenue from Volumetric Rates	\$15030872
d. Total Revenue from Non-Volumetric Charges, Fees and other Revenue Sources	\$6211344

3. Industrial

a. Water Rate Structure	Increasing Block
b. Sewer Rate Structure	Uniform
c. Total Revenue from Volumetric Rates	\$329655
d. Total Revenue from Non-Volumetric Charges, Fees and other Revenue Sources	\$57849

4. Institutional / Government

a. Water Rate Structure	Increasing Block
b. Sewer Rate Structure	Uniform
c. Total Revenue from Volumetric Rates	\$939230
d. Total Revenue from Non-Volumetric Charges, Fees and other Revenue Sources	\$313967

5. Irrigation

a. Water Rate Structure	Uniform
b. Sewer Rate Structure	Service Not Provided
c. Total Revenue from Volumetric Rates	\$1814610
d. Total Revenue from Non-Volumetric Charges, Fees and other Revenue Sources	\$293760

6. Other

a. Water Rate Structure	Increasing Block
b. Sewer Rate Structure	Service Not Provided
c. Total Revenue from Volumetric Rates	\$1172325
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	983209	986759
2. Actual Expenditures	983209	

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 12: Conservation Coordinator

Reporting Unit: **San Francisco PUC - Retail** BMP Form Status: **100% Complete** Year: **2002**

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? yes
4. Partner agency's name: None
5. If your agency supplies the conservation coordinator:
 - a. What percent is this conservation coordinator's position? 100%
 - b. Coordinator's Name Kimberley M. Knox
 - c. Coordinator's Title Water Conservation Administrator
 - d. Coordinator's Experience and Number of Years 16
 - e. Date Coordinator's position was created (mm/dd/yyyy) 11/22/1986
6. Number of conservation staff, including Conservation Coordinator. 5

B. Conservation Staff Program Expenditures

	This Year	Next Year
1. Budgeted Expenditures	432079	453067
2. Actual Expenditures	378148	

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 13: Water Waste Prohibition

Reporting Unit: **San Francisco PUC - Retail** BMP Form Status: **100% Complete** Year: **2002**

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:

The ordinance is connected with the Rules and Regulations regarding water service. This allows the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission to not only turn off the customer's water when they have repeatedly violated the ordinance. But it also allows the SFPUC to charge a fine or rate surcharge in the event of water shortage.

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:

City and County of San Francisco	Rules and Regulations Regarding Water Service
----------------------------------	---

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
Serve water only upon request
2. Describe measures that prohibit water uses listed above:

On the first violation, we give them a written notice. On the second violation, they receive a letter from the Water Conservation Administrator. On the third violation, they get a choice of a training or a water reducer device on their service line. On the fourth violation, the meter is homed.

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 no

produced.
 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.

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	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? yes
- 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."

San Francisco has very soft water. So very few of our customers have soft water conditioners.

E. Comments

The enforcement of the waste water ordinance is done by the SFPUC's Water Conservation's Field Service Inspectors. They do the enforcement along with the audits for BMP #1 and BMP #5.

Reported as of 10/

BMP 14: Residential ULFT Replacement Programs

Reporting Unit: **San Francisco PUC - Retail** BMP Form Status: **100% Complete** Year: **2002**

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	308	462
3. Direct Install	0	0
4. CBO Distribution	0	0
5. Other	1570	2410
Total	1878	2872

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

In the fall, we offer a rebate of up to \$50 per toilet (the cost of the toilet itself) if the customer applies for the rebate PRIOR to purchasing the toilet. We also sell Universal Rundle Toilets for only \$10 at sales during the spring. This is open to both single-family and multifamily customers who have already filed a conservation affidavit showing that they have already installed a low-flow showerhead and aerators with restrictors on all faucets. Restaurant owners are also eligible to purchase the toilets for only \$10 but few have opted to join this program.

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

In the fall, we offer a rebate of up to \$50 per toilet (the cost of the toilet itself) if the customer applies for the rebate PRIOR to purchasing the toilet. We also sell Universal Rundle Toilets for only \$10 at sales during the spring. This is open to both single-family and multifamily customers who have already filed a conservation affidavit showing that they have already installed a low-flow showerhead and aerators with restrictors on all faucets.

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	434890	446428
2. Actual Expenditures	323390	

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 page intentionally left blank

Reported as of 10/

Water Supply & Reuse

Reporting Unit:

San Francisco PUC - Retail

Year:

2001**Water Supply Source Information**

Supply Source Name	Quantity (AF) Supplied	Supply Type
Hetch Hetchy	61606	Imported
Local Watershed	26402	Local Watershed

Total AF: 88008

Reported as of 10/

Accounts & Water Use

Reporting Unit Name:

San Francisco PUC - Retail

Submitted to

CUWCC

Year:

2001**02/18/2003****A. Service Area Population Information:**

1. Total service area population 750966

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	108674	21271	0	0
2. Multi-Family	37455	31104	0	0
3. Commercial	21052	26347	0	0
4. Industrial	108	604	0	0
5. Institutional	995	5735	0	0
6. Dedicated Irrigation	1141	2947	0	0
7. Recycled Water	0	0	0	0
8. Other	0	0	0	0
9. Unaccounted	NA	0	NA	842
Total	169425	88008	0	842
		Metered		Unmetered

Reported as of 10/

Reported as of 10/

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

Reporting Unit: **San Francisco PUC - Retail** BMP Form Status: **100% Complete** Year: **2001**

A. Implementation

- 1. Based on your signed MOU date, 12/11/1991, your Agency STRATEGY DUE DATE is: 12/10/1993
- 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? 12/11/1991
- 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? 12/11/1991

B. Water Survey Data

Survey Counts:	Single Family Accounts	Multi-Family Units
1. Number of surveys offered:	17095	13014
2. Number of surveys completed:	6035	12294

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 no
- 7. Review or develop customer irrigation schedule yes no
- 8. Measure landscaped area (Recommended but not required for surveys) no no
- 9. Measure total irrigable area (Recommended but not required for surveys) no no
- 10. Which measurement method is typically used (Recommended but not required for surveys) Pacing
- 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.

The SFPUC/SFWD has a billing system that allows specific fields to be entered to monitor savings.

C. Water Survey Program Expenditures

	This Year	Next Year
1. Budgeted Expenditures	190000	190000
2. Actual Expenditures	180218	

D. "At Least As Effective As"

- 1. Is your AGENCY implementing an "at least as effective as" variant of this BMP? yes
 - 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."

The average single-family account only uses 10% of its water for outdoor irrigation. Almost all multifamily accounts do not have any outdoor water use due to the high price of land in San Francisco.

E. Comments

Reported as of 10/

BMP 02: Residential Plumbing Retrofit

Reporting Unit: **San Francisco PUC - Retail** BMP Form Status: **100% Complete** Year: **2001**

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 and County of San Francisco Ordinance 185-91 for Multifamily Ordinance 346-91 for Single-Family

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: 90%

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: 90%

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

The City and County of San Francisco requires that all owners of property in San Francisco must file a conservation affidavit testifying that low-flow showerheads have been installed in order to get the lower water rate. Subsequent inspections have found that this data is correct. Those who do not retrofit their homes, get a rate that is 75 cents per ccf higher than those who have retrofitted their homes. The number of accounts that have filed affidavits and have not filed affidavits are updated by our billing system on a monthly basis.

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? 11/22/1993

b. Describe your targeting/ marketing strategy.

The City and County of San Francisco requires that all owners of property in San Francisco must file a conservation affidavit testifying that low-flow showerheads have been installed in order to get the lower water rate. Subsequent inspections have found that this data is correct. Those who do not retrofit their homes, get a rate that is 75 cents per ccf higher than those who have retrofitted their homes. The tally on the accounts that have filed affidavits as well as those that have not filed affidavits are updated by our billing system on a monthly basis.

Low-Flow Devices Distributed/ Installed	SF Accounts	MF Units
2. Number of low-flow showerheads distributed:	0	0
3. Number of toilet-displacement devices distributed:	0	0

4. Number of toilet flappers distributed: 0 0

5. Number of faucet aerators distributed: 0 0

6. Does your agency track the distribution and cost of low-flow devices? no

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

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

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? yes

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."

Those who have installed showerheads using not more than 2.5 gallons per minute and aerators with restrictors on their faucets get the rate of \$1.49 per ccf. Those who do not install low-flow showerheads and aerators with restrictors on their faucets get a rate of \$2.24 per ccf. We have found that this rate structure has motivated our retail customers to retrofit their homes and buildings.

E. Comments

Reported as of 10/

BMP 03: System Water Audits, Leak Detection and Repair

Reporting Unit: **San Francisco PUC - Retail** BMP Form Status: **100% Complete** Year: **2001**

A. Implementation

- 1. Has your agency completed a pre-screening system audit for this reporting year? no
- 2. If YES, enter the values (AF/Year) used to calculate verifiable use as a percent of total production:
 - a. Determine metered sales (AF) 88008
 - b. Determine other system verifiable uses (AF) 0
 - c. Determine total supply into the system (AF) 88008
 - 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? no
- 6. Does your agency operate a system leak detection program? no
 - a. If yes, describe the leak detection program:

Unfortunately, our Distribution Division has disconnected our leak detection program. We only go out if there is complaints about water leaking into meter pits or on the ground.

B. Survey Data

- 1. Total number of miles of distribution system line. 1250
- 2. Number of miles of distribution system line surveyed. 38

C. System Audit / Leak Detection Program Expenditures

	This Year	Next Year
1. Budgeted Expenditures	148824	148824
2. Actual Expenditures	148824	

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

Reporting Unit: **San Francisco PUC - Retail** BMP Form Status: **100% Complete** Year: **2001**

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:

The City and County of San Francisco has been fully metered since 1916.

- 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:

Because the mixed-use meters are charged for sewer at \$4.86 per ccf as opposed to irrigation meters which are not charged for sewer, the water consumption of water irrigation meters is usually higher.

- 2. Number of CII accounts with mixed-use meters. 886
- 3. Number of CII accounts with mixed-use meters retrofitted with dedicated irrigation meters during reporting period. 2

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? yes
 - 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."

Because the mixed-use meters are charged for sewer at \$5.35 per ccf as opposed to irrigation meters which are not charged for sewer, the water consumption of water irrigation meters is usually higher.

E. Comments

Reported as of 10/

BMP 05: Large Landscape Conservation Programs and Incentives

Reporting Unit: **San Francisco PUC - Retail**
 BMP Form Status: **100% Complete**
 Year: **2001**

A. Water Use Budgets

- 1. Number of Dedicated Irrigation Meter Accounts: 1113
- 2. Number of Dedicated Irrigation Meter Accounts with Water Budgets: 1113
- 3. Budgeted Use for Irrigation Meter Accounts with Water Budgets (AF): 8818
- 4. Actual Use for Irrigation Meter Accounts with Water Budgets (AF): 2947
- 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? 11/1/1986
 - b. Description of marketing / targeting strategy:

We write to each landscape account, offering them to do a free landscape audit. If we do not hear from them, we write to them again.

- 2. Number of Surveys Offered. 1113
- 3. Number of Surveys Completed. 59
- 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 no
 - 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:

Yes, all of the surveys are entered onto our mainframe system and each year, we get a report on how much water they used as opposed to their budget.

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? yes

- 2. Number of CII mixed-use accounts with landscape budgets. 589
- 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? No

a. If YES, describe below:

Many of our multifamily and commercial customers do not have landscaping and our single-family accounts use 10% or less of their water on landscaping, our information to new customers is geared to interior use.

- 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? no
- 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	9242	9242
2. Actual Expenditures	9242	

E. "At Least As Effective As"

- 1. Is your AGENCY implementing an "at least as effective as" variant of this BMP? yes
 - 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."

Because 90% of SF's water is consumed indoors, all rebates are centered on reducing interior water use.

F. Comments

There appears to be some sort of programming glitch. Even though we completed every box, it still show 97%. CUWCC was unable to help us locate the problem.

Reported as of 10/

BMP 06: High-Efficiency Washing Machine Rebate Programs

Reporting Unit: **San Francisco PUC - Retail** BMP Form Status: **100% Complete** Year: **2001**

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.

PG&E offer a rebate of \$75 for a horizontal washer.
- 2. Does your agency offer rebates for high-efficiency washers? yes
- 3. What is the level of the rebate? 75
- 4. Number of rebates awarded. 115

B. Rebate Program Expenditures

	This Year	Next Year
1. Budgeted Expenditures	37500	37500
2. Actual Expenditures	8625	

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

Since the cost of administration is absorbed into the costs of administering the toilet rebate program, the SFPUC does not work with the Bay Area utilities and PG&E in offering a rebate program. This saves us approximately \$60,000 per year.

Reported as of 10/

BMP 07: Public Information Programs

Reporting Unit: **San Francisco PUC - Retail** BMP Form Status: **100% Complete** Year: **2001**

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 Conservation Section is in charge of promoting the toilet and washer rebate programs as well as the toilet sale program. The SFPUC's Communications Section is in charge of the SFPUC's web page, general brochures (such as those on general ways to reduce water use) and staffing tables at various events.

- 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	5
b. Public Service Announcement	yes	6
c. Bill Inserts / Newsletters / Brochures	yes	4
d. Bill showing water usage in comparison to previous year's usage	yes	
e. Demonstration Gardens	yes	1
f. Special Events, Media Events	yes	4
g. Speaker's Bureau	no	
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	45000	45000
2. Actual Expenditures	45000	

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: **San Francisco PUC - Retail** BMP Form Status: **100% Complete** Year: **2001**

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	10	300	0
Grades 4th-6th	yes	70	4097	88
Grades 7th-8th	yes	0	562	1
High School	yes	0	1300	1

- 3. Did your Agency's materials meet state education framework requirements? yes
- 4. When did your Agency begin implementing this program? 11/1/1986

B. School Education Program Expenditures

	This Year	Next Year
1. Budgeted Expenditures	28000	24000
2. Actual Expenditures	28000	

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 09: Conservation Programs for CII Accounts

Reporting Unit: **San Francisco PUC - Retail** BMP Form Status: **100% Complete** Year: **2001**

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	2105	127	100
b. Number of New Surveys Completed	107	0	50
c. Number of Site Follow-ups of Previous Surveys (within 1 yr)	107	0	50
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	0	0	0
i. Loans	0	0	0
j. Grants	0	0	0
k. Others	0	0	0

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

B. Conservation Program Expenditures for CII Accounts

	This Year	Next Year
1. Budgeted Expenditures	83913	92422
2. Actual Expenditures	83913	

C. "At Least As Effective As"

- 1. Is your AGENCY implementing an "at least as effective as" variant of this BMP? yes
 - 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."

The San Francisco Public Utilities Commission has made the decision that at this time it would only offer rebates to residential customers. The SFPUC does not offer any loans for retail customers.

D. Comments

Reported as of 10/

BMP 09a: CII ULFT Water Savings

Reporting Unit: **San Francisco PUC - Retail** BMP Form Status: **100% Complete** Year: **2001**

- 1. Did your agency implement a CII ULFT replacement program in the reporting year? No
- 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

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.

Because our top 20% of our commercial customers use 80% of the water consumed by that customer class, we target the top 20% of our commercial customers.

- 2. How does your agency advertise this program? Check all that apply. Direct letter
Web page
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.

We have found that direct letters and appeals during our seminars for professional building managers have been the most successful. We emphasize replacement of toilets with ultra low flow toilets through our audits, seminars for professional building managers. The Commission overseeing the SF Public Utilities Commission has rejected requests for commercial rebate programs. They have instead devoted their rebate funds to residential accounts.

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 ?

CII Subsector Number of Toilets Replaced

4.	Standard	Air	Valve Floor	Valve Wall
	Gravity Tank	Assisted	Mount	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.

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.

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 5
- b. Inadequate payback 4
- c. Inadequate ULFT performance 3
- d. Lack of funding 3
- e. American's with Disabilities Act 2
- f. Permitting 5
- 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.

The Commission overseeing the SF Public Utilities Commission have not rejected commercial rebate programs. They have instead devoted their rebate funds to residential accounts.

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?

The Commission overseeing the SF Public Utilities Commission have rejected commercial rebate programs. They have instead devoted their rebate funds to residential accounts.

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

The Commission overseeing the SF Public Utilities Commission have rejected commercial rebate programs. They have instead devoted their rebate funds to residential accounts.

Reported as of 10/

BMP 11: Conservation Pricing

Reporting Unit: **San Francisco PUC - Retail**
 BMP Form Status: **100% Complete**
 Year: **2001**

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	\$31564540
d. Total Revenue from Non-Volumetric Charges, Fees and other Revenue Sources	\$9306633

2. Commercial

a. Water Rate Structure	Increasing Block
b. Sewer Rate Structure	Increasing Block
c. Total Revenue from Volumetric Rates	\$16212751
d. Total Revenue from Non-Volumetric Charges, Fees and other Revenue Sources	\$6073686

3. Industrial

a. Water Rate Structure	Increasing Block
b. Sewer Rate Structure	Uniform
c. Total Revenue from Volumetric Rates	\$215909
d. Total Revenue from Non-Volumetric Charges, Fees and other Revenue Sources	\$32380

4. Institutional / Government

a. Water Rate Structure	Increasing Block
b. Sewer Rate Structure	Uniform
c. Total Revenue from Volumetric Rates	\$531205
d. Total Revenue from Non-Volumetric Charges, Fees and other Revenue Sources	\$680768

5. Irrigation

a. Water Rate Structure	Increasing Block
b. Sewer Rate Structure	Service Not Provided
c. Total Revenue from Volumetric Rates	\$1705552
d. Total Revenue from Non-Volumetric Charges, Fees and other Revenue Sources	\$276419

6. Other

a. Water Rate Structure	Increasing Block
b. Sewer Rate Structure	Service Not Provided
c. Total Revenue from Volumetric Rates	\$1041506
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	1173878	983209
2. Actual Expenditures	910557	

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 12: Conservation Coordinator

Reporting Unit: **San Francisco PUC - Retail** BMP Form Status: **100% Complete** Year: **2001**

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 Kimberley M. Knox
 - c. Coordinator's Title Water Conservation Administrator
 - d. Coordinator's Experience and Number of Years 15
 - e. Date Coordinator's position was created (mm/dd/yyyy) 11/22/1986
- 6. Number of conservation staff, including Conservation Coordinator. 5

B. Conservation Staff Program Expenditures

	This Year	Next Year
1. Budgeted Expenditures	432079	432079
2. Actual Expenditures	378148	

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 13: Water Waste Prohibition

Reporting Unit: **San Francisco PUC - Retail** BMP Form Status: **100% Complete** Year: **2001**

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:

The ordinance is connected with the Rules and Regulations regarding water service. This allows the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission to not only turn off the customer's water when they have repeatedly violated the ordinance. But it also allows the SFPUC to charge a fine or rate surcharge in the event of water shortage.
- 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:

City and County of San Francisco	Rules and Regulations Regarding Water Service
----------------------------------	---

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 no
 - e. Non-recirculating systems in all new decorative fountains yes
 - f. Other, please name yes
Serve water in food establishments only upon request
- 2. Describe measures that prohibit water uses listed above:

On the first violation, we give them a written notice. On the second violation, they receive a letter from the Water Conservation Administrator. On the third violation, they get a choice of a training or a water reducing device on their water service line. On the fourth violation, the meter is homed.

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 no

produced.
 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.

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? no

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? yes

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."

San Francisco has very soft water. So very few of our customers have soft water conditioners.

E. Comments

The enforcement of the waste water ordinance is done by the SFPUC's Water Conservation's Field Service Inspectors. They do the enforcement along with the audits for BMP #1 and BMP #5.

Reported as of 10/

BMP 14: Residential ULFT Replacement Programs

Reporting Unit: **San Francisco PUC - Retail** BMP Form Status: **100% Complete** Year: **2001**

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	230	346
3. Direct Install	0	0
4. CBO Distribution	0	0
5. Other	1600	2400
Total	1830	2746

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

In the fall, we offer a rebate of up to \$50 per toilet (the cost of the toilet itself) if the customer applies for the rebate PRIOR to purchasing the toilet. This is open to both single-family and multifamily customers who have already filed a conservation affidavit showing that they have already installed a low-flow showerhead and aerators with restrictors on all faucets.

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

In the fall, we offer a rebate of up to \$50 per toilet (the cost of the toilet itself) if the customer applies for the rebate PRIOR to purchasing the toilet. This is open to both single-family and multifamily customers who have already filed a conservation affidavit showing that they have already installed a low-flow showerhead and aerators with restrictors on all faucets.

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	454890	434890
2. Actual Expenditures	313690	

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 page intentionally left blank

Reported as of 10/

Water Supply & Reuse

Reporting Unit:

San Francisco PUC - Retail

Year:

2000**Water Supply Source Information**

Supply Source Name	Quantity (AF) Supplied	Supply Type
--------------------	------------------------	-------------

Total AF:

Reported as of 10/

Accounts & Water Use

Reporting Unit Name:

San Francisco PUC - Retail

Submitted to

CUWCC

Year:

2000**12/11/2000****A. Service Area Population Information:**

1. Total service area population 799000

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	108522	21099	0	0
2. Multi-Family	37406	32160	0	0
3. Commercial	21082	29004	0	0
4. Industrial	108	724	0	0
5. Institutional	1000	4223	0	0
6. Dedicated Irrigation	1123	2898	0	0
7. Recycled Water	0	0	0	0
8. Other	0	0	0	0
9. Unaccounted	NA	7209	NA	0
Total	169241	97317	0	0
	Metered		Unmetered	

Reported as of 10/

Reported as of 10/

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

Reporting Unit: **San Francisco PUC - Retail** BMP Form Status: **100% Complete** Year: **2000**

A. Implementation

- 1. Based on your signed MOU date, 12/11/1991, your Agency STRATEGY DUE DATE is: 12/10/1993
- 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? 4/1/1989
- 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? 3/1/1995

B. Water Survey Data

Survey Counts:	Single Family Accounts	Multi-Family Units
1. Number of surveys offered:	16721	1843
2. Number of surveys completed:	6221	1843

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 no no
- 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) no no
- 10. Which measurement method is typically used (Recommended but not required for surveys) Pacing
- 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.

We request a list of the top 20% of our residential customers. We then send 300 requests out at a time and then schedule those who request a conservation walkthrough in our schedule. We then send the inspector out and he/she fills out a check list and leaves a copy with the customer. We then enter the data onto the computer and send a copy of the final report with potential savings identified to the customer. We don't spend much time on irrigation because only 3% of SFWD's water demand is spent on landscaping.

C. Water Survey Program Expenditures

	This Year	Next Year
1. Budgeted Expenditures	142090	144095
2. Actual Expenditures	142090	

D. "At Least As Effective As"

- 1. Is your AGENCY implementing an "at least as effective as" variant of this BMP? yes
 - 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."

We request a list of the top 20% of our residential customers. We then send 300 requests out at a time and then schedule those who request a conservation walkthrough in our schedule. We then send the inspector out and he/she fills out a check list and leaves a copy with the customer. We then enter the data onto the computer and send a copy of the final report with potential savings identified to the customer. We don't spend much time on irrigation because only 3% of SFWD's water demand is spent on landscaping.

E. Comments

Reported as of 10/

BMP 02: Residential Plumbing Retrofit

Reporting Unit: **San Francisco PUC - Retail** BMP Form Status: **100% Complete** Year: **2000**

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:

Ordinance 185-91 for Multiple Family Buildings Ordinance 346-91 for Single Family Homes Ordinance 359-91 for Commercial Buildings and Institutional Buildings SFPUC passed two tier rate structure to enforce these ordinances in March 1994.

- 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: 91%
- 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: 91%
- 6. If YES to 2 OR 4 above, please describe how saturation was determined, including the dates and results of any survey research.

Customers are required to submit sworn conservation affidavits testifying that they have installed the low flow showerheads and aerators with restrictors on all faucets to receive the lower rate. We have also done 3,500 inspections over the last 3 years and found that 89-93% of our customers have the low flow showerheads.

B. Low-Flow Device Distribution Information

- 1. Has your agency developed a targeting/ marketing strategy for distributing low-flow devices? no
 - a. If YES, when did your agency begin implementing this strategy?
 - b. Describe your targeting/ marketing strategy.

Because they are required to do it under law and to get a water consumption rate that is 66% below the normal rate, we feel that it is the customers' responsibility to purchase their own low flow showerheads and aerators with restrictors. Customers who don't purchase and install these devices in their homes or buildings get a rate that is 50% higher than those who do install low-flow showerheads and aerators with restrictors on all faucets.

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

- 6. Does your agency track the distribution and cost of low-flow devices? no
 - a. If YES, in what format are low-flow devices tracked?
 - b. If yes, describe your tracking and distribution system :

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? yes
 - 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."

The City of San Francisco has passed three ordinance requiring all buildings in San Francisco to have low-flow showerheads and aerators with restrictors on all faucets or face a fine of \$500 per day under the Housing and Building Codes. SFPUC has further passed an ordinance stating that those who do not have the showerheads installed and the aerators with restrictors installed in their homes will receive a water consumption rate 66% higher than those who have these devices installed in their home or building.

E. Comments

Reported as of 10/

BMP 03: System Water Audits, Leak Detection and Repair

Reporting Unit: **San Francisco PUC - Retail** BMP Form Status: **100% Complete** Year: **2000**

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) 90108
 - b. Determine other system verifiable uses (AF) 0
 - c. Determine total supply into the system (AF) 97317
 - d. Using the numbers above, if (Metered Sales + Other Verifiable Uses) / Total Supply is < 0.9 then a full-scale system audit is required. 0.93
- 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:

We do a systematic leak detection program as specified in the AWWA Manual as well as looking at trouble spots where leakage has been found.

B. Survey Data

- 1. Total number of miles of distribution system line. 1250
- 2. Number of miles of distribution system line surveyed. 420

C. System Audit / Leak Detection Program Expenditures

	This Year	Next Year
1. Budgeted Expenditures	159952	169222
2. Actual Expenditures	159952	

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

Reporting Unit: **San Francisco PUC - Retail** BMP Form Status: **100% Complete** Year: **2000**

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:

We have been fully metered since 1916. There are no unmetered accounts.
- 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:

We have been fully metered in 1916. There are not any unmetered connections in San Francisco.

- 2. Number of CII accounts with mixed-use meters. 27
- 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? yes
 - 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."

We have been fully metered since 1916. CII accounts pay a sewer rate of \$5.40 per ccf with mixed-use accounts. Dedicated irrigation accounts do not have to pay for sewer. So the sewer rate is a great incentive for the CII accounts to change their mixed use meters on their own. But only 3% of the City's water consumption is spent on landscaping.

E. Comments

Reported as of 10/

BMP 05: Large Landscape Conservation Programs and Incentives

Reporting Unit: **San Francisco PUC - Retail** BMP Form Status: **100% Complete** Year: **2000**

A. Water Use Budgets

- 1. Number of Dedicated Irrigation Meter Accounts: 1113
- 2. Number of Dedicated Irrigation Meter Accounts with Water Budgets: 1113
- 3. Budgeted Use for Irrigation Meter Accounts with Water Budgets (AF): 1632
- 4. Actual Use for Irrigation Meter Accounts with Water Budgets (AF): 2454
- 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? 4/1/1988
 - b. Description of marketing / targeting strategy:

We notify all irrigation accounts, mixed used accounts and officials in the City's Recreation and Parks Department as well as the City's Department of Public Works (in charge of many medians) with letters as well as bill messages. We also offer free seminar to landscapers each spring.

- 2. Number of Surveys Offered. 655
- 3. Number of Surveys Completed. 655
- 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? no
- 6. Does your agency provide follow-up surveys for previously completed surveys? yes
 - a. If YES, describe below:

We send letters offering free follow-ups by letter each year as well as in our bill message with our water budget.

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. 27
- 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:

We send a brochure about water conservation as well as other services to all of our new customers.

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? no

D. Landscape Conservation Program Expenditures

	This Year	Next Year
1. Budgeted Expenditures	42326	42326
2. Actual Expenditures	42326	

E. "At Least As Effective As"

1. Is your AGENCY implementing an "at least as effective as" variant of this BMP? yes

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."

Only 3% of SFWD's water consumption is spent on landscaping. We provide water budgets to our dedicated landscape accounts as well as our mixed-use commercial meters that use 40% or more of their water on landscaping. Because so little water is used in landscaping, we don't offer any rebates or other incentives.

F. Comments

Reported as of 10/

BMP 06: High-Efficiency Washing Machine Rebate Programs

Reporting Unit: **San Francisco PUC - Retail** BMP Form Status: **100% Complete** Year: **2000**

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 Electric offers rebate of \$50 to \$75 for high-efficiency washers.

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

3. What is the level of the rebate? 75

4. Number of rebates awarded. 209

B. Rebate Program Expenditures

	This Year	Next Year
1. Budgeted Expenditures	75000	75000
2. Actual Expenditures	15675	

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 07: Public Information Programs

Reporting Unit: **San Francisco PUC - Retail** BMP Form Status: **100% Complete** Year: **2000**

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 Conservation Section uses bill inserts, brochures, radio spots in three languages, newspaper ads in three languages, public service announcements and web pages.

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	7
b. Public Service Announcement	yes	6
c. Bill Inserts / Newsletters / Brochures	yes	5
d. Bill showing water usage in comparison to previous year's usage	yes	
e. Demonstration Gardens	yes	1
f. Special Events, Media Events	yes	10
g. Speaker's Bureau	yes	8
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	61000	40000
2. Actual Expenditures	61000	

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: **San Francisco PUC - Retail** BMP Form Status: **100% Complete** Year: **2000**

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	31	4891	4
Grades 4th-6th	yes	21	2656	4
Grades 7th-8th	yes	4	66	0
High School	yes	18	540	0

3. Did your Agency's materials meet state education framework requirements? yes
 4. When did your Agency begin implementing this program? 9/1/1989

B. School Education Program Expenditures

	This Year	Next Year
1. Budgeted Expenditures	23500	30500
2. Actual Expenditures	23500	

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 09: Conservation Programs for CII Accounts

Reporting Unit: **San Francisco PUC - Retail** BMP Form Status: **100% Complete** Year: **2000**

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	170	0	270
b. Number of New Surveys Completed	170	0	270
c. Number of Site Follow-ups of Previous Surveys (within 1 yr)	0	0	0
d. Number of Phone Follow-ups of Previous Surveys (within 1 yr)	170	0	270

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	0	0	0

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? yes
- 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. 0
- 8. Estimated annual savings (AF/yr) from non-site-verified actions taken by agency since 1991. 1055

B. Conservation Program Expenditures for CII Accounts

	This Year	Next Year
1. Budgeted Expenditures	26400	88560
2. Actual Expenditures	26400	

C. "At Least As Effective As"

- 1. Is your AGENCY implementing an "at least as effective as" variant of this BMP? yes
 - 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."

We send a letter to each of our customers after the audit and include a written report on the audit with a list of recommended measures as well as the potential for savings.

D. Comments

Reported as of 10/

BMP 09a: CII ULFT Water Savings

Reporting Unit: BMP Form Status: Year:
 0% Complete 2000

1. Did your agency implement a CII ULFT replacement program in the reporting year? 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?

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.

2. How does your agency advertise this program? 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.

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.)

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?

3. What is the total number of customer accounts participating in the program during the last year ?

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

5. Program design.

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

a. If yes, check all that apply.

7. Participant tracking and follow-up.

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

b. Inadequate payback

c. Inadequate ULFT performance

d. Lack of funding

e. American's with Disabilities Act

f. Permitting

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.

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?

C. Conservation Program Expenditures for CII ULFT

1. CII ULFT Program: Annual Budget & Expenditure Data

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

- a. Labor
- b. Materials
- c. Marketing & Advertising
- d. Administration & Overhead
- e. Outside Services
- f. Total

2. CII ULFT Program: Annual Cost Sharing

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

D. Comments

Reported as of 10/

BMP 11: Conservation Pricing

Reporting Unit: **San Francisco PUC - Retail**
 BMP Form Status: **100% Complete**
 Year: **2000**

A. Implementation

Rate Structure Data Volumetric Rates for Water Service by Customer Class

1. Residential

a. Water Rate Structure	Uniform
b. Sewer Rate Structure	Uniform
c. Total Revenue from Volumetric Rates	\$30371033.81
d. Total Revenue from Non-Volumetric Charges, Fees and other Revenue Sources	\$8842315.6

2. Commercial

a. Water Rate Structure	Uniform
b. Sewer Rate Structure	Uniform
c. Total Revenue from Volumetric Rates	\$16758529.82
d. Total Revenue from Non-Volumetric Charges, Fees and other Revenue Sources	\$5978121

3. Industrial

a. Water Rate Structure	Uniform
b. Sewer Rate Structure	Uniform
c. Total Revenue from Volumetric Rates	\$439935.4
d. Total Revenue from Non-Volumetric Charges, Fees and other Revenue Sources	\$85294.4

4. Institutional / Government

a. Water Rate Structure	Uniform
b. Sewer Rate Structure	Uniform
c. Total Revenue from Volumetric Rates	\$920892.42
d. Total Revenue from Non-Volumetric Charges, Fees and other Revenue Sources	\$295691.4

5. Irrigation

a. Water Rate Structure	Uniform
b. Sewer Rate Structure	Uniform
c. Total Revenue from Volumetric Rates	\$1590556
d. Total Revenue from Non-Volumetric Charges, Fees and other Revenue Sources	\$126674.4

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	13480	13807
2. Actual Expenditures	13480	

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."

Irrigation is not a Revenue Class in San Francisco. It's a type of service (like standard or fire).

D. Comments

Reported as of 10/

BMP 12: Conservation Coordinator

Reporting Unit: **San Francisco PUC - Retail** BMP Form Status: **100% Complete** Year: **2000**

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: None
- 5. If your agency supplies the conservation coordinator:
 - a. What percent is this conservation coordinator's position? 100%
 - b. Coordinator's Name Kimberley M. Knox
 - c. Coordinator's Title Water Conservation Administrator
 - d. Coordinator's Experience and Number of Years 15 years in Water Conservation-Author of Five Water-Related Books
 - e. Date Coordinator's position was created (mm/dd/yyyy) 9/23/1989
- 6. Number of conservation staff, including Conservation Coordinator. 5

B. Conservation Staff Program Expenditures

	This Year	Next Year
1. Budgeted Expenditures	1148548	1158878
2. Actual Expenditures	1201331	

C. "At Least As Effective As"

1. Is your AGENCY implementing an "at least as effective as" variant of this BMP? yes

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."

The Conservation Administrator's position actually begin in September 1986. Greg Smith told me that we couldn't put a date earlier than 1989 and still get 100%. Please get rid of this glitch.

D. Comments

Reported as of 10/

BMP 13: Water Waste Prohibition

Reporting Unit: **San Francisco PUC - Retail** BMP Form Status: **100% Complete** Year: **2000**

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:

All of the restrictions listed below, including a restriction on serving water at restaurants, is part of our ordinance.

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 Francisco	Rules and Regulations Regarding Water Service
---------------	--

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 no
- e. Non-recirculating systems in all new decorative fountains yes
- f. Other, please name yes
Must serve water only upon request

2. Describe measures that prohibit water uses listed above:

We send out table tents. Customer complains. We send an inspector who posts a notice. Second complaint-a letter. Third complaint-restrictor in house pipe or a water conservation class. Fourth complaint-turn account off.

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 no

found by the agency governing board that there is an adverse effect on the reclaimed water or groundwater supply.

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	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? yes

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."

San Francisco has one of the softest water in the nation. We are not interested in promoting water softening ideas since our customers do not have to use water softeners.

E. Comments

Reported as of 10/

BMP 14: Residential ULFT Replacement Programs

Reporting Unit: **San Francisco PUC - Retail** BMP Form Status: **100% Complete** Year: **2000**

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	290	5147
3. Direct Install	0	0
4. CBO Distribution	1565	2340
5. Other	78	51
	<hr/>	
Total	1933	7538

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

San Francisco offers a rebate of up to \$50 for its residential customers-but they must apply prior to purchasing the toilet. The rebate program is offered in the fall. In the spring, SFWD sells water-efficient toilets for \$10 at six sales. All work is done in-house except community groups earn money by lifting toilets into customers' cars. The other category is that we will deliver toilets to senior citizens and others who can not get to the sale.

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

San Francisco offers a rebate of up to \$50 for its residential customers-but they must apply prior to purchasing the toilet. The rebate program is offered in the fall. In the spring, SFWD sells water-efficient toilets for \$10 at six sales. All work is done in-house except community groups earn money by lifting toilets into customers' cars. The other category is that we will deliver toilets to senior citizens and others who can not get to the sale.

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	661000	640775
2. Actual Expenditures	661000	

C. "At Least As Effective As"

1. Is your AGENCY implementing an "at least as effective as" no

variant of this BMP?

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

BMP Wholesaler Reports

Reported as of 12/

Water Supply & Reuse

Reporting Unit: **San Francisco PUC - Wholesale** Year: **2001**

Water Supply Source Information

Supply Source Name	Quantity (AF) Supplied	Supply Type
Hetch Hetchy	243119	Imported
Local Watershed	42903	Local Watershed

Total AF: 286022

Purchaser Information

Name of Agency	Quantity (AF) Supplied	Retailer or Wholesaler
Total AF:		

Reported as of 12/

BMP 03: System Water Audits, Leak Detection and Repair

Reporting Unit: **San Francisco PUC - Wholesale** BMP Form Status: **100% Complete** Year: **2001**

A. Implementation

1. Has your agency completed a pre-screening system audit for this reporting year? No
2. If YES, enter the values (AF/Year) used to calculate verifiable use as a percent of total production:
 - a. Determine metered sales (AF) 0
 - b. Determine other system verifiable uses (AF) 0
 - c. Determine total supply into the system (AF) 0
 - d. Using the numbers above, if (Metered Sales + Other Verifiable Uses) / Total Supply is < 0.9 then a full-scale system audit is required. 0.00
3. Does your agency keep necessary data on file to verify the values used to calculate verifiable uses as a percent of total production? no
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? no
6. Does your agency operate a system leak detection program? Yes
 - a. If yes, describe the leak detection program:

The SFPUC initiated a Pipeline Inspection Program in the early 1990s on its regional system's 280 miles of water transmission lines. Routine inspections are considered preventative maintenance measures, but they also provide information on pipeline leaks. These inspections are usually conducted year round with no more than one section of a major pipeline out of service at any time. The Pipeline Inspection Program is designed over a 20-year period and then repeats. The SFPUC has a goal to inspect one section per quarter (4/yr.) These sections average 4-6 miles each. Technically, the regional system does not have any distribution system components, only transmission system components. Staff performs meter calculations that estimate the leakage rate by comparing customer usage, plant production and water crossing the San Francisco County line.

B. Survey Data

1. Total number of miles of distribution system line. 350
2. Number of miles of distribution system line surveyed. 20

C. System Audit / Leak Detection Program Expenditures

	This Year	Next Year
1. Budgeted Expenditures	0	12800000
2. Actual Expenditures	0	

D. "At Least As Effective As"

1. Is your AGENCY implementing an "at least as effective as" No

variant of this BMP?

- 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 12/

BMP 07: Public Information Programs

Reporting Unit: **San Francisco PUC - Wholesale** BMP Form Status: **100% Complete** Year: **2001**

A. Implementation

- 1. Does your agency maintain an active public information program to promote and educate customers about water conservation? no
 - a. If YES, describe the program and how it's organized.

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	
b. Public Service Announcement	no	
c. Bill Inserts / Newsletters / Brochures	no	
d. Bill showing water usage in comparison to previous year's usage	no	
e. Demonstration Gardens	no	
f. Special Events, Media Events	no	
g. Speaker's Bureau	no	
h. Program to coordinate with other government agencies, industry and public interest groups and media	no	

B. Conservation Information 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

The SFPUC has a long-term Master Water sales contract with its wholesale customers. Under the terms of this contract, the SFPUC cannot provide direct financial assistance for conservation programs to a wholesale customer and subsequently add this expense to the wholesale rate base for that year. The SFPUC can provide staff to assist wholesale customer conservation efforts, and through agreement with the Bay Area Water Supply and Conservation Agency, can develop service area-wide conservation programs that can be funded as a joint expense by its retail and wholesale customers.

Reported as of 12/

BMP 08: School Education Programs

Reporting Unit: **San Francisco PUC - Wholesale** BMP Form Status: **100% Complete** Year: **2001**

A. Implementation

1. Has your agency implemented a school information program to promote water conservation? no

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	no	0	0	0
Grades 4th-6th	no	0	0	0
Grades 7th-8th	no	0	0	0
High School	no	0	0	0

3. Did your Agency's materials meet state education framework requirements? no

4. When did your Agency begin implementing this program?

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

The SFPUC has a long-term Master Water sales contract with its wholesale customers. Under the terms of this contract, the SFPUC cannot provide direct financial assistance for conservation programs to a wholesale customer and subsequently add this expense to the wholesale rate base for that year. The SFPUC can provide staff to assist wholesale customer conservation efforts, and through agreement with the Bay Area Water Supply and Conservation Agency, can develop service area-wide conservation programs that can be funded as a joint expense by its retail and wholesale customers.

Reported as of 12/

BMP 10: Wholesale Agency Assistance Programs

Reporting Unit: **San Francisco PUC - Wholesale** BMP Form Status: **100% Complete** Year: **2001**

A. Implementation

1. Financial Support by BMP

BMP	Financial Incentives Offered?	Budgeted Amount	Amount Awarded	BMP	Financial Incentives Offered?	Budgeted Amount	Amount Awarded
1	No			8	No		
2	No			9	No		
3	No			10	No		
4	No			11	No		
5	No			12	No		
6	No			13	No		
7	No			14	No		

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 No
 - 3) Commercial, industrial, and institutional surveys No
 - 4) Residential and large turf irrigation No
 - 5) Conservation-related rates and pricing No

3. Staff Resources by BMP

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

4. Regional Programs by BMP

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

B. Wholesale Agency Assistance 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

The SFPUC has a long-term Master Water sales contract with its wholesale customers. Under the terms of this contract, the SFPUC cannot provide direct financial assistance for conservation programs to a wholesale customer and subsequently add this expense to the wholesale rate base for that year. The SFPUC can provide staff to assist wholesale customer conservation efforts, and through agreement with the Bay Area Water Supply and Conservation Agency, can develop service area-wide conservation programs that can be funded as a joint expense by its retail and wholesale customers.

Reported as of 12/

BMP 11: Conservation Pricing

Reporting Unit: **San Francisco PUC - Wholesale**
 BMP Form Status: **100% Complete**
 Year: **2001**

A. Implementation

Rate Structure Data Volumetric Rates for Water Service by Customer Class

1. Residential

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

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 \$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 Service Not Provided
 c. Total Revenue from Volumetric Rates \$69400000
 d. Total Revenue from Non-Volumetric Charges, Fees and other Revenue Sources \$2000000

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

The SFPUC has long-term sales contracts with its wholesale customer agencies (they expire on 6/30/09). The agencies are charged a monthly service charge based on the size of their meters, and a charge for water deliveries based on one-month meter readings. The SFPUC adopted an Interim Water Shortage Allocation Plan in 2001 that provides a method for allocating water between the SFPUC and it's wholesale customer agencies collectively during shortages caused by drought. The Plan includes provisions for water conservation, transfers, banking, and excess use charges.

Reported as of 12/

BMP 12: Conservation Coordinator

Reporting Unit:

**San Francisco PUC -
Wholesale**BMP Form Status:
100% CompleteYear:
2001**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 Cheryl Munoz
 - c. Coordinator's Title Senior Water Resources Specialist
 - d. Coordinator's Experience and Number of Years 11 years in program implementation and policy making.
 - e. Date Coordinator's position was created (mm/dd/yyyy) 6/25/2001
6. Number of conservation staff, including Conservation Coordinator. 1

B. Conservation Staff Program Expenditures

	This Year	Next Year
1. Budgeted Expenditures	83308	52200
2. Actual Expenditures	1602	

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 SFPUC hired a full time conservation coordinator in June 2001. The coordinator began work on June 25, 2001, and worked a total of 5 days in FY 2000-2001.

Reported as of 12/

Water Supply & Reuse

Reporting Unit: **San Francisco PUC - Wholesale** Year: **2002**

Water Supply Source Information

Supply Source Name	Quantity (AF) Supplied	Supply Type
Hetch Hetchy	237498	Imported
Local watershed	41911	Local Watershed

Total AF: 279409

Purchaser Information

Name of Agency	Quantity (AF) Supplied	Retailer or Wholesaler
----------------	------------------------	------------------------

Total AF:

Reported as of 12/

BMP 03: System Water Audits, Leak Detection and Repair

Reporting Unit: **San Francisco PUC - Wholesale** BMP Form Status: **100% Complete** Year: **2002**

A. Implementation

1. Has your agency completed a pre-screening system audit for this reporting year? no
2. If YES, enter the values (AF/Year) used to calculate verifiable use as a percent of total production:
 - a. Determine metered sales (AF)
 - b. Determine other system verifiable uses (AF)
 - c. Determine total supply into the system (AF)
 - d. Using the numbers above, if (Metered Sales + Other Verifiable Uses) / Total Supply is < 0.9 then a full-scale system audit is required. 0.00
3. Does your agency keep necessary data on file to verify the values used to calculate verifiable uses as a percent of total production? no
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? no
6. Does your agency operate a system leak detection program? Yes
 - a. If yes, describe the leak detection program:

The SFPUC initiated a Pipeline Inspection Program in the early 1990s on its regional system's 280 miles of water transmission lines. Routine inspections are considered preventative maintenance measures, but they also provide information on pipeline leaks. These inspections are usually conducted year round with no more than one section of a major pipeline out of service at any time. The Pipeline Inspection Program is designed over a 20-year period and then repeats. The SFPUC has a goal to inspect one section per quarter (4/yr.) These sections average 4-6 miles each. Technically, the regional system does not have any distribution system components, only transmission system components. Staff performs meter calculations that estimate the leakage rate by comparing customer usage, plant production and water crossing the San Francisco County line.

B. Survey Data

1. Total number of miles of distribution system line. 350
2. Number of miles of distribution system line surveyed. 20

C. System Audit / Leak Detection Program Expenditures

	This Year	Next Year
1. Budgeted Expenditures	12800000	13600000
2. Actual Expenditures	4500000	

D. "At Least As Effective As"

1. Is your AGENCY implementing an "at least as effective as" No

variant of this BMP?

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 12/

BMP 07: Public Information Programs

Reporting Unit: **San Francisco PUC - Wholesale** BMP Form Status: **100% Complete** Year: **2002**

A. Implementation

1. Does your agency maintain an active public information program to promote and educate customers about water conservation? no

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

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	
b. Public Service Announcement	no	
c. Bill Inserts / Newsletters / Brochures	no	
d. Bill showing water usage in comparison to previous year's usage	no	
e. Demonstration Gardens	no	
f. Special Events, Media Events	yes	1
g. Speaker's Bureau	no	
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	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

The SFPUC is a member of the Bay Area Water Agencies Coalition (BAWAC). This organization is comprised of seven Bay Area agencies. BAWAC is committed to the advancement of water conservation and has worked collaboratively to "get the message out" and showcase area achievements in water conservation. The SFPUC has a long-term Master Water sales contract with its wholesale customers. Under the terms of this contract, the SFPUC cannot provide direct financial assistance for conservation programs to a wholesale customer and subsequently add this expense to the wholesale rate base for that year. The SFPUC can provide staff to assist wholesale customer conservation efforts, and through agreement with the Bay Area Water Supply and Conservation Agency, can develop service area-wide conservation

programs that can be funded as a joint expense by its retail and wholesale customers.

Reported as of 12/

BMP 08: School Education Programs

Reporting Unit:

San Francisco PUC - Wholesale

BMP Form Status:
100% Complete

Year:
2002

A. Implementation

- 1. Has your agency implemented a school information program to promote water conservation? no
- 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	no			
Grades 4th-6th	no			
Grades 7th-8th	no			
High School	no			

- 3. Did your Agency's materials meet state education framework requirements? no
- 4. When did your Agency begin implementing this program?

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

The SFPUC has a long-term Master Water sales contract with its wholesale customers. Under the terms of this contract, the SFPUC cannot provide direct financial assistance for conservation programs to a wholesale customer and subsequently add this expense to the wholesale rate base for that year. The SFPUC can provide staff to assist wholesale customer conservation efforts, and through agreement with the Bay Area Water Supply and Conservation Agency, can develop service area-wide conservation programs that can be funded as a joint expense by its retail and wholesale customers.

Reported as of 12/

BMP 10: Wholesale Agency Assistance Programs

Reporting Unit: **San Francisco PUC - Wholesale** BMP Form Status: **100% Complete** Year: **2002**

A. Implementation

1. Financial Support by BMP

BMP	Financial Incentives Offered?	Budgeted Amount	Amount Awarded	BMP	Financial Incentives Offered?	Budgeted Amount	Amount Awarded
1	No			8	No		
2	No			9	No		
3	No			10	No		
4	No			11	No		
5	No			12	No		
6	No			13	No		
7	No			14	No		

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 No
 - 3) Commercial, industrial, and institutional surveys No
 - 4) Residential and large turf irrigation No
 - 5) Conservation-related rates and pricing No

3. Staff Resources by BMP

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

4. Regional Programs by BMP

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

B. Wholesale Agency Assistance 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

The SFPUC has a long-term Master Water sales contract with its wholesale customers. Under the terms of this contract, the SFPUC cannot provide direct financial assistance for conservation programs to a wholesale customer and subsequently add this expense to the wholesale rate base for that year. The SFPUC can provide staff to assist wholesale customer conservation efforts, and through agreement with the Bay Area Water Supply and Conservation Agency, can develop service area-wide conservation programs that can be funded as a joint expense by its retail and wholesale customers.

Reported as of 12/

BMP 11: Conservation Pricing

Reporting Unit: **San Francisco PUC - Wholesale** BMP Form Status: **100% Complete** Year: **2002**

A. Implementation

Rate Structure Data Volumetric Rates for Water Service by Customer Class

1. Residential

- 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

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 Increasing Block Seasonal
- 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 \$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 Service Not Provided
- c. Total Revenue from Volumetric Rates \$70400000
- d. Total Revenue from Non-Volumetric Charges, Fees and other Revenue Sources \$2000000

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

The SFPUC has long-term sales contracts with its wholesale customer agencies (they expire on 6/30/09). The agencies are charged a monthly service charge based on the size of their meters, and a charge for water deliveries based on one-month meter readings. The SFPUC adopted an Interim Water Shortage Allocation Plan in 2001 that provides a method for allocating water between the SFPUC and it's wholesale customer agencies collectively during shortages caused by drought. The Plan includes provisions for water conservation, transfers, banking, and excess use charges.

Reported as of 12/

BMP 12: Conservation Coordinator

Reporting Unit: **San Francisco PUC - Wholesale** BMP Form Status: **100% Complete** Year: **2002**

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 Cheryl Munoz
 - c. Coordinator's Title Senior Water Resources Specialist
 - d. Coordinator's Experience and Number of Years 12 years in program implementation and policy development
 - e. Date Coordinator's position was created (mm/dd/yyyy) 6/25/2001
- 6. Number of conservation staff, including Conservation Coordinator. 1

B. Conservation Staff Program Expenditures

	This Year	Next Year
1. Budgeted Expenditures	85332	87465
2. Actual Expenditures	85332	

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 12/

Water Supply & Reuse

Reporting Unit: **San Francisco PUC - Wholesale** Year: **2003**

Water Supply Source Information

Supply Source Name	Quantity (AF) Supplied	Supply Type
--------------------	------------------------	-------------

Total AF:

Purchaser Information

Name of Agency	Quantity (AF) Supplied	Retailer or Wholesaler
----------------	------------------------	------------------------

Total AF:

Reported as of 12/

BMP 03: System Water Audits, Leak Detection and Repair

Reporting Unit: **San Francisco PUC - Wholesale** BMP Form Status: **100% Complete** Year: **2003**

A. Implementation

1. Has your agency completed a pre-screening system audit for this reporting year? no
2. If YES, enter the values (AF/Year) used to calculate verifiable use as a percent of total production:
 - a. Determine metered sales (AF)
 - b. Determine other system verifiable uses (AF)
 - c. Determine total supply into the system (AF)
 - d. Using the numbers above, if (Metered Sales + Other Verifiable Uses) / Total Supply is < 0.9 then a full-scale system audit is required. 0.00
3. Does your agency keep necessary data on file to verify the values used to calculate verifiable uses as a percent of total production? no
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? no
6. Does your agency operate a system leak detection program? Yes
 - a. If yes, describe the leak detection program:

The SFPUC initiated a Pipeline Inspection Program in the early 1990s on its regional system's 280 miles of water transmission lines. Routine inspections are considered preventative maintenance measures, but they also provide information on pipeline leaks. These inspections are usually conducted year round with no more than one section of a major pipeline out of service at any time. The Pipeline Inspection Program is designed over a 20-year period and then repeats. The SFPUC has a goal to inspect one section per quarter (4/yr.) These sections average 4-6 miles each. Technically, the regional system does not have any distribution system components, only transmission system components. Staff performs meter calculations that estimate the leakage rate by comparing customer usage, plant production and water crossing the San Francisco County line.

B. Survey Data

1. Total number of miles of distribution system line. 350
2. Number of miles of distribution system line surveyed. 20

C. System Audit / Leak Detection Program Expenditures

	This Year	Next Year
1. Budgeted Expenditures	13600000	13400000
2. Actual Expenditures	4500000	

D. "At Least As Effective As"

1. Is your AGENCY implementing an "at least as effective as" No

variant of this BMP?

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 12/

BMP 07: Public Information Programs

Reporting Unit: **San Francisco PUC - Wholesale** 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? no

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

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	
b. Public Service Announcement	no	
c. Bill Inserts / Newsletters / Brochures	no	
d. Bill showing water usage in comparison to previous year's usage	no	
e. Demonstration Gardens	no	
f. Special Events, Media Events	yes	1
g. Speaker's Bureau	no	
h. Program to coordinate with other government agencies, industry and public interest groups and media	no	

B. Conservation Information 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

The SFPUC is a member of the Bay Area Water Agencies Coalition (BAWAC). This organization is comprised of seven Bay Area agencies. BAWAC is committed to the advancement of water conservation and has worked collaboratively to "get the message out" and showcase area achievements in water conservation. The SFPUC has a long-term Master Water sales contract with its wholesale customers. Under the terms of this contract, the SFPUC cannot provide direct financial assistance for conservation programs to a wholesale customer and subsequently add this expense to the wholesale rate base for that year. The SFPUC can provide staff to assist wholesale customer conservation efforts, and through agreement with the Bay Area Water Supply and Conservation Agency, can develop service area-wide conservation

programs that can be funded as a joint expense by its retail and wholesale customers.

Reported as of 12/

BMP 08: School Education Programs

Reporting Unit:

San Francisco PUC - Wholesale

BMP Form Status:
100% Complete

Year:
2003

A. Implementation

- 1. Has your agency implemented a school information program to promote water conservation? no
- 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	no			
Grades 4th-6th	no			
Grades 7th-8th	no			
High School	no			

- 3. Did your Agency's materials meet state education framework requirements? no
- 4. When did your Agency begin implementing this program?

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

The SFPUC has a long-term Master Water sales contract with its wholesale customers. Under the terms of this contract, the SFPUC cannot provide direct financial assistance for conservation programs to a wholesale customer and subsequently add this expense to the wholesale rate base for that year. The SFPUC can provide staff to assist wholesale customer conservation efforts, and through agreement with the Bay Area Water Supply and Conservation Agency, can develop service area-wide conservation programs that can be funded as a joint expense by its retail and wholesale customers.

Reported as of 12/

BMP 10: Wholesale Agency Assistance Programs

Reporting Unit: **San Francisco PUC - 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	No			8	No		
2	No			9	No		
3	No			10	No		
4	No			11	No		
5	No			12	No		
6	No			13	No		
7	No			14	No		

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 No
 - 3) Commercial, industrial, and institutional surveys No
 - 4) Residential and large turf irrigation No
 - 5) Conservation-related rates and pricing No

3. Staff Resources by BMP

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

4. Regional Programs by BMP

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

B. Wholesale Agency Assistance 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

The SFPUC has a long-term Master Water sales contract with its wholesale customers. Under the terms of this contract, the SFPUC cannot provide direct financial assistance for conservation programs to a wholesale customer and subsequently add this expense to the wholesale rate base for that year. The SFPUC can provide staff to assist wholesale customer conservation efforts, and through agreement with the Bay Area Water Supply and Conservation Agency, can develop service area-wide conservation programs that can be funded as a joint expense by its retail and wholesale customers.

Reported as of 12/

BMP 11: Conservation Pricing

Reporting Unit: **San Francisco PUC - Wholesale** 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
- 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 \$71652000
- d. Total Revenue from Non-Volumetric Charges, Fees and other Revenue Sources \$3300000

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

The SFPUC has long-term sales contracts with its suburban agencies (they expire on 6/30/09). The agencies are charged a monthly service charge based on the size of their meters, and charged for the water delivered based on one-month meter readings. The SFPUC adopted an Interim Water Shortage Allocation Plan in 2001 that provides a method for allocating water between the SFPUC and its wholesale customer agencies collectively during shortages caused by drought. The Plan includes provisions for water conservation, transfers, banking, and excess use charges.

Reported as of 12/

BMP 12: Conservation Coordinator

Reporting Unit: **San Francisco PUC - Wholesale** BMP Form Status: **100% Complete** Year: **2003**

A. Implementation

- 1. Does your Agency have a conservation coordinator? yes
- 2. Is this a full-time position? no
- 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? 60%
 - b. Coordinator's Name Cheryl Munoz
 - c. Coordinator's Title Senior Water Resources Specialist
 - d. Coordinator's Experience and Number of Years 13 years of conservation program implementation and policy development
 - e. Date Coordinator's position was created (mm/dd/yyyy) 6/25/2001
- 6. Number of conservation staff, including Conservation Coordinator. 1

B. Conservation Staff Program Expenditures

	This Year	Next Year
1. Budgeted Expenditures	85332	53137
2. Actual Expenditures	52000	

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

In FY 03-04, the SFPUC will be updating and refining wholesale customer agencies supply and demand projections through the year 2030. The SFPUC plans to work closely with its wholesale customer agencies to identify conservation programs would be most effective based on the specific characteristics of each of the agencies.

Reported as of 12/

Water Supply & Reuse

Reporting Unit: **San Francisco PUC - Wholesale** Year: **2004**

Water Supply Source Information

Supply Source Name	Quantity (AF) Supplied	Supply Type
--------------------	------------------------	-------------

Total AF:

Purchaser Information

Name of Agency	Quantity (AF) Supplied	Retailer or Wholesaler
----------------	------------------------	------------------------

Total AF:

Reported as of 12/

BMP 03: System Water Audits, Leak Detection and Repair

Reporting Unit: **San Francisco PUC - Wholesale** BMP Form Status: **100% Complete** Year: **2004**

A. Implementation

1. Has your agency completed a pre-screening system audit for this reporting year? no
2. If YES, enter the values (AF/Year) used to calculate verifiable use as a percent of total production:
 - a. Determine metered sales (AF)
 - b. Determine other system verifiable uses (AF)
 - c. Determine total supply into the system (AF)
 - d. Using the numbers above, if (Metered Sales + Other Verifiable Uses) / Total Supply is < 0.9 then a full-scale system audit is required. 0.00
3. Does your agency keep necessary data on file to verify the values used to calculate verifiable uses as a percent of total production? no
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? no
6. Does your agency operate a system leak detection program? Yes
 - a. If yes, describe the leak detection program:

The SFPUC initiated a Pipeline Inspection Program in the early 1990s on its regional system's 280 miles of water transmission lines. Routine inspections are considered preventative maintenance measures, but they also provide information on pipeline leaks. These inspections are usually conducted year round with no more than one section of a major pipeline out of service at any time. The Pipeline Inspection Program is designed over a 20-year period and then repeats. The SFPUC has a goal to inspect one section per quarter (4/yr.) These sections average 4-6 miles each. Technically, the regional system does not have any distribution system components, only transmission system components. Staff performs meter calculations that estimate the leakage rate by comparing customer usage, plant production and water crossing the San Francisco County line.

B. Survey Data

1. Total number of miles of distribution system line. 350
2. Number of miles of distribution system line surveyed. 20

C. System Audit / Leak Detection Program Expenditures

	This Year	Next Year
1. Budgeted Expenditures	13400000	15200000
2. Actual Expenditures	4200000	

D. "At Least As Effective As"

1. Is your AGENCY implementing an "at least as effective as" No

variant of this BMP?

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 12/

BMP 07: Public Information Programs

Reporting Unit: **San Francisco PUC - Wholesale** 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? no

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

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	
b. Public Service Announcement	no	
c. Bill Inserts / Newsletters / Brochures	no	
d. Bill showing water usage in comparison to previous year's usage	no	
e. Demonstration Gardens	no	
f. Special Events, Media Events	yes	1
g. Speaker's Bureau	no	
h. Program to coordinate with other government agencies, industry and public interest groups and media	no	

B. Conservation Information 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

The SFPUC is a member of the Bay Area Water Agencies Coalition (BAWAC). This organization is comprised of seven Bay Area agencies. BAWAC is committed to the advancement of water conservation and has worked collaboratively to "get the message out" and showcase area achievements in water conservation. The SFPUC has a long-term Master Water sales contract with its wholesale customers. Under the terms of this contract, the SFPUC cannot provide direct financial assistance for conservation programs to a wholesale customer and subsequently add this expense to the wholesale rate base for that year. The SFPUC can provide staff to assist wholesale customer conservation efforts, and through agreement with the Bay Area Water Supply and Conservation Agency, can develop service area-wide conservation

programs that can be funded as a joint expense by its retail and wholesale customers.

Reported as of 12/

BMP 08: School Education Programs

Reporting Unit:

San Francisco PUC - Wholesale

BMP Form Status:
100% Complete

Year:
2004

A. Implementation

- 1. Has your agency implemented a school information program to promote water conservation? no
- 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	no			
Grades 4th-6th	no			
Grades 7th-8th	no			
High School	no			

- 3. Did your Agency's materials meet state education framework requirements? no
- 4. When did your Agency begin implementing this program?

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

The SFPUC has a long-term Master Water sales contract with its wholesale customers. Under the terms of this contract, the SFPUC cannot provide direct financial assistance for conservation programs to a wholesale customer and subsequently add this expense to the wholesale rate base for that year. The SFPUC can provide staff to assist wholesale customer conservation efforts, and through agreement with the Bay Area Water Supply and Conservation Agency, can develop service area-wide conservation programs that can be funded as a joint expense by its retail and wholesale customers.

Reported as of 12/

BMP 10: Wholesale Agency Assistance Programs

Reporting Unit: **San Francisco PUC - Wholesale** BMP Form Status: **100% Complete** Year: **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	No			8	No		
2	No			9	No		
3	No			10	No		
4	No			11	No		
5	No			12	No		
6	No			13	No		
7	No			14	No		

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 No
 - 3) Commercial, industrial, and institutional surveys No
 - 4) Residential and large turf irrigation No
 - 5) Conservation-related rates and pricing No

3. Staff Resources by BMP

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

4. Regional Programs by BMP

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

B. Wholesale Agency Assistance 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

In FY 2003-2004, the SFPUC participated in the CUWCC's Pre-Rinse Spray Valve Program. The SFPUC administered the Program on behalf of its wholesale customer agencies that elected to participate. The SFPUC has a long-term Master Water sales contract with its wholesale customers. Under the terms of this contract, the SFPUC cannot provide direct financial assistance for conservation programs to a wholesale customer and subsequently add this expense to the wholesale rate base for that year. The SFPUC can provide staff to assist wholesale customer conservation efforts, and through agreement with the Bay Area Water Supply and Conservation Agency, can develop service area-wide conservation programs that can be funded as a joint expense by its retail and wholesale customers.

Reported as of 12/

BMP 11: Conservation Pricing

Reporting Unit: **San Francisco PUC - Wholesale**
 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
- 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 \$96698000
- d. Total Revenue from Non-Volumetric Charges, Fees and other Revenue Sources \$3300000

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

The SFPUC has long-term sales contracts with its suburban agencies (they expire on 6/30/09). The agencies are charged a monthly service charge based on the size of their meters, and charged for the water delivered based on one-month meter readings. The SFPUC adopted an Interim Water Shortage Allocation Plan in 2001 that provides a method for allocating water between the SFPUC and its wholesale customer agencies collectively during shortages caused by drought. The Plan includes provisions for water conservation, transfers, banking, and excess use charges.

Reported as of 12/

BMP 12: Conservation Coordinator

Reporting Unit: **San Francisco PUC - Wholesale** BMP Form Status: **100% Complete** Year: **2004**

A. Implementation

- 1. Does your Agency have a conservation coordinator? yes
- 2. Is this a full-time position? no
- 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? 40%
 - b. Coordinator's Name Cheryl Munoz
 - c. Coordinator's Title Senior Water Resources Specialist
 - d. Coordinator's Experience and Number of Years 14 years of conservation program implementation and policy development
 - e. Date Coordinator's position was created (mm/dd/yyyy) 6/25/2001
- 6. Number of conservation staff, including Conservation Coordinator. 1

B. Conservation Staff Program Expenditures

	This Year	Next Year
1. Budgeted Expenditures	53137	45031
2. Actual Expenditures	35424	

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 SFPUC is in the process of updating and refining wholesale customer agencies supply and demand projections through the year 2030. This process is anticipated to be completed in the Fall of 2004. The SFPUC has been working closely with its wholesale customer agencies to identify conservation programs would be most effective based on the specific characteristics of each of the agencies.

