"In order to comply with legal requirements for posting of agendas, only those items filed with the District Secretary's office by noon, on Wednesday prior to the following Thursday meeting, not requiring departmental investigation, will be considered by the Board of Directors."

OPENING CEREMONIES

Pledge of Allegiance
Opening Prayer
Call to Order
Roll Call of Board Members

ADOPT AGENDA

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

Any person wishing to speak to the Board of Directors on matters listed or not listed on the agenda, within its jurisdiction, is asked to complete a Speaker Card and submit it to the District Clerk. Each speaker is limited to three (3) minutes. Under the State of California Brown Act, the Board of Directors is prohibited from discussing or taking action on any item not listed on the posted agenda. Comments related to noticed Public Hearing(s) and Business Matters will be heard during the occurrence of the item.

Public communication is the time for anyone to address the Board on any agenda item or anything under the jurisdiction of the District. No person will be allowed to make comments at any other time in the meeting except if there is a Public Hearing. Also, please remember that no disruptions from the crown will be tolerated. If someone disrupts the meeting, they will be removed.
CONSENT CALENDAR

All matters listed under the Consent Calendar are considered routine and will be enacted by one vote. There will be no separate discussion of these items unless a member of the Board of Directors, Staff Member, or any member of the public request a specific item(s) be removed for separate action.

Consideration of:

1. June 7, 2018 Board Meeting Minutes.
3. Consider A Water Supply Assessment for Bloomington Commerce Center.

PUBLIC HEARING

- First Public Hearing for the Transition from At-Large to District-Based Board Member Elections Pursuant to Elections Code Section 10010 And Government Code Section 34886

BUSINESS MATTERS

Consideration of:

4. Approval of Kaufman Law Firm for professional services rendered March 5, 2018 through April 15, 2018; Invoice No. 10113: $52,602.50.
5. Approval of Varner & Brandt, LLP for professional services rendered through May 31, 2018; Acct No. 23767M: $7,025.00.
6. Consider updating Bank Account Signers for West Valley Water District.

REPORTS - LIMITED TO 5 MINUTES MAXIMUM (Presentations or handouts must be provided to Board Members in advance of the Board Meeting).

- Board Members
- Legal Counsel
- General Manager

❖ 1,324 Days without a “Lost Time” Claim
UPCOMING MEETINGS

- July 16, 2018 - West Valley Water District Safety and Technology Committee Meeting at 6:00 PM at the District Headquarters

- July 17, 2018 - West Valley Water District Human Resources Committee Meeting at 6:00 PM at the District Headquarters

- July 17, 2018 - San Bernardino Valley Municipal Water District Regular Board Meeting at 2:30 PM at 380 E. Vanderbilt Way, San Bernardino, CA

- July 24, 2018 - West Valley Water District External Affairs Committee Meeting at 6:00 PM at the District Headquarters

- July 26, 2018 - West Valley Water District Regular Board Meeting at the District Headquarters at 6:00 PM.

FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

INFORMATION

CLOSED SESSION

- CONFERENCE WITH LEGAL COUNSEL - ANTICIPATED LITIGATION
  Significant exposure to litigation pursuant to paragraph (2) of subdivision (d) of Section 54956.9: Number of Cases: Four (4)

ADJOURN

DECLARATION OF POSTING:

I declare under penalty of perjury, that I am employed by the West Valley Water District and posted the foregoing Agenda at the District Offices on July 9, 2018.

Crystal L. Escalera, Board Secretary
Please Note:

Material related to an item on this Agenda submitted to the Board after distribution of the agenda packet are available for public inspection in the District's office located at 855 W. Baseline, Rialto, during normal business hours. Also, such documents are available on the District’s website at www.wvwd.org subject to staff's ability to post the documents before the meeting.

Pursuant to Government Code Section 54954.2(a), any request for a disability-related modification or accommodation, including auxiliary aids or services, in order to attend or participate in the above-agendized public meeting should be directed to Crystal Escalera, at least 72 hours in advance of the meeting to ensure availability of the requested service or accommodation. Ms. Escalera may be contacted by telephone at (909) 875-1804 ext. 704, or in writing at the West Valley Water District, P.O. Box 920, Rialto, CA 92377-0920.
OPENING CEREMONIES

Pledge of Allegiance - Lead by Director Dr. Taylor
Opening Prayer - Lead by Director Olinger
Call to Order
Roll Call of Board Members

ADOPT AGENDA

President Dr. Young opened by asking the Board to make an amendment to the agenda by adding two items to Closed Session. The first item was to discuss the San Bernardino Valley Municipal Water v. San Gabriel Valley Water Case No.: CIVDS1311085. The district received information earlier in the afternoon and needed to update the Board on the status of the case.
The other item being added was regarding a vote that was taking place the following week by LAFCO that the District needed to take a position on. Director Crowther Motioned to add the items which was second by Vice President Young. The Board then voted to add the item unanimously.

RESULT: APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER: Kyle Crowther, Director
SECONDER: Gregory Young, Vice President
AYES: Clifford Young, Gregory Young, Donald Olinger, Kyle Crowther, Michael Taylor

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION
- Soccoro Pantaleon presented the 2018 West Valley Water District Annual Water Conservation Poster Contest winners. Each year the district holds an annual poster contest for elementary students within the district. They are asked to create a poster based on a water conservation theme. This year's theme was “How Can I Help to Conserve Water?” Staff and Board members voted on the drawings to select 12 posters that will be featured in the West Valley Water District's calendar that is distributed to customers and schools throughout the year. All the selected students were invited to attend the meeting with their parents and received a certificate from the Board of Directors and $75 gift card to Target. The students also took pictures with the Board of Directors and their parents as part of the ceremony. The district received approximately 200 submissions and choose posters created by the following students: Adan Parida, Kaimie Magdaleno, Abigail Sanchez, Savannah Pinedo, Delma Porter, Mariana Castaneda, Neveah Mora, Ricky Ramirez, Leonardo Leon, Cesar Martinez, Yhazirha Cardenas and Sianna Deal.

- Mr. Don Griggs addressed the Board.

CONSENT CALENDAR

President Dr. Young requested to have item No. 5 (the Treasures report) moved from the Consent Calendar to Business Matters to allow the Treasurer to give a report and to take items No. 1 through No. 4 as one vote for approval. Director Olinger moved the Motion, second by Vice President Young. The vote passed as follows:

RESULT: ADOPTED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER: Donald Olinger, Director
SECONDER: Gregory Young, Vice President
AYES: Clifford Young, Gregory Young, Donald Olinger, Kyle Crowther, Michael Taylor

1. MAY 3, 2018 BOARD MEETING MINUTES

Items No. 1 through No. 4 were taken as one vote for approval. Director Olinger moved the Motion to approve these Consent Calendar items, second by Vice President Young. The vote passed as follows:
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2. MAY 17, 2018 REGULAR BOARD MEETING MINUTES

Items No. 1 through No. 4 were taken as one vote for approval. Director Olinger moved the Motion to approve these Consent Calendar items, second by Vice President Young. The vote passed as follows:

RESULT: ADOPTED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER: Donald Olinger, Director
SECONDER: Gregory Young, Vice President
AYES: Clifford Young, Gregory Young, Donald Olinger, Kyle Crowther, Michael Taylor

3. FEBRUARY 22, 2018 SPECIAL BOARD MEETING MINUTES

Items No. 1 through No. 4 were taken as one vote for approval. Director Olinger moved the Motion to approve these Consent Calendar items, second by Vice President Young. The vote passed as follows:

RESULT: ADOPTED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER: Donald Olinger, Director
SECONDER: Gregory Young, Vice President
AYES: Clifford Young, Gregory Young, Donald Olinger, Kyle Crowther, Michael Taylor

4. APRIL 21, 2018 MINUTES OF THE PRELIMINARY DRAFT WATER FACILITIES MASTER PLAN WORKSHOP

Items No. 1 through No. 4 were taken as one vote for approval. Director Olinger moved the Motion to approve these Consent Calendar items, second by Vice President Young. The vote passed as follows:

RESULT: ADOPTED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER: Donald Olinger, Director
SECONDER: Gregory Young, Vice President
AYES: Clifford Young, Gregory Young, Donald Olinger, Kyle Crowther, Michael Taylor

5. TREASURER'S REPORT

This item was moved to Business Matters to allow the Treasurer to present her report on the financial status of the District which was included in the agenda packet. Following the report and comments President Dr. Young requested the Treasurer to attend the July Finance Committee meeting. The request to Receive and File the report was denied.
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PUBLIC HEARING

There was no Public Hearing

BUSINESS MATTERS

1. APPROVAL OF TAFOYA & GARCIA, LLP FOR PROFESSIONAL SERVICES RENDERED IN THE MONTH OF MARCH, 2018; STATEMENT NO. 18-1003: $69,403.00. PAYMENT IS TO BE MADE AS FOLLOWS: $32,390.00 TO BE PAID OUT TO TAFOYA & GARCIA, LLP AND $37,013.00 TO BE PAID OUT TO TAFOYA & GARCIA, LLP TRUST

Robert Christman reported the bill presented covered special audit services and legal services for two months. The invoice was approved as presented for payment by the following vote:

| RESULT: | APPROVED [UNANIMOUS] |
| MOVE: | Gregory Young, Vice President |
| SECONDER: | Kyle Crowther, Director |
| AYES: | Clifford Young, Gregory Young, Donald Olinger, Kyle Crowther, Michael Taylor |

2. APPROVAL OF ZIPRICK & CRAMER FOR PROFESSIONAL SERVICES RENDERED IN THE MONTH OF APRIL 2018; INVOICE NO. 942: $3,469.44

General Manager Christman reported to the Board the law firm Ziprick & Cramer have been retained to work on the redistricting issue that was presented at the last Board meeting. This bill reflected the work completed thus far. It was approved for payment by the following vote:

| RESULT: | APPROVED [UNANIMOUS] |
| MOVE: | Gregory Young, Vice President |
| SECONDER: | Kyle Crowther, Director |
| AYES: | Clifford Young, Gregory Young, Donald Olinger, Kyle Crowther, Michael Taylor |

3. APPROVAL OF DAVID TURCH & ASSOCIATES FOR PROFESSIONAL SERVICES RENDERED APRIL 9 - 8, 2018: $25,000; MAY 9 - JUNE 8, 2018: $12,500

General Manager Christman reported one of the invoices being presented was incorrect. The invoice for April 9 - 8, 2018 was billed at $25,000 and should have been $12,500. David Turch & Associates will send a corrected bill for $12,500 to the district for payment. The invoice for June 8, 2018 was correctly billed at $12,500. Both payments were approved to pay at $12,500 each.

| RESULT: | APPROVED [UNANIMOUS] |
| MOVE: | Gregory Young, Vice President |
| SECONDER: | Michael Taylor, Director |
| AYES: | Clifford Young, Gregory Young, Donald Olinger, Kyle Crowther, Michael Taylor |
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4. APPROVAL OF SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY ELECTIONS OFFICE OF THE REGISTRAR OF VOTERS FOR THE NOVEMBER 7, 2017 CONSOLIDATED ELECTION; INVOICE NO. 2661: $157,638.00

Robert Christman reported to the Board of Directors the invoice being presented was unusually high due to this election not being a consolidated election with the majority of other elections in the county. The invoice is correct and represents our portion of the elections that took place in November 2017. Director Don Olinger commented on the cost of the vote for our District in relation to the percentage of voters that vote. Vice President Young replied unfortunately due to the legalities of the voting process we have no option to not pay for this election invoice and even with a low percentage voting, it was a higher number than in the past. The invoice was approved for payment.

RESULT: APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER: Donald Olinger, Director
SECONDER: Kyle Crowther, Director
AYES: Clifford Young, Gregory Young, Donald Olinger, Kyle Crowther, Michael Taylor

REPORTS - LIMITED TO 5 MINUTES MAXIMUM (Presentations or handouts must be provided to Board Members in advance of the Board Meeting).

- **Board Members**
  - Don Olinger: Commented on the 210 Interchange area and Districts property in the area in relation to Mr. Don Griggs comment on the Ribbon Cutting ceremony that took place earlier in the month.
  - Kyle Crowther: Replied to Mr. Don Griggs concern for the Directors not being at events in the District. Unfortunately, due to his regular job schedule he is not able to attend all the events but feels they are important and attends events as his schedule permits.
  - Greg Young: Thanked the staff for preparing the calendar contest presentation and feels strongly about instilling the values of water conservation at an early age. Vice President Young also reported that prior to the Board meeting, he was at the Colton Unified School District’s Board meeting with Director Crowther to present a rebate check which was received very well. He also thanked Director Olinger for attending the WESTCAS Conference that will be taking place and looks forward to hearing his report back on the water appropriations bill.
  - Dr. Michael Taylor: No report

- **Legal Counsel**
  - No report
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• General Manager

  ○ Reported on the Water Usage Rebate program. As of the day of the meeting 16,300 checks had been cashed for a total of approximately $1.87 million dollars. The program has been well received by customers and overall has been successful.

FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

  No future agenda items were announced.

INFORMATION

  No information items were announced.

CLOSED SESSION

  The Board adjourned into Closed Session at 7:10 PM and returned at 8:00 PM. Legal Counsel reported back that the review of the General Manager was discussed and will continue at the next Board meeting, instructions were given to staff in regards to the San Bernardino Valley Municipal Water v. San Gabriel Valley Water Case No.: CIVDS1311085, instructions were given to staff for LAFCO municipal services issue, and the Board voted 5-0 to reject the claim by Matthew Litchfield. This concluded his report.

• CONFERENCE WITH LEGAL COUNSEL-ANTICIPATED LITIGATION Significant exposure to litigation pursuant to paragraph (2) of subdivision (d) of Section 54956.9: Number of Cases: three (3)

• PUBLIC EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE EVALUATION Pursuant to Cal. Gov. Code Section 54957 Title(s): General Manager

ADJOURN

  The meeting adjourned at 8:00 PM.

____________________________
Dr. Clifford O. Young, Sr.
President of the Board of Directors
of West Valley Water District

ATTEST:

____________________________
Crystal L. Escalera, Board Secretary
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DATE: July 13, 2018
TO: Board of Directors
FROM: Clarence Mansell Jr., Interim General Manager
SUBJECT: CONSIDER A WATER SUPPLY ASSESSMENT FOR I-15 LOGISTICS CENTER

BACKGROUND:

On March 26, 2018, I-15 Logistics, LLC (“Developer”) submitted a request for West Valley Water District (“District”) to prepare a Water Supply Assessment (“WSA”) for its proposed project in the City of Fontana, known as I-15 Logistics Center (“Project”). The Project proposes a development that consists of an industrial warehouse located just north of Interstate 15 (I-15), south of Sierra Avenue, and east of Lytle Creek Road, as shown in Exhibit A. The industrial warehouse development consists of 61.17 acres located within a portion of the larger 119.34-acre project area, and includes a concrete tilt-up logistics warehouse of approximately 1,175,720 square feet, office spaces of approximately 30,000 square feet and associated facilities and improvements such as, a guard booth, parking, landscaping, and a detention basin. The Project will require water for consumptive and sanitary purposes to support employees at the facility and for irrigation of landscaped areas.

DISCUSSION:

The WSA is a necessary requirement for compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (“CEQA”), furthermore, the California Water Code (Code) requires projects as defined in Section 10912 of the Code, to include a WSA in their environmental impact report. The WSA evaluates whether the total water supplies available during normal, single-dry, and multiple-dry water years projected within the latest adopted Urban Water Management Plan (“UWMP”) will meet the anticipated water demand associated with the particular project, in addition to the existing and planned future uses.

1. A “Project” in the Water Code means any of the following:
2. A proposed residential development of more than 500 dwelling units.
3. A proposed shopping center or business establishment employing more than 1,000 persons or having more than 500,000 square feet of floor space.
4. A proposed commercial office building employing more than 1,000 persons or having more than 250,000 square feet of floor space.
5. A proposed hotel or motel, or both, having more than 500 rooms.
6. A proposed industrial, manufacturing, or processing plant, or industrial park planned to house more than 1,000 persons, occupying more than 40 acres of land, or having more than 650,000 square feet of floor area.
7. A mixed-use project that includes one or more of the projects specified in this subdivision.
8. A project that would demand an amount of water equivalent to, or greater than, the amount of water required by a 500 dwelling unit project.

This development is considered a project as defined by the Water Code per item number 5 above. The Code states that the District shall determine whether the projected water demand associated with a proposed project was included as part of the most recently adopted UWMP, and if so, the District may incorporate the requested information from the UWMP in preparing the elements of the WSA.

UWMPs are prepared to support the District’s long-term resource planning, and to ensure that adequate water supplies are available to meet existing and future water demands. The plans must be prepared every 5 years and submitted to the Department of Water Resources. The latest UWMP adopted by the District was the 2015 San Bernardino Valley Regional Urban Water Management Plan (“RUWMP”). The demand projections for water usage rates per acre were based on land use designations from City and County General Plans.

Attached as Exhibit B for your review is a WSA prepared by the District’s consultant, Water Systems Consulting, Inc. The water demand for this Project is anticipated to be 147 acre feet per year. The anticipated water demand associated with the Project was accounted for in the most recently adopted UWMP and information from that plan was utilized in the preparation of this WSA.

As demonstrated in the 2015 RUWMP, the water supply available in 20 years in a normal, single dry and multiple dry water years is sufficient to meet the projected demand associated with the project.

**FISCAL IMPACT:**

No fiscal impact at this time.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

It is recommended that the Board of Directors approve the Water Supply Assessment for I-15 Logistics Center.

Respectfully Submitted,

[Signature]
Clarence Mansell Jr., Interim General Manager

DG:ce

**ATTACHMENT(S):**
1. Exhibit A - Aerial Map
2. Exhibit B - Water Supply Assessment for I-15 Logistics Center

MEETING HISTORY:
06/06/18 Engineering and Planning Committee REFERRED TO BOARD
West Valley Water District makes every effort to ensure this map is free of errors but does not warrant the map or its features are either spatially or temporally accurate or fit for a particular use. The District provides this map without any warranty of any kind whatsoever, either express or implied. However, notification of any errors will be appreciated.

Legend

- Project Location

Exhibit A
I-15 Logistics Center

1 inch = 750 feet

Packet Pg. 15
# Table of Contents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TABLE OF CONTENTS</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHAPTER I – INTRODUCTION</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 610</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROJECT OVERVIEW</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHAPTER II – WATER SUPPLY ASSESSMENT</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DETERMINATION OF A PROJECT</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREPARER</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROJECT DEMANDS INCLUSION IN AN UWMP</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SYSTEM DESCRIPTION</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WATER DEMANDS</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Uses by Sector</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WATER SUPPLIES</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Overview</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface Water</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Water Project</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groundwater Supplies</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The San Bernardino Basin Area</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rialto-Colton Basin</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Riverside Basin</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chino Basin</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recycled Water</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desalinated Water</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exchanges or Transfers</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Water Supply and Projects</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary of Existing and Planned Sources of Water</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUPPLY RELIABILITY</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groundwater</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Water Project</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability by Type of Year</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Supply Reliability</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUFFICIENCY ASSESSMENT</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WATER SHORTAGE CONTINGENCY PLAN</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DETERMINATION</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESERVATION OF AUTHORITY</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter I – Introduction

This Water Supply Assessment (WSA) has been prepared for the I-15 Logistics Center (Project) in accordance with the provisions of Senate Bill No. 610 (SB 610). California Water Code references are provided throughout this document in italic text where relevant.

SB 610
For projects meeting certain criteria, a public water system supplier must prepare and approve a WSA that contains three parts:

- Explicit identification of existing and anticipated water supply entitlements, water rights and water service contracts, demonstrated by contracts, Capital Improvement Programs, and permit applications.
- If no water has been received from the source identified to supply the project, other competing purveyors that receive water from this source must be identified.
- If groundwater is a proposed supply, factors such as adjudicated rights, groundwater management practices and historical pumping must be presented to establish proper use of the resource.

The latest adopted Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP) may be utilized to provide the information required for the WSA. If the demands expected from the proposed project are not accounted for in the UWMP, a discussion must be included with regard to whether the water system’s total projected water supplies during normal, single dry and multiple dry years over a 20-year period from the date of the report, will meet the projected demand of the proposed project in addition to the system’s existing and projected future uses.

On the basis of the WSA, the public water supplier is required to provide “written verification” of “sufficient water supplies.” The verification must consider the following factors:

- The availability of water over the next 20 years.
- The applicability of any urban water shortage contingency analysis prepared per Water Code Section 10632.
- The reduction in water supply allocated to a specific use by an adopted ordinance.
- The amount of water that can be reasonably relied upon from other water supply projects, such as conjunctive use, reclaimed water, water conservation, and water transfer.

In June 2016 West Valley Water District (District) adopted the 2015 San Bernardino Valley Regional Urban Water Management Plan (RUWMP), as is required for water suppliers providing water for municipal purposes to more than 3,000 customers or supplying more than 3,000 acre feet per year (AFY).
The RUWMP projected water supplies to meet future demands through the year 2040. It assessed the projected demand and supply and concluded that the District has, and will have, an adequate water supply to meet all demands within their service area to 2040.

The RUWMP contains the following information as required by Water Code Section 10910 for WSAs:

- A detailed description of each groundwater basin that supplies the District with potable water.
- Copies of the court decrees and judgments for each groundwater basin.
- A detailed description and analysis of the amount and location of groundwater pumped by the District for each groundwater basin for the last five years.
- A detailed description and analysis of the amount and location of the groundwater projected to be pumped from each groundwater basin by the District.
- An analysis of the sufficiency of each groundwater basin to meet the District’s projected amounts to be pumped under normal, single dry year, and multiple dry year conditions for the next 20 years (2015 - 2040) in five-year increments.

This WSA incorporates information and direct citations from the RUWMP. Additional information can be found in the adopted RUWMP (https://wuedata.water.ca.gov/public/uwmp_attachments/6449323356/SBV_RUWMP_rev_with_appendices.pdf).

**Project Overview**

The Project site is located in unincorporated San Bernardino County just north of Interstate 15 (I-15), south of Sierra Avenue, east of Lytle Creek Road, and mostly within the northern portion of the City of Fontana’s (City’s) Sphere of Influence. The Project involves the development of a new warehouse facility, the realignment of Lytle Creek road, and the annexation of these components, and additional areas into the City of Fontana. The total annexation area into the City of Fontana would be 119.34 acres. The proposed annexation would include 22 parcels, inclusive of the warehouse site, and portions of the road right-of-way (ROW) for Lytle Creek Road, Sierra Avenue, and I-15. The Project includes Tentative Parcel Map 19712.

The Project is mostly within the water service area of the District (Figure 1), a public water system as defined in CWC Section 10912. The District’s existing service area and its sphere of influence area do not fully cover the project site; therefore, an expansion of the District’s sphere of influence is proposed to fully cover the Project area. Annexation of the project into the District’s service area is proposed so it can provide water service to this future area of the City. Additionally, San Bernardino Valley Municipal Water District (SBVMWD) is a wholesale water provider and State Water Contractor and provides water to the City and the District. SBVMWD’s existing service area does not fully include the Project site. Therefore, annexation of the Project into SBVMWD’s service area is also proposed so that it can provide wholesale water service for this future area of the City.
The Project site consists of 72.34 acres, located within a portion of the larger 119.34 acre annexation area. The portion of the project site being developed with uses associated with water demand includes 61.17 acres and consists of a concrete tilt-up logistics warehouse of approximately 1,175,720 square feet. The Project is being entitled to include two potential office spaces that would total approximately 30,000 square feet and would be located on the northeast and southeast corners of the proposed warehouse with associated facilities and improvements such as a guard booth, parking, landscaping, and a detention basin. The Project will require water for consumptive and sanitary purposes to support employees at the facility and for irrigation of landscaped areas.

The Project location incorporates an area that is currently developed with eight rural residential uses as well as undeveloped land. Two of the residences are proposed to be redeveloped into the proposed industrial use. The demands of the remaining existing residential uses are supplied privately and it is assumed they will not connect to the District’s water systems as part of this Project.
Chapter II – Water Supply Assessment

Determination of a Project

California Water Code section 10910

(a) Any city or county that determines that a project, as defined in Section 10912, is subject to the California Environmental Quality Act Division 13 (commencing with Section 21000) of the Public Resources Code, under Section 21080 of the Public Resources Code shall comply with this part.

As defined in Section 10912(a) (5) of the California Water Code, a proposed industrial, manufacturing, or processing plant, or industrial park planned to house more than 1,000 persons, occupying more than 40 acres of land, or having more than 650,000 square feet of floor area, must have a WSA included in their Environmental Impact Report. This particular Project falls into this category, and therefore requires a WSA.

Preparer

California Water Code section 10910

(b) The city or county, at the time that it determines whether an environmental impact report, a negative declaration, or a mitigated negative declaration is required for any project subject to the California Environmental Quality Act pursuant to Section 21080.1 of the Public Resources Code, shall identify any water system that is, or may become as a result of supplying water to the project identified pursuant to this subdivision, a public water system, as defined in Section 10912, that may supply water for the project. If the city or county is not able to identify any public water system that may supply water for the project, the city or county shall prepare the water assessment required by this part after consulting with any entity serving domestic water supplies whose service area includes the project site, the local agency formation commission, and any public water system adjacent to the project site.

The Project is mostly within the water service area of the District, a public water system as defined in Section 10912, and the District would supply water for the project. Figure 1 depicts the project location within the District’s current service area boundary. Annexation of the remaining portion of the Project into the District’s service area is proposed.
Figure 1. Project Location
Project Demands Inclusion in an UWMP

*California Water Code section 10910*

(c) (1) The city or county, at the time it makes the determination required under Section 21080.1 of the Public Resources Code, shall request each public water system identified pursuant to subdivision (b) to determine whether the projected water demand associated with a proposed project was included as part of the most recently adopted urban water management plan adopted pursuant to Part 2.6 (commencing with Section 10610).

(c) (2) If the projected water demand associated with the proposed project was accounted for in the most recently adopted urban water management plan, the public water system may incorporate the requested information from the urban water management plan in preparing the elements of the assessment required to comply with subdivisions (d), (e), (f), and (g).

The 2015 RUWMP is the most recently adopted UWMP by the District and outlines water supplies that will be used by the District to fulfill projected future demand. The District’s projected future water demands in the 2015 RUWMP were derived from three factors: the expected growth in service area population, the expected change in per-capita consumption, and the expected industrial growth in addition to overall demand growth. For planning purposes, the District estimated that beginning in 2020, its per-capita consumption would be approximately 10 percent higher than the observed 2015 value. This methodology assumes that all other non-residential water uses will increase proportionately to residential uses. It was also assumed industrial demand would increase by an additional 1,100 AFY beyond the projected demands determined using the per-capita methodology.

As shown on the Conceptual Site Plan in Figure 2, the proposed developed site area is 61.17 acres and is comprised of M-2 General Industrial, Warehouse (S-1), Office (B) uses. For the purposes of estimating water demands for the Project, the developed acres attributed to each use type, including landscape irrigation for light industrial and parking area requirements for both uses, were estimated by prorating the total developed area based on the building square feet for each use type. Demands were then estimated for the Project using land use based water demand factors from the District’s 2012 Water Master Plan (WMP). The land use demand factors are applied to gross estimated acreage for each land use. Applying the District’s 2012 WMP water usage rate of 2,000 gpd/acre for the Light Industrial building, parking and landscape irrigation areas and 3,500 gpd/acre to office building and parking areas yields a demand of 147 AFY as shown in Table 1. The Project is expected to be completed in a single phase and the water demands are expected to be in place by 2020. The existing residential uses within the Project area are not currently served by the District so the redevelopment of these uses does not impact the estimated demands for the Project area.
Table 1. Estimated Project Demands

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>WMP Factor (gpd/acre)</th>
<th>AFY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>6.13</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Industrial (Warehouse)</td>
<td>55.03</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>61.2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>147</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The RUWMP assumed that the District’s total industrial demands would increase from 709 AFY in 2015 to 2,231 AFY in 2040, a total increase of 1,522 AFY. The additional demands of the Project of 147 AFY are less than the assumed increase in industrial demands in the RUWMP; therefore, the demands of the Project were included in the RUWMP. Information from the 2015 RUWMP was used for this WSA and is described in detail in the following sections.

Note that the District is also currently preparing a WSA for another industrial development in their service area in the unincorporated San Bernardino County community of Bloomington that is estimated to have a net additional demand of 70 AFY. When considered in addition to the demands of this Project, the total is still lower than the assumed increase in industrial demands in the RUWMP.
Figure 2. Conceptual Site Plan
System Description

Water Code section 10631 (Urban Water Management Plan Requirements)
(a) Describe the service area of the supplier, including current and projected population, climate, and other demographic factors affecting the supplier’s water management planning. The projected population estimates shall be based upon data from the state, regional, or local service agency population projections within the service area of the urban water supplier and shall be in five-year increments to 20 years or as far as data is available.

A summary of the District’s service area and population are included in this section. Additional information related to the population estimates and other factors affecting the District’s water management planning are is published in the 2015 RUWMP.

The District is a County Water District, a public agency of the State of California, organized and existing under the County Water District Law (Division 12, Section 30,000 of the Water Code) of the State of California. Among other typical political subdivision powers, it has the power of taxation and eminent domain.

The District is located in southwestern San Bernardino County with a small part in northern Riverside County. The service area is shown in Figure 3. The District is adjacent to the western limits of the City of San Bernardino on the east; adjacent to and including the eastern part of the City of Fontana on the west; adjacent to the U.S. Forest Service boundary on the north; and the County of Riverside on the south. The District is divided into northern and southern sections by the central portion of the City of Rialto.

The current and estimated future populations within the District from the 2015 RUWMP are shown in Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population Served</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2030</th>
<th>2035</th>
<th>2040</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population Served</td>
<td>80,161</td>
<td>86,246</td>
<td>92,793</td>
<td>99,836</td>
<td>107,415</td>
<td>115,568</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 3. West Valley Water District Service Area
Water Demands

California Water Code section 10631

(e) (1) Quantify, to the extent records are available, past and current water use, over the same five-year increments described in subdivision (a), and projected water use, identifying the uses among water use sectors including, but not necessarily limited to, all of the following uses:
   (A) Single-family residential.
   (B) Multifamily.
   (C) Commercial.
   (D) Industrial.
   (E) Institutional and governmental.
   (F) Landscape.
   (G) Sales to other agencies.
   (H) Saline water intrusion barriers, groundwater recharge, or conjunctive use, or any combination thereof.
   (I) Agricultural.

(2) The water use projections shall be in the same five-year increments described in subdivision (a).

The Water Conservation Bill of 2009 (SBX7-7) is one of four policy bills enacted as part of the November 2009 Comprehensive Water Package. The Water Conservation Bill of 2009 provides the regulatory framework to support the statewide reduction in urban per capita water use described in the 20 by 2020 Water Conservation Plan. Consistent with SBX7-7, the District has determined and reported its existing baseline water consumption and established future water use targets in gallons per day per capita, as described in the 2015 RUWMP. To meet these targets the District has formulated a conservation program to meet these goals, as described in the 2015 RUWMP.

Water Uses by Sector

The District categorizes customers as single family residential, multi-family residential, landscape irrigation, agricultural irrigation, commercial, industrial, institutional, fire service, and hydrant uses. Water deliveries for each customer class for the years 2011 through 2015 are summarized in Table 3.
Table 3. Past Demands for Raw and Potable Water – Actual (AF)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use Type</th>
<th>Additional Description</th>
<th>Level of Treatment When Delivered</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Family</td>
<td>Drinking Water</td>
<td>12,017</td>
<td>12,789</td>
<td>12,400</td>
<td>11,958</td>
<td>9,786</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family</td>
<td>Drinking Water</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>597</td>
<td>566</td>
<td>553</td>
<td>504</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>Drinking Water</td>
<td>1,450</td>
<td>1,625</td>
<td>1,690</td>
<td>1,654</td>
<td>1,453</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>Drinking Water</td>
<td>1,020</td>
<td>1,232</td>
<td>1,160</td>
<td>1,157</td>
<td>825</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>Drinking Water</td>
<td>886</td>
<td>876</td>
<td>762</td>
<td>770</td>
<td>709</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural irrigation</td>
<td>Drinking Water</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>105</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape Irrigation</td>
<td>Drinking Water</td>
<td>1,355</td>
<td>1,674</td>
<td>1,687</td>
<td>1,799</td>
<td>1,319</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf Course</td>
<td>Drinking Water</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Service</td>
<td>Drinking Water</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydrant</td>
<td>Drinking Water</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>273</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales/Transfers/Exchanges</td>
<td>SB County Connection / Glen Helen</td>
<td>Drinking Water</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonrevenue</td>
<td>Drinking Water</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td>2,157</td>
<td>2,074</td>
<td>2,131</td>
<td>2,064</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>19,966</td>
<td>21,246</td>
<td>20,710</td>
<td>20,472</td>
<td>17,131</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Projected future water use was estimated using two factors: the expected growth in service area population, and the expected change in per-capita consumption. For planning purposes, the District estimated that beginning in 2020, its per-capita consumption would be approximately 10 percent higher than the observed 2015 value. While the District will continue to encourage conservation, this assumption reflects the possible change in behaviors that may occur after the current drought ends and mandatory drought restrictions are phased out. The estimated future demands are shown in Table 4 and Table 5. The District does not anticipate any routine or single large water sales to any agencies in the future. The District does not anticipate future water use related to saline barriers, groundwater recharge operations, or recycled water. For the purpose of projections, based on data from the past five years, nonrevenue water is assumed to be 10 percent of total sales. The District will continue efforts to decrease water loss and thereby reduce gallons per capita per day of water use.
### Table 4. Demands for Raw and Potable Water – Projected (AF)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use Type</th>
<th>Additional Description</th>
<th>Level of Treatment</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2030</th>
<th>2035</th>
<th>2040</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Family</td>
<td>Drinking Water</td>
<td></td>
<td>11,654</td>
<td>12,538</td>
<td>13,490</td>
<td>14,514</td>
<td>15,616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family</td>
<td>Drinking Water</td>
<td></td>
<td>600</td>
<td>646</td>
<td>695</td>
<td>747</td>
<td>804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>Drinking Water</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,730</td>
<td>1,861</td>
<td>2,002</td>
<td>2,154</td>
<td>2,318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>Drinking Water</td>
<td></td>
<td>982</td>
<td>1,057</td>
<td>1,137</td>
<td>1,223</td>
<td>1,316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>Drinking Water</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,944</td>
<td>2,008</td>
<td>2,077</td>
<td>2,151</td>
<td>2,231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Irrigation</td>
<td>Drinking Water</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape Irrigation</td>
<td>Drinking Water</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,571</td>
<td>1,691</td>
<td>1,819</td>
<td>1,957</td>
<td>2,105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf Course</td>
<td>Drinking Water</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Service</td>
<td>Drinking Water</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydrant</td>
<td>Drinking Water</td>
<td></td>
<td>325</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales/Transfers/Exchanges to other agencies</td>
<td>SB County Connection / Glen Helen</td>
<td>Drinking Water</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonrevenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20,799</td>
<td>22,256</td>
<td>23,802</td>
<td>25,492</td>
<td>27,312</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 5. Total Water Demands (AF)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demand</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2030</th>
<th>2035</th>
<th>2040</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Potable and Raw Water</td>
<td>17,131</td>
<td>20,799</td>
<td>22,256</td>
<td>23,802</td>
<td>25,492</td>
<td>27,312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recycled Water Demand</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Water Demand</td>
<td>17,131</td>
<td>20,799</td>
<td>22,256</td>
<td>23,802</td>
<td>25,492</td>
<td>27,312</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Water Supplies

**California Water Code section 10910**

(d)(1) The assessment required by this section shall include an identification of any existing water supply entitlements, water rights, or water service contracts relevant to the identified water supply for the proposed project, and a description of the quantities of water received in prior years by the public water system, or the city or county if either is required to comply with this part pursuant to subdivision (b), under the existing water supply entitlements, water rights, or water service contracts.

(2) An identification of existing water supply entitlements, water rights, or water service contracts held by the public water system, or the city or county if either is required to comply with this part pursuant to subdivision (b), shall be demonstrated by providing information related to all of the following:

(A) Written contracts or other proof of entitlement to an identified water supply.

(B) Copies of a capital outlay program for financing the delivery of a water supply that has been adopted by the public water system.

(C) Federal, state, and local permits for construction of necessary infrastructure associated with delivering the water supply.

(D) Any necessary regulatory approvals that are required in order to be able to convey or deliver the water supply.
District Overview
The District utilizes three primary sources for drinking water supply: local surface water from flows on the east side of the San Gabriel Mountains, including North Fork Lytle Creek, Middle Fork Lytle Creek, and South Fork Lytle Creek; groundwater; and imported water from the State Water Project (SWP). The District distribution system is divided into eight pressure zones; it currently has 25 existing reservoirs with a total storage capacity of approximately 72.61 million gallons. The District also operates a 14.4-MGD water filtration facility. These supplies are discussed further below. The contracts and entitlements for District water supplies are summarized in Table 8 and are enclosed in Appendix A through Appendix E.

Surface Water
The District has the right to divert and export 2,290 gpm out of the Lytle Creek Region when it is available as described in the Lytle Creek Judgment in Appendix A. The District can also purchase an additional 1,350 gpm of Lytle Creek flows through an agreement with the City of San Bernardino (San Bernardino is not able to utilize their surface water flows), which is treated at the Oliver P. Roemer WFF (see Appendix A). The District also utilizes Lytle Creek surface water flows for groundwater recharge in the Lytle Creek Basin.

The District is participating in regional planning efforts to capture additional stormwater for purposes of groundwater recharge.

State Water Project
The District receives SWP water from the San Bernardino Valley Municipal Water District (Valley District) through the Lytle Turnout off the San Gabriel Feeder Pipeline. Newly constructed metering and transmission facilities will enable the District to purchase and treat up to 20 MGD (approximately 23,000 AFY) at final treatment plant expansion. SWP water is treated at the District’s Oliver P. Roemer Water Filtration Facility (WFF) and used for potable supply, or can be used to supply non-potable customers, or for groundwater recharge in the Lytle Creek Basin. In 2006 the WFF was expanded to increase production capacity to 14.4 MGD. Ultimately this plant will have a capacity of 20.4 MGD. The District has been utilizing SWP water through the Lytle Turnout since 1999.

Groundwater Supplies
California Water Code section 10910
(f) If a water supply for a proposed project includes groundwater, the following additional information shall be included in the water assessment:
   (1) A review of any information contained in the urban water management plan relevant to the identified water supply for the proposed project.
   (2) A description of any groundwater basin or basins from which the proposed project will be supplied. For those basins for which a court or the board has adjudicated the rights to pump groundwater, a copy of the order or decree adopted by the court or the board and a description of the amount of groundwater the public water system, or the city or county if either is required to comply with this part pursuant to subdivision (b), has the legal right to pump under the order or decree. For basins that have not been adjudicated, information as to whether the department has identified the basin or basins as overdrafted or has projected that the basin will become overdrafted if present.
management conditions continue, in the most current bulletin of the department that characterizes the condition of the groundwater basin, and a detailed description by the public water system, or the city or county if either is required to comply with this part pursuant to subdivision (b), of the efforts being undertaken in the basin or basins to eliminate the long-term overdraft condition.

(3) A detailed description and analysis of the amount and location of groundwater pumped by the public water system, or the city or county if either is required to comply with this part pursuant to subdivision (b), for the past five years from any groundwater basin from which the proposed project will be supplied. The description and analysis shall be based on information that is reasonably available, including, but not limited to, historic use records.

(4) A detailed description and analysis of the amount and location of groundwater that is projected to be pumped by the public water system, or the city or county if either is required to comply with this part pursuant to subdivision (b), from any basin from which the proposed project will be supplied. The description and analysis shall be based on information that is reasonably available, including, but not limited to, historic use records.

(5) An analysis of the sufficiency of the groundwater from the basin or basins from which the proposed project will be supplied to meet the projected water demand associated with the proposed project. A water assessment shall not be required to include the information required by this paragraph if the public water system determines, as part of the review required by paragraph (1), that the sufficiency of groundwater necessary to meet the initial and projected water demand associated with the project was addressed in the description and analysis required by paragraph (4) of subdivision (b) of Section 10631.

The District draws approximately 65 percent of its water supply from its wells. The District’s normal operating practice is to pump its wells 16 hours a day during off peak hours to take advantage of Southern California Edison’s time of use rate. If, for some reason, wells are not in service (maintenance or repair), the District has the ability and right to pump its wells up to 24 hours per day. The District has approximately 36 MGD production capability from all of its wells in operation 24 hours per day.

The District extracts groundwater from five regional groundwater basins: Bunker Hill and Lytle Creek (which are both part of the San Bernardino Basin Area), Rialto-Colton, Riverside North, and Chino Basins. All five basins have been adjudicated and are managed, as discussed further in the following sections specific to each basin.

The District, in a joint venture with the City of Rialto and Valley District, constructed 25,000 feet of 48-inch transmission line known as the Baseline Feeder, which is described in the Baseline Feeder Agreement in Appendix E. Through an agreement with Valley District, the District is to receive 5,000 AFY of supply through this transmission line. The District has received water through the Baseline Feeder since 1998. Because this water is not produced by the District, it is not included in Table 6.

The District’s historical production for the past five years is shown in Table 6.
Table 6. Groundwater Volume Pumped (AF)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groundwater Type</th>
<th>Location or Basin Name</th>
<th>Water Quality</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alluvial Basin</td>
<td>Lytle Creek</td>
<td>Drinking Water</td>
<td>2,983</td>
<td>4,002</td>
<td>3,776</td>
<td>3,262</td>
<td>2,159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alluvial Basin</td>
<td>Riverside North</td>
<td>Drinking Water</td>
<td>3,144</td>
<td>3,932</td>
<td>3,389</td>
<td>2,992</td>
<td>2,065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alluvial Basin</td>
<td>Rialto-Colton</td>
<td>Drinking Water</td>
<td>4,883</td>
<td>4,093</td>
<td>4,005</td>
<td>3,916</td>
<td>2,505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alluvial Basin</td>
<td>Bunker Hill</td>
<td>Drinking Water</td>
<td>1,335</td>
<td>1,682</td>
<td>1,885</td>
<td>1,478</td>
<td>1,520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alluvial Basin</td>
<td>Chino</td>
<td>Drinking Water</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12,345</td>
<td>13,709</td>
<td>13,055</td>
<td>11,648</td>
<td>8,249</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The San Bernardino Basin Area

The San Bernardino Basin Area (SBBA) was defined by, and adjudicated in gross, by the Western-San Bernardino Judgment (Western Judgment) in 1969 (see Appendix B). The SBBA has a surface area of approximately 141 square miles and lies between the San Andreas and San Jacinto faults. The basin is bordered on the northwest by the San Gabriel Mountains and Cucamonga fault zone; on the northeast by the San Bernardino Mountains and San Andreas fault zone; on the east by the Banning fault and Crafton Hills; and on the south by a low, east-facing escarpment of the San Jacinto fault and the San Timoteo Badlands. Alluvial fans extend from the base of the mountains and hills that surround the valley and coalesce to form a broad, sloping alluvial plain in the central part of the valley. The SBBA encompasses the Bunker Hill sub basin (DWR Number 8.02-06) defined by DWR and also includes a small portion of the Yucaipa Basin (8-02.07) and Rialto-Colton Basin (8-02.04) as defined by DWR. The SBBA also encompasses surface water.

The Western Judgment established the natural safe yield of the SBBA to be a total of 232,100 AF per year (AFY) for both surface water diversions and groundwater extractions (the Western Judgment is provided in Appendix B). Surface water is diverted from Mill Creek, Lytle Creek, and the SAR. The average surface water diversions in the SBBA for direct use from 1968 to 2000 were 39,000 AFY.

The Western Judgment allocates 64,862 AFY of the safe yield, which equates to 27.95 percent, to the Plaintiffs. The Plaintiffs include the City of Riverside (the successor to the Riverside Water Company and the Gage Canal Company), Riverside Highland Water Company, Meeks & Daley Water Company, and Regents of the University of California. The Riverside County agencies may not exceed their allocation unless they participate in “New Conservation” (explained below).

The Non-Plaintiffs’ (agencies within San Bernardino County, including the District) rights were defined in the Judgment as 167,238 AFY, which equates to 72.05 percent of the safe yield. San Bernardino agencies are allowed to extract more than 167,238 AFY from the SBBA, as long as they import and recharge a like amount of water into the SBBA. The Western-San Bernardino Watermaster provides an annual accounting of both the plaintiff and non-plaintiff extractions and a comparison to the safe yield. The Watermaster bases the Valley District replenishment water requirement on the cumulative accounting of non-plaintiff extractions. If the cumulative extractions are less than the cumulative safe yield, there is a groundwater “credit” in the basin. In years when cumulative extractions are greater than their allocation, a “debit” is given. Recharge is also required to offset the export of water outside.
the SBBA in excess of the amount recorded during the base period (1959-1963). Credits are earned for any new supplies such as stormwater capture. As of the accounting performed for the 2015 Annual Western-San Bernardino Watermaster Report, the Non-Plaintiffs have 104,994 AF of net credit accumulated in the SBBA and are, therefore, not required to recharge. Although there is no recharge requirement under the Judgment, the Non-Plaintiffs have continued to recharge the SBBA.

Lytle Creek Sub basin

Lytle Creek Basin is part of the SBBA, and it is not identified as a separate sub-basin in DWR Bulletin 118-2003; however, the sub basin is an integral part of the Upper Santa Ana Valley Groundwater Basin and a major recharge area for both the Bunker Hill and Rialto-Colton sub basins. Historically, local agencies have recognized Lytle Creek sub basin as a distinct groundwater sub basin. In the Western Judgment, the Bunker Hill and Lytle Creek sub basins are combined into the SBBA. However, the three separate water-bearing zones and intervening confining zones of the Bunker Hill sub basin are not observed in the Lytle sub basin. Sediments within the Lytle sub basin are, for the most part, highly permeable, and the aquifer has a high specific yield. High permeability and specific yield tend to result in an aquifer that responds rapidly to changes in inflow (precipitation and streamflow) and outflow (groundwater pumping, streamflow, and subsurface outflow).

Lytle Creek sub basin is adjoined on the west by the Rialto-Colton sub basin along the Lytle Creek fault, and on the east and southeast by the Bunker Hill sub basin along the Loma Linda fault and Barrier G. The northwestern border of the sub basin is delineated by the San Gabriel Mountains, and runoff from the mountains flows south/southeast through Lytle and Cajon Creeks into the basin.

Numerous groundwater barriers are present within Lytle Creek sub basin, resulting in six compartments within the sub basin. Barriers A through D divide the northwestern portion of the sub basin into five sub-areas and the southeastern portion of the sub basin comprises the sixth sub-area. Barrier F divides the northwestern sub-areas from the southeastern sub-area. Studies have shown that the groundwater barriers are less permeable with depth. When groundwater levels are high during wet years, more leakage occurs across the barriers than when groundwater levels are lower (i.e., during dry years). The amount of pumping in each sub-area, in large part, controls the movement of groundwater across the barrier within the older alluvium but not the younger alluvium.

It is important to note that the water rights in Lytle Creek are set forth in long-standing court judgments governing the rights of the parties in that basin. The Lytle Creek Basin was adjudicated under the 1924 Judgment No. 17,030 from the Superior Court of San Bernardino County (Lytle Creek Judgment) and is managed by the Lytle Creek Water Conservation Association, which is made up of the successors to the stipulated parties of the judgment (a copy of the Lytle Creek Judgment is provided in Appendix J of the 2015 RUWMP and in Appendix A of this WSA). Table 7 shows historical extractions from the SBBA for years 2010-2014.
Table 7. Historic Groundwater Extractions and Surface Water Diversions from SBBA (AFY)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entity</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Plaintiffs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bear Valley Mutual Water Company (a)</td>
<td>17,524</td>
<td>16,862</td>
<td>15,560</td>
<td>15,259</td>
<td>17,102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Colton (a)</td>
<td>4,740</td>
<td>4,783</td>
<td>6,222</td>
<td>5,170</td>
<td>4,879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Valley Water District (a)</td>
<td>18,120</td>
<td>18,408</td>
<td>19,538</td>
<td>18,796</td>
<td>17,896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Loma Linda (a)</td>
<td>4,863</td>
<td>5,401</td>
<td>5,776</td>
<td>5,571</td>
<td>5,449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Redlands (a)</td>
<td>28,960</td>
<td>31,908</td>
<td>31,918</td>
<td>29,641</td>
<td>29,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Rialto (a)</td>
<td>5,325</td>
<td>3,377</td>
<td>3,109</td>
<td>4,082</td>
<td>4,132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Bernardino Valley MWD (a)</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>3,790</td>
<td>7,485</td>
<td>8,178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Bernardino (a)</td>
<td>49,185</td>
<td>50,331</td>
<td>50,250</td>
<td>46,853</td>
<td>44,798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Valley Water District (a)</td>
<td>7,986</td>
<td>7,697</td>
<td>8,637</td>
<td>7,723</td>
<td>6,397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yucaipa Valley Water District (a)</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Agencies in San Bernardino and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Entities (b)</td>
<td>16,474</td>
<td>19,288</td>
<td>23,053</td>
<td>17,597</td>
<td>15,062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal for Non-Plaintiffs</strong></td>
<td>153,634</td>
<td>158,770</td>
<td>167,973</td>
<td>158,397</td>
<td>153,147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plaintiffs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside Highland Water Company (c)</td>
<td>1,136</td>
<td>1,655</td>
<td>2,135</td>
<td>2,873</td>
<td>2,077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agencies in Riverside County (d)</td>
<td>52,987</td>
<td>54,151</td>
<td>60,159</td>
<td>60,885</td>
<td>57,072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal for Plaintiffs</strong></td>
<td>54,123</td>
<td>55,806</td>
<td>62,294</td>
<td>63,758</td>
<td>59,149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>207,757</td>
<td>214,576</td>
<td>230,267</td>
<td>222,155</td>
<td>212,296</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:

(a) Data from Volume 1 of the Western-San Bernardino Watermaster Annual Report for 2015.
(c) Riverside-Highland Water Company’s service area extends into both San Bernardino and Riverside counties. However, Riverside-Highland Water Company is a Plaintiff within the Western Judgment and therefore extractions for Riverside-Highland are typically included with those of Riverside County entities. Data from Table No. 11, Western-San Bernardino Watermaster Annual Report for 2015.
(d) Includes Agua Mansa Water Company and Meeks & Daley Water Company, Regents of the University of California, and the City of Riverside. Data from Table Nos. 10, 12, and 13 of the Western-San Bernardino Annual Report for 2015.
Rialto-Colton Basin
The Rialto-Colton subbasin underlies a portion of the upper Santa Ana Valley in southwestern San Bernardino County and northwestern Riverside County. This subbasin is about 10 miles long and varies in width from about 3.5 miles in the northwestern part to about 1.5 miles in the southeastern part. This subbasin is bounded by the San Gabriel Mountains on the northwest, the San Jacinto fault on the northeast, the Badlands on the southeast, and the Rialto-Colton fault on the southwest.

The District and its predecessors have been utilizing the Rialto Basin for water supply for more than 80 years. The Rialto Basin was adjudicated under the 1961 Decree No. 81,264 from the Superior Court of San Bernardino County (Rialto Basin Decree) (see Appendix C). Groundwater storage capacity of the basin is about 210,000 af (DPW 1934), with an estimated 120,000 af for the Rialto portion of the subbasin and about 93,000 af for the Colton portion. The basin shows quick rises of water levels during high precipitation years and slower decline over several years.

Under normal conditions, when the basin is not in adjudication, the District has unlimited extraction rights. During drought conditions when the adjudication is in effect, the District’s extraction right ranges from 3,067 afy in the most severe drought periods to a maximum of 6,134 afy. Existing wells in the Rialto Basin have the capacity to extract up to 10,000 afy during normal conditions.

North Riverside Basin
The North Riverside Basin (the portion of the Riverside Basin Area in San Bernardino County) is part of the 1969 Judgment No. 117,628 (Western Judgment- see Appendix B), under the Bunker Hill Basin. The Riverside Groundwater Basin is a large alluvial fill basin that is bounded by major faults and topographic barriers. Recharge to the basin occurs by the underflow from basins to the north, contributions from the Santa Ana River, and from percolation of surface water runoff from the surrounding uplands, in particular the Box Spring Mountains to the east. The District, which has no limits or restrictions on groundwater pumping in the basin, has been utilizing the North Riverside Basin for water supply for more than 60 years.

Extractions from the North Riverside Basin for use in Riverside County are limited to 21,085 AFY by the Judgment. Extractions for use in San Bernardino County are unlimited, provided that water levels at three index wells in the Rialto-Colton and Riverside North Basins stay above 822.04 feet MSL. The 2015 Integrated Regional Water Management Plan provided an estimate of 30,100 AFY as the sustainable supply from North Riverside for use in San Bernardino County, based on extractions from 1996 to 2005.

Chino Basin
Fontana Water Company, the City of Rialto, and the District extract water from Chino Sub basin, an adjudicated basin managed by the Chino Basin Watermaster. The Chino Sub basin lies in the southwest corner of San Bernardino County. The Chino Sub basin is bordered to the east by the Rialto-Colton fault. In the other three directions, the Chino Sub basin is ringed by impermeable mountain rock, the San Gabriel Mountains to the north, the Jurupa Mountains and Puente Hills to the south and southwest. Average annual precipitation across the basin is 17 inches. This part of the San Bernardino Valley is drained by San Antonio Creek and Cucamonga Creek southerly to the Santa Ana River.
On January 2, 1975, several Chino Basin producers filed suit in California State Superior Court for San Bernardino County (the "Court") to settle the problem of allocating water rights in the Chino Basin. On January 27, 1978, the Court entered a judgment in Chino Basin Municipal Water District v. City of Chino et al. (Chino Basin Watermaster Judgment) adjudicating water rights in the Chino Basin and establishing the Chino Basin Watermaster (see Appendix D). The Judgment adjudicated all groundwater rights in Chino Basin and contains a physical solution to meet the requirements of water users having rights in or dependent upon the Chino Basin. The Judgment also appointed the Watermaster to account for and implement the management of the Chino Basin. The Judgment declared that the initial operating safe yield of the Chino Basin is 145,000 AFY. The Basin is managed through implementation of the Chino Optimum Basin Management Plan. Per the Judgment, the District has a minimum of approximately 1,000 AFY of extraction rights. Extractions above that amount must be replenished with SWP water through a program with the Chino Basin Watermaster.

**Recycled Water**

The District does not currently have or use recycled water as a supply. The District is completing a master plan for potential use of recycled water within its service area. The District’s plans for recycled water are still preliminary, and the expected beneficial use has not been quantified.

**Desalinated Water**

The District does not currently use desalinated water as a supply and has no current plans to develop new desalinated water supplies.

**Exchanges or Transfers**

The District currently has interconnections with the Cities of Rialto, Colton and San Bernardino, the Fontana Water Company, Marygold Mutual Water Company, and Valley District which can be utilized as needed for short-term supply needs. These connections are not typically used for extended periods and are not relied on as a source of supply.

**Future Water Supply and Projects**

To meet the future demands within the system, the District plans to rehabilitate existing wells, to drill new wells, and equip wells with wellhead treatment if required. These wells are planned for various groundwater basins and pressure zones within the distribution system.

Groundwater is not the only planned supply source to be utilized by the District to meet the anticipated future demands. The District has expanded the Oliver P. Roemer Water Filtration Facility to allow additional treatment of SWP water when available. A future expansion of the plant will increase the ultimate capacity of the facility to 20.4 MGD.

Over time, the District intends to utilize a greater amount from each existing source, up to their legal rights and availability from each water supply source.

**Summary of Existing and Planned Sources of Water**

The District’s actual supplies used during 2015 are summarized in Table 8.
Table 8. Water Supplies - Actual

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Water Supply</th>
<th>Additional Detail on Water Supply</th>
<th>Entitlement, Right or Contract</th>
<th>2015 Actual Volume (AF)</th>
<th>2015 Water Quality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Surface Water</td>
<td>Lytle Creek</td>
<td>Lytle Creek Judgment &amp; Water Purchase Agreement- Appendix A</td>
<td>2,271</td>
<td>Drinking Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchased or Imported Water</td>
<td>SWP Water</td>
<td>No limit or contract; obtained from SBVMWD</td>
<td>2,244</td>
<td>Drinking Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groundwater</td>
<td>Lytle Creek</td>
<td>Lytle Creek Judgment &amp; Water Purchase Agreement- Appendix A</td>
<td>2,159</td>
<td>Drinking Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groundwater</td>
<td>Riverside North</td>
<td>Western Judgment- Appendix B</td>
<td>2,065</td>
<td>Drinking Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groundwater</td>
<td>Rialto-Colton</td>
<td>Rialto Basin Decree- Appendix C</td>
<td>2,505</td>
<td>Drinking Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groundwater</td>
<td>Bunker Hill</td>
<td>Western Judgment</td>
<td>1,520</td>
<td>Drinking Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groundwater</td>
<td>Chino</td>
<td>Chino Basin Watermaster Judgment- Appendix D</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Drinking Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchased or Imported Water</td>
<td>Baseline Feeder (Bunker Hill)</td>
<td>Baseline Feeder Agreement- Appendix E</td>
<td>4,367</td>
<td>Drinking Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>17,131</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The District plans to utilize a greater amount from each of its supply sources, up to the legal rights and availability. The District’s available supplies for future years are summarized in Table 9.

Table 9. Water Supplies – Projected (AF)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Water Supply</th>
<th>Additional Detail on Water Supply</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2030</th>
<th>2035</th>
<th>2040</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Surface Water</td>
<td>Lytle Creek</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>5,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchased or Imported Water</td>
<td>SWP Water</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groundwater</td>
<td>Riverside North</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>4,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groundwater</td>
<td>Rialto-Colton</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groundwater</td>
<td>SBBA Groundwater (Bunker Hill / Lytle)</td>
<td>9,500</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>17,000</td>
<td>19,500</td>
<td>19,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groundwater</td>
<td>Chino</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchased or Imported Water</td>
<td>Baseline Feeder (Bunker Hill)</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>36,400</td>
<td>41,900</td>
<td>45,400</td>
<td>48,400</td>
<td>48,400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Supply Reliability

California Water Code section 10631

(c) Describe the reliability of the water supply and vulnerability to seasonal or climatic shortage, to the extent practicable, and provide data for each of the following:

1. An average water year.
2. A single dry water year.
3. Multiple dry water years.

Groundwater

Some of the District’s wells have been impacted by arsenic, perchlorate and volatile organic carbons (VOCs). The District has implemented wellhead treatment as needed and continues to monitor groundwater contamination and the movement of groundwater contaminant plumes. These past and ongoing groundwater treatment projects have demonstrated that treatment is an economically viable alternative for handling arsenic, perchlorate and VOCs. Based on current conditions, water quality is not anticipated to affect District supply reliability. However, water quality issues are constantly evolving. The District will take action to protect and treat supply when needed, but it is well recognized that water quality treatment can have significant costs.

Geologic hazards within Lytle Creek have the potential to disrupt the water supply system by restricting the flow and/or introducing large quantities of suspended solids to the runoff, thereby increasing turbidity levels. To deal with this water quality issue, the District added pre-treatment capability at the Oliver P. Roemer WFF to achieve both turbidity removal and total organic carbon reduction.

State Water Project

During times of State-wide drought conditions, the availability of SWP water may be reduced. These conditions are normally known in advance, providing the District with the opportunity to plan for the reduced supply. During a drought period, it is Valley District’s priority to meet obligations to maintain lake levels at Big Bear Lake and to make direct deliveries to the water treatment plants operated by Redlands, the District, EVWD, YVWD, and SBMWD.

Reliability by Type of Year

During normal and wet years, Valley District uses SWP water for groundwater recharge. Therefore, this water is available for production during dry years. Through its use of groundwater storage, Valley District does not anticipate a reduction in the availability of SWP water during single or multiple dry years.

Due to the size of the groundwater basins utilized by the District, a single dry year will not affect well production. The annual amount produced in past normal, single dry, or multiple dry water years from a basin does not give an accurate representation of potential basin production. Factors such as lower system demand, cost of pumping, inoperable wells, pumping duration, replenishment costs, water quality, cost of supply and the ability to treat water all affect annual basin production numbers.
The District has been able to utilize up to 5,500 AFY during normal times from Lytle Creek surface flows and projects a minimum of 2,130 AFY during extended drought conditions. The District and its predecessors have been utilizing Lytle Creek surface flows for water supply for more than 130 years.

**Regional Supply Reliability**

The District is committed to minimizing the need to import water from other regions. The District operates a number of conservation programs to implement various Demand Management Measures, helping to reduce the need for imported water.

**Sufficiency Assessment**

*California Water Code section 10910*

(c) (3) If the projected water demand associated with the proposed project was not accounted for in the most recently adopted urban water management plan, or the public water system has no urban water management plan, the water assessment for the project shall include a discussion with regard to whether the public water system’s total projected water supplies available during normal, single dry, and multiple dry water years during a 20-year projection will meet the projected water demand associated with the proposed project, in addition to the public water system’s existing and planned future uses, including agricultural and manufacturing uses.

(4) If the city or county is required to comply with this part pursuant to subdivision (b), the water assessment for the project shall include a discussion with regard to whether the total projected water supplies, determined to be available by the city or county for the project during normal, single dry, and multiple dry water years during a 20-year projection, will meet the projected water demand associated with the proposed project, in addition to existing and planned future uses, including agricultural and manufacturing uses.

There has been a historical trend associated with drier years and an increase in water use among agencies. Conservation efforts have proven to be effective in decreasing water use in dry years, such as the past three years (2013-2015).

The District has estimated that demands could increase 10 percent during a single dry year. During a multiple dry year period, it is expected that conservation messaging and restrictions would lead to consumption dropping back down to normal year levels in the second dry year, and falling a further 10 percent in the third dry year.

The following tables summarize the anticipated supplies and demands for the District.

**Table 10. Normal Year Supply and Demand Comparison (AF)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Totals</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2030</th>
<th>2035</th>
<th>2040</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supply Totals</td>
<td>36,400</td>
<td>41,900</td>
<td>45,400</td>
<td>48,400</td>
<td>48,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demand Totals</td>
<td>20,799</td>
<td>22,256</td>
<td>23,802</td>
<td>25,492</td>
<td>27,312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>15,601</td>
<td>19,644</td>
<td>21,598</td>
<td>22,908</td>
<td>21,088</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 11. Single Dry Year Supply and Demand Comparison (AF)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Totals</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2030</th>
<th>2035</th>
<th>2040</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supply</td>
<td>33,030</td>
<td>38,530</td>
<td>42,030</td>
<td>45,030</td>
<td>45,030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demand</td>
<td>22,879</td>
<td>24,481</td>
<td>26,183</td>
<td>28,041</td>
<td>30,043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>10,151</td>
<td>14,049</td>
<td>15,847</td>
<td>16,989</td>
<td>14,987</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 12. Multiple Dry Years Supply and Demand Comparison (AF)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Totals</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2030</th>
<th>2035</th>
<th>2040</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Year</td>
<td>Supply</td>
<td>33,030</td>
<td>38,530</td>
<td>42,030</td>
<td>45,030</td>
<td>45,030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Demand</td>
<td>22,879</td>
<td>24,481</td>
<td>26,183</td>
<td>28,041</td>
<td>30,043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>10,151</td>
<td>14,049</td>
<td>15,847</td>
<td>16,989</td>
<td>14,987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Year</td>
<td>Supply</td>
<td>33,030</td>
<td>38,530</td>
<td>42,030</td>
<td>45,030</td>
<td>45,030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Demand</td>
<td>20,799</td>
<td>22,256</td>
<td>23,802</td>
<td>25,492</td>
<td>27,312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>12,231</td>
<td>16,274</td>
<td>18,228</td>
<td>19,538</td>
<td>17,718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Year</td>
<td>Supply</td>
<td>33,030</td>
<td>38,530</td>
<td>42,030</td>
<td>45,030</td>
<td>45,030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Demand</td>
<td>18,719</td>
<td>20,030</td>
<td>21,422</td>
<td>22,943</td>
<td>24,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>14,311</td>
<td>18,500</td>
<td>20,608</td>
<td>20,087</td>
<td>20,450</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Water Shortage Contingency Plan

Per California Water Code section 10632, the District has an adopted Water Shortage Contingency Plan that is included in the 2015 RUWMP.

### Determination

**California Water Code section 10911**

(c) The city or county may include in any environmental document an evaluation of any information included in that environmental document provided pursuant to subdivision (b). The city or county shall determine, based on the entire record, whether projected water supplies will be sufficient to satisfy the demands of the project, in addition to existing and planned future uses. If the city or county determines that water supplies will not be sufficient, the city or county shall include that determination in its findings for the project.

The District has verified that it has the water supplies available during normal, single-dry, and multiple-dry years within a 20-year projection that will meet the projected demand associated with the proposed Project, in addition to existing and planned future uses.

### Reservation of Authority

Nothing in this WSA shall be construed to create a right or entitlement to water service, or any specific level of service nor does it affect existing law concerning the District's obligation to provide water service to its existing customers or to any potential future customers. (See Government Code § 66473.7(m) and (n).)
In addition, the District specifically reserves its authority to impose reasonable terms and conditions or to refuse water service to any existing customers or to any potential future customers, in order to conserve water in the face of an existing or threatened water shortage. *(See Water Code § 350, et. seq.)*

**Conditions of Approval**

This assessment of reliable water supply is conditioned on the following:

1. The property owner will install water efficient devices and landscaping according to the requirements of the District’s water use efficiency ordinance(s), if any, at the time of construction of the Project to reduce the impact of this Project on District water supplies.

2. Prior to Project construction, the property owner is required to meet with District staff to develop a plan of service. The plan of service will include, but not be limited to, water and recycled water requirements to serve the Project. If there is a change in the circumstances detailed in this water supply assessment, the District has the option to suspend the approval of this WSA.

3. This Project is not located near any existing recycled water facilities; however, in the future it may be possible to serve this Project with recycled water. District policy recognizes recycled water as a preferred source of water supply for all non-potable water demands, including, without limitation, irrigation of recreation areas, green-belts, open space, common areas, commercial landscaping and supply for aesthetic impoundment or other water features. The majority of landscaped areas in this Project will be designed to use recycled water to the greatest extent possible.

   According to District requirements, the Project may be conditioned to construct a recycled water system physically separated from the potable water system. This system will need to be constructed to the District’s recycled water standards. The Project may also be conditioned to construct off-site recycled water facilities. The District will make a determination on requirements for recycled water use and facilities during the design phase of the Project.

4. This WSA will be reviewed every three (3) years until the Project begins construction. The property owner shall notify the District when construction has begun. The review will ensure that the information included in this WSA remains accurate and no significant changes to the Project or District’s water supply have occurred. If the property owner has not contacted the District within three (3) years of approval of this WSA, it will be assumed that the proposed Project no longer requires the estimated water demand calculated, the demand for this Project will not be considered in assessments for future Projects, and the assessment provided by this document will become invalid.

5. (a) Based on present information the District has determined that it will be able to provide adequate water supplies to meet the potable water demand for this Project in addition to existing and future uses. Water service will be guaranteed by the satisfaction of all rules and regulations of
the District. The District reserves the right to revisit this water supply assessment in the event of a potential increase in water demand to the Project.

(b) This WSA is not a commitment to serve the Project, but a review of District’s supplies based on present information available.

(c) Recycled water will be used to the greatest extent possible on the proposed Project.
References

DATE: July 13, 2018
TO: Board of Directors
FROM: Clarence Mansell Jr., Interim General Manager
SUBJECT: CONSIDER A WATER SUPPLY ASSESSMENT FOR BLOOMINGTON
COMMERCE CENTER

BACKGROUND:
On January 26, 2018, Howard Industrial Partners (“Developer”) submitted a request for West Valley Water District (“District”) to prepare a Water Supply Assessment (“WSA”) for its proposed project in the unincorporated community of Bloomington, known as Bloomington Commerce Center (“Project”). The Project proposes a development that consists of a 58-acre industrial site located north of Jurupa Avenue, south of Santa Ana Avenue, east of Locust Avenue, and west of Maple Avenue, as shown in Exhibit A. The Project is anticipated to include the development of 58 acres with a building footprint of 1,251,640 square feet by the year 2020. The warehouse building includes ancillary office space. The site will also contain 385 tractor trailer stalls, 420 parking spaces, and landscaped areas. The project will require water for consumptive and sanitary purposes to support employees at the facility and for irrigation of landscaped areas. The Project covers an area that is currently developed primarily with rural residential uses, so it is assumed that these will be redeveloped into the proposed industrial use.

DISCUSSION:
The WSA is a necessary requirement for compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (“CEQA”), furthermore, the California Water Code (Code) requires projects as defined in Section 10912 of the Code, to include a WSA in their environmental impact report. The WSA evaluates whether the total water supplies available during normal, single-dry, and multiple-dry water years projected within the latest adopted Urban Water Management Plan (“UWMP”) will meet the anticipated water demand associated with the particular project, in addition to the existing and planned future uses.

1. A “Project” in the Water Code means any of the following:
2. A proposed residential development of more than 500 dwelling units.
3. A proposed shopping center or business establishment employing more than 1,000 persons or having more than 500,000 square feet of floor space.
4. A proposed commercial office building employing more than 1,000 persons or having more than 250,000 square feet of floor space.
5. A proposed hotel or motel, or both, having more than 500 rooms.
6. A proposed industrial, manufacturing, or processing plant, or industrial park planned to house more than 1,000 persons, occupying more than 40 acres of land, or having more than 650,000 square feet of floor area.
7. A mixed-use project that includes one or more of the projects specified in this subdivision.
8. A project that would demand an amount of water equivalent to, or greater than, the amount of water required by a 500 dwelling unit project.

This development is considered a project as defined by the Water Code per item number 5 above. The Code states that the District shall determine whether the projected water demand associated with a proposed project was included as part of the most recently adopted UWMP, and if so, the District may incorporate the requested information from the UWMP in preparing the elements of the WSA.

UWMPs are prepared to support the District’s long-term resource planning, and to ensure that adequate water supplies are available to meet existing and future water demands. The plans must be prepared every 5 years and submitted to the Department of Water Resources. The latest UWMP adopted by the District was the 2015 San Bernardino Valley Regional Urban Water Management Plan (“RUWMP”). The demand projections for water usage rates per acre were based on land use designations from City and County General Plans.

Attached as Exhibit B for your review is a WSA prepared by the District’s consultant, Water Systems Consulting, Inc. The water demand for this Project is anticipated to be 130 acre feet per year. The anticipated water demand associated with the Project was accounted for in the most recently adopted UWMP and information from that plan was utilized in the preparation of this WSA.

As demonstrated in the 2015 RUWMP, the water supply available in 20 years in a normal, single dry and multiple dry water years is sufficient to meet the projected demand associated with the project.

**FISCAL IMPACT:**

No fiscal impact at this time.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

It is recommended that the Board of Directors approve the Water Supply Assessment for Bloomington Commerce Center.

Respectfully Submitted,

Clarence Mansell Jr., Interim General Manager
ATTACHMENT(S):
1. Exhibit A - Aerial Map
2. Exhibit B - Water Supply Assessment for Bloomington Commerce Center
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06/06/18 Engineering and Planning Committee REFERRED TO BOARD
EXHIBIT A
Final Draft Water Supply Assessment for Bloomington Commerce Center
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Chapter I – Introduction

This Water Supply Assessment (WSA) has been prepared for the Bloomington Commerce Center (Project) in accordance with the provisions of Senate Bill No. 610 (SB 610). California Water Code references are provided throughout this document in italic text where relevant.

SB 610
For projects meeting certain criteria, a public water system supplier must prepare and approve a WSA that contains three parts:

- Explicit identification of existing and anticipated water supply entitlements, water rights and water service contracts, demonstrated by contracts, Capital Improvement Programs, and permit applications.
- If no water has been received from the source identified to supply the project, other competing purveyors that receive water from this source must be identified.
- If groundwater is a proposed supply, factors such as adjudicated rights, groundwater management practices and historical pumping must be presented to establish proper use of the resource.

The latest adopted Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP) may be utilized to provide the information required for the WSA. If the demands expected from the proposed project are not accounted for in the UWMP, a discussion must be included with regard to whether the water system’s total projected water supplies during normal, single dry and multiple dry years over a 20-year period from the date of the report, will meet the projected demand of the proposed project in addition to the system’s existing and projected future uses.

On the basis of the WSA, the public water supplier is required to provide “written verification” of “sufficient water supplies.” The verification must consider the following factors:

- The availability of water over the next 20 years.
- The applicability of any urban water shortage contingency analysis prepared per Water Code Section 10632.
- The reduction in water supply allocated to a specific use by an adopted ordinance.
- The amount of water that can be reasonably relied upon from other water supply projects, such as conjunctive use, reclaimed water, water conservation, and water transfer.

In June 2016 West Valley Water District (District) adopted the 2015 San Bernardino Valley Regional Urban Water Management Plan (RUWMP), as is required for water suppliers providing water for municipal purposes to more than 3,000 customers or supplying more than 3,000 acre feet per year (AFY).
The RUWMP projected water supplies to meet future demands through the year 2040. It assessed the projected demand and supply and concluded that the District has, and will have, an adequate water supply to meet all demands within their service area to 2040.

The RUWMP contains the following information as required by Water Code Section 10910 for WSAs:

- A detailed description of each groundwater basin that supplies the District with potable water.
- Copies of the court decrees and judgments for each groundwater basin.
- A detailed description and analysis of the amount and location of groundwater pumped by the District for each groundwater basin for the last five years.
- A detailed description and analysis of the amount and location of the groundwater projected to be pumped from each groundwater basin by the District.
- An analysis of the sufficiency of each groundwater basin to meet the District’s projected amounts to be pumped under normal, single dry year, and multiple dry year conditions for the next 20 years (2015 - 2040) in five-year increments.

This WSA incorporates information and direct citations from the RUWMP. Additional information can be found in the adopted RUWMP (https://wuedata.water.ca.gov/public/uwmp_attachments/6449323356/SBV_RUWMP_rev_with_appendices.pdf).

**Project Overview**

The Project proposes a development that consists of a 58-acre industrial warehouse located north of Jurupa Avenue, south of Santa Ana Avenue, east of Locust Avenue, and west of Maple Avenue in the unincorporated San Bernardino County community of Bloomington, California. The Project is anticipated to include development of 58 acres with a building footprint of 1,251,640 square feet by the year 2020. The warehouse building includes ancillary office space. The site will also contain 385 tractor trailer stalls, 420 parking spaces, and landscaped areas. The project will require water for consumptive and sanitary purposes to support employees at the facility and for irrigation of landscaped areas. The Project covers an area that is currently developed primarily with rural residential uses, so it is assumed that these will be redeveloped into the proposed industrial use.
Chapter II – Water Supply Assessment

Determination of a Project

California Water Code section 10910
(a) Any city or county that determines that a project, as defined in Section 10912, is subject to the California Environmental Quality Act Division 13 (commencing with Section 21000) of the Public Resources Code, under Section 21080 of the Public Resources Code shall comply with this part.

As defined in Section 10912(a)(5) of the California Water Code, a proposed industrial, manufacturing, or processing plant, or industrial park planned to house more than 1,000 persons, occupying more than 40 acres of land, or having more than 650,000 square feet of floor area, must have a WSA included in their Environmental Impact Report. This particular Project falls into this category, and therefore requires a WSA.

Preparer

California Water Code section 10910
(b) The city or county, at the time that it determines whether an environmental impact report, a negative declaration, or a mitigated negative declaration is required for any project subject to the California Environmental Quality Act pursuant to Section 21080.1 of the Public Resources Code, shall identify any water system that is, or may become as a result of supplying water to the project identified pursuant to this subdivision, a public water system, as defined in Section 10912, that may supply water for the project. If the city or county is not able to identify any public water system that may supply water for the project, the city or county shall prepare the water assessment required by this part after consulting with any entity serving domestic water supplies whose service area includes the project site, the local agency formation commission, and any public water system adjacent to the project site.

The project is located north of Jurupa Avenue, south of Santa Ana Avenue, east of Locust Avenue, and west of Maple Avenue in the unincorporated San Bernardino County community of Bloomington, CA. The project is within the water service area of the District, a public water system as defined in Section 10912, and the District would supply water for the project. Figure 1 depicts the project location within the District’s service area boundary.
Figure 1. Project Location
Project Demands Inclusion in an UWMP

*California Water Code section 10910*

(c) (1) The city or county, at the time it makes the determination required under Section 21080.1 of the Public Resources Code, shall request each public water system identified pursuant to subdivision (b) to determine whether the projected water demand associated with a proposed project was included as part of the most recently adopted urban water management plan adopted pursuant to Part 2.6 (commencing with Section 10610).

(c) (2) If the projected water demand associated with the proposed project was accounted for in the most recently adopted urban water management plan, the public water system may incorporate the requested information from the urban water management plan in preparing the elements of the assessment required to comply with subdivisions (d), (e), (f), and (g).

The 2015 RUWMP is the most recently adopted UWMP by the District and outlines water supplies that will be used by the District to fulfill projected future demand. The projected future water demands in the 2015 RUWMP were derived from three factors: the expected growth in service area population, the expected change in per-capita consumption, and the expected additional industrial growth. For planning purposes, the District estimated that beginning in 2020, its per-capita consumption would be approximately 10 percent higher than the observed 2015 value. This methodology assumes that all other non-residential water uses will increase proportionately to residential uses. Therefore, it was assumed industrial demand would increase by an additional 1,100 AFY beyond the projected demands determined using the per-capita methodology.

Demands were estimated for the Project using land use based water demand factors from the District’s 2012 Water Master Plan (WMP) as shown in Table 1. The land use demand factors are applied to gross acreage for each land use including irrigation and parking areas.

### Table 1. Estimated Project Demands

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>WMP Factor (gpd/acre)</th>
<th>AFY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Light Industrial (Warehouse)</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the projections shown above, the total water demand for the Project by the year 2020 is 130 AFY.

The Project is redeveloping an area that is currently developed as rural residential. The District currently provides water service to 30 connections in the Project area. Based on the District’s actual customer consumption records for the period of 2011 to 2015, the total water demand of these existing connections was 60 AFY in 2015 and has been as high as 122 AFY in 2012. For the purposes of this WSA, the demands in 2015 are used to represent the existing water use for the Project area because 2015 is the most recent year used for future projections in the 2015 RUWMP. As the existing customers in the
Project area were being served by the District in 2015, existing demands of 60 AFY were included in the 2015 RUWMP for the Project area.

The projected demands for the Project are 130 AFY, but will be offset by the removal of the existing connections with a demand of 60 AFY; therefore, the net additional Project demand is approximately 70 AFY. The RUWMP assumed that the District’s total industrial demands would increase from 709 AFY in 2015 to 2,231 AFY in 2040, a total increase of 1,522 AFY. The net additional demands of the Project are less than the assumed increase in industrial demands in the RUWMP; therefore, the demands of the Project were included in the RUWMP. Information from the 2015 RUWMP was used for this WSA and is described in detail in the following sections.

**System Description**

*Water Code section 10631 (Urban Water Management Plan Requirements)*

(a) Describe the service area of the supplier, including current and projected population, climate, and other demographic factors affecting the supplier’s water management planning. The projected population estimates shall be based upon data from the state, regional, or local service agency population projections within the service area of the urban water supplier and shall be in five-year increments to 20 years or as far as data is available.

A summary of the District’s service area and population are included in this section. Additional information related to the population estimates and other factors affecting the District’s water management planning are is published in the 2015 RUWMP.

The District is a County Water District, a public agency of the State of California, organized and existing under the County Water District Law (Division 12, Section 30,000 of the Water Code) of the State of California. Among other typical political subdivision powers, it has the power of taxation and eminent domain.

The District is located in southwestern San Bernardino County with a small part in northern Riverside County. The service area is shown in Figure 2. The District is adjacent to the western limits of the City of San Bernardino on the east; adjacent to and including the eastern part of the City of Fontana on the west; adjacent to the U.S. Forest Service boundary on the north; and the County of Riverside on the south. The District is divided into northern and southern sections by the central portion of the City of Rialto.

The current and estimated future populations within the District from the 2015 RUWMP are shown in Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population Served</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2030</th>
<th>2035</th>
<th>2040</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population Served</td>
<td>80,161</td>
<td>86,246</td>
<td>92,793</td>
<td>99,836</td>
<td>107,415</td>
<td>115,568</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 2. West Valley Water District Service Area
**Water Demands**

*California Water Code section 10631*

(e) (1) Quantify, to the extent records are available, past and current water use, over the same five-year increments described in subdivision (a), and projected water use, identifying the uses among water use sectors including, but not necessarily limited to, all of the following uses:

(A) Single-family residential.
(B) Multifamily.
(C) Commercial.
(D) Industrial.
(E) Institutional and governmental.
(F) Landscape.
(G) Sales to other agencies.
(H) Saline water intrusion barriers, groundwater recharge, or conjunctive use, or any combination thereof.
(I) Agricultural.

(2) The water use projections shall be in the same five-year increments described in subdivision (a).

The Water Conservation Bill of 2009 (SBX7-7) is one of four policy bills enacted as part of the November 2009 Comprehensive Water Package. The Water Conservation Bill of 2009 provides the regulatory framework to support the statewide reduction in urban per capita water use described in the 20 by 2020 Water Conservation Plan. Consistent with SBX7-7, the District has determined and reported its existing baseline water consumption and established future water use targets in gallons per day per capita, as described in the 2015 RUWMP. To meet these targets the District has formulated a conservation program to meet these goals, as described in the 2015 RUWMP.

**Water Uses by Sector**

The District categorizes customers as single family residential, multi-family residential, landscape irrigation, agricultural irrigation, commercial, industrial, institutional, fire service, and hydrant uses. Water deliveries for each customer class for the years 2011 through 2015 are summarized in Table 3.
### Table 3. Past Demands for Raw and Potable Water – Actual (AF)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use Type</th>
<th>Additional Description</th>
<th>Level of Treatment When Delivered</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Family</td>
<td>Drinking Water</td>
<td>12,017</td>
<td>12,789</td>
<td>12,400</td>
<td>11,958</td>
<td>9,786</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family</td>
<td>Drinking Water</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>597</td>
<td>566</td>
<td>553</td>
<td>504</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>Drinking Water</td>
<td>1,450</td>
<td>1,625</td>
<td>1,690</td>
<td>1,654</td>
<td>1,453</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>Drinking Water</td>
<td>1,020</td>
<td>1,232</td>
<td>1,160</td>
<td>1,157</td>
<td>825</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>Drinking Water</td>
<td>886</td>
<td>876</td>
<td>762</td>
<td>770</td>
<td>709</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural irrigation</td>
<td>Drinking Water</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>105</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape Irrigation</td>
<td>Drinking Water</td>
<td>1,355</td>
<td>1,674</td>
<td>1,687</td>
<td>1,799</td>
<td>1,319</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf Course</td>
<td>Drinking Water</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Service</td>
<td>Drinking Water</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydrant</td>
<td>Drinking Water</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>273</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales/Transfers/Exchanges to other agencies</td>
<td>SB County Connection / Glen Helen</td>
<td>Drinking Water</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonrevenue</td>
<td>Drinking Water</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td>2,157</td>
<td>2,074</td>
<td>2,131</td>
<td>2,064</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>19,966</td>
<td>21,246</td>
<td>20,710</td>
<td>20,472</td>
<td>17,131</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Projected future water use was estimated using two factors: the expected growth in service area population, and the expected change in per-capita consumption. For planning purposes, the District estimated that beginning in 2020, its per-capita consumption would be approximately 10 percent higher than the observed 2015 value. While the District will continue to encourage conservation, this assumption reflects the possible change in behaviors that may occur after the current drought ends and mandatory drought restrictions are phased out. The estimated future demands are shown in Table 4 and Table 5. The District does not anticipate any routine or single large water sales to any agencies in the future. The District does not anticipate future water use related to saline barriers, groundwater recharge operations, or recycled water. For the purpose of projections, based on data from the past five years, nonrevenue water is assumed to be 10 percent of total sales. The District will continue efforts to decrease water loss and thereby reduce gallons per capita per day of water use.
Table 4. Demands for Raw and Potable Water – Projected (AF)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use Type</th>
<th>Additional Description</th>
<th>Level of Treatment</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2030</th>
<th>2035</th>
<th>2040</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Family</td>
<td>Drinking Water</td>
<td></td>
<td>11,654</td>
<td>12,538</td>
<td>13,490</td>
<td>14,514</td>
<td>15,616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family</td>
<td>Drinking Water</td>
<td></td>
<td>600</td>
<td>646</td>
<td>695</td>
<td>747</td>
<td>804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>Drinking Water</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,730</td>
<td>1,861</td>
<td>2,002</td>
<td>2,154</td>
<td>2,318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>Drinking Water</td>
<td></td>
<td>982</td>
<td>1,057</td>
<td>1,137</td>
<td>1,223</td>
<td>1,316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>Drinking Water</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,944</td>
<td>2,008</td>
<td>2,077</td>
<td>2,151</td>
<td>2,231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Irrigation</td>
<td>Drinking Water</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape Irrigation</td>
<td>Drinking Water</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,571</td>
<td>1,691</td>
<td>1,819</td>
<td>1,957</td>
<td>2,105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf Course</td>
<td>Drinking Water</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Service</td>
<td>Drinking Water</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydrant</td>
<td>Drinking Water</td>
<td></td>
<td>325</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales/Exchanges to agencies</td>
<td>SB County Connection / Glen Helen</td>
<td>Drinking Water</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonrevenue</td>
<td>Drinking Water</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,891</td>
<td>2,023</td>
<td>2,164</td>
<td>2,317</td>
<td>2,483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>20,799</td>
<td>22,256</td>
<td>23,802</td>
<td>25,492</td>
<td>27,312</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. Total Water Demands (AF)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demand</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2030</th>
<th>2035</th>
<th>2040</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Potable and Raw Water</td>
<td>17,131</td>
<td>20,799</td>
<td>22,256</td>
<td>23,802</td>
<td>25,492</td>
<td>27,312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recycled Water Demand</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Water Demand</td>
<td>17,131</td>
<td>20,799</td>
<td>22,256</td>
<td>23,802</td>
<td>25,492</td>
<td>27,312</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Water Supplies

**California Water Code section 10910**

(d)(1) The assessment required by this section shall include an identification of any existing water supply entitlements, water rights, or water service contracts relevant to the identified water supply for the proposed project, and a description of the quantities of water received in prior years by the public water system, or the city or county if either is required to comply with this part pursuant to subdivision (b), under the existing water supply entitlements, water rights, or water service contracts.

(2) An identification of existing water supply entitlements, water rights, or water service contracts held by the public water system, or the city or county if either is required to comply with this part pursuant to subdivision (b), shall be demonstrated by providing information related to all of the following:

(A) Written contracts or other proof of entitlement to an identified water supply.

(B) Copies of a capital outlay program for financing the delivery of a water supply that has been adopted by the public water system.

(C) Federal, state, and local permits for construction of necessary infrastructure associated with delivering the water supply.

(D) Any necessary regulatory approvals that are required in order to be able to convey or deliver the water supply.
**District Overview**
The District utilizes three primary sources for drinking water supply: local surface water from flows on the east side of the San Gabriel Mountains, including North Fork Lytle Creek, Middle Fork Lytle Creek, and South Fork Lytle Creek; groundwater; and imported water from the State Water Project (SWP). The District distribution system is divided into eight pressure zones; it currently has 25 existing reservoirs with a total storage capacity of approximately 72.61 million gallons. The District also operates a 14.4-MGD water filtration facility. These supplies are discussed further below. The contracts and entitlements for District water supplies are summarized in Table 8 and are enclosed in Appendix A through Appendix E.

**Surface Water**
The District has the right to divert and export 2,290 gpm out of the Lytle Creek Region when it is available as described in the Lytle Creek Judgment in Appendix A. The District can also purchase an additional 1,350 gpm of Lytle Creek flows through an agreement with the City of San Bernardino (San Bernardino is not able to utilize their surface water flows), which is treated at the Oliver P. Roemer WFF (see Appendix A). The District also utilizes Lytle Creek surface water flows for groundwater recharge in the Lytle Creek Basin.

The District is participating in regional planning efforts to capture additional stormwater for purposes of groundwater recharge.

**State Water Project**
The District receives SWP water from the San Bernardino Valley Municipal Water District (Valley District) through the Lytle Turnout off the San Gabriel Feeder Pipeline. Newly constructed metering and transmission facilities will enable the District to purchase and treat up to 20 MGD (approximately 23,000 AFY) at final treatment plant expansion. SWP water is treated at the District’s Oliver P. Roemer Water Filtration Facility (WFF) and used for potable supply, or can be used to supply non-potable customers, or for groundwater recharge in the Lytle Creek Basin. In 2006 the WFF was expanded to increase production capacity to 14.4 MGD. Ultimately this plant will have a capacity of 20.4 MGD. The District has been utilizing SWP water through the Lytle Turnout since 1999.

**Groundwater Supplies**

*California Water Code section 10910*

(f) If a water supply for a proposed project includes groundwater, the following additional information shall be included in the water assessment:

1. A review of any information contained in the urban water management plan relevant to the identified water supply for the proposed project.

2. A description of any groundwater basin or basins from which the proposed project will be supplied. For those basins for which a court or the board has adjudicated the rights to pump groundwater, a copy of the order or decree adopted by the court or the board and a description of the amount of groundwater the public water system, or the city or county if either is required to comply with this part pursuant to subdivision (b), has the legal right to pump under the order or decree. For basins that have not been adjudicated, information as to whether the department has identified the basin or basins as overdrafted or has projected that the basin will become overdrafted if present.
management conditions continue, in the most current bulletin of the department that characterizes the condition of the groundwater basin, and a detailed description by the public water system, or the city or county if either is required to comply with this part pursuant to subdivision (b), of the efforts being undertaken in the basin or basins to eliminate the long-term overdraft condition.

(3) A detailed description and analysis of the amount and location of groundwater pumped by the public water system, or the city or county if either is required to comply with this part pursuant to subdivision (b), for the past five years from any groundwater basin from which the proposed project will be supplied. The description and analysis shall be based on information that is reasonably available, including, but not limited to, historic use records.

(4) A detailed description and analysis of the amount and location of groundwater that is projected to be pumped by the public water system, or the city or county if either is required to comply with this part pursuant to subdivision (b), from any basin from which the proposed project will be supplied. The description and analysis shall be based on information that is reasonably available, including, but not limited to, historic use records.

(5) An analysis of the sufficiency of the groundwater from the basin or basins from which the proposed project will be supplied to meet the projected water demand associated with the proposed project. A water assessment shall not be required to include the information required by this paragraph if the public water system determines, as part of the review required by paragraph (1), that the sufficiency of groundwater necessary to meet the initial and projected water demand associated with the project was addressed in the description and analysis required by paragraph (4) of subdivision (b) of Section 10631.

The District draws approximately 65 percent of its water supply from its wells. The District’s normal operating practice is to pump its wells 16 hours a day during off peak hours to take advantage of Southern California Edison’s time of use rate. If, for some reason, wells are not in service (maintenance or repair), the District has the ability and right to pump its wells up to 24 hours per day. The District has approximately 36 MGD production capability from all of its wells in operation 24 hours per day.

The District extracts groundwater from five regional groundwater basins: Bunker Hill and Lytle Creek (which are both part of the San Bernardino Basin Area), Rialto-Colton, Riverside North, and Chino Basins. All five basins have been adjudicated and are managed, as discussed further in the following sections specific to each basin.

The District, in a joint venture with the City of Rialto and Valley District, constructed 25,000 feet of 48-inch transmission line known as the Baseline Feeder, which is described in the Baseline Feeder Agreement in Appendix E. Through an agreement with Valley District, the District is to receive 5,000 AFY of supply through this transmission line. The District has received water through the Baseline Feeder since 1998. Because this water is not produced by the District, it is not included in Table 6.
The District's historical production for the past five years is shown in Table 6.

Table 6. Groundwater Volume Pumped (AF)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groundwater Type</th>
<th>Location or Basin Name</th>
<th>Water Quality</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alluvial Basin</td>
<td>Lytle Creek</td>
<td>Drinking Water</td>
<td>2,983</td>
<td>4,002</td>
<td>3,776</td>
<td>3,262</td>
<td>2,159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alluvial Basin</td>
<td>Riverside North</td>
<td>Drinking Water</td>
<td>3,144</td>
<td>3,932</td>
<td>3,389</td>
<td>2,992</td>
<td>2,065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alluvial Basin</td>
<td>Rialto-Colton</td>
<td>Drinking Water</td>
<td>4,883</td>
<td>4,093</td>
<td>4,005</td>
<td>3,916</td>
<td>2,505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alluvial Basin</td>
<td>Bunker Hill</td>
<td>Drinking Water</td>
<td>1,335</td>
<td>1,682</td>
<td>1,885</td>
<td>1,478</td>
<td>1,520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alluvial Basin</td>
<td>Chino</td>
<td>Drinking Water</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12,345</td>
<td>13,709</td>
<td>13,055</td>
<td>11,648</td>
<td>8,249</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The San Bernardino Basin Area

The San Bernardino Basin Area (SBBA) was defined by, and adjudicated in gross, by the Western-San Bernardino Judgment (Western Judgment) in 1969 (see Appendix B). The SBBA has a surface area of approximately 141 square miles and lies between the San Andreas and San Jacinto faults. The basin is bordered on the northwest by the San Gabriel Mountains and Cucamonga fault zone; on the northeast by the San Bernardino Mountains and San Andreas fault zone; on the east by the Banning fault and Crafton Hills; and on the south by a low, east-facing escarpment of the San Jacinto fault and the San Timoteo Badlands. Alluvial fans extend from the base of the mountains and hills that surround the valley and coalesce to form a broad, sloping alluvial plain in the central part of the valley. The SBBA encompasses the Bunker Hill sub basin (DWR Number 8.02-06) defined by DWR and also includes a small portion of the Yucaipa Basin (8-02.07) and Rialto-Colton Basin (8-02.04) as defined by DWR. The SBBA also encompasses surface water.

The Western Judgment established the natural safe yield of the SBBA to be a total of 232,100 AF per year (AFY) for both surface water diversions and groundwater extractions (the Western Judgment is provided in Appendix B). Surface water is diverted from Mill Creek, Lytle Creek, and the SAR. The average surface water diversions in the SBBA for direct use from 1968 to 2000 were 39,000 AFY.

The Western Judgment allocates 64,862 AFY of the safe yield, which equates to 27.95 percent, to the Plaintiffs. The Plaintiffs include the City of Riverside (the successor to the Riverside Water Company and the Gage Canal Company), Riverside Highland Water Company, Meeks & Daley Water Company, and Regents of the University of California. The Riverside County agencies may not exceed their allocation unless they participate in “New Conservation” (explained below).

The Non-Plaintiffs’ (agencies within San Bernardino County, including the District) rights were defined in the Judgment as 167,238 AFY, which equates to 72.05 percent of the safe yield. San Bernardino agencies are allowed to extract more than 167,238 AFY from the SBBA, as long as they import and recharge a like amount of water into the SBBA. The Western-San Bernardino Watermaster provides an annual accounting of both the plaintiff and non-plaintiff extractions and a comparison to the safe yield. The Watermaster bases the Valley District replenishment water requirement on the cumulative...
accounting of non-plaintiff extractions. If the cumulative extractions are less than the cumulative safe yield, there is a groundwater “credit” in the basin. In years when cumulative extractions are greater than their allocation, a “debit” is given. Recharge is also required to offset the export of water outside the SBBA in excess of the amount recorded during the base period (1959-1963). Credits are earned for any new supplies such as stormwater capture. As of the accounting performed for the 2015 Annual Western-San Bernardino Watermaster Report, the Non-Plaintiffs have 104,994 AF of net credit accumulated in the SBBA and are, therefore, not required to recharge. Although there is no recharge requirement under the Judgment, the Non-Plaintiffs have continued to recharge the SBBA.

**Lytle Creek Sub basin**

Lytle Creek Basin is part of the SBBA, and it is not identified as a separate sub-basin in DWR Bulletin 118-2003; however, the sub basin is an integral part of the Upper Santa Ana Valley Groundwater Basin and a major recharge area for both the Bunker Hill and Rialto-Colton sub basins. Historically, local agencies have recognized Lytle Creek sub basin as a distinct groundwater sub basin. In the Western Judgment, the Bunker Hill and Lytle Creek sub basins are combined into the SBBA. However, the three separate water-bearing zones and intervening confining zones of the Bunker Hill sub basin are not observed in the Lytle sub basin. Sediments within the Lytle sub basin are, for the most part, highly permeable, and the aquifer has a high specific yield. High permeability and specific yield tend to result in an aquifer that responds rapidly to changes in inflow (precipitation and streamflow) and outflow (groundwater pumping, streamflow, and subsurface outflow).

Lytle Creek sub basin is adjoined on the west by the Rialto-Colton sub basin along the Lytle Creek fault, and on the east and southeast by the Bunker Hill sub basin along the Loma Linda fault and Barrier G. The northwestern border of the sub basin is delineated by the San Gabriel Mountains, and runoff from the mountains flows south/southeast through Lytle and Cajon Creeks into the basin.

Numerous groundwater barriers are present within Lytle Creek sub basin, resulting in six compartments within the sub basin. Barriers A through D divide the northwestern portion of the sub basin into five sub-areas and the southeastern portion of the sub basin comprises the sixth sub-area. Barrier F divides the northwestern sub-areas from the southeastern sub-area. Studies have shown that the groundwater barriers are less permeable with depth. When groundwater levels are high during wet years, more leakage occurs across the barriers than when groundwater levels are lower (i.e., during dry years). The amount of pumping in each sub-area, in large part, controls the movement of groundwater across the barrier within the older alluvium but not the younger alluvium.

It is important to note that the water rights in Lytle Creek are set forth in long-standing court judgments governing the rights of the parties in that basin. The Lytle Creek Basin was adjudicated under the 1924 Judgment No. 17,030 from the Superior Court of San Bernardino County (Lytle Creek Judgment) and is managed by the Lytle Creek Water Conservation Association, which is made up of the successors to the stipulated parties of the judgment (a copy of the Lytle Creek Judgment is provided in Appendix J of the 2015 RUWMP and in Appendix A of this WSA). Table 7 shows historical extractions from the SBBA for years 2010-2014.
Table 7. Historic Groundwater Extractions and Surface Water Diversions from SBBA (AFY)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entity</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-Plaintiffs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bear Valley Mutual Water Company (a)</td>
<td>17,524</td>
<td>16,862</td>
<td>15,560</td>
<td>15,259</td>
<td>17,102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Colton (a)</td>
<td>4,740</td>
<td>4,783</td>
<td>6,222</td>
<td>5,170</td>
<td>4,879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Valley Water District (a)</td>
<td>18,120</td>
<td>18,408</td>
<td>19,538</td>
<td>18,796</td>
<td>17,896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Loma Linda (a)</td>
<td>4,863</td>
<td>5,401</td>
<td>5,776</td>
<td>5,571</td>
<td>5,449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Redlands (a)</td>
<td>28,960</td>
<td>31,908</td>
<td>31,918</td>
<td>29,641</td>
<td>29,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Rialto (a)</td>
<td>5,325</td>
<td>3,377</td>
<td>3,109</td>
<td>4,082</td>
<td>4,132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Bernardino Valley MWD (a)</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>3,790</td>
<td>7,485</td>
<td>8,178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Bernardino (a)</td>
<td>49,185</td>
<td>50,331</td>
<td>50,250</td>
<td>46,853</td>
<td>44,798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Valley Water District (a)</td>
<td>7,986</td>
<td>7,697</td>
<td>8,637</td>
<td>7,723</td>
<td>6,397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yucaipa Valley Water District (a)</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Agencies in San Bernardino and Private Entities (b)</td>
<td>16,474</td>
<td>19,288</td>
<td>23,053</td>
<td>17,597</td>
<td>15,062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal for Non-Plaintiffs</strong></td>
<td>153,634</td>
<td>158,770</td>
<td>167,973</td>
<td>158,397</td>
<td>153,147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plaintiffs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside Highland Water Company (c)</td>
<td>1,136</td>
<td>1,655</td>
<td>2,135</td>
<td>2,873</td>
<td>2,077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agencies in Riverside County (d)</td>
<td>52,987</td>
<td>54,151</td>
<td>60,159</td>
<td>60,885</td>
<td>57,072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal for Plaintiffs</strong></td>
<td>54,123</td>
<td>55,806</td>
<td>62,294</td>
<td>63,758</td>
<td>59,149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>207,757</td>
<td>214,576</td>
<td>230,267</td>
<td>222,155</td>
<td>212,296</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:

(a) Data from Volume 1 of the Western-San Bernardino Watermaster Annual Report for 2015.


(c) Riverside-Highland Water Company’s service area extends into both San Bernardino and Riverside counties. However, Riverside-Highland Water Company is a Plaintiff within the Western Judgment and therefore extractions for Riverside-Highland are typically included with those of Riverside County entities. Data from Table No. 11, Western-San Bernardino Watermaster Annual Report for 2015.

(d) Includes Agua Mansa Water Company and Meeks & Daley Water Company, Regents of the University of California, and the City of Riverside. Data from Table Nos. 10, 12, and 13 of the Western-San Bernardino Annual Report for 2015.
Rialto-Colton Basin
The Rialto-Colton subbasin underlies a portion of the upper Santa Ana Valley in southwestern San Bernardino County and northwestern Riverside County. This subbasin is about 10 miles long and varies in width from about 3.5 miles in the northwestern part to about 1.5 miles in the southeastern part. This subbasin is bounded by the San Gabriel Mountains on the northwest, the San Jacinto fault on the northeast, the Badlands on the southeast, and the Rialto-Colton fault on the southwest.

The District and its predecessors have been utilizing the Rialto Basin for water supply for more than 80 years. The Rialto Basin was adjudicated under the 1961 Decree No. 81,264 from the Superior Court of San Bernardino County (Rialto Basin Decree) (see Appendix C). Groundwater storage capacity of the basin is about 210,000 af (DPW 1934), with an estimated 120,000 af for the Rialto portion of the subbasin and about 93,000 af for the Colton portion. The basin shows quick rises of water levels during high precipitation years and slower decline over several years.

Under normal conditions, when the basin is not in adjudication, the District has unlimited extraction rights. During drought conditions when the adjudication is in effect, the District’s extraction right ranges from 3,067 afy in the most severe drought periods to a maximum of 6,134 afy. Existing wells in the Rialto Basin have the capacity to extract up to 10,000 afy during normal conditions.

North Riverside Basin
The North Riverside Basin (the portion of the Riverside Basin Area in San Bernardino County) is part of the 1969 Judgment No. 117,628 (Western Judgment- see Appendix B), under the Bunker Hill Basin. The Riverside Groundwater Basin is a large alluvial fill basin that is bounded by major faults and topographic barriers. Recharge to the basin occurs by the underflow from basins to the north, contributions from the Santa Ana River, and from percolation of surface water runoff from the surrounding uplands, in particular the Box Spring Mountains to the east. The District, which has no limits or restrictions on groundwater pumping in the basin, has been utilizing the North Riverside Basin for water supply for more than 60 years.

Extractions from the North Riverside Basin for use in Riverside County are limited to 21,085 AFY by the Judgment. Extractions for use in San Bernardino County are unlimited, provided that water levels at three index wells in the Rialto-Colton and Riverside North Basins stay above 822.04 feet MSL. The 2015 Integrated Regional Water Management Plan provided an estimate of 30,100 AFY as the sustainable supply from North Riverside for use in San Bernardino County, based on extractions from 1996 to 2005.

Chino Basin
Fontana Water Company, the City of Rialto, and the District extract water from Chino Sub basin, an adjudicated basin managed by the Chino Basin Watermaster. The Chino Sub basin lies in the southwest corner of San Bernardino County. The Chino Sub basin is bordered to the east by the Rialto-Colton fault. In the other three directions, the Chino Sub basin is ringed by impermeable mountain rock, the San Gabriel Mountains to the north, the Jurupa Mountains and Puente Hills to the south and southwest. Average annual precipitation across the basin is 17 inches. This part of the San Bernardino Valley is drained by San Antonio Creek and Cucamonga Creek southerly to the Santa Ana River.
On January 2, 1975, several Chino Basin producers filed suit in California State Superior Court for San Bernardino County (the "Court") to settle the problem of allocating water rights in the Chino Basin. On January 27, 1978, the Court entered a judgment in Chino Basin Municipal Water District v. City of Chino et al. (Chino Basin Watermaster Judgment) adjudicating water rights in the Chino Basin and establishing the Chino Basin Watermaster (see Appendix D). The Judgment adjudicated all groundwater rights in Chino Basin and contains a physical solution to meet the requirements of water users having rights in or dependent upon the Chino Basin. The Judgment also appointed the Watermaster to account for and implement the management of the Chino Basin. The Judgment declared that the initial operating safe yield of the Chino Basin is 145,000 AFY. The Basin is managed through implementation of the Chino Optimum Basin Management Plan. Per the Judgment, the District has a minimum of approximately 1,000 AFY of extraction rights. Extractions above that amount must be replenished with SWP water through a program with the Chino Basin Watermaster.

**Recycled Water**

The District does not currently have or use recycled water as a supply. The District is completing a master plan for potential use of recycled water within its service area. The District’s plans for recycled water are still preliminary, and the expected beneficial use has not been quantified.

**Desalinated Water**

The District does not currently use desalinated water as a supply and has no current plans to develop new desalinated water supplies.

**Exchanges or Transfers**

The District currently has interconnections with the Cities of Rialto, Colton and San Bernardino, the Fontana Water Company, Marygold Mutual Water Company, and Valley District which can be utilized as needed for short-term supply needs. These connections are not typically used for extended periods and are not relied on as a source of supply.

**Future Water Supply and Projects**

To meet the future demands within the system, the District plans to rehabilitate existing wells, to drill new wells, and equip wells with wellhead treatment if required. These wells are planned for various groundwater basins and pressure zones within the distribution system.

Groundwater is not the only planned supply source to be utilized by the District to meet the anticipated future demands. The District has expanded the Oliver P. Roemer Water Filtration Facility to allow additional treatment of SWP water when available. A future expansion of the plant will increase the ultimate capacity of the facility to 20.4 MGD.

Over time, the District intends to utilize a greater amount from each existing source, up to their legal rights and availability from each water supply source.
Summary of Existing and Planned Sources of Water
The District’s actual supplies used during 2015 are summarized in Table 8.

Table 8. Water Supplies - Actual

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Water Supply</th>
<th>Additional Detail on Water Supply</th>
<th>Entitlement, Right or Contract</th>
<th>2015 Actual Volume (AF)</th>
<th>2015 Water Quality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Surface Water</td>
<td>Lytle Creek</td>
<td>Lytle Creek Judgment &amp; Water Purchase Agreement- Appendix A</td>
<td>2,271</td>
<td>Drinking Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchased or Imported Water</td>
<td>SWP Water</td>
<td>No limit or contract; obtained from SBVMWD</td>
<td>2,244</td>
<td>Drinking Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groundwater</td>
<td>Lytle Creek</td>
<td>Lytle Creek Judgment &amp; Water Purchase Agreement- Appendix A</td>
<td>2,159</td>
<td>Drinking Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groundwater</td>
<td>Riverside North</td>
<td>Western Judgment- Appendix B</td>
<td>2,065</td>
<td>Drinking Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groundwater</td>
<td>Rialto-Colton</td>
<td>Rialto Basin Decree- Appendix C</td>
<td>2,505</td>
<td>Drinking Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groundwater</td>
<td>Bunker Hill</td>
<td>Western Judgment</td>
<td>1,520</td>
<td>Drinking Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groundwater</td>
<td>Chino</td>
<td>Chino Basin Watermaster Judgment- Appendix D</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Drinking Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchased or Imported Water</td>
<td>Baseline Feeder (Bunker Hill)</td>
<td>Baseline Feeder Agreement- Appendix E</td>
<td>4,367</td>
<td>Drinking Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17,131</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The District plans to utilize a greater amount from each of its supply sources, up to the legal rights and availability. The District’s available supplies for future years are summarized in Table 9.

Table 9. Water Supplies – Projected (AF)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Water Supply</th>
<th>Additional Detail on Water Supply</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2030</th>
<th>2035</th>
<th>2040</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Surface Water</td>
<td>Lytle Creek</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>5,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchased or Imported Water</td>
<td>SWP Water</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groundwater</td>
<td>Riverside North</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>4,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groundwater</td>
<td>Rialto-Colton</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groundwater</td>
<td>SBBA Groundwater (Bunker Hill / Lytle)</td>
<td>9,500</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>17,000</td>
<td>19,500</td>
<td>19,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groundwater</td>
<td>Chino</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchased or Imported Water</td>
<td>Baseline Feeder (Bunker Hill)</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>36,400</td>
<td>41,900</td>
<td>45,400</td>
<td>48,400</td>
<td>48,400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Supply Reliability

*California Water Code section 10631*

(c) Describe the reliability of the water supply and vulnerability to seasonal or climatic shortage, to the extent practicable, and provide data for each of the following:

1. An average water year.
2. A single dry water year.
3. Multiple dry water years.

Groundwater

Some of the District’s wells have been impacted by arsenic, perchlorate and volatile organic carbons (VOCs). The District has implemented wellhead treatment as needed and continues to monitor groundwater contamination and the movement of groundwater contaminant plumes. These past and ongoing groundwater treatment projects have demonstrated that treatment is an economically viable alternative for handling arsenic, perchlorate and VOCs. Based on current conditions, water quality is not anticipated to affect District supply reliability. However, water quality issues are constantly evolving. The District will take action to protect and treat supply when needed, but it is well recognized that water quality treatment can have significant costs.

Geologic hazards within Lytle Creek have the potential to disrupt the water supply system by restricting the flow and/or introducing large quantities of suspended solids to the runoff, thereby increasing turbidity levels. To deal with this water quality issue, the District added pre-treatment capability at the Oliver P. Roemer WFF to achieve both turbidity removal and total organic carbon reduction.

State Water Project

During times of State-wide drought conditions, the availability of SWP water may be reduced. These conditions are normally known in advance, providing the District with the opportunity to plan for the reduced supply. During a drought period, it is Valley District’s priority to meet obligations to maintain lake levels at Big Bear Lake and to make direct deliveries to the water treatment plants operated by Redlands, the District, EVWD, YVWD, and SBMWD.

Reliability by Type of Year

During normal and wet years, Valley District uses SWP water for groundwater recharge. Therefore, this water is available for production during dry years. Through its use of groundwater storage, Valley District does not anticipate a reduction in the availability of SWP water during single or multiple dry years.

Due to the size of the groundwater basins utilized by the District, a single dry year will not affect well production. The annual amount produced in past normal, single dry, or multiple dry water years from a basin does not give an accurate representation of potential basin production. Factors such as lower system demand, cost of pumping, inoperable wells, pumping duration, replenishment costs, water quality, cost of supply and the ability to treat water all affect annual basin production numbers.
The District has been able to utilize up to 5,500 AFY during normal times from Lytle Creek surface flows and projects a minimum of 2,130 AFY during extended drought conditions. The District and its predecessors have been utilizing Lytle Creek surface flows for water supply for more than 130 years.

Regional Supply Reliability
The District is committed to minimizing the need to import water from other regions. The District operates a number of conservation programs to implement various Demand Management Measures, helping to reduce the need for imported water.

Sufficiency Assessment

**California Water Code section 10910**

(c) (3) If the projected water demand associated with the proposed project was not accounted for in the most recently adopted urban water management plan, or the public water system has no urban water management plan, the water assessment for the project shall include a discussion with regard to whether the public water system’s total projected water supplies available during normal, single dry, and multiple dry water years during a 20-year projection will meet the projected water demand associated with the proposed project, in addition to the public water system’s existing and planned future uses, including agricultural and manufacturing uses.

(4) If the city or county is required to comply with this part pursuant to subdivision (b), the water assessment for the project shall include a discussion with regard to whether the total projected water supplies, determined to be available by the city or county for the project during normal, single dry, and multiple dry water years during a 20-year projection, will meet the projected water demand associated with the proposed project, in addition to existing and planned future uses, including agricultural and manufacturing uses.

There has been a historical trend associated with drier years and an increase in water use among agencies. Conservation efforts have proven to be effective in decreasing water use in dry years, such as the past three years (2013-2015).

The District has estimated that demands could increase 10 percent during a single dry year. During a multiple dry year period, it is expected that conservation messaging and restrictions would lead to consumption dropping back down to normal year levels in the second dry year, and falling a further 10 percent in the third dry year.

The following tables summarize the anticipated supplies and demands for the District.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 10. Normal Year Supply and Demand Comparison (AF)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply Totals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demand Totals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11. Single Dry Year Supply and Demand Comparison (AF)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Totals</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2030</th>
<th>2035</th>
<th>2040</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supply Totals</td>
<td>33,030</td>
<td>38,530</td>
<td>42,030</td>
<td>45,030</td>
<td>45,030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demand Totals</td>
<td>22,879</td>
<td>24,481</td>
<td>26,183</td>
<td>28,041</td>
<td>30,043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>10,151</td>
<td>14,049</td>
<td>15,847</td>
<td>16,989</td>
<td>14,987</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12. Multiple Dry Years Supply and Demand Comparison (AF)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Totals</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2030</th>
<th>2035</th>
<th>2040</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Year</td>
<td>Supply Totals</td>
<td>33,030</td>
<td>38,530</td>
<td>42,030</td>
<td>45,030</td>
<td>45,030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Demand Totals</td>
<td>22,879</td>
<td>24,481</td>
<td>26,183</td>
<td>28,041</td>
<td>30,043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>10,151</td>
<td>14,049</td>
<td>15,847</td>
<td>16,989</td>
<td>14,987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Year</td>
<td>Supply Totals</td>
<td>33,030</td>
<td>38,530</td>
<td>42,030</td>
<td>45,030</td>
<td>45,030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Demand Totals</td>
<td>20,799</td>
<td>22,256</td>
<td>23,802</td>
<td>25,492</td>
<td>27,312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>12,231</td>
<td>16,274</td>
<td>18,228</td>
<td>19,538</td>
<td>17,718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Year</td>
<td>Supply Totals</td>
<td>33,030</td>
<td>38,530</td>
<td>42,030</td>
<td>45,030</td>
<td>45,030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Demand Totals</td>
<td>18,719</td>
<td>20,030</td>
<td>21,422</td>
<td>22,943</td>
<td>24,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>14,311</td>
<td>18,500</td>
<td>20,608</td>
<td>22,087</td>
<td>20,450</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Water Shortage Contingency Plan
Per California Water Code section 10632, the District has an adopted Water Shortage Contingency Plan that is included in the 2015 RUWMP.

Determination
California Water Code section 10911
(c) The city or county may include in any environmental document an evaluation of any information included in that environmental document provided pursuant to subdivision (b). The city or county shall determine, based on the entire record, whether projected water supplies will be sufficient to satisfy the demands of the project, in addition to existing and planned future uses. If the city or county determines that water supplies will not be sufficient, the city or county shall include that determination in its findings for the project.

The District has verified that it has the water supplies available during normal, single-dry, and multiple-dry years within a 20-year projection that will meet the projected demand associated with the proposed Project, in addition to existing and planned future uses.

Reservation of Authority
Nothing in this WSA shall be construed to create a right or entitlement to water service, or any specific level of service nor does it affect existing law concerning the District’s obligation to provide water service to its existing customers or to any potential future customers. (See Government Code § 66473.7(m) and (n).)
In addition, the District specifically reserves its authority to impose reasonable terms and conditions or to refuse water service to any existing customers or to any potential future customers, in order to conserve water in the face of an existing or threatened water shortage. (See Water Code § 350, et. seq.)

Conditions of Approval
This assessment of reliable water supply is conditioned on the following:

1. The property owner will install water efficient devices and landscaping according to the requirements of the District’s water use efficiency ordinance(s), if any, at the time of construction of the project to reduce the impact of this project on District water supplies.

2. Prior to project construction, the property owner is required to meet with District staff to develop a plan of service. The plan of service will include, but not be limited to, water and recycled water requirements to serve the project. If there is a change in the circumstances detailed in this water supply assessment, the District has the option to suspend the approval of this WSA.

3. This project is not located near any existing recycled water facilities; however, in the future it may be possible to serve this project with recycled water. District policy recognizes recycled water as a preferred source of water supply for all non-potable water demands, including, without limitation, irrigation of recreation areas, green-belts, open space, common areas, commercial landscaping and supply for aesthetic impoundment or other water features. The majority of landscaped areas in this project will be designed to use recycled water to the greatest extent possible.

According to District requirements, the project may be conditioned to construct a recycled water system physically separated from the potable water system. This system will need to be constructed to the District’s recycled water standards. The project may also be conditioned to construct off-site recycled water facilities within the limits of the project area on Maple Ave, Santa Ana Ave, Locust Ave and/or Jurupa Ave. The District will make a determination on requirements for recycled water use and type of facilities needed during the design phase of the project.

4. This WSA will be reviewed every three (3) years until the project begins construction. The property owner shall notify the District when construction has begun. The review will ensure that the information included in this WSA remains accurate and no significant changes to the project or District’s water supply have occurred. If the property owner has not contacted the District within three (3) years of approval of this WSA, it will be assumed that the proposed project no longer requires the estimated water demand calculated, the demand for this project will not be considered in assessments for future projects, and the assessment provided by this document will become invalid.

5. (a) Based on present information the District has determined that it will be able to provide adequate water supplies to meet the potable water demand for this project in addition to existing and future uses. Water service will be guaranteed by the satisfaction of all rules and regulations of
the District. The District reserves the right to revisit this water supply assessment in the event of a potential increase in water demand to the project.

(b) This WSA is not a commitment to serve the project, but a review of District’s supplies based on present information available.

(c) Recycled water will be used to the greatest extent possible on the proposed project.
References

Appendix A. Lytle Creek Judgment & Surface Water Purchase Agreement
Appendix B. Western Judgment
Appendix C. Rialto Basin Decree
Appendix D. Chino Basin Watermaster Judgment
Appendix E. Baseline Feeder Agreement
West Valley Water District  
Robert Tafoya, General Counsel  
Robert Christman, General Manager  
855 W. Baseline Rd.  
Rialto, CA 92376

July 05, 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4/18/2018</td>
<td>Invoice #10113</td>
<td>52,602.50</td>
<td>52,602.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ending Balance</td>
<td></td>
<td>52,602.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amount Due</td>
<td></td>
<td>52,602.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current</th>
<th>30 Days</th>
<th>60 Days</th>
<th>90 Days</th>
<th>120+ Days</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>52,602.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For Professional Services Rendered Through 05/31/2018

ATTN ROBERT CHRISTMAN
WEST VALLEY WATER DISTRICT
855 W BASELINE
PO BOX 920
RIALTO CA 92377

Page: 1
May 31, 2018
Account No: 23767M

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Previous Balance</th>
<th>Fees</th>
<th>Costs</th>
<th>Payments</th>
<th>Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23767-0000</td>
<td>9,235.00</td>
<td>7,025.00</td>
<td>-9,235.00</td>
<td>7,025.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

General Labor & Employment

PLEASE INCLUDE YOUR ACCOUNT NO. ON YOUR PAYMENT
PAYMENTS INCLUDED THROUGH 06/14/2018
BACKGROUND:

West Valley Water District (the “district”) has various bank accounts. Funds must be accessible to perform the daily operations of the organization. Checks must be issued and business transacted to meet financial obligations. Certain individuals must be delegated proper authority to act on behalf of the district with regard to these financial transactions.

DISCUSSION:

Banks require a signature card for bank signers. The district has several bank accounts that require an authorized representative to act on behalf of the district so that operational needs are met. Bank accounts owned by the district requiring signature authorization include:

JP Morgan Chase - General Government Checking
JP Morgan Chase - UTC Routine Checking
JP Morgan Chase - UTC Non-Routine Checking
CalTrust Pooled Investment Fund - Short Term
CalTrust Pooled Investment Fund - Medium Term
Bank of Hope
LAIF – Local Agency Investment Fund

The attached resolutions require approval to amend bank account access.

FISCAL IMPACT:

No fiscal impact

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Addition of Interim General Manager, Clarence Mansell, Jr. to all Chase accounts.
Addition of Interim General Manager, Clarence Mansell, Jr. to CalTrust Fund accounts.
Addition of Interim General Manager, Clarence Mansell, Jr. to Bank of Hope account.
Addition of Interim General Manager, Clarence Mansell, Jr. to LAIF account.
Removal of former Interim General Manager, Robert Christman from all district accounts.

Respectfully Submitted,

Clarence Mansell Jr., Interim General Manager

ATTACHMENT(S):
1. AMENDED RESOLUTION NO 2018-16 (00000007)
2. AMENDED RESOLUTION NO 2018-17
3. AMENDED RESOLUTION NO 2018-18 (00000002)
4. AMENDED RESOLUTION NO 2018-19 (00000002)
AMENDED RESOLUTION NO. 2018-16
A RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF
THE WEST VALLEY WATER DISTRICT,
AUTHORIZING SIGNATURE CARD CHANGES- ALL J.P MORGAN CHASE BANKS

WHEREAS, the West Valley Water District ("District") Board of Directors hereby finds that the deposit and withdrawal of money in ALL J.P Morgan (Chase Bank Accounts) in accordance with Government Code section 16429.1 et. Seq. for the purpose of Authorizing signature card changes to the successors in office as provided therein is in the best interests of the District.

WHEREAS, amending Resolution No. 2018-9 to additional successors to the J.P Morgan (ALL Chase Bank Accounts) for the purpose of deposits and withdrawals of District monies in the J.P Morgan (Chase Bank Accounts) in accordance with Government Code section 16429.1 et. Seq.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board of Directors hereby authorizes signature card changes to ALL J.P Morgan (Chase Bank Accounts) for the purpose of deposits and withdrawals of District monies in the ALL J.P Morgan (Chase Bank Accounts) in accordance with Government Code section 16429.1 et. Seq. for the purpose of investment as provided therein.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, as follows: Section 1 the following District officers holding the title(s) Director Linda Gonzalez, Director Robert J. Bourland, General Manager Matthew H. Litchfield, P.E., Chief Financial Officer Marie Ricci and Interim General Manager Robert Christman be removed as signers to ALL J.P Morgan (Chase Bank Accounts) and their successors in office, President Dr. Clifford O. Young, Sr., Vice President Greg Young, Interim General Manager Clarence C. Mansell, Jr., Chief Financial Officer Naisha Davis, Assistant General Manger Ricardo Pacheco, and Assistant General Manager Greg Gage are each hereby authorized to order the deposit or withdrawal of monies in ALL J.P Morgan (Chase Bank Accounts) and may execute and deliver any and all documents necessary or advisable in order to effectuate the purpose of this resolution and the purposes of the resolution and the transaction contemplated hereby:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dr. Clifford O. Young Sr.</th>
<th>Greg Young</th>
<th>Clarence C. Mansell Jr.</th>
<th>Naisha Davis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>Vice President</td>
<td>Interim General Manager</td>
<td>Chief Financial Officer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ricardo Pacheco</th>
<th>Greg Gage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assistant General Manager</td>
<td>Assistant General Manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section 2. That said Resolution shall be effective July 13, 2018 and shall remain in full force and effect until rescinded by Board of Directors by resolution and a copy of the resolution rescinding and or amending this resolution shall be filed with the State Treasurer’s Office.
ADOPTED, SIGNED, AND APPROVED THIS 13th DAY OF JULY, 2018 BY THE FOLLOWING VOTE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AYES:</th>
<th>DIRECTORS:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOES:</td>
<td>DIRECTORS:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABSENT:</td>
<td>DIRECTORS:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABSTAIN:</td>
<td>DIRECTORS:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dr. Clifford O. Young, Sr., President of the Board of Directors of the West Valley Water District

ATTEST:

_____________________________
Dr. Clifford O. Young, Sr., President of the Board of Directors of the West Valley Water District

_____________________________
Crystal L. Escalera
Board Secretary
AMENDED RESOLUTION NO. 2018-17
A RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF
THE WEST VALLEY WATER DISTRICT,
AUTHORIZING SIGNATURE CARD CHANGES FOR CALTRUST FUND

WHEREAS, The CalTrust Fund is established in the State Treasury under Government Code section 16429.1 et. Seq. for the deposit of money of a local agency for purposes of investment by CalTrust; and for the purpose of Authorizing signature card changes to the successors in office as provided therein.

WHEREAS, the West Valley Water District (“District”) Board of Directors hereby amend Resolution No 2018-10 in order to add an additional successor for the purpose of deposits and withdrawals of money in the CalTrust Fund in accordance with Government Code section 16429.1 et. Seq. for the purpose of investment as provided therein.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board of Directors hereby authorizes the deposits and withdrawals of District monies in the CalTrust Fund in the State Treasury in accordance with Government Code section 16429.1 et. Seq. for the purpose of investment as provided therein.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, as follows: Section 1 the following District officers holding the title(s) Director Linda Gonzalez, Director Robert J. Bourland, General Manager Matthew H. Litchfield, P.E., Chief Financial Officer Marie Ricci and Interim General Manager Robert Christman be removed from the CalTrust and their successors in office President Dr. Clifford O. Young, Sr., Vice President Greg Young, recently appointed Interim General Manager Clarence C. Mansell, Jr. and Chief Financial Officer Naisha Davis are each hereby authorized to order the deposit or withdrawal of monies in CalTrust Fund and may execute and deliver any and all documents necessary or advisable in order to effectuate the purpose of this resolution and the purposes of the resolution and the transaction contemplated hereby:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clifford O. Young, Sr.</th>
<th>Greg Young</th>
<th>Clarence C. Mansell, Jr.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>Vice President</td>
<td>Interim General Manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Naisha Davis
Chief Financial Officer

Section 2. That said Resolution shall be effective July 13, 2018 and shall remain in full force and effect until rescinded by Board of Directors by resolution and a copy of the resolution rescinding and or amending this resolution shall be filed with the State Treasurer’s Office.
ADOPTED, SIGNED, AND APPROVED THIS 13TH DAY OF JULY, 2018 BY THE FOLLOWING VOTE:

AYES: DIRECTORS:
NOES: DIRECTORS:
ABSENT: DIRECTORS:
ABSTAIN: DIRECTORS:

_____________________________
Dr. Clifford O. Young, Sr., President of the Board of Directors of the West Valley Water District

ATTEST:

_____________________________
Crystal L. Escalera
Board Secretary
AMENDED RESOLUTION NO. 2018-18
A RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF
THE WEST VALLEY WATER DISTRICT,
AUTHORIZING SIGNATURE CARD CHANGES FOR BANK OF HOPE

WHEREAS, the West Valley Water District (“District”) Board of Directors hereby finds that the deposit and withdrawal of money in the Bank of Hope in accordance with Government Code section 16429.1 et. Seq. for the purpose of Authorizing signature card changes to the successors in office as provided therein is in the best interests of the District.

WHEREAS, amending Resolution No. 2018-11 to add an additional successor to the Bank of Hope for the purpose of deposits and withdrawals of monies in the Bank of Hope in accordance with Government Code section 16429.1 et. Seq. for the purpose of Authorizing signature card changes to the successors in office as provided therein.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board of Directors hereby authorizes signature card changes to the Bank of Hope for the purpose of deposits and withdrawals of District monies in the Bank of Hope in accordance with Government Code section 16429.1 et. Seq. for the purpose of investment as provided therein.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, as follows: Section 1 the following District officers holding the title(s) Interim General Manager Robert Christman, General Manager Matthew H. Litchfield, P.E. and Chief Financial Officer Marie Ricci be removed from the Bank of Hope Account and their successors in office President Dr. Clifford O. Young, Sr., Vice President Greg Young, Interim General Manager Clarence C. Mansell, Jr., and Chief Financial Officer Naisha Davis be added to the Bank of Hope Account. And each are hereby authorized to order the deposit or withdrawal of monies in Bank of Hope and may execute and deliver any and all documents necessary or advisable in order to effectuate the purpose of this resolution and the purposes of the resolution and the transaction contemplated hereby:

Clarence C. Mansell, Jr.  
Interim General Manager

Dr. Clifford O. Young, Sr.  
President

Gregory Young  
Vice President

Naisha Davis  
Chief Financial Officer

Section 2. That said Resolution shall be effective July 13, 2018 and shall remain in full force and effect until rescinded and or amended by Board of Directors by resolution and a copy of the resolution rescinding and or amending this resolution shall be filed with the State Treasurer’s Office.
ADOPTED, SIGNED, AND APPROVED THIS 13TH DAY OF JULY, 2018 BY THE FOLLOWING VOTE:

AYES: DIRECTORS:
NOES: DIRECTORS:
ABSENT: DIRECTORS:
ABSTAIN: DIRECTORS:

__________________________
Dr. Clifford O. Young, Sr., President of the Board of Directors of the West Valley Water District

ATTEST:

__________________________
Crystal L. Escalera
Board Secretary
AMENDED RESOLUTION NO. 2018-19
A RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE WEST VALLEY WATER DISTRICT, AUTHORIZING SIGNATURE CARD CHANGES FOR LOCAL AGENCY INVESTMENT FUND

WHEREAS, The Local Agency Investment Fund is established in the State Treasury under Government Code section 16429.1 et. Seq. for the deposit of money of a local agency for purposes of investment by the State Treasurer; and

WHEREAS, the West Valley Water District ("District") Board of Directors hereby finds that the deposit and withdrawal of money in the Local Agency Investment Fund in accordance with Government Code section 16429.1 et. Seq. for the purpose of investment as provided therein is in the best interests of the District.

WHEREAS, amending Resolution No. 2018-12 to add additional successors to all investments of monies in the local agency investment fund by authorizing the successors in office to such investments of monies in the local Agency Investment Fund by authorizing signature cards to their successors.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board of Directors hereby authorizes the deposit and withdrawal of District monies in the Local Agency Investment Fund in the State Treasury in accordance with Government Code section 16429.1 et. Seq. for the purpose of investment as provided therein.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, as follows: Section 1, The following District officers holding the title(s) Interim General Manager Robert Christman, General Manager Matthew H. Litchfield, P.E. and Chief Financial Officer Marie Ricci be removed from the Local Agency Investment Fund and add their successors in office President Dr. Clifford O. Young, Sr., Vice President Greg Young, Interim General Manager Clarence C. Mansell, Jr., Chief Financial Officer Naisha Davis and Accountant Tamara Washington are each hereby authorized to order the deposit or withdrawal of monies in Local Agency Investment Fund and may execute and deliver any and all documents necessary or advisable in order to effectuate the purpose of this resolution and the purposes of the resolution and the transaction contemplated hereby:

Dr. Clifford O. Young, Sr.  Greg Young  Clarence C. Mansell, Jr.
President, Board of Directors  Vice President  Interim General Manager

Naisha Davis  Tamara Washington
Chief Financial Officer  Accountant
Section 2. That said Resolution shall be effective July 13, 2018 and shall remain in full force and effect until rescinded by Board of Directors by resolution and a copy of the resolution rescinding and or amending this resolution shall be filed with the State Treasurer’s Office

ADOPTED, SIGNED, AND APPROVED THIS 13TH DAY OF JULY, 2018 BY THE FOLLOWING VOTE:

AYES: DIRECTORS:
NOES: DIRECTORS:
ABSENT: DIRECTORS:
ABSTAIN: DIRECTORS:

_________________________________________
Dr. Clifford O. Young, Sr., President of the Board of Directors of the West Valley Water District

ATTEST:

____________________________
Crystal L. Escalera
Board Secretary