

LL-11
Latham & Watkins LLP
on behalf of the Golden Door Properties, LLC
Dated: March 30, 2018

1. Introduction

The comment letter submitted by Latham & Watkins on behalf of the Golden Door Properties, LLC, dated March 30, 2018, is a late letter that does not require a written response from the County.

Under CEQA Guidelines Section 15105, the County was legally required to provide a 45-day public review period on the Draft EIR. In order to provide additional time, the County instead afforded 60 days for public review and comment. The public comment period for the Draft EIR began on June 15, 2017, and ended on August 14, 2017. All comment letters received after expiration of the public review and comment period ending on August 14, 2017, are considered late comments.

A lead agency is required to consider comments on the Draft EIR and to prepare written responses if a comment is received within the public comment period. (Pub. Resources Code, §21091(d); CEQA Guidelines, §15088.) When a comment letter is received after the close of the public comment period, however, a lead agency does not have an obligation to respond. (Pub. Resources Code, §21091(d)(1); Pub. Resources Code, §21092.5(c).) Accordingly, the County is not required to provide a written response to late comment letters, including the March 30, 2018, letter from Latham & Watkins. (See, CEQA Guidelines, §15088(a)).

Nonetheless, for information purposes, the County has elected to respond to this late letter, but without waiving its position that written responses to late comment letters are not required by law.

2. The letter's summary of the Court of Appeal's recent decision in *Golden Door Properties, LLC v. Vallecitos Water District* (March 26, 2018) is at odds with the record.

The comment letter refers to the Court of Appeal's recent decision in *Golden Door Properties, LLC v. Vallecitos Water District*, filed March 26, 2018, a copy of which is contained in the Newland Sierra Final EIR, **Appendix JJ-19**. The letter also summarizes the Court of Appeal decision, which summary is at odds with the record and outcome of that litigation. For that reason, the County provides the following summary of the litigation and the ultimate Court of Appeal decision rejecting Golden Door's appeal in favor of the County of San Diego (County), the Vallecitos Water District (District or VWD), and Newland Sierra, LLC (project applicant).

In that case, Golden Door brought a lawsuit against the District, the County, and the project applicant. The suit challenged two documents known as a Water Supply Assessment (WSA) and

Responses to Late Comment Letters

a Water Verification, in which the District concluded there is sufficient water supply for the project and other development in its service area. Before the County analyzed the District's combined WSA and Water Verification and incorporated them into its Newland Sierra project EIR, Golden Door filed suit, requesting the trial court to declare the documents invalid. In response, the District rescinded its Water Verification and reissued the WSA only. Golden Door then amended its complaint in the suit to challenge the rescinded Water Verification, and to assert similar challenges to the WSA. The District, the County, and the project applicant successfully dismissed the suit in the trial court, but Golden Door filed an appeal, contending the trial court erred on numerous grounds.

On March 26, 2018, the Fourth Appellate District, Division One (San Diego), issued its 30-page written opinion rejecting all of Golden Door's contentions (*Golden Door Properties, LLC v. Vallecitos Water District, et al.*, Case No. D072280). The Court of Appeal held that Golden Door's challenges to the WSA were barred because governing law precludes claims against a water supplier for an alleged inadequate WSA while the underlying development project is still undergoing environmental review under CEQA. The Court of Appeal relied on another court case (*California Water Impact Network* decision), which was decided 10 years ago, to reject all of Golden Door's contentions challenging the WSA. The Court made clear the prior *California Water Impact Network* decision was "very similar" to the facts presented on the Newland Sierra project.

Further, Golden Door's challenges to the rescinded Water Verification were summarily dismissed. The Court of Appeal specifically found "unhelpful" Golden Door's focus on the fact that water supply and demand issues are matters of strong public interest because the "specific question" before the Court concerned the adequacy of a Water Verification that the District had rescinded. The Court of Appeal made clear:

- (a) "There is no public interest in issuing an advisory opinion" on a Water Verification not yet issued.
- (b) "There is no public interest in permitting premature judicial intervention."

The Court of Appeal stated that Golden Door may challenge the WSA in the County's ongoing CEQA proceedings and in CEQA litigation. The Court also stated Golden Door may challenge any later-approved Water Verification provided it follows applicable statutory procedures.

The County also addressed the Golden Door litigation and related appeal in the Final EIR's responses to comments. Please refer to **Response to Comment O-1-279**. In summary, the County does not concur with Golden Door's characterization of the Golden Door litigation or the outcome. In the County's view, the comment letter selectively quotes from the Court of Appeal decision without acknowledging the Court affirmed the trial court's rulings and rejected Golden Door's

Responses to Late Comment Letters

arguments on appeal. Golden Door’s ability to appeal further to the California Supreme Court has lapsed. Thus, the Court of Appeal decision is final; in favor of the County, the District, and the project applicant; and against Golden Door.

3. Water Demand and Supply Determinations

Nonetheless, the County notes that the District and the San Diego County Water Authority have confirmed there is more than sufficient water for the County to grow and develop pursuant to the County Board of Supervisors’ direction (after the Board’s own independent review). Please refer to the following Water Authority website links addressing water supplies, enhancing water supply reliability, future planning, and water shortage and drought response.¹ Please also see the following District website links addressing water supplies, reliability, and the District’s use of desalinated water from the Carlsbad plant.²

The Newland Sierra Draft EIR also made clear that the County itself makes the ultimate water supply determination, not the water suppliers, and that the County’s determination is based on its independent review of the *entire* record, not just the WSA (see EIR, Section 2.14, page 2.14-2):

The County of San Diego (County) must determine, based on the entire record, whether projected water supplies will be sufficient to satisfy the demands of the project, in addition to the demand associated with the existing and other planned future land use uses within the Vallecitos Water District potable water service area.

Based on the data presented in both the Draft and Final EIR and record, the County conducted its own independent review and evaluation. Based on that record, the County determined that the water supplies needed to serve the demand of the Newland Sierra project, in conjunction with the demand of other planned and future cumulative development within the District’s service area are adequate and reliable. (See e.g., Final EIR, Section 2.14, Utilities and Services Systems (Water Supply and Service).)³

As further evidence that sufficient supply exists to serve the project and that of existing and future users within the District, an analysis of the actual per capita water usage in the District covering the past five years (2012 through 2017) was conducted and is attached to the **Responses to Late Comment Letters** herein (refer to **LL-11 Attachment 1** prepared by GSI Water Solutions and entitled “Comparison of VWD 2015 UWMP Water Demand Projections with Historic Water

¹ Please see <https://www.sdcwa.org/water-supplies>; <https://www.sdcwa.org/enhancing-water-supply-reliability>; <https://www.sdcwa.org/future-planning>; <https://www.sdcwa.org/water-shortage-and-drought-response>.

² Please see <http://www.vwd.org/departments/conservation-and-outreach>, <http://www.vwd.org/home/showdocument?id=516>, <http://www.vwd.org/home/showdocument?id=5668>,

³ Please see the County’s website for the referenced EIR section https://www.sandiegocounty.gov/content/dam/sdc/pds/ProjectPlanning/NS/NSFEIR/2.14_Uilities%20and%20Service%20Systems_FEIR.pdf.

Responses to Late Comment Letters

Demand Rates,” August 2018). The analysis compares actual per capita usage for this five year period with the demand projections contained in the 2015 UWMP. The analysis shows that although demand reductions would be required under the 2015 UWMP analysis, no such reductions would be required if the 2015 UWMP had used current and recent per-capita water usage rates to estimate future demands for normal, single-dry, and multiple-dry years during the forecast period of 2020 through 2035.

4. The claim of a 36% cutback for existing Vallecitos Water District customers has been rebutted by the District.

The comments repeat claims that the District will need to implement a 36% cutback in supplies for all existing water customers in order to accommodate the water demand associated with the Newland Sierra project. The County does not concur with the comment, and previously responded to this same comment in the Final EIR (see, e.g., **Responses O-1-291** and **O-1-298**).

Further, in response to previous claims that “drastic mandatory rationing” must be imposed on District customers by as much as 36% so the County can approve the Newland Sierra project, the District itself specifically rebutted such claims in August 2017, as reported in the Newland Sierra Final EIR, **Response O-1-279**:

“Recently, the Twin Oaks Valley Property Owner’s Association published a newspaper ad noting “36% cuts to residents’ water supply” in relation to a proposed Newland Sierra housing project. *This statement is false.* The Vallecitos Water District is not in a drought emergency and therefore is not imposing any mandatory water-use cuts (reductions). *In addition, the District would never impose water-use reductions to any customers to allow for any proposed development, including the Newland Sierra project.*

To continue to provide reliable water service to our customers, Vallecitos is guided by its Master Plan, which analyzes existing and future land uses, as well as current water demands and trends, to evaluate the existing and future water needs for District customers well into the future. Even with the 1,624 acre-feet [asterisk omitted] of annual water demand projected for the proposed Newland Sierra development, *the District has already anticipated greater water use* (1,825 acre-feet per year) identified for this property during the 2017 Master Plan process without the development. *In other words, even if this development moves forward, the District will have sufficient water supplies for all new and existing customers.*

During the recent drought, the cutbacks to our customers were not due to a supply shortage, as Vallecitos had sufficient water supplies. The cutbacks were mandated by an Executive Order from Governor Brown. Even during the depth of the drought, Vallecitos’ water provider — the San Diego County Water Authority

Responses to Late Comment Letters

(SDCWA) — projected 85,196 acre-feet of water in storage after assuming an additional three consecutive years of drought. Since the drought has ended, SDCWA now has 171,000 acre-feet of water in storage, and no restrictions on deliveries to the Vallecitos Water District, or any agency. This is in addition to the drought-resilient water available from the Pacific Ocean from the District’s direct connection to the Claude “Bud” Lewis — Carlsbad Desalination Plant.

Regardless of development in our community, we encourage all residents to continue to make water conservation a permanent way of life.”⁴ (Italics added.)

In addition, at the November 16, 2016, public meeting in which the District Board of Directors considered and approved the project’s WSA, Director Hernandez specifically rejected this so-called “mandatory rationing” requirement (see District Board of Directors’ meeting transcript, Nov. 16, 2016, page 31, italics added):

“And I, too, wanted to make it perfectly clear — we’ve mentioned this a number of times. I know there are some out there that still come up and tell us that they’re concerned about that the existing rate payers are going to pay for some portion of the new water. That’s absolutely false. That’s absolutely wrong. Every new home that is going to be built is going to pay its own way. There is [no] burden on any of the existing rate payers, whether it’s one home or 600 homes. It makes no difference. The developers have to pay for all of the new development and the capacity that is required.”

Nonetheless, the comments repeat the incorrect assumption of a 36% cutback in the District’s existing supplies to account for the Newland Sierra project, and then assert that the Newland Sierra EIR should have addressed amendments to the 2015 Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP) and changes in District ordinances “to adopt or implement those cutbacks.” In response, the County concurs with the District, and finds no credible evidence that the District is cutting existing customer supplies, or proposes to cut existing customer supplies, to accommodate the Newland Sierra proposed project. Additionally, the County finds that the District is not imposing any mandatory water cuts or “rationing” to serve the proposed project (or any other development) within its service area (see also Final EIR, **Response O-1-291**). Thus, the County finds there is no need for the Newland Sierra EIR to evaluate any amendments to the adopted 2015 UWMP, or to evaluate any existing, proposed, or new District ordinances in relation to a cutback that has not occurred.

⁴ The District’s “Correction of Misinformation” is incorporated by reference and available for public review upon request to the County. It is also available for review at the District’s website: <http://www.vwd.org/Home/Components/News/News/2358/18>.

Responses to Late Comment Letters

The comments also request that the County “direct the District to modify, correct, or supplement the WSA to provide an honest and complete analysis of water supply in the District under section 10910 and 10911 of the Water Code.” The County does not agree with the comments.

First, the County has independently considered the WSA, and finds that the WSA is an advisory report that provides useful information from the District — the retail water supplier for the proposed project. The County further finds that the WSA provides useful information about the District’s water supplies and demands; and it provides helpful water data with regard to the District’s ability to serve the Newland Sierra project, along with other cumulative development in the District’s service area.

For example, WSA Tables 7.1 through 7.3 show the available water supply and demand based on the District’s 2015 UWMP, along with the conservation required to balance projected water supply and demand during normal, single-dry, and multiple-dry years from 2020 through 2035 in Sections 8 and 9 of the 2015 UWMP. For further responsive information, please see Final EIR, **Response O-1-298**, above.

In summary, the 2015 UWMP makes clear that if projected water supply shortfalls occur as projected, “additional conservation measures will be necessary to balance supply against the demands in the VWD’s service area” and that “Sections 8 and 9 further describe the demand reduction actions and conservation measures that VWD plans on implementing to balance supplies and demands,” including “working closely with the San Diego County Water Authority for future water supply planning” (Draft EIR, Appendix V-1 [2015 UWMP], page 7-5; see also pages 7-3 through 7-4). As such, the 2015 UWMP factored in required conservation.

The Draft EIR for the Newland Sierra project also specified the water conservation-related project design features (Draft EIR, pages 2.14-42 through 2.14-43), as follows:

“As a result of the water conservation regulatory laws and regulations and technological advances in the water fixture industry, homes constructed today are using dramatically less water than homes built a few years ago. For example, according to a report by the California Homebuilding Foundation, a new three-bedroom single-family home in California with four occupants uses 38 percent less indoor water than a similar-sized home built in 2005, and more than 50 percent less water than a non-retrofitted home built in 1980 (California Homebuilding Foundation 2010). This is primarily due to mandated restrictions in residential toilets (flushing volumes), shower and faucet rates, clothes washer volumes, leak reductions, and other devices (e.g., baths and dishwashers) (Water Research Foundation 2016).

Against this backdrop, and recognizing California’s water challenges and drought conditions, the project applicant has proposed water conservation design features

Responses to Late Comment Letters

to make the project a water-efficient community.

Indoor water conservation features include high-efficiency clothes washers and dishwashers, water-efficient toilets, faucets, and showerheads.

Outdoor water conservation features would include low-water-use landscaping in residential and non-residential landscapes, prohibitions of turf grass in residential front yards and within the street rights-of-way, and prohibitions on outdoor water use in dedicated open space (1,209 acres) and non-irrigated fuel modification areas (272.2 acres). The project also requires all single family homes to be plumbed for grey water systems, if feasible, to capture domestic water for reuse as outdoor landscaping irrigation.”⁵

Further, the Newland Sierra EIR includes GSI’s technical memorandum, titled “Water Conservation Demand Study for the Newland Sierra Specific Plan and EIR,” updated February 28, 2018 (EIR, Appendix T). The purpose of the GSI study is to calculate and substantiate the reductions in water usage (compared with the current water demand forecasts) that can be achieved for the project by implementing current indoor and outdoor water conservation measures required by state and local laws and regulations that became effective in 2015 and 2016. The “current” water conservation regulatory measures became effective in 2015 and 2016, and reduce indoor and outdoor water uses significantly compared with prior building and irrigation standards.

By comparing the Newland Sierra water demand estimates under these newest state and local water conservation standards with demand estimates that are based on pre-2015 conservation requirements, GSI has calculated the amount of savings that can be achieved by implementing the most current set of water conservation standards across the Newland Sierra proposed community.

As shown in GSI Tables ES-1 and ES-2, the total water demand in Newland Sierra under current (2015/2016) conservation measures is calculated to be 776,980 gallons per day (gpd) on an average daily basis (Table ES-1) and 870 acre-feet per year (afy) on an annual basis (Table ES-2).

⁵ The project’s proposed grey water systems could reduce sewage flow by 70 percent and could include installation of in-ground collection tanks as a certified grey water treatment system. However, as is the case with the project’s WSA demand calculations, the project’s Water Conservation Demand Study calculations of irrigation water demands assume that potable water supplies will be necessary for all residential landscape irrigation. If, at a future time, the County has permitting mechanisms in place to allow activation of the plumbed grey water systems, then irrigation water demands could be lower than assumed in the demand calculations presented in both the project’s SB 610 WSA and the project’s Water Conservation Demand Study prepared by GSI (EIR, Appendices S and T).

Responses to Late Comment Letters

This water demand is 673,180 gpd (or 754 afy) *lower* than a demand estimate based on pre-2015 conservation measures that is presented in Table 3.2 of the WSA (HDR, Nov . 2016), and 852,220 gpd (or 955 afy) lower than a pre-2015 demand estimate associated with the County's General Plan.

The decreases in water demand arising from current (2015/2016) water conservation requirements amount to 46% and 52% reductions, respectively, from the WSA and General Plan water demand estimates that are based on older water conservation standards (see also Final EIR, **Response O-1-305**).

5. Recent State legislation has strengthened indoor and outdoor water use efficiency requirements.

As explained below, the County also independently reviewed the District's 2015 UWMP in relation to two state legislative efforts that have established heightened water efficiency standards to help the state prepare better for droughts and climate change.

The first effort initiated in 2009 by Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger (SB 7, Water Conservation), and effective February 2010, requires the state to achieve an interim urban per capita (e.g., per person) water use target of 10% by December 31, 2015, and 20% reduction by December 31, 2020. (See Part 2.55 of the Water Code, commencing at Water Code section 10608.) These water conservation targets are calculated on a gallons-per-capita-per-day (gpcpd) basis, and the 2015 UWMP reflects VWD's compliance with such requirements.

Specifically, the 2015 UWMP shows VWD's calculated 2015 interim water usage target at approximately 179 gpcpd, and its 2020 target at approximately 159 gpcpd. (See 2015 UWMP, Table 5-1, p. 5-9.) Further, VWD shows that its *actual* per capita daily water use for 2015 was 117 gpcpd, which already is below the required 2020 target. (See 2015 UWMP, Table 5-2, p. 5-10.) This means that VWD is already compliant with the state's water efficiency standards well before the required target date of December 2020.

As further background, the District achieved this water savings due to the drought-driven water use restrictions imposed under Governor Edmund G. Brown, Jr.'s executive order in 2015. According to the 2015 UWMP, VWD achieved a cumulative water savings from June 2015 through March 2016 of 25.2% from its 2013 baseline established under the drought restrictions. (See 2015 UWMP, p. 5-9.) Nonetheless, the District plans to use its water demand management measures contained in Section 9 of the 2015 UWMP to maintain its emphasis on conservation to "ensure that the demands do not increase again to previous levels when drought alert levels are decreased" (as in 2017) and "water awareness wanes." (See 2015 UWMP, p. 5-10).

As explained further below, however, the County finds that other recently enacted laws will help to ensure even greater water efficiencies over time, which is another basis for the County's

Responses to Late Comment Letters

independent determination that sufficient supplies exist to meet demands for this project and other cumulative development in the District's service area.

In May 2018, Governor Edmund G. Brown, Jr. signed Senate Bill 606 (SB 606, Sen. Robert Hertzberg) and Assembly Bill 1668 (AB 1668, Assemblymember Laura Friedman), which establish even greater water efficiency standards than imposed in 2009/2010. SB 606 and AB 1668 establish long-term standards for the efficient use of water and a framework for the implementation and oversight of the new standards, which must be in place by 2022. The new legislation strengthens the state's water resiliency in the face of future droughts and climate change with provisions that include:

- Establishing an *indoor*, per person water use standard of 55 gallons per day until 2025, 52.5 gallons from 2025 to 2030, and 50 gallons beginning in 2030.
- Creating incentives for water suppliers to recycle water.
- Requiring both urban and agricultural water suppliers to set annual water budgets and prepare for drought (<https://www.gov.ca.gov/2018/05/31/governor-brown-signs-legislation-establishing-statewide-water-efficiency-goals/>).

According to the Office of the Governor, this new legislation builds on Governor Brown's ongoing efforts to make water conservation a way of life in California (https://water.ca.gov/LegacyFiles/wateruseefficiency/conservation/docs/20170407_EO_B-37-16_Final_Report.pdf).⁶

For context, the average American's water use declined to 82 gallons per day in 2015, which was an approximately 7% decline compared with usage 5 years earlier, according to a 2018 study by the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS). This decrease continued a trend that had been previously observed from 2005 to 2010, according to that same study.⁷ According to the *Sacramento Bee*, Californians used an average of 90 gallons per day in 2017, down from 109 gallons in 2013 (<https://waterwelljournal.com/water-efficiency-standards-established-in-california/>).

The County finds it is reasonably foreseeable that implementation of this new legislation will result in even greater water efficiency than VWD achieved in 2015 (i.e., an *actual* per capita daily water usage rate of 117 gpcpd). Further, the County finds that achieving a 117 gpcpd usage rate (or lower due to the recent legislation) means that the average daily per capita water usage rates

⁶ The report titled, "Making Water Conservation a California Way of Life" (Final Report, April 2017), builds on Executive Order B-37-16 that instructed state agencies to adopt permanent changes to use water, and provides recommendations for how to implement long-term improvements to water supply management that support water conservation.

⁷ See USGS 2018 report summary at <https://www.usgs.gov/news/water-use-across-united-states-declines-levels-not-seen-1970>. The USGS 2018 report discusses how for the nation as a whole, the per capita use for public water supply purposes went from 88 gallons per day in 2010 to 82 gallons per day in 2015. That is a 6.8% decrease (7% rounded).

Responses to Late Comment Letters

(expressed in units of gallons per capita per day [gpcpd]) will be lower than the rates assumed in the 2015 UWMP (the 2015 interim water usage target at approximately 179 gpcpd, and the 2020 target at approximately 159 gpcpd), producing even lower water demands than contemplated in the 2015 UWMP; and, therefore, no need exists for any district-wide 36% water demand reduction that Golden Door claims will be necessary in the future.

LL-11 ATTACHMENT 1:

GSI Water Solutions

“Comparison of VWD 2015 UWMP Water Demand Projections
with Historic Water Demand Rates”

August 29, 2018



Technical Memorandum

To: County of San Diego Planning & Development Services
Rita Brandin – Newland Sierra, LLC

From: John Porcello – GSI Water Solutions, Inc.

Date: August 29, 2018

Re: Comparison of VWD 2015 UWMP Water Demand Projections with Historic Water Demand Rates
(San Diego County, California)

Summary Conclusions

GSI Water Solutions, Inc., has prepared this technical memorandum to compare Vallecitos Water District's 2015 Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP) future projections of water demand volumes and usage rates with recent water demands. The comparison converts the annual future district-wide demands to per-capita (i.e., per person) usage rates. The purpose of this comparison is to evaluate how the 2015 UWMP projected demands would be expected to change if water demand usage rates similar to those seen in recent years (other than the drought years of 2015 and 2016) were to be used to calculate future water demands.

As discussed below, in normal, single-dry, and multiple-dry water years, the 2015 UWMP estimates that annual demand reductions would be needed in the range of approximately 24 percent to 35 percent. However, if per-capita water usage rates similar to those seen in recent non-drought years (2012-2014 and 2017) and drought years (2015-2016) were used, the projected district-wide demands for such water supply would produce lower water demands and no need for annual demand reductions.

This conclusion arises in part because (1) the recent non-drought years (2012-2014 and 2017) produce lower water demands than projected in the 2015 UWMP, and (2) the drought year (2015-2016) per-capita usage, which is representative of recent conditions most similar to that contemplated by single-dry and multiple-year conditions, shows declines in per-capita water usage due to drought-driven water use restrictions that were enacted in California in 2015.

In summary, as detailed below, the analysis shows that although demand reductions would be required under the 2015 UWMP analysis, no such reductions would be required if the 2015 UWMP had used current and recent per-capita water usage rates to estimate future demands for normal, single-dry, and multiple-dry years during the forecast period of 2020 through 2035.

Analysis

The 2015 Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP) for Vallecitos Water District (VWD, 2016) estimates that on an annual basis, future district-wide demands for potable and recycled water supply will total to 32,666 acre-feet (AF) in the year 2020 (which is equivalent to 10,644 million gallons [MG]) and will rise to 37,841 AF (12,330 MG) in the year 2035. These projections are for years of normal demands and normal water supply availability, as discussed in VWD's 2015 UWMP (VWD, 2016). Each demand estimate is based on population projections for VWD's service area that range from 105,889 residents in 2020 to 118,690 residents in 2035.

Accordingly, the normal-year annual demands of 32,666 to 37,841 AF (10,644 to 12,330 MG) equate to per-capita usage rates that range between 266 and 285 gallons per person per day (gpcpd). The 2015 UWMP also provides 20-year projections of water supplies and demands under a single-dry-year scenario and a multiple-dry-year scenario.

The 2015 UWMP's projected demands are noticeably higher than current and recent rates of district-wide water usage, which have ranged from as high as 5,645 MG (17,323 AF) in 2013 to as low as 4,349 MG (13,347 AF) in 2015. Water use records provided to Newland Sierra, LLC by VWD indicate that during the past 6 calendar years (2012 through 2017), average daily per-capita water usage rates (expressed in units of gallons per capita per day [gpcpd] and including agricultural irrigation uses) ranged between approximately 165 and 169 gpcpd during calendar years 2012 through 2014, then declined to 127 gpcpd in 2015 and remained well below the pre-2015 rate during calendar years 2016 (131 gpcpd) and 2017 (137 gpcpd). These rates included usage for agricultural irrigation, which used 325 MG, or 7.5 percent, of the 4,349 MG total water volume that VWD provided to its customers during calendar year 2015. (See Table 4-1 of the 2015 UWMP.) Excluding agricultural irrigation uses, per-capita use rates for urban customers were even lower, ranging between 155 and 164 gpcpd from 2012 through 2014 (average 159 gpcpd) and declining to 117 gpcpd in 2015 and 123 gpcpd in 2016.

The substantial decrease in per-capita use during 2015 occurred because of drought-driven water use restrictions that were enacted under a governor's executive order. Following the lifting of the executive order, VWD's records indicate that district-wide per-capita usage rate for calendar year 2017 was 137 gpcpd when including agricultural irrigation, which was between 28 and 32 gpcpd lower than the per-capita rates during the three years that preceded the governor's executive order.

Tables 1a and 1b show how the projected demands reported in the UWMP for **normal years** would be expected to change if per-capita usage rates similar to those seen in recent non-drought years (2012 through 2014 and 2017) were to be used in demand projection calculations. Table 1a provides the demand and supply volumes for each year in units of acre-feet (AF), while Table 1b uses units of millions of gallons (MG) each year. The analyses in Tables 1a and 1b show that although demand reductions would be required inside VWD's service area under the 2015 UWMP analysis, no such reductions would be required if the 2012-2014 daily average per-capita

usage rate (167 gpcpd, which includes agricultural irrigation) were to be used – a rate that is 99 to 118 gpcpd lower than the rates assumed in the 2015 UWMP analysis. Similarly, Tables 1a and 1b show that achieving the 2017 per-capita usage rate in the future (137 gpcpd, which includes agricultural irrigation and is 129 to 148 gpcpd lower than the rates assumed in the 2015 UWMP analysis) would produce even lower water demands and no need for demand reductions.

Table 1a
Acre-Feet (AF) of Projected Water Supply and Demand During a Normal Year,
Comparing Per-Capita Usage Rates from VWD’s 2015 UWMP Against
Recent Per-Capita Usage Rates Inside VWD’s Service Area
During Non-Drought Years 2012, 2013, 2014, and 2017

Description	2020	2025	2030	2035
VWD Population Projections (from 2015 UWMP)	105,889	115,368	117,002	118,690
VWD-Reported Analysis (From VWD’s 2015 UWMP)				
Annual Demand Totals ¹ (AF)	32,666	34,333	35,505	37,841
Equivalent Daily Per-Capita Usage Rate (gpcpd)	275	266	271	285
Annual Supply Totals ² (AF)	21,219	24,586	26,989	28,229
Annual Demand Reduction Required (AF)	11,447	9,747	8,516	9,612
Required Percent Reduction in Annual Demand	35.0%	28.4%	24.0%	25.4%
Analysis Using Average of 2012-2014 Actual Average Daily Per-Capita Usage Rates				
2012-2014 Avg. Daily Per-Capita Usage Rate (gpcpd)	167	167	167	167
Resulting Annual Demand Totals (AF)	19,847	21,624	21,930	22,246
Annual Supply Totals ² (AF)	21,219	24,586	26,989	28,229
Annual Demand Reduction Required (AF)	0	0	0	0
Required Percent Reduction in Annual Demand	0%	0%	0%	0%
Analysis Using 2017 Actual Average Daily Per-Capita Usage Rates				
2017 Avg. Daily Per-Capita Usage Rate (gpcpd)	137	137	137	137
Resulting Annual Demand Totals (AF)	16,282	17,740	17,991	18,250
Annual Supply Totals ² (AF)	21,219	24,586	26,989	28,229
Annual Demand Reduction Required (AF)	0	0	0	0
Required Percent Reduction in Annual Demand	0%	0%	0%	0%

1. Demand is presented in Table 4-3 of VWD’s 2015 UWMP and consists of recycled water demand (471 MG in 2020 and 2025, and 771 MG in 2030 and 2035) plus potable and raw water demand (including agricultural irrigation).

2. Supply includes future recycled water and potable water supply from storage available. These numbers differ from the San Diego County Water Authority’s 2015 UWMP assessment of supply totals available to VWD, as they include 3,500 AF (1,140 MG) per year of desalinated water supply provided by the Water Authority and they do not include the Water Authority’s assumptions for passive and active water conservation.

Source: Vallecitos Water District 2015 UWMP (VWD, 2016).

Table 1b
Million Gallons (MG) of Projected Water Supply and Demand During a Normal Year,
Comparing Per-Capita Usage Rates from VWD’s 2015 UWMP Against
Recent Per-Capita Usage Rates Inside VWD’s Service Area
During Non-Drought Years 2012, 2013, 2014, and 2017

Description	2020	2025	2030	2035
VWD Population Projections (from 2015 UWMP)	105,889	115,368	117,002	118,690
VWD-Reported Analysis (From VWD’s 2015 UWMP)				
Annual Demand Totals ¹ (MG)	10,644	11,187	11,569	12,330
Equivalent Daily Per-Capita Usage Rate (gpcpd)	275	266	271	285
Annual Supply Totals ² (MG)	6,914	8,011	8,794	9,198
Annual Demand Reduction Required (MG)	3,730	3,176	2,775	3,132
Required Percent Reduction in Annual Demand	35.0%	28.4%	24.0%	25.4%
Analysis Using Average of 2012-2014 Actual Average Daily Per-Capita Usage Rates				
2012-2014 Avg. Daily Per-Capita Usage Rate (gpcpd)	167	167	167	167
Resulting Annual Demand Totals (MG)	6,467	7,046	7,146	7,249
Annual Supply Totals ² (MG)	6,914	8,011	8,794	9,198
Annual Demand Reduction Required (MG)	0	0	0	0
Required Percent Reduction in Annual Demand	0%	0%	0%	0%
Analysis Using 2017 Actual Average Daily Per-Capita Usage Rates				
2017 Avg. Daily Per-Capita Usage Rate (gpcpd)	137	137	137	137
Resulting Annual Demand Totals (MG)	5,305	5,780	5,862	5,947
Annual Supply Totals ² (MG)	6,914	8,011	8,794	9,198
Annual Demand Reduction Required (MG)	0	0	0	0
Required Percent Reduction in Annual Demand	0%	0%	0%	0%

1. Demand is presented in Table 4-3 of VWD’s 2015 UWMP and consists of recycled water demand (471 MG in 2020 and 2025, and 771 MG in 2030 and 2035) plus potable and raw water demand (including agricultural irrigation).

2. Supply includes future recycled water and potable water supply from storage available. These numbers differ from the San Diego County Water Authority’s 2015 UWMP assessment of supply totals available to VWD, as they include 3,500 AF (1,140 MG) per year of desalinated water supply provided by the Water Authority and they do not include the Water Authority’s assumptions for passive and active water conservation.

Source: Vallecitos Water District 2015 UWMP (VWD, 2016).

Tables 2a and 2b show similar calculations for the **single-dry-year scenario**, using drought years 2015 and 2016 to select per-capita usage rates that are representative of recent conditions most similar to that contemplated by the single-dry-year scenario. As with the normal-year scenario, the single-dry-year scenario produces no need for annual demand reductions when recent daily per-capita usage rates are applied to VWD’s population estimates for the 20-year planning horizon.

Table 2a
Acre-Feet (AF) of Projected Water Supply and Demand During a Single Dry Year,
Comparing Per-Capita Usage Rates from VWD’s 2015 UWMP Against
Recent Per-Capita Usage Rates Inside VWD’s Service Area
During Drought Years 2015 and 2016

Description	2020	2025	2030	2035
VWD Population Projections (from 2015 UWMP)	105,889	115,368	117,002	118,690
VWD-Reported Analysis (From VWD’s 2015 UWMP)				
Annual Demand Totals ¹ (AF)	34,984	36,782	38,049	40,588
Equivalent Daily Per-Capita Usage Rate (gpcpd)	295	285	290	305
Annual Supply Totals ² (AF)	22,594	26,206	28,723	30,073
Annual Demand Reduction Required (AF)	12,390	10,576	9,326	10,515
Required Percent Reduction in Annual Demand	35.4%	28.8%	24.5%	25.9%
Analysis Using Average of 2015-2016 Actual Daily Per-Capita Usage Rates				
2015-2016 Avg. Daily Per-Capita Usage Rate (gpcpd)	129	129	129	129
Resulting Annual Demand Totals (AF)	15,268	16,635	16,870	17,114
Annual Supply Totals ² (AF)	22,594	26,206	28,723	30,073
Annual Demand Reduction Required (AF)	0	0	0	0
Required Percent Reduction in Annual Demand	0%	0%	0%	0%

1. Demand is presented in Table 4-3 of VWD’s 2015 UWMP and consists of recycled water demand (471 MG in 2020 and 2025, and 771 MG in 2030 and 2035) plus potable and raw water demand (including agricultural irrigation).

2. Supply includes future recycled water and potable water supply from storage available. These numbers differ from the San Diego County Water Authority’s 2015 UWMP assessment of supply totals available to VWD, as they include 3,500 AF (1,140 MG) per year of desalinated water supply provided by the Water Authority and they do not include the Water Authority’s assumptions for passive and active water conservation.

Source: Vallecitos Water District 2015 UWMP (VWD, 2016).

Table 2b
Million Gallons (MG) of Projected Water Supply and Demand During a Single Dry Year,
Comparing Per-Capita Usage Rates from VWD’s 2015 UWMP Against
Recent Per-Capita Usage Rates Inside VWD’s Service Area
During Drought Years 2015 and 2016

Description	2020	2025	2030	2035
VWD Population Projections (from 2015 UWMP)	105,889	115,368	117,002	118,690
VWD-Reported Analysis (From VWD’s 2015 UWMP)				
Annual Demand Totals ¹ (MG)	11,399	11,985	12,398	13,225
Equivalent Daily Per-Capita Usage Rate (gpcpd)	295	285	290	305
Annual Supply Totals ² (MG)	7,362	8,539	9,359	9,799
Annual Demand Reduction Required (MG)	4,037	3,446	3,039	3,426
Required Percent Reduction in Annual Demand	35.4%	28.8%	24.5%	25.9%
Analysis Using Average of 2015-2016 Actual Daily Per-Capita Usage Rates				
2015-2016 Avg. Daily Per-Capita Usage Rate (gpcpd)	129	129	129	129
Resulting Annual Demand Totals (MG)	4,975	5,420	5,497	5,576
Annual Supply Totals ² (MG)	7,362	8,539	9,359	9,799
Annual Demand Reduction Required (MG)	0	0	0	0
Required Percent Reduction in Annual Demand	0%	0%	0%	0%

1. Demand is presented in Table 4-3 of VWD’s 2015 UWMP and consists of recycled water demand (471 MG in 2020 and 2025, and 771 MG in 2030 and 2035) plus potable and raw water demand (including agricultural irrigation).

2. Supply includes future recycled water and potable water supply from storage available. These numbers differ from the San Diego County Water Authority’s 2015 UWMP assessment of supply totals available to VWD, as they include 3,500 AF (1,140 MG) per year of desalinated water supply provided by the Water Authority and they do not include the Water Authority’s assumptions for passive and active water conservation.

Source: Vallecitos Water District 2015 UWMP (VWD, 2016).

Tables 3a and 3b show similar calculations for the **multiple-dry-year scenario**, using drought years 2015 and 2016 to select per-capita usage rates that are representative of recent conditions most similar to that contemplated by the multiple-dry-year scenario. As with the normal-year and dry-year scenarios, the multiple-dry-year scenario produces no need for annual demand reductions when the 2015-2016 daily per-capita usage rates are applied to VWD’s population estimates for the 20-year planning horizon.

Reference

VWD. 2016. *2015 Urban Water Management Plan*. Prepared by Vallecitos Water District (VWD).

Table 3a
Acre-Feet (AF) of Projected Water Supply and Demand During a Multiple-Dry-Year Period,
Comparing Per-Capita Usage Rates from VWD's 2015 UWMP Against
Recent Per-Capita Usage Rates Inside VWD's Service Area
During Drought Years 2015 and 2016

Year	Description	2020	2025	2030	2035
	VWD Population Projections (from 2015 UWMP)	105,889	115,368	117,002	118,690
First Year	VWD-Reported Analysis (From VWD's 2015 UWMP)				
	Annual Demand Totals ¹ (AF)	34,953	36,736	37,991	40,489
	Equivalent Daily Per-Capita Usage Rate (gpcpd)	295	284	290	305
	Annual Supply Totals ² (AF)	22,585	26,188	28,692	30,018
	Annual Demand Reduction Required (AF)	12,368	10,548	9,299	10,471
	Required Percent Reduction in Annual Demand	35.4%	28.7%	24.5%	25.9%
	Analysis Using Average of 2015-2016 Actual Daily Per-Capita Usage Rates				
	2015-2016 Avg. Daily Per-Capita Usage Rate (gpcpd)	129	129	129	129
	Annual Resulting Demand Totals (AF)	15,268	16,635	16,870	17,114
	Annual Supply Totals ² (AF)	22,585	26,188	28,692	30,018
	Annual Demand Reduction Required (AF)	0	0	0	0
	Required Percent Reduction in Annual Demand	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Second Year	VWD-Reported Analysis (From VWD's 2015 UWMP)			
Annual Demand Totals ¹ (AF)		35,671	37,491	38,771	41,321
Equivalent Daily Per-Capita Usage Rate (gpcpd)		301	290	296	311
Annual Supply Totals ² (AF)		22,999	26,673	29,211	30,561
Annual Demand Reduction Required (AF)		12,672	10,818	9,560	10,760
Required Percent Reduction in Annual Demand		35.5%	28.9%	24.7%	26.0%
Analysis Using Average of 2015-2016 Actual Daily Per-Capita Usage Rates					
2015-2016 Avg. Daily Per-Capita Usage Rate (gpcpd)		129	129	129	129
Resulting Annual Demand Totals (AF)		15,268	16,635	16,870	17,114
Annual Supply Totals ² (AF)		22,999	26,673	29,211	30,561
Annual Demand Reduction Required (AF)		0	0	0	0
Required Percent Reduction in Annual Demand		0%	0%	0%	0%
Third Year		VWD-Reported Analysis (From VWD's 2015 UWMP)			
	Annual Demand Totals ¹ (AF)	36,684	38,556	39,872	42,496
	Equivalent Daily Per-Capita Usage Rate (gpcpd)	309	298	304	320
	Annual Supply Totals ² (AF)	23,604	27,382	29,963	31,353
	Annual Demand Reduction Required (AF)	13,080	11,174	9,909	11,143
	Required Percent Reduction in Annual Demand	35.7%	29.0%	24.9%	26.2%
	Analysis Using Average of 2015-2016 Actual Daily Per-Capita Usage Rates				
	2015-2016 Avg. Daily Per-Capita Usage Rate (gpcpd)	129	129	129	129
	Resulting Annual Demand Totals (AF)	15,268	16,635	16,870	17,114
	Annual Supply Totals ² (AF)	23,604	27,382	29,963	31,353
	Annual Demand Reduction Required (AF)	0	0	0	0
	Required Percent Reduction in Annual Demand	0%	0%	0%	0%

Table 3a
Acre-Feet (AF) of Projected Water Supply and Demand During a Multiple-Dry-Year Period,
Comparing Per-Capita Usage Rates from VWD’s 2015 UWMP Against
Recent Per-Capita Usage Rates Inside VWD’s Service Area
During Drought Years 2015 and 2016

Year	Description	2020	2025	2030	2035
------	-------------	------	------	------	------

1. Demand is presented in Table 4-3 of VWD’s 2015 UWMP and consists of recycled water demand (471 MG in 2020 and 2025, and 771 MG in 2030 and 2035) plus potable and raw water demand (including agricultural irrigation).

2. Supply includes future recycled water and potable water supply from storage available. These numbers differ from the San Diego County Water Authority’s 2015 UWMP assessment of supply totals available to VWD, as they include 3,500 AF (1,140 MG) per year of desalinated water supply provided by the Water Authority and they do not include the Water Authority’s assumptions for passive and active water conservation.

Source: Vallecitos Water District 2015 UWMP (VWD, 2016).

Table 3b
Million Gallons (MG) of Projected Water Supply and Demand During a Multiple-Dry-Year Period,
Comparing Per-Capita Usage Rates from VWD's 2015 UWMP Against
Recent Per-Capita Usage Rates Inside VWD's Service Area
During Drought Years 2015 and 2016

Year	Description	2020	2025	2030	2035
	VWD Population Projections (from 2015 UWMP)	105,889	115,368	117,002	118,690
First Year	VWD-Reported Analysis (From VWD's 2015 UWMP)				
	Annual Demand Totals ¹ (MG)	11,389	11,970	12,379	13,193
	Equivalent Daily Per-Capita Usage Rate (gpcpd)	295	284	290	305
	Annual Supply Totals ² (MG)	7,359	8,533	9,349	9,781
	Annual Demand Reduction Required (MG)	4,030	3,437	3,030	3,412
	Required Percent Reduction in Annual Demand	35.4%	28.7%	24.5%	25.9%
	Analysis Using Average of 2015-2016 Actual Daily Per-Capita Usage Rates				
	2015-2016 Avg. Daily Per-Capita Usage Rate (gpcpd)	129	129	129	129
	Annual Resulting Demand Totals (MG)	4,975	5,420	5,497	5,576
	Annual Supply Totals ² (MG)	7,359	8,533	9,349	9,781
	Annual Demand Reduction Required (MG)	0	0	0	0
	Required Percent Reduction in Annual Demand	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Second Year	VWD-Reported Analysis (From VWD's 2015 UWMP)			
Annual Demand Totals ¹ (MG)		11,623	12,216	12,633	13,464
Equivalent Daily Per-Capita Usage Rate (gpcpd)		301	290	296	311
Annual Supply Totals ² (MG)		7,494	8,691	9,518	9,958
Annual Demand Reduction Required (MG)		4,129	3,525	3,115	3,506
Required Percent Reduction in Annual Demand		35.5%	28.9%	24.7%	26.0%
Analysis Using Average of 2015-2016 Actual Daily Per-Capita Usage Rates					
2015-2016 Avg. Daily Per-Capita Usage Rate (gpcpd)		129	129	129	129
Resulting Annual Demand Totals (MG)		4,975	5,420	5,497	5,576
Annual Supply Totals ² (MG)		7,494	8,691	9,518	9,958
Annual Demand Reduction Required (MG)		0	0	0	0
Required Percent Reduction in Annual Demand		0%	0%	0%	0%
Third Year		VWD-Reported Analysis (From VWD's 2015 UWMP)			
	Annual Demand Totals ¹ (MG)	11,953	12,563	12,992	13,847
	Equivalent Daily Per-Capita Usage Rate (gpcpd)	309	298	304	320
	Annual Supply Totals ² (MG)	7,691	8,922	9,763	10,216
	Annual Demand Reduction Required (MG)	4,262	3,641	3,229	3,631
	Required Percent Reduction in Annual Demand	35.7%	29.0%	24.9%	26.2%
	Analysis Using Average of 2015-2016 Actual Daily Per-Capita Usage Rates				
	2015-2016 Avg. Daily Per-Capita Usage Rate (gpcpd)	129	129	129	129
	Resulting Annual Demand Totals (MG)	4,975	5,420	5,497	5,576
	Annual Supply Totals ² (MG)	7,691	8,922	9,763	10,216
	Annual Demand Reduction Required (MG)	0	0	0	0
	Required Percent Reduction in Annual Demand	0%	0%	0%	0%

Table 3b
Million Gallons (MG) of Projected Water Supply and Demand During a Multiple-Dry-Year Period,
Comparing Per-Capita Usage Rates from VWD’s 2015 UWMP Against
Recent Per-Capita Usage Rates Inside VWD’s Service Area
During Drought Years 2015 and 2016

Year	Description	2020	2025	2030	2035
------	-------------	------	------	------	------

1. Demand is presented in Table 4-3 of VWD’s 2015 UWMP and consists of recycled water demand (471 MG in 2020 and 2025, and 771 MG in 2030 and 2035) plus potable and raw water demand (including agricultural irrigation).

2. Supply includes future recycled water and potable water supply from storage available. These numbers differ from the San Diego County Water Authority’s 2015 UWMP assessment of supply totals available to VWD, as they include 3,500 AF (1,140 MG) per year of desalinated water supply provided by the Water Authority and they do not include the Water Authority’s assumptions for passive and active water conservation.

Source: Vallecitos Water District 2015 UWMP (VWD, 2016).