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Metropolitan Water District of Southern California

- Regional water wholesaler to 6 counties
  - 5,200 square mile service area
- 26 Member Agencies
- ~19 million residents
- Regional economy: $1 trillion
- Retail demand in 2009:
  - 4 million acre-feet
  - Provided about ½ of retail demands
Urban Southern California’s Water Supply Sources

- **Lake Shasta**
- **Lake Oroville**
- **Bay-Delta**
- **State Water Project (2.0 MAF)**
- **Los Angeles Aqueducts (0.5 MAF)**
- **Colorado River Aqueduct (1.25 MAF)**
- **Metropolitan Water District Service Area**
Colorado River Apportionments  (Million acre-feet)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Upper Basin States</th>
<th>Lower Basin States</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee's Ferry</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td></td>
<td>.05.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Apportionments

Deliveries in 1990s
## California's 1931 Seven Party Agreement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>1931 Agr. (maf/yr)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>PVID</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yuma Project</td>
<td>3.850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3(a)</td>
<td>IID &amp; CVWD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3(b)</td>
<td>PVID</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>MWD</td>
<td>0.550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>MWD</td>
<td>0.662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>IID, CVWD, PVID</td>
<td>0.300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Additional Ag Use</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary of California “4.4” Plan

- Quantify Coachella & Imperial’s priority rights (QSA)
- Implement Agricultural Conservation Measures
  - Line All-American and Coachella Canal
  - Fund IID Efficiency Programs (e.g., spill avoidance systems)
  - Develop PVID-MWD Crop Rotation and Fallowing Program
- Transfer conserved water to Southern California
- Provide Special Surplus to Metropolitan to keep Aqueduct filled through 2016
Even the best plans can run into trouble...
Lake Mead Storage
2000 – 2010
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MWD’s Water Supply Crash

- Cutback Began Jan. 1, 2003

- 2002 Available Supply:
  - 1,250,000 Acre-feet

- Initial Approved Supply 2003:
  - 513,000 Acre-feet
Key Benefits of PVID Partnership to MWD

- Program provides flexible supply to MWD
  - Between 30,000 and 120,000 AF/yr, per MWD’s call

- Provides long-term stability to MWD
  - 35 year term, through 2040

- Program is adaptable
  - During drought crisis in 2008, fallowing increase for 1 year

- Water can be stored in Lake Mead
  - Qualifies as “Extra-Ordinarily Conserved” Water
Keeping Partnership Strong

- PVID and MWD meet regularly to discuss and resolve issues
  - Committee established to discuss MWD’s management of land it owns in Valley
  - MWD agrees to treat land consistent with overall program

- MWD and PVID provide support for Community Improvement Fund
  - Non-voting participants on CIF Board

- PVID and MWD host annual recognition dinner
  - Will be held tomorrow night
Colorado River Supply Available to Urban Southern California

Supply (TAF)

- 2001: 1,250 TAF
- 2002: 1,250 TAF
- 2003: 750 TAF
- 2004: 750 TAF
- 2005: 900 TAF
- 2006: 700 TAF
- 2007: 800 TAF
- 2008: 900 TAF
- 2009: 1,200 TAF
- 2010: 1,200 TAF
Summary

- Metropolitan has adapted to living with less water from the Colorado River
  - Partnerships and programs has replaced surplus that was once available
- PVID partnership is cornerstone transfer to provide long-term reliability from Colorado River
- A good long-term working relationship is more important than meeting short-term needs
  - Compromise and consensus vs. coercion
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