



- Board of Directors  
*Water Planning and Stewardship Committee*

4/12/2011 Board Meeting

---

**8-6**

---

## **Subject**

Determine implementation status of Water Supply Allocation Plan for 2011/12; terminate 2010/11 implementation of Water Supply Allocation Plan; and reaffirm Baseline Water Use Efficiency Condition

---

## **Description**

Based on the current outlook of water supply, demand, and storage conditions, staff recommends that the Board not implement the Water Supply Allocation Plan (WSAP) for 2011/12. Additionally, staff recommends that as of April 13, 2011, the Board terminate implementation of the 2010/11 WSAP Level 2 allocation, and the current "Condition 3 – Water Supply Allocation" Water Supply Condition declaration while reaffirming Baseline Water Use Efficiency. As a result of terminating the 2010/11 WSAP implementation, the 2010/11 seawater barrier allocation would also be terminated. Further, once the current Level 2 WSAP allocation is lifted, the General Manager would also remove the 2011 Interim Agricultural Water Program (IAWP) reduction.

## **Background**

In February 2008, the Board approved Metropolitan's WSAP. The WSAP sets forth the specific formulas for calculating member agency supply allocations and the key implementation elements needed for administering an allocation. According to the WSAP, the Board is to consider implementation of the WSAP each April for the upcoming fiscal year. At that time, the Board determines the WSAP Regional Shortage Level, if any, that will be implemented for the following July through June.

In April 2009, the Board declared a regional "Water Supply Condition 3 – Water Supply Allocation" and implemented the WSAP at a Regional Shortage Level 2. The WSAP Level 2 set in April 2009 was in effect from July 1, 2009 through June 30, 2010. In April 2010, the Board again implemented the WSAP at a Regional Shortage Level 2. The current Level 2 WSAP implementation began July 1, 2010, and is effective through June 30, 2011.

In August 2010, the Board approved modifications to the WSAP formula, including a new provision that sets a separate Seawater Barrier Allocation and set the allocation of seawater barrier supplies for July 1, 2010 through June 30, 2011. One condition outlined in the Seawater Barrier Allocation provision is that cutbacks to seawater barrier demands be no deeper than the WSAP implemented at the time. As a result of terminating the current WSAP Level 2 implementation, the current implementation of the Seawater Barrier Allocation would also terminate.

In October 2008, the Board approved changes to the IAWP program that included provisions for a complete phase-out of the program by 2013. The IAWP Phase-Out defines the maximum IAWP Reduction Percentage that can be implemented based on the WSAP Regional Shortage Level in place at the time. Once the current Level 2 WSAP allocation is lifted, the General Manager would also remove the 2011 IAWP reduction.

Since the beginning of the year, staff has provided the Board with regular Water Surplus and Drought Management (WSDM) updates on the developing water supply, demand, and storage conditions for 2011. The regular WSDM update report for this month is included as [Attachment 1](#) to this letter, rather than as a separate

information item. The water supply, demand, and storage information contained in this letter is current as of March 28, 2011.

### **Key Considerations for 2011/12 WSAP Decision**

Key considerations in the WSAP implementation decision for 2011/12 are the SWP allocation, projected end-of-year storage, and potential supply increases in 2011.

The SWP allocation and projected end-of-year storage for 2011 are significantly higher than the conditions in 2009 and 2010. When the decision was made to implement the WSAP in April 2009, the State Water Project (SWP) Table A allocation was 20 percent and storage reserves were projected to drop below 1 MAF by the end of the year. Again in April 2010, the SWP Table A allocation stood at 15 percent and end of year storage was projected to be well below 1 MAF. Based on Metropolitan's storage management framework, the Board implemented the WSAP at a Regional Shortage Level 2 in both years. As the Board considers implementation of the WSAP for 2011/12, the water supply and storage conditions are considerably more favorable than in the previous two years.

Given current supply conditions and beginning-of-year storage levels of 1.69 MAF, staff estimates that storage levels will increase by up to 800 TAF. Under these conditions, the region could end the year with well above 2 MAF of water in dry year storage. In addition, there are a number of potential factors that could further improve the water supply and demand balance; these factors include unused agricultural supplies on the CRA system, lower than forecasted demands, and additional SWP allocation increases. Currently, the SWP Table A allocation is at 70 percent, but based on wet hydrologic conditions that occurred in March, staff projects that the SWP Table A allocation will increase and that storage levels could increase even more than currently shown.

Based on anticipated end-of-year storage levels and the potential for further additional increases in supply, staff recommends that no action be taken to implement the WSAP for 2011/12. For additional information on the forecasted range of outcomes for 2011 see [Attachment 1](#).

### **Key Considerations for Immediately Terminating Current Supply Allocations**

The above-normal supply conditions and significantly reduced member agency demands in 2010/11 support ending the current supply allocations, including Seawater Barrier and IAWP Allocations. Additionally, the Governor's action to terminate the State's drought proclamation highlights the difficulty of continuing allocations for another 10 weeks.

Through the end of February 2011, total cumulative member agency deliveries are about 385 TAF, or 27 percent, below the WSAP Regional Shortage Level 2. . Based on current demand trends, staff projects that none of the member agencies would exceed their allocations by the end of the Allocation Year; no penalties would be assessed for the 2010/11 WSAP. By ending the current WSAP allocation, there is very little risk of demands increasing beyond what is already accounted for in the water supply and demand balance.

In August 2010, the Board adopted an allocation of supplies to meet 100 percent of seawater barrier demands. Based on the 100 percent allocation of supplies, there is no risk of demand increase due to terminating the 2010/11 Seawater Barrier Allocation.

As the IAWP phase-out plan progresses, the program baseline has been reduced to less than 75 TAF from the original baseline of nearly 153 TAF. The program will be completely phased out by 2013. The IAWP phase-out also includes a gradual reduction of the IAWP discount and an adjustment in required delivery cutbacks under various water supply conditions. The current 20 percent IAWP reduction sets a total usage target for the program of about 60 TAF. The potential demand increase associated with removing the 2011 IAWP allocation is minimal. The maximum risk of increase is limited to about 15 TAF, which is the difference between the 60 TAF usage target and the 75 TAF baseline.

In total, staff estimates the potential demand increases from removing the 2010/11 allocation will be minimal. In addition, supplies are clearly available to meet these potential increases while still increasing regional storage levels.

**Recommendation**

Based on the current outlook of water supply, demand, and storage conditions, staff recommends that the Board not implement the WSAP for 2011/12. Additionally, staff recommends that as of April 13, 2011 the Board terminate implementation of the 2010/11 WSAP Level 2 allocation, and the current "Condition 3 – Water Supply Allocation" Water Supply Condition declaration. This action would also reaffirm the Baseline Water Use Efficiency Condition for the region.

**Policy**

---

By Minute Item 47393, dated February 12, 2008, the Board adopted the Water Supply Allocation Plan.

By Minute Item 47526, dated June 10, 2008, the Board adopted the Water Supply Alert Resolution.

By Minute Item 47672, dated October 14, 2008, the Board adopted changes to the Interim Agricultural Water Program.

By Minute Item 48237, dated April 13, 2010, the Board adopted implementation of the Water Supply Allocation Plan at a Level 2, and maintained the water supply "Condition 3 – Water Supply Allocation" declaration.

By Minute Item 48376, dated August 17, 2010, the Board adopted proposed adjustments to the Water Supply Allocation Plan, and the allocation of seawater barrier supplies for the 2010/11 Allocation Year.

**California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)**

---

CEQA determination for Options #1 and #2:

The project previously was determined to be categorically and statutorily exempt under the provisions of CEQA and State CEQA Guidelines. Specifically, the WSAP was found to be exempt under 15301 (Class 1), 15307 (Class 7), 15308 (Class 8) and 15378(b)(4) of the State CEQA Guidelines. In addition, the WSAP was found to be exempt pursuant to Water Code Section 10652, to the extent this plan serves as the basis for the urban water shortage contingency analysis required under Water Code Section 10631 and is incorporated into Metropolitan's RUWMP. These determinations were made on February 12, 2008, and a Notice of Exemption (NOE) was filed shortly thereafter. With the current board action, there is no substantial change proposed to the project. Hence, the previous environmental documentation prepared in conjunction with the project fully complies with CEQA and the State CEQA Guidelines. Accordingly, no further CEQA documentation is necessary for the Board to act with regard to the proposed action.

The CEQA determination is: Determine that the proposed action has been addressed previously in the original NOE and that no further environmental analysis or documentation is required.

CEQA determination for Option #3:

None required

**Board Options**

---

**Option #1**

Adopt the CEQA determination and

- a. Do not implement the WSAP for 2011/12;
- b. Terminate the current 2010/11 WSAP Level 2 implementation, and the current “Condition 3 – Water Supply Allocation” declaration as of April 13, 2011;
- c. Reaffirm Baseline Water Use Efficiency.

**Fiscal Impact:** None directly related to a declaration of a water supply condition or to an implementation of the WSAP

**Business Analysis:** Not implementing the WSAP for 2011/12, terminating the current WSAP allocation, and terminating the Water Supply Condition declaration is consistent with Metropolitan’s storage management framework. The reaffirmation of Baseline Water Use Efficiency emphasizes the importance of continuing conservation efforts.

**Option #2**

Adopt the CEQA determination and

- a. Do not implement the WSAP for 2011/12;
- b. Do not terminate the current 2010/11 WSAP Level 2 implementation; and
- c. Terminate the current “Condition 3 – Water Supply Allocation” declaration as of July 1, 2011.

**Fiscal Impact:** None directly related to a declaration of a water supply condition or to an implementation of the WSAP

**Business Analysis:** Not taking action to implement the WSAP for 2011/12, not terminating the current WSAP allocation, and not terminating the Water Supply Condition declaration is consistent with Metropolitan’s storage management framework, but creates potential confusion in messaging due to the timing of the 2011/12 implementation decision, and the timing of the existing supply allocations.

**Staff Recommendation**

---

Option #1

  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 Deven N. Upadhyay  
 Manager, Water Resource Management

3/30/2011  
Date

  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 Jeffrey Kightlinger  
 General Manager

3/30/2011  
Date

**Attachment 1 – Water Surplus and Drought Management Plan Report**



THE METROPOLITAN WATER DISTRICT  
OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

# Report

## Water Resource Management

- Water Surplus and Drought Management Plan

### Summary

This is a monthly report on developing demand and supply conditions for calendar year (CY) 2011.

On March 15, 2011, the California Department of Water Resources (DWR) increased the State Water Project (SWP) Table A allocation by another 10 percent, raising the current allocation to 70 percent. This increase is the second this calendar year following a relatively wet February and March. The 10 percent increase of SWP Table A boosted Metropolitan's SWP Table A supplies by 191 TAF. In addition, DWR also made Article 21 interruptible water available to the SWP contractors for the first time since 2007, and Metropolitan has taken delivery of about 150 TAF through the end of March 2011. Article 21 supplies are surplus flows that are periodically available in addition to the allocated Table A amounts and increases the total SWP water supplies for the year. DWR also made available the Turn-Back Water Pool for purchase. The Turn-Back Water Pool allows SWP contractors to sell and buy allocated SWP Table A water outside of their service area. Metropolitan is purchasing 8 TAF of the Pool A water. Furthermore, to prevent spilling carryover-water from CY 2010, Metropolitan took delivery of 104 TAF of SWP Non-Project Carryover water and 56 TAF of Article 14b Carryover water. Non-Project Carryover water is stored on behalf of Westlands Water District in CY 2010. Article 14b Carryover water is water that Metropolitan was not able to move in CY 2010 due to DWR system outages. In total, Metropolitan currently has a total of 2.51 MAF of supplies available to the service area from the SWP and the Colorado River Aqueduct (CRA).

In-region demands, obligations, and system losses are estimated to range between 1.72 MAF and 2.23 MAF. On the lower end of the range, the estimated demands are equivalent to CY 2010 actual demand. On the higher end, the estimated demands are based on actual January through March 2011 deliveries, full use of WSAP Level 2 member agency allocations for April through June and WSAP Baseline (no WSAP allocation) demands for July through December plus obligations to return or deliver water supply to other agencies and total system losses. For the third consecutive month, actual demands are tracking lower than WSAP levels.

Based on current water supplies and demands (WSAP allocations and 2010 actual demands), there is a range of outcomes for CY 2011. With demands at a higher end of 2.23 MAF Metropolitan will have a surplus of 280 TAF available for storage. With demands at a lower end of 1.72 MAF, Metropolitan could expect to store up to 790 TAF. Metropolitan has available storage put capacity of 1.05 MAF to manage surplus supply if needed. Although this total storage put capacity is available, some storage locations may be less desirable due to increased risk of future losses and potential cost implications. As the amount of available water to store approaches the maximum put capacity, storage management decisions may be made that reduces the effective storage put capacity for the year.

Although the year has reached a point where supplies have traditionally been stable, supply and demand conditions may continue to be variable through the year. Staff will provide updates to keep the Board apprised of any significantly changed conditions.

Supply & Demand Balance	Demand at Full WSAP Use	With 2010 Demand
Colorado River Aqueduct Available To Service Area	768,000	768,000
State Water Project Available to Service Area	1,739,000	1,739,000
Supplies Available to Service Area	2,507,000	2,507,000
In-Region Demands, Obligations, and Total System Losses	2,227,000	1,717,000
Water Balance	280,000	790,000
Storage Put Capacity	1,051,000	1,051,000

### Attachments

[Attachment A: WSDM Supplies for CY 2011](#)

Board Report (Water Surplus and Drought Management Plan)

**Detailed Report**

This report appries the Board of anticipated supply and demand conditions, and identifies potential actions that may be required to ensure reliability. The imported supplies shown in this report are organized to highlight the supplies and demands, obligations, and losses on the CRA and SWP. This allows for a full view of the available sources of supply anticipated for use within the service area. The balance between these supplies and the demands, obligations, and losses within the service area shows in the case of a shortage, the additional supplies or storage that would be needed. In the case of a surplus, the balance shows the amount of water that can potentially be stored. The section on storage highlights the available capacities of Metropolitan’s storage portfolio.

**Colorado River Aqueduct System**

The table below shows the current estimate of anticipated CRA supplies for CY 2011 is 0.94 MAF. This figure is 60 TAF less than the estimate provided in last month’s report. The 60 TAF of the Southern Nevada Water Authority Agreement (SNWA) water is not needed and has been removed from the list of anticipated CRA supplies since there are sufficient SWP supplies this year. CRA supplies consists of Metropolitan’s Basic Apportionment (550 TAF) and all other Colorado River supplies developed to date, including water transfers that are diverted at Metropolitan’s intake at Lake Havasu.

<b>Anticipated Supplies</b>	
Basic Apportionment	550,000
Canal Lining Water to MWD	16,000
Lower Colorado Water Supply Project	4,000
IID/MWD Conservation Program	85,000
PVID Land Fallowing	120,000
Water Exchanged with SDCWA (IID Transfer and Canal Lining)	161,000
Yuma Desalter	7,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>943,000</b>

Demands and obligations on the CRA system increased from 155 TAF to 175 TAF since last month’s report. The 20 TAF increase of obligation reflects the increase of SWP Table A allocation for SWP contractors Desert Water Agency and Coachella Valley Water District (DWCV), which in turn increased Metropolitan’s obligation to deliver water through the SWP exchange and delivery agreement with these two agencies. Other obligations comprised of delivery obligations to the Coachella Valley Water District (CVWD) as part of the Quantification Settlement Agreement, the 2008 exchange agreement with DWA and the Miscellaneous and Indian present perfected rights use. The table below lists the obligations and their corresponding quantities.

<b>Demands and Obligations</b>	
CVWD QSA Obligation	35,000
DWCV Table A (70 percent allocation)	136,000
DWA Exchange Agreement	1,000
Misc and Indian PPR Use	2,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>175,000</b>

The table below shows the total supplies and demands on the CRA System. This table reflects the obligations as mentioned above. The resulting figure of 768 TAF is the amount of water available to Metropolitan’s service area without using storage.

<b>Colorado River Aqueduct Available to Service Area</b>	
Anticipated Supplies	943,000
Demands and Obligations	175,000
Net Storage to Service Area	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>768,000</b>

Board Report (Water Surplus and Drought Management Plan)

**State Water Project System**

On March 15, 2011, DWR increased the SWP Table A allocation by 10 percent, raising the current allocation to 70 percent. This increase is the second this calendar year and follows a relatively wet February and March. The 10 percent increase of SWP Table A boosted Metropolitan’s SWP Table A supplies by 191 TAF. In addition, DWR also made Article 21 interruptible water available to the SWP contractors for the first time since 2007 and Metropolitan has taken delivery of about 150 TAF of the additional supply through the end of March 2011. Article 21 water is surplus flows that are periodically available in addition to the allocated Table A amounts and increases the total SWP water supplies for the year. DWR also made available Turn-Back Water Pool for purchase. The Turn-Back Water Pool allows SWP contractors to sell and buy allocated SWP Table A water outside of their service area. Metropolitan is purchasing 8 TAF of the Turn-Back Pool A water. Furthermore, to prevent spilling carryover-water from CY 2010, Metropolitan took delivery of 104 TAF of SWP Non-Project Carryover water and 56 TAF of Article 14b Carryover water. Non-Project Carryover water is stored on behalf of Westlands Water District in CY 2010. Article 14b Carryover water is water that Metropolitan was not able to move in CY 2010 due to DWR system outages.

The table below shows Metropolitan’s anticipated supplies from the SWP system. Note that Yuba Component 3 Water has been removed from the table. Under this agreement, when SWP Table A allocation is above 60 percent Yuba County Water Agency is not obligated to provide Component 3 Water. The net increase from last month’s report is 519 TAF. It should also be noted that the recent hydrologic conditions have improved the chances for further increases in the SWP Table A allocation.

<b>Anticipated Supplies</b>	
Metropolitan	
Table A (70 percent allocation)	1,338,000
Port Hueneme Agreement	1,000
SBVMWD Transfer	20,000
Article 21	150,000
MWD Turn-Back Water Pool A	8,000
SWP Non-Project Carryover	104,000
Article 14b Carryover	56,000
DWCV	
Table A	136,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,813,000</b>

Demands and obligations on the SWP totaling 74 TAF are shown below. At the current time, this is comprised of a return obligation to the Westlands Water District as part of the transfer and exchange program Metropolitan entered with them in CY 2010. The program was for a total of 111 TAF, with two-thirds of the program amount (74 TAF) due to be returned in CY 2011.

<b>Demands and Obligations</b>	
Westlands WD Exchange	74,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>74,000</b>

The table below shows the total supplies and demands from the SWP System. The resulting figure of 1.74 MAF is the amount of water available to Metropolitan’s service area.

<b>State Water Project Available to Service Area</b>	
Anticipated Supplies	1,813,000
Demands, Obligations & Losses	74,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,739,000</b>

Board Report (Water Surplus and Drought Management Plan)

**Storage Balances and Availability**

Metropolitan has developed significant storage programs within its service area as well as on the CRA and SWP systems. Water stored in these programs can be used to augment water supplies when needed. At times when supplies exceed demands, water can be stored for future use. Metropolitan’s dry-year storage totaled 1.69 MAF at the beginning of 2011, not including emergency storage of 626 TAF. Under current conditions Metropolitan does not anticipate needing to withdraw water from storage. The estimated put capacity to storage is 1.05 MAF. With the increase in SWP Table A allocation to 70 percent, Metropolitan is able to store up to 180 TAF in the SWP Carryover, a 40 TAF increase from when the SWP Table A allocation was at 60 percent. There was also a decrease in expected put capacity for several programs, including the removal of the Las Posas Program and a revision to the capacities for the Central Valley storage programs with Arvin-Edison and Semitropic. For a detailed breakdown of storage see [Attachment A](#).

<b>Dry-Year Storage Capacities</b>	
Storage Level	1,690,000
Take Capacity	1,529,000
Put Capacity	1,051,000

**In-Region Demands, Obligations, and Total System Losses**

In the Metropolitan service area, total water demand is comprised of member agency demands, obligations to deliver supplies (i.e. SDCWA/IID Transfer and Canal Lining), and total system losses including those from the CRA.

Since the first implementation of the WSAP in 2009, staff has been providing water demand estimates assuming member agencies make full use of their current WSAP allocations for the first half of the calendar year, combined with an unallocated “WSAP Baseline” demand for the second half of the calendar year. This method allows for transparent adjustments on a monthly basis as actual monthly water use figures replace previously estimated figures. The method provides for a clearly defined figure that is useful when the Board is considering potential WSAP implementation for the following year. Based on this method, the estimated in-region demands, obligations, and total system losses as of the end of March are 2.23 MAF. This includes estimated demands for January through March based on actual delivery to date, WSAP Level 2 demands for April through June and WSAP Baseline demands for July through December. This figure is about 106 TAF lower than previously reported as the actual deliveries for January through March were low. Demands in CY 2010 were significantly below the allocated WSAP Level 2, and this lower level of demand may continue through CY 2011. After final accounting, the actual in-region demands, obligations and total system losses for CY 2010 were estimated at approximately 1.72 MAF.

The table below shows a range of demands from calculated WSAP allocations to last year’s actual demands.

<b>In-Region Demands, Obligations, and Total System Losses</b>	<b>Demand at Full WSAP Use</b>	<b>With 2010 Demand</b>
Member Agency Demand	2,009,000	1,508,000
Water Exchanged with SDCWA (IID Transfer and Canal Lining)	161,000	152,000
System Losses	57,000	57,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,227,000</b>	<b>1,717,000</b>

**Water Balance**

Based on the current anticipated supplies from the CRA and SWP, there is a sufficient amount of water to meet and exceed both demand scenarios described above. If demand is at full WSAP use of 2.23 MAF, Metropolitan will have a surplus of 280 TAF for storage. If 2011 demands are similar to the CY 2010 demands of 1.72 MAF, there will be 790 TAF of surplus water for storage.



## Board Report (Water Surplus and Drought Management Plan)

The table below shows that there is sufficient storage put capacity to manage the potential range of supplies available for storage. Although this total storage put capacity is available, some storage locations may be less desirable due to increased risk of future losses and potential cost implications. As the amount of available water to store approaches the maximum put capacity, storage management decisions may be made that reduces the effective storage put capacity for the year.

Based on the supply and demand assumptions outlined in this report, the estimated end-of-year storage balance will range between 1.97 MAF and 2.48 MAF, and may increase to higher levels if additional supplies from the CRA and SWP become available and demands continue to be low.

<b>Supply &amp; Demand Balance</b>	<b>Demand at Full WSAP Use</b>	<b>With 2010 Demand</b>
Colorado River Aqueduct Supplies		
Anticipated Supplies	943,000	943,000
Demands and Obligations	175,000	175,000
<i>Colorado River Aqueduct Available To Service Area</i>	<i>768,000</i>	<i>768,000</i>
State Water Project Supplies		
Anticipated Supplies	1,813,000	1,813,000
Demands and Obligations	74,000	74,000
<i>State Water Project Available to Service Area</i>	<i>1,739,000</i>	<i>1,739,000</i>
<b>Supplies Available to Service Area</b>	<b>2,507,000</b>	<b>2,507,000</b>
<b>In-Region Demands, Obligations, and Total System Losses</b>	<b>2,227,000</b>	<b>1,717,000</b>
<b>Water Balance</b>	<b>280,000</b>	<b>790,000</b>
<b>Storage Put Capacity</b>	<b>1,051,000</b>	<b>1,051,000</b>
<b>Estimated End-of-Year Storage</b>	<b>1,970,000</b>	<b>2,480,000</b>

### Attachment A

Board Report (Water Surplus and Drought Management Plan on water supply and demand)

#### Projected WSDM Storage Use and Balances for CY2011 by Delivery System

2011 WSDM Storage	1/1/2011 Storage Levels	CY 2011 Take Capacity	CY 2011 Put Capacity
<b>Colorado River Aqueduct Delivery System</b>	<b>244,000</b>	<b>244,000</b>	<b>207,000</b>
Lake Mead ICS Account	227,000	227,000	200,000
Yuma Desalting Plant	17,000	17,000	7,000
<b>State Water Project System</b>	<b>681,000</b>	<b>561,000</b>	<b>457,000</b>
MWD SWP Carryover	0	0	180,000
DWCV SWP Carryover	0	0	87,000
SWP Non-Project Carryover	104,000	104,000	0
Article 14b Carryover	56,000	56,000	0
Castaic Lake (DWR Flex Storage)	154,000	154,000	0
Lake Perris (DWR Flex Storage)	65,000	65,000	0
Arvin Edison Storage Program	109,000	75,000	60,000
Semitropic Storage Program	111,000	57,000	74,000
Kern Delta Storage Program	82,000	50,000	56,000
Mojave Storage Program	0	0	0
<b>In-Region Supplies and WSDM Actions</b>	<b>879,000</b>	<b>588,000</b>	<b>273,000</b>
Diamond Valley Lake	638,000	459,000	172,000
Lake Mathews	139,000	61,000	43,000
Lake Skinner	40,000	6,000	4,000
IEUA/TVMWD (Chino Basin)	2,000	2,000	25,000
Long Beach (Cent. Basin)	6,000	6,000	3,000
Long Beach (Lakewood)	1,000	1,000	1,000
Foothill (Raymond and Monks Hill)	1,000	1,000	2,000
Calleguas (Las Posas)	35,000	35,000	0
MWDOC (Orange County Basin)	15,000	15,000	17,000
Three Valleys (Live Oak)	1,000	1,000	1,000
Three Valleys (Upper Claremont)	1,000	1,000	1,000
Compton	0	0	1,000
Western	0	0	3,000
Cyclic - USG	0	0	0
Cyclic - PM (Three Valleys)	0	0	0
Cyclic - IEUA (Chino Basin)	0	0	0
Supplemental Storage Program (Los Angeles)	0	0	0
<b>Other Programs</b>	<b>512,000</b>	<b>136,000</b>	<b>114,000</b>
Other Emergency Storage	334,000	0	0
Advance Delivery Account (DWCV)	178,000	136,000	114,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,316,000</b>	<b>1,529,000</b>	<b>1,051,000</b>
Emergency	626,000	0	0
<b>Total WSDM Storage</b>	<b>1,690,000</b>	<b>1,529,000</b>	<b>1,051,000</b>