

Urban Water Supplier Conservation Tiers

Tier	R-GPCD Range		# of Suppliers in Range	Conservation Standard
	From	To		
1			4	4%
2	0	64.99	27	8%
3	65	79.99	23	12%
4	80	94.99	42	16%
5	95	109.99	61	20%
6	110	129.99	45	24%
7	130	169.99	81	28%
8	170	214.99	61	32%
9	215	612.00	67	36%

Estimated Statewide Water Savings (%)	24%
--	------------

Urban Water Supplier Conservation Tiers

Supplier Name	Jul-Sep 2014 R-GPCD	Tier	Conservation Standard
Adelanto City of	108.5	5	20%
Alameda County Water Dist.	88.3	4	16%
Alco Water Service	124.2	6	24%
Alhambra City of	118.3	6	24%
Amador Water Agency	112.9	6	24%
American Canyon, City of	96.2	5	20%
Anaheim City of	108.6	5	20%
Anderson, City of	260.8	9	36%
Antioch City of	141.9	7	28%
Apple Valley Ranchos Water Co.	159.8	7	28%
Arcadia City of	318.5	9	36%
Arcata City of	43.5	1	4%
Arroyo Grande City of	132.2	7	28%
Arvin Community Services Dist.	157.9	7	28%
Atascadero Mutual Water Co.	163.0	7	28%
Atwater City of	308.0	9	36%
Azusa City of	97.3	5	20%
Bakersfield City of	279.9	9	36%
Bakman Water Co.	302.2	9	36%
Banning City of	179.4	8	32%
Beaumont-Cherry Valley Water Dist.	269.7	9	36%
Bella Vista Water Dist.	386.3	9	36%
Bellflower-Somerset Mutual Water Co.	96.1	5	20%
Benicia City of	105.6	5	20%
Beverly Hills City of	208.9	8	32%
Big Bear City Community Services Dist.	89.8	4	16%
Blythe City of	185.8	8	32%
Brawley City of	179.5	8	32%
Brea City of	125.9	6	24%
Brentwood City of	174.8	8	32%
Buena Park City of	107.0	5	20%
Burbank City of	128.2	6	24%
Burlingame City of	90.4	4	16%
Calaveras County Water Dist.	82.7	4	16%
Calexico City of	104.6	5	20%
California City City of	307.0	9	36%
California Water Service Co. Antelope Valley	297.0	9	36%
California Water Service Co. Bakersfield	197.6	8	32%
California Water Service Co. Bear Gulch	252.5	9	36%
California Water Service Co. Chico Dist.	210.4	8	32%
California Water Service Co. Dixon, City of	144.3	7	28%
California Water Service Co. Dominguez	83.7	4	16%
California Water Service Co. East Los Angeles	51.4	2	8%
California Water Service Co. Hermosa/Redondo	96.4	5	20%

Data current as of 7/15/15.

* Some data may be revised and will affect production and savings values; Tier and Conservation Standard will not change.

Urban Water Supplier Conservation Tiers

Supplier Name	Jul-Sep 2014 R-GPCD	Tier	Conservation Standard
California Water Service Co. Kern River Valley	148.9	7	28%
California Water Service Co. King City	67.7	3	12%
California Water Service Co. Livermore	120.5	6	24%
California Water Service Co. Los Altos/Suburban	173.8	8	32%
California Water Service Co. Marysville	125.5	6	24%
California Water Service Co. Mid Peninsula	87.4	4	16%
California Water Service Co. Oroville	131.6	7	28%
California Water Service Co. Palos Verdes	255.4	9	36%
California Water Service Co. Redwood Valley	93.3	4	16%
California Water Service Co. Salinas Dist.	86.0	4	16%
California Water Service Co. Selma	189.2	8	32%
California Water Service Co. South San Francisco	48.8	2	8%
California Water Service Co. Stockton	97.6	5	20%
California Water Service Co. Visalia	191.7	8	32%
California Water Service Co. Westlake	336.7	9	36%
California Water Service Co. Willows	168.6	7	28%
California-American Water Co. Los Angeles Dist.	156.8	7	28%
California-American Water Co. Monterey Dist.	56.0	2	8%
California-American Water Co. Sacramento Dist.	107.8	5	20%
California-American Water Co. San Diego Dist.	51.9	2	8%
California-American Water Ventura Dist.	184.6	8	32%
Camarillo City of	107.5	5	20%
Cambria Community Services Dist.	54.4	2	8%
Camrosa Water Dist.	183.3	8	32%
Carlsbad Municipal Water Dist.	138.6	7	28%
Carmichael Water Dist.	242.5	9	36%
Carpinteria Valley Water Dist.	98.2	5	20%
Casitas Municipal Water Dist.	183.0	8	32%
Castaic Lake Water Agency Santa Clarita Water Division	174.8	8	32%
Central Coast Water Authority	72.7	3	12%
Ceres City of	166.3	7	28%
Cerritos City of	153.6	7	28%
Chino City of	126.7	6	24%
Chino Hills City of	157.8	7	28%
Citrus Heights Water Dist.	201.4	8	32%
City of Big Bear Lake, Dept of Water & Power	80.8	4	16%
City of Newman Water Department	129.2	6	24%
Clovis City of	235.2	9	36%
Coachella City of	125.5	6	24%
Coachella Valley Water Dist.	288.6	9	36%
Coastside County Water Dist.	61.9	2	8%
Colton, City of	109.8	5	20%
Compton City of	63.6	2	8%
Contra Costa Water Dist.	139.9	7	28%

Data current as of 7/15/15.

* Some data may be revised and will affect production and savings values; Tier and Conservation Standard will not change.

Urban Water Supplier Conservation Tiers

Supplier Name	Jul-Sep 2014 R-GPCD	Tier	Conservation Standard
Corcoran, City of	223.7	9	36%
Corona City of	144.7	7	28%
Covina City of	154.7	7	28%
Crescent City City of	94.5	4	16%
Crescenta Valley Water Dist.	109.4	5	20%
Crestline Village Water Dist.	60.4	2	8%
Cucamonga Valley Water Dist.	184.2	8	32%
Daly City City of	58.8	2	8%
Davis City of	143.9	7	28%
Del Oro Water Co.	116.7	6	24%
Delano City of	119.4	6	24%
Desert Water Agency	416.0	9	36%
Diablo Water Dist.	147.7	7	28%
Dinuba City of	172.3	8	32%
Discovery Bay Community Services Dist.	189.6	8	32%
Downey City of	106.9	5	20%
Dublin San Ramon Services Dist.	75.9	3	12%
East Bay Municipal Utilities Dist.	94.2	4	16%
East Niles Community Service Dist.	271.8	9	36%
East Orange County Water Dist.	277.6	9	36%
East Palo Alto, City of	58.9	2	8%
East Valley Water Dist.	169.4	7	28%
Eastern Municipal Water Dist.	130.7	7	28%
El Centro City of	119.5	6	24%
El Dorado Irrigation Dist.	166.2	7	28%
El Monte City of	56.0	2	8%
El Segundo City of	97.9	5	20%
El Toro Water Dist.	119.9	6	24%
Elk Grove Water Service	145.3	7	28%
Elsinore Valley Municipal Water Dist.	146.3	7	28%
Escondido City of	103.6	5	20%
Estero Municipal Improvement Dist.	72.8	3	12%
Eureka City of	75.2	1	4%
Exeter City of	224.9	9	36%
Fair Oaks Water Dist.	274.1	9	36%
Fairfield City of	106.7	5	20%
Fallbrook Public Utility Dist.	217.3	9	36%
Fillmore City of	165.6	7	28%
Folsom City of	213.7	8	32%
Fortuna City of	121.2	6	24%
Fountain Valley City of	100.2	5	20%
Fresno City of	146.4	7	28%
Fruitridge Vista Water Co.	238.3	9	36%
Fullerton City of	136.8	7	28%

Data current as of 7/15/15.

* Some data may be revised and will affect production and savings values; Tier and Conservation Standard will not change.

Urban Water Supplier Conservation Tiers

Supplier Name	Jul-Sep 2014 R-GPCD	Tier	Conservation Standard
Galt City of	207.2	8	32%
Garden Grove City of	98.3	5	20%
Georgetown Divide Public Utilities Dist.	170.4	8	32%
Gilroy City of	117.6	6	24%
Glendale City of	107.1	5	20%
Glendora City of	242.0	9	36%
Golden State Water Co. Artesia	83.4	4	16%
Golden State Water Co. Barstow	125.4	6	24%
Golden State Water Co. Bay Point	69.3	3	12%
Golden State Water Co. Bell-Bell Gardens	60.8	2	8%
Golden State Water Co. Claremont	213.2	8	32%
Golden State Water Co. Cordova	224.5	9	36%
Golden State Water Co. Cowan Heights	401.6	9	36%
Golden State Water Co. Culver City	84.8	4	16%
Golden State Water Co. Florence Graham	59.7	2	8%
Golden State Water Co. Norwalk	72.2	3	12%
Golden State Water Co. Ojai	261.1	9	36%
Golden State Water Co. Orcutt	199.8	8	32%
Golden State Water Co. Placentia	119.0	6	24%
Golden State Water Co. S Arcadia	118.5	6	24%
Golden State Water Co. S San Gabriel	73.6	3	12%
Golden State Water Co. San Dimas	159.0	7	28%
Golden State Water Co. Simi Valley	129.8	6	24%
Golden State Water Co. Southwest	68.2	3	12%
Golden State Water Co. West Orange	94.2	4	16%
Goleta Water Dist.	65.5	3	12%
Great Oaks Water Co. Incorporated	104.2	5	20%
Greenfield, City of	82.9	4	16%
Groveland Community Services Dist.	127.5	6	24%
Grover Beach City of	62.1	2	8%
Hanford City of	160.0	7	28%
Hawthorne City of	86.7	4	16%
Hayward City of	62.1	2	8%
Healdsburg City of	128.2	6	24%
Helix Water Dist.	103.6	5	20%
Hemet City of	192.6	8	32%
Hesperia Water Dist. City of	174.6	8	32%
Hi-Desert Water Dist.	90.3	4	16%
Hillsborough Town of	324.5	9	36%
Hollister City of	104.4	5	20%
Humboldt Bay Municipal Water Dist.	132.1	1	4%
Humboldt Community Service Dist.	117.9	6	24%
Huntington Beach City of	109.0	5	20%
Huntington Park City of	51.9	2	8%

Data current as of 7/15/15.

* Some data may be revised and will affect production and savings values; Tier and Conservation Standard will not change.

Urban Water Supplier Conservation Tiers

Supplier Name	Jul-Sep 2014 R-GPCD	Tier	Conservation Standard
Imperial, City of	127.6	6	24%
Indian Wells Valley Water Dist.	240.8	9	36%
Indio City of	186.6	8	32%
Inglewood City of	65.1	3	12%
Irvine Ranch Water Dist.	91.7	4	16%
Joshua Basin Water Dist.	135.3	7	28%
Jurupa Community Service Dist.	155.5	7	28%
Kerman, City of	192.7	8	32%
Kingsburg, City of	332.7	9	36%
La Habra City of Public Works	137.5	7	28%
La Palma City of	96.1	5	20%
La Verne City of	176.5	8	32%
Laguna Beach County Water Dist.	121.0	6	24%
Lake Arrowhead Community Services Dist.	81.5	4	16%
Lake Hemet Municipal Water Dist.	150.5	7	28%
Lakeside Water Dist.	109.2	5	20%
Lakewood City of	105.0	5	20%
Lamont Public Utility Dist.	163.9	7	28%
Las Virgenes Municipal Water Dist.	318.4	9	36%
Lathrop, City of	100.5	5	20%
Lee Lake Water Dist.	182.3	8	32%
Lemoore City of	198.9	8	32%
Lincoln City of	193.4	8	32%
Lincoln Avenue Water Co.	137.2	7	28%
Linda County Water Dist.	211.0	8	32%
Livermore City of Division of Water Resources	100.0	5	20%
Livingston City of	204.2	8	32%
Lodi City of Public Works Department	210.3	8	32%
Loma Linda City of	173.2	8	32%
Lomita City of	98.3	5	20%
Lompoc City of	76.6	3	12%
Long Beach City of	83.8	4	16%
Los Angeles County Public Works Waterworks Dist. 29	325.2	9	36%
Los Angeles County Public Works Waterworks Dist. 40	205.5	8	32%
Los Angeles Department of Water and Power	90.0	4	16%
Los Banos, City of	165.4	7	28%
Lynwood City of	86.3	4	16%
Madera City of	157.3	7	28%
Madera County	328.1	9	36%
Mammoth Community Water Dist.	102.9	5	20%
Manhattan Beach City of	103.2	5	20%
Manteca City of	172.1	8	32%
Marin Municipal Water Dist.	107.4	5	20%
Marina Coast Water Dist.	76.5	3	12%

Data current as of 7/15/15.

* Some data may be revised and will affect production and savings values; Tier and Conservation Standard will not change.

Urban Water Supplier Conservation Tiers

Supplier Name	Jul-Sep 2014 R-GPCD	Tier	Conservation Standard
Martinez City of	95.5	5	20%
McKinleyville Community Service Dist.	74.6	1	4%
Menlo Park City of	88.6	4	16%
Merced City of	298.8	9	36%
Mesa Water Dist.	99.0	5	20%
Mid-Peninsula Water Dist.	101.4	5	20%
Millbrae City of	89.2	4	16%
Milpitas City of	72.3	3	12%
Mission Springs Water Dist.	160.0	7	28%
Modesto, City of	245.9	9	36%
Monrovia City of	154.6	7	28%
Monte Vista Water Dist.	125.0	6	24%
Montebello Land and Water Co.	80.5	4	16%
Montecito Water Dist.	197.4	8	32%
Monterey Park City of	99.9	5	20%
Morgan Hill City of	136.5	7	28%
Morro Bay City of	70.0	3	12%
Moulton Niguel Water Dist.	99.1	5	20%
Mountain View City of	82.5	4	16%
Myoma Dunes Mutual Water Co.	612.5	9	36%
Napa City of	109.2	5	20%
Nevada Irrigation Dist.	267.7	9	36%
Newhall County Water Dist.	166.5	7	28%
Newport Beach City of	137.8	7	28%
Nipomo Community Services Dist.	165.4	7	28%
Norco City of	224.3	9	36%
North Coast County Water Dist.	59.5	2	8%
North Marin Water Dist.	129.1	6	24%
North Tahoe Public Utility Dist.	161.3	7	28%
Norwalk City of	98.7	5	20%
Oakdale City of	213.2	8	32%
Oceanside City of	105.1	5	20%
Oildale Mutual Water Co.	306.4	9	36%
Olivehurst Public Utility Dist.	256.0	9	36%
Olivenhain Municipal Water Dist.	192.3	8	32%
Ontario City of	126.9	6	24%
Orange City of	148.7	7	28%
Orange Vale Water Co.	332.3	9	36%
Orchard Dale Water Dist.	78.4	3	12%
Otay Water Dist.	107.1	5	20%
Oxnard City of	66.6	3	12%
Padre Dam Municipal Water Dist.	109.4	5	20%
Palmdale Water Dist.	187.2	8	32%
Palo Alto City of	116.8	6	24%

Data current as of 7/15/15.

* Some data may be revised and will affect production and savings values; Tier and Conservation Standard will not change.

Urban Water Supplier Conservation Tiers

Supplier Name	Jul-Sep 2014 R-GPCD	Tier	Conservation Standard
Paradise Irrigation Dist.	240.8	9	36%
Paramount City of	67.0	3	12%
Park Water Co.	55.6	2	8%
Pasadena City of	139.0	7	28%
Paso Robles City of	146.0	7	28%
Patterson City of	148.3	7	28%
Perris, City of	111.9	6	24%
Petaluma City of	92.4	4	16%
Phelan Pinon Hills Community Services Dist.	181.6	8	32%
Pico Rivera City of	83.7	4	16%
Pico Water Dist.	119.0	6	24%
Pinedale County Water Dist.	247.0	9	36%
Pismo Beach City of	113.1	6	24%
Pittsburg City of	100.3	5	20%
Placer County Water Agency	207.2	8	32%
Pleasanton City of	119.8	6	24%
Pomona City of	95.9	5	20%
Port Hueneme City of	63.5	2	8%
Porterville City of	175.3	8	32%
Poway City of	201.7	8	32%
Quartz Hill Water Dist.	327.0	9	36%
Rainbow Municipal Water Dist.	243.0	9	36%
Ramona Municipal Water Dist.	165.9	7	28%
Rancho California Water Dist.	248.0	9	36%
Red Bluff City of	294.5	9	36%
Redding City of	253.7	9	36%
Redlands City of	274.5	9	36%
Redwood City City of	63.4	2	8%
Reedley City of	126.9	6	24%
Rialto City of	132.2	7	28%
Rincon Del Diablo Municipal Water Dist.	179.2	8	32%
Rio Linda - Elverta Community Water Dist.	278.1	9	36%
Rio Vista, city of	260.9	9	36%
Ripon City of	257.2	9	36%
Riverbank City of	191.4	8	32%
Riverside City of	135.3	7	28%
Riverside Highland Water Co.	253.9	9	36%
Rohnert Park City of	81.0	4	16%
Rosamond Community Service Dist.	158.3	7	28%
Roseville City of	145.1	7	28%
Rowland Water Dist.	99.3	5	20%
Rubidoux Community Service Dist.	158.0	7	28%
Rubio Canyon Land and Water Association	220.8	9	36%
Sacramento City of	146.4	7	28%

Data current as of 7/15/15.

* Some data may be revised and will affect production and savings values; Tier and Conservation Standard will not change.

Urban Water Supplier Conservation Tiers

Supplier Name	Jul-Sep 2014 R-GPCD	Tier	Conservation Standard
Sacramento County Water Agency	172.1	8	32%
Sacramento Suburban Water Dist.	181.9	8	32%
San Bernardino City of	131.1	7	28%
San Bernardino County Service Area 64	190.4	8	32%
San Bernardino County Service Area 70	139.9	7	28%
San Bruno City of	55.7	2	8%
San Buenaventura City of	91.3	4	16%
San Clemente City of	118.3	6	24%
San Diego City of	82.0	4	16%
San Dieguito Water Dist.	148.3	7	28%
San Fernando City of	120.3	6	24%
San Francisco Public Utilities Commission	45.4	2	8%
San Gabriel County Water Dist.	102.9	5	20%
San Gabriel Valley Fontana Water Co.	142.9	7	28%
San Gabriel Valley Water Co.	88.3	4	16%
San Jacinto City of	176.1	8	32%
San Jose City of	96.0	5	20%
San Jose Water Co.	105.7	5	20%
San Juan Capistrano City of	133.3	7	28%
San Juan Water Dist.	476.9	9	36%
San Lorenzo Valley Water Dist.	77.9	3	12%
San Luis Obispo City of	69.9	3	12%
Sanger City of	153.6	7	28%
Santa Ana City of	78.3	3	12%
Santa Barbara City of	79.6	3	12%
Santa Clara City of	88.3	4	16%
Santa Cruz City of	47.3	2	8%
Santa Fe Irrigation Dist.	604.6	9	36%
Santa Fe Springs City of	80.1	4	16%
Santa Margarita Water Dist.	129.4	6	24%
Santa Maria City of	93.0	4	16%
Santa Monica City of	99.2	5	20%
Santa Paula City of	160.2	7	28%
Santa Rosa City of	86.7	4	16%
Scotts Valley Water Dist.	91.6	4	16%
Seal Beach City of	64.7	2	8%
Serrano Water Dist.	539.0	9	36%
Shafter City of	236.5	9	36%
Shasta Lake City of	140.2	7	28%
Sierra Madre City of	214.2	8	32%
Soledad, City of	116.7	6	24%
Sonoma City of	142.5	7	28%
Soquel Creek Water Dist.	64.8	2	8%
South Coast Water Dist.	121.7	6	24%

Data current as of 7/15/15.

* Some data may be revised and will affect production and savings values; Tier and Conservation Standard will not change.

Urban Water Supplier Conservation Tiers

Supplier Name	Jul-Sep 2014 R-GPCD	Tier	Conservation Standard
South Feather Water and Power Agency	465.9	9	36%
South Gate City of	70.1	3	12%
South Pasadena City of	131.0	7	28%
South Tahoe Public Utilities Dist.	102.8	5	20%
Stockton City of	155.0	7	28%
Suburban Water Systems San Jose Hills	118.7	6	24%
Suburban Water Systems Whittier/La Mirada	141.1	7	28%
Suisun-Solano Water Authority	150.0	7	28%
Sunny Slope Water Co.	120.5	6	24%
Sunnyslope County Water Dist.	144.6	7	28%
Sunnyvale City of	85.2	4	16%
Susanville City of	274.0	9	36%
Sweetwater Authority	75.0	3	12%
Sweetwater Springs Water Dist.	80.7	4	16%
Tahoe City Public Utilities Dist.	100.9	5	20%
Tehachapi, City of	143.8	7	28%
Thousand Oaks City of	163.7	7	28%
Torrance City of	97.1	5	20%
Trabuco Canyon Water Dist.	158.0	7	28%
Tracy City of	134.6	7	28%
Triunfo Sanitation Dist. / Oak Park Water Service	195.7	8	32%
Truckee-Donner Public Utilities Dist.	139.4	7	28%
Tulare, City of	214.8	8	32%
Tuolumne Utilities Dist.	129.3	6	24%
Turlock City of	194.0	8	32%
Tustin City of	167.3	7	28%
Twentynine Palms Water Dist.	130.6	7	28%
Ukiah City of	108.6	5	20%
Upland City of	234.9	9	36%
Vacaville City of	199.9	8	32%
Valencia Water Co.	127.0	6	24%
Vallecitos Water Dist.	116.1	6	24%
Vallejo City of	91.3	4	16%
Valley Center Municipal Water Dist.	291.2	9	36%
Valley County Water Dist.	81.6	4	16%
Valley of the Moon Water Dist.	106.5	5	20%
Valley Water Co.	400.8	9	36%
Vaughn Water Co.	507.0	9	36%
Ventura County Waterworks Dist. No 1	175.3	8	32%
Ventura County Waterworks Dist. No. 8	156.1	7	28%
Vernon City of	47.9	2	8%
Victorville Water Dist.	155.4	7	28%
Vista Irrigation Dist.	105.5	5	20%
Walnut Valley Water Dist.	146.4	7	28%

Data current as of 7/15/15.

* Some data may be revised and will affect production and savings values; Tier and Conservation Standard will not change.

Urban Water Supplier Conservation Tiers

Supplier Name	Jul-Sep 2014 R-GPCD	Tier	Conservation Standard
Wasco City of	231.1	9	36%
Watsonville City of	100.3	5	20%
West Kern Water Dist.	133.0	7	28%
West Sacramento City of	143.0	7	28%
West Valley Water Dist.	212.3	8	32%
Westborough Water Dist.	40.6	2	8%
Western Municipal Water Dist. of Riverside	189.2	8	32%
Westminster City of	98.0	5	20%
Whittier City of	104.2	5	20%
Windsor, Town of	93.0	4	16%
Winton Water & Sanitary Dist.	228.9	9	36%
Woodland City of	119.8	6	24%
Yorba Linda Water Dist.	220.2	9	36%
Yreka, City of	186.6	8	32%
Yuba City City of	188.2	8	32%
Yucaipa Valley Water Dist.	265.0	9	36%
Statewide			

Data current as of 7/15/15.

* Some data may be revised and will affect production and savings values; Tier and Conservation Standard will not change.

Urban Water Supplier Data Revision Justifications

Supplier Name	Revised Standard	Original Standard	Data Revision Justification
Arcata City of	4%	8%	Meets qualifications outlined in California Code of Regulations, title 23, section 865, subdivision (c)(2)
Benicia City of	20%	28%	Revised PRU appears reasonable based on supplier's annual production and residential data for 2013/2014.
Beverly Hills City of	32%	36%	Revised population and PRU based on current data and appear reasonable.
Big Bear City Community Services District	16%	24%	Revised population uses SWRCB approved method. PRU changed to account for water required to protect environment/endangered species.
Buena Park City of	20%	24%	Original PRU included institutional use, which was subsequently removed. New PRU is consistent with suppliers reporting to DWR. No changes to population were made.
Burbank City of	24%	28%	Revised population data is consistent with DOF population estimates and Revised PRU is reasonably consistent with use patterns contained in the City's 2010 UWMP.
Calaveras County Water District	16%	32%	Total production was modified to exclude wholesale water. Revised PRU and population accounts for seasonal population increases based on information the supplier collected from local tourism authorities and studies conducted in the Lake Tahoe region.
Camrosa Water District	32%	36%	Updated population to account for customers outside of the City Boundary, but within the service area. University population was also included and University water use was moved from the CII sector to the residential sector accordingly. These changes reduced PRU and R-GPCD.
Casitas Municipal Water District	32%	36%	PRU appears reasonable with respect to the district's 2010 UWMP. 2014 and 2013 data resubmitted to correct total water production.
City of Big Bear Lake, Dept of Water & Power	16%	12%	Revised production subtracted water supplied to another water supplier. Revision appears reasonable.
Corona City of	28%	32%	7/14 PRU was incorrectly reported as 100%. New PRU is similar to surrounding months. Population did not account for unincorporated areas outside of City, but within service area or growth since 2010. New population aligns with census data.
Crestline Village Water District	8%	16%	Revised PRU accounts for transient population. Calculation appears reasonable.
Del Oro Water Company	24%	28%	Revised PRU appears accurate based on raw data provided by supplier. Original PRU used total billed water as the denominator instead of total water produced.
Discovery Bay Community Services District	32%	36%	Engineering firm conducted an analysis of the district. Revised PRU based on firm's assessment and appears reasonable.
Dublin San Ramon Services District	12%	16%	Primary change was updated population for the month of 7/14, which was originally left as the default value, minor changes to PRU appear reasonable based on 2010 UWMP use patterns.
El Monte City of	8%	20%	Revised PRU appears reasonable based on supplier billing. The need for future adjustments were noted in the original submission.

Urban Water Supplier Data Revision Justifications

Supplier Name	Revised Standard	Original Standard	Data Revision Justification
Elk Grove Water Service	28%	32%	Original population did not account for portions of the service are not within the city boundary. PRU was adjusted from estimates to actual data. New population appears to align with the suppliers' 2010 UWMP. Revised population determined using SWRCB suggested methodology.
Eureka City of	4%	24%	Meets qualifications outlined in California Code of Regulations, title 23, section 865, subdivision (c)(2)
Garden Grove City of	20%	28%	The decrease in the percent residential use is due to previously using the number of residential accounts to calculate the percent residential use instead of the volume of water used by the residential accounts. The City also revised the calculations for monthly volume of water used by residential accounts for more accuracy due to the bi-monthly billing cycles. The population was revised to match the City's UWMP. Garden Grove's Total Monthly Water Production was adjusted to remove IPR.
Georgetown Divide Public Utilities District	32%	36%	Revised PRU appears reasonable based on supplier billing data. Original submission of 100% was not accurate.
Golden State Water Company Claremont	32%	36%	Updated population used an accepted SWRCB methodology. Revised PRU used actual 2014 data rather than estimates.
Golden State Water Company West Orange	16%	20%	Supplier population was reduced. PRU was also reduced to a level that is reasonable consistent to use patterns reported in the Suppliers 2010 UWMP.
Healdsburg City of	24%	28%	Revised production accounts for wholesale water. Revised PRU uses actual billing data instead of estimates. Population updated based on current census numbers.
Humboldt Bay Municipal Water District	4%	28%	Meets qualifications outlined in California Code of Regulations, title 23, section 865, subdivision (c)(2).
Huntington Park City of	8%	12%	Original PRU based on number of connections not residential consumption. Revised data accurately presents new PRU.
Imperial, City of	24%	32%	Revised PRU appears adequate with respect to the revised PRU and information in the City's 2010 UWMP.
Indio City of	32%	36%	Population was revised to match DOF 2014 numbers plus an additional 5% for the areas outside of the municipal boundaries.
Kerman, City of	32%	36%	Revised population based on census data. Revised PRU appears reasonable based on supplier data.
La Palma City of	20%	28%	Revised PRU appears reasonable with respect to the city's UWMP. Population update from DOF.
Lakeside Water District	24%	20%	Revised population in accordance with UWMP projections.
Lamont Public Utility District	28%	32%	Revision to PRU to account for migrant population during April through November and the use of billing data rather than estimates appears reasonable..
Lincoln City of	32%	36%	Revised population data is consistent with DOF population estimates and revised PRU accounts for the system's high leaks.
Lodi City of Public Works Department	32%	36%	PRU updated to reflect 2014 information and waterloss. Original PRU used 2012 estimates.
Loma Linda City of	32%	36%	Revised PRU appears reasonable with respect to the City's 2010 UWMP
Los Banos, City of	28%	36%	Revised PRU based on actual residential use versus estimates.

Urban Water Supplier Data Revision Justifications

Supplier Name	Revised Standard	Original Standard	Data Revision Justification
Madera City of	28%	32%	Revised population data is consistent with DOF population estimates; revised production totals account for water sold to Madera County under emergency circumstances.
Manhattan Beach City of	20%	24%	PRU revised to account for accurate residential consumption. Original PRU used residential connections not consumption.
McKinleyville Community Service District	4%	16%	Meets qualifications outlined in California Code of Regulations, title 23, section 865, subdivision (c)(2)
Mission Springs Water District	28%	32%	Revised PRU appears accurate and aligns with details in the District's 2011 UWMP.
Montecito Water District	32%	36%	Revised production totals removed nonpotable water. Revised PRU appears reasonable when compared with the District's 2010 USBR WMP.
Napa City of	20%	24%	Population change is comparable with 2010 UWMP. PRU reduction was nominal and based upon lost water due to an earthquake event causing non-residential water loss.
Oakdale City of	36%	36%	Revised population appears legitimate (minor changes between 200 and 600 depending on the month).
Olivenhain Municipal Water District	32%	36%	Population estimates updated based on analyses conducted by DOF and documented by the supplier.
Orchard Dale Water District	12%	24%	Revised PRU appears reasonable with respect to the District's 2010 UWMP. Revised population appears consistent with Census data.
Padre Dam Municipal Water District	20%	24%	PRU corrected. Original data came from 2014 EAR, which contained incorrect information on residential volumes.
Port Hueneme City of	8%	12%	Revised PRU appears reasonable with respect to the city's 2010 UWMP
Sacramento Suburban Water District	32%	36%	Original PRU included non-revenue water and CII water. New PRU aligns with 2010 UWMP.
San Bernardino County Service Area 64	32%	36%	Revised PRU appears reasonable and in line with supplier's 2010 UWMP.
San Bernardino County Service Area 70	28%	32%	Revised PRU appears reasonable and in line with supplier's 2010 UWMP.
San Clemente City of	24%	28%	Revised PRU removed commercial irrigation.
Santa Barbara City of	12%	16%	Total monthly production figures revised to include potable water used with recycled water for ag and other customers.
Santa Margarita Water District	28%	24%	Original PRU calculation was incorrect. Revised PRU appears reasonable and aligns with the district's 2010 uwmp.
Shasta Lake City of	28%	32%	PRU was originally reported incorrectly as 100. Revised PRU appears reasonable with respect to the city's 2010 UWMP.
South Tahoe Public Utilities District	20%	28%	Revised PRU accounts for seasonal population increases as supported by various reports/studies collected by the supplier.
Torrance City of	20%	24%	Updates to population and PRU are consistent with the city's 2010 UWMP and similar un-revised months.
Trabuco Canyon Water District	28%	32%	Revised production subtracted backwash water. Population updated based on SWRCB approved methodology. Revised PRU appears reasonable based on supplier audit.
Vernon City of	8%	12%	Corrected production totals. Original totals had an error.

Urban Water Supplier Data Revision Justifications

Supplier Name	Revised Standard	Original Standard	Data Revision Justification
Vista Irrigation District	20%	24%	Original reports did not include non-revenue water in TMP, which resulted in revised PRU. No changes to population were made.