

**ALTERNATIVE FUNDING CONCEPTS FOR
WATER QUALITY AND WATER RIGHTS
PROGRAMS IN CALIFORNIA**

JANUARY 1992



**STATE WATER RESOURCES CONTROL BOARD
CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY**



□ PREFACE

Water and money are both limited resources. California's most vexing public policy issues often involve the allocation of either water or money for different purposes. Growing demands for and reduced supplies of these resources have renewed debate over past policies. In 1991, the Legislature considered how limited water should be apportioned during continued drought; it also addressed an unprecedented fiscal dilemma. When reviewing the proposed budget for the Water Resources Control Board, the Legislature determined that budget constraints necessitated new funding alternatives for the Board's water allocation and pollution control programs. Several questions and issues arose. Seeking answers to these, the Legislature declared:

"The state board shall submit to the Legislature by January 1992 a report evaluating the appropriateness and desirability of imposing new water quality and water rights fees to fund that portion of the board's water quality and water rights programs currently supported by the General Fund. These fees will also allow for future program expansion and to reduce existing backlogs."

*Supplemental Report of the
1991 Budget Act*

Accordingly, the Water Resources Control Board prepared this summary report. It describes the existing funding structure and its limitations, identifies potential conceptual alternatives, and suggests options for further consideration.

Budget development and implementation are ongoing processes subject to significant change and interpretation. In this report, staff used the most current and accurate data available to illustrate important points and define particular options. Most of the information contained in this report generally reflects the proposed Governor's Budget for Fiscal Year 1992-93.

Staff consulted with representatives of agriculture, business, commerce, industry, local government, rural interests, water and wastewater entities, and other persons and groups representing a variety of viewpoints. While we have endeavored to describe and incorporate many perspectives, this report presents an overview of some possible funding options and their implications. It should not be considered a consensus of opinion among the affected groups. Many may disagree with aspects of this report and perhaps suggest different alternatives. Given the limited time, information, and resources available, an exhaustive and comprehensive analysis of the Board's water quality and water rights responsibilities and ways these could be performed and financed is beyond the scope of this report.

In summary, this report attempts to provide the basic information needed to evaluate alternative funding mechanisms and make related budget and policy decisions. ■

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	i
BACKGROUND	1
The State and Regional Boards	1
Annual Waste Discharge Fees	2
PROJECT OBJECTIVES AND LIMITATIONS	4
The Purpose and Goals	4
Assumptions	4
Limitations	5
EXISTING FUNDING STRUCTURE	6
Basic Budget Information	6
Existing Fund Sources	6
General Fund	6
Federal Funds	7
Bond Funds	11
Special or Fee-related Funds	11
Current Fee Issues	12
Reimbursements	12
Comparison with Other State Agencies	12
EXISTING NEEDS AND FUTURE WORKLOAD	15
Resource Needs	15
The Funding Gap	16
EVALUATION CRITERIA AND PRELIMINARY ALTERNATIVES	20
Criteria and Considerations	20
Preliminary Alternatives	21
ANALYSIS OF PRINCIPAL ALTERNATIVES	23
Alternative 1: A Revised Waste Discharge Permit Fee Cap	23
Alternative 2: New Water Rights and Waste Discharge Permit Fees	24
Alternative 3: A Water Use Fee	26
Alternative 4: A Sewer Use Fee	27
SUGGESTED ALTERNATIVE	29
GLOSSARY	30
APPENDICES	
Appendix A, Assembly Bill 18 (as amended July 2, 1991)	A-1
Appendix B, Summary of Fee-related Revenue Sources	B-1
Appendix C, Estimated Fee Rates and Sample Amounts for Alternative 1	C-1
Appendix D, Estimated Fee Rates and Sample Amounts for Alternative 2	D-1
Appendix E, Estimated Fee Rates and Sample Amounts for Alternative 3	E-1
Appendix F, Estimated Fee Rates and Sample Amounts for Alternative 4	F-1
Appendix G, Statewide Sewer User Charge Summary	G-1

LIST OF FIGURES AND TABLES

FIGURE 1, Estimated Revenues and Expenditures	iv
TABLE 1, Distribution of Water Quality Program Resources by Fund Type	8
TABLE 2, Distribution of Water Rights Program Resources by Fund Type	9
TABLE 3, Projected Distribution of General Fund	10
TABLE 4A, Comparison of FY 1991-92 Operating Costs by Department	15
TABLE 4B, Comparison of FY 1992-93 Operating Costs by Department	15
TABLE 5, Proposed Augmentation to Reduce "Core Regulatory" Backlogs	16
TABLE 6, Proposed Augmentation to Reduce Water Rights Program Backlogs	17
TABLE 7, Proposed Augmentation to Improve Ground Water Pollution Control Programs	17
TABLE 8, Estimated Costs for Existing Program Categories Supported By "Old Bond" Funds	17
TABLE 9, Estimated Costs Inland Surface Water Plan Implementation	18
TABLE 10, Comparison of Revenue Needs	19

□ EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Protecting the quality and many beneficial uses of California's waters is the mission of the State Water Resources Control Board (State Board) and the nine Regional Water Quality Control Boards (Regional Boards). The Boards must balance competing demands on our water resources to maintain clean water for all uses.

Under current state and federal laws, the Boards work together to protect California's water resources. The State Board sets statewide water policies; it also allocates and enforces water rights. The Regional Boards adopt and enforce water quality standards within their boundaries.

The Problem

Recognizing the competing demands on the state's General Fund and the complexity of the State and Regional Boards' joint budget (see below), the Legislative Analyst suggested that enhanced fee financing may be appropriate and desirable. To address the issue more thoroughly, the Legislative Analyst recommended to the Legislature that the State and Regional Boards restructure its budget information and prepare a report evaluating alternative funding possibilities, particularly fees. More specifically, the Boards were directed to consider funding options that might:

- Replace some or all of the Boards' General Fund appropriation,
- Finance resource augmentations to reduce existing backlogs, and
- Support new programs and activities.

These recommendations were adopted by the Legislature and included in the *Supplemental Report of the 1991 Budget Act*. The primary purpose of this report is to define present fiscal limitations, identify and compare potential funding alternatives, and suggest potential options for further consideration by the Administration and the Legislature.

Current Funding

The annual cost of the State and Regional Boards' water pollution and water rights program is substantial. For the current fiscal year, an estimated \$410.2 million will be required for these purposes. The total "state operations" share (the money which supports staff salaries, contracts, and other costs) represents almost \$181.7 million of the total amount. For the budget year (Fiscal Year 1992-93), these amounts will increase to \$534.4 million and \$188.2 million, respectively. Roughly \$66.2 million of the state operations amount "passes-through" the Boards' budget for leaking underground tank cleanup activities; the "net" amount, \$115.5 million, more accurately represents the actual operating cost of the State and Regional Boards' programs.

In addition to the General Fund, approximately ten special or dedicated funds, six bond funds, 32 federal assistance agreements, and 14 categories of reimbursements finance the Boards' activities. Figure 1 shows the estimated revenue from these funding mechanisms and the expenditures for major program elements. Each of the 63 different fund sources is governed by unique state or federal laws, regulations, and policies. Typically, revenue from one source may only be used for specific purposes. This elaborate array of small, single-purpose funding mechanisms is difficult and costly to administer. It is also unpredictable and inflexible.

Key Considerations

Three key questions arise: Is a new fee alternative appropriate and desirable? If so, how much money is needed? And, how should it be raised?

- *Is a new fee alternative appropriate and desirable?*

An effective and efficient water resource protection program requires not only strong laws but solid, flexible funding and sufficient staff to

□ EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

carry out essential activities. The existing fiscal structure and numerous fund sources for the State and Regional Boards limit water quality and water rights programs in several ways. While the basic regulatory framework is much different today than it was in 1967 when it was devised, financing for water quality and water rights programs has not kept pace with these changes. For example, the combination of decreasing revenue and increasing demand has reduced the viability of the General Fund as a consistent revenue source. Equally important, a multitude of narrow, single-purpose funding mechanisms impedes regulatory flexibility and new policy directions. Consequently, a substantial "funding gap" now exists. To address burgeoning water resource issues, new ways to support the Boards' programs must be found. Clearly, consideration of a new fee alternative is appropriate and desirable both for the Boards and the regulatory community.

- *How much money is needed?*

Eventually, this question will be answered via the budget process. For purposes of evaluating funding alternatives, however, different amounts of money are required to replace existing General Fund, reduce current backlogs, and support new initiatives and workload. As one example, the proposed Governor's Budget for Fiscal Year 1992-93 will require \$3.8 million to augment permitting, inspection, and enforcement activities in the Boards' core regulatory programs.

The budget process may involve policy decisions which determine different revenue requirements. During legislative budget discussions last year, for example, policy makers considered replacing 75 percent of the Boards' General Fund with new or revised fees. If a similar change is made during the current budget process, possible funding alternatives must generate approximately \$33.4 million to "supplant" 75 percent of the General Fund amount proposed for Fiscal Year 1992-93. To fulfill all three objectives set forth in the *Supplemental Report*, almost \$65.3 million would be required for Fiscal

Year 1993-94. This report examines some revenue combinations within this range.

- *How should the money be raised?*

To answer this question, several factors were defined and used as a means of screening preliminary funding alternatives. In addition to different revenue amounts, these factors include: applicability, feasibility, equity, and acceptability. This report also incorporates other criteria from similar national studies and important considerations gleaned from earlier funding proposals.

When new or revised fees for water use, waste discharge permits, and water rights permits were briefly proposed in the last two legislative sessions, proponents and opponents alike suggested that fees should reasonably relate to regulatory costs. They also urged that those who benefit from California's water protection programs should pay fees to support them. To the extent possible, these thoughts were incorporated in this evaluation and report.

Preliminary Alternatives

Several alternatives might be used to close the funding gap. Among others, the following options were initially examined: income and sales assessments, advalorem assessments, "sin taxes," lottery, bonds, resource royalties, commodities surcharges, a comprehensive environmental fee, expanded "cost recovery," utility fees, and others. Many of these were clearly infeasible or inapplicable and, therefore, were rejected. In other instances, some options may have merit but scant information exists to analyze and develop these further.

From this preliminary screening, the four alternatives that may fulfill the designated criteria and purposes were: (1) a Revised Waste Discharge Permit Fee "Cap," (2) New Water Rights and Waste Discharge Permit Fees, (3) a Water Use Fee, and (4) a Sewer Use Fee. So these could be compared, sample fee schedules were

□ EXECUTIVE SUMMARY


developed for different ranges of revenue. These schedules are only examples; each option could be structured in many other ways. While all four alternatives offer potential, each one has several advantages and disadvantages.

The Suggested Alternative

Given the statewide fiscal constraints that currently confront all Californians, it was determined that the most realistic short-term alternative is (a) one which builds on the existing fee mechanisms rather than creating new fee systems and (b) one which minimizes the total cost to the regulated community. Consequently, the suggested alternative is to revise the existing maximum waste discharge permit fee "cap" in an amount necessary to support the proposed funding level in the Governor's Budget for Fiscal Year 1992-93. (A specific level for a revised "cap" will be identified through legislation.) This will require total waste discharge permit fee revenue of \$11.1 million in Fiscal Year 1992-93, an increase of \$3.8 million over the current year.

Over the long-term, the Board will continue to evaluate the existing fee schedule and suggest additional changes through its regulation setting process. ■

FIGURE 1
State Water Resources Control Board
Estimated Total Operating Budget for Fiscal Year 1991-92
 (based on \$115.5 million*)



* Excludes Underground Storage Tank "pass-through" (\$66,219)

□ BACKGROUND

California's Waterscape

California's waterscape shapes our lives. More than 2,500 waterbodies form a vast, interdependent network of natural streams and lakes, wetlands, bays and estuaries, constructed canals and reservoirs, underground aquifers, and the Pacific Ocean. The waterscape is the lifeblood for the human and natural environments alike. Almost 30 million Californians depend on this complex system for drinking water, food, jobs, power, and recreation. In turn, human activities produce wastes which eventually flow into and affect the modern waterscape. The state's water resources sustain several thousand species of birds, mammals, fish, reptiles, and amphibians. The waterscape nourishes 4,000 different native plants.

Despite such intensive use and development, overall water quality remains relatively good. Over the last 20 years, massive public and private investment and technological advancements have improved our control of conventional sewage-related pollutants such as bacteria, and suspended solids. But, the waterscape shows increased evidence of pollution from small quantities of chemicals, pesticides, and other toxic materials. At the same time, growing demands and persistent drought have aggravated water rights controversies. Major new efforts are underway to meet the ever-expanding challenge of protecting California's waters.

The State and Regional Boards

In 1967, the California Legislature created a unique framework to manage the state's most vital natural resource: its water. Recognizing that water quality and water quantity were integrally related, the Legislature concluded that a coordinated regulatory strategy was necessary to maintain sufficient supplies of clean water for all beneficial uses. The former State Water Pollution Control Board and State Water Rights Board were consolidated, along with the existing nine Regional Water Quality Control Boards (Regional Boards), within the newly-created State Water Resources Control Board (State Board). The new agency was assigned broad responsibilities to

implement coordinated water protection programs.

The State Board allocates and adjudicates water rights. Under law, persons who wish to appropriate (divert or store) surface water must obtain a water rights permit from the State Board. The water rights permit specifies how much water may be taken, its approved use, the season of taking, and other conditions necessary to protect the environment, public interests, and other water users. The State Board must enforce water rights so that water is not wasted or unreasonably used.

In 1969, the *Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act* gave the State and Regional Boards additional pollution control responsibilities. The Act is the cornerstone of the Boards' water protection mission. It directs the State Board to establish water quality policies and standards to safeguard the state's water resources. Within the joint regulatory framework, the Regional Boards implement these statewide standards in designated hydrographic areas or basins. Under the Act, each Regional Board also develops unique water quality plans for its basin and the specific uses of its waterbodies. Persons, municipalities, businesses, and industries that discharge wastes which may affect water quality must obtain a permit, known as "waste discharge requirements" (WDRs), from the respective Regional Board. These permits or requirements are based on the waste constituents, the associated activity, applicable federal and state provisions, and the beneficial uses of the receiving water.

The nine Regional Boards serve as the frontline for state and federal water pollution control programs. Each Regional Board monitors effluent and receiving water quality, conducts compliance inspections, and takes enforcement actions when violations are found. Periodically, waste discharge requirements are re-evaluated and upgraded to conform to new laws, revised water quality plans and standards, and current conditions. The State Board guides and oversees regional activities. Jointly, the Boards also carry out major water quality aspects of the federal *Clean Water Act*, which was modeled after the *Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act*.

□ BACKGROUND

Earlier Evaluations of Fee Funding Mechanisms

As the state's water quality and water rights programs evolved, the State and Regional Boards undertook new regulatory duties but the existing funding mechanisms did not keep pace with these new challenges. Historically, the state General Fund financed the majority of the Boards' water protection programs. A collection of filing fees for waste discharge requirements and water rights represented a small source of funds. Moreover, fee reimbursements constituted a meager fraction of the costs of the related programs. As General Fund constraints increased during the 1980's, however, the State and Regional Boards evaluated existing fee mechanisms, their limitations, and possible changes.

State Board staff reviewed various filing fees several times. They found a variety of shortcomings including: (a) unpredictable and unstable revenues, (b) fee inconsistencies, and (c) penalty and enforcement impediments. Because water rights and WDRs do not expire under state law, additional fees were only required if the permittee made a significant, material change. Forecasting when and if such changes might occur was exceedingly difficult. Thus, filing fee revenue fluctuated greatly from year to year. Filing fees were also inconsistent. A surface water discharger--regulated under a federal "National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System" (NPDES) permit--paid new filing fees every five years to renew the permits. Conversely, a land discharger only paid new filing fees if the discharge had changed materially. Existing law also omitted any penalty or enforcement procedure if applicable fees were not paid in a timely manner. Filing fee reimbursements became increasingly difficult to forecast.

Annual Waste Discharge Fees

So a more equitable and predictable fee system might be instituted, the State Board in 1988 proposed legislation authorizing annual waste discharge fees for both surface and land discharges. Senate Bill 2829 (Bergeson, Chapter 1026, Statutes of 1988) and Assembly

Bill 456 (Hansen, Chapter 627, Statutes of 1989) enacted annual waste discharge fee provisions and created a new fund, respectively. These laws took effect in January 1990. As specified in Section 13260 of the Water Code, the State Board must promulgate a fee schedule and regulations which generate the revenue amount set forth in the Budget Act each fiscal year. After doing so, the State Board began collecting approximately \$1.9 million from annual waste discharge fees during Fiscal Year 1990-91.

Recent Fee History

As part of the Fiscal Year 1991-92 budget process, the State Board proposed a \$4.5 million augmentation for its "core" water quality regulatory programs to enhance regulatory oversight as well as reduce sizable backlogs. At that time, about 18 percent of NPDES permits and 50 percent of WDRs had not been updated to reflect current laws and standards. Compliance inspections and enforcement actions were also done less frequently. Meanwhile, the numbers of dischargers and new chemical-specific toxicity limits continued to grow. The State Board proposed revising the current fee structure--a sliding scale based on relative threat to water quality--to finance the augmentation.

Concurrently, state budget negotiations renewed legislative interest in alternative fund sources for governmental programs, including the State and Regional Boards' water quality and water rights functions. Although the Legislative Analyst concluded that the proposed augmentation was necessary and appropriate, the analyst noted that the Boards' budget is large and complicated. The existing budget structure poorly describes actual regulatory activities; it also impedes meaningful decision-making or oversight. A seemingly haphazard patchwork of general revenue, federal funds, dedicated accounts, special fees, and reimbursements now supports the State and Regional Boards. This elaborate structure limits regulatory flexibility, frustrates policy change, and complicates the Boards' mandated goals. Enhanced fee financing may be appropriate and desirable.

□ BACKGROUND

So the California Legislature could consider these issues more thoroughly, the Legislative Analyst recommended that the State Board: (1) devise a proposal to restructure its budget information and (2) prepare a report to evaluate alternative funding possibilities, particularly fees. These recommendations were adopted by the Legislature and included in the Supplemental Report of the 1991 Budget Act.

Before either project began however, huge deficit projections prompted immediate changes. A substantial portion (\$19.3 million) of the Boards' General Fund support appropriation was shifted to unspecified fees in the 1991 Budget Act. The Budget Act stated that new and increased waste discharge and water rights fees should support the State and Regional Boards' programs. But statute now limits the maximum waste discharge fee to \$10,000 annually. Further, current law does not authorize the imposition of annual water rights fees. Legislative leaders, various advocate groups, and State Board staff hastily discussed and drafted "trailer" legislation for the necessary fee authority. The proposed legislation (the July 2, 1991 amendments to Assembly Bill 18, Sher) enumerated annual fee amounts for categories of waste discharge and certain water rights appropriations. (The text of this version of Assembly Bill 18 and a rough estimate of its fee schedule are included in Appendix A.) The proposed fee schedule was an interim measure only. The bill also directed the State Board to investigate and recommend an alternative funding mechanism before the interim schedule expired.

Proponents and opponents of Assembly Bill 18 urged specific conditions before any new or revised fees were imposed. Both factions suggested that the amount of fees should bear some reasonable relationship to the costs of the regulatory programs and the "service" provided by those programs. They also advised that those who benefit from California's water protection programs should pay fees to support them.

More specifically, municipalities and industries which are now regulated by waste discharge requirements contended that nonpoint

sources, such as urban runoff, agriculture, mines, timber harvest, etc., contribute greater quantities of pollutants which impair surface and ground water quality. Similarly, urban water interests and water rights permittees noted that the federal Central Valley Project and agriculture appropriate and use the most water. Both groups believe these presently "unregulated" or exempt categories impose a burden upon California's water resources; they argued that nonpoint pollutant sources should also pay fees.

Some further proposed that any regulatory fees should be based on the relative amount of pollutants discharged from each and every source. Other amendments to Assembly Bill 18 would have established an expenditure limit for those regulatory activities not directly associated with individual water rights holders or waste dischargers. For instance, developing water quality standards and monitoring ambient conditions could not exceed a specified percentage of the total budget under this limitation. No agreement could be reached and the revised fees proposed in the bill were not enacted.

Under law, the State and Regional Boards cannot spend more money than they receive. Therefore, reductions would have been required in virtually all water quality and water rights programs unless additional fee authority was also enacted. On the final day of the session, however, the California Legislature restored most of the General Fund (\$18.4 million) when it again amended and passed Assembly Bill 18. The bill also set the annual waste discharge fee revenue at \$7.4 million for Fiscal Year 1991-92. ■

□ PROJECT OBJECTIVES, ASSUMPTIONS, AND LIMITATIONS

The Purpose and Goals

In the *Analysis of the 1991-92 Budget Bill*, the Legislative Analyst recommended that the State Board evaluate and report whether new or different water quality and water rights fees should support the Boards' existing programs and future needs. Both the Budget Act (Vasconcellos, Chapter 118, Statutes of 1991) and Assembly Bill 18 (Sher, Chapter 460, Statutes of 1991) express legislative intent that revenues which support the Boards' activities be derived in part or in full from such fees. The supplemental reporting provision of the 1991 Budget Act states:

"The state board shall submit to the Legislature by January 1992 a report evaluating the appropriateness and desirability of imposing new water quality and water rights fees to fund that portion of the board's water quality and water rights programs currently supported by the General Fund. These fees will also allow for future program expansion and to reduce existing backlogs."

The purpose of this report is to define feasible options and evaluate them so policy makers may make informed decisions during the budget process.

Two key questions arise. How much money is needed? And, how should it be raised? In this report, both questions were considered according to specific directives set forth in the *Analysis*. The first question will be formally answered in the annual budget process. For purposes of evaluating funding alternatives, however, different amounts of money would be required to:

1. Replace some or all of the Boards' General Fund appropriation,
2. Reduce program backlogs, and
3. Support new programs and activities.

To address the second question, appropriate criteria were developed to analyze and compare possible alternatives. The Legislative Analyst

posed several specific questions which suggest some evaluation criteria. These questions were:

- How would increasing current regulatory fees or charging new ones affect the Boards' regulatory programs?
- Would total fee revenues be stable from year to year? Would such revenue successfully finance the regulatory programs over the long-term?
- How can fees be imposed and collected in a cost-effective manner?
- How would such fees affect the regulated community?
- Would the magnitude of fees cause adverse economic effects for fee payers?

Additional criteria and some potential options were adapted from similar funding studies conducted by national forums.

While limited information was available in many areas, this report endeavors to analyze potential alternatives, address basic issues, and make preliminary recommendations.

Assumptions

This report is a broad overview. It is not a comprehensive, detailed evaluation of the existing regulatory programs or all facets of particular funding options. Given the express purpose and time constraints, the following assumptions guided this study:

First, and most importantly, this report focuses on the amount of revenue required for the purposes set forth in the *Analysis* and alternative ways it might be raised. We did not consider revising current state and federal water rights and water quality laws to change particular programs and the associated costs. In this report, we assumed these laws are the foundation of a strong water protection program. We also assumed that the State Board's statewide plans, including those for thermal discharges and for inland surface, bay

□ **PROJECT OBJECTIVES, ASSUMPTIONS, AND LIMITATIONS**

and estuarine, and ocean waters, would be implemented in their present form. While alternatives which involve revising current law and policies could be considered in policy debate, such options are beyond the scope of this report.

Secondly, financing existing and planned water protection programs was assumed to be the primary goal. We acknowledge that desirable funding alternatives would incorporate monetary or other incentives for water quality protection. Any collateral benefits, however, were deemed secondary benefits.

Finally, whether and to what extent a new funding option should be implemented depends upon many policy issues. In this report, we assumed that such issues would be decided via the state budget process. At a minimum, alternative funding mechanisms should produce sufficient revenue to carry out the Boards' water protection programs as proposed in the Governor's Budget. We also considered the parameters specified by the Legislative Analyst and estimated the costs associated with each of the enumerated objectives. This report describes a range of revenue amounts for each alternative in the manner the Legislative Analyst set forth.

Limitations

This report necessarily relies upon information and data compiled from a variety of sources. For alternatives based upon existing waste discharge permits or water rights permits, data was extracted from the Boards' "Waste Discharger System" (WDS) and the "Automated Water Rights Information System" (AWRIS). Neither system was designed for fee or revenue purposes however. Limited information regarding alternatives based on broader "universes" exists. In these cases, additional data is required for a more thorough evaluation.

State Board staff attempted to coordinate this report with similar efforts for other environmental programs. The Department of Toxic Substances Control concurrently conducted a "90-day review" of its programs and funding structure. Likewise, the Department of Health

Services may consider fee options to support certain water-related health protection programs. The California Environmental Protection Agency has also begun an agency-wide analysis of the fee systems that its boards and departments administer. While each involves fiscal and fee issues, the underlying program activities are very specific. The nature of each review and the divergent timetables precluded joint study. ■

□ **EXISTING FUNDING STRUCTURE**

During legislative consideration of Assembly Bill 18 in June and July 1991, there was considerable interest and confusion regarding the State and Regional Boards' budget structure and composition. Consequently, this section describes important fiscal information.

Basic Budget Information

The State and Regional Boards jointly develop one budget. This budget reflects our two major responsibilities: (1) regulating and protecting water quality and (2) allocating and administering water rights. As a "program budget," its structure relates various fund sources and expenditures to these broad goals. While some "line-item" information is included, the Boards' budget does not describe the cost of particular tasks such as issuance of an individual NPDES permit. The water quality and water rights "programs" have been sub-divided into more detailed "elements." As the Legislative Analyst requested, these "elements" have been restructured this year. The water quality program budget displays expenditures for both State and Regional Boards. Because water rights functions are centralized within the State Board, no Regional Board expenditures are shown in the water rights program portion of the budget.

For purposes of the annual state budget process, the State and Regional Boards have two types of expenditures: state operations and local assistance. "State operations" includes expenditures which support state government (such as staff salaries, contracts, rent, etc.) while "local assistance" represents expenditures which support local governments (such as grants and loans). This report primarily concentrates on the state operations portion.

Existing Fund Sources

During Fiscal Year 1991-92, an estimated \$410.2 million will be required for all State and Regional Board programs. The operating or support budget equals \$181.7 million of this total. However, the operating budget amount includes underground storage tank cleanup monies (about \$66.2 million) which "pass through" the Boards'

support budget to local government and others. To get a more accurate sense of the Boards' actual operating costs, these "pass through" funds must be excluded. Thus, the estimated cost of staff salaries, contracts, rent, and other operating costs equals almost \$115.5 million.

In addition to the General Fund, ten special or dedicated funds, six bond funds, 32 federal assistance agreements, and 14 categories of reimbursements make up the various fund sources in the State and Regional Boards' operating budget. Each of these 63 funds is governed by unique state or federal laws, regulations, and policies. The authorized uses of these funds are narrowly defined. The following sections describe the key fund sources, where revenue actually comes from, how much money each source currently provides, what activities each source supports, and what limitations exist.

General Fund

Historically, the General Fund has been the single largest fund source for the Boards' operations. For example, it represented roughly 42 percent of the operating budget in Fiscal Year 1980-81 and 53 percent in Fiscal Year 1985-86. The General Fund mostly comprises revenue from personal and corporate income, bank, and insurance taxes. Miscellaneous other revenues and reimbursements are also deposited in the General Fund. When favorable economic conditions exist, these revenues grow; the General Fund can be a stable and reliable fund source. It affords considerable flexibility as its possible uses are very broad. As a result, virtually all "elements" of the Boards' budget include a General Fund share.

During the last several years, the General Fund has become increasingly unstable. Since 1988, declining tax revenues have necessitated reductions in many governmental programs. At the State and Regional Boards, numerous General Fund-supported programs were first reduced "across-the-board" (on a percentage basis). As salaries, rent, and other costs increased, the General Fund increment of such increases was sometimes withheld. Our resource base has

□ EXISTING FUNDING STRUCTURE

eroded over time from both practices. Since 1988, General Fund reductions equal, cumulatively, almost \$13.6 million. This year, all or major portions of water quality activities such as the Well Investigation Program and the Solid Waste Assessment Test Program, were eliminated or substantially reduced after General Fund reductions were required pursuant to the Budget Act. These "unallocated" and "trigger" reductions will likely exceed \$5.0 million.

Based on estimated budget data (excluding any reductions), the General Fund share of total operating budget has declined from 38 percent in Fiscal Year 1990-91 to about 19 percent this year. If the "pass through" underground tank cleanup funds are excluded, the current General Fund share equals about 30 percent.

Tables 1 and 2 show the distribution of the General Fund to specific budgetary programs, elements, and activities of the State and Regional Boards before unallocated or trigger reductions were taken. In the current year, the General Fund is roughly 16 percent of the total water quality program and 90 percent of the water rights program.) Some elements, such as permitted discharges and the technical assistance, have a relatively large General Fund share. The General Fund for these elements represents about 47 and 60 percent of the budgeted amount, respectively. Other elements, such as tank regulation and facility development, include small General Fund amounts (less than 4 percent). Table 3 shows forecasted distribution of General Fund by program and element for the current, budget, and "out" years.

Federal Funds

"Federal funds" commonly describes all funds received directly from any agency of the federal government. For many years, federal funds--primarily from the U.S. EPA--comprised an important fund source for California's water quality activities. As one example, yearly grant assistance pursuant to Section 106 of the *Clean Water Act* has supported several regulatory activities. When the Boards and the U.S. EPA first implemented a joint water pollution control

program in 1974, this grant funded basin planning, standards development, monitoring, NPDES permitting, enforcement, and other federally-mandated program areas. While the State and Regional Boards continue to do this work and more, the "Section 106" grant amount and its purchasing power have decreased markedly. In 1974, the "Section 106" grant supported almost 120 staff; today, this grant supports less than 50. Like the General Fund, many federal funds have lost value over time as they do not consider cost increases. State monies must compensate for this erosion.

As with the state General Fund, personal and corporate taxes are the primary revenue sources for federal funds to states. National economic stagnation reduces these revenues while growing debt payments and competing demands constrain spending for environmental programs. The 1987 amendments to the *Clean Water Act* evidence that U.S. EPA assistance to state water quality programs will decline even further. Yet, at the same time, the 1987 amendments impose complex and stringent new federal mandates.

Federal funds and the associated provisions present additional difficulties. For each federal assistance agreement, the State and Regional Boards must contribute a "matching" amount of state monies, or must pledge a certain budget share to designated purposes. These "matches" or "level of effort" pledges severely constrain program and funding adjustments. As an example, reductions or re-allocation of state monies might abrogate not only federal grant agreements but also the basic cooperative regulatory strategy. The U.S. EPA has implied that California would lose primacy unless certain fiscal requirements were met. New federal funds are also few and selective. In practice, the Boards are essentially forced to create new bureaucracies to administer certain federal funds even if these overlap with state water protection programs. Moreover, federal funds are often one-time mechanisms with no ongoing provisions. Cash-flow aspects compound these limitations. Thus, federal funds have become increasingly inflexible and administratively burdensome.

TABLE 1

DISTRIBUTION OF WATER QUALITY PROGRAM RESOURCES BY FUND TYPE
Estimated Amounts for Fiscal Year 1991-92
 (in thousands of dollars)

<u>Program 10 Elements</u>	<u>General Funds ^{1/}</u>	<u>Federal Funds</u>	<u>Bond Funds</u>	<u>Special or Fee-related</u>	<u>Reimbursements</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
10. Pollution Control—Permitted Facilities:						
NPDES Program*	\$ 2,538.	\$ 4,106.	\$ 0.	\$ 3,370.	\$ 0.	\$ 10,014.
Non-15 WDR Program*	5,939.	0.	0.	1,929.	0.	7,868.
Chapter 15 Program*	4,292.	0.	0.	1,916.	990.	7,198.
RCRA Program*	<u>0.</u>	<u>0.</u>	<u>0.</u>	<u>738.</u>	<u>1,043.</u>	<u>1,781.</u>
Total Element 10:	\$ 12,769.	\$ 4,106.	\$ 0.	\$ 7,953.	\$ 2,033.	\$ 26,861.
20. Pollution Control—Unpermitted Facilities:						
SLIC Program*	\$ 1,353.	\$ 4,389.	\$ 0.	\$ 0.	\$ 918.	\$ 6,661.
Forest Activities	256.	1,058.	0.	0.	0.	1,314.
Toxic Pits	127.	0.	0.	3,099.	0.	3,226.
Nonpoint Source	<u>0.</u>	<u>6,865.</u>	<u>0.</u>	<u>0.</u>	<u>0.</u>	<u>6,865.</u>
Total Element 20:	\$ 1,736.	\$ 12,312.	\$ 0.	\$ 3,099.	\$ 918.	\$ 18,066.
30. Tank Regulation and Cleanup:						
Underground Tanks ^{2/}	\$ 3,353.	\$ 3,655.	\$ 0.	\$ 71,538.	\$ 516.	\$ 79,062.
Aboveground Tanks	0.	0.	0.	1,702.	0.	1,702.
MSCA Activities*	<u>0.</u>	<u>1,603.</u>	<u>0.</u>	<u>0.</u>	<u>0.</u>	<u>1,603.</u>
Total Element 30:	\$ 3,353.	\$ 5,258.	\$ 0.	\$ 73,240.	\$ 516.	\$ 82,367.
40. Water Quality Assessment:						
Monitoring/Assessment	\$ 134.	\$ 591.	\$ 2,147.	\$ 0.	\$ 250.	\$ 3,122.
SWAT Program*	22.	0.	0.	0.	0.	22.
Well Investigation	2,714.	3,006.	0.	0.	0.	2,714.
Planning	3,015.	6,532.	4,271.	0.	0.	13,818.
Santa Monica Bay	0.	1,497.	0.	601.	0.	2,098.
Bay Protection	0.	165.	0.	3,986.	0.	4,245.
Other	<u>1,041.</u>	<u>33.</u>	<u>1,695.</u>	<u>0.</u>	<u>183.</u>	<u>5,864.</u>
Total Element 40:	\$ 6,926.	\$ 11,824.	\$ 8,113.	\$ 4,587.	\$ 433.	\$ 31,883.
50. Facility Development and Assistance	\$ 306.	\$ 6,729.	\$ 2,759.	\$ 0.	\$ 344.	\$ 10,128.
60. Technical Assistance	\$ 2,215.	\$ 0.	\$ 1,199.	\$ 106.	\$ 137.	\$ 3,657.
• <u>Water Quality</u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
WATER QUALITY PROGRAM TOTAL:	\$ 27,305.	\$ 40,229.	\$ 12,071.	\$ 88,985.	\$ 4,377.	\$ 172,962.
Less Underground Tank Cleanup "Pass-through" Funds:				-\$ 66,219.		-\$ 66,219.
NET WATER QUALITY TOTAL:	\$ 27,305.	\$ 40,229.	\$ 12,071.	\$ 22,766.	\$ 4,377.	\$ 106,743.
Relative Share of Program 10:	25.6%	37.7%	11.3%	21.3%	4.1%	100.0%

1. General Fund amounts do not include unallocated or trigger reductions pursuant to the 1991 Budget Act.
 2. The Underground Tank "special fund" amount includes "pass-through" funds (about \$66,219) for local cleanup activities which should be considered as a form of "local assistance" rather than "state operations."
- * See glossary for definition of terms, acronyms, and abbreviations.

TABLE 2

DISTRIBUTION OF WATER RIGHTS PROGRAM RESOURCES BY FUND TYPE
Estimated Amounts for Fiscal Year 1991-92
(in thousands of dollars)

<u>Program 20 Elements</u>	<u>General Funds ^{1/}</u>	<u>Federal Funds</u>	<u>Bond Funds</u>	<u>Special or Fee- related Special</u>	<u>Reimbur- sements</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
10. Water Appropriation:						
Applications	\$ 2,625.	\$ 102.	\$ 0.	\$ 0	\$ 182	\$2,909.
<u>Permits and Licenses</u>	<u>1,458.</u>	<u>16.</u>	<u>0.</u>	<u>0.</u>	<u>0.</u>	<u>1,474.</u>
Total Element 10:	\$ 4,083.	\$ 118.	\$ 0.	\$ 0.	\$ 182.	\$ 4,383.
20. Water Management and Enforcement:						
Bay-Delta	\$ 1,522.	\$ 0.	\$ 290.	\$ 0.	\$ 0.	\$ 1,812.
<u>Enforcement</u>	<u>1,056.</u>	<u>0.</u>	<u>0.</u>	<u>0.</u>	<u>0.</u>	<u>1,056.</u>
Total Element 20:	\$ 2,578.	\$ 0.	\$ 290.	\$ 0.	\$ 0.	\$ 2,868.
30. Determination of Existing Rights:						
Adjudications	\$ 43.	\$ 0.	\$ 0.	\$ 0.	\$ 109.	\$ 152.
Total Element 30:	\$ 43.	\$ 0.	\$ 0.	\$ 0.	\$ 109.	\$ 152.
40. Technical Assistance Water Rights:	\$ 1,137.	\$ 0.	\$ 0.	\$ 174.	\$ 0.	\$ 1,310.
<hr/>						
WATER RIGHTS PROGRAM TOTAL:	\$ 7,843.	\$ 118.	\$ 290.	\$ 174.	\$ 291.	\$ 8,713.
Relative Share of Program 20:	90.0%	1.4%	3.3%	2.0%	3.3%	100.0%
<hr/>						
NET WATER QUALITY AND WATER RIGHTS TOTAL:	\$ 35,146.	\$ 40,347.	\$ 12,361.	\$ 22,940.	\$ 4,668.	115,456.
RELATIVE SHARE OF TOTAL STATE OPERATIONS:	30.4%	35.0%	10.7%	19.9%	4.0%	100.0%
<hr/>						

1. General Fund amounts do not include unallocated or trigger reductions pursuant to the 1991 Budget Act.

TABLE 3

PROJECTED DISTRIBUTION OF GENERAL FUND
(in thousands of dollars)

<u>Budget Program and Elements</u>	<u>Fiscal Year^{1/} 1991-92</u>	<u>Fiscal Year^{1/} 1992-93</u>	<u>Fiscal Year^{2/} 1993-94</u>	<u>Later (out)^{2/} Years</u>
Program 10. Water Quality				
10. Pollution Control from Permitted Discharges	\$ 12,769.	\$ 12,588.	\$ 12,840.	\$13,096.
20. Pollution Control from Unpermitted Discharges	1,737.	1,740.	1,775.	1,810.
30. Storage Tank Regulation and Cleanup	3,353.	3,552.	3,623.	3,695.
40. Water Quality Assessments	6,926.	6,949.	7,088.	7,230.
50. Facility Development and Assistance	306.	238.	243.	248.
60. Technical Assistance Water Quality	<u>2,215.</u>	<u>2,156.</u>	<u>2,199.</u>	<u>2,243.</u>
Water Quality Sub-Total:	\$ 27,306.	\$ 27,223.	\$ 27,768.	\$ 28,322.
Program 20. Water Rights				
10. Water Appropriation	\$ 4,083.	\$ 4,063.	\$ 4,144.	\$ 4,227.
20. Water Management and Enforcement	2,578.	2,392.	2,440.	2,488.
30. Determination of Existing Rights	43.	48.	49.	50.
40. Technical Assistance Water Rights	<u>1,137.</u>	<u>1,219.</u>	<u>1,243.</u>	<u>1,268.</u>
Water Rights Sub-total:	\$ 7,841.	\$ 7,722.	\$ 7,876.	\$ 8,033.
<hr/>				
Total Estimated General Fund Share for State Operations:	\$ 35,148.	\$ 34,945.	\$ 35,644.	\$36,355.

1. These data are based on the "current year" and "budget year" amounts in the Governor's Budget proposal for Fiscal Year 1992-93.

2. The Fiscal Year 1992-93 estimate was increased two percent annually for subsequent year amounts.

□ **EXISTING FUNDING STRUCTURE**

Despite these impediments, the State and Regional Boards now receive federal funds from the U.S. EPA, the Department of Defense, and the Bureau of Reclamation. Approximately 20 percent of the total operating budget for the current year is derived from 32 federal fund programs. (Excluding underground tank "pass through" funds, the federal share would be 35 percent of the Boards' operating budget.) Tables 1 and 2 show the distribution of these federal funds to the major water quality and water rights program elements.

Bond Funds

The State Board administers six bond funds which primarily support local assistance. Where operating costs are allowed, the bond laws impose stringent limitations on the amount and the use of those funds. For example, the Clean Water Bond Law of 1984, among other things, created a revolving loan fund to assist municipal water reclamation and conservation projects; the State Board may use up to five percent of the total bond authorization to manage these loans and to conduct certain research and planning activities. Thus, the Boards only use bond sources to support a limited number of programs. The majority of these bond-funded activities directly relate to financing pollution control facilities.

The 1970, 1974, and 1978 bonds, which are popularly known as the "Old Bond" account, contribute the most bond dollars to the State and Regional Boards' operating budget. Unlike later bond laws, these particular bonds allow broader uses. In the current fiscal year, the Old Bond amount is approximately \$9.3 million; its share of the total operating budget is about 5 percent (or about 78 percent of all bond funds for state operations). The Old Bond funds, in combination with various federal grants, support virtually all water quality monitoring, assessment, and planning activities. As the common name implies, Old Bond funds were authorized many years ago. At current levels, the proceeds from the sale of these bond issues will be fully expended next year.

To implement the recently-adopted "Water Quality Control Plan for Inland Surface Waters of

California" (Inland Plan), the State Board has proposed a budget augmentation for Fiscal Year 1992-93. As federal law requires, the Inland Plan establishes performance goals and numeric water quality objectives which apply to point and nonpoint pollutant discharges. Nonpoint sources, such as agricultural drainage and storm water runoff, must comply with specific provisions of this plan. The State and Regional Boards must develop new procedures and conduct extensive monitoring so the plan will effectively protect beneficial uses of inland waters. The augmentation proposes spending much of the remaining Old Bond funds during Fiscal Year 1992-93 for these purposes. Ongoing implementation of the Inland Plan, as well as the existing Old Bond-funded activities, will become "unfunded" when all Old Bond monies have been expended. Unless an alternative is developed and implemented soon, this shortfall will severely affect the Boards' water protection mission in Fiscal Year 1993-94.

Special or Fee-related Funds

"Special funds" are "governmental cost funds" comprising taxes, licenses, fees, penalties, and other revenues. Typically, enabling laws specify that a fee or tax shall be collected from a designated source or that revenue shall be dedicated to a particular program. The majority of the Boards' "special funds" are fee-related. These include: (1) annual and filing fees for waste discharge requirements; (2) annual fees for direct and indirect discharges to specified bays; (3) biennial fees for aboveground petroleum storage tank facilities; (4) fees for hazardous waste generators (which the Department of Toxic Substances Control manages); (5) fees for personalized vehicle license plates (which the Department of Motor Vehicles manages); (6) license fees from underground storage tank testers; (7) surcharges on local permit fees for underground storage tanks; (8) a distribution fee for petroleum stored in underground tanks; (9) quarterly and annual assessments for surface impoundments which contain hazardous wastes; and (10) surtaxes on cigarette and tobacco products. Excluding underground tank cleanup "pass through" funds, fee-related mechanisms

□ **EXISTING FUNDING STRUCTURE**

contribute about 20 percent of the Boards' operating budget.

The Boards collect a number of other fees, such as water rights application fees and wastewater treatment plant operator certification fees. These are "reimbursements" and are deposited in the General Fund. Appendix B describes existing fees in greater detail.

Current Fee Issues

Jointly, this mélange of small fee systems has become increasingly difficult and costly to administer. Common fee problems include erratic, unpredictable revenue, dissimilar fee structures, inadequate penalties for late or non-payment, and inefficient rulemaking procedures to make necessary changes. The Waste Discharge Permit Fund (WDPF) serves as a representative example.

Each person for whom waste discharge requirements (WDRs) have been prescribed (with certain exceptions) must pay an annual fee to the State Board. The maximum annual fee shall not exceed \$10,000. Under law, the State Board must "automatically adjust" a schedule of fees to generate the revenue amount set forth in the annual budget act; to do so, it must promulgate administrative regulations.

When the budget bill was introduced last January, the State Board began rulemaking for a fee schedule which would produce the proposed appropriation. Following several changes in that amount, the State Board revised the proposed regulations three times. Crafting a schedule of fees--within a maximum limit and given a narrow population--for significantly different revenue amounts can be exacting.

Once the WDPF appropriation was signed into law in October 1991, final fee regulations were adopted. Invoices were mailed when the revised fee schedule became effective in January 1992. This "automatic" process required a full year. Worse, the law does not enable the State Board to assess financial penalties for late or non-payment. Necessary collection procedures are not

specified. Thus, the amount of delinquent fees may not be known until the fiscal year has almost ended (and the money has already been spent). Other fee systems which support the Boards' programs have many similar impediments.

Reimbursements

Reimbursements pay the State and Regional Boards for tasks that will be performed without a direct appropriation. Several laws authorize the Boards to receive money for particular purposes. If enabling law does not require that the money be deposited in a specific fund, it may be classified as a "reimbursement. As noted above, several existing fees are considered reimbursements. In Tables 1 and 2, such fees are grouped in the "reimbursements" category for simplicity. (Appendix B includes a description of fee-related reimbursements.) Where other state or local governmental agencies pay the State Board or a Regional Board for certain work, an interagency contract or agreement typically governs that activity. Such agreements also specify the terms and conditions for the reimbursement. Therefore, reimbursements have limited application.

Comparison with Other State Agencies

The number, type, and magnitude of the fund sources which support the Boards differ considerably from those of similar state agencies. Using budget data from last year's Governor's Budget, Table 4A compares proposed Fiscal Year 1991-92 operating budgets for other natural resource, environmental, or regulatory programs. As the Table 4A illustrates, the Air Resources Board (ARB), the Integrated Waste Management Board (IWMB), the Public Utilities Commission (PUC), and the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) all derive more than 75 percent of their support budgets from fee-related fund sources. From a closer review, each of these agencies relies on a small number of fee mechanisms for a relatively large share of their budgets. Based on comparable data, the State and Regional Board collect 12 or more different fees for roughly 9 percent of its budget. Table 4B, which compares proposed operating budgets for Fiscal Year 1992-93, generally reveals

□ **EXISTING FUNDING STRUCTURE**

an increasingly greater share of fee support for the same agencies; however, the State and Regional Boards' fee support remains smaller.

Tables 4A and 4B illustrate that General Fund support varies among similar departments. The state General Fund represents the largest, single fund source for the Boards; other agencies' shares are less. While listed in Tables 4A and 4B, the Department of Water Resources (DWR) affords a poor comparison because revenue derived from State Water Project water deliveries dominates its budget. From a limited comparison, it is evident that fund sources for the State and Regional Boards differ from those of other environmental and resources programs. ■

TABLE 4A
COMPARISON OF OPERATING BUDGETS BY DEPARTMENT AND FUND TYPE
FY 1991-92 BUDGET YEAR DATA FROM 1991 GOVERNOR'S BUDGET
 (dollars in thousands)

Fund Type	SWRCB		ARB		IWB		DTSC		DFG		DWR		CEC		PUC	
	Dollars	Percent	Dollars	Percent	Dollars	Percent	Dollars	Percent	Dollars	Percent	Dollars	Percent	Dollars	Percent	Dollars	Percent
General Fund	\$39,816	21.4%	\$0	0.0%	\$4,784	8.5%	\$0	0.0%	\$4,951	3.4%	\$33,134	14.0%	\$28	-0.0%	\$0	0.0%
Federal Fund(s)	\$40,847	22.0%	\$3,193	3.7%	\$0	0.0%	\$20,070	19.6%	\$23,141	15.9%	\$1,981	0.8%	\$61,740	57.2%	\$139	0.2%
Fee-related Fund(s)	\$16,949	9.1%	\$79,135	91.1%	\$46,125	82.4%	\$80,110	78.3%	\$89,480	61.5%	\$300	0.1%	\$38,239	35.4%	\$74,481	90.5%
Bond Fund(s)	\$12,454	6.7%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$194	0.2%	\$6,091	4.2%	\$3,176	1.3%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%
Reimbursements	\$4,590	2.5%	\$3,933	4.5%	\$0	0.0%	\$1,943	1.9%	\$15,946	11.0%	\$10,080	4.3%	\$435	0.4%	\$2,437	3.2%
Other Fund(s)	\$71,135	38.3%	\$69	0.7%	\$5,067	9.1%	\$0	0.0%	\$5,960	4.1%	\$187,935	79.4%	\$7,513	7.0%	\$5,837	6.1%
TOTAL: State Operations	\$185,791	100.0%	\$86,830	100.0%	\$55,976	100.0%	\$102,317	100.0%	\$145,569	100.0%	\$236,606	100.0%	\$107,952	100.0%	\$82,285	100.0%
TOTAL FY 1991-92 BUDGET	\$363,234		\$94,341		\$62,376		\$102,317		\$145,569		\$1,001,719		\$110,752		\$82,285	

TABLE 4B
COMPARISON OF OPERATING BUDGETS BY DEPARTMENT AND FUND TYPE
FY 1992-93 BUDGET YEAR DATA FROM 1992 GOVERNOR'S BUDGET
 (dollars in thousands)

Fund Type	SWRCB		ARB		IWB		DTSC		DFG		DWR		CEC		PUC	
	Dollars	Percent	Dollars	Percent	Dollars	Percent	Dollars	Percent	Dollars	Percent	Dollars	Percent	Dollars	Percent	Dollars	Percent
General Fund	\$34,945	18.6%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$4,187	2.5%	\$27,267	11.3%	\$25	0.0%	\$0	0.0%
Federal Fund(s)	\$35,538	18.9%	\$4,189	4.4%	\$0	0.0%	\$15,230	13.9%	\$26,991	16.1%	\$1,850	0.8%	\$25,376	38.0%	\$130	0.2%
Fee-related Fund(s)	\$19,793	10.5%	\$87,610	91.4%	\$59,209	91.9%	\$80,051	73.3%	\$108,174	64.5%	\$1,426	0.6%	\$35,478	53.1%	\$81,299	84.9%
Bond Fund(s)	\$16,939	9.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$6,932	6.2%	\$3,156	1.9%	\$1,539	0.6%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%
Reimbursements	\$3,567	1.9%	\$4,039	4.2%	\$188	0.3%	\$2,127	1.9%	\$17,114	10.2%	\$9,060	3.8%	\$435	0.7%	\$2,437	3.1%
Other Fund(s)	\$77,405	41.1%	\$0	0.0%	\$5,000	7.8%	\$2,933	2.7%	\$7,966	4.8%	\$199,196	82.9%	\$5,531	8.3%	\$1,567	1.8%
TOTAL: State Operations	\$188,187	100.0%	\$96,038	100.0%	\$64,397	100.0%	\$109,273	100.0%	\$167,588	100.0%	\$240,338	100.0%	\$66,845	100.0%	\$85,623	100.0%
TOTAL 1992-93 BUDGET	\$534,387		\$103,549		\$74,129		\$109,273		\$167,588		\$1,053,091		\$73,518		\$85,623	

□ **EXISTING NEEDS AND FUTURE WORKLOAD**

Significant funding limitations now exist in many water quality and water rights programs. Growing numbers of out-dated waste discharge requirements and applications for water rights are now backlogged and compliance monitoring has diminished considerably. Widespread ground water contamination is suspected in many parts of the state, but few pollutant sources are investigated. This section outlines the current resource needs for particular State and Regional Board water protection programs so that funding options and implications can be evaluated.

Waste Discharge Permitting Backlog

Waste discharge requirements (WDRs) are the cornerstone of the water quality regulatory program. WDRs specify effluent quantity and quality limits which protect beneficial uses of the receiving water. These often include compliance schedules. As such, the Regional Boards must periodically revise WDRs so they conform to current law, new technology, and appropriate water quality standards. The Regional Boards also regularly review monitoring data and conduct compliance inspections. If monitoring, inspections, or complaints reveal violations, civil and criminal enforcement may be pursued.

Competing programs and more complex responsibilities have produced a growing backlog of permits and requirements which must now be addressed. According to recent workplan data, more than 1,800 waste discharge requirement orders and about 260 NPDES permits should be updated but are now backlogged. Likewise, more than 7,000 compliance inspections which should be done each year are not performed. To ensure violations are detected, additional and more frequent inspections, along with more aggressive enforcement, will also be required.

Last year, the State and Regional Boards proposed augmenting the "core" water quality programs to reduce the substantial permitting backlog and to bolster other regulatory activities via increased annual waste discharge fees. This two-phase proposal was approved; the first phase will be implemented during the current fiscal year. As proposed in the *Governor's Budget 1992-93*, an

additional \$3.4 million will be required to support the second phase of the approved augmentation. (This is the amount necessary for Budget Change Proposal Number 1; the total proposed waste discharge permit revenue amount equals \$11.1 million.) Table 5 shows the estimated costs to continue the second phase of the "Pollution Control from Permitted Discharges" budget element augmentation in later years (assuming costs increase two percent annually).

<u>Fiscal Year</u>	<u>Cost</u>
1992-93	\$ 3,349.
1993-94	\$ 3,416.
1994-95	\$ 3,483.

While existing waste discharge fees, which were increased recently, support the first phase, the present fee law constrains implementation of the second phase. The maximum annual fee now equals the statutory limit (\$10,000). To generate additional fee revenue within this "cap," the lesser fee amounts must be increased. "Compacting" the fee schedule would impose a disproportionate burden on small and medium-sized dischargers.

Water Rights Program Backlogs

Like waste discharge requirements, a substantial number of water rights applications are now backlogged. Persistent drought conditions necessitated redirecting staff to drought-related activities. As a result, many water rights applications may not be reviewed within the legally prescribed timeframe. From available records, more than 825 applications are now pending. Further emergency drought redirections will add almost 200 more applications. Water rights must also be monitored and enforcement actions taken against illegal diverters.

As part of the Administration's emergency drought response efforts, a modest program augmentation was proposed to improve water

□ **EXISTING NEEDS AND FUTURE WORKLOAD**

rights application processing and bolster enforcement efforts. (This augmentation was included in Assembly Bill 16X in the First Extraordinary Session.) Table 6 summarizes the estimated amounts for a partial augmentation of the "Water Appropriation" budget element which reduce a portion of the current backlog.

<u>Fiscal Year</u>	<u>Cost</u>
1992-93	\$ 1,000.
1993-94	\$ 1,020.
1994-95	\$ 1,040.

Better Ground Water Pollution Detection

The State and Regional Boards have sustained significant General Fund reductions over several years. The aggregate effect of such reductions has necessitated reducing two important pollution detection programs: the Well Investigation Program and the Solid Waste Assessment Test Program. Widespread contamination has been discovered in numerous ground water aquifers, many of which are drinking water sources. Potential contaminant sources may include active and closed landfills. At previous funding levels, investigating suspected contamination of 2,700 drinking water wells would have taken more than 40 years; reviewing water quality assessment reports for 2,100 landfills had also been a relatively slow process.

<u>Fiscal Year</u>	<u>Cost</u>
1992-93	\$ 3,590.
1993-94	\$ 3,662.
1994-95	\$ 3,735.

As the result of cumulative reductions, both programs are severely constrained. To better assess and protect California's ground waters, systematic and continuous pollution detection will be required. From these programs, the State and Regional Boards determine which ground water resources require more regulatory effort. Table 7 summarizes the resources that are minimally necessary to restore these key ground water programs.

Old Bond Fund Termination

The remaining Old Bond funds will be spent during next fiscal year. Yet, the programs now supported by Old Bond funds are continuing "baseline" activities. A replacement mechanism should not only fund such ongoing "baseline" programs--such as water quality planning, monitoring and assessment, standards development, and other activities within the water quality assessment element--but also new workload associated with implementation of the Inland Plan. As Table 8 illustrates, the "baseline" activities will cost about \$9.3 million this year and almost \$14.0 million in Fiscal Year 1993-94.

<u>Fiscal Year</u>	<u>Cost</u>
1992-93	[\$ 14,309.]
1993-94	\$ 9,994.
1994-95	\$ 10,192.

The budget year amount shown above in Table 8 includes the costs of the existing "baseline" water quality planning activities (\$9.5 million) plus the first year costs (\$4.7 million) to implement the Inland Plan. The estimated costs to continue the plan in subsequent fiscal years are shown in Table 9. As all remaining Old Bond monies will be spent during Fiscal Year 1992-93, no fund source has been proposed for the "out year" amounts in Table 9.

□ **EXISTING NEEDS AND FUTURE WORKLOAD**

TABLE 9
**Estimated Costs for Inland Surface
Water Plan Implementation
(Requires Alternative Funding
After FY 1992-93)**
(in thousands of dollars)

<u>Fiscal Year</u>	<u>Cost</u>
1992-93	[\$ 4,744.]
1993-94	\$ 3,884.
1994-95	\$ 3,962.

The Funding Gap

From the preceding sections, it is apparent that the funding apparatus for the State and Regional Boards has not kept pace with the changing regulatory framework. The Boards' duties exceed available fiscal resources. The "funding gap" is substantial.

Since evaluating numerous combinations of revenue needs and funding alternatives was impractical, the directives set forth in the *Analysis of the 1991-92 Budget Bill* guided our analysis of potential options. Accordingly, alternative funding mechanisms were considered that might:

- (A) replace 75 percent of the General Fund appropriation;
- (B) replace 100 percent of the General Fund appropriation;
- (C) replace 100 percent of the General Fund appropriation and augment regulatory programs to reduce existing backlogs; and
- (D) replace 100 percent of the General Fund appropriation, augment regulatory programs to reduce existing backlogs, and support new workload (particularly the continued implementation of the Inland Plan).

During earlier budget debate about funding alternatives, decision-makers inquired what effects replacing 75 percent of the General Fund would have. Assuming no change in total amounts, this

substitution of fund sources would roughly double the special or fee fund share of the Boards' current budget. Some suggested fixing the Boards' General Fund share at 25 percent of the total budget in recognition of the State and Regional Boards' "public trust" duties which benefit everyone. In part for these reasons and for continuity, 75 percent replacement of General Fund was selected for component or scenario (A).

Table 10 summarizes the cumulative amounts for the four revenue components or scenarios defined above. Each of these amounts include the existing "baseline" fee appropriation amount as possible funding alternatives mostly build upon or supplant the existing annual waste discharge fee system. Table 10 excludes other existing fees however. One-time water rights application fees, for example, produce meager revenue; these might be retained or replaced under certain options. In general, existing fees classified as "reimbursements" are relatively small and would not influence this study. Minor fees that are intrinsic to a specific program activity (such as operator certification fees) were also excluded.

Table 10 also shows different revenue amounts for the next two fiscal years. In Fiscal Year 1992-93, remaining Old Bond monies would support first-year implementation of the Inland Plan. Once Old Bond funds are spent however, they must be replaced. Therefore, the respective General Fund and Old Bond "baseline" amounts are combined for Fiscal Year 1993-94 in Table 10. ■

TABLE 10
COMPARISON OF REVENUE NEEDS
(in thousands of dollars)

REVENUE COMPONENT(S) (Scenario)	WATER QUALITY		WATER RIGHTS		TOTAL PROGRAM	
	FY 92-93	FY 93-94 ^{1/}	FY 92-93	FY 93-94	FY 92-93	FY 93-94
A. Replace existing annual waste discharge fees and 75 percent of General Fund	\$ 28,121.	\$ 38,287.	\$ 5,792.	\$ 6,297.	\$ 33,913.	\$ 44,584.
B. Replace existing annual waste discharge fees and 100 percent of General Fund	34,927.	45,229.	7,722.	8,266.	42,649.	53,495.
C. Replace existing annual waste discharge fees, 100 percent of General Fund, and augment programs to reduce regulatory backlogs	41,907.	52,348.	8,722.	9,286.	50,629.	61,635.
D. Replace existing annual waste discharge fees, 100 percent of General Fund, augment programs to reduce regulatory backlogs, and support new workload	41,907.	56,232.	8,722.	9,286.	50,629.	65,519.

1. Fiscal Year 1993-94 amounts for Water Quality include "Old Bond" amount which must be replaced also.

□ EVALUATION CRITERIA AND PRELIMINARY ALTERNATIVES

In this section, important considerations and evaluation criteria are defined and preliminary funding alternatives are described.

CRITERIA AND CONSIDERATIONS

Many policy, fiscal, and administrative factors influence an evaluation of potential alternative funding mechanisms. To ascertain which options might be appropriate, the questions posed in the *Analysis of the 1991-92 Budget Bill* were incorporated along with criteria used in similar national studies examining new funding ideas for water protection programs. (These national studies are listed in the bibliography.) Earlier funding proposals affecting the State and Regional Boards dictated other considerations in this study. Taking these together, the following criteria distinguish feasible, appropriate options:

Applicability

- *Funding Mechanisms Should Achieve A Fundamental Purpose*

Producing revenue should be the foremost purpose of a new funding scheme. Collateral goals, such as pollution prevention or water conservation, should be considered desirable, but secondary benefits to any particular option.

- *Funding Mechanisms Should Be Compatible*

The underlying concept for a new funding scheme should be clear and simple. Fee or tax payers must understand not only how much they will pay but also why they are paying to support the State and Regional Boards. The fee amount and program costs should be reasonably related. An ideal option should also minimize competing demands from other governmental programs. Options integrally connected with water protection would be more compatible with the Boards' regulatory mission and programs.

- *Funding Mechanism Should Be Flexible and Changeable*

To be successful, funding options must accommodate changing regulatory strategies and

programs. Future legislation will inevitably modify current water protection programs. Where new laws add or reduce costs, the funding system must be adjusted accordingly. It must be designed so these adjustments can be made easily. Moreover, a preferred option should set forth broad principles guiding the use of revenue rather than narrow, specific allocations. It must also be flexible.

Feasibility

- *Funding Mechanisms Should Be Simple*

The Boards' existing fiscal structure is inordinately complex. The number of fund sources is large. In many cases, persons pay multiple fees but do not understand why and how these are determined. Unquestionably, a new revenue source must be simple.

- *Funding Mechanisms Should Be Reliable*

Revenue must be predictable, reliable, and certain. The mechanism should not only generate the expected revenue but also ensure sufficient cash-flow. Ideally, when revenue changes are made during the state budget process, the funding mechanism would also be adjusted. Convoluted administrative procedures defeat even the best options. Any data used to assess individual amounts must be verifiable and accurate.

- *Funding Mechanisms Should Be Enforceable*

Again, to succeed, new funding options must be enforceable. Equity principles and other policy factors become irrelevant if those who are required to pay don't. Financial penalties and collection provisions for late or non-payment must be included.

- *Funding Mechanisms Should Be Efficient*

Money should be spent protecting water rather than collecting money. Alternatives which consolidate various "revenue streams" in a single, broadly-defined fund enhance efficiency and flexibility. Where possible, existing administrative

□ **EVALUATION CRITERIA AND PRELIMINARY ALTERNATIVES**

processes within the Boards, the Board of Equalization, or other agencies should be used.

Equity

- *Funding Mechanisms Should Acknowledge Equity Concerns*

Each person who must pay a fee or tax wishes to be treated fairly. As individual perspectives influence judgements about particular options, "equity" is highly subjective. To some, an equitable system would assess only the "true" cost of specific services they use. For example, a permit fee would be based only on the cost of issuing an individual permit. Alternatively, "equity" may mean that persons who benefit from a given program would pay its costs. Others assert that those who pollute or impose a burden on water resources ought to pay for the programs which remedy problems they create. On a simpler level, some believe an equitable option should treat everyone equally. They argue that neighbors should pay the same amount.

Obviously, determining the relative service, benefit, or burden associated with individual water users or waste dischargers is enormously difficult. The apportionment of the costs of the State and Regional Boards' water protection programs is no less arduous. The immense scope of California's waterscape confounds such attempts: virtually everyone and everything uses water in some way. In truth, some combination of equity principles likely applies to the State and Regional Boards' water protection mission; desirable alternatives should acknowledge these circumstances.

Revenue Potential

- *Funding Mechanisms Must Have Sufficient Revenue Potential*

The revenue potential of an alternative funding mechanism must fulfill not only existing needs but also reasonable future requirements.

- *The Funding Mechanism Should Encompass a Broad Base*

The number of persons who must pay is also an important factor. In general, options should apply broadly for three reasons. First, the largest, possible number of fee payers reduces the financial burden upon any one person or group. Secondly, a diverse population builds a resilient base; fluctuations can be minimized. A broad-based option recognizes that the Boards' programs benefit the entire population. It may also realize economies of scale.

Acceptability

- *Funding Mechanisms Should Minimize Adverse Effects*

Public and private enterprises use water to produce many goods and services. New funding alternatives should not create undue hardship on such enterprises or people.

PRELIMINARY ALTERNATIVES

Based on the above criteria and considerations, the following preliminary alternatives were considered and rejected.

Income and/or Sales Assessments: Several types of assessments on personal, banking and insurance companies, corporations and retail sales generate revenue for governmental activities. Income and sales taxes represent the largest share of General Fund revenues. Constitutional restrictions and economic recession, however, effectively preclude either option for State and Regional Board purposes. Income and sales assessments are poorly suited for water protection programs; thus, both options were rejected.

Advalorem Assessments: Although property assessments have been historically used to finance government, Proposition 13 in 1977 significantly changed the application, use, and purpose of this funding mechanism. Property taxes are not viable given the existing legal and practical restrictions.

□ EVALUATION CRITERIA AND PRELIMINARY ALTERNATIVES

"Sin Taxes:" Several states use "sin taxes" (assessments on commodities such as cigarettes, tobacco, and alcohol) for environmental and water programs. This fund source now partly supports two small Board projects but numerous other agencies also compete for these funds. Demand for taxed commodities and revenue have recently declined. For these reasons, "sin taxes" were not evaluated further for the Boards' programs.

Lottery: The primary purpose of California's lottery is to generate additional monies for public education without imposing new or higher taxes. Lottery sales have also declined recently and new games have proven costly and marginally successful. While several other states finance environmental programs via state lotteries, California's appears to offer little potential.

Bonds: Through various bond measures, Californians have generously invested in the long-term management and protection of the state's natural resources. State and local governments, special districts, and others borrow money via bonds to finance major capital investment. General obligation, revenue, and other bonds provide funds to plan and build infrastructure. Bonding is not an appropriate or practical option for ongoing operating costs.

Resource Royalties: Persons who use natural resources such as oil, natural gas, timber, and minerals often pay royalties. In some states, these royalties support water quality programs. Here, the State Lands Commission collects royalties for oil, gas, and minerals extracted from state-owned lands. The Regional Boards regulate many of these activities via waste discharge requirements. While a regulatory relationship exists, oil and gas production has been limited for some years. Marginal revenue potential and competing governmental programs eliminate this option.

Commodities Surcharges: Levying fees or taxes on specific commodities or products that are potential pollutants is another option. For instance, a charge per unit processed, stored, or delivered could be assessed. As with sales taxes, this option may effectively generate stable revenue. But, it would not apply as broadly.

Similar mechanisms have already been created for dedicated purposes (such as underground tank cleanup and toxics remediation); the cumulative effect of these surcharges may be adverse. Additional commodities surcharges were deemed impractical and possibly unaffordable.

Comprehensive Environmental Fee: Persons and activities which affect the "environment" (or perhaps, just the "water media") would annually prepare and submit data enumerating how and how much they pollute. Some sort of scoring or point system could be used to evaluate that data and compute a commensurate fee. New Jersey has adopted a similar fee system for water pollution control. However, devising such a system for California would be inordinately complicated. On a broader scale (perhaps including air, water, solid waste, and toxics), some of these impediments might be reduced. This alternative must be better defined before it can be evaluated.

"Cost Recovery:" Another option would be greatly expanding "cost recovery." Many states' toxics programs recoup the cost of their regulatory work from responsible parties. This "cost recovery" supplements fines and penalties imposed for violations. Under the "fee for service" concept, waste dischargers and water users could be billed for the actual "state operations" costs of permitting, monitoring, and enforcement. The State and Regional Boards currently have minor cost recovery efforts and may consider limited expansion in the future. Accounting procedures to support a major expansion of cost recovery would likely be prohibitively expensive and burdensome. Cash-flow would also be uncertain. Consequently, "cost recovery" is not recommended as a viable long-term solution.

"Utility" Fees: Assessing fees for utility services is another possible means of funding regulatory programs. For the State and Regional Boards, related "utility" services might include water, wastewater, and refuse collection and disposal. These "utilities" not only benefit from specific regulatory activities but also impose substantial burdens on the state's water resources. A flat fee or variable fee for each utility customer would be

□ ***EVALUATION CRITERIA AND PRELIMINARY ALTERNATIVES***

simple and reliable; the long-term revenue potential may also be significant. While "utility" fees offer promise, earlier legislation to fund other governmental programs through such fees failed passage. Moreover, insufficient information about which entities provide such services, how many customers each serves, and how their funding mechanisms work now exists. ■

□ ANALYSIS OF PRINCIPAL ALTERNATIVES

The preliminary review suggested that four alternative funding mechanisms might satisfy the specified criteria. To evaluate these alternatives in more detail, sample fee schedules (which are located in the appendices) were developed for each option at different revenue amounts. The fee schedules only serve as examples for comparison; the range of fee amounts or the apportionment between fee categories are variable. The principal options could be structured several other ways.

ALTERNATIVE 1: A REVISED WASTE DISCHARGE PERMIT FEE CAP

Description

- **Basic Concept:** Every person for whom waste discharge requirements have been prescribed pursuant to Water Code Section 13260 must pay an annual fee to the State Board.
- **Fee Structure:** The State Board would periodically promulgate a sliding schedule of fees based on: the type of regulated activity, the volume of waste discharged, and its relative threat to water quality. The total fee revenue shall equal the amount set forth in the annual Budget Act.
- **Fee Ranges:** Many different fee schedules could be devised if the "cap" were increased or eliminated. For example, assuming the existing schedule of fees were increased in proportion to the amount of revenue to be raised in Table 10, the approximate annual fees would range from:

To replace 75 percent of the General Fund (Scenario "A") in Fiscal Year 1992-93:

Minimum annual fee: \$997 (for a Category IIIC, "Non-chapter 15 WDR" holder)

Maximum annual fee: \$49,859 (for a Category IA discharge of any type)

To replace all General Fund, reduce backlogs, and fund new workload (Scenario "D") in Fiscal Year 1993-94:

Minimum annual fee: \$1,927 (for a Category IIIC, "Non-chapter 15 WDR" holder)

Maximum annual fee: \$96,327 (for a Category IA discharge of any type)

Some sample fee schedules for this option, based on the amounts in Table 10, are included in Appendix C.

A second alternative would be to revise the existing fee structure by changing the maximum fee amount and thereby correcting present inequities and inconsistencies. Clearly, the range of fees could be increased or "stretched" if the maximum fee were set at higher amounts. This might decrease some or all lower tier fees.

- **Fee Payers:** Approximately 4,100 persons who now hold waste discharge requirements are required to pay annual fees during the current year. (Although the total number of regulated persons is about 6,200, many of these people are now exempt or are delinquent.) New point-source dischargers, such as storm water permittees and enrollees, might increase the potential number of future fee payers over time.

Program Considerations

- **Flexibility:** Increasing or eliminating the fee "cap" would link the persons who necessitate the present regulatory controls to one of the funding mechanisms which finances those controls. This particular option provides less opportunity to address new problems such as pollution from nonpoint sources (for which permits are not presently issued).
- **Implementation:** This alternative builds upon the existing annual waste discharge fee system. It would preserve current billing and collection processes. Existing procedures to adjust fee amounts and to collect fees, however, would likely become more resource intensive and less reliable as the total revenue amount increases.

□ ANALYSIS OF PRINCIPAL ALTERNATIVES

■ **Enforceability:** Beyond cash-flow timing, revising the existing "cap" alone would not resolve many fee enforcement matters. Revenue increases to replace General Fund, to reduce backlogs, and to support more work would likely exacerbate existing fee collection problems. More fee payers will likely become delinquent as fee rates increase significantly.

Fiscal Considerations

■ **Cash-flow:** Under current law, fee rulemaking and collection cannot begin until the revenue amount is fixed in the annual Budget Act. Changing the "cap" would require additional rulemaking time once the new statutory maximum became law. Late or non-payment remedies cannot be pursued until the program costs have already been incurred. This option presents serious cash-flow concerns.

Policy Considerations

■ **Narrow base:** The number of fee payers is relatively narrow (around 6,200 persons at best). This "universe" excludes many categories of water users and waste discharges.

■ **Accountability:** Fee payers would likely demand greater scrutiny and accountability for program activities and costs.

■ **Affordability:** Little economic information exists to evaluate "equity" and "affordability." The current fee structure further frustrates meaningful analysis; those dischargers which present the greatest threat are not always the same persons who discharge large volumes of waste or who might spread increased fee costs among many users or customers. While volume is the key factor, current fees also depend upon the condition of and threat to the receiving water; these circumstances vary throughout the state's 2,500 waterbodies.

ALTERNATIVE 2: NEW WATER RIGHTS AND WASTE DISCHARGE PERMIT FEES

Description

■ **Basic Concept:** Every person who discharges waste or uses water would pay a specified minimum fee; those who discharge more waste or use more water would pay additional fee increments according to one or more scale factors. Building upon the July version of Assembly Bill 18, "nonpoint" sources of pollutants (such as mining, agriculture, silviculture, and urban activities) as well as additional appropriators of water would be included.

■ **Fee Structure:** Persons who divert or store water pursuant to a water right permit or license, issued by the State Board, would be assessed an annual fee based on the permitted or licensed volume of water which may be appropriated. Fees for diversion and for storage would be calculated separately. Similarly, persons who discharge waste to surface waters or ground waters--under an individual or general waste discharge requirement order, a waiver of requirements, or best management practices and alternative control strategies established for a type or category of waste--would also pay an annual fee based on the total volume of waste authorized. Where the liquid or solid volume is unknown or not measurable, another size factor could be used.

■ **Fee Ranges:** For this option, Assembly Bill 18's fee structure was used as the basic framework. Additional fee categories such as nonpoint pollutant sources were added and costs were roughly distributed on the basis of budget elements. Using available data, the range of waste discharge fees necessary to replace all General Fund, reduce backlogs, and fund new workload during Fiscal Year 1993-94 (that is, revenue scenario "D") would roughly be:

Minimum annual fee: \$250 (for an industrial stormwater enrollee)

□ ANALYSIS OF PRINCIPAL ALTERNATIVES

Maximum annual fee: \$2,017,000 (for the City of Los Angeles' Hyperion Treatment Plant)

The corresponding range of annual water rights fees for the same revenue amount would be about:

Minimum annual fee: \$150 (for diversion less than 5.0 cubic feet per second)

Maximum annual fee: \$1,393,000 (for the Department of Water Resources' various State Water Project rights).

The July version of Assembly Bill 18 and sample worksheets for this option are included in Appendices A and D, respectively.

■ **Fee Payers:** The general categories of "point source" fee payers might include: municipal wastewater and stormwater dischargers; industrial waste and stormwater dischargers; power plants and other cooling water dischargers; operators of solid waste landfills, surface impoundments, and land treatment units; mining operations; and others. Conceptually, the following categories of "nonpoint source" fee payers would also be included: agricultural waste discharges; "unregulated" mining and landfill operations; dredging activities; and septic tank and subsurface disposal systems. More than 10,000 water rights holders under the State Board's jurisdiction would also pay annual fees.

Program Considerations

■ **Flexibility:** The amount and distribution of waste discharger and water users could be changed within the basic structure of this option. But, the fragmented nature of these various fee categories may actually exacerbate funding limitations. Fee payers would undoubtedly link fee categories with program activities; this may create incentives to implement or to reduce particular programs simply because revenue from related fee categories would be viewed as dedicated to those activities. As regulatory emphasis shifts from point sources to nonpoint sources and from new water supply development to competing public trust and human uses,

permitted dischargers and water rights holders may seek lower fees even though "permitting" program costs would not necessarily decrease. In this option, numerous fee categories may more narrowly constrain revenue uses.

■ **Implementation:** The number of potential fee payers is large and unwieldy. Identifying and collecting fees from perhaps more than 75,000 new fee payers will be exceedingly difficult. An agency such as the Board of Equalization, which has sophisticated collection mechanisms and expertise, may be better equipped to administer the large volume of fees under this alternative.

■ **Enforceability:** Expanding fees to include "unpermitted" waste dischargers may add significant fee enforcement complexities. For the most part, large numbers of unknown persons may discharge wastes associated with agricultural, dredging, mining, timber harvest, and urban activities. This option must include provisions that ensure persons required to pay fees cannot evade them.

Fiscal Considerations

■ **Collection Cost:** Because the majority of fee payers would remit nominal, flat fees, collection costs may be high, especially for lower revenue amounts shown in Table 10. Where possible, collection might be "piggy-backed" on similar fee systems (such as the Integrated Waste Management Board's solid waste tipping fee or the Department of Conservation's mining reporting fee). Coordinated, interagency billing and collection procedures would reduce administrative workload and costs.

Policy Considerations

■ **Different Scale Factors:** Earlier, some suggested that waste fees should be based on the toxicity and maximum pollutant loading or mass emissions of individual discharges or sources. Likewise, the type of water use in addition to or instead of the volume of use could be used to assess fees. Although either basis represents one way relative "burden" might be quantified, the associated fee mechanism would involve massive

□ ANALYSIS OF PRINCIPAL ALTERNATIVES

amounts of data that do not exist. Generating and evaluating such information for fee purposes would be exorbitantly costly. In many cases, if such data were available, many regulatory program activities would no longer be necessary. Because the State and Regional Boards must protect the quality and beneficial uses of more than 2,500 waterbodies equally, decisions regarding which scale factor might be appropriate are subjective.

■ **Apportionment Among Categories:** General water quality planning and standards programs affect all waste dischargers and water users, including many who would not pay fees under this alternative. How such costs are apportioned in the fee schedule remains a key but divisive issue.

■ **Federal Facilities:** Under current law, the federal government is exempt from water rights and some other fees. Yet, the Bureau of Reclamation's Central Valley Project diverts and stores the largest volumes of water statewide. Specific fee provisions might be devised to impose fees directly on the Bureau or its 130 water contractors.

■ **Affordability:** Municipal dischargers and water agencies would pass increased fees to their customers (residences and businesses). As a volumetric fee rates would be used (where practical), the per capita share of new water quality and water rights fees may be more consistent and equitable for large and small volumes alike. However, many factors in addition to total annual fee amounts influence local wastewater and water rates. The economic effects upon non-municipal (industrial) dischargers and private water rights holders is indeterminate.

ALTERNATIVE 3: A WATER USE FEE

Description

■ **Basic Concept:** This option would abolish existing annual waste discharge permit fees (and perhaps the one-time water rights fees) and instead establish a single assessment per acre-foot

of water used. The assessment would apply to all water used whether it originates in surface or ground water bodies.

■ **Fee Structure:** A single, flat fee rate would apply to all water used on any water right.

■ **Fee Ranges:** Assuming a water use fee were fully implemented to replace all General Fund, reduce backlogs, and support new workload in Fiscal Year 1993-94, the equivalent fee amount would be roughly \$1.90 per acre-foot of water used. A description of fee rates for other revenue scenarios is included in Appendix E.

■ **Fee Payers:** All water users would pay annual fees to the State Board in this option. Though the total number of users is unknown, it is obviously quite large. To reduce this number, individuals (single family homes, small farms, etc.) which use small amounts of water (under 500 acre feet per year) might be exempted.

Program Considerations

■ **Flexibility:** The specific fee rate could be set in statute and changed from time to time by the Legislature or an independent body such as the Board of Equalization to reflect changes made during the annual budget process. This alternative would allow the State and Regional Boards to set reasonable water protection priorities without major revisions to the basic funding mechanism as well.

■ **Implementation:** While a water use fee is a simple and straightforward concept, identifying water use for riparian, pre-1914, and ground water appropriators present significant technical and administrative difficulties. Scant data exists regarding the volume of water and the individual uses within each of these groups. Persons who appropriate surface water under riparian and pre-1914 water rights are now required to submit Statements of Diversion and Use. If penalties were prescribed for failure to report, these statements might also serve as the basis for fee assessment. Ground water use information is now only required for four adjudicated basins; some broader reporting requirement could be instituted.

□ ANALYSIS OF PRINCIPAL ALTERNATIVES

Fiscal Considerations

■ **Collection Costs:** Water use fees would be relatively easy to determine and to estimate if a single volumetric rate were selected. The dearth of data about individual use, however, complicates collection and vastly increases administrative costs.

■ **Revenue Potential:** At relatively low fee rates, a water use fee funding alternative offers substantial revenue potential.

Policy Considerations

■ **Applicability:** This option encompasses the broadest uses of California's water resources. It also represents a simple, fair, and reasonable measure of the burden or benefit derived from water use.

■ **Affordability:** From 1985 data, municipal and industrial water users pay--on average--approximately \$276 per acre-foot while agricultural users pay about \$22 per acre-foot. Assuming the "average" farm uses about 3 acre-feet of water per acre of crop, the estimated annual water use fee (under scenario D in Table 10) would be roughly \$744. A typical household which uses about 0.5 acre-foot of water annually would pay an additional \$1.00 on its water bill. If an "average" industry uses about 0.25 acre-feet of water per employee as DWR's data suggests and assuming that industry employs 100 people, its annual water use fee would be about \$48 dollars. The broad fee base and volumetric rate structure tend to minimize potential adverse economic effects.

■ **Competing Proposals:** Similar water use fee measures have been proposed for other purposes. In the current legislative session, Senate Bill 959 (Presley) would require certain urban water suppliers to pay a prescribed annual water tax. The tax proceeds would fund loans and grants to local entities so they may fulfill minimum drinking water standards and to unspecified recipients so they may cleanup ground water pollution or may restore and manage fish and water-dependent wildlife. If enacted, this bill would also partly

fund certain Department of Health Services and DWR programs.

ALTERNATIVE 4: A SEWER USE FEE

Description

■ **Basic Concept:** This alternative would assess a surcharge on "sewer users," any person who discharges waste into a publicly-owned treatment works (POTW).

■ **Fee Structure:** The municipality or special district that collects and treats wastewater from households, businesses, and other sewer users would impose a fee on customers' billing statements. Periodically, the sewer entity would remit the amount collected to the State Board.

■ **Fee Ranges:** A sewer use fee of roughly \$5.45 per sewer user or household annually would be necessary to replace 100 percent of the General Fund and Old Bond amounts, to augment regulatory programs and reduce backlogs, and to address new workload in Fiscal Year 1993-94. Appendix F includes a description of fee rates for other revenue scenarios.

■ **Fee Payers:** Approximately 605 local entities collect more than 3,000 million gallons of wastewater daily. Commercial and industrial sewer users comprise between 5 and 7 percent of this total flow. Households contribute the majority of sewer flows. Indirectly, more than 90 percent of California's residents would pay increased sewer use fees.

Program Considerations

■ **Flexibility:** A sewer use fee could be easily changed; it would also be simple and efficient. The fee payer "base" would grow as population increases and is reasonably stable. This base is extremely broad when viewed from the "true" payers so revenue fluctuations would be minimized.

□ ANALYSIS OF PRINCIPAL ALTERNATIVES

■ **Implementation:** Virtually all sewerage entities assess user charges from their customers rather than relying on ad valorem taxes or other funding mechanisms. As most of these entities received substantial state and federal grant assistance to design and construct POTWs, they must comply with "fair and equitable" user charge requirements. The State Board regularly reviews these local user charge systems for grant and loan-funded POTWs; Appendix G includes the most recent summary of local sewer use charges statewide. Implementing an annual assessment for the State and Regional Boards would involve only minor adjustments to the existing structure.

■ **Applicability:** This funding alternative recognizes the massive state and federal investment in POTWs and the Boards' continuing mission to ensure that these are properly operated, maintained, and updated so effluent discharges do not impair the state's water resources. In this regard, the majority of Californians who benefit from the State and Regional Boards' water protection programs and financial assistance programs would contribute part of costs of such programs.

Fiscal Considerations

■ **Revenue Potential:** Similar to Alternative 3, an annual sewer use funding option offers substantial revenue potential at relatively low fee rates.

■ **Collection Cost:** This alternative would build upon generally uniform sewer user charge systems that are now administered by sewerage entities. The annual sewer use fee for the State and Regional Boards could be set so these entities could recover incremental collection costs. Monthly collections at the local level along with periodic remittances to the State Board would also enhance cash-flow aspects.

Policy Considerations

■ **Unsewered Discharges:** This alternative would not assess fees for "unsewered" discharges from industrial facilities, agriculture, landfills, and others. While people in these groups would pay

as individuals, this aspect may present considerable policy implications.

■ **Affordability:** From reports sewerage entities submitted in 1990, sewer use fees presently range from \$0 to \$74 per month. (Appendix G summarizes sewer rates statewide.) In general, small communities pay higher local fees because their POTWs were constructed with less state and federal financial assistance. Their user charge systems must finance both capital and operating costs. Conversely, large urban areas pay lower local user charges. Existing sewer use charges may also include costs such as debt repayment, future capital outlay, operating reserves, or other cost components beyond operation and maintenance. A single "per capita" sewer use fee for the State and Regional Boards' programs would tend to minimize potential economic consequences of higher sewer charges. ■

□ **SUGGESTED ALTERNATIVE**

Growing regulatory demands coupled with resource limitations present new challenges to the State and Regional Boards. To address these challenges, an alternative funding mechanism to support the Boards' water quality and water rights programs should be considered. Statewide fiscal limitations, however, necessitate a very modest, cautious perspective on any new or different fees in the short-term.

Given the substantial fiscal concerns which now confront all Californians, the most realistic and viable option is one that: (a) builds upon the Boards' existing waste discharge fee system rather than impose entirely new fees and (b) minimizes the total cost to the regulated community. Consequently, the suggested alternative is to revise the maximum fee amount for persons who hold waste discharge requirements in an amount sufficient to support the regulatory efforts as proposed in the Governor's Budget. The specific amount of the revised "cap" will be established through legislation. The "cap" would be changed in order to generate \$11.1 million in waste discharge fees in the budget year. This revenue amount would fund a portion of the existing "core regulatory" programs' cost as well as the second phase augmentation to reduce growing backlogs in those programs. ■

□ **GLOSSARY**

Abbreviations, Acronyms, and Terms

acre-foot	A unit of measure of liquid volume; a volume of water one foot deep and one acre in acre; or, 43,560 cubic feet	Chapter 15	Chapter 15 of Title 23 of the Code of California Regulations regarding waste disposal to pits, ponds, lagoons, garbage dumps, toxic waste sites, etc.; the regulatory activities associated with waste discharge requirement orders issued for such discharges
af	Acre-foot		
afa	Acre-feet per annum; a typical measurement of water usage or storage	CVP	Central Valley Project, the federally-owned and operated system of dams, canals, and other water storage and conveyance works
appropriation	The diversion or storage of water under a right of beneficial use; also an authorization from a specific fund to a specific agency to make expenditures for specified purposes	DFG	Department of Fish and Game
ARB	Air Resources Board	DTSC	Department of Toxic Substances Control
AWRIS	Automated Water Rights Information System	DWR	Department of Water Resources
BCP	Budget Change Proposal or budget adjustment	effluent	Wastewater or other waste stream flowing from a treatment plant, reservoir, industrial facility, etc.
BMPs	Best Management Practices, a type of an alternative pollution control measure	Element	The second subdivision of budgetary "programs"; a collection of related components
BPTCP	Bay Protection and Toxic Cleanup Program	FY	Fiscal Year; a state fiscal year begins July 1 and ends the following June 30; a federal fiscal year begins October 1 and ends the following September 30
Bureau	U.S. Bureau of Reclamation; also referred to as USBR	IWMB	California Integrated Waste Management Board
CEC	Energy Resources Conservation and Development Commission (also called the "California Energy Commission")	gpd	Gallons per day
cfs	Cubic-foot per second; a unit of measure of the flow rate		

□ GLOSSARY

mgd	Million gallons per day; typical measurement of effluent flow rate	SWRCB	State Water Resources Control Board (for budget purposes, this term generally includes both the State Board and the nine Regional Boards)
MSCA	Multi-site Cooperative Agreement		
Non-15 WDR	Waste discharge requirement orders for point source discharges to land not regulated pursuant to the provisions of Chapter 15; also the regulatory activities associated with such discharges	WIP	Well Investigation Program
NPDES	National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System, the federal permit system for point source waste discharges to surface waters; also the regulatory activities associated with waste discharge requirement orders (or permits) for such discharges		
POTW	Publicly-owned treatment works		
Program	The activities of an organization grouped on the basis of common objectives; programs comprise elements, which can be further divided into components and tasks (the lowest defined program activity)		
PY	Past year; also personnel years, the estimated portion of a position expended for the performance of work		
RCRA	Resource Conservation and Recovery Act		
RWQCB	Regional Water Quality Control Board		
SLIC	Spills, Leaks, Investigations, and Cleanup		
SWAT	Solid Waste Assessment Test		

APPENDIX A

Assembly Bill 18 as amended July 2, 1991

This version of Assembly Bill 18 (Sher) is included as historical background information and as the basic model for Alternative 2, New Water Rights and Waste Discharge Permit Fees. Estimated fee amounts and categories for Assembly Bill 18 are shown on the accompanying spreadsheets.

AMENDED IN SENATE JULY 2, 1991
AMENDED IN SENATE MAY 14, 1991
AMENDED IN ASSEMBLY MARCH 11, 1991

CALIFORNIA LEGISLATURE—1991-92 REGULAR SESSION

ASSEMBLY BILL **No. 18**

Introduced by Assembly Member Sher

December 3, 1990

An act to amend Sections 9907, 9714, 9770, 9773, and 9774 of the Public Resources Code, relating to mining, and declaring the urgency thereof, to take effect immediately, 1540, 1550, and 13260 of the Water Code, relating to water.

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL'S DIGEST

AB 18, as amended, Sher. Mining; financial assurances; Water: fees.

(1) Under existing law, any person subject to waste discharge requirements of a regional water quality control board is required to pay the regional board an annual fee, not to exceed \$10,000, according to a schedule adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board on the basis of specified criteria.

This bill would require the state board and the regional boards, on or before July 1, 1992, to identify prescribed dischargers which are not yet subject to waste discharge permits. The bill would require persons for whom waste discharge requirements have been prescribed and those identified dischargers to pay an annual fee pursuant to a prescribed interim fee schedule which would remain in effect only until legislation establishing a fee schedule is enacted, or until July 1, 1993, whichever is earlier. The bill would authorize the state board to set fees to generate the amounts

appropriated from the Waste Discharge Permit Fund, which the bill would rename the Water Protection Fund.

The bill would require the Governor to submit to the Legislature proposed legislation prepared by the state board which includes a fee schedule to take effect on or before July 1, 1993, which would replace the interim fee schedule and would establish different categories of dischargers and an annual fee for each category on the basis of specified criteria. The bill would prohibit the imposition of the annual fee on or after that date if the Legislature has not enacted legislation establishing a new fee schedule.

The bill would impose a penalty of 10% for the late payment of fees.

The bill would make inoperative, on the enactment of the fee schedule, certain provisions regarding waste discharger fees applicable to facilities for confined animal feeding or holding operations.

The bill would authorize the state board to enter into an agreement with the State Board of Equalization to collect the fees.

(2) Under existing law, a fee based on a specified schedule is imposed for the issuance of a permit to appropriate water.

This bill would require, with specified exceptions, persons holding a permit or license to appropriate water to pay to the state board an annual fee pursuant to a prescribed fee schedule for the diversion or storage of water. The fees would be deposited in the fund. The bill would impose a penalty of 10% for the late payment of fees and would provide that the money generated from the penalties be used for prescribed purposes. The bill would make the fee schedule inoperative on July 1, 1993, and would prohibit the imposition of the annual fee on and after that date if the Legislature has not enacted legislation establishing a new fee schedule, as prescribed.

(3) This bill would authorize the state board, upon approval by the Director of Finance, to borrow from special funds for purposes related to the collection of the fees described in (1) and (2), as prescribed.

(4) This bill would require the state board, not later than April 1 of every year, to submit specified information to the

Legislature.

(1) The existing Surface Mining and Reclamation Act of 1975 exempts certain activities from its provisions. This bill would additionally exempt the solar evaporation of sea or bay water to produce salt and related minerals.

(2) Under existing law, no person may conduct surface mining operations unless a permit is obtained from a reclamation plan has been submitted to and approved by, and financial assurances for reclamation have been approved by, the lead agency for the operation; in accordance with prescribed procedures and requirements. This bill would require, if a mining operation is sold or ownership is transferred to another person, that the existing financial assurances remain in force and not be released by the lead agency until new financial assurances are secured from the new owner and have been approved by the lead agency. The bill would make related changes.

(3) Existing law requires the owner or other specified persons in charge of a mining operation to report annually to the State Geologist and the lead agency on specified matters, including whether an appeal or review of financial assurances is pending. This bill would additionally require the reports to state whether review of a reclamation plan or interim management plan is pending.

(4) The bill would declare that it is to take effect immediately as an urgency statute.

Vote: $\frac{2}{3}$ majority. Appropriation: no. Fiscal committee: yes. State-mandated local program: no.

The people of the State of California do enact as follows:

SECTION 1. Section 9907 of the Public Resources Code is amended to read:

1540. (a) A fee equal to one-half the amount computed by using the schedules in Article 1 (commencing with Section 1525) based on the approved application amount shall be paid to the state board at the time the permit is issued, except that no permit fee is

SECTION 1. Section 9907 of the Public Resources Code is amended to read:

1540. (a) A fee equal to one-half the amount computed by using the schedules in Article 1 (commencing with Section 1525) based on the approved application amount shall be paid to the state board at the time the permit is issued, except that no permit fee is

1 required under Section 1525.5.
 2 (b) The state board shall notify the applicant by
 3 registered mail of the amount of the fee which shall be
 4 paid before issuance of the permit. If the fee is not
 5 received by the state board within 30 days after the
 6 notice has been mailed the application shall be canceled.
 7 (c) The minimum amount of the fee required by
 8 subdivision (a) shall be one hundred dollars (\$100).
 9 (d) (1) On or before January 15 of each year, every
 10 permittee or licensee authorized to divert one or more
 11 cubic feet per second or to store 50 or more acre-feet,
 12 shall pay an annual fee based on the following rate
 13 schedule:

14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26
		Fee Category			Fee Rate							
		Permitted/licensed diversions	1 to 5 cubic feet/second		\$150 for diversion							
		More than 5 cubic	feet/second		\$40 per cubic							
		Permitted/licensed storage	50 to 100 acre-feet		\$100 for storage							
		More than 100 acre-feet			\$100 plus 35¢							
					per acre-foot							

27 (2) The fee schedule implemented pursuant to this
 28 subdivision shall remain in effect only until July 1, 1993.
 29 (3) A separate fee shall be paid for each permit or
 30 license pursuant to paragraph (1). If the permit or license
 31 authorizes both direct diversion and storage, the fee shall
 32 be the sum of the fee for diversion and the fee for storage.
 33 However, notwithstanding the number of permits or
 34 licenses held by the permittee or licensee for diversion or
 35 storage, the cumulative total of all annual fees paid by a
 36 permittee or licensee shall not exceed seventy-five
 37 thousand dollars (\$75,000).
 38 (4) For the 1991-92 fiscal year, the state board shall
 39 collect from each permittee and licensee subject to
 40 paragraph (1) an amount equal to 64 percent of the

1 annual fee.
 2 (5) Any permittee or licensee notified by the state
 3 board of the fee imposed by this subdivision may contest
 4 the fee by submitting the fee on a timely basis,
 5 accompanied by a petition setting forth the grounds for
 6 contesting the fee. After review of the petition and any
 7 other evidence the state board determines should be
 8 considered, the state board shall refund any amount
 9 submitted by the permittee or licensee which is in excess
 10 of the amount due. If requested by the permittee or
 11 licensee, the state board shall hold a hearing on any
 12 disputed facts material to a determination of the
 13 applicability or amount of the fee. Within 30 days after
 14 final action by the state board, the permittee or licensee
 15 may file with the superior court a petition for a writ of
 16 mandate in accordance with Section 1094.5 of the Code
 17 of Civil Procedure. Notwithstanding any other provision
 18 of law, abuse of discretion is established if the court
 19 determines that the findings of the state board are not
 20 supported by substantial evidence in the whole record.

21 (6) The Attorney General, upon request of the state
 22 board, shall petition the appropriate court to collect any
 23 fee imposed pursuant to this subdivision. Any person who
 24 fails to pay on a timely basis any fee imposed by this
 25 subdivision shall be required to pay, in addition to that
 26 fee, attorney's fees and costs for collection proceedings
 27 and a quarterly nonpayment penalty for each quarter
 28 during which the failure to pay persists. The nonpayment
 29 penalty shall be equal to 10 percent of the aggregate
 30 amount of the fee and nonpayment penalties which are
 31 unpaid as of the beginning of the quarter. The first and
 32 primary use of funds collected pursuant to this paragraph
 33 shall be for the water rights and water quality support
 34 programs, including, but not limited to, the repayment to
 35 loans and interest expense incurred pursuant to
 36 paragraph (10) of subdivision (d) of Section 13260.

37 (7) The Legislature finds that protection of water
 38 rights provides benefits to the general public as well as to
 39 holders of water rights. It is therefore the intent of the
 40 Legislature that the activities funded pursuant to this

1 section shall be supported by the General Fund as well as
2 by fees, and that the portion provided by the General
3 Fund should not be less than 25 percent of the fees
4 received pursuant to this section.

5 (8) It is the intent of the Legislature that the fees
6 imposed by this section are fees for purposes of Article
7 XIII B of the California Constitution.

8 (e) On or before January 1, 1993, the Governor shall
9 submit to the Legislature a report, prepared by the state
10 board, which includes proposed legislation which
11 recommends an appropriate fee schedule, collection
12 mechanisms, and related matters.

13 It is the intent of the Legislature to consider the
14 proposed legislation submitted by the Governor pursuant
15 to this subdivision and to enact legislation establishing a
16 new fee schedule to take effect on July 1, 1993.

17 (f) On and after July 1, 1993, no fee shall be imposed
18 for the diversion or storage of water unless the
19 Legislature enacts legislation imposing those fees.

20 SEC. 2. Section 1550 of the Water Code is amended to
21 read:

22 1550. All fees paid under the provisions of pursuant
23 to this chapter shall be paid deposited at least once a
24 month into in the State Treasury Water Protection Fund
25 by the state board and shall be accompanied by a
26 detailed statement thereof.

27 SEC. 3. Section 13260 of the Water Code is amended
28 to read:

29 13260. (a) All of the following persons shall file with
30 the regional board of that region a report of the
31 discharge, containing the information which may be
32 required by the regional board:

33 (1) Any person discharging waste or proposing to
34 discharge waste within any region that could affect the
35 quality of the waters of the state, other than into a
36 community sewer system.

37 (2) Any person who is a citizen, domiciliary, or
38 political agency or entity of this state discharging waste
39 or proposing to discharge waste outside the boundaries of
40 the state in a manner that could affect the quality of the

1 waters of the state within any region.

2 (3) Any person operating or proposing to construct an
3 injection well.

4 (b) No report of waste discharge need be filed
5 pursuant to subdivision (a) if the requirement is waived
6 pursuant to Section 13269. Except where the regional
7 board issues a request in writing for a specific discharge
8 or to a discharger, no report of waste discharge need be
9 filed by dischargers identified pursuant to paragraph (2)
10 of subdivision (e) until the legislation establishing a fee
11 schedule, as specified in paragraph (6) of subdivision (e),
12 is enacted.

13 (c) Every person subject to subdivision (a) shall file
14 with the regional board of that region a report of waste
15 discharge relative to any material change or proposed
16 change in the character, location, or volume of the
17 discharge.

18 (d) (1) Each person for whom waste discharge
19 requirements have been prescribed pursuant to Section
20 13263 shall submit an annual fee not to exceed ten
21 thousand dollars (\$10,000) according to a reasonable fee
22 schedule established by the state board. Fees shall be
23 calculated on the basis of total flow, volume, number of
24 animals, or area involved.

25 (2) Any fees collected pursuant to this section shall be
26 deposited in the Waste Discharge Permit Fund which is
27 hereby created. The money in the fund is available for
28 expenditure by the state board, upon appropriation by
29 the Legislature, for the purposes of carrying out this
30 division:

31 (e) Each person for whom waste discharge
32 requirements have been prescribed pursuant to Section
33 13263, or who has been identified pursuant to paragraph
34 (2) of subdivision (e), shall pay an annual fee imposed by
35 the state board. The fee shall be set to generate the
36 amounts annually appropriated by the Legislature from
37 the Waste Discharge Permit Fund, which is hereby
38 continued in existence as the Water Protection Fund.
39 The fee shall remain in effect only until legislation
40 establishing a fee schedule is enacted pursuant to

1 100,000 to 250,000 population \$10,000
 2 Less than 100,000 population \$5,000
 3 Industrial facilities in urban area \$250 per enrollee
 4 Industrial facilities outside urban area \$500 per enrollee
 5 All other regulated discharges \$500 per WDR
 6
 7 (2) (A) For the 1991-92 fiscal year, the state board shall collect from each discharger subject to paragraph (1) an amount equal to 64 percent of the annual fee.
 8 (B) For the 1991-92 fiscal year, the amount paid by persons in the category of "Landfills receiving waste" shall be proportionally reduced to reflect the transfer of funds to the Water Protection Fund pursuant to subparagraph (C).
 9 (C) Notwithstanding Chapter 2 (commencing with Section 47900) of Part 7 of Division 30 of the Public Resources Code, on June 30, 1991, the Controller shall transfer to the Water Protection Fund the sum of two million two hundred forty-eight thousand dollars (\$2,248,000) from the Integrated Waste Management Account in the Integrated Waste Management Fund.
 10 For the purposes of this paragraph, it is the intent of the Legislature, for the 1991-92 fiscal year, to provide short-term funding to support the state board's water quality program without increasing the fees imposed on operators of solid waste landfills pursuant to Division 30 (commencing with Section 40000) of the Public Resources Code. The funds transferred pursuant to this paragraph shall not be added to the California Integrated Waste Management Board's budgeted appropriations for the purpose of calculating the annual fee imposed on operators of solid waste landfills pursuant to Sections 46901 and 48000 of the Public Resources Code.
 11 (D) Notwithstanding any other provisions of law, for the 1991-92 fiscal year, any entity, as defined in subdivision (e) of Section 5470 of the Health and Safety

1 paragraph (6) of subdivision (e), or until July 1, 1993, whichever is earlier. The annual fee shall be based on the following rate schedule:
 2
 3
 4
 5 Fee Category Fee Rate
 6 Municipal discharges more than 0.10 MGD \$3,225 per MGD
 7 Municipal discharges 0.010 MGD or less \$1,000 per WDR
 8 Industrial discharges of 0.10 MGD or more \$7,500 per MGD
 9 Industrial discharges less than 0.10 MGD \$3,000 per WDR
 10 Cooling water discharges \$150 per MGD
 11 Landfills receiving waste
 12 Very Small (less than 50 tons/day) \$6,500 per WDR
 13 Small (50 to 100 tons/day) \$16,500 per WDR
 14 Medium (101 to 500 tons/day) \$35,000 per WDR
 15 Large (more than 500 tons/day) \$48,000 per WDR
 16 Landfills not receiving waste
 17 50 acres or less \$750 per WDR
 18 More than 50 acres \$7,000 per WDR
 19 Surface impoundments \$500 per acre
 20 Containing hazardous wastes \$250 per acre
 21 Not containing hazardous wastes \$2,500 per WDR
 22
 23 Land treatment units \$2,500 per WDR
 24 Waste piles \$2,500 per WDR
 25 Mining waste discharges \$1,000 per WDR
 26 Less than 100 acres disturbed 100 acres to less than 1,000 acres disturbed \$5,000 per WDR
 27 1,000 acres or more disturbed \$25,000 per WDR
 28 Stormwater discharges
 29 Areawide urban discharges
 30 More than 250,000 population \$50,000
 31
 32
 33
 34
 35
 36
 37
 38
 39
 40

1 Code, that is required to pay additional money to the
 2 state board pursuant to this section is authorized to adopt
 3 additional fees or otherwise modify its revenue program
 4 solely by giving notice pursuant to Section 6061 of the
 5 Government Code, at least seven days prior to the
 6 hearing at which the entity will consider or act on the
 7 additional fees or other modification to its revenue
 8 program.

9 (3) Each person subject to this section shall pay no
 10 more than one annual fee for each set of waste discharge
 11 requirements prescribed.

12 (4) The Legislature finds that many activities of the
 13 state board and the regional boards benefit the public
 14 interest and public trust values and may not be directly
 15 related to a specific discharger on whom fees can be
 16 imposed. It is therefore the intent of the Legislature that
 17 the activities funded pursuant to this section shall be
 18 supported by the General Fund as well as by fees, and
 19 that the portion provided by the General Fund shall not
 20 be less than 25 percent of the fees received pursuant to
 21 this section.

22 (5) Each report of waste discharge for a new
 23 discharge submitted under this section shall be
 24 accompanied by a fee equal in amount to the annual fee
 25 for the discharge. If waste discharge requirements are
 26 issued, the fee shall serve as the first annual fee. If waste
 27 discharge requirements are waived pursuant to Section
 28 13269, all or part of the fee shall be refunded.

29 (f) (1) On or before January 1, 1990, the state board
 30 shall adopt, by emergency regulations, a schedule of fees
 31 authorized under subdivisions (d) and (f). The total
 32 revenue collected each year through annual and filing
 33 fees shall be set at an amount equal to the revenue levels
 34 set forth in the Budget Act for this activity. The state
 35 board shall automatically adjust the annual and filing fees
 36 each fiscal year to conform with the revenue levels set
 37 forth in the Budget Act for this activity. If the state board
 38 determines that the revenue collected during the
 39 preceding year was greater than or less than the revenue
 40 levels set forth in the Budget Act, the state board may

1 further adjust the annual filing fees to compensate for the
 2 over and under collection of revenue.

3 (b) The emergency regulations adopted pursuant to
 4 this subdivision or subsequent adjustments to the annual
 5 fees shall be adopted by the state board in accordance
 6 with Chapter 25 (commencing with Section 11210) of
 7 Part 4 of Division 3 of Title 8 of the Government Code.
 8 The adoption of these regulations is an emergency and
 9 shall be considered by the Office of Administrative Law
 10 as necessary for the immediate preservation of the public
 11 peace, health, safety, and general welfare.
 12 Notwithstanding Chapter 25 (commencing with Section
 13 11210) of Part 4 of Division 3 of Title 8 of the Government
 14 Code, any emergency regulations adopted by the state
 15 board, or adjustments to the annual fees made by the
 16 state board pursuant to this section, shall not be subject
 17 to review by the Office of Administrative Law and shall
 18 remain in effect until revised by the state board.

19 (c)
 20 (6) (A) Annually, commencing in the fiscal year for
 21 which fees are adopted pursuant to subdivision (c), the
 22 state board may adjust the annual fee schedule and filing
 23 fees to generate the amounts annually appropriated by
 24 the Legislature from the Water Protection Fund.
 25 (B) The state board may, as necessary, adjust the
 26 billing periods for selected categories of dischargers in
 27 order to ensure that the amounts appropriated are
 28 generated during the 1991-92 fiscal year and subsequent
 29 fiscal years.

30 (7) (A) The Legislature finds that the state board
 31 incurs costs for various activities related to water rights
 32 and water quality, which are not directly related to
 33 specific water rights holders or dischargers. The
 34 Legislature further finds that for the 1991-92 fiscal year,
 35 these indirect costs are anticipated to equal
 36 approximately 22 percent of the direct costs of carrying
 37 out programs funded pursuant to this section and Section
 38 1540.

39 (B) "Indirect costs," for purposes of this section,
 40 means costs incurred for activities related to quality

1 assurance, Proposition 65, health and safety, planning,
 2 risk assessment, data processing, technical assistance, or
 3 other water rights and water quality support programs
 4 unrelated to any specific water rights holder or
 5 discharger.

6 (C) Not more than 22 percent of the fees collected
 7 pursuant to this section and Section 1540 shall, for the
 8 1991-92 and 1992-93 fiscal years, be expended for indirect
 9 costs. The Legislature, through the annual budget
 10 process, shall review the indirect costs of the state board's
 11 water rights and water quality programs and shall make
 12 every reasonable effort to minimize the indirect costs
 13 that are funded by fees. The indirect costs of activities
 14 shall be funded, to the extent feasible, with money
 15 derived from special funds, bonds funds, federal funds,
 16 and the General Fund.

17 (D) Not later than April 1 of every year, the state
 18 board shall submit to the appropriate policy and fiscal
 19 committees of the Legislature information identifying
 20 the costs of activities funded pursuant to this section and
 21 Section 1540 that are not directly related to specific water
 22 rights holders or dischargers of waste to waters of the
 23 state.

24 (8) Any regulations adopted by the state board to
 25 implement this subdivision or subdivision (e) shall be
 26 adopted in accordance with Chapter 3.5 (commencing
 27 with Section 11340) of Part 1 of Division 3 of Title 2 of the
 28 Government Code, except that the regulations need not
 29 be submitted to the Office of Administrative Law for
 30 review and approval pursuant to Article 6 (commencing
 31 with Section 11349) of that Chapter 3.5, and shall be filed
 32 with the Secretary of State upon submission by the state
 33 board.

34 (9) Any fees collected pursuant to this section, and any
 35 fines, penalties, or interest collected or earned in
 36 connection with those fees, shall be deposited in the
 37 Water Protection Fund. The money in the Water
 38 Protection Fund is available for expenditure by the state
 39 board, upon appropriation by the Legislature, for the
 40 purposes of carrying out the objectives and

1 responsibilities of the state board with respect to water
 2 quality and quantity.

3 (10) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, upon
 4 approval and order of the Director of Finance, the state
 5 board may borrow, from special funds which otherwise
 6 provide support for the state board, sufficient money for
 7 cash-flow purposes and up to five million dollars
 8 (\$5,000,000) for other than cash-flow purposes, related to
 9 the collection of fees pursuant to this section and Section
 10 1540. These loans shall be made at an interest rate equal
 11 to the rate earned by the Pooled Money Investment
 12 Account in effect on the date those loans are made. The
 13 duration of the loan shall be determined by the Director
 14 of Finance.

15 (11) It is the intent of the Legislature that the fees
 16 imposed by this section are fees for purposes of Article
 17 XIII B of the California Constitution.

18 (12) Any permittee notified by the state board of the
 19 fee imposed by this section may contest the fee by
 20 submitting the fee on a timely basis, accompanied by a
 21 petition setting forth the grounds for contesting the fee.
 22 After review of the petition and any other evidence the
 23 state board determines should be considered, the state
 24 board shall refund any amount submitted by the
 25 permittee which is in excess of the amount due. If
 26 requested by the permittee, the state board shall hold a
 27 hearing on any disputed facts material to determination
 28 of the applicability or amount of the fee. Within 30 days
 29 after final action by the state board, the permittee may
 30 file with the superior court a petition for a writ of
 31 mandate in accordance with Section 1094.5 of the Code
 32 of Civil Procedure. Notwithstanding any other provision
 33 of law, abuse of discretion is established if the court
 34 determines that the findings of the state board are not
 35 supported by substantial evidence in the whole record.

36 (13) The Attorney General, upon request of the state
 37 board, shall petition the appropriate court to collect any
 38 fee imposed pursuant to this section. Any person who fails
 39 to pay on a timely basis any fee imposed by this
 40 subdivision shall be required to pay, in addition to that

1 fee, attorney's fees and costs for collection proceedings
 2 and a quarterly nonpayment penalty for each quarter
 3 during which the failure to pay persists. The nonpayment
 4 penalty shall be equal to 10 percent of the aggregate
 5 amount of the fee and nonpayment penalties which are
 6 unpaid as of the beginning of the quarter. The first and
 7 primary use of funds collected pursuant to this paragraph
 8 shall be for the water rights and water quality support
 9 programs, including, but not limited to, the repayment of
 10 loans and interest expense incurred pursuant to
 11 paragraph (10) of this subdivision.

12 (14) Fees imposed pursuant to this section may be
 13 collected by the State Board of Equalization upon
 14 agreement and execution of a contract between the State
 15 Board of Equalization and the state board.

16 (e) (1) The fee schedule set forth in subdivision (d)
 17 is an interim schedule, necessitated by the immediate
 18 need to replace General Fund money in the state board's
 19 1991-92 budget with other sources of funding. This
 20 interim fee schedule shall remain in effect only until
 21 legislation establishing a fee schedule is enacted pursuant
 22 to paragraph (6), or until July 1, 1993, whichever is
 23 earlier.

24 (2) On or before July 1, 1992, the state board and the
 25 regional boards shall, to the extent feasible, identify
 26 dischargers which are significant sources of pollution to
 27 waters of the state and which are not yet subject to waste
 28 discharge permits issued by the regional boards. This
 29 shall include identification of nonpoint source
 30 dischargers.

31 (3) On or before January 1, 1993, the Governor shall
 32 submit to the Legislature proposed legislation, prepared
 33 by the state board, which includes a fee schedule which
 34 establishes different categories of dischargers and an
 35 annual fee for each category of discharger. In developing
 36 the proposed legislation, the state board shall hold public
 37 hearings to consider all of the following criteria in
 38 establishing these categories of dischargers and the
 39 annual fee for each category:

40 (A) The costs incurred by the state board and the

1 regional board directly related to the regulation,
 2 monitoring, and assessment of a category of dischargers.
 3 (B) Apportionment of an appropriate share of the
 4 state board's and the regional boards' costs not directly
 5 related to a specific discharger.

6 (C) The toxicity and relative threat to water quality
 7 posed by the pollutants discharged by a category of
 8 dischargers.

9 (4) In proposing categories of dischargers, the state
 10 board shall identify the common pollutant characteristics
 11 and other water quality-related factors shared by a group
 12 of dischargers which support the creation of each
 13 category of dischargers. The proposed legislation shall
 14 include, in the categories of dischargers subject to the fee,
 15 facilities or activities which cause or result in nonpoint
 16 discharges. The proposed legislation may establish
 17 requirements for the payment of annual fees by
 18 dischargers who have not been issued waste discharge
 19 requirements. It is the intent of the Legislature that the
 20 state board and the regional boards shall continue to
 21 identify dischargers which are significant sources of
 22 pollution and, as soon as practicable, shall issue waste
 23 discharge requirements, including general waste
 24 discharge requirements where appropriate, to the extent
 25 necessary to achieve the purposes of this division. Waste
 26 discharge requirements and permits issued pursuant to
 27 Sections 13263 and 13377 are not subject to Chapter 3.5
 28 (commencing with Section 11340) of Division 3 of Part 1
 29 of Title 2 of the Government Code.

30 (5) The proposed legislation prepared by the state
 31 board shall include fees applicable to all dischargers
 32 identified by the state board and the regional boards
 33 pursuant to paragraph (2).

34 (6) It is the intent of the Legislature to consider the
 35 proposed legislation submitted by the Governor pursuant
 36 to paragraph (3) and to enact legislation establishing a
 37 new fee schedule to take effect on or before July 1, 1993.
 38 On and after July 1, 1993, no fee comparable to the fee
 39 imposed pursuant to this section shall be imposed unless
 40 the Legislature enacts legislation imposing those fees in

1 compliance with this subdivision.
2 (f) The state board shall adopt regulations setting
3 forth reasonable time limits within which the regional
4 board shall determine the adequacy of a report of waste
5 discharge submitted under this section.

6 ~~(g)~~
7 (g) Each report submitted under this section shall be
8 sworn to or submitted under penalty of perjury.

9 ~~(h)~~ The regulations adopted by the state board
10 pursuant to subdivision (f) shall include a provision that
11 annual fees shall not be imposed on those who pay fees
12 under the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination
13 System until the time when those fees are again due, at
14 which time the fees shall become due on an annual basis.

15 ~~(i)~~
16 (h) For those dischargers who paid fees under the
17 National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System, and
18 whose five-year permit expires on or after July 1, 1991, the
19 state board shall reduce the amount of the 1991-92 fiscal
20 year annual fee by the prorated balance of the original
21 fee paid.

22 (i) Facilities for confined animal feeding or holding
23 operations, including dairy farms, which have been
24 issued waste discharge requirements or exempted from
25 waste discharge requirements prior to January 1, 1989,
26 are exempt from subdivision (d). If the facility is required
27 to file a report under subdivision (c) after January 1, 1989,
28 the report shall be accompanied by a filing fee, to be
29 established by the state board in accordance with
30 subdivision (f), not to exceed two thousand dollars
31 (\$2,000), and the facility shall be exempt from any annual
32 fee.

33 This subdivision shall become inoperative on the
34 enactment of a fee schedule pursuant to subdivision (e).

35 ~~(j)~~
36 (j) Any person operating or proposing to construct an
37 oil, gas, or geothermal injection well subject to paragraph
38 (3) of subdivision (a), shall not be required to pay a fee
39 pursuant to subdivision (d), if the injection well is
40 regulated by the Division of Oil and Gas of the

1 Department of Conservation, in lieu of the California
2 regional water quality control board for the region,
3 pursuant to the memorandum of understanding, entered
4 into between the State Water Resources Control Board
5 and the Department of Conservation on May 19, 1988.
6 This subdivision shall remain operative until the
7 memorandum of understanding is revoked by the State
8 Water Resources Control Board or the Department of
9 Conservation.

10 ~~(k)~~

11 (k) In addition to the report required by subdivision
12 (a), before any person discharges mining waste, the
13 person shall first submit the following to the regional
14 board:

15 (1) A report on the physical and chemical
16 characteristics of the waste that could affect its potential
17 to cause pollution or contamination. The report shall
18 include the results of all tests required by regulations
19 adopted by the state board, any test adopted by the State
20 Department of Health Services pursuant to Section 25141
21 of the Health and Safety Code for extractable, persistent,
22 and bioaccumulative toxic substances in a waste or other
23 material, and any other tests that the state board or
24 regional board may require, including, but not limited to,
25 tests needed to determine the acid-generating potential
26 of the mining waste or the extent to which hazardous
27 substances may persist in the waste after disposal.

28 (2) A report that evaluates the potential of the
29 discharge of the mining waste to produce, over the long
30 term, acid mine drainage, the discharge or leaching of
31 heavy metals, or the release of other hazardous
32 substances.

All matter omitted in this version of the
bill appears in the bill as amended in the
Senate, May 14, 1991 (J.R. 11).

Assembly Bill No. 18

CHAPTER 460

An act to amend Items 3940-001-001 and 3940-001-193 of Section 2.00 of the Budget Act of 1991, relating to water, making an appropriation therefor, and declaring the urgency thereof, to take effect immediately.

[Approved by Governor September 30, 1991. Filed with Secretary of State September 30, 1991.]

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL'S DIGEST

AB 18, Sher. Water: appropriation: support of State Water Resources Control Board.

The Budget Act of 1991 appropriates \$25,717,000 from the Waste Discharge Permit Fund for support of the State Water Resources Control Board.

This bill would, instead, appropriate \$7,350,000 from that fund for that purpose.

The bill would declare that it is to take effect immediately as an urgency statute.

Appropriation: yes.

The people of the State of California do enact as follows:

SECTION 1. Item 3940-001-001 of Section 2.00 of the Budget Act of 1991 is amended to read:

3940-001-001—For support of State Water Resources Control Board	38,933,000
Schedule:	
(a) 10-Water Quality	162,107,000
(b) 20-Water Rights	9,314,000
(c) 30.01-Administration	10,472,000
(d) 30.02-Distributed Administration	10,472,000
(dx) Unallocated trigger reduction	—43,000
(e) Reimbursements	—4,700,000
(f) Amount payable from the Hazardous Waste Control Account, General Fund (Item 3940-001-014)	—766,000
(g) Amount payable from the Waste Discharge Permit Fund (Item 3940-001-193)	—7,350,000
(h) Amount payable from the Environmental Protection Trust Fund (Item 3940-001-225)	—2,164,000
(i) Amount payable from the Public	

Resources Account, Cigarette and Tobacco Products Surtax Fund (Item 3940-001-235)	—780,000
(j) Amount payable from the Bay Protection and Toxic Cleanup Fund (Item 3940-001-282)	—2,450,000
(k) Amount payable from the Underground Storage Tank Tester Account (Item 3940-001-436)	—284,000
(l) Amount payable from the Underground Storage Tank Cleanup Fund (Item 3940-001-439)	—70,355,000
(m) Amount payable from the Underground Storage Tank Fund (Item 3940-001-475)	—1,206,000
(n) Amount payable from the Surface Impoundment Assessment Account, General Fund (Item 3940-001-482)	—3,179,000
(o) Amount payable from the 1984 State Clean Water Bond Fund (Item 3940-001-740)	—549,000
(p) Amount payable from the 1986 Water Conservation and Water Quality Bond Fund (Item 3940-001-744)	—299,000
(q) Amount payable from the 1988 Clean Water and Water Reclamation Fund (Item 3940-001-764)	—782,000
(r) Amount payable from the Federal Trust Fund (Item 3940-001-890)	—37,581,000

Provisions:

1. Notwithstanding any other provisions of law, upon approval and order of the Director of Finance, the State Water Resources Control Board may borrow sufficient funds, from special funds which otherwise provide support for the board, for cash purposes. Any such loans are to be repaid with interest at the Pooled Money Investment Account rate.
2. It is the intent of the Legislature that revenues to support the activities of the State Water Resources Control Board be derived, in part or in full, from various fees which the board is, or will be, authorized to collect. These fees may include a new or increased water rights fee.

SEC. 2. Item 3940-001-193 of Section 2.00 of the Budget Act of

1991 is amended to read:

3940-001-193—For support of State Water Resources Control Board, for payment to Item 3940-001-001, payable from the Waste Discharge Permit Fund... 7,330,000

SEC. 3. This act is an urgency statute necessary for the immediate preservation of the public peace, health, or safety within the meaning of Article IV of the Constitution and shall go into immediate effect. The facts constituting the necessity are:

In order to help ensure that California water resources are protected and to avoid endangerment of regulatory water quality and water rights programs, it is essential that this act take effect immediately.

O

NOTES: This version reflects Assembly Bill 18 as amended July 2, 1991.
Regulated industry (landfills) revised categories and added "Very Small."
The estimated numbers for "Very Small" and "Small" are guesses here.
(Assumed these changes were revenue neutral.)

SUMMARY OF REVENUE TARGET CALCULATIONS

	FY 91/92 Target Revenue	FY 92/93 Target Revenue
WDPF Baseline (Core Regulatory FOR A FULL YEAR)	\$6,350,000	\$6,350,000
Program redirection 91/92 and GF restoration 92/93 (FOR A FULL YEAR)	\$4,250,000	\$4,250,000
GF Offset HALF-YEAR 91/92 and FULL-YEAR 92/93 (per SB 88 Conf. Committee)	\$15,000,000	\$30,000,000
Net FEE REVENUE TARGET Amounts	\$25,600,000	\$40,600,000

NOTE: IMMA Transfer Item for FY 91/92 ONLY
(Portion of fund reserve will decrease the fees for those WDR holders
in the "Landfills receiving waste" category ONLY)

Ratio of FY 91/92 Net Amount to FY 92/93 Net Amount 64.0%

REVISED FEE ALTERNATIVE 12

Proposed FY 92/93 Fee Schedule: 91/92 Fees Equal 64% of 92/93 Amounts

Fee Category	Number of Fee Payers	Percent of Payers	Total Volume	Fee Rate	Percent of Revenue	Estimated Revenue
1. Municipal discharges of 0.10 MGD ADMF or more (based on "permitted" average dry weather flow) Some examples of large discharges: City of Los Angeles, Hyperion @ 420.0 Los Angeles CSD, JWPCP @ 385.0 City of San Diego, Point Loma @ 240.0 Orange County SD @ 225.0 Sacramento Regional CSD @ 181.0 San Jose/Santa Clara WPCP @ 167.0 East Bay MUD SD #1 @ 120.0 Los Angeles CSD, San Jose Crk. @ 100.0	~ 598	~ 12.87%	3,000	\$3,225 per MGD	28.87%	\$9,675,000
					{ 4.04%	{ \$1,354,500
					{ 3.70%	{ \$1,241,625
					{ 2.31%	{ \$774,000
					{ 2.16%	{ \$725,625
					{ 1.74%	{ \$583,725
					{ 1.61%	{ \$538,575
					{ 1.15%	{ \$387,000
					{ 0.96%	{ \$322,500
					{ 17.68%	{ \$5,927,550
2. Municipal discharges 0.10 MGD ADMF or less (based on "permitted" average dry weather flow)	~ 300	~ 6.45%	< 30	\$1,000 per WDR	0.90%	\$300,000
3. Industrial discharges of 0.10 MGD or more (based on "permitted" design flow)	~ 400	~ 8.61%	450	\$7,500 per MGD	10.07%	\$3,375,000
4. Industrial discharges less than 0.10 MGD (based on "permitted" design flow)	~ 1,200	~ 25.82%	15	\$3,000 per WDR	10.74%	\$3,600,000
5. Cooling water discharges (based on "permitted" design flow)	~ 30	~ 0.65%	19,000	\$150 per MGD	8.50%	\$2,850,000
6. Landfills receiving waste (based on prior year)						
a. Very Small (receiving less than 50 tons/day)	~ 107	? 2.30%	N/A	\$6,500 per WDR	2.08%	\$695,500
b. Small (receiving 50 to 100 tons/day)	~ 82	? 1.76%	N/A	\$16,500 per WDR	4.04%	\$1,353,000
c. Medium (receiving 101 to 500 tons/day)	~ 69	~ 1.48%	N/A	\$35,000 per WDR	7.21%	\$2,415,000
d. Large (500 tons/day or more)	~ 78	~ 1.68%	N/A	\$48,000 per WDR	11.17%	\$3,744,000
					{ 24.49%	{ \$8,207,500
7. Landfills MOT receiving waste						
a. 50 acres or less (footprint area)	~ 75	~ 1.61%	N/A	\$750 per WDR	0.17%	\$56,250
b. More than 50 acres	~ 225	~ 4.84%	N/A	\$7,000 per WDR	4.70%	\$1,575,000

REVISED FEE ALTERNATIVE 12
Proposed FY 92/93 Fee Schedule: 91/92 Fees Equal 64% of 92/93 Amounts

Fee Category	Number of Fee Payers	Percent of Payers	Total Volume	Fee Rate	Percent of Revenue	Estimated Revenue
8. Surface Impoundments						
a. Hazardous wastes	~ 25	~ 0.54%	150 ac	\$500 per acre	0.22%	\$75,000
b. Non-hazardous wastes	~ 225	~ 4.84%	1,000 ac	\$250 per acre	0.75%	\$250,000
9. Land Treatment Units	~ 10	~ 0.22%	N/A	\$2,500 per WDR	0.07%	\$25,000
10. Waste Piles	~ 20	~ 0.43%	N/A	\$2,500 per WDR	0.15%	\$50,000
11. Mining waste discharges						
a. Less than 100 acres disturbed	~ 59	~ 1.27%	N/A	\$1,000 per WDR	0.18%	\$59,000
b. 100 acres to less than 1,000 acres disturbed	~ 24	~ 0.52%	N/A	\$5,000 per WDR	0.36%	\$120,000
c. 1,000 acres or more disturbed	~ 12	~ 0.26%	N/A	\$25,000 per WDR	0.90%	\$300,000
12. Stormwater discharges [33 USC 1342(p)]						
a. Areawide urban (250,000 people or more)	~ 9	~ 0.19%	N/A	\$50,000 per WDR	1.34%	\$450,000
b. Areawide urban (100,000 to 250,000 people)	Unknown	0.00%	N/A	\$10,000 per WDR	0.00%	\$0
c. Areawide urban (100,000 people or less)	Unknown	0.00%	N/A	\$5,000 per WDR	0.00%	\$0
d. "Industrial facilities" in urban area	Unknown	0.00%	N/A	\$250 per enrollee	2.98%	\$1,000,000
e. "Industrial facilities" outside urban area	Unknown	0.00%	N/A	\$500 per enrollee	2.98%	\$1,000,000
13. All other REGULATED discharges (excluded above)	~ 1,100	~ 23.67%	N/A	\$500 per WDR	1.64%	\$550,000
SUB-TOTALS for Water Quality Fees (Water Code Section 13260):						
Chapter 15 WDR discharges	1,011	21.75%			31.98%	\$10,717,750
MPDES and Non-chapter 15 WDR discharges	3,637	78.25%			68.02%	\$22,800,000
ALL WDR regulated discharges	4,648	100.00%			100.00%	\$33,517,750

REVISED FEE ALTERNATIVE 12

Proposed FY 92/93 Fee Schedule: 91/92 Fees Equal 64% of 92/93 Amounts

Fee Category	Number of Payers	Percent of Fee Payers	Total Volume	Fee Rate	Percent of Revenue	Estimated Revenue
14. Permitted/licensed diversions: (includes Power and DWR; excludes USBR)						
a. 1 to 5 cubic feet per second	~ 1,025	~ 34.27%	2,200	\$150 for diversion	1.16%	\$76,875
b. More than 5 cubic feet per second	~ 842	~ 28.15%	203,700 cubic feet per second	\$40 per cfs up to \$75,000 maximum for any one entity	123.08%	\$8,148,000
15. Permitted/licensed storage: (includes Power and DWR; excludes USBR)						
a. 50 to 100 acre-feet per annum	~ 251	~ 8.39%	17,700	\$100 for storage	0.19%	\$12,550
b. More than 100 acre-feet per annum	~ 873	~ 29.19%	28,112.600 acre-feet per annum	\$100 plus \$0.35 per acre-foot up to maximum for any one entity	149.95%	\$9,926,710
LESS REDUCTIONS FOR ENTITIES WHICH PAY MAXIMUM (OFFSET AMOUNT) [For example, EBHUD's bill is computed from rates for BOTH diversion and storage BUT is then "capped" at \$75,000 total. The "capped" universe represents this OFFSET.]						

SUB-TOTALS for Water Rights Fees (Water Code Section 1540):

ALL Permits/Licenses (above thresholds) 2,991 100.00% \$6,620,000

TOTALS -- for Water Quality AND Water Rights fees:

7,639 WQ & WR Fee Payers; Total Estimated Revenue (92/93) \$40,137,750

Difference: (\$462,250)

REVISED WATER RIGHTS FEE ALTERNATIVE: \$75,000 FY 92/93 CAP

Permit/License Category	Number	Volume	FY 92/93 Fee Rate	Estimated Revenue FY 92/93	Minimum	Maximum (w/o cap)
1. Diversions						
a. >= 1.0 but < 5.0 cfs	- 1,025	2,200 cfs	\$150 for diversion (assume 50% success)	\$76,875	\$150	\$150
b. >= 5.0 cfs	- 842	203,700 cfs	\$40.00 per cfs	\$8,148,000	\$200	\$440,000
				Diversions sub-total:	\$8,224,875	
2. Storage						
a. >= 50 but < 100 afa	- 251	17,700 afa	\$100 for storage (assume 50% success)	\$12,550	\$100	\$100
b. >= 100 afa	- 873	28,112,600 afa	\$100 + \$0.35 per afa	\$9,926,710	\$135	\$1,239,835
				Storage sub-total:	\$9,939,260	
				Estimated Total Revenue:	\$18,164,135	
				Less "MR Target Amount":	(\$6,620,000)	
				"Surplus" to redistribute:	\$11,544,135	

Sample Fee Amounts (after ACMA et. al. proposal):

Permittee / Licensee	*** Diversion ***		***** Storage *****		Total Number	Computed Fee Amount (per entity)	Revised Fee FY 92/93	Revised Fee FY 91/92 (64 Percent)
	Number	Amount cubic feet per second	Number	Amount acre-feet per annum				
Dept of Water Resources	6	29,795	13	5,725,662	19	\$3,197,082	\$75,000	\$48,000
Pacific Gas & Electric	49	46,498	34	1,164,364	83	\$2,270,863	\$75,000	\$48,000
Turlock ID	* 6	6,461	4	2,743,600	10	\$1,219,100	\$75,000	\$48,000
Merced ID	* 5	5,055	4	1,749,200	9	\$814,820	\$75,000	\$48,000
Southern California Edison	* 14	7,835	15	935,918	29	\$642,471	\$75,000	\$48,000
Yuba CUD	* 7	2,630	6	1,267,900	13	\$549,565	\$75,000	\$48,000
Nevada ID	* 21	5,624	15	698,580	36	\$470,963	\$75,000	\$48,000
Yuba CVA	* 5	5,203	7	730,635	12	\$464,542	\$75,000	\$48,000
East Bay MUD	* 7	2,561	7	1,007,547	14	\$455,781	\$75,000	\$48,000
Calaveras CUD	* 9	3,689	11	713,874	20	\$398,516	\$75,000	\$48,000
Placer CVA	* 5	3,975	4	630,000	9	\$379,900	\$75,000	\$48,000
Sacramento MUD	* 5	4,570	4	526,600	9	\$367,510	\$75,000	\$48,000
Kings River WD	* 1	9,000	0	0	1	\$360,000	\$75,000	\$48,000
Oakdale ID	* 3	2,250	9	616,949	12	\$306,832	\$75,000	\$48,000
Monterey CVRA	* 2	900	2	570,000	4	\$235,700	\$75,000	\$48,000
El Dorado ID	* 3	1,540	10	427,321	13	\$212,162	\$75,000	\$48,000
Friant Power Authority	* 2	4,590	0	0	2	\$183,600	\$75,000	\$48,000
Sonoma CVA	* 4	462	3	368,100	7	\$147,615	\$75,000	\$48,000
Los Angeles DWP	* 5	1,564	6	231,079	11	\$144,038	\$75,000	\$48,000
Humboldt Bay MUD	* 2	1,200	3	240,000	5	\$132,300	\$75,000	\$48,000
United WCD	* 3	275	3	307,025	6	\$118,759	\$75,000	\$48,000
South Sutter WD	* 6	1,390	2	98,370	8	\$90,230	\$75,000	\$48,000
South San Joaquin ID	* 1	1,800	1	36,000	2	\$84,700	\$75,000	\$48,000
Santa Clara Valley WD	* 1	100	16	223,066	17	\$83,673	\$75,000	\$48,000
Oroville-Wyandotte ID	* 3	435	3	179,012	6	\$80,354	\$75,000	\$48,000
Olcuse WD	* 2	1,600	0	0	2	\$64,000	\$64,000	\$40,960
Kaweah River Power Authority	* 1	1,500	0	0	1	\$60,000	\$60,000	\$38,400
Yolo County FC & WCD	* 2	800	3	50,000	5	\$49,800	\$49,800	\$31,872
Solano ID	* 1	1,125	0	0	1	\$45,000	\$45,000	\$28,800
Reclamation Dist. #108	* 4	1,010	0	0	4	\$40,410	\$40,410	\$25,862
Casitas MUD	* 1	34	2	105,300	3	\$38,399	\$38,399	\$24,575
North San Joaquin WCD	* 1	500	1	50,000	2	\$37,600	\$37,600	\$24,064
Marin MUD	* 4	161	6	87,280	10	\$37,588	\$37,588	\$24,056
Alameda CUD	* 0	0	2	100,000	2	\$35,200	\$35,200	\$22,528
Madera-Chowchilla PA	* 1	866	0	0	1	\$34,640	\$34,640	\$22,170
Browns Valley ID	* 3	630	1	20,000	4	\$32,300	\$32,300	\$20,672
Coachella Valley WD	* 1	400	1	39,000	2	\$29,750	\$29,750	\$19,040
Georgetown Divide PUD	* 5	305	3	44,000	8	\$27,900	\$27,900	\$17,856
Semitropic USD	* 1	320	1	40,000	2	\$26,900	\$26,900	\$17,216
Chowchilla WD	* 2	101	1	50,000	3	\$21,656	\$21,656	\$13,860
Alameda CFC & WCD, Zone 7	* 0	0	3	60,822	3	\$21,588	\$21,588	\$13,816

Permittee / Licensee	*** Diversion ***		***** Storage *****		Total Number	Computed Fee Amount (per entity)	Revised Fee FY 92/93	Revised Fee FY 91/92 [64 Percent]
	Number	Amount cubic feet per second	Number	Amount acre-feet per annum				
Tuolumne Regional WD	* 0	0	1	60,000	1	\$21,100	\$21,100	\$13,504
Lower Tule River ID	* 1	500	0	0	1	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$12,800
Provident ID	* 3	460	0	0	3	\$18,400	\$18,400	\$11,776
Woodbridge ID	* 3	433	0	0	3	\$17,306	\$17,306	\$11,076
Sutter Extension WD	* 5	354	0	0	5	\$14,160	\$14,160	\$9,062
Santa Ynez River WCD	* 0	0	1	40,000	1	\$14,100	\$14,100	\$9,024
Rancho California WD	* 0	0	1	40,000	1	\$14,100	\$14,100	\$9,024
Brophy WD	* 0	0	1	40,000	1	\$14,100	\$14,100	\$9,024
Orange CMD	* 2	12	1	35,000	3	\$12,838	\$12,838	\$8,216
Metropolitan MD of So. Cal.	* 0	0	1	35,000	1	\$12,350	\$12,350	\$7,904
Reclamation Dist. #9999	* 3	285	0	0	3	\$11,387	\$11,387	\$7,288
Serrano ID	* 1	15	4	28,830	5	\$11,091	\$11,091	\$7,098
West Stanislaus ID	* 1	262	0	0	1	\$10,486	\$10,486	\$6,711
Glenn-Colusa ID	* 4	236	0	0	4	\$9,451	\$9,451	\$6,049
Banta Carbone ID	* 2	205	0	0	2	\$8,193	\$8,193	\$5,244
Maxwell ID	* 7	183	0	0	7	\$7,324	\$7,324	\$4,687
Princeton-Codora-Glenn ID	* 2	170	0	0	2	\$6,800	\$6,800	\$4,352
San Benito CMD	* 0	0	1	18,700	1	\$6,645	\$6,645	\$4,253
Paradise ID	* 0	0	2	18,300	2	\$6,605	\$6,605	\$4,227
Monterey Peninsula MWD	* 0	0	1	15,970	1	\$5,690	\$5,690	\$3,641
Camp Far West ID	* 2	26	2	10,000	4	\$4,742	\$4,742	\$3,035
Contra Costa WD	* 2	79	1	3,780	3	\$4,567	\$4,567	\$2,923
Stockton East WD	* 0	0	1	11,500	1	\$4,125	\$4,125	\$2,640
Maine Prairie WD	* 1	96	0	0	1	\$3,840	\$3,840	\$2,458
San Bernardino Valley WCD	* 0	0	2	10,400	2	\$3,840	\$3,840	\$2,458
El Nido ID	* 0	0	2	10,066	2	\$3,723	\$3,723	\$2,383
Cordus ID	* 2	90	0	0	2	\$3,600	\$3,600	\$2,304
North Marin WD	* 1	10	2	8,400	3	\$3,530	\$3,530	\$2,259
Redwood Valley CMD	* 1	29	1	2,800	2	\$2,220	\$2,220	\$1,421
Coastside CMD	* 0	0	1	5,580	1	\$2,053	\$2,053	\$1,314
Littlerock Creek ID	* 0	0	1	5,500	1	\$2,025	\$2,025	\$1,296
Carmichael WD	* 3	50	0	0	3	\$2,000	\$2,000	\$1,280
Palmdale WD	* 0	0	3	4,680	3	\$1,938	\$1,938	\$1,240
Gravelly Ford WD	* 0	0	1	5,000	1	\$1,850	\$1,850	\$1,184
Madera ID	* 0	0	1	4,700	1	\$1,745	\$1,745	\$1,117
Scott Valley ID	* 1	43	0	0	1	\$1,720	\$1,720	\$1,101
Eastern MWD	* 1	41	0	0	1	\$1,640	\$1,640	\$1,050
Angiola WD	* 1	36	0	0	1	\$1,447	\$1,447	\$926
Reclamation Dist. #1004	* 1	31	0	0	1	\$1,238	\$1,238	\$792
Valley Center MWD	* 0	0	1	3,000	1	\$1,150	\$1,150	\$736
Calaveras PUD	* 0	0	1	2,130	1	\$846	\$846	\$541
Amador CWA	* 0	0	1	1,600	1	\$660	\$660	\$422
Ramona WD	* 0	0	1	1,500	1	\$625	\$625	\$400
San Juan Suburban WD	* 1	15	0	0	1	\$600	\$600	\$384
Stinson Beach CMD	* 1	14	0	0	1	\$550	\$550	\$352
Sierra Lakes CMD	* 0	0	1	1,177	1	\$512	\$512	\$328
Las Virgenes MWD	* 0	0	1	1,030	1	\$461	\$461	\$295
Crestline-Lake Arrowhead WA	* 0	0	1	1,000	1	\$450	\$450	\$288
Elsinore Valley MWD	* 0	0	1	1,000	1	\$450	\$450	\$288
Irvine Ranch WD	* 0	0	1	960	1	\$436	\$436	\$279
Gressland WD	* 1	9	0	0	1	\$373	\$373	\$239
Brooktrails Township CSD	* 0	0	2	438	2	\$353	\$353	\$226
Mariposa PUD	* 0	0	2	428	2	\$350	\$350	\$224
Mammoth CMD	* 0	0	1	660	1	\$331	\$331	\$212
Lake Arrowhead CSD	* 0	0	1	302	1	\$206	\$206	\$132
Helix WD	* 0	0	1	300	1	\$205	\$205	\$131
Carpinteria CMD	* 0	0	1	150	1	\$153	\$153	\$98
Sub-totals	257	162,438	255	22,267,085	512	\$14,316,484	\$2,780,408	\$1,779,461
Miscellaneous Others	1,610	43,462	869	5,863,215	2,479	\$3,877,521	\$3,877,521	\$2,481,613
Totals	1,867	205,900	1,124	28,130,300	2,991	\$18,164,135	\$6,657,929	\$4,261,075

* Data obtained from ACWA "TAXDIV.XLS" spreadsheet.
This data was NOT VERIFIED and is used for relative comparison ONLY.

\$14,316,484 \$2,780,408

APPENDIX B

Summary of Fee-related Revenue Sources

This appendix describes various fees which partly support the State and Regional Boards. Some fees represent "dedicated" funding sources while others are classified as "reimbursements."

APPENDIX B
SUMMARY
FEE-RELATED REVENUE SOURCES
FISCAL YEAR 1991-92

FUND NAME, ACRONYM & NUMBER	ESTIMATED REVENUE	FEE SHARE	PROGRAM SUPPORTED	REVENUE SOURCE(S) (Fee Payers)	REVENUE COLLECTOR	PAYMENT FREQUENCY	STATUTORY AUTHORITY
Environmental Protection Trust Fund [EPIF] Fund 225	\$1,702	100%	Comp 370--Aboveground Petroleum Storage Tank Program	Aboveground petroleum storage facility owners/operators	SMRCB	Every Two Years	Health & Safety Code, Section 25270
Purpose: To implement a spill prevention, control, and countermeasures program for leaks to surface waters from specified aboveground petroleum storage tanks. The fees support compliance inspections, cleanup costs, restoration of wetlands, and program administration.							
Surface Impoundment Assessment Account [SIAM] Fund 482	\$3,158	~96%	Comp 190--TPCA Task 351--Employee Protection	Surface impoundment owners and operators	SMRCB	Annually and Quarterly	Health & Safety Code, Section 25208
Purpose: To administer the Toxic Pits Cleanup Act of 1984. To make existing surface impoundments which contain hazardous wastes safe or to close such impoundments. Health and Safety Code Section 25208.3 authorizes SMRCB to establish a fee schedule, to collect fees from persons discharging liquid hazardous wastes into a surface impoundment, and to deposit the collected fees into the Surface Impoundment Assessment Account of the General Fund.							
Waste Discharge Permit Fund [WDPF] Fund 193	\$7,350	~29%	Comp 100--MPDES Task 120--MR/Non-chpt 15 Task 130--Mining Waste Regs.	Persons who hold Waste Discharge Requirement Orders and National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permits	SMRCB	Annually	Water Code Section 13268 and Water Code Section 13260.1
Purpose: To support "core regulatory" activities which include prescribing waste discharge requirements, evaluating monitoring data, inspecting treatment facilities, and imposing enforcement measures. I.e., the State Board's MPDES, Non-Chapter 15 Waste Discharge Requirements (WDR), Chapter 15 MR, and Pretreatment Programs. The fee schedule adopted as regulation is based on the relative threat to water quality as well as flow volume.							
Bay Protection and Toxic Cleanup Fund [BPTCF] Fund 282	\$2,439	~36%	Comp 450--Bay Protection & Toxic Cleanup Program	Direct and indirect dischargers to specified bays/estuaries	SMRCB	Annually	Water Code, Section 13395
Hazardous Waste Control Account Bay Protection [HWCA] Fund 014	\$1,547	~62%	Comp 450--Bay Protection & Toxic Cleanup Program	Hazardous Waste Generators	BOE for DTSC	One-time Appropriation	CMC, Section 13394
Purpose: To continue implementation of the Bay Protection and Toxic Cleanup Program authorized by Chapter 269/89 (SB 475) to protect bays and estuaries from the effects of hazardous wastes. The statute requires SMRCB to implement a program to protect bays and estuaries from toxic contaminants and, where toxic contamination is found, plan for its cleanup and mitigation. SMRCB establishes the annual permit fee schedule via rulemaking.							

* State operations allocation for task/component based on estimated FY 91/92 baseline amounts. In thousands of dollars.

FUND NAME, ACRONYM & NUMBER	ESTIMATED REVENUE	FEE SHARE	PROGRAM SUPPORTED	REVENUE SOURCE(S) (Fee Payers)	REVENUE COLLECTOR	PAYMENT FREQUENCY	STATUTORY AUTHORITY
Wastewater Treatment Plant Operator Certification [R(OPCERT)] Fund 995	\$ 144	100%	Task 511-Operator Certification	Operators/Examinees	SMRCB	Varies	CVC, Section 1362B
Purpose: Fees are collected for certification applications, examinations, and renewals. These fees partly support this certification program.							
Wastewater Treatment Plant Operator Training [R(OPTRNG)] Fund 995	\$ 174	72%	Task 513--Operator/Training/ Certification Task 512--Operator/Training	Course paid by student fees	SMRCB	Varies	Budget Act. (Reimbursements)
Purpose: Wastewater treatment and pollution control training and coursework provided at the San Marcos Training Center (San Diego County).							
Underground Storage Tank Tester Account [USTTS] Fund 436	\$ 207	100%	Comp 310--UST Tester	Underground Storage Tank Test applicants and licensees	SMRCB	Varies but usually monthly	Chapter 1372/07 AB 1413/Cortese Health & Safety Code, Section 25284
Purpose: To create an underground storage tank tester licensing program for those individuals who conduct leak detection tests. Chapter 1372/87 creates a licensing program, administered by the State Board, for individuals who perform tank integrity tests on underground tanks containing hazardous substances. Tank testers are required to pay a fee at the time of licensing and at the time of renewal.							
UST Cleanup Fund [USTCF] Fund 439	\$70,118	60%	Comp 320--UST Pilot Program Comp 300--Cleanup Program Comp 320--UST Pilot Program	UST Owners/Operators	BOE	Annually	Chapter 1442/89 SB 299 SB 2004/Keene
Purpose: SB 299 created a cleanup fund to provide coverage to petroleum UST owners of up to \$1 million for each leaking tank and at least \$2 million annual aggregate coverage (multiple tanks) for each facility. The owner was responsible for a \$50,000 deductible. The program was funded by a \$200 per tank annual fee which generated about \$10.7 million in FY 89/90. Eligible tank owners could receive grants from the program for reimbursement of their cleanup costs if the tanks were in compliance. SB 299 also allowed the cleanup fund to be used to fund the local agency oversight program for the cleanup of USTs, an abandoned tank cleanup program, and an emergency cleanup and recalcitrant owner/operator site cleanup program. SB 2004 was introduced to increase the level of funding and expand the scope of the program created by SB 299. Now the per tank maintenance fee is replaced by a petroleum distribution fee which assesses 6 mills (\$0.006) for each gallon of petroleum placed in an underground storage tank. This is expected to increase the revenue by \$55 million above the 10.7. SB 2004 also permits the submittal of claims for prepayment approval of estimated costs of corrective action and the level of required deductible financial responsibility to be reduced from \$50,000 to \$10,000. Third party liability payments for property damage and/or personal injury are allowed, provided the owner/operator can meet the \$10,000 deductible fee.							
Underground Storage Tank Fund [USTSF] Fund 475	\$1,206	7%	Comp 300--UST Cleanup Program Task 351--Employee Protection	UST Owners/Operators	Local Agencies	Continuous	Chapter 1046/83 And 84 to 86 AB 1362 (Sher)
Purpose: To fund the permitting portion of the Underground Storage Tank (UST) program. Activities consist of developing regulations, preparing the annual statewide report, developing policy and technical guidance and providing guidance as requested by local agencies in the implementation of the UST Program and tracking by Regional Boards of tank leaks on the Leaking Underground Storage Tank Information System (LUSTIS).							

FUND NAME, ACRONYM & NUMBER	ESTIMATED REVENUE	FEE SHARE	PROGRAM SUPPORTED	REVENUE SOURCE(S) (Fee Payers)	REVENUE COLLECTION	PAYMENT FREQUENCY	STATUTORY AUTHORITY
Water Rights Application Fees [R(APPL)] Fund 995	\$ 152	~5%	Comp 600--Application Processing	Water Rights Applicants	SWRCB	Varies	California Water Code Section 1525
Purpose: The Water Code and regulations required the submission of a filing fee (\$100 minimum) determined by a graduated fee schedule based on amount of water intended for diversion or storage.							
Small Hydro Applications [R(SH HYDRO)] Fund 995	\$ 10	~0.3%	Comp 600--Applications	Water Rights Applicants	SWRCB	Varies	California Water Code Section 1525.5
Purpose: The Water Code and regulations specify that the State Board and the DFG must be reimbursed for their costs in evaluating and processing applications for small hydro projects. An initial deposit of \$1,000 must be submitted with the permit application; total fee paid cannot exceed "reasonable costs" of the State Board and the DFG.							
Water Rights Adjudications [R(ADJUD)] Fund 995	\$ 109	~70%	Comp 660--Adjudication Investigations	Litigants/Parties to Adjudication Case	SWRCB	Varies	California Water Code Section 2850
Purpose: The Water Code determines all rights to the use of water in a particular stream system. The process is initiated if a claimant petitions the State Board for an adjudication and the State Board finds the action necessary and in the public interest. Division 2, Part 3, Article 13 of the Water Code calls for the State Board to be reimbursed for expenses for adjudication.							

APPENDIX C

Estimated Fee Rates and Sample Amounts for Alternative 1 A Revised Waste Discharge Permit Fee Cap

The annual waste discharge permit fee schedules for Fiscal Year 1990-91 and 1992-92 are summarized in this appendix. Sample fee schedules, assuming a proportionate increase of the proposed Fiscal Year 1991-92 schedule, are presented for each of the revenue scenarios shown in Table 9. These are only examples; other structures could be developed if the maximum fee amount were increased (that is, the range of fees could be expanded).

DISTRIBUTION OF WDR HOLDERS
ORIGINAL FEE SCHEDULE
(Fiscal Year 1990-91)

Discharge Rating Threat to Water Quality	NPDES Permittees			Non-15 WDR Holders			Chp 15 WDR Holders			TOTALS	
	Number Billed	Delin- quent	Fee Amount	Number Billed	Delin- quent	Fee Amount	Number Billed	Delin- quent	Fee Amount	Number Billed	Revenue Amount
Category IA	88	14	\$1,300	86	8	\$1,100	98	14	\$3,100	236	\$442,400
IB	16	1	\$900	74	9	\$700	137	13	\$2,100	204	\$319,400
IC	5	0	\$700	26	3	\$600	6	0	\$1,600	34	\$26,900
Category IIA	30	1	\$600	51	4	\$500	35	2	\$1,300	109	\$83,800
IIB	23	1	\$500	634	43	\$400	264	33	\$1,100	844	\$501,500
IIC	47	9	\$400	247	38	\$300	30	10	\$800	267	\$93,900
Category IIIA	0	0	\$400	5	1	\$300	5	0	\$800	9	\$5,200
IIIB	15	0	\$300	379	40	\$200	139	22	\$600	471	\$142,500
IIIC	99	4	\$200	1,425	253	\$100	207	39	\$300	1435	\$186,600
Program											
Sub-totals -->	323	30	\$180,300	2,927	399	\$653,900	921	133	\$968,000	3,609	\$1,802,200
Appropriated Amount (Total Needed)											\$1,952,000
Difference (Deficit/Surplus)											-\$149,800
"Null Payments" (Delinquencies)										562	\$248,200
Total Amount Invoiced										4,171	\$2,050,400

DISTRIBUTION OF WDR HOLDERS
PROPOSED FEE SCHEDULE
(Fiscal Year 1991-92)

Discharge Rating Threat to Water Quality	NPDES PERMITTEES		NON-15 WDR HOLDERS		CHP-15 WDR HOLDERS		ESTIMATED TOTALS	
	Number Billed	Fee Amount	Number Billed	Fee Amount	Number Billed	Fee Amount	Total Payers	Revenue Amount
Category IA	63	\$10,000	77	\$10,000	99	\$10,000	239	\$2,390,000
IB	16	\$7,000	33	\$5,500	131	\$7,500	180	\$1,276,000
IC	3	\$5,500	26	\$3,000	6	\$6,000	35	\$130,500
Category IIA	34	\$4,000	50	\$2,000	31	\$5,000	115	\$391,000
IIB	92	\$2,000	666	\$1,200	282	\$4,000	1,040	\$2,111,200
IIC	61	\$1,200	276	\$900	45	\$3,000	382	\$456,600
Category IIIA	4	\$1,000	6	\$750	5	\$2,000	15	\$18,500
IIIB	18	\$750	347	\$400	138	\$1,500	503	\$359,300
IIIC	136	\$400	1,244	\$200	250	\$750	1,630	\$490,700
Program Sub-totals ---->	427	\$1,223,600	2,725	\$2,569,200	987	\$3,831,000	4,139	\$7,623,800
Appropriated Amount (Total Needed)								\$7,350,000
Difference (Deficit/Surplus)								=====
								\$273,800

NOTES: Assumes 100% of the fee payers invoiced actually pay the full amount in a timely manner.
(Based on data extracted from the Waste Discharger System.)

CAP92A

ALTERNATIVE 1: REVISED CAP
 DISTRIBUTION OF ESTIMATED NUMBER OF FEE PAYERS
 SCENARIO "A"
 REPLACE 75% OF GENERAL FUND
 Fiscal Year 1992-93

Discharge Rating Threat to Water Quality	NPDES PERMITTEES		NON-15 WDR HOLDERS		CHP-15 WDR HOLDERS		ESTIMATED TOTALS	
	Number Billed	Fee Amount	Number Billed	Fee Amount	Number Billed	Fee Amount	Total Payers	Revenue Amount
Category IA	46	\$49,859	47	\$49,859	86	\$49,859	179	\$8,924,761
IB	15	\$34,901	25	\$27,423	127	\$37,395	167	\$5,958,255
IC	3	\$27,423	25	\$14,958	6	\$29,916	34	\$635,715
Category IIA	39	\$19,944	50	\$9,972	35	\$24,930	124	\$2,148,966
IIB	87	\$9,972	639	\$5,983	266	\$19,944	992	\$9,995,805
IIC	59	\$5,983	263	\$4,487	40	\$14,958	362	\$2,131,398
Category IIIA	1	\$4,986	4	\$3,739	6	\$9,972	11	\$79,774
IIIB	19	\$3,739	344	\$1,995	136	\$7,479	499	\$1,774,465
IIIC	130	\$1,995	1,133	\$997	234	\$3,739	1,497	\$2,263,877
Program	-----		-----		-----		-----	
Sub-totals --->	399	\$5,233,052	2,530	\$10,735,553	936	\$17,944,411	3,865	\$33,913,016
Appropriated Amount (Total Needed)								\$33,913,000
Difference (Deficit/Surplus)								=====
								\$16

NOTES: Excludes FY 1992-93 invoices which were cancelled or returned mail. Assume additional NPDES number is offset by an equal number of delinquent or rescinded WDRs.
 (Based on data extracted from the Waste Discharger System and Annual Fees Remittance System.)

ALTERNATIVE 1: REVISED CAP
 DISTRIBUTION OF ESTIMATED NUMBER OF FEE PAYERS
 SCENARIO "B"
 REPLACE 100% OF GENERAL FUND
 Fiscal Year 1992-93

Discharge Rating Threat to Water Quality	NPDES PERMITTEES		NON-15 WDR HOLDERS		CHP-15 WDR HOLDERS		ESTIMATED TOTALS	
	Number Billed	Fee Amount	Number Billed	Fee Amount	Number Billed	Fee Amount	Total Payers	Revenue Amount
Category IA	46	\$62,703	47	\$62,703	86	\$62,703	179	\$11,223,837
IB	15	\$43,892	25	\$34,487	127	\$47,027	167	\$7,492,984
IC	3	\$34,487	25	\$18,811	6	\$37,622	34	\$799,468
Category IIA	39	\$25,081	50	\$12,541	35	\$31,351	124	\$2,702,494
IIB	87	\$12,541	639	\$7,524	266	\$25,081	992	\$12,570,449
IIC	59	\$7,524	263	\$5,643	40	\$18,811	362	\$2,680,465
Category IIIA	1	\$6,270	4	\$4,703	6	\$12,541	11	\$100,328
IIIB	19	\$4,703	344	\$2,509	136	\$9,405	499	\$2,231,533
IIIC	130	\$2,509	1,133	\$1,254	234	\$4,703	1,497	\$2,847,454
Program Sub-totals ---->	399	\$6,581,118	2,530	\$13,501,176	936	\$22,566,718	3,865	\$42,649,012
Appropriated Amount (Total Needed)								\$42,649,000
Difference (Deficit/Surplus)								===== \$12

NOTES: Excludes FY 1992-93 invoices which were cancelled or returned mail. Assume additional NPDES number is offset by an equal number of delinquent or rescinded WDRs.
 (Based on data extracted from the Waste Discharger System and Annual Fees Remittance System.)

ALTERNATIVE 1: REVISED CAP
 DISTRIBUTION OF ESTIMATED NUMBER OF FEE PAYERS
 SCENARIO "C"
 REPLACE 100% OF GENERAL FUND AND REDUCE EXISTING BACKLOGS
 Fiscal Year 1992-93

Discharge Rating ----- Threat to Water Quality -----	NPDES PERMITTEES		NON-15 WDR HOLDERS		CHP-15 WDR HOLDERS		ESTIMATED TOTALS	
	Number Billed	Fee Amount	Number Billed	Fee Amount	Number Billed	Fee Amount	Total Payers	Revenue Amount
Category IA	46	\$74,435	47	\$74,435	86	\$74,435	179	\$13,323,865
IB	15	\$52,105	25	\$40,939	127	\$55,826	167	\$8,894,952
IC	3	\$40,939	25	\$22,331	6	\$44,661	34	\$949,058
Category IIA	39	\$29,774	50	\$14,887	35	\$37,218	124	\$3,208,166
IIB	87	\$14,887	639	\$8,932	266	\$29,774	992	\$14,922,601
IIC	59	\$8,932	263	\$6,699	40	\$22,331	362	\$3,182,065
Category IIIA	1	\$7,444	4	\$5,583	6	\$14,867	11	\$119,098
IIIB	19	\$5,583	344	\$2,977	136	\$11,166	499	\$2,648,741
IIIC	130	\$2,977	1,133	\$1,489	234	\$5,583	1,497	\$3,380,469
Program	-----		-----		-----		-----	
Sub-totals ---->	399	\$7,812,276	2,530	\$16,027,387	936	\$26,789,352	3,865	\$50,629,015
Appropriated Amount (Total Needed)								\$50,629,000
Difference (Deficit/Surplus)								=====
								\$15

NOTES: Excludes FY 1992-93 invoices which were cancelled or returned mail. Assume additional NPDES number is offset by an equal number of delinquent or rescinded WDRs.
 (Based on data extracted from the Waste Discharger System and Annual Fees Remittance System.)

ALTERNATIVE 1: REVISED CAP
 DISTRIBUTION OF ESTIMATED NUMBER OF FEE PAYERS
 SCENARIO "D"
 REPLACE 100% OF GENERAL FUND, REDUCE EXISTING BACKLOGS, AND FUND NEW WORKLOAD
 Fiscal Year 1992-93

Discharge Rating Threat to Water Quality	NPDES PERMITTEES		NON-15 WDR HOLDERS		CHP-15 WDR HOLDERS		ESTIMATED TOTALS	
	Number Billed	Fee Amount	Number Billed	Fee Amount	Number Billed	Fee Amount	Total Payers	Revenue Amount
Category IA	46	\$74,435	47	\$74,435	86	\$74,435	179	\$13,323,865
IB	15	\$52,105	25	\$40,939	127	\$55,826	167	\$8,894,952
IC	3	\$40,939	25	\$22,331	6	\$44,661	34	\$949,058
Category IIA	39	\$29,774	50	\$14,887	35	\$37,218	124	\$3,208,166
IIB	87	\$14,887	639	\$8,932	266	\$29,774	992	\$14,922,601
IIC	59	\$8,932	263	\$6,699	40	\$22,331	362	\$3,182,065
Category IIIA	1	\$7,444	4	\$5,583	6	\$14,887	11	\$119,098
IIIB	19	\$5,583	344	\$2,977	136	\$11,166	499	\$2,648,741
IIIC	130	\$2,977	1,133	\$1,489	234	\$5,583	1,497	\$3,380,469
Program Sub-totals --->	399	\$7,812,276	2,530	\$16,027,387	936	\$26,789,352	3,865	\$50,629,015
Appropriated Amount (Total Needed)								\$50,629,000
Difference (Deficit/Surplus)								=====
								\$15

NOTES: Excludes FY 1992-93 invoices which were cancelled or returned mail. Assume additional NPDES number is offset by an equal number of delinquent or rescinded WDRs.
 (Based on data extracted from the Waste Discharger System and Annual Fees Remittance System.)

ALTERNATIVE 1: REVISED CAP
 DISTRIBUTION OF ESTIMATED NUMBER OF FEE PAYERS
 SCENARIO "A"
 REPLACE 75% OF GENERAL FUND
 Fiscal Year 1993-94

Discharge Rating Threat to Water Quality	NPDES PERMITTEES		NON-15 WDR HOLDERS		CHP-15 WDR HOLDERS		ESTIMATED TOTALS	
	Number Billed	Fee Amount	Number Billed	Fee Amount	Number Billed	Fee Amount	Total Payers	Revenue Amount
Category IA	46	\$65,548	47	\$65,548	86	\$65,548	179	\$11,733,092
IB	15	\$45,883	25	\$36,051	127	\$49,161	167	\$7,832,967
IC	3	\$36,051	25	\$19,664	6	\$39,329	34	\$835,727
Category IIA	39	\$26,219	50	\$13,110	35	\$32,774	124	\$2,825,131
IIB	87	\$13,110	639	\$7,866	266	\$26,219	992	\$13,141,198
IIC	59	\$7,866	263	\$5,899	40	\$19,664	362	\$2,802,091
Category IIIA	1	\$6,555	4	\$4,916	6	\$13,110	11	\$104,879
IIIB	19	\$4,916	344	\$2,622	136	\$9,831	499	\$2,332,388
IIIC	130	\$2,622	1,133	\$1,311	234	\$4,916	1,497	\$2,976,567
Program Sub-totals --->	399	\$6,879,630	2,530	\$14,113,937	936	\$23,590,473	3,865	\$44,584,040
Appropriated Amount (Total Needed)								\$44,584,000
Difference (Deficit/Surplus)								\$40

NOTES: Excludes FY 1992-93 invoices which were cancelled or returned mail. Assume additional NPDES number is offset by an equal number of delinquent or rescinded WDRs.
 (Based on data extracted from the Waste Discharger System and Annual Fees Remittance System.)

ALTERNATIVE 1: REVISED CAP
 DISTRIBUTION OF ESTIMATED NUMBER OF FEE PAYERS
 SCENARIO "B"
 REPLACE 100% OF GENERAL FUND
 Fiscal Year 1993-94

Discharge Rating Threat to Water Quality	NPDES PERMITTEES		NON-15 WDR HOLDERS		CHP-15 WDR HOLDERS		ESTIMATED TOTALS	
	Number Billed	Fee Amount	Number Billed	Fee Amount	Number Billed	Fee Amount	Total Payers	Revenue Amount
Category IA	46	\$78,649	47	\$78,649	86	\$78,649	179	\$14,078,171
IB	15	\$55,054	25	\$43,257	127	\$58,987	167	\$9,398,584
IC	3	\$43,257	25	\$23,595	6	\$47,189	34	\$1,002,780
Category IIA	39	\$31,460	50	\$15,730	35	\$39,324	124	\$3,389,780
IIB	87	\$15,730	639	\$9,438	266	\$31,460	992	\$15,767,752
IIC	59	\$9,438	263	\$7,078	40	\$23,595	362	\$3,362,156
Category IIIA	1	\$7,865	4	\$5,898	6	\$15,730	11	\$125,837
IIIB	19	\$5,898	344	\$3,146	136	\$11,797	499	\$2,798,678
IIIC	130	\$3,146	1,133	\$1,573	234	\$5,898	1,497	\$3,571,321
Program	-----		-----		-----		-----	
Sub-totals ---->	399	\$8,254,634	2,530	\$16,934,724	936	\$28,305,701	3,865	\$53,495,059
Appropriated Amount (Total Needed)								\$53,495,000
Difference (Deficit/Surplus)								=====
								\$59

NOTES: Excludes FY 1992-93 invoices which were cancelled or returned mail. Assume additional NPDES number is offset by an equal number of delinquent or rescinded WDRs.
 (Based on data extracted from the Waste Discharger System and Annual Fees Remittance System.)

ALTERNATIVE 1: REVISED CAP
 DISTRIBUTION OF ESTIMATED NUMBER OF FEE PAYERS
 SCENARIO "C"
 REPLACE 100% OF GENERAL FUND AND REDUCE EXISTING BACKLOGS
 Fiscal Year 1993-94

Discharge Rating Threat to Water Quality	NPDES PERMITTEES		NON-15 WDR HOLDERS		CHP-15 WDR HOLDERS		ESTIMATED TOTALS	
	Number Billed	Fee Amount	Number Billed	Fee Amount	Number Billed	Fee Amount	Total Payers	Revenue Amount
Category IA	46	\$90,616	47	\$90,616	86	\$90,616	179	\$16,220,264
IB	15	\$63,431	25	\$49,839	127	\$67,962	167	\$10,828,614
IC	3	\$49,839	25	\$27,185	6	\$54,370	34	\$1,155,362
Category IIA	39	\$36,247	50	\$18,123	35	\$45,308	124	\$3,905,563
IIB	87	\$18,123	639	\$10,874	266	\$36,247	992	\$18,166,889
IIC	59	\$10,874	263	\$8,155	40	\$27,185	362	\$3,873,731
Category IIIA	1	\$9,062	4	\$6,796	6	\$18,123	11	\$144,984
IIIB	19	\$6,796	344	\$3,626	136	\$13,592	499	\$3,224,980
IIIC	130	\$3,626	1,133	\$1,812	234	\$6,796	1,497	\$4,114,640
Program Sub-totals --->	399	\$9,510,784	2,530	\$19,511,477	936	\$32,612,766	3,865	\$61,635,027
Appropriated Amount (Total Needed)								\$61,635,000
Difference (Deficit/Surplus)								=====
								\$27

NOTES: Excludes FY 1992-93 invoices which were cancelled or returned mail. Assume additional NPDES number is offset by an equal number of delinquent or rescinded WDRs.
 (Based on data extracted from the Waste Discharger System and Annual Fees Remittance System.)

ALTERNATIVE 1: REVISED CAP
 DISTRIBUTION OF ESTIMATED NUMBER OF FEE PAYERS
 SCENARIO "D"
 REPLACE 100% OF GENERAL FUND, REDUCE EXISTING BACKLOGS, AND FUND NEW WORKLOAD
 Fiscal Year 1993-94

Discharge Rating Threat to Water Quality	NPDES PERMITTEES		NON-15 WDR HOLDERS		CHP-15 WDR HOLDERS		ESTIMATED TOTALS	
	Number Billed	Fee Amount	Number Billed	Fee Amount	Number Billed	Fee Amount	Total Payers	Revenue Amount
Category IA	46	\$96,327	47	\$96,327	86	\$96,327	179	\$17,242,533
IB	15	\$67,430	25	\$52,980	127	\$72,245	167	\$11,511,065
IC	3	\$52,980	25	\$28,898	6	\$57,796	34	\$1,228,166
Category IIA	39	\$38,531	50	\$19,265	35	\$48,164	124	\$4,151,699
IIB	87	\$19,265	639	\$11,559	266	\$38,531	992	\$19,311,502
IIC	59	\$11,559	263	\$8,668	40	\$28,898	362	\$4,117,585
Category IIIA	1	\$9,633	4	\$7,224	6	\$19,265	11	\$154,119
IIIB	19	\$7,224	344	\$3,853	136	\$14,449	499	\$3,427,752
IIIC	130	\$3,853	1,133	\$1,927	234	\$7,224	1,497	\$4,374,597
Program Sub-totals --->	399	\$10,109,956	2,530	\$20,741,073	936	\$34,667,989	3,865	\$65,519,018
Appropriated Amount (Total Needed)								\$65,519,000
Difference (Deficit/Surplus)								=====
								\$18

NOTES: Excludes FY 1992-93 invoices which were cancelled or returned mail. Assume additional NPDES number is offset by an equal number of delinquent or rescinded WDRs.
 (Based on data extracted from the Waste Discharger System and Annual Fees Remittance System.)

APPENDIX D

Estimated Fee Rates and Sample Amounts for Alternative 2 New Water Rights and Waste Discharge Permit Fees

Using the July 2, 1991 version of Assembly Bill 18 (see Appendix A) as a basic model, different fee schedules were estimated for each of the revenue scenarios shown in Table 9. These are only examples; other structures could be developed with different fee rates, categories, and distributions of program costs.

ALTERNATIVE 2: NEW WATER QUALITY AND WATER RIGHTS FEES
 SCENARIO "A" -- REPLACE 75% GENERAL FUND
 FISCAL YEAR 1992-93

Preliminary Fee Category	Estimated Number of Fee Payers	Estimated Percent of Fee Payers	Estimated Total Volume (MGD, liquids)	Fee Rate	Percent of Revenue	Estimated Revenue
A. DISCHARGES REGULATED BY WDRS ("POINT")						
1. Municipal (sewage) discharges (based on "permitted" average dry weather flow)	~ 1,750	~ 33.43%	3,030	\$310 plus \$3,100 per MGD > 0.1 MGD	41.34%	\$9,842,500
2. Industrial discharges (based on "permitted" design flow)	~ 1,450	~ 27.70%	475	\$610 plus \$6,100 per MGD > 0.1 MGD	15.89%	\$3,782,000
3. Cooling water discharges (based on "permitted" design flow)	~ 35	~ 0.67%	19,000	\$140 per MGD	11.17%	\$2,660,000
4. Landfills receiving waste (based on prior year volume received)	~ 335	~ 6.40%	~41 M tons/yr	\$0.12 per ton received (~20,000 acres)	20.67%	\$4,920,000
5. Landfills NOT receiving waste (based on footprint area)	~ 175	~ 3.34%	N/A	assume \$2,550 each	3.21%	\$765,000
6. Surface Impoundments (based on footprint area)						
a. Hazardous wastes	~ 25	~ 0.48%	~150 acres	\$1,000 per acre	0.63%	\$150,000
b. Non-hazardous wastes	~ 100	~ 1.91%	~1,100 acres	\$250 per acre	1.05%	\$250,000
7. Land Treatment Units (based on footprint area)	~ 35	~ 0.67%	~1,500 acres	\$30 per acre	0.19%	\$45,000
8. Waste Piles (based on footprint area)	~ 20	~ 0.38%	? acres	assume \$2,500 each	0.21%	\$50,000
9. Mining waste discharges (based on disturbed acres not reclaimed)	~ 95	~ 1.81%	? acres	assume \$2,500 each	1.00%	\$237,500
10. Stormwater discharges [33 USC 1342(p)]						
a. Areawide urban (250,000 people or more)	~ 15	~ 0.29%	N/A	\$25,000 each	1.58%	\$375,000
b. Areawide urban (100,000 to 250,000 people)	Unknown	--	N/A	\$10,000 each	0.00%	\$0
c. Areawide urban (100,000 people or less)	Unknown	--	N/A	\$5,000 each	0.00%	\$0
d. "Industrial enrollees" in urban area	Unknown	--	N/A	\$250 per enrollee	0.84%	\$200,000
e. "Industrial enrollees" outside urban area	Unknown	--	N/A	\$500 per enrollee	0.84%	\$200,000
11. All other REGULATED discharges (excluded above)	~ 1,200	~ 22.92%	Unmeasurable	\$275 per WDR	1.39%	\$330,000
SUB-TOTAL: NEW POINT SOURCES WQ FEES						
	~ 5,235	100.00%			100.0%	\$23,807,000

ALTERNATIVE 2: NEW WATER QUALITY AND WATER RIGHTS FEES
SCENARIO "A" -- REPLACE 75% GENERAL FUND
FISCAL YEAR 1992-93

Preliminary Fee Category	Estimated Number of Fee Payers	Percent of Fee Payers	Estimated Total Volume (cfs or afa)	Fee Rate	Percent of Revenue	Estimated Revenue
B. DISCHARGES NOT REGULATED BY WDRS ("NON-POINT")						
12. Discharges from agricultural activities (in accordance with Inland Plan)	-58,868	- 95.64%	~ 7.6 M acres	\$25 plus \$0.20 per acre irrigated	71.26%	\$2,990,918
13. Discharges from other mining operations (also regulated by Dept of Conservation)	- 908	- 1.48%	Unknown	assume \$375 each	8.11%	\$340,500
14. Discharges from other landfills (those subject to SWAT provisions)	- 1,775	- 2.88%		assume \$375 each	15.86%	\$665,625
15. Dredging activities (CWA Section 404 certifications, etc.)	?	--	?	assume revenue amount and allocate fee somehow	2.38%	\$100,000
16. Onsite Septic Systems	?	--	?	" "	2.38%	\$100,000
SUB-TOTAL: NEW NONPOINT SOURCES WQ FEES						
	-61,551	100.00%			100.0%	\$4,197,043
C. JURISDICTIONAL WATER RIGHTS						
1. Permitted/licensed diversions: (includes Power & DWR; excludes USBR)						
a. 0 to 5 cubic feet per second	- 3,600	- 33.91%	2,200	\$100 for diversion	6.09%	\$360,000
b. More than 5 cubic feet per second	- 842	- 7.93%	203,700 cfs	\$100 plus \$10 per cubic feet per second	35.89%	\$2,121,200
2. Permitted/licensed storage: (includes Power & DWR; excludes USBR)						
a. 0 to 500 acre-feet per annum	- 5,300	- 49.93%	18,000	\$100 for storage	8.97%	\$530,000
b. More than 500 acre-feet per annum	- 873	- 8.22%	28,112,600 afa	\$100 plus \$0.10 per acre-feet per annum	49.05%	\$2,898,560
SUB-TOTALS for New Water Rights Fees:						
	-10,615	100.0%			100.0%	\$5,909,760
TOTALS: NEW Water Quality AND Water Rights Fees: -77,401						
						\$33,913,803
				Target Revenue for this scenario:		\$33,913,000
				Difference (surplus/deficit):		\$803

ALTERNATIVE 2: NEW WATER QUALITY AND WATER RIGHTS FEES
SCENARIO "B" -- REPLACE 100% GENERAL FUND
FISCAL YEAR 1992-93

Preliminary Fee Category	Estimated Number of Fee Payers	Percent of Fee Payers	Estimated Total Volume (MGD, liquids)	Fee Rate	Percent of Revenue	Estimated Revenue
A. DISCHARGES REGULATED BY WDRS ("POINT")						
1. Municipal (sewage) discharges (based on "permitted" average dry weather flow)	~ 1,750	~ 33.43%	3,030	\$360 plus \$3,600 per MGD > 0.1 MGD	41.10%	\$11,430,000
2. Industrial discharges (based on "permitted" design flow)	~ 1,450	~ 27.70%	475	\$710 plus \$7,100 per MGD > 0.1 MGD	15.83%	\$4,402,000
3. Cooling water discharges (based on "permitted" design flow)	~ 35	~ 0.67%	19,000	\$170 per MGD	11.61%	\$3,230,000
4. Landfills receiving waste (based on prior year volume received)	~ 335	~ 6.40%	~41 M tons/yr	\$0.14 per ton received (~20,000 acres)	20.64%	\$5,740,000
5. Landfills NOT receiving waste (based on footprint area)	~ 175	~ 3.34%	N/A	assume \$3,000 each	3.24%	\$900,000
6. Surface Impoundments (based on footprint area)						
a. Hazardous wastes	~ 25	~ 0.48%	~150 acres	\$1,200 per acre	0.65%	\$180,000
b. Non-hazardous wastes	~ 100	~ 1.91%	~1,100 acres	\$275 per acre	0.99%	\$275,000
7. Land Treatment Units (based on footprint area)	~ 35	~ 0.67%	~1,500 acres	\$40 per acre	0.22%	\$60,000
8. Waste Piles (based on footprint area)	~ 20	~ 0.38%	? acres	assume \$2,900 each	0.21%	\$58,000
9. Mining waste discharges (based on disturbed acres not reclaimed)	~ 95	~ 1.81%	? acres	assume \$2,900 each	0.99%	\$275,500
10. Stormwater discharges [33 USC 1342(p)]						
a. Areawide urban (250,000 people or more)	~ 15	~ 0.29%	N/A	\$28,000 each	1.51%	\$420,000
b. Areawide urban (100,000 to 250,000 people)	Unknown	--	N/A	\$12,500 each	0.00%	\$0
c. Areawide urban (100,000 people or less)	Unknown	--	N/A	\$7,500 each	0.00%	\$0
d. "Industrial enrollees" in urban area	Unknown	--	N/A	\$250 per enrollee	0.81%	\$225,000
e. "Industrial enrollees" outside urban area	Unknown	--	N/A	\$500 per enrollee	0.81%	\$225,000
11. All other REGULATED discharges (excluded above)	~ 1,200	~ 22.92%	Unmeasurable	\$325 per WDR	1.40%	\$390,000
SUB-TOTAL: NEW POINT SOURCES WQ FEES						
	~ 5,235	100.00%			100.0%	\$27,810,500

ALTERNATIVE 2: NEW WATER QUALITY AND WATER RIGHTS FEES
SCENARIO "B" -- REPLACE 100% GENERAL FUND
FISCAL YEAR 1992-93

Preliminary Fee Category	Estimated Number of Fee Payers	Percent of Fee Payers	Estimated Total Volume (cfs or afa)	Fee Rate	Percent of Revenue	Estimated Revenue
B. DISCHARGES NOT REGULATED BY WDRS ("NON-POINT")						
12. Discharges from agricultural activities (in accordance with Inland Plan)	~58,868	~ 95.64%	7.6 M acres	\$50 plus \$0.30 per acre irrigated	72.37%	\$5,222,227
13. Discharges from other mining operations (also regulated by Dept of Conservation)	~ 908	~ 1.48%	Unknown	assume \$650 each	8.18%	\$590,200
14. Discharges from other landfills (those subject to SWAT provisions)	~ 1,775	~ 2.88%		assume \$650 each	15.99%	\$1,153,750
15. Dredging activities (CWA Section 404 certifications, etc.)	?	--	?	assume revenue amount and allocate fee somehow	1.73%	\$125,000
16. Onsite Septic Systems	?	--	?	" "	1.73%	\$125,000
=====						
SUB-TOTAL: NEW NONPOINT SOURCES WQ FEES	~61,551	100.00%			100.0%	\$7,216,177
=====						
C. JURISDICTIONAL WATER RIGHTS						
1. Permitted/licensed diversions: (includes Power & DWR; excludes USBR)						
a. 0 to 5 cubic feet per second	~ 3,600	~ 33.91%	2,200	\$125 for diversion	5.90%	\$450,000
b. More than 5 cubic feet per second	~ 842	~ 7.93%	203,700	\$125 plus \$13 per cfs cubic feet per second	36.09%	\$2,753,350
2. Permitted/licensed storage: (includes Power & DWR; excludes USBR)						
a. 0 to 500 acre-feet per annum	~ 5,300	~ 49.93%	18,000	\$125 for storage	8.68%	\$662,500
b. More than 500 acre-feet per annum	~ 873	~ 8.22%	28,112,600	\$125 plus \$0.13 per afa acre-feet per annum	49.33%	\$3,763,763
=====						
SUB-TOTALS for New Water Rights Fees:	~10,615	100.0%			100.0%	\$7,629,613
=====						
TOTALS: NEW Water Quality AND Water Rights Fees: ~77,401						\$42,656,290
						Target Revenue for this scenario: \$42,649,000
						Difference (surplus/deficit): \$7,290

ALTERNATIVE 2: NEW WATER QUALITY AND WATER RIGHTS FEES
SCENARIO "C" -- REPLACE 100% GENERAL FUND AND REDUCE BACKLOGS
FISCAL YEAR 1992-93

Preliminary Fee Category	Estimated Number of Fee Payers	Percent of Fee Payers	Estimated Total Volume (MGD, liquids)	Fee Rate	Percent of Revenue	Estimated Revenue
A. DISCHARGES REGULATED BY WDRS ("POINT")						
1. Municipal (sewage) discharges (based on "permitted" average dry weather flow)	~ 1,750	~ 33.43%	3,030	\$400 plus \$4,000 per MGD > 0.1 MGD	40.85%	\$12,700,000
2. Industrial discharges (based on "permitted" design flow)	~ 1,450	~ 27.70%	475	\$800 plus \$8,000 per MGD > 0.1 MGD	15.95%	\$4,960,000
3. Cooling water discharges (based on "permitted" design flow)	~ 35	~ 0.67%	19,000	\$190 per MGD	11.61%	\$3,610,000
4. Landfills receiving waste (based on prior year volume received)	~ 335	~ 6.40%	~41 M tons/yr	\$0.16 per ton received (~20,000 acres)	21.10%	\$6,560,000
5. Landfills NOT receiving waste (based on footprint area)	~ 175	~ 3.34%	N/A	assume \$3,200 each	3.09%	\$960,000
6. Surface Impoundments (based on footprint area)						
a. Hazardous wastes	~ 25	~ 0.48%	~150 acres	\$1,300 per acre	0.63%	\$195,000
b. Non-hazardous wastes	~ 100	~ 1.91%	~1,100 acres	\$300 per acre	0.96%	\$300,000
7. Land Treatment Units (based on footprint area)	~ 35	~ 0.67%	~1,500 acres	\$45 per acre	0.22%	\$67,500
8. Waste Piles (based on footprint area)	~ 20	~ 0.38%	? acres	assume \$3,200 each	0.21%	\$64,000
9. Mining waste discharges (based on disturbed acres not reclaimed)	~ 95	~ 1.81%	? acres	assume \$3,200 each	0.98%	\$304,000
10. Stormwater discharges [33 USC 1342(p)]						
a. Areawide urban (250,000 people or more)	~ 15	~ 0.29%	N/A	\$30,000 each	1.45%	\$450,000
b. Areawide urban (100,000 to 250,000 people)	Unknown	--	N/A	\$15,000 each	0.00%	\$0
c. Areawide urban (100,000 people or less)	Unknown	--	N/A	\$7,500 each	0.00%	\$0
d. "Industrial enrollees" in urban area	Unknown	--	N/A	\$250 per enrollee	0.80%	\$250,000
e. "Industrial enrollees" outside urban area	Unknown	--	N/A	\$500 per enrollee	0.80%	\$250,000
11. All other REGULATED discharges (excluded above)	~ 1,200	~ 22.92%	Unmeasurable	\$350 per WDR	1.35%	\$420,000
SUB-TOTAL: NEW POINT SOURCES WQ FEES						
	~ 5,235	100.00%			100.0%	\$31,090,500

ALTERNATIVE 2: NEW WATER QUALITY AND WATER RIGHTS FEES
 SCENARIO "C" -- REPLACE 100% GENERAL FUND AND REDUCE BACKLOGS
 FISCAL YEAR 1992-93

Preliminary Fee Category	Estimated Number of Fee Payers	Percent of Fee Payers	Estimated Total Volume (cfs or afa)	Fee Rate	Percent of Revenue	Estimated Revenue
B. DISCHARGES NOT REGULATED BY WDRS ("NON-POINT")						
12. Discharges from agricultural activities (in accordance with Inland Plan)	-58,868	~ 95.64%	7.6 M acres	\$75 plus \$0.45 per acre irrigated	73.33%	\$7,833,341
13. Discharges from other mining operations (also regulated by Dept of Conservation)	- 908	~ 1.48%	Unknown	assume \$950 each	8.08%	\$862,600
14. Discharges from other landfills (those subject to SWAT provisions)	- 1,775	~ 2.88%		assume \$950 each	15.79%	\$1,686,250
15. Dredging activities (CWA Section 404 certifications, etc.)	?	--	?	assume revenue amount and allocate fee somehow	1.40%	\$150,000
16. Onsite Septic Systems	?	--	?	" "	1.40%	\$150,000
SUB-TOTAL: NEW NONPOINT SOURCES WQ FEES						
	-61,551	100.00%			100.0%	\$10,682,191
C. JURISDICTIONAL WATER RIGHTS						
1. Permitted/licensed diversions: (includes Power & DWR; excludes USBR)						
a. 0 to 5 cubic feet per second	- 3,600	~ 33.91%	2,200	\$150 for diversion	6.09%	\$540,000
b. More than 5 cubic feet per second	- 842	~ 7.93%	203,700 cfs	\$150 plus \$15 per cubic feet per second	35.89%	\$3,181,800
2. Permitted/licensed storage: (includes Power & DWR; excludes USBR)						
a. 0 to 500 acre-feet per annum	- 5,300	~ 49.93%	18,000	\$150 for storage	8.97%	\$795,000
b. More than 500 acre-feet per annum	- 873	~ 8.22%	28,112,600 afa	\$150 plus \$0.15 per acre-feet per annum	49.05%	\$4,347,840
SUB-TOTALS for New Water Rights Fees:						
	-10,615	100.0%			100.0%	\$8,864,640
TOTALS: NEW Water Quality AND Water Rights Fees:						\$50,637,331
Target Revenue for this scenario:						\$50,629,000
Difference (surplus/deficit):						\$8,331

ALTERNATIVE 2: NEW WATER QUALITY AND WATER RIGHTS FEES
 SCENARIO "D" -- REPLACE 100% GENERAL FUND, REDUCE BACKLOGS, AND FUND NEW WORKLOAD
 FISCAL YEAR 1992-93

Preliminary Fee Category	Estimated Number of Fee Payers	Percent of Fee Payers	Estimated Total Volume (MGD, liquids)	Fee Rate	Percent of Revenue	Estimated Revenue
A. DISCHARGES REGULATED BY WDRS ("POINT")						
1. Municipal (sewage) discharges (based on "permitted" average dry weather flow)	~ 1,750	~ 33.43%	3,030	\$400 plus \$4,000 per MGD > 0.1 MGD	40.85%	\$12,700,000
2. Industrial discharges (based on "permitted" design flow)	~ 1,450	~ 27.70%	475	\$800 plus \$8,000 per MGD > 0.1 MGD	15.95%	\$4,960,000
3. Cooling water discharges (based on "permitted" design flow)	~ 35	~ 0.67%	19,000	\$190 per MGD	11.61%	\$3,610,000
4. Landfills receiving waste (based on prior year volume received)	~ 335	~ 6.40%	~41 M tons/yr	\$0.16 per ton received (~20,000 acres)	21.10%	\$6,560,000
5. Landfills NOT receiving waste (based on footprint area)	~ 175	~ 3.34%	N/A	assume \$3,200 each	3.09%	\$960,000
6. Surface Impoundments (based on footprint area)						
a. Hazardous wastes	~ 25	~ 0.48%	~150 acres	\$1,300 per acre	0.63%	\$195,000
b. Non-hazardous wastes	~ 100	~ 1.91%	~1,100 acres	\$300 per acre	0.96%	\$300,000
7. Land Treatment Units (based on footprint area)	~ 35	~ 0.67%	~1,500 acres	\$45 per acre	0.22%	\$67,500
8. Waste Piles (based on footprint area)	~ 20	~ 0.38%	? acres	assume \$3,200 each	0.21%	\$64,000
9. Mining waste discharges (based on disturbed acres not reclaimed)	~ 95	~ 1.81%	? acres	assume \$3,200 each	0.98%	\$304,000
10. Stormwater discharges [33 USC 1342(p)]						
a. Areawide urban (250,000 people or more)	~ 15	~ 0.29%	N/A	\$30,000 each	1.45%	\$450,000
b. Areawide urban (100,000 to 250,000 people)	Unknown	--	N/A	\$15,000 each	0.00%	\$0
c. Areawide urban (100,000 people or less)	Unknown	--	N/A	\$7,500 each	0.00%	\$0
d. "Industrial enrollees" in urban area	Unknown	--	N/A	\$250 per enrollee	0.80%	\$250,000
e. "Industrial enrollees" outside urban area	Unknown	--	N/A	\$500 per enrollee	0.80%	\$250,000
11. All other REGULATED discharges (excluded above)	~ 1,200	~ 22.92%	Unmeasurable	\$350 per WDR	1.35%	\$420,000
SUB-TOTAL: NEW POINT SOURCES WQ FEES						
	~ 5,235	100.00%			100.0%	\$31,090,500

ALTERNATIVE 2: NEW WATER QUALITY AND WATER RIGHTS FEES
 SCENARIO "D" -- REPLACE 100% GENERAL FUND, REDUCE BACKLOGS, AND FUND NEW WORKLOAD
 FISCAL YEAR 1992-93

Preliminary Fee Category	Estimated Number of Fee Payers	Percent of Fee Payers	Estimated Total Volume (cfs or afa)	Fee Rate	Percent of Revenue	Estimated Revenue
B. DISCHARGES NOT REGULATED BY WDRS ("NON-POINT")						
12. Discharges from agricultural activities (in accordance with Inland Plan)	-58,868	~ 95.64%	7.6 M acres	\$75 plus \$0.45 per acre irrigated	73.33%	\$7,833,341
13. Discharges from other mining operations (also regulated by Dept of Conservation)	~ 908	~ 1.48%	Unknown	assume \$950 each	8.08%	\$862,600
14. Discharges from other landfills (those subject to SWAT provisions)	~ 1,775	~ 2.88%		assume \$950 each	15.79%	\$1,686,250
15. Dredging activities (CWA Section 404 certifications, etc.)	?	--	?	assume revenue amount and allocate fee somehow	1.40%	\$150,000
16. Onsite Septic Systems	?	--	?	" "	1.40%	\$150,000
SUB-TOTAL: NEW NONPOINT SOURCES WQ FEES						
	-61,551	100.00%			100.0%	\$10,682,191
C. JURISDICTIONAL WATER RIGHTS						
1. Permitted/licensed diversions: (includes Power & DWR; excludes USBR)						
a. 0 to 5 cubic feet per second	~ 3,600	~ 33.91%	2,200	\$150 for diversion	6.09%	\$540,000
b. More than 5 cubic feet per second	~ 842	~ 7.93%	203,700 cfs	\$150 plus \$15 per cubic feet per second	35.89%	\$3,181,800
2. Permitted/licensed storage: (includes Power & DWR; excludes USBR)						
a. 0 to 500 acre-feet per annum	~ 5,300	~ 49.93%	18,000	\$150 for storage	8.97%	\$795,000
b. More than 500 acre-feet per annum	~ 873	~ 8.22%	28,112,600 afa	\$150 plus \$0.15 per acre-feet per annum	49.05%	\$4,347,840
SUB-TOTALS for New Water Rights Fees:						
	-10,615	100.0%			100.0%	\$8,864,640
TOTALS: NEW Water Quality AND Water Rights Fees: ~77,401						
						\$50,637,331
				Target Revenue for this scenario:		\$50,629,000
				Difference (surplus/deficit):		\$8,331

ALTERNATIVE 2: NEW WATER QUALITY AND WATER RIGHTS FEES
 SCENARIO "A" -- REPLACE 75% GENERAL FUND
 FISCAL YEAR 1993-94

Preliminary Fee Category	Estimated Number of Fee Payers	Percent of Fee Payers	Estimated Total Volume (MGD, liquids)	Fee Rate	Percent of Revenue	Estimated Revenue
A. DISCHARGES REGULATED BY WDRS ("POINT")						
1. Municipal (sewage) discharges (based on "permitted" average dry weather flow)	~ 1,750	~ 33.43%	3,030	\$385 plus \$3,850 per MGD > 0.1 MGD	40.88%	\$12,223,750
2. Industrial discharges (based on "permitted" design flow)	~ 1,450	~ 27.70%	475	\$765 plus \$7,650 per MGD > 0.1 MGD	15.86%	\$4,743,000
3. Cooling water discharges (based on "permitted" design flow)	~ 35	~ 0.67%	19,000	\$180 per MGD	11.44%	\$3,420,000
4. Landfills receiving waste (based on prior year volume received)	~ 335	~ 6.40%	~41 M tons/yr	\$0.15 per ton received	20.57%	\$6,150,000
5. Landfills NOT receiving waste (based on footprint area)	~ 175	~ 3.34%	N/A	assume \$3,250 each	3.26%	\$975,000
6. Surface Impoundments (based on footprint area)						
a. Hazardous wastes	~ 25	~ 0.48%	~150 acres	\$1,250 per acre	0.63%	\$187,500
b. Non-hazardous wastes	~ 100	~ 1.91%	~1,100 acres	\$300 per acre	1.00%	\$300,000
7. Land Treatment Units (based on footprint area)	~ 35	~ 0.67%	~1,500 acres	\$45 per acre	0.23%	\$67,500
8. Waste Piles (based on footprint area)	~ 20	~ 0.38%	? acres	assume \$3,200 each	0.21%	\$64,000
9. Mining waste discharges (based on disturbed acres not reclaimed)	~ 95	~ 1.81%	? acres	assume \$3,200 each	1.02%	\$304,000
10. Stormwater discharges [33 USC 1342(p)]						
a. Areawide urban (250,000 people or more)	~ 15	~ 0.29%	N/A	\$30,000 each	1.50%	\$450,000
b. Areawide urban (100,000 to 250,000 people)	Unknown	--	N/A	\$20,000 each	0.00%	\$0
c. Areawide urban (100,000 people or less)	Unknown	--	N/A	\$7,500 each	0.00%	\$0
d. "Industrial enrollees" in urban area	Unknown	--	N/A	\$250 per enrollee	0.75%	\$225,000
e. "Industrial enrollees" outside urban area	Unknown	--	N/A	\$500 per enrollee	0.75%	\$225,000
11. All other REGULATED discharges (excluded above)	~ 1,200	~ 22.92%	Unmeasurable	\$475 per WDR	1.91%	\$570,000
SUB-TOTAL: NEW POINT SOURCES WQ FEES						
	~ 5,235	100.00%			100.0%	\$29,904,750

ALTERNATIVE 2: NEW WATER QUALITY AND WATER RIGHTS FEES
 SCENARIO "A" -- REPLACE 75% GENERAL FUND
 FISCAL YEAR 1993-94

Preliminary Fee Category	Estimated Number of Fee Payers	Percent of Fee Payers	Estimated Total Volume (cfs or afa)	Fee Rate	Percent of Revenue	Estimated Revenue
B. DISCHARGES NOT REGULATED BY WDRS ("NON-POINT")						
12. Discharges from agricultural activities (in accordance with Inland Plan)	-58,868	~ 95.64%	7.6 M acres	\$60 plus \$0.35 per acre irrigated	73.67%	\$6,190,712
13. Discharges from other mining operations (also regulated by Dept of Conservation)	~ 908	~ 1.48%	Unknown	assume \$750 each	8.10%	\$681,000
14. Discharges from other landfills (those subject to SWAT provisions)	~ 1,775	~ 2.88%		assume \$750 each	15.84%	\$1,331,250
15. Dredging activities (CWA Section 404 certifications, etc.)	?	--	?	assume revenue amount and allocate fee somehow	1.19%	\$100,000
16. Onsite Septic Systems	?	--	?	" "	1.19%	\$100,000
SUB-TOTAL: NEW NONPOINT SOURCES WQ FEES						
	-61,551	100.00%			100.0%	\$8,402,962
C. JURISDICTIONAL WATER RIGHTS						
1. Permitted/licensed diversions: (includes Power & DWR; excludes USBR)						
a. 0 to 5 cubic feet per second	~ 3,600	~ 33.91%	2,200	\$135 for diversion	7.74%	\$486,000
b. More than 5 cubic feet per second	~ 842	~ 7.93%	203,700 cfs	\$135 plus \$10 per cubic feet per second	34.24%	\$2,150,670
2. Permitted/licensed storage: (includes Power & DWR; excludes USBR)						
a. 0 to 500 acre-feet per annum	~ 5,300	~ 49.93%	18,000	\$135 for storage	11.39%	\$715,500
b. More than 500 acre-feet per annum	~ 873	~ 8.22%	28,112,600 afa	\$135 plus \$0.10 per acre-feet per annum	46.63%	\$2,929,115
SUB-TOTALS for New Water Rights Fees:						
	-10,615	100.0%			100.0%	\$6,281,285
TOTALS: NEW Water Quality AND Water Rights Fees: -77,401						
						\$44,588,997
				Target Revenue for this scenario:		\$44,584,000
				Difference (surplus/deficit):		\$4,997

ALTERNATIVE 2: NEW WATER QUALITY AND WATER RIGHTS FEES
 SCENARIO "B" -- REPLACE 100% GENERAL FUND
 FISCAL YEAR 1993-94

Preliminary Fee Category	Estimated Number of Fee Payers	Percent of Fee Payers	Estimated Total Volume (MGD, liquids)	Fee Rate	Percent of Revenue	Estimated Revenue
A. DISCHARGES REGULATED BY WDRS ("POINT")						
1. Municipal (sewage) discharges (based on "permitted" average dry weather flow)	~ 1,750	~ 33.43%	3,030	\$440 plus \$4,400 per MGD > 0.1 MGD	41.11%	\$13,970,000
2. Industrial discharges (based on "permitted" design flow)	~ 1,450	~ 27.70%	475	\$880 plus \$8,800 per MGD > 0.1 MGD	16.06%	\$5,456,000
3. Cooling water discharges (based on "permitted" design flow)	~ 35	~ 0.67%	19,000	\$195 per MGD	10.90%	\$3,705,000
4. Landfills receiving waste (based on prior year volume received)	~ 335	~ 6.40%	~41 M tons/yr	\$0.18 per ton received (~20,000 acres)	21.72%	\$7,380,000
5. Landfills NOT receiving waste (based on footprint area)	~ 175	~ 3.34%	N/A	assume \$3,300 each	2.91%	\$990,000
6. Surface Impoundments (based on footprint area)						
a. Hazardous wastes	~ 25	~ 0.48%	~150 acres	\$1,500 per acre	0.66%	\$225,000
b. Non-hazardous wastes	~ 100	~ 1.91%	~1,100 acres	\$325 per acre	0.96%	\$325,000
7. Land Treatment Units (based on footprint area)	~ 35	~ 0.67%	~1,500 acres	\$50 per acre	0.22%	\$75,000
8. Waste Piles (based on footprint area)	~ 20	~ 0.38%	? acres	assume \$3,300 each	0.19%	\$66,000
9. Mining waste discharges (based on disturbed acres not reclaimed)	~ 95	~ 1.81%	? acres	assume \$3,300 each	0.92%	\$313,500
10. Stormwater discharges [33 USC 1342(p)]						
a. Areawide urban (250,000 people or more)	~ 15	~ 0.29%	N/A	\$35,000 each	1.55%	\$525,000
b. Areawide urban (100,000 to 250,000 people)	Unknown	--	N/A	\$20,000 each	0.00%	\$0
c. Areawide urban (100,000 people or less)	Unknown	--	N/A	\$10,000 each	0.00%	\$0
d. "Industrial enrollees" in urban area	Unknown	--	N/A	\$250 per enrollee	0.74%	\$250,000
e. "Industrial enrollees" outside urban area	Unknown	--	N/A	\$500 per enrollee	0.74%	\$250,000
11. All other REGULATED discharges (excluded above)	~ 1,200	~ 22.92%	Unmeasurable	\$375 per WDR	1.32%	\$450,000
SUB-TOTAL: NEW POINT SOURCES WQ FEES						
	~ 5,235	100.00%			100.0%	\$33,980,500

ALTERNATIVE 2: NEW WATER QUALITY AND WATER RIGHTS FEES
 SCENARIO "B" -- REPLACE 100% GENERAL FUND
 FISCAL YEAR 1993-94

Preliminary Fee Category	Estimated Number of Fee Payers	Percent of Fee Payers	Estimated Total Volume (cfs or afa)	Fee Rate	Percent of Revenue	Estimated Revenue
B. DISCHARGES NOT REGULATED BY WDRS ("NON-POINT")						
12. Discharges from agricultural activities (in accordance with Inland Plan)	-58,868	- 95.64%	7.6 M acres	\$100 plus \$0.32 per acre irrigated	73.93%	\$8,317,549
13. Discharges from other mining operations (also regulated by Dept of Conservation)	- 908	- 1.48%	Unknown	assume \$1,000 each	8.07%	\$908,000
14. Discharges from other landfills (those subject to SWAT provisions)	- 1,775	- 2.88%		assume \$1,000 each	15.78%	\$1,775,000
15. Dredging activities (CWA Section 404 certifications, etc.)	?	--	?	assume revenue amount and allocate fee somehow	1.11%	\$125,000
16. Onsite Septic Systems	?	--	?	" "	1.11%	\$125,000
SUB-TOTAL: NEW NONPOINT SOURCES WQ FEES						
	-61,551	100.00%			100.0%	\$11,250,549
C. JURISDICTIONAL WATER RIGHTS						
1. Permitted/licensed diversions: (includes Power & DWR; excludes USBR)						
a. 0 to 5 cubic feet per second	- 3,600	- 33.91%	2,200	\$140 for diversion	6.09%	\$504,000
b. More than 5 cubic feet per second	- 842	- 7.93%	203,700 cfs	\$140 plus \$14 per cubic feet per second	35.89%	\$2,969,680
2. Permitted/licensed storage: (includes Power & DWR; excludes USBR)						
a. 0 to 500 acre-feet per annum	- 5,300	- 49.93%	18,000	\$140 for storage	8.97%	\$742,000
b. More than 500 acre-feet per annum	- 873	- 8.22%	28,112,600 afa	\$140 plus \$0.14 per acre-feet per annum	49.05%	\$4,057,984
SUB-TOTALS for New Water Rights Fees:						
	-10,615	100.0%			100.0%	\$8,273,664
TOTALS: NEW Water Quality AND Water Rights Fees: -77,401						
						\$53,504,713
				Target Revenue for this scenario:		\$53,495,000
				Difference (surplus/deficit):		\$9,713

ALTERNATIVE 2: NEW WATER QUALITY AND WATER RIGHTS FEES
SCENARIO "C" -- REPLACE 100% GENERAL FUND AND REDUCE BACKLOGS
FISCAL YEAR 1993-94

Preliminary Fee Category	Estimated Number of Fee Payers	Percent of Fee Payers	Estimated Total Volume (MGD, liquids)	Fee Rate	Percent of Revenue	Estimated Revenue
A. DISCHARGES REGULATED BY WDRS ("POINT")						
1. Municipal (sewage) discharges (based on "permitted" average dry weather flow)	~ 1,750	~ 33.43%	3,030	\$480 plus \$4,800 per MGD > 0.1 MGD	40.85%	\$15,240,000
2. Industrial discharges (based on "permitted" design flow)	~ 1,450	~ 27.70%	475	\$960 plus \$9,600 per MGD > 0.1 MGD	15.95%	\$5,952,000
3. Cooling water discharges (based on "permitted" design flow)	~ 35	~ 0.67%	19,000	\$215 per MGD	10.95%	\$4,085,000
4. Landfills receiving waste (based on prior year volume received)	~ 335	~ 6.40%	-41 M tons/yr	\$0.20 per ton received (-20,000 acres)	21.98%	\$8,200,000
5. Landfills NOT receiving waste (based on footprint area)	~ 175	~ 3.34%	N/A	assume \$3,500 each	2.81%	\$1,050,000
6. Surface Impoundments (based on footprint area)						
a. Hazardous wastes	~ 25	~ 0.48%	-150 acres	\$1,750 per acre	0.70%	\$262,500
b. Non-hazardous wastes	~ 100	~ 1.91%	-1,100 acres	\$350 per acre	0.94%	\$350,000
7. Land Treatment Units (based on footprint area)	~ 35	~ 0.67%	-1,500 acres	\$60 per acre	0.24%	\$90,000
8. Waste Piles (based on footprint area)	~ 20	~ 0.38%	? acres	assume \$3,500 each	0.19%	\$70,000
9. Mining waste discharges (based on disturbed acres not reclaimed)	~ 95	~ 1.81%	? acres	assume \$3,500 each	0.89%	\$332,500
10. Stormwater discharges [33 USC 1342(p)]						
a. Areawide urban (250,000 people or more)	~ 15	~ 0.29%	N/A	\$35,000 each	1.41%	\$525,000
b. Areawide urban (100,000 to 250,000 people)	Unknown	--	N/A	\$20,000 each	0.00%	\$0
c. Areawide urban (100,000 people or less)	Unknown	--	N/A	\$10,000 each	0.00%	\$0
d. "Industrial enrollees" in urban area	Unknown	--	N/A	\$250 per enrollee	0.74%	\$275,000
e. "Industrial enrollees" outside urban area	Unknown	--	N/A	\$500 per enrollee	0.74%	\$275,000
11. All other REGULATED discharges (excluded above)	~ 1,200	~ 22.92%	Unmeasurable	\$500 per WDR	1.61%	\$600,000
=====						
SUB-TOTAL: NEW POINT SOURCES WQ FEES	~ 5,235	100.00%			100.0%	\$37,307,000
=====						

ALTERNATIVE 2: NEW WATER QUALITY AND WATER RIGHTS FEES
SCENARIO "C" -- REPLACE 100% GENERAL FUND AND REDUCE BACKLOGS
FISCAL YEAR 1993-94

Preliminary Fee Category	Estimated Number of Fee Payers	Percent of Fee Payers	Estimated Total Volume (cfs or afa)	Fee Rate	Percent of Revenue	Estimated Revenue
B. DISCHARGES NOT REGULATED BY WDRS ("NON-POINT")						
12. Discharges from agricultural activities (in accordance with Inland Plan)	~58,868	~ 95.64%	7.6 M acres	\$150 plus \$0.30 per acre irrigated	74.15%	\$11,109,027
13. Discharges from other mining operations (also regulated by Dept of Conservation)	~ 908	~ 1.48%	Unknown	assume \$1,350 each	8.18%	\$1,225,800
14. Discharges from other landfills (those subject to SWAT provisions)	~ 1,775	~ 2.88%		assume \$1,350 each	16.00%	\$2,396,250
15. Dredging activities (CWA Section 404 certifications, etc.)	?	--	?	assume revenue amount and allocate fee somehow	0.83%	\$125,000
16. Onsite Septic Systems	?	--	?	" "	0.83%	\$125,000
=====						
SUB-TOTAL: NEW NONPOINT SOURCES WQ FEES	~61,551	100.00%			100.0%	\$14,981,077
=====						
C. JURISDICTIONAL WATER RIGHTS						
1. Permitted/licensed diversions: (includes Power & DWR; excludes USBR)						
a. 0 to 5 cubic feet per second	~ 3,600	~ 33.91%	2,200	\$150 for diversion	5.78%	\$540,000
b. More than 5 cubic feet per second	~ 842	~ 7.93%	203,700 cfs	\$150 plus \$16 per cubic feet per second	36.21%	\$3,385,500
2. Permitted/licensed storage: (includes Power & DWR; excludes USBR)						
a. 0 to 500 acre-feet per annum	~ 5,300	~ 49.93%	18,000	\$150 for storage	8.50%	\$795,000
b. More than 500 acre-feet per annum	~ 873	~ 8.22%	28,112,600 afa	\$150 plus \$0.16 per acre-feet per annum	49.51%	\$4,628,966
=====						
SUB-TOTALS for New Water Rights Fees:	~10,615	100.0%			100.0%	\$9,349,466
=====						
TOTALS: NEW Water Quality AND Water Rights Fees: ~77,401						\$61,637,543
						=====
Target Revenue for this scenario:						\$61,635,000
Difference (surplus/deficit):						\$2,543

ALTERNATIVE 2: NEW WATER QUALITY AND WATER RIGHTS FEES
 SCENARIO "D" -- REPLACE 100% GENERAL FUND, REDUCE BACKLOGS, AND FUND NEW WORKLOAD
 FISCAL YEAR 1993-94

Preliminary Fee Category	Estimated Number of Fee Payers	Percent of Fee Payers	Estimated Total Volume (MGD, liquids)	Fee Rate	Percent of Revenue	Estimated Revenue
A. DISCHARGES REGULATED BY WDRS ("POINT")						
1. Municipal (sewage) discharges (based on "permitted" average dry weather flow)	~ 1,750	~ 33.43%	3,030	\$480 plus \$4,800 per MGD > 0.1 MGD	40.81%	\$15,240,000
2. Industrial discharges (based on "permitted" design flow)	~ 1,450	~ 27.70%	475	\$960 plus \$9,600 per MGD > 0.1 MGD	15.94%	\$5,952,000
3. Cooling water discharges (based on "permitted" design flow)	~ 35	~ 0.67%	19,000	\$215 per MGD	10.94%	\$4,085,000
4. Landfills receiving waste (based on prior year volume received)	~ 335	~ 6.40%	~41 M tons/yr	\$0.20 per ton received (~20,000 acres)	21.96%	\$8,200,000
5. Landfills NOT receiving waste (based on footprint area)	~ 175	~ 3.34%	N/A	assume \$3,500 each	2.81%	\$1,050,000
6. Surface Impoundments (based on footprint area)						
a. Hazardous wastes	~ 25	~ 0.48%	~150 acres	\$1,750 per acre	0.70%	\$262,500
b. Non-hazardous wastes	~ 100	~ 1.91%	~1,100 acres	\$350 per acre	0.94%	\$350,000
7. Land Treatment Units (based on footprint area)	~ 35	~ 0.67%	~1,500 acres	\$65 per acre	0.26%	\$97,500
8. Waste Piles (based on footprint area)	~ 20	~ 0.38%	? acres	assume \$3,500 each	0.19%	\$70,000
9. Mining waste discharges (based on disturbed acres not reclaimed)	~ 95	~ 1.81%	? acres	assume \$3,500 each	0.89%	\$332,500
10. Stormwater discharges [33 USC 1342(p)]						
a. Areawide urban (250,000 people or more)	~ 15	~ 0.29%	N/A	\$35,000 each	1.41%	\$525,000
b. Areawide urban (100,000 to 250,000 people)	Unknown	--	N/A	\$20,000 each	0.00%	\$0
c. Areawide urban (100,000 people or less)	Unknown	--	N/A	\$10,000 each	0.00%	\$0
d. "Industrial enrollees" in urban area	Unknown	--	N/A	\$250 per enrollee	0.74%	\$275,000
e. "Industrial enrollees" outside urban area	Unknown	--	N/A	\$500 per enrollee	0.74%	\$275,000
11. All other REGULATED discharges (excluded above)	~ 1,200	~ 22.92%	Unmeasurable	\$525 per WDR	1.69%	\$630,000
SUB-TOTAL: NEW POINT SOURCES WQ FEES						
	~ 5,235	100.00%			100.0%	\$37,344,500

ALTERNATIVE 2: NEW WATER QUALITY AND WATER RIGHTS FEES
SCENARIO "D" -- REPLACE 100% GENERAL FUND, REDUCE BACKLOGS, AND FUND NEW WORKLOAD
FISCAL YEAR 1993-94

Preliminary Fee Category	Estimated Number of Fee Payers	Percent of Fee Payers	Estimated Total Volume (cfs or afa)	Fee Rate	Percent of Revenue	Estimated Revenue
B. DISCHARGES NOT REGULATED BY WDRS ("NON-POINT")						
12. Discharges from agricultural activities (in accordance with Inland Plan)	~58,868	~ 95.64%	~ 7.6 M acres	\$175 plus \$0.50 per acre irrigated	74.89%	\$14,099,946
13. Discharges from other mining operations (also regulated by Dept of Conservation)	~ 908	~ 1.48%	Unknown	assume \$1,650 each	7.96%	\$1,498,200
14. Discharges from other landfills (those subject to SWAT provisions)	~ 1,775	~ 2.88%		assume \$1,650 each	15.56%	\$2,928,750
15. Dredging activities (CWA Section 404 certifications, etc.)	?	--	?	assume revenue amount and allocate fee somehow	0.80%	\$150,000
16. Onsite Septic Systems	?	--	?	" "	0.80%	\$150,000
=====						
SUB-TOTAL: NEW NONPOINT SOURCES WQ FEES	-61,551	100.00%			100.0%	\$18,826,896
=====						
C. JURISDICTIONAL WATER RIGHTS						
1. Permitted/licensed diversions: (includes Power & DWR; excludes USBR)						
a. 0 to 5 cubic feet per second	~ 3,600	~ 33.91%	2,200	\$150 for diversion	5.78%	\$540,000
b. More than 5 cubic feet per second	~ 842	~ 7.93%	203,700 cfs	\$150 plus \$16 per cubic feet per second	36.21%	\$3,385,500
2. Permitted/licensed storage: (includes Power & DWR; excludes USBR)						
a. 0 to 500 acre-feet per annum	~ 5,300	~ 49.93%	18,000	\$150 for storage	8.50%	\$795,000
b. More than 500 acre-feet per annum	~ 873	~ 8.22%	28,112,600 afa	\$150 plus \$0.16 per acre-feet per annum	49.51%	\$4,628,966
=====						
SUB-TOTALS for New Water Rights Fees:	-10,615	100.0%			100.0%	\$9,349,466
=====						
TOTALS: NEW Water Quality AND Water Rights Fees: -77,401						\$65,520,862
						=====
Target Revenue for this scenario:						\$65,519,000
Difference (surplus/deficit):						\$1,862

APPENDIX E

Estimated Fee Rates and Sample Amounts for Alternative 3 A Water Use Fee

This appendix summarizes the fee rate for different revenue scenarios shown in Table 9. It also illustrates some typical average household, farm, and industrial fee amounts based on historical data.

WATER

ALTERNATIVE 3: A NEW WATER USE FEE
ESTIMATED FEE RATES AND SAMPLE FEE AMOUNTS

Scenario	Estimated Annual Cost per Household (0.5 acre-feet/year/house) Fiscal Year 1992-93 1993-94	Estimated Annual Cost Average Irrigation Use (3 acre-feet/year/farm) Fiscal Year 1992-93 1993-94	Estimated Annual Cost Average Industrial Use (0.252 afa per employee) Fiscal Year 1992-93 1993-94
		[assume 129 acres]	[assume 100 employees]
A. Replace 75% of General Fund	\$0.50 \$0.66	\$386.01 \$507.47	\$25.14 \$33.04
B. Replace 100% of General Fund	\$0.63 \$0.79	\$485.45 \$608.90	\$31.61 \$39.65
C. Replace 100% of General Fund and reduce backlogs	\$0.74 \$0.91	\$576.28 \$701.55	\$37.53 \$45.68
D. Replace 100% of General Fund, reduce backlogs, and fund new workload	\$0.74 \$0.96	\$576.28 \$745.76	\$37.53 \$48.56

APPENDIX F

Estimated Fee Rates and Sample Amounts for Alternative 4 A Sewer Use Fee

This appendix summarizes the fee rate for different revenue scenarios shown in Table 9. It also illustrates some fee amounts for typical small, medium, and large POTW dischargers.

SEWER

ALTERNATIVE 4: A NEW SEWER USE FEE
ESTIMATED FEE RATES AND SAMPLE COMMUNITY AMOUNTS

Scenario	Estimated Annual Cost per Sewer User Fiscal Year 1992-93	Estimated Annual Cost Very Small Discharger (Lemon Cove 0.016 MGD) Fiscal Year 1992-93	Estimated Annual Cost Medium Discharger (Modesto 25.0 MGD) Fiscal Year 1992-93	Estimated Annual Cost Large Discharger (Sac Regional 181. MGD) Fiscal Year 1992-93
A. Replace 75% of General Fund	\$2.83	\$181	\$282,326	\$2,044,038
B. Replace 100% of General Fund	\$3.55	\$227	\$355,053	\$2,570,583
C. Replace 100% of General Fund and reduce backlogs	\$4.22	\$270	\$421,486	\$3,051,562
D. Replace 100% of General Fund, reduce backlogs, and fund new workload	\$4.22	\$270	\$421,486	\$3,051,562

APPENDIX G

Statewide Sewer User Charge Summary

This appendix summarizes statewide sewer user charge data collected during 1990 by the State Controller.

USER CHARGE SUMMARY

STATE WIDE

Prepared by: California State Water Resources Control Board
Division of Clean Water Programs

As of February 1, 1991

	NUMBER	AVERAGE	MEDIAN	RANGE		STD DEV
				LOW	HIGH	
TOTAL STATE	702	\$12.28	\$11.39	\$0.00	\$73.95	7.49
Pop <1000	168	\$15.48	\$14.00	\$0.00	\$73.95	9.74
Pop 1000-10000	259	\$12.30	\$11.00	\$0.00	\$51.00	7.19
Pop 10000-50000	168	\$11.01	\$9.60	\$0.00	\$28.68	5.38
Pop 50000-100000	48	\$9.84	\$9.59	\$0.00	\$19.61	3.93
Pop >100000	57	\$8.44	\$8.00	\$0.00	\$24.40	4.83
GRANT FUNDED	520	\$12.24	\$10.85	\$0.00	\$53.29	6.90
Pop <1000	84	\$16.60	\$15.00	\$2.25	\$53.29	8.92
Pop 1000-10000	195	\$12.80	\$11.00	\$0.00	\$51.00	6.87
Pop 10000-50000	147	\$11.00	\$9.60	\$0.00	\$28.68	5.35
Pop 50000-100000	40	\$10.12	\$12.00	\$0.00	\$19.61	3.92
Pop >100000	54	\$8.37	\$8.00	\$0.00	\$24.40	4.65
NON-GRANT FUNDED	182	\$12.31	\$10.00	\$0.00	\$73.95	8.98
Pop <1000	84	\$14.36	\$12.00	\$0.00	\$73.95	10.38
Pop 1000-10000	64	\$10.79	\$8.00	\$0.00	\$35.00	7.90
Pop 10000-50000	21	\$11.08	\$10.50	\$1.75	\$22.50	5.57
Pop 50000-100000	8	\$8.44	\$10.00	\$1.50	\$12.17	3.64
Pop >100000	3	\$9.82	\$7.95	\$2.10	\$19.42	7.19
TREATMENT LEVEL						
TOTAL						
Primary	108	\$11.69	\$10.50	\$0.00	\$37.00	7.50
Secondary	492	\$12.40	\$10.50	\$0.00	\$73.95	7.60
Advanced	102	\$12.20	\$10.50	\$3.00	\$34.00	6.89
GRANT FUNDED						
Primary	62	\$12.11	\$11.00	\$3.50	\$35.00	6.71
Secondary	376	\$12.41	\$11.00	\$0.00	\$53.29	6.99
Advanced	83	\$11.55	\$10.10	\$3.00	\$34.00	6.55
NON-GRANT FUNDED						
Primary	46	\$11.11	\$10.00	\$0.00	\$37.00	8.42
Secondary	117	\$12.34	\$10.00	\$0.00	\$73.95	9.30
Advanced	19	\$15.03	\$13.67	\$5.00	\$28.62	7.57

	NUMBER	AVERAGE	MEDIAN	RANGE		STD DEV
				LOW	HIGH	
NO AD VALOREM TAX	534	\$12.93	\$11.00	\$0.00	\$73.95	7.69
Pop <1000	122	\$17.25	\$15.00	\$3.03	\$73.95	10.02
Pop 1000-10000	199	\$12.71	\$11.00	\$2.00	\$51.00	7.41
Pop 10000-50000	133	\$10.88	\$9.58	\$0.00	\$28.68	5.36
Pop 50000-100000	42	\$9.99	\$9.59	\$1.50	\$19.61	3.59
Pop >100000	37	\$10.80	\$10.50	\$2.10	\$24.40	4.08
USE AD VALOREM TAX	167	\$10.10	\$9.18	\$0.00	\$28.00	6.38
Pop <1000	46	\$10.79	\$10.00	\$0.00	\$28.00	7.05
Pop 1000-10000	60	\$10.97	\$10.00	\$0.00	\$27.00	6.20
Pop 10000-50000	34	\$11.47	\$10.00	\$2.92	\$27.81	5.48
Pop 50000-100000	6	\$8.82	\$12.00	\$0.00	\$16.90	5.64
Pop >100000	20	\$4.07	\$4.08	\$0.00	\$13.52	2.51
CITIES	225	\$11.08	\$9.90	\$0.00	\$51.00	5.98
No Ad Valorem Tax O&M	212	\$10.91	\$9.80	\$0.00	\$51.00	5.95
Use Ad Valorem Tax O&M	13	\$13.80	\$11.75	\$5.75	\$27.81	5.93
Pay Debt Svc via U.C	136	\$11.33	\$9.90	\$0.00	\$51.00	5.99
No Debt via User Charge	87	\$10.78	\$10.00	\$1.50	\$35.00	5.98
DISTRICTS	476	\$12.81	\$13.25	\$0.00	\$73.95	8.06
No Ad Valorem Tax O&M	322	\$14.26	\$12.00	\$0.00	\$73.95	8.39
Use Ad Valorem Tax O&M	154	\$9.78	\$8.86	\$0.00	\$28.00	6.32
Pay Debt Svc via U.C	167	\$14.59	\$12.00	\$0.00	\$38.00	7.25
No Debt via User Charge	308	\$11.84	\$10.00	\$0.00	\$73.95	8.32

USER CHARGE SUMMARY

BY COUNTY

Prepared by: California State Water Resources Control Board
Division of Clean Water Programs

AS OF JULY 1, 1990

	No.	AVG	MEAN	RANGE	
				LOW	HI
ALAMEDA					
Total	9	\$9.95	\$10.65	\$2.92	\$14.75
Grant Funded	9	\$9.95	\$10.65	\$2.92	\$14.75
Non-Grant Funded	0	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Ad Valorem Tax	1	\$2.92	\$2.92	\$2.92	\$2.92
Non-Ad Valorem Tax	7	\$10.47	\$10.65	\$7.25	\$14.75
Primary Treatment	0	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Secondary Treatment	9	\$9.95	\$10.65	\$2.92	\$14.75
Advanced Treatment	0	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
ALPINE					
Total	3	\$17.83	\$18.78	\$14.70	\$20.00
Grant Funded	0	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Non-Grant Funded	3	\$17.83	\$18.78	\$14.70	\$20.00
Ad Valorem	0	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Non Ad-Valorem	3	\$17.83	\$18.78	\$14.70	\$20.00
Primary Treatment	0	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Secondary Treatment	2	\$19.39	\$20.00	\$18.78	\$20.00
Advanced Treatment	1	\$14.70	\$14.70	\$14.70	\$14.70
AMADOR					
Total	8	\$18.91	\$15.00	\$9.50	\$33.15
Grant Funded	7	\$18.56	\$15.00	\$9.50	\$33.15
Non-Grant Funded	1	\$21.35	\$21.35	\$21.35	\$21.35
Ad Valorem	0	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Non Ad-Valorem	8	\$18.96	\$21.35	\$9.50	\$33.15
Primary Treatment	1	\$15.00	\$15.00	\$15.00	\$15.00
Secondary Treatment	7	\$19.47	\$21.35	\$9.50	\$33.15
Advanced Treatment	0	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
BUTTE					
Total	7	\$6.17	\$7.00	\$0.00	\$10.70
Grant Funded	5	\$7.21	\$7.00	\$4.00	\$10.70
Non-Grant Funded	2	\$3.55	\$7.10	\$0.00	\$7.10
Ad Valorem	1	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Non Ad-Valorem	6	\$7.19	\$7.10	\$4.00	\$10.70
Primary Treatment	1	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Secondary Treatment	6	\$7.19	\$7.10	\$4.00	\$10.70
Advanced Treatment	0	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

	No.	AVG	MEAN	RANGE	
				LOW	HI
CALAVERAS					
Total	15	\$11.62	\$12.00	\$5.00	\$21.00
Grant Funded	9	\$12.71	\$12.00	\$9.00	\$21.00
Non-Grant Funded	6	\$10.00	\$12.00	\$5.00	\$16.00
Ad Valorem	5	\$10.20	\$9.50	\$5.00	\$16.00
Non Ad-Valorem	10	\$12.34	\$12.00	\$5.00	\$21.00
Primary Treatment	1	\$12.00	\$12.00	\$12.00	\$12.00
Secondary Treatment	12	\$11.18	\$11.50	\$5.00	\$21.00
Advanced Treatment	2	\$14.12	\$16.24	\$12.00	\$16.24
COLUSA					
Total	4	\$8.40	\$10.10	\$5.00	\$10.50
Grant Funded	3	\$9.53	\$10.10	\$8.00	\$10.50
Non-Grant Funded	1	\$5.00	\$5.00	\$5.00	\$5.00
Ad Valorem	0	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Non Ad-Valorem	4	\$8.40	\$10.10	\$5.00	\$10.50
Primary Treatment	2	\$7.75	\$10.50	\$5.00	\$10.50
Secondary Treatment	2	\$9.05	\$10.10	\$8.00	\$10.50
Advanced Treatment	0	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
CONTRA COSTA					
Total	15	\$10.74	\$9.67	\$5.50	\$28.68
Grant Funded	14	\$10.76	\$9.67	\$5.50	\$28.68
Non-Grant Funded	1	\$10.50	\$10.50	\$10.50	\$10.50
Ad Valorem	6	\$10.50	\$12.00	\$5.50	\$15.00
Non Ad-Valorem	9	\$10.90	\$9.50	\$6.71	\$28.62
Primary Treatment	0	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Secondary Treatment	15	\$10.74	\$9.67	\$5.50	\$28.68
Advanced Treatment	0	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
DEL NORTE					
Total	1	\$8.90	\$8.90	\$8.90	\$8.90
Grant Funded	1	\$8.90	\$8.90	\$8.90	\$8.90
Non Grant Funded	0	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Ad Valorem	0	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Non Ad-Valorem	1	\$8.90	\$8.90	\$8.90	\$8.90
Primary Treatment	0	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Secondary Treatment	1	\$8.90	\$8.90	\$8.90	\$8.90
Advanced Treatment	0	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
EL DORADO					
Total	4	\$14.06	\$14.70	\$6.25	\$20.28
Grant Funded	3	\$16.66	\$15.00	\$14.70	\$20.28
Non-Grant Funded	1	\$6.25	\$6.25	\$6.25	\$6.25
Ad Valorem	2	\$17.49	\$20.28	\$14.70	\$20.28
Non Ad-Valorem	2	\$10.63	\$15.00	\$6.25	\$15.00
Primary Treatment	1	\$6.25	\$6.25	\$6.25	\$6.25
Secondary Treatment	3	\$16.66	\$15.00	\$14.70	\$20.28
Advanced Treatment	0	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

	No.	AVG	MEAN	RANGE	
				LOW	HI
FRESNO					
Total	30	\$10.27	\$10.00	\$3.03	\$35.00
Grant Funded	15	\$11.65	\$10.00	\$4.37	\$35.00
Non-Grant Funded	15	\$8.90	\$8.00	\$3.03	\$22.48
Ad Valorem	5	\$9.85	\$11.50	\$4.50	\$12.00
Non Ad-Valorem	25	\$10.36	\$9.80	\$3.03	\$35.00
Primary Treatment	7	\$10.79	\$8.00	\$3.03	\$35.00
Secondary Treatment	21	\$10.28	\$10.20	\$4.37	\$22.48
Advanced Treatment	2	\$8.38	\$11.50	\$5.25	\$11.50
GLENN					
Total	2	\$8.00	\$8.00	\$4.00	\$8.00
Grant Funded	0	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Non-Grant Funded	2	\$6.00	\$8.00	\$4.00	\$8.00
Ad Valorem	0	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Non Ad-Valorem	2	\$6.00	\$8.00	\$4.00	\$8.00
Primary Treatment	0	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Secondary Treatment	2	\$6.00	\$8.00	\$4.00	\$8.00
Advanced Treatment	0	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
HUMBOLDT					
Total	17	\$13.73	\$12.00	\$8.00	\$24.00
Grant Funded	16	\$14.03	\$14.25	\$8.00	\$24.00
Non-Grant Funded	1	\$9.00	\$9.00	\$9.00	\$9.00
Ad Valorem	2	\$10.88	\$13.75	\$8.00	\$13.75
Non Ad-Valorem	15	\$14.11	\$14.25	\$9.00	\$24.00
Primary Treatment	1	\$15.00	\$15.00	\$15.00	\$15.00
Secondary Treatment	16	\$13.65	\$13.75	\$8.00	\$24.00
Advanced Treatment	0	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
IMPERIAL					
Total	12	\$11.09	\$125.50	\$5.00	\$16.50
Grant Funded	12	\$11.09	\$12.50	\$5.00	\$16.50
Non-Grant Funded	0	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Ad Valorem	2	\$11.75	\$12.50	\$11.00	\$12.50
Non Ad-Valorem	10	\$10.96	\$12.50	\$5.00	\$16.50
Primary Treatment	3	\$8.17	\$7.00	\$5.00	\$12.50
Secondary Treatment	8	\$12.01	\$12.58	\$7.26	\$16.50
Advanced Treatment	1	\$12.50	\$12.50	\$12.50	\$12.50
INYO					
Total	4	\$6.13	\$7.28	\$3.00	\$9.00
Grant Funded	4	\$6.13	\$7.28	\$3.00	\$9.00
Non-Grant Funded	0	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Ad Valorem	0	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Non Ad-Valorem	4	\$6.13	\$7.28	\$3.00	\$9.00
Primary Treatment	0	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Secondary Treatment	4	\$6.13	\$7.28	\$3.00	\$9.00
Advanced Treatment	0	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

	No.	AVG	MEAN	RANGE	
				LOW	HI
KERN					
Total	22	\$7.73	\$7.10	\$3.00	\$15.00
Grant Funded	13	\$7.42	\$7.35	\$3.00	\$15.00
Non-Grant Funded	9	\$8.17	\$7.00	\$4.60	\$12.00
Ad Valorem	2	\$8.30	\$12.00	\$4.60	\$12.00
Non Ad-Valorem	20	\$7.67	\$7.35	\$3.00	\$15.00
Primary Treatment	6	\$7.30	\$6.25	\$4.20	\$15.00
Secondary Treatment	16	\$7.89	\$10.00	\$3.00	\$12.00
Advanced Treatment	0	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
KINGS					
Total	6	\$10.96	\$8.50	\$7.80	\$21.00
Grant Funded	5	\$8.95	\$8.45	\$7.80	\$12.00
Non-Grant Funded	1	\$21.00	\$21.00	\$21.00	\$21.00
Ad Valorem	0	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Non Ad-Valorem	6	\$10.96	\$8.50	\$7.80	\$21.00
Primary Treatment	2	\$8.15	\$8.50	\$7.80	\$8.50
Secondary Treatment	3	\$13.63	\$8.00	\$8.00	\$21.00
Advanced Treatment	1	\$8.45	\$8.45	\$8.45	\$8.45
LAKE					
Total	7	\$12.95	\$12.60	\$8.15	\$17.00
Grant Funded	6	\$12.28	\$12.60	\$8.15	\$17.00
Non-Grant Funded	1	\$17.00	\$17.00	\$17.00	\$17.00
Ad Valorem	2	\$13.50	\$17.00	\$10.00	\$17.00
Non Ad-Valorem	5	\$12.73	\$12.60	\$8.15	\$17.00
Primary Treatment	0	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Secondary Treatment	7	\$12.95	\$12.60	\$8.15	\$17.00
Advanced Treatment	0	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
LASSEN					
Total	5	\$21.32	\$21.00	\$5.60	\$38.00
Grant Funded	2	\$13.30	\$21.00	\$5.60	\$21.00
Non-Grant Funded	3	\$26.67	\$28.00	\$14.00	\$38.00
Ad Valorem	0	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Non Ad-Valorem	5	\$21.32	\$21.00	\$5.60	\$38.00
Primary Treatment	2	\$24.50	\$28.00	\$21.00	\$28.00
Secondary Treatment	3	\$19.20	\$14.00	\$5.60	\$38.00
Advanced Treatment	0	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
LOS ANGELES					
Total	39	\$10.58	\$4.50	\$0.00	\$73.95
Grant Funded	33	\$8.99	\$4.50	\$0.00	\$53.29
Non-Grant Funded	6	\$19.20	\$5.55	\$1.50	\$73.95
Ad Valorem	24	\$6.35	\$4.25	\$0.00	\$25.83
Non Ad-Valorem	15	\$17.31	\$11.25	\$6.59	\$73.95
Primary Treatment	0	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Secondary Treatment	20	\$14.53	\$11.00	\$0.00	\$73.95
Advanced Treatment	19	\$6.38	\$4.25	\$3.00	\$28.62

	No.	AVG	MEAN	RANGE	
				LOW	HI
MADERA					
Total	14	\$10.62	\$10.00	\$2.25	\$20.50
Grant Funded	6	\$8.64	\$9.77	\$2.25	\$20.50
Non-Grant Funded	8	\$11.34	\$13.50	\$3.75	\$18.00
Ad Valorem	8	\$8.67	\$7.85	\$2.25	\$20.50
Non Ad-Valorem	6	\$13.21	\$14.65	\$7.10	\$18.00
Primary Treatment	2	\$14.08	\$14.65	\$13.50	\$14.65
Secondary Treatment	12	\$10.04	\$9.77	\$2.25	\$20.50
Advanced Treatment	0	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
MARIN					
Total	21	\$13.77	\$11.85	\$6.61	\$35.00
Grant Funded	18	\$13.97	\$13.25	\$6.61	\$35.00
Non-Grant Funded	3	\$12.58	\$8.33	\$7.17	\$22.25
Ad Valorem	15	\$12.69	\$11.67	\$6.83	\$22.25
Non Ad-Valorem	6	\$16.48	\$16.33	\$6.61	\$35.00
Primary Treatment	1	\$35.00	\$35.00	\$35.00	\$35.00
Secondary Treatment	16	\$13.30	\$11.85	\$6.37	\$22.25
Advanced Treatment	4	\$10.35	\$13.25	\$6.83	\$13.25
MARIPOSA					
Total	1	\$10.00	\$10.00	\$10.00	\$10.00
Grant Funded	1	\$10.00	\$10.00	\$10.00	\$10.00
Non-Grant Funded	0	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Ad Valorem	0	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Non Ad-Valorem	1	\$10.00	\$10.00	\$10.00	\$10.00
Primary Treatment	0	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Secondary Treatment	1	\$10.00	\$10.00	\$10.00	\$10.00
Advanced Treatment	0	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
MENDOCINO					
Total	10	\$11.66	\$11.00	\$6.60	\$18.00
Grant Funded	9	\$12.18	\$11.00	\$6.60	\$18.00
Non-Grant Funded	1	\$7.00	\$7.00	\$7.00	\$7.00
Ad Valorem	3	\$11.87	\$10.10	\$7.50	\$18.00
Non Ad-Valorem	7	\$11.58	\$11.00	\$6.60	\$18.00
Primary Treatment	3	\$14.65	\$15.00	\$11.00	\$18.00
Secondary Treatment	5	\$11.11	\$11.00	\$6.60	\$18.00
Advanced Treatment	2	\$8.55	\$10.10	\$7.00	\$10.10
MERCED					
Total	14	\$10.32	\$10.22	\$5.25	\$17.00
Grant Funded	11	\$10.50	\$10.22	\$5.25	\$17.00
Non-Grant Funded	3	\$9.67	\$10.00	\$7.50	\$11.50
Ad Valorem	4	\$8.15	\$8.50	\$6.60	\$10.00
Non Ad-Valorem	10	\$11.19	\$12.00	\$5.25	\$17.00
Primary Treatment	3	\$10.00	\$10.00	\$8.50	\$11.50
Secondary Treatment	11	\$10.41	\$10.22	\$5.25	\$17.00
Advanced Treatment	0	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

	No.	AVG	MEAN	RANGE	
				LOW	HI
MODOC					
Total	4	\$9.95	\$13.50	\$0.00	\$16.00
Grant Funded	3	\$13.27	\$13.50	\$10.30	\$16.00
Non-Grant Funded	1	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Ad Valorem	1	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Non Ad-Valorem	3	\$13.27	\$13.50	\$10.30	\$16.00
Primary Treatment	0	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Secondary Treatment	4	\$9.95	\$13.50	\$0.00	\$16.00
Advanced Treatment	0	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
MONO					
Total	4	\$10.53	\$12.10	\$7.00	\$16.00
Grant Funded	3	\$11.70	\$12.10	\$7.00	\$16.00
Non-Grant Funded	1	\$7.00	\$7.00	\$7.00	\$7.00
Ad Valorem	1	\$7.00	\$7.00	\$7.00	\$7.00
Non Ad-Valorem	3	\$11.70	\$12.10	\$7.00	\$16.00
Primary Treatment	1	\$7.00	\$7.00	\$7.00	\$7.00
Secondary Treatment	3	\$11.70	\$12.10	\$7.00	\$16.00
Advanced Treatment	0	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
MONTEREY					
Total	25	\$13.05	\$11.34	\$4.50	\$30.00
Grant Funded	17	\$11.75	\$9.39	\$4.50	\$30.00
Non-Grant Funded	8	\$15.81	\$16.67	\$5.48	\$28.00
Ad Valorem	5	\$12.95	\$9.39	\$8.00	\$26.83
Non Ad-Valorem	20	\$13.07	\$12.00	\$4.50	\$30.00
Primary Treatment	6	\$12.26	\$11.39	\$5.48	\$21.50
Secondary Treatment	17	\$11.77	\$9.39	\$4.50	\$30.00
Advanced Treatment	2	\$26.25	\$28.00	\$24.50	\$28.00
NAPA					
Total	11	\$12.23	\$12.00	\$5.00	\$25.00
Grant Funded	8	\$13.45	\$12.00	\$5.31	\$25.00
Non-Grant Funded	3	\$9.00	\$10.00	\$5.00	\$12.00
Ad Valorem	4	\$10.33	\$12.00	\$5.31	\$12.00
Non Ad-Valorem	7	\$13.32	\$11.00	\$5.00	\$25.00
Primary Treatment	3	\$9.00	\$10.00	\$5.00	\$12.00
Secondary Treatment	6	\$14.59	\$16.50	\$5.31	\$25.00
Advanced Treatment	2	\$10.00	\$11.00	\$9.00	\$11.00
NEVADA					
Total	4	\$18.13	\$14.50	\$8.00	\$39.00
Grant Funded	4	\$8.13	\$14.50	\$8.00	\$39.00
Non-Grant Funded	0	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Ad Valorem	1	\$14.50	\$14.50	\$14.50	\$14.50
Non Ad-Valorem	3	\$19.33	\$11.00	\$8.00	\$39.00
Primary Treatment	0	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Secondary Treatment	3	\$21.50	\$14.50	\$11.00	\$39.00
Advanced Treatment	1	\$8.00	\$8.00	\$8.00	\$8.00

	No.	AVG	MEAN	RANGE	
				LOW	HI
ORANGE					
Total	22	\$6.97	\$4.00	\$0.00	\$22.00
Grant Funded	18	\$7.29	\$4.00	\$0.00	\$22.00
Non-Grant Funded	6	\$6.13	\$7.95	\$0.00	\$14.50
Ad Valorem	12	\$3.44	\$3.33	\$0.00	\$14.50
Non Ad-Valorem	10	\$11.21	\$11.00	\$3.30	\$22.00
Primary Treatment	1	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Secondary Treatment	17	\$5.65	\$3.75	\$0.00	\$22.00
Advanced Treatment	4	\$14.33	\$14.50	\$7.95	\$21.00
PLACER					
Total	31	\$15.48	\$13.50	\$0.00	\$28.00
Grant Funded	17	\$16.38	\$13.50	\$8.00	\$28.00
Non-Grant Funded	14	\$14.40	\$14.00	\$0.00	\$27.40
Ad Valorem	8	\$16.79	\$21.35	\$0.00	\$28.00
Non Ad-Valorem	23	\$15.03	\$13.50	\$6.25	\$28.00
Primary Treatment	4	\$8.75	\$11.00	\$0.00	\$16.00
Secondary Treatment	18	\$14.65	\$13.50	\$6.25	\$28.00
Advanced Treatment	9	\$20.13	\$21.35	\$9.50	\$28.00
PLUMAS					
Total	4	\$10.04	\$11.76	\$4.65	\$12.00
Grant Funded	3	\$9.39	\$11.75	\$4.65	\$11.76
Non-Grant Funded	1	\$12.00	\$12.00	\$12.00	\$12.00
Ad Valorem	4	\$10.04	\$11.76	\$4.65	\$12.00
Non Ad-Valorem	0	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Primary Treatment	1	\$11.75	\$11.75	\$11.75	\$11.75
Secondary Treatment	3	\$9.47	\$11.76	\$4.65	\$12.00
Advanced Treatment	0	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
RIVERSIDE					
Total	26	\$11.95	\$10.00	\$1.75	\$27.00
Grant Funded	16	\$10.22	\$9.30	\$4.17	\$17.01
Non-Grant Funded	10	\$14.72	\$18.20	\$1.75	\$27.00
Ad Valorem	7	\$11.14	\$8.00	\$8.00	\$25.00
Non Ad-Valorem	19	\$12.25	\$10.45	\$1.75	\$27.00
Primary Treatment	2	\$10.10	\$18.20	\$2.00	\$18.20
Secondary Treatment	19	\$12.78	\$10.45	\$1.75	\$27.00
Advanced Treatment	5	\$9.53	\$9.00	\$4.17	\$15.50
SACRAMENTO					
Total	8	\$10.68	\$11.41	\$7.00	\$14.75
Grant Funded	7	\$10.10	\$9.85	\$7.00	\$13.25
Non-Grant Funded	1	\$14.75	\$14.75	\$14.75	\$14.75
Ad Valorem	0	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Non Ad-Valorem	8	\$10.68	\$11.41	\$7.00	\$14.75
Primary Treatment	1	\$7.00	\$7.00	\$7.00	\$7.00
Secondary Treatment	6	\$10.62	\$11.41	\$17.45	\$13.25
Advanced Treatment	1	\$14.75	\$14.75	\$14.75	\$14.75

	No.	AVG	MEAN	RANGE	
				LOW	HI
SAN BENITO					
Total	4	\$11.46	\$16.00	\$3.82	\$16.00
Grant Funded	2	\$9.91	\$16.00	\$3.82	\$16.00
Non-Grant Funded	2	\$13.00	\$16.00	\$16.00	\$16.00
Ad Valorem	0	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Non Ad-Valorem	4	\$11.46	\$16.00	\$3.82	\$16.00
Primary Treatment	3	\$9.94	\$10.00	\$3.82	\$16.00
Secondary Treatment	1	\$16.00	\$16.00	\$16.00	\$16.00
Advanced Treatment	0	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
SAN BERNARDINO					
Total	37	\$9.68	\$8.86	\$4.30	\$27.23
Grant Funded	28	\$9.02	\$8.50	\$4.30	\$14.30
Non-Grant Funded	9	\$11.73	\$9.00	\$8.50	\$27.23
Ad Valorem	7	\$8.83	\$8.86	\$4.30	\$14.29
Non Ad-Valorem	30	\$9.87	\$8.70	\$4.80	\$27.23
Primary Treatment	2	\$7.23	\$8.80	\$5.67	\$8.80
Secondary Treatment	27	\$10.08	\$8.86	\$4.80	\$27.23
Advanced Treatment	8	\$8.87	\$9.00	\$4.30	\$14.05
SAN DIEGO					
Total	37	\$16.55	\$13.52	\$5.00	\$37.00
Grant Funded	25	\$16.67	\$14.57	\$7.30	\$30.25
Non-Grant Funded	12	\$16.30	\$12.65	\$5.00	\$37.00
Ad Valorem	4	\$15.56	\$16.70	\$5.00	\$27.00
Non Ad-Valorem	33	\$16.67	\$13.50	\$7.08	\$37.00
Primary Treatment	15	\$15.25	\$13.00	\$7.08	\$37.00
Secondary Treatment	14	\$17.23	\$14.25	\$8.25	\$30.00
Advanced Treatment	8	\$17.81	\$20.65	\$5.00	\$30.25
SAN FRANCISCO					
Total	1	\$10.89	\$10.89	\$10.89	\$10.89
Grant Funded	1	\$10.89	\$10.89	\$10.89	\$10.89
Non-Grant Funded	0	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Ad Valorem	0	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Non Ad-Valorem	1	\$10.89	\$10.89	\$10.89	\$10.89
Primary Treatment	0	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Secondary Treatment	1	\$10.89	\$10.89	\$10.89	\$10.89
Advanced Treatment	0	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
SAN JOAQUIN					
Total	11	\$10.43	\$9.18	\$3.00	\$23.33
Grant Funded	8	\$9.90	\$9.90	\$3.50	\$22.50
Non-Grant Funded	2	\$11.84	\$9.18	\$3.00	\$23.33
Ad Valorem	5	\$9.35	\$7.73	\$3.00	\$23.33
Non Ad-Valorem	6	\$11.33	\$10.15	\$6.00	\$22.50
Primary Treatment	3	\$4.17	\$3.50	\$3.00	\$6.00
Secondary Treatment	6	\$13.97	\$10.15	\$8.78	\$23.33
Advanced Treatment	2	\$9.18	\$10.63	\$7.73	\$10.63

	No.	AVG	MEAN	RANGE	
				LOW	HI
SAN LUIS OBISPO					
Total	19	\$11.93	\$10.40	\$3.50	\$25.60
Grant Funded	12	\$13.34	\$10.54	\$3.50	\$25.60
Non-Grant Funded	7	\$9.51	\$6.50	\$6.00	\$14.80
Ad Valorem	3	\$8.93	\$6.00	\$6.00	\$14.80
Non Ad-Valorem	16	\$12.49	\$10.54	\$3.50	\$25.60
Primary Treatment	2	\$13.75	\$24.00	\$13.50	\$24.00
Secondary Treatment	17	\$11.72	\$10.40	\$6.00	\$25.60
Advanced Treatment	0	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
SAN MATEO					
Total	24	\$16.48	\$17.25	\$7.35	\$28.00
Grant Funded	22	\$16.61	\$17.25	\$7.35	\$28.00
Non-Grant Funded	2	\$15.09	\$18.00	\$12.17	\$18.00
Ad Valorem	2	\$25.16	\$27.81	\$22.50	\$27.81
Non Ad-Valorem	22	\$15.69	\$14.50	\$7.35	\$28.00
Primary Treatment	0	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Secondary Treatment	20	\$16.94	\$17.33	\$7.35	\$28.00
Advanced Treatment	4	\$14.16	\$12.42	\$9.96	\$22.08
SANTA BARBARA					
Total	15	\$14.49	\$14.00	\$6.34	\$28.95
Grant Funded	10	\$11.86	\$10.25	\$6.34	\$20.64
Non-Grant Funded	5	\$19.76	\$20.00	\$7.50	\$28.95
Ad Valorem	2	\$17.17	\$20.00	\$14.33	\$20.00
Non Ad-Valorem	13	\$14.08	\$10.50	\$6.34	\$28.95
Primary Treatment	0	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Secondary Treatment	14	\$15.07	\$14.00	\$7.50	\$28.95
Advanced Treatment	1	\$6.34	\$6.34	\$6.34	\$6.34
SANTA CLARA					
Total	14	\$12.18	\$10.89	\$6.62	\$19.61
Grant Funded	13	\$12.07	\$10.34	\$6.62	\$19.61
Non-Grant Funded	1	\$13.67	\$13.67	\$13.67	\$13.67
Ad Valorem	1	\$16.90	\$16.90	\$16.90	\$16.90
Non Ad-Valorem	13	\$11.82	\$10.34	\$6.62	\$19.61
Primary Treatment	0	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Secondary Treatment	6	\$12.01	\$10.34	\$9.20	\$18.41
Advanced Treatment	8	\$12.31	\$13.67	\$6.62	\$19.61
SANTA CRUZ					
Total	4	\$21.43	\$19.50	\$6.71	\$51.00
Grant Funded	3	\$22.07	\$8.49	\$6.71	\$51.00
Non-Grant Funded	1	\$19.50	\$19.50	\$19.50	\$19.50
Ad Valorem	0	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Non Ad-Valorem	4	\$21.43	\$19.50	\$6.71	\$51.00
Primary Treatment	2	\$13.11	\$19.50	\$6.71	\$19.50
Secondary Treatment	1	\$51.00	\$51.00	\$51.00	\$51.00
Advanced Treatment	1	\$8.49	\$8.49	\$8.49	\$8.49

	No.	AVG	MEAN	RANGE	
				LOW	HI
SHASTA					
Total	9	\$13.67	\$14.00	\$11.00	\$16.00
Grant Funded	8	\$13.50	\$14.00	\$11.00	\$16.00
Non-Grant Funded	1	\$15.00	\$15.00	\$15.00	\$15.00
Ad Valorem	1	\$14.43	\$14.43	\$14.43	\$14.43
Non Ad-Valorem	8	\$13.58	\$14.00	\$11.00	\$16.00
Primary Treatment	3	\$14.28	\$15.00	\$11.85	\$16.00
Secondary Treatment	4	\$13.55	\$14.43	\$11.00	\$14.75
Advanced Treatment	2	\$13.00	\$14.00	\$12.00	\$14.00
SIERRA					
Total	1	\$8.00	\$8.00	\$8.00	\$8.00
Grant Funded	0	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Non-Grant Funded	1	\$8.00	\$8.00	\$8.00	\$8.00
Ad Valorem	0	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Non Ad-Valorem	1	\$8.00	\$8.00	\$8.00	\$8.00
Primary Treatment	0	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Secondary Treatment	1	\$8.00	\$8.00	\$8.00	\$8.00
Advanced Treatment	0	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
SISKIYOU					
Total	9	\$12.63	\$9.00	\$2.50	\$35.00
Grant Funded	8	\$9.83	\$9.00	\$2.50	\$21.00
Non-Grant Funded	1	\$35.00	\$35.00	\$35.00	\$35.00
Ad Valorem	0	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Non Ad-Valorem	9	\$12.63	\$9.00	\$2.50	\$35.00
Primary Treatment	3	\$20.67	\$21.00	\$6.00	\$35.00
Secondary Treatment	6	\$8.61	\$9.00	\$2.50	\$13.95
Advanced Treatment	0	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
SOLANO					
Total	6	\$14.39	\$13.40	\$6.50	\$28.40
Grant Funded	5	\$15.97	\$13.40	\$9.80	\$28.40
Non-Grant Funded	1	\$6.50	\$6.50	\$6.50	\$6.50
Ad Valorem	0	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Non Ad-Valorem	6	\$14.39	\$13.40	\$6.50	\$28.40
Primary Treatment	0	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Secondary Treatment	5	\$14.59	\$12.25	\$6.50	\$28.40
Advanced Treatment	1	\$13.40	\$13.40	\$13.40	\$13.40
SONOMA					
Total	21	\$19.60	\$18.92	\$5.75	\$36.50
Grant Funded	20	\$19.56	\$18.92	\$5.75	\$36.50
Non-Grant Funded	1	\$20.50	\$20.50	\$20.50	\$20.50
Ad Valorem	2	\$9.13	\$12.50	\$5.75	\$12.50
Non Ad-Valorem	19	\$20.71	\$20.17	\$8.75	\$36.50
Primary Treatment	2	\$19.71	\$20.50	\$18.92	\$20.50
Secondary Treatment	15	\$19.55	\$20.17	\$5.75	\$36.50
Advanced Treatment	4	\$19.74	\$17.00	\$12.50	\$34.00

	No.	AVG	MEAN	RANGE	
				LOW	HI
STANISLAUS					
Total	14	\$8.05	\$6.50	\$3.00	\$22.75
Grant Funded	12	\$8.73	\$7.00	\$3.50	\$22.75
Non-Grant Funded	2	\$4.00	\$5.00	\$3.00	\$5.00
Ad Valorem	4	\$11.70	\$14.54	\$3.50	\$22.75
Non Ad-Valorem	10	\$6.59	\$6.50	\$3.00	\$11.10
Primary Treatment	3	\$6.17	\$6.00	\$5.50	\$7.00
Secondary Treatment	11	\$8.57	\$6.50	\$3.00	\$22.75
Advanced Treatment	0	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
SUTTER					
Total	3	\$7.82	\$10.75	\$0.00	\$12.70
Grant Funded	2	\$11.73	\$12.70	\$10.75	\$12.70
Non-Grant Funded	1	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Ad Valorem	1	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Non Ad-Valorem	2	\$11.73	\$12.70	\$10.75	\$12.70
Primary Treatment	2	\$6.35	\$12.70	\$0.00	\$12.70
Secondary Treatment	1	\$10.75	\$10.75	\$10.75	\$10.75
Advanced Treatment	0	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
TEHAMA					
Total	4	\$9.42	\$10.00	\$5.50	\$12.60
Grant Funded	3	\$9.23	\$9.58	\$5.50	\$12.60
Non-Grant Funded	1	\$10.00	\$10.00	\$10.00	\$10.00
Ad Valorem	1	\$10.00	\$10.00	\$10.00	\$10.00
Non Ad-Valorem	3	\$9.23	\$9.58	\$5.50	\$12.60
Primary Treatment	0	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Secondary Treatment	2	\$9.05	\$12.60	\$5.50	\$12.60
Advanced Treatment	2	\$9.79	\$10.00	\$9.58	\$10.00
TRINITY					
Total	1	\$13.00	\$13.00	\$13.00	\$13.00
Grant Funded	1	\$13.00	\$13.00	\$13.00	\$13.00
Non-Grant Funded	0	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Ad Valorem	0	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Non Ad-Valorem	1	\$13.00	\$13.00	\$13.00	\$13.00
Primary Treatment	0	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Secondary Treatment	1	\$13.00	\$13.00	\$13.00	\$13.00
Advanced Treatment	0	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
TULARE					
Total	26	\$11.19	\$8.00	\$4.50	\$28.35
Grant Funded	15	\$11.46	\$9.00	\$4.50	\$28.35
Non-Grant Funded	11	\$10.83	\$7.00	\$4.50	\$27.42
Ad Valorem	4	\$9.50	\$9.00	\$4.50	\$17.50
Non Ad-Valorem	22	\$11.50	\$8.00	\$4.50	\$28.35
Primary Treatment	6	\$10.57	\$8.00	\$4.50	\$27.42
Secondary Treatment	20	\$11.38	\$9.00	\$4.50	\$28.35
Advanced Treatment	0	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

	No.	AVG	MEAN	RANGE	
				LOW	HI
TUOLUMNE					
Total	6	\$13.30	\$15.00	\$8.50	\$19.83
Grant Funded	5	\$14.28	\$15.00	\$8.50	\$19.83
Non-Grant Funded	1	\$8.50	\$8.50	\$8.50	\$8.50
Ad Valorem	1	\$15.00	\$15.00	\$15.00	\$15.00
Non Ad-Valorem	5	\$12.96	\$10.50	\$8.50	\$19.83
Primary Treatment	1	\$10.50	\$10.50	\$10.50	\$10.50
Secondary Treatment	5	\$13.88	\$15.00	\$8.50	\$19.83
Advanced Treatment	0	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
VENTURA					
Total	17	\$13.13	\$10.50	\$1.05	\$33.90
Grant Funded	13	\$13.91	\$10.63	\$1.05	\$33.90
Non-Grant Funded	4	\$10.60	\$8.66	\$8.00	\$16.15
Ad Valorem	4	\$10.88	\$10.63	\$8.00	\$16.15
Non Ad-Valorem	13	\$13.83	\$10.50	\$1.05	\$33.90
Primary Treatment	1	\$8.00	\$8.00	\$8.00	\$8.00
Secondary Treatment	12	\$13.42	\$10.63	\$1.05	\$33.90
Advanced Treatment	4	\$13.57	\$16.55	\$10.22	\$17.00
YOLO					
Total	7	\$13.72	\$10.85	\$7.00	\$25.38
Grant Funded	6	\$14.67	\$17.00	\$7.00	\$25.38
Non-Grant Funded	1	\$8.00	\$8.00	\$8.00	\$8.00
Ad Valorem	1	\$17.00	\$17.00	\$17.00	\$17.00
Non Ad-Valorem	6	\$13.17	\$10.85	\$7.00	\$25.38
Primary Treatment	4	\$13.96	\$17.00	\$8.00	\$20.00
Secondary Treatment	3	\$13.39	\$7.80	\$7.00	\$25.38
Advanced Treatment	0	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
YUBA					
Total	3	\$7.72	\$8.05	\$6.10	\$9.00
Grant Funded	2	\$8.52	\$9.00	\$8.05	\$9.00
Non-Grant	1	\$6.10	\$6.10	\$6.10	\$6.10
Ad Valorem	0	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Non Ad-Valorem	3	\$7.72	\$8.05	\$6.10	\$9.00
Primary Treatment	0	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Secondary Treatment	2	\$7.55	\$9.00	\$6.10	\$9.00
Advanced Treatment	1	\$8.05	\$8.05	\$8.05	\$8.05

CONNECTION FEE SUMMARY

Single Family Residences

Prepared by: California State Water Resources Control Board
Division of Clean Water Programs

As of February 1, 1991

	NUMBER	AVERAGE	MEDIAN	RANGE	
				LOW	HIGH
CALIFORNIA TOTAL	699	1320	1000	0	6740
COUNTIES					
ALAMEDA	9	1412	1312	480	3100
ALPINE	3	1667	1400	400	3200
AMADOR	8	2386	2000	150	5150
BUTTE	7	908	600	15	3144
CALAVERAS	15	1326	1000	0	4460
COLUSA	4	619	375	50	1500
CONTRA COSTA	16	1282	1100	350	2855
DEL NORTE	1	3750	3750	3750	3750
EL DORADO	4	2625	2000	1000	6000
FRESNO	28	430	275	0	3500
GLENN	2	830	1500	160	1500
HUMBOLDT	17	1310	1000	440	3400
IMPERIAL	12	489	400	0	1200
INYO	4	438	0	0	1750
KERN	22	612	540	0	1570
KINGS	6	892	750	250	2000
LAKE	7	1064	800	250	3100
LASSEN	5	300	300	0	850
LOS ANGELES	39	913	950	0	2800
MADERA	14	278	0	0	2760
MARIN	21	952	1100	0	3500
MARIPOSA	1	650	650	650	650
MEDNOCINO	10	985	1000	0	1500
MERCED	15	1205	1400	0	2950
MODOC	4	395	540	200	600
MONO	4	1582	2000	485	2640
MONTEREY	25	1126	850	0	4000
NAPA	11	2128	1500	500	5000
NEVEDA	4	1486	968	750	3300
ORANGE	23	1794	2270	0	5772

	NUMBER	AVERAGE	MEDIAN	RANGE	
				LOW	HIGH
PLACER	31	1913	1700	0	4250
PLUMAS	4	731	1000	225	1200
RIVERSIDE	28	1460	1500	0	3942
SACRAMENTO	8	1098	998	295	3000
SAN BENITO	4	990	1650	18	2138
SAN BERNARDINO	37	1361	1400	0	4591
SAN DIEGO	37	2278	2000	0	4700
SAN FRANCISCO	1	0	0	0	0
SAN JOAQUIN	10	1231	1175	275	2281
SAN LUIS OBISPO	19	1270	1000	0	3900
SAN MATEO	25	1817	2035	110	4405
SANTA BARBARA	14	2444	1770	0	6740
SANTA CLARA	14	963	780	0	3800
SANTA CRUZ	4	1571	950	750	3760
SHASTA	9	1427	1500	0	4600
SIERRA	1	175	175	175	175
SISKIYOU	9	532	537	150	1200
SOLANO	6	2308	2150	1260	4851
SONOMA	20	2564	2000	900	6360
STANISLAUS	14	793	600	150	2200
SUTTER	3	733	900	0	1300
TEHAMA	4	855	500	100	1680
TRINITY	1	1025	1025	1025	1025
TULARE	26	677	700	0	1788
TUOLUMNE	6	1569	2250	300	2500
VENTURA	17	2091	1800	100	5610
YOLO	7	1026	750	40	3050
YUBA	3	1067	1000	700	1500

MONTHLY USER CHARGE SUMMARY

Single Family Residences

Prepared by: California State Water Resources Control Board
 Division of Clean Water Programs

(All Facilities)
 Sorted by District

DATE:04/15/91

AGENCY	POP INDEX	A.V. TAX	H2O USE	ADWF MGD	MONTHLY CHARGE	CONNECT FEE
Adin CSD	1	no	no	0.012	\$16.00	820.00
Almonte SD	3	yes	no	0.12	\$11.34	1600.00
Alpine SD	2	no	no	0.38	\$12.50	2000.00
Alpine Springs CWD	2	no	no	0.04	\$6.25	700.00
Alto SD	3	yes	no	0.08	\$15.00	1200.00
Alturas	2	no	no	0.5	\$10.30	600.00
Amador City	1	no	no	0.015	\$23.00	1830.00
Amador CSA 3*	1	no	no	0.015	\$21.35	5150.00
Anderson	2	yes	no	1.2	\$14.43	2307.00
Angels	2	no	no	0.215	\$11.50	800.00
Apple Valley WD	2	no	no	0.65	\$8.00	1600.00
Arbuckle PUD	2	no	no	0.28	\$5.00	\$50.00
Arcata*	3	no	yes	2.3	\$15.14	1450.00
Armona CSA	2	no	no	0.285	\$7.80	2000.00
Arnold*	1	no	no	0.05	\$16.24	1763.00
Arvin CSD*	3	no	no	0.68	\$7.35	426.00
Atascadero CSD*	3	no	no	1.1	\$10.54	573.00
Atwater	3	no	no	3.3	\$10.22	1500.00
Avalon	2	no	no	0.7	\$14.83	516.84
Avenal	2	no	no	0.816	\$5.25	225.00
Azusa	3	no	no	3.9	\$3.50	180.00
Baker CSD	1	no	no	0.07	\$8.80	100.00
Bakersfield	5	no	no	25.6	\$7.58	900.00
Banning	3	no	no	2.2	\$10.45	1500.00
Barstow	3	no	no	2.6	\$7.65	250.00
Bear Valley CSD	1	yes	no	0.06	\$12.00	1000.00
Bear Valley WD	1	no	no	0.6	\$18.78	1400.00
Bear Valley, CSA 70*	1	no	no	0.008	\$27.23	\$0.00
Beaumont	2	no	no	0.99	\$8.00	1000.00
Belmont	5	no	no	16.	\$12.42	1310.00
Benicia	3	no	no	2.5	\$12.25	2150.00
Berryessa Resort Impr	1	yes	yes	0.01	\$5.31	500.00
Beverly Hills	3	no	yes	5.5	\$11.25	\$0.00
Big Bear Area Reg Was	3	no	no	2.08	\$5.67	1200.00
Big Bear City CSD	3	no	no	2.1	\$5.67	1400.00
Big Bear Lake	3	no	no	1.5	\$14.00	1900.00
Big Pine CSD*	1	no	no	0.09	\$5.25	\$0.00
Biggs	2	no	no	0.203	\$7.00	600.00
Biola CSD	1	no	no	0.024	\$11.55	300.00
Bishop*	2	no	no	0.7	\$7.28	\$0.00
Blue Lake	2	no	no	0.1	\$15.00	2090.00
Blythe	3	no	no	1.3	\$17.01	825.00
Bodega Bay PUD	2	yes	no	0.16	\$12.50	1075.00
Bolinas Comm PUD	1	no	no	0.03	\$35.00	\$0.00
Boronda County SD	2	no	no	0.1	\$30.00	1800.00

AGENCY	POP INDEX	A.V. TAX	H2O USE	ADWF MGD	MONTHLY CHARGE	CONNECT FEE
Borrego WD*	1	yes	no	0.001	\$5.00	\$50.00
Brawley	3	no	no	3.3	\$7.00	300.00
Brentwood	2	no	no	0.7	\$9.50	1859.00
Bridgeport PUD*	1	no	no	0.08	\$7.00	465.00
Brooktrails CSD	2	no	no	0.13	\$7.50	800.00
Buellton CSD*	2	no	no	0.33	\$10.25	1200.00
Buena SD	3	no	no	0.73	\$15.00	3000.00
Burbank	4	no	no	16.	\$9.94	664.00
Burbank SD	2	no	no	0.335	\$10.34	830.00
Burlingame	3	no	yes	1.3	\$7.35	875.00
Burlingame Hills SMD	2	no	no	0.33	\$11.00	1050.00
Burney WD*	2	no	no	0.44	\$11.00	600.00
Buttonwillow CWD*	2	no	no	0.16	\$11.00	\$0.00
Cachunia SD*	2	no	yes	0.047	\$7.50	\$0.00
Calexico	3	no	no	2.1	\$11.75	520.00
California City	2	no	no	0.225	\$7.50	1535.00
California Pines CSD	1	yes	no	0.015	\$0.00	200.00
Calipatria	2	no	no	0.477	\$14.00	800.00
Calistoga	2	no	yes	0.65	\$11.00	5000.00
Calpella CWD	1	yes	no	0.03	\$18.00	1400.00
Camarillo SD	3	yes	no	4.	\$10.63	3650.00
Cambria CSD	2	no	no	0.6	\$19.72	2035.00
Camrosa WD	2	yes	no	1.1	\$8.66	1000.00
Cantua Creek	1	no	no	0.03	\$3.05	\$0.00
Capistrano Beach SD	3	no	no	1.1	\$22.00	2590.00
Cardiff County SD	3	no	no	1.38	\$20.53	4700.00
Carlsbad	5	no	no	19.5	\$7.30	1250.00
Carmel SD	3	yes	no	1.53	\$8.00	1020.00
Carmel Valley CSD-Zon	1	no	yes	0.065	\$24.50	\$0.00
Carmel Valley CSD-Zon	1	no	no	0.004	\$21.50	\$0.00
Carmel Valley CSD-Zon	1	no	no	0.007	\$16.67	\$0.00
Carpinteria SD	3	yes	no	1.1	\$14.33	2000.00
Caruthers CSD	2	yes	no	0.31	\$4.50	\$75.00
Caspar South WD	1	no	no	0.001	\$18.00	\$0.00
Castro Valley SD	3	yes	no	3.	\$2.92	460.00
Castroville CSD-Zone	1	no	no	0.07	\$6.21	1750.00
Cayucos SD*	2	no	no	0.389	\$6.40	1725.00
Central Contra Costa	5	no	no	36.	\$11.33	1800.00
Central Marin Sanit A	4	no	no	8.3	\$6.61	380.00
Ceres	3	no	no	1.9	\$6.50	1359.24
Channel Islands Beach	2	no	no	0.9	\$10.00	5610.00
Chester PUD	2	yes	no	0.6	\$4.65	225.00
Chico	3	no	no	4.	\$4.36	3144.00
Chino	4	no	no	5.5	\$9.59	2000.00
Chino Basin MWD	5	yes	no	45.	\$4.30	1700.00
Chowchilla	2	no	no	0.594	\$9.77	289.00
Chualar County SD	1	yes	no	0.05	\$11.34	384.00
Circle Oaks CWD	1	no	no	0.022	\$5.00	2500.00
City of Lakeport SD 1	2	no	no	0.5	\$17.00	800.00
Clear Lake MSD #1*	2	no	no	0.5	\$17.00	800.00
Clearlake Oaks CWD*	2	yes	no	0.3	\$10.00	1500.00
Cloverdale*	2	no	no	0.47	\$23.10	2000.00
Clovis	3	no	no	3.4	\$5.25	1627.00
Coachella SD	3	no	no	1.6	\$9.30	1500.00

AGENCY	POP INDEX	A.V. TAX	H2O USE	ADWF MGD	MONTHLY CHARGE	CONNECT FEE
Coachella Valley WD	5	no	no	6.48	\$10.00	1575.00
Coalinga	2	no	no	0.7	\$4.90	
Colfax	2	yes	no	0.115	\$11.15	1400.00
Colton	4	no	no	5.7	\$8.25	2800.00
Colusa*	2	no	no	0.6	\$10.10	375.00
Copper Cove CWD*	2	no	no	0.065	\$13.50	685.00
Corcoran	3	no	no	1.2	\$8.45	350.00
Corning	2	no	no	0.84	\$12.60	1680.00
Corona*	4	no	no	5.1	\$11.00	1680.00
Coronado	3	no	no	2.6	\$19.00	850.00
Corte Madera	2	yes	no	0.9	\$11.00	340.00
Cotati	2	yes	yes	0.5	\$5.75	2000.00
Cottonwood CSA #17*	2	no	no	0.17	\$14.00	\$0.00
Courtland SD	2	no	no	0.08	\$7.00	295.00
Covelo CSD	1	no	no	0.024	\$11.00	600.00
Crescent City	3	no	no	1.6	\$8.90	3750.00
Crescenta Valley CWD	3	no	no	1.48	\$20.00	\$25.00
Crestline SD	2	yes	no	0.648	\$14.29	1942.00
Crockett-Valona SD	2	yes	no	0.285	\$8.00	350.00
Crystal Springs CSD	2	no	no	0.51	\$24.33	2280.00
Cucamonga CWD	4	no	no	15.	\$7.40	1085.00
Culver City*	3	no	no	4.	\$11.51	348.00
Cupertino SD	4	no	no	4.5	\$8.00	1850.00
Dana Point SD	3	yes	no	1.6	\$9.33	2100.00
Daphnedale CSD	1	no	no	0.05	\$13.50	540.00
Davis Municipal Sewer	4	no	no	4.3	\$7.80	1219.00
Del Mar	2	no	no	0.5	\$21.65	975.00
Del Rey CSD	2	yes	no	0.3	\$9.50	350.00
Delano	3	no	no	3.	\$7.10	100.00
Delhi CWD	2	yes	no	0.169	\$10.00	1500.00
Delta Diablo SD-Z I*	3	no	no	3.5	\$6.93	1100.00
Delta Diablo SD-Z II*	3	no	no	3.5	\$7.12	1100.00
Delta Diablo SD-Z III	3	no	no	3.5	\$6.71	1100.00
Denair CSD	2	yes	no	0.3	\$14.54	334.00
Desert Lake CSD	1	no	no	0.05	\$7.00	\$85.00
Desert Water Agency	1	no	no	0.018	\$18.20	2520.00
Devonshire CSD	1	no	no	0.061	\$19.67	2280.00
Dinuba	3	no	no	1.9	\$9.60	485.00
Dixon	3	no	no	0.9	\$6.50	1343.00
Donner Summit PUD	1	no	no	0.048	\$39.00	3300.00
Dos Palos	2	no	no	0.45	\$13.50	800.00
Dublin San Ramon SD	4	no	no	7.2	\$12.50	3100.00
Dunsmuir	2	no	no	0.227	\$13.95	1200.00
Earlimart PUD	2	no	no	0.4	\$6.00	800.00
East Bay MUD	5	no	no	80.	\$10.65	750.00
East Blythe CWD	2	yes	no	0.865	\$16.00	100.00
East Niles CSD	3	no	no	1.72	\$5.25	200.00
East Orosi CSD	1	yes	no	0.006	\$17.50	800.00
East Palo Alto SD	3	no	no	1.3	\$22.08	1923.00
East Valley WD	3	no	no	1.4	\$9.00	1113.00
Eastern Sierra CSD	2	no	no	0.672	\$9.00	1750.00
Ebbetts Pass (Country	1	no	no	0.001	\$5.00	\$0.00
Ebbetts Pass (Forest	1	yes	no	0.02	\$8.50	250.00
Ebbetts Pass (Sequoia	1	yes	no	0.008	\$5.00	\$0.00

AGENCY	POP INDEX	A. V. TAX	H2O USE	ADWF MGD	MONTHLY CHARGE	CONNECT FEE
Ebbetts Pass CWD*	1	yes	no	0.015	\$16.00	155.00
Edgemont CSD	2	no	no	0.425	\$4.17	2600.00
El Cajon	4	no	yes	6.8	\$10.00	1728.00
El Centro	3	no	no	5.	\$7.26	\$0.00
El Dorado Irrigation	3	yes	no	2.015	\$14.70	1000.00
El Porvenir CSA 3G	1	no	no	0.02	\$3.03	\$0.00
El Rancho CSA 1	1	no	no	0.012	\$27.42	1286.00
El Segundo	3	no	yes	2.3	\$0.00	580.00
El Toro WD*	4	no	no	4.5	\$11.00	1190.00
Elsinore Valley MWD	3	no	no	3.2	\$15.50	2130.00
Emerald Bay SD*	2	yes	no		\$0.00	\$0.00
Emerald Lake Hts SMD	2	no	no	0.254	\$19.79	2280.00
Encinitas SD	4	no	no	2.	\$10.00	1500.00
Escalon	2	no	no	0.38	\$6.00	957.00
Escondido	5	no	no	15.8	\$24.40	4356.00
Esparto CSD	2	no	no	0.15	\$8.00	\$50.00
Estero MID*	3	no	no	13.2	\$18.00	1600.00
Etna*	1	no	no	0.082	\$6.00	300.00
Eureka*	3	no	no	4.3	\$9.50	2000.00
Exeter	2	no	no	0.78	\$5.75	750.00
Fair Oaks SMD	3	no	no	2.5	\$9.58	2280.00
Fairbanks Ranch SD	2	no	no	0.14	\$30.00	\$0.00
Fairfield-Suisun SD	4	no	no	12.8	\$13.40	4851.00
Fall River Mills CSD	1	no	no	0.068	\$11.85	\$0.00
Fallbrook SD	3	no	no	1.56	\$20.65	4264.00
Farmersville	2	no	no	0.65	\$9.50	1300.00
Fawnskin, CSA 53*	2	no	no	0.183	\$14.30	1400.00
Ferndale	2	no	no	0.215	\$15.00	3400.00
Fieldbrook CSD	1	no	no	0.04	\$24.00	2000.00
Firebaugh	2	no	no	0.2	\$18.48	250.00
Folsom	3	no	no	2.95	\$11.41	388.00
Folsom Lake SMD #2*	3	no	no	1.	\$11.75	3400.00
Folsom Lake SMD #3*	1	yes	no	0.065	\$19.00	2400.00
Fontana*	3	no	no	3.8	\$4.80	600.00
Forestville CSD	1	no	no	0.046	\$27.00	4481.00
Fort Bragg MID #1	2	no	no	0.5	\$7.00	1500.00
Fortuna	2	no	no	0.87	\$9.75	600.00
Franklin CWD	2	yes	no	0.44	\$7.50	1125.00
Freedom CSD*	2	no	no	0.6	\$12.00	4000.00
Fresno	5	no	no	50.78	\$4.37	800.00
Fresno CWD #38*	1	no	no	0.006	\$12.00	\$0.00
Fresno CWD #40*	1	no	no	0.01	\$11.50	\$0.00
Fresno CWD #41*	1	no	no	0.06	\$14.00	\$0.00
Galt	2	no	no	0.8	\$9.25	3000.00
Garberville SD	1	yes	no	0.03	\$8.00	500.00
Garden Grove SD	1	yes	no	0.08		2535.00
Georgetown Divide PUD	2	no	no	0.129	\$6.25	1500.00
Geyersville CSA 26	1	no	no	0.03	\$28.42	2000.00
Gilroy	4	no	no	4.587	\$18.41	3800.00
Golden Valley MWD	1	no	yes	0.03	\$5.55	\$0.00
Goleta SD*	4	no	no	6.4	\$9.00	1375.00
Goleta West SD	3	no	no	1.7	\$8.90	1375.00
Gonzales	2	no	no	0.4	\$5.48	2225.00
Granada SD*	2	no	no	0.312	\$25.00	3600.00

AGENCY	POP INDEX	A.V. TAX	H2O USE	ADWF MGD	MONTHLY CHARGE	CONNECT FEE
Grand Terrace	2	no	no	0.9	\$8.50	2800.00
Grass Valley	3	no	no	1.72	\$8.00	968.00
Graton CSA 2	2	no	no	0.08	\$20.17	2000.00
Grayson CSD*	1	no	no	0.06	\$5.00	600.00
Greenfield*	2	no	no	0.38	\$7.20	1660.00
Gridley	2	no	no	0.65	\$10.70	900.00
Grizzly Lake Resort I	1	yes	no	0.025	\$12.00	800.00
Groveland CSD	2	no	no	0.15	\$19.83	2362.00
Grover City*	3	no	no	0.95	\$6.50	\$0.00
Guadalupe	2	no	no	0.33	\$10.00	1200.00
Gustine	2	no	no	1.	\$5.25	2950.00
Half Moon Bay*	3	no	no	1.311	\$24.08	3144.00
Hanford	3	no	no	3.8	\$8.00	750.00
Harbor Industrial SMD	1	no	no	0.39		2280.00
Hayward	4	no	no	9.4	\$8.45	760.00
Healdsburg	2	no	no	1.05	\$10.21	900.00
Heather Glen CSD	1	yes	no	0.003	\$0.00	\$0.00
Heber PUD	2	yes	no	0.2	\$11.00	800.00
Helendale, CSA 70*	2	yes	no	0.219	\$10.00	\$25.00
Hercules*	3	no	no	3.25	\$10.50	1500.00
Heritage Ranch CSD	2	yes	no	0.275	\$14.80	1000.00
Hesperia WD	2	yes	no	0.5	\$9.00	1500.00
High Country, CSA 70*	1	no	no	0.014	\$14.70	1425.00
Hillsborough*	3	no	no	1.1	\$28.00	3000.00
Hilmar CWD*	2	yes	no	0.08	\$8.50	\$0.00
Hilton Creek CSD	1	no	no	0.067	\$16.00	2640.00
Hollister	3	no	yes	2.	\$3.82	2136.00
Holtville	2	no	no	0.55	\$12.58	350.00
Home Gardens SD	2	no	no	0.45	\$14.00	2640.00
Homestead Valley SD	3	yes	no	0.16	\$11.67	1500.00
Hopland PUD	1	no	no	0.056	\$11.00	1000.00
Hughson	2	yes	no	0.6	\$22.75	1200.00
Humboldt CSD	3	no	no	1.22	\$14.25	1400.00
Idyllwild WD ID #1	2	yes	no	0.15	\$7.50	1172.00
Imperial*	2	no	no	0.3	\$16.50	400.00
Inyokern CSD	2	no	no	0.4	\$6.25	650.00
Ione	2	no	no	0.323	\$9.50	1650.00
Irvine Ranch WD	5	no	no	12.5	\$7.95	1793.00
Isla Vista SD*	3	no	no	1.7	\$8.90	1375.00
Isleton*	2	no	no	0.115	\$13.25	998.00
Ivanhoe PUD	2	no	no	0.38	\$7.00	500.00
Jackson	2	no	no	0.55	\$14.70	1600.00
Jamestown SD*	2	no	no	0.15	\$16.45	2500.00
Julian SD*	1	no	no	0.03	\$30.25	1500.00
June Lake PUD	1	yes	no	0.21	\$7.00	1224.00
Kelseyville Cty Wtrwr	2	no	no	0.096	\$8.15	250.00
Kensington Square SMD	1	no	no	0.013	\$14.50	2280.00
Kerman*	2	no	no	0.614	\$11.50	\$0.00
Kettleman City CSD	2	no	no	0.28	\$12.00	250.00
Keyes CSD*	2	no	no	0.24	\$11.10	500.00
King City*	2	no	no	0.56	\$4.50	2400.00
Kirkwood Meadows	1	no	no	0.025	\$14.70	3200.00
Knights Landing SD	2	yes	no	0.012	\$17.00	750.00
La Mesa	4	no	no	5.1	\$10.90	1190.00

AGENCY	POP INDEX	A. V. TAX	H2O USE	ADWF MGD	MONTHLY CHARGE	CONNECT FEE
LaContenta CWD*	1	no	no	0.03	\$12.00	650.00
Laguna Beach	3	no	no	2.1	\$21.00	2500.00
Laguna CSA #10*	1	no	no	0.012	\$28.00	100.00
Laguna SD*	3	no	no	2.2	\$10.06	921.00
Lake Berryessa Resort	1	yes	no	0.01	\$12.00	500.00
Lake CSD ID 1	3	no	no	2.192	\$8.90	500.00
Lake CSD ID 3	2	no	no	0.2	\$12.60	500.00
Lake Hemet MWD	3	no	no	3.	\$1.75	\$0.00
Lake Oroville Area PU		no	no	0.565	\$7.10	250.00
Lakeport	2	yes	no	0.5	\$17.00	3100.00
Lakeside CSD	3	no	no	2.85	\$12.00	2000.00
Lamont PUD*	3	no	no	1.4	\$3.00	\$0.00
Las Gallinas Valley S	3	yes	no	2.1	\$8.08	1400.00
Las Lomas*	2	no	no	0.12	\$14.00	550.00
Las Virgenes MWD	4	yes	no	7.7	\$12.00	2800.00
Lassen Cty Waterworks	1	no	no	0.02	\$14.00	350.00
Lathrop CWD	2	no	no	0.5	\$10.15	275.00
Lauti Track Cty SA 2	1	no	no	0.05	\$12.50	1400.00
Leavitt Lake CSD	1	no	no	0.06	\$38.00	\$0.00
Lee Lake WD	2	no	no	0.166	\$24.33	\$0.00
LeGrand CSD	2	no	no	0.126	\$11.50	425.00
Lemon Cove SD	1	yes	no	0.01	\$4.50	500.00
Lemon Grove	3	no	no	2.422	\$11.00	500.00
Lemoore	3	no	no	1.8	\$8.50	500.00
Leucadia CWD	3	yes	no	0.65	\$16.70	2700.00
Lincoln	2	no	no	0.675	\$11.00	2210.00
Linda CWD	3	no	no	1.1	\$6.10	1500.00
Lindsay*	2	no	no	1.	\$8.00	700.00
Live Oak	2	no	no	0.35	\$12.70	1300.00
Livermore*	4	no	no	5.	\$14.75	2345.00
Livingston	2	no	no	1.	\$8.50	1500.00
Lockeford CSD*	2	no	no	0.21	\$22.50	1175.00
Lodi	3	yes	no	6.3	\$7.73	2281.00
Loleta SD	1	no	no	0.06	\$11.58	1000.00
Loma Linda	3	no	no	4.5	\$8.05	2260.00
Lompoc	3	no	no	3.5	\$14.05	271.00
London CSD	2	yes	no	0.028	\$7.00	\$45.00
Lone Pine CSD*	2	no	no	0.13	\$3.00	\$0.00
Long Beach	5	no	no	42.4	\$2.10	900.00
Los Alamos CSD	1	no	no	0.07	\$20.00	4750.00
Los Alisos WD	3	no	no	3.9	\$4.00	1100.00
Los Altos	3	no	no	0.28	\$9.20	190.00
Los Angeles	5	no	yes	315.	\$12.54	2168.00
Los Angeles CSD 01	5	yes	no	38.15	\$4.50	1000.00
Los Angeles CSD 02	5	yes	no	55.04	\$4.25	1020.00
Los Angeles CSD 03	5	yes	no	47.01	\$4.08	950.00
Los Angeles CSD 04	3	yes	no	6.5	\$14.58	2220.00
Los Angeles CSD 05	5	yes	no	70.11	\$4.08	1040.00
Los Angeles CSD 08	5	yes	no	30.5	\$3.92	1020.00
Los Angeles CSD 09	2	yes	no	0.26	\$14.58	2220.00
Los Angeles CSD 14	4	yes	no	8.55	\$4.08	1100.00
Los Angeles CSD 15	5	yes	no	5.47	\$4.08	910.00
Los Angeles CSD 16	5	yes	no	27.65	\$4.33	910.00
Los Angeles CSD 17	3	yes	no	3.83	\$4.50	950.00

AGENCY	POP INDEX	A.V. TAX	H2O USE	ADWF MGD	MONTHLY CHARGE	CONNECT FEE
Los Angeles CSD 18	5	yes	no	31.93	\$4.17	1020.00
Los Angeles CSD 19	5	yes	no	9.	\$4.17	980.00
Los Angeles CSD 20	3	yes	no	5.42	\$4.25	1100.00
Los Angeles CSD 21	5	yes	no	39.29	\$4.25	940.00
Los Angeles CSD 22	5	yes	no	29.34	\$4.33	990.00
Los Angeles CSD 23	1	yes	no	0.02	\$3.00	790.00
Los Angeles CSD 26	4	yes	no	5.84	\$7.42	1350.00
Los Angeles CSD 27	2	yes	no	0.15	\$0.00	2220.00
Los Angeles CSD 28*	2	yes	no	0.51	\$25.83	\$0.00
Los Angeles CSD 29	2	yes	no	1.19	\$4.58	930.00
Los Angeles CSD 32	3	yes	no	4.38	\$7.58	1350.00
Los Banos	3	no	no	2.	\$9.90	2000.00
Lost Altos Hills*	2	no	no	0.79	\$14.50	450.00
Lost Hills SD	1	no	no	0.086	\$15.00	400.00
Loyalton	2	no	no	0.235	\$8.00	175.00
Lytle Creek CSA 70*	1	no	no	0.089	\$13.25	325.00
Madera CSA 02A	1	no	no	0.07	\$16.25	\$0.00
Madera CSA 03	1	no	no	0.03	\$7.10	425.00
Madera CSA 06	1	yes	no	0.02	\$3.75	\$0.00
Madera CSA 07	1	yes	no	0.015	\$7.50	\$0.00
Madera CSA 16	1	no	no	0.009	\$13.50	\$0.00
Madera CSA 24	1	yes	no	0.012	\$10.00	\$0.00
Madera CSA 27	1	no	no	0.025	\$18.00	\$0.00
Madera MD 08 Zone A	1	yes	no	0.025	\$20.50	\$0.00
Madera MD 19, Zone A	1	yes	no	0.09	\$5.00	\$0.00
Madera MD 22, Zone A	1	yes	no	0.175	\$2.25	2760.00
Madera MD 28	1	yes	no	0.007	\$12.50	\$0.00
Madera MD 37	1	no	no	0.0004	\$14.65	\$0.00
Madera*	3	yes	no	3.8	\$7.85	425.00
Madison SD	1	no	no	0.025	\$20.00	\$40.00
Malaga CWD	2	no	no	0.075	\$5.25	275.00
Malibu Mesa (GC5)	2	no	no	0.17	\$28.62	\$0.00
Malibu Treatment Plt	1	no	no	0.033	\$73.95	\$0.00
Mammoth CWD*	2	no	no	1.5	\$12.10	2000.00
Manila CSD	2	no	no	0.055	\$18.00	600.00
Manteca	3	no	no	4.54	\$8.78	2222.00
Marin SD 1	3	yes	no	7.8	\$8.33	1200.00
Marin SD 2	2	yes	no	0.85	\$11.00	340.00
Marin SD 5	2	yes	no	0.75	\$13.25	2000.00
Marina CWD	3	no	no	1.3	\$12.00	1000.00
Mariposa PUD	2	no	no	0.252	\$10.00	650.00
Markleeville	1	no	no	0.025	\$20.00	400.00
Martell Wastewater Di	1	no	no	0.03	\$22.32	150.00
Marysville	3	no	no	1.5	\$8.05	700.00
Maxwell PUD	1	no	no	0.07	\$8.00	150.00
McCloud CSD	2	no	no	0.034	\$35.00	1000.00
McFarland	2	no	no	0.58	\$5.00	1000.00
McKinleyville CSD	2	no	no	0.6	\$11.00	750.00
Mendocino City CSD*	2	yes	no	0.1	\$10.10	1000.00
Mendota	2	no	no	1.	\$9.80	300.00
Merced	4	no	no	7.3	\$12.03	1400.00
Midway CSD	1	no	no	0.06	\$17.00	500.00
Mill Valley*	3	no	no	2.65	\$16.33	600.00
Millbrae	3	no	no	2.	\$10.50	500.00

AGENCY	POP INDEX	A.V. TAX	H2O USE	ADWF MGD	MONTHLY CHARGE	CONNECT FEE
Milpitas	4	yes	no	5.9	\$16.90	\$0.00
Miranda CSD*	1	no	no	0.02	\$12.00	500.00
Mission Canyon, CSA 1	2	no	no	0.3	\$20.64	5523.00
Mission Hills CSD	2	no	no	0.198	\$28.95	2660.00
Mission Springs WD	2	yes	no	0.59	\$6.00	640.00
Modesto*	5	no	no	26.	\$6.35	450.00
Mojave PUD	2	no	yes	0.375	\$4.20	1570.00
Mokelumne Hill SD	1	yes	no	0.036	\$9.50	1400.00
Mono Village WD	2	no	no	0.1	\$8.50	1000.00
Montague*	2	no	no	0.07	\$8.20	537.00
Montara SD	2	yes	yes	0.394	\$22.50	4405.00
Monteciteo SD	3	yes	no	0.85	\$20.00	3000.00
Monterey Regional WPC	5	no	no	19.	\$8.00	1700.00
Morgan Hill	4	no	no	1.8	\$19.61	1870.00
Morro Bay	3	no	no	1.4	\$9.08	2750.00
Moss Landing CSD	1	yes	no	0.07	\$26.83	1750.00
Moulton Niguel WD	5	no	yes	10.559	\$13.88	600.00
Mountain View SD	3	yes	no	1.636	\$10.00	2373.00
Mt Shasta	2	no	no	0.45	\$9.00	700.00
Murphys SD	2	yes	no	0.15	\$12.00	1500.00
Murray Park SMD		yes	no		\$7.17	316.00
Napa Berryessa Resort	1	yes	yes	0.05	\$12.00	500.00
Napa River - Reclamat	1	no	no	0.015	\$25.00	700.00
Napa SD	4	no	no	7.	\$16.50	3500.00
Needles	2	no	no	0.654	\$11.75	220.00
Nevada City*	2	no	no	0.4	\$11.00	925.00
Newcastle SD	1	yes	no	0.0015	\$8.00	3000.00
Newman	2	no	no	1.1	\$4.90	1535.00
Newport Beach*	4	no	no	7.06	\$3.30	\$30.00
Niland SD	2	yes	no	0.275	\$12.50	1200.00
Nipomo CSD	2	no	no	0.194	\$24.00	3900.00
North Auburn-SM #1*	3	no	no	1.3	\$13.50	1650.00
North Coast, CSA 30	2	no	no	0.116	\$33.90	1800.00
North Marin WD*	1	yes	no	0.015	\$16.00	930.00
North Marin WD-Tomale	1	no	no	0.015	\$22.10	1000.00
North of the River SD	3	no	no	3.2	\$6.75	625.00
North Tahoe PUD	2	yes	no	0.79	\$23.86	1000.00
Northcoast Region	3	no	yes	1.6	\$22.45	1797.00
Novato SD	3	yes	yes	4.7	\$6.83	1100.00
Nyland Acres, CSA 29	1	no	no	0.06	\$22.73	2825.00
Oak Knoll SMD	1	no	no	0.012	\$17.33	2280.00
Oakdale	3	no	no	1.3	\$7.00	625.00
Oakley Bethel Island	3	no	no	1.45		1930.00
Oakley SD*	3	yes	no	1.3	\$15.00	2855.00
Occidental CSD	1	no	no	0.02	\$36.50	2000.00
Oceana Marin	1	yes	no	0.015	\$22.25	3450.00
Oceanside	5	no	no	11.5	\$14.25	1565.00
Ojai Valley SD	3	yes	no	2.	\$16.15	1700.00
Olivehurst PUD	2	no	no	1.1	\$9.00	1000.00
Orange Cove	2	no	no	0.7	\$9.20	3500.00
Orange CSD 01	5	yes	no	27.09	\$3.75	2270.00
Orange CSD 02	5	yes	no	84.31	\$0.00	2270.00
Orange CSD 03	5	yes	no	85.48	\$2.53	2270.00
Orange CSD 05	3	yes	no	13.08	\$3.75	2270.00

AGENCY	POP INDEX	A.V. TAX	H2O USE	ADWF MGD	MONTHLY CHARGE	CONNECT FEE
Orange CSD 06	5	yes	no	15.29	\$4.08	2270.00
Orange CSD 07	5	yes	no	20.35	\$0.00	2270.00
Orange CSD 11	5	yes	no	16.76	\$3.33	2270.00
Orange CSD 13	2	no	no	1.28	\$6.53	2270.00
Orange CSD 14	4	yes	no	4.28	\$0.00	\$0.00
Orland	2	no	yes	0.7	\$4.00	160.00
Oro Grande, CSA 42*	1	no	no	0.046	\$14.20	1415.00
Oro Loma SD	5	no	no	10.2	\$7.25	1376.00
Orosi PUD	2	no	no	0.71	\$21.40	800.00
Otay WD	2	no	no	1.3	\$8.25	2500.00
Oxnard	5	no	no	18.	\$15.02	3262.00
Pacifica	3	yes	yes	2.8	\$27.81	688.00
Padre Dam MWD	4	no	no	5.2	\$12.00	1364.00
Pajaro CSD*	2	no	no	0.14	\$6.40	500.00
Pajaro CSD-Los Lomas*	2	no	no	0.1	\$13.98	550.00
Pajaro CSD-Sunny Mesa	1	no	no	0.016	\$10.90	500.00
Pajaro SD	2	no	no	0.5	\$6.73	500.00
Palm Springs*	3	no	no	6.5	\$7.75	2850.00
Palo Alto	5	no	no	21.5	\$8.60	\$0.00
Palo Cedro, CSA 8*	1	no	no	0.026	\$16.00	4600.00
Parlier	2	no	no	0.5	\$10.20	320.00
Paso Robles	3	no	no	2.1	\$8.82	817.00
Patterson	2	no	no	0.72	\$7.80	732.00
Pauma Valley CSD	1	no	no	0.065	\$7.08	2500.00
Pebble Beach CSD	2	yes	no	0.428	\$9.39	1550.00
Penngrove CSA 19	1	no	no	0.074	\$18.92	2000.00
Perris	3	no	no	1.9	\$14.79	600.00
Petaluma	3	no	no	4.5	\$8.75	2550.00
Pine Valley SD	1	no	no	0.018	\$37.00	2000.00
Pinedale CWD	2	no	no	0.22	\$5.00	178.00
Pinedale PUD	2	no	no		\$4.41	350.00
Pinole*	3	no	no	1.6	\$9.67	700.00
Pioneer Point, CSA 82	1	yes	no	0.105	\$8.86	\$50.00
Pismo Beach	2	no	yes	1.1	\$10.40	1100.00
Pittsburg	3	no	no	11.08	\$28.68	600.00
Pixley PUD	2	no	no	0.36	\$4.50	175.00
Placer CSA 21*	1	no	no	0.082	\$27.40	4250.00
Placer CSA 28, Z 11	1	no	no	0.05	\$13.50	1800.00
Placer CSA 28, Z 21	1	no	no	0.105	\$27.40	250.00
Placer CSA 28, Z 23	1	no	no	0.006	\$16.00	1700.00
Placer CSA 28, Z 2A-3	1	no	no	0.105	\$13.00	3000.00
Placer CSA 28, Z 6	1	no	no	0.05	\$17.00	1700.00
Placer CSA 28, Zone 5	1	no	no	0.06	\$14.00	1500.00
Placer CSA 28, Zone 6	1	no	no	0.05	\$15.50	1700.00
Placer CSA 28,Z 24	1	no	no	0.01	\$28.00	1500.00
Placer SMD 1	3	no	no	1.45	\$16.00	2700.00
Placer SMD 2	3	no	no	1.21	\$13.50	3500.00
Placer SMD 3	1	yes	no	0.08	\$28.00	3500.00
Placerville	2	no	no	0.95	\$15.00	2000.00
Plainview PUD	1	no	no	0.057	\$5.75	\$30.00
Planada CSD	2	no	no	0.435	\$12.00	700.00
Pleasanton	3			3.7	\$13.33	1312.00
Plymouth	1	no	no	0.1	\$15.00	2105.00
Point Arena	1	no	no	0.023	\$15.00	1500.00

AGENCY	POP INDEX	A.V. TAX	H2O USE	ADWF MGD	MONTHLY CHARGE	CONNECT FEE
Port Hueneme	3	no	no	2.8	\$10.00	3000.00
Porter Vista PUD	3	yes	no	4.6	\$9.00	1440.00
Porterville	3	no	no	4.6	\$11.34	485.00
Portola*	1	yes	no	0.24	\$11.75	500.00
Poway	3	no	no	3.3	\$14.57	2356.00
Quincy SD	2	yes	no	1.	\$11.76	1200.00
Rainbow MWD	2	no	no	0.23	\$11.00	2274.00
Ramona MWD*	3	no	no	0.877	\$17.76	4505.00
Rancho California WD	2	no	no	0.5	\$27.00	3942.00
Rancho California WD	1	yes	no	0.05	\$25.00	\$0.00
Rancho Murieta CSD	2	no	no	0.225	\$14.75	1000.00
Rancho Santa Fe CSD 1	2	no	no	0.208	\$26.50	2000.00
Rancho Santa Fe CSD 2	1	no	no	0.022	\$26.50	3760.00
Rancho Santa Fe CSD 3	1	no	no	0.04	\$26.50	3760.00
Red Bluff	3	no	no	1.3	\$9.58	340.00
Redding	4	no	no	8.	\$12.00	1950.00
Redlands*	4	no	no	5.5	\$8.50	2400.00
Redway CSD	1	yes	no	0.125	\$13.75	850.00
Redwood City*	4	no	no	19.	\$9.96	594.00
Reedley	3	no	no	1.9	\$7.75	346.00
Rialto	4	no	no	6.3	\$8.64	4591.00
Richardson Bay SD	3	yes	no	0.8	\$20.50	3500.00
Richmond MSD	4	yes	no	7.	\$12.50	750.00
Richvale SD	1	yes	no	0.03	\$0.00	\$15.00
Ridgecrest	3	no	no	3.6	\$6.08	540.00
Rio Alto WD	1	yes	no	0.15	\$10.00	500.00
Rio Dell	2	no	no	0.29	\$10.00	900.00
Rio Ramaza CSD*	1	yes	no	0.002	\$0.00	\$0.00
Rio Vista	2	no	no	0.42	\$28.40	2161.00
Ripon	2	no	no	0.609	\$3.00	561.00
Ripon MSD #1*	2	yes	no	0.7	\$3.00	537.00
River Pines PUD*	1	no	no	0.054	\$33.15	4600.00
Riverbank	2	no	no	0.955	\$5.50	400.00
Riverside*	5	no	no	31.5	\$9.00	2300.00
Rodeo SD	2	yes	no	0.85	\$12.00	600.00
Rohnert Park*	3	no	no	3.	\$12.50	3300.00
Rosamond CSD	2	yes	no	0.67	\$4.60	475.00
Roseville	4	no	no	8.1	\$9.50	2600.00
Rubidoux CSD*	3	no	yes	1.9	\$9.00	3000.00
Running Springs WD	2	no	no	0.56	\$8.70	1050.00
Russian River CSD	2	no	no	0.35	\$30.66	2000.00
Sabre City CSA 11*	1	no	no	0.045	\$11.00	1500.00
Sacramento CSD 1	5	no	no	50.	\$9.85	295.00
Sacramento Regional C	5	no	no	145.	\$7.45	807.00
Saddleback CSA 28 Z52	1	no	no	0.01	\$10.00	\$0.00
Salida SD	2	yes	no	0.45	\$6.00	500.00
Salsipuedes SD*	2	no	no	0.11	\$15.00	3000.00
Salton CSD	2	no	no	0.08	\$5.00	500.00
San Andreas SD*	2	no	no	0.25	\$12.00	1000.00
San Ardo WD	1	no	yes	0.045	\$7.00	\$0.00
San Bernardino	5	no	no	25.6	\$7.20	2260.00
San Bruno*	3	no	no	8.5	\$9.79	110.00
San Buenaventura	4	no	yes	8.5	\$16.55	701.00
San Clemente	3	no	no	3.9	\$9.97	5772.00

AGENCY	POP INDEX	A.V. TAX	H2O USE	ADWF MGD	MONTHLY CHARGE	CONNECT FEE
San Diego	5	yes	no	190.	\$13.52	3600.00
San Francisco	5	no	yes	66.9	\$11.92	\$0.00
San Jacinto	2	no	no	0.8	\$2.00	200.00
San Joaquin	2	no	no	0.25	\$35.00	450.00
San Joaquin Country C	1	yes	no		\$9.18	
San Joaquin CSA 15	1	yes	no	0.06	\$23.33	1082.00
San Jose	5	no	no	105.	\$14.20	780.00
San Juan Bautista	2	no	no	0.15	\$16.00	\$16.00
San Leandro	3	no	no	3.91	\$8.25	825.00
San Lorenzo Valley WD	1	no	no	0.009	\$19.50	825.00
San Luis Obispo CSA 1	1	no	no	0.025	\$12.00	\$0.00
San Luis Obispo CSA 1	2	no	no	0.04	\$25.60	2500.00
San Luis Obispo CSA 1	2	no	no	0.12	\$14.80	300.00
San Luis Obispo CSA 7	2	yes	no	0.02	\$6.00	\$0.00
San Luis Obispo CSA 7	2	yes	no	0.02	\$6.00	\$0.00
San Luis Obispo*	3	no	no	4.4	\$8.50	\$0.00
San Marcos CWD*	3	no	no	3.5	\$8.25	2400.00
San Mateo	5	no	yes	13.5	\$14.43	1260.00
San Miguel SD	2	no	yes	0.06	\$3.50	750.00
San Rafael SD	3	yes	no	8.	\$14.67	940.00
San Simeon Acres CSD	1	no	yes	0.11	\$22.55	2280.00
Sanger	3	yes	no	2.	\$11.75	1100.00
Santa Ana	5	no	yes	23.1	\$19.42	\$0.00
Santa Ana Region	4	no	no	5.8	\$9.00	2900.00
Santa Barbara	4	no	yes	6.	\$6.34	1770.00
Santa Clara	4	no	no	16.	\$6.62	583.00
Santa Clara CWD No 2-	3	no	no	1.73	\$13.67	900.00
Santa Cruz	5	no	no	10.5	\$8.49	750.00
Santa Maria	4	no	no	5.87	\$4.80	836.00
Santa Monica	5	no	yes	41.	\$11.00	1312.50
Santa Nella CWD	1	no	no	0.04		1780.00
Santa Paula*	3	no	no	2.1	\$7.10	394.00
Santa Rosa	5	no	yes	16.	\$15.47	3000.00
Santa Rosa Reg	3	no	no	3.69	\$17.00	
Santa Ynez CSD	2	no	no	0.135	\$14.00	1300.00
Saticoy SD	2	yes	no	0.12	\$8.00	100.00
Sausalito	3	no	no	1.5	\$9.00	800.00
Scenic Heights CSD	1	no	no	0.009	\$17.25	2280.00
Scotts Valley*	2	no	yes	0.675	\$51.00	3760.00
Seal Beach	3	no	yes	1.	\$12.50	1000.00
Seaside CSD	3	yes	no	1.6	\$9.20	850.00
Sebastopol	2	no	yes	0.8	\$34.00	6360.00
Seeley CWD	2	no	no	0.26	\$12.50	300.00
Selma-Kingsburg-Fowle	3	no	no	3.05	\$11.50	1110.00
Sewer Agency of So Ma	3	no	no	2.5	\$11.85	\$0.00
Sewerage Comm-Orovill	3	no	no	2.9	\$4.00	900.00
Shafter*	2	no	no	0.7	\$8.20	934.00
Shasta CSA 8	1	no	no	0.03	\$14.00	1500.00
Shasta Dam PUD	2	no	no	0.63	\$14.75	1883.00
Shaver Lake	1	no	no	0.12	\$15.52	\$0.00
Shaver Springs WD 40	1	yes	no	0.015	\$11.50	\$0.00
Shelter Cove	1	no	no	0.036	\$9.00	440.00
Sheridan CSA 06,ZA 1*	1	no	no	0.045	\$15.00	1500.00
Sierra Lakes CWD	2	yes	no	0.042	\$22.92	875.00

AGENCY	POP INDEX	A.V. TAX	H2O USE	ADWF MGD	MONTHLY CHARGE	CONNECT FEE
Simi Valley CSD	5	no	no	9.1	\$10.22	2270.00
Six Mile Village, CWD	1	no	no	0.003	\$21.00	3421.00
Sky Harbour WD 38	1	yes	no	0.006	\$12.00	\$0.00
Snelling CSD	1	yes	no	0.015	\$6.60	200.00
So Bay Cities SD	5	yes	no	13.04	\$3.75	1060.00
So Bayside	4	no	no	7.46	\$9.96	593.00
So Coast WD	3	yes	no	1.5	\$14.50	1835.00
So Gate	4	no	yes	8.	\$1.50	\$40.00
So Park CSD	3	no	no	0.15	\$20.50	2000.00
So Placer MUD	3	no	no	2.25	\$9.00	3450.00
So San Francisco	4	no	no	5.2	\$8.00	500.00
So San Luis Obispo CS	3	no	no	2.8	\$6.50	2000.00
So Tahoe PUD	3	yes	no	4.25	\$20.28	6000.00
Solana Beach SD	3	no	no	3.1	\$22.50	4500.00
Soledad	2	no	no	0.58	\$11.39	350.00
Solvang	2	no	no	0.32	\$10.50	1600.00
Sonoma Valley CSD	3	no	no	2.8	\$15.75	2000.00
Spanish Flat WD	1	no	no	0.05	\$10.00	1200.00
Spring Valley CSD	3	no	no	8.06	\$11.00	2000.00
Spring Valley Lake, C	2	yes	no	0.479	\$6.50	1435.00
Springville PUD	2	no	no	0.068	\$28.35	766.00
Squaw Valley CWD	2	yes	no	0.169	\$21.35	1125.00
St Helena MSD 1	2	no	no	0.35	\$16.75	3750.00
St Helena MSD No. 1*	2	yes	no	0.35	\$12.00	1500.00
Stallion Springs CSD	1	no	no	0.043	\$12.00	1000.00
Stege Sanit Dist*	3	yes	no	4.	\$5.50	480.00
Stockton*	5	no	no	28.	\$10.63	1495.00
Stratford PUD	2	no	no	0.07	\$21.00	1500.00
Strathmore PUD	2	no	no	0.3	\$6.00	500.00
Sultana CSD	1	no	no	0.051	\$17.00	650.00
Summerland SD	2	no	no	0.18	\$28.00	6740.00
Sunnyslope CWD	2	no	no	0.135	\$16.00	160.00
Sunnyvale	5	no	no	15.28	\$10.89	706.00
Sunol SD	2	no	no	0.17	\$9.92	720.00
Sunset Beach SD	2	yes	no	0.26	\$0.00	\$50.00
Susanville CSD	2	no	no	0.75	\$7.25	850.00
Sutter Creek	2	no	no	0.275	\$12.25	2000.00
Taft	2	no	no	0.89	\$9.65	100.00
Tahoe City PUD*	2	no	no	1.2	\$22.60	1000.00
Tahoe Truckee Sanit A	4	no	no	3.7	\$12.30	3000.00
Tamalpais CSD	2	no	no	0.325	\$20.08	2000.00
Tamarack Estates CSD	1	no	no	0.005	\$22.48	\$0.00
Tehachapi	2	no	no	0.42	\$8.75	600.00
Tehama CSD 1	1	no	no	0.04	\$5.50	100.00
Templeton CSD	2	no	mp	0.22	\$11.00	2400.00
Tennant CSD	1	no	no	0.03	\$21.00	175.00
Terra Bella SMD	2	no	no	0.15	\$14.00	287.00
Thermal SD	1	yes	no	0.14	\$8.00	1500.00
Thermalito Irrig Dist	2	no	no	0.27	\$10.00	550.00
Thousand Oaks	5	no	no	8.4	\$10.50	3600.00
Three Rivers CSD	2	no	no	0.03	\$5.00	\$0.00
Tiburon, SD 5*	2	yes	no	0.75	\$13.25	2000.00
Tipton CSD	2	no	no	0.17	\$8.00	925.00
Tomales WD	1	no	no	0.015	\$22.10	1000.00

AGENCY	POP INDEX	A.V. TAX	H2O USE	ADWF MGD	MONTHLY CHARGE	CONNECT FEE
Tracy	3	no	no	4.4	\$9.90	1300.00
Trancas Canyon (GC4)	1	no	no	0.058	\$53.29	\$0.00
Tranquillity PUD	1	no	no	0.12	\$10.00	450.00
Tres Pinos CWD	1	no	no	0.01	\$10.00	1650.00
Triunfo CSD	3	no	no	2.18	\$17.00	1450.00
Trona, CSA 82*	2	yes	no	0.118	\$8.86	\$50.00
Truckee SD	2	yes	no	1.4	\$14.50	750.00
Tucker Oaks WD	1	no	no	0.004	\$15.00	\$0.00
Tulare CSA 1*	1	no	no	0.012	\$27.42	1286.00
Tulare*	3	no	no	5.53	\$5.50	200.00
Tulelake	1	no	no	0.091	\$10.00	750.00
Tuolumne City SD	2	yes	no	0.061	\$15.00	2250.00
Tuolumne CWD 1	2	no	no	0.25	\$10.50	300.00
Tuolumne Reg WD	3	no	no	1.3	\$9.50	1000.00
Turlock	4	no	no	12.	\$8.80	100.00
Ukiah	3	no	no	2.2	\$6.60	550.00
Union SD	5	no	no	22.	\$11.41	1779.00
Upland	2	no	no	0.185	\$10.00	\$0.00
Vacaville	4	no	no	7.15	\$9.80	2080.00
Vallecitos WD	3	no	no	4.2	\$12.65	2400.00
Vallejo Sanit & Flood	5	no	no	12.	\$16.00	1260.00
Valley Center MWD	2	no	no	0.21	\$13.50	2955.00
Valley SD	3	yes	no	4.8	\$7.50	1250.00
Valley Springs SD*	1	no	no	0.036	\$12.50	1250.00
Ventura Cty Waterwork	3	no	no	2.	\$8.05	2500.00
Ventura Cty Waterwork	2	no	no	0.106	\$17.70	500.00
Ventura Regional	3	no	no	0.88	\$1.05	1184.00
Victorville SD	5	no	no	7.	\$8.00	1490.00
Visalia	4	no	no	8.86	\$7.00	1788.00
Vista	3	no	no	6.	\$12.75	1781.00
Walnut Grove SMD	2	no	no	0.055	\$12.50	2000.00
Wasco PUD	3	no	no	1.52	\$10.00	1300.00
Waterford CSD	2	yes	no	0.3	\$3.50	2200.00
Waterworks Dist 41	1	no	no	0.1	\$5.20	
Watsonville	3	no	no	8.	\$6.71	950.00
Weaverville SD	2	no	no	0.25	\$13.00	1025.00
Weed*	2	no	yes	0.393	\$8.00	150.00
Weott CSD	1	no	no	0.03	\$15.00	2000.00
West Bay SD	4	no	no	5.53	\$12.17	2035.00
West Contra Costa SD	4	no	no	7.	\$7.67	1407.00
West Lands WD	2	no	no	0.5	\$8.00	250.00
West Patton Village C	1	no	no	0.003	\$28.00	\$0.00
West Point*	1	no	no	0.02	\$10.62	2555.00
West Sacramento	3	no	no	3.5	\$25.38	3050.00
West Valley SD	5	no	no	10.5	\$9.70	800.00
Western MWD*	1	yes	no	0.046	\$8.00	2440.00
Westmorland	2	no	no	0.17	\$13.00	300.00
Westwood CSD*	2	no	no	0.23	\$21.00	300.00
Whispering Palms SD*	2	yes	no	0.07	\$27.00	1500.00
Wikiup CWD	2	no	no	0.375	\$15.25	5457.00
Williams	2	no	no	0.25	\$10.50	1500.00
Willits	2	no	no	0.75	\$12.44	1500.00
Willows	2	no	no	0.78	\$8.00	1500.00
Wilseyville*	1	no	no	0.002	\$9.00	4460.00

AGENCY	POP INDEX	A.V. TAX	H2O USE	ADWF MGD	MONTHLY CHARGE	CONNECT FEE
Windsor WD	3	no	no	0.84	\$15.00	4150.00
Wintergardens SMD	2	no	no	0.606	\$13.00	2000.00
Winterhaven WD	1	no	no	0.04	\$10.00	400.00
Winters	2	no	no	0.38	\$10.85	700.00
Winton Water/SD	2	no	no	0.46	\$12.00	1700.00
Woodbridge SD	2	yes	no	0.29	\$3.50	985.00
Woodlake	2	no	no	0.608	\$7.00	200.00
Woodland	3	no	no	4.75	\$7.00	1370.00
Woodville PUD	2	no	no	3.	\$12.00	700.00
Yountville	2	no	no	0.4	\$9.00	3760.00
Yreka*	2	no	no	0.8	\$2.50	250.00
Yuba City	3	no	no	4.2	\$10.75	900.00
Yucaipa Valley WD	3	no	no	2.8	\$6.50	2751.00

NOTES: Population Index: 1 = <1,000
2 = 1,000 - 10,000
3 = 10,000 - 50,000
4 = 50,000 - 100,000
5 = >100,000

A.V. Tax: Yes denotes agency utilizes Ad Valorem taxes to pay Operations and Maintenance Costs.

H2O Use: Yes denotes agency bases charges on water consumption.

MONTHLY USER CHARGE SUMMARY

Single Family Residences

Prepared by: California State Water Resources Control Board
Division of Clean Water Programs

(All Facilities)

Sorted by Population and District

DATE:04/15/91

AGENCY	POP INDEX	A.V. TAX	H2O USE	ADWF MGD	MONTHLY CHARGE	CONNECT FEE
Adin CSD	1	no	no	0.012	\$16.00	820.00
Amador City	1	no	no	0.015	\$23.00	1830.00
Amador CSA 3*	1	no	no	0.015	\$21.35	5150.00
Arnold*	1	no	no	0.05	\$16.24	1763.00
Baker CSD	1	no	no	0.07	\$8.80	100.00
Bear Valley CSD	1	yes	no	0.06	\$12.00	1000.00
Bear Valley WD	1	no	no	0.6	\$18.78	1400.00
Bear Valley, CSA 70*	1	no	no	0.008	\$27.23	\$0.00
Berryessa Resort Impr	1	yes	yes	0.01	\$5.31	500.00
Big Pine CSD*	1	no	no	0.09	\$5.25	\$0.00
Biola CSD	1	no	no	0.024	\$11.55	300.00
Bolinas Comm PUD	1	no	no	0.03	\$35.00	\$0.00
Borrego WD*	1	yes	no	0.001	\$5.00	\$50.00
Bridgeport PUD*	1	no	no	0.08	\$7.00	465.00
California Pines CSD	1	yes	no	0.015	\$0.00	200.00
Calpella CWD	1	yes	no	0.03	\$18.00	1400.00
Cantua Creek	1	no	no	0.03	\$3.05	\$0.00
Carmel Valley CSD-Zon	1	no	yes	0.065	\$24.50	\$0.00
Carmel Valley CSD-Zon	1	no	no	0.004	\$21.50	\$0.00
Carmel Valley CSD-Zon	1	no	no	0.007	\$16.67	\$0.00
Caspar South WD	1	no	no	0.001	\$18.00	\$0.00
Castroville CSD-Zone	1	no	no	0.07	\$6.21	1750.00
Chualar County SD	1	yes	no	0.05	\$11.34	384.00
Circle Oaks CWD	1	no	no	0.022	\$5.00	2500.00
Covelo CSD	1	no	no	0.024	\$11.00	600.00
Daphnedale CSD	1	no	no	0.05	\$13.50	540.00
Desert Lake CSD	1	no	no	0.05	\$7.00	\$85.00
Desert Water Agency	1	no	no	0.018	\$18.20	2520.00
Devonshire CSD	1	no	no	0.061	\$19.67	2280.00
Donner Summit PUD	1	no	no	0.048	\$39.00	3300.00
East Orosi CSD	1	yes	no	0.006	\$17.50	800.00
Ebbetts Pass (Country	1	no	no	0.001	\$5.00	\$0.00
Ebbetts Pass (Forest	1	yes	no	0.02	\$8.50	250.00
Ebbetts Pass (Sequoia	1	yes	no	0.008	\$5.00	\$0.00
Ebbetts Pass CWD*	1	yes	no	0.015	\$16.00	155.00
El Porvenir CSA 30	1	no	no	0.02	\$3.03	\$0.00
El Rancho CSA 1	1	no	no	0.012	\$27.42	1286.00
Etna*	1	no	no	0.082	\$6.00	300.00
Fall River Mills CSD	1	no	no	0.068	\$11.85	\$0.00
Fieldbrook CSD	1	no	no	0.04	\$24.00	2000.00
Folsom Lake SMD #3*	1	yes	no	0.065	\$19.00	2400.00
Forestville CSD	1	no	no	0.046	\$27.00	4481.00
Fresno CWD #38*	1	no	no	0.006	\$12.00	\$0.00
Fresno CWD #40*	1	no	no	0.01	\$11.50	\$0.00
Fresno CWD #41*	1	no	no	0.06	\$14.00	\$0.00

AGENCY	POP INDEX	A. V. TAX	H2O USE	ADWF MGD	MONTHLY CHARGE	CONNECT FEE
Garberville SD	1	yes	no	0.03	\$8.00	500.00
Garden Grove SD	1	yes	no	0.08		2535.00
Geyersville CSA 26	1	no	no	0.03	\$28.42	2000.00
Golden Valley MWD	1	no	yes	0.03	\$5.55	\$0.00
Grayson CSD*	1	no	no	0.06	\$5.00	600.00
Grizzly Lake Resort I	1	yes	no	0.025	\$12.00	800.00
Harbor Industrial SMD	1	no	no	0.39		2280.00
Heather Glen CSD	1	yes	no	0.003	\$0.00	\$0.00
High Country, CSA 70*	1	no	no	0.014	\$14.70	1425.00
Hilton Creek CSD	1	no	no	0.067	\$16.00	2640.00
Hopland PUD	1	no	no	0.056	\$11.00	1000.00
Julian SD*	1	no	no	0.03	\$30.25	1500.00
June Lake PUD	1	yes	no	0.21	\$7.00	1224.00
Kensington Square SMD	1	no	no	0.013	\$14.50	2280.00
Kirkwood Meadows	1	no	no	0.025	\$14.70	3200.00
LaContenta CWD*	1	no	no	0.03	\$12.00	650.00
Laguna CSA #10*	1	no	no	0.012	\$28.00	100.00
Lake Berryessa Resort	1	yes	no	0.01	\$12.00	500.00
Lassen Cty Waterworks	1	no	no	0.02	\$14.00	350.00
Lauti Track Cty SA 2	1	no	no	0.05	\$12.50	1400.00
Leavitt Lake CSP	1	no	no	0.06	\$38.00	\$0.00
Lemon Cove SD	1	yes	no	0.01	\$4.50	500.00
Loleta SD	1	no	no	0.06	\$11.58	1000.00
Los Alamos CSD	1	no	no	0.07	\$20.00	4750.00
Los Angeles CSD 23	1	yes	no	0.02	\$3.00	790.00
Lost Hills SD	1	no	no	0.086	\$15.00	400.00
Lytle Creek CSA 70*	1	no	no	0.089	\$13.25	325.00
Madera CSA 02A	1	no	no	0.07	\$16.25	\$0.00
Madera CSA 03	1	no	no	0.03	\$7.10	425.00
Madera CSA 06	1	yes	no	0.02	\$3.75	\$0.00
Madera CSA 07	1	yes	no	0.015	\$7.50	\$0.00
Madera CSA 16	1	no	no	0.009	\$13.50	\$0.00
Madera CSA 24	1	yes	no	0.012	\$10.00	\$0.00
Madera CSA 27	1	no	no	0.025	\$18.00	\$0.00
Madera MD 08 Zone A	1	yes	no	0.025	\$20.50	\$0.00
Madera MD 19, Zone A	1	yes	no	0.09	\$5.00	\$0.00
Madera MD 22, Zone A	1	yes	no	0.175	\$2.25	2760.00
Madera MD 28	1	yes	no	0.007	\$12.50	\$0.00
Madera MD 37	1	no	no	0.0004	\$14.65	\$0.00
Madison SD	1	no	no	0.025	\$20.00	\$40.00
Malibu Treatment Plt	1	no	no	0.033	\$73.95	\$0.00
Markleeville	1	no	no	0.025	\$20.00	400.00
Martell Wastewater Di	1	no	no	0.03	\$22.32	150.00
Maxwell PUD	1	no	no	0.07	\$8.00	150.00
Midway CSD	1	no	no	0.06	\$17.00	500.00
Miranda CSD*	1	no	no	0.02	\$12.00	500.00
Mokelumne Hill SD	1	yes	no	0.036	\$9.50	1400.00
Moss Landing CSD	1	yes	no	0.07	\$26.83	1750.00
Napa Berryessa Resort	1	yes	yes	0.05	\$12.00	500.00
Napa River - Reclamat	1	no	no	0.015	\$25.00	700.00
Newcastle SD	1	yes	no	0.0015	\$8.00	3000.00
North Marin WD*	1	yes	no	0.015	\$16.00	930.00
North Marin WD-Tomale	1	no	no	0.015	\$22.10	1000.00
Nyland Acres, CSA 29	1	no	no	0.06	\$22.73	2825.00

AGENCY	POP INDEX	A. V. TAX	H2O USE	ADWF MGD	MONTHLY CHARGE	CONNECT FEE
Oak Knoll SMD	1	no	no	0.012	\$17.33	2280.00
Occidental CSD	1	no	no	0.02	\$36.50	2000.00
Oceana Marin	1	yes	no	0.015	\$22.25	3450.00
Oro Grande, CSA 42*	1	no	no	0.046	\$14.20	1415.00
Pajaro CSD-Sunny Mesa	1	no	no	0.016	\$10.90	500.00
Palo Cedro, CSA 8*	1	no	no	0.026	\$16.00	4600.00
Pauma Valley CSD	1	no	no	0.065	\$7.08	2500.00
Penngrove CSA 19	1	no	no	0.074	\$18.92	2000.00
Pine Valley SD	1	no	no	0.018	\$37.00	2000.00
Pioneer Point, CSA 82	1	yes	no	0.105	\$8.86	\$50.00
Placer CSA 21*	1	no	no	0.082	\$27.40	4250.00
Placer CSA 28, Z 11	1	no	no	0.05	\$13.50	1800.00
Placer CSA 28, Z 21	1	no	no	0.105	\$27.40	250.00
Placer CSA 28, Z 23	1	no	no	0.006	\$16.00	1700.00
Placer CSA 28, Z 2A-3	1	no	no	0.105	\$13.00	3000.00
Placer CSA 28, Z 6	1	no	no	0.05	\$17.00	1700.00
Placer CSA 28, Zone 5	1	no	no	0.06	\$14.00	1500.00
Placer CSA 28, Zone 6	1	no	no	0.05	\$15.50	1700.00
Placer CSA 28, Z 24	1	no	no	0.01	\$28.00	1500.00
Placer SMD 3	1	yes	no	0.08	\$28.00	3500.00
Plainview PUD	1	no	no	0.057	\$5.75	\$30.00
Plymouth	1	no	no	0.1	\$15.00	2105.00
Point Arena	1	no	no	0.023	\$15.00	1500.00
Portola*	1	yes	no	0.24	\$11.75	500.00
Rancho California WD	1	yes	no	0.05	\$25.00	\$0.00
Rancho Santa Fe CSD 2	1	no	no	0.022	\$26.50	3760.00
Rancho Santa Fe CSD 3	1	no	no	0.04	\$26.50	3760.00
Redway CSD	1	yes	no	0.125	\$13.75	850.00
Richvale SD	1	yes	no	0.03	\$0.00	\$15.00
Rio Alto WD	1	yes	no	0.15	\$10.00	500.00
Rio Ramaza CSD*	1	yes	no	0.002	\$0.00	\$0.00
River Pines PUD*	1	no	no	0.054	\$33.15	4600.00
Sabre City CSA 11*	1	no	no	0.045	\$11.00	1500.00
Saddleback CSA 28 Z52	1	no	no	0.01	\$10.00	\$0.00
San Ardo WD	1	no	yes	0.045	\$7.00	\$0.00
San Joaquin Country C	1	yes	no		\$9.18	
San Joaquin CSA 15	1	yes	no	0.06	\$23.33	1082.00
San Lorenzo Valley WD	1	no	no	0.009	\$19.50	825.00
San Luis Obispo CSA 1	1	no	no	0.025	\$12.00	\$0.00
San Simeon Acres CSD	1	no	yes	0.11	\$22.55	2280.00
Santa Nella CWD	1	no	no	0.04		1780.00
Scenic Heights CSD	1	no	no	0.009	\$17.25	2280.00
Shasta CSA 8	1	no	no	0.03	\$14.00	1500.00
Shaver Lake	1	no	no	0.12	\$15.52	\$0.00
Shaver Springs WD 40	1	yes	no	0.015	\$11.50	\$0.00
Shelter Cove	1	no	no	0.036	\$9.00	440.00
Sheridan CSA 06, ZA 1*	1	no	no	0.045	\$15.00	1500.00
Six Mile Village, CWD	1	no	no	0.003	\$21.00	3421.00
Sky Harbour WD 38	1	yes	no	0.006	\$12.00	\$0.00
Snelling CSD	1	yes	no	0.015	\$6.60	200.00
Spanish Flat WD	1	no	no	0.05	\$10.00	1200.00
Stallion Springs CSD	1	no	no	0.043	\$12.00	1000.00
Sultana CSD	1	no	no	0.051	\$17.00	650.00
Tamarack Estates CSD	1	no	no	0.005	\$22.48	\$0.00

AGENCY	POP INDEX	A.V. TAX	H2O USE	ADWF MGD	MONTHLY CHARGE	CONNECT FEE
Tehama CSD 1	1	no	no	0.04	\$5.50	100.00
Tennant CSD	1	no	no	0.03	\$21.00	175.00
Thermal SD	1	yes	no	0.14	\$8.00	1500.00
Tomales WD	1	no	no	0.015	\$22.10	1000.00
Trancas Canyon (GC4)	1	no	no	0.058	\$53.29	\$0.00
Tranquillity PUD	1	no	no	0.12	\$10.00	450.00
Tres Pinos CWD	1	no	no	0.01	\$10.00	1650.00
Tucker Oaks WD	1	no	no	0.004	\$15.00	\$0.00
Tulare CSA 1*	1	no	no	0.012	\$27.42	1286.00
Tulelake	1	no	no	0.091	\$10.00	750.00
Valley Springs SD*	1	no	no	0.036	\$12.50	1250.00
Waterworks Dist 41	1	no	no	0.1	\$5.20	
Weott CSD	1	no	no	0.03	\$15.00	2000.00
West Patton Village C	1	no	no	0.003	\$28.00	\$0.00
West Point*	1	no	no	0.02	\$10.62	2555.00
Western MWD*	1	yes	no	0.046	\$8.00	2440.00
Wilseyville*	1	no	no	0.002	\$9.00	4460.00
Winterhaven WD	1	no	no	0.04	\$10.00	400.00
Alpine SD	2	no	no	0.38	\$12.50	2000.00
Alpine Springs CWD	2	no	no	0.04	\$6.25	700.00
Alturas	2	no	no	0.5	\$10.30	600.00
Anderson	2	yes	no	1.2	\$14.43	2307.00
Angels	2	no	no	0.215	\$11.50	800.00
Apple Valley WD	2	no	no	0.65	\$8.00	1600.00
Arbuckle PUD	2	no	no	0.28	\$5.00	\$50.00
Armona CSA	2	no	no	0.285	\$7.80	2000.00
Avalon	2	no	no	0.7	\$14.83	516.84
Avenal	2	no	no	0.816	\$5.25	225.00
Beaumont	2	no	no	0.99	\$8.00	1000.00
Biggs	2	no	no	0.203	\$7.00	600.00
Bishop*	2	no	no	0.7	\$7.28	\$0.00
Blue Lake	2	no	no	0.1	\$15.00	2090.00
Bodega Bay PUD	2	yes	no	0.16	\$12.50	1075.00
Boronda County SD	2	no	no	0.1	\$30.00	1800.00
Brentwood	2	no	no	0.7	\$9.50	1859.00
Brooktrails CSD	2	no	no	0.13	\$7.50	800.00
Buellton CSD*	2	no	no	0.33	\$10.25	1200.00
Burbank SD	2	no	no	0.335	\$10.34	830.00
Burlingame Hills SMD	2	no	no	0.33	\$11.00	1050.00
Burney WD*	2	no	no	0.44	\$11.00	600.00
Buttonwillow CWD*	2	no	no	0.16	\$11.00	\$0.00
Cachunia SD*	2	no	yes	0.047	\$7.50	\$0.00
California City	2	no	no	0.225	\$7.50	1535.00
Calipatria	2	no	no	0.477	\$14.00	800.00
Calistoga	2	no	yes	0.65	\$11.00	5000.00
Cambria CSD	2	no	no	0.6	\$19.72	2035.00
Camrosa WD	2	yes	no	1.1	\$8.66	1000.00
Caruthers CSD	2	yes	no	0.31	\$4.50	\$75.00
Cayucos SD*	2	no	no	0.389	\$6.40	1725.00
Channel Islands Beach	2	no	no	0.9	\$10.00	5610.00
Chester PUD	2	yes	no	0.6	\$4.65	225.00
Chowchilla	2	no	no	0.594	\$9.77	289.00
City of Lakeport SD 1	2	no	no	0.5	\$17.00	800.00
Clear Lake MSD #1*	2	no	no	0.5	\$17.00	800.00

AGENCY	POP INDEX	A. V. TAX	H2O USE	ADWF MGD	MONTHLY CHARGE	CONNECT FEE
Clearlake Oaks CWD*	2	yes	no	0.3	\$10.00	1500.00
Cloverdale*	2	no	no	0.47	\$23.10	2000.00
Coalinga	2	no	no	0.7	\$4.90	
Colfax	2	yes	no	0.115	\$11.15	1400.00
Colusa*	2	no	no	0.6	\$10.10	375.00
Copper Cove CWD*	2	no	no	0.065	\$13.50	685.00
Corning	2	no	no	0.84	\$12.60	1680.00
Corte Madera	2	yes	no	0.9	\$11.00	340.00
Cotati	2	yes	yes	0.5	\$5.75	2000.00
Cottonwood CSA #17*	2	no	no	0.17	\$14.00	\$0.00
Courtland SD	2	no	no	0.08	\$7.00	295.00
Crestline SD	2	yes	no	0.648	\$14.29	1942.00
Crockett-Valona SD	2	yes	no	0.285	\$8.00	350.00
Crystal Springs CSD	2	no	no	0.51	\$24.33	2280.00
Del Mar	2	no	no	0.5	\$21.65	975.00
Del Rey CSD	2	yes	no	0.3	\$9.50	350.00
Delhi CWD	2	yes	no	0.169	\$10.00	1500.00
Denair CSD	2	yes	no	0.3	\$14.54	334.00
Dos Palos	2	no	no	0.45	\$13.50	800.00
Dunsmuir	2	no	no	0.227	\$13.95	1200.00
Earlimart PUD	2	no	no	0.4	\$6.00	800.00
East Blythe CWD	2	yes	no	0.865	\$16.00	100.00
Eastern Sierra CSD	2	no	no	0.672	\$9.00	1750.00
Edgemont CSD	2	no	no	0.425	\$4.17	2600.00
Emerald Bay SD*	2	yes	no		\$0.00	\$0.00
Emerald Lake Hts SMD	2	no	no	0.254	\$19.79	2280.00
Escalon	2	no	no	0.38	\$6.00	957.00
Esparto CSD	2	no	no	0.15	\$8.00	\$50.00
Exeter	2	no	no	0.78	\$5.75	750.00
Fairbanks Ranch SD	2	no	no	0.14	\$30.00	\$0.00
Farmersville	2	no	no	0.65	\$9.50	1300.00
Fawnskin, CSA 53*	2	no	no	0.183	\$14.30	1400.00
Ferndale	2	no	no	0.215	\$15.00	3400.00
Firebaugh	2	no	no	0.2	\$18.48	250.00
Fort Bragg MID #1	2	no	no	0.5	\$7.00	1500.00
Fortuna	2	no	no	0.87	\$9.75	600.00
Franklin CWD	2	yes	no	0.44	\$7.50	1125.00
Freedom CSD*	2	no	no	0.6	\$12.00	4000.00
Galt	2	no	no	0.8	\$9.25	3000.00
Georgetown Divide PUD	2	no	no	0.129	\$6.25	1500.00
Gonzales	2	no	no	0.4	\$5.48	2225.00
Granada SD*	2	no	no	0.312	\$25.00	3600.00
Grand Terrace	2	no	no	0.9	\$8.50	2800.00
Graton CSA 2	2	no	no	0.08	\$20.17	2000.00
Greenfield*	2	no	no	0.38	\$7.20	1660.00
Gridley	2	no	no	0.65	\$10.70	900.00
Groveland CSD	2	no	no	0.15	\$19.83	2362.00
Guadalupe	2	no	no	0.33	\$10.00	1200.00
Gustine	2	no	no	1.	\$5.25	2950.00
Healdsburg	2	no	no	1.05	\$10.21	900.00
Heber PUD	2	yes	no	0.2	\$11.00	800.00
Helendale, CSA 70*	2	yes	no	0.219	\$10.00	\$25.00
Heritage Ranch CSD	2	yes	no	0.275	\$14.80	1000.00
Hesperia WD	2	yes	no	0.5	\$9.00	1500.00

AGENCY	POP INDEX	A.V. TAX	H2O USE	ADWF MGD	MONTHLY CHARGE	CONNECT FEE
Hilmar CWD*	2	yes	no	0.08	\$8.50	\$0.00
Holtville	2	no	no	0.55	\$12.58	350.00
Home Gardens SD	2	no	no	0.45	\$14.00	2640.00
Hughson	2	yes	no	0.6	\$22.75	1200.00
Idyllwild WD ID #1	2	yes	no	0.15	\$7.50	1172.00
Imperial*	2	no	no	0.3	\$16.50	400.00
Inyokern CSD	2	no	no	0.4	\$6.25	650.00
Ione	2	no	no	0.323	\$9.50	1650.00
Isleton*	2	no	no	0.115	\$13.25	998.00
Ivanhoe PUD	2	no	no	0.38	\$7.00	500.00
Jackson	2	no	no	0.55	\$14.70	1600.00
Jamestown SD*	2	no	no	0.15	\$16.45	2500.00
Kelseyville Cty Wtrwr	2	no	no	0.096	\$8.15	250.00
Kerman*	2	no	no	0.614	\$11.50	\$0.00
Kettleman City CSD	2	no	no	0.28	\$12.00	250.00
Keyes CSD*	2	no	no	0.24	\$11.10	500.00
King City*	2	no	no	0.56	\$4.50	2400.00
Knights Landing SD	2	yes	no	0.012	\$17.00	750.00
Lake CSD ID 3	2	no	no	0.2	\$12.60	500.00
Lakeport	2	yes	no	0.5	\$17.00	3100.00
Las Lomas*	2	no	no	0.12	\$14.00	550.00
Lathrop CWD	2	no	no	0.5	\$10.15	275.00
Lee Lake WD	2	no	no	0.166	\$24.33	\$0.00
LeGrand CSD	2	no	no	0.126	\$11.50	425.00
Lincoln	2	no	no	0.675	\$11.00	2210.00
Lindsay*	2	no	no	1.	\$8.00	700.00
Live Oak	2	no	no	0.35	\$12.70	1300.00
Livingston	2	no	no	1.	\$8.50	1500.00
Lockeford CSD*	2	no	no	0.21	\$22.50	1175.00
London CSD	2	yes	no	0.028	\$7.00	\$45.00
Lone Pine CSD*	2	no	no	0.13	\$3.00	\$0.00
Los Angeles CSD 09	2	yes	no	0.26	\$14.58	2220.00
Los Angeles CSD 27	2	yes	no	0.15	\$0.00	2220.00
Los Angeles CSD 28*	2	yes	no	0.51	\$25.83	\$0.00
Los Angeles CSD 29	2	yes	no	1.19	\$4.58	930.00
Lost Altos Hills*	2	no	no	0.79	\$14.50	450.00
Loyalton	2	no	no	0.235	\$8.00	175.00
Malaga CWD	2	no	no	0.075	\$5.25	275.00
Malibu Mesa (GC5)	2	no	no	0.17	\$28.62	\$0.00
Mammoth CWD*	2	no	no	1.5	\$12.10	2000.00
Manila CSD	2	no	no	0.055	\$18.00	600.00
Marin SD 2	2	yes	no	0.85	\$11.00	340.00
Marin SD 5	2	yes	no	0.75	\$13.25	2000.00
Mariposa PUD	2	no	no	0.252	\$10.00	650.00
McCloud CSD	2	no	no	0.034	\$35.00	1000.00
McFarland	2	no	no	0.58	\$5.00	1000.00
McKinleyville CSD	2	no	no	0.6	\$11.00	750.00
Mendocino City CSD*	2	yes	no	0.1	\$10.10	1000.00
Mendota	2	no	no	1.	\$9.80	300.00
Mission Canyon, CSA 1	2	no	no	0.3	\$20.64	5523.00
Mission Hills CSD	2	no	no	0.198	\$28.95	2660.00
Mission Springs WD	2	yes	no	0.59	\$6.00	640.00
Mojava PUD	2	no	yes	0.375	\$4.20	1570.00
Mono Village WD	2	no	no	0.1	\$8.50	1000.00

AGENCY	POP INDEX	A. V. TAX	H2O USE	ADWF MGD	MONTHLY CHARGE	CONNECT FEE
Montague*	2	no	no	0.07	\$8.20	537.00
Montara SD	2	yes	yes	0.394	\$22.50	4405.00
Mt Shasta	2	no	no	0.45	\$9.00	700.00
Murphys SD	2	yes	no	0.15	\$12.00	1500.00
Needles	2	no	no	0.654	\$11.75	220.00
Nevada City*	2	no	no	0.4	\$11.00	925.00
Newman	2	no	no	1.1	\$4.90	1535.00
Niland SD	2	yes	no	0.275	\$12.50	1200.00
Nipomo CSD	2	no	no	0.194	\$24.00	3900.00
North Coast, CSA 30	2	no	no	0.116	\$33.90	1800.00
North Tahoe PUD	2	yes	no	0.79	\$23.86	1000.00
Olivehurst PUD	2	no	no	1.1	\$9.00	1000.00
Orange Cove	2	no	no	0.7	\$9.20	3500.00
Orange CSD 13	2	no	no	1.28	\$6.53	2270.00
Orland	2	no	yes	0.7	\$4.00	160.00
Orosi PUD	2	no	no	0.71	\$21.40	800.00
Otay WD	2	no	no	1.3	\$8.25	2500.00
Pajaro CSD*	2	no	no	0.14	\$6.40	500.00
Pajaro CSD-Los Lomas*	2	no	no	0.1	\$13.98	550.00
Pajaro SD	2	no	no	0.5	\$6.73	500.00
Parlier	2	no	no	0.5	\$10.20	320.00
Patterson	2	no	no	0.72	\$7.80	732.00
Pebble Beach CSD	2	yes	no	0.428	\$9.39	1550.00
Pinedale CWD	2	no	no	0.22	\$5.00	178.00
Pinedale PUD	2	no	no		\$4.41	350.00
Pismo Beach	2	no	yes	1.1	\$10.40	1100.00
Pixley PUD	2	no	no	0.36	\$4.50	175.00
Placerville	2	no	no	0.95	\$15.00	2000.00
Planada CSD	2	no	no	0.435	\$12.00	700.00
Quincy SD	2	yes	no	1.	\$11.76	1200.00
Rainbow MWD	2	no	no	0.23	\$11.00	2274.00
Rancho California WD	2	no	no	0.5	\$27.00	3942.00
Rancho Murieta CSD	2	no	no	0.225	\$14.75	1000.00
Rancho Santa Fe CSD 1	2	no	no	0.208	\$26.50	2000.00
Rio Dell	2	no	no	0.29	\$10.00	900.00
Rio Vista	2	no	no	0.42	\$28.40	2161.00
Ripon	2	no	no	0.609	\$3.00	561.00
Ripon MSD #1*	2	yes	no	0.7	\$3.00	537.00
Riverbank	2	no	no	0.955	\$5.50	400.00
Rodeo SD	2	yes	no	0.85	\$12.00	600.00
Rosamond CSD	2	yes	no	0.67	\$4.60	475.00
Running Springs WD	2	no	no	0.56	\$8.70	1050.00
Russian River CSD	2	no	no	0.35	\$30.66	2000.00
Salida SD	2	yes	no	0.45	\$6.00	500.00
Salsipuedes SD*	2	no	no	0.11	\$15.00	3000.00
Salton CSD	2	no	no	0.08	\$5.00	500.00
San Andreas SD*	2	no	no	0.25	\$12.00	1000.00
San Jacinto	2	no	no	0.8	\$2.00	200.00
San Joaquin	2	no	no	0.25	\$35.00	450.00
San Juan Bautista	2	no	no	0.15	\$16.00	\$16.00
San Luis Obispo CSA 1	2	no	no	0.04	\$25.60	2500.00
San Luis Obispo CSA 1	2	no	no	0.12	\$14.80	300.00
San Luis Obispo CSA 7	2	yes	no	0.02	\$6.00	\$0.00
San Luis Obispo CSA 7	2	yes	no	0.02	\$6.00	\$0.00

AGENCY	POP INDEX	A.V. TAX	H2O USE	ADWF MGD	MONTHLY CHARGE	CONNECT FEE
San Miguel SD	2	no	yes	0.06	\$3.50	750.00
Santa Ynez CSD	2	no	no	0.135	\$14.00	1300.00
Saticoy SD	2	yes	no	0.12	\$8.00	100.00
Scotts Valley*	2	no	yes	0.675	\$51.00	3760.00
Sebastopol	2	no	yes	0.8	\$34.00	6360.00
Seeley CWD	2	no	no	0.26	\$12.50	300.00
Shafter*	2	no	no	0.7	\$8.20	934.00
Shasta Dam PUD	2	no	no	0.63	\$14.75	1883.00
Sierra Lakes CWD	2	yes	no	0.042	\$22.92	875.00
Soledad	2	no	no	0.58	\$11.39	350.00
Solvang	2	no	no	0.32	\$10.50	1600.00
Spring Valley Lake, C	2	yes	no	0.479	\$6.50	1435.00
Springville PUD	2	no	no	0.068	\$28.35	766.00
Squaw Valley CWD	2	yes	no	0.169	\$21.35	1125.00
St Helena MSD 1	2	no	no	0.35	\$16.75	3750.00
St Helena MSD No. 1*	2	yes	no	0.35	\$12.00	1500.00
Stratford PUD	2	no	no	0.07	\$21.00	1500.00
Strathmore PUD	2	no	no	0.3	\$6.00	500.00
Summerland SD	2	no	no	0.18	\$28.00	6740.00
Sunnyslope CWD	2	no	no	0.135	\$16.00	160.00
Sunol SD	2	no	no	0.17	\$9.92	720.00
Sunset Beach SD	2	yes	no	0.26	\$0.00	\$50.00
Susanville CSD	2	no	no	0.75	\$7.25	850.00
Sutter Creek	2	no	no	0.275	\$12.25	2000.00
Taft	2	no	no	0.89	\$9.65	100.00
Tahoe City PUD*	2	no	no	1.2	\$22.60	1000.00
Tamalpais CSD	2	no	no	0.325	\$20.08	2000.00
Tehachapi	2	no	no	0.42	\$8.75	600.00
Templeton CSD	2	no	mp	0.22	\$11.00	2400.00
Terra Bella SMD	2	no	no	0.15	\$14.00	287.00
Thermalito Irrig Dist	2	no	no	0.27	\$10.00	550.00
Three Rivers CSD	2	no	no	0.03	\$5.00	\$0.00
Tiburon, SD 5*	2	yes	no	0.75	\$13.25	2000.00
Tipton CSD	2	no	no	0.17	\$8.00	925.00
Trona, CSA 82*	2	yes	no	0.118	\$8.86	\$50.00
Truckee SD	2	yes	no	1.4	\$14.50	750.00
Tuolumne City SD	2	yes	no	0.061	\$15.00	2250.00
Tuolumne CWD 1	2	no	no	0.25	\$10.50	300.00
Upland	2	no	no	0.185	\$10.00	\$0.00
Valley Center MWD	2	no	no	0.21	\$13.50	2955.00
Ventura Cty Waterwork	2	no	no	0.106	\$17.70	500.00
Walnut Grove SMD	2	no	no	0.055	\$12.50	2000.00
Waterford CSD	2	yes	no	0.3	\$3.50	2200.00
Weaverville SD	2	no	no	0.25	\$13.00	1025.00
Weed*	2	no	yes	0.393	\$8.00	150.00
West Lands WD	2	no	no	0.5	\$8.00	250.00
Westmorland	2	no	no	0.17	\$13.00	300.00
Westwood CSD*	2	no	no	0.23	\$21.00	300.00
Whispering Palms SD*	2	yes	no	0.07	\$27.00	1500.00
Wikiup CWD	2	no	no	0.375	\$15.25	5457.00
Williams	2	no	no	0.25	\$10.50	1500.00
Willits	2	no	no	0.75	\$12.44	1500.00
Willows	2	no	no	0.78	\$8.00	1500.00
Wintergardens SMD	2	no	no	0.606	\$13.00	2000.00

AGENCY	POP INDEX	A.V. TAX	H2O USE	ADWF MGD	MONTHLY CHARGE	CONNECT FEE
Winters	2	no	no	0.38	\$10.85	700.00
Winton Water/SD	2	no	no	0.46	\$12.00	1700.00
Woodbridge SD	2	yes	no	0.29	\$3.50	985.00
Woodlake	2	no	no	0.608	\$7.00	200.00
Woodville PUD	2	no	no	3.	\$12.00	700.00
Yountville	2	no	no	0.4	\$9.00	3760.00
Yreka*	2	no	no	0.8	\$2.50	250.00
Almonte SD	3	yes	no	0.12	\$11.34	1600.00
Alto SD	3	yes	no	0.08	\$15.00	1200.00
Arcata*	3	no	yes	2.3	\$15.14	1450.00
Arvin CSD*	3	no	no	0.68	\$7.35	426.00
Atascadero CSD*	3	no	no	1.1	\$10.54	573.00
Atwater	3	no	no	3.3	\$10.22	1500.00
Azusa	3	no	no	3.9	\$3.50	180.00
Banning	3	no	no	2.2	\$10.45	1500.00
Barstow	3	no	no	2.6	\$7.65	250.00
Benicia	3	no	no	2.5	\$12.25	2150.00
Beverly Hills	3	no	yes	5.5	\$11.25	\$0.00
Big Bear Area Reg Was	3	no	no	2.08	\$5.67	1200.00
Big Bear City CSD	3	no	no	2.1	\$5.67	1400.00
Big Bear Lake	3	no	no	1.5	\$14.00	1900.00
Blythe	3	no	no	1.3	\$17.01	825.00
Brawley	3	no	no	3.3	\$7.00	300.00
Buena SD	3	no	no	0.73	\$15.00	3000.00
Burlingame	3	no	yes	1.3	\$7.35	875.00
Calexico	3	no	no	2.1	\$11.75	520.00
Camarillo SD	3	yes	no	4.	\$10.63	3650.00
Capistrano Beach SD	3	no	no	1.1	\$22.00	2590.00
Cardiff County SD	3	no	no	1.38	\$20.53	4700.00
Carmel SD	3	yes	no	1.53	\$8.00	1020.00
Carpinteria SD	3	yes	no	1.1	\$14.33	2000.00
Castro Valley SD	3	yes	no	3.	\$2.92	460.00
Ceres	3	no	no	1.9	\$6.50	1359.24
Chico	3	no	no	4.	\$4.36	3144.00
Clovis	3	no	no	3.4	\$5.25	1627.00
Coachella SD	3	no	no	1.6	\$9.30	1500.00
Corcoran	3	no	no	1.2	\$8.45	350.00
Coronado	3	no	no	2.6	\$19.00	850.00
Crescent City	3	no	no	1.6	\$8.90	3750.00
Crescenta Valley CWD	3	no	no	1.48	\$20.00	\$25.00
Culver City*	3	no	no	4.	\$11.51	348.00
Dana Point SD	3	yes	no	1.6	\$9.33	2100.00
Delano	3	no	no	3.	\$7.10	100.00
Delta Diablo SD-Z I*	3	no	no	3.5	\$6.93	1100.00
Delta Diablo SD-Z II*	3	no	no	3.5	\$7.12	1100.00
Delta Diablo SD-Z III	3	no	no	3.5	\$6.71	1100.00
Dinuba	3	no	no	1.9	\$9.60	485.00
Dixon	3	no	no	0.9	\$6.50	1343.00
East Niles CSD	3	no	no	1.72	\$5.25	200.00
East Palo Alto SD	3	no	no	1.3	\$22.08	1923.00
East Valley WD	3	no	no	1.4	\$9.00	1113.00
El Centro	3	no	no	5.	\$7.26	\$0.00
El Dorado Irrigation	3	yes	no	2.015	\$14.70	1000.00
El Segundo	3	no	yes	2.3	\$0.00	580.00

AGENCY	POP INDEX	A.V. TAX	H2O USE	ADWF MGD	MONTHLY CHARGE	CONNECT FEE
Elsinore Valley MWD	3	no	no	3.2	\$15.50	2130.00
Estero MID*	3	no	no	13.2	\$18.00	1600.00
Eureka*	3	no	no	4.3	\$9.50	2000.00
Fair Oaks SMD	3	no	no	2.5	\$9.58	2280.00
Fallbrook SD	3	no	no	1.56	\$20.65	4264.00
Folsom	3	no	no	2.95	\$11.41	388.00
Folsom Lake SMD #2*	3	no	no	1.	\$11.75	3400.00
Fontana*	3	no	no	3.8	\$4.80	600.00
Goleta West SD	3	no	no	1.7	\$8.90	1375.00
Grass Valley	3	no	no	1.72	\$8.00	968.00
Grover City*	3	no	no	0.95	\$6.50	\$0.00
Half Moon Bay*	3	no	no	1.311	\$24.08	3144.00
Hanford	3	no	no	3.8	\$8.00	750.00
Hercules*	3	no	no	3.25	\$10.50	1500.00
Hillsborough*	3	no	no	1.1	\$28.00	3000.00
Hollister	3	no	yes	2.	\$3.82	2136.00
Homestead Valley SD	3	yes	no	0.16	\$11.67	1500.00
Humboldt CSD	3	no	no	1.22	\$14.25	1400.00
Isla Vista SD*	3	no	no	1.7	\$8.90	1375.00
Laguna Beach	3	no	no	2.1	\$21.00	2500.00
Laguna SD*	3	no	no	2.2	\$10.06	921.00
Lake CSD ID 1	3	no	no	2.192	\$8.90	500.00
Lake Hemet MWD	3	no	no	3.	\$1.75	\$0.00
Lakeside CSD	3	no	no	2.85	\$12.00	2000.00
Lamont PUD*	3	no	no	1.4	\$3.00	\$0.00
Las Gallinas Valley S	3	yes	no	2.1	\$8.08	1400.00
Lemon Grove	3	no	no	2.422	\$11.00	500.00
Lemoore	3	no	no	1.8	\$8.50	500.00
Leucadia CWD	3	yes	no	0.65	\$16.70	2700.00
Linda CWD	3	no	no	1.1	\$6.10	1500.00
Lodi	3	yes	no	6.3	\$7.73	2281.00
Loma Linda	3	no	no	4.5	\$8.05	2260.00
Lompoc	3	no	no	3.5	\$14.05	271.00
Los Alisos WD	3	no	no	3.9	\$4.00	1100.00
Los Altos	3	no	no	0.28	\$9.20	190.00
Los Angeles CSD 04	3	yes	no	6.5	\$14.58	2220.00
Los Angeles CSD 17	3	yes	no	3.83	\$4.50	950.00
Los Angeles CSD 20	3	yes	no	5.42	\$4.25	1100.00
Los Angeles CSD 32	3	yes	no	4.38	\$7.58	1350.00
Los Banos	3	no	no	2.	\$9.90	2000.00
Madera*	3	yes	no	3.8	\$7.85	425.00
Manteca	3	no	no	4.54	\$8.78	2222.00
Marin SD 1	3	yes	no	7.8	\$8.33	1200.00
Marina CWD	3	no	no	1.3	\$12.00	1000.00
Marysville	3	no	no	1.5	\$8.05	700.00
Mill Valley*	3	no	no	2.65	\$16.33	600.00
Millbrae	3	no	no	2.	\$10.50	500.00
Monteciteo SD	3	yes	no	0.85	\$20.00	3000.00
Morro Bay	3	no	no	1.4	\$9.08	2750.00
Mountain View SD	3	yes	no	1.636	\$10.00	2373.00
North Auburn-SM #1*	3	no	no	1.3	\$13.50	1650.00
North of the River SD	3	no	no	3.2	\$6.75	625.00
Northcoast Region	3	no	yes	1.6	\$22.45	1797.00
Novato SD	3	yes	yes	4.7	\$6.83	1100.00

AGENCY	POP INDEX	A.V. TAX	H2O USE	ADWF MGD	MONTHLY CHARGE	CONNECT FEE
Oakdale	3	no	no	1.3	\$7.00	625.00
Oakley Bethel Island	3	no	no	1.45		1930.00
Oakley SD*	3	yes	no	1.3	\$15.00	2855.00
Ojai Valley SD	3	yes	no	2.	\$16.15	1700.00
Orange CSD 05	3	yes	no	13.08	\$3.75	2270.00
Pacifica	3	yes	yes	2.8	\$27.81	688.00
Palm Springs*	3	no	no	6.5	\$7.75	2850.00
Paso Robles	3	no	no	2.1	\$8.82	817.00
Perris	3	no	no	1.9	\$14.79	600.00
Petaluma	3	no	no	4.5	\$8.75	2550.00
Pinole*	3	no	no	1.6	\$9.67	700.00
Pittsburg	3	no	no	11.08	\$28.68	600.00
Placer SMD 1	3	no	no	1.45	\$16.00	2700.00
Placer SMD 2	3	no	no	1.21	\$13.50	3500.00
Pleasanton	3			3.7	\$13.33	1312.00
Port Hueneme	3		no	2.8	\$10.00	3000.00
Porter Vista PUD	3	yes	no	4.6	\$9.00	1440.00
Porterville	3	no	no	4.6	\$11.34	485.00
Poway	3	no	no	3.3	\$14.57	2356.00
Ramona MWD*	3	no	no	0.877	\$17.76	4505.00
Red Bluff	3	no	no	1.3	\$9.58	340.00
Reedley	3	no	no	1.9	\$7.75	346.00
Richardson Bay SD	3	yes	no	0.8	\$20.50	3500.00
Ridgecrest	3	no	no	3.6	\$6.08	540.00
Rohnert Park*	3	no	no	3.	\$12.50	3300.00
Rubidoux CSD*	3	no	yes	1.9	\$9.00	3000.00
San Bruno*	3	no	no	8.5	\$9.79	110.00
San Clemente	3	no	no	3.9	\$9.97	5772.00
San Leandro	3	no	no	3.91	\$8.25	825.00
San Luis Obispo*	3	no	no	4.4	\$8.50	\$0.00
San Marcos CWD*	3	no	no	3.5	\$8.25	2400.00
San Rafael SD	3	yes	no	8.	\$14.67	940.00
Sanger	3	yes	no	2.	\$11.75	1100.00
Santa Clara CWD No 2-	3	no	no	1.73	\$13.67	900.00
Santa Paula*	3	no	no	2.1	\$7.10	394.00
Santa Rosa Reg	3	no	no	3.69	\$17.00	
Sausalito	3	no	no	1.5	\$9.00	800.00
Seal Beach	3	no	yes	1.	\$12.50	1000.00
Seaside CSD	3	yes	no	1.6	\$9.20	850.00
Selma-Kingsburg-Fowle	3	no	no	3.05	\$11.50	1110.00
Sewer Agency of So Ma	3	no	no	2.5	\$11.85	\$0.00
Sewerage Comm-Oroville	3	no	no	2.9	\$4.00	900.00
So Coast WD	3	yes	no	1.5	\$14.50	1835.00
So Park CSD	3	no	no	0.15	\$20.50	2000.00
So Placer MUD	3	no	no	2.25	\$9.00	3450.00
So San Luis Obispo CS	3	no	no	2.8	\$6.50	2000.00
So Tahoe PUD	3	yes	no	4.25	\$20.28	6000.00
Solana Beach SD	3	no	no	3.1	\$22.50	4500.00
Sonoma Valley CSD	3	no	no	2.8	\$15.75	2000.00
Spring Valley CSD	3	no	no	8.06	\$11.00	2000.00
Stege Sanit Dist*	3	yes	no	4.	\$5.50	480.00
Tracy	3	no	no	4.4	\$9.90	1300.00
Triunfo CSD	3	no	no	2.18	\$17.00	1450.00
Tulare*	3	no	no	5.53	\$5.50	200.00

AGENCY	POP INDEX	A. V. TAX	H2O USE	ADWF MGD	MONTHLY CHARGE	CONNECT FEE
Tuolumne Reg WD	3	no	no	1.3	\$9.50	1000.00
Ukiah	3	no	no	2.2	\$6.60	550.00
Vallecitos WD	3	no	no	4.2	\$12.65	2400.00
Valley SD	3	yes	no	4.8	\$7.50	1250.00
Ventura Cty Waterwork	3	no	no	2.	\$8.05	2500.00
Ventura Regional	3	no	no	0.88	\$1.05	1184.00
Vista	3	no	no	6.	\$12.75	1781.00
Wasco PUD	3	no	no	1.52	\$10.00	1300.00
Watsonville	3	no	no	8.	\$6.71	950.00
West Sacramento	3	no	no	3.5	\$25.38	3050.00
Windsor WD	3	no	no	0.84	\$15.00	4150.00
Woodland	3	no	no	4.75	\$7.00	1370.00
Yuba City	3	no	no	4.2	\$10.75	900.00
Yucaipa Valley WD	3	no	no	2.8	\$6.50	2751.00
Burbank	4	no	no	16.	\$9.94	664.00
Central Marin Sanit A	4	no	no	8.3	\$6.61	380.00
Chino	4	no	no	5.5	\$9.59	2000.00
Colton	4	no	no	5.7	\$8.25	2800.00
Corona*	4	no	no	5.1	\$11.00	1680.00
Cucamonga CWD	4	no	no	15.	\$7.40	1085.00
Cupertino SD	4	no	no	4.5	\$8.00	1850.00
Davis Municipal Sewer	4	no	no	4.3	\$7.80	1219.00
Dublin San Ramon SD	4	no	no	7.2	\$12.50	3100.00
El Cajon	4	no	yes	6.8	\$10.00	1728.00
El Toro WD*	4	no	no	4.5	\$11.00	1190.00
Encinitas SD	4	no	no	2.	\$10.00	1500.00
Fairfield-Suisun SD	4	no	no	12.8	\$13.40	4851.00
Gilroy	4	no	no	4.587	\$18.41	3800.00
Goleta SD*	4	no	no	6.4	\$9.00	1375.00
Hayward	4	no	no	9.4	\$8.45	760.00
La Mesa	4	no	no	5.1	\$10.90	1190.00
Las Virgenes MWD	4	yes	no	7.7	\$12.00	2800.00
Livermore*	4	no	no	5.	\$14.75	2345.00
Los Angeles CSD 14	4	yes	no	8.55	\$4.08	1100.00
Los Angeles CSD 26	4	yes	no	5.84	\$7.42	1350.00
Merced	4	no	no	7.3	\$12.03	1400.00
Milpitas	4	yes	no	5.9	\$16.90	\$0.00
Morgan Hill	4	no	no	1.8	\$19.61	1870.00
Napa SD	4	no	no	7.	\$16.50	3500.00
Newport Beach*	4	no	no	7.06	\$3.30	\$30.00
Orange CSD 14	4	yes	no	4.28	\$0.00	\$0.00
Padre Dam MWD	4	no	no	5.2	\$12.00	1364.00
Redding	4	no	no	8.	\$12.00	1950.00
Redlands*	4	no	no	5.5	\$8.50	2400.00
Redwood City*	4	no	no	19.	\$9.96	594.00
Rialto	4	no	no	6.3	\$8.64	4591.00
Richmond MSD	4	yes	no	7.	\$12.50	750.00
Roseville	4	no	no	8.1	\$9.50	2600.00
San Buenaventura	4	no	yes	8.5	\$16.55	701.00
Santa Ana Region	4	no	no	5.8	\$9.00	2900.00
Santa Barbara	4	no	yes	6.	\$6.34	1770.00
Santa Clara	4	no	no	16.	\$6.62	583.00
Santa Maria	4	no	no	5.87	\$4.80	836.00
So Bayside	4	no	no	7.46	\$9.96	593.00

AGENCY	POP INDEX	A. V. TAX	H2O USE	ADWF MGD	MONTHLY CHARGE	CONNECT FEE
So Gate	4	no	yes	8.	\$1.50	\$40.00
So San Francisco	4	no	no	5.2	\$8.00	500.00
Tahoe Truckee Sanit A	4	no	no	3.7	\$12.30	3000.00
Turlock	4	no	no	12.	\$8.80	100.00
Vacaville	4	no	no	7.15	\$9.80	2080.00
Visalia	4	no	no	8.86	\$7.00	1788.00
West Bay SD	4	no	no	5.53	\$12.17	2035.00
West Contra Costa SD	4	no	no	7.	\$7.67	1407.00
Bakersfield	5	no	no	25.6	\$7.58	900.00
Belmont	5	no	no	16.	\$12.42	1310.00
Carlsbad	5	no	no	19.5	\$7.30	1250.00
Central Contra Costa	5	no	no	36.	\$11.33	1800.00
Chino Basin MWD	5	yes	no	45.	\$4.30	1700.00
Coachella Valley WD	5	no	no	6.48	\$10.00	1575.00
East Bay MUD	5	no	no	80.	\$10.65	750.00
Escondido	5	no	no	15.8	\$24.40	4356.00
Fresno	5	no	no	50.78	\$4.37	800.00
Irvine Ranch WD	5	no	no	12.5	\$7.95	1793.00
Long Reach	5	no	no	42.4	\$2.10	900.00
Los Angeles	5	no	yes	315.	\$12.54	2168.00
Los Angeles CSD 01	5	yes	no	38.15	\$4.50	1000.00
Los Angeles CSD 02	5	yes	no	55.04	\$4.25	1020.00
Los Angeles CSD 03	5	yes	no	47.01	\$4.08	950.00
Los Angeles CSD 05	5	yes	no	70.11	\$4.08	1040.00
Los Angeles CSD 08	5	yes	no	30.5	\$3.92	1020.00
Los Angeles CSD 15	5	yes	no	5.47	\$4.08	910.00
Los Angeles CSD 16	5	yes	no	27.65	\$4.33	910.00
Los Angeles CSD 18	5	yes	no	31.93	\$4.17	1020.00
Los Angeles CSD 19	5	yes	no	9.	\$4.17	980.00
Los Angeles CSD 21	5	yes	no	39.29	\$4.25	940.00
Los Angeles CSD 22	5	yes	no	29.34	\$4.33	990.00
Modesto*	5	no	no	26.	\$6.35	450.00
Monterey Regional WPC	5	no	no	19.	\$8.00	1700.00
Moulton Niguel WD	5	no	yes	10.559	\$13.88	600.00
Oceanside	5	no	no	11.5	\$14.25	1565.00
Orange CSD 01	5	yes	no	27.09	\$3.75	2270.00
Orange CSD 02	5	yes	no	84.31	\$0.00	2270.00
Orange CSD 03	5	yes	no	85.48	\$2.53	2270.00
Orange CSD 06	5	yes	no	15.29	\$4.08	2270.00
Orange CSD 07	5	yes	no	20.35	\$0.00	2270.00
Orange CSD 11	5	yes	no	16.76	\$3.33	2270.00
Oro Loma SD	5	no	no	10.2	\$7.25	1376.00
Oxnard	5	no	no	18.	\$15.02	3262.00
Palo Alto	5	no	no	21.5	\$8.60	\$0.00
Riverside*	5	no	no	31.5	\$9.00	2300.00
Sacramento CSD 1	5	no	no	50.	\$9.85	295.00
Sacramento Regional C	5	no	no	145.	\$7.45	807.00
San Bernardino	5	no	no	25.6	\$7.20	2260.00
San Diego	5	yes	no	190.	\$13.52	3600.00
San Francisco	5	no	yes	66.9	\$11.92	\$0.00
San Jose	5	no	no	105.	\$14.20	780.00
San Mateo	5	no	yes	13.5	\$14.43	1260.00
Santa Ana	5	no	yes	23.1	\$19.42	\$0.00
Santa Cruz	5	no	no	10.5	\$8.49	750.00

AGENCY	POP INDEX	A.V. TAX	H2O USE	ADWF MGD	MONTHLY CHARGE	CONNECT FEE
Santa Monica	5	no	yes	41.	\$11.00	1312.50
Santa Rosa	5	no	yes	16.	\$15.47	3000.00
Simi Valley CSD	5	no	no	9.1	\$10.22	2270.00
So Bay Cities SD	5	yes	no	13.04	\$3.75	1060.00
Stockton*	5	no	no	28.	\$10.63	1495.00
Sunnyvale	5	no	no	15.28	\$10.89	706.00
Thousand Oaks	5	no	no	8.4	\$10.50	3600.00
Union SD	5	no	no	22.	\$11.41	1779.00
Vallejo Sanit & Flood	5	no	no	12.	\$16.00	1260.00
Victorville SD	5	no	no	7.	\$8.00	1490.00
West Valley SD	5	no	no	10.5	\$9.70	800.00
Lake Oroville Area PU		no	no	0.565	\$7.10	250.00
Murray Park SMD		yes	no		\$7.17	316.00

NOTES: Population Index: 1 = <1,000
2 = 1,000 - 10,000
3 = 10,000 - 50,000
4 = 50,000 - 100,000
5 = >100,000

A.V. Tax: Yes denotes agency utilizes Ad Valorem taxes to pay Operations and Maintenance Costs.

H2O Use: Yes denotes agency bases charges on water consumption.

MONTHLY USER CHARGE SUMMARY

Single Family Residences

Prepared by: California State Water Resources Control Board
Division of Clean Water Programs

(All Facilities)

Sorted by County, Agency

DATE:04/15/91

AGENCY	POP INDEX	A.V. TAX	H2O USED	ADWF MGD	MONTHLY CHARGE	CONNECT FEE
COUNTY:Alameda =====						
Castro Valley SD	3	yes	no	3.	\$2.92	460.00
Dublin San Ramon SD	4	no	no	7.2	\$12.50	3100.00
East Bay MUD	5	no	no	80.	\$10.65	750.00
Hayward	4	no	no	9.4	\$8.45	760.00
Livermore*	4	no	no	5.	\$14.75	2345.00
Oro Loma SD	5	no	no	10.2	\$7.25	1376.00
Pleasanton	3			3.7	\$13.33	1312.00
San Leandro	3	no	no	3.91	\$8.25	825.00
Union SD	5	no	no	22.	\$11.41	1779.00

COUNTY:Alpine =====						
Bear Valley WD	1	no	no	0.6	\$18.78	1400.00
Kirkwood Meadows	1	no	no	0.025	\$14.70	3200.00
Markleeville	1	no	no	0.025	\$20.00	400.00

COUNTY:Amador =====						
Amador City	1	no	no	0.015	\$23.00	1830.00
Amador CSA 3*	1	no	no	0.015	\$21.35	5150.00
Ione	2	no	no	0.323	\$9.50	1650.00
Jackson	2	no	no	0.55	\$14.70	1600.00
Martell Wastewater Di	1	no	no	0.03	\$22.32	150.00
Plymouth	1	no	no	0.1	\$15.00	2105.00
River Pines PUD*	1	no	no	0.054	\$33.15	4600.00
Sutter Creek	2	no	no	0.275	\$12.25	2000.00

COUNTY:Butte =====						
Biggs	2	no	no	0.203	\$7.00	600.00
Chico	3	no	no	4.	\$4.36	3144.00
Gridley	2	no	no	0.65	\$10.70	900.00
Lake Oroville Area PU		no	no	0.565	\$7.10	250.00
Richvale SD	1	yes	no	0.03	\$0.00	\$15.00
Sewerage Comm-Orovill	3	no	no	2.9	\$4.00	900.00
Thermalito Irrig Dist	2	no	no	0.27	\$10.00	550.00

COUNTY:Calaveras =====						
Angels	2	no	no	0.215	\$11.50	800.00
Arnold*	1	no	no	0.05	\$16.24	1763.00
Copper Cove CWD*	2	no	no	0.065	\$13.50	685.00
Ebbetts Pass (Country	1	no	no	0.001	\$5.00	\$0.00

AGENCY	POP INDEX	A.V. TAX	H2O USED	ADWF MGD	MONTHLY CHARGE	CONNECT FEE
Ebbetts Pass (Forest	1	yes	no	0.02	\$8.50	250.00
Ebbetts Pass (Sequoia	1	yes	no	0.008	\$5.00	\$0.00
Ebbetts Pass CWD*	1	yes	no	0.015	\$16.00	155.00
LaContenta CWD*	1	no	no	0.03	\$12.00	650.00
Mokelumne Hill SD	1	yes	no	0.036	\$9.50	1400.00
Murphys SD	2	yes	no	0.15	\$12.00	1500.00
San Andreas SD*	2	no	no	0.25	\$12.00	1000.00
Six Mile Village, CWD	1	no	no	0.003	\$21.00	3421.00
Valley Springs SD*	1	no	no	0.036	\$12.50	1250.00
West Point*	1	no	no	0.02	\$10.62	2555.00
Wilseyville*	1	no	no	0.002	\$9.00	4460.00

COUNTY:Colusa						
=====						
Arbuckle PUD	2	no	no	0.28	\$5.00	\$50.00
Colusa*	2	no	no	0.6	\$10.10	375.00
Maxwell PUD	1	no	no	0.07	\$8.00	150.00
Williams	2	no	no	0.25	\$10.50	1500.00

COUNTY:Contra Costa						
=====						
Brentwood	2	no	no	0.7	\$9.50	1859.00
Central Contra Costa	5	no	no	36.	\$11.33	1800.00
Crockett-Valona SD	2	yes	no	0.285	\$8.00	350.00
Delta Diablo SD-Z I*	3	no	no	3.5	\$6.93	1100.00
Delta Diablo SD-Z II*	3	no	no	3.5	\$7.12	1100.00
Delta Diablo SD-Z III	3	no	no	3.5	\$6.71	1100.00
Hercules*	3	no	no	3.25	\$10.50	1500.00
Mountain View SD	3	yes	no	1.636	\$10.00	2373.00
Oakley Bethel Island	3	no	no	1.45		1930.00
Oakley SD*	3	yes	no	1.3	\$15.00	2855.00
Pinole*	3	no	no	1.6	\$9.67	700.00
Pittsburg	3	no	no	11.08	\$28.68	600.00
Richmond MSD	4	yes	no	7.	\$12.50	750.00
Rodeo SD	2	yes	no	0.85	\$12.00	600.00
Stege Sanit Dist*	3	yes	no	4.	\$5.50	480.00
West Contra Costa SD	4	no	no	7.	\$7.67	1407.00

COUNTY:Del Norte						
=====						
Crescent City	3	no	no	1.6	\$8.90	3750.00

COUNTY:El Dorado						
=====						
El Dorado Irrigation	3	yes	no	2.015	\$14.70	1000.00
Georgetown Divide PUD	2	no	no	0.129	\$6.25	1500.00
Placerville	2	no	no	0.95	\$15.00	2000.00
So Tahoe PUD	3	yes	no	4.25	\$20.28	6000.00

COUNTY:Fresno						
=====						
Biola CSD	1	no	no	0.024	\$11.55	300.00
Cantua Creek	1	no	no	0.03	\$3.05	\$0.00
Caruthers CSD	2	yes	no	0.31	\$4.50	\$75.00

AGENCY	POP INDEX	A. V. TAX	H2O USED	ADWF MGD	MONTHLY CHARGE	CONNECT FEE
Clovis	3	no	no	3.4	\$5.25	1627.00
Coalinga	2	no	no	0.7	\$4.90	
Del Rey CSD	2	yes	no	0.3	\$9.50	350.00
El Porvenir CSA 30	1	no	no	0.02	\$3.03	\$0.00
Firebaugh	2	no	no	0.2	\$18.48	250.00
Fresno	5	no	no	50.78	\$4.37	800.00
Fresno CWD #38*	1	no	no	0.006	\$12.00	\$0.00
Fresno CWD #40*	1	no	no	0.01	\$11.50	\$0.00
Fresno CWD #41*	1	no	no	0.06	\$14.00	\$0.00
Kerman*	2	no	no	0.614	\$11.50	\$0.00
Malaga CWD	2	no	no	0.075	\$5.25	275.00
Mendota	2	no	no	1.	\$9.80	300.00
Orange Cove	2	no	no	0.7	\$9.20	3500.00
Parlier	2	no	no	0.5	\$10.20	320.00
Pinedale CWD	2	no	no	0.22	\$5.00	178.00
Pinedale PUD	2	no	no		\$4.41	350.00
Reedley	3	no	no	1.9	\$7.75	346.00
San Joaquin	2	no	no	0.25	\$35.00	450.00
Sanger	3	yes	no	2.	\$11.75	1100.00
Selma-Kingsburg-Fowle	3	no	no	3.05	\$11.50	1110.00
Shaver Lake	1	no	no	0.12	\$15.52	\$0.00
Shaver Springs WD 40	1	yes	no	0.015	\$11.50	\$0.00
Sky Harbour WD 38	1	yes	no	0.006	\$12.00	\$0.00
Tamarack Estates CSD	1	no	no	0.005	\$22.48	\$0.00
Tranquillity PUD	1	no	no	0.12	\$10.00	450.00
Waterworks Dist 41	1	no	no	0.1	\$5.20	
West Lands WD	2	no	no	0.5	\$8.00	250.00

COUNTY:Glenn						
=====						
Orland	2	no	yes	0.7	\$4.00	160.00
Willows	2	no	no	0.78	\$8.00	1500.00

COUNTY:Humboldt						
=====						
Arcata*	3	no	yes	2.3	\$15.14	1450.00
Blue Lake	2	no	no	0.1	\$15.00	2090.00
Eureka*	3	no	no	4.3	\$9.50	2000.00
Ferndale	2	no	no	0.215	\$15.00	3400.00
Fieldbrook CSD	1	no	no	0.04	\$24.00	2000.00
Fortuna	2	no	no	0.87	\$9.75	600.00
Garberville SD	1	yes	no	0.03	\$8.00	500.00
Humboldt CSD	3	no	no	1.22	\$14.25	1400.00
Loleta SD	1	no	no	0.06	\$11.58	1000.00
Manila CSD	2	no	no	0.055	\$18.00	600.00
McKinleyville CSD	2	no	no	0.6	\$11.00	750.00
Miranda CSD*	1	no	no	0.02	\$12.00	500.00
Northcoast Region	3	no	yes	1.6	\$22.45	1797.00
Redway CSD	1	yes	no	0.125	\$13.75	850.00
Rio Dell	2	no	no	0.29	\$10.00	900.00
Shelter Cove	1	no	no	0.036	\$9.00	440.00
Weott CSD	1	no	no	0.03	\$15.00	2000.00

AGENCY	POP INDEX	A.V. TAX	H2O USED	ADWF MGD	MONTHLY CHARGE	CONNECT FEE
COUNTY:Imperial						
=====						
Brawley	3	no	no	3.3	\$7.00	300.00
Calexico	3	no	no	2.1	\$11.75	520.00
Calipatria	2	no	no	0.477	\$14.00	800.00
El Centro	3	no	no	5.	\$7.26	\$0.00
Heber PUD	2	yes	no	0.2	\$11.00	800.00
Holtville	2	no	no	0.55	\$12.58	350.00
Imperial*	2	no	no	0.3	\$16.50	400.00
Niland SD	2	yes	no	0.275	\$12.50	1200.00
Salton CSD	2	no	no	0.08	\$5.00	500.00
Seeley CWD	2	no	no	0.26	\$12.50	300.00
Westmorland	2	no	no	0.17	\$13.00	300.00
Winterhaven WD	1	no	no	0.04	\$10.00	400.00

COUNTY:Inyo						
=====						
Big Pine CSD*	1	no	no	0.09	\$5.25	\$0.00
Bishop*	2	no	no	0.7	\$7.28	\$0.00
Eastern Sierra CSD	2	no	no	0.672	\$9.00	1750.00
Lone Pine CSD*	2	no	no	0.13	\$3.00	\$0.00

COUNTY:Kern						
=====						
Arvin CSD*	3	no	no	0.68	\$7.35	426.00
Bakersfield	5	no	no	25.6	\$7.58	900.00
Bear Valley CSD	1	yes	no	0.06	\$12.00	1000.00
Buttonwillow CWD*	2	no	no	0.16	\$11.00	\$0.00
California City	2	no	no	0.225	\$7.50	1535.00
Delano	3	no	no	3.	\$7.10	100.00
Desert Lake CSD	1	no	no	0.05	\$7.00	\$85.00
East Niles CSD	3	no	no	1.72	\$5.25	200.00
Inyokern CSD	2	no	no	0.4	\$6.25	650.00
Lamont PUD*	3	no	no	1.4	\$3.00	\$0.00
Lost Hills SD	1	no	no	0.086	\$15.00	400.00
McFarland	2	no	no	0.58	\$5.00	1000.00
Mojave PUD	2	no	yes	0.375	\$4.20	1570.00
North of the River SD	3	no	no	3.2	\$6.75	625.00
Plainview PUD	1	no	no	0.057	\$5.75	\$30.00
Ridgecrest	3	no	no	3.6	\$6.08	540.00
Rosamond CSD	2	yes	no	0.67	\$4.60	475.00
Shafter*	2	no	no	0.7	\$8.20	934.00
Stallion Springs CSD	1	no	no	0.043	\$12.00	1000.00
Taft	2	no	no	0.89	\$9.65	100.00
Tehachapi	2	no	no	0.42	\$8.75	600.00
Wasco PUD	3	no	no	1.52	\$10.00	1300.00

COUNTY:Kings						
=====						
Armona CSA	2	no	no	0.285	\$7.80	2000.00
Corcoran	3	no	no	1.2	\$8.45	350.00
Hanford	3	no	no	3.8	\$8.00	750.00
Kettleman City CSD	2	no	no	0.28	\$12.00	250.00
Lemoore	3	no	no	1.8	\$8.50	500.00

AGENCY	POP INDEX	A.V. TAX	H2O USED	ADWF MGD	MONTHLY CHARGE	CONNECT FEE
Stratford PUD	2	no	no	0.07	\$21.00	1500.00

COUNTY:Lake =====						
City of Lakeport SD 1	2	no	no	0.5	\$17.00	800.00
Clear Lake MSD #1*	2	no	no	0.5	\$17.00	800.00
Clearlake Oaks CWD*	2	yes	no	0.3	\$10.00	1500.00
Kelseyville Cty Wtrwr	2	no	no	0.096	\$8.15	250.00
Lake CSD ID 1	3	no	no	2.192	\$8.90	500.00
Lake CSD ID 3	2	no	no	0.2	\$12.60	500.00
Lakeport	2	yes	no	0.5	\$17.00	3100.00

COUNTY:Lassen =====						
Lassen Cty Waterworks	1	no	no	0.02	\$14.00	350.00
Leavitt Lake CSD	1	no	no	0.06	\$38.00	\$0.00
Susanville CSD	2	no	no	0.75	\$7.25	850.00
West Patton Village C	1	no	no	0.003	\$28.00	\$0.00
Westwood CSD*	2	no	no	0.23	\$21.00	300.00

COUNTY:Los Angeles =====						
Avalon	2	no	no	0.7	\$14.83	516.84
Azusa	3	no	no	3.9	\$3.50	180.00
Beverly Hills	3	no	yes	5.5	\$11.25	\$0.00
Burbank	4	no	no	16.	\$9.94	664.00
Crescenta Valley CWD	3	no	no	1.48	\$20.00	\$25.00
Culver City*	3	no	no	4.	\$11.51	348.00
El Segundo	3	no	yes	2.3	\$0.00	580.00
Golden Valley MWD	1	no	yes	0.03	\$5.55	\$0.00
Las Virgenes MWD	4	yes	no	7.7	\$12.00	2800.00
Long Beach	5	no	no	42.4	\$2.10	900.00
Los Angeles	5	no	yes	315.	\$12.54	2168.00
Los Angeles CSD 01	5	yes	no	38.15	\$4.50	1000.00
Los Angeles CSD 02	5	yes	no	55.04	\$4.25	1020.00
Los Angeles CSD 03	5	yes	no	47.01	\$4.08	950.00
Los Angeles CSD 04	3	yes	no	6.5	\$14.58	2220.00
Los Angeles CSD 05	5	yes	no	70.11	\$4.08	1040.00
Los Angeles CSD 08	5	yes	no	30.5	\$3.92	1020.00
Los Angeles CSD 09	2	yes	no	0.26	\$14.58	2220.00
Los Angeles CSD 14	4	yes	no	8.55	\$4.08	1100.00
Los Angeles CSD 15	5	yes	no	5.47	\$4.08	910.00
Los Angeles CSD 16	5	yes	no	27.65	\$4.33	910.00
Los Angeles CSD 17	3	yes	no	3.83	\$4.50	950.00
Los Angeles CSD 18	5	yes	no	31.93	\$4.17	1020.00
Los Angeles CSD 19	5	yes	no	9.	\$4.17	980.00
Los Angeles CSD 20	3	yes	no	5.42	\$4.25	1100.00
Los Angeles CSD 21	5	yes	no	39.29	\$4.25	940.00
Los Angeles CSD 22	5	yes	no	29.34	\$4.33	990.00
Los Angeles CSD 23	1	yes	no	0.02	\$3.00	790.00
Los Angeles CSD 26	4	yes	no	5.84	\$7.42	1350.00
Los Angeles CSD 27	2	yes	no	0.15	\$0.00	2220.00
Los Angeles CSD 28*	2	yes	no	0.51	\$25.83	\$0.00
Los Angeles CSD 29	2	yes	no	1.19	\$4.58	930.00

AGENCY	POP INDEX	A. V. TAX	H2O USED	ADWF MGD	MONTHLY CHARGE	CONNECT FEE
Los Angeles CSD 32	3	yes	no	4.38	\$7.58	1350.00
Malibu Mesa (GC5)	2	no	no	0.17	\$28.62	\$0.00
Malibu Treatment Plt	1	no	no	0.033	\$73.95	\$0.00
Santa Monica	5	no	yes	41.	\$11.00	1312.50
So Bay Cities SD	5	yes	no	13.04	\$3.75	1060.00
So Gate	4	no	yes	8.	\$1.50	\$40.00
Trancas Canyon (GC4)	1	no	no	0.058	\$53.29	\$0.00

COUNTY:Madera						
=====						
Chowchilla	2	no	no	0.594	\$9.77	289.00
Madera CSA 02A	1	no	no	0.07	\$16.25	\$0.00
Madera CSA 03	1	no	no	0.03	\$7.10	425.00
Madera CSA 06	1	yes	no	0.02	\$3.75	\$0.00
Madera CSA 07	1	yes	no	0.015	\$7.50	\$0.00
Madera CSA 16	1	no	no	0.009	\$13.50	\$0.00
Madera CSA 24	1	yes	no	0.012	\$10.00	\$0.00
Madera CSA 27	1	no	no	0.025	\$18.00	\$0.00
Madera MD 08 Zone A	1	yes	no	0.025	\$20.50	\$0.00
Madera MD 19,Zone A	1	yes	no	0.09	\$5.00	\$0.00
Madera MD 22,Zone A	1	yes	no	0.175	\$2.25	2760.00
Madera MD 28	1	yes	no	0.007	\$12.50	\$0.00
Madera MD 37	1	no	no	0.0004	\$14.65	\$0.00
Madera*	3	yes	no	3.8	\$7.85	425.00

COUNTY:Marin						
=====						
Almonte SD	3	yes	no	0.12	\$11.34	1600.00
Alto SD	3	yes	no	0.08	\$15.00	1200.00
Bolinas Comm PUD	1	no	no	0.03	\$35.00	\$0.00
Central Marin Sanit A	4	no	no	8.3	\$6.61	380.00
Corte Madera	2	yes	no	0.9	\$11.00	340.00
Homestead Valley SD	3	yes	no	0.16	\$11.67	1500.00
Las Gallinas Valley S	3	yes	no	2.1	\$8.08	1400.00
Marin SD 1	3	yes	no	7.8	\$8.33	1200.00
Marin SD 2	2	yes	no	0.85	\$11.00	340.00
Marin SD 5	2	yes	no	0.75	\$13.25	2000.00
Mill Valley*	3	no	no	2.65	\$16.33	600.00
Murray Park SMD		yes	no		\$7.17	316.00
North Marin WD*	1	yes	no	0.015	\$16.00	930.00
Novato SD	3	yes	yes	4.7	\$6.83	1100.00
Oceana Marin	1	yes	no	0.015	\$22.25	3450.00
Richardson Bay SD	3	yes	no	0.8	\$20.50	3500.00
San Rafael SD	3	yes	no	8.	\$14.67	940.00
Sausalito	3	no	no	1.5	\$9.00	800.00
Sewer Agency of So Ma	3	no	no	2.5	\$11.85	\$0.00
Tamalpais CSD	2	no	no	0.325	\$20.08	2000.00
Tiburon, SD 5*	2	yes	no	0.75	\$13.25	2000.00

COUNTY:Mariposa						
=====						
Mariposa PUD	2	no	no	0.252	\$10.00	650.00

AGENCY	POP INDEX	A.V. TAX	H2O USED	ADWF MGD	MONTHLY CHARGE	CONNECT FEE
COUNTY:Mendocino =====						
Brooktrails CSD	2	no	no	0.13	\$7.50	800.00
Calpella CWD	1	yes	no	0.03	\$18.00	1400.00
Caspar South WD	1	no	no	0.001	\$18.00	\$0.00
Covelo CSD	1	no	no	0.024	\$11.00	600.00
Fort Bragg MID #1	2	no	no	0.5	\$7.00	1500.00
Hopland PUD	1	no	no	0.056	\$11.00	1000.00
Mendocino City CSD*	2	yes	no	0.1	\$10.10	1000.00
Point Arena	1	no	no	0.023	\$15.00	1500.00
Ukiah	3	no	no	2.2	\$6.60	550.00
Willits	2	no	no	0.75	\$12.44	1500.00

COUNTY:Merced =====						
Atwater	3	no	no	3.3	\$10.22	1500.00
Delhi CWD	2	yes	no	0.169	\$10.00	1500.00
Dos Palos	2	no	no	0.45	\$13.50	800.00
Franklin CWD	2	yes	no	0.44	\$7.50	1125.00
Gustine	2	no	no	1.	\$5.25	2950.00
Hilmar CWD*	2	yes	no	0.08	\$8.50	\$0.00
LeGrand CSD	2	no	no	0.126	\$11.50	425.00
Livingston	2	no	no	1.	\$8.50	1500.00
Los Banos	3	no	no	2.	\$9.90	2000.00
Merced	4	no	no	7.3	\$12.03	1400.00
Midway CSD	1	no	no	0.06	\$17.00	500.00
Planada CSD	2	no	no	0.435	\$12.00	700.00
Santa Nella CWD	1	no	no	0.04		1780.00
Snelling CSD	1	yes	no	0.015	\$6.60	200.00
Winton Water/SD	2	no	no	0.46	\$12.00	1700.00

COUNTY:Modoc =====						
Adin CSD	1	no	no	0.012	\$16.00	820.00
Alturas	2	no	no	0.5	\$10.30	600.00
California Pines CSD	1	yes	no	0.015	\$0.00	200.00
Daphnedale CSD	1	no	no	0.05	\$13.50	540.00

COUNTY:Mono =====						
Bridgeport PUD*	1	no	no	0.08	\$7.00	465.00
Hilton Creek CSD	1	no	no	0.067	\$16.00	2640.00
June Lake PUD	1	yes	no	0.21	\$7.00	1224.00
Mammoth CWD*	2	no	no	1.5	\$12.10	2000.00

COUNTY:Monterey =====						
Boronda County SD	2	no	no	0.1	\$30.00	1800.00
Carmel SD	3	yes	no	1.53	\$8.00	1020.00
Carmel Valley CSD-Zon	1	no	yes	0.065	\$24.50	\$0.00
Carmel Valley CSD-Zon	1	no	no	0.004	\$21.50	\$0.00
Carmel Valley CSD-Zon	1	no	no	0.007	\$16.67	\$0.00
Castroville CSD-Zone	1	no	no	0.07	\$6.21	1750.00
Chualar County SD	1	yes	no	0.05	\$11.34	384.00

AGENCY	POP INDEX	A.V. TAX	H2O USED	ADWF MGD	MONTHLY CHARGE	CONNECT FEE
Freedom CSD*	2	no	no	0.6	\$12.00	4000.00
Gonzales	2	no	no	0.4	\$5.48	2225.00
Greenfield*	2	no	no	0.38	\$7.20	1660.00
King City*	2	no	no	0.56	\$4.50	2400.00
Laguna CSA #10*	1	no	no	0.012	\$28.00	100.00
Las Lomas*	2	no	no	0.12	\$14.00	550.00
Marina CWD	3	no	no	1.3	\$12.00	1000.00
Monterey Regional WPC	5	no	no	19.	\$8.00	1700.00
Moss Landing CSD	1	yes	no	0.07	\$26.83	1750.00
Pajaro CSD*	2	no	no	0.14	\$6.40	500.00
Pajaro CSD-Los Lomas*	2	no	no	0.1	\$13.98	550.00
Pajaro CSD-Sunny Mesa	1	no	no	0.016	\$10.90	500.00
Pajaro SD	2	no	no	0.5	\$6.73	500.00
Pebble Beach CSD	2	yes	no	0.428	\$9.39	1550.00
Salsipuedes SD*	2	no	no	0.11	\$15.00	3000.00
San Ardo WD	1	no	yes	0.045	\$7.00	\$0.00
Seaside CSD	3	yes	no	1.6	\$9.20	850.00
Soledad	2	no	no	0.58	\$11.39	350.00

COUNTY:Napa						
=====						
Berryessa Resort Impr	1	yes	yes	0.01	\$5.31	500.00
Calistoga	2	no	yes	0.65	\$11.00	5000.00
Circle Oaks CWD	1	no	no	0.022	\$5.00	2500.00
Lake Berryessa Resort	1	yes	no	0.01	\$12.00	500.00
Napa Berryessa Resort	1	yes	yes	0.05	\$12.00	500.00
Napa River - Reclamat	1	no	no	0.015	\$25.00	700.00
Napa SD	4	no	no	7.	\$16.50	3500.00
Spanish Flat WD	1	no	no	0.05	\$10.00	1200.00
St Helena MSD 1	2	no	no	0.35	\$16.75	3750.00
St Helena MSD No. 1*	2	yes	no	0.35	\$12.00	1500.00
Yountville	2	no	no	0.4	\$9.00	3760.00

COUNTY:Nevada						
=====						
Donner Summit PUD	1	no	no	0.048	\$39.00	3300.00
Grass Valley	3	no	no	1.72	\$8.00	968.00
Nevada City*	2	no	no	0.4	\$11.00	925.00
Truckee SD	2	yes	no	1.4	\$14.50	750.00

COUNTY:Orange						
=====						
Capistrano Beach SD	3	no	no	1.1	\$22.00	2590.00
Dana Point SD	3	yes	no	1.6	\$9.33	2100.00
El Toro WD*	4	no	no	4.5	\$11.00	1190.00
Emerald Bay SD*	2	yes	no		\$0.00	\$0.00
Garden Grove SD	1	yes	no	0.08		2535.00
Irvine Ranch WD	5	no	no	12.5	\$7.95	1793.00
Laguna Beach	3	no	no	2.1	\$21.00	2500.00
Los Alisos WD	3	no	no	3.9	\$4.00	1100.00
Moulton Niguel WD	5	no	yes	10.559	\$13.88	600.00
Newport Beach*	4	no	no	7.06	\$3.30	\$30.00
Orange CSD 01	5	yes	no	27.09	\$3.75	2270.00
Orange CSD 02	5	yes	no	84.31	\$0.00	2270.00

AGENCY	POP INDEX	A.V. TAX	H2O USED	ADWF MGD	MONTHLY CHARGE	CONNECT FEE
Orange CSD 03	5	yes	no	85.48	\$2.53	2270.00
Orange CSD 05	3	yes	no	13.08	\$3.75	2270.00
Orange CSD 06	5	yes	no	15.29	\$4.08	2270.00
Orange CSD 07	5	yes	no	20.35	\$0.00	2270.00
Orange CSD 11	5	yes	no	16.76	\$3.33	2270.00
Orange CSD 13	2	no	no	1.28	\$6.53	2270.00
Orange CSD 14	4	yes	no	4.28	\$0.00	\$0.00
San Clemente	3	no	no	3.9	\$9.97	5772.00
Seal Beach	3	no	yes	1.	\$12.50	1000.00
So Coast WD	3	yes	no	1.5	\$14.50	1835.00
Sunset Beach SD	2	yes	no	0.26	\$0.00	\$50.00

COUNTY:Placer						
=====						
Alpine Springs CWD	2	no	no	0.04	\$6.25	700.00
Colfax	2	yes	no	0.115	\$11.15	1400.00
Folsom Lake SMD #2*	3	no	no	1.	\$11.75	3400.00
Folsom Lake SMD #3*	1	yes	no	0.065	\$19.00	2400.00
Heather Glen CSD	1	yes	no	0.003	\$0.00	\$0.00
Lauoti Track Cty SA 2	1	no	no	0.05	\$12.50	1400.00
Lincoln	2	no	no	0.675	\$11.00	2210.00
Newcastle SD	1	yes	no	0.0015	\$8.00	3000.00
North Auburn-SM #1*	3	no	no	1.3	\$13.50	1650.00
North Tahoe PUD	2	yes	no	0.79	\$23.86	1000.00
Placer CSA 21*	1	no	no	0.082	\$27.40	4250.00
Placer CSA 28, Z 11	1	no	no	0.05	\$13.50	1800.00
Placer CSA 28, Z 21	1	no	no	0.105	\$27.40	250.00
Placer CSA 28, Z 23	1	no	no	0.006	\$16.00	1700.00
Placer CSA 28, Z 2A-3	1	no	no	0.105	\$13.00	3000.00
Placer CSA 28, Z 6	1	no	no	0.05	\$17.00	1700.00
Placer CSA 28, Zone 5	1	no	no	0.06	\$14.00	1500.00
Placer CSA 28, Zone 6	1	no	no	0.05	\$15.50	1700.00
Placer CSA 28,Z 24	1	no	no	0.01	\$28.00	1500.00
Placer SMD 1	3	no	no	1.45	\$16.00	2700.00
Placer SMD 2	3	no	no	1.21	\$13.50	3500.00
Placer SMD 3	1	yes	no	0.08	\$28.00	3500.00
Roseville	4	no	no	8.1	\$9.50	2600.00
Sabre City CSA 11*	1	no	no	0.045	\$11.00	1500.00
Saddleback CSA 28 Z52	1	no	no	0.01	\$10.00	\$0.00
Sheridan CSA 06,ZA 1*	1	no	no	0.045	\$15.00	1500.00
Sierra Lakes CWD	2	yes	no	0.042	\$22.92	875.00
So Placer MUD	3	no	no	2.25	\$9.00	3450.00
Squaw Valley CWD	2	yes	no	0.169	\$21.35	1125.00
Tahoe City PUD*	2	no	no	1.2	\$22.60	1000.00
Tahoe Truckee Sanit A	4	no	no	3.7	\$12.30	3000.00

COUNTY:Plumas						
=====						
Chester PUD	2	yes	no	0.6	\$4.65	225.00
Grizzly Lake Resort I	1	yes	no	0.025	\$12.00	800.00
Portola*	1	yes	no	0.24	\$11.75	500.00
Quincy SD	2	yes	no	1.	\$11.76	1200.00

AGENCY	POP INDEX	A.V. TAX	H2O USED	ADWF MGD	MONTHLY CHARGE	CONNECT FEE
COUNTY:Riverside =====						
Banning	3	no	no	2.2	\$10.45	1500.00
Beaumont	2	no	no	0.99	\$8.00	1000.00
Blythe	3	no	no	1.3	\$17.01	825.00
Coachella SD	3	no	no	1.6	\$9.30	1500.00
Coachella Valley WD	5	no	no	6.48	\$10.00	1575.00
Corona*	4	no	no	5.1	\$11.00	1680.00
Desert Water Agency	1	no	no	0.018	\$18.20	2520.00
East Blythe CWD	2	yes	no	0.865	\$16.00	100.00
Edgemont CSD	2	no	no	0.425	\$4.17	2600.00
Elsinore Valley MWD	3	no	no	3.2	\$15.50	2130.00
Home Gardens SD	2	no	no	0.45	\$14.00	2640.00
Idyllwild WD ID #1	2	yes	no	0.15	\$7.50	1172.00
Lake Hemet MWD	3	no	no	3.	\$1.75	\$0.00
Lee Lake WD	2	no	no	0.166	\$24.33	\$0.00
Mission Springs WD	2	yes	no	0.59	\$6.00	640.00
Palm Springs*	3	no	no	6.5	\$7.75	2850.00
Perris	3	no	no	1.9	\$14.79	600.00
Rancho California WD	2	no	no	0.5	\$27.00	3942.00
Rancho California WD	1	yes	no	0.05	\$25.00	\$0.00
Riverside*	5	no	no	31.5	\$9.00	2300.00
Rubidoux CSD*	3	no	yes	1.9	\$9.00	3000.00
San Jacinto	2	no	no	0.8	\$2.00	200.00
Santa Ana	5	no	yes	23.1	\$19.42	\$0.00
Thermal SD	1	yes	no	0.14	\$8.00	1500.00
Valley SD	3	yes	no	4.8	\$7.50	1250.00
Western MWD*	1	yes	no	0.046	\$8.00	2440.00

COUNTY:Sacramento =====						
Courtland SD	2	no	no	0.08	\$7.00	295.00
Folsom	3	no	no	2.95	\$11.41	388.00
Galt	2	no	no	0.8	\$9.25	3000.00
Isleton*	2	no	no	0.115	\$13.25	998.00
Rancho Murieta CSD	2	no	no	0.225	\$14.75	1000.00
Sacramento CSD 1	5	no	no	50.	\$9.85	295.00
Sacramento Regional C	5	no	no	145.	\$7.45	807.00
Walnut Grove SMD	2	no	no	0.055	\$12.50	2000.00

COUNTY:San Benito =====						
Hollister	3	no	yes	2.	\$3.82	2136.00
San Juan Bautista	2	no	no	0.15	\$16.00	\$16.00
Sunnyslope CWD	2	no	no	0.135	\$16.00	160.00
Tres Pinos CWD	1	no	no	0.01	\$10.00	1650.00

COUNTY:San Bernardino =====						
Apple Valley WD	2	no	no	0.65	\$8.00	1600.00
Baker CSD	1	no	no	0.07	\$8.80	100.00
Barstow	3	no	no	2.6	\$7.65	250.00
Bear Valley, CSA 70*	1	no	no	0.008	\$27.23	\$0.00
Big Bear Area Reg Was	3	no	no	2.08	\$5.67	1200.00

AGENCY	POP INDEX	A. V. TAX	H2O USED	ADWF MGD	MONTHLY CHARGE	CONNECT FEE
Big Bear City CSD	3	no	no	2.1	\$5.67	1400.00
Big Bear Lake	3	no	no	1.5	\$14.00	1900.00
Chino	4	no	no	5.5	\$9.59	2000.00
Chino Basin MWD	5	yes	no	45.	\$4.30	1700.00
Colton	4	no	no	5.7	\$8.25	2800.00
Crestline SD	2	yes	no	0.648	\$14.29	1942.00
Cucamonga CWD	4	no	no	15.	\$7.40	1085.00
East Valley WD	3	no	no	1.4	\$9.00	1113.00
Fawnskin, CSA 53*	2	no	no	0.183	\$14.30	1400.00
Fontana*	3	no	no	3.8	\$4.80	600.00
Grand Terrace	2	no	no	0.9	\$8.50	2800.00
Guadalupe	2	no	no	0.33	\$10.00	1200.00
Helendale, CSA 70*	2	yes	no	0.219	\$10.00	\$25.00
Hesperia WD	2	yes	no	0.5	\$9.00	1500.00
High Country, CSA 70*	1	no	no	0.014	\$14.70	1425.00
Loma Linda	3	no	no	4.5	\$8.05	2260.00
Lompoc	3	no	no	3.5	\$14.05	271.00
Lytle Creek CSA 70*	1	no	no	0.089	\$13.25	325.00
Needles	2	no	no	0.654	\$11.75	220.00
Oro Grande, CSA 42*	1	no	no	0.046	\$14.20	1415.00
Pioneer Point, CSA 82	1	yes	no	0.105	\$8.86	\$50.00
Redlands*	4	no	no	5.5	\$8.50	2400.00
Rialto	4	no	no	6.3	\$8.64	4591.00
Running Springs WD	2	no	no	0.56	\$8.70	1050.00
San Bernardino	5	no	no	25.6	\$7.20	2260.00
Santa Ana Region	4	no	no	5.8	\$9.00	2900.00
Santa Maria	4	no	no	5.87	\$4.80	836.00
Spring Valley Lake, C	2	yes	no	0.479	\$6.50	1435.00
Trona, CSA 82*	2	yes	no	0.118	\$8.86	\$50.00
Upland	2	no	no	0.185	\$10.00	\$0.00
Victorville SD	5	no	no	7.	\$8.00	1490.00
Yucaipa Valley WD	3	no	no	2.8	\$6.50	2751.00

COUNTY:San Diego						
=====						
Alpine SD	2	no	no	0.38	\$12.50	2000.00
Borrego WD*	1	yes	no	0.001	\$5.00	\$50.00
Buena SD	3	no	no	0.73	\$15.00	3000.00
Cardiff County SD	3	no	no	1.38	\$20.53	4700.00
Carlsbad	5	no	no	19.5	\$7.30	1250.00
Coronado	3	no	no	2.6	\$19.00	850.00
Del Mar	2	no	no	0.5	\$21.65	975.00
El Cajon	4	no	yes	6.8	\$10.00	1728.00
Encinitas SD	4	no	no	2.	\$10.00	1500.00
Escondido	5	no	no	15.8	\$24.40	4356.00
Fairbanks Ranch SD	2	no	no	0.14	\$30.00	\$0.00
Fallbrook SD	3	no	no	1.56	\$20.65	4264.00
Julian SD*	1	no	no	0.03	\$30.25	1500.00
La Mesa	4	no	no	5.1	\$10.90	1190.00
Lakeside CSD	3	no	no	2.85	\$12.00	2000.00
Lemon Grove	3	no	no	2.422	\$11.00	500.00
Leucadia CWD	3	yes	no	0.65	\$16.70	2700.00
Oceanside	5	no	no	11.5	\$14.25	1565.00
Otay WD	2	no	no	1.3	\$8.25	2500.00

AGENCY	POP INDEX	A.V. TAX	H2O USED	ADWF MGD	MONTHLY CHARGE	CONNECT FEE
Padre Dam MWD	4	no	no	5.2	\$12.00	1364.00
Pauma Valley CSD	1	no	no	0.065	\$7.08	2500.00
Pine Valley SD	1	no	no	0.018	\$37.00	2000.00
Poway	3	no	no	3.3	\$14.57	2356.00
Rainbow MWD	2	no	no	0.23	\$11.00	2274.00
Ramona MWD*	3	no	no	0.877	\$17.76	4505.00
Rancho Santa Fe CSD 1	2	no	no	0.208	\$26.50	2000.00
Rancho Santa Fe CSD 2	1	no	no	0.022	\$26.50	3760.00
Rancho Santa Fe CSD 3	1	no	no	0.04	\$26.50	3760.00
San Diego	5	yes	no	190.	\$13.52	3600.00
San Marcos CWD*	3	no	no	3.5	\$8.25	2400.00
Solana Beach SD	3	no	no	3.1	\$22.50	4500.00
Spring Valley CSD	3	no	no	8.06	\$11.00	2000.00
Vallecitos WD	3	no	no	4.2	\$12.65	2400.00
Valley Center MWD	2	no	no	0.21	\$13.50	2955.00
Vista	3	no	no	6.	\$12.75	1781.00
Whispering Palms SD*	2	yes	no	0.07	\$27.00	1500.00
Wintergardens SMD	2	no	no	0.606	\$13.00	2000.00

COUNTY:San Francisco						
=====						
San Francisco	5	no	yes	66.9	\$11.92	\$0.00

COUNTY:San Joaquin						
=====						
Escalon	2	no	no	0.38	\$6.00	957.00
Lathrop CWD	2	no	no	0.5	\$10.15	275.00
Lockeford CSD*	2	no	no	0.21	\$22.50	1175.00
Lodi	3	yes	no	6.3	\$7.73	2281.00
Manteca	3	no	no	4.54	\$8.78	2222.00
Ripon MSD #1*	2	yes	no	0.7	\$3.00	537.00
San Joaquin Country C	1	yes	no		\$9.18	
San Joaquin CSA 15	1	yes	no	0.06	\$23.33	1082.00
Stockton*	5	no	no	28.	\$10.63	1495.00
Tracy	3	no	no	4.4	\$9.90	1300.00
Woodbridge SD	2	yes	no	0.29	\$3.50	985.00

COUNTY:San Luis Obispo						
=====						
Atascadero CSD*	3	no	no	1.1	\$10.54	573.00
Cambria CSD	2	no	no	0.6	\$19.72	2035.00
Cayucos SD*	2	no	no	0.389	\$6.40	1725.00
Grover City*	3	no	no	0.95	\$6.50	\$0.00
Heritage Ranch CSD	2	yes	no	0.275	\$14.80	1000.00
Morro Bay	3	no	no	1.4	\$9.08	2750.00
Nipomo CSD	2	no	no	0.194	\$24.00	3900.00
Paso Robles	3	no	no	2.1	\$8.82	817.00
Pismo Beach	2	no	yes	1.1	\$10.40	1100.00
San Luis Obispo CSA 1	1	no	no	0.025	\$12.00	\$0.00
San Luis Obispo CSA 1	2	no	no	0.04	\$25.60	2500.00
San Luis Obispo CSA 1	2	no	no	0.12	\$14.80	300.00
San Luis Obispo CSA 7	2	yes	no	0.02	\$6.00	\$0.00
San Luis Obispo CSA 7	2	yes	no	0.02	\$6.00	\$0.00
San Luis Obispo*	3	no	no	4.4	\$8.50	\$0.00

AGENCY	POP INDEX	A.V. TAX	H2O USED	ADWF MGD	MONTHLY CHARGE	CONNECT FEE
San Miguel SD	2	no	yes	0.06	\$3.50	750.00
San Simeon Acres CSD	1	no	yes	0.11	\$22.55	2280.00
So San Luis Obispo CS	3	no	no	2.8	\$6.50	2000.00
Templeton CSD	2	no	mp	0.22	\$11.00	2400.00

COUNTY:San Mateo						
=====						
Belmont	5	no	no	16.	\$12.42	1310.00
Burlingame	3	no	yes	1.3	\$7.35	875.00
Burlingame Hills SMD	2	no	no	0.33	\$11.00	1050.00
Crystal Springs CSD	2	no	no	0.51	\$24.33	2280.00
Devonshire CSD	1	no	no	0.061	\$19.67	2280.00
East Palo Alto SD	3	no	no	1.3	\$22.08	1923.00
Emerald Lake Hts SMD	2	no	no	0.254	\$19.79	2280.00
Estero MID*	3	no	no	13.2	\$18.00	1600.00
Fair Oaks SMD	3	no	no	2.5	\$9.58	2280.00
Granada SD*	2	no	no	0.312	\$25.00	3600.00
Half Moon Bay*	3	no	no	1.311	\$24.08	3144.00
Harbor Industrial SMD	1	no	no	0.39		2280.00
Hillsborough*	3	no	no	1.1	\$28.00	3000.00
Kensington Square SMD	1	no	no	0.013	\$14.50	2280.00
Millbrae	3	no	no	2.	\$10.50	500.00
Montara SD	2	yes	yes	0.394	\$22.50	4405.00
Oak Knoll SMD	1	no	no	0.012	\$17.33	2280.00
Pacifica	3	yes	yes	2.8	\$27.81	688.00
Redwood City*	4	no	no	19.	\$9.96	594.00
San Bruno*	3	no	no	8.5	\$9.79	110.00
San Mateo	5	no	yes	13.5	\$14.43	1260.00
Scenic Heights CSD	1	no	no	0.009	\$17.25	2280.00
So Bayside	4	no	no	7.46	\$9.96	593.00
So San Francisco	4	no	no	5.2	\$8.00	500.00
West Bay SD	4	no	no	5.53	\$12.17	2035.00

COUNTY:Santa Barbara						
=====						
Buellton CSD*	2	no	no	0.33	\$10.25	1200.00
Cachunia SD*	2	no	yes	0.047	\$7.50	\$0.00
Carpinteria SD	3	yes	no	1.1	\$14.33	2000.00
Goleta SD*	4	no	no	6.4	\$9.00	1375.00
Goleta West SD	3	no	no	1.7	\$8.90	1375.00
Isla Vista SD*	3	no	no	1.7	\$8.90	1375.00
Laguna SD*	3	no	no	2.2	\$10.06	921.00
Los Alamos CSD	1	no	no	0.07	\$20.00	4750.00
Mission Canyon, CSA 1	2	no	no	0.3	\$20.64	5523.00
Mission Hills CSD	2	no	no	0.198	\$28.95	2660.00
Monteciteo SD	3	yes	no	0.85	\$20.00	3000.00
Santa Barbara	4	no	yes	6.	\$6.34	1770.00
Santa Ynez CSD	2	no	no	0.135	\$14.00	1300.00
Solvang	2	no	no	0.32	\$10.50	1600.00
Summerland SD	2	no	no	0.18	\$28.00	6740.00

COUNTY:Santa Clara						
=====						
Burbank SD	2	no	no	0.335	\$10.34	830.00

AGENCY	POP INDEX	A.V. TAX	H2O USED	ADWF MGD	MONTHLY CHARGE	CONNECT FEE
Cupertino SD	4	no	no	4.5	\$8.00	1850.00
Gilroy	4	no	no	4.587	\$18.41	3800.00
Los Altos	3	no	no	0.28	\$9.20	190.00
Lost Altos Hills*	2	no	no	0.79	\$14.50	450.00
Milpitas	4	yes	no	5.9	\$16.90	\$0.00
Morgan Hill	4	no	no	1.8	\$19.61	1870.00
Palo Alto	5	no	no	21.5	\$8.60	\$0.00
San Jose	5	no	no	105.	\$14.20	780.00
Santa Clara	4	no	no	16.	\$6.62	583.00
Santa Clara CWD No 2-	3	no	no	1.73	\$13.67	900.00
Sunnyvale	5	no	no	15.28	\$10.89	706.00
Sunol SD	2	no	no	0.17	\$9.92	720.00
West Valley SD	5	no	no	10.5	\$9.70	800.00

COUNTY:Santa Cruz						
=====						
San Lorenzo Valley WD	1	no	no	0.009	\$19.50	825.00
Santa Cruz	5	no	no	10.5	\$8.49	750.00
Scotts Valley*	2	no	yes	0.675	\$51.00	3760.00
Watsonville	3	no	no	8.	\$6.71	950.00

COUNTY:Shasta						
=====						
Anderson	2	yes	no	1.2	\$14.43	2307.00
Burney WD*	2	no	no	0.44	\$11.00	600.00
Cottonwood CSA #17*	2	no	no	0.17	\$14.00	\$0.00
Fall River Mills CSD	1	no	no	0.068	\$11.85	\$0.00
Palo Cedro, CSA 8*	1	no	no	0.026	\$16.00	4600.00
Redding	4	no	no	8.	\$12.00	1950.00
Shasta CSA 8	1	no	no	0.03	\$14.00	1500.00
Shasta Dam PUD	2	no	no	0.63	\$14.75	1883.00
Tucker Oaks WD	1	no	no	0.004	\$15.00	\$0.00

COUNTY:Sierra						
=====						
Loyalton	2	no	no	0.235	\$8.00	175.00

COUNTY:Siskiyou						
=====						
Dunsmuir	2	no	no	0.227	\$13.95	1200.00
Etna*	1	no	no	0.082	\$6.00	300.00
McCloud CSD	2	no	no	0.034	\$35.00	1000.00
Montague*	2	no	no	0.07	\$8.20	537.00
Mt Shasta	2	no	no	0.45	\$9.00	700.00
Tennant CSD	1	no	no	0.03	\$21.00	175.00
Tulelake	1	no	no	0.091	\$10.00	750.00
Weed*	2	no	yes	0.393	\$8.00	150.00
Yreka*	2	no	no	0.8	\$2.50	250.00

COUNTY:Solano						
=====						
Benicia	3	no	no	2.5	\$12.25	2150.00
Dixon	3	no	no	0.9	\$6.50	1343.00
Fairfield-Suisun SD	4	no	no	12.8	\$13.40	4851.00

AGENCY	POP INDEX	A.V. TAX	H2O USED	ADWF MGD	MONTHLY CHARGE	CONNECT FEE
Rio Vista	2	no	no	0.42	\$28.40	2161.00
Vacaville	4	no	no	7.15	\$9.80	2080.00
Vallejo Sanit & Flood	5	no	no	12.	\$16.00	1260.00

COUNTY:Sonoma						

Bodega Bay PUD	2	yes	no	0.16	\$12.50	1075.00
Cloverdale*	2	no	no	0.47	\$23.10	2000.00
Cotati	2	yes	yes	0.5	\$5.75	2000.00
Forestville CSD	1	no	no	0.046	\$27.00	4481.00
Geyersville CSA 26	1	no	no	0.03	\$28.42	2000.00
Graton CSA 2	2	no	no	0.08	\$20.17	2000.00
Healdsburg	2	no	no	1.05	\$10.21	900.00
North Marin WD-Tomale	1	no	no	0.015	\$22.10	1000.00
Occidental CSD	1	no	no	0.02	\$36.50	2000.00
Penngrove CSA 19	1	no	no	0.074	\$18.92	2000.00
Petaluma	3	no	no	4.5	\$8.75	2550.00
Rohnert Park*	3	no	no	3.	\$12.50	3300.00
Russian River CSD	2	no	no	0.35	\$30.66	2000.00
Santa Rosa	5	no	yes	16.	\$15.47	3000.00
Santa Rosa Reg	3	no	no	3.69	\$17.00	
Sebastopol	2	no	yes	0.8	\$34.00	6360.00
So Park CSD	3	no	no	0.15	\$20.50	2000.00
Sonoma Valley CSD	3	no	no	2.8	\$15.75	2000.00
Tomales WD	1	no	no	0.015	\$22.10	1000.00
Wikiup CWD	2	no	no	0.375	\$15.25	5457.00
Windsor WD	3	no	no	0.84	\$15.00	4150.00

COUNTY:Stanislaus						

Ceres	3	no	no	1.9	\$6.50	1359.24
Denair CSD	2	yes	no	0.3	\$14.54	334.00
Grayson CSD*	1	no	no	0.06	\$5.00	600.00
Hughson	2	yes	no	0.6	\$22.75	1200.00
Keyes CSD*	2	no	no	0.24	\$11.10	500.00
Modesto*	5	no	no	26.	\$6.35	450.00
Newman	2	no	no	1.1	\$4.90	1535.00
Oakdale	3	no	no	1.3	\$7.00	625.00
Patterson	2	no	no	0.72	\$7.80	732.00
Ripon	2	no	no	0.609	\$3.00	561.00
Riverbank	2	no	no	0.955	\$5.50	400.00
Salida SD	2	yes	no	0.45	\$6.00	500.00
Turlock	4	no	no	12.	\$8.80	100.00
Waterford CSD	2	yes	no	0.3	\$3.50	2200.00

COUNTY:Sutter						

Live Oak	2	no	no	0.35	\$12.70	1300.00
Rio Ramaza CSD*	1	yes	no	0.002	\$0.00	\$0.00
Yuba City	3	no	no	4.2	\$10.75	900.00

COUNTY:Tehama						

Corning	2	no	no	0.84	\$12.60	1680.00

AGENCY	POP INDEX	A.V. TAX	H2O USED	ADWF MGD	MONTHLY CHARGE	CONNECT FEE
Red Bluff	3	no	no	1.3	\$9.58	340.00
Rio Alto WD	1	yes	no	0.15	\$10.00	500.00
Tehama CSD 1	1	no	no	0.04	\$5.50	100.00

COUNTY:Trinity *****						
Weaverville SD	2	no	no	0.25	\$13.00	1025.00

COUNTY:Tulare *****						
Avenal	2	no	no	0.816	\$5.25	225.00
Dinuba	3	no	no	1.9	\$9.60	485.00
Earlimart PUD	2	no	no	0.4	\$6.00	800.00
East Orosi CSD	1	yes	no	0.006	\$17.50	800.00
El Rancho CSA 1	1	no	no	0.012	\$27.42	1286.00
Exeter	2	no	no	0.78	\$5.75	750.00
Farmersville	2	no	no	0.65	\$9.50	1300.00
Ivanhoe PUD	2	no	no	0.38	\$7.00	500.00
Lemon Cove SD	1	yes	no	0.01	\$4.50	500.00
Lindsay*	2	no	no	1.	\$8.00	700.00
London CSD	2	yes	no	0.028	\$7.00	\$45.00
Orosi PUD	2	no	no	0.71	\$21.40	800.00
Pixley PUD	2	no	no	0.36	\$4.50	175.00
Porter Vista PUD	3	yes	no	4.6	\$9.00	1440.00
Porterville	3	no	no	4.6	\$11.34	485.00
Springville PUD	2	no	no	0.068	\$28.35	766.00
Strathmore PUD	2	no	no	0.3	\$6.00	500.00
Sultana CSD	1	no	no	0.051	\$17.00	650.00
Terra Bella SMD	2	no	no	0.15	\$14.00	287.00
Three Rivers CSD	2	no	no	0.03	\$5.00	\$0.00
Tipton CSD	2	no	no	0.17	\$8.00	925.00
Tulare CSA 1*	1	no	no	0.012	\$27.42	1286.00
Tulare*	3	no	no	5.53	\$5.50	200.00
Visalia	4	no	no	8.86	\$7.00	1788.00
Woodlake	2	no	no	0.608	\$7.00	200.00
Woodville PUD	2	no	no	3.	\$12.00	700.00

COUNTY:Tuolumne *****						
Groveland CSD	2	no	no	0.15	\$19.83	2362.00
Jamestown SD*	2	no	no	0.15	\$16.45	2500.00
Mono Village WD	2	no	no	0.1	\$8.50	1000.00
Tuolumne City SD	2	yes	no	0.061	\$15.00	2250.00
Tuolumne CWD 1	2	no	no	0.25	\$10.50	300.00
Tuolumne Reg WD	3	no	no	1.3	\$9.50	1000.00

COUNTY:Ventura *****						
Camarillo SD	3	yes	no	4.	\$10.63	3650.00
Camrosa WD	2	yes	no	1.1	\$8.66	1000.00
Channel Islands Beach	2	no	no	0.9	\$10.00	5610.00
North Coast, CSA 30	2	no	no	0.116	\$33.90	1800.00
Nyland Acres, CSA 29	1	no	no	0.06	\$22.73	2825.00
Ojai Valley SD	3	yes	no	2.	\$16.15	1700.00

AGENCY	POP INDEX	A.V. TAX	H2O USED	ADWF MGD	MONTHLY CHARGE	CONNECT FEE
Oxnard	5	no	no	18.	\$15.02	3262.00
Port Hueneme	3	no	no	2.8	\$10.00	3000.00
San Buenaventura	4	no	yes	8.5	\$16.55	701.00
Santa Paula*	3	no	no	2.1	\$7.10	394.00
Saticoy SD	2	yes	no	0.12	\$8.00	100.00
Simi Valley CSD	5	no	no	9.1	\$10.22	2270.00
Thousand Oaks	5	no	no	8.4	\$10.50	3600.00
Triunfo CSD	3	no	no	2.18	\$17.00	1450.00
Ventura Cty Waterwork	3	no	no	2.	\$8.05	2500.00
Ventura Cty Waterwork	2	no	no	0.106	\$17.70	500.00
Ventura Regional	3	no	no	0.88	\$1.05	1184.00

COUNTY:Yolo						
=====						
Davis Municipal Sewer	4	no	no	4.3	\$7.80	1219.00
Esparto CSD	2	no	no	0.15	\$8.00	\$50.00
Knights Landing SD	2	yes	no	0.012	\$17.00	750.00
Madison SD	1	no	no	0.025	\$20.00	\$40.00
West Sacramento	3	no	no	3.5	\$25.38	3050.00
Winters	2	no	no	0.38	\$10.85	700.00
Woodland	3	no	no	4.75	\$7.00	1370.00

COUNTY:Yuba						
=====						
Linda CWD	3	no	no	1.1	\$6.10	1500.00
Marysville	3	no	no	1.5	\$8.05	700.00
Olivehurst PUD	2	no	no	1.1	\$9.00	1000.00

COUNTY:						
=====						

NOTES: Population Index: 1 = <1,000
2 = 1,000 - 10,000
3 = 10,000 - 50,000
4 = 50,000 - 100,000
5 = >100,000

A.V. Tax: Yes denotes agency utilizes Ad Valorem taxes to pay Operations and Maintenance Costs.

H2O Use: Yes denotes agency bases charges on water consumption.

WASTEWATER TREATMENT/COLLECTION (SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION)

County _____

Date _____

District _____

1. Method of Charging residential/users:

- Flat rate
- Based on water consumption
- Other (specify) _____

2. Current user fee (monthly):
(include costs of regional facilities if applicable)

- \$ _____ Single family residence
- \$ _____ Apartments
- \$ _____ Mobile Homes

3. Is ad valorem tax used to pay for a portion or all of the operation and maintenance costs?

Yes No

4. Is debt service paid in part (or total) via user charges?

Yes No

5. Total wastewater budget for current year \$ _____.

6. Connection (or capacity) fees for a single family residence: (Do not include annexation fees or costs of physically connecting dwelling to the sewer.)

\$ _____

7. Has Clean Water Grant Funds been used to fund any portion of the wastewater facilities?

Yes No

8. Approximate population served by wastewater treatment facility: _____

9. Median Household Income \$ _____

10. Current average dry weather flow _____ MGD. Design Flow _____ MGD.
(obtain information from plant operator)

11. Wastewater facility level of treatment:
(obtain information from plant operator)

Primary _____ Secondary _____ Advanced _____

12. Person to contact for additional information:

Name _____ Title _____

Phone number () _____

If you have any questions pertaining to this questionnaire please call Mr. Frank Peters a (916) 739-4424.

