

Urban Water Supplier Conservation Standard for Extended Emergency Regulation Rulemaking - 2016

Summary Table Conservation Standards for Suppliers that Submitted Adjustments by 3/15/2016

Supplier Name	Original Conservation Standard (Released 7/15/15)	DRAFT Adjusted Conservation Standard (Based on Revised Jun-Sep 2014 R-GPCD and Default Climate Adjustment ¹)	NEW Conservation Standard (Based on Supplier-Submitted Adjustments Received by 3/15/16) ²
Anaheim City of	20%	20%	13%
Antioch City of	28%	28%	27%
Arvin Community Services District	28%	21%	21%
Atascadero Mutual Water Company	28%	28%	28%
Bakersfield City of	36%	33%	31%
Banning City of	32%	28%	28%
Beaumont-Cherry Valley Water District	36%	34%	32%
Blythe City of	32%	28%	28%
Brentwood City of	32%	29%	28%
Buena Park City of	20%	20%	13%
California Water Service Company Chico District	32%	30%	29%
California Water Service Company Dixon, City of	28%	25%	24%
California Water Service Company Dominguez	16%	16%	15%
California Water Service Company Hermosa/Redondo	20%	20%	19%
California Water Service Company King City	12%	10%	9%
California Water Service Company Livermore	24%	21%	21%
California Water Service Company Oroville	28%	26%	25%
California Water Service Company Visalia	32%	30%	29%
Camarillo City of	20%	20%	20%
Cambria Community Services District	8%	8%	8%
Camrosa Water District	32%	30%	24%
Carlsbad Municipal Water District	28%	28%	20%
Casitas Municipal Water District	32%	32%	32%
Castaic Lake Water Agency Santa Clarita Water Division	32%	29%	28%
Cerritos City of	28%	28%	21%
Chino City of	24%	22%	21%
Clovis City of	36%	34%	33%
Coachella City of	24%	20%	20%
Corona City of	28%	28%	28%
Crescenta Valley Water District	20%	18%	18%
Cucamonga Valley Water District	32%	30%	30%
Diablo Water District	28%	25%	23%
Dinuba City of	32%	30%	29%
Downey City of	20%	20%	14%
East Bay Municipal Utilities District	16%	16%	16%
East Orange County Water District	36%	36%	29%
East Valley Water District	28%	26%	22%
Eastern Municipal Water District	28%	28%	20%

¹ Based on R-GPCD (as reported by 1/1/16)

² For status of supplier-submitted adjustments, see Status Table

Urban Water Supplier Conservation Standard for Extended Emergency Regulation Rulemaking - 2016

Summary Table Conservation Standards for Suppliers that Submitted Adjustments by 3/15/2016

Supplier Name	Original Conservation Standard (Released 7/15/15)	DRAFT Adjusted Conservation Standard (Based on Revised Jun-Sep 2014 R-GPCD and Default Climate Adjustment ¹)	NEW Conservation Standard (Based on Supplier-Submitted Adjustments Received by 3/15/16) ²
El Centro City of	24%	20%	20%
El Dorado Irrigation District	28%	25%	24%
El Monte City of	8%	8%	8%
Elsinore Valley Municipal Water District	28%	28%	27%
Escondido City of	20%	18%	12%
Exeter City of	36%	34%	34%
Fairfield City of	20%	20%	19%
Fallbrook Public Utility District	36%	36%	28%
Folsom City of	32%	29%	28%
Fortuna City of	24%	20%	20%
Fountain Valley City of	20%	20%	13%
Fresno City of	28%	26%	25%
Fruitridge Vista Water Company	36%	33%	28%
Fullerton City of	28%	28%	21%
Galt City of	32%	29%	29%
Golden State Water Company Artesia	16%	16%	9%
Golden State Water Company Barstow	24%	20%	20%
Golden State Water Company Bay Point	12%	12%	12%
Golden State Water Company Claremont	32%	30%	30%
Golden State Water Company Cordova	36%	33%	32%
Golden State Water Company Cowan Heights	36%	36%	29%
Golden State Water Company Culver City	16%	16%	16%
Golden State Water Company Norwalk	12%	12%	8%
Golden State Water Company Orcutt	32%	32%	31%
Golden State Water Company Placentia	24%	24%	17%
Golden State Water Company S Arcadia	24%	22%	22%
Golden State Water Company S San Gabriel	12%	10%	10%
Golden State Water Company San Dimas	28%	26%	26%
Golden State Water Company Simi Valley	24%	22%	22%
Golden State Water Company Southwest	12%	12%	9%
Golden State Water Company Southwest	12%	12%	9%
Golden State Water Company West Orange	16%	16%	9%
Hanford City of	28%	24%	23%
Hawthorne City of	16%	16%	16%
Helix Water District	20%	20%	12%
Hemet City of	32%	14%	14%
Hesperia Water District City of	32%	28%	28%
Huntington Beach City of	20%	20%	13%
Huntington Park City of	8%	8%	8%

¹ Based on R-GPCD (as reported by 1/1/16)

² For status of supplier-submitted adjustments, see Status Table

Urban Water Supplier Conservation Standard for Extended Emergency Regulation Rulemaking - 2016

Summary Table Conservation Standards for Suppliers that Submitted Adjustments by 3/15/2016

Supplier Name	Original Conservation Standard (Released 7/15/15)	DRAFT Adjusted Conservation Standard (Based on Revised Jun-Sep 2014 R-GPCD and Default Climate Adjustment ¹)	NEW Conservation Standard (Based on Supplier-Submitted Adjustments Received by 3/15/16) ²
Indio City of	32%	28%	27%
Inglewood City of	12%	12%	11%
Irvine Ranch Water District	16%	16%	8%
Jurupa Community Service District	28%	28%	23%
Kerman, City of	32%	29%	29%
La Palma City of	20%	20%	13%
La Verne City of	32%	30%	30%
Laguna Beach County Water District	24%	24%	24%
Lake Hemet Municipal Water District	28%	26%	26%
Lakeside Water District	20%	18%	12%
Lakewood City of	20%	20%	12%
Lamont Public Utility District	28%	25%	25%
Las Virgenes Municipal Water District	36%	36%	35%
Lee Lake Water District	32%	32%	31%
Lincoln City of	32%	29%	28%
Loma Linda City of	32%	30%	30%
Long Beach City of	16%	12%	9%
Los Angeles Department of Water and Power	16%	14%	14%
Los Banos, City of	28%	25%	24%
Lynwood City of	16%	16%	10%
Madera City of	28%	26%	26%
Manhattan Beach City of	20%	20%	18%
Manteca City of	32%	30%	27%
Marina Coast Water District	12%	12%	11%
Mesa Water District	20%	20%	13%
Modesto, City of	36%	34%	33%
Monte Vista Water District	24%	22%	22%
Montebello Land and Water Company	16%	16%	9%
Morgan Hill City of	28%	28%	27%
Mountain House Community Services District	25%	25%	21%
Nevada Irrigation District	36%	33%	33%
Newport Beach City of	28%	28%	21%
Norco City of	36%	36%	36%
North Tahoe Public Utility District	28%	25%	25%
Norwalk City of	20%	20%	17%
Oceanside City of	20%	20%	12%
Oildale Mutual Water Company	36%	33%	31%
Olivenhain Municipal Water District	32%	32%	24%
Ontario City of	24%	22%	20%

¹ Based on R-GPCD (as reported by 1/1/16)

² For status of supplier-submitted adjustments, see Status Table

Urban Water Supplier Conservation Standard for Extended Emergency Regulation Rulemaking - 2016

Summary Table Conservation Standards for Suppliers that Submitted Adjustments by 3/15/2016

Supplier Name	Original Conservation Standard (Released 7/15/15)	DRAFT Adjusted Conservation Standard (Based on Revised Jun-Sep 2014 R-GPCD and Default Climate Adjustment ¹)	NEW Conservation Standard (Based on Supplier-Submitted Adjustments Received by 3/15/16) ²
Orange City of	28%	28%	21%
Orchard Dale Water District	12%	12%	8%
Otay Water District	20%	18%	12%
Padre Dam Municipal Water District	20%	18%	12%
Paramount City of	12%	12%	8%
Park Water Company	8%	8%	8%
Paso Robles City of	28%	24%	24%
Pico Water District	24%	24%	18%
Pismo Beach City of	24%	24%	22%
Pittsburg City of	20%	20%	19%
Placer County Water Agency	32%	29%	28%
Pleasanton City of	24%	24%	24%
Pomona City of	20%	18%	18%
Porterville City of	32%	26%	26%
Poway City of	32%	30%	24%
Rainbow Municipal Water District	36%	36%	28%
Ramona Municipal Water District	28%	26%	20%
Rancho California Water District	36%	36%	32%
Redding City of	36%	33%	33%
Redlands City of	36%	34%	33%
Reedley City of	24%	22%	22%
Rincon Del Diablo Municipal Water District	32%	32%	24%
Ripon City of	36%	34%	33%
Riverbank City of	32%	30%	30%
Riverside City of	28%	28%	25%
Riverside Highland Water Company	36%	34%	33%
Roseville City of	28%	25%	25%
Rubidoux Community Service District	28%	28%	20%
Sacramento County Water Agency	32%	25%	24%
San Bernardino City of	28%	26%	24%
San Bernardino County Service Area 70J	28%	25%	24%
San Diego City of	16%	16%	8%
San Dieguito Water District	28%	28%	20%
San Gabriel Valley Fontana Water Company	28%	26%	26%
San Jacinto City of	32%	30%	30%
San Juan Capistrano City of	28%	28%	27%
Santa Ana City of	12%	12%	8%
Santa Barbara City of	12%	12%	12%
Santa Fe Irrigation District	36%	36%	28%

¹ Based on R-GPCD (as reported by 1/1/16)

² For status of supplier-submitted adjustments, see Status Table

Urban Water Supplier Conservation Standard for Extended Emergency Regulation Rulemaking - 2016

Summary Table Conservation Standards for Suppliers that Submitted Adjustments by 3/15/2016

Supplier Name	Original Conservation Standard (Released 7/15/15)	DRAFT Adjusted Conservation Standard (Based on Revised Jun-Sep 2014 R-GPCD and Default Climate Adjustment ¹)	NEW Conservation Standard (Based on Supplier-Submitted Adjustments Received by 3/15/16) ²
Santa Margarita Water District	24%	24%	23%
Shafter City of	36%	33%	32%
South Gate City of	12%	12%	8%
Suburban Water Systems San Jose Hills	24%	22%	22%
Sweetwater Authority	12%	12%	8%
Torrance City of	20%	20%	19%
Tulare, City of	32%	30%	30%
Tustin City of	28%	28%	21%
Twentynine Palms Water District	28%	24%	24%
Vacaville City of	32%	29%	25%
Vallecitos Water District	24%	24%	16%
Valley Center Municipal Water District	36%	34%	28%
Vaughn Water Company	36%	33%	30%
Victorville Water District	28%	24%	24%
Vista Irrigation District	20%	20%	12%
Wasco City of	36%	33%	32%
West Kern Water District	28%	25%	25%
West Sacramento City of	28%	25%	25%
West Valley Water District	32%	30%	28%
Western Municipal Water District of Riverside	32%	32%	28%
Westminster City of	20%	20%	13%
Whittier City of	20%	20%	17%
Woodland City of	24%	21%	20%
Yorba Linda Water District	36%	36%	28%
Yreka, City of	32%	30%	30%
Yuba City City of	32%	29%	28%

¹ Based on R-GPCD (as reported by 1/1/16)

² For status of supplier-submitted adjustments, see Status Table

Urban Water Supplier Conservation Standard for Extended Emergency Regulation Rulemaking - 2016

Status Table Conservation Standards for Suppliers that Submitted Adjustments by 3/15/2016

Supplier Name	DRAFT Adjusted Conservation Standard (Based on Revised Jun-Sep 2014 R-GPCD ¹)	Status of Supplier Adjustments Submitted by 3/15/16			New Conservation Standard (Based on Supplier-Submitted Adjustments Received by 3/15/16)	State Water Board Comments
		In-Lieu Climate	Growth	Supply		
Anaheim City of	20%	-	-	approved	13%	
Antioch City of	28%	denied	approved	-	27%	Climate adjustment rejected - CIMIS stations are outside service area.
Arvin Community Services District	21%	denied	-	-	21%	Climate adjustment rejected - CIMIS stations are outside service area
Atascadero Mutual Water Company	28%	-	-	denied	28%	Supply adjustment rejected - no certification/supporting documents
Bakersfield City of	33%	-	approved	-	31%	
Banning City of	28%	-	-	-	28%	No adjustments submitted
Beaumont-Cherry Valley Water District	36%	-	approved	-	32%	
Blythe City of	28%	denied	-	-	28%	Climate adjustment rejected - CIMIS stations are outside service area
Brentwood City of	29%	-	approved	denied	28%	Supply adjustment rejected - not potable water
Buena Park City of	20%	-	-	approved	13%	
California Water Service Company Chico District	30%	-	approved	-	29%	
California Water Service Company Dixon, City of	25%	-	approved	-	24%	
California Water Service Company Dominguez	16%	-	-	approved	15%	
California Water Service Company Hermosa/Redondo	20%	-	-	approved	19%	
California Water Service Company King City	10%	-	approved	-	9%	
California Water Service Company Livermore	21%	-	approved	-	21%	
California Water Service Company Oroville	26%	-	approved	-	25%	
California Water Service Company Visalia	30%	-	approved	-	29%	
Camarillo City of	20%	-	approved	-	20%	
Cambria Community Services District	8%	-	-	approved	8%	Adjusted standard cannot fall below eight percent.

³ As reported by 1/1/16

Urban Water Supplier Conservation Standard for Extended Emergency Regulation Rulemaking - 2016

Status Table Conservation Standards for Suppliers that Submitted Adjustments by 3/15/2016

Supplier Name	DRAFT Adjusted Conservation Standard (Based on Revised Jun-Sep 2014 R-GPCD ¹)	Status of Supplier Adjustments Submitted by 3/15/16			New Conservation Standard (Based on Supplier-Submitted Adjustments Received by 3/15/16)	State Water Board Comments
		In-Lieu Climate	Growth	Supply		
Camrosa Water District	32%	-	-	approved	24%	Adjustment capped at eight percentage point reduction.
Carlsbad Municipal Water District	28%	-	-	approved	20%	Adjustment capped at eight percentage point reduction.
Casitas Municipal Water District	32%	denied	approved	-	32%	Climate adjustment rejected - no supporting documents and requested ETo below state average
Castaic Lake Water Agency Santa Clarita Water Division	29%	-	approved	-	28%	
Cerritos City of	28%	-	-	approved	21%	
Chino City of	24%	-	approved	-	21%	
Clovis City of	34%	denied	approved	-	33%	Climate adjustment rejected - CIMIS stations are outside service area
Coachella City of	20%	-	-	-	20%	No adjustments submitted
Corona City of	28%	denied	-	-	28%	Climate adjustment rejected - CIMIS stations are outside service area
Crescenta Valley Water District	20%	denied	-	-	18%	Climate adjustment rejected - default greater than the requested ETo
Cucamonga Valley Water District	32%	-	approved	-	30%	
Diablo Water District	25%	-	approved	-	23%	
Dinuba City of	30%	-	approved	-	29%	
Downey City of	20%	-	-	approved	14%	
East Bay Municipal Utilities District	16%	-	approved	-	16%	
East Orange County Water District	36%	-	-	approved	29%	
East Valley Water District	28%	denied	approved	-	22%	Climate adjustment rejected - CIMIS stations are outside service area
Eastern Municipal Water District	28%	approved	approved	approved	20%	
El Centro City of	20%	-	-	-	20%	No adjustments submitted
El Dorado Irrigation District	25%	approved	approved	-	24%	

³ As reported by 1/1/16
Table Last Updated April 12, 2016

Urban Water Supplier Conservation Standard for Extended Emergency Regulation Rulemaking - 2016

Status Table Conservation Standards for Suppliers that Submitted Adjustments by 3/15/2016

Supplier Name	DRAFT Adjusted Conservation Standard (Based on Revised Jun-Sep 2014 R-GPCD ¹)	Status of Supplier Adjustments Submitted by 3/15/16			New Conservation Standard (Based on Supplier-Submitted Adjustments Received by 3/15/16)	State Water Board Comments
		In-Lieu Climate	Growth	Supply		
El Monte City of	8%	-	approved	-	8%	Adjusted standard cannot fall below eight percent.
Elsinore Valley Municipal Water District	28%	denied	approved	-	27%	Climate adjustment rejected - CIMIS stations are outside service area
Escondido City of	20%	-	-	approved	12%	Adjustment capped at eight percentage point reduction.
Exeter City of	34%	denied	approved	-	34%	Climate adjustment rejected - CIMIS stations are outside service area
Fairfield City of	20%	-	approved	-	19%	
Fallbrook Public Utility District	36%	-	-	approved	28%	
Folsom City of	29%	-	approved	-	28%	
Fortuna City of	20%	-	approved	-	20%	
Fountain Valley City of	20%	-	-	approved	13%	
Fresno City of	26%	approved	approved	-	25%	
Fruitridge Vista Water Company	33%	-	approved	-	28%	
Fullerton City of	28%	-	-	approved	21%	
Galt City of	29%	-	-	-	29%	No adjustments submitted
Golden State Water Company Artesia	16%	-	approved	approved	9%	
Golden State Water Company Barstow	20%	-	approved	-	20%	
Golden State Water Company Bay Point	12%	-	approved	-	12%	
Golden State Water Company Claremont	32%	-	approved	-	30%	
Golden State Water Company Cordova	33%	-	approved	-	32%	
Golden State Water Company Cowan Heights	36%	-	approved	approved	29%	
Golden State Water Company Culver City	16%	-	approved	-	16%	
Golden State Water Company Norwalk	12%	-	approved	approved	8%	
Golden State Water Company Orcutt	32%	-	approved	-	31%	
Golden State Water Company Placentia	24%	-	approved	approved	17%	

³ As reported by 1/1/16

Urban Water Supplier Conservation Standard for Extended Emergency Regulation Rulemaking - 2016

Status Table Conservation Standards for Suppliers that Submitted Adjustments by 3/15/2016

Supplier Name	DRAFT Adjusted Conservation Standard (Based on Revised Jun-Sep 2014 R-GPCD ¹)	Status of Supplier Adjustments Submitted by 3/15/16			New Conservation Standard (Based on Supplier-Submitted Adjustments Received by 3/15/16)	State Water Board Comments
		In-Lieu Climate	Growth	Supply		
Golden State Water Company S Arcadia	24%	-	approved	-	22%	
Golden State Water Company S San Gabriel	12%	-	approved	-	10%	
Golden State Water Company San Dimas	28%	-	approved	-	26%	
Golden State Water Company Simi Valley	24%	-	approved	-	22%	
Golden State Water Company Southwest	12%	-	-	approved	9%	
Golden State Water Company Southwest	12%	-	-	approved	9%	
Golden State Water Company West Orange	16%	-	approved	approved	9%	
Hanford City of	24%	-	approved	-	23%	
Hawthorne City of	16%	-	approved	-	16%	
Helix Water District	20%	denied	-	approved	12%	Climate adjustment rejected - CIMIS stations are outside service area. Adjustment capped at eight percentage point reduction.
Hemet City of	16%	denied	-	-	14%	Climate adjustment rejected - CIMIS stations are outside service area
Hesperia Water District City of	28%	-	approved	-	28%	
Huntington Beach City of	20%	-	approved	approved	13%	
Huntington Park City of	8%	-	-	approved	8%	Adjusted standard cannot fall below eight percent.
Indio City of	28%	denied	approved	-	27%	Climate adjustment rejected - supporting document does not include station location information
Inglewood City of	12%	-	-	approved	11%	
Irvine Ranch Water District	16%	-	approved	approved	8%	
Jurupa Community Service District	28%	approved	approved	-	23%	
Kerman, City of	29%	-	-	-	29%	No adjustments submitted
La Palma City of	20%	-	-	approved	13%	

³ As reported by 1/1/16

Urban Water Supplier Conservation Standard for Extended Emergency Regulation Rulemaking - 2016

Status Table Conservation Standards for Suppliers that Submitted Adjustments by 3/15/2016

Supplier Name	DRAFT Adjusted Conservation Standard (Based on Revised Jun-Sep 2014 R-GPCD ¹)	Status of Supplier Adjustments Submitted by 3/15/16			New Conservation Standard (Based on Supplier-Submitted Adjustments Received by 3/15/16)	State Water Board Comments
		In-Lieu Climate	Growth	Supply		
La Verne City of	32%	denied	-	-	30%	Climate adjustment rejected - CIMIS stations are outside service area
Laguna Beach County Water District	24%	-	-	denied	24%	Supply adjustment rejected - not a qualifying drought-resilient supply.
Lake Hemet Municipal Water District	28%	denied	-	-	26%	Climate adjustment rejected - CIMIS stations are outside service area
Lakeside Water District	20%	-	-	approved	12%	Supply reported as 309 AF; WB staff converted to gallons. Adjustment capped at eight percentage point reduction.
Lakewood City of	20%	-	-	approved	12%	
Lamont Public Utility District	25%	denied	-	-	25%	Climate adjustment rejected - CIMIS stations are outside service area
Las Virgenes Municipal Water District	36%	denied	approved	-	35%	Climate adjustment rejected - CIMIS stations are outside service area
Lee Lake Water District	32%	denied	approved	-	31%	Climate adjustment rejected - CIMIS stations are outside service area
Lincoln City of	29%	-	approved	-	28%	
Loma Linda City of	32%	-	approved	-	30%	
Long Beach City of	12%	-	-	approved	9%	
Los Angeles Department of Water and Power	16%	approved	-	-	14%	
Los Banos, City of	25%	denied	approved	-	24%	Climate adjustment rejected - corrected typo results in default ETo
Lynwood City of	16%	-	-	approved	10%	
Madera City of	26%	denied	-	-	26%	Climate adjustment rejected - CIMIS stations are outside service area
Manhattan Beach City of	20%	-	-	approved	18%	

³ As reported by 1/1/16

Urban Water Supplier Conservation Standard for Extended Emergency Regulation Rulemaking - 2016

Status Table Conservation Standards for Suppliers that Submitted Adjustments by 3/15/2016

Supplier Name	DRAFT Adjusted Conservation Standard (Based on Revised Jun-Sep 2014 R-GPCD ³)	Status of Supplier Adjustments Submitted by 3/15/16			New Conservation Standard (Based on Supplier-Submitted Adjustments Received by 3/15/16)	State Water Board Comments
		In-Lieu Climate	Growth	Supply		
Manteca City of	30%	-	approved	-	27%	
Marina Coast Water District	12%	-	approved	-	11%	
Mesa Water District	20%	-	approved	approved	13%	Supply adjustment partially approved - colored water not a qualifying source
Modesto, City of	34%	-	approved	-	33%	
Monte Vista Water District	24%	-	approved	-	22%	
Montebello Land and Water Company	16%	-	-	approved	9%	
Morgan Hill City of	28%	-	approved	-	27%	
Mountain House Community Services District	25%	-	approved	-	21%	
Nevada Irrigation District	33%	-	approved	-	33%	
Newport Beach City of	28%	-	-	approved	21%	
Norco City of	36%	denied	-	-	36%	Climate adjustment rejected - CIMIS stations are outside service area
North Tahoe Public Utility District	25%	-	-	-	25%	No adjustments submitted
Norwalk City of	20%	-	-	approved	17%	
Oceanside City of	20%	-	-	approved	12%	
Oildale Mutual Water Company	33%	-	approved	-	31%	
Olivenhain Municipal Water District	32%	-	-	approved	24%	Adjustment capped at eight percentage point reduction.
Ontario City of	24%	-	approved	-	20%	
Orange City of	28%	-	-	approved	21%	
Orchard Dale Water District	12%	-	-	approved	8%	Adjusted standard cannot fall below eight percent.
Otay Water District	20%	-	-	approved	12%	Adjustment capped at eight percentage point reduction.
Padre Dam Municipal Water District	20%	-	-	approved	12%	Adjustment capped at eight percentage point reduction.
Paramount City of	12%	-	-	approved	8%	Adjusted standard cannot fall below eight percent.
Park Water Company	8%	-	-	approved	8%	Adjusted standard cannot fall below eight percent.

³ As reported by 1/1/16

Urban Water Supplier Conservation Standard for Extended Emergency Regulation Rulemaking - 2016

Status Table Conservation Standards for Suppliers that Submitted Adjustments by 3/15/2016

Supplier Name	DRAFT Adjusted Conservation Standard (Based on Revised Jun-Sep 2014 R-GPCD ³)	Status of Supplier Adjustments Submitted by 3/15/16			New Conservation Standard (Based on Supplier-Submitted Adjustments Received by 3/15/16)	State Water Board Comments
		In-Lieu Climate	Growth	Supply		
Paso Robles City of	24%	-	approved	denied	24%	Supply adjustment rejected - not a qualifying drought-resilient supply.
Pico Water District	24%	-	-	approved	18%	
Pismo Beach City of	24%	-	denied	-	22%	Growth adjustment modified; WB revised CII water use per connection.
Pittsburg City of	20%	denied	approved	-	19%	Climate adjustment rejected - CIMIS stations are outside service area
Placer County Water Agency	29%	-	approved	-	28%	
Pleasanton City of	24%	approved	approved	-	24%	
Pomona City of	20%	-	approved	-	18%	
Porterville City of	26%	denied	-	-	26%	Climate adjustment rejected - CIMIS stations are outside service area
Poway City of	32%	-	-	approved	24%	Adjustment capped at eight percentage point reduction.
Rainbow Municipal Water District	36%	-	-	approved	28%	
Ramona Municipal Water District	28%	-	-	approved	20%	Adjustment capped at eight percentage point reduction.
Rancho California Water District	36%	approved	approved	-	32%	
Redding City of	33%	-	-	-	33%	No adjustments submitted
Redlands City of	36%	-	denied	-	33%	Growth adjustment modified; WB staff applied revised population growth
Reedley City of	22%	-	approved	-	22%	
Rincon Del Diablo Municipal Water District	32%	-	-	approved	24%	
Ripon City of	34%	-	approved	-	33%	
Riverbank City of	30%	-	approved	-	30%	
Riverside City of	28%	approved	-	denied	25%	Supply adjustment rejected - not a qualifying drought-resilient supply.

³ As reported by 1/1/16

Urban Water Supplier Conservation Standard for Extended Emergency Regulation Rulemaking - 2016

Status Table Conservation Standards for Suppliers that Submitted Adjustments by 3/15/2016

Supplier Name	DRAFT Adjusted Conservation Standard (Based on Revised Jun-Sep 2014 R-GPCD ¹)	Status of Supplier Adjustments Submitted by 3/15/16			New Conservation Standard (Based on Supplier-Submitted Adjustments Received by 3/15/16)	State Water Board Comments
		In-Lieu Climate	Growth	Supply		
Riverside Highland Water Company	36%	-	approved	-	33%	
Roseville City of	25%	-	approved	-	25%	
Rubidoux Community Service District	28%	denied	-	approved	20%	Climate adjustment rejected - CIMIS stations are outside service area. Adjustment capped at eight percentage point reduction.
Sacramento County Water Agency	25%	-	approved	-	24%	
San Bernardino City of	28%	approved	approved	-	24%	
San Bernardino County Service Area 70J	25%	approved	-	-	24%	Includes revisions to source data (see page 15)
San Diego City of	16%	-	approved	approved	8%	Adjusted standard cannot fall below eight percent.
San Dieguito Water District	28%	-	-	approved	20%	
San Gabriel Valley Fontana Water Company	28%	denied	-	-	26%	Climate adjustment rejected - CIMIS stations are outside service area
San Jacinto City of	32%	denied	-	-	30%	Climate adjustment rejected - CIMIS stations are outside service area
San Juan Capistrano City of	28%	-	approved	-	27%	
Santa Ana City of	12%	-	-	approved	8%	Adjusted standard cannot fall below eight percent.
Santa Barbara City of	12%	-	-	denied	12%	Supply adjustment rejected - not producing water yet.
Santa Fe Irrigation District	36%	-	-	approved	28%	Supply reported as 956 AF; WB staff converted to gallons
Santa Margarita Water District	24%	-	approved	-	23%	
Shafter City of	33%	denied	approved	-	32%	Climate adjustment rejected - default greater than the requested ETO
South Gate City of	12%	-	-	approved	8%	Adjusted standard cannot fall below eight percent.
Suburban Water Systems San Jose Hills	24%	-	approved	-	22%	
Sweetwater Authority	12%	-	-	approved	8%	Adjusted standard cannot fall below eight percent.

³ As reported by 1/1/16

Urban Water Supplier Conservation Standard for Extended Emergency Regulation Rulemaking - 2016

Status Table Conservation Standards for Suppliers that Submitted Adjustments by 3/15/2016

Supplier Name	DRAFT Adjusted Conservation Standard (Based on Revised Jun-Sep 2014 R-GPCD ¹)	Status of Supplier Adjustments Submitted by 3/15/16			New Conservation Standard (Based on Supplier-Submitted Adjustments Received by 3/15/16)	State Water Board Comments
		In-Lieu Climate	Growth	Supply		
Torrance City of	20%	-	-	approved	19%	
Tulare, City of	30%	denied	-	-	30%	Climate adjustment rejected - CIMIS stations are outside service area
Tustin City of	28%	-	-	approved	21%	
Twentynine Palms Water District	24%	-	-	-	24%	No adjustments submitted
Vacaville City of	29%	-	approved	-	25%	Includes revisions to source data (see page 15)
Vallecitos Water District	24%	-	-	approved	16%	Adjustment capped at eight percentage point reduction.
Valley Center Municipal Water District	36%	-	-	approved	28%	Adjustment capped at eight percentage point reduction.
Vaughn Water Company	33%	-	approved	-	30%	
Victorville Water District	24%	denied	-	-	24%	Climate adjustment rejected - no supporting documents
Vista Irrigation District	20%	-	-	approved	12%	
Wasco City of	33%	denied	approved	-	32%	Climate adjustment rejected - no supporting documents (uploaded file is for growth)
West Kern Water District	25%	-	-	-	25%	No adjustments submitted
West Sacramento City of	25%	-	approved	-	25%	
West Valley Water District	32%	denied	approved	-	28%	Climate adjustment rejected - CIMIS stations are outside service area
Western Municipal Water District of Riverside	32%	approved	approved	-	28%	
Westminster City of	20%	-	-	approved	13%	
Whittier City of	20%	-	-	approved	17%	
Woodland City of	21%	-	approved	-	20%	
Yorba Linda Water District	36%	-	approved	approved	28%	
Yreka, City of	30%	-	approved	-	30%	
Yuba City City of	29%	-	approved	-	28%	

³ As reported by 1/1/16

Urban Water Supplier Conservation Standard for Extended Emergency Regulation Rulemaking - 2016
Summary Tables Conservation Standards for Suppliers that Submitted Source Data Corrections by 3/15/2016

Corrections to Supplier CIMIS ETo Zone Designation

Supplier Name	Previous CIMIS ETo Zone and Default Climate Adjustment			Revised CIMIS ETo Zone and New Conservation Standard		
	CIMIS ETo Zone	Default Climate Adjustment	Conservation Standard	Revised CIMIS ETo Zone	Default Climate Adjustment	New Conservation Standard with Default Climate Adjustment
California Water Service Company Antelope Valley	14	3%	33%	17	4%	32%
San Bernardino County Service Area 70J	14	3%	25%	17	4%	24%

Conservation Tier Changes Due to Corrections of R-GPCD Source Data

Supplier Name	Previous R-GPCD Source Data			Revised R-GPCD and New Conservation Standard (based on R-GPCD corrections submitted by March 15, 2016 and Default Climate Adjustment)		
	Jul-Sep 2014 R-GPCD	Conservation Tier	Conservation Standard	Revised Jul-Sep 2014 R-GPCD	Revised Tier (Conservation Standard)	New Conservation Standard with Default Climate Adjustment
Phelan Pinon Hills Community Services District	181.6	8	32%	142.7	7 (28%)	24%
Pinedale County Water District	146.0	7	28%	88.9	4 (16%)	14%
Vacaville City of	185.7	8	32%	156.3	7 (28%)	25%