San Diego County Water Authority
4677 Overland Avenue • San Diego, California 92123-1233
(858) 522-6600 FAX (858) 522-6568 www.sdcwa.org

April 25, 2011

John V. (Jack) Foley, Chairman
Metropolitan Water District of Southern California
P.O. Box 54153
Los Angeles, CA 90054-0153

Re: Board Memo 5-1 – Sale of discounted water

Dear Chairman Foley:

We have reviewed Board Memorandum 5-1 regarding the sale of discounted water by MWD and would like the following comments to be placed in the record by this letter and its attachment. The sale of discounted water by MWD at this time raises many questions and concerns, which we have organized and discuss in detail in Attachment 1 to this letter. We request that the staff respond in writing to these questions and concerns prior to the board taking any action.

Given the staff's own analysis, which describes its concerns about the performance and equity of the existing Replenishment Service Program (replenishment program) – it acknowledges that there is an "imbalance" between MWD costs and benefits under the Program (page 4) – we are surprised that the staff recommendation is nonetheless to support the sale of discounted water under the replenishment program.

While the recommended action takes into account the budgetary and fiscal constraints the member agencies have, it does not analyze or meaningfully address the unprecedented budgetary and fiscal constraints plaguing MWD. Our board's fiduciary duty is to MWD – not the member agencies. We fail to meet that duty if we vote to sell discounted water under a program that does not provide commensurate benefits to MWD. This is all the more important at a time when we are confronting a nearly $200 million budget shortfall in the current fiscal year.

The board memo is clear on its face that the replenishment program does not provide a proper foundation for the sale of discounted water. The Water Authority does not support the sale of discounted water by MWD under these conditions. But if the board chooses to do so in order to generate sales in the current fiscal year, then it should be made available to all of MWD's member agencies, rather than limited to replenishment sales.

Sincerely,

Jim Bowersox Director	Lynne Heidel Director	Keith Lewinger Director	Fern Steiner Director

Attachment 1: Issues Associated with the Sale of Discounted Water by MWD

cc: Jeff Kightlinger, General Manager

A public agency providing a safe and reliable water supply to the San Diego region

Attachment 1

Board Memorandum 5-1 – April 26, 2011Special Board Meeting
Issues Associated with the Sale of Discounted Water by MWD

1. **The real issue before the board is price – not local water storage.**

The board memo talks about "optimizing the reliability of water supply into the service area," but it is apparent that the real issue before the board is the price. MWD has already adopted a 2010/11 Water Management Program for local storage that allows member agencies to purchase additional water for local storage while protecting them from Water Supply Allocation Plan (WSAP) penalties. Some member agencies have purchased supplies under this program, but others have held out in hopes of receiving discounted replenishment water.

2. **MWD should be fully utilizing its own dry-year storage portfolio, rather than selling water at a discount to its member agencies.**

The board memo states that MWD is facing the "unexpected challenge" of managing and storing water in 2011. This is a very perplexing statement and calls into question MWD's water supply management capabilities. Storing water in good years is at the very heart of the water supply reliability program MWD developed through its Integrated Resources Plan (IRP).

Nine years ago, when MWD lost 662,000 AF of surplus water on the Colorado River *annually*, it shifted to a water supply reliability strategy that depends heavily on storing water in wet years in order to meet water demands during subsequent dry years. When this strategy was initially employed, MWD was counting on having water supplies that were "surplus" to its needs and available for storage seven out of every 10 years. To implement this strategy, MWD established rates and collected revenues from its member agencies and paid billions of dollars to create the dry-year storage accounts that today are in excess of 5 MAF. The Water Supply and Drought Management (WSDM) plan attached to the board memo shows a 2011 storage put capacity of more than 1 MAF.

More recently, MWD staff has consistently stated that the constraints in the Delta now mean that MWD can count on wet-year supplies being available for storage in only three of every 10 years; this is one of those three years. But rather than filling its own storage accounts, MWD staff is recommending selling this water at a discount to its member agencies.

We also find it troubling that for the first time – and in the context of a recommendation to sell water at a discount – the board has been informed that "some of the storage programs and locations" are "less desirable choices" for storage management. Further, that there are "increased risks of future losses from those programs, potential cost implications, and concerns about future dry-year performance." Given this description, it is difficult to understand why MWD made these "less desirable" dry-year storage investments in the first place. We request that a complete review of the dry-year storage program be placed on the agenda at the next board meeting and before the board takes action to sell the water that is available for storage at a discount.

A final note on MWD's dry-year storage portfolio relates to the budget. It is not possible to manage a dry-year storage account without incurring costs associated with the put and take of water into and from storage. The fact that MWD failed to adequately budget these costs is certainly no excuse to sell discounted water now in order to generate cash-flow. We request an analysis of how staff has budgeted these costs in the past and how it proposes to budget the costs associated with its dry-year storage program in the next and subsequent budget years. We also request a schedule of all costs and capital investments associated with developing new water supplies that will be needed to replace the water now proposed to be sold at a discount.

3. The sale of discounted water will displace full-service sales and exacerbate MWD's current budget and fiscal crisis.

The board letter is completely silent on the most damaging consequence of selling discounted water: every acre foot sold at the proposed discount will displace an acre-foot sale of water out of MWD's dry-year storage program at the full-service rate. The promise that this discounted water sales program will increase revenues to MWD focuses only on the revenues from discounted water sales and associated near-term fiscal consequences. Ignored in the board memo entirely is the indisputable truth that agencies that would have purchased water at the full service rate – either this fiscal year or in a subsequent year – will instead purchase that water at a discount through the direct discount of up to $143 per acre-foot and by avoiding future full service rate increases. MWD will not "make money" by selling water at a discount, it will lose money – 200,000 acre-feet of discounted water sales results in the loss of potentially more than $28 million in revenues. The impact of the lost revenues may not be fully realized in FY 2012, but will certainly be felt in the future.

It is apparent that the reason some MWD member agencies are holding back from purchasing water at the full service rate is precisely because they are waiting to buy it at a discount. That's a smart move for the member agency, but is certainly not in MWD's best interest.

The MWD board is legally required annually to adopt a cost of service and revenue requirement and fix rates that, taken together with other revenue sources, will be sufficient to pay MWD's fixed costs and other expenses. The MWD board has failed to do this and, instead, continues to rely upon inflated sales projections to support its water rates, budget and overspending. At its last meeting, the board was presented with information that projected MWD sales in the current fiscal year are trending to be 291,300 acre-feet below budget. At its meeting on the budget, MWD staff also assessed the value of its water in storage using full service rates. There is no way to reconcile the board's actions in adopting cost of service and revenue requirements with the proposed sale of discounted water.

4. The board memo does not provide a policy or legal basis for the sale of discounted water for replenishment.

The board memo presents a detailed list of concerns with the replenishment program (page 2), notably:

- Questionable and unquantifiable performance and expectations;
- Potential of shifting water sales within a year as opposed to generating true longer-term storage;
- Potential offset of full service sales;

- Unequal distribution of costs and benefits among participating and non-participating agencies;
- Questions on whether water was being stored for future use as opposed to being purchased to refill overdraft;
- Difficulties in measuring and verifying in-lieu deliveries to storage; and
- Cash-flow and budgeting issues associated with the frequency under which replenishment supplies are available.

Each of these seven concerns should be significant enough to dissuade the board from approving discounted replenishment sales. Taken together, however, the seven concerns represent perhaps the most troubled program in MWD's recent history. It is a confounding disconnect, therefore, that the board is being asked to forge ahead with the program without regard to these concerns. The board memo, as written, is very clear that there are significant questions about the performance and equity of the replenishment program. We request that the staff present a further analysis and respond to the "disconnect" between the information provided in the board memo and the staff recommendation for action.

5. The sale of discounted water sends the wrong message at a time when MWD is promising to pay substantial costs associated with a Delta Fix.

If MWD's member agencies are – as is clear from the board memo – unable or unwilling to pay for MWD's current fixed costs, how can MWD credibly commit to pay the additional costs associated with a Delta Fix? Will MWD's member agencies not be subject to the same "budgetary and fiscal constraints" when faced with the costs of a Delta Fix and other IRP investments? If this is indeed the economic reality – that current full service rates are too expensive to encourage MWD water sales to its member agencies – then the MWD board must reconsider MWD's entire water resources strategy. If we can't afford to pay our current fixed costs then it is difficult to see how we can afford to pay the billions of dollars of investment outlined in the 2010 IRP, including the Delta Fix being negotiated by management, seawater desalination projects and a host of other projects.

The continued disconnect between the board's decisions to spend money and the member agencies' willingness to pay for MWD projects is threatening MWD's very financial viability.