NIPOMO COMMUNITY SERVICES DISTRICT

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 25, 2012

10:00 A.M.

SPECIAL MEETING NOTICE & AGENDA WATER CONSERVATION COMMITTEE

COMMITTEE MEMBERS MICHAEL WINN, CHAIR LARRY VIERHEILIG, MEMBER PRINCIPAL STAFF MICHAEL S. LEBRUN, GENERAL MANAGER LISA BOGNUDA, ASSISTANT GENERAL MANAGER PETER SEVCIK, DISTRICT ENGINEER

MEETING LOCATION District Board Room 148 S. Wilson Street Nipomo, California

- 1. CALL TO ORDER, FLAG SALUTE & ROLL CALL
- 2. REVIEW WATER CONSERVATION PROGRAM 2012 ACTIVITY AND DISCUSS PROGRAM DIRECTION IN 2013 ACTION RECOMMENDED: Receive Report and Direct Staff
- 3. ADJOURN

*** End Special Meeting Notice ***

TO: WATER CONSERVATION COMMITTEE

FROM: MICHAEL S. LEBRUN



DATE: OCTOBER 22, 2012

REVIEW WATER CONSERVATION PROGRAM 2012 ACTIVITY AND DISCUSS PROGRAM DIRECTION IN 2013

ITEM

Review District Water Conservation Program and discuss Program Direction [RECOMMEND RECEIVE REPORT AND DIRECT STAFF]

BACKGROUND

The District adopted its Water Conservation Program in February 2008 with the primary goal of reducing water use by 15% utilizing a number of 'core' and 'non-core' conservation measures.

The core program measures include:

- Public outreach and education
- Advertising
- Workshops
- Technical assistance (leak detection and water audits)
- Conservation-based, multi-tiered water rate structure

The non-core measures are rebates for plumbing retrofits, high efficiency clothes washers, lawn or 'turf' removal, and 'smart' irrigation controller installations.

Of the core measures, all with the exception of 'workshops' were implemented in 2012. Additionally, the non-core measure of clothes washer rebates continue to be offered in 2012.

In 2004, water use per person per day within the District peaked at 257 gallon. In 2007, the year prior to a formal Conservation Program adoption, per capita use stood at 226 gallons per day. By 2010, per capita use dropped to 174 gallons per day or a 23% decrease in per capita use (2007-2010). In 2011, District per capita use is up slightly from 2010 at 182 gallons per day – still a near 20% decrease since 2007 and a near 30% decrease from the 2004 use rate.

A memorandum summarizing District per capita usage rates and District compliance with California Urban Water Conservation Council (CUWCC) Best Management Practices (BMP) for water conservation is provided – see Attachment A.

In 2006, the District established a full-time Water Conservation and Public Outreach position. The position was vacant most of 2011. The District utilized a combination of reassignment of duties and consulting services to continue program implementation and maintain compliance with State recommended Best Management Practices throughout 2011 and 2012. With the adoption of the District's 2012-2013 fiscal year budget, the full-time Water Conservation and Public Outreach position was eliminated and Water Conservation Program duties were formally transferred as follows (See 2012-2013 District Organizational Chart – Attachment B):

 <u>Conservation Program Administration</u> – Assistant Engineer, with consulting services as needed.

- <u>Customer Service and Education</u> Office staff and operations Customer Service worker.
- Outreach Public Information Assistant
- <u>Classroom Education</u> (grades K-6) by contract

2012 Summary of accomplishments:

- Implemented a 4-tier water conservation rate structure that is compliance with California Urban Water Conservation Council guidelines and best management practices. In the structure, 4th tier water rates apply at 100 units of water use and above (average District customer uses ~40 units per two-month billing period). Fourth tier water cost 300% of what first tier water cost providing a strong monetary signal to reduce water use. The full impact of this change will take a number of years to be felt as customers adjust their water use patterns over time.
- Answered approximately 1,300 calls from customers with questions about saving water/money. Each call is handled by a staff person who is informed on leak detection and basic water conservation and irrigation measures. Questions are answered and callers are directed to the District web resources and/or offered a 'service' visit by District Customer Service staff.
- Each month, staff reviews water meter read data and contacts property owners by 'door hanger' if usage is abnormally high. The District made approximately 270 such proactive notifications to customers this year.
- As of October 16, 2012, staff made 103 service calls to investigate leak reports/high water use. These service calls provide face-to-face, hands on, counseling/education on water conservation, irrigation practices, and leak detection.
- Distributed 'Water Ways The Story of Your Water' newsletter to all 3-6 grade teachers in Nipomo-area public schools (Dana, Nipomo, and Dorothea Lange schools) to promote a District-subsidized 'free' conservation presentation.
- Presented 'The Story of Your Water' training to twelve classes, approximately 340 students grades 3-6.
- Maintained and promoted the District's existing high efficiency clothes washer rebate program with 22 rebates issued through September of this year, 209 rebates issued over life of program (over 200 rebates totaling over \$15,000 over life of program).
- Maintained compliance with State requirements for water conservation Best Management Practices (BMP).
- Continued active water conservation reminders in billing, lobby area, and Adobe Press. Attached are most recent examples of Adobe Press advertisements showing the different message delivered according to the season (Attachment C). The Adobe Press is broadly distributed across the southern Nipomo Mesa every Friday. Conservation reminder 'bill-inserts' were also provided to customers in two of the six water bills in 2012.

- Participated with County-wide *Partners for Water Conservation* to implement a County specific website to aid home owners in plant selection and water conservation practices (see: www.slowaterwiselandscaping.com).
- Maintain and disseminate information regarding local water conservation oriented service providers upon request.

2013 Program Direction

In 2013, a five-year review of the Water Conservation Program will be undertaken. The District will provide a formal review of BMP compliance to the CUWCC, as required, by April 2013 and use this review as a launch for comprehensive program review.

With formalized staff assignment of the various Water Conservation Program elements and increased staffing (Assistant Engineer and Public Information Assistant vacancies are approved to be filled in early 2013), staff expects the District Water Conservation Program to continually improve and produce greater results.

Staff is developing a tracking system to more accurately capture customer-staff interactions related to water conservation. The new tracking system will be in place by January 1, 2013. Ongoing leak detection efforts will be improved as necessary and be more formally tracked and reported as well.

In 2013, the District will review, improve, and more aggressively promote its water audit (exterior and interior) program.

FISCAL IMPACT

District water conservation efforts are included in the 2012-2013 fiscal budget.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that your Committee receive the presentation, ask questions, and direct staff.

ATTACHMENTS

- A. Per-capita water use summary
- B. District Organization Chart
- C. Adobe Press Advertisements

OCTOBER 25, 2012

.

ITEM 2

÷

ATTACHMENT A

Copy of document found at www.NoNewWipTax.com

.

Date:	10/23/2012		
То:	Mr. Michael LeBrun Nipomo Community Services District 148 S. Wilson Street Nipomo, CA 93444	Phone:	(805) 929-1133
Prepared by:	Spencer Waterman		
SUBJECT:	2011 PER CAPITA WATER USE UPDATE AND BES STATUS SUMMARY	ST MANAGEMENT PF	RACTICES IMPLEMENTATION

This memorandum presents an update of the Nipomo Community Services District's (District) 2011 per capita water use and a summary of the District's California Urban Water Conservation Council (CUWCC) Best Management Practices (BMP) implementation status.

2011 Per Capita Water Use Update

A complete description of the per capita water use analysis is available in the District's 2010 Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP). Table 1, Table 2, and Figure 1 show the District's 2011 per capita water use in comparison with historical and benchmark per capita water uses described and defined in the 2010 UWMP.

Year	Gross Water Use, acre-ft/year	Population Served	Per Capita Water Use, gal/capita/day
1994	1,718.00	6,521	235.2
1995	1,805.00	6,885	234.0
1996	1,934.70	7,249	238.3
1997	2,036.86	7,613	238.8
1998	1,909.74	7,978	213.7
1999	2,271.20	8,342	243.1
2000	2,396.94	8,706	245.8
2001	2,285.04	9,050	225.4
2002	2,709.32	9,394	257.5
2003	2,633.33	9,739	241.4
2004	2,907.58	10,083	257.4
2005	2,787.29	10,427	238.6
2006	2,666.34	10,771	221.0
2007	2,818.36	11,116	226.4
2008	2,752.90	11,460	214.5
2009	2,698.18	11,804	204.1
2010	2,366.54	12,148	173.9
2011	2,487.70	12,204 ¹	182.0
¹ Calculated using applied to the pur	a factor of 2.92 personations i	ons per connectio n 2011	n established in 2010

T	able	1.	Per	Capita	Water	Use	Estimates
				and the second			

Parameter	Water Use (gpcd)
Baseline Daily Per Capita Water Use	240.0
2010 Daily Per Capita Water Use	173.9
2011 Daily Per Capita Water Use	182.0
2015 Interim Urban Water Use Target	222.0
2020 Urban Water Use Target	204.0

Table 2. Baseline, Compliance, Interim Target, and Target Water Use



Figure 1. Historical, Baseline, Interim Target, Target, and Compliance Per Capita Water Use

Figure 2 shows monthly per capita water use in 2010, 2011, and 2012-to-date. Per capita water usage peaks in the summer months, which reflects a typical demand pattern.



Figure 2. Monthly Per Capita Water Use

BMP Implementation Status

Water suppliers must have a complete UWMP to be eligible for State funding. State funding has been conditionally awarded to the District through the Proposition 84 Integrated Regional Water Management Round 1 Implementation Grant applied for by the County of San Luis Obispo. The conditions to receive the grant funding require the following from the District:

- An UWMP that is deemed complete by DWR
- > Implementation or a schedule and budget for implementation of BMPs

The District has completed its 2010 UWMP and it was deemed complete by California Department of Water Resources (DWR) on November 10, 2011. Additionally, on March 29, 2011, DWR confirmed its review of the District's AB1420 Self-Certification Statement –Tables 1 and 2 (AB1420 Tables) regarding implementation of the BMPs and determined that the District is eligible for State funding.

The AB 1420 Tables presented BMP compliance through the BMP Checklist compliance option. In addition to the BMP Checklist option, there are two alternative conservation approaches for BMP compliance –the Flex Track approach and the Gallons per Capita per Day (GPCD) approach. At the time that the AB1420 Tables were submitted, the District needed to show compliance by using the BMP Checklist option because a number of the BMPs were not fully implemented. Additionally, compliance through the GPCD alternative conservation approach was not verified at the time because it was dependent on DWR's ongoing review and approval of the District's UWMP and Senate Bill x 7-7 (SB7) GPCD compliance analysis. Now that the District has an approved UWMP and SB7 GPCD compliance analysis, the District should update its AB1420 Tables using the GPCD approach to remain eligible for State funding.

The specific requirements, definitions, and approaches for BMP implementation compliance, which are summarized and reported in the AB1420 Tables, are defined in California Urban Water Conservation Council's (CUWCC) Memorandum of Understanding (MOU). The MOU separates BMPs into Foundational BMPs and Programmatic BMPs. Water suppliers can evaluate their compliance with the MOU by using the full BMP list, the Flex Track Menu, or the GPCD approach. The District should evaluate its MOU compliance using the GPCD approach for the following reasons:

- 1. The GPCD approach is closely aligned with the methodology for measuring GCPD compliance with SB7.
- 2. The GPCD approach is closely aligned with State legislative funding eligibility requirements, which require compliance with SB7, rather than AB1420, for years after 2014.
- 3. The District will spend less time, effort, and funding on implementing Programmatic BMPs, provided it meets its GPCD requirements, which it currently does.

The GPCD approach allows the District to comply with the MOU by implementing the Foundational BMPs and utilizing the GPCD approach in lieu of implementing the Programmatic BMPs provided the District's GPCD approach results in equal or greater water savings when compared with the BMP list approach. To show that the District's GPCD approach achieves greater water savings than the BMP list approach, an evaluation of Programmatic BMP compliance is described in the following to sections.

Programmatic BMP Compliance

The GPCD approach for Programmatic BMP compliance includes the following sections as required by CUWCC.

For retail water agencies choosing the GPCD Option for compliance with the Programmatic BMPs, the retail water agency shall submit the following calculations along with supporting data as part of their first normal biennial report for that period:

(1) Potable Water GPCD for each year in the baseline period;

(2) 2018 GPCD Target and five Biennial GPCD Targets; and

(1) The District's potable water GPCD for each year in the baseline period and the baseline GPCD of 238.3 is shown in Table 3.

Calendar Year	Distribution System Population	Daily System Gross Water Use (mgd)	Annual Daily Per Capita Water Use (gpcd)	10 year running average
1997	7,613	2	239.0	
1998	7,978	2	213.7	
1999	8,342	2	243.1	
2000	8,706	2	245.8	
2001	9,050	2	225.4	
2002	9,394	2	257.5	
2003	9,739	2	241.4	
2004	10,083	3	257.4	
2005	10,427	2	238.6	
2006	10,771	2	221.0	238.3

Table 3. Baseline GPCD

(2) The District's Target and Biennial GPCD Targets are shown in Table 4. The District's 2018 GPCD Target is 195.4 GPCD as shown in the equation below.

2018 GPCD Target= 238 GPCD*0.82 = 195.4 GPCD

Year	Compliance Report	Target	Highest Acceptable Bound
2010	1	229.7	238.3
2012	2	221.1	229.7
2014	3	212.5	221.1
2016	4	204.0	212.5
2018	5	195.4	195.4

Table 4. Biennial GPCD Targets

The District's usage in 2011 was 182 GPCD as shown in the equation below:

District Potable Water GPCD = (2487.7 AFY-0 AFY)/12,204 people/365 days= 182 GPCD

The District's per capita water usage is currently below its 2018 GPCD Target of 195.4 and is therefore in compliance with the MOU for the GPCD approach for Programmatic BMP compliance. To support and document the District's GPCD compliance, the following materials will be submitted as required by the CUWCC MOU:

A retail water agency shall be considered to be in compliance with the BMPs in any reporting period when it submits the following:

(1) Complete "Water Supply & Reuse" and "Accounts & Water Use" standard reports;
(2) Supporting data necessary to calculate that reporting period's Potable Water GPCD; and
(3) Calculations showing the reporting period's Potable Water GPCD is less than or equal to that period's Biennial GPCD Target, or Highest Acceptable Bound when the period's Potable Water GPCD has been weather-adjusted

Foundational BMP Compliance

The District currently implements all of the Foundational BMPs to some extent, but will need to implement some additional items to be in compliance with the MOU. The following sections describe the Foundational BMP activities completed-to-date and future BMP activities necessary to remain in compliance with CUWCC MOU.

BMP 1.1.1 Conservation Coordinator

The District currently complies with this BMP by contracting with a consultant (Water Systems Consulting, Inc.) with an AWWA Water Use Efficiency Practitioner Grade 1 certification. The consultant is responsible for acting as a representative for the District for the CUWCC, researching and summarizing water use efficiency programs as requested by District staff, tracking, updating, and reporting BMP compliance, and ensuring that the District is upto-date with water use efficiency trends. Additionally, District Staff field questions and requests from customers and provide information, incentives, and materials to customers to encourage water conservation and water use efficiency. District Staff and its consultant coordinate and manage the water conservation program by tracking, planning, and reporting on BMP implementation.

BMP 1.1.2 Water Waste Prevention

The District is in compliance with and implements this BMP as described in the 2010 UWMP.

BMP 1.1.3 Wholesale Agency Assistance Programs

This BMP is not implemented or scheduled for implementation because it is not applicable to the District as a retail agency. In the future the District will be selling water to Golden State Water Company and Rural Water Company. It is anticipated that when this happens, the District will develop a plan to implement this BMP.

BMP 1.2 Water Loss Control

The District completed the AWWA Free Water Audit Software standard water audit and water balance analysis in November 2011 to determine the current volume of apparent and real water loss and the cost impact of these losses on operations. The District's water audit validity score calculated by the AWWA Software is 84 out of 100, which surpasses the CUWCC BMP requirement of achieving a score of 66 or higher. The results of the standard water audit and water balance are shown in Appendix A. The standard water audit and water balance is required to be completed at no less than annual intervals and submitted in the CUWCC BMP 1.2 report form every reporting period. The District will complete the next standard water audit and water balance by December 2012 and the next 2011-2012 CUWCC BMP report will be completed and submitted by April 2013.

The District is required to seek training in the AWWA water audit method and component analysis process during the first four years of BMP implementation. The District's consultant will attend an AWWA Water audit method training webinar on November 29, 2012 on behalf of the District to meet the requirements of this BMP. Upon completion of training, the consultant will prepare a required component analysis to be completed and submitted by April 2013. This component analysis will need to be updated every four years after this initial analysis.

Furthermore, the District is required to keep records of intervention(s) performed, including standardized reports on leak repairs, the economic value assigned to apparent losses and to real losses, miles of system surveyed for leaks, pressure reduction undertaken for loss reduction, infrastructure rehabilitation and renewal, volumes of water saved, and costs of intervention(s). Examples of these types of reporting forms are provided in Appendix B. The District does not currently have a formal leak repair database to track the required information and should implement one immediately for the purposes of establishing a water audit and water balance benchmark for comparison in future years.

BMP 1.3 Metering with Commodity Rates for All New Connections and Retrofit of Existing Connections

The District is 100% metered and bills on a bi-monthly using a four-tier rate structure, effective as of November 1, 2011. The District meets the coverage requirements of this BMP.

BMP 1.4 Retail Conservation Pricing

The District currently implements a rate structure that is compliant with the requirements of this BMP. An updated analysis will be completed by April 2013 to determine the status of compliance with the required minimum percentage of water sales revenue from volumetric rates.

BMP 2.1 Public Information Programs

The District currently implements this BMP as described in the 2010 UWMP. An updated description of the District's public information program will be provided in the annual report submitted to CUWCC in April 2013.

BMP 2.2 School Education Programs

The District currently complies with this BMP by contracting with Science Discovery to provide the following water use efficiency conservation education and materials:

1) Curriculum materials developed and/or provided by agency (including confirmation that materials meet state education framework requirements and are grade-level appropriate).

2) Materials distributed to K-6 students. When possible, school education programs will reach grades 7-12 as well.

3) Description of materials used to meet minimum requirement.

4) Annual budget for school education program.

5) Description of all other water supplier education programs (Lists follow in Section D).

An updated description of the school education program and materials will be provided in the annual report submitted to CUWCC in April 2013.

Appendix A. AWWA Water Audit

AWWA WLCC Free Water Audit S Copyright © 2010, American Water Works As	oftware Isociation All Rights	: <u>Reportin</u> sReserved	g Worksh	1001 WAS v4.2	Back to Instructions
Click to access definition Water Audit Report for: Reporting Year:	Nipomo Com 2010	nunity Services (1/2010 - 12/2010	District		
Please enter data in the white cells below. Where available, metered values sho	ould be used; if m	etered values are unava	aitable ptease estin	nate a value, Indicate y	our confidence in the accuracy of the
AI	volumes to be	entered as: ACRE-F	FEET PER YEAF	R	
WATER SUPPLIED	<<	Enter grading i	in column 'E'		EN MILLER AND
Volume from own sources:	10	2,366.540	acre-ft/yr	1	
Master meter error adjustment tenter positive value. Water imported:	n/a	0.000	acre-ft/yr		cre-tr/yr
Water exported:	11/A	0.000	acre-ft/yr		
WATER SUPPLIED:	<u> </u>	2,366.540	acre-ft/yr		
AUTHORIZED CONSUMPTION Billed motered:	10	2,292.980	acre-ft/yr		Click here:
Billed unmetered:	10	0.000	acre-ft/yr	Rents	buttons below
Unbilled unmetered:	2	29.592	acre-ft/yr	1.258	(O
Default option selected for Unbilled unmet	ered - a gra	ding of 5 is app	plied but not	displayed	
AUTHORIZED CONSUMPTION:		2,323.862	acre-ft/yr	a strat	percentage of water supplied value
WATER LOSSES (Water Supplied - Authorized Consumption	o L	42.678	acre-ft/yr		
Apparent Losses Unauthorized consumption:	2	5.916	acre-ft/yr	Pcnt:	Value:
Default option selected for unauthorized consumpt	ion - a grad	ding of 5 is app	lied but not	displayed	
Customer metering inaccuracies:	2.5	23.175	acre-ft/yr	1.00%	• • []
Apparent Losses:	7	30.091]		Choose this option to entor a percentage of billed metorod
Real Losses (Current Annual Real Losses or CARL)					consumption. This is NOT a default value
Real Losses = Nater Losses - Apparent Losses:		12.587	acre-ft/yr		
WATER LOSSES:		42.678	acre-ft/yr	Charles and	
SON-REVENUE WATER	2	73.560	acre-ft/vr		
Total Water Loss + Unbilled Metered + Unbilled Unmetered SYSTEM DATA			dere verje		
Length of mains: Number of active AND inactive service connections:	2 10	90.0	miles		
Connection density:		46	conn./mile m	ain	
Average length of customer service line:	2 10	32.0	ft	(pipe length be meter or proper	tween curbstop and customer rty boundary)
Average operating pressure:	? 10	75.0	psi		
	2-00-04	and the second second	- ALLEN ST		
JOST DATA Total annual cost of operating water system:	7 10	\$3,197,163	s/year		
Customer retail unit cost (applied to Apparent Losses): Variable production cost (applied to Real Losses):	? <u>6</u> ? 7	\$2.41 \$428.60	\$/100 cubic \$/acre-ft	feet (ccf)	
PERFORMANCE INDICATORS			10-11-11		
Financial Indicators Non-revenue water as percent b	v volume of	Water Supplied:	DED IN THE	3.15	
Non-revenue water as percent b Annu-	y cost of op al cost of A Annual cost	erating system: pparent Losses: of Real Losses:		1.65 \$31,589 \$5,395	
Operational Efficiency Indicators			100		
Apparent Losses per :	service conn	ection per day:		6.48 gallons/	connection/day
Real Losses per se	ervice conne	ction per day*:		2,71 gallons/	connection/day
Real Losses p	er length of	main per day*:		N/A	
Real Losses per service connection	n per day pe	r psi pressure:		0.04 gallons/	connection/day/psi
? Unavoidable	Annual Real	Losses (UARL):		109.02 acre-fee	et/year
From Above, Real Losses = Curr	ent Annual Re	al Losses (CARL):	r	12.59 acre-fer	at/year
7. Infrastructure Leaka	ge Index (II	I) [CARL/UARL]:		0.12	
only the most applicable of these two indicators will be	calculated		1. State 1. State 1.		
WATER AUDIT DATA VALIDITY SCORE:					
*** YOUR :		تنصر التحر اللي يرج ال	f 100 **:	*	AND A COLORED AND
	SCORE IS	: 84 out oi			
A weighted scale for the components of consumption an	SCORE IS	: 84 out of	<pre>r calculation</pre>	of the Water Audi	t Data Validity Score
A weighted scale for the components of consumption an PRIORITY AREAS FOR ATTENTION:	SCORE IS	is included in the	e calculation	of the Water Audi	t Data Validity Score
A weighted scale for the components of consumption an PRIORITY AREAS FOR ATTENTION: Based on the information provided, audit accuracy ca d: fustomer metering inaccuracies	SCORE IS Id water loss n be improve]	: 84 out of is included in the d by addressing	e calculation the followin	of the Water Audi	it Data Validity Score
A weighted scale for the components of consumption an PRIORITY AREAS FOR ATTENTION: Based on the information provided, audit accuracy ca 1: Customer metering inaccuracies 2: Customer retail unit cost (applied to Apparent Losses)	SCORE IS nd water loss n be improve]] EQ	: 84 out o: is included in the ed by addressing	e calculation the followir	of the Water Audi ng components:	it Data Validity Score

AWWA WLCC F	ree Water Au	udit Softwar	e: <u>Water Balance</u>	Water Audit Report For:	Report Yr:
	Copyright @ 2010, American	Water Works Association	All Rights Reserved. WAS v4.2	District	2010
	Water Exported 0.000			Billed Water Exported	
	alan ang sa		Billed Authorized Consumption	Billed Matered Consumption (inc. water exported) 2,292.980	Revenue Water
Own Sources (Adjusted for		Authorized Consumption	2,292.980	Billed Unmetered Consumption 0.000	2,292.980
known errors)		2,322.562	Unbilled Authorized Consumption	Unbilled Metered Consumption 0.000	Non-Revenue Water (NRW)
2,366.540	2.2.3		29.582	Unbilled Unmetered Consumption 29.582	
	Water Supplied		Apparent Losses	Unauthorized Consumption 5.916	73.560
	2,366.540	5.916	Customer Metering Inaccuracies 0.000		
		Water Losses		Systematic Data Handling Errors	
Water Imported		43.978	Real Losses	Leakage on Transmission and/or Distribution Mains Not broken down	
0.000			38.062	Leakage and Overflows at Utility's Storage Tanks Not broken down	
and the second				Leakage on Service Connections Not broken down	

AWWA Water Loss Control Committee

.

Appendix B. Example Leak Repair Report Forms

LEAKAGE MANAGEMENT PLAN TO CONTROL REAL LOSSES

Name of Water Utility:

Date: ____

I. Describe the Leakage Management Approach

A-1. Describe the general approach to be employed to create or refine the leakage management strategy for the water distribution system:

II. Leak Survey and Repair Plan

A. Leak Survey Area and Frequency

A-1. Based on records of previous leaks, type and age of piping, soil conditions, high pressure, and faulty installation practices, list the portion of the distribution system to be surveyed. List the survey frequency.

List percent of system to be surveyed ______ List frequency of surveys _____ Describe each area to be surveyed under item B-2 of this plan.

A-2. Total miles of main to be surveyed:

When calculating pipeline length, include the total length of pipe and exclude customer service connection piping. If only a portion of the system is surveyed, calculate the benefit-to-cost ratio for only the portion surveyed.

A-3. Average length of pipeline surveyed per day:

The average survey crew can survey about two miles of main per day. Factors include distances between services, traffic and safety conditions, and number of listening contact points. Explain if more than three miles per day are surveyed:

A-4. Number of working days needed to complete survey (divide line 2 by line 3): _

A-5. Describe personnel deployment:

B. Procedures and Equipment

B-1. Describe the procedures and equipment for detecting leaks. The best results are obtained by listening for leaks at all system contact points (such as water meters, values, hydrants, and blow-offs).

B-2. Describe why the areas noted on the map in step A-1 have the greatest recoverable leakage potential.

B-3. If listening for leaks will not include all contact points, describe the plan for detecting leaks.

B-4. Describe the procedures and equipment you will use to pinpoint the exact location of detected leaks.

B-5. Describe how the leak detection team and the repair crew will work together. How will they resolve the problem of dry holes?

Copyrighted material licensed to Spence: Waterman on 22-Oct-2012 for licensees #39 is use only No further reproduction or networking is permitted. Distributed by Thomson Scientific, Inc., www.sechstreet.com

Copyright @ 2009 American Water Works Association. All Rights Reserved.

B-6. Describe the methods you will u	se to determine th	e flow rates fo	r excavated leaks of var	ious sizes.
C. Staffing				
C-1. How many utility staff will be u	sed?			
Staffing costs including wages an	d benefits:			
Person 1 \$/hr \$/d	ν			
Person 2 \$/hr \$/d	лу <u> </u>			
TOTAL \$/hr \$/d	ay			
C-2. How many consultant staff will	be used?			
Cost of consultant staff:				
Person 1 \$hr \$/d	v			
Person 2 \$/hr \$/d	ıy			
TOTAL \$/hr \$/d	ay			
D. Leak Detection Survey Cost	s			
Leak detection surveys	\$/day	·	# of days	Cost, \$
D-1. Utility crew costs				
D-2. Consultant crew costs				
D-3. Vehicle costs				
D-4. Other				
D-5. Total survey costs	-			
E. Leak Detection Budget				
E-1. Cost of leak detection equipmen	t	\$		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
E-2. Leak detection team training		\$		
E-3. Leak detection survey costs		\$		
E-4. Total leak detection costs		\$		
F. Leak Survey and Repair Sche	dule			
Indicate realistic, practical dates:	F-1. When wil	the leak sur	vey begin?	
	F-2. When will	the leak sur	vey be completed?	
	F-3. When wil	leak repairs	begin?	
	F-4. When wil	leak repairs	be completed?	

APPENDIX A 217

Copyrighted material licensed to Spencer Waterman on 22-Oct-2012 for floensee8 #39 s use only. No further reproduction or networking is permitted

Distributed by Thomson Scientific,

Inc., www.techstreet.com

LEAKAGE MANAGEMENT PLAN TO CONTROL REAL LOSSES (continued)

III. Pressure Management Plan

Optimizing water pressure by removing excessive pressure levels and pressure surges is an effective strategy to sustain water infrastructure by minimizing background leakage, maintaining low leakage levels, and reducing water main ruptures and resulting damage. The water utility should assess the potential to improve pressure management in the water distribution system as a means of controlling leakage.

A-1. List the average pressure across the water distribution network:

A-2. List any discrete areas of the water distribution system (pressure zones, district metered areas) that experience average water pressure over 75 psi and/or exhibit poor infrastructure condition. These areas should be considered for optimized pressure management:

	Zone #1	Z	Cone #2	2	Zone #3	2	Zone #4
Name	Pressure	Name	Pressure	Name	Pressure	Name	Pressure

A-3. Describe the pressure optimization potential across the distribution system. First, list the pressure reduction potential for each zone (e.g., none, 15 psi reduction, 30 psi reduction, etc.). Next, describe the method to be employed to attain the improved pressure management (e.g., create/reconfigure pressure zone or DMA; install pressure-reducing valves, install variable-frequency drives on pumps, etc.).

Pressure Reduction Li	st Pressure Management Me	ethod		
Zone #1:				
Zone #2:				
Zone #3:				
Zone #4:				
A-4. List the Pressure Managem	ent Project Costs:			
	Size	Number	Unit Cost	Costa
Pressure-Reducing Valves:	the second se			
Variable-Frequency Drives:				
Flowmeters:				
Electronic Controllers:				
Precast Manholes:				
Misc. Piping & Hardware: List				
Construction: Labor worke	era, daya × wo	rkers × hr/d ×	days	
Equipment, Truck	×days			
			Total Cost:	
IV. Leakage Managemen	t Plan Summary			
A-1. List the Leakage Management Cost =	ent Plan Cost for the initial	year = Leak Detec	tion & Repair Cost +	Preesure Man-
A-2. List the anticipated reduction	on in leakage and cost savin	gs: Volume	Cost Savings	
Prepared by:			Date:	

218 WATER AUDITS AND LOSS CONTROL PROGRAMS

Name of Was	ter Utility:			Date:		
Leak Detecti	ion Team Members:					
Equipment U	ised:					
Area Surveye	d:	Map F	Reference:			
Street and Bl	ock Numbers:		Page	and Coordinate	8:	
Leak Number	Location or Address of Suspected Leak	Utility or Customer (U or C)	Leak Pinpointed? (Y or N)	Leak to be Rechecked? (Y or N)	Leak Repaired? (Y or N)	Not a Leak (Date)
		Meters	Hydrants	Valvea	Test Rods	Other
Indicate Num Points Used	ber of Manual Listening					
Indicate Num Listening Poin	eer of Leak Noise Logger Its Used					
Miles of Mains	Surveyed	1	Survey	Time		Hours
Number of Les	aks Suspected		To Be Rechecked			(Number)
Number of Leaks Pinpointed			Pinpointing Time			Hours
Remarks						

APPENDIX A 219

Name of Water Utility:	Date:	
Work Order Number: Repair Cr	rew Supervisor:	
LEAK IDENTIFICATION	Map Reference:	
Refer to Leak Discovery Report	Page and Coordinates:	
Discovery Date:	Leak No.:	
Location (include street name and number):		
For Main and Service Connection Pipir	ng Leaks Only	
Sketch a map of the site including:	If Main or Service Leak, Attach Three Photos	
1. Street name.	1. Straight down over leak or damage.	
2. Meter number if applicable.	2. Close-up of leak and damage.	
Mains and hydrants in shutdown area.	3. Any other photo which you feel will help	
 All valves (give valve numbers and show which were closed during repair). 		
 Locate leak to nearest intersection or house with address. Show distances to property lines or street conterlines. 		
Lask Found? (Von Ma)		
Type of Leak		
Meter Leak Main Line Leak	Joint Leak	
Meter Spud Leak Service Connection	Piving Lesk Other Lesk	
-Utility Responsib	Describe	
Meter Toke Leak		
Meter Yoke Leak Customer Respon Curb Stop Leak		
Meter Yoke Leak Customer Respon Curb Stop Leak		
Curb Stop Leak Customer Respon Curb Stop Leak Description of Repair		
Curb Stop Leak Customer Respon Curb Stop Leak Description of Repair Damaged part was:	If replaced, what material was used?	
Curb Stop Leak Customer Respon Curb Stop Leak Description of Repair Damaged part was: Repaired Replaced	If replaced, what material was used?	
Curb Stop LeakCustomer Respon Curb Stop Leak Description of Repair Damaged part was: Repaired Replaced If repaired, what repairs were made?	If replaced, what material was used? Repair Time (from/ro)	
Meter Yoke LeakCustomer Respon Curb Stop Leak Description of Repair Damaged part was: Repaired Replaced If repaired, what repairs were made? Leak Clamp Repacked Valve	If replaced, what material was used? Repair Time (from/to) Crew Size (persone)	
Meter Yoke LeakCustomer Respon Curb Stop Leak Description of Repair Damaged part was: Repaired Replaced If repaired, what repairs were made? Leak Clamp Repacked Valve Welded Repacked Joint	If replaced, what material was used? Repair Time (from/to) Crew Size (persone) Equipment Used for Repair	
Meter Yoke LeakCustomer Respon Curb Stop Leak Description of Repair Damaged part was: Repaired Replaced If repaired, what repairs were made? Leak Clamp Repacked Valve Welded Repacked Joint Other (describe)	If replaced, what material was used? Repair Time (from/to) Crew Size (persone) Equipment Used for Repair Backhoe	
Meter Yoke Leak	If replaced, what material was used? Repair Time (from/vo) Crew Size (persone) Equipment Used for Repair Backhoe Dump truck	
Meter Yoke LeakCustomer Respon Curb Stop Leak Description of Repair Damaged part was: Repaired Replaced If repaired, what repairs were made? Leak Clamp Repacked Valve Welded Repacked Joint Other (describe) Repair Costs:	If replaced, what material was used? Repair Time (from/ro) Crew Size (persone) Equipment Used for Repair Backhoe Dump truck Size of Leak:	
Meter Yoke LeakCustomer Respon Curb Stop Leak Description of Repair Damaged part was: Repaired Replaced If repaired, what repairs were made? Leak Clamp Repacked Valve Welded Repacked Joint Other (describe) Repair Costs: Materials \$ Other \$	If replaced, what material was used? Repair Time (from/to) Crew Size (persone) Equipment Used for Repair Backhoe Dump truck Size of Leak: Measured gpm	
Meter Yoke Leak	If replaced, what material was used? If replaced, what material was used? Repair Time (from/to) Crew Size (persone) Equipment Used for Repair Backhoe Dump truck Size of Leak: Measured gpm Estimated gpm	

220 WATER AUDITS AND LOSS CONTROL PROGRAMS

Description of Damag	e for Mains an	d Services	
What part was damaged:		Type of Break	
Ptpe Barrel 1	Flange nuts,	Split	
	bolts, tie rods	Hole	
Joint Other	(describe)	Circumfere	ntial Split
Valve		Broken Cou	ipling
In your opinion, what caused the damage?		Service Pulled	
		Cracked at	Corporation Stop
Estimated Age of Leak, in month	а	Gasket Blo	wn
How Determined?		Crushed Pij	pe
Escinisted Annual Volume	mul gal	Cracked Be	อบ
Esumated Annual Cost Impact \$		Other (desc	nibe)
Diameter of Main or Laberal, in b	n		
Depth to lop of Pipe, in in.			
Pipe material:	Du dila Inc.	1.57	G P
Galv. iron	Ductue iron	A.C.P.	System Pressure, psi
	Steel	P.v.C. I	How Determined?
Cast iron		Polyoblylene	
Original Thickness	Min Thickness o	f Cood Gray Deter	forstion is on-
ongener meterico.	Metal Remaining		Outside Inst
inches		inches	
Ls there evidence of previous lea general area? Yes	k or repairs in same No	Number of previous lea present:	ak repair clamps -
Last Repair Date (if known)	Cause of L	eak	
In your opinion, should pipe be r	eplaced? Y	es No I	Do not know
If yes, explain extent:			
For Excavations, Indica	ate Ground Co	onditions	
Type of Soil:		Existing Bedding:	Type of Cover.
Rocky	Sandy	Gravel/Sand	Concret
Clay	Hard Pan	Native Soil	Asphalt
Adobe	Loam	Pea Gravel	Soil

Copyrighted material licensed to Spencer Wateritian on 22-Oct-2012 for licensee' is use only. No further reproduction or networking is permitted. Distributed by Thomson Scientific, Inc., www.lectistreet.com

APPENDIX A 221

LEAKA COS	GE MANAGE	EMENT PRO	DGRAM MARY
Name of Water Utility: _		Date:	
Name of Report Preparer	:		
Leak Detection Surv	ey		
Total Number of Days Leak Survey Start Date:	Surveys Were Conducte Survey End Date:	d:	
Number of Me Listening Points:	ters Hydrants	Valves	Test Rods Other
Number of Suspected Leaks	Number	r of Pinpointed Leak	18C
Survey Time: hr	Miles of main surveys	ed:	
Pinpointing Time: h	r		
Average survey	y rate = <u>miles of main</u> total survey and	surveyed × 8 hr/d I pinpointing hours	= mi/d
Total number of visible leaks ing leak detection surveys):	s reported since survey s	tarted, from other s	ources (nor discovered dur-
Total number of visible leak ing leak detection surveys): Leak Repair Survey	s reported since survey s	tarted, from other se	ources (not discovered dur-
Total number of visible leaks ing leak detection surveys): Leak Repair Survey Date of First Leak Repair: _	s reported since survey s	tarted, from other so Last Leak Repair Co	ources (not discovered dur-
Total number of visible leaks ing leak detection surveys): Leak Repair Survey Date of First Leak Repair: Number of Repairs Needing Excavation:	s reported since survey s Date of . Number of Re Needing Exca	tarted, from other so Last Leak Repair Co spairs Not wation:	ources (not discovered dur- ompleted: Total Number of Repaired Leaks:
Total number of visible leaks ing leak detection surveys): Leak Repair Survey Date of First Leak Repair: Number of Repairs Needing Excavation: Total Water Losses From Excavated Leaks: gpm	a reported since survey s Date of : Date of : Number of Re Needing Exca Total Water L Nonexcavated gpm	tarted, from other so Last Leak Repair Co epairs Not vation: Losses From Leaks:	ources (not discovered dur- ompleted: Total Number of Repaired Leaks: Total Water Losses: gpm
Total number of visible leaks ing leak detection surveys): Leak Repair Survey Date of First Leak Repair: Number of Repairs Needing Excavation: Total Water Losses From Excavated Leaks: gpm	s reported since survey s Date of : Date of : Number of Re Needing Exca Total Water L Spm Excavared Leak Repair Costs	Last Leak Repair Co epairs Not vation: Leaks: Nonexcavated Leak Repair Costs	ources (not discovered dur- ompleted: Total Number of Repaired Leaks: Total Warer Losses: gpm Total Repair Costs
Total number of visible leaks ing leak detection surveys): Leak Repair Survey Date of First Leak Repair: Number of Repairs Needing Excavation: Total Water Losses From Excavated Leaks: gpm	a reported since survey s Date of : Date of : Number of Re Needing Exca Total Water L Nonexcavated gpm Excavared Leak Repair Costa	Last Leak Repair Co epairs Not vation: Losses From Leaks: Nonexcavated Leak Repair Costs	ources (not discovered dur- ompleted: Total Number of Repaired Leaks: Total Water Losses: gpm Total Repair Costs
Total number of visible leaks ing leak detection surveys): Leak Repair Survey Date of First Leak Repair: Number of Repairs Needing Excavation: Total Water Losses From Excavated Leaks: gpm Marerials Labor	s reported since survey s Date of . Date of . Number of Re Needing Exca Spm Excavared Leak Spm \$\$	tarted, from other as Last Leak Repair Co spairs Not vation: Leaks: Nonexcavated Leak Repair Costs \$\$	ources (not discovered dur- ompleted: Total Number of Repaired Leaks: Total Warer Losses: gpm Total Repair Costs S
Total number of visible leaks ing leak detection surveys): Leak Repair Survey Date of First Leak Repair: Number of Repairs Needing Excavation: Total Water Losses From Excavated Leaks: gpm Marerials Labor Equipment	s reported since survey s Date of : Number of Re Needing Exca Total Water L Nonexcavated gpm Excavared Leak Repair Costs \$ \$ \$	Last Leak Repair Co epairs Not wation: cosses From Leaks: Nonexcavated Leak Repair Costs \$ \$ \$	ources (not discovered dur- ompleted: Total Number of Repaired Leaks: Total Warer Losses: gpm gpm S
Total number of visible leaks ing leak detection surveys): Leak Repair Survey Date of First Leak Repair: Number of Repairs Needing Excavation: Total Water Losses From Excavated Leaks: gpm Marerials Labor Equipment Other	s reported since survey s Date of Number of Re Needing Exca Total Water I Nonexcavated gpm Excavared Leak Repair Costs \$\$	Last Leak Repair Co pairs Not vation: Leaks: Nonexcavated Leak Repair Costs \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$	ources (not discovered dur- ompleted: Total Number of Repaired Leaks: Total Warer Losses: gpm gpm S S S
Total number of visible leaks ing leak detection surveys): Leak Repair Survey Date of First Leak Repair: Number of Repairs Needing Excavation: Total Water Losses From Excavated Leaks: gpm Marerials Labor Equipment Other Subtotal	s reported since survey s Date of 1 Date of 1 Number of Re Needing Exca Total Water L Nonexcavated 	Last Leak Repair Co pairs Not vation: Leaks: Nonexcavated Leak Repair Costs \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$	ources (not discovered dur- ompleted: Total Number of Repaired Leaks: Total Warer Losses: gpm gpm S S S



OCTOBER 25, 2012

ITEM 2

ATTACHMENT B



OCTOBER 25, 2012

ITEM 2

ATTACHMENT C



Copy of document found at www.NoNewWipTax.com



Copy of document found at www.NoNewWipTax.com

Rubes

A4 FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 28, 2012

www.theadobepress.com

SPEAKING OUT

Leigh Rubin

Letters to the Editor

Maldonado best choice

To the Editor: To the Editor: We are opposite final detection time, and if you care, it is then to make up your mind who is best to expres-sent the Central Cossit. Lois Copposite and on the hand opweighter time ex-plaining to constituents what the breaks are. Abel Maldonado is a local rankier who has been inwhat the beneficia use. Alse had beneficial to be a set wheel invitually overy area of Central Coart pelitics, and is kically arises to rem-merce, as well as the people. The most of the people. The most of the people. The most of the people. The mass of the period and the people. The people of the times, the asymptotic people. The people of the people of the people of the people of the people. The people of the people o

either goulong, or govern-reent stands still. Denorit ment stands still. Thope those who read this thick about whether we need a nice kely or adedi-cated rancher/politician representing the Central Coast repeet Coast

Maldonado's taxing issue

To the Editor: We were disappointed to read Biooks/Firstene X at-tempt to confuse voters about our TV ad, and now wermail set the record



Be aware that water needs of plants (including grass) drop dramatically in the fall as the days get shorter. Over-watering in the fall can lead to plant

- Cooler weather and seasonal rains make It possible to significantly reduce and even stop landscape irrigation.

Lawns need very little irrigation in the winter. At the most apply 3 inch of water every three weeks if there is NO

Now is a good time to make sure your Irrigation system is working properly. Adjust your timer/controller back. Replace the backup battery. Fix all leaks.

Take advantage of cool and wet fail and winter weather to remove water hungry landscapes (lawn) and replace with drought tolerant spectes – see www.slowaterwiselandscaping.com for

locally tailored suggestions and Information

Fall officially begins on September 22 and Nipomo Community Services District offers the following suggestions to help residents lower their water bills:

disease.

rain.

350 10

Waking up In America

To the Editor: You have a chunce to save, our country. Donot be led ostray by someone who does not care for anyone, not the rich, middle chase or the poor. President Ohomm hos gotten rid of a silenated most of the leaders of count-ties that were our allies or filends.

mode of the leaders of example the filter sector allies or the filter sector of the sector of the Dark sector of the dark sector of the sector of the sector of the sector of the dark sector of the s

the our our raining the forever opro-operation with the forever opro-our of the operation of the operation

Library: Continued from A3

bours but those wanting a re-relator those who have large donation should call Kathy at 929-6649. Hensedo not leave your donation on the backgatio at the library.

With the holidayssoon With the bolidaysoon approaching, you may wish to have stight some of the bools the library has avail-able in mits, crafts and other creative activities. For some great blose, check the dia-pay behald the frant deak. Each example basis com-punden book available filled with kloses for checkout. Did you know that the

Harvest:

Continued from A2 Continued loom A2 children hit Nik K3 Zone in Her Bage Spure Park, Ar the ind the Kids Parade that end by Athen annual Lhn-cola Penny Tross. Western, pionere, Gay 'Yos and Vectorian contarmos are encounged, and those who aren't densed appro-priately may find thomselves thrown into the hooggive –

Gadget:

have you hoaked into the tiny world in no time. Site to See

Pipi http://pipil.com/

This clean, concise search rugine will do an extensitive search for anyone. This



orary get oct et and bet the. The Driverstof (he N) gene Library is a nonsprofil organ ization that providers voltu-leer sensities to the library and raiser finds (oradit-tionaltrationistic and the eventhal apparaton of the li-brary. Nauer Goldaco, the Prinnel' publicity chair can be reached internel? acteom or at \$20-523.

unless they're wearing an official Harvest Festival butothers if are vest restrict out ton. Buttons are available for \$1 at stores throughout Ar-royo Grande and will be nabe – including arbit for hoosgow prisonen – at the fest twal.

testival, Buying a numbered but-ton also enters the bearer to a drawing for a variety of prime.

prizes Button sale locations and drawing prize information are available at www.aghnesi lesticombuttons.htm

worki ize gran for anyone with a clear transfer donated and the second second second and the second second second friend angle factor be as young as you think. Baam Bancherg, also Gadet Off the health from the Combal Costing appear moment and fails stears. For each of the second cross the bit lead Stears. For encoder the bit lead Stears. GAD/STURRE, on Tretter GAD/STURRE, on Tretter and Gadget Orthon Reschool.



Combine Both-kitens, some pictured above, and cats are available for adoptional. Novino Dog & Cat Hougast, S25 Savdydele Drive: On a record Sunday, four stalf monities inderind 22 cats in an effort to curb faire overpopulation.

Pet: Continued from A2 Continued kan A2 mail cost to ling h. Sometimes this hardnet to sometimes this hardnet to ory. A couple of weeks ago 1 culled soccame who was ad-werking kit tens con Conjcuist. Holdbare that 1 could high bar get increats apped and mail model. She had a total of 11 bittens, the serving of armito casts 1 citarit get acaliback. (11 bittens to sta

continued havingk iters over the cost year, show will have 20 and it. Recently, base of usagent the good part of a Sunday mediating bases of the Sunday friend might belop produce in the next year. Obviously, my chances of Gaussian (Sunday have for work in Projection Bases) for the Sunday Control of the Sunday Sunday and the Sunday Sunday and the Sunday Sunday and Sunday Sunday and Sunday Sunday and Sunday Sunday and Sunday and Sunday Sunday and Sun

farming of ditions and pup-pies and adopt internation. Indepsping Hyporwards Bias hadp or need help, please context Animasia in Need Rund. By Deway, we have there and other loss digastics that are constant of Neproto Day of Carl Hoppinh, 33 Sandyaka Daise, and Sandi Chantanah in Need, anan-prefit again lasticing for theo and cash. For more information of Animasia in Need, anan-prefit again lasticing for theo and cash. For more information of Neproto Neuronal dogs and cash. For more information OVD-2005 or information of the website of thorondysederbogsist on

fire at to show, versions, lood, the music, youth and teen activities and more. The cost is §25 for presale thickes or \$30 at the door. For more information, contact 025-0051, et at. 260, or www.cartaneshabamin.org. Rallowers party at the Black take Community Room, featuring cost umes and favorite snacks. Bott more timform at lon about the event or men's friendship phab, contact Ed Hendeson, past president, at 929-7297.

The annual Auharan Artis Grapes and Grains Festivel will run from 10 a.m. to 4 p.m. Saturday, Oct. 6, at the Givid Centre. McClelland Street Corridor, 6158. Mc-Gelland St. The festival will include a

The set show, vetalors, lead, be mask, you hand teen The could \$15 for press upon him and the could be 025-009, edi. 200, or wear cartenableshowing The Saria Maria Coinard Ochechica Si Si Si Press The Saria Maria Coinard Callet als Show will be have a stratenableshow will be have the Baria Maria Callet als Show will be have and the show will be have the Baria Maria The show will be have many bit and the show will be have the Baria Maria Callet als Show will be have Maskets could for show and be have and form the Baria Maria Coinard Callet als Show will be have the Baria Charles Maria Coinard Callet als Show will be have the Baria Charles Maria Charles The show will be have the Baria Charles the Show Show and be have show and form the Baria Maria Charles Coinard for the Norme Charles of Commer Norgo films of the or the Show and park-ing artifee. For more have orther bar

Some Indoor Reminders: Weitzel: Fix leaks. A faucet that drips can waste up to 3,280 gallons of water per year. A leaky totlet can waste even more water - stop by District office at 148 South Wilson Street for a free totlet leak check kit. Continued Journ A2

Check your water meter to track water usage. See District website (ncsd.ca.gov) or call District (929-1133) for help. If your shower can fill a one-gallon bucket in less than 20 seconds, replace it with a water efficient showerhead.

Copy of document found at www.NoNewWipTax.com

Replace old tollets with more efficient low flow tollets and save as much as five gallons per flush and flush only when-necessary.

Thanks for doing all you can to protect our precious water resource - Nipomo Community Service District

white government of the second second

Continued from A3