

Final Report Appendices

**WATER AND WASTEWATER
MUNICIPAL SERVICE REVIEW REPORT**

Pass / Mountain Area

Prepared for:

**Riverside Local Agency
Formation Commission**

3850 Vine Street, Suite 110
Riverside, CA 92507-4225

Prepared by:

Dudek and Associates, Inc.

605 Third Street
Encinitas, CA 92024

February 2005

Riverside LAFCO
Water & Wastewater Municipal Service Review

Appendices

Appendix A	Western Riverside Council of Governments Population Chart
Appendix B	Database Reports
Appendix C	Financial Summaries
Appendix D	Federal, State and Local Regulatory Requirements for Water and Wastewater Systems

APPENDIX A
Western Riverside Council of
Governments Population Chart

Riverside LAFCO

Water & Wastewater Municipal Service Review

Western Riverside Council of Governments Population Chart

2000 CENSUS NUMBERS

WRCOG REGION

Population	1,197,618
Housing Units (DU's)	410,125
Pop/DU	2.92

City Totals	Pop	DU's
Banning city	23,443	9,739
Beaumont city	11,315	4,258
Calimesa city	7,371	3,263
Canyon Lake city	10,217	4,174
Hemet city	58,770	29,464
Lake Elsinore city	29,290	9,527
Moreno Valley city	142,548	41,462
Murrieta city	44,350	14,925
Norco city	23,797	6,220
Perris city	36,203	10,502
Riverside city	255,093	86,044
San Jacinto city	23,923	9,435
Temecula city	57,425	19,022
Total	723,745	248,035
Unincorporated County	473,873	162,090

Riverside LAFCO Water & Wastewater Municipal Service Review

City Level Comparison: Prefer Plan, No Project, and Local Input Dataset - Population

Cnty	Sub Fips	County	2000			2010 Population			2030 Population			2030 NP - LI		2030 Plan - NP		2030 Plan - LI	
			Population	Local Input	No Project	Plan	Local Input	No Project	Plan	Local Input	No Project	Plan	Diff	%	Diff	%	Diff
65		Riverside	1,559,544	2,053,764	2,085,484	2,085,500	2,840,431	3,045,350	204,919	7.21%	0	0.00%	204919	7.21%			

Cnty	Sub Fips	Subregion	2000			2010 Population			2030 Population			2030 NP - LI		2030 Plan - NP		2030 Plan - LI	
			Population	Local Input	No Project	Plan	Local Input	No Project	Plan	Local Input	No Project	Plan	Diff	%	Diff	%	Diff
65	3	West Riv. COG	1,205,353	1,591,390	1,614,645	1,614,600	2,172,334	2,329,654	2,329,702	157,320	7.24%	48	0.00%	157368	7.24%		
65	99	Coachella Valley COG	354,191	462,374	470,839	470,800	668,097	715,696	715,648	47,599	7.12%	-48	-0.01%	47551	7.12%		

Cnty	Sub Fips	City	2000			2010 Population			2030 Population			2030 NP - LI		2030 Plan - NP		2030 Plan - LI	
			Population	Local Input	No Project	Plan	Local Input	No Project	Plan	Local Input	No Project	Plan	Diff	%	Diff	%	Diff
WRCOG																	
65	3	3820	23,624	28,649	29,214	29,200	36,560	40,511	46,139	3,951	10.81%	5,627	13.89%	9,579	26.20%		
65	3	4758	11,408	27,599	27,305	27,300	75,000	78,666	90,290	3,666	4.89%	11,624	14.78%	15,290	20.39%		
65	3	9864	7,147	9,598	9,878	9,900	15,598	20,618	22,336	5,020	32.19%	1,718	8.33%	6,738	43.20%		
65	3	10928	9,985	10,848	10,900	10,900	11,324	11,655	11,097	331	2.92%	-558	-4.79%	-227	-2.01%		
65	3	16350	125,814	148,326	148,443	148,400	154,158	156,905	171,095	2,747	1.78%	14,490	9.24%	17,237	11.18%		
65	3	33182	59,008	101,945	105,102	105,100	163,549	178,303	169,636	14,754	9.02%	-8,668	-4.86%	6,087	3.72%		
65	3	39486	29,123	43,291	42,942	42,900	72,086	75,521	71,737	3,435	4.76%	-3,784	-5.01%	-349	-0.48%		
65	3	49270	142,658	166,191	169,902	169,900	196,900	210,883	238,704	13,983	7.10%	27,821	13.19%	41,804	21.23%		
65	3	50076	44,677	81,771	83,815	83,800	129,611	138,879	131,667	9,268	7.15%	-7,212	-5.19%	2,056	1.59%		
65	3	51560	24,208	25,547	26,071	26,100	29,412	32,122	30,239	2,710	9.21%	-1,883	-5.86%	827	2.81%		
65	3	56700	36,303	63,046	63,440	63,400	88,396	92,348	88,682	3,952	4.47%	-3,667	-3.97%	286	0.32%		
65	3	62000	256,363	302,590	307,855	307,500	361,521	388,879	367,489	27,358	7.57%	-21,391	-5.50%	5,968	1.65%		
65	3	67112	23,924	30,438	31,256	31,300	41,720	45,158	42,738	3,438	8.24%	-2,421	-5.36%	1,018	2.44%		
65	3	78120	58,476	81,442	83,509	83,500	99,388	107,356	101,129	7,968	8.02%	-6,226	-5.80%	1,741	1.75%		
65	3	99999	352,635	470,109	475,011	475,000	697,111	751,848	746,424	54,737	7.85%	-5,424	-0.72%	49,313	7.07%		
			1,205,353	1,591,390	1,614,645	1,614,200	2,172,334	2,329,654	2,329,702								

Cnty	Sub Fips	City	2000			2010 Population			2030 Population			2030 NP - LI		2030 Plan - NP		2030 Plan - LI	
			Population	Local Input	No Project	Plan	Local Input	No Project	Plan	Local Input	No Project	Plan	Diff	%	Diff	%	Diff
CVAG																	
65	99	7218	20,428	21,642	21,795	21,795	27,971	31,238	31,006	3,267	11.68%	-232	-0.74%	3,035	10.85%		
65	99	12048	42,898	58,390	59,711	59,711	93,186	100,497	95,399	7,311	7.85%	-5,099	-5.07%	2,213	2.37%		
65	99	14260	22,832	29,479	29,836	29,836	42,012	45,953	49,217	3,941	9.38%	3,264	7.10%	7,205	17.15%		
65	99	18996	16,607	27,115	27,709	27,709	49,115	52,882	53,394	3,767	7.67%	512	0.97%	4,279	8.71%		
65	99	36434	3,878	4,906	5,278	5,278	6,933	7,352	11,065	419	6.04%	3,714	50.51%	4,132	59.60%		
65	99	36448	49,341	62,553	63,915	63,915	89,008	97,394	92,271	8,386	9.42%	-5,124	-5.26%	3,263	3.67%		
65	99	40354	24,150	40,804	41,177	41,177	60,877	60,323	56,866	-554	-0.91%	-3,457	-5.73%	-4,011	-6.59%		
65	99	55184	41,307	52,753	54,599	54,599	62,000	67,379	63,402	5,379	8.68%	-3,978	-5.90%	1,402	2.26%		
65	99	55254	42,893	45,959	46,179	46,179	52,333	53,929	60,840	1,596	3.05%	6,912	12.82%	8,507	16.26%		
65	99	59500	13,357	16,672	17,563	17,563	26,513	30,170	28,675	3,657	13.79%	-1,495	-4.96%	2,162	8.16%		
65	99	99999	76,500	102,101	103,076	103,076	158,149	168,578	173,514	10,429	6.59%	4,936	2.93%	15,365	9.72%		
			354,191	462,374	470,839	470,839	668,097	715,696	715,648								

Riverside LAFCO Water & Wastewater Municipal Service Review

City Level Comparison: Prefer Plan, No Project, and Local Input Dataset - Household

Cnty	Sub Fips	County	2000 Household			2010 Household			2030 Household			2030 NP - LI		2030 Plan - NP		2030 Plan - LI		
			Household	Local Input	No Project	Plan	Household	Local Input	No Project	Plan	Local Input	No Project	Plan	Diff	%	Diff	%	Diff
65		Riverside	509,329	691,467	686,022	686,000	991,727	1,044,514	1,066,459	52,787	5%	21,945	2%	74,732	8%			
Subregion																		
65	3	West Riv. COG	385,956	524,327	521,612	521,600	750,440	792,200	808,168	41,760	6%	15,967	2%	57,728	8%			
65	99	Coachella Valley COG	123,373	167,140	164,410	164,400	241,287	252,314	258,292	11,027	5%	5,978	2%	17,005	7%			
WRCOG																		
Cnty	Sub Fips	City	2000 Household	Local Input	No Project	Plan	Local Input	No Project	Plan	Local Input	No Project	Plan	Diff	%	Diff	%	Diff	%
65	3	Banning city	8,944	11,180	11,140	11,100	15,790	16,677	19,418	887	6%	2,741	16%	3,628	23%			
65	3	Beaumont city	3,887	9,020	8,913	8,900	24,000	24,999	29,334	999	4%	4,335	17%	5,334	22%			
65	3	Calimesa city	2,982	4,200	4,173	4,200	10,076	10,471	11,596	395	4%	1,126	11%	1,520	15%			
65	3	Canyon Lake city	3,657	3,974	3,968	4,000	4,194	4,480	4,286	286	7%	-194	-4%	92	2%			
65	3	Corona city	38,190	44,529	44,427	44,400	46,280	49,433	55,204	3,153	7%	5,771	12%	8,924	19%			
65	3	Hemet city	25,344	45,872	45,448	45,400	75,234	78,996	76,835	3,762	5%	-2,161	-3%	1,601	2%			
65	3	Lake Elsinore city	8,900	12,777	12,704	12,700	21,545	22,664	22,010	1,119	5%	-655	-3%	465	2%			
65	3	Moreno Valley city	39,264	47,447	47,298	47,300	58,295	61,884	71,619	3,589	6%	9,735	16%	13,324	23%			
65	3	Murrieta city	14,503	27,348	27,110	27,100	43,348	45,670	44,265	2,322	5%	-1,405	-3%	917	2%			
65	3	Norco city	6,153	6,845	6,833	6,800	8,553	9,073	8,732	520	6%	-341	-4%	179	2%			
65	3	Perris city	9,685	16,746	16,606	16,600	23,494	24,815	24,362	1,321	6%	-453	-2%	868	4%			
65	3	Riverside city	82,453	99,326	99,044	99,000	125,396	133,003	128,492	7,607	6%	-4,511	-3%	3,096	2%			
65	3	San Jacinto city	8,381	11,098	11,047	11,000	15,686	16,552	16,015	866	6%	-537	-3%	329	2%			
65	3	Temecula city	18,659	26,573	26,432	26,400	33,999	36,053	34,721	2,054	6%	-1,332	-4%	722	2%			
65	3	Unincorporated	114,954	157,392	156,468	156,500	244,550	257,431	261,279	12,881	5%	3,848	1%	16,729	7%			
			385,956	524,327	521,612	521,400	750,440	792,200	808,168									
CVAG																		
65	99	Blythe city	4,103	4,513	4,504	4,504	6,694	7,059	7,014	365	5%	-45	-1%	320	5%			
65	99	Cathedral City city	14,135	19,838	19,718	19,718	32,073	33,751	32,753	1,678	5%	-997	-3%	680	2%			
65	99	Coachella city	4,834	6,316	6,287	6,287	9,733	10,254	11,228	521	5%	974	9%	1,495	15%			
65	99	Desert Hot Springs city	5,860	9,860	9,790	9,790	17,860	18,753	19,356	893	5%	603	3%	1,496	8%			
65	99	Indian Wells city	2,030	4,818	2,901	2,901	5,868	3,894	5,992	-1,974	-34%	2,098	54%	124	2%			
65	99	Indio city	13,952	18,286	18,196	18,196	27,533	29,029	28,116	1,496	5%	-913	-3%	583	2%			
65	99	La Quinta city	8,700	14,573	14,465	14,465	19,024	20,157	19,426	1,133	6%	-731	-4%	402	2%			
65	99	Palm Desert city	19,267	26,080	25,967	25,967	32,000	33,970	32,678	1,970	6%	-1,291	-4%	678	2%			
65	99	Palm Springs city	20,541	22,041	22,023	22,023	25,041	26,681	30,780	1,640	7%	4,100	15%	5,739	23%			
65	99	Rancho Mirage city	6,866	9,232	9,185	9,185	15,610	16,405	15,940	795	5%	-465	-3%	330	2%			
65	99	Unincorporated	23,085	31,583	31,373	31,373	49,851	52,361	55,007	2,510	5%	2,646	5%	5,156	10%			
			123,373	167,140	164,410	164,410	241,287	252,314	258,292									

Riverside LAFCO Water & Wastewater Municipal Service Review

City Level Comparison: Prefer Plan, No Project, and Local Input Dataset - Employment

Cnty	Sub Fips	County	2000		2010 Employment		2030 Employment		2030 NP - LI		2030 Plan - NP		2030 Plan - LI		
			Employment	Local Input	Local Input	No Project	Local Input	No Project	Plan	Diff	%	Diff	%	Diff	%
Riverside			526,546	738,889	727,703	727,700	998,686	1,052,840	1,121,721	56,154	5.63%	68,881	6.54%	125,035	12.55%
Subregion															
65	3	West Riv. COG	388,149	549,367	541,584	541,600	759,968	804,539	856,023	44,571	5.86%	51,484	6.40%	96,055	12.64%
65	99	Coachella Valley COG	138,397	189,522	186,119	186,100	236,718	248,301	265,698	11,583	4.89%	17,397	7.01%	28,980	12.24%
WRCOG															
65	3	Banning city	8,432	11,416	11,217	11,200	14,456	15,281	20,247	825	6%	4,965	32%	5,791	40%
65	3	Beaumont city	6,155	7,813	7,702	7,700	16,000	19,383	25,599	3,383	21%	6,216	32%	9,599	60%
65	3	Calimesa city	1,868	2,323	2,292	2,300	2,779	2,910	3,851	131	5%	941	32%	1,072	39%
65	3	Canyon Lake city	1,987	2,998	2,933	2,900	3,912	4,137	4,160	225	6%	23	1%	248	6%
65	3	Corona city	53,371	73,896	72,529	72,500	87,543	87,808	88,186	265	0%	377	0%	643	1%
65	3	Hemet city	18,105	32,623	31,657	31,700	50,033	53,207	53,627	3,174	6%	419	1%	3,594	7%
65	3	Lake Elsinore city	8,357	11,437	11,231	11,200	14,452	15,255	15,839	803	6%	585	4%	1,387	10%
65	3	Moreno Valley city	33,554	47,331	46,414	46,400	75,318	86,116	86,998	10,798	14%	882	1%	11,680	16%
65	3	Murrieta city	8,447	19,134	18,420	18,400	25,303	25,444	26,462	141	1%	1,018	4%	1,159	5%
65	3	Norco city	8,896	11,959	11,755	11,800	15,035	15,868	16,023	833	6%	155	1%	988	7%
65	3	Perris city	11,716	17,003	16,652	16,700	27,276	29,912	30,170	2,636	10%	259	1%	2,894	11%
65	3	Riverside city	126,681	166,424	163,774	163,800	227,758	234,193	236,079	6,435	3%	1,886	1%	8,321	4%
65	3	San Jacinto city	6,295	8,746	8,585	8,600	10,987	11,562	11,619	575	5%	57	0%	632	6%
65	3	Temecula city	24,354	39,018	38,039	38,000	65,594	73,109	70,901	7,515	11%	-2,208	-3%	5,307	8%
65	3	Unincorporated	69,931	97,246	98,386	98,400	123,522	130,353	166,262	6,831	6%	35,909	28%	42,740	35%
			388,149	549,367	541,584	541,600	759,968	804,539	856,023						
CVAG															
65	99	Blythe city	8,228	9,050	8,992		13,423	15,742	14,862	2,319	17%	-881	-6%	1,439	11%
65	99	Cathedral City city	12,987	23,229	22,547		33,218	35,608	39,374	2,390	7%	3,766	11%	6,156	19%
65	99	Coachella city	6,342	9,528	9,317		12,346	13,030	13,101	684	6%	71	1%	755	6%
65	99	Desert Hot Springs city	5,012	6,861	6,734		8,613	9,071	10,009	458	5%	938	10%	1,396	16%
65	99	Indian Wells city	1,222	4,179	3,984		4,279	3,958	4,344	-321	-8%	386	10%	65	2%
65	99	Indio city	16,118	22,162	21,759		28,352	30,028	30,212	1,676	6%	185	1%	1,860	7%
65	99	La Quinta city	6,700	10,500	10,243		15,200	16,238	17,565	1,038	7%	1,327	8%	2,365	16%
65	99	Palm Desert city	31,312	39,720	39,160		44,000	43,868	48,258	-132	0%	4,390	10%	4,258	10%
65	99	Palm Springs city	32,512	40,821	40,275		48,554	50,640	55,815	2,086	4%	5,175	10%	7,261	15%
65	99	Rancho Mirage city	9,137	11,185	11,049		13,138	13,673	15,067	535	4%	1,394	10%	1,929	15%
65	99	Unincorporated	8,827	12,287	12,059		15,595	16,444	17,090	849	5%	647	4%	1,495	10%
			138,397	189,522	186,119		236,718	248,301	265,698						

APPENDIX B

Database Reports

Riverside LAFCO Water & Wastewater Municipal Service Review

See individual reports

APPENDIX C

Financial Summaries

Riverside LAFCO

Water & Wastewater Municipal Service Review

INTRODUCTION

Appendix C provides a summary of financial information submitted by water and wastewater agencies in response to the Riverside LAFCO Water and Wastewater Municipal Service Review. Information was gathered during August-December 2003. The following provides a list of all agencies in the Municipal Service Review, noting those that did not provide a response to Riverside LAFCO's request for information, were covered in a recent service review, or no longer provide service.

PASS / MOUNTAIN SUBREGION

City of Banning

City of Beaumont

Beaumont Cherry Valley Water District

Cabazon County Water District – *did not provide information*

Eastern Municipal Water District – *included in the Western Region service review*

Fern Valley Water District

High Valleys Water District

Idyllwild Water District

Lake Hemet Municipal Water District – *included in the Western Region service review*

Pine Cove Water District

Pinyon Pines County Water District

Ruisenor Water District – *does not provide any services*

San Geronio Pass Water Agency

Yucaipa Valley Water District

Riverside LAFCO Water & Wastewater Municipal Service Review

District Name: City of Banning				
Financial Summary				
	2001-2002	2002-2003	2003-2004	Bond Summary
Revenues:	\$6,894,572	\$6,896,702	\$7,802,525	Current Bond Rating:
Expenses:	\$6,315,895	\$6,477,423	\$7,076,509	Source:
Capital Improvements:	\$984,640	\$491,876	\$780,000	
Reserves:	\$1,000,000	\$1,050,000	\$1,050,000	
Transfers to General Fund				
Revenue Sources				
Property Taxes:				
Special Taxes:				
Service Charges:				
Fees:	\$1,414,426	\$4,589,629	\$1,499,000	
Assessments:				
Stand-by Charges:				
Grants:				
Other:	\$129,298	\$92,836	\$77,725	
Reserves				
Replacement	\$450,934	\$302,644	\$700,000	
Capital Reserve Fund:	\$1,437,495	\$1,470,466	\$2,513,935	
Operating and Rate Stabilization Fund:	\$200,000	\$250,000	\$250,000	
Restricted Debt Reserves:	\$1,258,200	\$1,254,400	\$1,255,300	
Other Reserves*:				
Total Reserves:	\$3,346,629	\$3,277,510	\$4,719,235	
Total Reserves as % of Total Revenue:	49%	48%	60%	

Riverside LAFCO Water & Wastewater Municipal Service Review

District Name: City of Beaumont				
Financial Summary				
	2001-2002	2002-2003	2003-2004	Bond Summary
Revenues:	\$2,867,000	\$3,338,000	\$3,000,000	Current Bond Rating:
Expenses:	\$1,668,942	\$2,078,000	\$1,950,000	Source:
Capital Improvements:	\$5,000,000	\$5,000,000	\$5,000,000	
Reserves:	\$6,000,000	\$16,000,000	\$10,000,000	
Transfers to General Fund	\$150,000	\$150,000	\$160,000	
Revenue Sources				
Property Taxes:				
Special Taxes:				
Service Charges:				
Fees:	\$2,567,000	\$2,730,000	\$2,700,000	
Assessments:				
Stand-by Charges:	\$300,000	\$300,000	\$300,000	
Grants:				
Other: (interest income)				
Reserves				
Operating Reserves:				
Capital Reserve Fund:				
Operating and Rate Stabilization Fund:				
Restricted Debt Reserves:				
Other Reserves:				
Total Reserves:	\$6,000,000	\$16,000,000	\$10,000,000	
Total Reserves as % of Total Revenue:	209%	479%	333%	

Riverside LAFCO Water & Wastewater Municipal Service Review

District Name: Beaumont Cherry Valley Water District				
Financial Summary				
	2001-2002	2002-2003	2003-2004	Bond Summary
Revenues:	\$3,829,292	\$9,448,935	\$3,148,587	Current Bond Rating:
Expenses:	\$3,829,292	\$9,448,935	\$3,148,587	Source:
Capital Improvements:	\$1,035,064	\$3,795,000	\$3,725,000	
Reserves:	\$385,399	\$384,809	\$521,000	
Transfers to General Fund				
Revenue Sources				
Property Taxes:				
Special Taxes:				
Service Charges:				
Fees:	\$1,048,865	\$6,282,393		
Assessments:				
Stand-by Charges:				
Grants:				
Other:				
Reserves				
Operating Reserves:				
Capital Reserve Fund:	\$1,057,071	\$4,148,573	\$326,000	
Operating and Rate Stabilization Fund:	\$65,407	\$64,817	\$195,000	
Restricted Debt Reserves:				
Other Reserves:				
Total Reserves:	\$1,122,478	\$4,213,390	\$521,000	
Total Reserves as % of Total Revenue:	29%	45%	17%	

Riverside LAFCO Water & Wastewater Municipal Service Review

District Name: Cabazon County Water District				
Financial Summary				
	2001-2002	2002-2003	2003-2004	Bond Summary
Revenues:				Current Bond Rating:
Expenses:				Source:
Capital Improvements:				
Reserves:				
Transfers to General Fund				
Revenue Sources				
Property Taxes:				
Special Taxes:				
Service Charges:				
Fees:				
Assessments:				
Stand-by Charges:				
Grants:				
Other: (interest income)				
Reserves				
Operating Reserves:				
Capital Reserve Fund:				
Operating and Rate Stabilization Fund:				
Restricted Debt Reserves:				
Other Reserves:				
Total Reserves:	\$0	\$0	\$0	
Total Reserves as % of Total Revenue:				

Agency did not provide information for the service review.

Riverside LAFCO Water & Wastewater Municipal Service Review

District Name: Fern Valley Water District				
Financial Summary				
	2001-2002	2002-2003	2003-2004	Bond Summary
Revenues:	\$787,777	\$696,033	\$672,550	Current Bond Rating:
Expenses:	\$691,989	\$549,761	\$760,760	Source:
Capital Improvements:	\$558,850	\$231,800	\$236,066	
Reserves:	\$1,993,735	\$1,267,318	\$1,179,108	
Transfers to General Fund				
Revenue Sources				
Property Taxes:	\$359,590	\$364,980	\$325,000	
Special Taxes:				
Service Charges:				
Fees:	\$345,073	\$297,995	\$300,000	
Assessments:	\$24,377	\$21,849	\$2,550	
Stand-by Charges:				
Grants:				
*Other:	\$83,113	\$31,902	\$25,000	
Reserves				
Replacement				
Capital Reserve Fund:				
Operating and Rate Stabilization Fund:				
Restricted Debt Reserves:				
Other Reserves:				
Total Reserves:	\$1,993,735	\$1,267,318	\$1,179,108	
Total Reserves as % of Total Revenue:	2.53083677	182%	175%	

Riverside LAFCO Water & Wastewater Municipal Service Review

District Name: High Valleys Water District				
Financial Summary				
	2001-2002	2002-2003	2003-2004	Bond Summary
Revenues:	\$412,998	\$459,980	\$513,600	Current Bond Rating:
Expenses:	\$332,786	\$454,348	\$448,045	Source:
Capital Improvements:	\$0	\$0	\$0	
Reserves:	\$143,518	\$139,774	\$101,029	
Transfers to General Fund				
Revenue Sources				
Property Taxes:	\$318,179	\$309,620	\$281,000	
Special Taxes:				
Service Charges:				
Fees:				
Assessments:				
Stand-by Charges:		\$87,991	\$87,991	
Grants:				
Other: (interest income)				
Reserves				
Operating Reserves:				
Capital Reserve Fund:				
Operating and Rate Stabilization Fund:	\$118,237	\$121,339	\$82,914	
Restricted Debt Reserves:	\$25,281	\$18,416	\$18,116	
Other Reserves:				
Total Reserves:	\$143,518	\$139,755	\$101,030	
Total Reserves as % of Total Revenue:	35%	30%	20%	

Riverside LAFCO Water & Wastewater Municipal Service Review

District Name: Idyllwild Water District				
Financial Summary				
	2001-2002	2002-2003	2003-2004	Bond Summary
Revenues:	\$1,523,843	\$1,378,751	\$1,392,240	Current Bond Rating:
Expenses:	\$1,111,761	\$1,117,419	\$1,091,050	Source:
Capital Improvements:	\$314,370	\$233,720	\$587,200	
Reserves:	\$1,693,803	\$1,671,301	\$1,713,225	
Transfers to General Fund				
Revenue Sources				
Property Taxes:	\$250,592	\$255,139	\$253,000	
Special Taxes:	\$48,313	\$577	\$48,000	
Service Charges:				
Fees:	\$1,023,724	\$927,981	\$957,400	
Assessments:	\$68,013	\$32,235	\$28,460	
Stand-by Charges:				
Grants:	\$102,008	\$75,952	\$648	
Other: (interest income)	\$0	\$0	\$0	
Reserves				
Replacement	\$502,027	\$535,138	\$575,206	
Capital Reserve Fund:				
Operating and Rate Stabilization Fund:				
Restricted Debt Reserves:	\$1,191,776	\$1,136,163	\$1,138,019	
Other Reserves:				
Total Reserves:	\$1,693,803	\$1,671,301	\$1,713,225	
Total Reserves as % of Total Revenue:	111%	121%	123%	

Riverside LAFCO Water & Wastewater Municipal Service Review

District Name: Pine Cove Water District				
Financial Summary				
	2001-2002	2002-2003	2003-2004	Bond Summary
Revenues:	\$517,932	\$539,601	\$643,000	Current Bond Rating:
Expenses:	\$491,071	\$535,814	\$643,000	Source:
Capital Improvements:				
Reserves:	\$200,000	\$200,000	\$220,000	
Transfers to General Fund				
Revenue Sources				
Property Taxes:	\$87,946	\$90,000	\$95,000	
Special Taxes:				
Service Charges:				
Fees:				
Assessments:	\$28,282	\$29,019	\$27,000	
Stand-by Charges:				
Grants:				
Other:	\$69,050	\$87,061	\$85,000	
Reserves				
Replacement				
Capital Reserve Fund:				
Operating and Rate Stabilization Fund:				
Restricted Debt Reserves:				
Other Reserves:				
Total Reserves:	\$200,000	\$200,000	\$220,000	
Total Reserves as % of Total Revenue:	39%	37%	34%	

Riverside LAFCO Water & Wastewater Municipal Service Review

District Name: Pinyon Pines County Water District				
Financial Summary				
	2001-2002	2002-2003	2003-2004	Bond Summary
Revenues:	\$31,977	\$39,395	\$37,800	Current Bond Rating:
Expenses:	\$39,627	\$34,798	\$46,070	Source:
Capital Improvements:	\$3,000	\$3,000	\$6,600	
Reserves:	\$1,609	\$8,520	\$17,750	
Transfers to General Fund				
Revenue Sources				
Property Taxes:				
Special Taxes:				
Service Charges:				
Fees:	\$26,130	\$32,543	\$37,800	
Assessments:				
Stand-by Charges:	\$5,813	\$6,795	\$5,800	
Grants:				
Other: (interest income)				
Reserves				
Operating Reserves:	\$3,000	\$3,000	\$3,000	
Capital Reserve Fund:		\$0	\$3,600	
Operating and Rate Stabilization Fund:	\$1,609	\$8,520	\$17,750	
Restricted Debt Reserves:				
Other Reserves:				
Total Reserves:	\$4,609	\$11,520	\$24,350	
Total Reserves as % of Total Revenue:	14%	29%	64%	

Riverside LAFCO Water & Wastewater Municipal Service Review

District Name: Ruisenor Water District				
Financial Summary				
	2001-2002	2002-2003	2003-2004	Bond Summary
Revenues:				Current Bond Rating:
Expenses:				Source:
Capital Improvements:				
Reserves:				
Transfers to General Fund				
Revenue Sources				
Property Taxes:				
Special Taxes:				
Service Charges:				
Fees:				
Assessments:				
Stand-by Charges:				
Grants:				
Other: (interest income)				
Reserves				
Operating Reserves:				
Capital Reserve Fund:				
Operating and Rate Stabilization Fund:				
Restricted Debt Reserves:				
Other Reserves:				
Total Reserves:	\$0	\$0	\$0	
Total Reserves as % of Total Revenue:				

Agency does not provide services.

Riverside LAFCO Water & Wastewater Municipal Service Review

District Name: San Gorgonio Pass Water Agency				
Financial Summary				
	2001-2002	2002-2003	2003-2004	Bond Summary
Revenues:		\$5,674,000		Current Bond Rating:
Expenses:		\$4,513,000		Source:
Capital Improvements:		\$3,500,000		
Reserves:		\$3,017,000		
Transfers to General Fund				
Revenue Sources				
Property Taxes:		\$5,674,000		
Special Taxes:				
Service Charges:				
Fees:				
Assessments:				
Stand-by Charges:				
Grants:				
Other: (interest income)				
Reserves				
Operating Reserves:				
Capital Reserve Fund:				
Operating and Rate Stabilization Fund:				
Restricted Debt Reserves:				
Other Reserves:				
Total Reserves:	\$0	\$3,017,000	\$0	
Total Reserves as % of Total Revenue:		53%		

Riverside LAFCO Water & Wastewater Municipal Service Review

District Name: Yucaipa Valley Water District				
Financial Summary				
	2001-2002	2002-2003	2003-2004	Bond Summary
Revenues:		\$12,129,273		Current Bond Rating:
Expenses:		\$10,642,864		Source:
Capital Improvements:		\$7,800,421		
Reserves:		\$1,250,000		
Transfers to General Fund				
Revenue Sources				
Property Taxes:				
Special Taxes:				
Service Charges:				
Fees:				
Assessments:				
Stand-by Charges:				
Grants:				
Other: (interest income)				
Reserves				
Operating Reserves:				
Capital Reserve Fund:				
Operating and Rate Stabilization Fund:				
Restricted Debt Reserves:				
Other Reserves:				
Total Reserves:	\$0	\$1,250,000	\$0	
Total Reserves as % of Total Revenue:		10%		

APPENDIX D
Federal, State and Local Regulatory
Requirements for Water and
Wastewater Systems

Riverside LAFCO

Water & Wastewater Municipal Service Review

FEDERAL, STATE AND LOCAL REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS

Appendix D provides a brief overview of the current regulations for water and wastewater systems and is intended to provide basic information for those who may be unfamiliar with the complex and detailed regulatory requirements.

Numerous federal, state and local laws and agencies regulate water and wastewater. Some of the state and regional plans and policies build upon the federal legislation. In other instances, federal acts have established broad goals, which are to be achieved through implementation at the state and/or local levels. Finally, there are some regulations that are unique to California. There can be considerable and confusing overlap among the agencies, regulations and associated acronyms. The following discussion identifies a few of the major federal, state and local regulatory bodies and requirements for both water and wastewater programs.

Federal Laws and Regulations

The Clean Water Act (CWA), enacted in 1972, and the Safe Drinking Water Act (SDWA), enacted in 1974, are the two major federal laws that regulate the nation's water resources. A brief overview of relevant portions of the CWA is provided below:

❖ FEDERAL WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ACT OF 1972 (CLEAN WATER ACT OR CWA)

The CWA, with its amendments, is the principal law governing the nation's streams, lakes, and estuaries. It contains regulatory provisions that impose progressively more stringent requirements on industries and cities to reduce pollution and meet the goal of zero discharge of pollutants.

The CWA established as national goals the elimination of pollutant discharges to the navigable waters and the assurance that all navigable waters would be fishable and swimmable. It also established the following regulatory standards:

- No one has the right to pollute the navigable waters of the United States. Dischargers are required to obtain permits.
- Permits shall set limits on the concentration of the pollutants being discharged. A violation of the limits carries a penalty of fines or imprisonment.
- The best technology available shall be used to control the discharge of pollutants.

Other applicable sections of the CWA include:

Riverside LAFCO

Water & Wastewater Municipal Service Review

1. Section 303(d) – Impaired Waters List and Total Maximum Daily Loads
2. Section 303 (c) (2) (B) - National Toxics Rule
3. Section 319 – Non-point Source Management Program
4. Section 401 – State Water Quality Certification Program
5. Section 402 (p) – The National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System
6. Section 404 – Permits for Dredged or Fill Materials

❖ CWA SECTION 303(D) – IMPAIRED WATERS LIST AND TOTAL MAXIMUM DAILY LOADS

This requires each state to identify waters that do not meet water quality standards after application of technologically based controls. Applicable water quality standards include designated beneficial uses and adopted water quality objectives. Waterways are identified as designated Water Quality Limited Segments (WQLSs) and are prioritized for purposes of developing Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs) and establishing Waste Load Allocations (WLAs) as well as Load Allocations (LAs). The TMDL is the sum of waste load allocations (WLAs) for point sources of pollution, load allocations (LAs) for non-point sources of pollution and natural background sources. Essentially the TMDL is the amount of a pollutant that can be discharged into a water body and still maintain water quality standards.

❖ CWA SECTION 303(C)(2)(B) – NATIONAL TOXICS RULE

In November 1991, EPA proposed chemical specific, numeric criteria for priority toxic pollutants, including dioxin and pentachlorophenol, necessary to bring all states into compliance with the requirements of section 303(c)(2)(B) of the Clean Water Act. The requirement is known as the “National Toxics Rule”. Implementation of the NTR lagged for several years due to court challenges on the human health criteria for dioxin and pentachlorophenol but is now in effect. In 2000, the California SWRCB adopted a policy for implementation of the NTR. That policy established implementation procedures for three categories of priority pollutant criteria or water quality objectives. These are priority pollutant: **(1)** criteria promulgated by EPA as noted in the NTR that apply in California; **(2)** criteria proposed by EPA in the California Toxics Rule; and **(3)** water quality objectives contained in Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) water quality control plans (basin plans).

❖ CWA SECTION 319 – NON-POINT SOURCE MANAGEMENT PROGRAM

Section 319 regulates non-point source pollutants, which enter water from diffuse sources. Non-point source pollutants are often chemicals from lawns, automobile residues or urban runoff that enter the wastewater stream and water supply in large quantities and sudden surges, largely due to storms. Although California adopted a Non-point Source Management Plan

Riverside LAFCO

Water & Wastewater Municipal Service Review

(NPSMP) in 1988, cities and counties have only recently begun adopting local implementing rules and regulations. Control of this type of pollution has proven to be difficult and is expected to require costly upgrades in existing facilities and permit costs, particularly for wastewater facilities with high rates of infiltration.

❖ CWA SECTION 401 – STATE WATER QUALITY CERTIFICATION PROGRAM

Prior to the issuance of federal CWA permits, the State Water Resources Control Board, through the regional boards, certifies the quality of surface waters pursuant to Section 401 of the Clean Water Act. Section 401 requires that activities/facilities discharging pollutants into waters must obtain a state water quality certification permit proving that the activity complies with all applicable water quality standards, limitations, and restrictions.

❖ CWA SECTION 402 – NATIONAL POLLUTANT DISCHARGE ELIMINATION SYSTEM (NPDES)

Municipalities, Publicly Owned Treatment Works (POTWs), and most industries in the United States are now required to obtain an NPDES permit for discharges, including storm water runoff. NPDES permits regulate discharge of “pollutants from point sources to waters of the United States” to ensure that the discharges do not adversely affect surface water quality or beneficial uses. NPDES permits are authorized by Section 402 of the Clean Water Act and Section 13370 of the California Water Code and the California Code of Regulations, Title 23, Chapters 3 and 4. The responsibility for issuing NPDES permits in California has been delegated to the regional water quality control boards, subject to review and approval by the Regional Administrator (US EPA Region IX, San Francisco).

❖ CWA SECTION 404 – PERMITS FOR DREDGED OR FILL MATERIALS

Clean Water Act Section 404 permits are issued for the placement of dredged or fill materials into water including wetlands. The Section 404 permitting process is designed to ensure that the chemical, physical, and biological functions of the waters are protected. It includes mandatory measures to avoid, minimize, and mitigate impacts. The Section 404 permitting process is administered by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

❖ COASTAL ZONE ACT: REAUTHORIZATION AMENDMENTS (CZARA) SECTION 6217 (G)

The US EPA has identified measures to protect coastal waters from non-point source pollutants from agriculture. Specifically, the measures address erosion from cropland, application of nutrients/pesticides, confined animal facilities, grazing land, and cropland irrigation.

Riverside LAFCO

Water & Wastewater Municipal Service Review

❖ SAFE DRINKING WATER ACT OF 1974 (SDWA)

The SDWA required the EPA to identify potentially harmful contaminants in drinking water and to specify a maximum contaminant level for each contaminant. Water supply systems must meet these standards by using the best technology that is economical, available and technologically feasible.

The SDWA was amended in 1996 to require states to identify potential contamination threats and determine the security of drinking water sources. The amendment also required that qualified professionals operate water systems although California had already established a certification program. Other requirements include the following:

❖ CONSUMER CONFIDENCE REPORTS

Since 1999, public water systems must provide their customers with an annual water quality report providing data about the quality of the local drinking water, compliance with EPA's safety standards, sources of any contaminants, and potential health risks. The annual reports are included with water bills for systems with more than 10,000 customers; for smaller systems the information can be posted at a central location or published in local newspapers.

❖ WATER CONSERVATION PLANS

In 1998, the EPA issued guidelines for water conservation plans for public water systems. Now states may require a water system to submit a water conservation plan consistent with the EPA guidelines as a condition of receiving a loan.

❖ GROUNDWATER STANDARDS

Most Americans rely on groundwater as their source of drinking water and tap water and several SDWA rules regulate groundwater protection. It protects underground sources of drinking water under the Underground Injection Control (UIC) program.

❖ PROPOSED ARSENIC STANDARD

The EPA established the maximum allowable limit for arsenic in drinking water from 50 parts per billion (ppb) down to 5 ppb. Arsenic can produce a variety of health-related problems, including cancer, cardiovascular disease, neurological damage, and diabetes. Many water supplies in California are significantly higher than the 5 ppb level and would not meet the proposed standard without additional (and possibly very costly) treatment.

Riverside LAFCO

Water & Wastewater Municipal Service Review

❖ BIO-TERRORISM PREPAREDNESS AND RESPONSE ACT

Of concern to water and wastewater systems are security issues resulting from the adoption of the Bio-Terrorism Preparedness and Response Act. This Act requires every community water system that serves a population of greater than 3,300 persons to conduct a vulnerability assessment, certify and submit a copy of the assessment to EPA, prepare or revise an emergency response plan that incorporates the results of the vulnerability assessment and certify to EPA, within 6 months of completing the vulnerability assessment, that the system has completed or updated their emergency response plan. The basic elements of a vulnerability assessment include a characterization of the water system (i.e. mission and objectives); identification of avoidable adverse consequences; determination of critical assets that might be subject to terrorism; assessment of the probability of acts of terrorism occurring; evaluation of existing countermeasures; and development of a plan for reducing risks.

2.2.2 California Laws and Regulations

❖ PORTER-COLOGNE WATER QUALITY CONTROL ACT OF 1970

The California Water Code (CWC) is the principal state regulation governing the use of water resources within the State of California. This law controls water rights, the construction and management of dams and reservoirs, flood control, conservation, development and utilization of state water resources, water quality protection and management, and management of water-oriented agencies. The water quality provisions set forth in the CWC have been written to supplement provisions of the Health and Safety Code, Public Resources Code, Fish and Game Code, Food and Agriculture Code, Government Code, Harbors and Navigation Code, California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and California Endangered Species Act.

Division 7 of the CWC, the Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act of 1970, California 13000 to 14958, regulates water quality and pollution issues within California by protecting water quality and beneficial uses of all state waters. The Porter-Cologne Act is administered regionally by the State Water Resources Control Board and California Regional Water Quality Control Boards (RWQCB). While administration occurs at a regional level, regulations are promulgated on a statewide level to provide consistency. Aspects of the Porter-Cologne Act are similar to federal water quality regulations and programs.

The SWRCB and regional offices have broad powers and implement the CWA through the adoption of plans and policies, the regulation of discharges, the regulation of waste disposal sites and the cleanup of hazardous materials and other pollutants. It also requires reporting of unintended discharges of any hazardous substance, sewage, or oil/petroleum product.

Riverside LAFCO

Water & Wastewater Municipal Service Review

❖ URBAN WATER MANAGEMENT PLANNING ACT (1983)

As part of the CWC, all urban water suppliers of more than 3,000 customers or delivering more than 3,000 AF of water each year within California are required to prepare urban water management plans (UWMP) and update them every five years. The UWMP must include five-year comparisons of projected water use to projected water supply using single and multiple dry water conditions as well as a detailed recycled water analysis based on an assessment of wastewater capacity.. Most Riverside County agencies required to have UWMP completed them in 2000 and will be required to prepare an update in 2005.

The law requiring UWMP has been amended by recent legislation. Senate Bill (SB) 221 {Kuehl} requires that water agencies verify that a sufficient water supply is available prior to completion of any land development with 500 or more homes. SB 610 {Costa} amended the code and now agencies using groundwater must include specific information in the UWMP.

❖ PROPOSITION 65

California's Safe Drinking Water Act, Proposition 65, regulates water facilities with 10 or more employees that manufacture, package, or operate in California or sell products in California. The Act prohibits these facilities from deliberately discharging listed chemicals into sources of drinking water.

❖ CAL-FED WATER PROGRAM

The Cal-Fed is a multi-agency cooperative water program that was created to address water issues and disputes in the State of California. Program participants include a wide range of special interests.

❖ CALIFORNIA TOXICS RULE

Of particular concern to wastewater providers, the EPA recently promulgated numeric water quality criteria for priority toxic pollutants and other water quality standards for waters in California pursuant to section 303(c)(2)(B) of the CWA if those pollutants could be reasonably expected to interfere with the designated uses of state waters. Although California had adopted numeric criteria for priority toxic pollutants in 1992, the courts ordered California to rescind these water quality control plans in 1994 and the new water quality criteria rule, known as the California Toxics Rule (CTR), temporarily replaced the standards adopted in 1991. The CTR established ambient aquatic life criteria for 23 priority toxics, ambient human health criteria for 57 priority toxics, and a compliance schedule provision.